

Poverty & Race

POVERTY & RACE RESEARCH ACTION COUNCIL

May/June 1995

Volume 4: Number 3

Affirmative Action: A Roundtable

The focus of this May/June issue of P&R is affirmative action. The news is far from good, as we all know: a reactionary initiative headed for the California ballot (with nearly universal predictions that it will pass—and, like Proposition 187, it may become the harbinger of similar measures in other states); President Clinton's "top to bottom" review; defection of liberal Democratic Senators like Joseph Lieberman of Connecticut; upcoming reviews by the Supreme Court and other judicial

bodies; a Justice Department "show" suit accusing Illinois State University of discriminating against white males; loaded Congressional hearings; dismaying poll results (often a function of biased wording); irresponsible media coverage (such as the "No White Men Need Apply" US News cover). The list goes on and on.

Rather than our usual practice of commissioning commentaries, we opted for excerpting already published pieces, since so much good writing has recently

appeared on our side of the issue. (We also have listed on page 10 a selection of other studies and articles for further reference. Additional suggestions are welcome, as we plan to publish a supplementary list in the July/ August P&R.)

We likely will keep the discussion going in our next issue. So, as usual, we solicit your comments and will publish as many as possible.

Affirmative action is of course linked to other issues that have been the subject of recent newsletters: reparations (what distinctions, if any, should be made between remedying past injustices vs. focussing on current injustices?); racial/ethnic categories (how to reconcile the multiracialism question

(Please turn to page 2)

Let's get serious about money. In the last issue of *P&R*, we printed the names of the 400+ persons who have contributed to keep our newsletter going. While we're really grateful for their support, that leaves some 7,000 of you who get *P&R*, presumably value it (at least that's what all our feedback tells us), yet have not dipped into your pockets to help cover our costs.

We're under some pressure to make *P&R* a subscription publication, rather than free. I can't tell you how much I don't want to do that. But one of our two largest funders has just let us know they will be giving us one more close-out grant, which puts great pressure on us to bring in more revenue. We're a small operation—just four of us—and most of the foundation funds we receive go right out the door again in the form of the social science research grants we make to support advocacy work against poverty and racism.

It costs us about \$7000 an issue in hard costs (layout, printing, postage)—not including our own in-house labor (typesetting as well as all the editorial work). That's ca. \$42,000 a year—and going up, as our circulation constantly increases (to say nothing of postal rates and paper costs).

If everyone kicked in about \$6 a year, we'd cover costs. Not everyone will do that, of course. But we do hope to hear from more than the 400+ people who have already generously contributed. PLEASE—use the Business Reply Envelope attached inside (with your own stamp, if possible—76¢ of your contribution now goes to the PO when they process BREs) to send us \$25 or more. Thank you.

Chester Hartman
Executive Director

CONTENTS:

Affirmative Action: ...	1-10
William L. Taylor	
Roger Wilkins	
Charles Moskos	
Maxine Waters	
Salim Muwakkil	
et al.	
Doubled-up Families ...	11
Why Not Democracy? ...	13
PRRAC Grantee Final Reports	15
PRRAC Update	16
Advocacy Updates	17
Resources	19

(ROUNDTABLE: Continued from page 1)

with enforcement of affirmative action guidelines?); the "permanent racism" thesis (what is the most we can expect from even an effective affirmative action program?); Bell Curve thinking (how

does the new "scientific racism" intersect with the move on affirmative action?)

What is most important is to bring to bear facts to this emotional and highly politicized debate. Most of the studies lend support to affirmative action, but we need more research, focussed on the

questions that arise most frequently in the political arena. And we should be demanding that the other side produce facts and statistics to back their assertions. It's an argument we can win. But it will take both solid information and good strategy.

Affirmative Action: The Questions To Be Asked

by William L. Taylor

... The questions to be asked include the following: Has affirmative action worked? Is affirmative action still needed? Is affirmative action unfair to others; does it undermine the merit principle? Are the social costs of affirmative action too high? What would be the cost to society of abandoning affirmative action?

Has Affirmative Action Worked?

... Much evidence shows that affirmative action is one of a cluster of national policies that enabled minorities and women to make substantial economic and educational gains during the 1970s and 1980s. These gains have occurred across the spectrum of occupations—in police and fire departments and other public service occupations, in manufacturing and trucking, in the construction trades, in service occupations, in managerial positions and in the professions ...

For example, in police departments, the numbers of black police officers went from 23,796 in 1970 to 63,355 in 1990. Black representation in fire departments rose from 2.5% in 1960 to 11.5% in 1990....

Black representation also increased dramatically in other key industries during the period 1970-90. For example, the number of electricians went from 14,145 to 43,275; bank tellers from 10,633 to 46,332; health officials from 3,914 to 13,125; and pharmacists from 2,501 to 7,011....

There can also be little question that affirmative action policies of colleges and universities and the creation of more minority scholarship opportunities, along with federal programs providing greater access for low-income students to institutions of higher education through loans and Pell grants, have played a large role in the major increases in minority college enrollment that we saw during the 1970s and 1980s....

A recent RAND Corporation study—*Student Achievement and the Changing American Family*, Kirby, Berends and Williamson (1994)—reports that the largest gains in student performance in elementary and secondary schools from 1970 to 1990 were made by minority students. Indeed, according to this study and others, 40% or more of the academic gap between black and white youngsters was closed during this period.

That is remarkable progress. Among the contributing factors, according to the RAND study, is the fact that the number of black parents with college degrees or experience quadrupled during the two decades, so that now about 25% of black parents have college

degrees or experience. (Hispanic-American parents have made similar, although less dramatic, educational gains.) The occupational and income gains made by black parents during this period have also contributed to the formation of stable, middle-class families and to the achievement gains of children. Affirmative action has played an important role in all this....

We should not fail to note that the RAND study and others like it provide powerful evidence that affirmative action policies do not dilute the merit principle. As the achievement gap between minorities and whites is closed, what we are witnessing is increased productivity for individuals and for the nation.

Is Affirmative Action Still Needed?

While affirmative action has contributed significantly to a closing of the gap attributable to discrimination, minorities and women still face barriers in seeking jobs, education and housing. Evidence of the continuing legacy of discrimination can be seen in the number of employment discrimination complaints filed at the Equal Opportunity Commission (over 91,000 last year); the litany of Justice Department cases cited by Assistant Attorney General Deval Patrick in his testimony before the House Subcommittee on Employer-Employee Relations last month; the testing studies conducted by the Urban Institute and the Fair Employment Council of Greater Washington summarizing the overall prevalence of discrimination encountered by minority job seekers; and the con-

Poverty & Race (ISSN 1075-3591) is published six times a year by the Poverty & Race Research Action Council, 1711 Conn Ave NW, #207, Washington, DC 20009, 202/387-9887, fax: 202/387-0764. Chester Hartman, Editor; Catherine M. Dom, Editorial Assistant. There is no charge for the newsletter, but donations are encouraged. Articles, article suggestions and general comments are welcome, as are notices of publications, conferences, job openings, etc. for our Resources Section. Articles generally may be reprinted, providing PRAC gives advance permission.

clusions of the Glass Ceiling Commission's report, which include, among other things, finding that 97% of senior managers at Fortune 1000 industrial corporations are white males, and that only 5% of senior management at industrial and service companies are women, virtually all of them white.... [see box, page 10]

Is Affirmative Action Unfair to Others?

The notion that affirmative action somehow constitutes "reverse discrimination" ignores the fact that courts have taken pains to balance competing interests in shaping affirmative action remedies. The rules of affirmative action have been worked out over two decades, and the parameters of the policy have been set by the Burger and Rehnquist courts....

Evidence of misapplication of the policy is minimal (as is demonstrated by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's data that only 1.7% of race-based charges received by the EEOC are made by white males filing on the basis of race, as well as by the recent study of court cases and other data conducted by Professor Alfred Blumrosen of Rutgers, which found that "reverse discrimination" cases accounted for a tiny percentage of some 3,000 reported employment discrimination cases between 1990 and 1994), and certainly is not cause to junk the policy.

What Would Be the Cost to Society of Abandoning Affirmative Action?

Abandoning affirmative action policy is bound to do damage to the economic status of minorities and women.... Abandoning affirmative action would also likely divide us even more into a society of "haves" and "have nots."

Certainly we all aspire to become a "color-blind" society in which judgments are made, in Dr. King's memorable phrase, on the contents of one's

character rather than the color of one's skin. But who in this room or this Congress or this nation can say with a straight face that we have reached the point in our society where the great bulk of our citizens are color-blind, where race does not matter, where children do not suffer disadvantage because of their race or national origin?

If we cannot truthfully make these statements, then abolishing or curtailing affirmative action would be akin to

throwing away one of the major cures while allowing the disease to continue unchecked.

William L. Taylor, a PRRAC Board member, has served as a civil rights lawyer in one capacity or another ever since he joined Thurgood Marshall's staff at the NAACP Legal Defense Fund 40 years ago. The above remarks are excerpted from his testimony before the House Subcommittee on the Constitution, April 3, 1995. □

Racism Has Its Privileges

by Roger Wilkins

...Affirmative action, as I understand it, was not designed to punish anyone; it was, rather—as a result of a clear-eyed look at how America actually works—an attempt to enlarge opportunity for *everybody*. As amply documented in the 1968 Kerner Commission report on racial disorders, when left to their own devices, American institutions in such areas as college admissions, hiring decisions and loan approvals had been making choices that discriminated against blacks. That discrimination, which flowed from doing what came naturally, hurt more than blacks: It hurt the entire nation, as the riots of the late 1960s demonstrated. Though the Kerner report focused on blacks, similar findings could have been made about other minorities and women.

Affirmative action required institutions to develop plans enabling them to go beyond business as usual and search for qualified people in places where they did not ordinarily conduct their searches or their business. Affirmative action programs generally require some proof that there has been a good-faith effort to follow the plan and numerical guidelines against which to judge the sincerity and the success of the effort. The idea of affirmative action is *not* to force people into positions for which they are unqualified but to encourage institutions to develop realistic criteria for the enterprise at hand and then to find a reasonably diverse mix of people qualified to be engaged in it. Without

the requirements calling for plans, good-faith efforts and the setting of broad numerical goals, many institutions would do what they had always done: assert that they had looked but "couldn't find anyone qualified," and then go out and hire the white man they wanted to hire in the first place.

Affirmative action has done wonderful things for the United States by enlarging opportunity and developing and utilizing a far broader array of the skills available in the American population than in the past. It has not outlived its usefulness. It was never designed to be a program to eliminate poverty. It has not always been used wisely, and some of its permutations do have to be reconsidered, refined or, in some cases, abandoned. It is not a quota program, and those cases where rigid numbers are used (except under a court or administrative order after a specific finding of discrimination) are a bastardization of an otherwise highly beneficial set of public policies.

President Clinton is right to review what is being done under present laws and to express a willingness to eliminate activities that either don't work or are unfair. Any program that has been in place for thirty years should be reviewed. Getting rid of what doesn't work is both good government and good politics. Gross abuses of affirmative action provide ammunition for its opponents and undercut the moral

(Please turn to page 4)

(PRIVILEGES: Continued from page 3)

authority of the entire effort. But the President should retain—and strengthen where required—those programs necessary to enlarge social justice....

Uses of the Past

It goes without saying... that blacks and whites remember America differently. The past is hugely important, since we argue a lot about who we are on the basis of who we think we have been, and we derive much of our sense of the future from how we think we've done in the past. In a nation in which few people know much history, these are perilous arguments, because in such a vacuum, people tend to weave historical fables tailored to their political or psychic needs.

Blacks are still recovering the story of their role in America, which so many white historians simply ignored or told in ways that made black people ashamed. But in a culture that batters us, learning the real history is vital in helping blacks feel fully human. It also helps us understand just how deeply American we are, how richly we have given, how much has been taken from us and how much has yet to be restored. Supporters of affirmative action believe that broad and deep damage has been done to American culture by racism and sexism over the whole course of American history and that they are still powerful forces today. We believe that minorities and women are still disadvantaged in our highly competitive society and that affirmative action is absolutely necessary to level the playing field....

The Politics of Denial

The fact is that the successful public relations assault on affirmative action flows on a river of racism that is as broad, powerful and American as the Mississippi. And, like the Mississippi, racism can be violent and deadly and is a permanent feature of American life. But while nobody who is sane denies the reality of the Mississippi, millions of Americans who are deemed sane—some

of whom are powerful and some even thought wise—deny, wholly or in part, that racism exists....

One of the best examples of denial was provided recently by the nation's most famous former history professor, House Speaker Newt Gingrich. According to *The Washington Post*, "Gingrich dismissed the argument that the beneficiaries of affirmative action, commonly African Americans, have been subjected to discrimination over a period of centuries. 'That is true of virtually every American,' Gingrich said, noting that the Irish were discriminated against by the English, for example."

That is breathtaking stuff coming from somebody who should know that blacks have been on this North American continent for 375 years and that for 245 the country permitted slavery. Gingrich should also know that for the next hundred years we had legalized subordination of blacks, under a suffocating blanket of condescension and frequently enforced by nightriding terrorists. We've had only thirty years of something else.... For a historian to assert that "virtually every American" shares the history I have just outlined comes very close to lying.

Denial of racism is much like the denials that accompany addictions to alcohol, drugs or gambling. It is probably not stretching the analogy too much to suggest that many racist whites are so addicted to their unwarranted privileges and so threatened by the prospect of losing them that all kinds of defenses become acceptable, including insistent distortions of reality in the form of hypocrisy, lying or the most outrageous political demagoguery....

The United States is not now and probably never will be a color-blind society. It is the most color-conscious society on earth. Over the course of 375 years, whites have given blacks absolutely no reason to believe that they can behave in a color-blind manner....

While I don't hold the view that all blacks who behave badly are blameless victims of a brutal system, I do believe that many poor blacks have, indeed, been brutalized by our culture, and I know of no blacks, rich or poor, who who haven't been hurt in some measure by the racism in this country. The current mood (and, in some cases like the Speaker's, the cultivated ignorance) completely ignores the fact that some blacks never escaped the straight line of oppression that ran from slavery through the semislavery of sharecropping to the late mid-century migration from Southern farms into isolated pockets of urban poverty. Their families have always been excluded, poor and without skills, and so they were utterly defenseless when the enormous American economic dislocations that began in the mid-1970s slammed into their communities, followed closely by deadly waves of crack cocaine. One would think that the double-digit unemployment suffered consistently over the past two decades by blacks who were looking for work would be a permanent feature of the discussions about race, responsibility, welfare and rights.

Angry White Males

But a discussion of the huge numbers of black workers who are becom-

"To my mind there is only one way to moral authority for those of us who want affirmative action done away with: to ask that discrimination by race, gender or ethnicity be a criminal offense, not just civil. If someone can go to jail for stealing my car stereo, he ought to do considerably more time for stifling my livelihood and well-being by discriminating against me.... [In a society like ours, discrimination is the greatest and most disruptive social evil. In a multiracial democracy of individuals, you have to make it a felony.]"

Excerpted from "Affirmative Action Must Go," by Shelby Steele, *The New York Times*, March 1, 1993.

ing economically redundant would raise difficult questions about the efficiency of the economy at a time when millions of white men feel insecure. Any honest appraisal of unemployment would reveal that millions of low-skilled white men were being severely damaged by corporate and Federal Reserve decisions; it might also refocus the anger of those whites in the middle ranks whose careers have been shattered by the corporate downsizing fad....

[In a society that,] from the beginning of the Republic, [has] been taught that skin color is destiny and that whiteness is to be revered.... it is understandable that white males would take their pre-

ferences as a matter of natural right and consider any alteration of that a primal offense. But a nation that operates in that way abandons its soul and its economic strength, and will remain mired in ugliness and moral squalor because so many people are excluded from the possibility of decent lives and from forming any sense of community with the rest of society....

Though the centuries of cultural preference enjoyed by white males still overwhelmingly skew power and wealth their way, we have in fact achieved a more meritocratic society as a result of affirmative action than we have ever previously enjoyed in this country.

If we want to continue making things

better in this society, we'd better figure out ways to protect and defend affirmative action against the confused, the frightened, the manipulators and, yes, the liars in politics, journalism, education and wherever else they may be found. In the name of longstanding American prejudice and myths and in the service of their own narrow interests, power-lusts or blindness, they are truly victimizing the rest of us, perverting the ideals they claim to stand for and destroying the nation they pretend to serve.

Excerpted from The Nation, March 27, 1995. □

Affirmative Action: The Army's Success . . .

by Charles Moskos

...There is an institution where affirmative action works and works well—the U.S. Army. Not that the Army is a racial Utopia by any means. But nowhere else in American society has racial integration gone as far or has black achievement been so pronounced. Indeed, the Army is the only institution in America where whites are routinely bossed around by blacks.

Affirmative action has been crucial in bringing about this positive state of affairs. It has also been key in our military's unquestioned effectiveness. What then can we learn from the Army's affirmative action program?

The first lesson is that affirmative action in the Army eschews quotas but does have goals. Guidelines for Army promotion boards are to select minority members equivalent to the percentage in the promotion pool. This means that the Army promotion process is based not on the number of minority members in the Army, but on the number of minority members in the pool of potential promotees to the next higher rank. Very important, there are no "time-tables" to meet goals.

The process goes like this. The board takes into consideration past assignments, evaluation ratings, education

and promotability to the next higher level after the one under consideration. The strongest candidates are eliminated quickly; so are the weakest ones. In reality, goals become operative only in the gray middle. As one well-informed white officer said: "Only fully qualified people are promoted, but not necessarily the best-qualified. But don't forget, we are talking micromillimeter differences in these cases."

There is no denying that pressure to meet the goals is strong. If the goal is not met, the board must defend its decisions. If this looks like a quota by another name, think again. The number of blacks who are promoted from captain to major, a virtual prerequisite for an officer seeking an Army career, is usually below the goal. Why this is so is a matter of debate and Army heartburn. The most plausible explanation for the shortfall is that a disproportionate number of black officers do not possess the writing and communication skills for promotion to staff jobs. In all other ranks, including colonel through general officers, promotions show little racial difference.

One other remark on the "goals vs. quota" distinction. The military has no hint of two promotion lists, whites

being compared only with whites, blacks with blacks. All candidates are held to the same standards.

Maintenance of standards may cause short-term turmoil, as it did in the Army in the 1970s, but it also means that those who attain senior positions are fully qualified. Also important, those blacks promoted have self-confidence that makes them the strongest defenders of standards for their own black subordinates. The Army, by taking the heat early on, reduced its troubles later. An organi-

(Please turn to page 6)

"The American dream may not be as easy for some to pursue as for others. White women and minorities make up over half the workforce and while my opposition to the notion of quotas could not be stronger, you do not have to be a brain surgeon to deduce that something is wrong out there."

Sen. Robert Dole, 1991, quoted by Nina Totenberg, "Weekend Edition," National Public Radio, March 18, 1995.

(ARMY: Continued from page 5)

zation that promotes less highly qualified people to buy temporary peace only invites long-term disaffection.

Although affirmative action in the Army is not without its tensions, it is not a prescription for loss of self-esteem by blacks or resentment by whites. No identifiable group of underqualified minority members occupies positions of authority in the Army. The military does not elaborately disguise its goals or its methods of attaining them, because it does not have to deal with the situation that drives quota systems in civilian institutions: a dearth of qualified blacks.

This brings us to another lesson: A level playing field is not always enough. The Army shows how youths from diverse backgrounds can be made to meet uniform and demanding standards. The Army has successfully introduced programs to bring young people up to enlistment standards, to raise enlisted soldiers up to noncommissioned officer standards, to bring black undergraduates up to officer commissioning standards and to raise high school graduates up to West Point admission standards. These programs are not exclusively targeted on minority soldiers, but they are disproportionately Afro-American. These programs cost money and require a significant commitment of resources.

The objective should always be to prepare members of a historically disadvantaged population to compete on an equal footing with the more privileged. Good affirmative action acknowledges that compensatory action may be needed to help members of disadvantaged groups to meet the standards of competition. Bad affirmative action suspends those standards.

So what finally can be transferred from the Army? Maybe a broad lesson: Affirmative action can do what it is supposed to do when there is an unambiguous guarantee of equal opportunity, clear standards of performance and a commitment to raise people to meet those standards.

Excerpted from *The Washington Post*, March 15, 1995. □

Affirmative Action: Why Bosses Like It

Corning, a small town in upstate New York, used to be about as multicultural as an episode of "I Love Lucy." In the past decade, however, it has made enormous efforts to immerse itself in the melting pot, getting hooked up to a black-oriented cable channel, bringing in a black hairdressing business (which has recently decamped) and instituting a "diversity awareness" program in the local schools.

All this was the work of the town's biggest employer, the eponymously named Corning, a technology company. When James Houghton became chairman in 1983, he made workforce diversity one of the company's top three priorities (the other two were total quality and a higher return on equity). The company has made every effort to recruit people from minority groups, forming close relations with organizations such as the National Black MBA Association and even linking managers' bonuses to diversity targets.

But it has been discovered that affirmative action is not enough if the people you have carefully hired and expensively trained decide to leave. So the company has also gone out of its way to make minorities feel at home, providing them with "mentors," putting all managers through "sensitivity training" (one and a half days for gender awareness, two and a half for racial awareness), and celebrating diversity in its in-house newspaper.

Corning is not alone in its enthusiasm for such things. Avon Products, a cosmetics company, has set up a "multicultural participation counsel" to encourage diversity among employees. Xerox Corporation, an office-equipment maker, regards affirmative action as "a corporate value, a management priority and a formal business objective" (in the words of its former chairman, David Keams) and has set employment targets for women and minorities throughout the company.

Digital Equipment Corp., a computer company, has established a Valuing Differences program, which

sponsors cultural events, such as Black History Month, and encourages workers to form small discussion groups to help them "confront their prejudices." Many companies send employees to the American Institute for Managing Diversity, based at Morehouse College in Atlanta, to have their consciences raised on matters multicultural.

Even Wall Street is catching political correctness. Firms that win Department of Labor awards for their success in implementing affirmative action are rewarded with a boost in their share price within ten days of the announcement, according to an article in the current issue of the *Academy of Management Journal*. Press disclosures that firms discriminate against women or minorities soon result in a fall in the share price.

So far as many businesses are concerned, multiculturalism is not just a moral matter. White males already make up a minority of the workforce, and 85% of new recruits between now and 2000 will be women or non-white men. So firms with a good track record of producing non-white managers and managing people from different backgrounds will enjoy a growing advantage in recruiting and motivating workers. They may also be more attuned to an increasingly diverse population of customers. Equally, firms which continue to favor white men will find themselves fishing in a shrinking pool of potential employees.

Most intriguingly, ethnic diversity may help American firms outperform their rivals abroad. In particular, it is becoming an article of faith in American business schools that heterogeneous firms will be better placed to form global alliances and strike international deals than the Japanese, who tend to reserve real power for themselves, or the Europeans, with their history of colonial entanglements.

Reprinted from *The Economist*, March 11, 1995. □

Scapegoating

by Maxine Waters

...This [California anti-affirmative action] initiative is a product of a climate that has nothing to do with affirmative action *per se*. Unemployment is still high in California. Many manufacturing jobs have fled to Third World countries in search of cheap labor. We've been buffeted by fires and floods and quakes.

Governor Pete Wilson and others are telling white males who are working people that Blacks, Latinos, women, etc. are taking away their jobs, their businesses, their admission to higher education.

That's easier than explaining to working people about economic policies that have shifted good-paying American jobs overseas, rewarded financial speculation over real investment in jobs,

and caused working people's incomes to stagnate or decline. There's a word for this. It's called scapegoating....

White males make up one-third of America. Yet, white males constitute 80% of the membership in the House of Representatives, 92% of the Senate, 92% of the Fortune 500 senior executives, 67% of the Supreme Court, 80% of tenured university faculty and 90% of newspaper editors. Given these numbers, can anyone tell me how white males are being put upon by affirmative action?...

In fact, even white males have a stake in affirmative action. They have wives, daughters, mothers and others who are in the workforce, making money to pay the mortgage. Without affirmative action, those women would have less

opportunity and bring home less pay....

There is already too much political posturing in the debate about affirmative action. I do not support wide-ranging, ill-defined reviews. All this talk about "reviews" signals that perhaps something is wrong and needs to be "fixed." I do not want people starting with the idea something is wrong before first understanding what affirmative action is and is not.

Excerpted from Statement by Congresswoman Maxine Waters (D-CA) prepared for the Congressional Black Caucus Brown Bag on Affirmative Action, March 16, 1995, Washington, DC. Rep. Waters is Co-Chair of the Affirmative Action Task Force of the Congressional Black Caucus. □

The Presumption of Stupidity: Affirmative Action, Occupational Apartheid

by Brent Staples

.... It is absurd to argue, as many critics do, that affirmative action has placed African-Americans under suspicion of incompetence, by propelling them into positions they do not rightly deserve. Bred into this country's bones, the presumption that blacks are inherently less "qualified" would be a driving force in any case. An alternative view of affirmative action is that it breaks down occupational apartheid, the notion that elite jobs are for white folks only. The process is wrenching, but how could it be otherwise?...

In high school, I was an average student, with no plans for college. Providence appeared in the form of a professor from Widener University who talked me into going to college one afternoon on a street corner. I was accepted without S.A.T.'s, but took them for ceremonial purposes. My scores were unimpressive, and the college was right not to care. Often the

scores tell more about privilege than about "merit" or potential to succeed. I graduated 26th in a class of 370 at Widener, well ahead of many white prep-school kids who had done well on the S.A.T.'s. This black boy who was "not college material" went on to earn a Ph.D. at the University of Chicago.

There are thousands of stories like this one. But in the Reaganaut 80's, many African-Americans who could tell those stories became converts to the gospel of Horatio Alger, suddenly claiming that success had been earned through hard work and rectitude

alone. Poverty, they say, stems from sloth and moral laxness. The convert's role I will never play.

When I was 17, the society spotted me a few points on the S.A.T.'s and changed my life. I became a writer—and a middle-class taxpayer—as many other black men went on to prisons, cemeteries and homeless shelters. Sounds like a small investment to me. The country would be wise to keep making it.

Excerpted from Editorial Notebook, New York Times, March 5, 1995. □

"Blacks are such a small fraction of the population that the lost opportunities to white men are really minuscule," said Barbara R. Bergmann, an economics professor at The American University in Washington.
The New York Times, March 6, 1995.

Affirmative Action, by Another Name

by Steven A. Holmes

Editor's note: A recent ruling by Federal Judge Stanley Sporkin, a Reagan appointee, dismissing an out-of-court settlement designed to forestall prosecution of the Microsoft Corp. on antitrust charges, brought forth this interesting analogy.

"Simply telling a defendant to go forth and sin no more does little or nothing to address the unfair advantage it has already gained," Judge Sporkin said recently, in declaring that the settlement did little to help Microsoft's competitors catch up. They had been the victims of what the Justice Department said was Microsoft's anti-competitive practices.

Substitute the words "white males" for Microsoft and "minorities and women" for its competitors, and the judge's words sound remarkably similar to a rationale for affirmative action.

"If you look at it in a broad sense, in terms of a remedy, there are similarities," said David Neely, assistant dean of the John Marshall Law School in Chicago. "The legal definition of affirmative action is a remedy for an illegal act—discrimination."

... [O]ne little-noticed fact in the current debate: many of the principles underlying affirmative action, including the use of quotas, have been ac-

cepted in spheres outside the volatile world of race and sex relations without a peep from conservatives.

Take, for example, the concept of compensation for past injustices. There is the Government's payment of \$1.2 billion to the families of Japanese-Americans who spent World War II in internment. The payment to the Japanese also affirmed the notion of the sons paying for the sins of the fathers. Nearly one-third of those who paid taxes last year, and therefore contributed to the reparations payments, were born after World War II. They could not have supported the Government's policy of putting Japanese-Americans in prison camps.

And what of quotas? In 1986, the Reagan Administration negotiated a trade agreement with Japan under which that country set a goal of American manufacturers gaining 20 percent of Japan's market in computer chips. The policy, though highly contentious, is still in force. Yet conservatives, who are often backers of free trade, saying purchasing decisions should be made solely on quality and merit, have generally not criticized the deal as a manipulation of the market.

The computer chips agreement is rare in international trade negotiations—as are rigid quotas in affirmative

"I suspect that it would be impossible to arrange an affirmative action program in a racially neutral way and have it successful. To ask that this be so is to demand the impossible. In order to get beyond racism, we must first take account of race. There is no other way. And in order to treat some persons equally, we must treat them differently. We cannot—we dare not—let the Equal Protection Clause perpetuate racial supremacy."

United States Supreme Court Justice Harry Blackmun, University of California Regents v. Bakke, 1978.

action. But the use of numerical goals to measure the success of opening the Japanese market to American goods and services is not. In recent rounds of trade talks the Japanese have agreed to the use of certain goals like increasing the number of foreign bidders for government procurement contracts or raising the number of American car dealerships in Japan.

Such actions—which encourage the diversification of the Japanese market and the use of numerical goals to determine whether a good faith effort is being made—are the staples of much of affirmative action policy....

Excerpted from "Washington Talk," New York Times, March 10, 1995. □

"The fact is, to eradicate the opportunity-diminishing effects of poverty, we would have to eradicate poverty itself. Affirmative action is thus a good example of the right hand not caring what the left hand is doing: American society generates inequality in every conceivable way, which affirmative action then palliates for a handful of lucky people."

Excerpted from "Subject to Debate," by Katha Pollitt, The Nation, April 24, 1995.



Reaffirm the Affirmative

by Max Frankel

... To reward people for something beyond merit is as American as apple pie. Universities routinely bend a bit to admit the children of alumni, acknowledging with a wink that this fosters loyalty and annual contributions. Few objected when "diversity" in a Northern college meant saving a few places for Southern or Western students. If Californians don't watch the language of that amendment they could end up sinking their best college teams; how else but by "affirmative action" do they recruit so many black athletes and favor them with "set aside" scholarships.

Many enterprises, including this newspaper, favor the rapid rise of the boss's kids, tapping their devotion to the business. Immigrants have always acted affirmatively to help their own advance in certain lines of work—Irish cops, Italian truckers, Jewish peddlers, Portuguese fishermen, Chinese laundrers, Korean grocers. And politicians practiced affirmative action long before they had a name for it; no Voting Rights Act was needed 50 years ago to persuade New York Democrats to nominate a Vincent Impellitteri and a Lazarus Joseph to share the ticket with a William O'Dwyer....

Excerpted from the New York Times Magazine, February 26, 1995. □

Have You Moved?

If so, please let us know so we can update our mailing list. This will help PRRAC save money on postage costs (your newsletter does not get forwarded to your new address; we pay for it to be returned to us).

Thank you!

A 32-page report prepared for [Senator Majority Leader Robert J.] Dole by the Congressional Research Service released this week lists close to 160 such policies [granting preferences to individuals on the basis of race, sex, national origin or ethnic background] throughout the federal government....

But most of the federal programs, executive orders and regulations listed in the report to Dole do not contain such numerical requirements [quotas].

Rather, the policies more often talk of goals and incentives for providing minorities and women opportunity—using such language as "encourage," "positive efforts" and "to the extent practicable."

Excerpted from "Rights Debate: Both Side Uneasy," by Kevin Merida, The Washington Post, Feb. 23, 1995.

Affirmative Action, R.I.P.

by Salim Muwakkil

Affirmative action, as we have known it, is probably dead. Good riddance. For the past quarter of a century, many blacks have looked to affirmative action, despite its shortcomings, as a symbol of America's long-denied promise of racial equality.

But its original purpose, as a means to help compensate African-Americans for slavery and its racist legacy, has long since been lost. With affirmative action's racial aspects toned down for the consumption of white voters, it has become less a hand-up for poor blacks than a stepladder to the middle class for many white American families....

The original purpose of affirmative action policies was to chip away at race-specific disparities between black and white Americans. But according to most studies,... the major beneficiaries of these policies have been white women....

By de-emphasizing affirmative action's racial aspects, liberals succeeded in making the programs more palatable but less effective. The raging right-wingers who have seized control of Congress have no intention of making it either more effective or more palatable; they have targeted it for death....

The notion of legislative recompense for racial injustice was never wildly popular in a land so steeped in traditions of white supremacy, but national leaders 30 years ago at least understood the need for compensatory justice. Of course,

their motives were not entirely pure.

During the '60s, when federal programs were first designed to "take affirmative action to overcome the effects of prior discrimination," American cities were going up in smoke. From 1964 to 1969, some 65 U.S. cities exploded in violent upheavals. Aside from the toll in lives and property, the situation was bad for business. Studies assessing the violence found that racist hiring policies had been a precipitating factor. Affirmative action was born in that smoke-charred climate.

The policy's Democratic architects were praised for devising a relatively innocuous way to redistribute some of the United States' maldistributed wealth. Support for the policies was bipartisan; during a time of economic expansion, most Americans thought the measures deserved a try....

The concept of affirmative action essentially is a euphemism for reparations, and this point is lost when its advocates urge its expansion across race lines. African-Americans were deeply damaged by the institution of slavery; indeed, they were created by slavery.

Until this society understands the need to devote itself to repairing that damage, it seems certain that we will continue to drift from crisis to crisis, until we reach one too many.

Excerpted from In These Times, March 20, 1995. □

Useful Resources on Affirmative Action

Please send us additional items (or references thereto) for listing in our next issue.

- "History of Affirmative Action," Ch. 1 of the 1984 Citizens' Commn. on Civil Rights study, *Affirmative Action to Open the Doors of Job Opportunity: A Policy of Fairness & Compassion That Has Worked*. 36 pp., available from the Commn., 2000 M St. NW, #400, Wash., DC 20036, 202/659-5565. The Commission is currently preparing an updated study of affirmative action; contact them for information.
- Affirmative Action in the 1990s: Staying the Course," by William L. Taylor & Susan M. Liss, *Annals, Amer. Academy of Pol. & Social Science*, Sept. 1992 (8 pp.). Available from the Citizens' Commn. on Civil Rights (see item above).
- "Newsroom Guide to Civil Rights," by David Anderson—a project of the Citizens' Commn. on Civil Rights (ca. 150 pp., 1994). \$10.45 from the Communications Consortium Media Ctr., 1333 H St. NW, #700, Wash., DC 20005, 202/682-1270.
- *Clear and Convincing Evidence: Measurement of Discrimination in America*, eds. Michael Fix & Raymond Struyk (Urban Institute, 1993).
- "Summary of FEC Testing Studies" (4 pp.), available (likely free) from the Fair Employment Council of Gtr. Wash., 1300 19th St. NW, #320, Wash., DC 20036, 202/463-7088. The full copies of the studies summarized are available from FEC.
- Joleen Kirschenman & Kathryn Neckerman, "'We'd Love to Hire Them, But...': The Meaning of Race for Employers," in *The Urban Underclass*, eds. Christopher Jencks & Paul Peterson (The Brookings Institution, 1991), pp. 203-232.
- *Good for Business: Making Full Use of the Nation's Human Capital*, A Fact-Finding Report of the Federal Glass Ceiling Commission (243 pp., March 1995). Available from US Govt. Printing Office (202/783-3238, 512-0132) and its regional bookstores; doc. # is 029-016-00157-3. The Commission's research papers are available from the Dept. of Labor, 200 Constitution Ave. NW - Rm. C-2313, Wash., DC 20210, 202/219-7342.
- Congressional Research Service, Feb. 17, 1995 32-page memo to Hon. Robert Dole, "Compilation & Overview of Federal Laws & Regulations Establishing Affirmative Action Goals or Other Preference Based on Race, Gender or Ethnicity." Available from Sen. Dole's office (202/224-6521) or possibly from CRS, Wash., DC 20540-7000.
- "The Spoils of Victimhood: The Case Against the Case Against Affirmative Action," by Michael Kinsley, *The New Yorker*, March 25, 1995 (8 pp.). Available from PRRAC with a SASE.
- Christopher Jencks, "Affirmative Action or Quotas?," Ch. 1 of *Rethinking Social Policy: Race, Poverty & The Underclass* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992), pp. 24-69.
- "Unnecessary Evil: Why Inequality is Bad for Business," by Randy Albelda & Chris Tilly; "The Racial Divide Widens: Why African-American Workers Are Losing Ground," by Marc Breslow, in *Dollars & Sense*, Jan./Feb. 1995 and Mar./Apr. 1995, respectively. Available from PRRAC with a SASE.
- Testimony of Asst. Atty. General Deval Patrick and Theodore Shaw of the NAACP Legal Defense & Educ. Fund (and a PRRAC Board member) before the House Subcomm. on Employer-Employee Relations, March 24, 1995. Try the Subcomm. first—2181 RHOB, Wash., DC 20515-6100, 202/225-4527—if unavailable, contact PRRAC.
- "Affirmative Action Polling Results," March 30, 1995 memorandum (3 pp. + atts.); "Affirmative Action for Women & Minorities—It Works Well, It Is Necessary and It Benefits America" (March 7, 1995), from the Leadership Conf. on Civil Rights, 1629 K St. NW, #1010, Wash., DC 20006, 202/466-3311.
- "Time & Money Producing Racial Harmony in Military," by Steven Holmes, *NY Times*, April 5, 1995. Available from PRRAC with a SASE.
- "Rutgers Proud of Law School's Set-Asides," by Dale Russakoff, *Wash. Post*, April 10, 1995. Available from PRRAC with a SASE.
- Prof. Alfred Blumrosen of Rutgers has done a study for the Dept. of Labor's Office of Contract Compliance Programs that shows (in the words of the *NY Times*' headline reporting the study) "reverse discrimination of whites is rare." The study itself is unavailable ("an internal document leaked to the press," we were told by the Public Affairs folks), but we'll be glad to send both the *Wash. Post* & *NY Times* accounts with a SASE.
- The Congressional Black Caucus Foundation (908 Penn. Ave. SE, Wash., DC 20003, 202/675-2060) has several publications: "The Attack on Affirmative Action: A Racist Diversion from Solving America's True Problems" (Feb. 21, 1995); "Black Businesses & Minority Set-Asides" (Feb. 27, 1995); "The Mean Season for African Americans"; "If African Americans Had Parity With Whites...."
- "California Summer: 1995" is a National Lawyers Guild (LA Chapter) project, patterned after "Mississippi Summer," working to defeat the state's upcoming affirmative action initiative, as well as undertaking post-Prop. 187 immigrant support work. To volunteer (students, legal workers, lawyers) or contribute financially, contact NLG, 8124 W. 3rd St. #201, LA, CA 90048, 213/664-4988.

PRRAC Researchers Report

Living on the Edge: Doubled-up Families in America

by Diana M. Pearce

Over the last decade, the United States experienced a housing crisis, most visibly in the form of burgeoning homelessness, as housing prices outstripped family incomes and government housing programs and subsidies were drastically cut back. One less visible, but no less real, manifestation of this crisis is the increase in doubling-up. This PRRAC-funded study was undertaken to document that increase, and to determine the extent and nature of doubling-up among families. It was prompted by scattered information that increasing numbers of homeless families were doubled-up before they became homeless, and that many homeless families were going from shelters back into doubled-up situations. Almost nothing was known about the phenomenon of families doubling-up, although it was widely believed to be an unstable situation, often unhealthy psychologically and physically, and highly correlated with homelessness. The minimal information published by the Census Bureau is only on subfamilies, usually unrelated, with none on the "primary" family (who owns or rents the housing) or on doubled-up households (DUHs) as a whole.

The study used 1983 and 1990 unpublished Current Population Survey data on all families (two or more related persons) sharing a household with another family (or occasionally, two other families). Census data were not used because the decennial Census does not count unrelated subfamilies (they are counted as individuals, but their relationship to each other is not recorded). Although unrelated families are a minority—most doubled-up families are related to each other—they are the fastest-growing type of doubled-up family (DUFs) and should not be excluded. The beginning date of 1983

was chosen because in that year the Census Bureau first began to count certain types of households as doubled-up.

Doubling-up on the Rise

Over the 1980s, the number of doubled-up families increased to over 5 million, including 8.7 million children. Who was doubled-up changed as well over the decade: while the average doubled-up household held three adults and two children in the early 1980s, by 1990 the average doubled-up household had three children and two adults, and seven out of eight DUHs had children in them. Doubled-up households also shifted in location, with fewer in rural areas and more in metropolitan areas. Minority-led DUHs increased their concentration in the central city, while the white increase in DUHs was largely confined to the suburbs, thus adding to the racial polarization of many metropolitan areas. Women-maintained families were also concentrated in the central city, with five out of six DUHs having one or both families women-maintained.

The 1980s also saw racial and gender shifts, as Hispanics experienced the largest increase of any racial/ethnic group, and now account for one-sixth of DUHs. The proportion of doubled-up families maintained by women alone increased by one-third, so that in four out of five DUHs one or both families are woman-maintained. Black doubled-up families have the highest proportion of women-maintained households and families, and over half have both families maintained by women. In more than 90% of poor DUHs, one or both families are women-maintained, and two-thirds of black and Hispanic DUHs are poor.

DUHs divide into two distinct types, distinguished by income, gender, race and the presence of children. The most prevalent type of DUH is low-income or poor, has several children, is disproportionately likely to be minority, and/or concentrated in the central city. A second distinct type, however, is predominantly white, with one or both families consisting of a childless married couple, lives mostly in suburban areas, and is relatively affluent. This report concentrates on the first type, for when these two distinct types are averaged together, the result is misleading, blurring the picture of the phenomenon of doubling-up.

High rates of employment characterize DUFs. Overall, 80% of families and 90% of households receive wage and salary income, with earnings accounting for an average of 80% of income for DUFs. Despite their work efforts, poverty rates are very high: over 40% of DUFs have poverty-level incomes (compared to a poverty rate of 12% for all families). Low income is particularly characteristic of women-maintained secondary families, one-half of whom have annual incomes below \$5000, and 70% below \$10,000. (By comparison, 14% and 28%, respectively, of male householder secondary families have incomes this low). As a result, two-thirds of women-maintained secondary families—but only one-fourth of male-householder secondary families—are poor.

Poverty Status and Eligibility for Assistance

Low income also characterizes minority DUFs. While only 7% of white families have annual incomes less than

(Please turn to page 12)

(DOUBLED-UP: Continued from page 11)

\$10,000, 50% of black and 40% of Hispanic DUFs have incomes this low. Not surprisingly, 50% of black and 40% of Hispanic doubled-up families are poor. The most disadvantaged are secondary families maintained by women of color, one-half of whom have incomes below *one-half* of the poverty threshold.

More than half of DUHs have at least one poor family in them, yet only one-fifth of DUHs are counted as poor by the Census Bureau. The low official poverty count occurs because Census officials do not look at related families separately, but consider them one single family or household for poverty determination purposes. Thus, a family's efforts to deal with poverty, by moving in with relatives or others, effectively hides that poverty from our view. *Official poverty measures therefore miss about 2 million poor families per year because they are doubled-up.*

The hidden poverty of DUFs does not just result in inaccurate statistics. Despite their very high poverty rates, very few DUHs secure any public help in meeting their basic needs. Only 15% receive income from welfare, and when they do, it accounts for less than half their income on average. Doubled-up households are equally unlikely to receive other types of benefits for low-income families: only one out of twenty doubled-up households receives any housing aid, and only 8% received any unemployment insurance benefits—and for those who do, it averaged a paltry 4% of total family income. The most common help received is food stamps, which one-fifth of households receive—but again, it is only received for an average of two months of the year.

Many program eligibility requirements lock these families into long-term poverty. For example, for a family in a DUH to qualify separately for food stamps, they have to show that they shop, store, prepare and eat their food separately. Likewise, many other programs' eligibility requirements bar poor doubled-up families from getting the help they need to exit poverty, creating a Catch-22 situation. Without educa-

tion, child care and job training, many of these family heads will not have the means to live on their own. If they try to live on their own without aid, they may well become homeless, or lose their children because they are unable to support them adequately.

One-fifth of DUFs are headed by a young mother, less than 25 years old, including 6% who are teens, but because eligibility standards are based on *total* household income, many are denied access to any public assistance, including teen parent programs. For some of these families, doubling-up may provide the kind of adult support needed by these young mothers (as has been advocated in a number of welfare reform proposals, including that put

Official poverty measures miss about 2 million poor families per year because they are doubled-up.

forth by the Clinton Administration), although at the same time impoverishing and placing stress on the larger household. Since recent research has shown that the majority of teen mothers have been physically or sexually abused as children, many of these young women need access to services that will support their becoming self-sufficient out of their homes—but cannot get them because they are doubled-up.

Recommendations

The report makes recommendations for changes in four areas. First, it recommends that the Census Bureau collect full information on doubled-up families, in both annual CPS surveys and the decennial Census, and publish full information on *both* doubled-up families in a DUH as well as doubled-up households as a whole.

Second, eligibility standards that bar poor families within doubled-up households from receiving any assistance should be modified.

Third, since the high rates of poverty

are due to low earnings (rather than low participation in the labor force), expanded income and non-cash benefit programs should be targeted to young single mother families. In particular, expanded ETC programs at the state level, and fuller participation in the federal ETC program, should be sought to alleviate these families' poverty. In-kind benefits, particularly subsidized child care, health care and access to education and training, should be provided to help these families become self-sufficient.

Finally, the report calls for a more flexible, geographically specific standard of need than that provided by the national poverty threshold measure. Already, a crude version of such a variable standard, in the form of area median income, is used to determine eligibility for housing assistance but not for other programs. Self-sufficiency standards provide such a measure, with need determined on the basis of local housing costs (using HUD's fair market rents), local child care costs (given age and number of children, using Family Support Act-determined market rate child care), as well as the costs of local health care, food and transportation. With locally-specific standards of need, true rates of poverty/need can be determined, and eligibility for various types of public assistance can be determined on the basis of real need.

With welfare reform on the national agenda, the issue of doubling-up becomes more urgent. Whatever the end results of Congress' deliberations, two outcomes are nearly certain: states will have more flexibility and less money. Whether mandated by federal prohibitions or dictated by constrained budgets, the amount of assistance to poor families is likely to decrease. With less income, more families will be unable to make their rent, and will become homeless, or will double up. Since doubling up is quite often not a stable solution—half of families entering Washington, DC homeless shelters have come from a doubled-up situation—not dealing with the increase in doubling-up will end up creating greater housing instability and homelessness for increas-

(Please turn to page 18)

Why Not Democracy?

by David Kairys

Perhaps the greatest public relations coup of recent decades was the instantaneous conversion of the 1994 electoral campaigns—almost universally condemned as unprincipled and repulsive—into a “mandate” and “landslide” for Republicans swept into office by slim margins.

The most that can fairly be said of the election results is that less than 20% of those eligible to vote favored the Republican program (and many of those were anti-Clinton votes), almost the same number went the other way, and most people stayed home.

President Clinton's 1992 victory was treated similarly. Like most winning Presidents, he received more than a dismal 20%, but not by much. Even President Reagan's 1980 “landslide” consisted of his getting only 27% of the eligible voters. Participation in these and all recent elections is disproportionately white and higher income. In the November 1992 elections, 37.2% of persons 18 and over with incomes under \$10,000 voted, compared with 80.0% of those with incomes over \$50,000. By race, 63.6% of voting age whites voted, 54.6% of Blacks, 28.9% of Hispanic origin (of any race).

A mantle of legitimacy is regularly bestowed on anyone who wins, no matter how they win, or how minuscule their margins of victory or the proportions of the electorate who voted. Our electoral process doesn't yield mandates, only exaggerated legitimacy, frustrated citizens and precarious winners.

Progressive voices are often silent or silenced these days, but the silence on this issue—the fundamental crisis of democracy in America—is puzzling. There is a widespread sense that things aren't working right and that the political system is part of the problem rather than the solution. Most Americans, across the political spectrum, perceive themselves and their views and interests as excluded from public discourse and political decision-making.

The deep anger and alienation from the political process presents an opportunity for progressives to continue perhaps our most sustained and successful struggle since the beginning of the republic: the extension and redefinition of democracy to include all our people.

This alienation and anger is often expressed in terms of hostility to those who have, or seem to have, power, particularly “politicians”—a label that now connotes disgrace. It is also evident in the cynicism and basic lack of respect or common decency shown to candidates and officeholders. This has been nurtured and exploited by the media,

The reluctance of progressives to embrace the democracy issue is hard to understand.

but they have struck a chord with the public. Politics has become a spectator sport in which strategy and tactics are more important than principle and the capacity to endure humiliation is more important than insight or integrity.

Needed Reforms

The highest priority for meaningful reform is to confront the perception and reality that votes are bought and politicians are for sale. The current system amounts to sanitized and legalized bribery. The average House of Representatives seat now costs over \$500,000 to win. Raising such enormous sums of money keeps officials from the work of government, distorts their views and votes and creates a fundamental conflict of interest. We will not have public officials who take principled stands, lead instead of go where the money and power are, or really represent people of ordinary means as long as they are dependent on large contributors.

The other Western democracies, and democracies throughout the world, have electoral systems that are structurally different from ours in two fundamental ways. We are one of only a few democracies that has not adopted proportional representation, and of those few, we are the only one in which the issue has not been the subject of long-standing public debate. Proportional representation systems (there are a variety of them) allow voters to choose from a range of candidates and parties and bestow power in proportion to voter support. (See Douglas J. Amy's article on *proportional representation as a means for empowering minorities and the poor in Poverty & Race*, September/October 1994).

In contrast, we generally have, at the federal, state and local levels, what political scientists call a “single-member plurality” system, which bestows all power on the highest vote getter, even if he or she does not receive a majority. This system discourages voter choice, distorts voter preferences, promotes the two-party monopoly and encourages legislators to consider the narrow interests of their districts rather than the general public interest. On the federal level, the single-member plurality system for members of the House of Representatives is established not in the Constitution, but by an act of Congress; it could be changed to a proportional system simply by a new act of Congress.

Bestowing legitimacy and power on winners with sometimes small pluralities contradicts basic democratic precepts, particularly when so few of our people vote. An old Latin word—quorum—embodies a traditional American idea about the legitimacy of political processes. If you don't have a quorum, usually set at half the eligible voters, there can be no valid or binding vote. That's the rule for nearly every board of directors, neighborhood group and Cub Scout troop. It means you

(Please turn to page 14)

(DEMOCRACY: Continued from page 13)

can't chase away most of the voters and then claim victory.

Further, we are almost alone among the democracies in rejecting the parliamentary system in favor of a winner-take-all, fixed-term presidential election that is divorced from elections of legislators. The formal name for this is "checks and balances," but it is at the core of what we now call and condemn as "gridlock" and the "two-party monopoly." The winner wins all, and the losers get no ongoing power or influence in the Presidency or Congress. This encourages compromise before elections—the watered down, mushy positions and the low level of political debate to which we have become accustomed—and the tendency of winners after elections to ignore the range of voter views rather than engage in dialogue or compromise. Votes for candidates who do not win are in this sense "wasted," and votes for third-party candidates usually seem senseless, since they reduce the total vote for the major-party candidate closest to the voter's views.

Contrast this to parliamentary systems: A range of parties and candidates put forward their various positions before elections and compromise afterwards to form a majority coalition that selects the chief executive (usually

called prime minister). Each party maintains ongoing power and influence in the legislature in proportion to its vote, and if at any time the majority no longer supports the ruling coalition, there is a new election. Voters have every reason to participate even if their favorite candidate is unlikely to win. These systems regularly draw three-quarters to over 90% of the voters to the polls. (A "Representation Index" published by the Center for Voting & Democracy—calculated by multiplying

The current system amounts to sanitized and legalized bribery.

voter turnout by the percentage of votes cast for winning candidates—showed that in the 1994 House of Representatives election Florida brought up the rear with a 12.4 rating, while South Dakota was the highest, with 35.0. By contrast, Germany had a 76.3, South Africa close to 90 in their 1994 elections.)

Finally, we should eliminate the barriers to voting and to ballot access by third parties. A party or individual shouldn't have to be as rich as Ross Perot to get on the ballot. And we are

the only major democracy that requires voters to register and regularly strikes them off lists of eligible voters if they haven't voted recently. Most everywhere else, if you are a citizen and you show up on election day, you vote.

These systemic features should be the focus of the widespread popular discontent with the electoral process, but conservative Republicans, who routinely oppose even minor democratic reforms such as the motor-voter bill, have diverted our attention to the issue of term limits. Without the reforms emphasized here, term limits would likely increase, not decrease, the proportion of our legislators who are wealthy and the speed of the revolving door between government and special interests, only deepening the reality and the public's sense that the system is closed and fixed. Nothing in the term-limited process encourages new directions, new leadership or enhanced popular participation in the political process.

The problem is not with the notion of a life or career of public service. We need more of that—particularly the brand of public service that includes the insight and courage to look beyond appeals to fear and narrow self-interest. And public service should be available to people of ordinary means. But term limits are, at best, a gimmicky diversion.

What we must confront is the fear of democracy at the core of the system devised by the framers of the Constitution and the fundamental obstacle their approach poses to meaningful democracy in the 20th and 21st centuries. The constitutional convention was attended by representatives chosen by state legislatures to resolve interstate commercial rivalries that were impeding trade. The framers, who transformed their gathering into a constitutional convention on their own, were among the elite of each state, and they met in secret behind closed doors. Their fear that the people, if really empowered, would undercut the privileges of wealth and create chaos dominated the proceedings.

(Please turn to page 18)

A Democracy Agenda

- Eliminate PACs and private funding of elections, and strictly limit payments of any kind to public officials
- Provide all qualified candidates limited public funding and limited, free media time in equal amounts
- Proportional representation at the federal, state and local levels
- Investigate a longer-term conversion to a parliamentary system
- A quorum requirement set at one half of all people eligible to vote, without which a new election would be required
- Eliminate voter registration requirements
- Eliminate barriers to third-party ballot access
- Access to the media for people of ordinary means

PRRAC Grantee Products and Final Reports

In addition to regularly reporting on the advocacy work PRRAC-supported research helps foster (see page 17), we periodically list the written products of these research grants, in the hope that this work can be useful to, and perhaps replicated by, other groups in other parts of the country. Copies of the following materials, as well as further information on the project, may be obtained by contacting the organization listed. Where available, prices and page length are indicated.

Living On The Edge: Doubled-Up Families In America, by Diana M. Pearce (August 1994, 41 pp. + 47 tbls.), available from Wider Opportunities for Women, 815 15th St. NW, Suite 916, Wash., DC 20005, 202/638-3143. \$30. The Executive Summary and A Briefing Paper on Self-Sufficiency Standards are also available for the same source. \$3 each.

Housing Court, Evictions and Homelessness: The Cost and Benefits of Establishing a Right to Counsel (June 1993, 21 pp.), published by and available from the Community Training and Resource Center and City Wide Task Force On Housing Court, 666 Broadway #410, New York, NY 10012, 212/982-5512. \$2.50 + SASE.

Testing For Racial Discrimination at the Local Housing Authorities (March 1994, 14 pp.), published by and available from the Massachusetts Coalition for the Homeless, 288 A St., 4th flr., Boston, MA 02210, 617/737-3508. Contact Linda Johnson for a free copy.

The Effects of Court-Ordered Housing Subsidies for Homeless Families in Suffolk County, New York: Advocacy, Program and Policy Implications, by Lynne Soine and Mary Ann Burg (April 1994, 45 pp.), available from Soine at the Center for Human Resources, Social Work Program, SUNY at Plattsburgh, NY 12901, 518/564-4174, or from Burg, Dept. of Community Health and Family Medicine, Univ. of Florida, P.O. Box 103588, Gainesville, FL 32610-3588, 904/387-8073. Free.

Glass Ceilings and Bottomless Pits: Women, Income, and Poverty in Massachusetts, by Randy Albelda and Chris Tilly (June 1994, 36 pp.),

published by and available from Women's Statewide Legislative Network, 37 Temple Place, 3rd flr., Boston, MA 02111, 617/426-1878. \$10 (inquire about bulk rates and low-income prices).

No Homeless People Allowed: A Report on Anti-Homeless Laws, Litigation and Alternatives in 49 United States Cities (December 1994, 120 pp. + App.), available from the National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty, 918 F St. NW, #412, Wash., DC 20004, 202/638-2535. \$25, \$18 for small non-profits.

Women Garment Workers in El Paso, Texas: Comparisons Between Workers in Small, Medium and Large Factories, by Juanita G. Fernandez (n.d. [1994], 25 pp.), available from Cindy Arnold, La Mujer Obrera, c/o Centro Obrero, PO Box 3975, El Paso, TX 79923, 915/533-9710. \$5.

Setting the Standard: International Labor Rights and U.S. Trade Policy, by Richard Rothstein (March 1993, 35 pp.), available from the Economic Policy Institute, 1730 Rhode Island Ave. NW, #203, Wash., DC 20036, 202/775-8810. \$5.

A Long Way From Home: Chicago's Homeless Children and the Schools, by Bernardine Dohrn (February 1992, 71 pp.), available from the Legal Aid Foundation of Chicago, 343 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, IL 60604, 312/341-1070.

Preserving Expiring Use Restriction Projects: A Handbook for Tenant Advocates, Non-Profit Groups and Public Officials in Massachusetts, by Emily Achtenberg (January 1992, 332 pp.), available from Citizens' Housing and Planning Association, 16 North St.,

Easton, MA 02109, 617/742-0820. \$35 for non-profits and public agencies, \$65 for others.

HOMES Coalition: Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy, Omaha, Nebraska (July 1991, 26 pp.), available from the Housing Opportunities through Many Efforts and Services Coalition, 3014 N. 45th St., Omaha, NE 68104, 402/571-4508.

Poor Families and Poor Housing: The Search for Decent Housing in Virginia's Private, Unassisted Market, by C. Theodore Koebel and Mary Ellen Rives (June 1993, 26 pp.), available from Koebel, Virginia Tech, 401 Wallace Hall, Blacksburg, VA 24061, 703/231-3993. Free.

Dealing with Desperation: A Census of Maryland's Sheltered Homeless, by Anne Shlay (July 1992, 85 pp.), available from Action for the Homeless, 1021 N. Calvert St., Baltimore, MD 21202, 410/659-0300. \$4, Executive Summary, \$2.

The Residential Concentration and Segregation of Blacks in Allegheny County (PA) from 1950 to 1990 (January 1993, 35 pp.), by Joe Darden; **Sanders v. HUD: Summary of Findings and Conclusions**, by Yale Rabin (March 1993, 14 pp.), both available from the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, 1450 G St. NW, #400, Wash., DC 20005, 202/662-8330.

Race and Economics in the Rural Midwest (March 1992, 122 pp.), by PrairieFire, University of Iowa/Labor Center, and the Center for Democratic Renewal, available from PrairieFire, 550 11th St., Des Moines, IA 50309, 515/244-5671.

(Please turn to page 16)

(REPORTS: Continued from page 15)

A Descriptive Study of the Educational Resources of the Hartford Public Schools and Disparities with Other Districts, by Gary Nutriello (November 1992, 271 pp.), available from the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation, 132 W. 43rd St. #503, NYC, NY 10036, 212/944-9800.

Does the Punishment Fit the Crime? Drug Users and Drunk Drivers, Questions of Race and Class, by Cathy Shine and Marc Maurer (March 1993, 36 pp.), available from The Sentencing Project, 918 F St. NW, #501, Wash., DC 20004, 202/628-0871.

South Central Los Angeles: Anatomy of an Urban Crisis, edited by Allen J. Scott and E. Richard Brown, published by and available from the Lewis Center, UCLA School of Public Policy & Social Research, 1301 Perloff Hall, LA, CA 90095-1467, 310/206-4417 (Working Paper No. 5, \$15).

The Impact on Individuals and Communities of the Reduction in Social Services in Michigan in 1991-1992 (May 1993, 56 pp.), available from the Michigan League for Human Services, 300 N. Washington Sq. #401, Lansing, MI 48933, 517/487-5436. \$10.

Unfulfilled Promises: Racial Discrimination and Neglect in Tucson's Public and Federally-Subsidized Housing, by Linda Bohlke, with data analysis by Martin Taylor (November 1993, 104 pp.), available from the Southern Arizona People's Law Center, 606 N. Fourth Ave., Tucson, AZ 85705, 602/623-7306. \$10.

A final report on violations of the WARN Act, which protects workers from unannounced and unplanned plant closures, is available from the Sugar Law Center for Economic and Social Justice, 2915 Cadillac Tower, Detroit, MI 48226, 313/962-6540.

Welfare Reform and the Forgotten Population: The Impact of General Assistance Cuts on Single Adults and Its Implications for National Policy (October 1993, 12 pp.), published by and available from the National General

PRRAC Update

PRRAC BOARD AWARDS: The Center for Law & Social Policy, headed by PRRAC Board member Alan Houseman, held a wonderful 25th Anniversary Dinner on March 11, honoring Justice William J. Brennan. Special recognition awards were given to PRRAC Board member Duffy Campbell, Co-President of the National Women's Law Center, and ex-Board member Robert Greenstein, who heads the Center on Budget & Policy Priorities. Guest speaker was Angela Blackwell, new Vice President of the Rockefeller Foundation, also an ex-PRRAC Board member.

PRRAC BOARD MEETING: The PRRAC Board will hold its Spring meeting May 6-7 in San Francisco—a report will appear in our next issue. The first day will be a mini-conference with several dozen California guests—researchers, funders, activists, policy experts—to discuss with us affirmative action, immigration, fiscal constraints and other “cutting edge” issues in that

state which will impact the rest of the country as well.

SOUTHERN TOUR: PRRAC Executive Director Chester Hartman just returned from a tour of Alabama and Mississippi with a group of progressive funders (Veatch, Norman, Public Welfare, Abelard, New World, Funding Exchange), sponsored by the National Network of Grantmakers. The focus was “The Unfinished Civil Rights Agenda,” and meetings were held with a range of impressive grassroots groups in both states.

URBAN POVERTY ROUNDTABLE: The Leadership Conference on Civil Rights held a three-day Roundtable on Urban Poverty, April 7-9. Among the 40 attendees were PRRAC Board members Jack Roger, Alan Houseman, and Bill Taylor, PRRAC Social Science Advisory Board member Paul Ong, and PRRAC Executive Director Chester Hartman.

Assistance Working Group, c/o the Jewish Council on Urban Affairs, 220 S. State St. #1910, Chicago, IL 60604, 312/663-0960.

A final report on ***The Orange County Health Care Organizing and Action Project*** (February 1993, 115 pp.) is published by and available from the Poverty Law Center, 600 W. Santa Ana Blvd. #202, Santa Ana, CA 92701, 714/541-1010.

A remedial court order addressing educational funding and opportunities for school children in the State of Alabama was obtained by and is available from the ACLU Foundation, stemming from their lawsuit, *Harper v. James* (formerly

Harper v. Hunt). ACLU Foundation, 132 W. 43rd St. #503, NYC, NY 10036, 212/944-9800. [See also PRRAC Advocacy Update on page 17.]

A formal declaration by Yale Rabin on behalf of Rhode Island Legal Services outlines the racial segregation effects of a HUD-approved proposal for replacement housing being by the Providence Housing Authority. (March 1991, 16 pp.) Available free from PRRAC.

Regional Housing Mobility: A Survey of Need in Hartford, by Kim McClain and David Desiderato (January 1992, 16 pp.), available from Citizens' Research Education Network, 32 Elm St., Hartford, CT 06106, 203/249-1416. Free.

PRRAC Grantees' Advocacy Updates

Legal Assistance Foundation of Chicago

343 S. Dearborn St., #700
Chicago, IL 60604
312/347-8365

Contact: Rene Heybach

One of PRRAC's earliest grants was to the Legal Assistance Foundation of Chicago to enable one of its researchers, Bernardine Dohrn, to document the city's failure to provide homeless children with an adequate education, as required under the McKinney Act. The report, "A Long Way From Home: Chicago's Homeless Children and the Schools" (71 pp., Feb. 1992), is available from LAF. That report was then used in support of litigation.

Homeless children in Illinois have recently won the right to enforce access to Illinois schools under Illinois law, including the right to transportation, prompt enrollment and the right to remain in their "school of origin." After a lower court's 1993 dismissal of their class action lawsuit (*Salazar v. Edwards*) against the State of Illinois and the Chicago Board of Education under the federal McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, homeless children, parents and advocates pushed for passage of the new Illinois "Education of Homeless Children Act," H.B. 3244, which extends to Illinois children even greater protections than those provided by federal law.

Under the new Act, effective January 1, 1995, all Illinois schools are obligated, among other things, to (1) immediately enroll a homeless child, whether or not the child has academic or medical records or proof of residency; (2) take responsibility for obtaining any documents necessary for the child's continued attendance; (3) give a homeless child a choice of schools to attend: the school attended when he or she lost housing, the school last attended or the school nearest where the child actually lives; (4) provide transportation to a homeless child when

necessary; (5) create an "ombudsperson" in the school region to resolve any placement disputes; and (6) ensure that a family's choice of placement will be respected pending the resolution of a dispute. In addition, the Act expressly creates a civil action (including attorneys fees and costs) for enforcement of these rights.

Despite the new Act, the plaintiff homeless children and parents in *Salazar* have appealed the lower court's dismissal. That dismissal was based on the holding of the district court in *Lampkin v. District of Columbia*, Civ. No. 92-0910, 1992 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8049 (D.D.C. June 9, 1992) determining that the educational provisions of the McKinney Act were *not* judicially enforceable. But the lower court's decision in *Lampkin* has now been reversed by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, *Lampkin v. District of Columbia*, 27 F.3d 605 (D.C. Cir. 1994), and the U.S. Supreme Court has denied certiorari. In addition, Congress recently passed legislation protecting the judicial enforceability of federal-state funding statutes. On appeal in *Salazar*, plaintiffs are urging the Illinois appellate court to adopt the D.C. Circuit's reasoning in *Lampkin*. Oral argument on the appeal is expected shortly.

The American Civil Liberties Union/ Alabama

132 W. 43rd St., #503
New York, NY 10036
212/944-9800, ext. 769

Contact: Julie Fernandes

The American Civil Liberties Union and the ACLU of Alabama have been working to ensure that the legal victories that were won in their landmark school reform litigation of *Harper v. James* (formerly *Harper v. Hiron*) result in improved schools and school systems for Alabama's children (Appendix to the *Opinion of the Justices*, 624 So.2d 107 (Ala. 1993)). The ACLU represents a class of school children alleging that

Alabama's system of public education is both inadequate and inequitable. PRRAC funding supported two distinct but interrelated purposes: (1) a study of the disparate racial impact of Alabama's school funding system; and (2) the development of new school finance models that would provide for the equitable distribution of education services to poor black students regardless of their county of residence. The legal victories have been substantial, but the political battle to implement the reforms has proven difficult.

The state trial court issued both an order establishing the state's liability and an order describing the appropriate remedy. After the court issued the remedy order in October 1993, plaintiffs worked extensively with defendants and various advocacy groups to translate the remedy order into actual reforms.

However, the political climate in the state changed dramatically with the November elections. Alabama elected a new governor, Fob James, Jr., who is hostile to the litigation and hostile to comprehensive school reform as described and mandated by the court's orders. The election also produced an entirely new State Board of Education. Seven of the nine members of the Board are new, and two members are openly hostile to the litigation and to reform. These developments have presented new challenges for the ACLU and the school reform movement in Alabama.

First, Governor James has mounted a litigation challenge to the authority of the trial court to define the parameters of a constitutional public education system and to order effective remedies for constitutional violations. The ACLU was successful in persuading the Alabama Supreme Court to reject a belated attempt by the governor to undo the liability order. An appeal to the remedy order is still pending.

(Please turn to page 18)

(UPDATES: Continued from page 17)

The ACLU has met with various Alabama groups committed to the remedy order's vision of school reform, in order to determine how best to implement the court's orders and how to go forward with school reform even if the governor's challenges to the remedy order are successful. The ACLU is also working toward further developing a coalition of organizers, activists and lawyers to defeat the anti-reform propaganda being put forth by the governor and groups like the Eagle Forum. It has become increasingly clear to those involved in the litigation that real reform can only happen with the support of the larger community. To that end, the ACLU is committed to community education and outreach that focuses on the court's orders and the litigation's vision of effective school reform. □

(DOUBLED-UP: Continued from page 12)

ing numbers of poor families. Not addressing housing problems at any level—whether affordability, doubling-up or homelessness—will simply slide us further down the slippery slope of leaving more and more families in distress, and more and more children

Program eligibility requirements lock doubled-up families into long-term poverty.

and their parents experiencing lives of chaos and hopelessness without the help they need.

The results of this report have been used with welfare policymakers to co-

ordinate housing and welfare initiatives as they impact on poor families, through the Ad Hoc Task Force on Housing/Homeless Issues in Welfare Reform. As plans for the next Census develop, it will be used to advocate for better measures of family composition and poverty in the Year 2000 Census.

Diana Pearce is Director of the Women and Poverty Project, which she founded 10 years ago. She is completing a book on women's poverty, titled *No Bread, No Roses*. The full report, "Living on the Edge: Doubled-up Families in America" (41 pp. + 47 tables), is available for \$30 from the author, Wider Opportunities for Women, 815 15th St. NW, #916, Washington, DC 20005, 202/638-3143. The Executive Summary and A Briefing Paper on Self-Sufficiency Standards are available for \$3 each from the same source. □

(DEMOCRACY: Continued from page 14)

An Issue for Progressives

The reluctance of progressives to embrace the democracy issue is hard to understand. There is a tendency to see political democracy in an exclusively instrumental fashion. Perhaps at a deeper level, there may be some distrust of the people, which we often discuss as a problem unique to conservatives. Mass democracy surely involves risks; perhaps some of the reluctance is based on a sense that currently oppressed groups might have even more to fear from broadened participation. However, a revitalization of American democracy would increase the proportion of the vote that comes from groups currently excluded or discounted in mainstream politics and would promote dialogue and compromise. There simply will not be progressive reform—or significant attention paid to progressive concerns—unless politicians feel responsibility to and pressure from the people in the midsection and at the bottom of the economic ladder, who are not major campaign contributors or consistent voters. Further, the appeal

to democracy raises the question of control by an elite—the question of class—in a way that can be heard even in the current political environment, and may be extended to other issues.

As we search our old files and our souls for progressive visions and program ideas, shouldn't meaningful participation in a fair democratic process and in a political dialogue to which people of ordinary means have access be seen as a fundamental need of the people? It is a necessary prerequisite for progressive change and for a basic sense of national purpose, cohesion

and connection in a large, diverse society such as ours.

David Kairys, a civil rights lawyer for over 25 years, is professor of law at Temple University and the author of *With Liberty and Justice for Some* (New Press, 1993), from which this article is partially drawn. The article grew out of his work with a coalition attempting to formulate a "human rights agenda" (contact: Jeanne Mirer, National Lawyers Guild, 313/961-6420; Adjoa Aiyetoro, National Conference of Black Lawyers, 202/234-9735). □

Resources

- Center for Voting and Democracy (proportional representation), 6905 Fifth St. NW, #203, Washington, DC 20012; 202/882-7378
- Center for Responsive Politics (campaign financing), 1320 19th St. NW, #700, Washington, DC 20036; 202/857-0044
- Ballot Access News, P.O. Box 470296, San Francisco, CA 94147; 415/922-9779
- Working Group for Electoral Democracy (financing), 273 Shelbourne Rd., Colrain, MA 01340
- Center for New Democracy (financing), 410 7th St. SE, Washington, DC 20003; 202/543-0773
- National Institute for Voting Rights (litigation on financing), 1130 Massachusetts Ave., 3rd fl., Cambridge, MA 02138; 617/441-8200
- Committee for the Study of the American Electorate, 421 New Jersey Ave. SE, Washington, DC 20003; 202/546-3221
- Public Citizen, 2000 P St. NW, #609, Washington, DC 20036; 202/633-3000
- Common Cause, 2030 M St. NW, #300, Washington, DC 20036; 202/833-1200

Resources

When ordering items from the Resources section, please note that most listings direct you to contact an organization other than PRRAC. 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 (32¢ unless otherwise indicated). Orders may not be placed by telephone or fax.

When we fill SASE orders, we enclose a contributions envelope; please—especially if you are a frequent user of our service—try to send us some needed operating funds. Thank you.

Race/Racism

• "An Analysis of Black & White Income Differences: Queens County [NYC] and the US," by Andrew Beveridge & Jeannie D'Amico (4 pp. + tables, Oct. 1994), is available (no price listed) from Prof. Beveridge, Dept. Sociology, Queen College/CUNY, 65-30 Kissena Blvd., Flushing, NY 11367-1597, 718/520-7088.

• *Between Melting Pot & Mosaic: African Americans & Puerto Ricans in the NY Political Economy*, by Andrés Torres, has just been published by Temple Univ. Press. \$23.45 from them, 800/447-1656.

• "Black Population as Percent of Total County Population - 1990 - & Congressional Districts" is a large colored wall map of 11 Southern states, county-by-county. Available (no price listed) from the So. Reg.

Council, 134 Peachtree St. NW, #1909, Atlanta, GA 30303, 404/522-8764.

• *Challenging Racism & Sexism: Alternative to Genetic Explanations*, eds. Ethel Tobach & Betty Rosoff (337 pp., 1994), is published by The Feminist Press; \$14.95.

• New Temple Univ. Press Books: *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge*, ed. Richard Delgado (contributions by Derrick Bell, Randall Kennedy, Girardeau Spann, Regina Austin, Ian Haney López, Lisa Bernoto, et al.)—560 pp., \$22.95; *Chinatown: The Socioeconomic Potential of an Urban Enclave*, by Min Zhou (304 pp., 1992/1995 pb, \$18.95); *Filipino American Lives*, by Yen Le Espiritu (265 pp., \$16.95); *Waiting on Washington: Central American Workers in the Nation's Capital*, by Terry Repak (240 pp., \$16.95). S/h \$3 first book, 75¢ addl., 800/447-1656.

• "The Black Population in the United States: March 1994 and 1993," by Claudette Bennett (137 pp. + apps., Jan. 1995), a new Census publication (P20-480), described as "the most comprehensive statistical portrait of the nation's African American population since the 1970s," is available (possibly free) from 301/457-2794. A related report is "Characteristics of the Black Population: 1990," CP-3-6 (326 pp. + tables, Oct. 1994), available from the same number.

• "The Empty Promise: The EEOC and Hispanics" is a new report from the Natl. Council of La Raza, 1111 19th St. NW, #1000, Wash., DC 20036, 202/785-1670; ask about price.

• "The Fiscal Irresponsibility Act: Implications for Blacks, the Working Class & Most Americans" is a 9-page, March 1995 analysis from the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation, 908 Penn. Ave. SE, Wash., DC 20003, 202/675-2060; no price listed.

• *The Los Angeles Riots: Lessons for the Urban Future*, ed. Mark Baldassare (255 pp., 1994), has been published by Westview; \$16.95.

Poverty/Welfare

• "A Look at AFDC Recipients" is a graphic showing marital status, education, children, race, average mo. payment per family, and % of total state residents on AFDC, from the March 3, 1995 *Wash. Post*. It's yours with a SASE.

• *Disadvantaged Young Men: The Union Inst. Office of Social Responsibility* has several reports available on this topic. For a publications list, contact them at 1731 Conn. Ave. NW, #300, Wash., DC 20009-1146, 202/667-1313.

• *Discriminatory Check-Cashing Practices: A Wash. Post* survey of 96 Washington-area Safeway supermarkets revealed lower cash-back limits (over the amount of the purchase) in poorer neighborhoods. We'll send a copy of the March 29, 1995 article with a SASE.

• "Ending Corporate Welfare As We Know It," by Stephen Moore & Dean Stansel (23 pp., March 1995), is available (no price listed) from The Cato Inst., 1000 Mass. Ave. NW, Wash. DC 20001 (202/842-0200).

• "Fighting Poverty in America: A Study of American Public Attitudes" is available (free) from the Ctr. for the Study of Policy Attitudes, 11 Dupont Circle, #610, Wash., DC 20036, 202/232-7500.

• "Getting Smart About Welfare" is an Issue Brief, available (\$2.50) from the Ctr. for Women Policy Studies, 2000 P St. NW, #508, Wash., DC 20036.

• "House Rescissions Would Hit Programs for the Poor" is an 8-page, March 7, 1995 paper from the Ctr. on Budget & Policy Priorities, 777 N. Capitol NE, #705, Wash., DC 20002, 202/408-1080; contact them for price.

• "Implementing JOBS: The Participant's Perspective" is a new report from the Rockefeller Inst. of Govt.-SUNY. \$1.50 from the Inst., 411 State St., Albany, NY 12203, 518/443-5258.

• "Low-Income Families: Comparisons of Incomes of AFDC & Working Poor Families," by Jane Ross (GAO/T-HEHS-95-63, 13 pp., Jan. 1995), is available, free, from USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, MD 20884-6015.

• "No Duty, No Floor: Permissible State Conduct Under the Temporary Family Assistance Block Grant," by Mark Greenberg (4 pp., March 1995), is available (possibly free) from the Ctr. for Law & Social Policy, 1616 P St. NW, #150, Wash., DC 20036, 202/328-5140. A related March 1995 CLASP publication is "The Temporary Family Assistance Block Grant: Frozen Funding, Flawed Flexibility."

• **"Number of Poor Children Under Six Increased from 5 to 6 Million 1987-1992"** is the Winter/Spring 1995 *News & Issues* publication from the Natl. Ctr. for Children in Poverty. The thrice-yearly newsletter is free: 154 Haven Ave. NYC, NY 10032, 212/927-8793.

• **Older Women in Poverty: Private Lives & Public Policies**, by Amanda Barusch, presents life histories of older low-income women (half of whom are ethnic minorities), integrated with policy analysis and a reform agenda. \$42.45 from Springer Pub. Co., 536 Broadway, NYC, NY 10012, 212/431-4370.

• **"Poor Households as Percent of Total Households-1989"** is a large colored wall map, showing 13 Southern states, county-by-county. Available (no price listed) from the So. Reg. Council, 134 Peachtree St. NW, #1900, Atlanta, GA 30303, 404/522-8764.

• **"Poverty and Public Spending Related to Poverty in NYC"** (39 pp., Aug. 1994) is available (no price listed) from the Citizens Budget Comm., 11 Penn Plaza #900, NYC, NY 10001, 212/279-2695.

• **Poverty in New Zealand: Poor New Zealand: An Open Letter on Poverty**, by Charles Waldegrave & Rosalyn Coventry (158 pp., 1987); "An Overview of Recent Research on Poverty in New Zealand," by Charles Waldegrave (34 pp., Dec. 1994); and other materials, some dealing with racial issues around the Maori and Asian Pacific Islanders, are available from Waldegrave, The Family Center, PO Box 31-050 Lower Hutt, Aotorearoa, NZ tel. 64-4-569 7112.

• **"Poverty Indicators: Ohio"** (1993) and **"Poverty**

Indicators: Cuyahoga County, Ohio" (1994) are available (\$12 and \$20, respectively) from George Zeller, Council for Econ. Opps. in Gtr. Cleveland, 668 Euclid Ave. #700, Cleveland, OH 44114, 216/696-9077.

• **The Coalition to Protect the American Standard of Living** is an effort to defeat Congressional legislation that would repeal the federal prevailing wage law (Davis-Bacon). Contact them at 815 16th St. NW, Wash., DC 20036, 202/347-1461.

• **"The Myth of Welfare Megarths,"** by James Johnson, Jr., David Grant & Walter Farrell, Jr., appeared in the June 1994 issue of *State Government News*. Using 1990 Census PUMS data, the study shows that "for the nation as a whole and irrespective of whether the states offer low, medium or high benefits, the number of interstate African American migrants who receive public assistance is small and not worth the media attention and public policy attention it receives."

• **"The Road to Independence: A Blueprint for Welfare Reform in NY State: A Report of the NY State Welfare Reform Task Force,"** chaired by (PRRAC grantee) Russell Sykes of the State Communities Aid Assn. (46 pp. + apps., Dec. 1994), may be available from Sykes (SCAA, One Columbia Pl., Albany, NY 12207, 518/463-1896) or Commr. Michael Dowling, NYS Dept. Social Services, 40 N. Pearl St., Albany, NY 12243-0001.

• **The Work Alternative: Welfare Reform & the Realities of the Job Market**, eds. Demetra Smith Nightingale & Robert Haveman (230 pp., Jan. 1995), is available (\$27.95) from Univ. Press of America, 4720 Boston Way, Lanham, MD 20706, 800/462-6420.

• **"Welfare Dependence: Concepts, Measures & Trends,"** by Peter Gottschalk & Robert Moffitt (Reprint no. 708, 1994), shows that "when measured as the total time an individual is on welfare or as the percentage of a person's income that derives from welfare, welfare dependency among women did not increase between 1974 and 1987, contrary to popular perception." Available (\$2) from the Inst. for Research on Poverty, 1180 Observatory Dr., 3412 Soc. Sci. Bldg., Univ. Wisc., Madison, WI 53706, 608/262-6358.

• **"Welfare, Out-of-Wedlock Childbearing and Poverty: What Is the Connection?,"** by Sharon Parrott & (former PRRAC Board member) Robert Greenstein (45 pp., Jan. 1995), is available from the Ctr. on Budget & Policy Priorities, 777 N. Capitol NE, #705, Wash., DC 20002, 202/408-1080. Also available: **"The House Ways & Means Welfare Proposal,"** by Sharon Parrott (20 pp. + app., March 1995); **"An Analysis of the Proposed Rainy Day Fund"** (3 pp., March 1995)—on the Republican bill to establish federal and state funds intended to ease the problem of funding shortfalls in the cash welfare proposal; **"What Do We Spend on 'Welfare?,"** by Sharon Parrott (14 pp., Feb. 1995). Contact CBPP for prices.

• **"Welfare Reform: Implications of Proposals on Legal Immigrants' Welfare"** (GAO/HEHS-95-58, 23 pp., Feb. 1995) is available, free, from USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, MD 20884-6015.

• **"Welfare Reform"** is a 2-page "talking points" paper from the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation, 908 Penn. Ave. SE, Wash., DC 20003, 202/675-2060; no price listed.

• **Welfare Reform:** Most natl. organizations working on welfare reform regularly post inf. & new resources on HANDSNET. Look in the Children, Youth & Families Forum and the State & Federal Budget Forum.

• **"Welfare 'Reform': Where are the Jobs?,"** is a March 1995, 4-page report (part 5 of its *Uncommon Sense* series), available (possibly free) from the Natl. Jobs for All Coalition, 475 Riverside Dr. #853, NYC, NY 10115, 212/ 870-3449. The Coalition has just appointed its first Exec. Dir., Timothy Canova; its Advisory Board includes Gertram Gross, Augustus Hawkins, Robert Heilbroner, Frank Reissman & Juliet Schor.

• **"Welfare That Works: The Working Lives of AFDC Recipients,"** by (PRRAC Social Science Advisory Board member) Heidi Hartmann, Roberta Spalter-Roth, Lois Shaw & Beverly Burr (88 pp., March 1995), is available (no price listed) from the Inst. for Women's Policy Research, 1400 20th St. NW, #104, Wash., DC 20036, 202/785-5100. A summary is available, probably free, from Millennium Communications Group, 1150 18th St. NW, 8th flr., Wash., DC 20036, 202/872-8800.

• **"Welfare to Work: AFDC Training Program Spending Billions But Not Well Focused on Employment,"** by Jane Ross (GAO/T-HEHS-95-51, 8 pp., Jan. 1995), is available, free, from USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, MD 20884-6015.

• **"Welfare to Work: Current AFDC Program Not Sufficiently Focused on Employment"** is a GAO report (GAO/HEHS-95-28, 41 pp., Dec. 1994) available, free, from USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, MD 20884-6015.

* **"When Welfare Ends: Subsistence Strategies of Former GA Recipients,"** by Sandra Danziger & Sherrie Kossoudji (43 pp., Feb. 1995), the Final Report of the General Assistance Project, is available (possibly free) from the authors, Univ. Mich. School of Social Work, 1065 Fricke Bldg., Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1285.

* **"Mainstreaming Poverty: Economic Insecurity & The American Dream,"** sponsored by the Next America Foundation (founded by Michael Harrington) and World Hunger Year, will be held May 17 at Trinity College in DC. A followup session, tentatively set for Spring 1996, will call on activists from around the country to adopt and implement the new agenda shaped at the first conference. Inf. from Frank Llewellyn, NAF, 180 Varick St., 12th flr., NYC, NY 10014, 212/727-8610, or Bill Ayres or Jenifer Urrf at WHY, 212/629-8850.

* **"Devolution or Demolition: The Effect of the Personal Responsibility Act on Aid to Families with Dependent Children"** (18 pp. + atts., April 1995) is available (no price listed) from the Ctr. on Social Welfare Policy & Law, 1625 K St. NW, #1250, Wash., DC 20006-1694, 202/293-8514, HN0560.

* **The Personal Responsibility Act: The Ctr. on Budget & Policy Priorities** has published analyses of the "welfare reform" bill (just passed by the House, heading for the Senate as of late April) affecting food stamps, WIC, and child nutrition programs, as follows: "The Food Stamp Provisions of the House Welfare Bill" (10 pp., April 1995); "Discussion of Selected Food Stamp Provisions in the Personal Responsibility Act" (11 pp., April 1995); "The Child Nutrition Block Grants" (10

pp., April 1995); "Do the Block Grants Cut Child Nutrition Programs?" (6 pp., April 1995). Contact the Ctr., 777 N. Capitol St. NE, #705, Wash., DC 20002, 202/408-1080 for prices.

Community Organizing

* **"Organizational Development Tools"** is available (\$29) from ResourceWomen, 4527 S. Dakota Ave. NE, Wash., DC 20017, 202/832-8071.

* **The Journal of Community Practice: Organizing, Practice, Planning, Development & Change** is a new quarterly publication of the Assn. for Community Organization & Social Adm. \$36/yr. indivs., \$48 insts., \$60 lib. ACOSA also publishes a networking guide, has a syllabus exchange, etc. Inf. and membership from Terry Mizrahi, Hunter College School of Social Work, 129 E. 79 St., NYC, NY 10021, 212/452-7112.

Economic/Community Development

* **"A Sustainable Economy for the 21st Century,"** by Juliet Schor, is a March 1995 pamphlet from the Open Magazine Pamphlet Series, PO Box 2726, Westfield, NJ 07091, 908/789-9638. \$4. Contact them for their publications list.

* **"Beyond NAFTA: Toward Equity & Sustainability"** is a report of an Oct. 1994 conf. sponsored by the Havens Ctr. for the Study of Social Structure & Social Change at the Univ. of Wisc. The 52-page report is available for \$4 from the Ctr., Rm. 8117 Social Sci. Bldg., 1180 Observatory Dr., Univ. Wisc., Madison, WI 53706, 608/262-1420.

* **CRA Watch** is a new newsletter (likely free) from the Ctr. for Comm. Change, 1000 Wisconsin Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20007, 202/342-0567.

* **"Micro-Enterprise and Women: The Viability of Self-Employment as a Strategy for Alleviating Poverty"** (76 pp., Nov. 1994) is available (\$15) from the Inst. for Women's Policy Research, 1400 20th St. NW, #104, Wash., DC 20036, 202/785-5103.

* **"Rebuilding Inner-City Communities: A New Approach to the Nation's Urban Crisis"** (69 pp., March 1995) is a Statement by the Research & Policy Comm. of the Comm. for Econ. Dev. \$18 from CED, 477 Madison Ave., NYC, NY 10022, 212/688-2063.

* **"Religious Institutions as Partners in Community-Based Development"** is the theme of the Feb. 1995 issue of *Progressions*, the Lilly Endowment's Occasional Report. Likely free from Laura Henn at Lilly, 2801 N. Meridian St., PO Box 88068, Indianapolis, IN 46208, 317/924-5471.

* **Request for Papers: The Natl. Congress for Comm. Econ. Dev.** is seeking applied research papers on economic development projects & comm. dev. corps. \$5000 will be given for each commissioned paper. Submit 2-3 page concept papers asap to Kevin Kelly, NCCED, 1875 Conn. Ave. NW, #510, Wash., DC 20009, 202/234-5009.

* **The Popular Economics** is the newsletter of the Ctr. for Popular Economics, Box 785, Amherst, MA 01004, 413/545-0743.

* **Legislative Attacks on CRA:** Bills have been introduced in the Senate & House that would gut the Community Reinvestment

Act. Action is needed *immediately*. For materials, inf., contact Allen Fishbein or Debby Goldberg at the Ctr. for Comm. Change, 1000 Wisconsin Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20007, 202/342-0519.

* The Natl. Congress for Comm. Econ. Dev. is holding its Washington Policy Forum May 15-17 in DC. Inf. from NCCED, 1875 Conn. Ave. NW, #524, Wash., DC 20009, 202/234-5009.

* The Tufts Univ. Management & Community Development Inst. will be held June 3-10 in Medford, MA. Some 50 short courses are offered, taught by (among others) Kim Bobo, Michael Swack, Robert Engler, James Stockard, Charlotte Ryan, Rob Hollister, Kris Rondeau, Louise Dunlap and Chuck Collins. Inf. from MCDI, Lincoln Filene Ctr., Tufts, Medford, MA 02155, 617/627-3459.

* The 3rd Annual Goddard Business Inst.—"education for socially responsible business leadership & management"—will be held July 9-20 in Plainfield, VT. Inf. from the Inst., 800/468-4888.

Education

* **"Charter Schools: New Model for Public Schools Provides Opportunities & Challenges"** (GAO/HEHS-95-42, 47 pp., Jan. 1995) is available, free, from USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, MD 20884-6015.

* **"Early Childhood Programs: Local Perspectives on Barriers to Providing Head Start Services"** (GAO/HEHS-95-8, 61 pp., Dec. 1994) is available, free, from USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, MD