The Other Side of Immigration: Humane, Sensible & Replicable Responses in a Changing Nation

by Susan Eaton

Xenophobia may still grab the headlines and reliably fuel the scorn of conservative talk radio. It may even this year advance more state legislative proposals that would criminalize immigrants, make life difficult for them and make it easier to deport them.

With immigrant enforcement bills passing first in Arizona in 2010 and in Georgia, Alabama, South Carolina, Utah and Indiana in 2011, human and civil rights organizations have had no trouble identifying who and what to fight against. But amid the nativist noise and the legislative rancor, a comparably quiet movement is giving immigrants and their supporters something concrete to fight for.

The relatively newly branded, but long-standing “immigrant integration” initiative provides a powerful framework for articulating and implementing humane, constructive and practical alternatives to marginalizing and excluding immigrants. This impulse plays out in programs, policies and practices in communities all across the country, and in most cases, extends to immigrants who are both legally present and not. On the ground examples have taken hold in a wide range of communities across the country.

A Better Way to Live

In the city of Dalton in north Georgia, local health officials train women from the growing Latino population as promotoras. A common public health practice in Latin-American countries, the promotoras bring to more Spanish speakers proper care and information, reducing fear and increasing comfort with and access to the American health care system.

Public education officials in Utah have invested in a growing system of dual immersion schools through which native English speakers and the growing number of native Spanish speakers come together to learn in both languages.

In 2000, the then-mayor of Indianapolis, Bart Peterson, faced minimal opposition in development of a cohesive immigrant integration agenda to welcome and assist immigrants from around the world. The programs in operation include policies and training designed to improve public safety in immigrant communities, increase immigrants’ access to loans and banks, and establishment of an Immigrant Welcoming Center that provides coordinated services. City officials credit the immigrant integration initiatives with increases in business investment, new international trade relationships, and a reduction in crime. Other city governments that have taken the lead in welcoming and integrating immigrants through English classes, language access, education, training and coordinated services include Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and Littleton, Colorado.

The town of Fremont, Nebraska gained notoriety in the Summer of
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2010 when 57% of voters passed an ordinance that made it unlawful to rent apartments or houses to people who are in the country illegally. It also banned the hiring or “harboring” of people without documents. The local ordinance spurred a spate of what have become costly lawsuits. The ordinance has yet to be implemented because the ACLU won a court injunction against the law and local observers doubt it ever will. In the shadow of this national controversy, immigrants from Latin America, Africa and Southeast Asia began meeting with native-born Americans in towns across Nebraska for structured dialogue and social events designed to reduce stereotypes, enhance social cohesion and educate local reporters about the contributions immigrants make in their communities. It is one of dozens of efforts operated at the grassroots level but coordinated in part by the national organization Welcoming America.

“Ordinarily, we’d all be leading entirely separate lives,” says Kristen Ostrom, who helped begin the Fremont branch of the organization, Nebraska is Home, with her acquaintance, Maria Ortiz. “We have each other now and we will be a force...for the future. But more importantly, I think, it’s our relationships with each other, this sharing, that gives us power. We found a better way to live.”

“**A Two-Way Process**

That Fills a Gap

The idea behind immigrant integration is simple and best expressed by The Migration Policy Institute, the national leader in immigrant integration research and policy analysis:

“We define integration broadly as the process by which immigrant newcomers achieve economic mobility and social inclusion in the larger society,” MPI researchers write. This definition of integration goes much further than assimilation, MPI explains, and implies a “dynamic, two-way process” that involves changes on the part of not just immigrants but also of members of the receiving community. Since 2009, the Migration Policy Institute has recognized the best immigrant integration practices through its annual *E Pluribus Unum* prizes.

It is important to understand the immigrant integration movement as “proactive” as opposed to the largely “reactive” marches and protests in recent years, which usually responded to proposed measures designed to criminalize immigrants. Those highly publicized events enhanced coalition-building and provided important momentum, but the protest architects had yet to articulate a clear on-the-ground alternative to immigrant exclusion. Immigrant integration fills that gap.

Advocates and practitioners frame immigrant integration as a reflection of a few deeply held American values and common-sense principles:

- **One:** “Integration” reflects the United States’ true, better self as an inclusive, welcoming nation built and enhanced by the contributions of immigrants.
- **Two:** Integrating immigrants—through education, self-sustaining work and in areas of health and social life—so that they become self-reliant stakeholders who identify with, care about and contribute to their communities helps immigrants and their families but is also in our collective economic and social interest.

- The third argument, advocating for increased opportunities for citizenship, is that a voting, engaged, enfranchised and invested public strengthens democracy and social cohesion at the local, state and national levels.

**Setting an Example in Integration Nation**

So then, what, exactly would immigrant integration look like in a community, a state legislature or expressed in a federal budget? How would it manifest itself in policy and practice?

In a school where educators are committed to “immigrant integration,” counselors and teachers would create a safety net for vulnerable immigrant children and second-generation immigrant children through pre-school programs, after-school programs and the facilitation of multilingualism for all students.

In a community, every adult would have access to English classes and, if necessary, to job-training. People who are still learning English would have access to important information and government services in their native language through translation technology or interpreters. It would be easier to become a naturalized citizen of the United States because community agencies would provide classes that prepare immigrants for their naturalization tests and would also provide assistance with the legal process of becoming a citizen. Local law enforcement practice would encourage immigrants’ trust of the police, rather than exacerbate fear of deportation and racial profiling. Immigrants and their families would have a place to go, such as Philadelphia’s Welcoming Center for New Pennsylvanians or the 35-year-old Refugee and Immigrant Cen-
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In November 2011, PRRAC, in collaboration with the Charles Hamilton Houston Institute for Race and Justice at Harvard Law School, launched the documentation and mobilization project called One Nation Indivisible (ONI).

The brainchild of its co-directors, Susan Eaton and Gina Chirichigno, One Nation Indivisible has two equally important goals. Through written and multimedia narratives, the organization tells and spreads stories about people trying to achieve, sustain and improve racially, culturally, economically and linguistically diverse schools, communities and social institutions. ONI also convenes conferences and strategy sessions, so the people who populate these stories can share strategies, inform state and national policy agendas, grow their networks, and connect with national experts. One Nation Indivisible works closely with the National Coalition on School Diversity (www.schooldiversity.org). It helps coordinate NCSD’s activities and strengthen NCSD members’ connections to community-based, pro-integration practitioners whose voices are too often missing from the national stage.

ONI has produced, or is in the process of producing, stories from several communities across the country. This includes Eden Prairie, Minnesota, where educators recently implemented a school desegregation plan and a series of equity-based reforms in response to changing demographics. ONI also documented the efforts of an anti-immigrant legislative coalition in New Jersey that has successfully prevented passage of anti-immigrant legislation for two years. ONI made visits to a “dual-immersion” school in Framingham, Massachusetts, where native English-speaking students and native Spanish speakers come together to learn in both languages. In April 2012, ONI will travel to Omaha, Nebraska, where deepening segregation led officials to create schools that bring together students from urban and suburban communities.

In the coming months, ONI will release stories and media exploring ongoing integration efforts in Dalton (Georgia), Seattle, Philadelphia, Boston and Raleigh. Narratives will soon be available on the ONI website, onenationindivisible.org, and disseminated as hard copies at conferences and convenings. ONI also incorporates the collected stories into presentations its co-directors make at a variety of venues across the country.

ONI recognizes the varied meanings attached to the word “integration,” by embracing a broad definition of the term, which can be applied to every facet of life. Integration in this case refers not merely and not necessarily to physical segregation’s opposite, but to a fuller acceptance, a richer coming together and a willful expansion of community circles. “Desegregation,” Martin Luther King wrote, could be accomplished by laws, but “integration” required acknowledgment of a web of mutuality, a shared fate. Similarly, “immigrant integration,” as opposed to “assimilation,” refers to a two-way process between foreign-born people and native-born people and their shared community.

“We choose to tell stories about integration in process not because we think it safe to ignore the very real threat of xenophobia and racism, but because conflict-driven stories get so much ink elsewhere and get told over and over without satisfying resolution,” said ONI co-director Susan Eaton. “Instead, by highlighting the constructive ways people respond to diversity and to racial and cultural change, we believe a fuller, more balanced, more hopeful picture of our nation can emerge.”

One Nation Indivisible is made possible through grants from The Norfleet Progress Fund to PRRAC and from the WK Kellogg Foundation to the Charles Hamilton Houston Institute.

Robert L. Carter

We dedicate this issue of Poverty & Race to Federal Judge Robert L. Carter, who passed away in January at age 94. As the NY Times obituary put it, he was “a leading strategist and a persuasive voice in the legal assault on racial segregation in 20th-century America.”
As a result, federal policies and programs related to integration are, as Michael Fix of the Migration Policy Institute characterizes them: “ad hoc, underfunded and skeletal.”

However, some state governments have pursued concerted, coherent integration efforts. Five states—Illinois, Washington, Massachusetts, Maryland and New Jersey—have taken the lead in crafting coherent integration agendas. In each, Democratic governors signed executive orders establishing an advisory council or task force on immigrant integration or “incorporation.” The plans that resulted from these executive orders are in varying stages of implementation. In every state, efforts have been hampered by budget constraints and in some cases by leadership changes. Even so, these efforts are significant because they represent the first establishment of “immigrant integration” as an affirmative agenda. In so doing, they provide templates for other states.

“We are and we will continue to be a nation that depends and thrives on the contributions of immigrants and refugees,” Massachusetts Gov. Deval Patrick said at a press conference where he expressed full support for the “New Americans Agenda” developed by a diverse committee of advocates, practitioners and government officials. “Our nation and our economy have been at their best when we welcome the ideas and the commitment of newcomers and when we help them integrate into our language and into our society.”

Integrating immigrants is in our collective economic and social interest.

Why Now? The Immigrant Integration Imperative

Experts offer four reasons why the traditional “hands off” approach to immigrant integration is no longer sensible.

First and most obviously is the substantial share composed of the immigrant population and their children. About 12% of the nation’s population—or about 36.7 million people—are foreign-born, according to the U.S. Census. Another 33 million—or 11% of the population—are children of at least one foreign-born parent. Thus, 1 in 5 people in the United States is either a first- or second-generation immigrant. The foreign-born population is growing at a far faster rate than the native-born population. (From 2000-2008, the immigrant population increased by 22%, while the native-born population increased by just 6.3%.)

Second, over the last 20 years, immigrants have begun settling in new areas of the country (the South in particular) and in new types of communities, including smaller cities, rural areas and suburbs. These places tend not to be well-equipped to incorporate immigrants and have little experience with immigrants from Latin America, whose experiences and cultures differ from earlier European immigrants.

Third, historians explain that during previous major migration waves, integration was achieved by what the Migration Policy Institute terms “mediating” institutions, which no longer have a strong a presence in our society. This included large manufacturing companies, unions that welcomed immigrants into their ranks, and political party “machines” that vied for membership. Now, if anyone assists immigrants, it is usually small and underfunded community-based organizations, churches and schools. More funding would certainly increase these organizations’ effectiveness. However, experts also stress that such organizations do not have capacity or skills to accomplish the enormous, multi-faceted task of immigrant integration without coordination and guidance at other levels.

Finally, the “status” of immigrants has changed, with a larger share of the whole “undocumented” or “unauthorized” immigrants, who are vulnerable to deportation and exploita-
tion and thus forced into a second-class membership. Undocumented “status” alone prevents people from integrating as full members of a community, except, of course, through their labor. This has negative implications not only for the undocumented but for growing numbers of children. The Pew Hispanic Center finds that of the 10.2 million undocumented immigrants in the United States, nearly half are parents of minor children. A parent’s vulnerability and disenfranchisement makes these U.S. citizen children highly vulnerable, too, for a host of reasons. In the worst case, separation from a deported parent obviously negatively affects child well-being in numerous ways, as does persistent anxiety about the possibility of that separation.

Surveying immigrant integration initiatives across a country as vast and varied as ours, it becomes clear that people come to support such policies and programs and practices for a variety of reasons. Some of these reasons may be moral, even spiritual, and others grow from common-sense economics. And though commonly it is progressive organizations that advance an immigrant integration agenda, its foot-soldiers in local communities are typically non-ideological people who have traditionally kept low profiles. They often include business leaders, directors of English as a Second Language centers, mayors, practical-minded bureaucrats, elected leaders in government and heads of non-profits. Perhaps this is why the movement—or, more accurately, the practice of immigrant integration—manages to find support from both liberal and conservative thinkers and academics. Immigrant integration advocates and practitioners come from a wide variety of fields and political persuasions but speak in unison about shared fate. They stick to a basic message: Economic prosperity and the integrity of our democracy depends upon immigrants finding their own success and in their committing to their communities and to the United States over the long term.

### Selected Resources

- **Immigrant Welcome Center – Indianapolis**
  

- **The Migration Policy Institute – Immigrant Integration**
  
  [www.migrationpolicy.org](http://www.migrationpolicy.org)

- **The National League of Cities**
  

- **National Network for Immigrant & Refugee Rights**
  
  Contact PRRAC Bd member Cathi Tactaquin, ctactaquin@nmirr.org

- **National Partnership for New Americans & National Immigrant Integration Conference**
  

- **New Americans Agenda – Massachusetts**
  

- **The Opportunity Agenda – “Framing the Immigration Debate”**
  
  [http://opportunityagenda.org/framing_immigration_debatell](http://opportunityagenda.org/framing_immigration_debatell)

- **Welcoming America**
  
  [www.welcomingamerica.org](http://www.welcomingamerica.org)

- **Welcoming Center for New Pennsylvanians**
  

### Further Reading


While in the Bay Area recently, I met with several local groups doing PRRAC-like work. A very impressive bunch. One in particular struck me as a nice model for local/regional/national work in a range of areas, and so I asked them to describe their organization and the work it does. Herewith…. CH

Causa Justa :: Just Cause: Multi-Racial Movement-Building for Housing Rights

by Maria Poblet & Dawn Phillips

Causa Justa :: Just Cause (CJJC) is a multi-racial, multi-generational grassroots organization building community leadership to achieve housing justice and immigrant rights for low-income San Francisco and Oakland residents.

In 2010, CJJC emerged from the strategic merger of two powerful organizations: St. Peter’s Housing Committee and Just Cause Oakland. These two organizations represent more than 30 years of combined experience working toward housing and racial justice for African Americans and Latinos. The primary goal of the merger was to build a more powerful grassroots force for justice in San Francisco, Oakland and beyond.

We believed that a larger, stronger organization that effectively combines service, organizing and electoral strategies across a broader geographic and demographic reach results in a more cohesive and strategic justice movement, with more wins for our communities. And we thought that by consolidating resources and streamlining systems we would be able to build a more sustainable and effective organization in the long run.

Power and scale

Prior to the merger, St. Peter’s Housing Committee had been working for more than 25 years defending tenants’ and immigrant rights and fighting gentrification in San Francisco’s Mission District. Just Cause Oakland emerged from a successful 2002 campaign to pass a tenants’ rights ballot initiative to restrict evictions and evolved into long-term organizing and policy advocacy to defend housing rights. Both organizations also had in common an active base of community residents who played key roles in developing and directing the work of the organizations.

Over the years, the two organizations ran parallel campaigns around housing, anti-gentrification and community development in our respective cities. We engaged in numerous discussions about our organizational models and our analyses of the problems in our communities. Our members have participated in joint actions, and they have built relationships at countless conferences and meetings. Through those years of shared work, we have built an incredibly strong foundation; we have a high degree of shared values, a solid working relationship, strong personal relationships and complementary organizational models. This foundation put us in an ideal place to take our work to the next level in this crucial historical moment.

About four years ago, we began a deliberative process to examine the viability of merging into a single organization. We spent one year engaged in research and discussions with our staff, members and key stakeholders and allies to thoughtfully examine the potential benefits, risks, challenges and opportunities of a merger. We concluded that turning two organizations into one would lead to greater impact for low-income communities in San Francisco and Oakland. We also believed that our experience could provide guidance to other organizations considering structural convergence of this kind.

Implementation of the merger began in earnest in January 2010, with restructing of staff roles, opening new offices, developing our board, joint fundraising and administration, and beginning the on-the-ground integration of our programs. On July 1, 2010 we legally became a single organization.

Based on our analysis of the political moment and our organizational potential, we hoped to achieve four key outcomes from the merger:

Build power and scale

The enormity of the challenges that poor people face today—where injus-
tices felt locally (e.g., the foreclosure crisis, cuts in critical social programs, etc.) are deeply connected to national and international dynamics—requires that progressives work in new and different ways, focused on building convergence and alignment, for greater impact. No longer can small organizations, working in isolation, have lasting and strategic impact on social, racial and economic justice issues that are degrading our communities. Not only does national and global interconnectedness demand that we become smarter, stronger organizations, but also that we collaborate to a degree we have not in the past in order to launch winning strategies for municipal, regional and even national change.

The merger allowed us to qualitatively scale up our work. We went from the original 500 members each previous organization had, to our current membership of 2,100. We now work with over 20 staff in 3 offices and in two languages (Spanish and English), and reach thousands more community members through our various programs and activities. Other aspects of our growing scale include adding foreclosure prevention and defense work with homeowners, engaging around municipal budget and revenue issues, and tripling the number of people we reach through our online and social media communications. As the crisis facing our communities worsen, we want to ensure that the level of support we can provide grows proportionally.

While coalitions, alliances and networks have played an important role, yielded results and built strong relationships, they are often impermanent and subject to the unpredictable capacity and shifting priorities of member organizations. Most fall short of arriving at meaningful long-term agreements, political alignment, strategic allocation of resources, sharing of staff and claims of leadership. This limits our collective impact. In spite of good intentions and rhetoric, at the end of the day it is nearly impossible for groups to prioritize what is best for all the partners, and for the movement as a whole, rather than for their own organization.

The majority of today’s generation of progressives have not seen a grassroots movement that can operate on a large scale and where sacrifices for the whole are readily made. Our vision is that this merger can be part of a larger trend towards convergence, alignment and greater impact among grassroots progressive organizations in the United States. Realizing this vision means that it will not be enough to just build up and advance the work of our individual organization. We have to actively participate and in fact lead the development of new formations that can create this type of national and international connections with our local work and programs. In the last few years, CJJC has committed heavily to building up the Right to the City alliance (RTTC) be-

PRRAC Update

- A well-deserved congratulations to the NYU’s Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy, a recipient of the coveted “MacArthur Award for Creative and Effective Institutions.” The Center is co-directed by PRRAC Social Science Advisory Board member Ingrid Gould Ellen, along with co-director Professor Vicki Been. This (million dollar!) award “recognizes the Furman Center’s excellence in providing objective, policy-relevant research to address the challenges facing neighborhoods in New York City and across the nation.” We are proud of our past work with the Furman Center on assessing the systemic impacts of federal housing programs, and we look forward to continuing our relationship in the future.

- Another winner of the MacArthur Foundation’s 2012 award was Chicago’s Business and Professional People for the Public Interest, formerly headed by Alex Polikoff, one of PRRAC’s regular partners, mentors and collaborators. The MacArthur announcement notes that “BPI public housing director and former executive director Alexander Polikoff successfully argued the landmark 1976 Gautreaux case in which the U.S. Supreme Court determined that the Chicago Housing Authority had unconstitutionally segregated African American public housing residents. For more than 40 years, BPI has continued its work to break down the racial segregation and economic isolation that produced one of the worst public housing systems in the nation. Today, the reform efforts of BPI and others are helping to guide Chicago’s $1.6 billion Plan for Transformation, which aims to end the racial, economic and social isolation of public housing residents.” Part of the MacArthur Foundation’s award will help support the “Polikoff-Gautreaux Fellowship Program,” created in 1999 to give recent law and public policy graduates hands-on experience and the legal and analytical skills necessary to build careers in public interest law and advocacy.

- Moving on: Last month, we said goodbye to two long-time staff members, Kani Sidman (Kruckenberg), a Policy Associate who did much of our health disparities policy work, and Lauren Hill, our Communications and Development Associate. We are always sorry to see talented staff leave as they move on to bigger and better things, but we also wish them well in their new positions.
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cause we think that it has the potential to promote this type of dynamic movement convergence.

Right to the City is a national alliance of almost 40 racial, economic and environmental justice organizations located in 9 national urban centers. Through shared principles and a common analysis of gentrification, the alliance is providing local organizations like CJJC a way to engage in national work around housing, land use and anti-displacement issues. RTTC supports grassroots groups, who are deeply grounded in the frontline struggles and needs of working-class communities, to summarize and lift up visionary solutions and policy alternatives to address the various aspects of the housing and economic crisis. The alliance allows organizations like ours to come together with similar groups nationally, and fight at a scale much larger than we are individually able to. What is even more exciting is the ability to re-articulate the wisdom we have accumulated from deep, local work into viable national policy. A vibrant national housing movement needs formations like RTTC.

Build a stronger organizing model

St. Peter’s Housing Committee developed out of a service provision model into a model that brings together services and organizing. St. Peter’s had been running a tenant counseling clinic helping tenants advocate for themselves around issues like rent increases, evictions and harassment. These counseling services served as a mechanism for building a membership organization that can, in turn, organize fighting campaigns around issues of gentrification and displacement. Just Cause Oakland, on the other hand, developed out of a more traditional community-organizing model that prioritized door-to-door outreach to recruit large numbers of members to participate in fighting campaigns. This organizational merger offered an exciting opportunity to build on the best capacities of both organizations.

Our merged model has also integrated an electoral organizing aspect focused on using election cycles and relevant ballot issues as a way to engage our membership and community base. We have dramatically increased our involvement in sweeping outreach to our neighborhoods to engage residents in crucial civic processes that impact their lives. We have developed the skills, team and technology to reach out to thousands of people in a matter of weeks, in both San Francisco and Oakland. Our civic engagement work is ensuring that our communities count and are counted around the key political issues and processes that affect their lives. We have developed the skills, team and technology to reach out to thousands of people in a matter of weeks, in both San Francisco and Oakland. Our civic engagement work is ensuring that our communities count and are counted around the key political issues and processes that affect their lives.

At its core however, community organizing is fundamentally about building relationships and developing leadership. Causa Justa :: Just Cause has invested deeply in developing resident leaders from the neighborhoods where we work. A large part of our work is about creating the spaces for members to engage with each other around political discussion, learn about issues affecting their communities, and support them in developing both the analytical and “hard” skills necessary to be effective organizers and political actors. Our members serve on committees that develop our campaigns, they support each other in fighting the

banks and landlords, they raise funds for the organization, and they push themselves to be leaders of the organization, their communities and a broader movement for social, economic and racial justice.

Build multi-racial alliances

An important motivation for the merger was our shared commitment to building solidarity between Just Cause Oakland’s African-American base and St. Peter’s Housing Committee’s large membership in San Francisco’s Latino community. While systematic racism has created many divisions between these two groups, we believed, then as now, that an equally strong basis and need for unity exists. Building a multi-racial organizing model is about answering the question of how to simultaneously build the strength and position of each group while advancing an agenda of mutual interest.

Both communities share a common experience of disenfranchisement, permanent second-class citizenship, racial discrimination and oppression, as well as having been deeply impacted by state violence and policing. Effective multi-racial organizing has to just as accurately articulate the specific and unique ways in which these conditions are affecting each group. CJJC’s work is about supporting African Americans and Latinos to name the specific conditions impacting their individual community, to understand the basis of their shared struggle, and to develop campaigns that speak both to specific community interests as well as the shared interests of both groups. This is challenging and complicated work that since the merger we have strived daily to be better at.

By bringing African Americans and Latinos together to address these conditions, we hope to contribute to building the foundation of a vibrant national grassroots movement. African-American and Latino unity is one part of a broader front, made up of other
Build a more sustainable organization

While increasing political impact and effectiveness was the core motivation for the merger, we did want to become better positioned to respond to the economic crisis threatening the viability of many social justice organizations. We also wanted to alleviate having two organizations duplicating the tedious work of fund-raising, administration and management, and instead put that time and resources into the direct organizing and movement-building work.

In the first phase, the merger allowed CJJC to develop a more efficient organization where we have been able to do more work with the same amount of financial resources. In the current phase, we have worked on growing and diversifying our organizational resource base. As of this year, we have grown our overall budget by approximately 20%, and among other successes, completed an inspiring effort that raised $100,000 from individual donor contributions alone.

The merger has allowed us to effectively use economies of scale to our organizational benefit. As a larger organization, we have been able to improve everything from our level of technology, to our financial management system, to increasing our organizational presence by expanding into more neighborhood offices. Growing our organizational infrastructure has boosted our organizing capacity. We can now more closely track the level of participation of our members in the work, improve the level of media coverage around our key issues, and provide community residents with more physical access to our work and services.

For small organizations such as we used to be, we strongly feel that considering a strategic restructuring creates the possibility of both realizing the potential for large-scale change and a creative approach for dealing with this challenging economic environment.

This process has not been easy or simple. We merged two organizations with very different practices, cultures (literally and figuratively), languages, histories and roots. It took a great deal of commitment for everyone involved to go from a place of comfortable familiarity with doing things a certain way and with folks we knew well, to diving into unknown territory with new and different people. While there was widely held belief in the strategic opportunities the merger presented, there were also serious challenges, including the departure of some who felt that their interests were no longer a fit with the organization’s new direction.

As our experiment continues to evolve, we are committed to ensuring that being “bigger” is not just about increasing our size. That it is much more about growing the quality and impact of our work. That “more” actually means more justice for more people in more places. And that fundamentally, we remain grounded in our core political commitments, even as we encounter more opportunities that could take us away from our roots and community base.

We want our work to contribute towards building a broad social justice movement that can wrestle our communities and this country back from big banks and corporations, corrupt politicians, and those that keep racism alive and well. As a growing regional organization, we will continue to anchor and advance key efforts around housing and immigration statewide and nationally. We will support sister organizations working on other issues, in other areas, so that the momentum of our collective efforts results in a just and equitable future for all people.

The change we want cannot be achieved through the passage of legislation, or by electing a new person into political office, or by becoming a better-funded organization. The change we want to see requires us to develop new political, economic and social relationships from the blocks in our neighborhoods, to cities across the country, and nations across the globe. The change we want to see requires us to build a real peoples’ movement for justice, human rights and democracy.
Occupy Wall Street, SLATE & SNCC: Lessons?

by Mike Miller

Occupy Wall Street (OWS) has everyone talking about equality, power and democracy. That’s good. Whatever else might come of it, the formerly uninterested are now downloading charts and graphs on how the 1% are ripping everyone else off, and talking about what they’re reading.

The initial organizing was done by small “a” anarchists—not the ones who dress in black and throw rocks through downtown windows, but people who engage in nonviolent direct action against the economic powers-that-be who really run the show, and organize how they do it in a highly participatory, democratic, non-hierarchical “pre-figurative” way; they intend to relate to others similarly engaged by “horizontal” mechanisms in order to avoid the formation of a cooptable and unaccountable leadership, and are highly suspicious of anything having to do with electoral politics, or with negotiations with the power structure. In general, I’m sympathetic with these sentiments, though, as in many things political, the devil is in the details, and I don’t think you can simply build a parallel system and ignore incumbent power.

If this movement takes off, it has been waiting to happen. Staggering accumulation of wealth by the few, declining standard of living for large sectors of the middle class, growing unemployment and underemployment, debt accumulated by recent college graduates who can’t find jobs so they can pay it off, prohibitive costs for future college students, foreclosures, evictions and underwater homes, insulting hidden-small-print bank fees…the list goes on. In minority communities, the causes are even more shocking: widespread destruction of wealth for African-American and Latino households, Depression-and-beyond levels of youth unemployment, massive numbers of young men incarcerated, widespread hopelessness among the young…a similar list could go on.

TV stories of mass direct action in Arab Spring, southern-tier European countries, Wisconsin’s action to occupy the state capitol and, perhaps, stories told at home by parents and grandparents who were part of the ‘60s all no doubt provided fuel for the fire waiting to be lit.

Initial reactions by various establishments contributed to OWS growth: Police harassment and brutality made people madder and more determined; patronizing media confirmed their view that mass media are not to be trusted; the 180-degree flip-flop by major media like The New York Times confirmed for them that they were on the right track. The immense show of support that forced New York Mayor Bloomberg to back off from his threatened winter police crack-down showed that people across the country were getting enlisted in the movement, as did the more-or-less spontaneous OWS demonstrations in hundreds, if not now thousands, of cities and towns across the country.

“The action is in the reaction” Saul Alinsky noted in his Rules for Radicals. In my organizing experience, The Establishment is typically one step behind in its reaction: what they do to stop you only makes you grow, both because it confirms what you’ve been doing, and it tells you that you’re making an impact. For an organization or movement that uses this principle, participants gain confidence in leadership because things appear to be changing. It is only later that the question of cooptation must be faced. It is at that point that most movements become confused and perish, leaving perhaps substantial gains in public policy and cultural attitudes, but failing to accomplish their larger goals. I will return to this point below.

For now, the avoidance of specific policy proposals or demands seems exactly right. To the question, “What do you want?,” the demonstrators responded “Justice” and presented an indictment of the evils visited upon the 99% by the economic powers-that-be. That’s about what they should say at this point. They are now wrestling with whether and what more to say. It’s a difficult question.

Were I at the Assembly in NYC, I would argue that they should organize assemblies of 5,000–10,000 people in dozens of metro centers across the country, addressing the question, “What do we want?” before they say much more.

(Community organizing groups around the country have assemblies with this number of participants now. That their program is positive but relatively timid is a different question for a different discussion.) The question now seems to me to be, “How do we get to the point of hundreds of thousands-to-millions of people being in motion?” And how should that movement be expressed? Something I’ll also return to below.

The movement is now under tremendous pressure to say more about what it wants; current efforts to adopt program are, in part, a response to this pressure. At, or close to, the center of OWS, there are no doubt all kinds of ideological groupings who want to give direction to the movement (“an ideology”). I hope there are Obama Organizing for America (OFA) Democrats, Tea Party populists and others who are now becoming engaged because OWS sounds

---

Mike Miller (mikeotc@aol.com), a former SNCC Field Secretary and director of a Saul Alinsky organizing project, directs the ORGANIZE Training Center in San Francisco.
better to them than what they’ve been doing. I hope there’s room for such new faces at, or close to, the center of this movement.

At the same time it draws diverse political tendencies toward its center, OWS is reaching out to people who may only be prepared to say, “I want my house back,” “I want a decent job,” “I want my voice heard,” “I’m tired of being ripped off by the 1%,” and similar pithy expressions of anger and justice. These are the people who have often been featured on friendly evening TV news shows. Their stories are deeply moving. These are the stories that should continue to be projected. They resonate with millions of Americans; that’s why the Democrats are making friendly sounds about OWS: They have to. The Democrats are threatened by this movement because it may energy and financial support away from them.

**SLATE and SNCC: Lessons From the 1960s?**

The early days of the UC Berkeley student movement—the late 1950s to the early 1960s—were a period in which people emerging from “the silent generation” of the McCarthy era had to deal with these questions. I was among them. I think we did pretty well, and that there are lessons to be learned from what we did. At the University of California, we formed a “campus political party” called SLATE. (It wasn’t an acronym, but referred to the fact that our organizational origins were in a slate of candidates that challenged the “sandbox politics” of the incumbent fraternity/sorority-dominated student government by raising local economic and racial justice issues in housing, service and employment, along with global concerns such as opposition to apartheid in South Africa and justice for farm workers.) We combined internal democracy, which allowed us to involve liberal “d” and “D” democrats, social democrats, democratic socialists, vanguard party socialists and communists, pacifists, anarchists, utopians and unaffiliated moderates and liberals, with a broad public appeal that was expressed in a “lowest significant common denominator” program that appealed to a majority of the student body. It was that combination that led to the threat of a SLATE student government and, in turn, led the university administration to first make SLATE an “off-campus” organization (leading to the name “student league accused of trying to...”)

*(Please turn to page 12)*
The problem is how to create a big tent under which many people can find a home.

and/or corporate-sponsored agent provocateurs who will infiltrate the movement.

Similarly, the southern student movement, expressed in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (“Snick”), engaged initially in direct action on broadly supported demands: non-discrimination in public accommodations, hiring of blacks in downtown stores, “courtesy titles” (“Miss,” “Mrs.” and “Mister” to replace “boy” and “girl”). Subsequent voting rights demands had the same “lowest significant common denominator” character. The demand for no literacy requirements for voting stretched the consensus, but in ways that vast numbers of people supported when they understood the reasons why: You can’t deny us education for literacy, then deny us the right to vote because we’re not literate.

When the SNCC-organized and -influenced Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party actually sought recognition in the Democratic Party by presenting itself for seating at the 1964 Atlantic City national Party Convention, it began with a demand that appeared to have a “lowest significant common denominator” characteristic: “Seat us and not the racist ‘regulars’”—direct, simple and supportable by the vast majority of Americans.

But MFDP lacked the breadth and depth of support to effectively pursue the demand. President Lyndon Johnson was able to reverse commitments made by state Democratic Parties to the MFDP and, in so doing, undo Credential Committee votes the MFDP thought it had committed to its cause. SNCC, MFDP and their allies simply lacked the breadth of support to hold the Democrats to their word when the President told them to do otherwise.

Nor did LBJ negotiate with the MFDP. Instead a “compromise” (two “at large” seats) was unilaterally announced. It was negotiated, to the extent there were any negotiations at all, with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP Executive Director Roy Wilkins), United Automobile Workers (UAW President Walter Reuther) and other liberals—and not organizations that represented the grassroots liberalism that was then growing across the country. MFDP rejected the two seats, but there was nothing more it could do. Instead, it returned to Mississippi and endorsed and worked for the Johnson-Humphrey ticket even as the white “regulars” supported and voted overwhelmingly for conservative Republican candidate Barry Goldwater. More than anything else, the Atlantic City experience unleashed the unraveling of SNCC. Had the MFDP challenge won, or even had there been a “split the delegation 50/50” compromise negotiated, a different story might have followed.

Further, after LBJ was re-elected President, the problem of movement depth appeared: MFDP’s base began to erode as more moderate black leaders, organizations and non-activist people began to enter politics because the presence of federal voter registrars and other protection made it safer to do so, and as patronage poured into Mississippi via organizations that were outside the SNCC/MFDP sphere of influence.

In my reading of these lessons, the problem facing OWS is not the absence of an elaborated radical ideology or the lack of specific policy pro-
posals. Rather, it is how to create a big tent under which many people can find a home—i.e., a lowest significant common denominator program; and how to develop an organizing strategy that roots the movement deeply in ever-expanding constituencies that encompass a majority of the American people. That, in turn, requires using tactics that can involve everyday Americans—shifting them from observers of history to its co-creators.

These can both be framed in core values of equality, solidarity, community, participation, justice, democracy, etc. that resonate with the majority of Americans. Program and policy can be measured against these value criteria. For example, a program that subsidizes lenders with low- to middle-income taxpayer money to put foreclosed homeowners in new homes would be unacceptable because it doesn’t do anything about breaking up the power of the banks or about the inequality of the tax structure. A program that says, “make the banks pay—they got us in the mess; they should clean it up” would be acceptable.

It is in following this kind of approach that the possibility of radicalizing large numbers of the American people has its best chance. The “education” of the public will be provided initially by the reaction of the establishment to proposals that are supportable by the majority of Americans. For example, the proposal that public high schools have classes of 20 students maximum (as elite prep schools do) opens a broad discussion even though it is not now “realistic.” (“Trickle-down” economics is another example: Before anything gets to those who most need it, bribes must be paid to those who already have the most. That is the present pattern of dominant Democratic Party policy, as expressed in the deals Obama negotiated with the medical-pharma-hospital-insurance industry to get their support for extending health care insurance to more Americans. Republicans, of course, want to give everything to those who already have the most. These facts are apparent to growing numbers of Americans. Advocates of this approach use the skepticism people have about government to argue the case for their point of view. Until people feel, and in fact have, some control over their government, the skepticism will remain.)

SNCC/MFDP’s challenge in Mississippi was to create depth of participation in the black community that (a) established an organizational framework and program resistant to the patronage and other cooptation of the national Democrats, and, at the same time, (b) demonstrated that any effort to bypass it would meet massive resistance by Mississippi blacks—in the same way the racist Dixiecrats had blocked efforts to bypass them.

The same thing happened at UC during, especially, the Free Speech Movement. Administration efforts to bypass it failed; efforts to enlist the faculty against it boomeranged as the Faculty Senate endorsed FSM. But some of SLATE’s campaigns had this dimension as well—a breadth of support that the Administration could not break.

Without depth of base, high levels of participation and internal democracy, and a broadly-based program, no movement or organization is able to defeat the resources that can be unleashed against it when power elites decide that they are not going to negotiate “in good faith” and are, on the other hand, going to co-opt or isolate their opposition.

Strategies Other Than Electoral Politics

There will be tremendous pressure for OWS to endorse Democrats and participate in the coming 2012 election. I hope they don’t. I hope they don’t start a third party either. The contribution they are now making is to shift the country’s political dialog to a focus on equality, and the corruption of vast accumulations of wealth and income.

In SLATE, we fairly quickly learned that mass direct action had to accompany participation in student government if we were to accomplish anything. SNCC began with disruptive mass direct action in the sit-ins and freedom rides, but opened a second front when it adopted its voter registration program.

A next course of action that could begin to build a broad base of support might be a targeted boycott of one of the banks that is a bad offender in the mortgage/foreclosure crisis. Direct action like this should precede the metropolitan area assemblies I earlier referred to. Those assemblies could then adopt a platform for a new nation, conceived in liberty and justice, and dedicated to the proposition that
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all people are created equal.

There are both community banks and credit unions that are options for people to transfer their funds to. A negotiation with the targeted bank might say, “pull the rest of the banks together and we will negotiate one package with all of you.” That would especially be the case if the initially targeted bank didn’t negotiate until it was forced to. (Cesar Chavez did something similar with the major grape grower in Delano, forcing it to bring all the growers to the table.)

Another pre-electoral politics option is creating cooperative (worker, consumer and mixed ownership) enterprises with vastly different pay scales from those on Wall Street (the Basque region’s Mondragon has a pay-scale top-to-bottom ratio of about 7:1 after taxes; they are internally democratic and seek big majorities—though not consensus—on matters facing them). This would express OWS’s desire to be pre-figurative in its politics.

What Does a Significant Common Denominator Program Look Like?

OWS can develop a platform on the basis of its present “declaration” of principles (adopted in New York). For example and illustration:

(a) return foreclosed homeowners to their former or similar homes, and their former neighborhoods, with affordable re-negotiated mortgages;
(b) reduce public college and university tuition to 1960 (inflation-adjusted) fees;
(c) create private, non-profit or public sector living-wage jobs for all who are able to work;
(d) treat child-rearing as work;
(e) break-up any financial or corporate institution considered “too big to fail,” including all corporations that received bailouts;
(f) pay for all new program costs with progressive (i.e., based on ability to pay) taxes and revenue sources;
(g) reverse the income-tax structure to 1950 Republican (Dwight Eisenhower) rates;
(h) extend Medicare to all Americans;
(i) slow, halt and reverse U.S. human-caused global warming activities in the next 25 years, and implement year-by-year enforceable standards for reaching this goal;
(j) eliminate all legal and employer barriers to the right of workers to freely choose union representation should they desire it;
(k) end all barriers to equal rights and opportunities based on race, ethnicity, religion, gender, gender orientation, age, physical ability, region, etc.;
(l, m, n,) etc. on all other matters in the OWS declaration.

Without the pressure to participate in 2012 elections, the discussion of a platform could take place after a history of successful mass boycotts, the creation of economic alternatives, and the development of a structure that encompasses principles of horizontalism, subsidiarity (decentralize authority as far as possible in an organizational or society structure), participatory democracy and broad-based participation.

These are some considerations that I hope will enter the present Occupy conversations.

Reader Comments/Responses

Comment:
I was surprised that Manuel Pastor and Vanessa Carter seem to forget that race is socially determined and defined ("Reshaping the Social Contract: Demographic Distance and Our Fiscal Future," P&R, January/February 2012). Consequently, the authors cannot assume that American racial categories will be the same in 2050 as they are today. Projecting current trends, by 2050, many middle-class people now described as Asians or Latinos will be considered white.
Moreover, with about 10% of today’s marriages already interracial, a large number of their children may be defining themselves as multiracial.
(Remember, in the 19th century, the then-dominant whites whitened the "black Irish," and in the 20th, the originally "swarthy" Southern and Eastern European "races" who began arriving in the 1880s.) As a result, whites may still be numerically dominant in 2050. It is also possible that the majority-minority "line," should there be just one, will be divided into higher-class/Lighter-skinned people and lower-class/darker ones. Further, many present Latinos are whitened and racism remains intense, African Americans will not only be at the bottom but could be farther below the rest of the population economically and politically than today. The programs the two authors discuss aren’t going to help poor African Americans and other dark-skinned people much now, and if my scenario makes sense, we need to start thinking about more drastic policies and how they can be implemented.

Herbert J. Gans
(hjg1@columbia.edu)

Response:
We thank Professor Gans for his response to our article—and are indeed honored that it provoked his interest. We concur that race is a social construct and that it is a very real determinate in the everyday lives of all Americans. And that is exactly why any new approaches to politics, policies and programs must address the realities of racial disparity and avoid the sort of “leapfrogging” to whiteness that Gans raises.
That said, we think he is misreading some key trends in racial identity, misinterpreting our understanding of the importance of Black economic and political progress, and perhaps misreading the logic of our policy recommendations.

First, since the Census introduced the category Hispanic/Latino, the share of Latinos marking white has been on a steady decline. While it’s true that the share marking white rose from 48% in 2000 to 53% in 2010, that seems mostly related to the fact that the question now explicitly (and in bolded text) says that Hispanic is not a race and that respondents must mark a race. Even then, the share marking “other”—essentially rejecting U.S. racial categories—was still 37%. Moreover, in statistical analysis conducted with Laura Pulido of USC, we found that time in country is actually correlated with the share marking “other” rising—there’s something about encountering the anti-immigrant fervor in this country that just beats the “white” out of you.

Even if Gans is right to worry about the temptation of white privilege for Latinos and others, we think the best way to keep that productive sense of “otherness” alive is to strengthen authentic coalitions between Latinos, Asians and African Americans. Indeed, we were somewhat surprised by his sense of our treatment of African Americans, particularly as we have long contended that the only way to secure progress for new immigrants is through investing in the full economic integration of traditional African-American communities. Because of that, we’ve written about workforce strategies that fit both Black and Brown; partnered with a historically Black church to help its leaders renew their new social justice agenda in a new immigrant Latino neighborhood; and highlighted the importance of coalitions in our latest report, All Together Now: African Americans, Immigrants and the Future of California.

Finally, we accept that our policy package—tying disinvested neighborhoods into regional economies; reversing the school-to-prison pipeline; tailoring workforce development programs to specific communities; and putting all this in the context of major tax and fiscal reform—could be more “drastic.” However, we were also considering political feasibility, and we’d be glad to move the needle in the ways that we recommend even as we join with Gans and others in an even more ambitious agenda to achieve equity in contemporary America.

Manuel Pastor
(mpastor@dornsife.usc.edu) & Vanessa Carter
(vbcarter@dornsife.usc.edu)

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 ($/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 (45¢ 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

- The Museum of the African Diaspora in downtown San Francisco (685 Mission St.) is certainly worth a visit when next in ‘Frisco. www.moadsf.org [13272]


- A Convenient Hatred: The History of Antisemitism, by Phyllis Goldstein (405 pp., 2012, $17.95). Foreword by Sir Harold Evans, is a meticulously documented account of the scourge of antisemitism, in 16 chronologically ordered chapters, starting with its Beginnings (586 BCE-135 CE), up through Antisemitism Today. Available from Facing History and Ourselves, 16 Hurd Rd., Brookline, MA 02445-6919, 800/856-9039 [13275]


- The Emperor Has No Clothes: Teaching About Race and Racism To People Who Don’t Want to Know, by Tema Okun (212 pp., 2010, $45.99), has been published by Information Age Publishing. [13295]

- We Ain’t What We Ought To Be: The Black Freedom Struggle From Emancipation to Obama, by Stephen Tuck (528 pp., 2010, $29.95), has been published by Belknap Press. [13296]

- Growing a Global Heart, co-founded by Belvie Rooks & Dedan Gills, is reachable at PO Box 307, Sausalito, CA
appear in Manville, will shortly honor and remember the Atlantic slave route to trees along the Trans-Mississippi. "Planting a million trees that are a dream) from them, 29 Winter St., 2nd flr., Boston, MA 02108, 617/423-2148, www.faireconomy.org [13330]

- The Evolving Significance of Race: Living, Learning, and Teaching, by Sherick Andre Hughes & Theodorea Regina Berry (328 pp., 2012, $36.95), has been published by Peter Lang Publishing. Lead author contactable at shughes1@umd.edu [13337]

- "Traces of the Trade: A Story from the Deep North," a documentary from The Tracing Center on Histories and Legacies of Slavery, is available (screening or program) from them, PO Box 1062, Watertown, MA 02471, 617/924-3400, info@tracesoftrade.org [13357]

- Jackson, Mississippi: An American Chronicle of Struggle and Schism, by John R. Salter, Jr. (previous name -- now Hunter Gray), has been reprinted by Bison Books (272 pp., 2011). [13370]

- African American Community Development (with Twelve Case Studies), by William M. Harris, Sr. (288 pp., 2012, $139.95), has been published by Edwin Mellen Press. [13390]

- "Slavery By Another Name" is a 90-min. documentary, produced/directed by Sam Pollard, highlighting convict leasing, peonage, involuntary servitude. DVD available at 800/PLAYPBS. Among those featured in the film is Douglas Blackmon, author of a 2009, 469-page book of the same name (with subtitle "The Re-enslavement of Black Americans, from the Civil War to World War," published by Anchor.

- "The Audacity of Eucharistic Hope and the Legacy of Lynching," by Alex Mikulich, is a 2-page article in the Winter 2011 issue of Just South Quarterly, published by Loyola Univ. New Orleans' Jesuit Social Research Inst., 6363 St. Charles Ave., Box 94, New Orleans, LA 70118-6143, 504/864-7746, jsri@loyno.edu, www.loyno.edu/jsri/. A caption under a photo of a Greenwood, MS tree, from which a 26-year-old man was hung in 2010, notes that the photographer, Joshua Kristal, has an ongoing “Lynching Memorial Project,” in which he is documenting historical sites of racial violence in the U.S. More inf. from joshuakristal.com

- "The Impossible Weight of History" is a long article, by Sarah Kaufman, in the Feb. 19, 2012 Washington Post (p.E1), subtitled, "On the eve of groundbreaking, the African American museum has much to learn from its neighbors,” discusses the Washington Mall project the new museum’s director, Lonnie G. Bunch III, wrote about in the Jan./Feb. 2012 [TG: can you check is that’s correct issue?] P&R. If you can’t locate it on the Internet, we’ll be happy to send you a copy, if you furnish a SASE. A related article, “Shining New Spotlight on Civil Rights Era: Cities Are Planning Museums,” appeared in the Feb. 20, 2012 NY Times (p. A8) – same offer.

- "Waiting on a Dream: Donors wonder what happened to Wilder’s plans for a slavery museum” is yet another related article, this a front-pager, by Susan Svrfuga, from the Feb. 12, 2012 Washington Post, about former Virginia Governor L. Douglas Wilder’s project to build the U.S. National Slavery Museum in Fredericksburg – which filed for bankruptcy last fall. Same offer as above (to mail you a copy of the clip).


- "Racial segregation continues, and even intensifies: Manhattan Institute report heralding the 'end' of segregation uses a measure that masks important demographic and economic trends," by Richard Rothstein (Feb. 3, 2012), is available at http://www.epi.org/publication/racial-segregation-continues-intensifies/ [13396]

- "Siglo XXI Forging the Future of Latinos in a Time of Crisis" was a conference, held Feb. 22-25, by and at the Center for Puerto Rican Studies in NYC. Inf. from them, 695 Park Ave., #E1429, NYC, NY 10021, 212/772-4197, dhermand@hunter.cuny.edu [13395]

- "Opportunity for Black Men and Boys" was a Feb. 23, 2012 National Telebriefing put on by The Opportunity Agenda and Topos Partnership. Inf. from OA, 568 Broadway, #302, NYC, NY 10012, 212/334-5977, contact@opportunityagenda.org [13314]

- Racial Justice Webinar Series: The
Applied Research Center has scheduled the following webinars: “Changing the Conversation on Race” (March 15); “Taking Real Steps Toward Racial Justice” (April 19). Inf./registration at arc@arc.org, www.arc.org. 32 Broadway, #1801, NYC, NY10004.

- "Race and Retail Conference" will be held May 4, 2012 at Rutgers Univ. Call for Proposals had a Feb. 29 deadline (but you can try...), race ethnicity@ssas.rutgers.edu [13340]
- "The 4th World Conf. on Remedies to Racial and Ethnic Economic Equalities" will be held Oct. 12-14, 2012 at the Univ. of Minnesota’s Roy Wilkins Center for Human Relations. Inf. from rwilkins@umn.edu [13279]

"Slavery at Jefferson's Monticello: Paradox of Liberty" is an exhibit [first-rate: I’ve been there - CH] at the National Museum of American History on the Wash. Mall, through Oct. 14. See also Edward Rothstein’s review of it in the Jan. 27, 2012 NY Times. If you can’t find it on the Internet, we can mail you a copy if you provide a SASE. [13306]

Poverty/Welfare

- "Helping Poor Families Gain and Sustain Access to High-Opportunity Neighborhoods," by Jennifer T. Comey, Daniel Kuehn, Austin Nichols, Kaitlin Franks & David Price (14 pp., Oct. 2011), is available (possibly free) from The Urban Inst., 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037-1231, 202/833-7200, pubs@urban.org [13276]
- Poverty & Power: The Problem of Structural Inequality, by Edward Royce (340 pp., 2008, $34.95), has been published by Rowman & Littlefield [13287]
- WhyDon’tAmericanCitiesBurn?Inequality, Poverty, and Hope for Urban America, by Michael B. Katz (240 pp., 2011), has been published by Univ. Penn. Press. The New America Foundation on Feb. 17 hosted a discussion with Katz; inf. from them, 1107 9th St., NW, 83204, hunterbadbear@winsconsin.edu [13393]
- The Institute for Research on Poverty (Univ. Wisc.) has initiated an extramural funding program to enhance our understanding of the relationship between poverty and public policy. Proposal submission deadline was March 1, but inf. available from the Institute, 1180 Observatory Dr., Madison, WI 53706 rsnell@ssc.wisc.edu, www. irp.wisc.edu [13336]
- "2012 Assets and Opportunity Scorecard" has been released by The Corporation for Enterprise Development, finding that the number of asset-poor families -- those lacking savings or other assets to cover basic expenses if income loss occurs -- has increased by 21% since their 2009-10 Scorecard. The asset-poverty rate is now nearly 2x the Census Bureau’s official income-poverty rate of 15.1%. Available at http://assetsandopportunity.org/scorecard/ [13380]
- "Assessing Inequality, Mobility, and Opportunity" was a Feb. 9, 2010 Hearing by the Senate Budget Comm. Further inf. from Comm. Chair, Sen. Kent Conrad. [13363]
- "On the Edge: Consequences of a Widening Economic Divide," sponsored by the California Budget Project, will be held March 15, 2012 in Sacramento. Inf. from them, 1107 9th St., Sacramento, CA 95814, 916/444-0500. [13307]

Community Organizing

- A Community Organizing Course taught by Hunter Gray (former name: John R. Salter, Jr.), a Native American, is available from him, 2000 Sandy Ln., Pocatello, ID 83204, hunterbadbear@hunterbear.org [13371]

- The International School for Bottom-Up Organizing can be reached c/o B. Belcore, 5357 N. Winchester Ave., #1, Chicago, IL 60640. [13384]

Criminal Justice

- "On the Chopping Block: State Prison Closings," by Nicole D. Porter (Fall 2011), is available (no price listed) from The Sentencing Project, 1705 DeSales St. NW, 8th flr., Wash., DC 20036, 202/628-0871, staff@sentencingproject.org, www.sentencingproject.org [13291]
- The National Reentry Resource Center provides information on voting restoration. Reachable at 100 Wall St., 20th flr., NYC, NY 10005, 877/332-1719. [13315]
- "Race and Partisan-ship in Criminal Disen-


- A 3-Part Series on Race and Justice in Dane County, WI can be found at Madison.com [13355]

- "Still Dreaming: Continuing the Legacy of the Civil Rights Movement Through Criminal Justice Reform" will be held March 13, 2012 at the Center for American Progress, 1333 H St. NW, 10th flr., Wash., DC 20005, 202/682-1611.

- "Lynching and the Death Penalty" will be held March 23-24, 2012 at the Univ. of Texas School of Law. Keynote speaker is Bryan Stevenson, "Lynching, Racial History and the Death Penalty Disqualification." Inf. from the Law School’s Capital Punishment Center and its William Wayne Justice Center for Public Interest Law. [13268]

### Economic/Community Development

- "Beyond GDP: New Measures for a New Economy" (Jan. 2012, 31 pp.) is available (no price given) from Demos, 220 Fifth Ave., 2nd flr., NYC, NY 10001, 212/633-1405, [13274]

- The New Metropolis: Building a Sustainable and Healthy Bay Area in the Age of Global Warming, a 2-part film/community engagement project, by Andrea Torrice, is available from Torrice Productions, 3420 Cornell Pl., Cincinnati, OH 45220, 513/751-7050. [13290]

- "More than a roof: Case studies [Montgomery Cty, MD; Louisville; Boston; San Diego; Portland, OR; Lynn, MA] of public housing agency," by Maya Brennan & Jeffrey Lubell, a 19-page, Jan. 2012 Issue Brief, is available (possibly free) from the National Housing Center, 1900 M St. NW, #200, Wash., DC 20036, 202/466-2121, www.nhc.org [13310]

- "Framework: The New Potential for Data in Managing Neighborhood Change," by G. Thomas Kingley & Kathryn Petit, is available (no price given) from The Urban Institute, 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037. 202/833-7200. [13328]

- Next Generation Community Revitalization: A Work in Progress is a project of The BridgeStone Group, offices in Boston, NYC and SF. Contact them at 535 Boylston St., 10th flr., Boston, MA 02116, 617/572-2833, www.bridgespan.org [13332]

- Fair Play is the quarterly(?) of United for a Fair Economy, 29 Winter St., Boston, MA 02108, 617/423-2148, www.faireconomy.org [13333]


- Center for Social Policy Digest: Connecting Research and Communities has been initiated out of the Center for Social Policy at UMass-Boston. Initial issue features "New Supplementary Poverty Measures an Improvement over Current Measure; Highlights Cliff Effects and Explosion in Near-Poor Families," by Randy Albelda. Contact vonvogler@umb.edu [13341]

- "The Community Development Venture Capital Alliance" will hold its 2012 Annual Conference March 22-23, 2012 in Wash., DC. Inf. at www.cdva.org/conference. [13266]

- "Strategies for a New Economy" will be held June 8-10, 2012 at Bard College. Inf. from neweconomics@neweconomicsinstitute.org [13389]

### Education


- Daisy Bates: First Lady of Little Rock, a first-rate [I saw it recently at the Main SF Library - CH] documentary on a key figure in the 1950s integration of Central High School, is available from Independent Television Service, 651 Brannan St., #410, SF, CA 94107, 415/356-8383, itvs@itvs.org, www.itvs.org [13285]

- Who Stole Public Schools from the Public?, by Claudia L. Edwards (242 pp., 2011, $29.95) -- a case study of Mt. Vernon, NY -- has been published by University Press of America. [13311]

- Task Force on Preventing Community
Colleges from Becoming Separate and Unequal has been convened by The Century Foundation. PRRAC Bd. member John Brittain is a member. Inf. from 212/452-7723, [13361]

- "For Every Child, Multiple Measures: What Parents and Educators Want from K-12 Assessment" is a Jan.[?] 2012 study, available (no price given) from the National Coalition for Parent Involvement in Education, admin @npie.org, www.npie.org [13364]


- Guidance on the Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity in Postsecondary Education: Recently released by the Office of Civil Rights, it’s available at http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-pse-201111.htm [13374]

- "12 for 2012" is the Education Commission of the States’ report, focusing on 12 issues the Commission feels will move education policy forward this year. Available at http://www.ecs.org/ [13381]

- "Seizing the Opportunity: How Education Advocacy Groups and

State Policy Makers Work Together to Advance Reform" (12 pp., Jan. 2012) is available from Education First & Policy Innovators in Education. Available (no price listed) from PIE, PO Box 19462, Mpls., MN 55419, info@pie-network.org, www.pie-network.org [13383]

- A Match on Dry Grass: Community Organizing as a Catalyst for School Reform, by Mark R. Warren & Karen L. Mapp and the Community Organizing and School Reform Project (328 pp., 2011, $24.95), has been published by Oxford Univ. Press. [13391]


- "Watching Teachers Work: Using Data from Classroom Observations to Improve Teaching" was a Jan. 26, 2012 panel discussion held by and at The New America Foundation. Inf. from 202/596-3367, gunter@newamerica.net, www.NewAmerica.net [13271]

- "Local Innovations in Child Care and Early Learning" was held Feb. 23, 2012 by The New America Foundation. Inf. from them, 1899 L St. NW, #400, Wash., DC 20036, 202/596-3367. [13366]

- “Advancing the Legacy of Mendez and Brown: A National Conference on School Diversity” will be held May 17, 2012 in DC. Register at www.school-diversity.org

Employment/Labor/Jobs Policy

- "Child Labor: Alive and Well on American 'Farms'" is the lead article in the Jan. 2012 issue of Public Citizen Health Letter; available from them (possibly free), 1600 20th St. NW, Wash., DC 20009. [13300]

- "A More Perfect Union" is a long, detailed success story, by Robert Kuttner, about the workers in New York’s Central Park Boat house restaurant and their union, Local 6 of the hotel & restaurant workers’ union; reprinted in the Jan. 2012 issue of Public Citizen Health Letter, available (possibly free) from them, 1600 20th St. NW, Wash., DC 20009. [13301]


- "Hit hard by the recession, left behind in the recovery: achieving full employment for black workers" was held at The Economic Policy Institute Feb. 16, 2012 -- Rep. John Conyers, Jr. the keynoter. Inf. from EPI, 1333 H St. NW, #300 E. Tower, Wash., DC 20005, 202/775-8810, events@epi.org [13354]

- "Insurgency and Resistance: The 34th Annual North American Labor History Conf." will be held Oct. 18-20, 2012 at Wayne St. Univ., Detroit. Papers/panel proposals due by March 23. Inf. from 313/577-2525, nalhc@wayne.edu [13278]

Families/ Women/ Children


- Urban Girls: Resisting Stereotypes, Creating Identities, eds. Bonnie Leadbeater & Niobe Way (410 pp., 1996, $30), was published by NYU Press. [13338]


- "Supporting Low-Income Parents of Young Children: The Palm Beach County Family Study Fifth Annual Report," by Julie Spielberger, Lauren Rich, Carolyn Winje, Molly Scannell & Marcia Goueva (231 pp., 2011), is available from Chapin Hall, 1313 E. 60 St., Chicago, IL 60637, 773/753-5900, cjones@chapinhall.org [13353]
- "Shattered Families" a 2012[?] report from the Applied Research Center, providing the first national data on the more than 5,000 children in foster care due to the detainment or deportation of their parents, is available for free download at www.arc.org [13356]

- "Links Between Young Children’s Behavior and Achievement: The Role of Social Class and Classroom Composition" appeared in a recent [2012?] issue of American Behavioral Scientist. [13360]

- Helping Teens Stop Violence, Build Community and Stand for Social Justice, eds. Allan Creighton & Paul Kivel (264 pp., July 2011), has been published (20th anniv. edition) by Hunter House. [13372]

- "Fragile Families" is the theme of the Fall 2010 issue of The Future of Children, a collaborative of Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs and The Brookings Institution. 10 articles, including ones on Incarceration in Fragile Families, Race & Ethnicity, and Child Well-Being. [13375]


- "Promise Neighborhood Initiative: Supporting Cradle to College Success" was a Jan. 24, 2012 Urban Institute event. Inf. from them, 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037. 202/833-7200. [13326]

"Child Welfare, Race, and Disparity: New Findings, New Opportunities" was a Feb. 9, 2012 Child & Family Policy Forum, by Chapin Hall at the Univ. of Chicago. Inf. from them, 1313 E. 60th St., Chicago, IL 60637, 773/753-5900, info@chapinhall.org [13289]

- "Missing in Child Care and Early Education in America," sponsored by The New America Foundation, was held Oct. 20, 2011 in DC. Inf. from them, 1899 L St. NW, #400, Wash., DC 20006, 202/596-3367, [13387]

Health
- "The Role of Community-Based Strategies in Addressing Metropolitan Segregation and Inequality," by Mala Andre Hutson & Sacoby Wilson, appeared in Community Development, 42(4), 2011, pp. 476-93. [13377]

Homelessness
- "The Role of Supportive Housing in Homeless Children’s Well-Being: An Investigation of Child Welfare and Educational Outcomes," by Saahoon Hong & Kristine N. Piescher (31 pp., Winter 2012), is issue No. 11 of MiniLink -- Minnesota-Linking Information for Kids. Available (no price listed) from the Univ. of Minn. School of Social Work. [13282]

- "Banking on Vacancy: Homelessness & Real Estate Speculation" is a Jan. 2012 report by Picture the Homeless. Available from them (no price given), 2427 Morris Ave., 2nd flr., Bronx, NY 10468, 646/314-6423, adrian@picturethehomeless.org [13329]

- "The State of Homelessness in America 2012"- For inf. on this Jan. 2012 report, contact the National Alliance to End Homelessness, 1518 K St. NW, #410, Wash., DC 20005, 202/638-1526, naeh@naeh.org [13331]

- "Ending Homelessness among Older Adults and Elders through Permanent Supportive Housing" (41 pp., Dec. 2011) is available (no price given) from Hearth, 1640 Washington St., Boston, MA 02118, agarmay@hearth-home.org [13345]

Housing
- The Edge is the online magazine of HUD’s Office of Policy Development & Research, providing a preview of their newly released research, periodicals, news and commentaries on housing and urban development issues. Available via HUD User, PO Box 23268, Wash., DC 20026-2328, 800/245-2691. [13320]


- "The Right to Adequate Housing" (53 pp., 2011[?]) has been issued by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, NYC, NY 10017. [13386]

- "Where Do Families Go After Foreclosure?" was a Jan. 26, 2012 Urban Institute event. Inf. from them, 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/833-7200. [13327]

- "The 2012 Annual Housing Policy Conference & Lobby Day," held by the National Low Income Housing Coalition (headed by former PRRAC Bd. member Sheila Crowley), will take place March 25, 2012 in Wash., DC. Barney Frank will be the luncheon speaker. Inf. from the Coalition, 727 15th St. NW, 6th flr., Wash., DC 20005, 202/
**Immigration**

- **Immigration and the 2012 Election** was a Feb. 2[?] Web Chat held by The Brookings Institution Metropolitan Program. Inf. from 202/797-6000, metro@brookings.edu [13358]

- "**Beyond the Dream: Changing the Conversation About Immigration**" was Jan. 17, 2012 event cosponsored by The New America Foundation & ImmigrationWorks USA. Inf. from the Foundation, 1899 L St. NW, #400, Wash., DC 20006, http://newamerica.net/events/2012/beyond_the_dream [13284]

- "**Responding to Immigrants: Bridging Research and Practice to Meet the Needs of Immigrants in New Growth Communities**" will be held May 3, 2012 at the Univ. Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Proposals due by March 5 (likely before this issues arrives, but always useful to check re possible extension/exception) to focalpoint.immigration@gmail.com. Conf. inf. at https://sites.google.com/site/respondingtoimmigrants/ [13388]

**International Human Rights and U.S. Civil Rights Policy**

- "**State of Human Rights in the District of Columbia as a Human Rights City**" is available (no price listed) from David Schwartzman, 202/829-9063, dschwartzman@gmail.com [13343].

- "**Fourth Periodic Report on the Implementation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights in the United States**" was issued by the United Nations Human Rights Committee on Dec. 30, 2011. Inf. on how to obtain it available from the National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty, 1411 K St. NW, #1400, Wash., DC 20005, 202/638-2535, aberes@nlchp.org [13394]

**Miscellaneous**

- **Government Is Good: An Unapologetic Defense of a Vital Institution**, by Douglas Amy (320 pp., 2011, $19.95), has been published by Dog Ear Publishing. [13298]

- **SOUL School of Unity & Liberation**, founded in 1996, works "to lay the groundwork for a strong social justice movement by developing a new generation of organizers with the skills and analysis necessary to build community power and win systemic change," can be contacted at 1904 Franklin St., #904, Oakland, CA 94612, 510/451-5466, angelique@schoolforunityandliberation.org [13335]

**Job Opportunities/ Fellowships/ Grants**

- **The State of the Judiciary: Judicial Nominations During the First Three Years of the Obama Presidency** (18 pp., 2012) is available (no price listed) from The Alliance for Justice, 11 Dupont Circle NW, 2nd flr., Wash., DC 20036, 202/822-6070. [13342]

- "**Code for America** is "a new kind of public service -- helping governments work better for everyone with people and the power of the web." Inf. from its founder, Jennifer Puhlik, 85 2nd St., #710, SF, CA 94105. [13367]

- "**Protecting the Right to Vote and Empowering Voters Through Collaboration**" was a Feb. 14, 2012 Internet Advocacy Roundtable held by the Center for American Progress Action Fund. Inf. from 202/682-1611. [13368]

- "**The State of the Judiciary: Judicial Nominations During the First Three Years of the Obama Presidency**" is available (no price listed) from The Alliance for Justice, 11 Dupont Circle NW, 2nd flr., Wash., DC 20036, 202/822-6070. [13342]

- "**The Economic Policy Institute** (Wash., DC) is seeking a Research and Policy Director and an Education Policy Researcher. For former. resume/ltr. to research-jobs@epi.org; for latter, same to education-jobs@epi.org [13322]

- **The Connecticut Fair Housing Center** is seeking a Staff Attorney, Fair Lending and Foreclosure Prevention Project. Resume/ltr. to Jeff Gentes at the Center, 221 Main St., 4th flr., Hartford, CT 06106, 860/920-5241, jgentes@ctfairhousing.org. [13344]

- **The Federal Reserve Board** is seeking a Counsel in its Fair Lending Enforcement Section of the Div. of Consumers Affairs. Resume Maureen Yap, 202/452-2642, maureen.c.yap@frb.gov [13352]

- **ATD Fourth World Movement** offers 3-month, hands-on internships to introduce interns to their work and approach -- they work with people experiencing situations of persistent poverty in partnership with individuals from all walks of life and communities. They also support a local and/or national ATD FW team. Inf. at www.4thworldmovement.org/internship.php [13362]

- **Demos (NYC)** is hiring a Communications Director. Ltr./resume to lstrayer@demos.org -- "Communications Direct + your name" in Subject line. [13379]
### PRRAC’S SOCIAL SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Acevedo-Garcia</td>
<td>Bouvé College of Health Sciences, Northeastern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier de Souza Briggs</td>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camille Zubihrsky Charles</td>
<td>Department of Sociology, Univ. of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefanie DeLuca</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid Gould Ellen</td>
<td>New York Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wagner School of Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance Freeman</td>
<td>Columbia Univ. School of Architecture, Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Goering</td>
<td>Baruch College, City Univ. of New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Hartmann</td>
<td>Inst. for Women’s Policy Research (Wash., DC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Kornblum</td>
<td>CUNY Center for Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriette McAdoo</td>
<td>Michigan State Department of Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando Mendoza</td>
<td>Department of Pediatrics, Stanford Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roslyn Arlin Mickelson</td>
<td>Univ. of No. Carolina-Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Noguera</td>
<td>New York Univ. School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Ong</td>
<td>UCLA School of Public Policy &amp; Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Orfield</td>
<td>UCLA Civil Rights Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory D. Squires</td>
<td>Department of Sociology, George Washington Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margery Austin Turner</td>
<td>The Urban Institute (Wash., DC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Weir</td>
<td>Department of Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Williams</td>
<td>Harvard School of Public Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If You Are Not Already a *P&R* Subscriber, Please Use the Coupon Below.

- **Sign Me Up!**  
  - 1 year ($25)  
  - 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  
1200 18th Street NW • Suite 200 • Washington, DC 20036
POVERTY & RACE RESEARCH ACTION COUNCIL
Board of Directors/Staff

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
Haas Center for Diversity & Inclusion
University of California-Berkeley
Berkeley, CA

TREASURER
Spence Limbocker
Neighborhood Funders Group
Annandale, VA

Janis Bowdler
National Council of La Raza
Washington, DC

John Brittain
University of the District of Columbia School of Law
Washington, DC

Sheryll Cashin
Georgetown University Law Center
Washington, DC

Craig Flourney
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, TX

Damon Hewitt
NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.
New York, NY

Olati Johnson
Columbia Law School
New York, NY

Elizabeth Julian
Inclusive Communities Project
Dallas, TX

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

Anthony Sarmiento
Senior Service America
Silver Spring, MD

Theodore Shaw
Columbia Law School
New York, NY

Brian Smedley
Health Policy Institute
Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies
Washington, DC

Catherine Tactaquin
National Network for Immigrant & Refugee Rights
Oakland, CA

Camille Holmes Wood
National Legal Aid & Defender Assn.
Washington, DC

[Organizations listed for identification purposes only]

Philip Tegeler
President/Executive Director
Saba Bireda
Deputy Director
Chester Hartman
Director of Research
Gina Chirichigno
Co-Director
One National Indivisible
Ebony Gayles
Law & Policy Fellow
Samantha Hodges
Emerson National Hunger Fellow
Cara Brumfield
Policy Intern