The Social Spatial Segregation in the Cities of Latin America

Francisco Sabatini

Inter-American Development Bank
Sustainable Development Department
Social Programs Division

Dr. Francesco Sabatini is Profesor at the Institute of Urban Studies of the Catholic University of Chile. He holds a Ph.D in Urban Planning from the University of California, Los Angeles, a degree in Sociology and a Master in Urban Development from the Catholic University of Chile

Presentation

The cities offer Latin America and the Caribbean their best opportunity for economic and social development. Aside from concentrating on more than two thirds of the population, it is estimated that urban activities will generate more than 75% of the expected growth of the Gross Domestic Product in the next two decades. Therefore, in order to improve the competitiveness of economic activities in national and global markets, it is necessary to not only maintain healthy economic policies and eliminate commerce barriers, but also to improve the cities' abilities to provide an efficient platform to support the establishment and development of many types of companies. Adequate provision of infrastructure and good living conditions, factors attracting skilled labor and industrialists to the cities, are crucial initiatives of local economic development, yet they are not sufficient. Access to well-paying jobs and good urban services are critical in order to increase the populations' opportunities to live according to their desires and values. Yet, true social development will not occur unless concrete measures are taken to remove other barriers, including spatial segregation of the poorest households and ethnic or cultural discrimination. Social inclusion and economic development are equally important in reducing violence and other antisocial behaviors. In summary, a more inclusive city is a more productive city, encouraging growing markets for local products and services, thus contributing to the acceleration of economic growth.

This document analyzes the first of the barriers mentioned above, spatial segregation of the poorest households. It discusses the characteristics and trends of residential segregation in the cities of Latin America, its causes and consequences, the state of research in this field and the policies that could control spatial segregation. The document emphasizes the fact that segregation is a complex phenomenon with some positive dimensions from the perspective of the social policies, as it could help improve their targeting and efficiency. The negative dimensions of the phenomenon are also identified, such as social stigmatization of the low-income or minority-occupied neighborhoods. These considerations are important in the implementation of one of the central proposals of the Bank's Social Development Strategy, which advocates the coordination of policies and programs in the territory.[1]

I hope the publication of this study helps disseminate the available knowledge of this phenomenon to public policy managers and Bank staff, contributing to improve the design and execution of territorially centered social development policies and programs.

Eduardo Rojas
Principal Urban Development Specialist
Social Development Division
Sustainable Development Department

[1] I.A.D.B., "Social Development. Strategy Document," Washington, DC, 2003.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Characteristics and Trends of Segregation 3

Definitions and Precisions of Approach 7

Popular Explanations of Segregation 12

Impacts 18

Policy to Control Segregation and its Relation to the
Territorial Strategy of Social Program Coordination 23

Annex
The Latin American Segregation Paradigm 33

References 37

Introduction

This report discusses the characteristics and trends of residential segregation in the cities of Latin America, the causes and consequences, the status of the research within this field and the policies that would control segregation. As the report concludes, there is a discussion of the possible implications of the Inter-American Development Bank's (I.A.D.B.) continual efforts in targeting and improving the efficiency of the urban social policies.

One of the three goals of the Bank's new Social Development Strategy is the territorially integration of the provision of social services. One must consider the fact that since 1994, the Bank allocates 50 percent of its resources to the poor. For this reason, the Strategy has as much importance for the Bank as for the countries of the Region.

Questioning the relevancy of segregation is particularly adequate considering how segregated Latin American cities are. Nevertheless, linking the strategy of targeting and social policy effectiveness with the reality of our segregated cities provokes yet another question that we should not ignore: Are we implying that the spatial segregation of the poor urban communities, a fact unanimously condemned, could help a strategy oriented at improving social policies? The segregated locations of the poor would favor the strategy to territorially integrate the provision of social services. Wouldn't this be a contradiction?

Most of the Latin American researchers and urban specialists would reject the idea that Government aims "to take advantage of" segregation of the poor people in order to make the social programs more targeted and efficient. This is not only concerning moral repairs. Likewise, critics would call attention to the politics of a government's implicit legitimization of segregating the poor through this type of action. This will amount to an acceptance of the noticeable social inequalities, a fundamental cause of the existing spatial segregation in the cities.

However, the conclusion of the present document is different. Segregation is a complex phenomenon with a clearly positive dimension: the spatial concentration of the studied social group, which could help to improve the targeting and efficiency of the social policies. Complementarily, the most negative dimensions of the phenomenon, specifically the configuration of neighborhoods and socially homogenous areas and their social stigmas, are the least helpful in the territorial targeting strategy of social policies. On the other hand, this report concludes by emphasizing the general contribution that the social policies can make by controlling segregation, beyond specific strategies of territorial coordination.

The first chapter of this report focuses on the characterization of the phenomenon of urban residential segregation in Latin America, based on available studies and in our own research efforts. We will describe the traditional pattern of segregation in Latin American cities and its most recent trends. We will emphasize familiar aspects, for example; the strong spatial concentration of the upper and growing middle classes and the concentration of the poor as well as other generally avoided socially diverse groups present in the affluent areas of our cities. Amidst these trends, we will emphasize the modification of the traditional pattern of segregation recognized in most recent decades.

The second chapter contains a composed definition of segregation and various precisions concerning approach and methodologies. The definition highlights different objective aspects of segregation, which are important in deciphering their distinct practical implications. In addition, we will emphasize the relevance of the subjective characteristics of segregation. The formation of territorial stigmas, as much by society as by the poor people themselves, has significantly negative implications. Finally, among the precisions of method and approach, we will discuss the nature of the segregation process, considering the positive as well as the negative consequences, and the

importance of the geographic scale of the location and the method of measurement.

In the third chapter, we critically analyze the predominant approaches to the urban residential segregation in Latin America. We will review, with particular concern, a series of statements and perspectives of the causes of the phenomenon that we consider incorrect. Specifically, we will attempt to reject the virtual "demonization" that has been associated with segregation, creating a more balanced and practical vision, favorable to policy design. This balance, as well as the pragmatic approach, is strengthened when emphasizing that this is a phenomenon rather than a problem, and by stressing its changing character as a process. In one annex, we include a more detailed critique of segregation through an analysis of the most popular approach in Latin America. We consider it significantly detrimental to the advancement of public policy in issues of urban residential segregation.

The fourth chapter focuses on the impacts on the quality of life and the perpetuation of poverty. We will emphasize the effects of social disintegration caused by spatial segregation, in a context defined by economic liberalization and other changes associated with the "globalization" of our economies. We will demonstrate that in past decades, spatial segregation of the poor, having both negative and positive effects, has been deprived of the latter and faces a worsening of its negative consequences.

In the fifth chapter, we propose policy measures designed to neutralize the worst effects of segregation, while at the same time aiming to take advantage of the positive impacts of the territorial coordination of social services, which can emerge from distinct situations and geographic scales of segregation. Segregation is not bad per se, as we would have argued in previous chapters. The policies and measures proposed guide the process of segregation towards solutions with positive impacts on the poor and the social policies benefiting them. We will emphasize the importance of adopting a mixed strategy of spatial interventions, such as the reduction of the scale of segregation and, in special cases, the dispersion of the poor, mixed with other social policies. Additionally, we will focus on those strategies helping to improve the accessibility and mobility of the poor within the boundaries of each city, and other strategies that incite greater possibilities of interaction within the different social groups.

The character of this report is strongly influenced by the limited empirical research on residential segregation in Latin American cities. On one hand, the studies that put the hypothesis to the test are scarce, a basic requirement of scientific research. On the other hand, currently there are no statistical series or comparable measurements between cities, except maybe the most recent case in Brazil.

Nevertheless, the research of the subject of residential segregation through statistical studies has intrinsic limitations, which justifies different approaches, such as the present, in which the empiric-qualitative analysis and the conceptual interpretation reinforce themselves. The statistics used in developing countries, and especially in the United States, which has the greatest tradition and sophistication in segregation measurement, show serious methodological and theoretical limitations. For example, it is worth noting that the dissimilarity index, vastly utilized internationally due to its simplicity, measures a dimension of segregation that proves to be the most positive of the phenomenon. Larger dissimilarity indexes do not necessarily represent a negative factor.

Along with these, we will argue that the we can not solve the needed advancement required in the segregation analysis in Latin America though added data and applications of quantitative methods, but mainly through empirical research that allows us to surpass the overly simplistic visions by which we have interpreted the reality of our cities.

Characteristics and Trends of Segregation

Throughout most of the 20th century, the cities of Latin America exhibited a pattern of residential segregation similar to the European "compact city" model. The groups higher on the social scale were concentrated in the central area, containing also the best quality of construction and architecture.

The cities decay, socially and physically, towards the periphery, with the exception of the geographic area in which a sort of cone of "modern" city formed during the 20th century. Examples of such geographically influenced construction are residential and commercial neighborhoods occupied by high-income and rapidly ascending groups. In this aspect, the Latin American city does not differ much from the Continental-European Mediterranean city. Paris, like many cities of the old continent, has a concentrated cone of families with higher income that have settled in a defined geographic area - in this case, towards the West. Perhaps the most notable difference between the Latin American upper class and their European counterparts is the faster pace at which they have deserted the center of the cities.

An alternative model of a capitalistic city is that of the Anglo-American suburbs. There, the upper class, inspired by an anti-urban ideology of protestant origins, occupied the periphery of the cities, while the lower class individuals populated the central areas.

The suburbanization of the urban upper class was a process initiated as early as the middle of the 20th century. In London, a pioneering city of this urban revolution, suburbs emerged, even when the technology of transportation (carriages) was rather precarious. The evolution of the train, the streetcar and, much later, the automobile, would facilitate the development of the suburb, having a significant impact on the United States.

The model of the compact city does not always appear in pure form in Latin America. There are at least three explanations:

- The degree and historical period in which the upper class have left the center of each city, similar to the degree of concentration of these groups in a particular area of urban growth, varies from city to city. For example, in Bogotá the degree of spatial concentration of the upper class is greater than in Mexico City; and in Lima, the upper class left the central areas many decades before their counterparts in Santo Domingo.
- The influence of the cultural pattern of the suburban city has affected our continent, as we explain later in the presentation, much more in the adoption of architectural fashions and urban styles than in the identity formation and consolidation of the social group present in the suburban movement in the countries of origin.
- Due to the importance of the European colonization in the formation of the urban systems, most of the cities of Latin America were constructed along the coast or a river, introducing random geographic factors having an influence on the urban form and moving away the authentic model cities.

TRADITIONAL PATTERN OF SEGREGATION

We can summarize the "traditional" pattern of Latin American segregation as having the characteristics listed below. After this enumeration, we will see that the economic reform and political changes occurring around the beginning of the 1980s encouraged altercations to this pattern. The characteristics are:

- The significant spatial concentration of upper class groups and the ascending middle classes to an extreme in only one zone of the city, with its apex in the historical center, and a clear direction of expansion towards the periphery (referred to as the "high-income neighborhood").
- The conformation of ample housing areas for the poor, mainly in distant and poorly serviced peripheral areas, but also in deteriorated sectors close to the city-center.

- The significant social diversity of the "high-income neighborhoods", where, along with virtually all of the upper class, certain middle and low class groups live, with the important exception of "laborers," "informal dwellers" or "marginalized groups," as they have dominated the poorest groups in different periods.

The first two characteristics are amply recognized in the specialized literature, even amongst authors outside of the Region (an example of a recent text is by Meyer and Bähr, 2001). However, this is not true concerning the third characteristic, which is generally ignored.

Concerning the final characteristic, the social diversity of the "high-rent neighborhoods," it is important to contrast the situation of segregation in Latin American cities with cities in the United States. In the US, suburbs tend to be more homogenous in social terms. In fact, a community generally consists of a neighbors' association that, working openly or implicitly with the local municipality, resort to a series of legal and formal measures to exclude the lower class (with restrictions on building height, minimum lot size, specification of architectural typology etc.). The homogeneity is clear in racial terms: on average a white resident of a metropolitan area of the United States lives in census tracks where 83 percent of the population is white, whereas the typical black resident lives in census tracks where only 54 percent population is black (Briggs, 2001 based on the census data through the year 2000). The extreme social diversity in areas of discriminated groups, especially Afro-Americans, is expressed in the fact that the denomination of "*ghettos"* is often applied to segregated areas where the Afro-American population represents only 40 percent of the population (Jargowsky, 1997).

The Latin American cities demonstrate an inverse situation: the areas inhabited by the very poor are much more socially homogenous than the residential areas of the upper class. For example, in 1990 in Mexico City, the upper class (7.5 percent of the population) represented only one third of the population of the 23 delegations and richest municipalities of the city (out of 183). However, the poorest social layer (18 percents of the population) represented 79.4 percent of the occupants of the 35 delegations and poorest municipalities of the city (Rubalcava and Schteingart, 1999). Recent studies in Rio de Janeiro produce similar results, confirming the social diversity of even the most affluent areas of Latin America (Preteceille and Ribeiro, 1999; Ribeiro, 2000).

THE LARGE SCALE OF SEGREGATION

We can integrate the first two characteristics of the traditional Latin American pattern of segregation noted with the idea of large-scale residential segregation. In fact, many specialists mention this characteristic of Latin American cities in literature and debates. Nevertheless, it needs two explanations:

- It is also a characteristic of cities in other regions of the world, such as in the United States, where rich and poor, Anglo-Saxon and minorities, appear to be clearly segregated when observing the overall territory of the cities; and
- A methodological question in this judgment is raised, relative to the inclusive viewpoint by which it is based. To the contrary, if we focused on the smaller geographic scales, we would have to conclude that the "Latin American high-income neighborhoods" are not very segregated, because of the social diversity recently discussed.

How can we make the condition of diversity in the "high-income neighborhoods" compatible with the obvious characteristics of large-scale segregation shown by the Latin American cities? The key point here is that certain neighborhoods exclude the poor, groups that make up more than 50 percent of the population of each city. Hypothetically interpreted, one could attribute this fact to two historical factors:

- The prevalence of the European urban culture in the Latin American upper class, more so than the Anglo-American, leads them to reproduce in the zones where they concentrated in the 20th Century, the social and city structure of industrial European cities. All but the "informal" poor are admitted to the project[2].

[2] We argue later that Latin American urban upper class have undertaken somewhat of a historical project in constructing the suburbanized areas like pieces of "cit-

Those groups publicize the condition of being poor countries, thus societies exclude them from the "high-income neighborhoods," causing substantial agglomerations of "informal" poverty in the peripheries of our cities.
- The intrinsically speculative operation of the land markets result in the proprietors setting land prices for higher income social groups that overflow into the area. This mechanism, which we will discuss in detail later, would have functioned as a method of expulsion of the poor families from the "high-income neighborhoods" within a very short period after their origination.

OTHER TYPES OF RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION

The Latin American city shows other forms of residential segregation in addition to separation according to socioeconomic status. There are racial, ethnic and age differences in the urban population that have some manifestation in special terms. Unfortunately, researchers have practically excluded these types of segregation from social research (some exceptions are the works of Telles, 1992a and 1992b; Germain and Polèse, 1996; and Hiernaux, 2000)[3]. The efforts have been concentrated in the socioeconomic aspects, and even these efforts have been minor and deficient, as we will argue in Chapter 3.

In any case, the few existing empirical studies prove that segregation of racially or ethnically discriminated groups tends to correspond with segregation of low socioeconomic groups (in the case of Brazil, see Telles, 1992a). Coincidently, a study relating to Spanish immigration in Buenos Aires during 1850-1930 dismisses the notion that ethnic enclaves had formed in the city (Moya, 1998).

In comparison with the United States, where ethnic and racial residential segregation is very marked, Latin American cities present a different panorama. According to the only apparent comparable quantitative study to those of the United States, the ethnic segregation of the African population in Brazilian cities is significantly smaller than in the Americans (Telles, 1992b). Although the study consists of outdated numbers, the subsequent table replicates the data in this study. We base this on values of the index of dissimilarities, the most used index in the international study of segregation. The value indicates the percentage of the population of African origin having to change residential area (census district) in order to achieve a homogenous distribution within the city.

TABLE 1
Index of Residential Dissimilarity by Race in the 10 Greater Brazilian Metropolitan Areas and in select Metropolitan Areas of the United States: 1980.

BRAZILLIAN CITIES	INDEX	US CITIES	INDEX
Sao Paulo	37	New York	73
Río de Janeiro	37	Los Angeles	86
Belo Horizonte	41	Chicago	76
Porto Alegre	37	Detroit	87
Recife	38	Philadelphia	77
Salvador	48	Washington	69
Fortaleza	40		
Curitiba	39		
Brasília	39		
Belén	37		

ies within developed countries" having a significant continental European influence.

[3] Cities of the United States with the majority of the population of Hispanic origin represent an area of ethnic segregation cases that Latin American researches should study in the future (Mike Davis, 2000, in a study of this phenomenon).

With respect to differences in age groups, the analysis of the complete census information demonstrates a greater presence of children living in the periphery and the elderly living in the central areas[4]. This is predictable in cities growing at relatively high rates, with a significant immigration, especially when immigration has "specialized" in the poor, within more extended families; similar to what has happened in the last decades in Latin America.

CHANGES TO THE TRADITIONAL PATTERN OF SEGREGATION

The traditional pattern of segregation, which began settling in the 20th century, has recently demonstrated that it not absolute. Since 1980, the pattern has undergone important changes because of the following new dynamics:

- The introduction of alternatives to residential development for the high or middle-income groups outside the "high-income districts," that is outside of the traditional areas where these social groups are concentrated, in many incidences, in the center of low-income settlements (Bearings, 1990; Sabatini, 1997; Caldeira, 2000).
- The emergence of shopping, office and services subcenters, outside the CDB and the "high-income districts," usually in the crossing of radial and ring roads where you can access wide market opportunities (Gorelik, 1999; Frúgoli, 2000).
- The generalization of the increases in land prices throughout the urban areas, making it inevitable to locate new housing developments for the low-income groups outside the cities in the surrounding region.
- The appearance of discontinuous residential growth patterns favoring smaller urban centers and the use of rustic houses in patterns, oscillating between vacation and permanent residences, fueling the "sprawl" as the dominant growth typology (Hack, 2000).
- The urban renovation of deteriorated central areas, focused as much on the restoration of old houses for residential or other uses, as in the construction of high-rise residential buildings for the middle class (Hardoy and Guttman, 1992; Red, 1999).

The two preceding changes are numerically less important than the first three, and are confined to cities of countries or regions with higher levels of economic development. Sao Paulo, a city exhibiting most clearly the five changes and conforming a true "urban region," mimics changes in the urban skyline maintained by the principal cities of the developed world – a phenomenon also entitled "diffused city " (Dematteis, 1997).

We will discuss the causes of the deliberated changes when we discern the factors behind the process of social spatial segregation (Chapter 3). The discussion concerning whether or not these changes have become more evident in an increasing number of cities and represent a disruption in the traditional pattern of segregation is secondary. It is more important to examine the possible urban and social implications. Chapter 4 focuses on the impacts of segregation and its recent changes.

[4] We have seen segregation maps according to age groups in Mexican (Germain and Polèse, 1996) and Argentinean (Towers, 1999) cities.

Definitions and Precisions of Approach

The social segregation of urban space, also known as residential segregation, is a spatial phenomenon with complex connections to social differences and inequalities, a complexity usually leading to confusion. For this reason, it is important to point out what we mean by segregation and the distinguishable dimensions of the phenomenon.

GENERAL DEFINITION

In broad terms, residential segregation corresponds to the spatial agglomeration of families of a similar social condition, regardless of how we define the social differences. Segregation is determined according to conditions of ethnicity, migratory origin, age or socioeconomic status, along with other conditions. In Latin America, we focus our attention on socioeconomic segregation, as the few completed empirical studies focus on this type, ignoring other forms of social separation of urban space. This is understandable considering that the distinct social inequalities, of income and rank or social class, represent the most salient characteristics of social structure in Latin American countries - more than poverty, in any case.

COMPOUND DEFINITION

Segregation requires a composed definition to account for its differences, which have distinct implications, as much in terms of its social and urban impacts as with respect to the public policy. Here, we will differentiate three dimensions of segregation:

- The degree of spatial concentration of the social groups;
- The social homogeneity presented by different inner city areas and
- The prestige or social stature (or lack of stature) of different areas or neighborhoods in each city.

The first two are objective dimensions of segregation, registered in thematic maps of the city, as well as through statistical indexes such as the index of dissimilarity. We mentioned these dimensions earlier as the most prevalent international measurement tool of segregation. In thematic maps, they color areas to mark the location of different groups; and the indexes measure the degree by which the numerical significance of each social class within the communities create differences among neighborhoods and inner city areas.

The third dimension, relative to the prestige of the neighborhood, is of a subjective nature. This refers to the images, perceptions, reputation and territorial stigmas designated by the city's population to some of its neighborhoods. At one extreme, the social prestige of the neighborhoods forms the basis for real estate value for promoters and in the realization of capital gains (land rents) for its residents; and at the other extreme of the social scale, the stigmatization of the neighborhoods contributes to various forms of social disintegration.

"NEW POVERTY": A CRUCIAL TREND

The subjective dimension of segregation is central in some key processes taking place in contemporary cities, including those of Latin America:

- On one hand, in the growth of the urban real estate sector, we explain an international phenomenon by the liberalization of the traditionally regulated urban markets and the significant flow of capital that it attracts. Segregation is a significant condition in many residential real estate businesses.
- On the other hand, the "new poverty" that is increasing in the cities (according to the European denomination), is clearly associated with the surge or reinforcement of territorial stigmas: neighborhoods full of drug dealers, delinquency, school desertion and adolescent pregnancy, among other forms of social disintegration. These neighborhoods are similar to the areas known as black "ghettos" in North American cities, which are being replicated in other regions:

- In Europe, in the form of immigrant neighborhoods; and
- In Latin America, through the conversion of old precarious workers' neighborhoods into concentrations of unemployed or underemployed populations politically marginalized, where the social problems discussed are increasing.

Although there are significant differences between various neighborhoods of "new poverty," it is important to recognize its proliferation and association with territorial stigmas. These are alimented by the population in general, and even by the authorities, and by the residents of the discriminated neighborhoods. However, the stigmas have objective foundations, among which changes in "objective" segregation are prominent. The reduction in the degree of social heterogeneity in the discriminated and poorest residential areas of the cities (an effect of the second dimension of segregation) appears to be a universal phenomenon of the era, in which social inequalities continue to grow.

In the United States, while the segregation of the black population has declined in recent decades (notable in the decrease of the dissimilarity index), the social problems in the ghettos have become more severe. Whether through the impoverishment of the middle class black families residing in these neighborhoods, through their emigration towards the suburbs, or due to both, such ghettos are considered more homogenously poor that before (Massey and Denton, 1993). The precarious settlements of Latin American cities have the same problem. Greater rates of unemployment and more flexible labor regimes have created more socially homogenous neighborhoods in terms of poverty. The manner by which the increase of objective segregation (dimension 2) and other contextual factors explain the surge of territorial stigmas will be the focus of Chapter 4.

CONCEPTUAL APPROACH

We can summarize the approach adopted to analyze social segregation, its causes, effects and implications for urban policies through the four assertions discussed below. We will evaluate the fourth concept, concerning the nature of the segregation process, more thoroughly, as it summarizes the first three assertions:

- Residential segregation is a phenomenon, not a problem

  The effects of residential segregation can be positive as well as negative. As many studies have concluded and major cities show, the formation of ethnic enclaves is positive, for the preservation of the minority class cultures and the enrichment of the cities, which eventually become more cosmopolitan. Qadeer (2001) discusses the case of Toronto, recognized as one of the more cosmopolitan and multicultural cities of our times.

  We can attribute the most recent outbreak of violence in immigrant neighborhoods – the case of several British cities during 2001, a crisis that gave rise to a governmental commission and special report on the problem (see Cantle, 2001) - more to the spatial accumulation of poor and other discriminated families than to ethnic residential segregation. In fact, the European ethnic enclaves, unlike the ghettos of African-Americans, depict significant ethnic diversity, including the representation of a substantial percentage of the families of the hegemonic nationality in each city (French, Swedish or British families, according to each particular case).

  On the other hand, with respect to the positive effects of segregation, it is important to clarify that spatial segregation of social classes is usually a function of "normal" or "comprehensible" social practice, specifically in the search for social identities or the eagerness of the community to attain a better quality of life. The fact that not all families in a particular city live within favorable conditions, which allows them to validate their situation through a collective identity and encourages them to improve their quality of life, does not necessarily endorse the situation as socially condemnable.
- Residential segregation is a constituent element of social reality

  Society does not exist outside the space, as is often assumed in the traditional disciplinary culture of social sciences. The space itself takes on social meaning and plays various rolls in social practices. Specifically, segregation is

a part of particular social practices of the greatest importance:

- Segregation is important in the formation of social identities. In dynamic societies with powerful processes of social mobility, such as those of capitalist societies, spatial segregation is a common resource in consolidating the identities of the ascending groups, or used in defending the identities threatened by these changes. Accordingly, we consider contemporary western cities more spatially segregated than preindustrialist cities.
- Spatial segregation is part of the mechanism offering a socially differentiated access to public goods or collective consumption, such as landscape, environment, neighborhood safety and, in general, quality of life.
- Segregation is instrumental in building more communitarian styles of social life. Confidence is an important social capital in the construction of a social life with a strong communitarian and less individualistic content. Confidence, as demonstrated through social research, requires that the parts involved in the relation exhibit similar lifestyles, a condition known as social homogeneity. The Lomnitz (1977) study, in the "colonies" of Mexico City, is perhaps the most widely recognized in Latin America, which examines these issues; alternatively, Durston (2001) emphasizes the role of confidence in the development of "social capital" in Latin America.

- The geographic scale under which segregation takes place is significant in its effects.
  The negative impacts of segregation are associated with a less significant interaction between social classes. Spatial isolation of the poor or discriminated groups, and their perception of this condition, perpetuates social disintegration. Therefore, if segregation occurs within a reduced geographic scale, like a small city or through the conformation of smaller, socially homogenous neighborhoods, the negative effects of segregation can be less significant or non-existent. However, when segregation intensifies in broader scales, exceeding margins of "the walking scale" and limiting the options of physical interaction between social classes, spatial segregation can become counterproductive, especially for the poor.
- Residential segregation is a process, not a situation
  The term itself, borrowed from Biology, has a clearly dynamic and incessantly shifting connotation. Nevertheless, in the tradition of urban studies, particularly in Latin America, this implication has lost validity. It is possible that the static bias established by the general concept of residential segregation is due to the predominance of architects and geographers in the field of urban planning.

A process approach to segregation must start by examining it as a socially collective fact that we should come to understand. Segregation is not solely a problem; it is also a phenomenon, with its own right to exist and possibly, a more or less predictable phase of evolution. What are the explanations and motives behind segregation? Do third parties practice this type of auto-segregation or spatial exclusion? Wouldn't this behavior reflect comprehensible or reasonable aspects? When unfolding the process dimension, we open an intellectual avenue for these considerations and a minor objectivity in the analysis.

There are several interpretations along this line. Perhaps, the most recognized at an international level is the "assimilation" approach. This describes the stages of the assimilation process of a city's ethnic minority group transitioning from preliminary spatial segregation to a permanent dispersion within the city. Fundamentally, the concept is based on the dynamic situation of the North American cities during the 20th century. Students of the School of Chicago, headed by Robert Park, elaborated this concept early on. In any case, in the discussion of the possible policies to control segregation in Chapter 5, we debate the need to analyze this approach further.

In Latin America, urban planners and demographers have pondered and debated the existence of evolutionary systems of spatial segregation of poor immigrants within the cities. Perhaps the best-known interpretation is that which occurs when families settle in central areas of the city in a first stage of integration. After integrating themselves in employment, social and eventually

political networks, these families move to the periphery, whether through illegal land occupancy, lot purchases through business deals of questionable legality or through government sponsored housing solutions. Families exchange room space, legal and material security (the most common periphery homes in Latin American cities are built mainly on private property) for accessibility and proximity to occasional jobs.[5]

According to the composed definition of segregation, there is a transition between a situation of first stage residential segregation (spatial concentration of the group and urban space shared with other groups) to a second stage (social homogeneity of the space). In time, poor families tend to isolate themselves from other social groups. It is possible to counteract the effects through other methods of social integration, in particular, through employment or economic integration and political participation. Labor flexibilization and the political marginalization of the poor, components of the present context, remove this layer and add "negativity" to spatial segregation, as we will argue later.

However, in "normal" conditions, the system reaches a positive stage: corresponding physically, to the urban assimilation of the settlement to the city; and socially, to an acceptable level of social heterogeneity. The effects of time and fortuitous experiences of each stage create greater social diversity amongst the families. Motivation of the settlers is of essence in the self-building of their homes or in neighborhood improvement efforts. Within each city, there are a series of goals contributing to the collective imagination, such as those traditionally adopted by the Chilean settlers. Their hope is to move beyond the stage of "camping" (illegal invasion) to becoming a "settlement" recognized by the authorities (who urbanize and legalize the settlement), until finally forming a "villa." They associate the "villa" with "formal" residential construction of various degrees of consolidation: consistent architectural style, homes complying with normal urban standards of construction or the quality of the building materials.

This explanatory model does not have a generalized spectrum since, among other explanations, poverty has become a "product" generated more by the cities themselves than by the migrations, and also because in much of Latin America the migrants opt to live with relatives already living in the periphery (Hauser, 1962: 317; Peattie, 1987). Yet, it exposes certain clues to help understand the evolution of residential segregation of the poor and middle-class up through the present time. In particular, under aggravated conditions of economic and employment uncertainty, similar to conditions today, there is a tendency to blend social classes within the space in order to increase their sense of security. According to the traditional explanation, this security is what the inner city slums offer to immigrants. The crisis thus incites a backward progression of spatial segregation of poor families in Latin American cities towards the poor homogenous periphery. This aborts the possibility of realizing the final stage of progression, a stage in which the old poor peripheral neighborhood is eventually assimilated with the rest of the city, in which an adequate level of social diversity is reached and finally in which the individual no longer identifies himself as an "immigrant," rather as a respected resident of the city.

This trend of social integration under crises takes on two forms: the impoverishment or "popularization" of central areas and the arrival of middle class families affected by the crisis in the poor neighborhoods of the periphery. This occurred in the 80s in Sao Paulo, Brazil. The economic crisis produced significant alterations in the segregation pattern of the city, creating a backward progression in the segregation progress. One study (by Rolnik et. al. 1990), which we will examine more thoroughly in a subsequent chapter, describes these changes, concluding that the crisis reflected a "perverse setback in segregation" due to the impoverishment of middle class groups and further intensification of social inequalities.

During the most recent decades, changes in the process of segregation are apparent in Latin American cities. Meffert describes the movement

[5] In 1959, the relators of an important seminar organized by CEPAL, regarding Urbanization Problems in Latin America, argued the necessity of carrying out "re-localization programs" designed to provide housing to the migrants "which were crowded together in slums" (Hauser, 1962: 72).

of poor families from the periphery to central areas as a form of pacific occupation of the city by the poor in Mexico City (1990 – cited by Mires, 1993: 101). Earlier, Matos Mar discussed similar trends in Lima (1988); and Mires suggested that the modern Latin American city "has been invaded from its own interior," emphasizing self-regulation theories as possible explanations for these changes (1993).

Currently, the mounting economic and social crisis within various Latin American countries may be stimulating social spatial mixing in order to revert feelings of insecurity.

Accordingly, we will examine an Argentinean case in Chapter 4, Section C. In this case, the extreme social insecurity instigated by the crisis influenced a broader social mixing within the space, supporting the notion that social isolation is the most detrimental aspect of residential segregation.

Finally, among other "process related" aspects of residential segregation fitting into our approach, we will discuss the connection between segregation and social differentiation, and the development or defense of social identities. As we will argue, residential segregation is associated more with social differentiation than social differences.

Popular Explanations of Segregation

We frequently explain segregation in Latin American cities by attributing it to existing social inequalities that, as discussed earlier, characterize these societies. The urban space reflects these social inequalities, as if through a mirror. Large-scale segregation, apparent in Latin American cities, is consistent with the existing social inequalities, thus the explanation seems to self-maintain.

Another common explanation in the Region connects segregation to the activities of real estate developers pursuing the profits that can be obtained on the high and medium income housing markets. The capitalization of the land rents, the specific form of profits generated in the real estate sector, requires "*sine qua non,*" the spatial segregation of the poor and other undesirable land uses. It is a well-known fact that the presence of poor families and other unattractive land uses inhibit the appreciation of real estate in a given neighborhood or city sector. Again, this appears to be a self-evident explanation.

Yet another frequently suggested explanation attributes the suburbanization of the upper class, a central element in the segregation patterns of our cities, to an act of replicating the cultural and consumption patterns of developed nations, principally European nations and then later, in the 20th century, the United States. Unlike the previous explanations, this one is quite ambiguous. It exhibits a judgmental moral tone in reference to the "foreign oriented" culture of the upper class.

Documents and publications adhering to these interpretations abound, particularly to the first, thus it seems redundant to include references. Even though it is not an approach with a widespread acceptance among specialists, these interpretations have influenced the public. However popular and accepted they may be, the explanations still have deficiencies. After citing examples of refuting facts, we will present a modified version of these explanations, which in our opinion adheres more to the facts.

The Annex "Latin American Paradigm of Segregation," contains a description and more thoroughly detailed critique of the first interpretation, as, within the Region, it turned into a form of truth that does not requires demonstration. It is important to enter into this debate, as we believe this interpretation of segregation constitutes a formidable obstacle in the design and application of the policies to control residential segregation.

FACTS THAT REFUTE THE POPULAR IDEAS OF SEGREGATION

The following facts, materializing in recent years and recorded through empirical statistical studies, challenge the first explanation:

- The backward progression of residential segregation in Sao Paulo during the eighties, called the "lost decade of Latin America," while amidst an economic crisis, the distribution of income became more unequal (Rolnik *et. al.,* 1990: 13 and 52);
- The decrease in the index of residential segregation during the intercensual period of 1982 - 1992 in Conception (Chile), a change accompanied by a significant increase in social inequalities (Sabatini *et. al.,* 2001a). [6]

This first explanation also uncovers a contradiction in the social diversity of the "high-income neighborhoods" of the cities, a characteristic of the traditional pattern of segregation that we

[6] In Conception, mayor inequalities lead to a growth in the percentage of population in high and low income levels, detrimentally lacking the participation of middle income groups in the income distribution structure (social layers are defined according to the occupation of the head of household). The movement of both extreme layers "towards" the center of the social scale, occupied by groups traditionally less spatially segregated, explains the decent of the segregation indexes. However, considering that spatial dimension is an integral part of social reality and that it is impossible to understand or define social groups "outside" of the space, we conclude that the negative progression of segregation is a fact and not simply a methodological effect.

pointed out earlier. The idea or theory of the mirror, as an interpretation of the origin of segregation, is inconsistent with this characteristic. The analysts frequently ignore this inconsistency, and when they do discuss it, they do not offer a sufficient explanation.

Alternatively, the second explanation, implicating the operation of the real estate markets, is contradictory to the specific urban development processes taking place in certain cities, some older and others more recent:

- The densification of higher-income neighborhoods, old and new, through high-rise housing construction for families of lower than average income for the area.
- These projects allow promoters to significantly profit and their indirect impact is to reduce residential segregation. Considering the significant concentration of good quality facilities and services in these neighborhoods, there is always a strong demand to live in high-rise buildings. This introduces two relevant points to our discussion: the "verticalization" of these neighborhoods and its effect on the reduction of segregation are important processes; also, there is no significant social (and cultural) resistance to social spatial mixing, a similar fact of the suburbs of North American cities.
- The dispersion of closed condominiums for middle and high-income families around the urban periphery, many in areas already populated by the poor.
- They established this practice in the eighties with unequal intensity in a variety of Latin American cities, from Santiago, Chile to San Jose, Costa Rica; from Puebla, Mexico to Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Consequently, Villaça discusses the relative spatial proximity that is taking place between different social groups in the major Brazilian cities (1998). Rolnik, et.al. affirm that in San Paulo during the eighties, an "increase in relative proximity among the different social groups in the space" took place (1990). Portes found that, in the case of Bogotá, certain high-income residential developments were being established in poor areas (1990). Towers (2001) asserts the same in the case of Buenos Aires.
- Earlier, Alexander Portes predicted this phenomenon in some Latin American capitals (1990), connecting it to the regressive trends in income distribution, that in turn caused an increase in poverty in the cities. Later, the change would be interpreted as a widespread emerging trend in cities of Latin America, caused mainly by changes in the private real estate sector (Sabatini, 1997) – which we will analyze later in the document.
- At the same time, this dispersion of condominiums represents an increase in residential segregation, as well as a reduction of its geographic scale. The guards and fences emerge at the same time that the physical distance between the rich and the poor diminish.

Finally, the third explanation, implying that Latin American countries imitate the cultural patterns of developed countries, does not distinguish between urban spatial forms and architectural styles, nor does the explanation distinguish between those religious cultures continuing, to this day, to make a difference in the models of urban structure in capitalistic societies. Catholic societies have most clearly preserved the continuity of the pre-industrialist city, along with some protestant societies, such as the Lutherans. These societies do not undertake the urban Anglo-American revolution, which prompts segregation of the upper class in the suburbs.

Finally, the social diversity of the "Latin American high-income neighborhoods" contradicts the suburban model, which has social homogeneity as one of its essential characteristics. The adoption of European architectural styles is confused with the adoption of the patterns of urban segregation of nations that have been the leaders of capitalist development in the last century: first England, and later the United States.

REINTERPRETATION OF THE CAUSES OF SEGREGATION

Now, we offer a secondary interpretation of these three popular explanations of the origin of urban segregation in Latin America, striving to make them consistent with the facts:

With respect to the explanation attributing segregation to social inequalities, it appears to us that residential segregation reflects processes of social

differentiation more than social differences. The connection between social differences and spatial segregation is inverse rather than direct, as assumed habitually. Certain groups newly developing their identity, as well as existing groups fearing that their identity is being threatened, often resort to spatial segregation in order to stabilize their identity. It is common, when feeling threatened, for emerging middle class groups in dynamic economies, or ethnic minorities, to create neighborhoods of ethnic enclaves.

In this manner, when differences and inequalities are threatened, or when they are minor or indistinct, groups increasingly resort to spatial segregation. Conversely, when social differences are clear and profound, due to prevailing distinctions of status (as apparent in the European pre-industrialist societies and in the majority of existing Latin American societies), the groups can effectively share the urban space. The European pre-industrialist city showed a significant social mix in the space, and the Latin American cities exhibit considerable diversity in their "high-income neighborhoods."

This interpretation stems from a dynamic approach to segregation, incorporating "the spatial component" within social structures and not outside them in the manner of a "reflection." It also highlights the personal motivation in the modification of segregation patterns (in Fishman, 1987 and Sennett, 1970 similar interpretations are made concerning segregation in cities of England and the United States, respectively).

In regards to the <u>explanation implicating the activities of real estate developers</u>, it is important to emphasize that land rents, which these agents intend to capitalize, do not depend on the socioeconomic level of the residents, rather on their ability to pay per square meter of constructed or qualified land. Sometimes the social exclusion (forced spatial segregation of undesirable social groups or activities) is a method of increasing the profits, however at other times; high-rise construction encourages this increase by expanding the volume of floor space available for sale. Often, these business deals thrive when they succeed in attracting foreign groups of a lower income class in comparison with the residents of the respective areas. In summary, developers relate pragmatically with segregation, profiting whether broadening or decreasing its effects.

Nevertheless, real estate markets and segregation have other more significant relations, of which the following two seem the most pertinent to this presentation: the inversion of the relationship between land use and land price due to the unique characteristics of markets and the dependency of developers on the structure of land prices in the city.

In the first relation, we must focus on the intrinsically speculative nature of urban land markets and the relevant impact they have on the segregation pattern. Given the peculiarities of urban land as infinitely differentiated, only partially interchangeable and non-reproducible, among other characteristics, the causal relationship between land use and land price is usually reverted. Land prices, determined by uses, eventually turn into a factor excluding uses. Owners set their price based on the expected use. When a neighborhood begins to attract higher income residents, owners speculatively raise their prices anticipating "enhanced" uses, creating an obstacle for lower income groups wanting to settle there – somewhat of a self-fulfilling prophecy. We have given this mechanism, particular to the imperfect land markets, the definition "spatial propagation of land speculation" (Sabatini and Arenas, 2001; Sabatini and Smolka, 2001). This evokes a transition from "type 1" segregation (spatial concentration of a group), which is not entirely bad, to a "type 2" segregation (social homogeneity of the neighborhood), which can produce negative effects, as depicted in Chapter 4.

The second correlation between land markets and patterns of segregation refers to the subordination of location decisions of the principal Latin American developers in the city land pricing structure. This subordination was important in the consolidation of the traditional pattern of segregation throughout the 20th century. The illegal land settlers chose the cheapest land because of the decreased risk of legal repression and eviction; and the State housing programs began implementing their projects on less expensive land, thus lowering their overall costs. Illegal land settlement and

State housing programs have forced poor people to live in places already stricken with poverty – the low income of the residents explains the lower land prices (Smolka, 2002). Private real estate companies, partially due to their traditional atomization, executed smaller projects designated for areas where the social condition corresponded to the demand fulfilled by the projects[7]. Surprisingly, these three distinct agents abided by the same spatial logic, having to do with the land markets, gathering support in favor of the traditional pattern of segregation.

The explanation concerning the imitation of cultural patterns is vague, as we implied earlier. Nonetheless, we believe the explanation points out an undeniable fact. The Latin American upper class has been culturally "dependent." They have arduously tried to recreate the reality of developed nations within their own. In their efforts, they have counted on State assistance and often the complacency of other social groups.

This enduring and sustained eagerness invokes a weak social identity, constantly evolving. As we pointed our earlier, when social identities are fragile, groups resort to spatial segregation. It is reasonable to interpret the construction of "high-income neighborhoods" in Latin American cities as a resource to the spatial form, with the goal of developing the less chauvinistic identity of a developed country.

As indicated earlier in this presentation, all groups of the industrial European social structure fit in these "high-income neighborhoods," which are understood as genuine pieces of city of developed countries. This is consistent with the catholic *ethos* of Latin America. Consequently, the "high-income neighborhoods" are exceptionally diverse, excluding only those who do not conform to this definition or objective: the "informal" or "marginalized," groups in a class below the formal laborers. Their presence deteriorates the identity of the "city of a developed country" that they have been trying to build.[8]

The scarce development of the economies forced the concentration of all private and public efforts in the construction of this affluent and "modernistic" exception to a single area of the city, in the middle of the under-developed space. Consequently, it is important to point out the notable concentration of the upper class in city spaces (segregation in the first dimension).

Accordingly, the coincidence between strong social inequalities and noticeable spatial segregation of the cities is quite apparent as well as deceptive.

REINTERPRETATION OF THE PRESENT TRENDS EXHIBITED BY SEGREGATION

With respect to the present trends of segregation in our cities, the most common interpretation is the theory that segregation is growing because of increasing social inequalities, while refusing or ignoring the facts that indicate something different[9]. Furthermore, the assertion that segregation is escalating is not qualified regarding the scale or the dimensions in which it occurs.

We will analyze these issues in the Annex, emphasizing that the empirical studies carried out in Latin America are not usually designed to test theories, rather to "demonstrate" that segregation is increasing, a fact considered obvious.

Hence, there are flaws in many of the studies carried out to interpret the changes of the traditional pattern of segregation. There is an apparent ideological resistance to the idea that spatial segregation could be reducing; at least in some sectors of the city periphery. Regardless, this resistance is coherent with the perception of segregation as a mirror image of social inequalities, given that recently, they have been increasing.

---

[7] We discussed the changes to the traditional pattern in Chapter 1.

[8] These aspirations of European identity have had an expression in urban planning philosophy and practice amongst Latin American leaders for quite some time. In Santiago in 1872, one Chilean leader, Major Benjamín Vicuña Mackenna, proposed the creation of a central road to exclude the poor "informal" groups from their "own city" and "culture." In addition, the Viennese urban planner Karl Brunner proposed a plan to transform Santiago, having an explicit image of the "European" social structure (Vicuña Mackenna, 1872; Brunner, 1932).

[9] See "Changes in the traditional pattern of segregation" in Chapter 1.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the main causes of social spatial segregation in Latin American cities are the following, differentiating between causes operating at the level of the motivations of the different actors and aggregated or "systematic" causes. Included in this summary are the major factors that have influenced the changes effecting segregation in most recent years.

They stress the following motivations:

- The first is the enthusiasm to construct a multiple class identity of city (and society) similar to that of developed countries. In recent decades, the generation of profits no longer requires the spatial concentration of private and public resources, as it was required in earlier eras, explaining the relative dispersion of the "modern neighborhoods" within the space of each city. This change represents new opportunities to decrease distances and to increase interactions between different social groups.
- The increase in value of real estate property, whether as business (for developers and other investors who profit from land appreciation) or as family assets, is a contributing factor promoting the social homogeneity of the space over the social motivations (of social identity) of the high and middle-income groups that tend to self-segregate. Many wealthy families do not like the idea of poorer people living close, because, according to popular belief, it could affect the increase in the value of their property. Accordingly, this conviction operates as a specific form of the self-fulfilled prophecy we mentioned earlier. There could be, at the same time, more cultural space for social mixing, or for the reduction of physical distances between social groups, than what the traditional pattern of segregation demonstrates. The decrease of high and upper middle class group concentration in "high-income neighborhoods," due to the construction of gated communities in other areas of the city, reinforces this concept.[10] The middle class Latin American suburb is more of a physical reality, imitating traditions of Anglo-American architectural and urban planning elements, than a replication of the organized neighborhoods of the North American suburbs, which exclude certain social groups while developing social class identities. Although elements of real estate valorization and development of group identities are evident in both societies, they have a different impact, influencing policy design. Both the secular instability of Latin American economies and the most segregated character of social structure have more influence in the segregation of real estate valorization than in the formation of social class identities.
- Additional motivations of segregation include those relative to quality of life. Groups that have the option to select certain areas of the city with sufficient access to public and collective goods (goods that are hard to obtain individually) tend to concentrate in one area of the city. Accordingly, segregation actually improves the possibilities for families to enjoy the landscape, nature, environment and residential security.
- Secondary in importance is the incidence of affirmation and defense of social group identities in the self-segregation of upper income and other emerging groups. Culturally, because our societies harbor significant social differences, lower levels of social mobility and hierarchal relations between groups and classes, they are more open to a greater social mix in the city space. The reduction in the scale and intensity in segregating the poorest groups, indisputably the most significant challenge our cities face, is more feasible in this respect than it initially appears.

- The following "systemic" factors impacting segregation and its evolution should be noted:
- The accumulation of the poor and the formation of extensive homogenous areas where the poor reside are the result of the aggregate impact of the forces and motivations just described. The upper and middle-income groups build cities according to their interests, marginalizing the underprivileged from the enjoyment of material and symbolic benefits

[10] Coincidently, the Report of Human Development in Chile 2002 of the PNUD discovered, through a national survey, that 63.3% of Chileans claimed to feel no disadvantage in living near impoverished families.

afforded by the neighborhoods they constructed.

- As we have discussed earlier, the management of the developers' land pricing structure in many cities was crucial in stabilizing what would become the traditional pattern of urban segregation throughout or continent. In particular, we must emphasize the role of illegal land settlers and state housing programs in the existing concentration of poverty in the cities' periphery.
- Since the eighties, the liberalization of the land markets, the concentration of real estate capital, the adoption of the gated community model and the construction of significant regional urban infrastructures, particularly in road and transportation, are amongst the significant factors that have affected the modification of the traditional pattern of segregation. Due to the considerable size of the real estate projects and a favorable institutional and economic context, real estate developers have begun to spread out their commercial and residential land investments, no longer restricting them to "high-income neighborhoods" and central areas, as they did before. In particular, the location of middle and high-income residential developments in lower-income districts allows them to capture significant land rents. The relatively large size of the projects allows the investors to restructure residential segregation on a reduced spatial scale.
- Essentially, these projects promote a change in the segregation scale, with more intense segregation on a smaller geographic scale. The social homogeneity of these new communities is very high, although the physical distance to the residential areas of poorer families diminishes.
- The spatial dissemination of land speculation from downtown and "high-income neighborhoods" to other areas of the city is one of the systematic factors affecting modification of segregation in most recent decades. The dispersion of residential developments, businesses and "modern" services induces the traditional speculative vortex of the land markets to spread to the whole city. This fact, along with the increasing formalization of the land markets promoted by land tenure regularization, policies and programs, is a contributing factor in the expulsion of new poor families outside the cities. In addition, new highways and an increase in automobile ownership help to re-create, on a larger scale, the traditional segregated urban models where the poor people live in the periphery, yet with the important caveat that the previously settled poor families benefit from the reduction in the scale of the segregation.

Impacts

We pointed out earlier that segregation has positive as well as negative effects. Before we review the known impacts of segregation in Latin American cities, which are few given the scarcity of studies, we will discuss the effects of segregation from a broader international perspective.

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE SEGREGATION; VOLUNTARY AND FORCED

The two objective dimensions of segregation significantly differ with respect to their effects. The spatial concentration of a social group (first dimension), whether ethnic or socioeconomic, usually has a positive impact, as much for the group as for the city and the community. The preservation of the customs and identities of the ethnic groups, known as "minorities" in cities of developed countries, and the social and political "empowerment" of the Latin American urban poor are examples of the beneficial effects of spatial concentration.

However, when the spatial social homogeneity is strong (second dimension), the effects tend to be negative, particularly in the social disintegration of the poor, an effect that we will demonstrate later in this document. It is important to note that we relate the most negative effects of segregation to their involuntary character. The poor and discriminated groups are excluded from certain neighborhoods and areas of the city. Then, they are forced to concentrate in the worst areas of the city by land markets, social housing policies and forced eradications.

The distinction between these two objective dimensions of segregation relates to the differences between voluntary and forced segregation. The spatial concentration of a group (first dimension) does not exclude new families of different social conditions from moving to the area. There are families of inferior social condition, or from racially or ethnically discriminated groups, that prefer to live in neighborhoods where groups of higher social status predominate. Conversely, other families prefer living with those of equal status in segregated neighborhoods, where they feel comfortable and can rely on the security of the social networks of mutual aid, which are usually quite strong in these communities.

It is important to point out that spatial concentration of social groups is a form of segregation that, on the extreme, could be a result of the citizens exerting their free will. We could classify this voluntary form of segregation as "natural," as it is associated with the affirmation of social identities, the respect for well-defined values, or the search for a better quality of life. Besides, it originates in the personal choice of dwelling location of the individuals and their families, which is a value in itself.

It is also true that discriminated or impoverished groups appear spatially concentrated, and that this circumstance is far from being the result of their own preferences. Nevertheless, the localization of these groups in our cities shows a relative dispersion to areas of the urban periphery, including deteriorated central areas, rather than a concentration in one internal zone, as often occurs with higher-income groups. Conversely, these residential areas show a noticeable absence of families of different social conditions. Social spatial homogeneity is the most outstanding characteristic of the segregation of lower income groups in Latin American cities, and this homogeneity is clearly not the result of the collective free location decisions of their members.

In effect, social spatial homogeneity, the second objective dimension of segregation, can hardly occur without mediating the use of the power. It is extremely improbable that highly homogenous districts will conform as an effect of the aggregation of individual decisions. The State, exerting a monopoly of legitimate use of force within the society, is involved, either directly or indirectly, in every form of compulsory segregation (Marcuse, 2001).

Nevertheless, the apparently spontaneous segregation resulting from the free operation of land markets has an involuntary component. Not everything is voluntary and free in the residential segregation of higher-income groups. High density of land uses make it possible for poorer families to settle in practically any area of the city, even in areas of high land costs. In fact, it is usually a smart business decision for real estate investors to build high-density houses for lower income families in prestigious neighborhoods.

In cities of developed, as well as developing, countries, it is common for lower income families, and even racially discriminated groups, to express a desire to share neighborhoods with other social groups, even the groups that discriminate them (see Squires *et.al,* 2001 for the case of the African-American population in the United States).

If the desire exists for the poor to move to areas where higher income families concentrate, and if this is a good real estate investment decision, how do we explain the emergence of socially homogenous areas? In reality, the State always plays a part in the emergence of this form of segregation. In affluent neighborhoods, the legal system and specifically the construction and urban norms, play a key role in excluding the unwanted families from the area. There is a recurrent requirement for minimum lot sizes with little technical justification. This takes place in neighborhoods and areas well endowed with infrastructural material and services that could support much higher densities. The social exclusion objectives, and not the technical needs, are behind the motivations defining minimum size for lots. Poorer families cannot buy such large lots, even if the unitary land price is low.

They apply land use and building norms to protect neighborhoods from the intrusion of other settlers, as well as other legal arrangements, with the North American suburbs representing the most developed prototype. The communities of the Unites States are organizations that specify physical and architectural criteria for the neighborhood, to protect the neighborhood from unwanted groups. Conversely, real estate agents and the banks issuing mortgages usually resort to veiled forms of social discrimination with similar purposes when they coincide with their interests. Thus, the segregation of the suburbs would be, largely, a planned process and not only spontaneous, but a forced reality for individuals excluded from these places, exercised by those who merely seem to practice their freedom of choice.

In the Latin American city, as we have already pointed out, this form of segregation is strong within the poorer communities and less significant in affluent areas. The forms of coercion, similar to those that explain the relative absence of poor families in the wealthy neighborhoods, cause the agglomeration of poor households or an emergence of socially homogenous settlements. Without the possibilities of attaining land in good neighborhoods, due to the high land prices as well as the zoning standards preserving the "exclusivity" of those neighborhoods, poor families are forced to buy or illegally settle on land in segregated locations. The State also develops social housing projects in a spatially segregate manner, mainly for the same reasons.

The terms enclave and ghetto differentiate both forms of segregation (Peach, 2001; Boal, 2001). The African-American ghettos represent types of coercive segregation causing negative effects, not only for those living within the ghettos, but also for the entire city. According to Massey and Denton, a ghetto is defined as a set of neighborhoods exclusively inhabited by members of one social group, in which virtually all the members of that group live (1993: 18-19).

We should also discuss the wealthy ghettos, emphasizing their overall negative effects, including those affecting the residents themselves. Boredom is one of these negative consequences, and is seemingly to blame for the gentrification process in many cities. Often, groups of young people, children of the suburban residents, seek out the energetic ambience of the older, deteriorated central neighborhoods. For decades, researchers have implicated a lack of social diversity as the explanation behind this prominent characteristic of the suburbs in many North American cities (Sennett, 1970). Alternatively, ethnic or socioeconomic enclaves stand up as a contrast. These are voluntary forms of segregation, whose outcome is more

positive than negative. Social homogeneity is not their trademark.

As these involuntary forms of segregation are related to the action of the State, and because they concentrate the negative effects, the policies to control segregation, in principle, have ample room for action. By modifying what the State acts or does not act upon, without reducing or restricting the localization decisions freely adopted by the citizens, it would be possible to make progress in controlling the detrimental effects of residential segregation.

INFLUENCE OF THE SEGREGATION SCALE[11]

When considering smaller neighborhoods, particularly in medium size cities, segregation could have less negative effects, or simply not have any at all, even in the areas marked by social homogeneity (second dimension). However, when low-income and homogenous neighborhoods are surrounded by other low-income neighborhoods, segregation tends to reach a more vast geographic scale, generating negative consequences that did not exist without this agglomeration of poverty.

Once again, we return to the example of the African-American ghettos in the United States, whose negative effects have been broadly documented. As the Massey and Denton definition indicates, the ghetto consists more of an agglomeration of neighborhoods than single neighborhoods. Massey and Denton also indicate these groups as the most isolated and geographically encapsulated people of the United States, while also emphasizing that "they live in large and contiguous settlements of densely occupied neighborhoods that are 'packed' around the urban centers" (1993: 77).

The scale is significant because it worsens the effects of physical, employment and social isolation of these groups, considered the most relevant aspect of spatial segregation in what matters for social integration. Alternatively, a critical concern in the materialization of the effects of social disintegration is the phenomenon known as subjective segregation. The physical isolation of the other social groups causes an intensification of this sensation, as well as the conviction of "being a surplus."

This isolation not only heightens the feelings of nonconformity of the residents themselves, yet also influences the image that residents of other neighborhoods have of these homogenous agglomerations of poor and discriminated groups. The broad scale of segregation and the intensity of its dimension 2 represent the principal spatial factor contributing to the emergence of territorial stigmas. The disdain and repulse of other groups is an important precursory factor of social disintegration of these objectively and subjectively segregated groups.

Studies carried in Chilean cities validate the negative social effects of the geographic scale of the segregation of poor groups (Sabatini *et.al.* 2001a and 2001b). The statistical correlations between the degree of social spatial homogeneity and social problems are greater when the analysis focuses on contiguous census districts of low-income groups than when analyzed separately. The qualitative study of pairs of poor segregated urban neighborhoods, with different geographic scales within each city, confirms those results. According to those studies, the social problems that increase due to the agglomeration of poor census districts include low scholastic performance, unemployment, adolescent pregnancy and the indolence of the youth (homes of young people who neither study nor work, a group that typically falls into drug addiction problems and delinquency).

The geographic scale of segregation shows contradictory trends during most recent decades in Latin American cities. In one direction, the scale seems to be contracting, while in another direction, broadening.

We connect the first positive trend to the evolution of real estate and land markets. Previously, we pointed out the relative dispersion, apparent in many Latin American cities, of enclosed residential condominiums, commercial spaces and "mod-

[11] The empirical data provided in this section and the following two sections of this chapter, in support of the argument, comes from research carried out in recent years in the main Chilean cities.

ern" office centers outside the traditional areas where high-income groups and activities concentrate. We have also attributed this change within the cities to the liberalization of the land markets, the expansion and concentration of the real estate capital and the improvement of urban infrastructure, particularly the roads.

From the point of view of public policy, we should not ignore the market trends that influence a decrease in the physical distances between social groups, as restricted as this phenomenon is to certain parts of the urban periphery and as limited as the effect is on certain poor groups. In any case, it is another empirical revelation that the poor are not segregated inevitably by the markets, and it offers a historic opportunity to reverse segregation to some degree. It is important to reinforce these market processes within the policies to control segregation.

The second trend corresponds to the increase of the segregation scale, particularly for newly impoverished households. Earlier, when we discussed the relationship between land markets and segregation, we emphasized the phenomenon that we have labeled "propagation of land speculation." In the context of the liberalization and reduction of regularization policies of land markets implemented in recent decades in Latin America, this phenomenon affects the whole of the urban space, stimulating spatially generalized increases in land prices. In this manner, the increase in the segregation of the poor would reach a regional scale (Sabatini and Smolka, 2001). At a maximum, poor families who access a house should do so in areas far from the urban fringe, whether in open spaces or less populated central areas.

INCREASE IN THE NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF SEGREGATION

The segregation of the poor groups in the Latin American cities has both urban and social impacts. Among the first type of impacts, it is worth mentioning the accessibility difficulties and the deficiencies of services and urban facilities in certain residential areas. Among the second, the problems of social disintegration explained earlier are worth discussing further. They represent forms of impoverishment or social degradation linked to the disadvantages of physical isolation.

The urban impacts are well known. Spatial segregation causes the poor people of our cities to become even poorer. However, the social disintegration effects, and their vast social impacts, are relatively recent. We could say that segregation is showing a "negativeness" which was not previously noticeable with such intensity and scope. In Chile, the empirical studies illustrate that, before the 80s, segregation of the poor did not have the same socially disintegrating effects that are apparent today. In addition, some social variables, such as scholastic performance, employment and indolence of the youth, showed less negative values within the most segregated, poor census tracks (socially homogenous) in comparison with poor census tracks of greater social diversity (Sabatini *et.al.,* 2001b). According to Touraine's famous locution, this segregation, in a political context of "centrality of the marginalized groups," favored the organization and the social and political "empowerment" of the poor people. Clearly, the circumstances in the case of Santiago, in which we detect this positive effect, may constitute an exception, while demonstrating at least one possibility that has apparently disappeared.

Thus, we conclude that while in the past, segregation of the poor had both negative (urban) and positive (education, employment, and family associated with the political and social strengthening of its territorial base) effects, the most complex effects of social decomposition are now worsening. The explanations are spatially "objective," associated with the relentless increase in the intensity and scale of segregation of most of the poor, and spatially subjective, associated with the surge of territorial stigmas and the reinforcement of existing stigmas. In addition, there are non-spatial explanations, related to the "flexibility" of the employment markets and the advancement of a political system "based on marketing research" that limits the political participation of the poor in voting.

During acute social crises, under uncertain and insecure conditions of "economic globalization" and increased flexibility in labor relations, the negative consequences and disadvantages of spa-

tial isolation become particularly severe, as indicated by the current situation in some cities of Argentina. In a crisis so severe that the main economic and social variables collapse (employment, income, investments, etc.), it is interesting to explore the changes in the urban spatial structure and figure out the causes. The few indications available, an area that is certainly in need of more thorough examination, highlight changes such as the movement of middle class residents from central places to the poor periphery, and, as we mentioned earlier, the "popularization" of the Center evident in Sao Paulo and Concepción.

One fact attracting the attention of Argentina is the small amount of violence that erupts in such dramatic social situations. The solidarity networks, mutual aid and expansion of barter systems seem to work together in strengthening feelings of unity amongst the Argentineans against adversity. Perhaps the social spatial mixture may be playing a part in this *sui generis* process in the progress towards social integration. Which advancement opportunities in the control and reduction of residential segregation offer such acute crises? In Chapter 5, which relates to Policies, we will come back to this discussion.

THE FIXATION ON TERRITORIAL STIGMAS

In order for the negative effects of socially homogenous areas towards the interior of the cities to take place, the concurrence of territorial stigmas is required. Without these stigmas, it would be difficult to understand why spatial segregation develops from social disintegration. These negative territorial images usually contrast those associated with the other form of objective segregation, functional or ethnic enclaves. Neighborhoods of bohemians or artists, of restaurants, of Italian, Chinese or other minority ethnic groups, are usually associated with the cosmopolitan condition of each city and its tourist attractions.

Problems of violence and social disintegration taking place in immigrant neighborhoods of European cities do not invalidate this fact. In reality, these neighborhoods are not enclaves of segregation, as we have defined them here. They do not correspond to the spatial concentration of a single ethnic group sharing space with people of another origin.

Rather, they correspond to impoverished ghettos, which are the spatial concentration of poor people, immigrants or non-immigrants, generated by the functioning of the economy. An ethnically diverse, poor population, as well as a few poor natives, usually crowds together in the ghettos. For example, an extensive variety of ethnic groups, and no less than 30 percent of Swedish families, makes up the worst neighborhoods of some Swedish cities (Andersson and Molina, 2001). The homogeneity in poverty, rather than the concentration of immigrants, is the most probable cause of most of the problems. The fact that many of them are foreign does not produce rather aggravates the social isolation, which originates in the labor markets, and is later reinforced, as much by objective spatial segregation as by increasing territorial stigmas.

The major significance of these spatially negative images is expressed through the recent disadvantages faced by inhabitants of poor neighborhoods of our cities. It has become common for these residents to conceal their address to increase the possibilities of finding a job, as demonstrated in the case of Rio de Janeiro, where there is a market for the poor population in the renting of formal addresses.

Although associated in intensity and geographic scale with objective segregation, territorial stigmas do not necessarily disappear or weaken when segregation recedes. The persistence of territorial stigmas, beyond the modifying circumstances of spatial isolation and social homogeneity that influenced their development, is one of the most complex facets of the phenomenon. This is a critical hurdle for any policy to control segregation within our cities, and forces us to supplement urban and spatial instruments with social, non-spatial measures, as we will discuss in the next chapter.

Policy to Control Segregation and its Relation to the Territorial Strategy of Social Program Coordination

In this panorama of precarious information and empirical studies, in which even the theoretical dialogue is biased, it is difficult and rather daring to make policy proposals. For most, the panorama of urban segregation in Latin America has important specificities beyond the shared characteristics among cities of the region, and the policies should address these differences. In addition, as we will emphasize, the policies to control segregation should be "calibrated" to the cultural characteristics and circumstances of each situation in a methodical trial and error type of process. Countries with a tradition of such policies, particularly the United States, understand the necessity to carefully design and periodically modify the policies in order to obtain the desired effects and prevent them from generating an outcome which is completely opposite of what they set out to accomplish.

Nevertheless, there are sufficient hints as to the reality of residential segregation in the Region, particularly concerning its effects and trends, helping to provide the general foundation of a policy to control segregation. The subsequent pages contribute to this task.

GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF A POLICY TO CONTROL SEGREGATION

The general objectives of a policy to control residential segregation should be to stimulate social integration. In order to do so, the policy must differentiate the explainable and positive components of segregation from the negative ones, especially those affecting the poor.

Simultaneously, this policy should balance the combination of two possible methods of social integration: the traditional method of social mobility, and the integration from diversity, predominantly emphasized today.

In fact, the trendy concepts of urban social integration encourage the efforts to surpass the old "assimilation" models of social integration, replacing them with models that increase integration from the diversity. Specifically, the classic interpretation of the sociologists of the School of Chicago, from the early 20th century, pointed out an assimilation of minorities into the predominant social and physical structures of the city, loosing their initial spatial segregated status. The critique of the school of Chicago and the new concepts of integration seem to suit the cities in which integration, and similarly residential segregation, problems include clear ethnic and racial components, as in the United States, Canada and Europe.

Nevertheless, how can we apply these new emphases to our cities, where the most explicit form of residential segregation is not ethnic, but socioeconomic? It is not possible to equate socioeconomic disparities to ethnic ones, given that all the groups are equal in value and positively diversified. The socioeconomic differences are hierarchical, whereas the ethnic differences, initially and independent of income level, are horizontal. The first denote social inequalities; and the second, social differences.

The reinforcement of the territorial identities, in the sense of belonging to a neighborhood or sector of the city, appears as a method of adding social diversity to our cities and, ideally, of converting the inequalities into differences. Another method is to pay attention to the ethnic minorities in our cities, such as the indigenous peoples. Considering that these individuals are part of the poor segregated groups, the revitalization of their culture counteracts a "bad" socioeconomic segregation (social homogeneity) with a "positive" ethnic segregation (the concentration of members of a minority group in areas that they share with non-indigenous people). This would constitute progress with respect to diversity, and would not imply the need to move any person from his/her place of residence.

The same struggles and efforts that built many of the poor neighborhoods of Latin American cities open up a third avenue of working for more effective territorial identities. The experiences of accomplishment and success usually facilitate feelings of "belonging," as well as strengthen territorial identities.[12] The significant feelings of success and accomplishment are undeniable in the construction of these settlements, based on the strengths of the grass root organizations and their own efforts, and in defiance of uncooperative laws and policies. Finally, the densification and construction of second homes on their lots, particularly when counting on the support of *ad hoc* programs and policies, might help the economic advancement of many poor families. In addition, greater levels of social diversity are made possible, which promotes a more distinct identity of the areas and greater sense of belonging for their occupants.

We must consider that, in terms of the present subject, the straight adoption of the integration discourse "for diversity" could influence strategies that implicitly promote a structure similar to a social caste system. Whereas the ethnic differences and, especially, the racial differences are relatively rigid, one can manipulate the socioeconomic distinctions through social mobility. To a certain extent, insisting on the integration approach through diversity could throw water on the mill of more traditional positions in regards to segregation. The groups that resist the reversal of residential segregation argue that, similar to other social groups, poor or discriminated groups have "lifestyles" that should be respected.

From a spatial point of view, the argument indicates that the segregated neighborhoods have a progressive dynamic, or neighborhood fabric, which should not be hindered, or altered. This interpretation confuses affluent neighborhoods with city, and the data is contradictory. The available evidence indicates that social mobility and the different forms of segregation reversal and social spatial mixing are aspirations of the poor or discriminated groups. It also shows that spatial segregation of the poor produces complex problems of social disintegration, particularly in the present times, casting a shadow on the progressive elements in those specific neighborhoods.

The balanced combination of both strategies of social integration, mobility and social diversity, should be a permanent concern of any policy to control segregation.

We should make special mention of the atmosphere of economic and social crisis currently looming over several countries of the region. The need to attain minimum conditions of survival can ignite changes in patterns of residential segregation, as we have commented before. Crisis environments seemingly cause increases in residential mobility, and with that, opportunities to attain objectives of increasing spatial social mixing or physical integrating between social groups. The atmosphere of opportunity also arises from the weakening of the differentiation and social discrimination logics observed in "normal" times. The "social learning" in a more socially mixed and integrated urban life could be part of the same urban housing and social policies designed to respond to the crisis, similar to the way in which the immediate reaction to cope with natural disasters might include large scale objectives of hazard prevention.[13]

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES

Consistent with the analysis we have developed thus far, the specific objectives of a policy to control segregation would be:

- Extensive physical interaction between peoples of different social groups.
- Better access to city services for the poor.
- Weakening of territorial stigmas.

[12] The connection between success and territorial identity is one of the main findings in urban communities of Uruguay, identified through the studies of Arocena *et.al.* (1993).

[13] Other more detained discussions of "social learning," such as the process linked to the tradition of the urban planning, is found in Friedmann (1992); and a presentation of urban policies oriented towards the construction of diversified urban spaces, is observed in Sennett (1970).

The best strategy to follow in attaining these objectives would consist of measures designed to neutralize the following urban processes:

- The conversion of first type segregation to the second type, meaning, a process of avoiding the dilemma of the spatial concentration of a group ending up as a spatial social homogeneity;
- The broadening of the geographic scale of segregation between poor groups; and
- The formation of territorial stigmas or the persistence of existing stigmas.

When stated in positive terms, the strategy would include practices designed to:

- Increase social spatial diversity;
- Reduce the geographic scale of segregation; and
- Create urban conditions or environments that avoid the development of territorial stigmas.

It is difficult to find a pure example of a socially homogenous neighborhood. Similarly, a segregated neighborhood will always subsist in some intermediate point between spatial concentration of the predominant group and the social heterogeneity of the area. Therefore, we should identify the best possible situation, which undoubtedly cannot be determined technically, rather empirically. In other words, determining the margin between enclave and ghetto is a process of trial and error, requiring public management and a policy design with strong, inductive components, fieldwork and coordination of territorial initiatives. We could say the same of efforts oriented towards the neutralization or destruction of stigmas. Detailed *ex ante* formulas do not exist.

The policy proposed would be fundamentally directed to control residential segregation of the very poor. However, because the segregation of the poor is dependent on the segregation process of other groups and other areas of the city, policies and programs would have to include actions on those other areas and groups. Furthermore, some of the main actions would have to apply, considerably or exclusively, to these groups or areas. For instance, it is more difficult to increase the social spatial diversity within poor neighborhoods, than in middle and high-class neighborhoods through the integration of poor families within these affluent areas. We could say the same concerning the decrease of the geographic scale of segregation: which fundamentally consists of promoting the dispersion of middle and high-income residential developments in the total space of each city.

POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

A policy to control segregation for Latin American cities could be made up of the following policies and programs, oriented towards realizing the objectives previously enumerated:

- mobility of the people;
- the control of urban development and land uses; and
- the improvement and recovery of the neighborhoods.

Policies and programs of population mobility

In Latin American cities, a high proportion of low-income housing is private property, contrasting to the prevalence of rentals in similar groups of Europe and North America. In spite of this, residential mobility is significant in the first case.

There are practically no systematic or comparable studies concerning residential mobility in Latin America. Recently, the population and housing census began incorporating questions that increase our knowledge of segregation at the intra-urban scale and advances in computer science, allowing us to process large quantities of data more rapidly. Studies are underway, particularly within CEPAL, yet still there are no conclusive findings. As in other themes relative to urban residential segregation in Latin America, it is imperative to study the residential mobility in order to design successful practices.

Possibly, the simultaneous occurrence of owner occupied housing and residential mobility is explained by the significant housing deficit faced within these groups (doubling up of households); and by the fact that mobility diminishes when low-income households have access to lots or houses in full ownership status. A context of residential mobility could facilitate the application of residential segregation modification measures. Rather than transferring the families, it is possible

to have a significant influence on the destination points of families who change their residence.

Spatial Dispersion of Poor Families. Programs of spatial dispersion of the poor should be a part of the social housing policies, not only because these programs help lessen the most severe consequences of segregation, but also because they open up the possibilities for the poor families to chose where they want to live.

The preference of the spatially segregated lower-income groups to live in more integrated neighborhoods appears to be an international trend. Conversely, many people of higher social status consider the preference to segregate as "natural." This belief is so widespread that one of the more prevalent arguments justifying segregation is that the poor individuals, despite their societal origin, prefer living in socially homogenous neighborhoods. The studies repeatedly show that this conviction is largely erroneous amongst poor or discriminated groups.[14]

On the other hand, it is important to mention the fact that the individual liberties of these groups are usually sacrificed in social policies. Perhaps, social spatial segregation, and this lack of freedom in choosing their place of residence, reveals that groups achieve progress within our cities by moving to a new area, rather than improving the existing neighborhoods. For many, the desire to move to a new neighborhood is not just a dream, yet also promotes the negligent treatment of the neighborhoods in which they live.

The dispersion of poor families could be accomplished through social housing projects localized in affluent areas of the cities, or by offering subsidies for the purchase or rental of housing, allowing low-income families access to other submarkets.

The beneficiary families of these programs will fulfill a crucial roll for the city. Poor families living in neighborhoods mostly occupied by other social groups contribute in order to prevent spatial concentration (first dimension of segregation) from turning into spatial social homogeneity (second dimension).

One of the most significant obstacles faced by this type of initiative is the increase in the direct costs of social housing programs. Confronted with this obstacle, it is important to emphasize the fact that if urban policies do not develop their objectives and practices to meet longer temporal horizons - where the indirect or social costs are no longer felt – they would be unable to solve the problems such as those associated with segregation. Conceivably, there are no successfully applied measures to control segregation that have not had to assume a more comprehensive spatial and temporal perspective, unbound to the direct costs of the interventions.[15]

[14] Even the groups that are most susceptible to explicit rejection in mixed neighborhoods, like the African-Americans in the United States, show a clear preference for integrated solutions (Schuman *et.al.*, 1997; Squires, 2001).

[15] The United States show advances worthy of more research concerning this practice of spatial dispersion of poor families. The most famous case is the *Housing Choice Voucher* program, known as *Section 8,* introduced in the Nineties. It is a subsidy allowing poor households to rent in middle-class neighborhoods. Also noteworthy are programs of de-segregation applied in different cities and municipalities around the country, particularly from the mid-nineties. They consist especially of the construction of small, low-density public housing projects in middle class suburban neighborhoods. These projects include complementary demolition programs of public housing buildings. In 1996, they demolished 30,000 social housing building and they hoped to demolish 100,000 more between 1997 and 2000; between 1996 and 1999, 136,300 small, public house groups homes were constructed in dispersed locations in various neighborhoods, many of which were middle class; and in March 1997, they announced a construction program of 193,800 social houses in 2400 neighborhoods (Belkin, 1999). Both dispersion policies have provoked aggravated and long conflicts. Nevertheless, the programs that have provoked the most serious social, political and legal conflicts, those reaching the Supreme Court of the United States, such as the Gautreaux program in Chicago (1976) and Yonkers in New York (1993), have had mainly positive effects for the immigrants, including the neighbors - see, respectively, Rosembaum and Popkin (1991) and Briggs *et.al.* (1999), which produce results supporting this practice.

In any case, the dispersion of poor families is more feasible in cities where the poor are a minority, as in developed countries. Programs of this type benefit only a small percentage of the poor in Latin American cities. However, the dispersion of affluent families seems a more "productive" policy in terms of making changes to the segregation pattern. In principle, the main disadvantage is that moving one of these families to a low-income area is much more complex than moving a poor family to a better neighborhood. Nevertheless, the dispersion of middle class and upper class families is common and supported by a new type of market process, making it reasonable to consider it a new practice and possible policy, as we will discuss later in this document.

Spatial Concentration of Families with Similar Ethnic or Cultural Origin. The poor population of the cities is usually heterogeneous based on variables other than the economic-social condition. Usually there are foreign or indigenous groups, particularly in times of significant international migratory flows. The cultural wealth that these groups represent for the city is likely to dissolve if they are spatially dispersed. However, by attaining a certain degree of spatial concentration, they can add diversity and identity to specific neighborhoods. There is a spontaneous inclination, at least on the part of families who integrate these minority groups, to move closer geographically.[16] Through public intervention, it would be feasible to recognize and, to a certain degree, stimulate these preferences.

A controlled policy of spatial concentration of these particular groups should be a part of the general policy to control segregation, as much from a cultural policy point of view, in its objective of cultural preservation of the indigenous or of Latin American integration, as through adding social diversity to the homogenous poor neighborhoods. We emphasize control because it prevents the extreme over-representation of a particular group within a neighborhood from prompting an exodus of local families or non-natives. We must handle this intervention with extreme caution, as we run the danger of promoting the social or territorial stigmatization of these groups or neighborhoods. As a complementary practice, perhaps as an element of other social policies, we should support these minority groups in developing networks or communities of non-territorial interest.

Public Transportation. Urban transportation is one of the key factors of residential segregation. If certain upper class families did not have access to an automobile, they could not significantly separate themselves from other social groups. Similarly, while workers and families of modest income did not have access to public transportation, they could not move away, or be moved away, from neighborhoods and other areas of ample employment opportunities. The segregation was kept at a relatively reduced scale, determined by the necessity of physical interaction between social groups.

Partly for cultural reasons, the effect of the changes in transportation technology in the cities of Latin America was more evident in the social isolation of the poor rather than in the upper class groups. As we have indicated, the "high-income neighborhoods" are more socially diverse than the areas inhabited by the poor.

Similarly, the more relevant transportation policies in the control of segregation are those that actually improve the public transportation services. Nevertheless, these require disincentives for the use of automobiles, particularly with the purpose of allocating a more significant percentage of the streets for massive public transportation use and reducing the travel times for the poor, which are usually quite high.

Even though the residential segregation patterns did not change, the improvement of public transportation allowed low-income groups greater access to the city and more substantial interaction with other social groups. Better transportation services allow for better accessibility to the city, and they lessen the negative impact, on a specified geographic scale, of residential segregation.

Household Eradication. There are situations in which the forced eradication of poor families to

[16] Gissi (2001) discovered this segregation trend within the families of Mapuche origin in the impoverished periphery of Santiago

other neighborhoods is necessary, either to protect them from physical risks, to protect the environmental standards or to eliminate territorial stigmas. The environmental and legal regularization of land use may require it. In addition, and as indicated while discussing the previous group of policies and programs, the territorial disruption of stigmas and the reduction of delinquency problems that commonly manifest in those areas, often require this extreme measure.

Policies and Programs to Control Urban Development Processes and Land Uses

Spatial Dispersion of Residential Neighborhoods and "Modern" Commercial Centers. The support of the dispersion of these private developments for the middle and high-income groups in the urban space represents a clear example of urban policy taking advantage of and regulating the dynamics of the market in its favor.

As we have analyzed, this dispersion reflects a substantial change taking place in Latin American cities, whose full impact cannot be fully taken advantage of due mainly to ideological resistance. An important and necessary action is the separation of two commonly confused facts: the reduction of the physical distance between social groups that is taking place in the urban periphery, and the use of fences and security systems within the neighborhoods under construction. The social inequalities and, to a certain level, the desire for social exclusion are increasing, yet the geographic scale of residential segregation is diminishing.

The limited studies completed on this phenomenon, considering the point of view of the low-income neighbors witnessing these new developments within their areas, indicate that the families perceive this phenomenon as positive. The benefits are as symbolic as they are material or functional. The poor families extensively welcome "modernization," as it causes the social stigmatization of the sector or municipality to regress. In material terms, the construction of the new developments improves the quality of services and urban facilities of the area, promoting the conformation of sub-centers within the city; and in regards to the functional aspects, it cuts down the travel time for the poor due to greater proximity of the service and employment opportunities.[17]

It could be possible to direct the spatial dispersion of "modern" residential neighborhoods and commercial centers from the public sector. The localization of investments in public works, changes in the norms of land use, tax exemption measures and even concessions could be used to influence the localization of these projects.

Control of Land Speculation. Measures both to control the process of land incorporation with urban usage and to capture capital gains seem unavoidable when attempting to avoid the negative effect of the free operation of land markets in the residential segregation of the poor.

The uncontrolled projection of the inherently speculative logic of private land ownership and management, to the peri-urban areas, only promotes an increase in land prices and, with it, the segregation of the poor to an even larger scale.[18] Measures to control the geographic expansion of the city should not be inflexible, rather developed to avoid the speculative spirals of land prices that eventually reinforce the large-scale segregation of the poor. We have observed processes that are positive to a certain degree for segregation, such as the dispersion of "modern" real estate projects, which likewise have had significantly negative effects on the segregation of the poor, specifically with respect to new poor families. Along with "the modern" projects, the expectations of better land prices propagate amongst the community.

It seems inevitable to face, with *ad hoc* methods, the speculative rationality that contributes to the larger scale reproduction of the traditional segregation of the poor and permeates the private own-

[17] Certain empirical studies in Chile that prove the positive valuations made by the poor regarding the reduction of the scale of segregation are those of Galleguillos (2000), Sellés and Stambuk (2001) and Sabatini *et.al.* (2001b).

[18] The policies of liberalization of land dispersion applied in countries of different continents have failed in their objective to control the price inflation; rather the effect has been to stimulate the increase in prices (Comby and Renard, 1996; Sabatini, 2000).

ership of land and of the markets in which the land is transacted. The control of urban growth, today largely left to market forces, would be one method, and the capture of capital gains another.

The capture of capital gains, in addition to its ethical justification, is imperative to influence the evolution of segregation. One of the commonly asserted arguments against methods of segregation reversion is that they cause a patrimonial loss to the residents and a weakening of the urban development dynamic of the neighborhoods. In opposing these arguments, there are two possible strategies to consider:

- The establishment of minimum norms of social spatial mixing (which we will review at a later point); and
- New normative and positive, rather than punitive, methods to capture capital gains.

The capture of capital gains is required to debilitate the speculative logic that permeates land markets, as well as the rather unjustified connection made by the private agents between increases in the value of real estate and the segregation (exclusion) of the poor. Many middle and high-income families decide to live in segregated residential locations, based not entirely on their preferences, rather more on the belief that it is necessary in order to increase the value of the real estate. This conviction is not coherent with the cultural attitudes of these groups in seeking broader levels of social mixing in the space.

Among the new, less threatening forms of capital gains capture are the concession schemes for locating public works (or the inter-temporal priorities in the execution of planned public works) and the concessions of modifications of the land use norms. These two factors, public works and changes in land use norms, have a vast influence on the value of land in each city, specifically in the spatial projection of the progression of land appreciation. These are intrinsic powers of the State, unutilized in capturing capital gains, generated by the joint efforts of the public sector and the community. The modality of concessions allows for the introduction of this policy as a mechanism to finance urban development, rather than to establish new taxes.

Social Housing Quotas. The enforcement of social housing quotas in middle and high-income residential developments is a new approach to urbanism and zoning, helping to promote the socially mixed uses of the land.

Varying in modalities and intensity, this form of measurement exists in several countries outside Latin America. Frequently, they are expressed in percentages of land or constructed area within the new residential neighborhoods, and at other times, they are formulated as an objective concerning the social composition of districts or inner-city areas.

Nevertheless, the formation "from the top down" of socially integrated neighborhoods has considerable dangers. For example, the inadequate localization of the neighborhoods might involve high transportation costs for the residents or a high dependency on automobile use, creating particularly severe difficulties for the low-income families, driving them further into poverty.

Alternatively, excessively high quotas of participation of poor families could force out the remaining families, triggering a process of social homogenization in the neighborhood, precisely the phenomenon that they are trying to avoid. In Europe, similar housing programs of social integration failed in the nineties.[19]

It seems inevitable that a method of trial and error be integrated into the formulation and implementation of this type of program, in which the social, cultural and urban diversity of each city are critical in attaining the desired results.

As we have anticipated, the promotion of this policy stimulates two main issues of debate. There are those referring to the patrimonial damage, which we have already discussed, and those referring to the "unnatural" character of social spatial mixing, which is less sustainable. The second relies on false data, such as data insinuating that spatial segregation has always existed in every

[19] France exhibits an outstanding case of application and revision of these types of programs under Lionel Jospin's governmental policy of "urban solidarity."

city throughout time, or that cohabitation between classes encourages hatred and resentment.

The fixation on these quotas of incorporating social housing should be universal in order to prevent the introduction of additional distortions within the urban markets. For the same reason, it is not advisable to set fixed quotas from case to case, as was evident in the renowned judicial litigation cases triggered by programs of desegregation in cities of the United States.

Policies and Programs of Neighborhood Improvement and Rehabilitation

Territorial Coordination of Services and Social Programs. A strategy of territorial coordination in the provision of urban social services aims at implementing a multi-sector attack on poverty. The actions in specialized fields concerning social necessities and problems should be mutually reinforced. A specific sector program – for example, of labor training - can be neutralized or surpassed by the families' overall condition of poverty, if no attention is given to health, housing and recreation, among others.

It seems obvious that spatial segregation of the poor facilitates the introduction of similar social policies. The spatial concentration of the beneficiaries not only assists the multi-sector actions concerning poverty, yet also allows for cost reductions in the provision of services and better conditions for monitoring and modification of the interventions. Nevertheless, these advantages do not require that the beneficiaries live in socially homogenous areas; only that they live closer to one another.

By living in closer proximity, the poor can help themselves politically. The change in the situation of segregation shown by the cities is not only a question of law and the design and implementation of policies and programs "from the top down." Social mobilization seems to be a requirement to introduce sustainable changes to the pattern of residential segregation. In the least, we draw this conclusion from the historical experience of the United States, perhaps the country with the most segregated cities today, as well as the society showing the most systematic efforts to control segregation. Since the introduction of the Fair Housing Act in 1968, the accomplishments in the fight against segregation have been due mainly to the social struggles of the discriminated groups themselves (Atlas, 2002).

Although we should not confuse segregation with poverty, the improvement of the living conditions of many families living in poor neighborhoods contributes to the reduction in their social homogeneity (the "negative" dimension of segregation). We should also consider that for many poor families, the option to settle in neighborhoods of predominantly affluent social groups is not a comfortable alternative. The progressive development of their existing neighborhood continues to be a more desirable option, for the poor families as well as the city. The promotion of social diversity in these neighborhoods through the territorial coordination of initiatives to overcome poverty, including the encouragement of new enterprises, is a promising path in stimulating neighborhood rooting and identity, and helps prevent the formation of territorial stigmas. The support for grouping families of indigenous origin, as indicated before, can also add social diversity to poor neighborhoods of the cities.

The preference to live in a community where others are equal in social status is an inclination many people have and should be respected. This is not a crucial problem, as long as it does not debilitate the personal contact of the poor families with people of more affluent social conditions. Thus, neighborhood improvement programs in poor areas are specific tools in the control of segregation. In order to increase overall benefits, the explicit incorporation of such programs within a general policy to control segregation seems prudent.

Land regularization. These programs have been applied in different countries of the region with varied intensity. They are important components of any policy to control segregation. Illegal land occupation or lack of compliance with land use and construction norms, designate many poor neighborhoods as "illegal" or "irregular." The social polarization between the stigmatized neighborhoods and the rest of the city, an issue faced daily in cities all around the world, is un-

doubtedly fueled by this condition of illegality or irregularity.

Unfortunately, the regularization policy tends to generate more problems than it solves. The declining significance of informal land markets, the reinforcement of the private ownership and the failure of liberalization policies to control land prices, are all factors that make accessing the land more difficult than it already was for the poor families (Sabatini and Smolka, 2001). Despite the social objectives we discussed, these actions could reinforce the spatial segregation of the poor in these cities, taking it to wider territorial scales.

Without land speculation control measures, such as those previously discussed, it seems difficult to avoid these negative secondary effects of providing poor families with legal access to land. The granting of legal ownership rights to land should not be an isolated measure, rather a part of the political process that grants legal status to the "rights to the city" (Fernandes, 2001; Fernandes & Varley, 1998). At the same time, measures to regularize land ownership should be included in a general policy to control segregation, with the containment of land speculation as one of its central elements.

Battling the Delinquencies and Territorial Stigmas. The multi-sector programs that battle delinquencies and territorial stigmas are necessary and important components of a policy to control segregation. Once consolidated, territorial stigmas no longer depend on the segregation pattern from which they originated. Therefore, the disarticulation of these stigmas requires a combination of social policies. In extreme cases, the partial eradication of the residential population might be necessary, as previously indicated.

The insecurity of employment, the lack of coverage of social services, including a pension system, and the precariousness of jobs are all general urban conditions that widely facilitate the development of territorial stigmas. In order to sort through the amassing of social disintegration problems, and the violence that often accompanies them, it is essential to design programs to dismantle existing territorial stigmas.

Delaying the implementation of these types of initiatives causes the problems to worsen. Thus, a concrete alternative to social and economic integration usually arises and takes over these neighborhoods: the drug networks and mafias. In many poor Latin American neighborhoods there are conditions similar to those that historians recognize as precursors to the emergence of the gangster phenomena (see, for example, Gambetta, 1991). Initially, these communities exhibit a general feeling of mistrust in the State, the formal economy and the judicial system. After losing confidence in "the system," the people open themselves to other accessible alternatives, including trafficking drugs from their own homes. The right to do so, surpassing the moral implications, is a conviction that increases hand in hand with the unemployment situation and the negation of formal citizen rights.

In an international arena, and particularly in Europe, the Nineties symbolized a progressive era in the recovery of "neighborhoods in crisis." Initially, the neighborhoods are identified, and later they become the objects of multi-sector programs, with varied results and degrees of success. Within the European Community, a network of more than 40 cities with "neighborhoods in crisis" formed. They are now executing programs of physical and economic recovery, as well as social integration. The focus of these neighborhoods is poverty and not the foreign origin of their occupants.

The Favela Bairro program in Rio de Janeiro, supported by the I.A.D.B, is perhaps the most significant program of this type existing in Latin America. Although it does not focus on segregation, we can analyze it as a program that battles segregation, with the incorporation of these settlements into the design and life of the city as one of its central objectives. This is accomplished through measures that include the improvement of road conditions and the development of economic activities and services, already offered in other parts of the city, which could be made available for the use of residents in the neighborhoods surroundings the beneficiary "favela."

The scarce actions to control or reverse segregation taken on by Latin American cities today are concentrated in these types of initiatives. Many of

these correspond to *ad hoc* programs developed to confront critical situations of delinquency and violence in certain neighborhoods. These programs, whether isolated or more balanced, should include explicit objectives focusing on segregation, including some measures that facilitate the mobility of people in the urban space and others that lessen the negative images of these neighborhoods.

THE ROLL OF THE I.A.D.B.

The I.A.D.B. can make an obvious contribution to the initiatives listed in the third group of policies and programs. They have demonstrated such contributions in their support of the Favela Neighborhood program. Nevertheless, the Bank can also play a more direct and important role in the remaining policies.

A clear case would be the policy that refers to the localization of urban infrastructure investments. The localization, or timing, of these investments could be integrated with the objectives to change the cities' pattern of segregation. The support of "participating budgets," such as those used by the municipality of Belo Horizonte in Brazil, or the support of schemes of concessions for the location and timing of the investments, are two possible methods of integrating policies to control segregation within Bank operations.

We must think of the city as a resource to promote social integration. Accordingly, we can facilitate the daily movement of the people in the city space as well as their residence changes. In addition, we can promote urban development processes, largely focused on social mixing in the space, and eliminate the state of hopelessness, impoverishment and social degradation that our cities indisputably produce. The I.A.D.B. is undoubtedly capable of making significant contributions in each one these areas.

Annex
The Latin American Segregation Paradigm

We have indicated that the most widespread explanation of residential segregation in Latin American cities is to attribute it to the strong existing social inequalities. This reflects a dominant vision that has developed into a true intellectual paradigm. It not only includes theoretical affirmations (explanations), but also philosophical orientations regarding the perceived reality and the appropriate methods of research. Consequently, we talk of a paradigm and not simply of an explanatory approach.

We will identify the key aspects of the paradigm and discuss the essential factors of each one. In addition, we will emphasize our main divergences with respect to each aspect.

There are studies by Latin American specialists worth mentioning that constitute, in one or more aspects, exceptions to the paradigm. Largely, the theoretical and methodological restructuring needed by this field of study relies on these exceptions.

Subsequently, we will outline and critically discuss the main characteristics of the Latin American segregation paradigm.

The definition of the concept of segregation is vague. Segregation is commonly confused with inequalities, social polarization and urban poverty in books and discourse. Segregation is the term used by many urban planners in defining urban poverty. Anti-spatialism, engaging with Latin American urbanism (Towers, 1996), seems to strip the concept of segregation of its spatial essence. The urban planner is limited to study the manifestations or spatial expressions of social and economic phenomenon defined "outside" of the space.

Studies of segregation are inspired by the ideological energy of denouncing the social structures. These studies can help expose negative factors and forces on which the social system is based. We have discussed the three most popular explanations of segregation in Latin American literature: social inequalities, the real estate speculation and the imitation of cultural patterns of developed nations. The three explanations are more useful in the criticism of Capitalism than in helping to understand the characteristics and true trends of residential segregation in our cities.

Segregation is "natural" and impossible to revert. Segregation could phase out solely if social inequalities and poverty disappeared. As the battle with both social inequalities and poverty is constant, and perhaps impossible to win, thus segregation becomes literally, "natural" or "normal." Segregation has always been and will continue to be a part of the urban scene. This conclusion is similar to the arguments, from rightist ideologies, insinuating that poverty and inequalities have always existed and will exist forever.

Those ideological biases go along with another methodological bias: the reductionism of empirical work. In the empirical studies, they select facts or aspects that satisfy what we know "theoretically," such as the notion that inequalities are increasing and therefore segregation is increasing. The generalized preference for the study of gated communities is perhaps the most common modality that adopts reductionism.

Complementary, reductionism and the ideological bias also encourage an obstinate attitude in confronting the empirical evidences that threaten the descriptive structure of the paradigm. For example, many of the authors have surrendered to the empirical evidence that physical distance between the rich and poor is diminishing in important areas of the cities, as an effect of spatial dispersion of residential developments for middle and upper-income groups. Thus, they end up making declarations of faith, such as "segregation equally exists" or that even through progressive movement,

spatial segregation continues to be a significant issue. Others look for explanations of the reduced distances, such as the implication that the gated design of the neighborhoods allows the poor to live in proximity, ignoring the fact that, whatever the explanation may be, objectively they reduce the distances. Finally, there are those who criticize this reduction of segregation, for example denouncing it as a "perverse reduction of segregation," and attributing it to spatially fortuitous facts (such as the impoverishment of traditionally less segregated middle-income groups), which permits them to propagate the validity of the impoverishment and social polarization processes.

Consequently, this does not comply with perhaps the basic requirement of all scientific research: to submit your ideas (hypothesis) with the risk of empirical rejection. According to the British aphorism, the researchers apparently point out, "these are the conclusions that support my hypothesis."

Segregation, as we have indicated, is a complex phenomenon due to its different dimensions, the variations according to geographic scales and its ambivalent correlation to the formation of social identities, and it tends to be over simplified in the Latin American paradigm.

It would not have distinguishable dimensions. It would always be negative. It would not have autonomy as a spatial phenomenon capable of influencing others, rather it would be a simple manifestation of different forces; an epiphenomenon that only enable us to discover the operations of the other forces.

A scarce quantity of empirical research in segregation exists in Latin America. Aside from the exceptional cases, researchers do not work with statistical indexes of segregation, or there are neither continuous nor comparable statistics of the phenomenon. Systematic statistical research is a remote ideal.

Researchers do not study the subjective dimensions of the phenomenon, whose most imperative concern are territorial stigmas, highly significant in the growing "new poverty" (underclass, the ghetto effect), and in the increasing negativeness exhibited by spatial segregation of the poor in cities of Latin America[20].

A marked bias towards the static study of segregation can be observed. In spite of being a process, a static, or at its best, a "statically comparative," approach predominates amongst students of segregation. Perhaps the dominant presence of architects and geographers in the field of urban planning, more so than sociologists, economists and anthropologists, can explain this bias.

The most widespread tradition of empirical research corresponds to the construction of "colored maps" (thematic plans constructed with spatially segregated census information). These maps represent an impoverished version of city models from the Chicago School, which were actually models of the development of the cities. These "color maps," similar to photography, attempt to portray the social structure (or socially inequalities) when the salient characteristic of the capitalist societies is change and processes of mobility. In the same manner that the spatial is excluded from social reality when conceived as its simple reflection, it tends to drain the social reality of its dynamic or temporal essence.

We construct the paradigm upon the conception of the relations between the social and the spatial, which we can categorize as schematic. Spatial segregation is understood as a "reflection" (and indicator) of social inequalities. There would be a sort of "symmetry" between social inequalities and spatial differences. Quite some time ago, Yujnovski advised that, when designing policies, this social determinism becomes the opposite, spatial determinism. From a simple reflection, the space becomes a causal factor of social changes, as an instrument of policy (Yujnovski, 1975). Between anti-spatialism and spatialism, there is a profound ontological connection: space and society inter-

[20] Perhaps we should recover some of the insightful approaches of many Latin American ONGs of the Eighties, some of which emphasize the importance of subjective realities in the perpetuation of poverty, such as the phenomenon of "learned hopelessness." This is a line of research reaching its peak in the older works of Oscar Lewis concerning the "culture of poverty."

preted as independent elements of the social reality, including the suggestion of formal relations, such as one of "symmetry."

Nevertheless, there are noteworthy exceptions to the Latin American segregation paradigm. The following studies or areas of work illustrate some of the exceptions:

- The works of Flavio Villaca regarding Brazilian cities (1997; 1998)
- Villaca is one of the few researchers granting causal importance to segregation, while focusing on its impacts. Accordingly, the idea of segregation is detached as a simple indicator of social inequalities.
  Many argue that segregation represents an instrument to create and maintain those inequalities. The focus is on the subject of power, indicating that spatial segregation and, specifically, the construction of "high-rent neighborhoods" must be understood as instruments of power in the hands of the upper class groups and the State in order to maintain the injustice that characterizes our social system.
- The works of Martim Smolka (1992a; 1992b) and Samuel Jaramillo (1997) regarding the relationship between the operation of urban land markets, urban structure and residential segregation.
- These works strengthen the understanding of the mutual influence existing between the urban economy and segregation, offering valuable viewpoints and advances in the discovery of specific processes of change in spatial patterns, particularly demonstrated in the case of the abandonment of the central areas by the upper class.
- The works of Alexander Bearings (1990), Rubén Kaztman (2001) and Guillermo Wormald concerning the relationship between segregation, social capital and employment markets.
- Alexander Bearings, in his studies of the informal employment markets, as well as Rubén Kaztman and Guillermo Wormald, in their work in social capital, designate an explicative value to segregation, as a spatial fact influencing the results and limitations of the social policies and employment.
- The works of Edward Telles (1992) and of the group led by Luiz César Ribeiro in Brazil (Preteceille and Ribeiro, 1999) which measure segregation.
- These works comply with the requisites through examining empirical evidence and by having elaborated a theoretical connection between segregation and processes of urban development. The comparisons of our cities with the situations in American and European cities have prompted them to improve their understanding of the cities they study.
- Studies based on the historical evolution of residential segregation in Latin American cities (Amato, 1970; van Lindert and Verkoren, 1982; Sabatini, 1982; of Ramon, 1992; Cáceres *et.al.*, 2002a and 2002b).
- These studies cover the spatial dynamics of all social groups and establish explanatory connections with cultural and economic climates.
- Chilean studies concerning the evolution of segregation with base in census analysis and other types of empirical data (the recent publications are those of Ortiz, 2000; Schiapacasse, 1998; Rodriguez, 2001; Sabatini *et.al,* 2001a and 2001b).

In recent years, diverse Chilean professionals have launched a line of empirical investigation based on the analysis of census statistics, the use of surveys and qualitative methods designed to help understand the evolution of the urban Chilean residential segregation within the last decades. These studies are as descriptive, and of strong geographic connotation, as they are explanatory, in their attempt to connect segregation to the formation of social identities, the real estate markets and the social problems that continue growing in the impoverished "populations" of the Chilean cities.

These different works represent a certain split with the Latin American segregation paradigm that we have criticized. Recently, in certain countries such as Brazil and Chile, and perhaps in Mexico and Argentina as well, the renovations seem to have advanced more than in other years. Likely, this is due to the major reconstruction of their economies. In such context, the changes to traditional patterns emerge with more clarity. In countries with less traditionally segregated cities,

such as Buenos Aires and Mexico City, those changes are not having as strong of an effect on the reduction in the segregation scale as more traditionally segregated cities. Actually, they could be accentuating the scale of segregation in a generalized form within the entire city and groups. Finally, in certain countries more than in others, the persistence of the theoretical structuralist approaches, characteristic of the social sciences of the continent, might be delaying the triumph over the paradigm we have analyzed.

References

Amato, Peter. 1970. “El papel de la elite y patrones de asentamiento en la ciudad latinoamericana”. *Revista Interamericana de Planificación,* Vol. IV, #13-14.

Andersson, Roger; y Molina, Irene. 2001. *Racialization and Migration in Urban Segregation Processes; Key Issues for Critical Geographers*. Universidad de Uppsala: Mimeo.

Arocena, J.; Bervejillo, F.; Capurro, M.; y Trylesinski, F. 1993. *Iniciativa Local en Condiciones Adversas; el caso de Quebracho.* Serie Desarrollo Local #1 del CLAEH. Montevideo: CLAEH.

Atlas, John. 2002. “Courting Racial Justice”. *Reviews,* en el Sitio Web del National Housing Institute (www.nhi.org; 07/05/02).

Belkin, Lisa. 1999. *Show me a Hero; The story of an urban tragedy.* Boston: Little, Brown &Co.

Boal, Frederick. 2001. *Urban Ethnic Segregation and the Scenarios Spectrum*. Ponencia presentada en el seminario internacional Segregation in the City, organizado por el Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. Cambridge, Mass., julio.

Briggs, Xavier de Souza. 2001. *Ties that bind, bridge, and constrain: Social capital and segregation in the American Metropolis.* Ponencia presentada en el seminario internacional Segregation in the City, organizado por el Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. Cambridge, Mass., julio.

Briggs, Xavier de Souza; Darden, Joe; y Aidala, Angela. 1999. “In the Wake of Desegregation: Early Impacts of Scattered-Site Housing on Neighborhoods in Yonkers, New York”. *Journal of the American Planning Association* Vol.65, #1.

Brunner, Karl. 1932. *Santiago de Chile: Su estado Actual y Futura Formación*. Santiago: La Tracción.

Cáceres, Gonzalo; Booth, Rodrigo y Francisco Sabatini. 2002a. "Suburbanización y suburbio en Chile: una mirada al Gran Valparaíso decimonónico (1820-1870)". *Revista Archivium* Nº4.

Cáceres, Gonzalo; Booth, Rodrigo y Francisco Sabatini. 2002b. "La suburbanización de Valparaíso y el origen de Viña del Mar: entre la villa balnearia y el suburbio de ferrocarril (1870-1910)", en Pastoriza, Elisa(Edit.), *Ciudades balnearias del sur: actores, practicas sociales y políticas públicas. Los casos argentino, chileno y uruguayo.* Buenos Aires: Ed. Biblos (en prensa).

Caldeira, Teresa. 2000. *Cidade de muros*. Sao Paulo: Edusp.

Cantle, Ted. 2001. *Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team Chaired by Ted Cantle.* Home Office Ministry, England. (www.homeoffice.gov.uk/reu/community).

Comby, J; y Renard, V. 1996. *Les Politiques Foncières*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Davis, Mike. 2000. “Urbanismo mágico”, *New Left Review*, N°3.

De Ramón, Armando. 1992. *Santiago de Chile: 1541-1991; Historia de una Sociedad Urbana*. Madrid: Mapfre.

Dematteis, Giuseppe. 1997. “Suburbanización y periurbanización. Ciudades anglosajonas y ciudades latinas”, en Monclús, Francisco Javier (Ed.), *La ciudad dispersa*. Barcelona: CCCB.

Durston, John. 2001. *Capital social: Parte del problema, parte de la solución*. Documento de referencia DDR/1 de la CEPAL. Santiago: mimeo.

Fernandes, Edesio & Varley, Ann (Eds.). 1998. *Illegal Cities: Law and Urban Change in Developing Countries*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Fernandes, Edesio. 2001. “Law and the production of urban illegality,” *Land Lines* (May) 13(3): 1-4, Newsletter of the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy

Fishman, Robert. 1987. *Bourgeois Utopias; The Rise and Fall of Suburbia*. New York: Basic Books.

Friedmann, John. 1992. *Empowerment: The Politics of Alternative Development*. Blackwell.

Frúgoli, Heitor. 2000.*Centralidad en Sao Paulo*. Sao Paulo: Cortez.

Galleguillos, Ximena. 2000. *La satisfacción residencial y la segregación urbana en un contexto de pobreza*. Tesis para optar al título de Magíster en Desarrollo Urbano. Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. Santiago: mimeo

Gambetta, Diego. 1991. “La Mafia: el precio de la desconfianza”, en Aguiar, Fernando (Comp.), *Intereses individuales y Acción Colectiva*. Madrid: Editorial Pablo Iglesias.

Germain, Annick y Mario Polèse. 1996. “La ecología humana de Puebla: ensayo de geografía residencial”, en Pérez, Salvador y Mario Polèse (Eds.), *Modelos de análisis y de planificación urbana. Estudios sobre la evolución y tendencias de la ciudad de Puebla*. Ciudad de México: Plaza y Valdés.

Gissi, Nicolás. 2001. *Asentamiento e Identidad Mapuche en Santiago.* Tesis para optar al Magíster en Asentamientos Humanos y Medio Ambiente, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. Santiago: mimeo.

Gorelik, Adrián. 1999. *La Grilla y el Parque*. Buenos Aires: UNQ.

Hack, Gary. 2000. “Infrastructure and regional form”, en Hack, G. y Simmons, R., *Global City Regions: Their Emerging Forms*. Londres: Spon Press.

Hardoy, Jorge Enrique y Margarita Guttman. 1992. Impacto de la urbanización en los centros históricos de Iberoamérica. Tendencias y perspectivas. Madrid: Mapfre.

Hauser, Philip. 1962. La Urbanización en América Latina. París: UNESCO.

Hiernaux, Daniel. 2000. *Metropoli y Etnicidad. Los indígenas en el Valle de Chalco*. Ciudad de México: El Colegio Mexiquense.

Jaramillo, Samuel. 1997. *Exclusión social y segregación socioespacial en las ciudades de América Latina. Notas para su interpretación teórica*. Ponencia presentada al IV Encuentro Internacional Hábitat Colombia.

Jargowsky, Paul. 1997. *Poverty and Place; Ghettos, Barrios, and the American City*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Kaztman, Rubén. 2001. *Seducidos y abandonados: pobres urbanos, aislamiento social y políticas públicas.* Ponencia presentada al Seminario Internacional Las diferentes expresiones de la vulnerabilidad social en América Latina y el Caribe. Santiago, 20 y 21 de junio.

Lomnitz, Larissa. 1977. *Cómo sobreviven los marginados*, Ciudad de México: Siglo XXI.

Marcuse, Peter. 2001. *Enclaves Yes, Ghettos No: Segregation and the State*. Ponencia presentada al Seminario Internacional Las diferentes expresiones de la vulnerabilidad social en América Latina y el Caribe. Santiago, 20 y 21 de junio.

Massey, Douglas & Denton, Nancy. 1993. *American Apartheid; Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Harvard University Press.

Matos Mar, José. 1988. *Desborde Popular y Crisis del Estado: El nuevo rostro del Perú en la Década de 1980* . Lima: CONCYTEC.

Mires, José. 1993. *El Discurso de la Miseria o la Crisis de la Sociología en América Latina*. Caracas: Nueva Sociedad.

Meyer, Kerstin y Bähr, Jurgen. 2001. “Condominios in greater Santiago de Chile and their Impact on the Urban Structure”, *Die Erde*, Vol. 132, #3.

Moya, José. 1998. *Cousins and Strangers. Spanish Immigrants in Buenos Aires, 1850-1930.* University of California Press.

Orfield, Myron. 1997. *Metropolitics: A Regional Agenda for Community and Stability*. USA: Brookings Institution Press & Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Ortiz, José. 2000. “Evolución de la diferenciación areal interna del espacio social del Gran Santiago: una dinámica opuesta a la sostenibilidad social de la ciudad”, *Informaciones Geográficas*, #34.

Peach, Ceri. 2001. *The Ghetto and the Ethnic Enclave*. Ponencia presentada en el seminario internacional Segregation in the City, organizado por el Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. Cambridge, Mass., julio.

Peattie, Lisa. 1987. *Planning: Rethinking Ciudad Guayana*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

PNUD. 2002. *Desarrollo Humano en Chile. Nosotros los Chilenos: Un Desafío Cultural*. Santiago: PNUD.

Portes, Alejandro. 1990. "La urbanización de América Latina en los años de crisis", en Coraggio, José Luis (Ed.), *La Investigación Urbana en América Latina*. Vol. 3. Quito: Ciudad.

Preteceille, Edmond y Ribeiro, Luiz Cesar de Queiroz. 1999. "Tendências da Segregação Social em Metrópoles Globais e Desiguais: Paris e Rio de Janeiro nos anos 80". *Revista EURE*, Vol. 26#76.

Qadeer, Mohammad. 2001.*Ethnic Segregation in a Multicultural City.* Ponencia presentada en el seminario internacional Segregation in the City, organizado por el Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. Cambridge, Mass., julio.

Ribeiro, L.C.Q. 2000. "Cidade desigual ou cidade partida? Tendencias da metrópole do Río de Janeiro". En Ribeiro, L.C.Q. *O futuro das Metrópoles: desigualdades e gobernabilidade*. RJ: UFRJ-FASE.

Rodríguez, Jorge. 2001. *Segregación residencial socioeconómica: ¿Qué es, Cómo se mide, Qué está pasando, Importa?*. Santiago: Documento de trabajo CEPAL-CELADE.

Rojas, Eduardo. 1999. *Old Cities, New Assets; Preserving Latin America's Urban Heritage*. Estados Unidos: Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo y The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rolnik, Raquel; Kowarik, Lucio; y Somekh, Nadia. 1990. *Sao Paulo: Crise e Mudança*. Sao Paulo: PMSP/Editora Brasiliense.

Rosembaum, James y Popkin, Susan. 1991. "Employment and earnings of low-income blacks who move to middle-class suburbs", en Jencks, Ch. y Peterson, P. (Eds.), The Urban Underclass. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Rubalcava, Rosa maría y Schteingart, Martha. 1999. *Segregación socioespacial en el Área Metropolitana de la ciudad de México.* Ciudad de México: mimeo.

Sabatini, F. y Arenas, F. 2001. "Entre el Estado y el marcado: resonancias geográficas y sustentabilidad social en Santiago, Chile", en *Revista EURE* Vol.26#79. También publicado como: "Between the State and the Market: Geographical Resonance and Social Sustainability in Santiago, Chile", in Dubois-Taine, G. & Henriot, C. (Eds.), *Cities in the Pacific Rim; Diversity and Sustainability*. France: PUCA.

Sabatini, F. y Smolka, M. 2001. The 1980s Reforms and the Access of the Poor to Urban Land in Latin America. Ponencia presentada en el seminario internacional "Currents of Change: Globalization, Democratization and Institutional Reform in Latin America". Instituto de Estudios Latinoamericanos. Universidad de Estocolmo, Suecia

Sabatini, F.; Cáceres, G.; y Cerda, J. 2001a. "Segregación residencial en las principales ciudades chilenas: Tendencias de las tres últimas décadas y posibles cursos de acción". *Revista EURE* Vol.27#82.

Sabatini, F.; Cáceres, G.; y Cerda, J. 2001b. *Segregación residencial en las grandes ciudades chilenas, 1970-1992: Concepción y Valparaíso*. Santiago: Mideplan.

Sabatini, Francisco. 1982. *Santiago: Sistemas de producción de viviendas, renta de la tierra y segregación urbana, 1870-1980*. Documento de Trabajo #128, Instituto de Estudios Urbanos, P.Universidad Católica de Chile.

Sabatini, Francisco. 1997. *Liberalización de los mercados de suelo y segregación social en las ciudades latinoamericanas: el caso de Santiago, Chile*. Documentos del Instituto de Estudios Urbanos, Serie Azul #14. P. Universidad Católica de Chile. Ponencia presentada ante el XX International Congress of the Latin American Studies Association, LASA, Guadalajara, México, abril 1997.

Sabatini, Francisco. 2000. "Reforma de los mercados de suelo en Santiago, Chile: efectos sobre los precios de la tierra y la segregación residencial." *Revista EURE* Vol.26#77.

Schiapacasse, Paulina. 1998. *Diferenciación del espacio social intraurbano en el Gran Santiago. Un análisis a nivel distrital.* Tesis para optar al grado de Magister en Geografía. Universidad de Chile.

Schuman, H.; Steech, Ch.; Bobo, L.; y Krysan, M. 1997. *Racial attitudes in America: Trends and interpretations*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sellés, Loreto y Stambuk, Francisca. 2001. *Asentamiento de grupos medios- alto en sectores populares, bajo la forma de comunidades enrejadas : una mirada externa*. Informe del Taller de Titulación, Instituto de Sociología, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. Santiago: mimeo.

Sennett, Richard. 1970. *The Uses of Disorder; Personal Identity and City Life*. New York and London: Norton.

Smolka, Martim. 1992a. “Expulsando os pobres e redistribuiendo os ricos: ‘dinâmica imobiliária’ e segregaçao residencial na cidade do Rio de Janeiro”. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos de Populaçao,* Vol. 9, #1.

Smolka, Martim. 1992b. “Mobilidad intra-urbana no Rio de Janeiro: da estratifica social a segregaçao residencial no espaço”. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos de Populaçao,* Vol. 9, #2.

Smolka, Martim. 2002. “El funcionamiento de los mercados de suelo en América Latina: algunas características”. Por publicarse en Smolka, M. (Ed.) *Tierra de Exclusión*.Cambridge, Mass.: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Squires, Gregory; Friedman, Samantha; y Saidat, Catherine. 2001. *Housing Segregation in the United States: Does Race Matter*? Ponencia presentada en el seminario internacional Segregation in the City, organizado por el Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. Cambridge, Mass., julio.

Telles, Edward E. 1992. “Residential Segregation by Skin Color in Brazil”. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 57, #2.

Telles, Edward, 1992, “Segregaçao racial e crise urbana”, en Ribeiro, L.C.Q. *Globalizaçao, fragmentaçao e reforma Urbana. O futuro das cidades brasileiras na crise*. RJ: Civilizaçao Brasileira.

Torres, Horacio. 1996. *El origen interdisciplinario de los estudios urbanos*. Ponencia presentada al seminario internacional del Programa de Investigaciones sobre el Campo Urbano. Vaquerías, Argentina, octubre 17-20. Buenos Aires: mimeo.

Torres, Horacio. 2001. “Cambios socioterritoriales en Buenos Aires durante la década de 1990”, en *Revista EURE,* Vol. 27, #80.

Van Lindert, Paul y Verkoren, Otto. 1982. “Segregación residencial y política urbana en La Paz, Bolivia”. *Boletín de Estudios Latinoamericanos y del Caribe*, N°33.

Vicuña Mackenna, Benjamín. 1872. *La transformación de Santiago*. Santiago: Imprenta Tornero.

Villaça, Flavio. 1997. *Efeitos do espaco sobre o Social na Netrópole Brasileira*. Ponencia presentada al VII Encuentro Nacional de ANPUR. Recife, mayo.

Villaça, Flavio. 1998. *Espaco Intra-Urbano no Brasil*. Sao Paulo: Studio Nobel.

Yujnovski, Oscar. 1975. “Notas sobre la investigación de la configuración espacial interna y las políticas de uso del suelo en América Latina”. *Revista Interamericana de Planificación* Vol.IX, #35.