

School segregation by race is extreme and increasing, despite the 1954 Brown decision. And, for many known reasons, these racial patterns clearly disadvantage blacks, Latinos and other racial minorities. Today's courts are hostile to racially-based remedies, and there is considerable resistance among the majority white population to forced integration. And so we are left with a dilemma: Do we nonetheless keep pushing for racial integration, as we did in the 60s and 70s? Do we instead try to make separate truly equal? Do we just throw up our hands? Are there other means towards that same end? Richard Kahlenberg of The Century Foundation proposes class-based integration steps as an alternative that can achieve the goal of racial integration. Gary Orfield of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, a long-time fighter for integrated schools, takes issue with at least some of Kahlenberg's premises and proposals (see page 5). We'd be happy to hear from other P&R readers on this vital issue. -CH

Socioeconomic School Integration

by Richard D. Kahlenberg

Today, most of the education reform world, liberal and conservative, accepts as a given that American children will attend schools that are largely segregated by class and race. There is a strong policy consensus that concentrations of poverty, whether in public housing or in public schools, reduce life chances, and an equally strong political consensus that we can't do much of anything to alleviate those conditions. Those institutions that remain devoted to bringing about the important work of school integration – for example, the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, and the Harvard Civil Rights Project – define the issue primarily through the lens of race, and they are facing an increasingly frustrating uphill battle. Whereas a focus on segregation by race made eminent legal sense for years, as the Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* sought to correct the gross injustice of racial apartheid, today courts use *Brown* to say

that all classifications by race are inherently suspect, striking down even voluntary race-conscious efforts to promote integration.

For those of us who care about equal educational opportunity and integration, the times demand a new approach that goes beyond trying to make separate but equal work, on the one hand, or simply pursuing a failing legal race-based integration strategy, on the other. This new approach seeks to integrate students by economic status, such as eligibility for free or reduced price lunch. Because much of the nation's concentration of poverty is the result of racial discrimination in housing, any plan to reduce economic isolation will produce, as a positive byproduct, a fair measure of racial integration. Moreover, the economic integration strategy helps create in all schools the single most powerful predictor of a good education: the presence of a core of middle-class families who will insist upon, and get, a

quality school for their children. In order to be politically sustainable, this new strategy should avoid forced busing and instead ride the popular wave of greater school choice. While private school vouchers undercut equal opportunity, programs of public school

(Please turn to page 2)

CONTENTS:

Socioeconomic School Integration ...	1
PRRAC Update	4
Response:	
Gary Orfield	5
Reparations/ Apologies	7
California Rural Legal Assistance	9
DC Vote Update	12
Racism in Schools ...	14
Resources	15

(SCHOOL: Continued from page 1)

choice, if properly implemented, can be a powerful vehicle for overcoming residential segregation by race and class.

Why Integration?

Why should we care about integration at all? A recent Public Agenda survey found that most parents, black and white, prioritize quality schools over integrated schools. Many blacks have come to see racial desegregation as essentially insulting. Why do black kids need to sit next to white kids to learn? As Clarence Thomas put it: "It never ceases to amaze me that the courts are so willing to assume that anything that is predominantly black must be inferior." Alternatively, under the new economic integration, what good does it do poor kids to sit next to rich kids?

The answer is that the separation of poor and middle-class children is the fountainhead of a host of related inequalities of educational opportunity. Specifically, here are ten reasons why socioeconomic integration matters:

- Good schools require an adequate financial base (as measured against student needs) to provide small class size, modern equipment and the

like. Low-income schools, on average, spend about half of what more affluent schools spend per pupil.

- Good schools require that money is spent wisely, on the classroom rather than on bureaucracy. In low-income areas, pressure is intense to make education a jobs program, so bureaucracies are more likely to be bloated.

- Good schools require an orderly environment. Low-income schools report disorder problems twice as often as middle-class schools.

- Good schools have a stable student and teacher population. High-poverty schools see more than twice as much student mobility as low-poverty schools, and teacher mobility is four times as high.

- Good schools have a solid principal and well-qualified teachers trained in the subject they are teaching. Teachers in high-poverty schools are more likely to be unlicensed, more

The times demand a new approach that goes beyond trying to make separate but equal work.

likely to teach out of their field of expertise, more likely to have low teacher test scores, more likely to be inexperienced, and more likely to have less formal education. Even when paid comparable salaries, most teachers consider it a promotion to move from poor to middle-class schools, and the best teachers usually transfer out of low-income schools at the first opportunity.

- Good schools have a meaty curriculum and high expectations. Curriculum in high-poverty schools is more watered down; and expectations are so low that the grade of A in a low-income school is often the same as a grade of C in middle-class schools, as measured by standardized tests results. In many low-income schools, AP classes and high-level math are not even offered.

- Good schools have active parental involvement. In low-income

schools, parents are four times less likely to be members of the PTA and much less likely to participate in fund-raising.

- Good schools have motivated peers who value achievement and encourage it among classmates. Peers in low-income schools are less academically engaged, less likely to do homework, more likely to watch TV, more likely to cut class and less likely to graduate – all of which have been found to influence the behavior of classmates.

- Good schools have high-achieving peers, whose knowledge is shared informally with classmates all day long. In low-income schools, peers come to schools with about half the vocabulary of middle-class children, so any given child is less likely to expand his or her vocabulary through informal interaction.

- Good schools have well-connected classmates who will help provide access to jobs down the line. Children attending high-poverty schools are cut off from access to informal connections that serve middle-class children well in finding jobs after graduation.

It is true, of course, that high-poverty schools can work, given a particularly charismatic principal or an unusually devoted teaching staff. The Heritage Foundation recently published a report, *No Excuses*, which "found not one or two [but] twenty-one high poverty high performing schools." The problem, of course, is that the Department of Education has identified some 7000 high poverty schools nationally that are low-performing.

The one type of successful school that Americans have been able to replicate time and time again are those in which a majority of the students are middle-class. Study after study has found that low-income students do better, and middle-class achievement does not suffer, in economically integrated majority middle-class schools. In a nation in which two-thirds of students are middle-class (not eligible for free or reduced price lunch), it is entirely plausible to set a goal of making all schools majority middle-class.

Poverty and Race (ISSN 1075-3591) is published six times a year by the Poverty & Race Research Action Council, 3000 Conn. Ave. NW, #200, Washington, DC 20008, 202/387-9887, fax: 202/387-0764, E-mail: info@prrac.org. Chester Hartman, Editor. Subscriptions are \$25/year, \$45/two years. Foreign postage extra. Articles, article suggestions, letters and general comments are welcome, as are notices of publications, conferences, job openings, etc. for our Resources Section. Articles generally may be reprinted, providing PRRAC gives advance permission.

© Copyright 2001 by the Poverty & Race Research Action Council. All rights reserved.

Race vs. Class

If integration matters, the new emphasis should be on socioeconomic status. Except where a district is rooting out the vestiges of discrimination – in which case the use of race is appropriate, even constitutionally required – leading with socioeconomic integration offers three advantages.

First, from a legal standpoint, *Brown vs. Board of Education* has largely run its course. The courts have made it clear that desegregation orders are meant to be temporary and with increasing frequency are releasing school districts from court supervision. Over the past 20 years, our schools have been slowly resegregating. Today, 70% of black students attend majority minority schools, up from 63% in 1980. Thirty years ago, it made sense to lead with race because *Brown* found that purposeful racial segregation is illegal but said nothing about segregation by socioeconomic status. Now, however, the legal posture has now changed 180 degrees. Conservative courts in Montgomery County, Maryland, Arlington, Virginia, and elsewhere have found, that, absent the lingering effects of past discrimination, efforts to promote school diversity by considering a student's race may itself be unconstitutional. The Supreme Court has not definitively ruled on this issue, but the election of George W. Bush certainly makes it more likely that a future Court majority will continue down the path of requiring race-neutrality except where race is used as a remedy to past discrimination. Indeed, in Wake County, North Carolina, an income integration plan was recently adopted based on the fear that the existing racial balance plan was probably unconstitutional. By contrast, even Justices Antonin Scalia and Clarence Thomas have written that using economic status is perfectly legal.

Second, on the merits, the factors that drive the quality of a school have much more to do with class than with race. As Harvard University's Gary Orfield noted in his 1996 book, *Dismantling Desegregation*, separate is

inherently unequal, not because "something magic happens to minority students when they sit next to whites," but because minority schools are so often "isolated high-poverty schools that almost always have low levels of academic competition, performance, and preparation for college or jobs."

Numerous studies have confirmed the findings of the 1966 Coleman Report that the "beneficial effect of a student body with a high proportion of white students comes not from racial composition *per se* but from the better educational background and higher educational aspirations that are, on the average, found among whites." This

Any plan to reduce economic isolation will produce, as a positive byproduct, a fair measure of racial integration.

finding is confirmed by other studies that conclude that racial integration is much more likely to raise academic achievement of African American students when the plan involves more affluent suburban whites, as in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina, as opposed to poor and working-class whites, as in Boston, Massachusetts.

The data on the various factors that make for a difficult learning environment – peers who are disruptive, who cut class, watch excessive TV, and drop out of high school; parents who are inactive in the school – all track much more by class than by race. Even the widely touted issue of African American students running down academic excellence as "acting white" turns out to be more closely associated with economic class (poor whites also denigrate achievement, on average).

Third, there is also a political advantage to leading with economic rather than racial integration. In some communities, like La Crosse, Wisconsin, local leaders believed that economic integration would go over bet-

ter with the public, in part because poor whites would also benefit, and in part because it would prevent opponents of integration from playing the "race card." More broadly speaking, there is an argument that progressives have a particular political interest in leading with class, so that so-called "Reagan Democrats" would see a benefit to their children – and would seek an alliance with African Americans, rather than opposing them.

How to Get There

How should economic school integration be accomplished? Compulsory busing – which gives parents no say in their children's school assignment – is a political nonstarter. A 1998 Public Agenda poll found that 76% of white parents, as well as a substantial minority (42%) of African American parents, were opposed to "busing children to achieve a better racial balance in the schools." But we've learned a number of things since the racial desegregation era of the early 1970s about how to make integration more politically palatable.

The first lesson is to emphasize choice over coercion. Voucher proponents say it's unfair to trap kids in bad schools – a stunning admission for conservatives who once defended the neighborhood school at all costs. Vouchers are wrongheaded for a num-

(Please turn to page 4)

We dedicate this issue of *Poverty & Race* to the memory and good works of Richard Cloward, a model practitioner of PRRAC's aim to marry intellectual work with radical activism. He and wife Frances Piven have been major contributors to our understanding of the function of welfare programs and their key role of social movements. A celebration of his life and work will be held September 20 in NYC. Information from Ken Grossinger, 202/966-2305, kgrossin@aficio.org

(SCHOOL: Continued from page 3)

ber of reasons, and they divide Americans politically, but there is consistently more than 70% support for greater school choice within the public school system. Choice empowers families where busing (or automatic neighborhood assignment) leaves them impotent.

The second lesson is to emphasize that economic integration is primarily about making schools effective and raising academic achievement. Last year, Wake County (Raleigh), North Carolina schools adopted a policy that no school is to have more than 40% of its students eligible for free or reduced price lunch (family income less than 185% of the poverty line) or have more than 25% of its students reading below grade level. The purpose of the Wake County program is not to rectify historic discrimination or to promote a utopian vision of an integrated society but to create quality schools and raise academic achievement. Says Wake County schools attorney Ann Majestic, it's "educational engineering," not social engineering.

The third lesson is to give educational incentives for middle-class families to buy in to integrated schools. It is important to offer middle-class families something in return, a reason to venture beyond local schools, whether that be smaller class size or an emphasis on the arts. We should capitalize on the common-sense notion that in education one size doesn't fit all.

Programs of public school choice can be a powerful vehicle for overcoming residential segregation by race and class.

The most promising mechanism is a system of assignment known as "controlled choice," used in Cambridge, Massachusetts and elsewhere. Automatic assignment based on what neighborhood people can afford to live in is abolished. Officials poll parents and find out what kinds of schools they'd like. Then they make every school

within a given geographic region a magnet school, providing special signatures or themes (e.g., computers, arts) or special pedagogical approaches (e.g., Montessori, back to basics). Families rank preferences, and those choices are honored by school officials in a way that will also ensure that all schools are majority middle-class. Schools that are underchosen get extra help, just as a lagging professional football team gets a first-round draft pick. The same 1998 Public Agenda poll which found strong opposition to busing found substantial support for racial integration combined with choice. Asked whether they favored or opposed "letting parents choose their top three schools, while the district makes the final choice, with an eye to racial balance," 61% of white parents favored the approach (35% disapproved), while 65% of black parents approved (34% opposed).

The era of court-ordered racial desegregation is coming to an end. But to give up on racial and economic integration altogether – pouring greater and greater resources into making separate but equal a little more equitable – is to concede almost all of the problem. Greater public school choice is in our future. The question is whether progressives can harness the choice movement to help overcome the massive inequalities inherent in a system that educates poor and middle-class children separately.

Richard D. Kahlenberg (kahlenberg@tcf.org), a senior fellow at The Century Foundation, is author of All Together Now: Creating Middle-Class Schools through Public School Choice (Brookings Institution Press, 2001), and is Executive Director of The Century Foundation Task Force on the Common School, chaired by Lowell P. Weicker, Jr. (<http://www.equaleducation.org/WhatsNew/Releases/CommonSchools.html>). The views expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the Task Force. □

PRRAC Update

- We say goodbye to **Melissa Best**, our Administrative Assistant, who leaves us after a year and half to complete her degree work at the Univ. of the District of Columbia; and we welcome in her stead **Tracy Jackson**, who comes to us from her most recent position at the All Souls Unitarian Church in DC.
- We also say goodbye to PRRAC Board member **Shari Dunn Buron** and thank her for her work as Board Treasurer.
- And our final goodbye is to **Alejandra Lopez-Fernandini**, PRRAC's 2001 Mickey Leland/Bill Emerson Hunger Fellow, who leaves us after six productive months here, off to spend the next year in

Peru.

- PRRAC President/Executive Director **Chester Hartman** is recipient of the 2001 Robert & Helen Lynd Award from the Community & Urban Sociology Section of the Amer. Sociological Assn., "for lifetime contribution to community and urban sociology."
- We thank the following recent financial contributors to PRRAC (some of whom responded to our suggestion that they donate all or part of their tax rebate to us – "an offer" that's still very much open to any of you as well): **Vernon McClean, Elsie Y. Cross Assn., Alvin and Ann Schorr, Suzy Post, The Joyce Foundation & Anon.**

Response

by Gary Orfield

Socio-economic integration is a good idea, but it is not the same as racial integration, may not provide some of the important advantages, does not have any enforceable basis in law, and often has been extremely controversial.

It is true that students in isolated high-poverty schools and neighborhoods suffer disadvantages regardless of race, but the fact is that there are few such schools and communities that are white. The basic reality is that race is related to but different in some critical ways from class. Middle-class blacks and Latinos face discrimination on racial grounds, poor blacks and Latinos face dual discrimination, and even upper-class blacks tend to live in segregated patterns and experience differential treatment on the basis of race. My black students at Harvard are often followed in stores and treated unequally not far from Harvard Square. Middle-class blacks often live with and attend school with more poor children than poor whites do because of differential housing practices and various forms of discrimination. Even in elite settings their children are often placed in lower-track classes, based on racial assumptions by counselors and teachers. Class-based solutions do not consider the fact that white resistance to being in predominantly black neighborhoods is independent of class and that the highest-income black families are as segregated from white counterparts as the lowest-income.

A variety of experiments with class-based integration show shortcomings. It failed to integrate Lowell High School, a selective public school in San Francisco; it failed miserably in the UCLA Law School; it has been a very partial and inequitable substitute for affirmative action in many institutions

A variety of experiments with class-based integration show shortcomings.

of higher education, which have had to rely on a variety of proxies for race, such as segregated high schools, to make up some of the losses due to affirmative action bans.

The assumption that it will be more politically popular than race-based desegregation is questionable. All the battles against suburban housing exclusion, about zoning and land use policies that excluded affordable, rental, and subsidized housing, were class-based, but they were often interpreted in racial terms and almost always defeated politically. Class-based desegregation lacks the history of discrimination argument as well as a legal basis, because economic discrimination is not considered illegitimate in American law or ideology, since economic status is considered a result of individual attainment rather than group position. When class-based school

desegregation was tried in Duluth years ago and in Wassau, Wisconsin, it produced an intense political reaction and was ended. School boards have always had the authority, plus some good educational reasons, to do this, but almost none do. The interest in it today is mostly from those desperate to retain some of what they see as beneficial racial desegregation threatened by hostile courts.

Anyone seriously considering class-based desegregation or class-based affirmative action needs to be skeptical about any claims that it will do the same thing or be readily accepted. Obviously, class-based desegregation is much better than none and has real educational benefits, but those expecting to achieve and maintain racial integration through this method would do well to try to include specific definitions of class that are more related to race – like persistent poverty and isolation in areas of concentrated residential poverty – and to think hard about the effects of cutting off middle-class blacks and Hispanics from the reach of civil rights remedies. Otherwise, class-based remedies can have the effect of helping the temporarily poor whose families have strong human capital, such as recent highly educated immigrants or recently divorced or downsized suburban families whose long-term prospects are very positive without special attention and who are not the victims of discrimination.

And we should realize that there are particular benefits that come from racial integration, in terms of learning and preparation for adult and community life, that do not come from economic diversity. In surveys we are conducting in high schools around the country, we find students reporting clear evidence of such benefits. We know almost nothing about whether or not class integration lowers or increases racial and class prejudice.

I agree that social class desegregation
(Please turn to page 6)

Website Update

We are in the midst of a massive reorganization of the content and display of the PRRAC website. We are creating a dynamic, database-driven site, which we hope will facilitate your finding the information you want on issues related to poverty and race in a timely manner. Over the next few months you will see a gradual transition to a site that stays fresh and current each month, is easy and fast to navigate, and allows simple or complex searches. The site will eventually include all the resources and articles from all issues of *P&R* back to its beginnings in 1992.

(RESPONSE: Continued from page 5)

tion needs exploration. Such exploration should include a careful sorting out of a variety of experiences and dilemmas. Until that work is fully done, and Kahlenberg's is only a first step in that direction, there is often a tendency to overgeneralize from limited information. It would certainly be foolish to give up race-based remedies, particularly where they, unlike class-based responses, can be linked to a remedial context and at least partially protected from local politics. Parents of lower-class students usually have very little influence and even less organization than minority parents and communities, and the continuation and support for good class-based remedies will be entirely dependent on political systems in which the poor are largely unrepresented. Class integration may be all that is left if the Supreme Court continues to dismantle race-conscious remedies, so it is very important that we have a sober and realistic analysis of its possibilities and real limitations.

My basic view is that a class-based remedy has to come from the elected branches of government in a society that denies class as a significant category, and that one which really helped with race would often have to be done in a way that would be attacked both as a subterfuge for race and as unfair to whites and Asians of similar income levels. The work I am doing with the group of scholars working with John Stanfield of Morehouse College on the reasons for the educational failure of black and Latino middle-class students has strongly reinforced my view that it is a terrible

failure to leave this issue off the table or to assume that class integration (defined by free lunch status, for example) of middle-class and poor blacks would produce a good solution rather than just accelerate out-migration of whites and the black middle class.

Nothing in my teaching and work on housing makes me think that addressing class without race will help much on the problems that we face. New Jersey's Mt. Laurel litigation

The assumption that it will be more politically popular than race-based desegregation is questionable.

built more than 30,000 units and almost none of them went to urban minorities. Without something very specific like Chicago's Gautreaux remedy, the class approach has consistently led to funding white departure and spreading housing segregation for minority families. This was apparent in the low-income home ownership program (Sec. 235) and in the private market voucher-type programs (Sec. 8). You can produce a great deal of housing for the poor and only intensify segregation, confining the black and Latino poor in areas with the kinds of schools that will keep them poor.

A good class-based remedy, just like a strictly limited and targeted voucher plan serving only minority kids in terrible schools, could be a very good thing, but my analysis of both the history of related policies and the total

Want to Present Your Work to a Washington Audience?

We'll be glad to host and help you publicize a presentation of your research and/or advocacy work on race and poverty issues. Let us know well in advance when you'll be in Washington, give us guidance on whom or what kinds of people to invite, and we'll send out the notices and sponsor your talk (usually best held during lunchtime).

unwillingness of policymakers in any branch of government to make and enforce complex definitions, plus my strong belief that unorganized constituencies of powerless people are consistently treated poorly, makes me believe that such policies would usually be poorly drawn, usually have weak effects, and would not long be able to retain targeted funding for transportation, recruitment and other key elements necessary to make a desegregation plan succeed.

None of this means that we should not try class-based plans where there is a will and no better alternative. I think we should. But it would be very wrong to think, on the basis of existing evidence, that they would be likely to be nearly as good for minority students, and, for social integration, as good as race-based remedies. It might be best considered as a supplement to rather than a replacement for race-targeted remedies.

Gary Orfield (orfielga@gse.harvard.edu) is Professor of Education and Social Policy at Harvard University and co-director of The Harvard Civil Rights Project. Among his books are Dismantling Desegregation and Deepening Segregation in American Public Schools. □

Edith Witt Internship Grant

We're still accepting nominations/submissions for this year's Edith Witt Internship grant (ca. \$2100) "to help develop a new generation of community activists." To apply: Send us a letter from the sponsoring organization, describing the organization's mission and outlining the work to be done by the Edith Witt Intern; and a personal statement (250-500 words) from the proposed intern and her/his resume. Deadline is Oct. 31, 2001. Pass the word on to relevant grassroots groups.

Reparations/Apologies

Periodically, we note recent happenings with respect to apologies for past racial injustices and compensatory steps – this is the most recent collection:

- Thousands of Mexicans brought to the US as farm and railroad laborers (known as braceros) during WWII have brought a class action against the US and Mexican governments (modeled after the successful suits of Holocaust survivors against Swiss banks and German companies), alleging they never received money deducted from their paychecks. As many as 300,000 laborers or their heirs are involved. Ten percent of their wages were deducted and held in savings accounts, and the money was to be transmitted from American banks to Mexican banks and given to the braceros upon their return to Mexico. With interest, the amount of money now owed could be \$500 million or more. (Details are in a front-page story from the 4/29/01 *NY Times*; we can send you a copy if you send us a SASE.

- Congressional Gold Medals were recently awarded to 29 Navajo “code talkers,” who used their unique language to develop a code that foiled Japanese intelligence and played a crucial role in the Pacific during World War II. Despite their important contribution, and the fact that they were Marines, they were mistreated at the time (one reported how fellow American troops held him at gunpoint, menacingly insisting he was a Japanese soldier) and until now their work was not recognized. (A feature film on their experience, “Windtalkers,” is scheduled to open later this year.)

- “Hidden from History: The Canadian Holocaust - The Untold Story of the Genocide of Aboriginal Peoples by Church & State in Canada,” published by the Truth Commission into Genocide in Canada, is available online: <http://annett55.tripod.com>. The report is the result of more than 6 years of research and contains testimonies of nearly 200 aboriginal eyewitnesses to murder, torture, sterilizations and other crimes against humanity committed at church-run residential schools and hospitals across Canada. More than 50,000 Indian children died in these facilities between 1891 and 1984, according to government statistics. More inf. from. Kevin Annett, kevin_annett@hotmail.com, 604/293-1972. (A short piece in the Winter 2000 *Native Americas Journal* raises the question of whether Natives who attended American boarding schools should sue for the abuses they endured – for more inf., contact Leslie Logan, 607/254-4955, 1188@cornell.edu; for inf. on the Journal, www.nativeamericas.com.)

- *Of Civil Wrongs and Rights* is a new film, by Paul Fournier, on Fred Korematsu, who challenged the WWII internment of Japanese-Americans before the Supreme Court (and lost in 1944) but carried on his 40-year legal fight to victory. For inf. about the film (and accompanying lesson

plans and materials), email pov@pbs.org or go to www.pbs.org/pov (other contact inf: 800/688-4768 & Talking Back, PO Box 750, Old Chelsea Sta., NYC, NY 10011).

- Relatedly, a new memorial (the Japanese American Memorial to Patriotism During World War II) on Washington’s National Mall – “an apology set in stone” – by Davis Buckley/Paul Matisse/Nina Akamu was dedicated last June (it’s at the triangle of NJ, Louisiana and D Sts., NW. close by the Capitol and Union Sta.). As the *Wash. Post* review of the memorial put it, it “commemorates the courage and, under the circumstances, incredible sense of duty of Japanese Americans who served in the US military during the war.” Go visit it next time you’re in DC.

- The Korea Truth Commission (733 15th St. NW, #515, Wash., DC 20005, 202/347-9300, iacenterdc@yahoo.com, www.iacenter.org) is demanding investigation and compensation regarding the US role in massacres of Korean civilians during the Korean War.

- Princeton’s graduating class of 2001 did a wonderful thing in making Justice Bruce M. Wright an honorary member of the class, as symbolic apology for the university having turned Wright away in 1936 when he arrived to register. (Three years later, in response to Wright’s request for an explanation of this indignity, the university’s director of admissions, wrote that Princeton “does not discriminate against any race, color, or creed,” but that there were a number of Southern students at the college, “and as you know, there is still a feeling in the South quite different from that existing in New England. My personal experience would enforce my advice to any colored student that he would be happier in an environment of others of his race.”) Not until a decade after they rejected Wright did Princeton admit black students. If you’d like to have a copy of the lovely June 5, 2001 *NY Times* story, send us a SASE.

- Yale, Harvard, Brown, et al.: Recently released and widely publicized research documents how money from the slave trade financed Yale’s first endowed professorship, its first endowed scholarships and its first endowed library fund. Brown University’s early benefits from the slave trade have been long acknowledged. And Prof. Daniel Coquillette of Harvard Law School has discovered that the school was endowed with the proceeds from the sale of slaves working in the sugar fields of Antigua. Disinterring such history – likely true for many of our beloved institutions – is important in educating the public, as well as pos-

(Please turn to page 8)

sibly enhancing support for reparations of some type. A copy of Brent Staples' Aug. 14, 2001 *NY Times* column, "Wrestling With the Legacy of Slavery at Yale," is available from us with a SASE. A letter in the *Times* commenting on the Staples column notes, regarding the current relevance of these historical facts: "The most important issue highlighted by the revelations about Yale's past is whether admissions preferences to relatives of alumni by institutions like Yale that have a racially discriminatory past are themselves racially discriminatory and unlawful."

+ The Aug. 27, 2001 *Newsweek* has several useful pieces on reparations, including pro/con essays by Manning Marable and Shelby Steele, an update on US support by Ellis Cose, and some background materials. We can send you the 6-page section with a SASE. PRRAC's first "best of *P&R* book, *Double Exposure: Poverty and Race in*

America, also has a first-rate symposium on the topic, with brief contributions by John Powell, Sharon Parker, Theodore Shaw, Howard Winant, Richard America, David McReynolds, Kalonji Olusegun, Ronald Trosper and John Tateishi. We can send you those 10 pages with a SASE (55¢ postage) – or, better, order the whole book from us (\$27.95 + \$3.50 s/h).

+ "50 Years of Denial: Japan & Its Wartime Responsibilities" is an internatl. conf., Sept. 6-9, 2001, in SF, "to highlight the Japanese government's steadfast denial of its aggression & atrocities in the 14 Asian countries it invaded & occupied during the Pacific War (1931-45) & its continuing refusal to apologize & compensate for its crimes against humanity." Likely this issue of *P&R* is arriving too late to attend, but inf. from the Rape of Nanking Redress Coal., 268 12th Ave., #8, SF, CA 94118, 415/374-8992. □

"The Drug War is the New Jim Crow," is the title of an article by Graham Boyd, founder and director of the ACLU Drug Policy Litigation Project, appearing in the July/Aug. 2001 issue of *NACLA Report on the Americas*. It contains a fascinating table supporting his contention that the drug war's racial targeting has "managed to replicate – at least on a statistical level – the shame of chattel slavery in this country." For the full article, or to subscribe to this first-rate publication, contact NACLA (N. Amer. Congress on Latin Amer.), 475 Riverside Dr., #454, NYC, NY 10115, 212/870-3146, nacla@nacla.org.

Projected Black Inmate Population and Black Male Slaves

<i>Year</i>	<i>Projected Black Male Inmate Population</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Black Male Slave Population</i>
2000	792,000	1820	783,781
2005	1,040,027	1830	1,001,986
2008	1,224,719	1840	1,244,000
2017	1,999,916	1860	1,981,395

The number of African-American male inmates is derived from the baseline of two million prisoners and the fact that African-American men represent 41.3% of the total inmate population. The growth in prison population assumes a constant yearly growth rate of 5.6%. This was the average rate of growth for the decade from 1990 to 2000. Source: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice statistics, *Prisoners and Jail Inmates at Midyear 2000* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, March 2001). The data regarding slavery are from Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, Study 00003, Historical Demographic, Economic, and Social Data: U.S., 1790-1970. Ann Arbor, ICPSR.

Board Member Report

Legal Services Practice: Devolution to Second-Class Justice

by José Padilla

This year, California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc. (CRLA) celebrates 35 years of existence. If “survival” were the sole gauge of a successful legal aid program, CRLA would consider itself successful indeed. But CRLA was a creature of 60s idealism that believed the injustices of American poverty could change in their various economic and social forms through a concerted government “anti-poverty war.” However, virtually all of the anti-poverty program efforts fell victim to the federal politics that reversed course from the Reagan presidency onward. Legal Aid, as one of those efforts, devolved to the rationed state it is in today – mired in regulatory controls that relegate poor communities to the same “second-class” status that poverty represents.

From inception, the critical debate was whether Legal Aid was to “reform” poverty in significant ways or whether it was to be about individual “access” to lawyer services, without challenging larger causes of injustice and poverty. Ironically, the bulk of Legal Aid work, including CRLA’s, is not about “law reform,” but about addressing the day-to-day poverty problems that beset families who cannot access the public benefit systems or other so-called “safety nets” – those who cannot cover monthly rent payments when a tragedy strikes or are suddenly unemployed.

But the goal of opponents of Legal Aid has been to apply a political “antiseptic” to the social justice practice, to free it from what they see as “contamination” – the practice of law reform, civil rights, labor rights and human rights. CRLA’s practice has mixed law reform and individual ser-

vices. Politically, opponents of Legal Aid call civil rights work “social engineering”: efforts to take on politically charged issues such as segregation, voting rights, immigrant representation, abortion rights and class action suits.

In 1972, because of political impacts of CRLA’s legal work, California governor Ronald Reagan vetoed CRLA’s funds in an effort to eliminate it. In response, the national strategy was to take Legal Aid out of state politics and send it to the national level, creating with the Legal Services Act of 1974 a new semi-governmental agency – the Legal Services Corporation – charged with regulatory and other programmatic oversight of Legal Aid.

CRLA has experienced almost 30 years under that law. In that time, government, in the form of the President, Congress, and the politically appointed Legal Services Corporation leadership, has tried to create a poor people’s Legal Service that is apolitical. Although the decade of the 70s saw a new law and an expansion of Legal Aid that reached its goal of “equal access” under President Jimmy Carter, the 1980’s saw the political attack renewed. The attack came in the form of a presidential effort to eliminate Legal Services; significant “defunding”; a “witch hunt” strategy using federal investigations to deter work; and use of regulatory restrictions to depoliticize Legal Aid practice.

Legal Aid as Second-class Justice Practice: Denial of Access. There are multiple ways to deny communities “access” to a system of justice. Among the ones experienced by Legal Aid

providers are: (1) Inequity in numbers of advocates; (2) Inequity in pursuit of critical issues and in service of critical populations; (3) Direct attacks against political programs or against controversial advocacy.

A. Inequity in Numbers: Minimum Access As a Civil Rights Issue.

Access to civil rights protections is itself a civil rights issue. Generally, the poorest members of an ethnic community (including immigrants) are the most vulnerable to civil rights violations because they lack the education, sometimes the understanding, to feel entitled (as a productive person) to their basic legal and human rights. Immigrants, even if legally in the country, may not realize that governmental authority would enforce civil and other rights that in their native countries may not be a function of government in theory or in practice. Therefore, to the extent Legal Aid is unavailable to ethnic communities beset by poverty, both civil rights and basic legal rights go unprotected. The decline in the number of lawyers in Legal Services points to an increasing disparity between the poor and the general US population. CRLA is a case in point.

The Example of Rural Inequity in Civil Representation. Even as statistics indicate that the American public enjoys an unprecedented access to legal assistance, the relentless attack on Legal Services show how “access” to the civil justice system has come to mean something dramatically different for the poor.

- General American population (1992): 1 attorney for 320 Americans
(Please turn to page 10)

(CRLA: Continued from page 9)

cans.

- CRLA service regions (1997): 1 attorney for 18,236 rural poor.
- CRLA statewide, rural farm workers (1997): 1 attorney for 40,965 workers.

The numbers are only the symptom. The cause has been the political defunding of social service programs, including Legal Services, through two major national attacks: national politics under the Reagan presidency in the early 1980s; and the Gingrich “Contract Against Americans” of the mid-1990s. Although the loss of funding was of critical proportions, “over-regulation” as a means of deterring specific advocacy happened simultaneously.

Defundings of the 1980s and the 1990s. In the two defundings, CRLA went from a 75-attorney law firm, with offices that averaged 5 attorneys each and that provided one lawyer to 5,000 poor, to a program in 1996 with 35 attorneys, averaging 1-2 per office.

During the first Reagan term, total elimination of Legal Aid failed, but nonetheless depleted the Legal Aid workforce enormously. CRLA’s response to the threat of elimination was to create an independent sister corporation, the CRLA Foundation, a strategy to continue CRLA’s mission of rural Legal Aid without government funds, but CRLA suffered a one-third loss of staffing. Fifteen years later, the 1996 Gingrich Congress eliminated another one-third, reducing the firm to 35 attorneys. CRLA could say it had come full circle – in 1996, CRLA began with 35 attorneys; 30 years later, it was back to square one.

B. Inequity in the Pursuit of Critical Issues: Denying Legal Service to

Please get your library to subscribe to *P&R*. We can provide a complete set of back issues.

Critical Populations.

Were I to capture in one phrase my 22-year experience in Legal Aid and civil rights advocacy, it would be that opponents of Legal Aid have been very effective in using regulatory reform politically to deter civil rights advocacy and to take “race” out of Legal Aid practice. In assessing regulatory reform as a “race” issue, all of the major restrictions limit taking action against the very activities promoting “racism”: electoral gerrymandering, segregation, and racial and national origin discrimination. And as a Latino whose own family “came across,” perhaps the most insulting reform was the prohibition against representing the undocumented poor – a restriction explicitly aimed at the most vulnerable of the Latino community. No one has called these “reforms” “racist,” but they are so, since no communities except “communities of color” would take on such litigation in claiming justice. For the ethnic poor, Legal Aid lawyering has suffered a continual erosion of its ability to address the issues at the heart of civil rights work.

From the very enactment of the Legal Services Act of 1974, school desegregation was excluded from the issues Legal Aid could address. Since then, electoral redistricting has also fallen to the wayside. The most effective and symbolic procedural means for effectuating civil rights remedies – the class action – went that way with the 1996 LSC regulatory “reforms.” Further, with the elimination of class action, the ability to afford immigrant working poor basic employment rights protections has virtually vanished as well.

Challenging “Racialized” Regulations. In the late 1980s, CRLA challenged, as a plaintiff, two of the restrictive regulations that most adversely impacted our ethnic client communities – the federal prohibition against bringing redistricting litigation with federal funds, and the ban on providing IRCA amnesty residents with legal assistance. In *CRLA et al. v. LSC*, the Legal Services Corporation effectuated a new “alien regulation,”

prohibiting LSC-funded Legal Service programs from using LSC funds to provide legal assistance to permanent residents who had legalized under the Immigration and Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA). LSC believed that federal Legal Services was akin to receiving other public benefits and was “welfare” assistance that could threaten the immigrant status of “amnesty aliens” immigrating under IRCA. In 1989, along with two employee unions – AFL-CIO and ILGWU – CRLA filed suit in federal court. Federal Judge Thelton Henderson issued a temporary restraining order applied nationally and enjoined LSC from implementing this regulation. In November 1989, Federal Judge Stanley Weigel permanently enjoined application of the regulation and granted our motion for summary judgment. The successful ruling had profound national impact. We estimate that some 2 million immigrant residents would remain eligible for critical legal assistance.

In *TRLA et al. v. LSC*, three rural programs challenged a prohibition preventing Legal Service programs from becoming involved with redistricting or census-related activity. Legal Aid programs in Texas and the deeper South had effectively used voting rights litigation on behalf of poor/ethnic communities for political empowerment. This marked the first time that LSC, without explicit Congressional mandate, had issued a substantive restriction. For local programs, Congressionally authorized to establish local priorities, the new regulation eliminated a community’s option for establishing voting rights as a priority. Although programs could use other governmental funds, such as state money, to bring this type of litigation, many programs did not have access to such funds. Programs also predicted that in the future, all funds (state and federal) might be subject to such restrictions, removing this type of litigation from Legal Aid dockets altogether. This later came true in 1996.

In 1989, CRLA, with Texas Rural Legal Aid and North Mississippi Rural Legal Services, programs painfully

aware of the consequences of not providing this citizen/immigrant empowerment, unsuccessfully sued LSC in federal court, challenging its authority to issue such an extraordinary restriction.

Rural Poverty is Not Color-Blind. Most Legal Aid organizations implicitly pursue “color-blind” strategies in their decisions to prioritize resources. Traditional civil rights issues are left to the civil rights groups such as the NAACP or MALDEF or other ethnic advocacy groups. Perhaps that may be an option for urban-based Legal Aid programs that relate to strong civil rights networks addressing urban civil rights problems, but it is the opposite for rural programs. Clearly, the economic resources of civil rights law groups are not extraordinary. Until the cuts of 1996, for example, CRLA had more lawyers within California than MALDEF had throughout the country.

In rural California, there is no civil rights infrastructure that brings these resources to the civil rights defense for rural poor ethnic communities. Generally, the infrastructure of nonprofit organizations in rural communities is much less developed than in metropolitan areas. Urban nonprofit resources and capacity are rarely used to benefit rural client communities. Although such urban groups may be approached to represent the rural ethnic poor on an ad hoc basis, their institutional focus (for reasons of history and resource efficiency) is generally urban. These groups will generally not have the local presence to maintain ongoing, day-to-day relationships that allow them to stay in touch with the changing legal needs that come from changing demographics and economic conditions. CRLA has always filled this void out of necessity.

In CRLA’s 35 years, its lawyers have brought every kind of civil rights case that could be found in a rural setting. The work has addressed such issues as English literacy in voting; voting rights for non-landowners; school district at-large electoral challenges; police misconduct; prison conditions; employment discrimination on

the basis of race, sex and national origin; sexual discrimination; sexual harassment in agriculture; environmental racism in Latino towns; affirmative action; education rights of immigrant and limited-English-speaking children, statewide welfare reform; and, at the turn of the 21st century, labor peonage. This came about not because we sought to be called civil rights lawyers but because rural racism was never color-blind.

C. Direct Attacks Against Political Programs or Against Controversial Advocacy. Surviving “Witch Hunt” and Challenging Attacks on Behalf of Rural Clients.

At the same time that investigations were significantly wasting already diminished resources, new regulations were being passed by Congress or the Legal Services Corporation. Some programs fought back. CRLA suffered some of these inequities along with the other hundreds of Legal Aid organizations. We were all denied the same dollars when defunding occurred. But where the inequities were felt differently was when the more political programs seemingly were singled out for special political harassment and special investigations. These were the programs that co-counseled with civil rights firms, that used class actions, that did civil rights work with the ethnic poor, particularly Black and Mejjicano. They were the ones that defended the rights of immigrants and the rights of farm workers.

Federal Investigations of the 1980s and Fighting Back. I first entered CRLA in the 1977-80 phase when President Jimmy Carter funded “The Expansion Years.” Unfortunately, I became Director during the height of the Reagan assault against the poor. A 1990 National Legal Aid & Defender Association report succinctly described the nature of the attack that followed:

“With the election of President Reagan, the [existing LSC] faced an openly hostile administration. This conflict dated back to the then-Governor Reagan’s fight with

CRLA, but it also reflected his strong belief that large-scale social programs were not the Federal government’s responsibility...”

With the shift in LSC Board composition, the new investigation strategy came into being. As noted in the NLADA report:

“Simultaneously, the [LSC] staff imposed more requests for information and began to use monitoring visits as an opportunity to harass local programs rather than a method of providing technical assistance to improve service delivery.”

Hostile Federal Reviews. From the mid-1980s to the early 1990s, federal reviews became reviews of “technicality.” Reviews were only about regulatory compliance. Programs perceived this as an objective to use regulatory noncompliance in order to warrant defunding. Programs also perceived this as a diversion of resources from the real purpose – to serve the interests of the poor aggressively. In a period of six years, CRLA suffered three such technical monitors: 1985, 1988 and 1991. It is difficult to describe, 10-15 years later, the political fear these reviews seemed to strike. Yet, they were moments when the program felt the most united and focused on survival – survival to maintain the ability “to serve the poor another day.” Harassment also came in the form of destabilizing funding practices. Whereas Legal Aid programs were generally approved for funding by the beginning of a calendar year, the 1986 investigations resulted in 15 programs being put on either three-month or month-to-month funding. CRLA was not on this short list.

Although seemingly less hostile, the second and third visits continued to waste staff resources spent in pre-visit preparations, as these reviews were seen as federal efforts to find technical regulatory violations and to assess program management practices. Again,

(Please turn to page 12)

(CRLA: Continued from page 11)

little interest in quality representation and services was shown. In retrospect, these three reviews were political threats that ultimately failed to end any program. They may well have identified practices that later became crippling restrictions.

Each review was scheduled for two weeks; the reviewers numbered 17, then 15, and then 10. I can say these were paper wars arguing whether an “i” had been dotted or a “t” crossed.

Beginning with the 1986 review, CRLA was represented by a large San Francisco corporate law firm – Howard, Rice, Nemerovski, Canady, and Falk. We selected this reputable law firm because one of the partners had participated in CRLA’s defense during the Reagan veto of the early 1970s. Again, as in 1972, CRLA used corporate counsel against the intrusive reviews, but also in its defense where CRLA was investigated for bringing what the government described as “abortion litigation.”

As previously noted, in 1989, CRLA joined two litigation actions against LSC. Thereafter, an independent investigation in 1990 was brought because of litigation that benefited health clinics. Finally, in 1991, LSC returned for its third “hostile” investigation, which ended abruptly when CRLA unions sued the government, charging violations of employee privacy.

Fighting Back. Part of the political defense of Legal Aid that allowed it to survive the 1980s was a national

DC Vote Update

Following up our lead story in the July/Aug. issue (“Voteless in DC: Government Without the Consent of the Governed”), these updates:

- The San Francisco Board of Supervisors unanimously passed a support resolution (introduced by Supervisor Matt Gonzalez), which awaits Mayor Willie Brown’s expected signature), joining previous moves by the Chicago and Philadelphia City Councils. Please see if you can get your own local legislative body to pass a similar resolution – in many cities, it should be an easy matter: for information on wording and how to do this, contact Amy Slemmer at DC Vote, 202/462-6000, aslemmer@dcvote.org. Such actions help to create the necessary national awareness of this shameful denial of democracy, and also influence members of Congress, where remedial action must take place.
- According to Ray Browne, the District’s elected “shadow Representative,” the Boston and Houston City Councils are “on the cusp” of taking similar actions, and the mayors of Las Vegas and Portland (OR) are strongly considering issuing proclamations supporting the District’s cause.
- A committee of the Illinois House of Representatives has voted

out a resolution endorsing DC’s drive for voting representation in Congress.

- DC Vote organized a “DC Freedom Summer” action, leafleting tourists at the Mall every weekend with fact sheets, and asking them to sign support petitions.
- A local DC activist testified in Geneva before the 59th session of the UN Comm. on Elimination of Racial Discrimination, arguing that the lack of voting rights for DC residents (2/3 of whom are minorities) violates a UN convention the US ratified in 1994. In the same way that the national government’s response to the Civil Rights Movement in the 60s was motivated to a large extent by fears of international condemnation, moves like this help create a similar set of external pressures.
- DC Mayor Anthony Williams presented the District’s case before the US Conf. of Mayors and will shortly introduce a formal resolution of support, which is expected to pass.
- Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle, a supporter of voting rights for DC, has indicated he will hold hearings on the issue, although no date

has been set.

- A documentary on the issue is in progress, from the Home Rule Film Project: contact Rebecca Kingsley, the producer/director, at 1664 Park Rd. NW, Wash., DC 20010, 202/387-4911, www.thelastcolony.org
- Amer. Univ. Law Prof. Jamin Raskin has published “A Right to Vote,” in the Aug. 27, 2001 *American Prospect*, expanding the DC Vote issue to plug for a constitutional right to vote. (Did you know no such right exists in our Constitution? As the Supreme Court ruled in *Bush v. Gore*, “the Equal Protection Clause does not protect the right of all citizens to vote, but rather the right of all qualified citizens to vote.”) The constitutions of at least 135 nations guarantee the right of people to vote and to be represented at all levels of government. Among the few nations joining us without such a constitutional right are Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Libya, Pakistan, Azerbaijan, Indonesia, Singapore and Chechnya. We’ll send you a copy of 3-page article with a SASE. □

fight. That is another story. This is about how CRLA fought back against specific charges and issues. After the second federal review of 1988, we can look back and count four victories. For us, “victory” itself was redefined. We call it “moral” victory to stand up and fight the issue – win or lose – and some we lost. These “defenses” were: (1) winning the right to allow immigrants with legal amnesty to receive Legal Services; (2) challenging the regulation that prohibited legal services programs from being involved in voting rights redistricting and census-related activity; (3) defending litigation that had provided health planning funds for health clinics; (4) challenging federal regulations that accessed employee personnel information.

Rural Health Clinic Funding. LSC Attacks the “Abortion Issue” in California. In February 1990, CRLA was placed on month-to-month funding for an entire year and was subject to another investigation because of our involvement in *Lickness et al. v. Kizer et al.*, successful litigation filed against Governor Deukmejian, who, in the summer of 1989, cut \$24 million of the \$36 million provided by the state legislature for family planning. The money was not to fund abortions but involved family planning counseling that included informing women that abortion was one option. Ultimately, in response to our litigation, the governor allowed the legislature to restore the funding to these clinics. CRLA eventually was fined \$13,000 for this involvement. Given the fact that \$20 million had been restored to more than 500 health clinics serving nearly 500,000 poor women, the fine was paid without appeal.

Employee Privacy: CRLA Unions Sue LSC and CRLA. In 1991, CRLA was monitored for the third time. CRLA’s labor unions had threatened to sue LSC because of a regulation that created special employee files that unlawfully contained private employee information, such as job evaluations, work grievances and resigna-

tion letters. LSC sought access to such material. The unions disagreed. LSC monitored CRLA for eight days with a ten-member team. CRLA unsuccessfully negotiated with LSC to limit full access to the information. Failing to reach agreement, CRLA agreed to release the special files on the ninth day of the review. CRLA notified its unions of this intent and notified LSC of the likelihood that CRLA unions would sue. LSC suspended the review within an hour of CRLA’s agreement to comply, charging CRLA with non-cooperation. The cancellation proved timely because within an hour of cancellation, CRLA’s unions entered the CRLA central office prepared to serve both CRLA and LSC with the suit, *Lawyers Union of Rural California et al. v. Legal Services Corporation et al.* In 1992, Federal Judge Marilyn Patel ruled in favor of LSC and provided it with “broad latitude to enforce [such] requests” for employees information. The case was finally settled.

D. 1995 – 2000: Contract Against the Poor And Direct Blows to “Law Reform.”

The short tale above takes us to the beginning of the 90s. Justice has not returned. The Clinton presidency did nothing to change the prohibitions; on the contrary, they worsened. Legal Aid suffered another devastating defunding, much like the Reagan attack of 1984. It resulted in another 25% defunding – CRLA losing 33% of its statewide staffing.

The 1990s almost mirror the politics of the 1980s. The worst changes to civil rights work came in this decade – the “poisoning” of all funds received by a Legal Services program was the most destructive. Whereas non-federal funds could, in the past, be used freely to perform all work otherwise prohibited by regulation, now these too became “governed” by federal laws. As an example, receiving one federal dollar brought with it the

myriad of prohibitions and restrictions on the use of any non-federal dollars.

And directly restricting law reform, the 90s brought a prohibition against, specifically, bringing welfare reform legal challenges and bringing class actions with any program dollars if you receive any federal Legal Service funds. Affirmative developments included two successful lawsuits. *Legal Aid of Hawaii et al. v. Legal Services Corporation* allowed programs to grant non-federal funds to other non-LSC-funded groups to perform prohibited work. The other was *LSC v. Velasquez*, which prohibited LSC from enforcing the welfare reform restriction that had limited advocacy only to individual welfare cases that did not include constitutional or statutory challenges to existing laws. Also, special services for farm workers were preserved politically through White House public acknowledgement of its importance and through the support of Congressman Howard Berman.

The Clinton presidency that began with hope in 1992 failed to produce significant changes to undo the restrictions of the 1980s. Rural poverty increased, but funding remained virtually static or declined. And because of the Congressional and presidential shifts to the Right of center, regulatory changes continue without change.

José Padilla (jpadilla@crla.org), vice-chair of PRRAC’s Board, is Executive Director of California Rural Legal Assistance. □

Be sure to send us items for our Resources section.

Making the Grade: Exposing Structural Racism in Our Schools

by Tammy Johnson and Terry Keleher

“...it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education.”

— *Brown v. Board of Education*
(1954)

Nearly a half century has elapsed since the U.S. Supreme Court outlawed school segregation, yet students of color still don't enjoy the educational opportunities available to their white peers. The *Brown v. Board of Education* decision spawned widespread efforts aimed at racial integration, yet it failed to produce racial equity.

Although many community-based organizations across the country engage in organizing and advocacy efforts to address racism in schools, the very existence of racism continues to be denied or hotly contested by the general public, the media and policy-makers. Without hard evidence, advocates' charges of racism are easily dismissed, and most public policies continue to ignore the significant dynamic of race. If serious reform measures aimed at equity are to succeed, the scope of racial inequity must be fully revealed, acknowledged and understood.

Methodology

In 1999, the Applied Research Center (ARC) developed a research tool called *Making the Grade: A Racial Justice Report Card*, to assist community groups in documenting, exposing and challenging racial inequities in schools. The program measures six quantitative and four qualitative indicators, such as graduation and college

entrance rates, disciplinary actions and drop-out rates, and access to gifted and advanced placement classes. It also provides users with a sample public information request to submit to their local school district. Once users collect and enter the data, the program computes statistical calculations to assess significant variations across racial categories. The Racial Justice Report Card then produces a customized report for the school or district under study, displaying grades of Pass or Fail on each of the ten indicators, as well as a final letter grade and potential policy proposals.

A PRRAC grant enabled ARC to provide additional technical assistance to three community-based organizations around the country. These included Bell County Race and Education Group, a predominantly African American community organization based in Southeastern Kentucky that works with the Democracy Resource Center; Californians for Justice, a multi-racial statewide social justice organization that used the report card to research racial disparities in San Diego, Long Beach and San Jose; and the North Carolina Racial Justice Network, which used the tool to assess the Guilford County School District.

Findings

The Report Cards reveal that on almost every key indicator, students of color had very different experiences than their white peers, confirming what many parents and students of color already know: public schools remain separate and unequal.

Californians for Justice (CFJ) gained a better understanding of key

education issues, not only in the three school districts they studied, but in the entire state. CFJ used the data to demonstrate that unequal resources and opportunities yielded unequal performance outcomes. In recent years, California has invested heavily in standardized testing, an academic performance index linked to rewards and punishments, and a high school exit exam that can result in diploma denial. CFJ's data shift the focus from individual blame to institutional accountability. The release of their report, *Still Separate, Still Unequal*, attracted wide media attention from major news outlets around the state, including the *Los Angeles Times*. CFJ and other partners are using the collected data to develop a statewide agenda for public education in California.

The North Carolina Racial Justice Network found that although their local school district had made some attempts to address racial issues, including the provision of diversity training for some of its employees, the district still received a grade of D after failing seven out of ten areas. Currently, the group is focused on changing discipline policy in order to prevent schools from contributing to the tracking of African American males into the juvenile justice system.

In Kentucky, the Bell County School District was less than forthcoming with the requested public records, providing incorrect and incomplete data. The Kentucky activists turned this roadblock into an opportunity to educate and mobilize their community, and to hold decision-makers accountable for their actions. The community group chose to focus on teacher quality in order to bring more public attention to critical needs.

The findings of these organizations were similar to those of more than twenty other organizations around the country that have used the Racial Justice Report Card. Last year, ARC compiled data from twelve cities into a national report, *Facing the Consequences: An Examination of Racial Discrimination in U.S. Public Schools*. Release of this report received prominent coverage in major cities across the country, including the *New York Times*, *Washington Post* and the Associated Press, as well as front-page coverage in *USA Today*. Significantly, some of the media coverage used terms such as “institutional racism” and “discrimination” to describe the inequality. Findings from the report were shared with the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, the U.S. Department of Justice and the California legislature.

Implications

- It is significant to note that the Racial Justice Report Card does not rely on standardized test scores to measure equity in schools. Standardized tests are often inappropriately used as a sole measure of performance and have been associated with racial bias,

especially evident in differential test scores across race. Many of these tests primarily measure educational opportunities, rather than proficiencies or potentials. As more high-stakes consequences are attached to these tests, individual students of color are most likely to be blamed for institutional failures. By examining other indicators, the Racial Justice Report Card keeps the focus of attention on institutions, rather than individuals.

- Researchers and activists used the racial disparities documented in the Report Cards to claim that there was racial discrimination in the public schools. Though the courts and often the general public require the element of intent to be present in order for there to be “discrimination,” activists using the Report Card assert that racially disparate *outcomes* alone, whether intentional or not, are sufficient to be called discrimination.

- By bringing more public attention and understanding to the phenomenon of structural racism, some of the most fundamental problems in our schools are more likely to be addressed.

- Though the Racial Justice Report Card is used primarily as a tool for documenting problems, most commu-

nity groups have used it as an advocacy tool as well, shedding light on needed reforms in critical areas, such as teaching quality and discipline.

Tammy Johnson tjohnson@arc.org is the program director of ARC's ERASE Initiative and recently authored the study "Vouchers: A Trap, Not a Choice."

Terry Keleher arcaction@arc.org is a senior researcher at the Applied Research Center. He has authored several reports on school equity issues and formerly served as an administrator and teacher at an alternative secondary school.

The Applied Research Center is a nonprofit public policy, education and research institute that focuses on issues of race and social change. The ERASE Initiative (Expose Racism and Advance School Excellence) is a national program of ARC that challenges racism in public schools and promotes racial justice and academic excellence for all students. Copies of reports and other materials are downloadable at www.arc.org. For more information, contact the Applied Research Center, 3781 Broadway, Oakland, CA 94611; 510/653-3415; erase@arc.org. □

Resources

Our Resources Section is somewhat shorter than usual in this issue. PRRAC is in the midst of a major revamping of our information systems (see Website Update box, page 5) in order to make all the information resources we have and produce easily accessible, via our website and other means. That involves changing the way I produce the Resources entries -- and learning new computer tricks is no easy task for this old dog. So things slowed down markedly, and I didn't want to delay any further production/ mailing of the Sept./Oct. issue. Hence, we opted to go with a short Resource Section rather than delay production -- all the items we didn't have time to list will be in the next issue. Also, you may note some formatting inconsistencies, typos and weirdnesses -- program bugs that will be exterminated by the time the Nov./Dec. issue appears. Starting this month, each resource is followed by a bracketed number (e.g., [637]). This is the Item ID number, which you will be able to use to locate that resource on the PRRAC website. -- CH

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 (34¢ unless otherwise indicated). Orders may not be placed by telephone or fax. Please indicate which issue of P&R you are ordering from.

Race/Racism

- *Crucifying a Color: Understanding the Nature of Our Blackness*, by Kenneth L. Johnson (159 pp., 1996) is a scientific, biochemical discussion on skin color. From Fertile Soil Publishing, PO Box 48006, Oak Park MI 48237. Contact the author at jrevkenny@cs.com [615]

- *"Making Human Rights Real,"* (47pp., 2001) report from the Internat'l. Human Rights Law Group, 1200 18th St., NW, # 602, Wash.,

DC, 20036, 202/822-4600, humanrights@hrlawgroup.org. Website: www.hrlawgroup.org [605]

● **“America Becoming: The Growing Complexity of America’s Racial Mosaic,”** (5 pp, 2001) RAND Policy Brief. Available in electronic form online. Website: www.rand.org/labor/popmatters/ [617]

● **“Harassment - What To Do If It Happens To You,”** is a August 2001 pamphlet with information and scenarios for response for people who have been subject to prejudice-motivated acts at the workplace and for those who counsel them. \$7 from The Prejudice Inst., 2743 Maryland Ave., Baltimore, MD 21218, 410/366-9654, prejinst@aol.com. Website: www.prejudiceinstitute.org [672]

● **Race, Gender & Class 3rd Annual Conf.,** will be held **Oct. 18-20, 2001** at Southern Univ. in New Orleans. Speakers include Bill Fletcher, Bob Wing, Gary Delgado, Edna Bonacich et al. Inf. from 504/286-5232 or 5157, jbelkhir@suno.edu. [675]

● **“Building Inclusive Prosperity in a Diverse Society,”** the 17th Annual Training Conference of the Natl. Community Capital Assn. will be held **Oct. 24-27, 2001** in Memphis. Information from the Assn. 620 Chestnut St. #572, Phila., PA 19106, 215/923-4754. Website: www.communitycapital.org [623]

● **1961 Freedom Riders 40th Reunion,** will be held **Nov. 8-11, 2001** in

Jackson, MS. For inf./contributions, 888/242-5415. reunion@freedomridersfoundation.org [680]

● **Challenging White Supremacy Workshop,** will be held on 6 Sundays, **Oct. 7-Jan. 27, 2002** in SF. Inf. from 415/647-0921, cws@igc.org [738]

Poverty/ Welfare

● **Hardships in America: The Real Story of Working Families,** by Heather Boushey, Chauna Brocht, Bethney Gundersen, and Jared Bernstein (July 2001) has been published by the Econ. Policy Inst., 1660 L St. NW, #1200, Wash., DC 20036, 202/331-5540. [606]

● **“Why Some Women Fail to Achieve Economic Security: Low Job Skills and Mental Health Problems Are Key Barriers,”** is the topic of the Aug. 2001 issue of *The Forum*, available from the Research Forum on Children, Families & the New Federalism, 154 Haven Ave., NYC, NY 10032, 212/304-7150, info@researchforum.org [666]

● **“2001 Report on Illinois Poverty,”** published by the Illinois Poverty Summit, is available at www.heartland-alliance.org/newnewsite/whatsnew.html [582]

● **“Designing Tax Cuts to Benefit Low Income Families,”** by Frank J. Sammartino (June 2001) is an Urban Inst. Policy Brief, available at Website: www.urban.org [596]

● **“Why Are Welfare Caseloads Falling?,”** by Stephen H. Bell (March 2001) is an Urban Inst. paper, available (free) from bnowak@ui.urban.org or at Website: www.newfederalism.urban.org/html/discussion01-02.html [599]

● **“How Welfare and Work Policies Affect Employment and Income: A Synthesis of Research,”** by Dan Bloom, and Charles Michalopoulos (76 pp., May 2001) is available from Manpower Demonstration Research Corp., 16 E. 34 St., NYC, NY, 10016, 212/532-3200. Website: www.mdrc.org [603]

● **“Welfare Reform Authorization & Rural America,”** (2001) a report from the Jt. Ctr. for Poverty Research, is available at Website: www.jcpr.org/RuralPovertyReport.pdf [626]

● **“Rewarding Work: The Impact of the Earned Income Tax Credit in Greater Washington, DC,”** (12 pp., June 2001) is available (likely free) from the Brookings Ctr. on Urban & Metropolitan Policy, 1775 Mass. Ave. NW, Wash. DC, 20036, 202/797-6139. Website: www.brookings.edu/urban [670]

● **“Teen Parents & Welfare: Do Diverted Teens Become the Unemployable?,”** is a **Nov. 16, 2001** audioconf., sponsored by the Ctr. for Law & Social Policy. Inf. from Website: www.clasp.org/audioconference/brochure.html [686]

● **“Reauthorization: What Looms for 2002?,”**

is a **Dec. 7, 2001** audioconf., sponsored by the Ctr. for Law & Social Policy. Inf. from Website: www.clasp.org/audioconference/brochure.html [687]

Community Organizing

● **“Now Hear This: The Nine Laws of Successful Advocacy,”** a 2001 report from Fenton Communications, available in PDF form on their website. Further info. from Fenton, 1320 18th St. NW, Wash., DC, 20036, 202/822-5200, nowhearthis@fenton.com Website: www.fenton.com [592]

● **Midwest Academy Training Sessions for Organizers,** will be held in Chicago (**Oct. 15-19, 2001; March 4-8, 2002; May 17-19, 2002** (Spanish); in NJ (**Nov. 12-16, 2001; Nov. 18-22, 2002**); & Calif. (**June 10-14, 2002**). Contact the Academy, 28 E. Jackson Blvd., #605, Chicago, IL 60604, 312/427-23204, mwacademy1@aol.com [688]

Criminal Justice

● **“Whose Safety? Women of Color & the Violence of Law Enforcement,”** by Anannya Bhattacharejee (59 pp., 2001) is a publication from the Amer. Friends Service Comm. \$8.50 from AFSC, 1501 Cherry St., Phila., PA 19102, 888/588-2372. Offprints of the Exec. Summary are available, free, from 215/241-7126, cruweb@afsc.org [602]

- **“Racism & the Criminal Injustice System”**, is the title of four July 2001 fact sheets (“African Americans & the Criminal Injustice System,” “Latinos & the Criminal Injustice System,” “Native Americans & the Criminal Injustice System,” “Facts on CCPOA, the Calif. Correctional Peace Officers Assn.”), from the Prison Activist Resource Ctr., PO Box 339, Berkeley, CA 94701, 510/893-4648. Downloadable from Website: www.prisonactivist.org/factsheets [600]

Economic/Community Development

- **“Smart Growth for Neighborhoods: Affordable Housing and Regional Vision,”** by Leah Kalinosky, Kathy Desmond, and Dennis Johnson (24 pp., July 2001) is a report from the Natl. Neighborhood Coal. 1030 15th St., NW, #325, Wash., DC 20005, 202/408-8553, nncnnc@erols.com. Website: www.neighborhoodcoalition.org [613]

- **“Smart Growth and Community Development”**, is a **September 13, 2001** Wash. DC conf. Speakers include Neal Peirce, Bruce Katz, Angela Blackwell & Christine Todd Whitman. Contact Dan Tatar, Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, 804/697-8463. [667]

Education

- **All Children Can Learn: Lessons from the Kentucky Reform Experience**, ed. by Roger S.

Pankratz, and Joseph M. Petrosko (320 pp., 2001) has been published by Jossey-Bass, 800/956-7739; \$25. [608]

- **Crossing Over to Canaan: The Journey of New Teachers in Diverse Classrooms**, by Gloria Ladson-Billings (192 pp., 2001) is available (\$24.95) from Jossey-Bass publishers, 800/956-7739. [611]

- **Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education**, ed. by James A. Banks, and Cherry A. McGee Banks (912 pp., 2001) has been published by Jossey-Bass, 800/956-7739; \$85. [612]

- **“The New Segregation” & “School Desegregation Policies & Judicial Trends in the United States”**, by Luis M. Laosa, appear in the Spring 2001 issue of *ETS Policy Notes*, available from ETS Policy Inf. Ctr., Rosedale Rd., 04-R, Princeton, NJ 08541, 609/734-5694, pic@ets.org. Website: www.ets.org/research/pic [669]

- **“Developing Family & School Partnerships: Guidelines for Schools & School Districts,”** is a 2001 pamphlet, available (possibly free) from the Natl. Coal. for Parent Involvement in Educ., 3929 Old Lee Hwy, #91-A, Fairfax, VA 22030. [604]

- **“The ABC’s of Public Financing for Early Care and Education: A Research and Advocacy Resource Book,”** (155 pp., 2001) is available (no price listed) from the Inst. for Women’s Policy Research, 1707 L St. NW, #750, Wash., DC 20036, 202/785-5100. Website:

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

www.iwpr.org [609]

- **“Leading for Diversity: How School Leaders Can Improve Interethnic Relations,”** by Rosemary Henze, Anne Katz, Edmundo Norte, and Susan Sather (27 pp., 2001) is a report based on 21 case studies across schools in the US with highly diverse student populations. \$5.50 from the Ctr. for Research on Education, Diversity, & Excellence, 1156 High St., Santa Cruz, CA 95064, 831/459-3500, crede@cats.ucsc.edu. Website: www.crede.ucsc.edu [668]

- **Partners for Public Education**, is a just-launched media and grassroots organizing campaign, cosponsored by the NAACP and People for the American Way, aimed at encouraging black & Latino parents to become more deeply involved in their children’s education. For inf., contact 202/467-2361. [677]

- **“Evolving Purposes of Testing & Assessment Systems”**, is the CRESST (Natl. Ctr. for Research on Evaluation, Standards & Student Testing) Annual Conf., **September 13 - 14, 2001** at UCLA. Inf. from 310/794-9140. [630]

- **The Natl. Commn. for African American Education**, is holding its

Education Policy Forum, **Oct. 26, 2001** at the Rayburn House Office Bldg. in DC. Inf. from the Commn., 2142 Industrial Pkwy, #202, Silver Spring, MD 20904, 202/415-1674. [691]

- **“High Stakes: Achievement, Assessment & Advocacy Through Multicultural Education”**, is the 11th annual internatl. conf. of the Natl. Assn. for Multicultural Education **Nov. 7-11, 2001**, in Las Vegas. Inf. from NAME, 733 15th St. NW, #430, Wash., DC 20005, 202/628-6263, name@nameorg.org. [681]

- **The Amer. Council on Rural Special Education**, is holding its 22nd natl. conf. **March 7- 9, 2002** in Reno. Session proposals due Oct. 1. Contact ACRES, 2323 Anderson Ave., #226, Manhattan, KS 66502, 785/532-2737, acres@ksu.edu. [679]

Employment/ Jobs Policy

- **Unlevel Playing Fields: Understanding Wage Inequality & Discrimination**, by Randy Albelda, Robert W. Drago, and Steven Shulman (August 2001) has been published by Econ. Affairs Bureau. \$21.95. Contact Dollars & Sense, 740 Cambridge

St., Cambridge, MA 02141, 617/876-2434, dollars@dollarsandsense.org [629]

● **“Divided We Fall: Deserving workers slip through America’s patchwork unemployment insurance system,”** by Jeffrey Wenger, a 24-page, Aug. 2001 Econ. Policy Inst. Briefing Paper, is available (no price listed) from EPI, 1660 L St. NW, #1200, Wash., DC 20036, 202/775-8810. Website: www.epinet.org [560]

● **“Help Wanted: Low-Income Single Adult Job Seekers and the Programs Serving Them,”** is an 81 page, May 2001 Mid-America Inst. on Poverty Research & Policy Report. \$10 from the Inst., 298 LaSalle, #1818, Chicago, IL 60604, 312/660-1342, arynell@heartland-alliance.org [590]

● **“Building New Partnerships for Employment: Collaboration Among Agencies & Public Housing Residents in the Jobs-Plus Demonstration,”** by Linda Y. Kato, and James A. Riccio (143 pp., May 2001) is a Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation report, available, likely free, from MDRC, 16 E. 34 St, NYC, NY, 10016, 212/532-3200. Website: www.mdrc.org [601]

● **“Gloomy Weather for Labor Day 2001: Job losses, falling real wages hit the majority of US states,”** by Edith Rasell, and Yvon Pho (20 pp., Sept., 2001) Econ. Policy Inst. Briefing Paper. It examines changes in employment and unemployment rates and wages in all 50 states and the District of Columbia

across three time periods. Avail. from EPI, 1660 L St., NW, Wash., DC 20036, 202/775-8810. [673]

Families/ Women/ Children

● **“Asian American Factsheets,”** (2001): The Coal. for Asian American Children & Families has published a series of Fact Sheets: “Snapshots of NYC: An Overview of Asian American Families,” “Education and NY’s Asian American Children,” “Child & Family Health of NY’s Asian American Community,” “Understanding the Issues of Abuse & Neglect & Asian American Families.” Available (likely free) from the Coal., 212/809-4675, x25, wng@cacf.org [624]

● **“State Initiatives to Promote Early Learning: Next Steps in Coordination of Subsidized Child Care, Head Start & State Prekindergarten,”** is a mid-2001 paper from the Ctr. for Law & Social Policy. Available (free) from CLASP, 1616 P St. NW, #150, Wash., DC 20036 or Website: www.clasp.org/pubs/childcare [683]

● **“An Ounce of Prevention & A Pound of Cure: Developing State Policy on the Payment of Child Support Arrears by Low Income Parents,”** is a mid-2001 paper, by Paula Roberts, available from the Ctr. for Law & Social Policy, 1616 P St. NW, #150, Wash., DC 20036, Website: www.clasp.org/pubs/childenforce/Arrearage%20Paper.PDF [684]

● **“The Child Poverty Reduction Act,”** has been introduced in the Senate (S.1027) by Charles Schumer (D-NY) and in the House (H.R. 2166) by Rep. Fortney Pete Stark (D-CA). For copy of the bill, go to the Website: www.thomas.loc.gov [682]

● **“Life at Low Wages: What Work & Child Rearing Choices Do Parents Face?”**, is a Nov. 2, 2001 audioconf., sponsored by the Ctr. for Law & Social Policy. Inf. from Website: www.clasp.org/audioconference/brochure.html [685]

● **“Family Support: Time Has Come!”**, is an April 22-25, 2002 conf. in Chicago. Inf. from 312/338-0900, Website: www.familysupportamerica.org [607]

Health

● **“Are We Responding to Their Needs? States’ Early Experiences Serving Children with Special Health Care Needs Under SCHIP,”** by Ian Hill, Amy Westphal Lutzky, and Renee Schwalberg (40 pp., June 2001) is an Urban Inst. Occasional Paper, available from bnw@ui.urban.org or Website: www.newfederalism.urban.org/html/op48/occa48.html [715]

● **“Does SCHIP Spell Better Dental Care Access for Children? An Early Look at New Initiatives,”** by Ruth A. Almeida, Ian Hill, and Genevieve M. Kenney (31 pp., July 2001) is available (likely free) from The Urban Inst., 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/833-7200 paffairs@ui.urban.org

Website: www.urban.org [552]

● **“Why Aren’t More Uninsured Children Enrolled in Medicaid or SCHIP?,”** by Genevieve M. Kenney, and Jennifer Haley (7 pp., May 2001) is an Urban Inst. Policy Brief, available, free, from bnw@ui.urban.org. [589]

● **“How Familiar Are Low-Income Parents with Medicaid & SCHIP?,”** by Genevieve M. Kenney, Jennifer Haley, and Lisa Dubai, a 7 pp., May 2001 Urban Inst. report, is available, free, from 202/261-5687 or at Website: www.newfederalism.urban.org/html/series_b34/b34.html [591]

● **“Has the Jury Reached a Verdict? States’ Early Experiences with Crowd Out under SCHIP,”** by Amy Westphal Lutzky, and Ian Hill, is a 25 pp., June 2001 Urban Inst. occasional paper, available online or from the Inst., 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/833-7200, paffairs@ui.urban.org. Website: www.newfederalism.urban.org/html/op47/occa47.html [594]

● **“Ambulatory Care for the Urban Poor: Structure, Financing & System Stability,”** by Barbara Ormond, and Amy Westphal Lutzky, is a 38-page, June 2001 Urban Inst. report, available online. Website: www.newfederalism.urban.org/html/op49/occa49/html [598]

● **“Young Men’s Sexual and Reproductive Health,”** ed. by Freya L. Sonenstein (48 pp., Nov. 2000) is available from the Urban Inst. 2100 M

St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/261-5709, paffairs@ui.urban.org [614]

- **“Child Health Insurance: What Expansion Options Increase Coverage Best?”**, is a **Sept. 14, 2001** national audio conference, hosted by the Ctr. for Law & Social Policy. For inf., contact Website: www.clasp.org/audioconference/brochure/html. [619]

- **“Uniting for Health Care”, October 4 - 5, 2001** is the annual conference of the Calif. Primary Care Assn. in Sacramento. For more information call 916/440-8170. [664]

Housing

- ***In Pursuit of a Dream Deferred: Linking Housing & Education Policy***, ed. by John A. Powell, Gavin Kearny, and Vina Kay (285 pp., 2001) has been published by Peter Lang. Available from the Inst. on Race & Poverty, 415 Law Ctr., 229-19th Ave. S., Mpls., MN 55455, 612/625-8071. [674]

- **“Race & Housing in the Postwar City: An Explosive History,”** by Raymond A. Mohl, is a 22-page article appearing in the Spring 2001 issue of *The Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*. Other useful articles in the issue are:

Remember to send us items for our Resources Section

“Race & Housing in Chicago,” by Roger Biles (8 pp.); “‘Hemmed In’: The Struggle Against Racial Restrictive Covenants & Deed Restrictions in Post-World War II Chicago,” by Wendy Plotkin (31 pp.); “‘Apologies to Dracula, Werewolf, Frankenstein’: White Homeowners & Blockbusters in Postwar Chicago,” by Amanda Irene Seligman (26 pp.); “What Went Wrong with Public Housing in Chicago? A History of the Robert Taylor Homes,” by D. Bradford Hunt (30 pp.). The issue is available (\$5+s/h) from the Society, 210 1/2 S. 6th St., #200, Springfield, IL 62701-1503. [631]

- **“Rucker v. Davis & Its Significance for Tenant Advocates,”** appears in the July/Aug. 2001 issue (pp. 144-158) of *Clearinghouse Review*, published by the Natl. Ctr. on Poverty Law, 205 W. Monroe St., 2nd fl., Chicago, IL 60606-5013, 312/263-3830; contact them for ordering inf. [640]

- **“The ‘One Strike’ Policy in Public Housing,”** by Barclay Thomas Johnson, appears in the July/Aug. 2001 issue (pp. 159-177) of *Clearinghouse Review*, published by the Natl. Ctr. on Poverty Law, 205 W. Monroe St., 2nd fl., Chicago, IL 60606-5013, 312/263-3830. Contact them re ordering inf. [641]

- **“Housing and Property Restitution for Refugees & Internally Displaced Persons: International, Regional & National Resources,”** (124 pp., June 2001) is available (\$15) from the

Centre on Housing Rights & Evictions. 83 Rue de Montbrillant, 1202 Geneva, Switzerland, 41-22-7341028. [620]

- **“Housing: What Do Suburbs or PHAs [public housing authorities] Spell for Low Income Kids & Parents?”**, is a **Oct. 19, 2001** audioconference, hosted by the Ctr. for Law & Social Policy. Website: www.clasp.org/audioconferences/brochure.html [621]

Immigration

- **“Census 2000 Undercount of Immigrants & Farmworkers in Rural California Communities,”** by Ilene J. Jacobs, and Edward Kissam, is a 31-page, Aug. 2001 report, available from Kissam, The Aguirre Gp., 480 E. 4th Ave., #A, San Mateo, CA 94401, 510/482-9979, ekissam@aiweb.com [689]

- **Strengthening Immigrant Families and American Communities Conference**, will be held **December 9-11, 2001** in San Diego, sponsored by Grantmakers Concerned with Immigrants & Refugees. Info. from 707/824-4375, info@gcir.org. Website: www.gcir.org [665]

Miscellaneous

- **“Rights for Some: The Erosion of Democracy,”** by Jean Hardisty, is the 12-page lead article in the Summer 2001 issue of *The Public Eye*, published by Political Research Associates, 1310 Broadway, #201, Somerville, MA 02144-1731, 617/666-5300. Subs: \$29/indivs. & nonprofits, \$19 students

& low-income, \$39 others. The issue also contains an extensive resource listing of Right-Wing Groups & Ideologies, prepared by Chip Berlet. [627]

- **“From Digital Disconnect to Digital Empowerment: Building a More Equitable Society Through Leadership, Investment, and Collaboration,”** (63 pp., Spring 2001) a report from the Leadership Conference Education Fund, examines the capacity & use of new technologies among national civil rights organizations as well as their understanding and participation in communications and Internet public policy issues. Available (possibly free) from LCEF, 1629 K St. NW, #1010, Wash., DC 20006, 202/466-3311. Website: www.civilrights.org [616]

- **“Illinois Assembly on Political Representation & Alternative Electoral Systems - Exec. Summary,”** a body headed by former Dem. Congressman Abner Mikva & former Rep. Gov. Jim Edgar, calls for bringing the cumulative voting system back. The 35-page, 2001 summary is available (possibly free) from the Univ. of IL Inst. of Govt. & Public Affairs, 1007 W. Nevada, Urbana, IL 61801, 217/333-3340. [632]

Job Opportunities/Fellowships/Grants

- **The American Civil Liberties Union Foundation**, has several open positions: **Staff Attorney** (Natl. Legal Dept.);

Attorney (Reproductive Freedom Proj.); **Dir. of Gift Planning & a Sr. Gift Planning Officer** (Devlpmt. Dept.). Ltr./resume/3 refs./writing sample to ACLUF, 125 Broad St., 18th Fl., NYC, NY 10004, 212/549-4601. Website: www.aclu.org [743]

● **The Fellowship of Reconciliation**, is looking for a **Natl. Coordinator**. For applic., contact Box 271, Nyack, NY 10960, 845/358-4601, 845-358-4924(fax). [745]

● **The Natl. Ctr. on Law & Poverty**, needs a **Housing Staff Attorney**. Ltr./resume/writing sample/2 refs. to the Ctr., 205 W. Monroe St., 2nd Fl., Chicago, IL 60606, 312/263-3830 x251. williamwilen@povertylaw.org. [747]

● **The Natl. Employment Law Project**, seeks a **Staff Attorney**. Ltr./resume/3 refs. to NELP, 55 John St., 7th Fl., NYC, NY 10038, 212/285-3025, 212/285-3044 (fax), nelp@nelp.org. [748]

● **The Washington Peace Center**, is hiring a **Coordinator**. Ltr./resume to the Ctr., 1000 Wisconsin Ave. NW, #104, Washington, DC 20009. [749]

● **The Centre on Housing and Evictions**, seeks a **Coordinator** (Women & Housing Rights Programme). Resume/ltr. to COHRE, 83 Rue de Montbrillant, 1202 Geneva, Switzerland. Website: www.cohre.org [750]

● **The Center for Community Change**, seeks a **Research Director**. Ltr./resume to the

Ctr., 1000 Wisconsin Ave NW, Washington, DC 20007, 202/342-0567, lopezC@commchange.org. [751]

● **Food First/The Institute for Food and Development Policy**, is seeking a **Senior Analyst/Economist**. Resume/ltr./3 refs./writing sample to 398 60th St., Oakland, CA 94618, 510/654-4551 (fax), foodfirst@foodfirst.org. [742]

● **Interfaith Housing of Western Maryland**, is filling three positions: **Deputy Director, Director** (Home Ownership Housing) & an **Asst. Project Mgr.** (Multi-family & Special Projects). Resume/ltr. to 731 North Market St., Frederick, MD 21701, 301/66204225, 301/662-6477 (fax). Website: www.interfaithhousing.org [752]

● **The Asian Pacific American Legal Resource Center**, is hiring a **Legal Interpreter**. Resume/ltr. to 733 15th St. NW, #315, Washington, DC 20005, 202/393-3572, 202/393-0995 (fax), george.wu@apalrc.org. [753]

● **The Ford Foundation**, (Human Rights & International Cooperation unit) seeks a **Program Officer** (Racial Justice). Resume/ltr. to the Fdn., 320 E. 43rd St., NYC, NY 10017, 212/573-5262, 212/351-3644 (fax), j.graber@fordfound.org. [754]

● **DEMOS**, a new research/advocacy org., seeks an **Associate Director**. C.V./salary reqs./writing sample to 155 Ave. of the Americas, 4th Fl., NYC, NY 10013, jobs.democracy@demos-

usa.org. [756]

● **The Open Society Institute**, is offering several **Fellowships** in the following areas: Crime and Communities Media, Soros Justice Postgraduate, & Soros Justice Senior. Website: www.soros.org/crime [758]

● **The Boston Lawyers' Committee**, seeks an **Executive Director**. Resume/ltr. to Maguerite McEnery, Boulware & Associates, Inc., 175 West Jackson Blvd., #1841, Chicago, IL, 60604, 312/322-0088, 312/322-0092 (fax), marg@boulwareinc.com. [760]

● **The Ctr. for Children & Families**, (Education Development Ctr.) is seeking a **Research Associate**. Ltr./resume/3 refs. to EDC, 55 Chapel St., Newton, MA 02458, 617/969-3440 (fax), msweet@edc.org. [762]

● **The Los Angeles Unified School District**, (Program & Evaluation & Research Branch) is seeking applications for a **Project Director & Asst. Director**. For more info contact Julie Slayton, 213/625-6976, jslayton@lausd.k12.ca.us. [763]

● **Community Organizing & Family Issues**, has the following openings: **Lead Organizer, Local Organizer & Program Administrator**. Ltr./resume to COFI, 954 W. Washington, Box 42, Chicago, IL 60607. [767]

● **American Civil Liberties Union of Texas**, is in need of an **Office Manager**. Ltr./resume to ACLU/Texas, PO Box 3629, Austin, TX 78764. [768]

● **ACORN**, has immediate openings for **Organizers**. Website: www.acorn.org/contact-us/index.html [769]

● **People for the American Way Foundation**, seeks a **Project Coordinator**. Ltr./resume to hiring_committee@hotmail.com. [770]

● **The Joint Center for Political & Economic Studies**, is seeking a **Program Associate**. Ltr./resume/salary reqs. to nrobinson@jointcenter.org. [772]

● **The American Civil Liberties Union**, invites applications for a **Field Director**. Ltr./resume/writing sample to ACLU Washington Legislative Office, 122 Maryland Ave. NE, Washington, DC 20002. [773]

● **The North Star Fund**, is accepting applications from NYC grassroots organizations for **Grants**. For guidelines/applic., contact the fund, 305 Seventh Ave., 5th Fl., NYC, NY 10001-6008, 212/620-9110, 212/620-8178 (fax). Website: www.northstarfund.org/grants.htm [775]

● **The Advancement Project**, seeks a **Project Director**. Resume/refs. to 1730 M St. NW, #401, Washington, DC, 20036, ttull@advanceproj.org. [777]

● **The Social Policy Action Network**, seeks a **Sr. Policy Analyst**. Ltr./resume/writing sample to SPAN, 444 North Capitol, #309, Washington, DC 20001, 202/434-4769. Website: www.epn.org/jobs/span010817.html [778]

● **The New Voices Natl. Fellowship Prog.**, is available to support small nonprofits and promising social justice leaders. Two-yr. grants include salary, fringe benefits, financial asst., mentoring & prof. dev. 15 awards will be made. Jan. 15, 2002 deadline. Inf. from Acad. for Educ. Devl., 1825 Conn. Ave NW, #744, Washington, DC 20009, 202/884-

8051, newvoice@aed.org. [779]

● **Occidental College's Dept. of Politics**, has a tenure-track opening. Ltr./c.v./3 ltrs. of rec. by Nov 30 to Prof. Peter Dreier, c/o Sylvia Chico, schico@oxy.edu. [782]

● **The Mickey Leland-Bill Emerson Hunger Fellows Prog.**, is hiring a **Co-Director**. Ltr./resume

by Sept. 14 to John Kelly at the Prog., Congressional Hunger Ctr., 229 1/2 Penn. Ave. SE, Washington, DC 20003, jkelly@hungercenter.org. [786]

● **International Grantmaking Forum**, sponsored by Grantmakers Without Borders, will be held in Oakland. For info, contact John Harvey,

617/794-2253, gwob@att.net. (October 26-27, 2001) [701]

● **Jobs & Living Wages for the Poor**, is the current grant program of the Discount Fdn. Send 1-page inf. ltr to the Fdn., 6712 Tildenwood Ln., Rockville, MD 20852-4320, 301/468-1288, by Jan. 11, 20002. www.discountfoundation.org [737]

PRRAC'S SOCIAL SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD

Richard Berk
UCLA Department of Sociology

Frank Bonilla
CUNY Department of Sociology

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

William Kornblum
CUNY Center for Social Research

Harriette McAdoo
Michigan State School of Human Ecology

Fernando Mendoza
Stanford Univ. Department of Pediatrics

Paul Ong
UCLA Grad. School Architecture & Urban Planning

Gary Orfield
Harvard Univ. Grad. School of Education

Gary Sandefur
Univ. Wisconsin Inst. for Poverty Research

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

Challenges To Equality

Poverty and Race in America

Chester Hartman, Editor
Foreword by Congressman John Lewis

The best articles and symposia from *Poverty & Race*, the bimonthly publication of the Poverty & Race Research Action Council, on the country's two most important, and seemingly intractable, social problems – and the added impact when they intersect.

Includes contributions by Julian Bond, Michael Omi, Bebe Moore Campbell, Raul Yzaguirre, John Powell, James Loewen, Herbert Gans, Richard Kahlenberg, Joe Feagin, S.M. Miller, Marian Wright Edelman, Kati Haycock, William L. Taylor,

William Ayers, Rep. Cynthia McKinney, Carl Anthony, Angela Oh, George Galster, Paul Wachtel, Arnaldo Garcia, Jonathan Kozol, Marcus Raskin, Frances Fox Piven, Frank Wu, David Shipler, Benjamin DeMott, Peter Edelman, Hugh Price, Manning Marable, Howard Zinn, Bill Ong Hing, James Early and others 99 articles in all!

Published by M.E. Sharpe © 2001
336 Pages; Index
ISBN 0-7656-0727-1 PB \$26.95
ISBN 0-7656-0726-3 HC \$68.95

Order your copy today!

Use the order form below to receive your copy of this special collection

SEND TO: PRRAC, 3000 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20008
Tel: 202/387-9887 Fax: 202/387-0764 Email: info@prrac.org

I would like to order *Challenges to Equality: Poverty and Race in America*
Specify binding and quantity:

- Paperback @ \$26.95 x _____ (qty.) Amount \$ _____
 Hardcover @ \$68.95 x _____ (qty.) Amount \$ _____
 Shipping/handling: add \$3.50 for the first book and \$1.50 for each additional book.
- Enclosed is my check/money order payable to PRRAC. Purchase order # _____
Please bill me.

Subtotal \$ _____
Shipping/Handling \$ _____
Total amount \$ _____

SHIPPING INFORMATION

Name (please print): _____ Title: _____

Organization/University: _____

Shipping address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip code: _____

Telephone (____) _____ Fax (____) _____ email _____

For Classroom Examination Copy, contact M.E. Sharpe, (800) 541-6563

(See other side for Table of Contents)

Challenges To Equality: Poverty and Race in America

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD: *Rep. John Lewis*

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION: *Chester Hartman*

I. INTEGRATION

Civil Rights, Now & Then: *Julian Bond*

Wake Up, Jared Taylor! America is a Democracy Now!:
Howard Winant

Digging Out of the White Trap: *Marian Groot & Paul
Marcus*

Response: *Chip Berlet & Surina Khan*

Bilingual Education: *Bebe Moore Campbell*

Race and Space: *john a. powell*

Telling History on the Landscape/History Quiz: *James
Loewen*

SYMPOSIUM: Is Integration Possible?

Editor's Introduction

By the Color of Our Skin: The Illusion of
Integration and the Reality of Race: *Leonard
Steinhorn & Barbara Diggs-Brown*

COMMENTARIES: *Jerome Scott & Walda Katz-Fishman,
Herbert J. Gans, John Calmore, Richard D.*

Kahlenberg, Howard Winant, Robert Jensen, Angela E.

Oh, James Loewen, Noel Ignatiev, Florence Wagman

Roisman, James Early, Don DeMarco, Joe Feagin &

Yvonne Combs, George C. Galster, S.M. Miller,

William L. Taylor, John Woodford, Frank Wu, Paul L.

Wachtel, Ty DePass

Response: *Leonard Steinhorn*

II. POVERTY

Growing Poverty in a Growing Economy: *Jared
Bernstein*

Welfare Reform and Racial/Ethnic Minorities: The
Questions to Ask: *Steve Savner*

The Outcomes of Welfare Reform for Women: *Barbara
Gault & Annisah Um'rani*

America's Fifth Child: It's Time To End Child Poverty
in America: *Marian Wright Edelman*

Wealth, Success, and Poverty in Indian Country:
D. Bambi Kraus

Race and Poverty in the Rural South: *Cynthia Duncan &
Margaret Walsh*

Poverty, Racial Discrimination, and the Family Farm:
Stephen Carpenter

III. EDUCATION

Editor's Introduction

The Growing Education Gap: *Kati Haycock*

SYMPOSIUM: Is Racial Integration Essential to Achieving
Quality Education for Low-Income Minority Students,
In the Short Term? In the Long Term? *Phyllis Hart
& Joyce Germaine Watts, Lyman Ho, Kati Haycock,
john a. powell, Sheryl Denbo & Byron Williams,
Marcelitte Failla*

SYMPOSIUM : The Standards Movement in Education:

Will Poor & Minority Students Benefit? *John
Cawthorne, Peter Negroni, William Ayers, Monty Neill*

High Stakes Testing and Standards-Based Reform:
Jay Heubert

The Education Vision: A Third Tier: *S.M. Miller*

IV. DEMOCRATIC PARTICIPATION

Why Not Democracy?: *David Kairys*

New Means for Political Empowerment: 'Proportional'
Voting: *Douglas Amy, Fred McBride & Robert Richie*

Race, Poverty and the 'Wealth Primary': *Jamin B.*

Raskin

COMMENTARIES: *Ellen Malcolm, Hollywood Women's
Political Committee, John C. Bonifaz, Rep. Cynthia A.*

McKinney

V. ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Race, Poverty and Sustainable Communities: *Carl
Anthony*

Race and Poverty Data as a Tool in the Struggle for
Environmental Justice: *Kary L. Moss*

Analysis of Racially Disparate Impacts in the Siting
of Environmental Hazards: *Thomas J. Henderson,
David S. Bailey & Selena Mendy*

The Street, the Courts, the Legislature and the Press:

Where Environmental Struggles Happen: *Rachel Godsil*

The Truth Won't Set You Free (But It Might Make the
Evening News): The Use of Demographic Information

in Struggles for Environmental Justice in California:
Luke Cole

Key Research and Policy Issues Facing Environmental
Justice: *Bunyan Bryant*

VI. RACE, POVERTY, AND....

Editor's Introduction

Race, Poverty, and the Two-Tiered Financial Services
System: *Robert D. Manning*

Race, Poverty, and Transportation: *Rich Stolz*

Race, Poverty, and Corporate Welfare: *Greg LeRoy*

Race, Poverty, and the Militarized Welfare State:

Bristow Hardin

Race, Poverty, and the Federal Reserve System: *Tom
Schlesinger*

Race, Poverty, and Social Security: *john a. powell*

Race, Poverty, and Immigration: *Arnoldo Garcia*

Race, Poverty, and Globalization: *john a. powell & S.P.
Udayakumar*

VII. PRESIDENT CLINTON'S RACE INITIATIVE

Editor's Introduction

Notes on the President's Initiative on Race: *Chester
Hartman*

The Speech President Clinton Should Have Made:
Howard Winant

SYMPOSIUM: Advice to the Advisory Board: *Raul
Yzaguirre, Marcus Raskin, Jonathan Kozol, Julian
Bond, Hugh Price, Manning Marable, S.M. Miller,
Peter Dreier, Peter Edelman, Howard Zinn, Herbert J.
Gans, Benjamin DeMott, Frances Fox Piven, Michael
Omi, Lillian Wilmore, William L. Taylor, David K.
Shipler, Theodore M. Shaw*

Comments on the Advisory Board Report: *S.M. Miller,
Bill Ong Hing, Clarence Lusane, Frances Fox Piven,
Lillian Wilmore, Frank Wu, Marcus Raskin, Sam
Husseini, Peter Dreier*

POVERTY & RACE RESEARCH ACTION COUNCIL
Board of Directors

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

VICE-CHAIRS
Kati Haycock
*The Education Trust
Washington, DC*

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

SECRETARY
john powell
*Univ. of Minnesota
Institute on Race & Poverty
Minneapolis, MN*

Deepak Bhargava
*Center for Community Change
Washington, DC*

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

Thomas Henderson
*Lawyers' Committee for Civil
Rights Under Law
Washington, DC*

Judith Johnson
*DeWitt Wallace-Readers
Digest Fund
New York, NY*

Elizabeth Julian
Dallas, TX

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

Don Nakanishi
*University of California
Los Angeles, CA*

Florence Wagman Roisman
*Indiana University
School of Law
Indianapolis, IN*

Anthony Sarmiento
*AFL-CIO
Washington, DC*

Theodore M. Shaw
*NAACP Legal Defense
& Educational Fund
New York, NY*

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

William L. Taylor
Washington, DC

*[Organizations listed for
identification purposes only]*

Chester W. Hartman
President/Executive Director

Denise Rivera Portis
*Office Manager/
Latino Outreach Coordinator*

Tracy Jackson
Administrative Assistant

Poverty & Race Research Action Council

3000 Connecticut Ave. NW • Suite 200
Washington, DC 20008
202/387-9887 FAX: 202/387-0764
E-mail: info@prrac.org
Website: www.prrac.org

Address Service Requested

9-10/01

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