

Ending/Reducing Poverty: A Forum

In April, the Center for American Progress—“a nonpartisan research and educational institute dedicated to promoting a strong, just and free America that ensures opportunity for all”—released the final report of its Task Force on Poverty: **From Poverty to Prosperity: A National Strategy to Cut Poverty in Half**. The Task Force was co-chaired by Angela Glover Blackwell of PolicyLink and Peter B. Edelman, Prof. of Law at Georgetown Univ. Other Task Force members were: Rebecca Blank, Linda Chavez-Thompson, Rev. Dr. Floyd H. Flake, Wizipan Garriott, Maude Hurd, Charles E.M. Kolb, Meizhu Lui, Alice M. Rivlin, Barbara J. Robles, Robert Solow, Dorothy Stoneman and Wellington E. Webb. Mark Greenberg was Task Force Executive Director.

Below is the report’s Executive Summary (the full report is available at the CAP website: www.americanprogress.org). We asked a range of policy experts and activists for their comments on the report and its recommendations, along with the Center’s responses to those comments, by Task Force Co-Chairs Blackwell and Edelman, CAP Sr. VP for Domestic Policy Cassandra Butts and Task Force ED Greenberg. We welcome readers’ responses as well, with the possibility we may print a letters forum in our September/October issue.

From Poverty to Prosperity: Executive Summary

Thirty-seven million Americans live below the official poverty line. Millions more struggle each month to pay for basic necessities, or run out of savings when they lose their jobs or face health emergencies. Poverty imposes enormous costs on society. The lost potential of children raised in poor households, the lower productivity and earnings of poor adults, the poor health, increased crime, and broken neighborhoods all hurt our nation. Persistent childhood poverty is estimated to cost our nation \$500 billion each year, or about 4 percent of the nation’s Gross Domestic Product. In a world of increasing global competition, we cannot afford to squander these human resources.

The Center for American Progress last year convened a diverse group of national experts and leaders to examine the causes and consequences of poverty in America and make recommendations for national action. In this re-

port, our Task Force on Poverty calls for a national goal of cutting poverty in half in the next 10 years and proposes a strategy to reach the goal.

Our nation has seen periods of dramatic poverty reduction at times when near-full employment was combined with sound federal and state policies, motivated individual initiative, supportive civic involvement, and sustained national commitment. In the last six years, however, our nation has moved in the opposite direction. The number of poor Americans has grown by five million, while inequality has reached historic high levels.

Consider the following facts:

One in eight Americans now lives in poverty. A family of four is considered poor if the family’s income is below \$19,971—a bar far below what most people believe a family needs to get by.

Still, using this measure, 12.6 percent of all Americans were poor in

2005, and more than 90 million people (31 percent of all Americans) had incomes below 200 percent of federal poverty thresholds.

(Please turn to page 2)

CONTENTS:

CAP Poverty Report ...	1
Supreme Court	
School Decision	3
Comments on CAP Report:	
Chris Howard	6
Herbert Gans	7
David Shipler	8
Mtangulizi Sanyika ..	8
William E. Spriggs .	10
Margy Waller	10
Michael Wenger	11
Jill Cunningham	12
CAP Response	13
Resources	14

(SUMMARY: Continued from page 1)

Millions of Americans will spend at least one year in poverty at some point in their lives. One third of all Americans will experience poverty within a 13-year period. In that period, one in 10 Americans are poor for most of the time, and one in 20 are poor for 10 or more years.

Poverty in the United States is far higher than in many other developed nations. At the turn of the 21st century, the United States ranked 24th among 25 countries when measuring the share of the population below 50 percent of median income.

Inequality has reached record highs. The richest one percent of Americans in 2005 had the largest share of the nation's income (19 percent) since 1929. At the same time, the poorest 20 percent of Americans had only 3.4 percent of the nation's income.

It does not have to be this way. Our nation need not tolerate persistent poverty alongside great wealth.

The United States should set a national goal of cutting poverty in half over the next 10 years. A strategy to cut poverty in half should be guided by four principles:

Promote Decent Work. People should work and work should pay enough to ensure that workers and their families can avoid poverty, meet basic needs, and save for the future.

Provide Opportunity for All.

Children should grow up in conditions that maximize their opportunities for success; adults should have opportunities throughout their lives to connect to work, get more education, live in a good neighborhood, and move up in the workforce.

Ensure Economic Security. Americans should not fall into poverty when they cannot work or work is unavailable, unstable, or pays so little that they cannot make ends meet.

Help People Build Wealth. All Americans should have the opportunity to build assets that allow them to weather periods of flux and volatility, and to have the resources that may be essential to advancement and upward mobility.

We recommend 12 key steps to cut poverty in half:

1. Raise and index the minimum wage to half the average hourly wage. At \$5.15, the federal minimum wage is at its lowest level in real terms since 1956. The federal minimum wage was once 50 percent of the average wage but is now 30 percent of that wage. Congress should restore the minimum wage to 50 percent of the average wage, about \$8.40 an hour in 2006. Doing so would help over 4.5 million poor workers and nearly nine million other low-income workers.

2. Expand the Earned Income Tax Credit and Child Tax Credit. As an earnings supplement for low-income working families, the EITC raises incomes and helps families build assets. EITC expansions during the 1990s helped increase employment and reduced poverty. But the current EITC does little to help workers without children. We recommend tripling the EITC for childless workers, and expanding help to larger working families. Doing so would cut the number of people in poverty by over two million. The Child Tax Credit provides a tax credit of up to \$1,000 per child, but provides no help to the poorest families. We recommend making it available to all low- and moderate-income families. Doing so would move two million children and one million parents out of poverty.

3. Promote unionization by enacting the Employee Free Choice Act. The Employee Free Choice Act would require employers to recognize a union after a majority of workers signs cards authorizing union representation and establish stronger penalties for violation of employee rights. The increased union representation made possible by the Act would lead to better jobs and less poverty for American workers.

4. Guarantee child care assistance to low-income families and promote early education for all. We propose that the federal and state governments guarantee child care help to families with incomes below about \$40,000 a year, and also expand the child care tax credit. At the same time, states should be encouraged to improve the quality of early education and broaden access for all children. Our child care expansion would raise employment among low-income parents and help nearly three million parents and children escape poverty.

5. Create two million new "opportunity" housing vouchers, and promote equitable development in and around central cities. Nearly 8 million Americans live in neighborhoods of concentrated poverty where at least 40 percent of residents are poor. Our nation should seek to end concentrated poverty and economic segregation, and promote regional equity and inner-city revitalization. We propose that over the next 10 years the federal government fund two million new "opportunity vouchers" designed to help people live in opportunity-rich areas. New affordable housing should be in communities with employment opportunities and high-quality public services, or in gentrifying communities. These housing policies should be part of a broader effort to pursue equitable development strategies in regional and local planning efforts, including efforts to improve schools, create affordable housing, assure physical security, and enhance neighborhood amenities.

6. Connect disadvantaged and disconnected youth with school and

(Please turn to page 5)

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

© Copyright 2007 by the Poverty & Race Research Action Council. All rights reserved.

The Seattle/Louisville Decision and the Future of Race-Conscious Programs

by Philip Tegeler

By now, most readers of *Poverty & Race* will have had the chance to absorb some of the commentary on the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1* (the consolidated ruling in challenges to "voluntary" school integration programs in Louisville and Seattle)—and the important message that a) the legal justifications for racial integration are still in place, b) school districts can still take a variety of steps to promote racial integration, and c) we are one Supreme Court Justice away from a radical rollback of state and local power to undertake race-conscious programs of any kind.

A Divided Court

The *good news* in this decision is that despite the obviously adverse result and an extremely troubling plurality opinion (Justices Roberts, Alito, Thomas and Scalia), at the end of the day a narrow majority of five justices, including Justice Kennedy, supported the principle that reduction of racial isolation (also referred to as the interest in diversity or integration) constitutes a compelling governmental interest, and that government can take race-conscious steps to achieve these goals so long as they do not classify *individuals* on the basis of race in a way that allocates educational benefits.

The *bad news* is not so much the adverse result (or the new and stricter scrutiny of individual racial classifications dictated by Justice Kennedy's concurring opinion), but rather the plurality opinion's barely concealed hostility to any kind of remedial race-conscious measure, whether or not it includes an individual racial classification.

Philip Tegeler (ptegeler@prrac.org) is PRRAC's Executive Director.

As Justice Breyer eloquently points out, the plurality opinion ignores the long-standing duality of equal protection jurisprudence—where much stricter scrutiny is applied to racial classifications that *exclude* members of racial minority groups than to those programs that seek to *include* them.

The plurality opinion's failure to observe this distinction between exclusion and inclusion is related to their rewriting of the history of the 14th Amendment not as a compensatory response to slavery but as a prescrip-

The plurality opinion fails to observe the distinction between exclusion and inclusion.

tion for a color-blind society—and their re-reading of the arguments in *Brown v. Board of Education* to stand not for racial integration of formerly excluded Black students but for the elimination of all racial assignments in public schools (a re-reading that prompted protests from the advocates who argued *Brown*—*NY Times* 6/29/07).

And, in a willful misuse of precedent, the plurality opinion seeks to conflate what school districts may be required to do by the courts with what districts are permitted to do on their own: referring to the long-standing

principle that court-ordered racial remedies under the 14th Amendment are permitted only in response to "de jure" (or intentional) segregation, the plurality conjures this same de jure principle as a necessary predicate to voluntary use of racial classifications by local districts—without acknowledging their judicial sleight-of-hand and without acknowledging the long-standing precedent permitting such voluntary measures.

The arguments raised by PRRAC and others in their "Amicus Brief of Housing Scholars and Research and Advocacy Organizations" were not directly cited by the court, but the underlying arguments of the amicus brief—regarding the government's role in creating and sustaining residential segregation, and the relationship between housing and school segregation (including the positive effect of school integration on stable integrated housing patterns)—were recognized in both the concurrence and the dissent.

Justice Kennedy, casting the crucial "ninth vote" (5-4) that will ultimately define the meaning and application of this decision, writes that "the decision today should not prevent school districts from continuing the important work of bringing together students of different racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds. Due to a variety of factors—some influenced by government,

(Please turn to page 4)

Congrats, National Housing Law Project!

Our sister/brother organization, the National Housing Law Project in Oakland, Calif. has won one of the 8 "Building Creative & Effective Institutions" awards from The MacArthur Foundation (only 3 of which were to US groups—the Woodstock Inst. in Chicago is another winner). NHLP has for decades done wonderful work around the full range of progressive housing issues. Beyond the honor and well-deserved recognition, the award includes \$500,000, which the Project will use to create a cash operating reserve, develop new talent and upgrade its telecommunications system. www.nhlp.org is their website.

(SEATTLE: Continued from page 3)

some not—neighborhoods in our communities do not reflect the diversity of our Nation as a whole.” And Justice Breyer observes: “Cities that have implemented successful school desegregation plans have witnessed increased interracial contact and neighborhoods that tend to become less racially segregated,” and that school integration plans are “helpful in limiting the risk of ‘white flight’,” citing studies from Marvin Dawkins, Jomills Braddock and Gary Orfield (a member of PRRAC’s Social Science Advisory Board).

Responding to the Court’s Ruling

In response to the Court’s ruling, there may be a temptation to abandon the goal of racial integration in favor of either separate-but-equal enhancements to racially isolated schools, or integration on socioeconomic grounds alone. The former approach is always an important and valuable goal, but can never stand alone—and while the latter is a promising approach, we cannot rely solely on economic integration to address the real educational harm that involves educational isolation on the basis of both race and poverty.

This is not the time to retreat. Justice Kennedy’s concurrence—supported by four dissenting Justices—

authorizes new and creative efforts to reduce racial isolation in the public schools, and we should take advantage of this moment of opportunity to expand choice for racially isolated students. Advocates who have successfully advanced educational adequacy claims in a dozen or more states should consider the role of racial and economic isolation in the design of their remedial plans. Metropolitan, inter-district public school choice programs in Boston, Hartford, St. Louis and Minneapolis should be replicated in other cities as a means of easing racial isolation. The federal government should expand its funding of inter-district magnet schools in the most racially segregated regions of the country. New federal, state and local pro-

The relationship between housing and school segregation was recognized in both the concurrence and dissent.

grams to “affirmatively further fair housing” should take a more prominent role in addressing racial isolation in the public schools, using expanded housing mobility programs, inclusionary zoning, regionally targeted use of housing trust fund expenditures, and site selection guidelines for assisted family housing that look explicitly at school performance and school racial and economic isolation.

Looking beyond the decision’s immediate impact on public education, we must also consider the vulnerability of race-conscious programs in the areas of housing, health, environmental regulation, employment and criminal justice, and develop a plan to protect and expand programs designed to attack long-standing racial disparities in these areas.

There is an important research agenda here, which PRRAC has already begun, to identify work that is needed both to protect race-conscious programs by ensuring that they are narrowly tailored to achieve their goals, and to develop alternative approaches that take race into account but also weigh other factors (including alternative definitions of poverty and poverty concentration) in targeting persistent racial disparities.

The Court and International Law

Finally, it is ironic that *Parents Involved in Community Schools* has been issued while the United States is in the midst of a UN review of its compliance with the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Disparities (see *P&R* 16:1, March/April 2007), a treaty that expects detailed internal assessments of racial segregation and racial disparities, and requires affirmative (and even race-conscious) measures by state parties to remedy both governmental discrimination and general societal discrimination and disparities. What will the CERD Committee think of the Court’s plurality opinion—which can fairly be read as a rejection of the entire concept of the treaty? This will not be the first time that the United States is out of step with world opinion, but in the area of human rights and civil rights, the US has sometimes prided itself on being in the lead. Perhaps one day soon the Court will return to the precedents and international obligations it is on the verge of rejecting. In the meantime, we need to keep moving forward in our organizing and advocacy, in the shadow of this fragile 5-4 ruling. □

New on PRRAC’s Website

“Housing Mobility Plus”: A series of best practices convenings to highlight connections between housing mobility and health, employment and education/youth development

PRRAC is co-hosting a series of 2007 forums, with invited experts, practitioners and funders in health, employment and education, to explore policies and programs that can more effectively connect families who are participating in housing mobility programs with opportunities in their new communities. The materials from the May housing mobility and health forum are now posted on PRRAC’s website (www.prrac.org/projects/housingmobility.php), and the materials from our recent housing mobility and employment forum are posted on the website of Inclusion, our co-convenor of that forum (www.inclusionist.org/employmentandhousing). The third and final forum, on housing mobility and education, will be held later this year.

(SUMMARY: Continued from page 2)

work. About 1.7 million poor youth ages 16 to 24 were out of school and out of work in 2005. We recommend that the federal government restore Youth Opportunity Grants to help the most disadvantaged communities and expand funding for effective and promising youth programs—with the goal of reaching 600,000 poor disadvantaged youth through these efforts. We propose a new Upward Pathway program to offer low-income youth opportunities to participate in service and training in fields that are in high demand and provide needed public services.

7. Simplify and expand Pell Grants and make higher education accessible to residents of each state. Low-income youth are much less likely to attend college than their higher-income peers, even among those of comparable abilities. Pell Grants play a crucial role for lower-income students.

We propose to simplify the Pell grant application process, gradually raise Pell Grants to reach 70 percent of the average costs of attending a four-year public institution, and encourage institutions to do more to raise student completion rates. As the federal government does its part, states should develop strategies to make post-secondary education affordable for all residents, following promising models already underway in a number of states.

8. Help former prisoners find stable employment and reintegrate into their communities. The United States has the highest incarceration rate in the world. We urge all states to develop comprehensive reentry services aimed at reintegrating former prisoners into their communities with full-time, consistent employment.

9. Ensure equity for low-wage workers in the Unemployment Insurance system. Only about 35 percent of the unemployed, and a smaller share of unemployed low-wage workers, receive unemployment insurance benefits. We recommend that states (with federal help) reform “monetary

Witt Internship

We are accepting applications for PRRAC’s 2007 Edith Witt Internship grant, “to help develop a new generation of community activists.” The fund, established by her family, friends and co-workers, honors the memory of a wonderful human rights activist in San Francisco. To apply: send or email (to Chester Hartman at PRRAC, chartman@prrac.org) a letter from the sponsoring organization, describing the organization’s mission and outlining the work to be done by the Edith Witt Intern; and a personal statement (250-500 words) from the proposed intern and her/his resume. Pass the word to relevant grassroots groups.

eligibility” rules that screen out low-wage workers, broaden eligibility for part-time workers and workers who have lost employment as a result of compelling family circumstances, and allow unemployed workers to use periods of unemployment as a time to upgrade their skills and qualifications.

10. Modernize means-tested benefits programs to develop a coordinated system that helps workers and families. A well-functioning safety net should help people get into or return to work and ensure a decent level of living for those who cannot work or are temporarily between jobs. Our current system fails to do so. We recommend that governments at all levels simplify and improve benefits access for working families and improve services to individuals with disabilities. The Food Stamp Program should be strengthened to improve benefits, eligibility, and access. And the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program should be reformed to shift its focus from cutting caseloads to helping needy families find sustainable employment.

11. Reduce the high costs of being poor and increase access to financial services. Despite having less income, lower-income families often pay more than middle and high-income families for the same consumer products. We recommend that the federal and state governments should address the foreclosure crisis through expanded mortgage assistance programs and by new federal legislation to curb unscrupulous practices. And we propose that the federal government establish a \$50 million Financial Fairness Innovation

Fund to support state efforts to broaden access to mainstream goods and financial services in predominantly low-income communities.

12. Expand and simplify the Saver’s Credit to encourage saving for education, homeownership and retirement. For many families, saving for purposes such as education, a home, or a small business is key to making economic progress. We propose that the federal “Saver’s Credit” be reformed to make it fully refundable. This Credit should also be broadened to apply to other appropriate savings vehicles intended to foster asset accumulation, with consideration given to including individual development accounts, children’s saving accounts, and college savings plans.

We believe our recommendations will cut poverty in half. The Urban Institute, which modeled the implementation of one set of our recommendations, estimates that four of our steps would reduce poverty by 26 percent, bringing us more than halfway toward our goal. Among their findings:

Taken together, our minimum wage, EITC, child credit, and child care recommendations would reduce poverty by 26 percent. This would mean over nine million fewer people in poverty and a national poverty rate of 9.1 percent—the lowest in recorded U.S. history.

The racial poverty gap would be narrowed. White poverty would fall from 8.7 percent to 7 percent. Poverty among African Americans would fall from 21.4 percent to 15.6 percent. Hispanic poverty would fall from 21.4

(Please turn to page 6)

(SUMMARY: Continued from page 5)

percent to 12.9 percent and poverty for all others would fall from 12.7 percent to 10.3 percent.

Child poverty and extreme poverty would both fall. Child poverty would drop by 41 percent. The number of people in extreme poverty would fall by over two million.

Millions of low- and moderate-income families would benefit. Almost half of the benefits would help low- and moderate-income families.

That these recommendations would reduce poverty by more than one quarter is powerful evidence that a 50 percent reduction can be reached within a decade.

The combined cost of our principal recommendations is in the range of \$90 billion a year—a significant

cost but one that is necessary and could be readily funded through a fairer tax system. An additional \$90 billion in annual spending would represent about 0.8 percent of the nation's Gross Domestic Product, which is a fraction of the money spent on tax changes that benefited primarily the wealthy in recent years. Consider that: The current annual costs of the tax cuts enacted by Congress in 2001 and 2003 are in the range of \$400 billion a year.

In 2008 alone the value of the tax cuts to households with incomes exceeding \$200,000 a year is projected to be \$100 billion.

Our recommendations could be fully paid for simply by bringing better balance to the federal tax system and recouping part of what has been lost by the excessive tax cuts of recent years. We recognize that serious action has

serious costs, but the challenge before the nation is not whether we can afford to act, but rather that we must decide to act.

The Next Steps

In 2009, we will have a new president and a new Congress. Across the nation, there is a yearning for a shared national commitment to build a better, fairer, more prosperous country, with opportunity for all. In communities across the nation, policymakers, business people, people of faith, and concerned citizens are coming together. Our commitment to the common good compels us to move forward. □

Comments on CAP Report:

Chris Howard

From Poverty to Prosperity performs a valuable service by describing the poverty problem clearly and collecting many good ideas to remedy the problem. Now comes the hard part—figuring out how to translate these ideas into practice. Frankly, we have known for a while that more childcare assistance, a larger Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and many other recommendations in this report would reduce poverty. The main difficulty, now and throughout US history, is convincing people in power to embrace these changes and fight for them. We need to think about politics as much as policy.

The authors of the report believe that the United States has an opportu-

Christopher Howard (cdhowa@wm.edu) is Professor of Government at the College of William and Mary and author of The Welfare State Nobody Knows: Debunking Myths about U.S. Social Policy (Princeton Univ. Press, 2007).

nity to do something significant about poverty. This opportunity is supposedly rooted in a national yearning for change (which is asserted but never proven) and upcoming elections. While I can see some positive signs, I also see trouble. As the authors note, poverty remains stubbornly high in the United States while inequality is growing. The report's recommendations, if enacted, would reduce both poverty and inequality. Nevertheless, the relationship between poverty and inequality has become more complicated in recent years, and it is possible to reduce inequality without doing much at all to relieve poverty. Politically, the temptation to do so is strong, which is why a report drawing attention to poverty is particularly important right now.

The missing piece here is the middle class. While inequality has worsened in recent decades, literally all the growth has occurred in the upper half of the income distribution. The gap between the rich and poor in this coun-

try has grown because the gap between the rich and the middle class has grown; the income gap between the poor and the middle class is virtually identical today to what it was 30 years ago. Thus, when you tax the affluent to pay for benefits targeted at the middle and upper-middle classes, you reduce inequality without reducing poverty. The US government currently spends hundreds of billions of dollars each year doing just that. Major tax expenditures for homeowners and for workers with health and pension benefits are the best examples, but the Child Tax Credit qualifies as well. Some of our social regulations, such as the Family and Medical Leave Act, also help the haves more than the have-nots. This trend could easily continue. Many middle-class families are experiencing greater economic insecurity and having trouble affording health insurance, saving for their own retirement or saving for their child's education. Because political participation varies directly with income and education, and

because fiscal constraints seem daunting, many elected officials will be inclined to focus on the middle class before they worry about the poor and the near-poor. Advocates who worry about poverty need to make sure that discussions about inequality do not leave out the most disadvantaged members of society. They should insist that any changes in policy address poverty and inequality.

As far as politics, the report is largely silent. The basic strategy consists of setting an ambitious goal, listing dozens of policy changes that would help achieve that goal, and arguing that the benefits of change would outweigh the costs. *From Poverty to Prosperity* is long on charts, tables, statistics and references to previous studies—the kind of evidence that policy

experts and academics find persuasive. I'm just not sure that anyone else does. For instance, as Kent Weaver demonstrates in *Ending Welfare as We Know It* (Brookings, 2000), social scientific research did not have much impact on the 1996 welfare reform law. Instead, elected officials used such studies as ammunition to justify policy changes they already planned to support for personal, partisan or ideological reasons.

If part of the strategy is to attract more attention to poverty, my reading of recent history says to be careful. When issues surrounding poverty have been in the spotlight, the trend has been to retrench means-tested social programs; dramatic cuts in 1981 and 1996 are the best examples. On the other hand, when policymakers

have worked a bit more behind the scenes, growth has been possible. During the 1980s and 1990s, eligibility for Medicaid and the EITC was expanded on several occasions, and EITC benefits increased substantially. In each case, there were few Congressional hearings and little media coverage. Advocates shrewdly attached their changes to much larger bills and watched while legislators debated other, more controversial provisions. Admittedly, “Be Quiet and Be Clever” may not be the most inspiring or most democratic strategy in the world. To win a truly public debate, however, the authors of this report may need to recast some of their recommendations in order to distribute benefits across a larger constituency, ranging from the poor to the middle class. □

Herbert J. Gans

In these dark days when almost no one in Washington talks about poverty, “A National Strategy to Cut Poverty in Half” is a welcome and comprehensive anti-poverty program. It also contains an implicit four-part strategy which is worth analyzing briefly because it is both a typical and an apolitical strategy.

It treats non-poor Americans with *data-generating shock*, in order to impress them with the amount of poverty and inequality in the country and with *guilt-tripping*, in order to shame them for permitting these evils to exist. Then it advocates *economic rationality*, by proposing to spend \$90 billion to save the country the \$500 billion childhood poverty alone is said to cost, and it ends with *consensual rhetoric*, claiming a national “yearn-

ing for a shared national commitment to build a...fairer...country...with opportunity for all.”

Many of us active in anti-poverty policy in the 1960s but outside politics used a similar strategy. Although it may have helped to prepare the substantive ground for the original War on Poverty, I do not think it accomplished its political goal, and I doubt it will work now.

Many non-poor people are unmoved by inequality—in fact, many like to be slightly ahead of the Joneses. They are ambivalent about poverty, sympathizing with but also stigmatizing the poor, especially non-working ones. While they want poverty ended, they oppose many specific anti-poverty policies, starting with welfare.

Consequently, policy must be complemented by an explicit political strategy, and let me suggest six parts of one that may be useful to activists and campaigning politicians.

1. Broaden the policy to cover the below-median-income population, the country's “working people,” or target it mainly to the working poor but without excluding the politically less popular non-working ones.

2. Wherever possible, add to the budgets and broaden the eligibility for already existing and thus politically accepted policies—e.g., EITC, the Child Tax Credit, etc. as well as other income and job programs known to get resources to the poor. Suggest realistic and politically feasible ways of funding them.

3. Demonstrate the policy's political virtues—e.g., how it might persuade its supporters and beneficiaries to vote and vote Democratic.

4. Participate in programs to increase voting among the poor, although they may wait until they have more reason to vote—i.e., the existence of an anti-poverty policy like this one.

5. Lobby for the policy with the Democratic frontrunners—unless the already-persuaded John Edwards is one. If funds and workers are limited, work instead in the Congressional elections. A new anti-poverty policy requires a majority of liberal and center-left Democrats in both Houses.

6. Publicize the novel and long-range programs in order to place them on the political agenda and to familiarize people who will someday vote on and implement them. □

Herbert J. Gans (hjpg1@columbia.edu) is Robert S. Lynd Professor of Sociology Emeritus at Columbia University and a past president of the American Sociological Association. He is the author of over a dozen books, including War Against the Poor (Basic Books, 1995).

David K. Shipler

This thoughtful report vividly illustrates the American contradiction: a society with the skills, but not the will, to alleviate poverty. Most of the problems addressed in this blueprint are susceptible to the enhancement of existing government programs and the addition of a few new, creative ideas. But the hardships afflicting poor families run across a broad spectrum. At one end are those easiest to overcome with more money, in the areas of housing, schooling, health, wages, child care, asset building and the like. This is the part of the spectrum where the country has failed, as liberals rightly observe, in its public education, government services and private economy.

At the other end, more distant from ready solutions, stand the issues central to conservatives' arguments: the

David Shipler (dshipler@comcast.net), a former NY Times reporter, is the author of The Working Poor: Invisible in America (Knopf, 2004) and A Country of Strangers: Blacks and Whites in America (Knopf, 1997).

personal and family failures that become critical to a person's capacity in the competitive labor market. How to combat the bad parenting, teenage pregnancy, low graduation rates, inadequate skills, drug use, alienation, poor work ethics and other internal obstacles to success? Just as liberals are right to point to societal institutions, so conservatives are correct to aim at individual and family dysfunction. Both are part of the ecology of poverty.

It is easy for many conservatives to use individual disabilities to blame the victims and wash their hands of the issue. And many liberals find it convenient to blame societal institutions for creating the individual handicaps. At the extremes, these two ideologies freeze discussion. What we need is a multi-ideological approach that recognizes both ends of the spectrum and acknowledges the full sweep of the difficulties that burden families in destitution.

The recommendations here are dramatic, sensible and expensive investments with the likelihood of a hand-

some return. But they are only a step. They do not recognize fully that when a poor person in America presents her problem to an agency, she comes inside an invisible web of other problems that cannot be addressed unless we create gateways through which people can pass into multiple services. Imagine if a teacher with a hungry student could do more than toss the kid a Granola bar (as some have told me they do), but also had resources in school to check the family's eligibility for food stamps and refer them to a food bank or even to a malnutrition clinic if the child is underweight or developmentally delayed. Imagine if probation officers, pediatricians, job trainers, housing specialists and caseworkers of various kinds had the tools to address the issues backstage that jeopardize the performances of their clients. Solving poverty is a matter of connecting the dots, recognizing interactions among those in both the liberals' and the conservatives' favorite arenas, and then changing the ecological system. □

Mtangulizi Sanyika

The report's Executive Summary prescribes solutions that might have some impact on the protracted problem of poverty in the U.S. However, it raises more questions than it provides answers. The report sounds quite similar to other neo-liberal ideas that have been proposed over the years on how to address the problems of poverty within the existing rules and structures. The report implies that poverty can be reduced while maintaining the existing race-class-gender relationships within the political economy. After years of observing the failed policy prescriptions that vacillate between

Mtangulizi Sanyika (WAZURI@aol.com) is Project Manager, African American Leadership Project of New Orleans.

government and market approaches, it is my conclusion that the types of "practical" recommendations in the report are limited as permanent solutions to the protracted problem of decades-old poverty. The issue of poverty elimination is linked to a variety of other social issues requiring a paradigm shift that transforms the social, political and economic relationships in American society. Problems such as globalization, wealth concentration, militarism, the environment, gentrification, health care, etc. are intrinsically linked to the problem of poverty. Poverty is not simply a problem of insufficient income; instead, it is also a problem of "opportunity deprivation" which is structural in nature as evidenced by the decades of systemic racism, sexism and wealth-income in-

equalities.

For instance, policy proposals to rebuild New Orleans—a low-income, predominantly Black city — must transcend the rhetoric of equitable intent, and instead develop models of a transformed nonracial, urban economic democracy. That is to say, a "new" New Orleans must eliminate all of the prior systemic inequalities based on race, class and gender, or we are simply recreating the "separate and unequal" status quo of the past. It is not enough to argue that 10 or 20 years from now poverty will be reduced by 50%. African Americans and poor people in New Orleans should not have to wait that long, especially the 40% who have lived in disgraceful poverty since the 1960s. As we watched billions of no-bid dollars and incentives

flow through the hands of the established white elites, or observed the squandering of millions of taxpayer dollars on a sweetheart deal to mismanage the Road Home program, it is obvious that the rich keep getting richer at the peoples' expense. Radical solutions are required if poverty is to be eliminated in New Orleans. While I do not object to the proposed recommendations of the report, at best they are only transitional. Thus, I would argue that more systemic interventions are also required to eradicate both income inequality and opportunity deprivation.

The following five strategic approaches might move us closer to democracy by eradicating the race-class-gender inequalities and problems that existed in New Orleans and elsewhere for decades. Katrina simply exposed the magnitude of the problem that exists in all urban communities in the U.S. New Orleans will be a testing ground to develop an urban economic democracy that eliminates poverty.

First, **reparations** are due to African Americans and others who were exploited for centuries by the forces of government and capital in the building of this country. This is especially true for the resource-limited African Americans whose ancestors provided the free labor that built the agrarian South and laid the groundwork for industrialization of the North. The principle of Reparations is a well-established international legal right that is

Fellowship Opening at PRRAC

Skadden and Equal Justice Works Fellowships for graduating law students

PRRAC is also seeking applicants to sponsor for the Skadden and Equal Justice Works law fellowships to begin in the Fall of 2008. Applicants may be 3rd year law students or students currently in a judicial clerkship that is scheduled to end in the Summer of 2008. The potential Fellow(s) selected by PRRAC will work with PRRAC staff to develop a proposal related to one of PRRAC's current priority areas. For more information, please visit www.prrac.org (job bank). For additional information about the fellowship programs, visit www.equaljusticeworks.org or www.skadden.com.

due to Black Americans and others as well. Reparations could take many forms, including wealth and land transfers, cash payments, Community Development projects that address health care, housing, education, business development and other services that may equalize opportunity.

Secondly, there should be a **Victims' Compensation Fund** established for the victims of Katrina, just as there was for the victims of 9/11, to compensate all victims of this disaster that resulted from human error. A legitimate claim can be made that levee failure and government neglect imposed unnecessary harm, loss of life and material belongings, and undue suffering on thousands of people, for which they should be compensated. A starting place might be \$250,000 per household.

Thirdly, as the city is rebuilt, there should be specific provisions to en-

hance **wealth-building opportunities** for Black and poor people, such as access to homeownership for public housing residents, rental dwellers and Section 8 voucher holders. As the economy expands and diversifies, there should also be opportunities for asset-limited populations to develop partnerships with developers and asset-rich firms, in order to expand opportunity and wealth.

Fourthly, the 75,000 former Orleanian workers in the hospitality industry should be paid a **"livable wage"** with good benefits and working conditions. This alone would remove significant numbers of Orleanians from the income poverty rolls. A minimum wage will not eliminate poverty for the working poor. Locally-based good jobs and employment training are also required.

Finally, there should be integrated federal, state and municipal policies that require schools to work, health care to be available, housing to remain affordable, public transit to work everywhere, public safety to be accountable, and deep taxation on intergenerational wealth transfers. Youth must be integrated into all aspects of poverty elimination, and illegal drugs and weapons *must* be eradicated from all communities.

Such a comprehensive approach is the only solution to the decades of systemic inequality and neglect. Transitional policies and programs are useful, but much more radically practical interventions are required to eliminate poverty, rather than to simply alleviate it. □

Race, Place, Opportunity Conference

On Oct. 12, the UNC Law School (whose Dean is PRRAC Bd. Chair John Charles Boger) is hosting "One People, One Nation? Housing and Social Justice: The Intersection of Race, Place and Opportunity."

Confirmed speakers include (PRRAC Bd. Members/Exec. Dir.) John Powell, Florence Roisman, Elizabeth Julian, Philip Tegeler; Nancy Denton, Roger Clay, Derrick Bell, Michael Calhoun, Shanna Smith, Sheryll Cashin and others. PRRAC is co-sponsor, along with the Natl. Housing Law Proj., Natl. Econ. Dev. & Law Ctr., No. Carolina Housing Coal. & No. Carolina Justice Ctr. The conf. will be preceded by an evening reception, Oct. 11, honoring John Calmore, whose work will be the subject of a special Spring 2008 issue of the *North Carolina Law Review*, with contributions by Kimberle Crenshaw, Derrick Bell, Mari Matsuda, John Powell, Gerald Torres, Charles Lawrence, Florence Roisman and others. Inf. from 919/962-0226, civilrights@unc.edu

William E. Spriggs

The Center for American Progress put together a stellar team of experts on poverty. Their report is very comprehensive. A key component is to remind people that work must pay, and be able to lift people out of poverty. This truth ought to be self-evident; unfortunately, since the 1980s the discussion of fighting poverty has taken on the burden of fighting individual behavior.

The CAP recommendations on the minimum wage may appear to be silly to some, because of the degeneration in the debate. The report recommends raising the minimum wage and then indexing it to prevent the labor market from producing the oxymoron of working poor people.

People are poor because they do not make enough money. This limit could be because they cannot work. Laws prevent children from working, and not surprisingly, among Hispanics and African Americans huge shares of poor people are children. The elderly and the disabled, for the most part, also are unlikely to work, but are helped by Social Security. Children whose parents have died or are disabled are helped by Social Security, as well, and now outnumber those children who are helped by Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), the reform of the previous entitlement, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).

Among working-age adults, however, the problem of poverty is primarily the problem of needing higher wages and more opportunities to work. Of course, working-age women household heads in poverty are heavily affected by the need to earn enough for them and to support their non-working dependent children (as opposed to their non-working dependent parents who are helped by Social Security).

William E. Spriggs (wspriggs@howard.edu) is Professor and Chair of the Dept. of Economics at Howard University.

In the 1990s, women were helped by previous increases in their human capital—thanks to lowering discriminatory barriers to women in education and in the labor market—and a record-breaking increase in employment that helped pressure the easing of gender (and racial) discrimination in the labor market. The result was that the median earnings for women, for the first time, rose above the poverty threshold for a family of three. Childhood poverty dipped, accordingly. Similarly, in the 1960s, a then record labor market, and measures to decrease racial discrimination, pushed the median earnings of Black men above the poverty threshold for, first, a family of three, and then for a family of four. And, Black child poverty declined almost in half. Those are the only two periods of meaningful declines in American child poverty. And, both the 1960 and 1990 spurts were helped by increases in the federal minimum wage.

The hard reality of our economy is that it does generate bad jobs—those

that pay low wages and lack benefits. And, in a competitive labor market, that means those who face the most hurdles—those created by society by discrimination and inequality, and those created by poor individual choice—end up losing the sprint for decent jobs. Clearly, poor individual choices alone cannot explain who ends up being poor—Scooter Libby, and his criminal record, Paris Hilton and Britney Spears, now a single Mom, are evidence enough that poor choices are not the real issue. So, while it is true that poor choices can lead to poverty, not all mistakes land all people in poverty; and the deeper truth is that society's acceptance of low wages for the jobs we want done, and should value—child daycare worker, nursing home attendant—trap people below the poverty line, and because we need those jobs done, people who are virtuous, and people who have made mistakes, will end up in those jobs. The CAP report is important for putting that all in perspective. □

Margy Waller

A review of The Center for American Progress' Task Force on Poverty report begins—and ends—with the report's title: *From Poverty to Prosperity: A National Strategy to Cut Poverty in Half*.

Others may have a detailed analysis of the task force policy recommendations. But because the report is pre-

Margy Waller (waller@inclusionist.org) is a co-founder of Inclusion and director of The Mobility Agenda. She served as a domestic policy advisor in the Clinton-Gore White House and a visiting fellow at the Brookings Institution. More about Inclusion's alternative to the poverty framework can be found at <http://www.inclusionist.org/reframingpoverty>.

mised on a goal to cut poverty, these recommendations will have little impact. If CAP had developed a different title and goal, there would be more payoff from the organizational endorsement of this set of proposals.

As it is, utilizing a goal to end poverty probably dooms the rest of the report, because it won't work.

A policy framework that slices and dices beneficiaries creates an "other," violating the big idea that we are all in this together. Rather than arguing to fix the economy for a distinct class—the poor—our narrative should describe an economy that works for all of us.

There are three problems with the poverty goal.

First, poverty is a flawed measure for assessing progress toward desired

outcomes, including many of the report's proposals. As a result, a goal to "halve poverty" is both limited and limiting. CAP copied this initiative from the UK, where Tony Blair established a similar goal in 1999, but the definition and public understanding of poverty are vastly different in the UK than in the US, making the UK model difficult to transfer across the Atlantic.

Poverty in the UK is measured using absolute and relative measures of income and also by a material deprivation measure (added to ensure that families do not fall too far behind the rest in meeting material needs), all supporting an official national plan for social inclusion. In the US, the official poverty formula uses only an *absolute* measure of income deprivation based on household budgets in the 1950s. Since poverty signifies something quite narrow in our country, we need a new framework for the kind of multi-dimensional policy proposals in the CAP report.

Second, public understanding of the causes and remedies for poverty hinders adoption of the very policy solutions outlined in the CAP report. While advocates point to opinion surveys showing public support for "helping the needy," such arguments overlook the limitations of opinion polling. If the public support were indeed this strong, Congress would have acted accordingly long ago.

The limitations of the support identified by the polls are significant. Too many people believe that people are poor because of *bad decisions* or *personal moral failing*. While the percentage agreeing with such statements can shift depending on how the question is worded and where it falls in the survey, the agreement is so strong across surveys over time that it's folly to wrap policy proposals in a goal to reduce poverty.

In a recent Pew survey, 7 of 10 people agreed that the poor are too dependent on government assistance. And a review of the opinion surveys *after* the 1996 changes in federal welfare law finds as much as half the public is inclined to blame individual "lack of effort" for poverty, as many or more than before the law changed. It turns out that welfare changes didn't undermine conservative arguments after all.

Third, by defining the problem as "poverty," the CAP report opens the door to a losing scenario for policy-making. The media simplifies these debates and portrays them as two competing proposals. My crystal ball predicts proposals like these in any Congressional debate over the best way to cut poverty in half:

1) The *Law to Halve Poverty Over Ten Years* with good schools, universal pre-k, financial education, expanded tax credits and Pell Grants,

health coverage for all, expanded food stamps and childcare, indexed minimum wage, unions; and

2) *Making Poverty History Act*, stressing marriage and work.

Conservatives would demolish the first, comprehensive proposal because it goes far beyond the stated goal of raising income above the poverty line (about \$20,000 for a family of 4), and the public won't support such spending proposals if they believe people are poor due to personal failures.

The CAP report and goal sets up a debate about "personal responsibility" that will feel sadly familiar to anyone who followed the evolution of welfare legislation in the last decade. We should develop policy goals by consulting the research evidence *and* anticipating the debate's impact on policy outcomes and public understanding.

Progressives have already lost on the issues of poverty and "personal responsibility." It's time to recast the goal as one of economic mobility and social inclusion. CAP missed an opportunity by sticking to an old—and failed—framework for this debate. The progressive agenda and political campaigns of the near and longer term will benefit greatly if CAP would expend its considerable expertise and resources on developing an alternative lens designed to build broad public support for these policy solutions. □

Michael R. Wenger

I applaud the Center for American Progress for trying to put the elimination of poverty back on the public policy agenda. The report of its Task Force on Poverty is an important step in this direction.

Michael R. Wenger (mwenger@jointcenter.org) is a program consultant for the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies and former Deputy Director for Outreach and Program Development for President Clinton's Initiative on Race.

But the report's failure to acknowledge the critical intersection of race and poverty is deeply disappointing:

1. Racism is never explicitly mentioned as a cause of poverty, which risks leaving the impression that the racial disparities the report enumerates have nothing to do with the legacy of our oppressive history or with persistent institutional racism today.
2. There is no mention of addressing racism as a way to reduce poverty, which guarantees that

the report's recommendations will not level the playing field for people of color.

Failure to recognize that racism and poverty are inextricably intertwined has significant policy implications. For example, the report recommends ways in which to assist with prisoner re-entry, but it never mentions the mandatory sentencing policies that disproportionately and unjustly send people of color to prison in the first place. Similar examples of racist policies and
(Please turn to page 12)

(WENGER: Continued from page 11)

practices must be addressed in education, employment, and access to homeownership and quality health care if we are to create equal opportunity for people of color. The preponderance of black faces in the gruesome post-Katrina pictures was no accident. Even President Bush acknowledged, at least verbally, that the legacy of our history of racism played a major role in the disproportionate impact of the disaster on African Americans.

We know the issue of race is fraught with emotion and is, thus, a difficult topic to discuss. And the report does make the point that its recommendations will narrow the racial poverty gap. Fair enough. However, unless we recognize racism as a root cause of poverty and propose specific steps to uproot it, we will treat only symptoms. The disease of racism will continue

unchecked, and ending poverty will remain a distant dream.

Public officials shy away from the issue because they believe it alienates white voters. But a think tank like the Center for American Progress, by thoughtfully and forthrightly addressing the issue and providing data to demonstrate the continuing salience of race as a determinant of treatment in society, could educate the public that the civil rights legislation of the 1960s did not create racial equity. This could begin to change the racial climate, build a critical mass of support for directly confronting racism, and offer some political cover for public officials.

The Katrina disaster, by riveting the nation's attention, created a window of opportunity—still slightly ajar, though closing fast—to talk more openly about the interconnection of poverty and race. We should seize

Summer Interns

PRRAC welcomes its new 2007 summer interns: **Tori Gordon**, our Law & Policy Intern, just finished her first year at Georgetown University Law Center, and **Carl Owens**, a junior at Princeton, joins us through the Princeton Office of Public Interest Internships.

what remains of this window to advance the racial dialogue in a way that does not blame people for past wrongs or ascribe racial animus to current policies and practices, but reflects upon our collective community responsibility to address past wrongs, as well as current, often subconscious, racist practices that persist in our institutions. As Rabbi Abraham Heschel has told us: "We may not all be guilty, but we are all responsible." □

Jill Cunningham

"In the fight to overcome extreme poverty, the poorest families are the first ones to take action. Make us your partners as you move forward on the agenda of peace, development and human rights for all. Let's pool our knowledge, yours and ours. Let's act now, no longer separately, but together."

Such was the call to partnership that Tita Villarosa, a grandmother who has lived in a cemetery in Manila for more than 15 years, delivered in a face-to-face meeting with then-UN Secretary General Kofi Annan on October 17, 2005. She was part of a small delega-

tion from impoverished communities in 8 countries (including the US) who dialogued with Annan on that International Day for the Eradication of Poverty. (www.oct17.org)

It is Tita's call for a partnership involving the experience, know-how and participation of people in poverty themselves that, in our view, is lacking in the CAP's nonetheless comprehensive report. To have seen people with a direct experience of persistent poverty as experts on the CAP Task Force on Poverty, and to more expressly acknowledge what struggling families do already to fight poverty, would, in our view, have strengthened the report's ambitious and far-reaching policy proposals.

In November of 2005, independent UN expert Arjun Sengupta followed this vital strategy, consulting with those hit hard by Hurricane Katrina and its aftermath, as well as people affected by long-term poverty in other communities. In his report on extreme poverty and human rights in the US, he emphasized that "*The full partici-*

pation of people living in poverty should be ensured in the design, implementation, monitoring and assessment of programs for combating poverty. Such programs should build on poor people's own efforts, . . . responding to their actual needs." (<http://www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/chr/docs/62chr/E.CN.4.2006.43.Add.1.pdf>, p.2, my emphasis). We commend CAP's idea of an annual report on progress, but would like to see the expressed framework for people in poverty to be part of that evaluation.

Such a multi-voiced partnership is not easy, nor automatic. Families and communities in extreme poverty have had sometimes generations of humiliations and failures. Very few initiatives in society have proven to them that they have an expertise to share. Thus, we need to create more opportunities that bring people from different social backgrounds together to work on common aspirations. Such initiatives create greater understanding of the obstacles faced by families in poverty, and can help generate

Jill Cunningham (jillc@4thworldmovement.org) is the Director of the Fourth World Movement, the US branch of the human rights-based, anti-poverty organization, International Movement ATD Fourth World. She acknowledges Janet Nelson, International Board member and former UNICEF Regional Deputy Director in Geneva, for help with this comment.

greater social cohesion and solidarity. Cutting poverty in half—whether in the US or internationally—is insufficient. Tita and others like her, here and abroad, do not ask to halve poverty; they want to eradicate it. Our experience has shown that, unless anti-poverty strategies make special efforts, from the start, to reach those living in extreme poverty, the gap between them and the rest of the population

simply increases, economically and in terms of social exclusion. Programs that effectively include the “hardest to reach,” however, have proven to benefit all concerned. To this end, we appreciate CAP’s “progressive universalism” approach and applaud the real goal: “to end American poverty in a generation.” Or sooner. As Tita said, “Let’s act now...together.” □

20% Book Discount

Lexington Books is providing *P&R* readers with a 20% discount on our most recent “best of *P&R*” collection, *Poverty & Race in America: The Emerging Agendas*. Use code **8S6POVRA** when ordering (800/462-6420), and you will receive this discount.

Center for American Progress Response

by Angela Glover Blackwell, Peter Edelman, Cassandra Butts and Mark Greenberg

We thank PRRAC for encouraging discussion of and commentary on our report. We wrote the report to show that the nation has the capacity to dramatically reduce poverty and to help make the case for a national goal of cutting poverty in half in the next ten years. The report is one of a number of recent initiatives and efforts across the country—from the faith-based community, civil rights groups, mayors and others—seeking to elevate local, state and national attention to poverty. We are encouraged both by the growing momentum and by the number of people and groups who have found our report helpful. We recognized that our recommendations, while extensive, were not a comprehensive cataloging of a complete agenda for progressive social change in America. Addressing poverty is one part of a broader agenda, but we wrote the report to emphasize that it should be an essential part of that agenda.

We agree with a number of observations made by commenters. For example, we agree with Jill Cunningham

about the importance of active involvement and participation of the poor, and with Herbert Gans about the importance of promoting higher voting turnout among low-income people, elevating attention to poverty in the 2008 elections, and building on successful and popular programs. We share David Shipler’s view that a successful strategy needs to meld calls for social and personal responsibility. We agree with Mtangulizi Sanyika that poverty is not simply a problem of insufficient income but is also a structural problem of “opportunity deprivation.” That is why we propose a strategy combining the four themes of decent work, promoting opportunity, ensuring security and helping people build wealth. And we agree with Bill Spriggs, both about the critical role of adequate wages, and about the importance of not treating the failures of the labor market as failures of personal responsibility.

Our report includes twelve recommendations which we believe, taken together, would cut poverty in half. Several commenters point to areas that we didn’t discuss or that they wished we had discussed in greater detail. In particular, Mike Wenger wishes we had spent more time discussing the role of and calling for efforts to bring an end to racism. We are very mindful of the central role that racism has played in American social policy, and a number of Task Force members have spent much of their lives addressing it. We think that an important contri-

bution of this report is that, in addition to highlighting the role of racism, we call for measuring the extent to which policies reduce the racial poverty gap. Moreover, our proposals, if implemented, would result in the lowest African-American and Hispanic poverty rates in US history and a dramatic reduction in the racial poverty gap. At the same time, a comprehensive agenda should include but must go beyond the report’s recommendations—as we emphasize in the report.

Almost all of the commenters speak favorably of the need for a renewed national effort to address poverty. Several, however, raise questions about how to make the most effective case or about the political viability of focusing on poverty. Herbert Gans emphasizes the limits of “guilt-tripping” and “consensual rhetoric.” Chris Howard suggests the importance of tying efforts to those that benefit the middle class, and working “behind the scenes” with a “be quiet and be clever strategy.” Margy Waller asserts that it is folly to wrap policy proposals in a goal of reducing poverty.

We agree that guilt-tripping is not an effective strategy, but we think a broad consensus can be built, on moral and economic grounds, that sustained poverty is contrary to our national interest. The moral case is not that we should feel guilty about poverty but rather that it is wrong to tolerate it. The economic case cannot be limited

(Please turn to page 14)

Angela Glover Blackwell (ablackwell@policylink.org) & Peter Edelman (Edelman@law.georgetown.edu) co-chaired the CAP Task Force; Cassandra Butts (cbutts@americanprogress.org) is CAP’s Sr. VP for Domestic Policy; Mark Greenberg (mgreenberg@americanprogress.org) was Task Force Exec. Dir.

(RESPONSE: Continued from page 13)

to a call to narrow self-interest, because most Americans aren't poor and don't risk persistent poverty. But Americans respond to more than narrow self-interest—one compelling example is the success of the minimum wage movement; another is the increasing recognition of the importance of early education to the nation's future growth. Our nation needs a healthy, well-educated, capable workforce in order to be globally competitive in the 21st Century. The research of Harry Holzer of Georgetown University and his colleagues found that poverty imposes a half trillion dollar cost on the economy each year.

For many issues, an effective approach can draw upon the shared interests of low- and moderate-income Americans. We urge a framework of progressive universalism—that when a problem or need is shared by many, the solution should provide help to all, with the most help to those who need it most. However, an effective long-run strategy cannot just talk publicly about the middle class while seeking to quietly slip provisions to help the poor into bills. If legislators don't see or hear a constituency urging them to do more than address middle-class needs, why would they do so? Further, some issues that are fundamental to addressing poverty—helping disconnected youth re-engage, prisoner re-entry, housing and development strategies to address concentrated poverty—are not likely to be prominent in a middle-class agenda. The agendas to address middle-class insecurity and to reduce poverty are overlapping and complementary, but limiting our public discussion to the middle class won't get us far enough.

Margy Waller essentially dismisses the relevance to the US of the UK's commitment to end child poverty because the UK uses a broader set of measures of poverty. But advancing a commitment to a national goal could, and likely would, generate renewed discussions about how to better measure poverty. When Tony Blair in 1999

announced the goal of ending child poverty, there was no established official poverty measure in the UK for purposes of reaching the goal. The measures were announced in 2003, after a consultation process, and four years after the national goal was declared. Since 1998-99, absolute child poverty has fallen in the UK by more than half, relative poverty by 18%, and the Tory Party leadership now speaks favorably of the importance of reducing child poverty. UK policymakers urge the need for both poverty reduction and social inclusion, but it is highly unlikely that there would be the same pressure for efforts to reduce child poverty in the absence of a quantifiable, measurable goal.

Waller also contends that talking about poverty is doomed to fail because many people believe the poor are at fault for their conditions, and progressives have “lost” the personal responsibility issue. Polling data show that the public is pretty evenly divided on whether the biggest explanation for poverty is individual behavior or social conditions, but the data also show that most people believe it's a combination of the two. This isn't reason to avoid talking about poverty. Of course it's true that poverty is caused by both individual and social causes. We won't generate public support for policies that appear to reward bad behavior—

Thank\$

We're happy to acknowledge recent financial contributions from **Howell Baum, Michael Allen, Katherine & Eric Kravetz, John W. Edwards, Henry Korman, Fred Pincus, Nora Lester Murad.**

whether we talk about “poverty” or another term or concept. Our report makes clear that the persistence of poverty cannot be reduced to individual failings, but it also shows how the nation can dramatically reduce poverty in ways that are entirely consistent with expecting and rewarding individual initiative and responsibility.

We are very encouraged by the increasing attention to poverty in Congress, among the public, and among Presidential candidates. Such attention can and should grow in the coming months—a John Zogby poll recently found that most voters would be more likely (58% more likely, 8% less likely) to vote for a candidate committed to a goal of cutting poverty in half in ten years. This is a key moment in which to advance a national campaign to address poverty in America, and we look forward to working with a broad range of people and groups in such an effort. □

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 (41¢ unless otherwise indicated). Orders may not be placed by telephone or fax. Please indicate from which issue of P&R you are ordering.

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

Race/Racism

- ***The Cost of Privilege: Taking on the System of White Supremacy & Racism***, by Chip Smith (466 pp., 2007, \$19.95), has been published by Camino Press, PO Box 87941, Fayetteville, NC 28304, 910/670-0891, <http://www.costofprivilege.com/> [10363]

- ***Our Diverse Society: Race & Ethnicity - Implications for 21st Century American Society***, by David Engstrom & Lissette M. Piedra (242 pp., 2006, \$44.99), has been published by NASW Press, 800/227-3590, <http://www.naswpress.org/> [10371]

- ***The State of Black Michigan, 1967-2007***, eds. Joe T. Darden, Curtis Stokes & Richard W. Thomas (416 pp., Sept. 2007), is being published by Michigan State Univ. Press, 1405 S. Harrison Rd., #25, Manly Miles Bldg., E. Lansing, MI 48823-5245, <http://www.msupress.msu.edu/> [10379]

- ***Teaching about Asian Pacific Americans: Effective Activities, Strategies & Assignments for Classrooms & Communities***, eds. Edith Wen-Chu Chen & Glenn K. Omatsu (2006), has been published by Rowman & Littlefield. [10382]

- ***Driven Out: The Forgotten War Against Chinese Americans***, by Jean Pfaelzer (432 pp., 2007), has been published by Random House. It deals with the ethnic cleaning of Chinese Americans from California & the Pacific North-

west in the 2nd half of the 19th Century. [10388]

- ***Inequality.org***, a website from Demos: A Network of Ideas & Action, offers a downloadable package of up-to-date statistics & graphs on income, wealth & mobility; up-to-date summaries of media coverage & commentary; links to the latest studies & research papers; reports from the campaign trail; etc. [10398]

- ***Bulletin - Runnymede's Quarterly*** devotes its 24-page, March 2007 issue to the British experience with slavery. Available from The Runnymede Trust, 7 Plough Yard, Shoreditch, London EC2A 3LP England, +44(0)20 7377 9222, info@runnymedetrust.org, <http://www.runnymedetrust.org/> [10400]

- ***Black on the Block: The Politics of Race and Class in the City***, by Mary Patitillo (338 pp., 2007, \$29), has been published by Univ. of Chicago Press. It's a study of Chicago's North Kenwood-Oakland neighborhood. [10404]

- ***Complicity: How the North Promoted, Prolonged, and Profited from Slavery***, by Anne Farrow, Joel Lang, Jenifer Frank & Cheryl Magazine, is a 2005 Ballantine Book version of the *Hartford Courant* series on how Connecticut was involved in the slave economy of the colonies. [10418]

- ***"Ku Klux Klan Rebounds"*** (20 pp., Feb. 2007), from the Anti-Defamation League, is available at <http://www.adl.org/> [10424]

- ***"African Americans Pay Higher Auto Loan Rates But Can Take Steps to Reduce This Expense"*** (2 pp., May 2007), from the Consumer Federation of America, is available at www.consumerfed.org/ [10427]

- ***"Food Stamps as Medicine: A New Perspective on Children's Health"*** (6 pp., Feb. 2007) is available (possibly free) from Children's Sentinel Nutrition Assessment Program, 725 Mass. Ave., Mezzanine SW, Boston, MA 02118, 617/414-5251, [10431]

- ***"The Covenant with Black America"*** (Tavis Smiley) has launched its 2008 Presidential election blog series, "featuring lively, thoughtful & provocative discussions around the ten covenants." Inf. from Glenda @covenantwithblackamerica.net [10434]

- ***Brick by Brick: A Civil Rights Story*** is a 2007 film documentary, directed/produced by Bill Kavanagh, about the long-running Yonkers housing drama. Inf. from Kavanagh Productions, 32 Broadway, #1711-12, NYC, NY 10004, 212/480-0065, bill@kavanaghproductions.com, <http://www.brick-by-brick.com/> [10436]

- ***"Ten Ways to Fight Hate: A Community Response Guide"*** (32 pp., 3rd ed., 2005) is available (likely free) — in Spanish language version as well — from the Southern Poverty Law Ctr., 400 Washington Ave., Montgomery, AL 36104, www.tolerance.org/10_ways [10440]

- ***"101 Tools for Tolerance: Simple Ideas for Promoting Equity & Celebrating Diversity"*** (16 pp., n.d.) is available (likely free) from the Southern Poverty Law Ctr., 400 Washington Ave., Montgomery, AL 36104, <http://www.tolerance.org/> [10441]

- ***DRC Opportunity Access*** is the new newsletter of the Discrimination Research Ctr., 125 University Ave., #102, Berkeley, CA 94710-1616, 510/845-3473. [10444]

- ***"Why We Can't Wait: Reversing the Retreat on Civil Rights: A Regional Conference,"*** co-sponsored by the Leadership Conf. on Civil Rights Educ. Fund, UNC, Duke, No. Carolina Central & Restore Civil Rights will be held Oct. 19-20, 2007 in Durham. Inf. from swanson@civilrights.org [10439]

Poverty/Welfare

- ***"The State of Poverty: 12 Ways to Lead Change"*** is the 2007 National Agenda of the Shriver Natl. Ctr. on Poverty Law. Available (no price listed) from them at 50 E. Washington, #500, Chicago, IL 60602, 312/263-3830, <http://www.povertylaw.org/> [10438]

Community Organizing

- ***We Make Change: Community Organizers Talk About What They Do — and Why***, by Kristin Layng Szakos & Joe Szakos (263 pp., 2007, \$27.95), has been

published by Vanderbilt Univ. Press, 615/343-2446, sue.havlish@vanderbilt.edu, www.VanderbiltUniversityPress.com [10362]

- **“Grassroots Organizing Essentials”** is a one-evening (July 23, 2007) class at SALSA, the DC-based Inst. for Policy Studies’ Social Action & Leadership School for Activists. A related one-evening (July 17) class is “Grassroots Advocacy.” Inf. from SALSA, 202/234-9382, x229 [10405]

Criminal Justice

- **“Impact and Cost-Benefit Analysis of the Maryland Reentry Partnership Initiative,”** a 2007 Urban Inst. report, is available (no price listed) from The Urban Inst., 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/261-5709. [10448]

- **“Informing and Engaging Communities through Reentry Mapping,”** a 2007 Urban Inst. report, is available (no price listed) from The Urban Inst., 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/261-5709. [10449]

Education

- ***Dewey’s Dream: Universities and Democracies in an Age of Education Reform — Civil Society, Public Schools & Democratic Citizenship***, by Lee Benson, Ira Harkavy & John Puckett (149 pp., 2007), has been published by Temple Univ. Press, www.temple.edu/tempress [10356]

- **“Where We Teach: The CUBE Survey of**

Urban School Climate,” by Brian K. Perkins (104 pp., 2007), is available (no price listed) from the Council of Urban School Boards of Education, 1680 Duke St., Alexandria, VA 22314-3493, 703/838-NSBA, www.nsba.org/cube [10358]

- **“Pre-Kindergarten in the South: The Region’s Comparative Advantage in Education”** (29 pp., 2007) is available (no price listed) from the Southern Educ. Fdn., 135 Auburn Ave. NE., 2nd flr., Atlanta, GA 30303, <http://www.southerneducation.org/> [10359]

- **“Deprived of Dignity: Degrading Treatment & Abusive Discipline in New York City & Los Angeles Public Schools,”** by Elizabeth Sullivan (62 pp., March 2007), is available (no price listed) from the Natl. Econ. & Social Rights Inst., 90 John St., #308, NYC, NY 10038, 212/253-1710, <http://www.nesri.org/> [10360]

- **“Bringing a Human Rights Vision to Public Schools: A Training Manual for Organizers”** (May 2007) is available from the Natl. Econ. & Social Rights Initiative, 212/253-1785, laura@nesri.org [10364]

- **“From the Second Line”** is a 44-page, 2006 collection of personal narratives by students from the New Orleans Charter Science and Math High School, chronicling their evacuations from Hurricane Katrina. Available (possibly free) from the Katrina Writing Proj., 1717 Bissonnet, #802, Houston, TX 77005. [10365]

- **“The Practical Benefits of Growth Models for Accountability & the Limitations Under NCLB,”** by Pete Goldschmidt & Kilchan Choi, is an 11-page, Spring 2007 Policy Brief, available (no price listed) from the UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation, GSE&IS Bldg., Mailbox 951522, LA, CA 90095-1522. [10369]

- **“Village Building & School Readiness: Closing Opportunity Gaps in a Diverse Society,”** by Charles Bruner (85 pp., Jan. 2007), a State Early Childhood Technical Assistance Network Resource Brief, is available (no price listed) from the Child & Family Policy Center, 218 6th Ave., #1021, Des Moines, IA 50309-4013, 515/280-9027, <http://www.cfpciowa.org/> [10372]

- ***Enriching Children, Enriching the Nation - Public Investment in High-Quality Prekindergarten***, by Robert G. Lynch (140 pp., May 2007, \$14.50), is available from the Economic Policy Inst., 1333 H St. NW, E. Tower #300, Wash., DC 20005, publications@epi.org [10374]

- **“A New Way on School Integration,”** by Richard D. Kahlenberg, a 16-page, Nov. 2006 Issue Brief, is available (possibly free) from The Century Fdn., 41 E. 70 St., NYC, NY 10021, 212/535-4441, <http://www.tcf.org/> [10384]

- **“Aligning Postsecondary Expectations and High School Practice: The Gap Defined,”** a 2007 ACT study, is available at

www.act.org/path/policy/reports/curriculum.html [10385]

- **“Beating the Odds: A City-by-City Analysis of Student Performance and Achievement Gaps on State Assessments,”** a 2007 report by the Council of the Great City Schools, is available at www.cgcs.org/publications/achievement.aspx [10386]

- ***Democratic Dilemmas***, by Julie A. Marsh (2007), has been published by SUNY Press. It “reveals how power, values, organizational climates and trust played key roles” in 2 Calif. school districts that achieved vastly different results. [10390]

- **“‘Unlovely’ - How a market-based educational experiment is failing New Orleans’ children,”** by Leigh Dingerson (2007), on the takeover of New Orleans’ public schools, is available (possibly free) from the author, Ctr. for Community Change, 1536 U St. NW, Wash., DC 20010, 202/339-9349, Ldingerson@communitychange.org, <http://www.communitychange.org/> [10391]

- **“Learning In and Out of School in Diverse Environments: Life-Long, Life-Wide, Life-Deep”** (2007?) is available (\$12)—as well as other related publications—from the Center for Multicultural Education, 222 Miller Hall/Box 353600, Univ. Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-360, 206/543-3386. [10399]

- **“Diplomas Count: Ready for What? Preparing for College, Careers & Life after**

High School,” a 2007 *Education Week* report, is available at www.edweek.org/ew/toc/2007/06/12/index.html [10406]

- **The High Cost of Teacher Turnover** is the subject of 2007 report from the Natl. Commn. On Teaching & America's Future. The study — based on analysis of 5 school districts (Chicago; Granville, NC; Jemez Valley, NM; Milwaukee; Santa Rosa, NM) — estimates that teacher turnover costs the nation over \$7.3 billion annually, draining resources, diminishing teacher quality, undermining the nation's ability to close the student achievement gap. Available at www.nctaf.org/resources/demonstration_projects/turnover/Teacher/TurnoverCostStudy.htm [10407]

- **Segregated schools hinder reading skills** is the conclusion of a (2007?) report by Kirsten Kainz from the Natl. Ctr. for Education Statistics, available at www.fpg.unc.edu/news/pr_detail.cfm?ID=692 [10414]

- **Florida's flawed voucher program** is the subject of a 2007 report, by Sara Mead, from the Education Sector, available at www.educationsector.org/research/research_show.htm?doc_id=506895 [10415]

- **“Rescuing Brown v. Board of Education: Profiles of Twelve e School Districts Pursuing Socioeconomic School Integration,”** by Richard D. Kahlenberg (June 2007), looks at these districts: Wake County (Raleigh), NC; La Crosse, WI; Cambridge, MA; Berkeley, CA;

Brandywine, DE; Charlotte-Mecklenberg, NC; Manatee County, FL; McKinney, TX; Minneapolis; Omaha; Rochester, NY; SF. Available (possibly free) from The Century Fdn., 41 E. 70 St., NYC, NY 10021, 212/452-7723. [10416]

- **“Evaluation of the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program: Impacts After One Year”** (152 pp., June 2007), from the US Dept. of Education's Inst. of Education Sciences, is available at iew.ed.gov/ncee/pdf/20074009.pdf [10423]

- **“Getting Honest About Grad Rates: How States Play the Numbers and Students Lose,”** by Daria Hall (15 pp., June 2007), from The Education Trust (headed by ex-PRRAC Bd. member Kati Haycock), is available at www2.edtrust.org [10425]

- **“Understanding High School Graduation Rates,”** a 2007 Alliance for Excellent Education analysis highlighting discrepancies between state-reported rates and independent estimates, including a state-by-state analysis, is available at www.all4ed.org/publications/wcwc/index.html [10433]

- **“From No Child Left Behind to Every Child a Graduate,”** the Alliance for Excellent Education's 4th Annual High School Conf., will be held **Oct. 4-5, 2007** in Washington, DC. Info from the Alliance, www.all4ed.org [10383]

- **“Leadership for Change: A Nation without Dropouts,”** the Communities in Schools Natl. Conf., will be held **Oct. 31-Nov. 4, 2007** in Atlanta. Inf. from Com-

munities in Schools, 277 S. Washington St., #210, Alexandria, VA 22314, 800/CIS-4KIDS, <http://www.cisnationalconference.org/> [10370]

Families/ Women/ Children

- **“Fathers' Risk Factors & their Implications for Healthy Relationships & Father Involvement,”** a 3-page, Feb. 2007 Fragile Families Research Brief, is available (possibly free) from the Center for Research on Child Wellbeing, Wallace Hall, 2nd fl., Princeton Univ., Princeton, NJ 08544, www.fragilefamilies.princeton.edu/ffpubs.asp [10375]

- **“One in Three: The Case for Wanted and Welcomed Pregnancy”** (14 pp., May 2007) is available (likely free) from The National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy, 1776 Mass. Ave. NW, #200, Wash., DC 20036, 202/478-8500, <http://www.teenpregnancy.org/> [10421]

Food/ Nutrition/ Hunger

- **The Almanac of Hunger and Poverty in America - 2007** (704 pp.) has been published by America's Second Harvest, 35 E. Wacker Dr., #2000, Chicago, IL 60601, 312/263-2303, <http://www.secondharvest.org/> [10357]

Health

- **“Confronting Disparities While Reforming Health Care: A Look at Massachusetts”** (9 pp., June 2007) is available (possibly free) from Families USA, 1201 New York Ave., #1100, Wash., DC 20005, 202/628-3030, healthaction@familiesusa.org, <http://www.familiesusa.org/> [10394]

- **“Lung Function, Asthma Symptoms & Quality of Life for Children in Public Housing in Boston: A Case Series Analysis,”** by Jonathan I. Levy, LK Welker-Hood, James E. Clougherty, Robin E. Dodson, Suzanne Steinbach & H.P. Hynes, appeared in the Dec. 2004 issue of *Environmental Health: A Global Access Science Source*. Available at www.ehjournal.net/content/3/1/13 [10417]

- **“New Beginnings for Perinatal Health: Medical, Social & Community Integration,”** the Natl. Perinatal Assn. Annual Conf., will be held **Sept. 27-29, 2007** in New Orleans. Inf. from 888/971-3295, deb@pronursingresources.com, <http://www.nationalperinatal.org/> [10380]

Homelessness

- **“Homeless People Count: Vacant Properties in Manhattan”** is a 23-page, May 2007 report, available (no price listed) from Picture the Homeless, 2427 Morris Ave., Bronx, NY 10468, 646/314-6423, sam@picturethehomeless.org [10389]

- **HUD's first Annual Homeless Assessment Report to Congress**

(2007) is available at www.huduser.org/publications/povsoc/annual_assess.html [10409]

Housing

● **“Can Promise Enforcement Save Affordable Housing in the United States?”**, by Kristen David Adams (77 pp.), appeared in the Spring 2004 (Vol. 41, No. 2) *San Diego Law Review*. Reprints may be available from Prof. Adams, Stetson Univ. College of Law, 1401 61st St. S., Gulfport, FL 33707, 727/562-7800, <http://www.law.stetson.edu/> [10367]

● **“Housing, Personhood, and Dignity”** is the title of a symposium in the Fall 2006 issue (Vol. 36, No. 1) of *Stetson Law Review*. The Introduction to the 291-page volume, by Prof. Kristin David Adams, includes a selected annotated bibliography of about 70 books/articles. For (free) copies of the issue, contact Prof. Adams, Stetson Univ. College of Law, 1401 61st St. S., Gulfport, FL 33707, 727/562-7800, <http://www.law.stetson.edu/> [10368]

● **“The Economic Cost of Substandard Housing Conditions Among North Carolina’s Children”** (2007?) conservatively estimates substandard housing’s contribution to the state’s childhood illnesses, injuries & disabilities at \$95 million. Available at www.nchousing.org/NC%20Sub%20Housing%20Costs%20Final%20Draft.pdf [10377]

● **“A Place to Call Home? Affordable Housing Issues in America”** is the title of a symposium in Vol. 42, No. 2 (2007) of *Wake Forest Law Review*. Included in the 5 articles are “Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing in Regional Housing Markets: The Baltimore Public Housing Desegregation Litigation,” by (PRRAC Bd. member) Florence Wagman Roisman, and “Obstacle to Opportunity: Housing Working and Poor People Can Afford in New Orleans since Katrina,” by William P. Quigley. A reprint of Prof. Roisman’s article is available at mdeer1@iupui.edu [10381]

● **“The State of Rental Housing in Cook County: Current Conditions & Forecasts”** (2007) and a related 2007 report, “A Rental Housing Action Plan for Cook County,” both from The Preservation Compact, a civic partnership of public, private & nonprofit orgs., are available at www.macfound.org/site/c.1kLXJ8MQKrH/b.1134955/k.DC98/Newsletters_and_Publications/apps/n1/newsletter2.asp [10393]

● **“Affordable Housing Needs 2005: Report to Congress,”** a 2007 HUD report, is available at www.huduser.org/publications/affhsg.affhsgneeds.html [10396]

● **“Priced Out in 2006,”** reporting that rents for small, moderately-priced apartments exceeded the monthly SSI income of people with disabilities, is available (free) from Technical Assistance Collaborative, 535 Boylston St., #1301, Boston, MA 02116,

www.tacinc.org/Pubs/PO2006release.htm [10397]

● **“Components of Inventory Change: 2003-2005,”** a May 2007 HUD report, showing a loss of 1.5 million units renting for less than \$600/mo., is available at www.huduser.org/datasets/cinch/cinch05/cinch03-05.html [10401]

● **“Rental Market Dynamics,”** a May 2007 HUD report, showing loss of low-rent units, is available at www.huduser.org/datasets/cinch/cinch05/cinch03-05.html [10402]

● **“Interim Evaluation of HUD’s Homeownership Zone Initiative”** (2007) is available (nominal fee) from HUD USER (800/245-2691, option 1) or downloadable free at www.huduser.org/publications/homeown/InterimEval.html [10408]

● **“Labor Unions and Affordable Housing: An Uneasy Relationship,”** by Hilary Botein, appeared in 42 *Urban Affairs Review* (2007). [10411]

● **“Do First Time Home Buyers in the U.S. Improve Their Neighborhood Quality?”**, a 2007 HUD study, is available at www.huduser.org/Publications/pdf/HomeBuyersImproveNeighbrhdQty.pdf [10412]

● **Subprime Mortgages: America’s Latest Boom and Bust**, by Ed Gramlich (2007), has been published by The Urban Inst., 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/261-5709. [10413]

● **“Subsidized Affordable Housing Strategies -**

A Comparative Analysis,” by Tim McKenzie (2007), is available (possibly free) from the author, 503/295-2368, TMcKensie@TimMcK.com [10419]

● **“Public Housing Residents Survey Training Manual”** (Sept. 2003), from the Healthy Public Housing Initiative, is available at www.hsph.harvard.edu/hphi/trainingmanual.pdf [10422]

● **“Housing Trust Fund Progress Report 2007”** is available (\$10) from Maribel Molina-Villa, Ctr. for Comm. Change, 8736 Nogal Ave., Whittier, CA 90606, mvilla@communitychange.org [10430]

● **“Fair Play for Housing Rights”** (2007), focusing on problems associated with mega-events such as Olympic Games, is available (no price given) from COHRE - Centre on Housing Rights & Evictions, PO Box 1160, Collingwood 3066 Victoria, Australia, +61.3.9417.7505, fionn@cohre.org [10443]

● **“Bringing Shared-Equity Homeownership to Scale”** is the theme of the Spring 2007 issue of *Shelterforce: The Journal of Affordable Housing and Community Building*. \$7.50 (\$18/yr. sub.) from 400 Bloomfield Ave., #211, Montclair, NJ 07042, 973/509-2888, nhi@nhi.org, <http://www.nhi.org/> [10445]

● **“The Housing Landscape for Returning Prisoners in the District,”** a 2007 Urban Inst. report, analyzes Wash., DC neighborhoods that have high rates of returning prisoners and the types of housing &

housing support services available in these neighborhoods. Available (no price listed) from The Urban Inst., 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC 20037, 202/261-5709. [10447]

● **“Fair Housing Law: Current Issues Affecting the Elderly and People with Disabilities,”**

sponsored by Housing Research & Advocacy Ctr. and the Western Reserve Area Agency on Aging, will be held **Aug. 23, 2007** in Cleveland. Inf. from the Center, 3631 Perkins Ave, #3A-2, Cleveland, OH 44144, info@thehousingcenter.org, http://www.thehousingcenter.org/ [10378]

● **“One People, One Nation? Housing and Social Justice: The Intersection of Race, Place and Opportunity,”** sponsored by the Univ. of No. Carolina School of Law (whose Dean is PRRAC Board Chair John Charles Boger), will be held **Oct. 12, 2007** at the UNC Law School. PRRAC is one of several co-convenors, including the Natl. Housing Law Proj. Inf. from 919/962-0226, civilrights@unc.edu. [10420]

● **“National Housing & HIV/AIDS Research Summit III,”** convened by the Natl. AIDS Housing Coal., will be held **March 5-7, 2008** in Baltimore. Inf. from the Coalition, 727 15th St. NW, 6th fl., Wash., DC 20005, 202/347-0333, nahc@nationalaidshousing.org [10376]

Immigration

● **“Immigration’s Economic Impact”** (8 pp., June 2007), by the President’s Council of Economic Advisors, is available at www.whitehouse.gov/cea/cea_immigration_062007.pdf [10426]

Miscellaneous

● **“Transform”** is the 64-page 2006 Annual Report of the John S. & James L. Knight Fdn. Included are 6 Stories of Transformation. Available (free) from the Foundation, Wachovia Financial Ctr., 200 S. Biscayne Blvd., #3300, Miami, FL 33131-2349, 305/908-2600. [10361]

● **“Good Money Collective: A Chronicle of ATR: A Territory Resource Foundation which became the Social Justice Fund Northwest,”** by Alan Rabinowitz (80 pp., 2007, \$15), has been published by PHAR, 3400 E. Laurelhurst Dr. NE, Seattle, WA 98105-5447, 206/525-7041, [10366]

● **“The Evaluation Exchange,”** Spring 2007 issue, focuses on “Advocacy and Policy Change.” Available (free, as is a sub) from them at Harvard Grad. School of Education, 3 Garden St., Cambridge, MA 02138, 617/496-4304, hfrp_pubs@gse.harvard.edu [10387]

● **“The Limits of Social Enterprise: A Field Study & Case Analysis”** is the Seedco Policy Center’s first report (June 2007), available (possibly free) from the Center, 915 Broadway, 17th fl., NYC, NY 10010, 212/473-0255, seedcopolicycenter@seedco.org, http://www.seedco.org/ [10403]

● **“State of Opportunity 2007,”** from The Opportunity Agenda, updates their 2006 report, tracking how opportunity was faring along the indicators of equality, security, mobility, voice, redemption & community. Available (no price listed) from them, 212/334-5977. [10437]

● **“Rebuilding Efforts in New Orleans”** is the theme of the Spring 2007 issue of *Research Connections*, www.crgc.umd.edu/publications/ [10446]

● **Highlander Research & Education Center** is holding its 75th Anniversary celebration in New Market, TN, **Aug. 31-Sept. 2, 2007**. Inf. from 865/933-3443, x226, anasa@highlandercenter.org [10435]

● **The Thelton E. Henderson Ctr. for Social Justice** is holding its 2007 Trailblazers in Justice Gala, **Sept. 20, 2007** in Oakland, CA. John Doar is the Honoree. Inf. from jnavarro@law.berkeley.edu, 510/643-5723. [10442]

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*

Darrell Armstrong
*Shiloh Baptist Church
Trenton, NJ*

Maria Blanco
*Lawyers' Committee for
Civil Rights
San Francisco, CA*

Olati Johnson
*Columbia University
Law School
New York, NY*

Elizabeth Julian
*Inclusive Communities
Project
Dallas, TX*

Anthony Sarmiento
*Senior Service America
Silver Spring, MD*

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

VICE-CHAIR

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

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

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

William L. Taylor
*Citizens' Commission
on Civil Rights
Washington, DC*

SECRETARY

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

Craig Flournoy
*Southern Methodist
University
Dallas, TX*

Don Nakanishi
*University of California
Los Angeles, CA*

*[Organizations listed for
identification purposes only]*

Thomas Henderson
*Sprenger & Lang
Washington, DC*

Dennis Parker
*American Civil Liberties
Union
New York, NY*

Philip D. Tegeler
President/Executive Director

TREASURER

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

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

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

Chester Hartman
Director of Research

Nkiru Azikiwe
Health Policy Fellow

Poverty & Race Research Action Council

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

Address Service Requested

7-8/07

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