

Integration and Housing Choice: A Dialogue

This year, PRRAC has had the honor of supporting the work of the National Commission on Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, an independent Commission co-chaired by former HUD Secretaries Henry Cisneros and Jack Kemp, and sponsored by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, the National Fair Housing Alliance and the NAACP Legal Defense Fund. Over the course of hearings in five cities, the Commission has heard testimony on serious problems in fair housing enforcement, the need for stronger fair housing oversight of HUD grantees, origins and solutions to the foreclosure crisis, the relation between school and housing segregation, and the structural impediments to fair housing in federal and state housing programs. Several of the Commission witnesses also spoke to the complex question of personal choice in a housing market that has been distorted by discrimination and public policy decisions—exploring the meaning of choice in such a market, the extent to which choice is influenced by racial perceptions, and what policymakers can do to support integrative choices. The three witnesses excerpted here (Camille Zubrinsky Charles, Ingrid Gould Ellen and Maria Krysan) provide different and complementary perspectives on this question. Their full testimony, and the testimony of other Commission witnesses, can be found at www.prrac.org/projects/fairhousingcommission.php. The Commission expects to release its final report on December 9 at a press conference at the National Press Club in Washington, DC.

Who Will Live Near Whom?

by Camille Zubrinsky Charles

Scholars and policymakers have long viewed residential segregation by race as a core aspect of racial inequality, implicated in both intergroup relations and in larger processes of individual and group social mobility.

Whether by choice or by constraint, persisting racial residential segregation

*Camille Zubrinsky Charles (ccharles@pop.upenn.edu), a member of PRRAC's Social Science Advisory Board, is the Edmund J. and Louise W. Kahn Term Professor in the Social Sciences, Dept. of Sociology, Grad. School of Education & Ctr. for Africana Studies at the Univ. of Pennsylvania. She is the author of *Won't You Be My Neighbor? Race, Class and Residence in Los Angeles* (Russell Sage, 2006).*

has serious implications for both present and future mobility opportunities. Where we live affects our proximity to good jobs, educational quality and safety from crime, as well as the quality of our social networks and our physical and mental health.

As one of the most racially, ethnically and culturally diverse cities in the world, Los Angeles offers important lessons for understanding patterns of residential segregation by race as well as the factors—both individual and structural—that influence aggregate-level neighborhood patterns. There is a long history of African-American settlement there. Moreover, as a top destination for new immigrants, the school system there offers instruction in nearly 100 languages, boasts the largest Latino/a and Korean popula-

tions in the country and is home to the first majority-Chinese suburb (Monterey Park). As one of nearly 40 majority-minority metros, Los Angeles offers a glimpse of the future of America.

(Please turn to page 2)

CONTENTS

Residential Choice:	
Camille Z. Charles	1
Ingrid G. Ellen	3
Maria Krysan	8
Witt Internship	4
House Apology for Slavery	9
Resources	11

(LIVE NEAR?: Continued from page 1)

Rapid changes in population composition associated with massive immigration from Latin America and Asia (e.g., in 2000, about one-third of LA County residents were foreign-born, up from 22% in 1980); economic restructuring and persistent economic inequality along racial-ethnic lines (e.g., in 2000, nearly one-quarter of blacks and Latinos lived in poverty, compared to less than 10% of whites and 14% of Asians); and patterns of intergroup tensions and often negative racial attitudes (e.g., uprisings in 1965 and 1992, increasing black-brown tensions) all contribute to—and are consequences of—persisting residential segregation by race.

In terms of trends in racial residential segregation, since 1980, Los Angeles is one of a very few large metros that embodies several national trends. Like many older cities of the Midwest and Northeast, blacks are hypersegregated—exhibiting extreme isolation on at least four of five standard measures of residential distribution. And, in a new twist, Los Angeles is one of only two cities (New York is the other), as of the 2000 Census, to see its Latino population become hypersegregated. Equally important, despite reports of declining black-white segregation since 1980, there has been virtually no increase in blacks' exposure to whites in their neighborhoods;

both Latinos and Asians have experienced substantial declines in their exposure to whites since 1980 as well. To the extent that racial residential segregation is deeply implicated in persisting racial economic inequality and tenuous intergroup relations, and inasmuch as trends in Los Angeles point to our national future, it is an optimal location for a consideration of the future of fair housing.

In general, social scientists debate the relative importance of three factors—real and/or perceived social class disadvantage, neighborhood racial composition preferences, and housing market discrimination—as primary contributors to persisting racial residential segregation. While economic inequality between racial/ethnic groups remains a pressing problem, objective differences in social class status cannot account for persisting racial residential segregation. Analyses of the housing market also reveal persisting discrimination against African Americans, Latinos and Asians in both the owner and rental markets. Here, I focus on the role of neighborhood racial composition preferences—and in particular the factors that motivate preferences—as critical for understanding not only aggregate housing patterns, but the role fair housing legislation can play in creating and maintaining stable, racially/ethnically integrated communities, in light of current patterns and trends in racial attitudes (including preferences).

Neighborhood Racial Composition Preferences: A Brief Summary

Over the last two-and-a-half decades, there has been meaningful change in the neighborhood racial composition preferences of whites, shifting toward increased tolerance for sharing neighborhoods with more than token numbers of blacks and other minorities. At the same time, a clear majority of blacks remain willing to live in areas where their group is in

the minority, and show a clear preference for 50/50 neighborhoods. Nonetheless, substantial differences remain in both the meaning and preferred levels of racial integration across racial categories. For many whites, a racially integrated neighborhood is one that is majority-white. To put it plainly, whites are *willing* to live with small numbers of blacks, Latinos and/or Asians, but *prefer* to live in predominantly same-race neighborhoods. Nonwhites, on the other hand, all prefer substantially more racial integration and are more comfortable as a numerical minority compared to whites. Still, the same-race preferences of nonwhites exceed whites' preferences for integration. Moreover, patterns of neighborhood racial composition preferences follow a predictable racial hierarchy: Whites are always the most-preferred out-group and blacks the least-preferred; Asians and Latinos, usually in that order, are located in between these two extremes.

What Drives Preferences—Classism, Ethnocentrism or Prejudice?

A variety of factors shape residential decision-making: cost and affordability, the quality of the housing stock, preferences for particular dwelling amenities, proximity to work or other important destinations, stage in the life course, the quality of the public schools. Consequently, aggregate-level residential outcomes are the result of a multitude of individual-level attitudes and behaviors. In analyses of patterns of racial residential preferences, however, three hypotheses are typically considered:

Classism: Perceived differences in socioeconomic status that heavily coincide with racial-ethnic boundaries contribute to racial residential preferences.

Ethnocentrism: Members of all social groups tend to be ethnocentric—that is, prefer to associate with co-
(Please turn to page 5)

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

© Copyright 2008 by the Poverty & Race Research Action Council. All rights reserved.

Supporting Integrative Choices

by Ingrid Gould Ellen

I have been asked to draw on my research on racially integrated neighborhoods—and in particular neighborhoods shared by white and black households—in order to suggest a few policies that might help to promote racial integration. I am focusing on policies other than anti-discrimination efforts in the housing market, but this should not imply in any way that I believe that housing market discrimination does not exist or is unimportant to address. Indeed, it's critical.

That said, much of the policy discussion about racial segregation has focused *solely* on housing market discrimination. As I argued in my 2000 book, *Sharing America's Neighborhoods: The Prospects for Stable, Racial Integration*, I believe the causes of the current ongoing levels of segregation are complex and involve more than housing market discrimination. Accordingly, any effective policy response should be multi-faceted as well, supplementing anti-discrimination efforts with other pro-integrative policies.

One key cause of ongoing segregation, besides the failure to adequately combat housing market discrimination, is the fact that white households, when moving in the ordinary course, tend to avoid moving into integrated neighborhoods. The question is why. My research suggests that white households' motivation to avoid sharing neighborhoods with blacks often does

not stem from a desire to live exclusively among other whites or from the fact that their taste for local public services differs from that of blacks. White resistance to integrated living appears to be much more the result of negative racial attitudes, and in particular, race-based neighborhood stereotyping. Specifically, white households tend to believe that: (1) black-white integrated neighborhoods, even if they are currently appealing places to live, will soon enough become all-black; and (2)

Any effective policy response should be multi-faceted.

all-black neighborhoods are bad places to live, with poor schools and high rates of dilapidation and crime. Based as they are on negative stereotypes about partly or largely black neighborhoods, white decisions to avoid integrated neighborhoods seem objectionable in a way that decisions to cluster voluntarily with other members of one's own ethnic group are not.

What is more, there are social costs to this ongoing perpetuation of racial segregation. There's considerable research suggesting that neighborhood segregation contributes to racial differences in education, health, housing and labor market outcomes. And while

evidence is inconclusive, several studies suggest that white households typically become more racially tolerant as a result of living among and being exposed to others from different racial groups. Finally, the collective consequences of individual residential choices may result in fewer integrated neighborhoods than is socially optimal. Many white and black households, that is, may in fact prefer to live in racially mixed environments, but because of a widespread lack of faith in the stability of these areas, these environments are relatively rare.

In short, there are reasons to believe that racial segregation is harmful not only to minority households (because separate is still unequal in so many respects) but also to society as a whole. Thus, in my view, there is justification for some carefully tailored, non-coercive government policies to promote integration—policies that go beyond combating discrimination. As noted, white households do not typically make their residential choices based on some innate preferences or tastes for racial composition; rather, neighborhood preferences are mutable and profoundly shaped by circumstances, context and the set of alternatives. Put simply, neighborhood stereotypes can be chipped away at.

In the spirit of Cass Sunstein's and
(Please turn to page 4)

Ingrid Gould Ellen (ige2@nyu.edu) is Associate Professor of Urban Planning and Public Policy at New York University's Wagner School and Co-Director of the Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy. She is author of Sharing America's Neighborhoods: The Prospects for Stable Racial Integration (Harvard University Press, 2000) and numerous journal articles relating to the segregation of neighborhoods and schools.

J.L. Chestnut, Jr.

We dedicate this issue of *Poverty & Race* to the important, but insufficiently recognized, civil rights career of J.L. Chestnut, Jr., who died in late September. Chestnut was *the* civil rights lawyer (and the first Black lawyer) in Selma, Alabama—far from the easiest place to play that role. He got lots of activists out of jail, fought for voting rights, inclusion of Blacks on juries, school desegregation, and represented a coalition of Southern Black farmers who won some \$1 billion in reparations from the US Dept. of Agriculture as a result of the Department's discriminatory policies. His autobiography (written with Julia Cass), *Black in Selma: The Uncommon Life of J.L. Chestnut, Jr.*, was published by Farrar, Straus & Giroux in 1990.

(CHOICES: Continued from page 3)

Richard Thaler's recent book, *Nudge* (Yale Univ. Press, 2008), I'd like to push us all to think about ways that we can "nudge" households to make residential choices that might promote racial integration and ultimately prove to be better matches for them, too. I am not suggesting that we force households to live in particular neighborhoods—any policies that restrict people's freedom to live where they want should be avoided—but I believe there are ways we can encourage households to broaden their horizons and consider a wider set of communities in making their residential choices.

My policy suggestions fall into three categories: (1) providing accurate information; (2) making the choice of a mixed neighborhood more appealing in low-cost ways; and (3) changing the "architecture of choice," to borrow the words of Sunstein and Thaler.

The Need for Information

First, in terms of information, perhaps most critically, we can let households know that while a majority of neighborhoods are racially segregated, a substantial and growing minority are well integrated and not just fleetingly, but typically over many years. My own empirical research has demonstrated this. Yet the stubborn belief on the part of many that rapid racial transition is inevitable has helped, by

its self-fulfilling nature, to undermine racial mixing. The more we can do to break the chain of assumptions that white households reflexively hold about integrated neighborhoods, the more likely those neighborhoods will remain stable.

Many households make their residential choices based on very limited information and consider only a small set of alternatives. Thus, we might also invest in web-based neighborhood information systems that would make it easy for people to gather information about a broad set of neighborhoods when making their residential choices—about school quality, crime and the like. There will no doubt be some integrated neighborhoods that in

Neighborhood stereotypes can be chipped away at.

terms of these legitimate quality-of-life indicators score low in peoples' minds, just as there are all-white neighborhoods that score low; but there will be plenty of mixed neighborhoods that score relatively high.

Making Integrated Neighborhoods More Appealing

A second set of policies would try to make the choice of an integrated neighborhood more appealing in relatively low-cost ways. My research

suggests that when white households have more secure expectations about the future quality of life in a community, they are more likely to tolerate racial integration. The implication is that racial mixing is more stable in communities in which school quality, property values and other neighborhood attributes seem particularly secure. To the extent this is true, aggressively attacking any superficial signs of decline—"fixing the broken windows" that James Q. Wilson and George Kelling (in their March 1982 *Atlantic Monthly* article) pointed to as a signal of social disorder—may be critical in encouraging white households to consider integrated communities they might otherwise avoid. Another possibility would be to invest in specialized magnet schools and to introduce school choice, at least within the public school system. For if it is true, as my research suggests, that much of white resistance to integrated neighborhoods is rooted in fears about the quality of integrated schools, then breaking the link between residence and school should encourage white households to be more open to living in racially diverse environments.

Altering the "Architecture" of Choice

Finally, I'd like to push us to think about ways to change the "architecture" of residential choices. Can we come up with ways to present neighborhood choices in a manner that will encourage—though not force—households to make pro-integrative choices? One relatively modest possibility is for government to undertake affirmative marketing strategies to encourage white and minority households to consider neighborhoods where they are racially under-represented—through a traditional television advertising campaign, for example, that promotes the benefits of mixed neighborhoods. In order to get Realtors involved in these

(Please turn to page 10)

Witt Internship

We are accepting applications for PRRAC's 2008 Edith Witt Internship grant, "to help develop a new generation of community activists." The fund, established by her family, friends and co-workers, honors the memory of a wonderful human rights activist in San Francisco. To apply: As soon as possible, send or email (to Chester Hartman at PRRAC, chartman@prrac.org) 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. Pass the word to relevant grassroots groups.

ethnics.

Prejudice: More active out-group avoidance is at the root of neighborhood racial composition preferences.

The expression of prejudice can take a variety of forms, including negative racial stereotypes, perceptions of social distance and the belief that one or more groups pose a competitive threat to one's own group. Also important, though not typically considered, are minority-group beliefs about the prevalence of discrimination; these beliefs may influence the preferences of minority-group members for whites or for same-race neighbors. To understand what drives neighborhood racial composition preferences requires systematic testing of the various hypotheses, preferably the simultaneous examination of said explanations.

Three items capture variants of prejudice. *Racial stereotyping* is an important aspect of traditional prejudice or simple out-group hostility. The measure used here is a summary of four traits—intelligence, preference for welfare dependence, English-language ability, and involvement in drugs and gangs. *Social distance* is the degree to which respondents believe that an out-group is “difficult to get along with socially” relative to his or her own group. Rather than simple out-group hostility, this form of prejudice is fueled by a commitment to a specific group status or relative group position, as opposed to simple out-group hostility. What matters most is the magnitude or degree of difference from particular out-groups that in-group members have socially learned to expect and maintain. Beliefs about *racial-group threat or competition* offer another lens through which to examine feelings of racial hostility—the degree to which an individual believes that more opportunities (economic and/or political) for an out-group results in fewer opportunities for one's own group. Finally, *minority-group members' beliefs about whites' attitudes toward them and/or the prevalence of racial discrimination* is captured in a

general perception of whites as “tending to discriminate” against minority groups. Results of my research indicate that classism and ethnocentrism play, at best, marginal roles in individuals' residential decision-making—with the clear exception of Asians, but even for this group class concerns appear to be much more salient for immigrants than for the native-born. In most cases, any evidence that supports these explanations pales in comparison to evidence that supports explanations rooted in the various forms of racial prejudice. Simply put, whites' preferences for neighborhood racial integration are best understood as motivated by prejudice, not classism or ethnocentrism.

The expression of prejudice can take a variety of forms.

The most powerful predictors of blacks' neighborhood racial composition preferences is racial prejudice—whether negative racial stereotypes, the perception of whites and Asians as socially distant, the perception of whites as tending to discriminate against them, or the fear that more jobs and political power for Asians means less for them. Neither concerns about avoiding poverty nor some “innate” desire to stay “with my own kind” are influential.

Latinos' neighborhood racial composition preferences are motivated primarily by prejudice and perceptions of whites as discriminatory; perceptions of blacks as economically disadvantaged play a very minor role, as does ethnocentrism when potential neighbors are Asian or same-race.

In summary, neighborhood racial composition preferences are primarily a function of racial prejudice; for blacks, Latinos and, to a lesser extent, Asians, there is the added concern about hostility directed toward them by whites. Assertions that preferences are driven primarily by either “classism” or ethnocentrism are simply not supported by the evidence.

Where Do We Go From Here?

My goal is to elucidate patterns of neighborhood racial composition preferences and the forces that drive them, and to situate racial preferences within the broader context of historic and contemporary American race relations. The good news for the future of public policy related to housing opportunity, housing choice and inequality more broadly is that whites are increasingly *willing* to live in close proximity to racial minorities, and a sizable number of blacks, Latinos and Asians, remain *willing* to live in predominantly white areas. To capitalize on this willingness, however, requires being always mindful of the way that race continues to shape both our day-to-day interactions and our overall worldview.

The bad news, both for public policy and the nation, is that most whites still prefer predominantly or overwhelmingly white neighborhoods, while most nonwhites prefer more same-race neighbors than most whites are willing to tolerate. Most Americans—irrespective of race, ethnicity or nativity status—continue to embrace anti-minority stereotypes, including many who are willing to share residential space with racial minorities. Conversely, most blacks, Latinos, and Asians have a keen sense of their subordinate positions relative to whites, and of whites' negative attitudes; this often leaves them suspicious of overwhelmingly white areas (a sort of “better safe than sorry” mentality).

Across racial groups, patterns of neighborhood racial composition preferences reveal a clear and consistent racial rank-ordering of out-groups as potential neighbors: Whites are always the most preferred out-group neighbors, and the most likely to prefer entirely same-race neighborhoods and/or only limited contact with nonwhites—especially blacks. Blacks are always the least-preferred out-group neighbors, and the most open to substantial integration with all other groups. Asians and Latinos, respec-

(Please turn to page 6)

tively, are in between these extremes. To varying degrees, all groups express preferences for *both* meaningful integration and a strong co-ethnic presence, yet preferences for the latter appear to depend on the race of potential neighbors, and are strongest when potential neighbors are black.

Available evidence indicates that active, present-day racial prejudice plays a particularly important role in driving preferences, always more important than either social class concerns or ethnocentrism. In many instances, neither of these factors matters at all. And, although the evidence supports both variants of racial prejudice, it is particularly persuasive with respect to the sense of group position hypothesis. This is especially true for whites, the group at the top of the status hierarchy: Maintaining their status advantages and privilege necessitates a certain amount of social distance from nonwhites—particularly blacks and Latinos, who occupy the lowest positions on the aforementioned hierarchies. More than token integration with these groups signals an unwelcome change in status relationships. Indeed, the racial pecking order is so widely known that Latinos and Asians—many of them unassimilated immigrants—mirror (and arguably exaggerate) it in their preferences for integration.

Conversely, with whites clearly in the most privileged positions of the economic, political and prestige hierarchies in American society, nonwhites have traditionally associated upward social mobility with proximity to them. That many nonwhites hold negative stereotypes of whites but are still interested in sharing residential space with them is indicative of this orientation. At the same time, nonwhites' beliefs about discrimination and hostility from whites, combined with an awareness that whites are not "on the same page" may cause some minority homeseekers to limit their housing searches to areas where they feel welcome, or to decide not to search at all. Thus, a neighborhood's racial compo-

sition acts as a signal for homeseekers: Areas with substantial co-ethnic representation are viewed as welcoming; overwhelmingly white neighborhoods can evoke concerns for nonwhites about hostility, isolation and discomfort—both psychological and, sometimes, physical; and, for whites, racially mixed or majority-minority neighborhoods signal at least a perceptual loss of relative status advantage, particularly when there is a sizable black and/or Latino community. Thus, for all groups, preferences for same-race neighbors have more to do with aversion to others than with in-group solidarity.

Neighborhood racial composition preferences are primarily a function of racial prejudice.

These clearly racial concerns cut across class lines. Indeed, studies of the attitudes and experiences of middle-class blacks suggest that, paradoxically, this subset of blacks may be: 1) most pessimistic about the future of race relations; 2) most likely to believe that whites have negative attitudes toward them; and 3) increasingly less interested in predominantly white neighborhoods. Thus, the most upwardly mobile blacks may be among the most suspicious of whites and least interested in sharing residential space with them. For this group, affordability is not nearly the obstacle that whites' racial prejudice is, and this is due, in no small measure, to the fact that most whites—irrespective of their own social class status—adhere to negative racial stereotypes, deny the persistence of pervasive racial prejudice and discrimination, and are quite likely to oppose race-targeted social policies.

Whites' racial prejudice—and minority responses to it—poses a more obvious, but equally difficult challenge for improving the housing options of the poor, including those who participate in public housing programs. For many, the obvious material benefits clearly outweigh concerns about and/

or day-to-day experiences of prejudice and discrimination. For a non-trivial few, however, fears of isolation and hostility will prevail, and participants will return to the ghetto, and others will opt out entirely when confronted with the reality of moving to a potentially hostile environment. While not at the bottom of the status hierarchy, Asians and Latinos are also subordinate groups grappling with similar racial issues. As we increase our knowledge of Asian and Latino racial attitudes, a similar paradox may emerge within these groups as well.

As we move into the 21st century and continue to struggle with racial inequality in all areas of American life, we must be ever mindful that race still matters, and it matters over and above social class characteristics. In so doing, we must also be mindful of how and why race matters. White objections to race-targeted social policy point to the necessity for well-crafted, universal housing policies that will gain widespread public support but also manage to address issues more directly tied to race. Potentially useful strategies for encouraging whites and nonwhites to share residential space come from studies documenting the characteristics of stably integrated neighborhoods. Residents of these communities often work together on community betterment projects (e.g., building playground equipment for a park or working to have street lights installed) or general community-building efforts that bring people of varied racial backgrounds together, working toward a common goal. Such activities, particularly when they become part of the larger neighborhood culture, can fundamentally alter attitudes on both sides of the racial divide by highlighting what residents share in common, helping to build trust and potentially reducing stereotypes.

Another common strategy emphasizes aggressive public relations campaigns that sing the praises of particular communities. Some of these may stress the value added by diversity; others highlight desirable neighborhood amenities, services and community events that make the area gener-

ally attractive; those that do both might ultimately be the most successful. Aggressive marketing strategies seem particularly beneficial when neighborhoods can be advertised as among “the best” in a particular metropolitan area. Positive marketing might also help to attract blacks, Latinos and Asians to overwhelmingly white communities by informing these groups that they are open to and interested in creating stable, friendly and racially diverse communities.

Active, diligent enforcement of anti-discrimination laws is also both appropriate and necessary. This, however, is likely to be a far more difficult and potentially less rewarding task. As it stands, the burden of proving discrimination is placed on the victim, yet empirical evidence suggests that present-day discrimination is often so subtle that few victims are likely to suspect that their housing choices are being constrained. Add to this the gulf of racial misunderstanding separating whites and racial minorities: Where blacks see “a racist moment,” whites see “an isolated incident,” or a “misinterpretation of events” or, even worse, they argue that blacks are “overreacting.” In response, blacks become increasingly distrustful of a system that is supposed to protect them, pessimistic about the future of race relations, and increasingly less inclined

to incur the psychic costs associated with filing a complaint.

To give teeth to anti-discrimination enforcement, we need a new enforcement strategy that builds the capacity of local, state and federal civil rights agencies to conduct widespread, ongoing audit studies as a credible deterrent. Tests could be undertaken of randomly selected real estate agencies and of those suspected of discrimination. Those agencies found to consistently evince fair treatment could be publicly rewarded, while those shown to discriminate could be sanctioned, both publicly and financially. In the lend-

Without such efforts, it seems unlikely we can “live together” in the near future.

ing market, where audit studies are more difficult, regular analysis of Home Mortgage Disclosure Act data presents a method for charting the practices of lenders. Such strategies have the potential to create meaningful deterrents. Furthermore, with regular monitoring, there are published records of documented discrimination that could: 1) help to alter whites’ beliefs about inequality and discrimination; and 2) be used by victims as evidence in complaints, documenting sys-

Coming up Dec. 7-8:

**Housing Justice
Network
National Conference**

Washington, DC

**(for more information
go to www.nhlp.org)**

tematic mistreatment. Together, these benefits could help move us toward better racial understanding as whites have the “proof” they need to believe what blacks and other racial minorities “just know.”

Without such efforts, and given the state of race relations more generally, it seems unlikely that we can “live together” in the near future. It has been argued that increasing racial diversity might create a “buffer” for blacks, creating opportunities for residential mobility and contact with whites. Yet Latinos and Asians are at least as likely to hold negative stereotypes of blacks as whites are, and more likely to object to the prospect of sharing residential space with them. Furthermore, while whites hold negative stereotypes of both Latinos and Asians, they tend to be less severe than their stereotypes of blacks. Thus, whites are likely to view blacks as culturally deficient, while perceiving largely immigrant Latino and Asian populations as culturally distinct. Similarly, stereotypes of immigrants working hard at menial jobs and complaining less may further fuel anti-black sentiment, fostering the belief that blacks “push too hard” or “are always looking for a handout.” Hence, rather than operating as a “buffer” or source of greater options and acceptance for blacks, increasing racial diversity may simply add to the climate of resistance to blacks as neighbors, and further complicate efforts at achieving either greater racial understanding or more equitable housing outcomes. □

Resources

Douglas S. Massey and Nancy A. Denton, “Hypersegregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas: Black and Hispanic Segregation Along Five Dimensions,” *Demography* 26(3), 1989, pp. 373-91.

Rima Wilkes and John Iceland, “Hypersegregation in the Twenty-First Century: An Update and Analysis,” *Demography* 41(1), 2004, pp. 587-606.

National Fair Housing Alliance, *Unequal Opportunity – Perpetuating Housing Segregation in America*, 2006.

Maria Krysan and Reynolds Farley, “The Residential Preferences of

Blacks: Do They Explain Persistent Segregation?,” *Social Forces* 80 (2002), pp. 937-80.

Camille Zubrinsky Charles, “Can We Live Together? Racial Preferences and Neighborhood Outcomes,” in *The Geography of Opportunity: Race and Housing Choice in Metropolitan America*, ed. Xavier de Souza Briggs (Brookings Inst. Press, 2005)

Yinger, John, *Closed Doors, Opportunities Lost: The Continuing Costs of Housing Discrimination* (Russell Sage, 1995).

Confronting Racial “Blind Spots”

by Maria Krysan

Segregation is caused by a complicated set of inter-related processes. I focus on just one part of this complicated process. But that should not be taken to mean that it is the only one, or even the most important one. However, I believe it has not received the attention it deserves.

I have spent more than a decade investigating the attitudes people hold about sharing neighborhoods with people of different races/ethnicities. My research on these racial residential preferences, however, tends to complicate what is too often construed as a “personal choice” explanation for segregation. The argument often goes: If preferences cause segregation, then policy has no role, since we are segregated because people “want” it that way. In short, the preferences explanation is often pitted against the idea that there is housing discrimination, and the two are seen as independent and in competition with each other as explanations of segregation.

My work tends to show that discrimination and preferences are not independent and that preferences are not “neutral” and “unproblematic,” but rather constrained and complicated. For example, I show that to describe African-American racial residential preferences as favoring “50-50” or majority-minority neighborhoods and to then conclude, as some have, that

segregation is caused by minority preferences, is problematic. Indeed, if we look more in-depth at African-American preferences, using different methods, we find that African-American preferences are far from “segregation-promoting.” Or, by asking *why* African Americans hold the preferences they do, we discover that it is less because of a “neutral” in-group prefer-

Discrimination and preferences are not independent.

ence, and more because of a desire to avoid discrimination in largely white communities.

Racial Blind Spots

I want to discuss a new concept—racial blind spots—that I have been developing with my colleagues in Detroit and Chicago. Much of our understanding of racial residential preferences comes from asking people in surveys about hypothetical neighborhoods with imaginary racial compositions. By gauging preferences in this way, we sidestep the really important point that people don’t buy imaginary homes in hypothetical neighborhoods. People buy and rent real homes in actual communities. And if peoples’ knowledge of the metropolitan area and of the neighborhoods they might live in is racialized—and by that I mean if residents of different racial/ethnic backgrounds know about different communities in the metropolitan area in which they live—and if that knowledge is shaped by the racial/ethnic composition of the community, then these patterns of knowledge—or the lack of knowledge—may constitute an important barrier to integrated living, since it is difficult to move into a neighborhood if you don’t know anything

about it.

In a recent large-scale survey in Chicago and Detroit, we showed people maps that identified many communities in the Chicago or Detroit metropolitan area and asked, among other things, which of them they “didn’t know anything about.”

For the most part, we found that whites, blacks and Latinos all tend to know more about communities their co-ethnics live in. But it is also the case that African Americans and Latinos, relative to whites, know about a broader range of different kinds of communities—racially mixed and racially segregated alike. For African Americans and Latinos, the few blind spots are communities that are both predominantly white *and* geographically distant from the city, thus creating a barrier to the possible integration of communities like this. But there are plenty of predominantly white communities about which African Americans do not have blind spots relative to whites; as such, there are clearly other barriers—perhaps discrimination, or perhaps “negative” knowledge about how African Americans are treated in these communities.

For their part, whites are far less likely than Latinos or African Americans to know about heavily African-American communities; perhaps not surprisingly. But what is troubling, from the standpoint of encouraging integration, is that whites’ blind spots also include communities that are racially mixed (either with Latinos or African Americans)—even those where whites are in the majority. To remain stably integrated, of course, communities like this must have housing demand from *all* racial/ethnic groups. And our study shows whites have a blind spot for these kinds of communities.

In sum, to move to a place, a person must have knowledge of it. Of course, those who consult with real

Maria Krysan (krysan@uic.edu) is a member of the Inst. for Government & Public Affairs faculty and Associate Professor of Sociology at the Univ. of Illinois at Chicago. She is co-author (with H. Schuman, L. Bobo and C. Steeh) of Racial Attitudes in America: Trends and Interpretations (Harvard University Press, 1997) and is responsible for a website that updates the data from that book (<http://www.igpa.uillinois.edu/programs/racialattitudes>).

estate agents may be introduced to communities they never considered, but it is likely that many people approach an agent with a particular geography already in mind. Moreover, in another question on our survey, we learned that there is substantial racial matching between client and agent: The great majority of whites (98%), blacks (70%) and Latinos (70%) are assisted by a real estate agent of their same racial/ethnic background. Thus, although agents' blind spots are likely to be fewer than those of their clients, this race-matching of agent and client may further aggravate the barrier of community knowledge or at the least minimizes the improvements a real estate agent might offer.

Our study of racial blind spots suggests that affirmative marketing—educating residents about the variety of housing options available—is a critical step in the goal for integrated living. There are substantial racial blind spots in community knowledge that must be overcome. The kinds of work currently being done by places like the Oak Park Regional Housing Center or to be done in the future by the start-up, MoveSmart.org, are two examples of organizations seeking to reduce these kinds of blind spots. Policies and programs like this, in concert with critical enforcement work, can be one part of the solution needed to help dismantle the pernicious pattern of segregation in many of our nation's cities. □

Resources

<http://www.igpa.uillinois.edu/system/files/CriticalIssues07-2008Krysan.pdf>

<http://www.igpa.uillinois.edu/system/files/PF20-3.pdf>

MoveSmart.org

Maria Krysan and Michael Bader (2007), "Seeing the City through a Prism of Race." *Social Forces* 86(2): 699-733.

Apology for Slavery

On July 29, the House passed, by voice vote (with no nays), an apology for slavery. The resolution, introduced in February 2007 by Rep. Steve Cohen of Memphis, had 120 sponsors. Full, eloquent text below:

H. Res. 194

In the House of Representatives, U. S.,
July 29, 2008.

Whereas millions of Africans and their descendants were enslaved in the United States and the 13 American colonies from 1619 through 1865;

Whereas slavery in America resembled no other form of involuntary servitude known in history, as Africans were captured and sold at auction like inanimate objects or animals;

Whereas Africans forced into slavery were brutalized, humiliated, dehumanized, and subjected to the indignity of being stripped of their names and heritage;

Whereas enslaved families were torn apart after having been sold separately from one another;

Whereas the system of slavery and the visceral racism against persons of African descent upon which it depended became entrenched in the Nation's social fabric;

Whereas slavery was not officially abolished until the passage of the 13th Amendment to the United States Constitution in 1865 after the end of the Civil War;

Whereas after emancipation from 246 years of slavery, African-Americans soon saw the fleeting political, social, and economic gains they made during Reconstruction eviscerated by virulent racism, lynchings, disenfranchisement, Black Codes, and racial segregation laws that imposed a rigid system of officially sanctioned racial segregation in virtually all areas of life;

Whereas the system of de jure racial segregation known as 'Jim Crow,' which arose in certain parts of the Nation following the Civil War to create separate and unequal societies for whites and African-Americans, was a direct result of the racism against persons of African descent engendered by slavery;

Whereas a century after the official end of slavery in America, Federal action was required during the 1960s to eliminate the de jure and de facto system of Jim Crow throughout parts of the Nation, though its vestiges still linger to this day;

Whereas African-Americans continue to suffer from the complex interplay between slavery and Jim Crow—long after both systems were formally abolished—through enormous damage and loss, both tangible and intangible, including the loss of human dignity, the frustration of careers and professional lives, and the long-term loss of income and opportunity;

Whereas the story of the enslavement and de jure segregation of African-Americans and the dehumanizing atrocities committed against them should not be purged from or minimized in the telling of American history;

Whereas on July 8, 2003, during a trip to Goree Island, Senegal, a former slave port, President George W. Bush acknowledged slavery's continuing legacy in American life and the need to confront that legacy when he stated that slavery 'was . . . one of the greatest crimes of history . . . The racial bigotry fed by slavery did not end with slavery or with segregation. And many of the issues that still trouble America have roots in the bitter experience of other times. But however long the journey, our destiny is set: 'liberty and justice for all.';

Whereas President Bill Clinton also acknowledged the deep-seated problems caused by the continuing legacy of racism against African-Americans that began with slavery when he initiated a national dialogue about race;

(Please turn to page 10)

(APOLOGY: Continued from page 9)

Whereas a genuine apology is an important and necessary first step in the process of racial reconciliation;

Whereas an apology for centuries of brutal dehumanization and injustices cannot erase the past, but confession of the wrongs committed can speed racial healing and reconciliation and help Americans confront the ghosts of their past;

Whereas the legislature of the Commonwealth of Virginia has recently taken the lead in adopting a resolution officially expressing appropriate remorse for slavery and other State legislatures have adopted or are considering similar resolutions; and

Whereas it is important for this country, which legally recognized slavery through its Constitution and its laws, to make a formal apology for slavery and for its successor, Jim Crow, so that it can move forward and seek reconciliation, justice, and harmony for all of its citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) acknowledges that slavery is incompatible with the basic founding principles recognized in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal;

(2) acknowledges the fundamental injustice, cruelty, brutality, and inhumanity of slavery and Jim Crow;

(3) apologizes to African Americans on behalf of the people of the United States, for the wrongs committed against them and their ancestors who suffered under slavery and Jim Crow; and

(4) expresses its commitment to rectify the lingering consequences of the misdeeds committed against African Americans under slavery and Jim Crow and to stop the occurrence of human rights violations in the future. □

(CHOICES: Continued from page 4)

efforts, too, which is critical, we might consider something more novel. Specifically, in combination with a significant crack-down on unlawful racial steering by realtors (which research suggests remains a significant issue), we might consider offering a legal safe-harbor from the crackdown to those realtors who show clients a certain number of homes in a neighborhood in which the clients are racially under-represented. Obviously, there

would be lots of issues to work through before something like this could and should be tried, but I hope it's illustrative of the kind of policy brainstorming I think we need in this area.

Using Section 8 As a Tool

There's also considerable room to change the architecture of choice among one set of households—Section 8 recipients. Experience in other policy areas suggests that changing the default option for choices can lead to profoundly different outcomes. Thus, why not reform the Section 8 voucher program so it is administered at a regional level? Why not introduce more widespread counseling? And why not incorporate a default option that voucher holders use their vouchers in low-poverty neighborhoods? Households could of course opt out of this

New on PRRAC's Website

- Proceedings of the National Commission on Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity: review witness statements, videotaped testimony, and exhibits submitted at the five regional hearings of this independent commission co-chaired by former HUD Secretaries Henry Cisneros and Jack Kemp.

- *Building Opportunity: Civil Rights Best Practices in the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program* (2008 edition, published by PRRAC and the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights).

- Public opinion poll on support for voluntary interdistrict school integration programs in Connecticut (prepared for the Sheff Movement coalition, Hartford, 2008).

default choice if they had a strong reason to prefer to live in higher-poverty areas. But in the process of opting out, they would be pushed to reflect on their decision, rather than simply reflexively choosing a high-poverty community, which for most voucher recipients is the status quo.

In summary, I would argue that there are many non-coercive policies we could adopt that would encourage households to consider a wider set of residential choices and foster racial integration in the process. I have suggested a few. While the optimism of many people during the civil rights era that integration was just around the corner now seems hopelessly naïve, I remain hopeful that in conjunction with stepped-up anti-discrimination efforts, these policies can help to broaden people's residential choice sets and nudge us all towards a more integrated world. □

Visit
PRRAC's
website at:

www.prrac.org

Resources

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

When ordering items from PRRAC: SASE = self-addressed stamped envelope (42¢ unless otherwise indicated). Orders may not be placed by telephone or fax. Please indicate from which issue of P&R you are ordering.

Race/Racism

- "A National Action Agenda: Policy Recommendations to Empower South Asian Communities in the United States (2008)" (55 pp., 2008[?]) is available from the Natl. Coal. of South Asian Organizations, 6930 Carroll Ave., #506, Takoma Park, MD 20912, 301/270-1855, saalt@saalt.org, <http://www.saalt.org/> [11056]
- *Integral* is a new periodical (premiere issue scheduled for Dec. 2008) from the Fund for an OPEN Society. Focus is on intentional integration measures. First issue includes contributions by Michael Wenger, Myron Orfield, Leo Vasquez, Clement Price and others. Inf. from Barbara Heisler Williams, Fund for an OPEN Society, 14 S.

Orange Ave., S. Orange, NJ 07079-4198, 973/821-4198, bhw@opensoc.org, <http://www.opensoc.org/> [11087]

- "Ending American Apartheid: How Cities Achieve and Maintain Racial Diversity," by Daniel Lauber (63 pp., updated 2008)—dl@planningcommunications.com—is downloadable at <http://www.planningcommunications.com/> [11103]

- *Pinoy Capital: The Filipino Nation in Daly City*, by Benito M. Vergara, Jr. (240 pp., 2008, \$24.95), has been published by Temple Univ. Press, 800/621-2736, www.temple.edu/tempress [11113]

- *Legacy and Legitimacy: Black Americans and the Supreme Court*, by Rosalee A. Clawson & Eric N. Waltenburg (224 pp., 2008, \$23.95), has been published by Temple Univ. Press, 800/621-2736, www.temple.edu/tempress [11114]

- *Theorizing Discrimination in an Era of Contested Prejudice: Discrimination in the United States*, by Samuel Roundfield Lucas (296 pp., 2008, \$45), has been published by Temple Univ. Press, 800/621-2736, www.temple.edu/tempress [11115]

Poverty/Welfare

- "Financial Inclusion and Ethnicity: An Agenda for Research and

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.

Policy Action" (78 pp., July 2008) is available (check \$ price) from The Runnymede Trust in London, info@runnymedetrust.org, <http://www.runnymedetrust.org/> [11041]

- *Peaceful, Positive Revolution: Economic Security for Every American*, by Steven Shafarman (254 pp., 2008, \$16.95), has been published by Tendril Press, 303/696-9227, <http://www.tendrilpress.com/> [11047]

- New Brookings Inst. Study on Concentrated Poverty can be downloaded at www.brookings.edu/multimedia/video/2008/0812_poverty_berube.aspx [11125]

- "The Benefits Gap: How ACORN is Helping Bridge the Gap" (Jan. 2008) is available (no price given) from ACORN, 2609 Canal St., 5th flr., New Orleans, LA 70119, 504/267-3700, <http://www.acorn.org/> [11128]

Community Organizing

- **Popular Education Workshops on the Current Financial Crisis**—ideal for community organizations, unions and others—are being organized by Labor Notes. Contact Mark Brenner, 718/284-4144, mark@labornotes.org [11079]
- "Organizing for Social Change," training sessions by The Midwest Academy, still have some late 2008 dates: **Nov. 17-21** in Baltimore/Wash., DC; **Dec. 3-5** in Chicago. Inf. from 312/427-2304, mwacademy1@aol.com, <http://www.midwestacademy.com/> [11061]

Criminal Justice

- "Expanding their Vote: State Felony Disenfranchisement Reform, 1997-2008," by Ryan S. King (29 pp., Sept. 2008), is available (no price listed) from The Sentencing Project, 514 Tenth St. NW, #1000, Wash., DC 20004, 202/628-0871, <http://www.sentencingproject.org/> [11049]

- **Wrongful Conviction: International Perspectives on Miscarriages of Justice**, eds. C. Ronald Huff & Martin Killias (312 pp., 2008, \$59.50), has been published by Temple Univ. Press, 800/621-2736, www.temple.edu/tempress [11052]

- **“Hate Thy Neighbor: Violent Racial Exclusion and the Persistence of Segregation,”** by Jeannine Bell, a 28-page article, appeared in Vol. 5, No. 4 (Fall 2007) of *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*—part of a Symposium featuring over a dozen related pieces. Prof. Bell can be reached at Indiana Univ. School of Law, 211 S. Indiana Ave., Bloomington, IN 47405-7001, 812/856-5013, jeabell@indiana.edu [11104]

- **The Execution of Willie Francis: Race, Murder and the Search for Justice in the American South**, by Gilbert King (324 pp., 2008, \$26), has been published by Civitas Books. [11109]

- **“The Window of Opportunity Pre-Release Handbook,”** by Eddie B. Ellis, who, at age 31, was released after 15 years behind bars, then produced this 52-page handbook in order to help others make the transition. It’s \$25, at eddieellis_ebe@yahoo.com, [11123]

Economic/Community Development

- **“A Plan to Revive the American Economy”** (85 pp., Aug. 2008) is available (no price listed) from the Economic Policy

Inst., as part of their Agenda for Shared Prosperity project: 1333 H St. NW, #300 E. Tower, Wash., DC 20005-4707, 202/775-8810, <http://www.epi.org/> [11040]

- **“The New American Economy: A Rising Tide that Lifts Only Yachts”** (11 pp., updated for 2008) is part of the Reality Check series, available (\$3.50) from The Century Foundation, 41 E. 70 St., NYC, NY 10021, 212/535-4441, <http://www.tcf.org/> [11062]

- **“The Strength of Community in a Sea of Change: The CLT Story,” Dec. 2-5** in Boston, is the 2008 National Community Land Trust Network Annual Meeting and National CLT Academy. 888/845-8759, ncltn@resource-plus.com, <http://www.cltnetwork.org/> [11068]

Education

- **Because of Race: How Americans Debate Harm and Opportunity in Our Schools**, by Mica Pollock (277 pp., 2008, \$29.95), has been published by Princeton Univ. Press, 609/258-9491, Fortunato@press.princeton.edu [11036]

- **“Why Rural Matters 2007: The Realities of Rural Education Growth,”** by Jerry Johnson & Marty Strange (113 pp., Oct. 2007), is available (no price listed) from the Rural School and Community Trust, 1530 Wilson Blvd., #240, Arlington, VA 22209, 703/243-1487, <http://www.ruraledu.org/> [11045]

- **Race and Class Matters at an Elite College**, by Elizabeth Aries (256 pp., 2008, \$24.95), [the elite college is Amherst] has been published by Temple Univ. Press, 800/621-2736, www.temple.edu/tempress [11050]

- **Swimming Against the Tide: African American Girls and Science Education**, by Sandra L. Hanson (208 pp., 2008, \$40), has been published by Temple Univ. Press, 800/621-2736, www.temple.edu/tempress [11051]

- **“Democracy at Risk: The Need for a New Federal Policy in Education”** (55 pp., April 2008) is available (no price listed) from The Forum for Education and Democracy, 1307 New York Ave. NW, #300, Wash., DC 20005, 202/372-7684, bglen@forumforeducation.org, www.forumforeducation.org (11059)

- **“Has Student Achievement Increased Since 2002? State Test Score Trends Through 2006-07”** (June 2008) is available from the Center on Educational Policy; go to <http://www.cep-dc.org/> [11069]

- **Personal Post-Katrina Narratives from Gulf Coast Students**, a set of essays and more, assembled by the Southern Education Foundation (135 Auburn Ave. NE, 2nd fl., Atlanta, GA 30303-2503, 404/523-0001), can be found online at <http://www.southerneducation.org/> [11074]

- **Out-Of-School Time Evaluations:** The Harvard Family Research Project has produced two

new (2008) OST evaluations: “Research Update 3: Using Evaluation to Inform OST Programming and Serve Older Youth” and “OST Bibliography: 40 New Entries.” Contact them at the Harvard Grad. School of Education, 3 Garden St., Cambridge, MA 02138, hfrp@hfrp.ccsend.com [11081]

- **“The Community Agenda for America’s Public Schools,”** endorsed by well over 100 organizations, was recently released by the Coalition for Community Schools. Inf. and a copy of the Agenda available from CCS, c/o Inst. for Educational Leadership, 4455 Conn. Ave. NW, #310, Wash., DC 20008, 202/822-8405, x156, ccs@iel.org, <http://www.communityschools.org/> [11088]

- **“Improving Public Schools”** (n.d.) is an action kit put out by the National League of Cities’ Inst. for Youth, Education and Families. Contact them for ordering inf.: 1301 Penn. Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20004-1763, 202/626-3000, <http://www.nlc.org/> [11090]

- **“What Happened to Dropouts from the High School Class of 2004?”** is a 2008 brief from the California Dropout Research Project, available at www.lmri.ucsb.edu/dropouts/download.php?file=statisticalbrief-10.pdf [11094]

- **“Out of Many, One: Towards Rigorous Common Core Standards from the Ground Up”** is a 2008 report from Achieve, showing that more and more states are aligning their curriculum standards with those for

college and work readiness. Available at www.achieve.org/files/CommonCore.pdf [11095]

- **“Where We Stand: America’s Schools in the Twenty-First Century”** is a new PBS documentary. You can watch the five segments at www.pbs.org/wnet/wherewestand/ [11097]

- **IEL Leadership Connections Newsletter** is a bimonthly electronic publication from the Institute for Educational Leadership. Contact them at 4455 Conn. Ave. NW, #310, Wash., DC 20008, 202/822-8405, iel@iel.org [11105]

- **Improving No Child Left Behind: Getting Education Reform Back on Track**, ed. Richard D. Kahlenberg (288 pp., Oct. 2008, \$19.95), has been published by The Century Foundation, 1333 H St. NW, 10th flr., Wash., DC 20005, 202/745-5476. Contributors include Amy Stuart Wells, John Yinger, Lauren B. Resnick and others. [11106]

- **“From No Child Left Behind to Every Child a Graduate”** is an Aug. 2008 Alliance for Excellent Education report. Contact them at 1201 Conn. Ave. NW, #901, Wash., DC 20036, 202/828-0828, Alliance@all4ed.org; downloadable at www.all4ed.org/publication_material/reports/ECAG [11119]

- **“Dropouts, Diplomas, and Dollars: U.S. High Schools and the Nation’s Economy”** is an Aug. 2008 Alliance for Excellent Education report. Contact them at 1201 Conn. Ave. NW, #901, Wash., DC 20036,

202/828-0828, Alliance@all4ed.org; downloadable at www.all4ed.org/files/Econ2008.pdf [11120]

- **“Using Early-Warning Data to Improve Graduation Rates: Closing Cracks in the Education System”** is an Aug. 2008 Alliance for Excellent Education brief. Contact them at 1201 Conn. Ave. NW, #901, Wash., DC 20036, 202/828-0828, Alliance@all4ed.org; downloadable at www.all4ed.org/files/EWI.pdf [11121]

- **“Community Colleges: A Special Supplement to the Condition of Education 2008”** is a 2008 report from the National Center for Education Statistics; downloadable at www.nceds.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2008033 [11122]

- **“Organized Communities, Stronger Schools, A Preview of Research Findings,”** by Kavitha Mediratta, Seema Ramesh Shah & Sara McAlister, a 2008 Annenberg Institute for School Reform report, is available at www.annenberginstitute.org/pdf/OrganizedCommunities.pdf [11126]

- **“Celebrate 25 Years of Local Education Funds,”** Nov. 16-18 in San Francisco. Inf. from <http://www.publiceducation.org/> [11072]

- **“Comprehensive Educational Equity: Overcoming the Socio-economic Barriers to School Success,”** the Fourth Annual Equity Symposium, sponsored by The Campaign for Educational Equity and Teachers College-Columbia Univ., will be held Nov. 17-18 at Columbia.

Among the presenters: Edmund Gordon, Geoffrey Canada, Pedro Noguera, Richard Rothstein, Henry Levin, and Michael Rebell. Inf. at www.tcequity.org/symposium [11082]

Employment/ Labor/ Jobs Policy

- **“The Labor Day List; Partnerships that Work”** (2008 edition, 16 pp.), “celebrating successful labor relations strategies in the new economy,” is available (possibly free) from the American Rights at Work Education Fund, 1100 17th St. NW, #950, Wash., DC 20036, 202/822-2127, srbprogram@americanrightsatwork.org, <http://www.americanrightsatwork.org/> [11057]

- **The Man Who Hated Work and Loved Labor: The Life and Times of Tony Mazzocchi**, by Les Leopold (544 pp., 2007, \$24.95), has been published by Chelsea Green, <http://www.chelseagreen.com/> [11107]

- **“Career Academies: Long-Term Impacts on Labor Market Outcomes, Educational Attainment, and Transitions to Adulthood,”** by James J. Kemple (47 pp., June 2008), is available (no price listed) from MDRC, 16 E. 34 St., NYC, NY 10016-4326, 212/532-3200. <http://www.mdrc.org/> [11112]

Families/ Women/ Children

- **The Delinquent Girl**, ed. Margaret A. Zahn (344 pp., 2008, \$54.50), has been published by Temple Univ. Press, 800/621-2736, www.temple.edu/tempres [11053]

- **The Institute for Youth, Education and Families**, an entity within the National League of Cities, “helps municipal leaders take action on behalf of the children, youth, and families in their communities.” 1301 Penn. Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20004, 202/626-3014, iyef@nlc.org [11067]

- **The Medical-Legal Partnership** is a unique program, bringing resources together from both areas, run by the Dept. of Pediatrics at Boston Medical Center and the Boston Univ. School of Medicine. Inf. at <http://www.mlpforchildren.org/> [11073]

- **“Toward a Brighter Future: An Essential Agenda for America’s Young People”** (13 pp., 2008?) is available (possibly free) from the National Collaboration for Youth (an affinity group of the National Human Services Assembly), 1319 F St. NW, #402, Wash., DC 20004, 202/347-2080, x21, nthompson@nassembly.org, <http://www.collab4youth.org/> [11084]

- **“Broadening the Base: Strengthening Mississippi’s Working Families Through a System of Strong Child Care”** (2008?), prepared

by the Mississippi Economic Policy Center, is available (no price given) from the Mississippi Center for Justice, PO Box 1023, Jackson, MS 39215-1023, 601/352-2269, Contact_us@mscenterforjustice.org, <http://www.mscenterforjustice.org/> [11086]

- **Whole Child** is a project of the Assn. for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1703 N. Beauregard St., Alexandria, VA 22311-1714, 800/933-2723, wholechild@ascd.org, <http://www.wholechildeducation.org/> [11091]

- **Black Men and Boys Initiative**, a project of the Twenty-First Century Foundation, can be reached at <http://www.bmbnrc.org/> [11093]

- **“Katrina’s Children No Matter What!”** has embarked on a 12-month national tour, featuring their film, *Katrina’s Children*, and a panel discussion of the current status of children in New Orleans and the far-reaching educational implications of the aftermath of disaster. Current schedule includes Decatur and Savannah, GA, Dallas and Austin, New Orleans and Philadelphia. Contact Carolyn Gillman, 504/875-1257, drcarolyn.gillman@gmail.com for further inf. and to book the tour in your community. [11083]

- **“Rebuilding Sustainable Communities for Children and Their Families After Disasters”** will be held Nov. 16-19 in Boston, an international conf. sponsored by the College of Public and Community Service at Univ. Mass.-Boston. (PRRAC Dir. of Research Chester Hartman is

presenting findings from the Hurricane Katrina experience.) Inf. from 617/287-7100, Adenrele.Awontona@umb.edu [11132]

Health

- **“Health Care Proposals of the 2008 Democratic and Republican Presidential Nominations”** (39 pp., Aug. 2008) is available (possibly free) from the Joint Ctr. for Political and Economic Studies, 1090 Vermont Ave. NW, #1100, Wash., DC 20005, 202/789-3500, jointcenter.org [11042]

- **The National Assembly on School-Based Health Care**, the national voice for school-based health centers, founded in 1995, can be reached at 666 11th St. NW, #735, Wash., DC 20001, 202/638-5872, <http://www.nasbhc.org/> [11070]

- **Broken Levees, Broken Lives** is a new video, from the California Nurses Assn., on the state of health care in New Orleans three years after Hurricane Katrina devastated the city and closed Charity Hospital, the primary provider of emergency room care in the city. See it at neworleanslabormedia.org [11071]

- **“Losing Ground: Declines in Health Coverage for Children and Families in Mississippi”** (2007) is available (no price listed) from the Mississippi Ctr. for Justice and the Mississippi Health Advocacy Program, the former at PO Box 1023, Jackson, MS 39215-1023, 601/352-2269, Contact_us@mscenterforjustice.org, [http://www.mscenter](http://www.mscenterforjustice.org/)

forjustice.org/ [11085]

- **Social Determinants of Health:** The final report of the World Health Organization Commission on the Social Determinants of Health is downloadable at [www.who.int/social_determinants/final_report/en/index/html](http://www.who.int/social_determinants/final_report/en/index.html) [11110]

- **The Healthy City Project** aims “to improve the accessibility of services to low-income, underserved families and to help develop sensible public policies based on sound data that will improve the quality of life for all communities in Los Angeles. Contact them at <http://www.healthycity.org/> [11129]

Housing

- **“The Fair Housing Act After 40 Years: Continuing the Mission to Eliminate Housing Discrimination and Segregation”** is a 309-page Symposium appearing as Vol. 41, No. 3 (2008) of the *Indiana Law Review*. Among the 10 article authors are (PRRAC Bd. & Soc. Sci. Adv. Bd. members) Florence Wagman Roisman, Elizabeth Julian, John Powell & Margery Austin Turner; plus Monroe Little, Jr., James Kushner, John Relman, James Rosenbaum, Stefanie DeLuca, Leonard Rubinowitz, Kathryn Shelton & Robert Schwemm. Copies of the issue are \$15, from Chris Paynter, Indiana Law Review, 530 W. New York, Ave., Indianapolis, IN 46202. [11048]

- **“The Housing Needs of Extremely Low-**

Income Delaware Households” (2008?) is available (possibly free) from the Delaware Housing Coalition, PO Box 1633, Dover, DE 19903-1633, 302/678-2286, dhc@housingforall.org, <http://www.housingforall.org/> [11063]

- **HUD USER** regularly provides housing research and information. They can assist with research questions—800/245-2691. [11080]

- **“Building the Research Capacity at HUD”** was released in late September, an advance copy distributed by the National Research Council. Contact the National Academies Press, 500 Fifth St. NW, Lockbox 285, Wash., DC 20055, 800/624-6242, <http://www.nap.edu/> [11092]

- **“Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice in the City of Naperville, Illinois,”** by Daniel Lauber (82 pp., Nov. 2007)—dplanningcommunications.com—is downloadable at <http://www.planningcommunications.com/> [11102]

- **Mo’ Money, Mo’ Money, Mo’ Money** is a 9-minute 2008 video from the California Reinvestment Coalition, an educational documentary on the mortgage crisis. Contact them at 474 Valencia St., #230, SF, CA 94103, 415/864-3980. You can find it on YouTube, <http://www.calreinvest.org/> [11117]

- **“Preserving Safe, High Quality Public Housing Should Be a Priority of Federal Housing Policy,”** by

Barbara Sard & Will Fisher, is a 36-page, Sept. 2008 report (no price listed) from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (headed by former PRRAC Bd. member Robert Greenstein), 820 First St. NE, #510, Wash., DC 20002, 202/408-1080, center@cbpp.org, http://www.cbpp.org/ [11130]

• **“Rural Housing Summit,”** convened by the California Coalition for Rural Housing, will be held **Oct. 27-28** in Pacific Grove. Speakers include (PRRAC Board member) Sheila Crowley and Moises Loza, Exec. Dir. of the Housing Assistance Council. Inf. from 916/443-4448, cristina@calruralhousing.org [11078]

• **“New Strategies in Fair Housing Conference,”** sponsored by the Housing Research & Advocacy Center, will be held **Nov. 14** in Cleveland. Speakers include (PRRAC Bd.

members) John Powell, Demetria McCain and Florence Wagman Roisman, and James Perry, Shanna Smith, Dennis Keating, Robert Schwemm and others. Inf. from 216/361-9240, http://www.thehousingcenter.org/ [11116]

Immigration

• **“Los Angeles on the Leading Edge: Immigrant Indicators and Their Policy Implications”** (April 2008) is available (no price given) from the Migration Policy Inst., 202/266-1910, mmittelstadt@migrationpolicy.org; downloadable at www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/NCIIP_Los_Angeles_on_the-Leading_Edge.pdf [11098]

• **“New Estimates of Unauthorized Youth Eligible for Legal Status under the DREAM Act”** (10 pp., Oct. 2006) is available (possibly free) from the Migration Policy

Inst., 202/266-1924, mfix@migrationpolicy.org, http://www.migrationpolicy.org/ [11099]

• **“In Our Hands: Building Solidarity & Community”** is the 9th Annual Refugee & Immigrant Women’s Leadership Conf., **Nov. 14-16** in Atlanta. Inf. from 404/299-0180, x226, info@riwn.org [11076]

Rural

• **“The First CRLA Rural Justice Forum”** will be held **Oct. 27** in Los Angeles. This California Rural Legal Assistance (headed by PRRAC Board member Jose Padilla) event will deal primarily with farmworker housing conditions and related health disparities—for advocates, researchers and practitioners. Inf. from bhughes@crla.org, 530/742-7235. [11075]

Miscellaneous

• ***The Concept of Community: Lessons from the Bronx***, by Harold DeRienzo (239 pp., 2008), has been published by IPOC, ipoc@ipocpress.com. [11046]

• ***The Leftmost City: Power and Progressive Politics in Santa Cruz***, by Richard Gendron & G. William Domhoff (256 pp., \$27), will be published in December by Westview Press, 800/343-4499, http://www.perseusacademic.com/ [11108]

• ***The Measure of America: American Human Development Report 2008-2009*** (July 2008) addressed long-term Katrina recovery and includes a Gulf Coast Recovery Plan. A joint publication of the Social Science Research Council and Columbia Univ. Press, it can be ordered at <http://www.measureforamerica.org/> [11111]

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

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

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

Name _____

Address _____

Address Line 2 _____

City, State, Zip _____

Telephone: _____ email: _____

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

POVERTY & RACE RESEARCH ACTION COUNCIL
Board of Directors

CHAIR

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

VICE-CHAIR

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

SECRETARY

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

TREASURER

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

Darrell Armstrong

*Shiloh Baptist Church
Trenton, NJ*

Maria Blanco

*Institute on Race, Ethnicity
and Diversity
University of California
Law School*

Berkeley, CA

Victor Bolden

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

Sheryll Cashin

*Georgetown University
Law Center
Washington, DC*

Craig Flournoy

*Southern Methodist
University
Dallas, TX*

Thomas Henderson

*Sprenger & Lang
Washington, DC*

Olati Johnson

*Columbia University
Law School
New York, NY*

Elizabeth Julian

*Inclusive Communities
Project
Dallas, TX*

Spence Limbocker

*Neighborhood Funders
Group
Washington, DC*

Demetria McCain

*Inclusive Communities
Project
Dallas, TX*

S.M. Miller

*The Commonwealth
Institute
Cambridge, MA*

Don Nakanishi

*University of California
Los Angeles, CA*

Dennis Parker

*American Civil Liberties
Union
New York, NY*

Florence Wagman

Roisman
*Indiana University
School of Law
Indianapolis, IN*

Anthony Sarmiento

*Senior Service America
Silver Spring, MD*

Catherine Tactaquin

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

William L. Taylor

*Citizens' Commission
on Civil Rights
Washington, DC*

Camille Wood

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

*[Organizations listed for
identification purposes only]*

Philip D. Tegeler

President/Executive Director

Chester Hartman

Director of Research

Jason Small

Law & Policy Fellow

Kami Kruckenberg

Health Policy Fellow

Poverty & Race Research Action Council

1015 15th Street NW • Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005
202/906-8023 FAX: 202/842-2885
E-mail: info@prrac.org
Website: www.prrac.org

Address Service Requested

9-10/08

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