

More Than Just Race: Being Black and Poor in the Inner City

by William Julius Wilson

In *More than Just Race*, I hope to further our understanding of the complex and interrelated factors that continue to contribute to racial inequality in the United States. In the process, I call for reexamining the way social scientists discuss two important factors associated with racial inequality—*social structure* and *culture*. Although the book highlights the experiences of inner-city African Americans, it should be emphasized that the complexities of understanding race and racial inequality in America are not limited to research on blacks. Formal and informal aspects of inequality have also victimized Latinos, Asian Americans and Native Americans. In this book, however, I use the research on inner-city African Americans to elaborate my analytic framework because they have been the central focus of the structure-versus-culture dispute.

William Julius Wilson (bill.wilson@harvard.edu) is the Lewis P. and Linda L. Geysler University Professor at Harvard University and the author of several award-winning books, including The Declining Significance of Race (1980); The Truly Disadvantaged (1987); and When Work Disappears (2006). His précis is drawn from More Than Just Race: Being Black and Poor in the Inner City (W.W. Norton Co., 2009 – 190 pp., \$24.95).

Taking Culture Seriously

The book will likely generate controversy in some circles because I dare to take culture seriously as one of the explanatory variables in the study of race and urban poverty—a topic that is typically considered off-limits in academic discourse because of a fear that such analysis can be construed as “blaming the victim.” Indeed, I develop a framework that integrates structural forces—ranging from those that are racial, such as segregation and discrimination, to those that are non-racial such as changes in the economy—and cultural forces to not only show how the two are inextricably linked, but also to explain why structural forces should receive far more attention than cultural factors in accounting for the social outcomes of poor African Americans and in framing public policies to address racial inequality.

That said, my book examines two types of cultural forces: (1) national views and beliefs on race, and (2) cultural traits—shared outlooks, modes of behavior, traditions, belief systems, worldviews, values, skills, preferences, styles of self-presentation, etiquette, and linguistic patterns—that emerge from patterns of intra-group interaction in settings created by discrimination and segregation, and that reflect collective experiences within

those settings.

I want to avoid limited conceptions of culture defined in the simple and traditional terms of group norms, values and attitudes toward family and work, and also consider cultural repertoires (habits, styles and skills) and the micro-level processes of meaning-making and decision-making—that is, the way that individuals in particular groups, communities or societies develop an understanding of how the world works and make decisions based on that understanding. The processes of meaning-making and decision-making are reflected in cultural frames (shared group constructions of reality).

Racism has historically been one of the most prominent American cultural frames and has played a major role in determining how whites perceive and act toward blacks. In the United States

(Please turn to page 2)

CONTENTS:

More Than Just Race ..	1
Land Use Regulations & Segregation	3
New PRRAC Grants	5
Technology of Mobilization	6
Housing Surveys	8
Farmworker Victory .	12
Resources	13

today, there is no question that the more categorical forms of racist ideology—in particular, those that assert the biogenetic inferiority of blacks—have declined significantly, even though they still may be embedded in institutional norms and practices.

The vast majority of social scientists agree that as a national cultural frame, racism, in its various forms, has had harmful effects on African Americans as a group. Indeed, considerable research has been devoted to the effects of racism in American society. However, there is little research and far less awareness of the impact of emerging cultural frames in the inner city on the social and economic outcomes of poor blacks.

How Cultural Frames Are Shaped

Note that distinct cultural frames in the inner city have not only been shaped by race and poverty, but in turn often shape responses to poverty, including responses that may contribute to the perpetuation of poverty. Indeed, one of the effects of living in racially segregated neighborhoods is exposure to group-specific cultural traits (orientations, habits and worldviews as well as styles of behavior and particular skills) that emerged from patterns of

racial exclusion and that may not be conducive to factors that facilitate social mobility.

However, many liberal scholars are reluctant to discuss or research the role that culture plays in the negative outcomes found in the inner city. It is possible that they fear being criticized for reinforcing the popular view that the negative social outcomes—poverty, unemployment, drug addition and crime—of many poor people in the inner city are due to the shortcomings of the people themselves. Harvard University sociologist Orlando Patterson maintains that there is “a deep-seated dogma that has prevailed in social science and policy circles since the mid-1960s: the rejection of any explanation that invokes a group’s cultural at-

Americans tend to de-emphasize the structural origins of poverty and welfare.

tributes — its distinctive attitudes, values and tendencies, and the resulting behavior of its members—and the relentless preference for relying on structural factors like low incomes, joblessness, poor schools and bad housing.”

Patterson claims that social scientists have shied away from cultural explanations of race and poverty because of the widespread belief, referred to above, that such explanations are tantamount to blaming the victim; that is, they support the conclusion that the poor themselves, and not the social environment, are responsible for their own poverty and negative social outcomes. He colorfully contends that it is “utterly bogus” to argue, as do many academics, that cultural explanations necessarily blame the victim for poor social outcomes.

Patterson argues that to hold an individual responsible for his behavior is not to rule out any consideration of the environmental factors that may have evoked the questionable behavior to begin with. “Many victims of child abuse end up behaving in self-destructive ways,” he states. “To point out the link between their behavior and

the destructive acts is in no way to deny the causal role of their earlier victimization and the need to address it.” Patterson also contends that a cultural explanation of human behavior not only examines the immediate relationship between attitudes and behavior, but it also looks at the past to investigate the origins and changing nature of these attitudes.

The Perils of the Cultural Argument

The use of a cultural argument, however, is not without peril. Anyone who wishes to understand American society must be aware that explanations focusing on the cultural traits of inner-city residents are likely to draw far more attention from policymakers and the general public than structural explanations will. It is an unavoidable fact that Americans tend to de-emphasize the structural origins and social significance of poverty and welfare.

In other words, the popular view is that people are poor or on welfare because of their own personal shortcomings. A 2007 Pew Research Center survey revealed that “fully two-thirds of all Americans believe personal factors, rather than racial discrimination, explain why many African Americans have difficulty getting ahead in life; just 19% blame discrimination.” Nearly three-fourths of U.S. whites (71%), a majority of Hispanics (59%), and even a slight majority of blacks (53%) “believe that blacks who have not gotten ahead in life are mainly responsible for their own situation.”

The strength of American cultural sentiment that individuals are primarily responsible for poverty presents a dilemma for anyone who seeks the most comprehensive explanation of outcomes for poor black Americans. Why? Simply because, as noted above, cultural arguments that focus on individual traits and behavior invariably draw more attention than do structural explanations in the United States. Accordingly, I feel that a social scientist has an obligation to try to make

(Please turn to page 9)

Poverty and Race (ISSN 1075-3591) is published six times a year by the Poverty & Race Research Action Council, 1015 15th Street NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20005, 202/906-8023, fax: 202/842-2885, E-mail: info@prrac.org. Chester Hartman, Editor. Subscriptions are \$25/year, \$45/two years. Foreign postage extra. Articles, article suggestions, letters and general comments are welcome, as are notices of publications, conferences, job openings, etc. for our Resources Section. Articles generally may be reprinted, providing PRRAC gives advance permission.

© Copyright 2009 by the Poverty & Race Research Action Council. All rights reserved.

Land Use Regulations and Housing Segregation

by Aviva Rothman-Shore and Kara E. Hubbard

The Fair Housing Center of Greater Boston is currently developing a visual presentation illustrating the connection between current land use regulations and housing segregation.

With an emphasis on land use regulations and a geographic focus on Eastern Massachusetts, our project is intended to help demonstrate to both communities and policymakers that the forces behind housing segregation go beyond affordability. A significant component of our project involves the synthesis of information from previously written reports about the discriminatory effects of zoning, but we are also presenting an exciting new perspective. Using Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping, we are combining land use regulation data with the recently unveiled Massachusetts “opportunity maps” from the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity. Through this collaboration, we will explore the connection between land use regulations and access to areas of high opportunity.

Description of Our Presentation

The presentation is intended to be an educational tool geared towards a variety of audiences, including policymakers, local officials and residents. Because of the wide range in audiences, the project does not take an overly academic tone. Our methodology consists of three components: (1) a historical timeline of policies that

Aviva Rothman-Shore (ashore@bostonfairhousing.org) is Outreach and Policy Director at the Fair Housing Center of Greater Boston.

Kara E. Hubbard will receive her Master of Arts in Urban and Environmental Policy and Planning from Tufts Univ. in May 2009, following which she will join HUD as a Program Analyst.

have contributed to housing segregation; (2) a power point presentation explaining in more detail the policies highlighted by the time line; and (3) a series of analytical maps.

(1) Historical Timeline

The primary aim of the timeline is to depict how housing regulations have shifted from policies that explicitly contribute to segregation to policies that contribute more implicitly (e.g., location of subsidized housing in high-poverty areas). Policies that have

The forces behind housing segregation go beyond affordability.

helped lessen the impact of segregation are also included, such as the recent amendment of the local preference regulations by the state’s Department of the Housing and Community Development. The Massachusetts DHCD stipulates that cities and towns can only specify local preferences for up to 70% of affordable units. Preferences were revised to only include current residents, municipal/school department employees and employees of local businesses, and not family of local residents.

In addition: (1) communities must demonstrate the need for local preferences and demonstrate that they will not have a disparate impact on protected classes; (2) the subsidizing agency must approve the local preference scheme; (3) durational residential preferences are not permitted; and (4) advertising cannot include any local preferences.

(2) Power Point

Data gathered from *Route 128: Boston’s Road to Segregation*, a 1975 report issued by the Massachusetts Committee Against Segregation, was

used to explain how while redlining institutionalized racial segregation in the cities, it was the development of the suburbs via the construction of Route 128 that magnified the effects of segregation by increasing the physical separation between whites and people of color. Municipalities responded to the subsequent in-migration of jobs and people to the suburbs by enacting rigid zoning ordinances. Zoning regulations were created to control density, protect open space, and artificially inflate housing prices. Strict zoning restrictions are still in use today and can have a disparate impact on African Americans and Latinos, and in particular family households, because they limit affordability and the number of rental multifamily housing opportunities.

To illustrate the impact of current zoning regulations, our project relies heavily upon information gathered from the Housing Regulation Database, a joint effort by the Pioneer Institute for Public Policy Research and Harvard University’s Rappaport Institute for Greater Boston. The database contains information regarding zoning codes, subdivision requirements and environmental regulations in 187 Eastern and Central Massachusetts communities. The Housing Regulation Database has fueled several research reports that informed our project and provided the necessary data to illustrate clear links between land use regulations and housing segregation, particularly in three areas: large minimum

(Please turn to page 4)

John Hope Franklin

We dedicate this issue of *Poverty & Race* to the rich and influential career and exemplary life of John Hope Franklin, who passed away in late March.

(LAND USE: Continued from page 3)

lot size requirements, multifamily zoning, and age-restricted zoning.

Below are some key findings from the Housing Regulation Database and the subsequent research reports:

- More than half (95) of the municipalities in Greater Boston zone over 50% of their land area for lot sizes of 1 acre per home or greater.
- 14 municipalities within 50 miles of Boston zone more than 90% of their land for 2-acre lot sizes, and 27 municipalities zone more than 90% of their land for at least 1-acre lot sizes.
- In *Regulation and the Rise of Housing Prices in Greater Boston*, Edward L. Glaeser, Jenny Schuetz and Bryce Ward found that as the minimum lot size increases by 1 acre, the share of affordable homes (a home for which an average resident of the region could afford to pay 30% of income) drops by 8%.
- 43% of the municipalities have over 90% of their land zoned for single-family use, and another 27% of municipalities have between 81-90% zoned for single-family use.
- In *Housing and Land Use Policy*, Amy Dain reports that only 10% of the municipalities prohibit multifamily housing outright, but the rest regulate such development so

tightly that building such housing is infeasible. Dain found that age-restricted housing is driven by municipal policy, not market demand. Senior housing is often more readily accepted because such households are perceived as only having a positive fiscal impact on communities, unlike families with school-aged children.

(3) Analytical Maps

Our work synthesizes the zoning data from the Housing Regulation Database with opportunity mapping data. In partnership with the Massachusetts Law Reform Institute, the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity recently released *The Geography of Opportunity: Building Communities of Opportunity in Massachusetts*. This report includes a series of

14 municipalities zone more than 90% of their land for 2-acre lots.

opportunity maps that document the spatial segregation of opportunity in the state. For example, more than 90% of African-American and Latino households in 2000 were isolated in the areas of lowest opportunity in Massachusetts. The Kirwan Institute put forward five classifications of opportu-

nity through the use of 19 indicators which were then assessed separately in three opportunity areas (educational, economic, and neighborhood/housing quality).

Our first maps investigated the spatial segregation of subsidized housing in areas of low opportunity in Eastern Massachusetts as well as the racial breakdown of households across areas of high and low opportunity. For these maps, we utilized data from the 2000 U.S. Census via MassGIS, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development. One significant finding from our maps was the geographic concentration of projects using the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program in areas of low and very low opportunity. Only 14% (41) of the 289 LIHTC projects in Greater Boston are located in either high- or very-high-opportunity areas, whereas 79.6% (230) are located in low- or very-low-opportunity areas.

The bulk of our analytical mapping focused on illustrating the relationship between zoning and access to housing in areas of high opportunity. For these maps, we used data from the Housing Regulation Database and its subsequent reports, as well as the opportunity data from the Kirwan Institute. Our study area included the following Massachusetts counties: Suffolk, Middlesex, Essex, Norfolk and Plymouth. Boston was excluded because it was not included within the Housing Regulation Database.

Our hypothesis was that the suburban municipalities in high-opportunity areas would have strict land use regulations that help sustain housing barriers, especially for lower-income families and people of color. To investigate this hypothesis, zoning data were overlaid on the opportunity maps. The restrictiveness of each municipality's zoning regulations was then assessed using three categories: (1) no allowance for multifamily housing; (2) age-restricted zoning regulations; and (3) large average minimum lot size requirements for multifamily housing. Opportunity data within the municipi-

Resources

(Copies of all of the articles are available from Rothman-Shore)

Massachusetts Committee Against Segregation, *Route 128: Boston's Road to Segregation* (1975)

Edward L. Glaeser, Jenny Schuetz and Bryce Ward. *Regulation and the Rise of Housing Prices in Greater Boston* (2006)

Amy Dain, *Housing and Land Use Policy in Massachusetts* (2007)

Jenny Schuetz, *Guarding Town Walls: Mechanism and Motives for Restricting Multifamily Housing in Massachusetts* (2008)

Jenny Schuetz, *No Renters In My Suburban Backyard: Land Use Regulation and Rental Housing* (2008).

Massachusetts Affirmative Fair Housing Policy (April 2009), <http://www.mass.gov/Ehed/docs/dhcd/hd/fair/affirmativefairhousing.pdf>

Websites: Pioneer Institute – <http://www.pioneerinstitute.org/>; Kirwan Institute – <http://kirwaninstitute.org/>

palities with strict zoning regulations were then assessed to determine if there is a relationship between land use regulations and barriers to areas of high opportunity.

Results of the Research and Potential Application

Our maps represent the first time that opportunity mapping data in Massachusetts have been explored through a zoning lens. These maps help to illustrate that land use regulations, while not overtly discriminatory, contribute to spatial segregation both in terms of access to housing and to areas of high opportunity. Our results found that the 80% of the census tracts in municipalities with restrictive zoning were either very-high or high-opportunity as compared to 43% in the remaining municipalities.

Below is a summary of the results of our map series for Eastern Massachusetts:

- 11 of the municipalities have zoning regulations that outlaw multifamily housing completely.
- 47 municipalities have zoning by-laws that impose age restrictions on multifamily housing in any zoning district (municipalities divide their land by zoning districts and then determine what can be built in each district based on the zoning).
- 34 municipalities had an average minimum lot size requirement of 1 acre or greater for multifamily housing.
- 75 municipalities were found to have restrictive zoning. Within these 75 municipalities, there are 228 census tracts. 46% (106) are in very-high-opportunity areas, 34% (77) are in high-opportunity areas, 16% (36) are in moderate-opportunity areas and 4% (9) are in low-opportunity areas. There are no areas of very-low-opportunity within the 75 municipalities with strict zoning.
- 71 municipalities were found to not have restrictive zoning. Within these 71 municipalities, there are

2009 PRRAC Small Grants Program

We are pleased to announce the 2009 recipients of PRRAC's Small Grants Program, which supports research on race and poverty issues that is tied to an advocacy plan. This year's program is focused on the Seattle/King County region. The program is funded this year by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, with additional support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

- “Housing for New Immigrants,” Washington Low Income Housing Alliance
- “Access to Comprehensive Pediatric Care,” the Seattle Medical-Legal Partnership
- “Kent County School District Use of Discipline,” ACLU of Washington
- “White Center and Annexation,” White Center Community Development Association
- “Suburbanization of Homelessness,” *Real Change*
- “Reducing Health Care Disparities,” Washington CAN! Education/Research Fund
- “Tenant Screening Policies,” Columbia Legal Services
- “Housing Choice Vouchers and the Housing Market,” Martha Galvez, NYU
- “New Racism/Health Curricula for Environmental Justice Youth Corps,” Just Health Action
- “Social Networks and Gentrification,” Deidre Bowen, Mako Fitts, Gary Perry, Seattle University
- “King County Opportunity Mapping—Mapping to Promote Equitable Community Development, Northwest Justice Project (with the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race & Ethnicity)

We organized a forum at the University of Washington Evans School of Public Affairs on May 7 (likely this issue of *P&R* is arriving after that date) for presentation of the projects to an audience of local activists and researchers.

PRRAC's Dir. of Research Chester Hartman (chartman@prrac.org, 202/906-8025) can furnish contact and further inf. about any of these projects upon request.

456 census tracts. 33% (77) of these tracts are either very-low-opportunity or low-opportunity (73). 24% (111) are moderate-opportunity, 21% (96) are high-opportunity and 22% (99) are very-high-opportunity.

It is important to note that the data presented above are limited in scope. The zoning regulations were assessed based only on data from the Housing Regulation Database and subsequent reports. Consideration was not given to how the regulations are actually implemented on the ground. For example, some municipalities may technically zone for multifamily housing but only in districts that are already built out to capacity. Further investi-

gation of the impact of the regulations at the local level would be needed to draw a more thorough conclusion.

The final version of our visual presentation will soon be placed on the Fair Housing Center of Greater Boston's website at www.bostonfairhousing.org, where it can be used to educate a wide range of audiences. The Fair Housing Center plans to use the presentation at community meetings to help residents understand the impact of local regulations. The presentation could also be used to inform policymakers or practitioners in related fields. For further information about the project or to receive a status update, contact Aviva Rothman-Shore, 617/399-0491 or via email. □

The Technology of Mobilization: Computer Mediated Communication and Youth Organizing in the Bronx

By John M. Beam

In Autumn of 2005, 2,000-2,500 students walked out of DeWitt Clinton High School to protest metal detectors and other lock-down policies imposed by the Mayor and Chancellor. Then, 1,500 of them proceeded to march through the streets of the Bronx to the borough headquarters of the New York City Department of Education. They organized this action through Sconex.com (a social networking site that links students who attend the same school) and text messaging. No adult-led community group working on New York City education justice issues has mounted a public action so large and so militant in recent memory.

Computer Mediated Communication (CMC) is an under-examined reality in the lives politically active teenagers. (For purposes of this discussion, CMC includes Internet-connected computers, cell phones, instant messaging/chat/IM, email and social networking sites. We do not include YouTube or some of the newer applications oriented to smart phones such as Twitter, although the former is in-

creasingly showing up in the arsenal of mobilization tools used by adult and youth-led groups.) Analysts, advocates and organizers interested in understanding how social change is contested at a grassroots level by urban youth need to understand how young people relate to the nearly ubiquitous technologies they increasingly use to manage their personal relationships and their civic engagement.

Government officials have politicized the use of CMC tools. Policymakers have targeted some of their decisions directly at youth.

CMC technology use has become a widespread and defining feature of youth culture. In 2000, 73% of youth 12-17 used the Internet. In 2005, the number was up to 87%. By 2008, 94% of all teens were using the Internet or email. While the digital divide still exists, it has shrunk dramatically in the last few years among white, black and Hispanic youth. As many as 91% of all teens at all family income levels are users.

Meanwhile, government officials have politicized the use of CMC tools. Policymakers have targeted some of their decisions directly at youth. Other decisions are likely to have a disproportionate impact on young people because they are disproportionately heavy CMC users.

New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg's vigorous attempt to ban cell phones from schools embodies an

"expect the worst" approach to both technology and youth that hinders their capacity to take part in policy debates directly affecting their education and community.

A May 15, 2006 *NY Times* account reported: "Bloomberg's resistance [to cell phones in schools] reflects the administration's beliefs that cell phones are disruptive and difficult to control in the classroom and that they all too often become means for cheating, gang activity or other undesirable behavior." Moreover, April 27, 2006 *NY Times* article had also observed:

"[NYC Schools] Chancellor Klein defended the scanning [mandatory metal detectors] and the cell phone ban yesterday, telling reporters that students had used cell phones to take pictures in locker rooms, cheat on exams and summon friends to start fights."

More recently, New York City Police Commissioner Raymond Kelly testified before the U.S. Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. Referring to recent events in Mumbai, India, he said, "Law enforcement needs to find ways to disrupt cell phones and other communications."

NY Civil Liberties Union Associate Legal Director Christopher T. Dunn responded that "it was reasonable for the police to focus on terrorists using cellphones, but he expressed concerns about broader measures....[S]erious issues would arise if that could only be done by the police taking control of communications systems or by closing down large areas of cellphone usage."

John M. Beam (John_Beam@verizon.net) is a policy analyst and advocate and former community and political organizer. Most recently he was executive director of the National Center for Schools and Communities at Fordham University, which recently closed as result of collateral damage from the financial meltdown. The full report from which this article is drawn, including an extensive list of supporting reference, is available at www.NCSCatFordham.org.

Exploring What Works

Youth-controlled communication is, therefore, of dual interest as a resource urban youth must defend and a tool they can use to mobilize around issues they face on a daily basis. Youth CMC activity on the Internet and wireless networks has been examined regularly. In addition, CMC as a set of tools to use for political action on the Internet is an occasional topic of study — e.g., electronic petitions, fundraising for candidates, on-line debate. There has been, however, much less work done on CMC as a set of tools for on-the-ground political activity. Our Technology of Mobilization project emphasized the organizing functions of CMC. With the major exception of widespread resentment of the Mayor's cell phone ban in the schools, defending CMC from adult officialdom has not surfaced as an issue in the South Bronx...yet.

With assistance from a PRRAC research grant, Sistas and Brothas United (SBU), a youth-run affiliate of the Northwest Bronx Community Clergy Coalition, and the Fordham University National Center for Schools and Communities conducted a pilot project to explore how SBU activists use CMC in their work and what sorts of capacity-building might enhance the effectiveness of Internet and wireless tools in their organizing work.

Our investigation took place during Spring, Summer and Fall of 2008. Various logistical and learning-curve realities impeded the smooth implementation of the project plan. However, the partnership made substantial progress in understanding how Bronx student activists use technology, how they might further adapt it to the needs of their organizing agenda, and how action research projects unfold in the real world of youth organizing.

Major components of our effort included:

- A listening session with middle and high school students discussing technology and social networking.
- A survey of Internet and wireless technology usage among SBU and non-SBU Bronx students.

- A field-test using Instant Messaging as a mobilization tactic.
- A field-test using individual social networking friends lists as a mobilization tactic.
- A field-test using an organizational (SBU) MySpace bulletin and group text messaging as mobilization tactics.
- A leadership discussion of preferred CMC outreach methods.
- Analysis and synthesis of results.

Technology User Survey

A survey of technology usage developed and administered by a SBU

By 2008, 94% of all teens were using the Internet or email. While the digital divide still exists, it has shrunk dramatically in the last few years among white, black and Hispanic youth.

working group collected information from 229 students in ten schools, with 90% of responses coming from three schools where the group is especially active.

Results varied by SBU membership, gender and school, sometimes significantly. The economics of technology use varied by communication mode, with family subsidies for Internet connection being much more frequent than for the texting bill.

SBU members (n=41) were significantly more likely than non-SBU members (n=155) to cite their cell phone as their favorite tool for “personal, school, and community business” (80.5% vs. 54.5%, $z = 3.02, p < .01$).

SBU members were significantly more likely than non-SBU members to send over 50 texts per day (31.6% vs. 14.2%, $z = 2.59, p < .005$), but they were also significantly more likely to receive 25 or fewer texts per day (68% vs. 55%, $z = 1.92, p < .05$). Thus,

SBU members were net initiators of text communication in their circles.

Nearly 60% of all respondents checked their email one to three times daily. SBU members were significantly more likely than non-SBU members to check their email seven to nine times a day (26.8% vs. 9.9%, $z = 2.28, p < .005$). This finding initially flies in the face of research that suggests the declining popularity of email as a tool for social communication. Conversation with active SBU members, however, suggests that much of their intensive email use is related to checking for alerts from their social networking sites. Almost 90% of respondents have MySpace pages, and, in fact, as their main computer use, SBU members were significantly more likely than non-SBU members to cite social networking (63% vs. 48%, $z = 1.71, p < .05$).

CMC and Mobilization

SBU members conducted field-tests of individual and organizational outreach using Instant Messaging (IM), MySpace and phone texting to boost attendance for a spoken word competition, a Unity Day Fair, and a SBU general meeting, respectively. With the major exception of a survey of youth and other community residents attending a Unity Day Fair (N=181), the somewhat loose execution and resulting smaller guesstimated Ns for resulting turnout provide less than definitive hints at the relative effectiveness of various CMC tools.

We are left with speculative conclusions that are beyond the resources of this project to test but that are rooted in both earlier research and our observations from this investigation.

The personal touch—figuratively and, we presume, literally—is still highly valued in the relational dimension of youth communication. Outreach tactics that involve a personal and personalized contact (word of mouth, door knocking, phone calls) played an important role—in the case of the Unity Day Fair, an overwhelmingly domi-

(Please turn to page 8)

(MOBILIZATION: Continued from page 7)

nant role—in the turnout for each monitored event.

According to a 2004 Kaiser Family Foundation report: “Online political communication that tends to turn off young people involves ‘viral’ campaigns that are less personalized and less interactive: most unwelcome are weekly text messages with campaign updates via cell phone or other handheld device (69% turned off vs. 23% more likely to pay attention), followed by Internet banner ads (53% turned off vs. 36% more likely to pay attention), e-mails encouraging voter turnout (50% turned off vs. 41% more likely to pay attention), and weekly e-mail updates about campaign endorsements and events (49% turned off vs. 42%

more likely to pay attention).”

We should not be surprised, therefore, that the mass outreach of MySpace bulletins (the new spam?) or texts were not magnetic in their appeal. According to SBU activists who are veterans of the 2005 walkout at DeWitt Clinton, Sconex.com was useful be-

The long-standing relational approach to organizing is not about to be replaced with the BlackBerry.

cause it provided the *interactive* platform for the pre-action debate — i.e., not just one-way bulletins. Equally important was the fact that debate attracted opinion leaders of the various

groups within the school (e.g., the Goths). These students, in turn, were the grassroots leaders who entered the classrooms at the beginning of the walkout to call out their personal networks after having texted them by cell beforehand.

A closely linked notion is that the central function of CMC tools for youth is maintaining personal relationships. As a 2003 article in *The Journal of Language and Social Psychology* concluded: “The attraction of the Internet for most [young] people is not access to information but access to social environments.”

A corollary of these two ideas is the popularity of CMC resources that provide or reinforce intimate, real-time communication. These are Instant Messaging and—mundane though it

Annual Surveys of Housing Discrimination and Affordability

Two leading housing advocacy organizations have just released their annual reports on the state of fair housing and housing affordability in America. The “Fair Housing Trends” report from the National Fair Housing Alliance tracks key indicators of housing segregation; the annual “Out of Reach” report from the National Low Income Housing Coalition documents the continuing housing affordability gap in a state-by-state analysis. Here are brief summaries of the key findings of each report:

“Fair Housing Trends”

The National Fair Housing Alliance (NFHA) released its 2009 Fair Housing Trends Report, “Fair Housing Enforcement: Time for a Change,” tracking private and government fair housing enforcement activity in the prior year. NFHA reports that the number of fair housing complaints handled by private groups jumped by 17% from the previous year, to 20,173. This amounts to 66% of all complaints nationwide. In 2008, HUD handled

only 2,123 fair housing complaints, state and local agencies only 8,429, and the Justice Department only 33 cases.

NFHA observed that the increase in complaints handled by private fair housing agencies was related to the worsening foreclosure crisis and internet advertising that violates fair housing laws. NFHA alone filed more than 350 complaints with HUD last year based on internet advertising discrimination. The majority of the ads discriminate against families with children. All types of discrimination against families increased between 2007 and 2008.

In the area of fair lending, NFHA reports that private fair housing centers around the country have seen more cases of discrimination in mortgage lending than ever before. Yet HUD initiated only four investigations into lending discrimination last year and the Justice Department brought only one mortgage lending case. Overall, according to NFHA, HUD handled only 60 fair lending complaints in 2008, compared to 1,500 handled by private fair housing centers. [\[housing.org\]\(http://housing.org\)](http://www.nationalfair</p></div><div data-bbox=)

“Out of Reach”

The National Low Income Housing Coalition’s “Out of Reach 2009” reports that the national average two-bedroom “Housing Wage” rose to \$17.84, up from \$17.32 last year. The Housing Wage is the hourly wage that a household must earn in order to afford the Fair Market Rent, assuming full-time, year-round employment. The Fair Market Rent is HUD’s estimate of what a tenant needs to be able to pay in order to be assured of finding a modest rental home in a range of neighborhoods within a reasonable amount of time. This year’s Housing Wage translates into an annual income of \$37,105. Published since 1989, “Out of Reach” compares the cost of rental housing with household incomes, each state’s minimum wage, and average renter wages in every state, metropolitan area and county in the country. www.nlihc.org/oor/oor2009

might be—the phone.

Some research suggests that young people frequently employ the more intimate format of IM to *support* face-to-face relationships. A 2007 Pew Internet and American Life Project study concluded: “For the entire population of those ages 12-17, phone conversations and face-to-face meeting are the most frequently chosen ways to communicate with friends outside of school.”

In our convenience sampled tech usage survey, Instant Messaging was the second “most” used choice for SBU members and first place for non-SBU in their computer use. “Calling people” was by far the most popular phone use for both groups at 62.5% and 53.1%, respectively. The real-time, but more abstracted, Instant

Messaging was a distant second for the SBU and non-SBU respondents for “most” used phone activity (40% and 35.4%).

Conclusions

Although this preliminary exploration of the current and potential role of the Computer Mediated Communication infrastructure of youth culture in the Bronx has raised more issues than it has resolved, we can already identify three useful lessons.

The long-standing relational approach to organizing is not about to be replaced with the Blackberry. Youth organizers and young community leaders will continue to identify issues and recruit leaders and core supporters

knocking on doors, sitting around the kitchen tables, and leafleting on the corners across the street from our overcrowded high schools.

CMC, however, does offer agile ways to transmit *expected* information (e.g., the location of a demonstration) that is part of a plan organized through face-to-face or basic telephone formats.

With thought and creativity, we should be able to marry the relational to the technological. An example of such a marriage would be consciously organized phone trees that link *within* pre-existing networks—e.g., neighbors in a building, active members of committees, Goths—so that news, motivation and mobilization occur along lines of existing personal relationships as well as political affinity. □

(JUST RACE: Continued from page 2)

sure that the explanatory power of his or her structural argument is not lost to the reader and to provide a context for understanding cultural responses to chronic economic and racial subordination.

The Causal Flow Between Structure and Culture

Consider, for example, the complex causal flow between structure and culture. In an impressive study that analyzes data from a national longitudinal survey, with methods designed to measure intergenerational economic mobility, the sociologist Patrick Sharkey of New York University found that “more than 70% of black children who are raised in the poorest quarter of American neighborhoods, the bottom 25% in terms of average neighborhood income, will continue to live in the poorest quarter of neighborhoods as adults.”

He also found that since the 1970s, a majority of black families have resided in the poorest quarter of neighborhoods in *consecutive generations*,

compared to only 7% of white families. Thus he concludes that the disadvantages of living in poor black neighborhoods, like the advantages of living in affluent white neighborhoods, are in large measure inherited.

We should also consider another path-breaking study that Sharkey co-

The disadvantages of living in poor black neighborhoods are in large measure inherited.

authored with senior investigator Robert Sampson, a Harvard University sociologist, and another colleague, Steven Raudenbush, that examined the durable effects of concentrated poverty on black children’s verbal ability. They studied a representative sample of 750 African-American children, ages 6-12, who were growing up in the city of Chicago in 1995, and followed them anywhere they moved in the United States for up to 7 years. The children were given a reading examination and vocabulary test at three different periods. Their study shows “that residing in a severely disadvantaged neighborhood cumula-

tively impedes the development of academically relevant verbal ability in children.”

Their results reveal: (1) that the neighborhood environment “is an important developmental context for trajectories of verbal cognitive ability”; (2) that young African-American children who had earlier lived in a severely disadvantaged neighborhood had fallen behind their counterparts or peers who had not resided previously in disadvantaged areas by up to 6 IQ points, a magnitude estimated to be equivalent to “missing a year or more of schooling”; and (3) “that the strongest effects appear several years after children live in areas of concentrated disadvantage.” This research raises important questions “about ways in which neighborhoods may alter growth in verbal ability, producing effects that linger on even if a child leaves a severely disadvantaged neighborhood.”

The studies by Sharkey and Sampson and his colleagues both suggest that neighborhood effects are not solely structural. Among the effects of living in segregated neighborhoods over extended periods is repeated exposure to cultural traits—and this would include linguistic patterns, the focus

(Please turn to page 10)

(JUST RACE: Continued from page 9)

of Sampson et al.'s study—that emanate from or are the products of racial exclusion, traits, such as verbal skills, that may impede successful maneuvering in the larger society.

As Sharkey points out, “when we consider that the vast majority of black families living in America’s poorest neighborhoods come from families that have lived in similar environments for generations . . . continuity of the neighborhood environment, in addition to continuity of individual economic status, may be especially relevant to the study of cultural patterns among disadvantaged populations.” Unfortunately, very little research attention has been given to these cumulative cultural experiences.

Thus, in addition to structural influences, exposure to different cultural influences in the neighborhood environment over time has to be taken into account if one is to really appreciate and explain the divergent social outcomes of human groups. But, to repeat, in delivering this message we must make sure that the powerful influence of structural factors do not recede into the background.

The Relative Importance of Culture and Structure

Indeed, a fundamental question remains: What is the relative importance of these two dimensions in accounting for the formation and persistence of the inner-city ghetto, the plight of black males and the breakdown of the black family—three subjects that I focused on in my book. Culture matters, but I

Housing and Civil Rights

Recent advocacy on “affirmatively furthering fair housing” in federal housing programs available at:

www.prrac.org/projects/civilrightshousing.php

would have to say it does not matter nearly as much as social structure.

From a historical perspective, it is hard to overstate the importance of racialist structural factors that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. fought so hard against. Aside from the enduring effects of slavery, Jim Crow segregation, public school segregation, legalized discrimination, residential segregation, the FHA’s redlining of black neighborhoods in the 1940s and 1950s, the construction of public housing projects in poor black neighborhoods, employer discrimination and other racial acts and processes, there is the impact of political, economic and policy decisions that were at least partly influenced by race.

In contrasting the combined impact of the structural factors with cultural factors, it would be very hard to argue that the cultural factors in the black community are equally as important in determining life chances or creating

The political framing of poverty in the New Deal era was quite different from today.

racial group outcomes. For example, if one attempts to explain rapid changes in social and economic outcomes in the inner city, there is little evidence that cultural forces have the power of changes in the economy. We only need to consider the impact of the economic boom on the reduction of concentrated racial poverty in the 1990s to illustrate this point.

Policymakers who are dedicated to combating the problems of race and poverty and who recognize the importance of structural inequities face an important challenge—namely, how to generate political support from Americans who tend to place far more emphasis on cultural factors and individual behavior than on structural impediments in explaining social and economic outcomes. After all, beliefs that attribute joblessness and poverty to individual shortcomings do not engender strong support for social programs

to end inequality. Nonetheless, in addressing the problem of structural inequities it would not be wise to leave the impression in public discussions that cultural problems do not matter. Indeed, proposals to address racial inequality should reflect awareness of the inextricable link between aspects of structure and culture.

Framing Public Policy Discussion

For all of these reasons, it is extremely important to discuss how the issues of race and poverty are framed in public policy discussions. How we situate social issues in the larger context of society says a lot about our commitment to change. A useful example of how this works comes to me from Robert Asen, a professor in the Department of Communication Arts at the University of Wisconsin. He has reminded me that the *political framing* of poverty—that is, the way in which political leaders formulate arguments about how we as a nation should talk about and address issues of poverty—in the New Deal era was quite different from the political framing of poverty today.

During the New Deal era, the emphasis was on structure—namely, the devastating impact of the economic crisis. Americans clearly recognized that hundreds of thousands of citizens were poor or unemployed mainly because of a severe and prolonged job shortage. In the public arena today, poverty tends to be discussed in reference to individual initiative. This distinction, he points out, reveals how larger shifts in society have influenced our understanding of the nature of poverty.

Therefore, we ought to consider the contingency of political frames at particular moments in time. These “deliberative frames” not only orient our debates on public policy, but they can also be shifted through debate. So, just because cultural explanations resonate with policymakers and the public today does not mean that structural explanations cannot resonate with them tomorrow. To shift political frames,

however, and hopefully provide a more balanced discussion, requires parallel efforts among politicians, engaged citizens and scholars.

In my previous writings, I called for the framing of issues designed to appeal to broad segments of the population. Key to this framing, I argued, would be an emphasis on policies that would directly benefit all groups, not just people of color. My thinking was that, given American views about poverty and race, a color-blind agenda would be the most realistic way to generate the broad political support that would be necessary to enact the required legislation. I no longer hold to this view.

The question is not whether the policy should be race-neutral or universal, the question is whether the policy is framed to facilitate a frank discussion of the problems that ought to be addressed and to generate broad political support to alleviate them. So now my position has changed: In framing public policy, we should not shy away from an explicit discussion of the specific issues of race and poverty; on the contrary, we should highlight them in our attempt to convince the nation that these problems should be seriously

confronted and that there is an urgent need to address them. The issues of race and poverty should be framed in such a way that not only a sense of fairness and justice to combat inequality is generated, but also people are made aware that our country would be better off if these problems were seriously addressed and eradicated.

Barack Obama's Speech

In considering this change of frame—indeed, a change of mindset on race and poverty—I am drawn to then-Senator Barack Obama's speech on race given March 18, 2008. His ora-

Very little research attention has been given to cumulative cultural experiences.

tory provides a model for the type of framing I have in mind. In taking on the tough topic of race in America, Obama spoke to the issue of structure and culture, as well as their interaction. He drew America's attention to the many disparities that exist between

**You can now
donate
online! at
www.prrac.org**

the "African-American community and the larger American community today"—disparities that "can be traced to inequalities passed on from an earlier generation that suffered under the brutal legacy of slavery and Jim Crow." He also discussed the lack of economic opportunity among black men, and how "the shame and frustration that came from not being able to provide for one's family contributed to the erosion of black families."

However, Obama did not restrict his speech to addressing structural inequities; he also focused on problematic cultural and behavioral responses to these inequities, including a cycle of violence among black men, and a "legacy of defeat" that has been passed on to future generations. And he urged those in the African-American community to take full responsibility for their lives by demanding more from their fathers, and spending more time with their children "reading to them, and teaching them that while they may face challenges and discrimination in their own lives, they must never succumb to despair or cynicism; they must always believe that they can write their own destiny."

By combining a powerful discussion of structural inequities with an emphasis on personal responsibility, Barack Obama did not isolate the latter from the former, as is so often the case in the remarks of talk show hosts, journalists, and conservative politicians and commentators. Obama's speech gave an honest appraisal of structural racial inequality as he called for all Americans to support blacks in their struggle to help themselves. To repeat, I feel that this speech could serve as a model for the kind of careful political framing of the issues of race and poverty that we need in this country in order to move forward. □

Resources

Asen, Robert. 2002. *Visions of Poverty: Welfare Policy and the Political Imagination*. Lansing: Michigan State University Press

Obama, Barack. 2008. "A More Perfect Union." Text of speech, March 18. <http://my.barackobama.com/page/content/hisownwords>

Patterson, Orlando. 2006. "A Poverty of the Mind." *New York Times*, March 26.

Pew Research Center. 2007. *Optimism about Black Progress Declines: Blacks See Growing Values Gap Between Poor and Middle Class*. Washington, DC, Nov. 13.

Sampson, Robert J., Patrick Sharkey and Stephen W. Raudenbush. 2008. "Durable Effects of Concentrated Disadvantage on Verbal Ability among African-American Children." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 105 (Jan. 22):845-852.

Sharkey, Patrick. 2008. "The Intergenerational Transmission of Context." *American Journal of Sociology* 113 (Jan.):931-69.

Wilson, William Julius. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass and Public Policy*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Victory for Farmworkers in California Mobile Home Park

The following is a just-in report from Ilene Jacobs and Arturo Rodriguez, attorneys with California Rural Legal Assistance.

In a remarkable decision issued yesterday, Federal Judge Stephen G. Larson ended six years of litigation brought by the United States Government to close Duroville, a mobile home park in California with 270 mobile homes which serve as low-cost housing for over 2,000 full-time residents, 90-95% of them farmworkers. At peak harvest seasons, the park's population would double as migrant workers came to the Coachella Valley and stayed with friends and families. One resident testified that the park was home to 1,500 members of the Purepecha, an indigenous people from the Mexican State of Michoacan, and that they were a community, self-governing and largely independent. Evidence at trial established that the park was home to over 450 school-age children who attended state-of-the-art schools located within a couple of miles from the park. The park manager estimated that there were an additional 600 children at the park too young to attend school.

Here is the excerpt from Judge Larson's opinion:

"The Park, or Duroville or Los Duros, as it is better known by its residents, is not a business, it is a village; thousands of our fellow human beings call the Park home. It is not nearly as safe or as healthy as we would want it to be; it is, nonetheless, home for a community of people who are poor, under-educated, disenfranchised, and, in

many respects, exploited. The Court must also add that, despite these disadvantages, these very same people, based on the evidence at trial, are an honest, hard-working, proud, colorful, and family-oriented community of people committed to educating their children and raising them to be productive and successful members of our society. The evidence at trial indicates that some are undocumented, some are resident aliens, and some are United States citizens; this complicated combination of immigration statuses places many of the residents of the Park in the crossroads of our Nation's incongruous immigration and agricultural policies that, on the one hand, portend that undocumented workers lack legal status while at the same time predicating the economic efficiency of an agricultural industry on their hard work; it appears to this Court that we have, once again, established a rather 'peculiar institution' to service our agrarian needs.

"In any event, the evidence at trial clearly established that to accede to the government's—and now Mr. Duro's—request to promptly close the Park, without identifying where the vast majority of its residents would then live, would create a major humanitarian crisis. For the Court to close the Park under current conditions would create one of the largest forced human migrations in the history of this State. Unlike another forced migration in this State's history—the internment of Japanese citizens during World War II—there is not even a

Manzanar for these residents to go. The Court, since the early hearings in this case, has pressed the government to identify and present relocation proposals for the residents of the Park. Although the Court recognizes and applauds the efforts of various government actors, including the United States Attorney himself, to explore potential alternatives, and although the County of Riverside, under the leadership of Supervisor Roy Wilson and his colleagues, and with the support of Senators Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer, have together made significant strides in developing and funding potential alternatives, the evidence at trial clearly establishes that any such alternatives are many months, and perhaps several years, away. Moreover, any of the proposed alternatives are further complicated by the immigration issue referenced above. As unsafe and unhealthy as the Park may be—circumstances the Court has observed first-hand through its visits to the park—it nonetheless offers a shelter in place for a people who otherwise have nowhere to go. Until and unless alternative housing is available—alternative housing that is safe, healthy, affordable and truly available to the residents—this Court will not close Duroville." □

Judge Larson's full ruling is available at www.prrac.org/pdf/duroville.pdf. PRRAC's Chester Hartman was an expert witness for the families at trial, testifying to the dire consequences of displacing the residents into Riverside County's upscale housing market.

Resources

Most Resources are available directly from the issuing organization, either on their website (if given) or via other contact information listed. Materials published by PRRAC are available through our website: www.prrac.org. Prices include the shipping/handling (s/h) charge when this information is provided to PRRAC. "No price listed" items often are free.

When ordering items from PRRAC: SASE = self-addressed stamped envelope (44¢ unless otherwise indicated). Orders may not be placed by telephone or fax. Please indicate from which issue of P&R you are ordering.

Race/Racism

- "Civil Rights Monitor 2007-2008," whose Senior Editor is PRRAC Bd. member William L. Taylor, (39 pp.) is available (possibly free) from the Leadership Conf. on Civil Rights Educ. Fund, 1629 K St. NW, 10th fl., Wash., DC 20006, 202/466-3311, www.civilrights.org [11383]
- "The State of Black America 2009" is available (\$19.95) from the National Urban League, 120 Wall St., NYC, NY 10005, 212/558-5300. [11409]

Poverty/Welfare

- "Promoting Bank Services among Low-Income Customers," by

Rebecca Blank, is the 7-page lead article in *New England Community Developments*, 2008, Issue 3, the publication of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. Available (likely free) from them, 600 Atlantic Ave., Boston, MA 02210, 617/973-3201, Anna.Steiger@bos.frb.org [11385]

- **Poverty & Public Policy: A Global Journal of Social Security, Aid, and Welfare** is a new journal from the Policy Studies Organization. Contents of initial issue and other inf at www.bepress.com/pso_poverty [11389]

- "Center for Economic Opportunity: Early Achievements & Lessons Learned" (149 pp., Jan. 2009) is available (possibly free) from the Office of Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg, City of New York, NYC, NY 10007. [11399]

- "Overcoming Poverty, Building Capacity" (82 pp., Oct. 2008) is available (possibly free) from VISTA, 800/942-2677, americacorps.gov [11401]

Criminal Justice

- "The Changing Racial Dynamic of the War on Drugs," by Marc Mauer (April 2009, 20 pp.), is available (possibly free) from The Sentencing Proj., 514 10th St. NW, #1000, Wash., DC 20004, 202/628-0871, www.sentencingproject.org [11377]

Please drop us a line letting us know how useful our Resources Section is to you, as both a lister and requester of items. We hear good things, but only sporadically. Having a more complete sense of the effectiveness of this networking function will help us greatly in foundation fundraising work (and is awfully good for our morale). Drop us a short note, letting us know if it has been/is useful to you (how many requests you get when you list an item, how many items you send away for, etc.) Thank you.

- "2008 Hate Crimes Survey: Summary and Recommendations" is available (free online) from Human Rights First, 333 Seventh Ave., 13th fl., NYC, NY 10001-5108, 212/845-5200, www.humanrightsfirst.org [11382]

Economic/Community Development

- "Crisis on Main Street: Recommendations for Small Business Recovery" is a 7-page, March 2009 Policy Brief from Seedco Financial (possibly free), 915 Broadway, 18th fl., NYC, NY 10010, czanoni@seedco.org, www.Seedco.org [11381]
- "Reclaiming Vacant Properties: Building Leadership to Restore Communities," sponsored by the National Vacant Properties Campaign ("Creating Opportunity from Abandonment") and others, will be held June 1-3 in Louisville. Invited speakers include Louisville Mayor Jerry Abramson, Marc Morial of the Natl. Urban League (and former mayor of New Orleans)

and Alan Mallach of Brookings Inst. Inf. from the Campaign, 1707 L St. NW, #1050, Wash., DC 20036, 717/545-9991, sschermer@schmermer-assoc.com [11380]

Education

- "PTA National Standards for Family-School Partnerships Assessment Guide" (29 pp., 2008) is available (possibly free) from the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 800/307-4782, info@pta.org, www.pta.org [11387]
- "The Growing Imbalance: Recent Trends in U.S. Postsecondary Education Finance" (64 pp., 2008), a report of the Delta Cost Project, is available free online; the Project is at 1250 H St. NW, #700, Wash., DC 20005, deltaproject.org, @deltacostproject.org, www.deltacostproject.org [11388]
- "Arne Duncan and the Chicago Success Story: Myth or Reality?," by Jitu Brown, Eric (Rico) Gutstein & Pauline Lipman, a highly critical review of the new Education Secretary's

work in Chicago, appeared in the Spring 2009 issue of *Rethinking Schools*. Contact them at 1001 E. Keefe Ave., Milwaukee, WI 53212, 414/964-9646, RSBusiness@aol.com, www.rethinkingschools.org [11391]

- **“Learning Teams: Creating What’s Next,”** a report by the Pew Center on the States, envisions a shortage of teachers as retirements escalate. Available at <http://www.nctaf.org/documents/NCTAFLearningTeams408REG2.pdf>

- **“Reengaging High School Dropouts: Early Results of the National Guard Youth ChallenNGe Program Evaluation,”** by Dan Bloom (78 pp., Feb. 2009), is available (no price listed) from MDRC, 16 E. 34 St., NYC, NY 10016, 212/532-3200, www.mdrc.org [11397]

- **“Learning Around the Clock: Benefits of Expanded Learning Opportunities for Older Youth”** (163 pp., March 2009) is available (\$15) from American Youth Policy Forum, 1836 Jefferson Pl. NW, Wash., DC 20036, 202/775-9731, www.aypf.org [11398]

- ***From the Courtroom to the Classroom***, eds. Claire E. Smrekar & Ellen B. Goldring (March 2009, \$29.95), has been published by Harvard Education Press, 617/384-7249, jeffrey_perkins@harvard.edu. It examines recent developments pertaining to school segregation in the U.S. [11407]

- ***The Flat World and Education: How America’s Commitment to***

Equity Will Determine Our Future, by Linda Darling-Hammond (240 pp., June 2009, \$21.95), has been published by Teachers College Press, 800/575-6566, www.tcpres.com [11410]

- ***Unraveling the “Model Minority” Stereotype: Listening to Asian American Youth***, by Stacey J. Lee (2nd ed., April 2009, 176 pp., \$24.95), has been published by Teachers College Press, 800/575-6566, www.tcpres.com [11411]

- ***NCLB at the Crossroads: Reexamining the Federal Effort to Close the Achievement Gap***, eds. Michael Rebell & Jessica Wolff (April 2009, 312 pp., \$36), has been published by Teachers College Press, 800/575-6566, www.tcpres.com [11412]

- ***The School Leaders Our Children Deserve: Seven Keys to Equity, Social Justice, and School Reform***, by George Theoharis (April 2009, 192 pp., \$24.95), has been published by Teachers College Press, 800/575-6566, www.tcpres.com [11413]

- **“Why High Stakes Accountability Sounds Good but Doesn’t Work – And Why We Keep Doing It Anyway,”** an April 2009 report by Gail Sunderman and Heinrich Mintrop commissioned by the UCLA Civil Rights Project (headed by PRRAC Social Science Advisory Board member Gary Orfield), is available at <http://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu> or from 571/217-7004.

- **“Why Teachers Improve (and How): Achieving Progress in**

Secondary Schools toward Excellence with Equity” is the 5th annual Research-to-Practice Conf. of Harvard’s Achievement Gap Initiative, **June 29-July 1** at Harvard. Inf. from ronald_ferguson@hks.harvard.edu [11404]

Families/ Women/ Children

- ***Women of Color as Social Work Educators: Strengths and Survival***, eds. Halaevalu F. Ofahengaue Vakalahi, Sandra Hardin Starks & Carmen Ortiz Hendricks (300 pp., 2007), was published by the Council on Social Work Education; available from them at 1725 Duke St., #500, Alexandria, VA 22314-3457, www.cswe.org [11394]

- ***Feminism Seduced: How Global Elites Use Women’s Labor and Ideas to Exploit the World***, by Hester Eisenstein (272 pp.), has just been published by Paradigm Publishers. It is an “unflinching critique of hegemonic feminism’s complicity in abandoning issues of class and race even as it pays lip service to them.” 800/887-1591 [11403]

Health

- **“Mental Health, Resilience and Inequalities”** is a 2009 British study documenting the stigma of discrimination as strongly correlated with mental health problems. An Executive Summary and the full report are available from the Mental Health Foundation, 9th flr., Sea

Containers House, 20 Upper Ground, London SE1 9QB UK, 020 7803 1100, mhf@mhf.org.uk, www.mentalhealth.org.uk [11393]

- **“Childhood Poverty and Health: Cumulative Risk Exposure and Stress Dysregulation”** links poor kids’ stress to brain impairment and many other health implications. Available from Gary Evans, Departments of Design & Environmental Analysis and of Human Development, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853-4401, gwe1@cornell.edu.

Housing

“Policy Issues in Public and Assisted Housing” is a Symposium appearing in Vol. 10, No. 1 (2008) of *Cityscape*, the 3x/yr. publication of HUD’s Office of Policy Development & Research. The articles include those dealing with deconcentration of housing choice voucher recipients, use of flat rents in the public housing program, the role of social networks in making housing choices, and other topics. Subs are free - cityscape@hud.gov, www.huduser.org/periodicals/cityscape.html [11386]

Immigration

- ***Sleepwalking to Segregation? Challenging Myths About Race and Migration***, by Nissa Finney & Ludi Simpson (218 pp., 2009, \$29.95), published by Policy Press in Great Britain, is available from International Specialized Book Services, 920 NE 58th Ave., #300, Portland, OR 97213-3786, 503/287-

3093, www.isbs.com
[11395]

• **“Severing a Lifeline: The Neglect of Children in America’s Immigration Enforcement Policy”** (111 pp. + Apps., 2009), prepared by Dorsey & Whitney (50 South St., #1500, Minneapolis, MN 55402, 612/340-2600) for The Urban Institute is available (possibly free) from them, 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20036, 202/833-7200, www.ui.org [11400]

Rural

• **“California Rural Legal Assistance Annual Report 2007”** (CRLA is headed by PRRAC Board Vice-Chair José Padilla) is available (likely free) from them, 631 Howard St., #300, SF, CA 94105-3907, 415/777-2752, www.crla.org [11378]

• **CRLA in the News** is the quarterly publication

of California Rural Legal Assistance (headed by PRRAC Board Vice-Chair José Padilla). Likely free: 631 Howard St., #300, San Francisco, CA 94105-3907, 415/777-2752, www.crla.org [11408]

Miscellaneous

• **How to Vote Effectively on a Non-Partisan Basis**, by Morris H. Kramer (100 pp., Oct. 2006, \$11.95), has been published by Infinity Pub. Co., 777/BUYBOOK, info@buybooksontheweb.com, www.buybooksontheweb.com [11390]

• **No Enemy to Conquer: Forgiveness in an Unforgiving World**, by Michael Henderson (230 pp., Feb. 2009), has been published by Baylor Univ. Press, 800/537-5487, www.baylorpress.com [11392]

• **“The Advocacy Handbook: A**

Practitioner’s Guide to Achieving Policy Goals through Organizational Networks” has been published by Columbia Books, 888/265-0600. [11402]

• **“Thirsting for Change: Obama’s First 100 Days”** is available (likely free) from the Institute for Policy Studies, 202/234-9382, x227, info@ips-dc.org, www.ips-dc.org [11414]

Job Opportunities/ Fellowships/ Grants

• **United for a Fair Economy** (Boston) is seeking a new **Executive Director**. April 10 deadline (but you can see if they are extending). Ltr./writing sample/salary history-requirements/contact inf. for 3 refs. (in MS Word 2003 Documents attachment) to Judy

Freiwirth, judy@NonprofitSA.com [11368]

• **The National Priorities Project** is hiring a **Research Director**. Resume/ltr./writing sample/names-phone#’s of 2 refs. to the Project, 243 King St., #239, Northampton, MA 01060, kris@nationalpriorities.org [11369]

• **Teaching for Change (Wash., DC)** is hiring a **Parent Organizer** for its Tellin’ Stories school-based and city-wide parent organizing program. 202/238-0109, Ltr./resume to jchoe@teachingforchange.org [11405]

• **The Center for Social Inclusion** is seeking a **Researcher**. \$40-55,000. Ltr./resume/writing sample (6 pp. max.)/3 refs. to Jacob Farber, CSI, 65 Broadway, #1800, NYC, NY 10006. May 22 deadline.

If You Are Not Already a P&R Subscriber, Please Use the Coupon Below.

Sign Me Up! 1 year (\$25) or 2 years (\$45)

Please enclose check made out to PRRAC or a purchase order from your institution.

Name _____

Address _____

Address Line 2 _____

City, State, Zip _____

Telephone: _____ email: _____

Mail to: Poverty & Race Research Action Council
1015 15th Street NW • Suite 400 • Washington, DC 20005

POVERTY & RACE RESEARCH ACTION COUNCIL
Board of Directors

CHAIR

John Charles Boger
*University of North Carolina
School of Law
Chapel Hill, NC*

VICE-CHAIR

José Padilla
*California Rural Legal
Assistance
San Francisco, CA*

SECRETARY

john powell
*Kirwan Institute for the Study
of Race & Ethnicity
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH*

TREASURER

Sheila Crowley
*National Low Income
Housing Coalition
Washington, DC*

Maria Blanco
*Institute on Race, Ethnicity
and Diversity
University of California
Law School
Berkeley, CA*

Victor Bolden
*NAACP Legal Defense
& Educ. Fund
New York, NY*

Janice Bowdler
*National Council
of La Raza
Washington, DC*

John Brittain
*Lawyers Committee for
Civil Rights Under Law
Washington, DC*

Sheryll Cashin
*Georgetown University
Law Center
Washington, DC*

Craig Flournoy
*Southern Methodist
University
Dallas, TX*

Olati Johnson
*Columbia University
New York, NY*

Elizabeth Julian
*Inclusive Communities
Project
Dallas, TX*

Spence Limbocker
*Neighborhood Funders
Group
Annandale, VA*

Demetria McCain
*Inclusive Communities
Project
Dallas, TX*

S.M. Miller
*The Commonwealth
Institute
Cambridge, MA*

Don Nakanishi
*University of California
Los Angeles, CA*

Dennis Parker
*American Civil Liberties
Union
New York, NY*

Anthony Sarmiento
*Senior Service America
Silver Spring, MD*

Catherine Tactaquin
*National Network for
Immigrant & Refugee
Rights
Oakland, CA*

William L. Taylor
*Citizens' Commission
on Civil Rights
Washington, DC*

Camille Wood
*National Legal Aid
Defender Assn.
Washington, DC
[Organizations listed for
identification purposes only]*

Philip Tegeler
President/Executive Director

Chester Hartman
Director of Research

Kami Kruckenberg
Health Policy Fellow

Poverty & Race Research Action Council
1015 15th Street NW • Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005
202/906-8023 FAX: 202/842-2885
E-mail: info@prtrac.org
Website: www.prtrac.org
Address Service Requested 5-6/09

Nonprofit
U.S. Postage
PAID
Jefferson City, MO
Permit No. 210