

November/December 2006

Volume 15: Number 6

Structural Racism

As our nation continues to experience and suffer from the consequences of slavery and Jim Crow, it is increasingly important that we look more deeply into what causes the enormous racial disparities that exist in income, wealth, education, housing, employment, health, crime—throughout our society. Understanding and then wielding the concept of structural racism is an essential starting point if we are to succeed in changing those realities, and we are pleased to offer this set of essays by some of its leading theorists and practitioners. We thank Hiram José Irizarry Osorio of the Kirwan Institute for his assistance in assembling and shepherding this forum.

The upcoming Supreme Court hearing on challenges to two local school systems' attempts to consciously take race into account in order to counter the achievement gap very much relates to this issue, and we are also pleased to print, as a complement to the structural racism forum, excerpts from two of the amicus briefs that have been filed with the Court.

Why Structural Racism? Why a Structural Racism Caucus?

by Anne C. Kubisch

The term “structural racism” has gained traction in recent years as a way of describing how racial dynamics are playing out in 21st Century America. Of course, using the word “structural” to characterize societal inequities has a long history, and even joining the term “structural” with “racism” is not new. But current usage of “structural racism” has brought with it some important efforts to reconceptualize and clarify the significance of race in our post-civil rights society, where discrimination is against the law, Latinos are the largest minority group, African Americans are occupying some of the most powerful positions in the country, and other core tenets in our national racial consciousness are undergoing significant change. It represents a new effort on the part of a cross-section of academics, advocates, practitioners, civil rights leaders and so-

cial policy analysts to highlight current racial disparities, explain why race continues to be such a potent predictor of socioeconomic well-being, and identify the implications for policy and practice.

Structural racism has both theoretical and practical dimensions, and there has been an important, if not yet seamless, interaction between the academic and practitioner communities as the concept has been developed. The academic origins lie in critical race theory and studies of whiteness, power and privilege. These have focused on the notion of race as a social and political construct that works to maintain the advantages associated with whiteness and the burdens associated with color, even as laws, policies and practices change. More applied researchers have conducted studies that identify, analyze and explain how racial outcome gaps persist in key sectors that deter-

mine opportunity and well-being—notably income, education, employment, housing, health, criminal jus-

(Please turn to page 2)

CONTENTS:

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Symposium: | |
| Structural Racism | 1 |
| Kubisch | 1 |
| Grant-Thomas/ powell | 3 |
| Lawrence | 7 |
| Quiroz-Martinez | 9 |
| Wiley | 11 |
| powell/Menendian ... | 13 |
| Supreme Court | |
| amicus briefs | 16 |
| Katrina | 20 |
| Resources | 22 |
| Index for Vol. 15 | 26 |

tice and political participation. Within the academy, therefore, there has been some lively scholarship that has provided a new lexicon, a framework for examining racial dynamics, and data and analysis to inform policy discussion.

From the practitioner perspective, the last decade has seen some refreshing and empirically based re-examination of why poverty and other “rotten outcomes” persist in a nation with such a vibrant economy. While some have developed strong arguments that emphasize individual responsibility for successes and failures in life, others have tried to identify and understand why it is that opportunities to exercise individual responsibility are not distributed equally across class and racial groups. This has opened up new lines of communication and collaboration between the civil rights and social/economic justice communities. Practitioners in fields such as education reform, economic development and social services have renewed their interest in investigating the special barriers to improving outcomes for the poor and disenfranchised that are caused by interracial dynamics and racism, and are re-evaluating the extent to which these dynamics are being factored into anti-poverty strategies.

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 2006 by the Poverty & Race Research Action Council. All rights reserved.

The Structural Racism Caucus

In 2004, a group of scholars and practitioners who had been working independently on various pieces of the structural racism puzzle came together to form a network of support and collaboration called the Structural Racism Caucus (SRC). Its mission is to eradicate racial hierarchies by applying a structural analysis to social, economic and political inequities, and promoting research, messaging, advocacy and change strategies pertaining to

Structural racism has both theoretical and practical dimensions.

structural racism. The Caucus has identified four lines of work to promote its mission:

- **Articulating and making available theoretical and definitional aspects of structural racism.** This is focused on refining the functional definition of structural racism and developing more accessible information about how structural racism is manifested in specific issue areas, as well as in local, regional and global contexts.
- **Informing the development of strategies and tools to promote change.** The Caucus identifies existing strategies and tools to further communities’ and advocates’ abilities to incorporate a structural analysis in their efforts to achieve racial equity, and it serves as a coordinating space to support the development of new strategies, techniques and tools. For example, one set of tools might help organizations define and promote racially equitable outcomes in particular sectors, such as education or housing. Another set of tools might relate more to capacities and actions required to organize communities to make demands on the public sector and hold public agencies accountable to their constituents.

- **Amplifying messages about structural racism to the social justice and social change field through a range of communications strategies.** This implies developing the capacity to speak to a variety of general and elite audiences—in government, media, business, nonprofits, community-based organizations—to help spread the racial equity message and as a strategy to engage them in the change process. The SRC uses a website for some communications (<http://www.structuralracism.org>), but also develops strategies using newspaper articles, op-ed pieces, white papers, television/radio appearances and so on.
- **Bridging, and bringing more coherence to, fragmented efforts around issues of race.** The Caucus convenes key players, shares information and coordinates collective work.

It should be noted that not everyone is comfortable with making structural racism a dominant frame for analyzing, talking about and working on the problems of inequity in America. Even among those who are committed to reducing racial disparities, there are some who believe that the term structural racism will alienate potential partners; they advocate a more pragmatic and universalist approach that organizes around “embedded disadvantage” or “equal opportunity.” The Structural Racism Caucus is based on the premise that a structural analysis must underlie all equity work in order for that work to be successful, and that a place that champions this perspective is a critical part of the change landscape. It emerges out of historical experience demonstrating that unless the issues surrounding race and racism are intentionally and energetically kept on the table, they tend to fall off the table, even among progressive social change activists.

The Work Ahead

This new racial analysis has allowed practitioners, policymakers and fund-

ers to see why their traditional social and economic development programs are falling short, and has challenged them to identify more, different and new strategies that account for the undermining effects of structural racism. While there is still a long way to go before specific strategies and tools are found that will undo structural racism, there are at least two general categories of thinking and action that seem to be promising.

First, the structural racism lens points out the systemic and interrelated causes of persistent poverty. For example, inadequate housing and a weak local economy result in a low tax base which leads to lousy schools that produce poorly prepared workers who can't make a living in a restructured economy, which means that they don't bring enough income to their families and communities to provide adequate housing and a decent tax base. Our siloed, categorical way of designing social interventions inevitably falls short of addressing these inter-related problems in a holistic way, and the structural racism analysis requires us to re-examine our basic assumptions about how to bring about change. Though the structural approach may seem "too big," we ignore it at our peril and end up placing unrealistic expectations on narrow, programmatic, bandaid-like solutions. Instead, we must be ambitious and creative about strategies to complement and enhance the tools we have in our program toolbox.

Second, the structural racism lens emphasizes the context within which we are attempting to mount social, economic and political change. This includes:

- The *values context* that allows Americans to operate with the mindset that we live in an equal opportunity nation, where everyone has a chance for self-improvement and where lack of success is due to flaws in individual ability and effort.
- The *knowledge context* that normalizes racial inequities and allows Americans to accept statistics about disproportionality in, for example,

the educational or criminal justice systems as "just the way things are."

- The *cultural context* that permits racialized images and stereotypes to persist in the media.
- The *psychological context* that reinforces a sense of entitlement on the part of the white population and a sense of "non-entitlement" and low societal expectations on the part of people of color.
- The *political context* in which power is exercised in ways that sustain white privilege.

Having now articulated a framework for understanding how racialized outcomes continue to be produced in 21st Century America, the challenge is to keep pushing on how to operationalize change using this new

The Caucus convenes key players, shares information and coordinates collective work.

framework. Strategies are likely to include adding political and communicative dimensions to our traditional programmatic and technical approaches to change. They are likely to require coalitions of various types, depending on particular strategic entry points for change. They are likely to emphasize cross-sectoral interventions. The Structural Racism Caucus is a vehicle that can keep the flame lit;

encourage those who are undertaking critical new research and analysis; support the hard work of strategy and tools development; create a powerful message and voice around addressing structural racism; and keep people in touch with one another.

An example of the potential of the Caucus is the *amicus* brief recently prepared by SRC members regarding the two Supreme Court cases in Seattle and Jefferson County, Kentucky about use of race in student assignment in public schools. The brief uses a structural racism argument to support consideration of race in determining where students go to public school. The authors point out that public schools in both locations are segregated and unequal because of the convergence of tax policies, housing policies, education financing and other policies, in addition to race and class dynamics. This results in poorer schools for people of color. Therefore the fundamental democratizing institution in our society—the public education system—is actually reproducing racial hierarchy due to the cumulative effects of public policies and practices. The *amicus* brief is an example of the kind of work the SRC is undertaking to enhance the reach, power and influence of a message that can ultimately undo structural racism.

Anne C. Kubisch (akubisch@aspensroundtable.org) is Co-Director of the Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change and a Member of the Structural Racism Caucus. □

Toward a Structural Racism Framework

by Andrew Grant-Thomas and John A. Powell

For many people, the term "structural racism" mystifies rather than clarifies. Popular confusion around what is meant by the term hampers our collective ability to build on the real gains made by two generations of anti-racism activism. With the end of Jim Crow laws and a clear decline in the most blatant forms of interpersonal

racial discrimination, critical race projects often lack the explanatory clarity needed to effectively ground the ongoing struggle against racial inequity in the 21st Century. As a result, anti-racist efforts can prove ineffective, even counterproductive. The absence of a clear understanding of struc-

(Please turn to page 4)

tural racism also supports the cynicism of people who regard as “whining” any analysis that departs from strict individualist interpretations of racial inequality today.

The discussion of structural racism we present in this article and employ in the work of the Structural Racism Caucus emphasizes the powerful impact of inter-institutional dynamics, institutional resource inequities, and historical legacies on racial inequalities today. These factors do not alone determine the depth or scope of racial inequality. In arenas from employment to housing to health care, interpersonal racial bias remains an active and powerful contributor to racial inequality. Economic booms and recessions, globalization, and technological and medical innovation certainly matter. Insofar as group “culture” is an adaptation to restrictive (or expansive) opportunity structures, cultural factors may also play a role. On the other hand, the social structures we emphasize promote racially inequitable distributions of social, political and economic goods and services even in the absence of avowed “racists,” even absent self-sabotaging behavior by racial minorities, and notwithstanding the play of macroeconomic, cultural and other large-scale factors. Any promising attempt to dismantle the underpinning of durable racial inequality must account for the structural dynamics we highlight here.

Traditional Approaches to Thinking about Racism

In terms of our understanding of racism, the last 50 years of activism and theorizing around race and racial inequality seem to have left us back where we started. Today, both popular and scholarly definitions of racism similarly refer most often to beliefs and belief systems, to feelings, or to behaviors based on race. Four features of this common sense about the nature of racism deserve mention:

On one hand, because we associate feelings, beliefs and behaviors primarily with individuals, most accounts imply that racism is first and foremost a matter of *individual* agency. According to this conception, racism is lodged in the hearts and minds of individuals and made manifest by the words they speak, the actions they perform and the thoughts they harbor. The *essentialist* tinge of this construction is clear: One is or is not racist, all the time or never. As a rule, people’s words and actions also are interpreted as racist only if they are *intentionally* enacted to produce outcomes that injure some or benefit

Structural racism emphasizes the powerful impact of inter-institutional dynamics, institutional resource inequities and historical legacies on racial inequalities today.

others. Finally, for many, racism requires that the offending word or act be *race-targeted*.

Although the individualist, essentialist, intentionalist and race-targeted model of racism reflects our present common sense about the nature of racism, anti-racism efforts have long recognized the model’s weaknesses as a general or inclusive account of racism. “Institutional racism” was the designation given in the late 1960s to the recognition that, at very least, racism need not be individualist, essentialist or intentional. Institutional racism can be prescribed by formal rules but depends, minimally, on organizational cultures that tolerate such behaviors. Racist institutional decisions neither require nor preclude the participation of racist individuals. In Jim Crow laws and anti-miscegenation statutes, many observers saw that the law, the institutions it governed and even the broader culture itself related differently to African Americans than to whites. Those institutional and cultural practices generated a dynamic only partly dependent on the racial attitudes of the people

engaged in them. This suggested that while racist individuals had to be monitored and possibly reformed, rehabilitating our key social, political and cultural institutions was even more critical to the achievement of racial justice.

The institutional racism framework reflects a broader recognition of the forms through which racialized power is deployed, dispersed and entrenched. However, while elucidating ways in which racism is often non-individualist, non-essentialist and non-intentionalist by focusing on intra-institutional dynamics, this framework fails to account for the ways in which the *joint* operations of social institutions produce important outcomes. This is a crucial gap, for it is often the interaction between institutions, rather than the operation of each in isolation, that generates racial group disparities. Whereas both the individual and institutional racism frameworks emphasize dynamics triggered immediately by race, racism and racial inequality often originate in treatment inspired by non-race factors (e.g., class status, religious belief, language) that interact with race in patterned ways. This kind of secondary racism, a function of inter-institutional relations, forms the leading edge of structural racism.

The Structural Racism Framework

We review and critique the theoretical frameworks of individual racism and of institutional racism, not to suggest that they are irrelevant to understanding racial inequality today, but rather to underline their incompleteness. This is not merely a matter of semantics. Each framework represents vastly different ways of understanding the contemporary production of racial inequality. Each identifies different causes and implications, and points to different strategic responses. We present the structural racism framework as one that offers important additional insight into the nature of racism today and as a model for effective social praxis.

One's capacity to flourish, or "to lead a life one has reason to value," as Nobel Laureate Amartya Sen describes it, is contingent on access to opportunity. Opportunities, as we define them here, are resources and services that contribute to stability and advancement. Access to opportunity is not equally available to all. In American society, opportunity is produced and regulated by institutions, institutional interactions and individuals, jointly and differentially providing and denying access along lines of race, gender, class and other markers of social difference.

From both the individual and institutional racism perspectives, racist treatment attaches directly to the victim's race; the difference lies in the degree to which each sees racism as institutionally constrained. Where the individual racism view focuses on race-targeted, discretionary treatment, institutional racism speaks to the race-targeted and procedural (i.e., rule-based) dimension of racism. As institutional racism shifts our focus from the motives and actions of individual people to the practices and procedures *within* an institution, structural racism shifts attention from the single, intra-institutional setting to *inter-institutional* arrangements and interactions. "Inter-institutional arrangements and interactions" are what we mean by "structures." We turn away from the internal dynamics of institutions, not because those dynamics are incidental to the production of racial inequality, but because we want to highlight the degree to which (and means by which) inter-institutional arrangements themselves shape very important results.

Because Americans often take individual people to be the main vehicles of racism, we fail to appreciate the work done by racially inequitable structures. But, in fact, all complex societies feature institutional arrangements that help to create and distribute the society's benefits, burdens and interests. These structures are neither natural nor neutral, as Harvard Law Professor Roberto Unger argues. And just as we cannot account for or address the impact of institutional racism by only

considering a given individual's actions or psychological state, we cannot adequately understand the work structures do simply by looking at the practices and procedures of a single institution, as political philosopher John Rawls underscores. Iris M. Young uses Marilyn Frye's bird-in-the-birdcage metaphor for illustrating the works of structures. If we approach the problem of durable racial inequality one "bar" at a time, it is hard to appreciate the fullness of the bird's entrapment, much less formulate a suitable response to it. Explaining the bird's inability to take flight requires that we recognize the connectedness of multiple bars,

Racist institutional decisions neither require nor preclude the participation of racist individuals.

each reinforcing the rigidity of the others. In confronting racism we must similarly account for multiple, intersecting and often mutually reinforcing disadvantages, and develop corresponding response strategies.

We can describe a social system as structurally racist to the degree that it is configured to promote racially unequal outcomes. For example, a society marked by highly interdependent opportunity structures and large inter-institutional resource disparities will likely be very unequal with respect to the outcomes governed by those institutions and opportunity structures. Whether that inequality assumes a *racial* caste will depend, in part, on the racial conditions in place when the current structural configuration came into being, conditions that will have been shaped in turn partly by the previous structural configuration. The dynamic established by initial conditions can be very durable indeed. In a society that features structural inequalities with respect to opportunities and institutional resources, initial racial inequality in motion will likely stay in motion. But, again, actual outcomes, including the depth of inequality, will depend sub-

The Structural Racism Caucus

The Structural Racism Caucus is co-sponsored by the following organizations: Applied Research Center; The Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change; Center for Social Inclusion; Institute on Race and Poverty; Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity; and the Philanthropic Initiative for Racial Equity. The Caucus is funded by the C. S. Mott Foundation. For more information, go to www.kirwaninstitute.org/projects/srcaucus.htm.

stantially on non-structural factors, dynamics at the individual and intra-institutional levels not least among them. A thorough analysis of a given racial disparity will look to all three levels.

Social Opportunity as a Function of Inter-Institutional Dynamics

Institutional actors matter, not only because of the social goods under their immediate purview (schools and education, hospitals and medical care, faith-based organizations and spiritual guidance, among others), but also for the variable terms of access they offer to other institutions and to social networks. The operation of different institutional actors within and across domains such as education, employment, health care and criminal justice jointly produce social opportunities and outcomes. This interdependence has profound implications for transmitting inequality across domains and for remedying inequality. But how is racial inequality, in particular, introduced into the system in the first place? Part of the answer lies at the level of interpersonal and intra-institutional processes, which is why we underline the insights of the individual and institutional racism perspectives. Another

(Please turn to page 6)

important part of the answer is given by history.

The Sediment of History

We argue that there *are* powerful causal links between historically grounded arrangements and conditions and present inequalities. The general failure to recognize them owes to several factors. For one, many people, especially white Americans, mistakenly believe that racial equality has already been achieved, not only in terms of the law and popular sensibilities, but in terms of group outcomes as well. Six in ten white respondents to a 2001 national survey by the *Washington Post*, the Kaiser Family Foundation and Harvard University believed that blacks had *equal or better* access to health care than whites do. Half thought blacks and whites had similar levels of education, and half thought blacks enjoyed comparable job status.

Perhaps the most important reason for past-present myopia in this context is the one highlighted by the structural racism framework—the inappropriately narrow construction of racism that sets the terms of the racial inequality debate in the United States. If we insist that racism can only take recognizably individualist, essentialist, intentionalist and race-targeted forms, then, indeed, with the demise of Jim Crow laws the connections between the past and present are relatively few and largely symbolic. But what if we relaxed the assumption that racism attaches only to people, policies and practices that intentionally discriminate on the basis of race? What if we agreed that racism is best defined with respect to the outcome it produces (racial inequality), rather than with reference to its specific content or intent? From this conceptual vantage point it becomes clear that the legacies of the past remain deeply implicated in the production and reproduction of racial and ethnic inequality in a variety of ways.

For example, the roots of contemporary wealth disparities between

whites and nonwhites lie mainly in historical public and private sector practices that allowed millions of white, but not black, families to buy homes and build equity in the 1940's, 1950's and 1960's. The FHA funded sales in racially homogeneous white neighborhoods and favored the purchase of homes in the suburbs. The underwriting manual for home mortgage insurance disseminated by the federal government was forthrightly racist.

The federal government also pushed home buyers to adopt covenants that precluded the sale of subsidized homes to nonwhites. While both racial covenants and racist mortgage insurance policies were declared unconstitutional in 1948, their legacy prompted private companies to engage

The institutional racism framework fails to account for the ways in which the joint operations of social institutions produce important outcomes.

in redlining practices that continue to shape housing market outcomes. The effects of those policies play out in the huge contemporary gaps the intergenerational transfers of wealth.

Conclusion

We believe that interpersonal and institutional racisms remain potent contributors to the persistence of racial and ethnic inequalities. We also acknowledge the likelihood that a range of other factors not discussed here also play important roles. But we also insist that any approach to remedying

inequality that does not account for the role of inter-institutional arrangements and interactions and historical legacies is likely to fail or, at best, enjoy only partial success.

Borrowing from Sociology Professor Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, we can list four ways in which a structural racism approach troubles and refigures more conventional frameworks, with important implications for analysis and policy intervention. *First*, in contrast to the individualist discourse, a structural understanding conceives of racism as a *societal* outcome. *Second*, while traditional conceptualizations of racism understand it as a static phenomenon, a structural understanding sees racism as a dynamic force recognized more for its effects than for any particular content. *Third*, while traditional approaches identify only race-targeted treatment as possibly racist, a structural understanding underlines the significance of both overt and covert modes. *Fourth*, traditional understandings of racism conceive of it as a historical phenomenon whose presence in 21st Century America can only be regarded as anomalous. The structural perspective understands contemporary disparities as partly derivative from norms and conditions established long ago, including some established without racial intent.

Andrew Grant-Thomas (grantthomas.1@osu.edu) is the Deputy Director of the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race & Ethnicity.

john a. powell (powel008@yahoo.com), a PRRAC Board Member, is the Executive Director of the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race & Ethnicity and Williams Chair in Civil Rights and Civil Liberties at the Moritz College of Law, at Ohio State Univ. □

20% Book Discount

Lexington Books is providing P&R readers with a 20% discount on our new “best of P&R” collection, *Poverty & Race in America*:

The Emerging Agendas. Use code **8S6POVRA** when ordering (800/462-6420), and you will receive this discount.

Retooling Community-Building for Racial Equity

by Keith Lawrence

“Community-building” ideas have been quite influential within community redevelopment and social justice circles in the U.S. over the past four decades. Generally speaking, community-building approaches emphasize popular participation, local leadership, social capital and networks, and the strengthening of local capacities as keys to fixing urban and rural communities mired in poverty and its attendant ills. Many promising strategies have been implemented in pursuit of these outcomes, the latest being the “comprehensive community initiatives” of the 1990s, designed to address the complex of factors that usually contribute to any single aspect of local disadvantage. But in the aggregate, community-building interventions have had a modest success record. Few, if any, of the chronically poor and disadvantaged places targeted by community-builders have been truly transformed. More frustratingly, although the field has accumulated a great deal of knowledge about the strengths and weaknesses of discrete initiatives, it still has not come up with the definitive blueprints for place-based intervention that have long been sought by practitioners.

To be sure, community-building’s modest record of accomplishment reflects the enormous complexities of poverty and disadvantage far more than it suggests lack of practitioner wisdom or dedication. Inequality, after all, has always been a cornerstone of this nation’s political economy. Despite our egalitarian myths, inequality remains a basis of our public education, criminal justice, housing, employment and other wealth-generating institutions and systems. Indeed, when we contrast our democratic aspirations with the increasing depth of familiar inequalities, we may well ask whether the community-building sector ought to be prominent in our minds. It seems more logical that principal responsibility for addressing this contradiction

should fall to public institutions expressly designed to promote equality. However, while this may be true, there are at least two reasons why community-builders might be well positioned to play an important catalytic role.

Community-building organizations are rare associational spaces where residents of chronically poor communities come together to express their values and preferences regarding local de-

Community-building organizations are rare associational spaces.

velopment. They also uniquely bring together leaders and stakeholders from the philanthropic, academic, business and government sectors for sustained attention to the problems of communities that, on their own, typically cannot engage local and state governance. In this way, they function as “mediating structures”: civil society formations that, as Theodore Kerrine puts it, “stand between the individual in his or her private life and the large institutions of modern society.” They provide spaces where ordinary citizens can discover what they believe and want in common, and where they might begin to find and sound their collective voice. Community-building organizations that genuinely help local residents participate in governance enhance what Richard Couto describes as “the democratic prospect of increased social and economic equality, and stronger communal bonds.”

Secondly, residents of our most distressed communities are disproportionately black and brown. Larger numbers of whites are poor, but poverty’s incidence is higher and more persistent for African Americans, Latinos and Native Americans. Poor racial minorities also tend to be spatially concentrated, thanks to well-known char-

acteristics of the housing market. Community-builders are therefore in the midst of the nation’s deepest contradiction: the co-existence of white privilege in its marketplaces of opportunity with democratic ideals that all rest on an assumption of equal personhood regardless of race.

Structural racism is a principal source of inequality. The Aspen Institute’s Roundtable on Community Change defines structural racism as “the ways in which history, ideology, public policies, institutional practices, and culture interact to maintain a racial hierarchy that allows the privileges associated with whiteness, and the disadvantages associated with color, to endure and adapt over time.” It describes the infusion of a racial sensibility into the visible and invisible fabric of American life—one that sorts, ranks and stratifies Americans in sometimes obvious, but mostly subtle, ways. Fundamentally, it is the embeddedness of racist beliefs and assumptions in what we “know” about individuals and groups of color, and in principles and practices that we consider normal, race-neutral and fair. It is, at its root, a shared set of beliefs about race and social merit that still heavily influences how we allocate wealth, opportunity and privilege.

This shared “race knowledge” informs both public governance and private decision-making. Through the combined effect of institutional policies and practices shaped by this cognitive consensus on race, social resources are allocated in ways that keep on reinforcing white privilege and relegating Americans of color disproportionately to the margins. It is the hard-to-see but nonetheless real and powerful societal dimension of the “failures” and “dysfunctions” associated in the public mind with millions of Americans of color.

(Please turn to page 8)

The Work of Community-Builders

Community-builders already imagine themselves to be serving democratic and equality ideals. “Movement,” “equity,” “empowerment” and other progressive terms are familiar parts of the community-building rhetoric. But this language is not really reflected in its dominant operational paradigm. For the most part, the community-building culture is pragmatic, functionalist and averse to political engagement. Such a posture becomes less and less effective as economic and racial structural forces not only harden the racial cast of poverty and disadvantage, but also steadily reduce prospects for the upward social mobility promised by American liberalism. Indeed, the May 13, 2005 *Wall Street Journal* made this page-one observation about class mobility:

As the gap between the rich and poor has widened since 1970, the odds that a child born in poverty will climb to wealth—or that a rich child will fall into the middle class—remain stuck. Despite the spread of affirmative action, the expansion of community colleges and the other social changes designed to give people of all classes a shot at success, Americans are no more or less likely to rise above, or fall below, their parents’ economic class than they were 35 years ago.

Structural barriers make persistent local disadvantage less amenable to the capacity-building solutions currently favored by community-building leaders. Thus, it seems that now, more than ever, there is need for intentional work to shift the community-building paradigm. Along with its traditional outcome goals, the field could also be reconfigured to develop the collective civic capacities of residents and institutional stakeholders for two purposes: identification and coherent articulation of the policies and practices important for equity and justice, and direct engagement of governance in pursuit of

those goals.

None of this is likely to materialize without an ideological transformation within community-building itself commensurate with the challenge of structural racism. The likelihood of such transformation might depend on the willingness of community-building elites to articulate and promote core beliefs, principles and practices that are consistent with a vision of racial equity and democratic empowerment. New images of progress, practical tools, funding parameters and knowledge agendas would have to be constructed. Community-builders would need to team up with others toiling for

“Movement,” “equity,” “empowerment” are familiar parts of the community-building rhetoric.

social justice. This work would require building a critical mass within and beyond the field around a common vision and shared agenda that is focused on racial equity.

Community-building can aspire to counter structural racism by becoming an unequivocal facilitator of civic engagement for its clientele. It can take this course secure in the conviction that personal responsibility and individualism only consistently bear fruit when people can count on certain basic resource and opportunity thresholds in their local settings. The field can dispel the myth that beefed-up, non-political, individual and organizational capacities alone could compensate for the broader society’s under-provision of resources and opportunities in some settings. Moreover, it can debunk popular bootstrap, social capital and other self-determination myths by acknowledging that these only really serve advancement goals when communities already have a foundation of decent jobs, safety and stability, positive place identity and civic consciousness.

Armed with this outlook, and with a structural analysis of how race and

class converge to undermine civic capacities, community-builders might take concrete steps toward empowering constituents for engagement of regressive public policies and institutional practices. Local inequity in any domain is almost always traceable to a particular convergence of business, government, bureaucratic and civic powerbrokers standing beyond the political reach of those who are denied their fair share. Drawing on the resources of local and national allies, the field could mobilize the competencies, leadership and collective voice required to inject the preferences of underserved communities into the governance process.

The Challenges

Several challenges loom large for the change in direction recommended here, the first being that of initiating ideological change within community-building. On this “how” question, the good news is that history shows that dominant political, cultural and organizational paradigms do shift—sometimes quite fundamentally. And wherever we look back at what we later recognize to be fundamental shifts, we see critical moments, actors and social contexts.

Very generally speaking, the key change ingredients and process seem to be as follows: Highly motivated advocates, researchers, critics and other opinion leaders frame something as an issue and attempt to socialize a reform vision among a larger public or audience. They adopt it because it appeals to them on some basic level. The likelihood of such “mass” adoption—the scale essential for real cultural/political transformation—increases when elite reframing and mobilizing efforts coincide with critical events or background contexts that focus attention on that issue area. Adoption is also more likely when the message is uncomplicated, has strong common sense appeal and offers perceptible rewards for change.

For community-building, the “for

what?” question will have to be met with convincing explanations of what is to be gained by a shift in emphasis toward race, equity, power and democracy. Pragmatists will particularly want to know how such values can be made operational and translated into concrete outcomes. Nonetheless, it

seems unlikely that the recipe for transforming community-building institutions and culture would be any different to what appears to work elsewhere: elite leadership and timely exploitation of opportune moments to mobilize stakeholders around a transformational vision.

Keith Lawrence (keithl@aspenroundtable.org) is a Research Associate at the Aspen Institute Roundtable on Community Change, where he is a principal contributor to its efforts to reframe approaches to race within the community-building field. □

Youth Organizing Tackles the “Racism You Can’t Name”

by Julie Quiroz-Martínez

The California High School Exit Exam provides a graphic illustration of structural racism and a compelling story of youth organizing to challenge it. California legislators passed the exit exam into law in 1999 with the stated goal of improving academic performance in public schools. This year, the exit exam’s real teeth were finally bared. Beginning in 2006, California schools are required to deny diplomas to high school seniors who don’t pass the exam. Not surprisingly, most students who fail are black and brown youth concentrated in the worst public schools. In fact, in what is known as the Williams lawsuit settlement (*Williams v. State of California*), the State of California acknowledged that these schools lack the books, qualified teachers and basic health and safety standards needed for a good education.

No one understands the exit exam implications better than students at Richmond High School, located in Richmond, California, a city with a population that is 36% Black and 27% Latino, and has an official poverty rate of 16%. Of Richmond High’s 345 seniors in 2006, 83 (24%) failed the exit exam. “The exit exam affects most of the student body, both Latinos and African Americans,” observes Raquel Jimenez, program director of Youth Together, an organization that facilitates youth organizing at Richmond and other high schools in the region.

It was students at Richmond High, therefore, who led a campaign to convince the county board of education to defy the law. “We started gearing up a few years ago,” recalls Jimenez,

“as part of a statewide effort by Californians for Justice, a statewide grassroots racial justice organization. The work at Richmond High was part of a larger organizing and legal strategy demanding equal learning conditions for all students.” According to Jimenez, who began working with Youth Together a decade ago as a 22-year-old fresh out of college, a Richmond High student came up with idea

Students at Richmond High led a campaign to convince West Contra Costa Unified School District to defy the law.

of asking the school board to take a stand against the exit exam. “It was exciting to think about a school board engaging in civil disobedience. We thought it could be a really powerful example for other school boards.” Dave Brown, a sympathetic school board member, agreed to introduce such a resolution.

When the school board met in April 2006 to vote on the resolution, it faced intense local and even national media attention and a room packed with hundreds of students and parents. In the end, the school board voted down Brown’s resolution that would have granted diplomas to students completing an alternative “Senior Year Demonstration Project.” “We lost the vote,” concludes Jimenez, “but we succeeded in letting a mass of people know we weren’t asking for lower

standards for students, but for schools to live up to higher standards. And we provoked really defensive remarks from the state superintendent of schools.” Jimenez sees this as “a battle of whose story is being told.” “It’s a struggle against racism that you can’t name,” she observes. “This society has defined racism as being about individuals. It’s not talked about as systemic.

The local work in Richmond is a critical piece of a larger strategy with a structural racism analysis at its core. Youth Together works closely with the lawyers who filed the suit seeking to block the exit exam on the grounds of unequal protection. In fact, Youth Together helped recruit students to serve as plaintiffs in the case (*Valenzuela v. California State Board of Education*) that is set to go to trial before the California Supreme Court as early as next year. While the legal challenge did not help the 83 Richmond High seniors denied diplomas this year, the battle continues.

“Young people can’t change the system by themselves,” Jimenez argues. “But young people have experience with schools, with prisons, with violence that reveals structural racism and mobilizes parents and other adults. We need legal strategies that reflect that analysis and organizing.” Mike Chavez of Californians for Justice underscores the need for grassroots organizing: “Even when we have a legal victory,” he observes, “it is the ongoing grassroots pressure and engagement that ensures implementa-

(Please turn to page 10)

tion.”

The ongoing story of the California exit exam reveals some of structural racism’s key features:

- Ostensibly “color-blind” public policies and institutional practices that serve to deepen chronic racial disparities in education.
- A “level playing field” ideology that blames individual students for systemic failures.
- Components of a powerful infrastructure that continues to lock people of color into low socioeconomic status.

Perhaps even more importantly, this story suggests that youth organizing provides a rich source of experience and leadership that is crucial for building a movement capable of bringing down the structures of racism. While Richmond High students did not succeed in changing county school board policy, their work is contributing to a larger regional and statewide infrastructure, putting out alternative media messages, and sparking bold ideas in other localities.

Two years ago, I worked on a report entitled *Changing the Rules of the Game: Youth Development & Structural Racism* (see box). Through research, convenings, interviews and site visits, we uncovered a small but vibrant number of youth organizations seeking to apply a structural racism analysis in their work. Observing the work of these organizations, we came to the following conclusions:

1. Practitioners lack support for addressing structural racism issues they face in their everyday work.

Our preliminary scan of research and organizational descriptions suggested that racism and racialized outcomes received little explicit attention. But the youth organizations we subsequently met with and visited told a dramatically different story. For them, understanding and addressing racism was fundamental to their day-to-day youth development work and broader theory of change.

One youth organizer suggested that

every organization working with young people—not just youth organizing groups—has a role to play in addressing racism:

Even if a group is not doing collective direct action, youth need to know how different institutions function in order to survive day to day. Like in youth employment, they may tell you how to go to an interview. They may tell you “You can’t dress like that, you can’t act like that.” But do they then tell them what the research shows about discrimination? It’s like they’re saying, “It’s all on you.” They’re not telling them that there are insti-

Lawyers filed the suit seeking to block the exit exam on the grounds of unequal protection.

tutional factors that determine whether they’re going to succeed. – *Jeremy Lahoud, Generation Y, Chicago*

Lahoud’s comment also suggests that even organizations that perceive themselves as “neutral” on the question of racism may in fact be perpetuating or contributing to the challenges youth face.

2. A keen analysis lies at the core of any structural racism approach.

Using different vocabulary and approaches, each group acknowledged, to varying degree, three defining features of racism:

- **History** – present-day racism was built on a long history of racially distributed resources and racialized ideas that continue to shape our view of ourselves and others.
- **Hierarchy** – racial categories and exclusions still determine the distribution of resources, power and opportunity.
- **Infrastructure** – a broad range of policies and institutions sustain the history and hierarchy of present-day racism.

The core racial justice “practice” of these groups is the engagement of

young people in critical examination of the root causes of the issues they face and solutions to the problems they experience. In a recent interview, Raquel Jimenez of Youth Together observed:

Our workshops with youth members promote big-picture analysis. We do workshops on Proposition 13, which happened in 1978 and froze California property taxes and basically allowed the upper classes to refuse to pay for other people’s children’s education. We look at state funding of education and how the issue is not equal funding but funding targeted to schools that have been underfunded.

Along with an intense focus on analysis, many groups expressed an urgent need to create opportunities for youth to process deep and painful emotions regarding racism. Groups seeking to create opportunities for healing often described their approach as blending analysis with emotional exploration, viewing this intersection as critical for engaging youth who have been most pushed to the margins.

3. Collective action is key to understanding and addressing structural racism.

Because racism affects people as a group and not just individually, anti-racist approaches must also operate at the collective level. For example, Reggie Moore of Milwaukee’s Urban Underground describes how racism informs the way young people in UU’s after-school leadership development program shape their community action projects:

The selection of civic participation projects is based on the personal connection or experience youth have with an issue based on their race. We have focused on Black voter turn-out, police-involved shootings, police in schools, and teen homeless, all looking through a racial lens.

Invariably, this collective action involves a highly developed participatory process of issue identification that acknowledges young people’s collec-

tive experience of racism. Our report found that not only do groups develop campaigns with a racial justice lens, but perhaps most importantly, they do so through a participatory process in which youth research, respond to and ultimately reframe issues that affect their lives.

4. Developing a structural racism approach requires specific and intentional organizational investment.

One of the most time- and resource-

consuming aspects of maintaining a racial justice focus is the need to develop a shared political and racial justice analysis among staff and volunteers. Along with direct support to youth organizing groups, national and regional intermediaries are a key resource that can offer materials and training grounded in a well-developed racial justice analysis.

Raquel Jimenez agrees that investing in youth organizing is key: “Youth have knowledge that can inform strat-

egy,” she maintains. “Youth are fearless. The question is when adults are going to become equally alarmed.”

Julie Quiroz-Martínez (Julie@mosaicideas.com) lives in Oakland, California, where she is co-principal of mosaic, a collaboration of consultants who assist organizations and foundations to develop new ideas, strategies and capacity for achieving racial and social justice. □

Structural Racism and Rebuilding New Orleans

by Maya Wiley

How do we rebuild an entire region, rebuild our country, and make it healthier, increasing the economic, social and political well-being of all its residents? And why does it matter for the nation? These are questions posed by the story of Gulf Coast rebuilding and of the fight to recover New Orleans. To answer them, we must look at race, particularly the way it has driven our structural arrangements—multi-institutional interactions—which have created conditions for scarcity of resources instead of opportunities. We must also look at how to use race to transform the structural arrangements. Race has built an unsound house. The foundation is cracked, and the basement is filling with water. Those in the basement, largely people of color, thanks to generations of race discrimination, will drown first. But the upper floors will eventually fill with water too.

Consider that, nationally, from 2000 to 2005, housing costs rose 52% while incomes rose but 2%. Then consider that the US Department of Housing and Urban Development’s programs reach only 25% of those eligible. Our increasing insecurity across communities is a national issue brought into sharp relief in the Gulf Coast. Fifty-three percent of New Orleans’ units were rental units. Yet rebuilding policies barely address that reality. Rental housing costs have risen almost 40% in New Orleans since the levees

failed, thanks to the destruction of much of the rental housing stock. Rebuilding the Gulf Coast provides an opportunity to adopt policies to fix our local and national problems. If we pay attention to the basement, pour a better, stronger foundation and make sure no one is relegated to the basement,

Our increasing insecurity across communities is a national issue brought into sharp relief in the Gulf Coast.

our national house would provide a place of community and comfort, as well as a reliable shelter from the storms we must weather.

The structural racism analysis, a diagnostic as well as strategic tool, helps us identify and target the national investments and national, state and local policies and practices that will both build a stronger New Orleans and a stronger nation. Structural racism looks to the relationship and interaction between our public and private institutions which produce barriers for people-of-color communities and, therefore, everyone. Schools, colleges and universities, employers, banks, housing, transportation systems and news media do not operate in isolation. They work together and affect each other. Employers want to be near transportation hubs. We look for hous-

ing near good schools. Schools are locally funded, so they tend to be better where housing is expensive. Thanks to a history of race discrimination that both created and disinvested in poor communities of color and poor communities in general, these relationships do not impact communities in a race-neutral way.

Consider, for example, that the federal government invested in the creation of a white middle class with both New Deal and post-World War II programs, giving those who received those investments opportunities to improve their lives. These programs were critically important, but also largely discriminated against people of color. The Federal Housing Administration (FHA), created in 1934, subsidized mortgages and insured private mortgages, but often required new owners to add racially restrictive covenants to their deeds, ensuring all-White neighborhoods. By the 1950s, federal money insured half the mortgages in the United States, but only in segregated White neighborhoods. The FHA urged developers, bankers and local governments to use zoning ordinances and physical barriers to protect racial segregation. The post-World War II GI Bill fueled a massive movement of White men into high-paying professional and managerial jobs. Blacks, many of whom were denied entry to the armed services because of the color

(Please turn to page 12)

of their skin, were less likely to get GI Bill benefits. Black veterans who did qualify did not get the good-paying jobs. In addition to job discrimination, the United States Employment Service funneled many Black veterans into low-skilled, lower-paying jobs than their White comrades in arms. These policies resulted in the creation of White suburbs and the shrinking of urban tax bases around the country, increasing racial segregation and concentrated poverty.

If your grandparents had an eighth-grade education, could not get a mortgage loan and were not eligible for any government mortgage assistance programs because of their race, they had no house to refinance to pay for a child's college tuition. They had no house to leave to next generations. They had no retirement benefits. White people, even poor ones, often had more educational opportunities, got more government help to buy homes and were able to buy them in areas where their homes would appreciate in value. This meant they could build asset wealth even if their incomes were low, and help their children and grandchildren. Racial disparities—high rates of poverty, unemployment, illnesses, etc.—are symptoms of structural arrangements that produced, directly or indirectly, disinvestment in communities of color.

This is an important point because while White poverty is unacceptable, White poverty and Black and Latino poverty nationally do not look the same. For example, 34% of poor Blacks and 22% of poor Latinos live in high-poverty neighborhoods (where at least 25% of the residents are poor), compared to only 6% of poor Whites. In fact, a low-income White family earning \$15,000 per year has about \$10,000 in asset wealth, while the same low-income Black family has zero asset wealth. In New Orleans, these disparities may explain why, as the Brookings Institution has reported, 32.7% of Black New Orleanians had no car to escape the flood waters, while more than 90% of Whites did. Again,

White and Black poverty did not look the same, since 52% of poor Black New Orleanians lacked access to a car, compared to only 17% of poor Whites.

New Orleans exemplifies the multi-institutional historic policies and practices that produced White suburbs and nonwhite concentrated poverty. New Orleans has become *more* segregated and poverty more concentrated over the last 40 years. An important Brookings Institution report noted that as recently as 1976, there were no New Orleans neighborhoods with a concentration of Blacks. In 1970, although New Orleans was a poor city, its poor were

In the city of New Orleans, communities of color made up nearly 80% of the population in flooded neighborhoods.

not highly concentrated in hyper-segregated neighborhoods. Between 1970 and 2000, the poverty rates in the city didn't change, but there were 66% more neighborhoods of concentrated poverty (here defined as 40% or more of the residents living at or below the poverty level). This means that poor people had fewer choices about where to live and were living in communities with few jobs, inadequate transit to jobs and underfunded, poor-performing schools. In 1970, 54% of the region's population lived in the central city, but by 2000 New Orleans had only 36% of the region's population. This loss of population also meant the loss of jobs. In 1970, the city had two-thirds of the region's jobs. By 2000, the city's share of jobs sank to less than half (42%) of the region's jobs. The city lost jobs and tax revenues to the suburbs. Suburbs often do not thrive when the urban centers they are built around are struggling. The Census Bureau estimates that, in 2004, no population growth occurred in the New Orleans metropolitan region as a whole, and between 2000 and 2005 the city lost almost 29,000 residents.

Given that opportunity has not been spread evenly or fairly, it is not sur-

prising that New Orleans' people-of-color communities were both more vulnerable to the flooding and, while incredibly resilient under the circumstances, are struggling to rebuild. Sixty-seven percent of the city was Black before the levees gave way to a Category 3 Hurricane Katrina (compared to 42% in 1970). Almost one-third (28%) of New Orleanians were poor, and 84% of those poor were Black. Poor Blacks were four times more likely than poor Whites to live in extremely poor areas (43% compared to 11%) and, according to the Louisiana Department of Education, during the 2004-05 school year, the state considered 63% of New Orleans' public schools "academically unacceptable." Public education in New Orleans was 93% Black and only 4% White, and 74% of its black students were poor. Crime rates were high, and the city's criminal justice system contributed about 16% of the state's prison population.

Generally, those most significantly impacted by the current state of New Orleans, with the notable exceptions of the wealthy and predominantly White Lakeview neighborhood and the largely White working class St. Bernard Parish, are poor communities of color. In the city of New Orleans, communities of color made up nearly 80% of the population in flooded neighborhoods. Over 20% of people hit hard by the flood waters from the broken levees were living at or below the poverty line, and another 30% were living just above the poverty line. Almost half (44%) of those harmed by the broken levees were Black. Nearly 70% of poor people impacted by the storm were Black.

The Center for Social Inclusion's (CSI) new report, "The Race to Rebuild: The Color of Opportunity and the Future of New Orleans," examines how rebuilding is progressing in planning districts across New Orleans. According to CSI's analysis contained in the study's Report Card, rebuilding is not making the grade. Rebuilding is far from robust in any community, but communities of color, regardless of middle-class status, are having a harder

time rebuilding. Previous residents of neighborhoods such as the Lower Ninth Ward (97% African-American), Bywater (88% people of color) and Village de l'Est (96% people of color) face the greatest challenges to rebuilding. This is, in part, because of the length of time to get utilities like water and electricity working in these communities; reliance on public transit and public schools; and the lack of flood insurance.

Wealthier districts with large White populations, such as Lakeview, also face adversity, and their residents have suffered tremendous loss. Relatively speaking, however, Lakeview residents have more opportunities to rebound from catastrophe because they had greater financial assets and relied less on systems likely to be disrupted by these horrible events, such as public schools and transportation. The impact of destroyed housing, an economy struggling to recover, inadequate health care options, a limited public education system, and a hurricane protection system that may not be sufficient to withstand another assault do not offer many New Orleanians sufficient opportunities to return.

So some have rationalized the exclusion of a traumatized population with arguments that they are better off in Houston, Atlanta and other cities struggling to absorb unprecedented numbers of displaced people. The argument is that schools are better and there are more jobs. Maybe, but that depends. The structural arrangements may not be sufficiently different in displaced communities to allow more opportunity. It depends on whether people are able to get housing near job centers. It depends on whether they are able to get mental health and other health services. It depends on whether they are actually in high-performing schools. We know little about how displaced persons are faring, except in Houston, where the city has produced some survey results suggesting that 59% of displaced New Orleanians remain unemployed one year later. It also ignores the importance of social networks in helping people rebuild their lives. Whether or not they are able to

maintain or recreate important social networks is unclear.

What we do know is that the fates and well-being of Whites, Blacks, Latinos, Asian Americans and Native Americans are linked. White communities may be farther along in rebuilding than communities of color, but are hardly thriving. We also know that to help all communities thrive, we must address the structures blocking opportunity. To do this, we look to the most vulnerable and excluded, identify how the structures are excluding them, and develop policy and practice interventions. Research by economist Manuel Pastor and others finds that when we

New Orleans exemplifies the multi-institutional historic policies and practices that produced White suburbs and nonwhite concentrated poverty.

invest in poor communities of color, whole regions become wealthier and regional poverty rates decrease. We also know that policy strategies like inclusionary zoning, transit that connects poor communities to job centers, and revising education financing formulas to increase resources to public schools help to connect people to opportunity and build more opportunity. The structural race lens points us to the importance of all of these strategies, across institutions, coordinated in implementation and impact.

Government investment created the White middle class. It can create and rebuild a stronger and expanded middle class that includes people of color. We can start in the Gulf Coast and in the communities asked to absorb tens of thousands of displaced people. We will learn there how to build our new national house and make that house a home.

Maya Wiley (info@thecsi.org) is the founder and Director of the Center for Social Inclusion, in New York City, a national policy advocacy organization working to transform structural racism (www.centerforsocialinclusion.org). □

Race vis-à-vis Class in the U.S.?

by john a. powell
and Stephen Menendian

In his groundbreaking 1903 treatise, *The Souls of Black Folk*, W.E.B. Du Bois wrote, "for the problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color-line." A century later, and a full generation removed from the battles of the Civil Rights era, many now suggest that class, not race, is the greatest cleavage in American society. They fear that talk of race and the evils of racism obscure the more powerful politics of class and divide those sharing a common economic interest. Such claims hinge upon what is meant by race and class, and assume that the two are separable, conceptually and strategically.

In truth, neither race nor class is well understood. Perhaps the most critical flaw in our formulations of race and class is that they are assumed to be phenotypical markers or economic locations ahistorically derived and acontextually applied. Our current understanding of race and class did not arrive as the culmination of inevitable objective, historical logic. Race and class acquired meaning over time and are not comprehensible outside of that development.

History Lessons

From the American Revolution to the Industrial Revolution and Civil War, race and class were uncertain markers in a struggle that ultimately shaped many of the institutional arrangements under which we live today. Through the ideology of the American Revolution, the indentured European servant became a free white laborer while black slavery remained firmly intact and protected by powerful economic interests and guarded by our Constitution. To reconcile the love for liberty with the reality of slavery,

(Please turn to page 14)

Americans adopted an uncomfortable narrative of black inferiority and racial otherness. These developments ensured that the newly emergent industrial working class clearly identified as white.

Immigrants arriving in this country forcibly negotiated a color line protected by law, custom and ideology. The first Immigration and Naturalization Act, unanimously passed by the first Congress, restricted immigration to free whites. The ways in which the Irish, for example, competed for work and adjusted to industrial morality in America made it all but certain that they would adopt and extend the politics of white unity. From this nation's inception, the race line was used to demarcate and patrol the divide between those who constituted the "We" in "We The People." It was no surprise when in March of 1857, the United States Supreme Court, led by Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, declared in the *Dred Scott* case that all blacks—slaves as well as free—were not and could never become citizens of the United States.

Even when freed blacks were brought into the political community after the Civil War and granted citizenship, a now well-imbedded narrative of black inferiority and legacy of separation ensured that whites did not see themselves as having commonalities with blacks. According to economists Alberto Alesina and Edward Glaeser, much of the difference between American and European welfare systems can be explained by racial heterogeneity. In a pattern that persists today, opponents of welfare programs deploy racialized narratives to rouse a majority in opposition. In contrast to the generous Civil War pensions, provisions to the Freedmen's Bureau were short-lived, meager and stigmatizing. Many believed that welfare provisions to freed slaves were undeserved, and the Bureau was characterized as an immense bureaucracy whose programs were likely to make blacks lazy, dependent and prone to live off of "handouts." Racism contributed to the

undoing of Reconstruction, but the failure of Reconstruction to secure blacks' rights as citizens and free laborers accelerated racism's spread until, by the early 20th Century, it had fully pervaded the nation's culture and politics, with profound class consequences, complicating the efforts of reformers for generations.

Not only were blacks excluded from the bevy of New Deal programs, race was carefully used to narrow these programs, limit their applicability and ultimately to reverse their trajectory, to the detriment of similarly situated whites. New Deal programs could not survive the Southern voting block unless they were carefully restricted to leave the region's racial patterns undisturbed. As a consequence of our racialized past, Americans live with a comparatively thin social welfare system.

There has never been — at least in 20th Century America — a progressive political movement built solely on class.

The phenomenal economic growth of the post-WWII period was shaped by the racially inscribed New Deal institutions to produce the economic reality and new identity of the middle class, from which blacks were substantially excluded. The racism that influenced the New Deal programs and excluded blacks institutionalized racial disparities and imprinted the emergent middle class as white. The invisibility of the racial imprint on middle-class consciousness and institutions makes it possible for rejuvenated narratives of black otherness and unworthiness, conceived in the antebellum period, to persist, now explained in cultural terms rather than biology. The narrative of the American Dream—hard work and fair play—is the primary explanation for social mobility. Race is a critical part of the construction of class-as-merit. It is this individualistic ideology that helps to defeat class solidarity.

Today's Tasks

Race is so intimately intertwined with our class understandings that a politics of class will ultimately be split asunder by the subterranean use of race. Today, the race issue undergirds messages on taxes, government spending, poverty, immigration, crime, rights, values and even urban development. The racial mythology of the welfare state has become so entrenched in party politics that it constrains the policy choices for progressive change that would benefit all Americans, whatever their color or class. Race was critical to the development of arrangements that prevent class solidarity and of a political movement hostile to helping citizens in need. American exceptionalism, characterized by a weak labor movement, a thin social welfare apparatus and a stronger states' rights institutional framework, cannot be understood without seeing the role that race has played as our formative institutions were developed. Class identity and class consciousness itself has been thoroughly shaped and limited by our racialized arrangements. Because class is understood as an individual position, it is an empty vessel for building up a progressive movement. All but the most destitute and wealthiest Americans consider themselves middle-class.

As we move toward a majority-minority nation, the need to develop and sustain multi-racial, multi-class coalitions will become increasingly important. The challenge is to link—to integrate—the interests of people of color with those of the white working and middle classes without losing sight of race. Race and class inequalities are inextricably linked, and collective solidarity across races can be achieved only by fleshing out their intersections, not by ignoring them. The most successful multi-racial, multi-class progressive movements in the United States tackled race directly. Multi-racial coalitions were critical to Abolition movement, the Civil Rights Movement and even the New Deal coalition. The key to whether progressive movements will obtain widespread support or be

vulnerable to the negative use of race, implicitly or explicitly deployed, has been their commitment to interracial solidarity.

Summing Up

Long-standing institutional arrangements and deeply imbedded social narratives were disrupted by the transformation following the Civil War. As freed slaves were incorporated into the body politic of the nation, white workers and farmers glimpsed the possibility of solidarity along class lines unencumbered by racial division. The Populist movement sought to harness this possibility into a broad-based, multi-racial alliance of white farmers, trade workers and freed slaves. Southern planters, fearing an alliance between white and blacks, used race to split the movement. Fifty years later, union efforts were similarly stymied because of the fear of disrupting the racial order of the South. The CIO's de-emphasizing race and failing to make strong appeals to black workers made it virtually impossible to generate the grassroots support necessary to combat the exclusions and weaknesses of New Deal labor legislation. Indeed, Southern fears of returning black soldiers joining the union movement were part of the impetus for the Taft-Hartley Act. In the late '70s Cleveland Mayor Dennis Kucinich tried to build a progressive movement by emphasizing economic issues, since these united various city constituencies, but downplaying social issues, the most important of which was race. In doing so, race-baiting crept into the election and destroyed his chances of uniting the city's black and white working-class neighborhoods.

A closer look at the evolution and interplay of race and class in America illustrates the limitations of a race-neutral politics of class. Progressives who call for universalist programs that focus on class in lieu of race offer no mechanism for instilling the social solidarity necessary to propel a progressive agenda forward. Targeted universalism is a strategy that recognizes the

need for a platform that is universal and also responsive to the needs of the particular. Leadership can also make a difference. Both Harold Washington in Chicago, and Los Angeles Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa built broad-based multi-racial, multi-class coalitions and succeeded by keeping both race and class issues in focus. There has never been—at least in 20th Century America—a progressive political movement built solely on class. To inoculate such efforts from divisive race-baiting, there must be discourse to inspire whites to link their fates to nonwhites. This cannot be done by

ignoring race, but by finding a way to speak to a multi-racial, multi-class audience with ideas like targeted universalism and with language that unashamedly embraces American values of justice.

John A. Powell (powel008@yahoo.com) is Executive Director of the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race & Ethnicity and Williams Chair in Civil Rights and Civil Liberties at the Moritz College of Law at Ohio State Univ.

Stephen Menendian (steve.menendian@gmail.com) is a Research Associate at the Kirwan Institute. □

Further Readings

- Alesina, Alberto & Edward L. Glaeser (2004). *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo (1997). "Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 62, No. 3.
- Brookings Institution (2005). *New Orleans after the Storm: Lessons from the Past, a Plan for the Future*, www.brookings.edu/dybdocroot/metro/pubs.20051012_NewOrleans.pdf
- Brown, Michael et al. (2003). *White-Washing Race: The Myth of a Color-Blind Society*. Univ. of California Press.
- Cashin, Sheryll (2004). *The Failures of Integration: How Race and Class are Undermining the American Dream*. NY: Public Affairs Press.
- Center for Social Inclusion (2006). *The Race to Rebuild: The Color of Opportunity and the Future of New Orleans*, www.centerforsocialinclusion.org/PDF/racetorebuild.pdf
- Conley, Dalton (2001). "The Black-White Wealth Gap." *The Nation*, March 29.
- Couto, Richard A., with Catherine S. Guthrie (1999). *Making Democracy Work Better: Mediating Structures, Social Capital, and the Democratic Prospect*. Chapel Hill: Univ. of No. Carolina Press.
- Ford, Richard Thompson (1995). "The Boundaries of Race: Political Geography in Legal Analysis." 107 *Harvard Law Review*.
- Frye, Marilyn (1983). "Oppression," *The Politics of Reality*. Trumansburg, NY: The Crossing Press.
- Kerrine, Theodore M. (1980). "Mediating Structures: A Paradigm for Public Policy." *Soundings*, 62:3 Winter.
- Massey, Douglas & Nancy A. Denton (1993). *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Pastor, Jr., Manuel et al. (2000). *Regions That Work: How Cities and Suburbs Can Grow Together*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.
- Quiroz-Martinez, Julie, Daniel HoSang & Lori Villarosa (2004). *Changing the Rules of the Game: Youth Development & Structural Racism*. Washington, DC: Philanthropic Initiative for Racial Equity, www.raciaequity.org
- Rawls, John (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press.
- Rusk, David (1999). *Inside Game/Outside Game: Winning Strategies for Saving Urban America*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Sen, Amartya (1999). *Development as Freedom*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Unger, Roberto Mangabeira (2001). "False Necessity: Anti-Necessitarian Social Theory in the Service of Radical Democracy" from *Politics A Work in Constructive Social Theory*. London/New York: Verso.
- Young, Iris Marion (2001). "Equality of Whom? Social Groups and Judgments of Injustice." *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, Volume 9, Number 1.

Excerpts from Supreme Court Briefs

Over 40 friend-of-the-court briefs were filed by civil rights, civic and education groups in the “voluntary school integration cases” (*Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District* and *Meredith v. Jefferson County Board of Education*). These cases in the U.S. Supreme Court may determine whether local school districts can voluntarily consider race in school assignments, in order to promote school integration. We present excerpts from two of these briefs here—from a coalition of housing organizations and scholars and from the Caucus for Structural Equity. To see complete copies of these two briefs (with full citations and footnotes), go to PRRAC’s home page at www.prrac.org. For basic fact sheets on the Louisville and Seattle cases, and a manual on voluntary K-12 school integration, go to www.naacpldf.org.

Excerpt from *Amicus* Brief of Housing Scholars and Research and Advocacy Organizations

PRRAC helped to organize a Brief of Housing Scholars and Research and Advocacy Organizations, to discuss the “reciprocal relationship” between housing and school segregation, and the need for school integration programs to counter residential segregation patterns, which are heavily influenced by government policy and private discrimination.

The Housing Brief was joined by PRRAC, the Institute on Race and Poverty, the National Fair Housing Alliance, the National Low Income Housing Coalition, the Gamaliel Foundation, the National Housing Law Project, the Inclusive Communities Project, the Center for Cities and Schools at the University of California-Berkeley, the Kentucky Human Rights Commission and the Metropolitan Housing Coalition of Louisville. The brief was also joined by 31 professors of sociology, planning, law, history and other disciplines, with a shared expertise on the causes and consequences of residential segregation. The complete list of signers is on our website (www.prrac.org). The brief was drafted by Michael B. de Leeuw, Alexis Karteron and Megan K. Whyte at Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson (with substantial input from Myron Orfield, Phil Tegeler, John Powell and others).

Since at least the 1970s, this Court has recognized the reciprocal relationship between residential integration and school integration. Subsequent social science has confirmed this connection. Given the vital importance of meaningful racial integration for our democratic society, it is necessary to consider the links between schools and housing to assess fully a school district’s compelling interest in promoting school integration. Such an examination reveals that housing markets distorted by private discrimination and government policy are incapable of creating residential integration that would make school integration measures unnecessary, and that school integration promotes residential integration, benefiting all Americans.

Contrary to the assertion of Petitioner *Parents Involved in Community Schools*, today’s housing patterns are not simply products of private, free choice. Segregated residential patterns result from an array of policies and actions by public and private actors. Beginning with historical state-sponsored discrimination, such as *de jure*

racial segregation in public housing, discriminatory public housing site selection and tenant assignment policies, and purposeful exclusion of African Americans from federal mortgage lending programs, government at all levels has indelibly formed the landscape of America’s metropolitan areas.

In addition, discriminatory practices, both public and private, continue to mar the housing market. Real estate agents, for example, frequently steer people to different neighborhoods based on their race. Mortgage lending and insurance redlining contribute to residential segregation because lenders and insurers offer different terms and policies to minority homebuyers, and deny their applications at disproportionately high rates....

This Court best explained the strong connection between school and residential segregation in *Keyes*:

[I]t is obvious that a practice of concentrating Negroes in certain schools by structuring attendance zones or designated “feeder” schools on the basis of

race has the reciprocal effect of keeping other nearby schools predominantly white. Similarly, the practice of building a school . . . to a certain size and in a certain location, “with conscious knowledge that it would be a segregated school,” has a substantial reciprocal effect on the racial composition of nearby schools. So also the use of mobile classrooms, the drafting of student transfer policies, the transportation of students, and the assignment of faculty and staff, on racially identifiable bases, have the clear effect of earmarking schools according to their racial composition, and this, in turn, *together with the elements of student assignment and school construction, may have a profound reciprocal effect on the racial composition of residential neighborhoods within a metropolitan area, thereby causing further racial concentration within the schools.*

400 U.S. at 201-02 (emphasis added). As *Keyes* explains, racial segregation patterns in schools cannot be understood without reference to racial residential patterns. For a school district to take no action in response to coex-

tensive school segregation and residential segregation would be to acquiesce to both—contrary to strong national policies regarding school desegregation, fair housing, and residential integration....

The compelling nature of a school district's interest is underscored by the positive impact of school desegregation programs on residential integration. See Diana Pearce, Ctr. for Nat'l Pol'y Rev., *Breaking Down Barriers: New Evidence on the Impact of Metropolitan School Desegregation on Housing Patterns* 3 (1980) (citing evidence of increased housing integration in places with metropolitan desegregation programs). During the 1970s, cities that had undergone metropolitan school desegregation experienced "markedly greater rates" of housing

integration than did other cities. Pearce, *supra*, at 26-27. Between 1970 and 1990, residential integration occurred at twice the national average in communities with metropolitan school desegregation programs. Erica Frankenberg, *The Impact of School Segregation on Residential Housing Patterns: Mobile, Alabama, and Charlotte, North Carolina*, in *School Resegregation: Must the South Turn Back?* 164, 180 (John Charles Boger & Gary Orfield, eds., 2005). A recent study of 15 metropolitan regions explains that comprehensive school desegregation programs are strongly correlated with *stable* residential integration. Inst. on Race & Poverty, *Minority Suburbanization, Stable Integration, and Economic Opportunity in Fifteen Metropolitan Regions* (2006); see also Pearce, *supra*, at 51-52 (find-

ing school desegregation supports stable, integrated communities). Concomitant with the extensive segregation revealed by the 2000 Census..., "[m]any neighborhoods that are integrated at a given time actually are in transition to a less diverse status." Inst. on Race & Poverty, *supra*, at 22; see also Orfield, *Metropolitan School Desegregation*, *supra*, at 136-37. Therefore, "encouraging findings about the potential for metro-wide school integration to stabilize neighborhoods while increasing equal access to educational opportunity" are particularly important. Inst. on Race & Poverty, *supra*, at 27....

Integrated schools promote stable integrated neighborhoods. As this Court recognized, "The location of
(Please turn to page 18)

Please support PRRAC's annual appeal!

Dear friends of PRRAC:

After years of defensive tactics, the civil rights movement is approaching a new moment of opportunity. Although Congress has done much damage, and the Supreme Court will likely continue to restrict enforcement and question any use of race in social policy, our collective vision of what needs to be done to dismantle structural racism has sharpened. There is increasing communication and coordination between sectors; more unity and discipline on shared goals (the recent reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act is a strong example); and, especially after Hurricane Katrina, a willingness to openly discuss the racial underpinnings of social and economic policy.

PRAAC is an important participant in a growing community of organizations that are attacking the structural roots of poverty and racial injustice (some of these groups are featured in this issue of *Poverty & Race*). Just as when PRRAC was founded in 1989, there is still a compelling need to identify and disseminate the research that is needed to inform race and poverty advocacy: Advocates and organizers need to talk to researchers, and vice versa. New frames and strategies benefit from a space where they can be shared and debated. And more than ever, we need to confront the central role of racial and economic segregation in the perpetuation of disadvantage.

We need your support to keep this important work going. Please consider a generous annual donation to PRRAC (using the attached envelope).



Philip Tegeler
PRRAC Executive Director

(HOUSING: Continued from page 17)

schools may thus influence the patterns of residential development of a metropolitan area and have important impact on composition of inner-city neighborhoods.” *Swann*, 402 U.S. at 20-21. Parents frequently choose their homes based at least partly on the schools that their children will attend, and they see segregated schools as powerful signals that may discourage them from buying homes in certain neighborhoods. *Frankenberg, supra*, at 179; *Pearce, supra*, at 4. Where racially identifiable schools exist, White parents who can afford to do so frequently move to White districts on the belief that the schools in those neighborhoods will be better. *Frankenberg, supra*, at 179; *Pearce, supra*, at 9-10. By influencing where people with means choose to live, segregated schools perpetuate and exacerbate residential segregation.

Real estate agents even market homes differently based on whether schools in the district are racially identifiable. To provide legal signals about the racial composition of neighborhoods, advertisements for homes in districts with segregated schools list the names of schools, if they are predominantly White, from two to ten times more frequently than do advertisements for homes in districts with integrated

schools. *Orfield, Metropolitan School Desegregation, supra*, at 135; *Pearce, Breaking Down Barriers*, at 9, 14-18. In districts with truly integrated schools, home advertisements mention schools much less often and focus instead on things like distance to offices, stores, and recreational facilities. *Orfield, Metropolitan School Desegregation, supra*, at 135; *Pearce, supra*, at 12, 14. By including White school names in advertisements, real estate agents reinforce the notion that the ability to attend segregated schools is an important—and desirable—feature of a property. *Pearce, supra*, at 18. (Recent testing studies actually indicate that real estate agents describe schools as “good” or “bad” as a proxy for the racial or ethnic composition of neighborhoods. See Nat’l Fair Housing Alliance, *Unequal Opportunity—Perpetuating Housing Segregation in America: 2006 Fair Housing Trends Report* (Apr. 5, 2006)).

In addition, among the long-term benefits of school policies promoting integration is the greater likelihood that students who have attended integrated schools will live in integrated neighborhoods later in life. The Seattle School District explicitly recognized the benefits of residential integration when it adopted its “racial tiebreak” for oversubscribed high schools. Along with improved critical thinking skills

among both White and minority students, and “the socialization and citizenship advantages of racially diverse schools,” the Seattle School District identified as a compelling interest the following conclusion reached by its expert: “that ‘research...strongly shows that graduates of desegregated high schools are more likely to live in integrated communities than those who do not, and are more likely to have cross-race friendships later in life.’” *Parents Involved in Cmty. Sch.*, 426 F.3d at 1175 (emphasis added); see also Amy Stuart Wells & Robert L. Crain, *Perpetuation Theory and the Long-Term Effects of School Desegregation*, 64 Rev. Educ. Res. 531, 551-52 (1994) (reviewing studies finding students in integrated schools more likely to have lasting cross-racial relationships and concluding “interracial contact in elementary or secondary school can help blacks overcome perpetual segregation”).

These findings affirm the significant value of school desegregation efforts. Aside from their obvious impact on a single school’s racial composition, school desegregation programs also make powerful contributions to residential integration in both the short and long term, which is a worthy goal, in accordance with local and national policy.... □

Excerpt from *Amicus Brief of the Caucus for Structural Equity*

The Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race & Ethnicity, in collaboration with many of the nation’s leading scholars on the structural and institutional dynamics underlying persistent racial exclusion in the United States, submitted an Amicus Brief in support of the Seattle and Jefferson County [KY] School Boards. The brief locates the current controversy in the context of Brown v. Board of Education and its progeny. In these cases, the court identified the harm of segregation and recognized the important role school boards play in ameliorating this harm through the use of race-conscious measures. The brief argues that school boards may intervene to disrupt the processes that produce segregation and cumulative racialized disadvantage. The Brief of the Caucus for Structural Equity was drafted by Daniel Shulman at Gray, Plant, Mooty, Mooty & Bennett, with substantial input from, among others, John Powell, Andrew Barlow, Ian Haney Lopez, Phil Tegeler and Andrew Grant-Thomas.

Petitioners and the Solicitor General ignore *Brown’s* central finding that racial segregation is inherently harmful, and instead assert that this landmark case reduces to the proposition that racial classification is inherently harmful. To that end, the Government’s lawyer argues that *Brown’s* command reduces to one phrase, selectively culled from *Brown II*:

“achiev[ing] a system of determining admission to the public schools on a non-racial basis.” (Brief for the United States as *Amicus Curiae* Supporting Petitioner in No. 05-908, p. 6.)

While there is and will continue to be some contestation over the scope and implications of the *Brown I* and *II* decisions, it is clear that Petitioners and the

Solicitor General argue for an interpretation that is far too narrow. Tellingly, these very same characterizations of *Brown* were offered in the 1960s and early 1970s by recalcitrant local jurisdictions that similarly sought to undermine school integration. In response to these efforts, this Court made it clear that such an overly narrow and

decontextualized reading of *Brown* is inappropriate. More specifically, this Court explicitly considered and rejected claims that the Constitution is colorblind in a manner that forbids school districts from adopting race-conscious strategies to achieve integration....

As every frustrated parent, teacher or principal (judge, doctor or social worker) knows, institutional opportunities and outcomes are shaped, often dramatically, by inputs beyond the control of particular institutional actors. So historical legacies, neighborhood dynamics, family resources, and government policies like *No Child Left Behind* do a great deal to shape educational outcomes, but schools exert little direct influence over any of them. A substantial research literature makes clear that in the case of pervasive racial segregation in the nation's K-12 schools the effects are especially harmful, both for students and for our society as a whole. But if school districts unilaterally can do little to shape most of the processes that feed segregation, they nonetheless ought to be able to use the few, modest tools within their grasp to disrupt the dynamic of segregation before it reaches its predictable conclusion within the schools themselves. The use of race as one element in student assignment plans is an indispensable means to that end. A great deal hinges on this Court's willingness to uphold its use.

School segregation is the result of a dynamic and cumulative process, not a static and episodic one. We cannot adequately understand the process or the production of durable racial inequality more generally only by examining singular discriminatory episodes or by looking at the practices and procedures of a single institution. In confronting racial inequality we must similarly account for multiple, intersecting, and often mutually reinforcing advantages and disadvantages and develop corresponding response strategies.

At the group level, racial and ethnic minorities are trapped by cumulative disadvantages, much of it surely unintended but nonetheless predictable and knowable. For example, housing discrimination constrains many black and

Hispanic youth to attend high-poverty schools. Children in these schools are much less likely than their affluent peers to attend college, and more likely to drop out of school or complete their education in a correctional facility. All three outcomes reduce the labor market options these young adults are likely to have, with grave implications for their chances to secure health and retirement benefits. It follows that in order to fully understand why so many elderly African Americans and Hispanics live at or below the poverty line, we not only must retrace their life-long relationship to the labor market, but also their relationship to the housing market, and to the educational and criminal justice systems.

The production of racial inequality is largely cumulative in three distinct but related respects, all of them readily apparent in the context of school segregation. First, advantage and disadvantage have cross-generational causes and effects. Consider current racial gaps in wealth. In 2000, non-Hispanic white households enjoyed a median net worth of \$79,400, *eight times* the net worth of Hispanic households and *ten times* the net worth of African American households. Even at similar levels of income, huge gaps remain. Most of the wealth gap owes to equally enormous racial differences in the intergenerational transfer of wealth, the roots of which we find mainly in historical public and private sector policies and practices that created wealth for whites and denied it to non-whites. For example, the key initiatives of the New Deal and Fair Deal era, including Social Security, Unemployment Insurance, and the G.I. Bill, all but excluded African Americans from their benefits. As a result, African Americans whose parents came of age in the 1940s and 1950s will receive less than one-tenth the inheritance of their white peers.

Racial inequality accumulates across social arenas as well. Outcomes in one domain, whether favorable or unfavorable, shape outcomes in other domains. For example, fifty years of research on "neighborhood effects" documents the ways that social opportunities and outcomes cluster spatially in an intricate, but nonetheless intelligible web of reciprocal causation. Because public in-

frastructure and basic services like transportation, education, public safety, and recreation are funded largely by local tax revenues, residents in poor municipalities are taxed at higher rates than those in more affluent areas for similar services—or, they receive lesser services for the taxes they pay. Childhood obesity rates escalate in low-income neighborhoods as fear of crime and the lack of playgrounds and parks in poor areas keeps children indoors. Segregation and unequal access to health care mean that racial minorities receive less and worse health care than whites do, exacerbating health disparities. Health difficulties in turn undermine student academic performance. Employment, health, wealth, crime and safety, delinquency and risky behavior, educational achievement, recreation—neighborhood residence has implications for them all.

Finally, inequality also arises from interactions within a single social domain over time. Thus, a poor work history in one's young adult years will likely hamper one's ability to secure future employment, get promotions, and earn high wages. A student judged precocious in elementary and middle school is more likely to be placed in college-prep classes in high school, making her a more appealing college admissions candidate. Offers of admission with generous financial aid packages in turn will make it more likely that she attends college and graduates on time.

We could add many other examples of cumulative causation across generations, across domains, and within domains, but none would be more compelling or more exemplary of the structural and institutional dynamics underlying persistent racial exclusion in the United States than the case of school segregation. More than five decades after *Brown* the nation's public schools remain extremely segregated by race and class, with most urban African American and many Hispanic students isolated from real educational opportunity in poor school districts. Jefferson County's and Seattle's limited use of race-based student assignment plans reflects the school boards' appreciation of these dynamics and represents modest, efficient, and necessary efforts to address them. □

Greg Squires and I, along with several other contributors (including PRRAC Board Member John Powell) to There Is No Such Thing As a Natural Disaster: Race, Class and Hurricane Katrina, recently returned from New Orleans, where we did a book presentation at the excellent Oct. 19-21 conference sponsored by Dillard University's Deep South Center for Environmental Justice. As inspiring as the event was, the tour of the city that Evangeline Franklin (who contributed the chapter on health impacts) took us on was enormously depressing—so many of the neighborhoods outside the touristy French Quarter look not too different from what they looked like a year ago August when Katrina and Rita hit. Robert Bullard, who heads the Environmental Justice Center at Clark Atlanta Univ., one of the speakers, prepared this handout, which says it all. Although he wrote it in Dec. 2005, it unfortunately could have been written yesterday—see our most relevant Structural Racism forum in this issue. With his permission, we're happy to reprint it—Bullard can be reached at rbullard4ej@worldnet.att.net — CH

Katrina and the Second Disaster: A Twenty-Point Plan to Destroy Black New Orleans

by Robert D. Bullard

As reconstruction and rebuilding move forward in New Orleans and the Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama Gulf Coast region, it is clear that the lethargic and inept emergency response after Hurricane Katrina was a disaster that overshadowed the deadly storm itself. Yet, there is a “second disaster” in the making—driven by racism, classism, elitism, paternalism, and old-fashion greed. The following “Twenty-Point Plan to Destroy Black New Orleans” is based on trends and observations made over the past three months. Hopefully, the good people of New Orleans, Louisiana, the Gulf Coast, and the United States will not allow this plan to go forward—and instead adopt a principled plan and approach to rebuilding and bringing back New Orleans that is respectful of all of its citizens.

1. Selectively Hand Out FEMA Grants. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is being consistent in the slow response in getting aid to Katrina survivors. FEMA's grant assistance program favors middle-income households. Make it difficult for low-income and black Katrina survivors to access government assistance. Direct the bulk of the grant assistance to middle-income white storm victims. The Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights and several other legal groups have sued FEMA over its response and handling of aid to storm victims. FEMA has referred more than two million people,

many of them with low incomes, to the Small Business Administration (SBA) to get the loans.

2. Systematically Deny the Poor and Blacks SBA Loans. Screen out poor and deny black households disaster loans. The *New York Times* editorial summed up this problem: “The Poor Need Not Apply.” The Small Business Administration has processed only a third of the 276,000 home loan applications it has received. However, the SBA has rejected 82% of the applications it received, a higher percentage than in most previous disasters. Well-off neighborhoods like Lakeview have received 47% of the loan approvals, while poverty-stricken neighborhoods have gotten 7%. Middle-class black neighborhoods in the eastern part of the city have lower loan rates.

3. Award Insurance Claims Using the “Wind or Water” Trap. Because of the enormity of the damage in the wake of Katrina, insurance companies will categorize a lot of legitimate wind claims as flood- or water-related. The “wind or water” problem will hit black storm victims hardest because they are likely to have their insurance with small companies—since the major firms “redlined” many black neighborhoods. Most rebuilding funds after disasters come from private insurance—not the government.

4. Redline Black Insurance Policyholders. Numerous studies show that African Americans are more likely than whites to receive insuffi-

cient insurance settlement amounts. Insurance firms target black policyholders for low and inadequate insurance settlements based on majority black zip codes to subsidize fair settlements made to white policyholders. If black homeowners and business owners expect to recover from Katrina, then they must receive full and just insurance settlements. FEMA and the SBA cannot be counted on to rebuild black communities.

5. Use “Greenbuilding” and Flood-Proofing Codes To Restrict Redevelopment. Requiring rebuilding plans to conform to “greenbuilding” materials and new flood-proofing codes that can price many low- and moderate-income homeowners and small business owners out of the market. This will hit black homeowners and black business owners especially hard, since they generally have lower incomes and lower wealth.

6. Apply Discriminatory Environmental Clean-up Standards. Failure to apply uniform clean-up standards can kill off black neighborhoods. Use of full-scale clean-up of white neighborhoods to residential standards, while allowing no clean-up or partial clean-up (industrial standards) of black residential neighborhoods. Failure to clean up black residential areas can act as a disincentive for redevelopment. It could also make people sick. Use the argument that black neighborhoods were already highly polluted with

background contamination “hot spots” exceeding EPA safe levels pre-Katrina and thus need not be cleaned to more rigorous residential standards.

7. Sacrifice “Low-Lying” Black Neighborhoods in the Name of Saving the Wetlands and Environmental Restoration. Allow black neighborhoods like the Lower Ninth Ward and New Orleans East to be “yielded back to the swamp” while allowing similar low-lying white areas to be rebuilt and redeveloped. This is a form of “ethnic cleansing” that was not possible before Katrina. Instead of emphasizing equitable rebuilding, uniform clean-up standards, equal protection, and environmental justice for African-American communities, public officials should send mixed signals for rebuilding vulnerable “low-lying” black neighborhoods.

8. Promote a Smaller, More Upscale, and “Whiter” New Orleans. Concentrating on getting less-damaged neighborhoods up and running could translate into a smaller, more upscale, and whiter New Orleans and a dramatically down-sized black community. Clearly, shrinking New Orleans neighborhoods disproportionately shrinks black votes, black political power, and black wealth.

9. Revise Land Use and Zoning Ordinances to Exclude. Katrina can be used to change land use and zoning codes to “zone against” undesirable land uses that were not politically possible before the storm. Also, “expulsive” zoning can be used to push out certain land uses and certain people.

10. Phased Rebuilding and Restoration Scheme That Concentrates on the “High Ground.” New Orleans officials are being advised to concentrate rebuilding on the areas that remained high and dry after Katrina. These areas are disproportionately white and affluent. This scenario builds on pre-existing inequities and “white privilege” and ensures future inequities and “white privilege.” By the time rebuilding gets around to black “low-lying” areas, there is not likely to be any rebuilding funds left. This is the “oops, we are out of funds” scenario.

11. Apply Eminent Domain as a

Black Land Grab. Give Katrina evacuees one year to return before the City is allowed to legally “take” their property through eminent domain. Clearly, it will take much longer than a year for most New Orleanians to return home. This proposal could turn into a giant land grab of black property and loss of black wealth they have invested in their homes and businesses.

12. No Financial Assistance for Evacuees to Return. Thousands of Katrina evacuees were shipped to more than three dozen states with no provisions for return—equivalent to a “one-way” ticket. Many Katrina evacuees are running short of funds. No money translates into no return to their homes and neighborhoods. Promote the “right to return” without committing adequate resources to assist evacuees to return.

13. Keep Evacuees Away from New Orleans Jobs. The nation’s unemployment rate was 5% in November 2005. The November 2005 jobless rate for Katrina returnees was 12.5%, while 27.8% of evacuees living elsewhere were unemployed. However, the black jobless rate was 47% in November, compared with 13% for whites who have not gone back. Katrina evacuees who have made it back to their home region have much lower levels of joblessness. This is especially important for African Americans whose joblessness rate fell over 30 percentage points for returnees. The problem is that the vast majority of black Katrina evacuees have not returned to their home region. Only 21% of black evacuees have returned, compared with 48% of whites.

14. Fail to Enforce Fair Housing Laws. Allow housing discrimination against blacks to run rampant. Katrina created a housing shortage and opened a floodgate of discrimination against black homeowners and renters. In December 2005, the National Fair Housing Alliance (NFHA) found high rates of housing discrimination against African Americans displaced by Hurricane Katrina. In 66% of the tests conducted by the NFHA, 43 of 65 instances, whites were favored over African Americans.

15. No Commitment to Rebuild and Replace Low-Income Public Housing. Shortly after Katrina struck, even the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) spoke of not rebuilding all of the public housing lost during the storm. The HUD Secretary’s statement is a powerful signal to New Orleans’ poor that public housing may not be around for them to return to.

16. Downplay the Black Cultural Heritage of New Orleans. Promote rebuilding and the vision of a “new” New Orleans as if the rich Black Culture did not matter or act as if it can be replaced or replicated in a “theme park” type redevelopment scenario. Developers should capture and market the “black essence” of New Orleans without including black people.

17. Treatment of Mixed-Income “Integrated” Housing as Superior to All-Black Neighborhoods. First, there is nothing inherently inferior about an “all-black” neighborhood—or all-black anything for that matter. Black New Orleanians who chose to live in neighborhoods that happen to be all-black (whites have always had the right to move in or move out of these neighborhoods) should not be forced to have their neighborhoods rebuilt as “integrated” or “multicultural” neighborhoods. Also, “mixed-income” housing to many blacks conjures up the idea of 10% of the fair market housing units set aside for them. Many blacks are battle-weary of being 10%. New Orleans was 68% black before Katrina—and most black folks were comfortable with that.

18. Allow “Oversight” (Overseer) Board to Manage Katrina Funds That Flow to New Orleans. Take away “home rule” since the billions of Katrina redevelopment dollars that will flow to New Orleans is too much money for a majority black city council and a black mayor to oversee or manage. More important, the oversight board will need to represent “big-money” interests (real estate, developers, banking, insurance, hotels, law firms, tourist industry, etc.) well beyond the purview of a democratically

(Please turn to page 22)

(KATRINA: Continued from page 21)

ected city government to ensure that the vision of the “new” New Orleans, “smaller and more upscale,” gets implemented.

19. Delay Rebuilding and Construction of New Orleans Schools. The longer the New Orleans schools stay closed, the longer the families with children will stay away. Schools are a major predictor of racial polarization. Before Katrina, over 125,000 New Orleans children were attending schools in the city. Blacks made up 93% of New Orleans’ schools. Evacuated children are enrolled in school districts from Arizona to Pennsylva-

nia. Three months after the storm, only one of New Orleans’ 116 schools is open.

20. Hold Elections without Appropriate Voting Rights Act Safeguards. Almost 300,000 registered voters left New Orleans after Katrina. The powerful storm damaged or destroyed 300 of the 442 polling places. Holding city elections poses major challenges regarding registration, absentee ballots, city workers, polling places, and identification for displaced New Orleanians. Identification is required at the polls and returning residents may not have access to traditional identification papers (birth certificates, drivers licenses, etc.) destroyed by the

hurricane. More than three months after Katrina struck, 80% of New Orleans voters have not made their way back to the city, including most African Americans, who comprised a two-thirds majority of the population before the storm. Most of the estimated 60,000 to 100,000 New Orleans residents who have made it back are white and middle class, changing the racial and political complexion of the city. Holding elections while the vast majority of New Orleans voters are displaced outside of their home district and even their home state is unprecedented in the history of the United States, but also raises racial justice and human rights questions. □

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 (39¢ 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

- **“Young Men of Color in the Media: Images & Impacts,”** by Robert M. Entman (40 pp., 2006), a Dellums

Commn. Report, is available (possibly free) from the Jt. Ctr. Health Policy Inst., 1090 Vermont Ave. NW, #1100, Wash., DC 20005, www.jointcenter.org. [10003]

- **“Black Churches and the Faith-Based Initiative,”** by David A. Bosisit (22 pp., 2006), reports findings from a national survey. Available (possibly free) from the Joint Ctr. for Political & Econ. Studies, 1090 Vermont Ave. NW, #1100, Wash., DC 20005-4961. [10018]

- **Understanding recent changes in child poverty over the past 10 years** is the subject of a 2006 report by Austin Nichols, available (possibly free) from The Urban Inst., 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/261-5687, [10020]

- **“The Experiences & Effects of Economic Status Among Racial & Ethnic Minorities,”** by

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.

Dennis Chong & Dukhong Kim, appeared in the Aug. 2006 *American Political Science Review*, available at www.apsanet.org/imgtest/APSRAug06ChongKim.pdf [10026]

- **“Beyond Slavery: Overcoming Its Religious & Sexual Legacy”** was held in mid-October, 2006 at Brandeis Univ. Inf. from The Feminist Sexual Ethics Proj., MS 054, Brandeis Univ., PO Box 549110, Waltham, MA 02454-9110, 781/736-3228, www.brandeis.edu/projects/fse [10007]

- **The Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action, Integration & Immigrant Rights & Fight for Equality By Any Means Necessary (BAMN)** is organizing a March in Washington, Dec. 4, 2006—the morning of the Supreme Court arguments in the Seattle & Louisville school integration cases. Inf. at www.bamn.org

Poverty/ Welfare

- ***Social Solutions to Poverty: America's Struggle to Build a Just Society***, ed. Scott Myers-Lipton (344 pp., 2006), has been published by Paradigm Publishers, smlipton@sjsu.edu [9998]
- ***Work Over Welfare: The Inside Story of the 1996 Welfare Reform Law***, by Ron Haskins (2006), has been published by Brookings Inst. Press, www.brookings.edu/es/ccf/workoverwelfare.htm [10031]

Community Organizing

- ***"Organizing Communities, Saving Lives"*** is ACORN's 2005 Annual Report. For copies of the 46-page document, phone 202/547-2500. [10036]

Criminal Justice

- ***"A New Generation of Native Sons: Men of Color & the Prison-Industrial Complex,"*** by Adolphus G. Belk, Jr. (47 pp., 2006), a Dellums Commn. Report, is available (possibly free) from the Jt. Ctr. Health Policy Inst., 1090 Vermont Ave. NW, #1100, Wash., DC 20005, [10001]
- ***"Saving Futures, Saving Dollars: The Impact of Education on Crime Reduction and Earnings,"*** an Alliance for Excellent Education issue brief, is available (possibly free) from them, 1201 Conn. Ave. NW, #901, Wash., DC 20036,

202/828-0828, Alliance@all4ed.org, www.all4ed.org/publications/SavingFutures.pdf [10012]

- ***"Incarceration and Crime: A Complex Relationship"*** (2006) is available (free) from The Sentencing Project, 514 Tenth St., #1000, Wash., DC 20004, 202/628-0871, <http://www.sentencingproject.org/> [10049]
- ***"Punishment: The U.S. Record"*** will be held **Nov. 30-Dec. 1, 2006** at the New School for Social Research, in NYC. Inf. at 212/229-5776, x3121, socres@newschool.edu [10035]

Education

- ***"Miles to Go, Louisiana—The Only Way Forward: Changing Directions in Education"*** (22 pp., 2006), on how the state's economic problems are linked to its lower levels of education, is available (possibly free) from the Southern Educ. Fdn., 135 Auburn Ave. NE., 2nd fl., Atlanta, GA 30303. Their website also has detailed reports on other Southern states, <http://www.southerneducation.org/> [10004]
- ***"The American Teacher: Expectations & Experiences,"*** a 2006 survey from the MetLife Fdn., is available at www.metlife.com/Applications/Corporate/WPS/CDA/PageGenerator/0,4132,P13393,00.html. [10006]
- ***"Promoting School Readiness through Universal Preschool,"*** by Kristen Oshyn & Laura Newland, is a 16-page, 2006 report, available (possibly free) from The Century Fdn., 41 E. 70 St., NYC, NY 10021, 212/535-4441, [10008]
- ***"Where a Diverse Community Comes Together to Make Schools Better for All"*** is an 8-page, 2006 account of Montgomery County, MD, available (possibly free) from Study Circles Resource Ctr., 697 Pomfret St., PO Box 203, Pomfret, CT 06258-0203, src@studycircles.org, <http://www.studycircles.org/> [10014]
- ***"Why Preschool Pays Off"*** revisits the Brookline Early Education Project (which ran from 1973-81) 25 years later, showing the potential of high-quality early intervention programs to level the playing field and lead to measurable improvements in participants' school performance & adult life choices—saving taxpayers' money over time. Available at carnegie.org/results/14/index.html. [10019]
- ***What the public really wants on education*** is the subject of a 2006 survey of public opinion polls, by the Center for American Progress, available at www.americanprogress.org/site/pp.asp?c=biJRJ8OVF&b=2071009 [10022]
- ***"Opportunity in America: The Role of Education,"*** by Isabel Sawhill, is a 2006 issue brief from The Future of Children, available at www.futureofchildren.org/usr_dc/opportunity_policy_brief.pdf. [10023]
- ***Language challenges can affect parental involvement at school*** is the subject of a 2006

report from the Natl. Ctr. for Education Statistics, using data from the 2003 Natl. Household Education Surveys Program. Downloadable at nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2006086 [10037]

- ***"Dismantling a Community,"*** a 2006 report from the Ctr. for Comm. Change, shows how "officials have used the tragedy of Hurricane Katrina for social experimentation [and] the consequences of privatization within the New Orleans public school system." Available at www.communitychange.org/issues/education/publications/ [10041]
- ***"Issues & Opportunities in Out-of-School Time Evaluation"*** is a 2006 brief from the Harvard Family Research Proj., 3 Garden St., Cambridge, MA 02138, 617/495-9108, hfrp@gse.harvard.edu, <http://www.hfrp.org/> [10056]
- ***"Summer Success: Challenges & Strategies in Creating Quality Academically Focused Summer Programs"*** (Oct. 2006), from the Harvard Family Research Proj. (3 Garden St., Cambridge, MA 02138, 617/495-9108), hfrp@gse.harvard.edu, can be downloaded at www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/projects/afterschool/resources/issuebrief9/html [10057]
- ***Closing the Racial Academic Achievement Gap***, by Matthew Lynch (2006), has been published by African American Images; author can be contacted at lynch39083@aol.com [10066]

- **“Closing the Achievement Gap: Linking Families, Schools & Communities,”** co-sponsored by the Harvard Grad. School of Education & the Harvard Family Research Proj., is **Nov. 9-11, 2006** in Cambridge (most likely you will be getting this issue of *P&R* too late to attend; ex post facto inf. from 800/545-1849), www.gse.harvard.edu/ppe [10011]

Employment/ Jobs Policy

- **“The Labor Day List: Partnerships that Work”** (12 pp., Aug. 2006), “celebrating partnerships between employers & their employees’ unions that both meet the needs of workers & fulfill business objectives in the global economy,” is available (possibly free) from American Rights at Work, 1100 17th St. NW, #950, Wash., DC 20036, 202/822-2127, ndaruwala@americanrightsatwork.org, <http://www.americanrightsatwork.org/> [10013]

- **The Labor Heritage Foundation** has a 2006 Catalogue of labor music, art, books & films. Available (presumably free) from the Foundation, 815 16th St. NW, Wash., DC 20006, 202/639-6204. [10029]

- **“Two-Thirds of States Qualify for Extending Counting of TANF Job Search & Job Readiness Assistance,”** by Elizabeth Lower-Basch (3 pp., Oct. 2006), is available (free) from the Ctr. for Law & Social Policy (headed by PRRAC founding Board member Alan Houseman), 1015 15th St. NW, #400,

Wash., DC 20005, 202/906-8000. [10045]

- **“Get the Prescription: Child Care Workers Need Paid Sick Days,”** by Jodie Levin-Epstein (July 2006), is available (free) from the Ctr. for Law & Social Policy (headed by founding PRRAC Bd. member Alan Houseman), 1015 15th St. NW, #400, Wash., DC 20005, 202/906-8000. [10059]

- **“And Injustice For All: Workers’ Lives in the Reconstruction of New Orleans,”** by Judith Browne-Dianis, Jennifer Lai, Marielena Hincapie & Saket Soni (76 pp., July 2006), jointly published by Advancement Project, Natl. Immigration Law Ctr. & New Orleans Worker Justice Coal., is available (no price given) from Advancement Project, 1730 M St. NW, #910, Wash., DC 20036, 202/728-9557, ap@advancementproject.org [10062]

Environment

- **Materials Matter: Toward a Sustainable Materials Policy,** by Kenneth Geiser (479 pp., 2001), was published by MIT Press. [9996]

Families/ Women/ Children

- **“Men & Communities: African American Males & the Well-Being of Children, Families & Neighborhoods,”** by James B. Hyman (26 pp., 2006), a Dellums Commn. Report, is available (possibly free) from the Jt. Ctr. Health

Policy Inst., 1090 Vermont Ave. NW, #1100, Wash., DC 20005, <http://www.jointcenter.org/> [10000]

- **“Public Policies & Practices in Child Welfare Systems That Affect Life Options for Children of Color,”** by Ernestine F. Jones (24 pp., 2006), a Dellums Commn. Report, is available (possibly free) from the Jt. Ctr. Health Policy Inst., 1090 Vermont Ave. NW, #1100, Wash., DC 20005, www.jointcenter.org. [10002]
- **Unsung Heroines: Single Mothers & the American Dream,** by Ruth Sidel (244 pp., 2006, \$17.95), has been published by Univ. Calif. Press, 800/777-4726, go.ucpress.edu/Sidel [10033]

- **“Building Bridges Between the Healthy Marriage, Responsible Fatherhood & Domestic Violence Movements: Issues, Concerns & Recommendations,”** by Paula Roberts, is a 12-page, Oct. 2006 brief, available (free) from the Ctr. for Law & Social Policy (headed by PRRAC founding Board member Alan Houseman), 1015 15th St. NW, #400, Wash., DC 20005, 202/906-8000. [10043]

- **“State Fact Sheets on Child Welfare Funding”** (Oct. 2006) are available (free) from the Ctr. for Law & Social Policy (headed by PRRAC founding Board member Alan Houseman), 1015 15th St. NW, #400, Wash., DC 20005, 202/906-8000. [10044]

Food/ Nutrition/ Hunger

- **Changing the Face of Hunger,** by former Congressman Tony Hall (202 pp., 2006, \$21.99), has been published by W Publishing Gp., 615/902-2234, <http://www.thomasnelson.com/> [9997]

Health

- **“A Profile of Young Children in the Los Angeles Healthy Kids Program: Where Are They & What Are Their Experiences in the Program?,”** by Embry Howell, Lisa Dubay, Genevieve M. Kenney, Louise Palmer, Ian Hill & Martha Kovac (Oct. 2006), is available (likely free) from The Urban Inst., 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/261-5709. [10053]

- **“Eight Americas: Investigating Mortality Disparities Across Races, Counties & Race-Counties in the United States”** appeared in the Sept. 2006 *PloS Medicine*. Downloadable at downloadable.at.medicine.plosjournals.org/perlerv?request=get-document&doi=10.371/journal.pmed.0030260 [10058]

- **“Health Action 2007,”** sponsored by Families USA, will be held **Jan. 25-27, 2007** in DC. Barack Obama, Uwe Reinhardt & Bob Edgar are among the speakers. Inf. from Families USA, 1201 NY Ave. NW, #1100, Wash., DC 20005, info@familiesusa.org, <http://www.familiesusa.org/> [10054]

Homelessness

- “**Characteristics of Transitional Housing for Homeless Families: Final Report,**” by Martha R. Burt (Oct. 2006), is available (likely free) from The Urban Inst., 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/261-5709. [10052]
- **A 2006 study on violence in the lives of homeless women** is available at www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/211976.pdf [10061]

Housing

- “**Voucher Homeownership Study,**” a 2006 HUD report, is available (nominal fee) at 800/245-2691-option 1, or downloadable free at www.huduser.org/publications/homeown/voucher/homeown.html [10005]
- **Bringing Buildings Back: From Abandoned Properties to Community Assets,** by Alan Mallach (2006), has been published by the National Housing Inst., distributed by Rutgers Univ. Press, rutgerspress@rutgers.edu [10028]
- **Shelterforce #147,** 2006, has several articles of interest to P&R readers: “It’s Like You’re Walking But Your Feet Ain’t Going Nowhere,” by Kristin Carlisle, on Katrina evacuees in Texas; “Homeowner Rescue,” by Winton Pitcoff, on foreclosure programs offered by nonprofit orgs.; “Thinking Collectively,” by Lisa Ranghelli, on how Boston’s Community Labor United helps unions & housing activists build power together; “The Truth About Concentrated

Poverty,” by Rachel Bogardus Drew. See nhi.org [10055]

- “**Unfair Lending: The Effect of Race & Ethnicity on Subprime Mortgages**” (May 2006), from the Center for Responsible Lending, can be downloaded at www.responsiblelending.org/reports/HMDA2006.cfm [10060]
- “**Fixing the Housing Voucher Formula: A No-Cost Way to Strengthen the ‘Section 8’ Program**” (Oct. 2006), from the Center on Budget & Policy Priorities, is available at www.cbpp.org/11-1-06hous.htm [10063]
- “**The Third National Forum on the Human Right to Housing**” was held **Sept. 21, 2006**, hosted by the Natl. Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty. Conf. materials may be available from the Center, 1411 K St. NW, #1400, Wash., DC 20005, 202/638-2535, network@nlchp.org, <http://www.nlchp.org/> [10051]

Immigration

- “**Report of the Task Force on Immigration & America’s Future,**” headed by Lee Hamilton & Spencer Abraham, has issued an Executive Summary, the full report, and Task Force background papers, available, respectively, at: [10021]
- “**A Shared Future: The Economic Engagement of Greater Chicago & Its Mexican Community**” is a 2006 report from the Chicago Council on Global Affairs, 312/738-1503, <http://www.mfacmchicago.org/> [10025]

- **Crossing Over: Comparing Recent Migration in the United States and Europe,** ed. Holger Henke (330 pp., 2005, \$80.75), has been published by Lexington Books, <http://www.lexingtonbooks.com/> [10039]

Miscellaneous

- **Quiet Revolution** is the latest (2006) of the annual films produced by the Alliance for Justice. The 23-minute documentary—narrated by Bradley Whitford (Josh in *West Wing*) and featuring Drew Days III, Harold Koh, Barack Obama, Cass Sunstein, Judith Resnik and others—deals with how “an increasingly influential cadre of ultra-conservatives—or movement conservatives—has waged a quiet war on the law as we know it” over the past 25 years. Free, from the Alliance, 866/347-7866, <http://www.afj.org/> [10017]
- **Landmark Cases Left Out of Your Textbooks,** ed. Ann Fagan Ginger, is an 88-page, 2006 publication, written for students & activists, telling how 43 human rights cases were “won” (i.e., in ways broader than court decisions), ranging from Katrina victims back to the Haymarket Martyrs of May Day, 1886. \$10+s/h from Meiklejohn Civil Liberties Inst., 510/848-0599, <http://www.mcli.org/> [10038]

Job Opportunities/ Fellowships/ Grants

- **UCLA Postdoctoral/ Visiting Scholar Fellow-**

ships are available (one each) for each of the Ethnic Studies Research Centers (American Indian, Asian American, African American, Chicano). \$32-35,000 + research support/health benefits. PhD (or terminal degree in the arts) a prerequisite. 9-12 mos. beginning Oct. 1, 2007. Applic. deadline Jan. 12, 2007, www.gdnet.ucla.edu/iacweb/applic.htm [10040]

- **The Dept. of Public Policy & Public Affairs, McCormack Grad. School of Policy Studies, UMass-Boston** is hiring **2 Faculty** at the full, assoc. or asst. prof. level. Ltr./c.v./names of 3 refs. by Jan. 5, 2007 to Search Comm., Search 695d, at the Dept., 100 Morrissey Blvd., Boston, MA 02125. [10046]
- **The School of Urban & Public Affairs, Univ. of Louisville** is filling a tenure-track **Asst. Prof. Planning Faculty** position. Apply immediately, ref. JOB ID 20689, www.louisville.edu/jobs [10048]
- **The Lawyers Comm. for Civil Rights Under Law** is hiring a **Housing/ Community Development Staff Atty.** Ltr./ resume/substantial writing sample/list of refs. by Nov. 15 to Office Mgr. LCCRUL, 1401 NY Ave. NW, #400, Wash., DC 20005. [10064]
- **The Natl. Comm. for Responsive Philanthropy** is hiring a new **Executive Director.** Resume to Ford Webb Associates, Attn: NCRP, PO Box 645, Carlisle, MA 01741 or NCRP@fordwebb.com [10065]

Poverty & Race Index, Vol. 15 (2006)

This Index includes the major articles in the six 2006 issues of Poverty & Race (Vol. 15). The categories used frequently overlap, so a careful look at the entire Index is recommended. Each issue also contains an extensive Resources Section, not in the Index below, but available in database form cumulatively for all 15 volumes. We are happy to make available photocopies of any of the articles listed in the Index. We also can send an Index for any or all of the first 14 volumes of P&R (1992-2005). Please order by number and article name and include a self-addressed, stamped envelope. You can also find these articles on our website, www.prrac.org.

Race/Racism

475. "Truth and Reconciliation in Greensboro, North Carolina: A Paradigm for Social Transformation," Marty Nathan & Signe Waller, Jan./Feb.
476. "FEMA and Civil Rights," Alan Clive, Jan./Feb.
477. "When Affirmative Action Was White," Ira Katznelson, March/April
478. "The Political Repercussions of Hurricane Katrina," Chester Hartman, March/April
479. "Race, Poverty and Pesticides," Jay Feldman, March/April
480. "Apologies/Reparation," March/April
481. "The Chicago Freedom Movement 40 Years Later: A Symposium," May/June
- "Assessing the Chicago Freedom Movement," James Ralph
 - "Success & the Chicago Freedom Movement," Mary Lou Finley
 - "The End-the-Slums Movement," Bernard LaFayette, Jr.
 - "Forty Years of the Civil Rights Movement in Chicago," Dick Simpson
 - "Overall, Things Are Not Good," Salim Muwakkil
482. "Farewell to the Leadership Council," May/June
483. "Greensboro Truth & Reconciliation Commission," May/June
484. "Freedom Riders," Raymond Arsenault, July/Aug.
485. "Race, Poverty and Oral History," Alan H. Stein with Gene B. Preuss, Sept./Oct.
486. "Katrina Books," Sept./Oct.
487. "Structural Racism Forum," Nov./Dec.
- "Why Structural Racism? Why a Structural Racism Caucus?," Anne Kubisch
 - "Toward a Structural Racism Framework," Andrew Grant-Thomas & John A. Powell
 - "Retooling Community-Building for Racial Equity," Keith Lawrence
 - "Youth Organizing Tackles 'Racism You Can't Name'," Julie Quiroz-Martinez
 - "Structural Racism and Rebuilding New Orleans," Maya Wiley
 - "Race vis-à-vis Class in the U.S.," John A. Powell and Stephen Menendian
488. Excerpts from *amicus* briefs for upcoming Supreme Court school integration cases, Nov./Dec.
489. "Katrina and the Second Disaster: A Twenty-Point Plan to Destroy Black New Orleans," Robert D. Bullard, Nov./Dec.

Poverty/Welfare

490. "Opportunity and the Automobile," Margy Waller, Jan./Feb.
491. "Katrina's Blueprint for Ending Poverty," Lance Hill, May/June

Families/Women/Children

492. "Girls in the 'Hood: Evidence on the Impact of Safety," Susan J. Popkin, Tama Leventhal & Gretchen Weismann, Sept./Oct.

Housing

493. "Discrimination Against Participants in the Housing Choice Voucher Program" Isabelle M. Thabault & Eliza T. Platts-Mills, Jan./Feb.
494. "Housing is the Foundation of HIV Prevention and Treatment," Virginia Shubert & Hilary Botein, July/Aug.
495. "Family Housing Opportunities in the LIHTC Program," July/Aug.

Immigration

496. "National Statement to Support Human and Civil Rights for All Immigrants and to Oppose Compromise Immigration Reform Proposals," May/June
497. "Xenophobia/Racism," July/Aug.

PRRAC Activities & News

498. *Poverty & Race in America: The Emerging Agendas* - Table of Contents for PRRAC's 3rd "best of P&R" book, Jan./Feb.
499. "PRRAC's Edith Witt Internships," May/June
500. "New PRRAC Research/Advocacy Grants," May/June

PRRAC'S SOCIAL SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD

Frank Bonilla
CUNY Department of Sociology

Xavier de Souza Briggs
MIT Department of Urban Studies & Planning

Camille Zubrinsky Charles
Department of Sociology, Univ. of Pennsylvania

John Goering
Baruch College, City Univ. of New York

Heidi Hartmann
Inst. for Women's Policy Research (Wash., DC)

William Kornblum
CUNY Center for Social Research

Harriette McAdoo
Michigan State School of Human Ecology

Fernando Mendoza
Department of Pediatrics, Stanford Univ.

Paul Ong
UCLA School of Public Policy
& Social Research

Gary Orfield
Harvard Univ. Grad. School of Education

Gary Sandefur
Univ. Wisconsin Inst. for Poverty Research

Gregory D. Squires
Department of Sociology, George Washington Univ.

Margery Austin Turner
The Urban Institute

Margaret Weir
Department of Political Science,
Univ. of California, Berkeley

**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*

Darrell Armstrong

*Shiloh Baptist Church
Trenton, NJ*

Maria Blanco

*Lawyers' Committee for
Civil Rights
San Francisco, CA*

Craig Flournoy

*Southern Methodist
University
Dallas, TX*

Thomas Henderson

*Sprenger & Lang
Washington, DC*

Camille Holmes

*National Legal Aid &
Defender Assn.
Washington, DC*

Olati Johnson

*Columbia University
Law School
New York, NY*

Elizabeth Julian

*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*

Florence Wagman

Roisman
*Indiana University
School of Law
Indianapolis, IN*

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*

*[Organizations listed for
identification purposes only]*

Philip D. Tegeler

President/Executive Director

Chester Hartman

Director of Research

Nkiru Azikiwe

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@prrac.org
Website: www.prrac.org

Address Service Requested

11-12/06

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