Tensions Among Minority Groups?

Last December, New America Media (NAM) released the results of a major national poll, “Deep Divisions, Shared Destiny: A Poll of African Americans, Hispanics and Asian Americans on Race Relations Sponsored by New America Media and Nine Founding Ethnic Partners.” A total of 1,105 African-American, Asian-American and Hispanic adults were polled (as noted below, Native Americans were not included), using sophisticated methodology, “designed to be representative of the adult population of the three major racial and ethnic minorities in the United States.” A typical newspaper headline reporting the story was “Survey Points to Tensions Among Chief Minorities” (New York Times, 12/13/07).

Yet the results—covering attitudes about a wide range of issues—are far more complex, and less one-sidedly conflictful, than these headlines suggested. We therefore asked several of PRRAC’s close associates to comment on the results. Full poll results are available at http://media.newamericamedia.org/images/polls/race/exec_summary.pdf

Racial-Ethnic Destinies

by S.M. Miller

Polls, such as this one on “Deep Divisions, Shared Destiny,” report the low (5%) margin of error of their study. Like many other polls, they neglect to point out that this error margin applies to the study as a whole. The margin of error for each of the three racial-ethnic groups, the sub-samples, may be larger than the overall error margin. Some lowering of confidence in the reports for each group is necessary.

A second concern is that polling is affected by contexts—political, economic, cultural—that occur around the time of the question-asking. Would the respondents have the same response in today’s reeling economy as they had in August-September, 2007 before the economy’s faltering became disturbingly evident? Better times breed optimism. As the report declares, the racial-ethnic landscape is in flux. The landscape will be made by events, circumstances, actions and responses by each group and by the broader society. In a few months and certainly years from now, new outlooks may appear.

Despite these and other doubts about the confidence we should place in polling reports, it is useful to examine convergence and differences among the three racial-ethnic groups. The great positive report is that people of color have positive attitudes about American society and each other. That provides the potential of their becoming a (somewhat) unified political force. Many pressures, particularly competition for jobs and political space, operate against that potential. Unfortunately, America needs

(Please turn to page 2)
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scapegoats, especially in difficult days. Over the years, Blacks, Irish, Jews, Italians, leftists, gays, etc. have been isolated, demeaned and discriminated against. One of the three racial-ethnic groups may be offered as economic villains or illegal workers (Hispanics) or as authors of their own economic difficulties (Blacks), undeserving of attention, because they are not motivated to produce the social capital that would provide them easy access to the higher reaches of the economic ladder. A common front against the scapegoating of any of the three groups may not emerge.

The immigration issue affects Black attitudes toward Hispanics who compete for jobs and are willing to work for low wages. Blacks are much more pessimistic about full inclusion in American society than the other two groups (two-thirds of Blacks do not believe that equal opportunity occurs) and may engage in actions that disturb the others. In some localities, Hispanics may be moved to issues and confrontations that bother the other two groups. Asians may decide that their economic and social integration in the USA is secure and avoid working with the other two groups. Both Hispanics and Asians fear crime by Blacks and may reject collaborating with them.

How to surmount these possible obstacles? One important approach has developed. Leaders of national organizations of the three groups are meeting. Perhaps over time some public remarks on political and other issues will emerge from the joint sessions as common purposes and actions occur. A national day calling attention to the difficulties and achievements of the three, and Native Americans, might be useful. The prospects of working together will be affected by the state of the economy (which group, Black or Hispanics, gains more political attention). A particular issue that needs a common position is immigration, which is of great importance for Hispanics. If a common position has emerged among the national leaders, it has not had wide publicity.

At least as important as national coordination is the coming together of the three groups at local levels. Local variations are not highlighted by national politics. As the report declares, “high levels of ethnic isolation exist among the groups which may underlie and reinforce racial tensions.” Discussions among local leaders and organizations could diminish antagonisms and differences among the groups. The goal would be to move toward joint action, although the early stage is likely to be mutual aid where the other two groups support the third group on its particular issue. Over time, this mutual aid might grow into an on-going coalition with a common agenda.

The common local program would emphasize one or another of such issues as unemployment, low wages, job up-grading, affirmative action, housing inadequacies, police and criminal justice treatment, access to health facilities, neighborhood amenities, educational issues. Focusing on a very limited set of issues—my mantra is that if you have more than three goals or issues at a time, you don’t have any goal—is important. Big goals and limited means lead to disillusioning failure (unless limited compromises are acceptable).

The report concludes optimistically that the three groups “will ultimately [my emphasis] work out ways to relate to each other for their mutual benefit over the long term” because they share important values. The assumption is that attitudes about values and conditions as depicted in a poll will have an enduring trajectory. Looking to a nearer-term future, consultation, collaboration, mutual aid, positive joint experiences and good economic and political times may reduce the time needed for ultimate change based on common core values. Today’s fields of action are important.

Great Cause for Optimism

by Wade Henderson

The survey gives me great cause for optimism. Throughout history, people have drawn boundaries based on differences of race and ethnicity, and untold conflicts have resulted. America—and in particular, our civil rights movement—changed that by enshrining the principle of equality under law and by promising tolerance and respect for all people. Distrust isn’t completely absent (and the survey reflects some of that distrust)—but what is remarkable is the degree to which today’s African Americans, Latinos and Asian Americans are bonded by friendship and a commitment to working together to make America a more just and equal society.

Strikingly, all three groups view the civil rights movement as establishing
On April 13, 1873, the United States experienced the worst one-day slaughter of blacks by whites in its history. In tiny Colfax, La., white paramilitaries attacked lightly armed African-American freedmen who had assembled in a local courthouse to defend their elected officeholders. By the time the Colfax Massacre was over, more than 60 black men lay dead. Most were killed after they had surrendered.

Perhaps even more shocking than the bloodshed in Louisiana was the ultimate resolution of the case. Initially, Northern public opinion was outraged, and the Grant Administration vowed swift punishment for the guilty. But as Louisiana whites rallied around the massacre’s perpetrators, the costs—financial and political—of prosecution mounted. Washington gradually lost interest. Denied the funds and military support he needed, New Orleans-based U.S. Attorney James R. Beckwith valiantly tried to win convictions, but succeeded against only three of the 98 men he indicted. Even that paltry result was overturned by Supreme Court Justice Joseph P. Bradley in mid-1874; his ruling gave a green light to Klan-like groups in Mississippi and South Carolina, which overthrew those states’ pro-civil rights Republican governments in 1875 and 1876, respectively. When the full Court upheld Bradley’s ruling in 1876, it dealt a lasting blow to federal law enforcement authority throughout the South.

Thus did a white supremacist crime mutate into a white supremacist triumph. This is why I called my book about the Colfax Massacre, The Day Freedom Died.

My goal was to provide the first definitive account of the massacre—from its origins in the antebellum plantation economy of Louisiana’s Red River Valley, to its repercussions in constitutional law today. It is too late to correct a 135-year-old injustice. But I felt an urgent need to correct the record. For the injustice at Colfax was compounded by cover-up. White Louisianans have systematically distorted the event, blaming rampant “Negroes” for provoking their own murders and erecting marble monuments and historical markers in honor of the guilty. This cover-up, unfortunately, was abetted for many years by historians, Northern and Southern, who taught that Reconstruction had collapsed due to its own misguided attempt to include unworthy black men in government. In that sense, I was following the revisionist trail blazed by historians such as John Hope Franklin, Kenneth Stampp and Eric Foner. Thanks to them, the rights and wrongs of Reconstruction are now more accurately comprehended; the old fable of carpetbaggers and scalawags has lost currency and respectability.

But as I completed the book, I also wondered whether the time has come to take the interpretation of Reconstruction in a new direction. The work of Franklin, Stampp and Foner properly emphasized the political and economic weaknesses of Reconstruction, such as the Radical Republican Congress’s failure to distribute land to Alabama became the last state to do so, not until 2000. June 12 now is an informal holiday—“Loving Day”—celebrated by many interracial couples (4.3 million such now in the nation, according to the Census Bureau).

Mildred Loving

We dedicate this issue of Poverty & Race to Mildred Loving, the woman who successfully challenged Virginia’s miscegenation laws, who died in May at age 68. She married a white man, Richard Loving, in 1958, was arrested by the county sheriff and two deputies who burst into their house five weeks after their marriage. She pleaded guilty to violation of the state’s Racial Integrity Act, had her one-year prison sentence suspended on condition that the couple leave Virginia and not return together or at the same time for 25 years. Then, with the help of ACLU lawyers, she challenged the law (similar to those then existing in 16 other states—at one time or another, 38 states had such laws), was rebuffed by the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals, whereupon the case went to the US Supreme Court, which on June 12, 1967 unanimously struck down state laws requiring separation of races in marriage. The full text of the case, Loving v. Virginia, 388 U.S. 1 (1967), is available (free) at www.findlaw.com/casecode/supreme.html. States, however, were slow to change their constitutions—Alabama became the last state to do so, not until 2000. June 12 now is an informal holiday—“Loving Day”—celebrated by many interracial couples (4.3 million such now in the nation, according to the Census Bureau).
Southern blacks, or the Grant Administration’s evolution from a revolutionary force to a patronage machine.

However, Reconstruction not only failed because of such flaws in its design; it failed because it was resisted. It was resisted through cruel but sophisticated paramilitary campaigns, starting with the Ku Klux Klan’s rampage through the Southeastern states in the late 1860s and culminating in the Red Shirts’ seizure of power in South Carolina in 1876. Southern litigation and Southern terrorism attacked Reconstruction at its weakest points: a post-Civil War constitutional structure whose new rules of state-federal relations were open to judicial interpretation, and a Northern political climate in which sympathy for beleaguered freedmen did not exceed the desire to avoid a new Civil War. The rulings of Justice Bradley and his Supreme Court colleagues reflected Northerners’ interest in an exit from the intractable morass of the South.

For all the savagery they visited upon black freedmen and their white Republican supporters, for all their warfare against Republican-led state militia units, the white Reconstruction-era paramilitaries in Louisiana—as far as I can determine—never killed or wounded a single Federal soldier. Indeed, white supremacist politicians went out of their way to praise U.S. generals in their public statements, even as they may have cursed them in private. The reason was simple: The white supremacists assumed that, as long as they did not actually harm U.S. troops, white Northern public opinion would not support the all-out invasion that could have crushed them. And they were right.

Eventually, the U.S. government retreated from the post-Civil War South just as it would retreat from Vietnam and Somalia a century later—and as it may yet retreat from Iraq. What began as a bold effort at democratization and nation-building ended as a politically-military quagmire. I mean this as a provocative analogy, not an exact one: Washington’s duty to its own citizens, regardless of the cost, was more apparent than its duty to Southeast Asia or Africa. Still, for the idealistic men (and women) who traveled South from New England during and after the Civil War, places such as Coshatta, Louisiana and Vicksburg, Mississippi were almost as alien, culturally, as Mogadishu and Baghdad are to U.S. soldiers and diplomats today.

Surveying the ruins of Reconstruction after he left the White House, Ulysses S. Grant concluded that the South had needed neither home rule or episodic federal intervention, but benevolent dictatorship. “Looking back, over the whole policy of Reconstruction, it seems to me that the wisest thing would have been to have continued for some time the military rule,” he said. “That would have enabled the Southern people to pull themselves together and repair material losses. Military rule would have been just to all: the Negro who wanted freedom, the white man who wanted protection, the Northern man who wanted Union. As state after state showed a willingness to come into the Union, not on their terms but upon ours, I would have admitted them. The trouble about the military rule in the South was that our people did not like it. It was not in accordance with our institutions. I am clear now that it would have been better to have postponed suffrage, reconstruction, State governments, for ten years, and held the South in a territorial condition. But we made our scheme, and must do what we can with it.”

Grant’s analysis—a characteristic mixture of hard-head militarism and wishful idealism—has its attractions. But, as Grant acknowledged, “our people did not like it.” The white South was firmly united behind “reconstruction,” while the Republican Party was an agglomeration of industrialists, farmers, Negro freedmen, and Northern-born officeholders in the South. This coalition lacked unity; it lacked conviction; it lacked certitude. And certitude was the one thing the white South had in abundance. The South pushed and pushed on Republican fault lines until they cracked. The Confederate States of America lost the Civil War. But the South won Reconstruction.

a template for equality which benefits all Americans. Until the civil rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s, America lived a contradiction, denying African Americans its foundational ideal of equality. As a result, African Americans, but also Latinos and Asian Americans. Indeed, Title VII established protections against discrimination not only for African Americans, but for those of any race or national origin; Brown v. Board of Education banned the separate-but-equal doctrine for all minorities. So it’s not surprising that nearly 70% of Latinos and Asian Americans believe that the civil rights movement helped them and almost 90% of the three groups believe they should work together for their collective good.

The Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the civil rights movement left an indelible imprint on our national fabric, so that America would never again betray our founding principles by excluding minorities. Today, anti-immigrant sentiments test these principles. But the legal tenets and the tolerance the civil rights movement established continue to turn Americans toward equality.
New Challenges to Segregation in the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program

A federal lawsuit against the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs and a rulemaking petition to the Internal Revenue Service are the latest efforts to bring the LIHTC Program into compliance with the Fair Housing Act.

The Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program is currently the nation’s largest assisted housing production program. Each year, the IRS allocates authorized tax credits under the program to state housing finance agencies, which then receive proposals from developers to use the credits to finance local development projects, which typically include a significant number of low- and moderate-income housing units.

Unfortunately, the program has operated with little civil rights oversight since its inception in 1986—despite the Fair Housing Act mandate that all federal agencies (and their state grantees) take steps affirmatively to further fair housing. As PRRAC and many other critics have pointed out, the LIHTC Program as currently administered by state housing finance agencies promotes racial and economic segregation by continuing to funnel low-income housing units into poor and predominantly minority communities that already include a disproportionately high amount of assisted housing. This pattern of LIHTC investment denies many low-income renters the opportunity to choose assisted housing in higher-opportunity, less segregated areas.

The new lawsuit, Inclusive Communities Project, Inc. v. Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs et al., was filed in March in federal court in Dallas. The complaint describes a pattern that is familiar—family LIHTC housing concentrated in predominantly minority neighborhoods, particularly in the state’s metropolitan areas. It seeks an injunction “requiring defendants to allocate Low Income Housing Tax Credits in the Dallas metropolitan area in a manner that creates as many Low Income Housing Tax Credit-assisted units in non-minority census tracts as exist in minority census tracts.”

The plaintiff, Inclusive Communities Project, Inc., is a Dallas-based non-profit which promotes more racially and economically inclusive communities, and administers the housing mobility portion of the remedy in the Walker v. HUD public housing desegregation case. Its president, Elizabeth Julian, is former Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity at HUD and is on PRRAC’s Board. This lawsuit is the first civil rights challenge to the LIHTC Program since a similar case in the Connecticut state courts was dismissed on procedural grounds in 2006. (An earlier state court case in New Jersey was also dismissed, in a muddled opinion that deferred to the state agency’s decisionmaking process without looking carefully into the plaintiffs’ substantive claims.)

The Inclusive Communities Project is also the originator of a petition for rulemaking, recently filed with the IRS, which demands that the agency finally adopt regulations (about 20 years late!) to implement its Fair Housing Act obligations and provide strong guidance to state Housing Finance Agencies on their obligations to affirmatively further fair housing in state administration of the program. Such guidance should include collecting and maintaining racial and ethnic data about LIHTC residents and applicants, strong affirmative marketing requirements, and siting rules that will prevent continued over-concentration of LIHTC developments in poor and predominantly minority communities.

Both the federal court complaint and the rulemaking petition are available at www.prrac.org/projects/lihtc.php.

Other Resources

Building Opportunity: Civil Rights Best Practices in the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program (PRRAC and the Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, 2006)

Are States Using the Low Income Tax Credit to Enable Families with Children to Live in Low Poverty and Racially Integrated Neighborhoods? (Abt Associates, 2006)

The above two items are available at www.prrac.org/projects/lihtc.php


Achieving Racial Convergence:  
A Leadership Challenge

by Don T. Nakanishi

The “Deep Divisions, Shared Destiny” poll provides credence for a continuum of competing views on the interracial and interethnic relations and perceptions among African Americans, Asian Americans and Latino Americans. The results, for example, underscore the familiar themes of mistrust, tensions, competition and lack of social relations that have often characterized the interactions among these groups. The findings, however, also demonstrate a number of common experiences and shared views of being people of color in 21st century American society, as well as mutual appreciation for the contributions and strengths of each group.

There were two findings which I found to be particularly noteworthy and far from obvious. First, I was very pleased to see that the vast majority of Latino-American (73%) and Asian-American (65%) respondents agreed with the statement, “African Americans have helped all racial and ethnic groups by leading the fight for civil rights and against discrimination.” I found this positive recognition to be significant because most of these respondents—55% of the Latino Americans and 80% of the Asian Americans in the survey—were immigrants, who are oftentimes described as lacking knowledge, appreciation, as well as a sense of linked fate with the leadership and contributions that African Americans have provided in expanding civil rights for all Americans, especially those from racial and ethnic communities. Moreover, Latino and Asian immigrants, be they workers or small business owners, have been viewed largely as competitors, antagonists or worse in many highly publicized urban conflicts with African Americans in recent years.

For both political organizing and political research purposes, it would be revealing to build on this survey and to understand the extent to which these positive sentiments are widespread, how they were acquired, and whether they can be leveraged for future collective action. For example, Asian immigrants are oftentimes described as having acquired negative stereotypes of African Americans in their Asian home countries prior to migrating to the United States, and continuing to adhere to them during their adjustment and acculturation to this country. If that is the case, then how do they come to believe that they have benefited from the struggles of African Americans? And do they or can they, in turn, develop a sense of reciprocity towards African Americans? Future research efforts might also be undertaken to see if the efforts and achievements of Latino-American and Asian-American civil rights and progressive groups and leaders in the past, as well as the present, are also positively recognized and shared by members of all three populations.

The second somewhat unexpected, but welcomed finding was that the three groups of respondents, despite their many differences, expressed their highest level of agreement in the entire survey for the following statement: “African Americans, Latinos, and Asians have many similar problems. They should put aside their differences and work together on issues that affect their communities.” 92% of Latino Americans, 89% of African Americans and 86% of Asian Americans agreed with the statement. Since this poll was undertaken by ethnic media organizations, the respondents were asked whether the ethnic media had such a responsibility for bringing the three communities “closer together.” 78% of Latino-American, 69% of African-American and 73% of Asian-American respondents believed that the ethnic media had such a responsibility.

However, if they had been asked, I am fairly certain that the respondents would have expressed the same expectation of other leaders, sectors and groups of these three communities to seek common ground and undertake more collective action. I believe they are understandably tired and angry about many divisive aspects of the current state of relationships among the three groups, and challenge all of us to work towards achieving greater racial convergence. 

PRRAC’s Law & Policy Fellow

We are pleased to welcome PRRAC’s new Law & Policy Fellow, Jason Small. After graduating from Yale Law School in 1998, Jason did legislative-related work in D.C. for several years (including a stint at the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation) before deciding to go into private law practice with a firm in his home town of Decatur, Illinois. We are fortunate that Jason decided to return to Washington—and are looking forward to working with him on several of PRRAC’s housing and education initiatives.

Don T. Nakanishi (dtn@ucla.edu), a PRRAC Board member, is Director and Professor, UCLA Asian American Studies Center.
‘Minority’ is a Problem Concept
by john a. powell

The New America Media poll on racial and ethnic attitudes between Blacks, Hispanics and Asian Americans is both very important and subject to many of the limitations that we have experienced in the past when striving to talk openly about the attitudes and positions of different racial and ethnic groups in the United States. There are problems with the poll. The poll continues the troubling practice of leaving out Native Americans; there may be a good reason for this, but it is not offered. Polls tend to only capture what a respondent is consciously thinking at the time. They are generally not sensitive to implicit attitudes, nor do they capture how attitudes are impacted and shift by structural arrangement. But this poll, though important, suffers from additional problems (discussed below) which are more closely related to the subject matter of race. This poll is important because there has been far too little attention paid to salient differences in attitudes and perceptions between racial and ethnic populations in this country. Typically, the focus is on European Americans in relationship to other groups, particularly African Americans. Consequently, there is a need to better understand the dynamic interactions between African Americans, Latinos and Asian Americans.

For some time, there has been a call for a more inclusive and nuanced approach to looking at racial and ethnic issues in the United States. And while this is somewhat easier said than done, this poll begins to move us in the right direction even as it exposes some of the difficulties. In looking at the issue of race in America, it is easy to over-focus or under-focus on European Americans when thinking about race. This poll suffers from the latter. We have to recognize the dominant role European Americans have played and continue to play in many ways, but we must also broaden our gaze, to work for a more textured, multi-relational perspective. Indeed, we should be interested not only in perspective, but also in conditions and situatedness. Again, not an easy task.

This poll includes Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians as the three largest ethnic and racial minority groups in the U.S. There are a number of problems even at this level. “Minority” is a problem concept. Do they mean a numeric minority? If so, then what does majority-minority mean? If they just mean numbers, why don’t we refer to men in the U.S. as minorities? What is the difference between racial groups and ethnic groups? Blacks, for example, are clearly more than one ethnic group, and Hispanics are clearly more than one race.

The problems go beyond nomenclature. I believe that it is important for groups to gain mutual understanding and work together. But what are the conditions and assumptions that can support these collaborations? Is there some similar experience—immigration, exclusion, income level, education, culture or history—that might help to bring these groups together and reduce the tension between them? Are there institutional or structural issues that make cooperation—or competition—more likely, such as competing in a school system? It is not surprising that people who voluntarily immigrate to the U.S. from great distances are more likely to believe in the American Dream than those living here historically denied the dream. Asians are disaggregated, while other groups are not. This might make sense, but it needs some explanation. Ten percent of Blacks are foreign-born. Does this impact how they answer the questions in the poll? We do not know. One might think that Africans who come to the U.S. as immigrants, not refugees, might have similar opinions about the American Dream as other immigrants.

There are some surprises in this poll. For example, Blacks and Hispanics both indicate experiencing a high degree of discrimination, 92% and 85% respectively. Asians report discrimination at much lower levels. Yet Hispanics were the most likely to believe that every American has an equal opportunity to succeed. It might be useful to point out where there is significant tension between what a group believes and what it experiences.

Finally, there were a few questions that stand out as odd, if not problematic. For example, why are groups being asked about their fear of Blacks and no other populations or Hispanics taking jobs?

While there are a number of issues with this poll that need attention, the poll is a move in the right direction toward a deeper nuanced understanding of how different racial and ethnic groups understand each other. New America Media and its partners should be congratulated for this undertaking. But more work is needed.

John a. powell (powe1008@yahoo.com), a PRRAC Board member, is Executive Director of the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity and holds the Williams Chair in Civil Rights and Civil Liberties at the Moritz College of Law, The Ohio State University.
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Understanding Commonalities

by Maria Blanco

In December 2007, New American Media released the results of a poll of African-American, Asian-American and Latino adults on race relations between these groups. In a long overdue method to obtain clear and in-depth polling results, the respondents were interviewed in English, Spanish, Mandarin, Cantonese, Korean, Vietnamese or Tagalog, as needed.

Much of the media coverage that followed release of the poll focused on the poll’s findings that tensions and stereotypes existed between the groups. For the most part, this was not news to anyone who lives and works in these communities and is familiar with ethnic relations in cities where “minorities” have become the majority. The 1990 Census revealed that racial and ethnic minorities constitute a majority

Settlement Announced in Hartford Regional School Desegregation Case

A new settlement agreement has been announced in Connecticut’s Sheff v. O’Neill case. The Sheff case, filed in 1989 under the Connecticut Constitution, challenged the state system of segregated and unequal schools in Hartford and surrounding suburban school districts (about 94% of Hartford schoolchildren are Black or Latino, and the city is surrounded by a number of well-resourced, predominantly white districts).

The Connecticut Supreme Court’s landmark 1996 decision found the racial and economic isolation of Hartford schoolchildren to be directly related to state-sanctioned school district lines that were coterminous with town boundaries, and directed the legislative and executive branches to take immediate action (see Poverty & Race, Sept./Oct. 1996).

The Sheff case is one of the first successful challenges to the urban/suburban school divide after the failure of the Detroit schools case (Milliken v. Bradley) in 1974. Plaintiffs are represented by the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, the national and state ACLU, the Puerto Rican Legal Defense Fund, the Hartford-based Center for Children’s Advocacy, and Hartford attorney Wesley Horton.

A voluntary two-way integration remedy: The approach developed in Connecticut after the state supreme court decision—involving construction of new regional magnet schools along with expansion of an existing suburban transfer program—has grown very slowly since 1996 (so slowly that the plaintiffs have been forced to return to court four times!). Nonetheless, it has resulted in creation of a dozen or more excellent magnet schools that have successfully attracted both city and suburban children, and a suburban transfer program, “Project Choice,” that is increasingly popular, with long waitlists every spring when the program runs its annual lottery. As a result, at the present time, about 11% of Hartford minority schoolchildren are placed in schools that are considered desegregated under the plan.

New “demand” standard for compliance: The new settlement agreement seeks to continue to expand the number of integrated magnet and choice program seats to the point where at least 80% of all Hartford students who seek admission to these programs will have a seat. In the interim, the agreement commits the state to providing at least 41% of Hartford minority schoolchildren access to a desegregated educational setting by the year 2013.

Comprehensive planning process: The new settlement is more detail-oriented than past compliance efforts, requiring the State Department of Education to develop a detailed Comprehensive Management Plan by the end of 2008, to outline goals, and define how those goals will be met and measured. The plan would be administered in part by a Regional School Choice Office to oversee implementation of the plan and to support collaboration between the state and stakeholders throughout the Hartford Region, including the plaintiffs and the City of Hartford.

With support from the Hartford Foundation for Public Giving, PRRAC is working with a community-based coalition of parents, teachers and other supporters of quality, integrated education in the Hartford region. The “Sheff Movement coalition” has developed a major research report on the Project Choice program, produced an excellent 30-minute documentary based on the experiences of alumni of the program, and is building a growing network of parents, teachers, and other city and suburban residents who support quality, integrated education.

For more information and to read the new settlement agreement, go to www.sheffmovement.org.
in seven of the country’s ten largest cities. The demographic changes that brought Latinos and Asian Americans into traditionally African-American neighborhoods have occurred in a period of increasing economic stratification and deterioration of urban housing and infrastructure. The intergroup tensions produced by diminishing opportunities and resources in large cities are as predictable as the existence of tensions and stereotypes between whites and African Americans, Asian Americans and Latinos during this period.

Unfortunately and predictably, the media said little about arguably the most novel and important poll finding: All the groups expressed optimism and a strong belief that relations between the groups will improve significantly over the next decade. Not only did they expect relations to improve, they strongly (80-92%) indicated that they needed to put aside their differences and work together on problems they believe they share with each other. These findings are important not only because they anticipate a much-desired reduction in tensions. They presage an understanding that to move beyond conflict, communities must identify the shared policies and politics needed to address the deterioration of neighborhoods and schools in cities and suburbs that are increasingly segregated and left behind. This understanding of commonalities can also be the basis for an analysis of work competition that identifies the origin of that competition in employer practices and government inattention that have supported a race to the bottom in wages and working conditions.

The failure to report this insight underscores another hidden nugget in the survey: Large numbers of respondents across groups indicated that mainstream media were irresponsible in their coverage of racial tensions. Hopefully, the New American Media survey points to a more responsible way to report on the issues of communities of color.

---

**Tax Aversion: The Sequel**

Since publishing “Tax Aversion: The Legacy of Slavery,” by Robin Einhorn, in the March/April 2008 *Poverty and Race*, PRRAC has learned of an innovative new lawsuit that attacks the constitutional property tax provisions of the State of Alabama on the basis of their discriminatory origins.

In *P&R*, Prof. Einhorn argues that the United States’ anti-taxation tendencies stem not from the radical artisans of the Boston Tea Party, but from the oligarchic slave-holding elites of the South. The provisions of the Alabama Constitution pertaining to *ad valorem* (“according to value”) taxes place limits on the amount of taxation municipalities, counties and referenda can raise. By “persuading the non-slave-holding majorities that the weak government and constitutionally restrained tax power were actually in the interests of the non-slaveholders themselves,” Prof. Einhorn wrote, “...[m]ajorities voluntarily renounced the right to regulate their society by majority rule. Giving up the essence of self-government, they celebrated the outcome as democracy.”

In *India Lynch, et al. v. The State of Alabama*, CV-08-S-0450-NE, plaintiffs are seeking a declaratory judgment from a federal court that the property tax restrictions in the Alabama Constitution violate Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 200d et seq., and the United States Constitution. This novel approach derives from the U.S. District Court for Northern District of Alabama’s reasoning in a recent Alabama higher education case, *Knight and Sims v. Alabama*, 458 F.Supp2d 1273 (N.D. Ala. 2004). *Knight* was brought by long-time civil rights attorney James Blacksher in 1981, claiming that Alabama’s policies governing higher education tended to perpetuate its formerly *de jure* segregated university system. Although the court in *Knight* did not find a continuing connection between the discriminatory property taxes and the current higher education system, the court observed: “the current *ad valorem* [property] tax structure is a vestige of discrimination inasmuch as the [state] constitutional provisions governing the taxation of property are traceable to, rooted in, and have their antecedents in an original segregative, discriminatory policy.”

In non-legal terms, *Knight* states that Alabama’s response to Reconstruction, *Brown v. Board of Education* and other attempts to provide equal access to Blacks in education were met with hostility from the white establishment. To ensure that the Black population would continue to be undereducated and disenfranchised, Alabama placed constitutional limits on how much money could be raised by property taxes for education within the state. This ensured that black schools would be underfunded, even if many white students also suffered. Such tax provisions are still in place today. The plaintiffs wanted the tax structure to be held as having a segregative effect on Alabama’s colleges and universities. Although, as noted above, they were denied because the court found no nexus between the higher education system and the tax structure, the current lawsuit seeks a declaratory judgment affirming the findings in *Knight* about the underlying property tax system, thereby helping to eliminate an excuse to keep taxes low and schools underperforming.

Attorney for the plaintiffs James Blacksher plans to post updates on this case at http://www.knightisms.com. He can be reached at jblacksher@ns.sympatico.ca.
The Survey Blues
by Howard Winant

This New America Media Poll appears to be state-of-the-art stuff, although I haven’t been able to examine the underlying data. That’s on one level. Yet, looked at in another way, in terms of what these results mean about racial/ethnic identity in the U.S., about interracial conflict, belief in “the American dream,” or just about anything else, the jury is still out.

For all the professionalism of the survey design, the questions leave a lot to be desired. Essentially, respondents are asked to comment on a series of cliches about race in the United States. Such topics as social mobility by race, patterns of discrimination, fear of blacks (they “commit most of the crime,” you know...), intergroup competition, and so on have been extensively studied. Therefore, we have very good data on, say, patterns of discrimination in housing, arrest and sentencing practices, and many other similar issues. To conduct a survey on attitudes toward these topics both repeats other works and in many ways doesn’t live up to them. Indeed, so many surveys of racial attitudes have been carried out in recent years that it would require a whole bibliographic essay just to list them all with any evaluative criteria in view. Let’s just cite some important practitioners: Larry Bobo (Harvard), Howard Schuman (Univ. Michigan), Michael Dawson (Univ. Chicago), Reynolds Farley (Univ. Michigan), Jennifer Hochschild (Harvard), Joe Feagin (Texas A&M).

I’m generally suspicious of the concerns and wordings of questions. I have doubts about “construct validity” throughout this and at least some other inquiries. I wonder about the experiential dimensions and effects of interviewing people about their racial atti-

Howard Winant (hwinant@soc.ucsb.edu) is Professor of Sociology at Univ. of California-Santa Barbara.
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

- Race/Ethnicity: Multidisciplinary Global Contexts is a brand new periodical (Autumn 2007 was Vol. 1, No. 1 - “Transnational Migration, Race, Citizenship” - 170 pp.), co-edited by PRRAC Board member John A. Powell. Sub. inf. from 800/842-6796.


- Defying Dixie: The Radical Roots of Civil Rights, 1919-1950, by Glenda Elizabeth Gilmore (642 pp., 2008, $39.95), has been published by W.W. Norton. [10850]


- “40 Years Later: The Unrealized American Dream,” by Dedrick Muhammad (March 2008), has been published by the Institute for Policy Studies, 202/234-9382, dedrick@ips-dc.org, downloadable at www.ips-dc.org/getfile.php?id =170 [10880]

- WECAN is The White Anti-Racist Community Action Network, which “offers a protected online space where white anti-racists and people of color who support and encourage white anti-racists can assemble, network, share in community, and act to transform our larger society to one that is racially just.” http://www.wacan.org/ [10910]

- Class and the Color Line: Interracial Class Coalition in the Knights of Labor and the Populist Movement, by Joseph Gerteis (274 pp., 2007, $23.95), has been published by Duke Univ. Press, 919/687-3650, eboyer@dukeupress.edu, http://www.dukeupress.edu/ [10657]


Poverty/Welfare

- “Poverty Scorecard 2007 - Rating Members of Congress” (42 pp., March 2008) is available (possibly free) from the Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law, 50 E. Washington St., #500, Chicago, IL 60602, http://www.povertylaw.org/ [10853]

- Why America Lost the War on Poverty — And How to Win It, by Frank Stricker (360 pp., 2007, $19.95), has been published by Univ. of No. Carolina Press, 800/848-6224. [10888]


- “Income Inequality Hits Record Levels, New CBO Data Show,” by Arloc Sherman, is a 4-page, Dec. 2007 report, available (likely free) from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (headed by former PRRAC Board member Robert Greenstein), 820 First St. NE, #510, Wash., DC 20002, 202/408-1080, center@cbpp.org, http://www.cbpp.org/ [10907]

- “Updated CBO Data Reveal Unprecedented Increase in Inequality,” by Jared Bernstein (4 pp., Dec. 2007), is available (likely free) from the Economic Policy Institute, 1333 H St. NW, 300 E. Tower, Wash., DC 20005, 202/775-8810, www.epi.org/content.cfm/ib239 [10908]
• “Bridging the Gap” (2008), on the obstacles and opportunities facing low-income working families in Alabama, is available (no price given) from ARISI, PO Box 1188, Montgomery, AL 53101, 800/832-9060, http://www.arisecitizens.org/ [10699]

• What have we learned about poverty and inequality? Evidence from cross-national analysis is the focus of a 2007 report by Gary Burtless, available (no price listed) from the Unv. of Wisconsin Inst. for Research on Poverty, 1180 Observatory Dr., Madison, WI 53706, www.irp.wisc.edu/publications/focus/pdfs/foc251i.pdf [10751]

• “Innovative Financial Services for the Undereserved: Opportunities and Outcomes” will be held April 16-17, 2009 in Wash., DC, sponsored by the Community Affairs Dept. of the Federal Reserve Bank. A call for papers has been issued — papers or abstracts to be submitted by July 15 to KC.CAResearchConf@kc.frb.org, or call 816/881-2004. [10873]

**Economic/Community Development**

• The Concept of Community: Lessons from the Bronx, by Harold DeRienzo (239 pp., 2008), has been published by IPOC di Pietro Condemi in Milan, ipoc@ipopress.com. [10819]

• Colonias in Arizona and New Mexico: Border Poverty and Community Development Solutions, by Adrian X. Esparza & Angela J. Donelson (208 pp., 2008, $19.95), has been published by Univ. of Arizona Press, 520/621-3920, hdolan@uapress.arizona.edu, http://www.uapress.arizona.edu/ [10820]


• Americans for Fairness in Lending can be reached at 77 Summer St., 10th flr., Boston, MA 02120, 866/45-AFFIL. [10892]

**Community Organizing**

• “Gathering VI: Building a Home for Organizers,” sponsored by the National Organizers Alliance, will be held at the National Labor College, June 29 – July 2, 2008, in Silver Spring, MD. Inf. from NOA, 2307 Martin Luther King Jr. Ave. NE, Wash., DC 20001, 202/543-6603, gatherings6@noacentral.org [10847]

**Criminal Justice**

• Race to Execution is a 2007 film by Rachel Lyon, narrated by Charles Ogletree, Jr., tracing the fate of 2 Death Row inmates, in Alabama and Chicago. Inf. from http://www.fionessmedia.com/ [10849]


• Perversion of Justice is a short documentary of one woman’s struggle to raise her children from federal prison. Inf. at www.perversionofjustice.com/index.html [10678]

**Education**

• “Improving the Distribution of Teachers in Low-Performing High Schools” is an April 2008 Brief from the Alliance for Excellent Education, available (including an audio & video from their forum) at www.all4ed.org/events/distributioineachers_lowperformingHSs [10840]

• “Every Student Counts: The Case for Graduation Rate Accountability” is an April 2008 Brief from the Alliance for Excellent Education; available at www.all4ed.org/files/ESA_GradRateAcct.pdf [10841]

• “Cities in Crisis: A Special Analytic Report on High School Graduation” (April 2008), prepared by the Editorial Projects in Education Research Ctr., was released by America’s Promise Alliance; available at www.americaspromise.org/APAPage.aspx?id=10354 [10844]

• “Measuring and Improving the Effectiveness of High School Teachers” is an April 2008 Brief from the Alliance for Excellent Education, available at www.all4ed.org/files/TeacherEffectiveness.pdf [10845]


• “What Keeps Good Teachers in the Classroom? Understanding and Reducing Teacher Turnover,” a 2008 Alliance for Excellent Education brief, is available from them (likely free), 1201 Conn. Ave. NW, #901, Wash., DC 20036, 202/828-0828, Alliance@all4ed.org, www.all4ed.org/files.TeachTurn.pdf [10861]


• A Class of Their Own: Black Teachers in the Segregated South, by Adam Fairclough (2007), has been published by Belknap/Harvard Univ. Press. [10865]

• “Free to Read: Growing a Nation of Readers by Investing in Families and Communities” (July 2006) is available in Executive Summary and complete form from Judith Jones, Dir. of Free to Grow, at Columbia University’s Mailman School of Public Health, 722 W. 168 St., 8th flr., NYC, NY 10032, 212/305-8120, knr2101@columbia.edu, http://www.freetogrow.org/ [10876]


• “The State of Latino Education in Massachusetts,” by Nicole Lavan & Miren Uriarte, is a 2008 report form the Gaston Institute for Latino Community Development and Public Policy, Univ. Mass., 100 Morrissey Blvd., Boston, MA 02125, gaston.feedback@umb.edu [10884]

• Early Ed Watch is a new (2008) listserv from The New America Foundation, 1630 Conn. Ave. NW, 7th flr., Wash., DC 20009, mead@newamerica.net [10887]

• Frogs Into Princes: Writings on School Reform by Larry Cuban (216 pp., 2008, $27.95), has been published by Teachers College Press, 800/575-6566. [10895]

• High Expectations: The Cultural Roots of Standards Reform in American Education, by William A. Proefriedt (208 pp., 2008, $42.95), has been published by Teachers College Press, 800/575-6566. [10896]

• Race, Schools, and Hope: African Americans and School Choice After Brown, by Lisa M. Stuiberg (224 pp., 2008, $27.95), has been published by Teachers College Press, 800/575-6566. [10897]

• The Seduction of Common Sense: How the Right Has Framed the Debate on America’s Schools, by Kevin K. Kumashiro (128 pp., 2008, $15.95), has been published by Teachers College Press, 800/575-6566. [10898]

• Every Child’s Right: Academic Talent Development by Choice, Not Chance, by Lauren A. Sosniak & Nina Hersch Gabelko (178 pp., 2008, $26.95), has been published by Teachers College Press, 800/575-6566. [10899]

• Test Driven: High-Stakes Accountability in Elementary Schools, by Linda Valli, Robert G. Croninger, Marilyn J. Chambless, Anna O. Graebor & Daria Buese (208 pp., 2008, $29.95), has been published by Teachers College Press, 800/575-6566. [10900]

• The Implementation Trap: Understanding Reform in High Schools, eds. Jonathan A. Supovitz & Elliot H. Weinbaum (208 pp., 2008, $28.95), has been published by Teachers College Press, 800/575-6566. [10902]

• The Nature and Limits of Standards-Based Reform and Assessment, eds. Sandra Mathison & E. Wayne Ross (224 pp., 2008, $28.95), has been published by Teachers College Press, 800/575-6566. [10903]

• Data-Driven School Improvement: Linking Data and Learning, eds. Ellen B. Mandinach & Margaret Honey (304 pp., 2008, $51.95), has been published by Teachers College Press, 800/575-6566. [10904]

• Diversity and the New Teacher: Learning from Experience in Urban Schools, by Catherine Cornbleth (192 pp., 2008, $27.95), has been published by Teachers College Press, 800/575-6566. [10905]

• Building Racial and Cultural Competence in the Classroom: Strategies from Urban Educators, eds. Karen Manheim Teel & Jennifer E. Obidah (192 pp., 2008, $24.95), has been published by Teachers College Press, 800/575-6566. [10906]

• “Going for Gold: Secrets of Successful Schools,” by Barry Newsstead, Amy Saxton & Susan Colby appeared in the Spring 2008 edition of Education Next. Available (likely free) from The Bridgespan Group, 535 Boylston St.,
Employment/Labor/Jobs Policy

- “Aspire Public Schools: Building the Organizational Capacity for Healthy Growth,” by Amy Saxton, Alonna Jackson & Alan Tuck (2008), is available (possibly free) from The Bridgespan Group, 535 Boylston St., 10th flr., Boston, MA 02116, knowledge@bridgespan.org [10913]

- “Building on the Promise: State Initiatives to Expand Access to Early Head Start for Young Children and their Families,” by Rachel Schumacher & Elizabeth DiLauro (5 pp., April 2008), is available (free) from the Center for Law and Social Policy (headed by former PRRAC Board member Alan Huseman), 1015 15th St. NW, #400, Wash., DC 20005, 202/906-8000, http://www.clasp.org/ [10832]

- The Evaluation Exchange, in its May 2008 issue, focuses on family involvement. Available (possibly free) from the Harvard Family Research Project, 3 Garden St., Cambridge, MA 02138, 617/495-9108, hfpr@gse.harvard.edu, http://www.hfpr.org/ [10855]


- “Trends in Infancy/Early Childhood and Middle Childhood Well-Being, 1994-2006” (April 2008) is available (possibly free) from the Foundation for Child Development, 145 E. 32 St., 14th flr., NYC, NY 10016. [10886]

- The Medical-Legal Partnership for Children is a program of the Dept. of Pediatrics at Boston Medical Center and the Boston Univ. School of Medicine, http://www.mlppforchildren.org/ [10911]


- “Multi-Family Housing & Child Care Training,” sponsored by the Low Income Investment Fund, will be held June 12, 2008 in Oakland and June 19, 2008 in Los Angeles. Inf. from 415/489-6147, lparent@liifund.org [10843]

Food/Nutrition/Hunger

- “America’s Second Harvest 2007 Annual Report” is available (likely free) from them at 35 E. Wacker Dr., #2000, Chicago, IL 60601, 312/263-2303, http:// secondharvest.org [10677]

Health

- “Designed for Disease: The Link Between Local Food Environments and Obesity and Diabetes” is a 10-page April 2008 report from PolicyLink, UCLA’s Center for Health Policy Research and the California Center for Public Health Advocacy. The study shows that if fast food and convenience stores dramatically outnumber grocery stores and produce markets, risks increase with respect to these two diseases. Available (possibly free) from PolicyLink, 1438 Webster St., Oakland, CA 94612, 510/663-2333. [10854]

- Reform Matters: Making Real Progress for Women and Health Care is a new (2008) project of the National Women’s Law Center (co-directed by former PRRAC Board member Nancy Duff Campbell). Inf. from 202/588-5180. [10863]


- “Trafficked” is a 5-page article in the Fall 2007 issue of Harvard Public Health Review, 401 Park Dr., Boston, MA 02215, 617/384-8988, review@hsph.harvard.edu [10661]

Homelessness

- “State of the Homeless” (2008), from the Coalition for the Homeless, is the 9th annual report on homelessness in New York City — concluding that 2007 was the worst year for homelessness in the city since the Great Depression. pmarkee@cfthomeless.org, www.coalitionforthehomeless.org/advocacy/StateoftheHomeless2008.html [10868]
Housing

- The Housing Journal is published (likely quarterly) by the Delaware Housing Coalition. The 16-page Spring 2008 issue is available from them (possibly free), PO Box 1633, Dover, DE 19903-1633, 302/678-2286, dhc@housingforall.org, http://www.housingforall.org/ [10829]


- Call for Papers: The Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy is publishing an issue devoted to housing and poverty; subsequent issues will be devoted to poverty and the elderly, and juvenile justice and poverty. Inf./submission guidelines from 512/796-9195. [10834]

- “Zoning as a Barrier to Multifamily Housing Development” (March 2008), a study conducted by the American Planning Assn. focusing on 6 metropolitan areas (Boston, Miami-Dade County, Mpls.-St. Paul, Portland (OR), Sacramento & Wash., DC), is available at www.huduser.org/publications/polleg/zoning_MultifmlyDev.html [10839]

- “Losing the Dream” is the theme of the 21-page, Spring 2008 issue of Rural Voices, published by The Housing Assistance Council. Subs. are free from them, 1025 Vermont Ave. NW, #606, Wash., DC 20005, 202/842-8600, http://www.ruralhome.org/ [10842]


- The Regulatory Barriers Clearinghouse has been established by HUD, a database of reform strategies and relevant resources at the state and local level, http://www.regbarriers.org/ [10851]

- “America’s Rental Housing: The Key to a Balanced National Policy” (2008) is available ($30) from the Harvard Joint Center for Housing Studies, 617/495-7908, or downloadable free at www.jchs.harvard.edu/publications/rental/ rh08_americas_rental_housing/index.html [10858]

- “State of Metropolitan [Louisville] Housing Report 2007” (34 pp.) is available (possibly free) from the Metropolitan Housing Coalition, PO Box 4533, Louisville, KY 40204, 502/584-6858, http://www.metropolitanhousing.org/ [10859]

- “Housing and Public Safety” is a 13-page, Nov. 2007 report from the Justice Policy Inst; available from them (possibly free), 1003 K St. NW, #500, Wash., DC 20001, 202/558-7974, http://www.justicepolicy.org/ [10866]

- “No Way to Treat Our People: FEMA Trailer Residents 30 Months after Katrina” (May 2008) was released by the Louisiana Justice Institute and the Children’s Defense Fund. 55% of surveyed FEMA trailer residents are unsure where they will live and could easily become homeless if their parks are closed, as scheduled shortly. Available at www.louisianajusticeinstitute.org/files/all/docs/LJI_FEMA_Trailer_Report_Publication.pdf [10870]


Immigration

- “The National Alliance of HUD Tenants is holding is 14th annual conf., June 21-24, 2008 at Gallaudet Univ. in DC. Inf. from 42 Seavens Ave., Jamaica Plain, MA 02130, 617/267-2949.

- “Inclusionary Zoning and its Effects on Housing Markets” is the subject of a March 2008 study by the Center for Housing Policy and New York University’s Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy. Focus is on SF, suburban Boston and Wash., DC region. Policy brief and full working paper are available at www.nhc.org/housing/iz [10882]

- Asylum Denied: A Refugee’s Struggle for Safety in America, by Dennis Kenney & Philip G. Schrag (352 pp., 2008), has been published by Univ. Calif. Press. It’s
an extraordinary case study of persistence and bravery on the part of a Kenyan, the idiocy of the US immigration system, and the importance of good lawyering. [10817]

- “Los Angeles on the Leading Edge: Immigrant Integration Indicators and Their Policy Implications,” by Michael Fix, Margie McHugh, Aaron Matteo Terrazas & Laureen Laglagaron (68 pp., April 2008), is available (no price listed) from the Migration Policy Inst., 1400 16th St. NW, #300, Wash., DC 20036, 202/266-1940, downloadable at www.migrationpolicy.org/integration [10828]

**Miscellaneous**


- “Hurricane Katrina and the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement: A Global Human Rights Perspective on a National Disaster,” by Chris Kromm & Sue Sturgis (39 pp., Jan., 2008), is available ($5) from The Institute for Southern Studies, PO Box 531, Durham, NC 27702, 919/419-8311, x25, gulfwatch@southernstudies.org, http://www.southernstudies.org/

- “Using International Law and Foreign Human Rights Law in Public Interest Advocacy,” by

PRRAC Board member Florence Roisman, appeared in Vol. 18:1 (2008) of *Ind. Int’l & Comp. L. Rev*. Free reprints of the 18-page article are available from m.deerl@iupui.edu [10833]

- **The Cohen Report** is a monthly e-newsletter by Rick Cohen, who until recently headed the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. The Feb. 2008 issue can be found at www.nonprofitquarterly.org/content/view/509/1/ [10885]

- “The Ariel-Schwab Black Investor Survey: Saving and Investing Among Higher-Income African-Americans and White Americans” (32 pp., Oct. 2007) is available (likely free) from Ariel Mutual Funds, 800/29-ARIEL. Copies of previous years’ results are available from 646/424-9750. [10893]

**Job Opportunities/ Fellowships/ Grants**

- **The National Women’s Law Center** (whose Co-President is former PRRAC Bd. of Directors member Nancy Duff Campbell) is hiring a Legal Fellow, a Public Policy Fellow, a Senior Counsel, a Legislative Counsel & several other positions. Inf. at http://www.nwlc.org/ [10815]

- The University of the District of Columbia is seeking a new President. UDC, an urban land-grant institution, is an open admissions university, with a diverse student population of 5,000 and a large international student body. It has 75 undergraduate programs, including 20 assoc. degree programs, 12 master’s degree programs and offers a JD from the David Clarke School of Law. Expressions of interest by applicants and/or nominations should be sent (preferably by email) with c.v., brief ltr. of interest, and names/contact inf. for 5 references, to UDCCo-Pres. Search@wittkiefer.com, 301/654-5070, http://email4.udc.edu/exchange/HOWARD/UDC Presidentsearch@wittkiefer.com [10816]

- The National Housing Institute is seeking an Executive Director. NHI, located in Montclair, NJ, is a 33-year-old progressive nonprofit communications, advocacy and research org. dedicated to providing resources and information to those advocating for and/or creating/preserving affordable housing and thriving communities. NHI publishes the quarterly magazine *Shelterforce*. Ltr./resume/brief writing sample/names of 3 refs. to edsearch@nhisearch.org [10825]

- **The National Housing Law Project** is seeking an Executive Director. Ltr./resume with salary history/2 writing samples/names-contact inf. for 3 refs. to edsearch@nhlp.org or mailed to NHLP, 614 Grand Ave., #320, Oakland, CA 94610. [10826]

- **The Washington Lawyers Comm. for Civil Rights & Urban Affairs** is hiring a Fair Housing Litigation Project Director. Ltr./resume to Susan Gilbert at the Comm., 11 Dupont Circ. NW, #400, Wash., DC 20036, susan.gilbert@washlaw.org [10827]

- **The Southern Institute for Education and Research** at Tulane Univ. is accepting applications from graduate and undergraduate students for unpaid internships — working with Inst. staff on new projects aimed at racial healing and reconciliation in the aftermath of Katrina and promoting effective social justice volunteer service. Ltr./resume to Meredith Bethune (May 20 deadline), 504/247-1624, mbethune@tulane.edu [10835]

- **The US Human Rights Network** is hiring an Associate Director for its Atlanta office. Ltr./resume/writing sample by June 9 to them at 250 Georgia Ave., #330, Atlanta, GA 30344, searchAD@ushrnetwork.org

- **The National Low Income Housing Coalition** (headed by PRRAC Board member Sheila Crowley) is hiring a Communications Director, as well as several Interns (Communications, Legislative, Outreach, Research). For the staff position, resume/ltr. to Linda Couch at the Coalition, 727 15th St. NW, 6th flr., Wash., DC 20005, fax: 202/393-1972. For the internships, resume/ltr. to linda@nlihc.org, fax 202/393-1973. Questions: 202/662-1530, x228. [10871]
Half In Ten, an exciting new national anti-poverty campaign, chaired by former Senator John Edwards, was launched on May 13 in Philadelphia. The Campaign is a strategic partnership that includes the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), the Center for American Progress Action Fund (CAPAF), the Coalition on Human Needs (CHN), and the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights (LCCR). Building on the research and recommendations outlined in the Center for American Progress report, From Poverty to Prosperity, the groups are developing and coordinating a multiyear, multifaceted public education and advocacy campaign to accomplish the goal of cutting poverty in half within ten years.

From Poverty to Prosperity outlined 12 policy solutions for dramatically reducing, and eventually ending, poverty. The Urban Institute was able to demonstrate that the combined impact of just four of the solutions—expanding the EITC and child tax credit, raising the minimum wage to 50% of the average wage, and expanding and restructuring child care assistance—would result in a 26% reduction in poverty nationwide. Thus, these recommendations alone would move the country half-way toward the goal of cutting poverty by 50%.

Half in Ten intends to provide an unprecedented level of coordination among federal and state anti-poverty efforts and serve as a strategic hub that sets the table to achieve state and federal policy wins. The hub has a number of valuable spokes. John Edwards brings proven commitment and dedication to the issue along with the ability to command a national stage. LCCR includes nearly 200 organizations representing people of color, women, children, labor unions, individuals with disabilities, older Americans, major religious groups, gays and lesbians, and civil liberties and human rights groups. ACORN is a grassroots organization that encompasses over 1,000 neighborhood chapters in 110 cities. CHN has more than 100 anti-poverty and human needs groups under its umbrella. CAPAF offers the wisdom of a think tank and a proven communications strategy. Half In Ten is continuing to build additional alliances with other entities that are invested in the goal of ending poverty. Contacts: info@halfinten.org, www.halfinten.org

Our July/August 2007 issue of Poverty & Race had as the lead item a Forum on “From Poverty to Prosperity,” the final report of the Center for American Progress’ Task Force on Poverty, co-chaired by Angela Glover Blackwell and Peter Edelman. Forum contributors were Chris Howard (William & Mary), Herbert Gans (Columbia), David Shipler, Mtangulizi Sanyika (African American Leadership Project of New Orleans), William Spriggs (Howard Univ.), Margy Waller (Inclusion), Michael Wenger (Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, and Jill Cunningham (Fourth World Movement), followed by CAP’s response (from Blackwell, Edelman, Cassandra Butts and Mark Greenberg). The Forum can be found in the back issues of P&R on PRRAC’s website, www.prrac.org

UN Special Rapporteur on Racism Visiting U.S.

Doudou Diène, the United Nations’ Special Rapporteur on Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, is visiting US cities (Washington, NYC, Chicago, Omaha, LA, New Orleans, Miami, San Juan) from May 19-June 6, at the invitation of the US Government. The local sessions will gather first-hand information on these topics, holding meetings with government representatives (both local and national), members of the legislative and judicial branches—plus discussions with NGOs, community members, representatives of political parties, academics, and other organizations and individuals working in the fields of racism and discrimination. Following these visits, Mr. Diène will submit a final report for consideration at a forthcoming session of the Human Rights Council in 2009.

Further inf. from Laleh Ispahani at the American Civil Liberties Union (lispahani@aclu.org). Also, this website: http://www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/racism/rapporteur/index.htm
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

Address Service Requested
5-6/08
In this article, it will be shown that race is a predictor of crime, a better predictor of crime than poverty and related economic variables are, and that race continues to predict crime even when the effects of poverty are controlled for. Race as a Predictor of Crime. At the individual level, the relationship between race and crime is extremely well established. Ellis, Beaver, and Wright (2009) reviewed 113 studies which looked at whether or not Blacks commit more crime than whites and found that all 113 did. Poverty in the United States of America refers to people who lack sufficient income or material possessions for their needs. Although the United States is a relatively wealthy country by international standards, poverty has consistently been present throughout the United States, along with efforts to alleviate it, from New Deal-era legislation during the Great Depression to the national War on Poverty in the 1960s to poverty alleviation efforts during the 2008 Great Recession. 2.2 Poverty and Race. 2.3 Health, Nutrition and Learning. 2.4 Parents. How do test score differences associated with poverty differ from those associated with race? What is the definition of poverty? How does poverty affect learning?