Hurricane Katrina’s violent winds and waters tore away the shrouds that ordinarily mask the country’s racial pattern of poverty and neglect. Understandably, most commentators focused on the woeful federal response. Others, taking a longer view, yearned for a burst of activism patterned on the New Deal. But that nostalgia requires a heavy dose of historical amnesia. It also misses the chance to come to terms with how the federal government in the 1930s and 1940s contributed to the persistence of two Americas.

In “To Fulfull These Rights,” a June 1965 graduation address at Howard University, President Lyndon Johnson asked why the black population of the United States had fallen even further behind the country’s white majority during the two decades since the end of the Second World War, despite the era’s sustained national prosperity. Conceding that “we are not completely sure why this is,” he stressed the need to adopt bold new policies of affirmative action to remedy the disabilities following from two centuries of oppression.

Johnson missed the chance to assay how the major policies of the New Deal and Fair Deal of the 1930s and 1940s, inflected by the preferences of the Southern wing of the Democratic Party, had massively advantaged American whites while often excluding African Americans, especially the majority who still lived in the 17 states that mandated de jure racial segregation. Southern members of Congress used occupational exclusions and took advantage of American federalism to insure that their region’s racial order would not be disturbed by national policies. Farmworkers and maids, the jobs held by most Southern blacks, were denied Social Security pensions and access to labor unions. Benefits for veterans were administered locally. The famous GI Bill adapted to “the Southern way of life” by accommodating to segregation in higher education, to the job ceilings local officials imposed on returning black soldiers who came home from a segregated Army, and to an unwillingness to offer loans to blacks even when they were insured by the federal government. Of the 3,229 GI Bill-guaranteed home, business and farm loans made in 1947 in Mississippi, for example, only 2 went to black veterans.

Together, these policies transferred more than $100 billion to create a modern middle class during the first decade after the Second World War, a sum more than six times the amount spent on Marshall Plan aid in war-torn Europe. Without attention to this history, the ambition to create affirmative action for the black poor and the dispossessed was made difficult. Without attention to this history today, it is hard to know how to proceed.

Affirmative action, as it came to operate, focused mainly on opportunities for middle-class blacks seeking access to higher education and top-tier jobs. This affirmative action has worked to great effect, creating a more racially-just and diverse society than otherwise would have been the case. But the black affirmative action programs instituted since 1965 in fact were paltry in their scope and scale compared to the massive governmental transfers that disproportionately aided whites in the previous three decades, 1935-65.

Questioning Affirmative Action

Presently, many US politicians and much of the wider public are questioning the effectiveness of any kind of
affirmative action in the face of continuing black disadvantage and the wider impact of globalization on the population as a whole. Many view affirmative action as an expensive exercise that violates principles of merit and equal opportunity and that, in any event, has not achieved its original goals as enunciated by President Johnson in 1965. Further, there is no agreement or clarity about what, if anything, should be put in its place.

Current policy possibilities become clearer when we take into account not just the affirmative action policies that have been called by that name, but the full range of affirmative action—including affirmative action for whites—that marked much of American social policy in the key formative period that preceded the civil rights revolution.

The almost exclusively white-targeted nature of this extensive federal legislation has largely been ignored by policy analysts, just as it was by Lyndon Johnson.

Thus, often without realizing it, the United States has practiced what, in effect, was white affirmative action on a highly generous and widespread basis, followed by a much more modest program of black affirmative action. By understanding this history, we can come to terms with the widening gap between blacks and whites noted by Lyndon Johnson and with the incapacity of many blacks to be able to make good this gap in the following four decades.

The policy implications of a full appreciation of these features of modern US history, in short, are the opposite of currently popular views. Properly designed and funded, affirmative action policies can work very effectively, but the ingrained bias in a white direction has to be acknowledged and transcended. If American politicians and public opinion are serious about racial equality, this history indicates the need to implement an affirmative action program as ambitious as that delivered to whites during the three decades before President Johnson spoke out in 1965. It is important to consider both the principles that could animate such an effort and to imagine the form it might take.

The Roosevelt and Truman Administrations

Although no single period can account for why race and class continue to be so closely entwined today, such a critical moment lies just behind us, during the Administrations of Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman, when such great progressive national policies as Social Security, protective labor laws and the GI Bill generated what I have called “affirmative action for whites.” As a historian, I have tried to set this record straight. As a political scientist, I have sought to understand the mechanisms that made this history possible. As a citizen, I have sought to comprehend the implications of these past policies for possibilities today.

During Jim Crow’s last hurrah in the 1930s and 1940s, when Southern members of Congress controlled the gateways to legislation, policy decisions dealing with welfare, work and war excluded or differentially treated the vast majority of African Americans. Between 1945 and 1955, the federal government transferred unprecedented sums to support retirement and fashion opportunities for job skills, education, homeownership and small business formation. Together, these domestic programs dramatically reshaped the country’s social structure by creating a modern, well-schooled, home-owning middle class. At no other time in American history had so much money and so many resources been targeted at the generation completing education, entering the workforce and forming families.

Imagine two countries, one the richest in the world, the other among its most destitute. Then suppose a global program of foreign aid transferred well over $100 billion, but to the rich nation, not the poor. This is exactly what happened as a result of the cumulative impact of the most important domestic policies of the 1930s and 1940s. Social Security began to pay old age pensions in 1939. By the end of the 1940s, its original provisions had been impressively improved. The GI Bill was the largest targeted fully national program of support in American history. The country passed new labor laws that promoted unions and protected people as they worked. The Army was a great engine of skill training and mobility during the Second World War. None of these was a marginal or secondary program. To the contrary, individually and collectively they organized a revolution in the role of government that remade the country’s social structure in dramatic, positive ways.

But most blacks were left out. The damage to racial equity caused by each program was immense. Taken together, the effects of these public laws were devastating. Social Security, from which the majority of blacks were excluded until well into the 1950s, quickly became the country’s most important social legislation. The labor laws of the New Deal and Fair Deal...
The Political Repercussions of Hurricane Katrina

by Chester Hartman

As of this writing (mid-February), the postponed New Orleans elections are scheduled for April 22, with a May 20 run-off if needed—set by Gov. Kathleen Blanco under pressure from a federal judge. The mayor’s office, the entire seven-member city council, and the sheriff and tax assessor’s offices, as well as some possible important voter propositions, all are on the ballot. It will be a very closely watched election, not only for what its results say and portend for the city’s future, but also because of the likely unprecedented (at least for American elections) details of voting procedures, given the vast geographic dispersion of the electorate.

While the population flow back into the city is slow and somewhat unpredictable, in very rough terms only some 200,000 of the 500,000 pre-Katrina New Orleanians will be in the city on April 22. The big questions are who those voters are and how, where and whether they will vote.

Vanilla City?

The first question can be reliably answered, at least in general terms: The city’s white population—about one-third of pre-hurricane New Orleans—suffered far less damage and displacement, and those who had to leave were in a better position to return quickly. Conversely, the two-thirds of the city that was African-American evacuated in far higher proportions and is far less able to return. These people are now scattered in large numbers in such cities as Houston, Jackson and Atlanta, but are all over the map, from Rhode Island to Alaska. To the extent that place affects ability and willingness to vote, the cards are already well stacked. If one adds to those new realities the consistent data that voting rates are higher for whites and for those with higher socioeconomic status, the racial disparity is magnified.

Prior to the hurricanes, New Orleans was one of the most solid centers of black political power in the country. Of the state’s seven Congressional districts, only New Orleans has an African-American majority. Four of the nine African Americans in the State Senate are from New Orleans, as are one-third of the of the State House representatives, and five of the city’s seven city councilors are African-American. If some of the projections/plans for a city with radically changed demographics are realized, the city will have far less representation and power in Baton Rouge, and might even wind up with a population too small to constitute a Congressional district (which in turn could lead to creation of a new majority African-American district elsewhere in the state). Beyond the state, still to be solidified relocation patterns could affect Houston, Atlanta, Jackson and other locales where ex-New Orleanians decide to stay in large numbers.

The Diaspora

The other big question is how, and whether, the far-flung dispersed population—as well as those who will be in New Orleans on Election Day—will vote.

First, consider those who stayed or will have returned to the city. Some 300 of the city’s 442 parish electoral precincts suffered storm damage. Extensive consolidation into a far fewer number of polling places is mandated. This raises problems of crowding, lines and adequate staffing; people whose lives are still disrupted and full of hassles are not likely to stand around, possibly for hours, waiting to cast their vote. Beyond that is the transportation issue: Consolidation of voting places means longer trips for most voters—trips made very difficult by the city’s still broken public transit system.

In terms of the larger population of displaced people, big questions exist about how and whether they will vote. Never in the nation’s history has there been an election in which so large a portion of the electorate must vote if they vote at all, by absentee ballot—a system that tests both the will and capacity of the voting mechanism as well as the voter.

One option for those going back and forth to their former homes, but not finally returning to the city, is to vote early in person (assuming the city makes provision for this); a 2005 state law change gives voters that right. Another potentially important option is the fax machine. Louisiana law re-

Never in the nation’s history has there been an election in which so large a portion of the electorate must vote by absentee ballot.

Coretta Scott King

We join the world in mourning the death of Coretta Scott King, who so capably carried on (and in many respects expanded) the human rights work of her husband after his 1968 assassination. She would have appreciated the fact that those who spoke at her funeral, in the presence of President Bush and many other power-holders, pulled no punches, criticizing our country’s many anti-human rights policies.
An unanswerable question is the extent to which there will be voter apathy among those no longer in New Orleans. For some, absence may only increase their fervent desire to return and their understanding of the political importance of the vote in order to achieve that goal. For others, the longer they stay away, the more they may turn cynical and less oriented to their former city and neighborhood. Voter turnout among absentee voters will be the key determinant of the election outcome, as well as an important signal of future population trends.

Of course, the problem could be ameliorated by universal voter registration, overseen at the national level, as exists in nearly every modern democracy—as suggested by Rob Richie and Ryan O’Donnell of the Center for Voting and Democracy in their Dec. 22, 2005 Washington Post op-ed, “Louisiana’s Electoral Disaster.” That would enable citizens to be registered to vote, no matter where they lived, in an automatic process administered by nonpartisan, independent officials. Even more “radical” would be creation of a Constitutional right to vote, as proposed by American Univ. Law Professor Jamin Raskin and others.

Other ways to facilitate absentee voting include the adaptation of provisions already in place to allow voting by military personnel and overseas citizens—under the federal Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act; extension of the voting period; and making absentee ballots available online and at public locations such as DMV sites, libraries and post offices. Highly exaggerated concerns about fraud are adequately addressed via certification and perjury penalty notices.

Like many other problems that Katrina brought out into the open so forcefully, reforms that are needed to address these issues provide a model for much wider application.

The Big Race

The mayoral race is at the center of attention. Mayor Ray Nagin hasn’t done himself any favors with his “chocolate city” remark or with his reference to the deity. He hasn’t come even close to achieving a Rudy Giuliani-type response to the disaster, which evoked near-universal admiration for the Big Apple’s mayor. Lt. Gov. Mitch Landrieu announced his candidacy just as this issue was going to press. And while handicapping elections is never a sure thing, the smart money says that, for the first time since 1978, New Orleans may very well have a white mayor. When Landrieu’s family name and connections—son of the city’s last white mayor, brother of the state’s senior US Senator—are added to the new racial makeup of the likely electorate, a white mayor is by far the most likely scenario. This prediction is supported by the popularity of former Mayor Moon Landrieu, as well as Sen. Landrieu and Lt. Gov. Landrieu himself, among black voters. The ex-mayor openly opposed racist David Duke in his election bid; Senator Landrieu co-sponsored the recent Senate apology for not having passed federal anti-lynching legislation (see the September/October Poverty & Race). On top of all of this is the unhappiness expressed by black New Orleanians about the recommendations of Mayor Nagin’s Bring Back New Orleans Commission. Probably the only question is whether Landrieu will win by a majority on April 22 in order to avoid a run-off. (Why anyone would want the job is beyond the scope of this article.)

Run-off elections have their own downsides: Turnout usually falls off, especially among poor and minority voters; the second-round election costs the city a lot of money; and the process of sending out and returning absentee ballots creates additional difficulties. Louisiana law already provides...
Race, Poverty and Pesticides
by Jay Feldman

The US government’s policies and practices in regulating toxic pesticides, whether by neglect or design, are inherently racist. This manifests itself daily in the disproportionate health and environmental hazards in people of color communities. The effects of pesticides on human health and the environment are well documented in scientific and policy journals, while the disproportionate risk to people of color communities is not fully discussed as the national disgrace that it is. Pesticides are linked to a range of effects, including cancer, birth defects, reproductive effects, respiratory illness (including asthma and reactive airway disease), neurological disorders (including Parkinson’s and Lou Gehrig’s disease), learning disabilities and endocrine system disruption. The range of effects and their impact on daily life is staggering and unacceptable given the availability of safe alternatives that do not poison people or contaminate their communities.

Injustice in Risk Assessment

Risk assessments that calculate “acceptable” risks across population groups do not disclose the disproportionate effect that pesticide use has on people of color communities. Public policies emanating from so-called “science-based” decisions are actually highly politicized risk management decisions based on fraudulent assumptions about exposure. Take the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA), which has been touted by many as a “health-based” standard for regulating pesticides (said to be far superior to the “risk-benefit” standard of the Federal Insecticide Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, FIFRA), which allows escalating and uncapped hazards based on a subjective judgment of benefits to the chemical user and society. The “better” health-based standard still drives the use of unnecessary toxic pesticide products that meet the standard—even though that standard allows some rate of harm based on uncertain knowledge about chemical interactions, and despite the availability of safer non-toxic practices and products.

There is an inherent assumption that if a pesticide meets a highly questionable “acceptable” risk threshold, it has value or benefit. This calculation ignores the disproportionate risk, for example, to African-American inner-city children whose asthmatic conditions are caused or triggered by the very pesticide products that meet the health-based standard. The disproportionate impact of this and other public health and environmental policies, contributing to disproportionately high morbidity and mortality due to asthma, is borne out by the statistics on asthma: 12.5% of children nationwide, 17% of children in New York City and 30% of children in Harlem, New York City. According to the National Institutes of Health’s National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Disease, African Americans are 4 to 6 times more likely than whites to die from asthma. Therefore, any time our policies allow regulators to permit uses of pesticides with known asthma effects, which is done daily, a disproportionate impact is felt in the African-American community. Among other policies, this toxics policy contributes to a cycle of poverty, as asthma is the leading cause of school absenteeism due to chronic illness.

The lesson of Hurricane Katrina can be applied to environmental policy. The disproportionate health risk that African Americans suffer has been exposed more clearly with the continuing news about the Katrina disaster since last August. Few argue with the criticism that the evacuation in advance of Katrina and the response in its wake ignored the necessary special attention to low-income people who required assistance getting out of New Orleans and other areas in the Gulf Coast region. Even more troubling than the inadequate response was the premeditated decision to allow the risk of a disaster that would disproportionately impact the lives of low- and moderate-income African Americans. The Army Corps of Engineers, according to interviews and reports, knew that its levees could not withstand a fast-moving Category 3 hurricane. And so, decision-makers made the determination to write off sectors of the city, such as the 9th Ward, inhabited by African Americans.

Katrina also illustrates the failure to measure accurately worst-case scenarios resulting in contamination and poisoning, and to calculate clean-up costs that are far more costly than prevention-oriented approaches. The flooded land, parks, houses, schools, hospitals and other buildings left behind after Katrina are now contaminated with mixtures of toxic chemicals that will have untold effects far into the future. This is compounded by a government relaxation of environmental laws, such as a waiver for oil refineries to emit more pollutants, including benzene, into the air, contributing to further increases in residents’ toxic body burden.

Unfortunately, policy decisions leading up to the Katrina disaster are not unique, but part of a pattern of institutional racism that is also pervasive in our nation’s pesticide policy.

Compromising Farmworker Health

We cannot leave the discussion of institutional racism in our federal pes-
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ticide law without highlighting the provision in FQPA that disallows consideration of occupational pesticide exposure when calculating “aggregate exposure levels” of toxic pesticides that have a common mechanism of toxicity. The law embraces the importance of calculating aggregate risk to a point, by taking into account “aggregate exposure levels of consumers (and subgroups) to the pesticide residue and to other related substances, dietary and nondietary exposure from nonoccupational sources,” thus specifically leaving out the overall risk to farmworkers, who typically are people of color. The important advances associated with a mandate to evaluate and regulate aggregate risk leaves out those at highest risk, those who handle pesticides in the fields as pesticide applicators and harvesters.

This policy, a point of contention for many organizations, was not lost on farmworker advocates when it was adopted in 1996. In the 1960s, Cesar Chavez brought to light the serious impact of pesticides on farmworkers and the deplorable and inhumane working conditions that included pesticide poisoning, and a lack of sanitary facilities, clean drinking water, health benefits and livable wages. Since that time, although there have been advances for many farmworkers with union contracts and the emergence of new leaders, such as Baldemar Velazquez of the Farm Labor Organizing Committee and others, the daily toxic assault on farmworkers continues. Despite a federal farmworker protection standard, its implementation is undermined by a lack of pesticide incident reporting, poor enforcement of existing regulations and grower noncompliance.

Children at Highest Risk

Overall, pesticides present the greatest threat to children and other sensitive population groups. Thirteen million children live in poverty in the US, a highly disproportionate number of whom are African-American and Latino. This is significant, since children are especially vulnerable to toxic exposure because their organ systems are developing and they take in more toxic chemical relative to body weight than do adults. Hardest hit from pesticide exposure are those children living in poverty with poor nutrition and weakened respiratory and immune systems, inadequate health care, lack of information on pesticide hazards and non-toxic alternatives to pesticides, and contaminated air and water from chemical manufacturing plants and waste sites located in their communities.

The 48 pesticides that are commonly used by schools across the United States are linked to cancer, birth defects, nervous system damage and other effects. In a June 1999 article in a peer-reviewed journal, “Pesticides and Inner-City Children: Exposures, Risks, and Prevention,” Dr. Philip Landrigan and his colleagues concluded: “Developmental toxicity is the major threat posed by the exposure of fetuses, infants, and children in the inner city to heavy levels of pesticides. The concordance of young children’s disproportionately heavy exposure to pesticides, coupled with their developmental vulnerabilities, places them at seriously increased risk for neurologic, endocrine, and other developmental disabilities.” According to a 2002 report by New York State Attorney General Eliot Spitzer, “Pest Control in Public Housing, Schools and Parks: Urban Children At Risk”: “Our findings are a cause for concern. Housing authorities, school and park administrators, and the children’s parents frequently use toxic pesticides in areas where children may be exposed. These pesticides include some that may cause cancer, interfere with the normal development of a child’s nervous system, increase the incidence of asthmatic attacks, or irritate the skin, eyes, respiratory system and digestive system.”

Environmental Justice Dismantled

The pesticide problems inflicted on people of color is made worse by the Bush Administration’s disregard for a 1994 Executive Order and a national commitment to address the issue of disproportionate risk. In March 2004, the Environmental Protection Agency was told by its Inspector General’s (IG) office that the Agency had failed to provide adequate protection for minorities and low-income families who, it said, are disproportionately affected by pollution. The report (“Evaluation Report: EPA Needs to Consistently Implement the Intent of the Executive Order on Environmental Justice”) concludes that Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice (“Federal Action to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-income Populations”), signed by President Clinton in 1994, has not been fully implemented, nor has EPA “consistently integrated environmental justice into its day-to-day operations.” It further states: “EPA has not identified minority and low-income, nor identified populations addressed in the Executive Order, and has neither defined...
nor developed criteria for determining disproportionately impacted.” “Disproportionately impacted” is defined by the IG as a generic term used by EPA, regions and stakeholders to identify the adverse effects of environmental actions that burden minority and/or low-income populations at a higher rate than the general populations.

Moreover, the report discloses that the Bush Administration has previously reinterpreted the order—without authority to do so—to shift emphasis away from the very populations the order was written to protect. The report states: “We believe the Agency is bound by the requirement of Executive Order 12898 and does not have the authority to reinterpret the order. The Acting Deputy Administrator needs to reaffirm the Executive Order 12898 applies specifically to minority and/or low-income populations that are disproportionately impacted.” The Administration then defended its action by stating that it would provide environmental justice to “everyone.” The EPA response states: “The Agency does not accept the Inspector General’s central and baseline assumption that environmental justice only applies to minority and/or low-income individuals. The EPA firmly believes that environmental justice belongs to all people...” Then in August 2005, the Bush Administration released its draft Environmental Justice Strategic Plan that defines environmental justice as “the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income [emphasis added], with respect to development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies”—thus ignoring or undermining the critical emphasis on disproportionate impact.

### PRRAC Update

- **PRRAC Board Member Camille Holmes** has moved from the Center for Law & Social Policy to the National Legal Aid & Defender Association, where she is Director of Training and Community Education.
- **We thank the following readers for their recent contributions to PRRAC: ACLU of Ohio, Mijha Butcher, Elliott Currie, Alan Mallach, Alexander Polikoff,** Emmett Schaefer, Clifford Schrupp/Fair Housing Center of Metropolitan Detroit.
- **PRRAC co-hosted a very well-attended Feb. 15 book party at The Urban Institute for Alex Polikoff and his just-released Waiting for Gautreaux: A Story of Segregation, Housing, and the Black Ghetto (Northwestern Univ. Press - 422 pp., 800/621-2736).**

### Responding to the Lack of Response

It is critical that the national conversation growing out of Katrina continue and broaden. At the same time, it is essential that attention turn to community-based action for change across the country, given an unresponsive Congress and executive branch. Communities have the authority and increasingly recognize the need to take action in the face of federal government inaction and blatant disregard for impacts of inadequately regulated poisons on children. For example, communities like Washington, DC, with its exploding childhood asthma rate, have opted out of the Centers for Disease Control-supported West Nile virus pesticide spray program, instead adopting public education and mosquito source reduction campaigns that have been proven more effective than the toxic sprays. Communities such as Chicago, Seattle, New York, Cuyahoga County (Ohio), San Francisco and Los Angeles are taking pesticides out of their schools, libraries, parks or public buildings. People are increasingly managing their homes and urban landscapes without toxic chemicals. The availability of organic food is growing exponentially—a direct response to concerns about pesticide-intensive agricultural practices, resulting food residues, environmental contamination and worker hazards. Local campaigns must ensure that those who suffer disproportionate health and environmental risks because of our nation’s pesticide policies are not left out of the changes taking place in communities across the country.

Jay Feldman(jfeldman@beyondpesticides.org) is a founder and Executive Director of Beyond Pesticides, which was established in 1981 as the National Coalition Against the Misuse of Pesticides to educate on toxic hazards of pesticides and advocate for changes in policies and practices that are protective of health and the environment. Beyond Pesticides publishes numerous newsletters, including the quarterly Pesticides and You ($25/ year), and operates the website www.beyondpesticides.org.

### Communities are taking pesticides out of their schools, libraries, parks and public buildings.

Remember to send us items for our Resources section.
created a framework of protection for tens of millions of workers who secured minimum wages, maximum hours and the right to join industrial as well as craft unions. African Americans who worked on the land or as domestics—the great majority—lacked these protections. When unions made inroads in the South, where most blacks lived, moreover, Congress changed the rules of the game to make organizing much more difficult. Perhaps most surprising and most important, the treatment of veterans after the war, despite the universal eligibility for the benefits offered by the GI Bill, perpetuated the blatant racism that had marked the affairs of a still-segregated military during the war itself. Comparatively little of this largesse was available to black veterans. With these policies, the Gordian Knot binding race to class tightened.

This is an unsettling history, especially for those of us who keenly admire the New Deal and Fair Deal. At the very moment a wide array of public policies were providing most white Americans with valuable tools to insure their old age, get good jobs, acquire economic security, build assets and gain middle-class status, black Americans were mainly left to fend on their own. Ever since, American society has been confronted with the results of this twisted and unstated form of affirmative action.

Despite the prosperity of post-war capitalism’s golden age, an already immense gap between white and black Americans widened. Even today, after the great achievements of civil rights and affirmative action, wealth for the typical white family, mainly in homeownership, is ten times the average net worth for blacks, and a majority of African-American children in our cities subsist below the federal poverty line.

**Retrieving LBJ’s Ambitious Project**

By contrast, Lyndon Johnson depicted policies for racial equity that would target “the poor, the unemployed, the uprooted, and the dispossessed.” He famously noted that “freedom is not enough,” because “you do not take a person who, for years, has been hobbled by chains and liberate him, bring him to the starting line of a race and then say, `you are free to compete with all the others,’ and still justly believe you have been completely fair.” The past four decades have not been kind to this vision. It is important now, in the early 21st century, to retrieve Johnson’s ambitious project by connecting the goals and precepts he enunciated to the history of racial bias that was deeply embedded in American social policy.

Johnson had in mind the kind of comprehensive effort the GI Bill had provided to most returning soldiers but without its exclusionary pattern of implementation. But that form of assertive, mass-oriented affirmative action never happened. By sustaining and advancing a growing African-American middle class, the affirmative action we did get has done more to advance fair treatment across racial lines than any other recent public policy, and thus demands our respect and support. But as the scenes from New Orleans vividly displayed, so many who were left out before have been left out yet again.

Rather than yearn for New Deal policies that were tainted by racism, we would do better in present circumstances to return to the ambitious plans President Johnson announced but never realized in order to close massive gaps between blacks and whites, and between more and less prosperous blacks.

**The Bakke/Justice Powell Standards**

In the 1978 Supreme Court case, *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, Justice Lewis Powell, a quite conservative Republican, offered clear and strict standards for racial rectification. These guidelines can help guide such a program. Powell argued that modifications to color-blind policies could be undertaken to remedy race-based disadvantages when two conditions are met. There must be a clear and tight link connecting affirmative action’s remedies to specific historical harms based on race. This tie between past action and present policy has to be strong and precise. More general claims about racism in the country’s past are not enough. Neither can the goal to be pursued by affirmative action be vague or only of moderate importance. It must be sufficiently valuable as a social good to justify suspending rules that ordinarily must be blind to race. Further, if there is a non-racial way to pursue a given goal, that course should always be preferred. Powell insisted on these two principles—that racial injuries be specific and clear; and that a compelling public purpose must be identified when racial remedies are applied—because a color-blind society is desirable and color-coding is inherently susceptible to misuse.

Building on these principles has significant advantages. First, Powell’s demand for strict scrutiny appropriately sets the bar high, but not beyond reach. It balances a widely shared desire to make color-neutrality the dominant norm with the cheerless recognition that this goal cannot be achieved if the role race has played in American life is downplayed or, worse, ignored. As settled law, Powell’s deeply historical approach has been applied to the type of affirmative action developed during the Johnson and Nixon

---
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Administrations, but it also can shape and motivate a considerably broader effort that might target affirmative action at those who are less well-off.

Powell’s distinctions placed the onus of proof on the character of the historical evidence that is deployed to justify rectification. A focus on the policies about welfare and work, as well as war and post-war, which the Southern wing of the Democratic Party successfully imposed during the New Deal and Fair Deal, is consistent with this requirement. They provide the content Powell requires to justify acts of official rectification.

Retrospectively, we can also see how Johnson’s 1965 speech anticipated Powell’s standards. The President’s analysis of how the racial gap had widened, though deficient, sought to clarify the facts regarding the present status of blacks in American society. He provided a model of justification for affirmative action by summarizing the racial gap, arguing about causes and spelling out why the divide distinguishing racial groups constitutes a major public concern. By taking these steps, he fulfilled Justice Powell’s second stipulation. He also sought to connect his remedies to the causes he had identified. In this approach, he followed Justice Powell’s first requirement.

Combining Powell’s principles and Johnson’s ambitions can push us forward to a framework for public policies that can respond to the injuries inflicted by officially sanctioned racism. Though motivated by a desire to protect Jim Crow, many of the methods and instruments those programs used were adopted on a non-racial basis. A renewed and extended program of affirmative action could offer a reciprocal possibility. Responding to non-racial racism, affirmative action could be established in ways that at least partially transcend race, even while primarily rectifying racial injustice.

Beneficiaries must be targeted with clarity and care. The color-blind critique argues that race, as a group category, is morally unacceptable even when it is used to counter discrimination. But there is an important distinction this view misses. African-American individuals have been discriminated against because they were black, and for no other reason. Obviously, this violates basic norms of fairness. But under affirmative action, they are compensated not for being black, but only because they were subject to unfair treatment at an earlier moment because they were black. If, for others, the policies also were unjust, they, too, must be included in the remedies. When national policy kept out farmworkers and maids, the injury was not limited to African Americans. Nor should the remedy.

On this understanding, it is important to identify the recipients of affirmative compensation who have a direct relationship to the harm being remedied. This does not mean that they necessarily had to experience a specific act of discrimination directly. To qualify, however, it needs to be shown how discriminatory institutions, decisions, actions and practices have negatively affected their circumstances. This approach does not limit remedies to individuals who have faced injustice directly, one at a time; neither does it justify remedies for African Americans as a unitary or exclusive group that has shared in a history of racism except when the harm, as in military segregation, was created with unambiguously racist categories.

At the very moment public policies were helping white Americans, black Americans were mainly left to fend on their own.

Needed: Corrective Justice

Popular and political support for corrective justice, in short, as well as judicial legitimacy, will depend on the clarity and persuasiveness of the association between harms and remedies. One of two approaches is possible. A closely-targeted program of rectification would search for identifiable individuals who have been harmed, even at the distance of one or two generations, by the pattern of exclusions and local administration documented in my book (see below). This policy could yield both tangible and symbolic compensation. As examples:

- For the lag in entering the Social Security system, the excluded could be identified and they, or their heirs, could be offered one-time grants that would have to be paid into designated retirement funds.
- For the absence of access to the minimum wage, tax credits equivalent to the average loss could be tendered.
- For the lack of access to key programs under the GI Bill, programs of subsidized mortgages, small business loans and educational grants could now be put in place.

These measures could be targeted to those who stand in a direct line to those who were harmed, but both to keep their costs in check and target spending on those most in need, they would also be available only up to a particular level before being taxed back.

Alternatively, a less administratively burdensome but still exacting approach could be crafted. With this design, the broad target group for assertive federal policies would be poor Americans who face conditions produced by the constellation of the patterns of eligibility and administration the South placed inside the most important New Deal and Fair Deal programs. Although less exact at the individual and family level, this approach would authorize a major assault on inequality and poverty that would be justified by these historical patterns and remedied by policy interventions offering boosts into middle-class status. The major instruments would be the same as those the federal government utilized in the GI Bill: subsidized mortgages, generous grants for education and training, small business

(Please turn to page 10)
loans, and active job-searching and placement. This line of attack on the legacies of exclusion also could deploy an expanded Earned Income Tax Credit, assure generous child care and guarantee basic health insurance.

Either way, it is not only the persons, or group of people, who have to be identified, but the specific qualities of racial discrimination. There is something of a hierarchy. Individual private acts of prejudice and discrimination count for less than more pervasive institutional ones. Injuries dealt by government count for more than private patterns of institutional racism. When government is directly involved, claims for systemic compensation to match systemic harm become most compelling. Public policies, after all, have been the most decisive instruments dividing Americans into different racial groups with vastly different life circumstances and possibilities.

Speaking from the French Quarter in New Orleans last September, President George W. Bush recognized that Hurricane Katrina has revealed “deep, persistent poverty” with “roots in a history of racial discrimination.” Any serious search for what he called “bold policies” might begin by taking both the history of affirmative action for whites and Lyndon Johnson’s urgency and prescriptions to heart. For without an unsentimental historical understanding of the policy roots of black isolation and dispossession, the response to the disaster in the Gulf states will remain no more than a gesture.

Ira Katznelson (iiik1@columbia.edu) is a professor of political science and history at Columbia University. He is the author of When Affirmative Action Was White: An Untold History of Racial Inequality in America (W.W. Norton, 2005), whose chapters – “Welfare in Black and White,” “Rules for Work,” White Veterans Only,” etc. — provide detailed data supporting his argument.

For the first time since 1978, New Orleans may very well have a white mayor.

The potential longer-term effects of Katrina on political representation in New Orleans and the State of Louisiana extend beyond the April/May period. The city’s eight-term Congressman, William J. Jefferson, is implicated in bribery charges that, combined with what appears to be significant erosion of his electoral base, could well unseat him in the November general elections. As a senior member of the Ways & Means Committee, Congressman Jefferson wields considerable power, and replacing him would weaken the city’s clout in Washington.

Congressman Jefferson is not the only politician who has cause to worry about the longer-term impacts. Both Governor Blanco (in 2003) and Senator Landrieu (in 2002) won by relatively small margins—margins that were largely, if not totally, due to the African-American vote. A reduced black electorate in the state could significantly endanger their reelection.

An additional, more worrisome longer-term impact is redistricting caused by Katrina-related population shifts. Rebuilding/repopulation will undoubtedly be a protracted process, extending beyond November 2006. Existing Congressional districts (especially New Orleans, but perhaps others in the state, as well as in Alabama and Mississippi) may wind up underpopulated, especially if absentee voting procedures are inadequate. Will the “Texas Model” come into play, with a redrawing of Congressional districts in between decennial censuses? One possibility, suggested by civil rights attorney Kristin Clarke-Avery and her late colleague Tulane law professor M. David Gelfand, is postponement of federal elections, possibly throughout the Southeast. While a federal statute states that a uniform date is to be set throughout the country for biennial House elections, a 1982 Federal District Court case (Busbee v. Smith) held that under certain circumstances—for instance, in the case of a “natural disaster”—they can be held at other times. Given the Justice Department’s role in approving voting procedures under Section 5 of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, that may be an avenue to explore.

Katrina, Rita and Wilma had an enormous impact in many areas, not the least of which is on the political front.

Chester Hartman (chartman2@aol.com) is PRRAC’s Director of Research. He is a member of the Long-Range Planning Task Force of Governor Blanco’s Louisiana Recovery Authority and co-editor (with Greg Squires) of Routledge’s forthcoming volume of essays, There’s No Such Thing As a Natural Disaster: Race, Class & Katrina. A variation of this article is appearing in Focus, the magazine of the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies.
We periodically offer a compendium of recent reports dealing with apologies and reparations around the world — for whatever lessons and models they might provide here at home. The most recent appeared in our January/February 2005 issue, and one of the chapters in our new “best of P&R” book — Poverty & Race in America: The Emerging Agendas (Lexington Books, 2006) — contains the “best” of prior examples. We’ll be happy to send you a compendium of all 9 earlier such reports; just send us a SASE (63¢ postage).

- The Church of England, two centuries after profiting from the venture, has apologized to the descendants of its victims for its role in the global slave trade, which involved running a Caribbean island (Barbados) sugar plantation and branding the blacks who worked on it. A further instance cited in the apology was a $23,000 payment made to the Bishop of Exeter in compensation for the loss of 665 slaves after Barbados emancipated them in 1833. (Wash. Post, 2/11/06)

- South Carolina Governor Mark Sanford signed a bill to add the name of former Senator Strom Thurmond’s biracial daughter — Essie Mae Washington-Williams — to the list of his children engraved on his monument. (NY Times, 6/29/04)

- The Congregation of the Sisters of Mercy, a Roman Catholic religious order in Ireland, apologized unconditionally for the “physical and emotional trauma” its nuns inflicted on children raised in its orphanages and schools. A 1966 television documentary that exposed the extent of abuse at one of the Dublin orphanages in the 1950s and 1960s prompted an earlier public apology, but the most recent statement went further, noting that abuse survivors had dismissed the earlier apology as conditional and incomplete. (NY Times, 5/6/04)

- Norway will compensate the country’s 8,000-12,000 “war children” — born to Norwegian women and German soldiers during the World War II German occupation — for the systematic harassment and bullying they were subjected to after the war. Each will receive $3,000-$30,000; but the amounts fall short of claims of up to $72,000 sought by the Association of War Children. (NY Times, 7/3/04)

- Illinois Lieutenant Governor Pat Quinn and a representative of the Illinois State Legislature came to Salt Lake City to present to Utah Governor Olene Walker and leaders of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints a copy of Illinois’ House Resolution 793, expressing “official regret” for the violence and state-sanctioned condemnation that caused the Mormons to leave the state in 1846 on the trek that led them to Utah. (NY Times, 4/8/04)

- Under a bill approved by the state’s Senate, stretches of Mississippi highways in three counties are being renamed for James Chaney, Andrew Goodman and Michael Schwerner, the three civil rights workers murdered by Klan members in Philadelphia, MS in 1964. The bill also will rename a portion of another highway the Emmett Till Memorial Highway. (Wash. Post, 2/11/05)

- Great Britain will seek ways to compensate African countries for the thousands of medical professionals who leave the continent to work in the British health service. The compensation will take the form of in-country training, provision of medicines to help with tackling infrastructure problems — albeit no financial compensation. About 70,000 qualified Africans leave their home countries every year to work abroad, in the UK, other parts of Europe, and the US, leaving the world’s poorest nations battling epidemics of AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis without sufficient qualified medical personnel. (NY Times, 8/20/05)

- Louisiana Governor Kathleen Blanco has pardoned a woman arrested in 1963 while trying to integrate a public swimming pool. (NY Times, 1/17/05)

- Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi observed the 60th anniversary of the Japan’s defeat in World War II by apologizing for the country’s past militarism in Asia and pledging to uphold its postwar pacifism. However, China, Korea and other Asian nations feel this is inadequate, pointing to Japan’s adoption of textbooks that whitewash its wartime past, as well as the Prime Minister’s visit to the Yasukuni Shrine, the Shinto memorial where Class A war criminals are enshrined along with the war dead. (NY Times, 8/23/05, 8/16/05)

- Can’t win ‘em all: A federal judge in Chicago, for the second time, dismissed a suit by slave descendants for reparations from corporations that benefited from slavery, holding that it was a political issue for the legislative or executive branch to deal with, and that since slavery was abolished a century and a half ago, the statute of limitations rules out damages. (Wash. Post & NY Times, 7/7/05)
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 (39c 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 and Impacts,” by Robert M. Entman (40 pp., 2006), is available (no price listed) from The Dells Commission, c/o The Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies’ Health Policy Institute, 1090 Vermont Ave. NW, #1100, Wash., DC 20005, http://www.jointcenter.org/ [9697]

• “Update” is the 20-page, Fall 2005/Winter 2006 report from the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity (headed by PRRAC Board member John Powell). Articles on their Katrina Mapping Project, structural racism, “Understanding Whites’ Racial Policy Options,” and more. Available (possibly free) from the Institute, Ohio St. Univ., 423 Mendenhall Lab, 125 So. Oval Mall, Columbus, OH 43210, 614/292-2634, parchia.1@osu.edu [9712]

• The Wellspring is the newsletter of the William Winter Institute for Racial Reconciliation at the Univ. of Mississippi, named for the former governor and member of President Clinton’s Race Initiative Advisory Board. Available (likely free) from the Institute, PO Box 1848, University, MS 38677-1848, 661/915-6734, wwirr@olemiss.edu [9714]


• Freedom Riders: 1961 and the Struggle for Racial Justice, by Raymond Arsenault (690 pp., 2006), has been published by Oxford Univ. Press. The author, John Hope Franklin Professor of Southern History at the Univ. of South Florida, devoted 10 years to this remarkable treatment, which includes a 54-page Appendix, a Roster of Freedom Riders, providing, for each Rider, the names/demographics for each Rider, geography of origin, occupation or status, and, wherever available, follow-up details of the person’s post-Ride life, http://www.oup.com/ [9716]

• Hurricane Katrina: Response and Responsibilities, ed. John Brown Childs (182 pp., 2006, $10 — all proceeds to People’s Hurricane Relief Fund), has been published by New Pacific Press (204 Locust St., Santa Cruz, CA 95060). It consists of 31 short essays by a diverse group of contributors, among them: Bettina Aptheker, Grace Lee Boggs, Jeremy Brecher, David Cohen, Arnoldo Garcia, Michael Lerner and Wynton Marsalis, www.literaryguillotine.com/npp/nphome.html [9721]

• Come Hell or High Water: Hurricane Katrina and the Color of Disaster, by Michael Eric Dyson (258 pp., 2006, $23), has been published by Basic Civitas Books, http://www.basiccivitasbooks.com/ [9722]

• Free At Last? Black America in the 21st Century, eds. Juan Battle, Michael Bennett & Anthony Lemelle (287 pp., 2006), is available from Transaction Publishers. [9665]

• “Response to Legacies of Community Racial Violence in the South” is the subject of a 3-day conference at the Univ. of Mississippi, co-sponsored by The William Winter Institute, The Birmingham Pledge, & Southern Truth and Reconciliation, March 17-19, 2006. Inf. from The Winter Inst., 662/915-6734, wwirr@olemiss.edu [9715]

• “Rethinking the Discourse on Race: A Symposium on How the Lack of Racial Diversity in the Media Affects Justice & Policy,” sponsored by the Ronald H. Brown Ctr. for Civil Rights & Econ. Dev. of the St. Johns Univ. School of Law, will be held April 28-29, 2006 in NYC. Inf. from Prof. Leonard Baynes, baynesl@stjohns.edu. Proposal submission was Jan. 15 (but doesn’t harm to try): www.stjohns.edu/academics/graduate/law/prospective/RonBrown/racemedia/fo: [9672]

Poverty/Welfare

• The Cost of Being Poor: Poverty, Lead Poisoning, and Policy Implementation, by Jeanita W. Richardson (222 pp., 2005, $119.95), has been published by Greenwood Press, 800/225-5800, http://www
www.greenwood.com/ [9703]

- “Income of U.S. Workforce Projected to Decline If Education Doesn’t Improve” is an 8-page, Nov. 2005 report available (possibly free) from the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 152 N. Third St., #705, San Jose, CA 95112, 408/271-1699, http://www.highereducation.org/ [9710]


Community Organizing

- The National School for Strategic Organizing, run by the Labor/Community Strategy Ctr. in Los Angeles, is recruiting applicants for its new class (July 3-Dec. 19, 2006). Applications due by April 1; serious financial assistance available. Inf. from Tammy Bang Luu at the Ctr., 3780 Wilshire Blvd., #1200, LA, CA 90010, 213/387-2800, school@thestrategycenter.org, http://www.thestrategycenter.org/ [9675]

Criminal Justice


- “Sentencing with Discretion: Crack Cocaine Sentencing After Booker” is a Jan. 2006 report from The Sentencing Project, on the results of the Supreme Court’s 2005 decision striking down mandatory application of federal sentencing guidelines as unconstitutional (but keeping them intact by requiring that they be consulted in an advisory capacity). Available from the Project, 514 10th St. NW, #1000, Wash., DC 20004, 202/628-0871; downloadable at www.sentencingproject.org/pdfs/crackcocaine-afterbooker.pdf [9678]

Economic/Community Development


Education

- “Students on the Move,” by (PRRAC Director of Research) Chester Hartman, appeared in the February 2006 issue of Educational Leadership, the monthly magazine of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Copies of the 5-page article are available from the author at chartman@prrac.org, http://www.ascd.org/ [9699]


- Teaching for Change has available its 34-page Spring/Summer 2006 Catalogue of Resources (Pre-K through College) on Equity and Social Justice. Available from them at PO Box 73038, Wash., DC 20056-3038, 800/763-9131, http://www.teachingforchange.org/ [9713]

- “A Tale of Two Schools” (Sept. 2005) is a series of 12 district-specific reports, accompanied by a new web-based tool (hiddengap.org) “that provides hidden teacher-spending gap information for every school in California.” Available (no price listed) from Education Trust-West, 155 Grand Ave., #1025, Oakland, CA 94612, 510/465-6444, RAl@edtrustwest.org, http://www.edtrustwest.org/ [9718]

- “Residential Education: Policy and Practice” is the annual conf. of the Coalition for Residential Education, March 26-28, 2006 in DC. Inf. from the Coalition, 888 16th St. NW, #300, Wash., DC 20009, 202/496-9189, maura.boyce@gmail.com, http://www.residential.org [9707]

Employment/Jobs Policy


Environment

- “Thirsty for Justice: A People’s Blueprint for California Water” (132 pp., June 2005) is available (no price listed) from Environmental Justice Coalition for Water, 654 13th St., Preservation Park, Oakland, CA 94610, 510/286-8400. A 20-page companion piece, Community Perspectives, containing case studies and community water demands, is available as well — in Spanish and
English, www.ejcw.org/blueprint.html [9709]


**Food/Nutrition/Hunger**


**Health**

- “Housing is the Foundation of HIV Prevention and Treatment,” a 16-page, 2005 paper from the National AIDS Housing Coalition, is available (possibly free) from Nancy Bernstine at the Coalition, 1518 K St. NW, Wash., DC 20005, 202/347-0333, nahc@nationalaidshousing.org, http://www.nationalaidshousing.org/ [9728]

- **Journal of Health Care for the Poor & Underserved** is a quarterly peer-reviewed journal from Meharry Medical College. Subs. are $25 students, $62 indivs., $295 insts. from Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, PO Box 19966, Baltimore, MD 21211-0966, 800/548-1784, www.press.jhu/journals [9767]

**Housing**

- “2005 State of Metropolitan [Louisville] Housing Report” (22 pp.) is available (possibly free) from the Metropolitan Housing Coalition, PO Box 4533, Louisville, KY 40204, 502/584-6858, http://www.metropolitanhousing.org/ [9701]

- “Life Together: How Housing Laws Define American Families,” by Frank S. Alexander, a 20-page, Feb. 2005 pamphlet, is available (likely free) from Prof. Alexander, Emory University School of Law, 1301 Clifton Rd., Atlanta, GA 30322-2770, 404/712-8815, falexander@law.emory.edu [9702]


- “Affordable Housing Trust Funds” a (2005?) Fannie Mae Foundation Issue Brief, is available at www.knowledgeplex.org/wp/new_content/policy_brief/reftables/ahtf_brief.pdf [9711]

- “Rural Housing Goes Green” is the theme of the Fall 2005 issue of Rural Voices, the quarterly magazine of The Housing Assistance Council. The 33-page issue has 8 articles on the subject. Copies available (possibly free) from HAC, 1025 Vermont Ave. NW, #606, Wash., DC 20005, 202/842-8600, hac@ ruralhome.org, http://www.ruralhome.org/ [9717]


**Rural**


**Miscellaneous**


- “The 9/11 Project: A collaborative project to represent families of victims of the World Trade Ctr. attacks on Sept. 11, 2001” (2005) is available (likely free) from the coordinating org., NY Lawyers for the Public Interest, 151 W. 30 St., NYC, NY 10001, http://www.nylpi.org/ [9688]

**Job Opportunities/Fellowships/Grants**

- **Child Trends** is seeing a new President/CEO. It’s a DC-based “independent, nonparti-
san research org. with an exclusive focus on children & the improvement of their well-being.” Staff of 50, $6.5 mil. annual budget. Ltr./resume (right away) to jjackson@childtrends.org [9695]

• Sargent Shriver Natl. Ctr. on Poverty Law is seeking a half-time Staff Atty./Legal Editor for Clearinghouse Review: Journal of Poverty Law and Policy. Org. is in Chicago, but telecommute relationship acceptable.

Ltr./resume/short writing sample to Ilze Hirsh at the Ctr., 50 E. Washington St., #500, Chicago, IL 60602, ilzechirsh@povertylaw.org [9696]

• The Labor Community Strategy Center is seeking an Office Manager. Ltr./resume/names&phone# of 3 profl. refs. to Geoff Ray at the Center, 3780 Wilshire Blvd., #1200, LA, CA 90010, fax: 213/387-2800, geoff@thestrategycenter.org [9727]
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