

Political Sociology

States, Power, and Societies

Fall 2006

Volume 13, Number 1

Symposium: Katrina, Race and Politics



Residents of Iberville PH development (which sits next to the French Quarter) marching, among other things, against a powerful hotel developer's plan to carry out a mixed income redevelopment plan that would reduce the number of apartments from 860 to 300 (photo credit: Jay Arena).

Liberal Bad Faith in the Wake of Hurricane Katrina

Adolph Reed, *University of Pennsylvania*
& Stephen Steinberg, *Queens College*

So, Barbara Bush was right after all when she said, "So many of the people in the arena here, you know, were underprivileged anyway, so this, this is working very well for them." And Rep. Richard Baker, a 10-term Republican from Baton Rouge, was right when he was overheard telling lobbyists: "We finally cleaned up public housing in New Orleans. We couldn't do it, but God did." The publication of both statements elicited public condemnation and was followed by a flurry of hairsplitting denials. But it is now clear that their only transgression was to say in unvarnished language what many pundits, politicians, and policy wonks were think-

continued on page 2

Inside ...

Katrina Symposium:

Liberal Bad Faith	1
Q&A w/ Xavier de Souza Briggs	1
Which Side Are You On?	6
HUD to New Orleans Poor ..	11

Plus:

What's the "L" on Global Politics?	9
The Immigrant Challenge	16
Political Sociology 2006 Section Awards	18

Interview with Xavier de Souza Briggs

By Vanessa Adel
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

What is the Moving to Opportunity program that you and others propose as a solution to concentrated poverty?

Let's be careful. Many of us have advocated MTO as an important tool for fighting ghetto poverty. But relocation strategies alone are far too limited to address the range of problems associated with segregation in America. This is especially true of economic segregation that takes the form of concentrated urban poverty. MTO is a federal demonstration, and the first-ever randomized experiment of its kind, which gave very low-income, mostly minority families living in public

continued on page 13

Liberal bad faith, cont'd ...

ing. Since then, there has been a stream of proposals in more circumspect language, first by conservatives and then by a liberal policy circle at Harvard, that also envision the resettlement of New Orleans' poverty population far from the Vieux Carré, Garden District and other coveted neighborhoods of the "new" New Orleans.

David Brooks weighed in first, in a September 8 column in the New York Times under the title, "Katrina's Silver Lining." How can such a colossal natural disaster that devastated an entire city and displaced most of its population have "a silver lining"? Because, according to Brooks, it provided an opportunity to "break up zones of concentrated poverty," and thus "to break the cycle of poverty." The key, though, is to relocate the poor elsewhere, and to replace them with middle class families who will rebuild the city. "If we just put up new buildings and allow the same people to move back into their old neighborhoods," Brooks warned, "then urban New Orleans will become just as rundown and dysfunctional as before."

OK, this is what we expect from the neocons. Enter William Julius Wilson, whose message in *The Declining Significance of Race* catapulted him to national prominence. In an appearance on *The News Hour*, Wilson began by diplomatically complimenting Bush for acknowledging the problems of racial inequality and persistent poverty, and then made a pitch for funneling both private and public sector jobs to low-income

people. So far so good. But then Wilson shifted to some ominous language:

"Another thing, it would have been good if he had talked about the need to ensure that the placement of families in New Orleans does not reproduce the levels of concentrated poverty that existed before. So I would just like to underline what Bruce Katz was saying and that is that we do have evidence that moving families to lower poverty neighborhoods and school districts can have significant positive effects."

Wilson was referring to his fellow panelist on *The News Hour*, Bruce Katz, who was chief of staff for the Department of Housing and Urban Development in the Clinton administration. According to Katz, to build "a competitive healthy and viable city," we need "to break up the concentrations of poverty, to break up those federal enclaves of poverty which existed in the city and to really give these low income residents more choice and opportunity." Finally, it becomes clear what Katz is driving at:

"I think the city will be smaller and I'm not sure if that's the worst thing in the world. I think we have an opportunity here to have a win-win. I think we have an opportunity to build a very different kind

continued on page 3

About the newsletter:

Political Sociology: States, Power and Societies is the official newsletter of the Political Sociology section of the American Sociological Association. All articles published herein remain the sole property of the authors. Please contact individual authors for more information.

The newsletter welcomes any and all submissions. Please keep letters under 300 words and articles between 750-1500 words. Submissions can be sent to polSOC@soc.umass.edu.

All content is left to the discretion of the editor.

editor: Gianpaolo Baiocchi

with help from: Vanessa Mohr Adel, Sofia Checa, and Brian Connor at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Check us out on the web: www.asanet.org/sectionpolitic

Liberal bad faith, cont'd ...

of city, a city with a much greater mix of incomes. And, at the same time, we have the opportunity, if we have the right principles and we have the right tools to give many of those low income families the ability to live in neighborhoods, whether in the city, whether in the suburbs, whether in other parts of the state or in other parts of the country, live in neighborhoods where they have access to good schools, safe streets and quality jobs.”

Stripped of its varnish, what Wilson and Katz are proposing is a resettlement program that will result in a “smaller” New Orleans that is depleted of its poverty population.

This is not all. Together with Xavier Briggs, a sociologist and urban planner at MIT, Wilson posted a petition on the listserv of the Urban Sociology Section of the American Sociological Association, under the title “Moving to Opportunity in the Wake of Hurricane Katrina.” After some hand wringing about the terrible impact of Katrina, we’re presented with the silver lining: “... our goal for these low-income displaced persons, most of whom are racial minorities, should be to create a ‘move to opportunity.’” Of course, this is followed by the necessary caveat: “we do not seek to depopulate the city of its historically black communities,” et cetera, et cetera. But the main thrust of the petition touts “a growing body of research” that demonstrates the “significant positive effects” of “mobility programs” that break up “concentrated poverty.” By happy coincidence, Briggs has just published an edited volume, *The Geography of Opportunity*, with a foreword by William Julius Wilson, which promotes such mobility programs.

The dangerous, reactionary implications of a government-sponsored resettlement program were apparently not evident to the 200-plus signatories, which include some of the most prominent names in American social science: First on the list was William Julius Wilson, followed by Christopher Jencks, Lawrence Katz, David Ellwood, Herbert Gans, Todd Gitlin, Alejandro Portes, Katherine Newman, Jennifer Hochschild, Sheldon Danziger, Mary Jo Bane, to mention some of the names on just the first of ten pages of signatories. With these luminaries at the head of the petition, given their unimpeachable liberal credentials, scores of urban specialists flocked to add their names. But how is the position laid out in the measured language of the petition different from the one expressed by Barbara Bush, Rep. Richard

Baker, and David Brooks? This is a relocation scheme, pure and simple. Of course, the petition was careful to stipulate that this was a voluntary program, leaving people with a “choice” to return to New Orleans or to relocate elsewhere. However, as these anointed policy experts surely know, the ultimate outcome hinges on what policies are enacted. If public housing and affordable housing in New Orleans are not rebuilt, if rent subsidies are withheld, then what “choice” do people have but to relocate elsewhere? The certain result will be “a smaller and stronger New Orleans,” depleted of its poverty population.

Already public officials are crowing about the “new” New Orleans. According to a recent article in the *New York Times*, “the bullets and drugs and the fear are gone now, swept away by Hurricane Katrina, along with the dealers and gangs and most of the people.” Step forward another credentialed expert, Peter Scharf, executive director of the Center for Society, Law and Justice at the University of New Orleans. Hurricane Katrina, Scharf exults, “was one of the greatest crime-control tools ever deployed against a high-crime city,” sweeping away, by his estimate, as many as 20,000 participants in the drug culture before the storm.

Here we see the first problem of the “moving to opportunity” discourse. It is a throwback to the crude environmental determinism of the Jacob Riis era, which equated urban pathology with the urban environment, and assumed that a more salubrious environment – more commodious housing, playgrounds, and clean streets – would provide a panacea for the “ills of the city.” One Progressive Era book began with the instructive story about a lamppost that had been the site of a rash of suicides. Alas, the authorities removed the lamppost, and poof, the suicides ceased! Does anyone doubt that New Orleans’ drug trade will not reestablish itself elsewhere?

On closer examination, the campaign against “concentrated poverty” is a scheme for making poverty invisible. The policy is based on an anti-urban bias that is as frivolous as it is deep-seated, as though the romanticized small towns across the nation are not plagued with the litany of “urban” problems. Wherever there is chronic joblessness and poverty, and no matter its color, there are high rates of crime, alcoholism, drugs, school dropouts, domestic violence, and mental health

Liberal bad faith, cont'd ...

issues, especially among the poor youth who pass up the option to rescue themselves by joining the army and fighting America's imperial wars. To echo C. Wright Mills, when poverty is spread thin, then these behaviors can be dismissed as individual aberrations stemming from moral blemishes, rather than a problem of society demanding political action.

Besides, what kind of policy simply moves the poor into somebody else's back yard, without addressing the root causes of poverty itself, and in the process disrupts the personal networks and community bonds of these indigent people? Contrary to the claim of the petition, the "careful studies" that have evaluated the "moving to opportunity" programs report very mixed results, and why should one think otherwise? Unless the uprooted families are provided with jobs and opportunities that are the sine qua non of stable families and communities, "move to opportunity" is only a spurious theory and an empty slogan.

This brings attention to two other fatal flaws in the logic of "moving to opportunity" policy. It is based on a demonized image of the reprobate poor, who make trouble for themselves and others. Yes, the drug dealers are swept out of the 9th ward, but so are countless others, often single mothers with children, with an extended kin network of siblings, aunts, uncles, cousins, and that heroic grandmother, who indeed have deep roots in the communities from which they are being evicted. How is it that this Gang of 200, from their ivory towers and gilded offices, presume to speak for the poor? Tossing in a caveat to the effect that "we do not seek to depopulate the city or its historically black communities" must be read literally. They want only to depopulate the city of concentrated poverty, and they will leave intact middle-class black communities that will insulate them from charges of racism.

The great fallacy of the "moving to opportunity" programs is that, by definition, they reach only a small percentage of the poverty population (and typically those who are both motivated and qualified to participate in the program). Left behind are masses to fend for themselves, particularly since the "moving to opportunity" programs are themselves used as an excuse to disinvest in these poor black communities that are written off as beyond redemption. Moving to opportunity becomes a perverse euphemism for policy abdication of the poor people left behind who are in desperate need of programs, services, and jobs.

Here, finally, is what is most sinister and myopic about the "moving to opportunity" concept. It is not part of a comprehensive policy to attack poverty and racism: to rid the United States of impoverished ghettos that pockmark the national landscape. Rather the policy is enacted in places where poor blacks occupy valuable real estate, as was the case for Cabrini Green in Chicago. After Cabrini Green was imploded, and its displaced residents sent off with Section 8s, median sales prices of single-unit homes in the vicinity soared from \$138,000 to \$700,000 during the 1980s, and the area lost 7,000 African Americans and gained 4,000 whites. It is only a matter of time before we read upbeat news accounts about the gentrifying neighborhoods surrounding the Vieux Carré.

What is perhaps saddest and most reprehensible about the petition of the Gang of 200 is the solipsistic arrogance on which it rests. This initiative comes at a time when ACORN and other advocacy groups and grassroots activists in New Orleans have championed "the right of return" for even its poorest citizens displaced by Katrina. According to the National Low Income Housing Coalition, over 140,000 units of housing were destroyed, the majority of them affordable for low-income families. But the Housing Authority of New Orleans has shut down its public-housing operations, and informed landlords of people assisted by federal rent vouchers that government rent subsidies for impacted units have been suspended indefinitely. According to Mike Howells, an organizer with a local human rights group, "sensing an opportunity to enhance the fortunes of real estate interests and to dump a form of public assistance that mainly benefits poor working class locals, Washington and local authorities are using Hurricane Katrina as a pretext for effectively gutting government subsidized housing in New Orleans."

Sure enough, the key player on Mayor Nagin's "Bring New Orleans Back Commission" is Joe Canizaro, a billionaire local developer and one of President Bush's "pioneers," i.e., individuals who raised at least \$100,000 for the Bush presidential campaign. The commission initially retained the Urban Land Institute – a real estate development industry organization on whose board Canizaro sits – to propose a framework for pursuing reconstruction. Unsurprisingly, that proposal called for a form of market-based triage. It recommended that reconstruction efforts should be focused in proportion to areas' market value and further

Liberal bad faith, cont'd ...

suggested that rebuilding of New Orleans East and the Lower Ninth Ward be deferred indefinitely. What else could we have expected? Asking such an outfit how to rebuild a devastated city is like asking a fox how to organize a chicken coop.

As we write, the fate of displaced poor New Orleanians is more precarious than ever. FEMA has terminated rent payments for thousands. Only 20 of the 117 public schools that existed before the hurricane are operating, and 17 of those 20 have opened as charter schools. The school board laid off all the teachers and staff months ago – so much for concerns about poverty. Most of the city remains empty, eerily quiet and covered with a gray, filmy residue that shows how high floodwaters were in each neighborhood. And the eerie quiet underscores the colossal failure of government at all levels to propose a plan for the hundreds of thousands of people who have been dislocated for six months and counting.

Tellingly, the outrage that Canizaro and the Urban Land Institute's proposal sparked among working-class homeowners only reinforced poor people's marginalization. The relevant unit of protest against the ULI plan, its moral center, became homeownership. But what of the tens of thousands who weren't homeowners before Katrina? Who is factoring their interests into the equation? Did Barbara Bush speak for history, ratified by the policy circle at Harvard, when she said, "So many of the people in the arena here, you know, were underprivileged anyway, so this, this is working very well for them."

The Gang of 200's petition reproduces and reinforces this disregard for the idea that poor people may have, or deserve to have, emotional attachments to a place they consider home. This is one way in which the stereotype of the "urban underclass" – which Wilson in particular has done so much to legitimize – is insidious: it defines poor people's lives as only objects for "our" administration (and just who makes up the circle of "we" anyway?). It effectively divests the poor of civic voice, thus reprising 19th century republican treatment of those without property as ineligible for full citizenship.

We are braced for the counterattack from the Gang of 200. First, they will howl about the obvious differences between Indian removal and the Negro removal that

they advocate.¹ We are more struck by the similarities. Naiveté and hubris can go hand-in-hand. Wilson et al. rushed to tout their silly pet idea without a whit's thought of the social, political, and economic dynamics and tensions that might be at play in the debate over how to reconstruct New Orleans. Their sole proviso is the lame reassurance that the city's distinctive diversity should be preserved. They gave no thought that Republicans might link the city's repopulation to their desire to gut Democratic power in New Orleans and move Louisiana into the column of reliably Republican states. They apparently also failed to consider the potential that their *idée fixe* would play into the hands of real estate development interests and others who relish any opportunity to dissipate New Orleans's black electoral majority. Such talk began well before the floodwaters began to recede.

Recently, a politically connected white lawyer in the city remarked that Katrina provided an opportunity to rebuild a smaller, quainter New Orleans, more like Charleston. (Charleston, of course, has an ample poor black servant class for its tourist economy, but a white electoral majority.) And speaking of Charleston, a low-income housing project near downtown was condemned and razed after Hurricane Hugo in 1989 because the flood and storm surge supposedly had rendered the land on which it stood too toxic to afford human habitation. The site subsequently became home to the aquarium, a key node in Charleston's tourist redevelopment. Rumors abound that luxury condos may also now be in the works for the site.

Next, the Gang of 200 will accuse us of defending segregated housing and opposing their proposal to integrate blacks into mixed income and mixed race neighborhoods. This does not withstand even a moment's scrutiny. Without doubt, many poor black people aspire to move to a "better neighborhood," and they should have the option to do so. If the Gang of 200 were serious about helping them, first on their policy agenda would be a proposal for massive enforcement of existing laws against housing discrimination, in order to drive a wedge through the wall of white segregation. The problem here is that relocation is being enacted through 1 The phrase negro removal is shorthand for a criticism of the racial dynamics of so-called urban renewal projects in the 1960s, and the saying "urban renewal or negro removal" is originally attributed to James Baldwin.

Liberal bad faith, cont'd ...

a state-sponsored resettlement policy, and notwithstanding promises for “traditional support services,” these poor families (and not all of them are poor!), will be relocated in poor, segregated neighborhoods. The only certain outcome is that New Orleans will be depleted of its poor black population in neighborhoods that are ripe for development.

It is astounding that the Gang of 200 do not see the expropriation of poor neighborhoods and the violation of human rights. And they remain strangely oblivious of their potential for playing into the hands of the retrograde political forces that would use their call to justify displacement. Well-intentioned, respectable scholars as they are, they live no less than anyone else within a political culture shaped largely by class experience and perception. And the poverty research industry, of which Wilson is an avatar and leading light, has been predicated for decades on the premise that poor people are defective, incapable of knowing their own best interests, that they are solely objects of social policy, never

its subjects. Worst of all, they provide liberal cover for those who have already put a resettlement policy into motion that is reactionary and racist at its core.

**This article first appeared in *Black Commentator*.

Adolph Reed is a noted author and professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania. He was Co-Chair of the Chicago Jobs With Justice Education Committee; serves on the board of Public Citizen, Inc.; is a member of the Interim National Council of the Labor Party; and national co-chair of the Labor Party's campaign for Free Higher Education. Prof. Reed can be contacted at alreed2@earthlink.net.

*Stephen Steinberg teaches in the Urban Studies Department at Queens College. His most recent book *Turning Back: The Retreat from Racial Justice in American Thought and Policy* received the Oliver Cromwell Cox Award for Distinguished Anti-Racist Scholarship. In addition to his scholarly publications,*

Which Side Are You On?: Public Housing, Racism, Sociology and the Struggle for Post-Katrina New Orleans

Jay Arena

Tulane University

"I see the need for accelerated self-reflection in sociology...The communities, colleges, universities agencies, companies, and other settings in which we practice sociology are shaped in part by the oppressive social relations of the larger society. We need a liberating and emancipating sociology that takes risks to counter these oppressive social relations in our own bailiwicks" (Joe Feagin, 2001, p. 13).

How is racism reproduced in the post-civil rights, post-[petty] apartheid, United States and what does Sociology have to do with it?

In this essay I look at, from the perspective of a ‘grass roots sociologist’ involved in the struggle for a just reconstruction of New Orleans, one expression of the new racism: the destruction of public housing, and displacement of communities, particularly as played out in pre and post-Katrina New Orleans. Consistent with Joe Feagin’s call for a ‘self renewal process’ within our

discipline, which he sees as central for forging a critical, social justice sociology, I highlight the role sociologists and sociology played legitimating this new form of ‘negro removal’ that drove thousands of mostly African America and Latino working class families from the U.S.’s increasingly desired central cities in the 1990s and 2000s. I conclude with how the local and national ruling class is using hurricane Katrina to further this displacement agenda, and the need for sociologists to speak out and not legitimate this agenda.

Hope VI and the New Racism

The Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) HOPE VI program was the linchpin of the Clinton administration’s 1990s reform effort to downsize and privatize public housing. In the name of deconcentrating poverty, liberating residents from ‘dense’ public housing arrangements, and creating ‘mixed income’ communities--combinations of market and subsidized renters--the federal government approved the elimination of over 70,000 low income, rent controlled, public housing apartments across the country through this program (NHLP 2002, p. 7). In

Which side are you on?, cont'd ...

addition, HOPE VI redevelopment further reduced the stock of affordable housing by accelerating gentrification in the neighborhoods surrounding the developments. Overwhelmingly African Americans, and other communities of color, bore the brunt of displacement (Popkin et al. 2004, p. 8).

Despite the way HOPE VI helped displace poor, working class, particularly, African Americans families, the program was sold by its liberal backers as an anti-poverty initiative. The intellectual foundations for making this claim is found, as both supporters and critics of the program acknowledge, in the work of renowned Sociologist William Julius Wilson. Creation of mixed income communities was a way, or so the argument went, to 'break up' the 'concentrated poverty' of public housing and the attendant social ills, particularly an underclass, ghetto culture, that perpetuates poverty. These arguments, drawn from Professor Wilson's works, were harnessed by the Democrats, that oversaw the program locally and nationally, and the developers that wanted to grab valuable public housing real estate, to carry out and legitimate a new round of 'negro removal'. The deconcentrating poverty mantra provided a convenient cover to avoid addressing serious anti-poverty, 'deconcentrating wealth' demands of unionization, living wages, national health care, and enforcement of fair housing rules. The substantive new racism of HOPE VI came dressed and legitimated in symbolic anti-racist, anti-poverty garb.

New Orleans and Public Housing 'Reform'

The Clinton administration's public housing reform hit New Orleans with particular ferocity. In the early 1990s the city had approximately 14,000 units of public housing, providing shelter for approximately 20% of the African American community. In the face of tenant demands for improved housing, jobs, and an end to police brutality, authorities responded with a massive demolition campaign. Between 1995 and 2005, the New Orleans public housing stock was halved, with no significant private sector affordable replacement.

One of the most egregious examples of this downsizing was the HOPE VI redevelopment of the former St. Thomas development. Originally encompassing 1,500 apartments, the St. Thomas was located along the city's riverfront, and at the center of the expanding tourism sector, the key part of the local economy and main producer of jobs.

St. Thomas residents did suffer from 'concentrated poverty'. Although many did have paid employment, over 90% of families had 'extremely low incomes'--below 30% of area median income. About 80% of families had incomes that placed them below the poverty line. Yet, local authorities did not respond to concentrated poverty by guaranteeing jobs at decent wages, with benefits, in the nearby tourist sector. In fact the local Democratic leadership, led by Mayor Marc Morial, opposed efforts to facilitate unionization--through so-called AFL-CIO labor peace agreements--of the city's hotels and restaurants. Furthermore, working with the hotel/restaurant lobby, the local government pulled out all stops to prevent passage of a living wage bill that would have raised the minimum wage \$1 for all private sector workers. The Mayor also worked to break a unionization drive of his own, low-waged, municipal workforce--40% of whom made less than the poverty level for a family of four.

Instead of addressing poverty by redistributing the wealth, it was done by redistributing the previous members of this low income, African American community. The 'redeveloped' St. Thomas, now called River Gardens and under private management, became a 'mixed income' community of almost 1200 units, of which less than 200 are public housing units, down from the original 1500. Promises of day care centers, tenant management and ownership, and right of return for former tenants--guarantees made by developers and government officials early on in the process-- were broken. Skyrocketing home values in the surrounding neighborhood--they rose 30% alone in the year after demolition plans were approved--drove more low income, mostly African American, renters from the city's increasingly desired--and unflooded-- riverfront

Prominent developers, such as Joseph Canizaro and his partners, who owned land near the former public housing development, made tens of millions in profits from the expulsion of the community. The development company, HRI, that led the privatization efforts also made handsome profits. Yet, the CEO of the company also invoked the work of Wilson to legitimate his efforts, one that drove hundreds of families from the area, as an antipoverty initiative and beneficial for low-income African Americans.

"The biggest impact I ever got was [from] the

Which side are you on?, cont'd ...

Julius Wilson book, Truly Disadvantaged...the loss of role models, and [that] we just got to break this [poor Black public housing communities] stuff up. That influenced me in everything that I'm doing, and I think I'm one of the few people that got it.... I guess what they don't understand in this town...what 10 housing projects, 50,000 people concentrated in an area, [what] that meant for a city. So ... that's my background.

"[Because] If you don't get a mixed income community, then Julius [Wilson] would tell you it ain't going to work...our mission is to create diverse, vibrant communities" (Interview with CEO of HRI, April 2004).

Public Housing and the Struggle for Post-Katrina New Orleans

Elimination of the city's remaining public housing developments has been a key component of elite efforts to restructure the city. HUD and the local housing authority, in the aftermath of the hurricane, have closed 5,000 of the city's 7,000 desperately needed, rent controlled, public housing apartments even though they are in better shape, generally, than the private housing stock. The ideas of mixed income communities and deconcentrating poverty, as was done before the storm, are being used to legitimate this agenda and prevent the return low income Black families to the city. Authorities, from HUD secretary Jackson, to Mayor Nagin, to Governor Blanco, have extolled the virtues of the 'mixed income success story' of St. Thomas and say this will be the model for any development that is reopened. They have argued it would be an injustice to allow people to return to these bastions of concentrated poverty.

In addition to mixed income ideology, public housing residents have faced, from both Democrats and Republicans, denigration as criminals and welfare cheats to justify their permanent expulsion. For example, City Councilman Oliver Thomas attacked residents as 'lazy soap opera watchers' that have to 'learn to do for self'. Nonetheless, despite these verbal attacks, and the steel doors and fences that authorities have erected at the developments, public housing residents have made a concerted and valiant effort to return to their homes. On April 4th, for example, exiled St. Bernard [not the parish] public housing development residents, many who had to drive in from Houston, and supporters, rallied to demand the reopening of their community. They then

led a march that ended in a clash with police as they tried to break down a chain fence and reclaim their homes. Residents of the now closed Lafitte development, composed of 900 well built apartments, that suffered very little flood damage, continue efforts to reoccupy their homes despite police arrests and intimidation.

Sociology, Politics, and New Orleans

As a public sociologist that understands this role as not simply giving lectures but being actively involved in taking sides and participating in the struggles of the communities we study, I have become acutely aware of the political implications of our work. I have seen, particularly over the last year, how ideas developed in the academy have had enormous impacts over the struggle for public housing, which is a key part of the larger class struggle for the city. Thus myself, and others in New Orleans' United Front for Affordable Housing, were elated when Reed and Steinberg published their critique of the mixed income ideology and the reactionary agenda it is being used to legitimate. We encourage other sociologists to speak out, and assist our movement by writing, as well as inviting us to speak at your campus or sending student volunteers to not simply mine the community for data, as many have done, but to assist in the day to day work involved in challenging the ethnic and class cleansing agenda. Finally, I realize that sociologists are not always able to control the ways their research, or arguments, are used. Thus, we call on sociologists, whose work is being used to destroy public housing in New Orleans and across the country, to speak out against the apparently wrong-headed ways their research is being used. Silence is consent.

References

Feagin, J. Social Justice and Sociology: Agendas for the Twenty-First Century, *American Sociological Review*, 66, 1, 1-20.

National Housing Law Project (NHLP). 2002. False Hope: A Critical Assessment of HOPE VI Public Housing Redevelopment Program. Washington, D.C.

Popkin, S., B. Katz, M. Cunningham, K. Brown, J. Gustafson, M. Turner. 2004. A Decade of HOPE VI: Research Findings and Policy Challenges. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute & The Brookings Institute.

The writer, and the United Front for Affordable Housing, can be reached at 504-520-9521, or email: jar-ena@tulane.edu

What's the "L" on Global Politics?

By **Alex Hicks**
Emory University

The Spring-2006 symposium on Douglas Massey's *Return of the "L" Word: A Liberal Vision for the New Century*, provides both deserved praise and a constructive criticism of Massey's vision so far as domestic politics and policy are concerned. However, Massey's discussion of global politics in his chapter entitled "Global Policies" goes mostly unaddressed in the symposium.

Perhaps this chapter is more debatable than the rest of Massey's book. Perhaps where global issues are concerned, I am simply less close to the sort of moderate, broadly status quo politics that finds expression in Massey's "L" Word" and Domhoff and Hochschild's responses to it. In either case, I think that a contestation of Massey "Global Policies" can add to the discussion of the Spring-2006 symposium

It's hard to get Massey's Chapter 6 in sufficient focus to gauge what agreement would mean. The chapter starts out with a nice review of the course and eventual breakdown and consequences of the "first wave" globalization, from 1800 to 1914. It considers not just WWI, but its flawed resolution and reactions to it, such as the Smoot-Hawley tariff resurgence and the Great Depression. It then follows with an account of the institutional constitution and economic course of the second half of the twentieth century that tends to present a rosy picture of globalization, despite some nuance regarding underemphasized sub-periods. For example, Massey writes that "during the last half of the twentieth century, as trade resumed and the global economy steadily expanded, the multilateral institutions created in the aftermath of World War two performed well" (pp.96). Further, he writes,

International trade and security enabled by multilateral institutions such as the UN, GATT and the WTO allowed development to spread faster and more widely than at any point in human history; despite widespread belief to the contrary, over the last quarter of the twentieth century general trade generally worked to close the gap between the rich and the poor nations. National economic growth during the postwar period was enabled by access to large markets and by the formation and deployment

of human capital." (pp. 96-97).

While a later section of the book does treat these matters more critically (referring to "structural adjustment" as "destructive" on p98), Massey stresses no links between the 1990s policy prescriptions of the Washington Consensus and the 1970s post-Keynesian shift in economic thought that stressed globalization and world markets over national economies and states (the post-Pinochet and OPEC shift from state to global market openness). Massey segregates his criticisms of globalization in the "Washington Consensus" section of Chapter 6 from a generally unqualified attribution of global progress in the "last half of the twentieth century." He attributes this progress to the forces of institutions such as the post-WW II "UN, GATT" duo and the neo-liberal-era WTO. He also makes the claim that "over the last quarter of the twentieth century general trade generally worked to close the gap between the rich and the poor nations" (p. 96). More extensive criticism would have been more enlightening.

On aggregate economic growth during the postwar period, presumably a half century in which the "global economy steadily expanded" and "development to spread faster and more widely than at any point in human history," (p. 96) the progressive worldwide slowdown of the growth of nations since the 1960s that is documented in Table 1 bears note.

Table 1: Per Capita GDP Growth, 1960-1999

	1960-70	1970-80	1980-99
Developing	3.1	2.8	1.5
Developed	3.9	2.4	2.2

Chang (2002: 132-134).

On "generally" closing "the gap between the rich and the poor nations over "the last quarter of the twentieth century," Milanovic (2006, Chap. 11) establishes that international inequality closes over these years only if one weighs nations by population, allowing Indian and Chinese growth to swamp aggregate figures. If one accounts for recent decades of increasing inequality within India and China by decomposing global household gini indexes of inequality into intra-national and extra-national components, no net, egalitarian, international trend survives.

Global Politics, cont'd ...

As for Massey's celebratory inventory of "Asian tigers" such as Taiwan, South Korea, Singapore, Hong Kong and Malaysia" that "joined the ranks of the developed nations" Milanovic's (2006, Chap. 7) discussion of the mobility of nations within the world economic order, 1960-2000, provides a bracing antidote. In 1960 there were 41 "countries as rich as Portugal and 22 contenders for such prosperity. By 2000 there were only 31 nations as rich as Portugal and 7 contenders. Of the 22 1960 contenders, only two, Singapore and Hong Kong, were "rich" in 2000, as were two 1978 contenders (Mauritius and Taiwan, plus the 1978 Third World nation, South Korea). In short, Massey's Asian tigers comprise most of Milanovic's handful of upwardly mobile success. As for Massey's examples of nations marked by "rapid improvements in the material living standards of millions," namely "command economies in Eastern Europe, China and South Asia," (p. 103) fall into a few types, according to Milanovic. These include the long-affluent (e.g., Slovenia), the downwardly-mobile into the Third World (e.g., Croatia, Hungary, Lithuania and Russia; the resolutely Third World Poland and Thailand) ;and the downwardly-mobile into Fourth World status (e.g., Latvia, Romania) of many Latin American and Asian and most African nations.

The broad implications for politics and policy are clear. The failings of the neo-liberal anti-developmentalism cannot be segregated from Massey's larger picture of economic change and multilateral institutions in the second half of the twentieth century. True, Massey's account of the "Washington Consensus" (pp. 97-102) and his prescriptions for a "Progressive Globalism" (pp. 110-116) do qualify his vision. However, they hardly justify neglect of the case for economic devolution in the last quarter of the twentieth century and since.

In his discussion of the spread of free trade, Massey conveys no sense of the near demise of developmental economics and of affirmative theories of the developmental state accompanying the ascent of the new classical economics underlying neo-liberal thought (McMichaels, 2000), nor any sense of the new interests in the developmental state (Chang, 2003; Chibber, 2003). In chastising the Washington consensus he conveys no sense of the possible net damage for economic growth and equality of IMF agreements (Vreeland, 2003; Barro and Lee 2005). Neither is the challenge presented to all extant global and national development strategies of the encroaching environmental crisis (Gray, 2006).

Post-World War II economic performance cannot be assessed without qualification for the post-Bretton Woods deterioration in economic performance. Brief criticism of the Washington Consensus cannot, like some causal estimate salvaged by the addition of a control whose absence had suppressed the true relation, redeem the poor economic performance of neo-liberal era. Massey's call for "Progressive Globalization," which is to say for fairer free trade, labor rights and IMF democratization, plus progressive U.S. leadership on these, surely is meant to direct us in an admirably progressive liberal direction (pp. 111-116). However, the last half century signals a need to promote a balance of national developmental policy and free trade in the spirit of the Asian Tigers. The call for labor rights offers no guidance among the antimonies of labor rights and cheap-labor advantage in the "developing" world. Call for IMF democratization sidesteps questions about the plausibility of a arm of core finance as the organization for global macro-economic regulation. The assertion that reforms "will require U.S. leadership" (p. 116) may be accurate, but it come without anygrappling with the difficulties of such a call to a nation marked by high agricultural protection, weak labor unions and powerful financial interests.

Of course, the current national political dialogue toward which Massey directs his endorsement of the "L" word is pretty much silent on global economic issues. Moreover, Massey attempts to articulate a view of global policies that can reconcile relatively academic analysis and pragmatic, action-oriented analysis. This is an admirable, even inspiring, goal, and more than I dare attempt here. Nevertheless, I cannot reconcile my self to Massey on "global policies." Although I am glad to proceed as political activist along lines quite consistent with Massey's Return of the "L" Word on most of the issues that it address, on global politics and polices I find more misdirection than assistance. Perhaps questions like those that I raise here can help stimulate efforts at painting a global political vision that lends itself to a liberal, US-based practice.

References

- Barro, Robert J. and Lee, John W. 2005. "IMF programs: Who is chosen and what are the effects?" *Journal of Monetary Economics* 52 (7): 1245-1269
OCT 2005
- Chang, Ha-Joon. 2002. *Kicking Away the Ladder*. London: anthem press.

Global Politics, cont'd ...

Chibber, Vivek. 2003. *Locked in Place*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton, University Press.

Domhoff, G. William. 2006. "Liberals and Leftists: Where Massey's Vision Falls Short." *Political Sociology: States, Power and Societies*, Volume 12, Number 2.

Hochschild, Jennifer L. 2006. "Are there Really No Hard Choices for Liberals?" *Political Sociology: States, Power and Societies*, Volume 12, Number 2.

McMichaels, Philip. 2000. *Development and Social Change*. Thousand oaks, CA: Pine Forge.

Massey, Douglas. 2005. *Return of the "L" Word : A Liberal Vision for the New Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton, University Press.

Milanovic, Branko. 2005. *Worlds Apart: Measuring International and Global Inequality*. Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press

Vreeland, James. 2003. *The IMF and Economic Development*. Cambridge ; New York : Cambridge University Press.

Alex Hicks can be reached at Ahicks@emory.edu.

HUD to New Orleans Poor: _Go F(ind) Yourself

by Bill Quigley

Loyola University, New Orleans School of Law

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has announced they plan to demolish over five thousand public housing apartments in New Orleans. In August 2005, HUD reported they had 7,381 public apartments in New Orleans. Now HUD says they now have 1000 apartments open and promise to repair and open another 1000 in a couple of months. After months of rumors, HUD confirmed their intention to demolish all the remaining apartments.

HUD's demolition plans leave thousands of families with no hope of returning to New Orleans where rental housing is scarce and costly. In New Orleans, public housing was occupied by women, mostly working, their children as well as the elderly and disabled. To these mothers and children, HUD Secretary Alphonso Jackson said: "Any New Orleans voucher recipient or public housing resident will be welcomed home." Exactly how people will be welcomed home, HUD did not say.

How can thousands of low-income working families come home if HUD has fenced off their apartments, put metal shutters over their windows and doors and are now plans to demolish their homes? Jackson, who is likely sleeping in his own bed, urged patience for the thousands who have been displaced since August of 2005: "Rebuilding and revitalizing public housing isn't something that will be done overnight."

Patience is in short supply in New Orleans as over 200,000 people remain displaced. "I just need somewhere to stay," Patricia Thomas told the Times-Pica-

yune. Ms. Thomas has lived in public housing for years. "We're losing our older people. They're dropping like flies when they hear they can't come home."

Demolition of public housing in New Orleans is not anew idea. When Katrina displaced New Orleans public housing residents, the Wall Street Journal reported U.S. Congressman Richard Baker, a 10 term Republican from Baton Rouge, telling lobbyists: "We finally cleaned up public housing in New Orleans. We couldn't do it, but God did." This demolition plan continues HUD's efforts to get out of the housing business. In 1996, New Orleans had 13,694 units of conventional public housing. Before Katrina, New Orleans was down to half that, 7,379 units of conventional public housing. If they are allowed to accelerate the demolition, public housing in New Orleans will have been reduced by 85% in the past decade.

The federal demolition of housing in New Orleans continues a nation-wide trend that has led some critics to suggest changing HUD's official name to the Department of Demolition of Public Housing. Much of the public housing demolition nationally comes through of a federal program titled 'Hope VI' - a cruelly misnamed program that destroys low income housing in the name of creating "mixed income housing."

Who can be against tearing down old public housing and replacing it with mixed income housing? Sounds like everyone should benefit doesn't it? Unfortunately that is not the case at all. Almost all the poor people involved are not in the mix. New Orleans has already

Go F(ind) Yourself (Housing)!, cont'd ...

experienced the tragic effects of HOPE VI. The St. Thomas Housing Development in the Irish Channel area of New Orleans was home to 1600 apartments of public housing. After St. Thomas was demolished under Hope VI, the area was called River Gardens. River Gardens is a mixed income community -home now to 60 low income families, some middle income apartments, a planned high income tower, and a tax-subsidized Wal-Mart! Our tax dollars at work -destroying not only low-income housing but neighborhood small businesses as well.

Worse yet, after Katrina, the 60 low-income families in River Gardens were not even allowed back into their apartments. They were told their apartments were needed for employees of the housing authority. It took the filing of a federal complaint by the Greater New Orleans Fair Housing Center to get the families back into their apartments.

As James Perry, Director of the Greater New Orleans Fair Housing Center says about the planned demolition of public housing, "If the model is River Gardens, it has failed miserably." Despite HUD's promise to demolish homes, the right of people to return to New Orleans is slowly being recognized as a human rights issue. According to international law, the victims of Katrina are "internally displaced persons" because they were displaced within their own country as a result of natural disaster. Principle 28 of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement requires that the U.S. government recognize the human right of displaced people to return home. The US must "allow internally displaced persons to return voluntarily, in safety and with dignity, to their homes or places of habitual residences. Such authorities shall facilitate the reintegration of returned or resettled internally displaced persons. Special efforts should be made to ensure the full participation of internally displaced persons in the planning and management of their return or resettlement and reintegration." The US Human Rights Network and other human rights advocates are educating people of the Gulf Coast and the nation about how to advocate for human rights. HUD has effectively told the people of New Orleans to go find housing for themselves. New Orleans already

has many, many people, including families, living in abandoned houses - houses without electricity or running water. New Orleans has recently been plagued with an increase in the number of fires. HUD sactions will put more families into these abandoned houses. Families in houses with no electricity or water should be a national disgrace in the richest nation in the history of the world. But for HUD and others with political and economic power this is apparently not the case.

As in the face of any injustice, there is resistance.

NAACP civil rights attorney Tracie Washington promised a legal challenge and told HUD, "You cannot go forward and we will not allow you to go forward."

Most importantly, displaced residents of public housing and their allies have set up a tent city survivors village outside the fenced off 1300 empty apartments on St. Bernard Avenue in New Orleans. If the authorities do not open up the apartments by July 4, they pledge to go through the fences and liberate their homes directly. The group, the United Front for Affordable Housing, is committed to resisting HUD's efforts to bulldoze their apartments by any means necessary. If the government told you that they were going to bulldoze where you live, and deny you the right to return to your home, would you join them?

Bill Quigley is a human rights lawyer and professor at Loyola University New Orleans School of Law. You can reach him at Quigley@loyno.edu.

[For more information about the July 4 protest by the United Front for Affordable Housing, call Endesha Juakali at 504.239.2907, Elizabeth Cook 504.319.3564, or Ishmael Muhammad at 504.872.9521. If you know someone who is a displaced New Orleans public housing resident and they want to join in a challenge to HUD's actions, they can get more information at www.justiceforneworleans.org; For more information on the human rights campaigns for Katrina victims, see the US Human Rights Network at www.ushrnetwork.org or the National Economic and Social Rights Initiative, www.nesri.org.]

Interview with Xavier Briggs, cont'd from page 1

housing the opportunity to relocate to low poverty neighborhoods using subsidies (vouchers) in the private rental market. It was launched by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in metro Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, L.A., and New York City in 1994, and the participating families have been tracked ever since. The aim is to see if relocation and a shift in neighborhood context have a measurable impact on the well-being and prospects of those families. So MTO is a well-studied experiment in “assisted housing mobility,” but there are dozens of such efforts, run with less fanfare and study, across the country. Many go back to the late 60s and the post-riot commissions on ghetto poverty and racial divides in America.

What were the intentions behind the “Moving to Opportunity in the wake of Katrina” scholar’s petition that was posted on the ASA urban sociology listserv?

Our main aim was to make clear that there is serious science to support a structured effort to help vulnerable families live in the most secure and opportunity rich places possible. I drafted the petition, and the student-run think tank that sponsored it recruited fellow sociologists Christopher Jencks and William Julius Wilson to co-sign as principal authors. But then we also recruited economist Lawrence Katz, and by the time the petition had circulated for a few weeks, there were over 176 well-respected signatories representing all the major social science disciplines and a host of allied fields, such as urban planning and public health, as well.

We weren’t naïve about the politics of response. In the wake of Katrina, it seemed—and has proven to be the case—that the federal government and other players had no strategy for addressing the issues outlined in our petition—or even for meeting the more basic standard of humane relocation. The contrast with the 1994 Northridge earthquake is stunning, especially for those of us who worked in the Clinton administration. HUD was responsive and creative then; it worked quickly to optimize the housing and neighborhood outcomes for people displaced. Today, it’s a different agency in a different administration, of course.

How do you respond to the Reed and Steinberg’s assertion that moving-to-opportunity proposals for New Orleans will target the black poor for resettlement while enabling mostly white middle and

upper classes to gain control of prime real estate as well as enabling politicians to establish a whiter electorate?

It’s a polemic to which we haven’t responded, except for this conversation with you. We offered assisted mobility as an option, and it’s one that focuses on the most vulnerable families, who tend to be black and very, very poor. It’s a conception of housing beyond shelter, housing as a tool for access to resources. Yet Reed and Steinberg caricatured our argument as a plan to “resettle the black masses,” to empty out the city. New Orleans had some communities that probably should not be rebuilt as they were, but we didn’t enter into that debate, and one can both rebuild and resettle creatively.

Mobility programs, I should add, can be run on a small scale, say for a few hundred or a few thousand very disadvantaged families. They don’t target entire racial groups or even entire neighborhoods. There’s one valid critique of efforts that would undermine repopulation of New Orleans by those displaced, though it isn’t a critique of well-targeted relocation programs. That critique, it seems to me, is a cultural one: To preserve and enrich New Orleans’s distinctive culture, you need the producers of that culture—the natives—to return in sufficient numbers. I certainly don’t want to see a denatured theme park version of the city and its culture emerge. Terry Nichols Clark’s new book, *The Entertainment City*, shows why mayors and developers have moved so aggressively in that direction, commodifying urban culture—and few have the raze-and-rebuild opportunity that Katrina generated.

Are Moving to Opportunity-type programs anti-theoretical to advocacy for right of return?

Not at all. But the right-to-return principle will be meaningless without specific legal protections and creative community development, such as “land banking” in attractive neighborhoods—all of which will take some time to play out. In an op-ed for the *Boston Globe*, Margery Austin Turner and I outlined why assisted mobility programs can and should complement aggressive, inclusionary rebuilding and resettlement, and we warned about land grabs by the well off and well-positioned. But again, as a practical matter, Katrina relocatees have to live elsewhere, at least for a time.

Interview with Xavier Briggs, cont'd ...

And the odds are that some will find Houston and other comparatively job-rich cities to be a welcome alternative to going home, at least in the short to medium term. The biggest issue in rebuilding right now, I think, is the need to house the workforce that is doing the rebuilding and beginning to regenerate a local consumer economy, i.e. beyond tourism. Many of the black poor can't return to their homes—they're uninhabitable—and they don't have any livelihood options in New Orleans. It's disingenuous to romanticize all of their former communities as cohesive and supportive and ready to be re-occupied. Some of the neighborhoods were dangerous, divided, jobless places with people barely scraping by. They need not be rebuilt as they were, not under some polemic about displacement or any other banner.

How do you respond to Reed and Steinberg's criticism that breaking up concentrated poverty through mobility programs fails to address the root causes of poverty?

It was poorly stated—another caricature—but it's essentially correct. Relocation alone is not a solution to "root causes." We never presented it as such. But it's also inadequate, it seems to me, to discuss social policy under hypothetical conditions of massive public support for social investment in the poorest people and their neighborhoods. We can build up people and places both, but we will probably never be able to act collectively on our problems in the state of persistently high race and class segregation that the worst ghettos represent. Ghettos are not natural agglomerations of people. They're created by barriers to housing choice, and they reinforce cycles of despair and failure. There are strengths in them, to be sure, among people who support each other against the odds, and there are ways to build on those strengths. But the choice between, say, expanding housing choice and attacking racial discrimination in the labor market (or overhauling our political structure to make it more inclusionary and accountable to the marginalized) is a silly, false choice.

What would the logistics of resettlement choices look like? How voluntary are resettlement options in a socio-political context of intense economic constraints?

The basics are counseling, search assistance, and cultivating landlords or otherwise generating "locations." These are all labor intensive, and we have

ample evidence that doing them on the cheap or on the fly is disastrous: The most vulnerable families can fall between the cracks and face tougher challenges after relocating. Done well, families can excel. But assisted relocation isn't for everyone. Some families need intensive services on site, and some would not be welcomed by private landlords or others in the mainstream housing market, for example because of criminal records or addiction problems in the household.

What are the pitfalls of state-sponsored Moving to Opportunity-type programs as you see them? Are there vulnerabilities to misuse by power-hungry politicians as Reed and Steinberg assert?

The politicians simply aren't very interested in these programs, though a number of prominent journalists, such as David Brooks, tried to lobby for them in the weeks after Katrina. But perhaps that's a cop-out on my part. I can't evade the question just because MTO-type programs are so politically invisible. The concern that poverty "deconcentration" programs will break up blocs of minority voters goes back to the 60s, back when there really were debates about bold, at-scale responses to urban problems. We don't have those debates any more. But again, the aim of these programs is to reduce dangerous levels of poverty concentration and racial isolation, not to move everyone out. The programs have never functioned on a scale that threatened very significant demographic change in neighborhoods or the political make-up of cities. And there's evidence that assisted relocation programs can work hand in hand with well-designed community redevelopment initiatives.

The federal HOPE VI program redevelops public housing to become mixed-income developments. That requires relocating the original residents so that the old projects can be demolished. Sue Popkin of The Urban Institute has outlined what it takes to serve the "hard to house" (the most vulnerable and at risk) in these transitions. On the international front, the World Bank, working with organizations accountable to the urban poor (such as slum dwellers) has developed guidelines for humane relocation and resettlement, including models for developing effective new communities and/or redeveloping older ones for new functions.

What about the current proposals to demolish more than 50 percent of the existing public housing in

Interview with Xavier Briggs, cont'd ...

New Orleans?

Before the storm, some of the New Orleans public housing projects were infamously distressed—among the most crime-ridden and socially dysfunctional places in the city—but others were, and I’m told are, in decent shape. The most important thing is to replace the supply of units affordable to very low income people. There may be strong reasons not to rebuild, and even to demolish, particular public housing developments. I don’t have much faith in the current HUD leadership, but I wouldn’t dismiss the proposal on that basis alone.

How about the public discussion about reconstruction after Katrina? What needs to be part of the discussion? What of the civic participation of the poor?

In the latest issue of the ASA’s urban journal, *City & Community*, I outlined some ideas on this, along with realities about housing and jobs in an urban economy that was essentially shut down entirely and now needs to be “rebooted.” Nationally, we need a serious discussion about economic inequality, in particular wage levels and health and other benefits. We can and should both reduce poverty and work to make it less devastating for those who have to experience it, especially for long periods of time. MTO, by the way, is at minimum an important tool for the latter, by buffering poor folks from the riskiest places and so making the positive, inclusionary development of those places viable again. John Edwards and a handful of other political leaders seem willing to try to compel that important conversation.

In the Gulf Coast region, there ought to be a public discussion of the economic future, with the poor as a part of it. New Orleans had been losing population and stagnating economically for years, for example. In the city itself, there are many more specific issues about inclusionary reconstruction, generating jobs and connecting the least able to them in viable ways, overhauling the failing public schools. The State of Louisiana has invested some effort in rethinking policy in these areas, and the State has some resources. The city is still a fiscal mess and has long lacked much control over key policy levers. So this is a level of government question, too. It would be wonderful if the region around New Orleans assumed some responsibility for its fate, but that hasn’t been the way of America’s suburbs, of course. What I wouldn’t do is a massive community participation exer-

cise on every aspect of reconstruction. Engage various publics, including the urban poor along the “Katrina diaspora” in developing some big priorities, clarify for people the market and fiscal realities that confront the city and its people, and then plan while doing.

Everything about the city’s community organizations needs strengthening vis-a-vis the challenges of post-storm planning and redevelopment, and funders, front-line organizers and service providers, and researchers have been working intensively in this area for the past two decades. Chaskin et al’s *Building Community Capacity* (2001) is an excellent source on the multiple dimensions of this kind of work, which is hard to fund, hard to do, and hard to measure well. So is Gitell and Vidal’s *Community Organizing: Social Capital as a Development Strategy*, which explores the challenges associated with creating new goal-oriented networks and capable organizations where they don’t exist. The recent *Urban Affairs Review* issue featuring insightful political analyses of New Orleans before and after the storm is likewise a good source. Burns and Thomas argue, for example, that New Orleans was a “regimeless” city lacking durable mechanisms of cooperation between elites and nonelites—or grasstops and grassroots. The institutional backbone of black New Orleans, for example, was in shoestring cultural organizations and a few churches, not organizations with bricks-and-mortar community development capacity and experience, nor much in the way of political clout to redirect outcomes or shape local political agendas.

We know a great deal about what works, and signs are that the most vulnerable New Orleanians need community organizations strengthened so that they can play some meaningful role in reconstruction. Otherwise, the city’s traditional patron-client politics will replay as usual—at entirely new levels of exclusion. Reed and Steinberg were right to worry about that.

Xavier de Souza Briggs teaches at the Kennedy School of Government of Harvard University.

The Immigrant Challenge

By Aldon Morris, Northwestern University
Dan Clawson, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

A new immigrant movement is roaring through major American cities. It has mobilized masses of immigrants who protest for citizenship rights, decent wages, and educational opportunities. The movement has launched multiple marches of half a million, a million, or more, while framing itself as the new civil rights movement and modeling its protests after the famous Black campaigns of the 1950s and 60s. The movement draws on the nation's historic image as a melting pot of immigrant groups, and its participants consist of some of the nation's poorest and most vulnerable souls, many of whom are classified as illegal undocumented aliens.

We'd like to take this opportunity to pose what we know are, from the point of the left in sociology, several contrarian and suspect questions, issues we think sociologists and the left need to at least debate.

Move people to the United States, or development to the Global South? Much of the poverty of the Global South originated from centuries of slavery and exploitation imposed by the West. Should our focus be on people's right to move anywhere at any time, or on people's right to live at least at a decent subsistence level wherever they may be? Many migrants prefer to remain in their countries of origin, if they could land decent jobs. Should we not be challenged to think how much could be done by rich countries for comparatively limited amounts? In the world there are 1.2 billion people living on \$1 a day or less, and 2.7 billion living on \$2 a day or less. To raise the incomes of all those people up to \$2 a day would require 1% of the income of people in affluent countries. That is, a 1% tax rate (across all rich countries) and income transfer to the poor could more than double the income for more than a billion people, and would significantly raise incomes for another billion and a half. Making this work would involve enormous technical-delivery problems, but there is no reason the tax could not be 2% or even, can we imagine it, 3%. Of course we need more than simple income transfers: we need a variety of structural changes, including controls on capital and guarantees of worker rights.

Unlimited migration may benefit individual migrants. It is far from clear that it necessarily aids the sending countries. Remittances are a major source of

income, but the drain of some of the most energetic and talented members of foreign countries involve significant costs. It impoverishes families, health care, education and the drive toward self sufficiency.

Will African Americans pay disproportionate costs? Migration has the potential to impose greater costs on two specific groups: African Americans and union workers. Economists and policy makers agree that immigration reduces African American incomes especially among the poor, but they qualify this by adding that such decreases are marginal; in one leading study, a reduction of eight percent. Put this issue in perspective: the average faculty member has a much larger cushion than the average low-income African American. How would faculty react to a proposed pay cut of say eight percent? Moreover, how would they react if that pay cut could be attributed to a specifiable group (say, an expansion in the use of non-tenure-track faculty)? Additionally, there is a non-trivial possibility that decades from now, today's immigrants will have prospered while African Americans remain at the bottom on a range of social indicators. This is a real possibility given the tendency of employers to systematically favor immigrants over African Americans and given white Americans' preference not to work and socialize with Blacks.

Unions? Unlimited immigration also imposes special challenges for labor unions. On the one hand, many of the most impressive union victories of recent years have been based among immigrant workers. On the other hand, tight labor markets help workers. The US Chamber of Commerce, the Associated General Contractors, and many employer groups strongly support more immigration. While progressives view immigrants in social justice terms, it should be remembered that many large corporations support migration to the extent of aiding migrants to illegally cross the border and to approve days off for them to protest. They are well aware that immigrant workers can be exploited economically and used against unionization because of their vulnerability and precarious legal status. Support for immigration is a messy political business consisting of an unholy alliance between fat cats and the downtrodden.

No limits on migration? The key to most labor union activity is restricting the supply of labor. Most progressive initiatives depend on collective decisions to restrict individual choices. Thus when a collective decision on a minimum wage is made we do not (legally) permit

The Immigrant Challenge, cont'd ...

individuals to choose to work for less, recognizing that such “freedom” would drive down wages for all workers. If workers fight to improve conditions, to go on strike, we condemn those who take strikers’ jobs.

Why then, does it seem mandatory to support individuals’ right to migrate whenever and wherever they like? If the legalization of all immigrants currently residing in the United States should be supported is there any policy, involving any restriction on future migration, that warrants support? Or is our position to be: Since we have been unable to impose meaningful controls on capital, or working conditions, or guarantees of workers’ rights, in either the United States or the rest of the world, therefore we will shift our efforts from collective solutions and demand that if capital is free to move wherever it wants, on whatever conditions it wants, then individuals should be as well? Will that create the kind of world we want to see, or should we be promoting a vision of collective decisions to create equality and decent conditions for all?

African Americans and union workers need to avoid scapegoating immigrants, who obviously did not cause African Americans’ or unions’ problems. Black people have been continuously exploited and oppressed for centuries before the emergence of the new immigrant movement. American unions have been in serious trouble and on the brink of near total elimination for many years. The real trick is to identify the common ground which the three groups occupy. That ground includes wages, working conditions and the ability to be free, in a society that exploits the poor and people of color and throws up roadblocks for those who would organize for a more equitable distribution of resources. One example of common ground in terms of working conditions will suffice. An organizer working to build a union among immigrant workers of Nebraska Beef complained, “people weren’t getting bathroom

breaks, and even urinated in their clothes on the line.” Meanwhile, across the country in Mississippi a union organizer attempting to organize poor Black women into a union at a Delta Pride catfish plant relates that “workers had to ask for permission to relieve themselves. Often, they were refused. Tales of grown women and men urinating on the processing line (or wearing diapers as a precaution) were common.” These are the kind of conditions at the center of both groups’ union organizing and they are the nitty gritty issues capable of forging coalitions between immigrants and America’s other locked out groups.

What coalitions? Progressive politics will be shaped by the coalitions that form, or the gaps created, between unions, African Americans, and immigrants. Unions could embrace immigrants and neglect African Americans; African Americans can support or oppose new immigrant groups. But immigrants are also challenged to build coalitions with their natural allies. They will need to ignore the convenient claim that African Americans are on the bottom because they lack a work ethic. Immigrants will need to examine whether they seek a shallow assimilation route into American society by attempting to whiten their identity and serve as a brown model minority. It is possible that the work of building a mass movement in America and learning from the protest tradition of Black Americans will point the immigrant community to a path that seeks social justice for all. That is the vision that could help to lift all boats stuck at the bottom. We need to continue to ask the hard questions that will help to illuminate this path.

Dan Clawson can be reached at clawson@sadri.umass.edu

Got something to say? Share it with us!
Send letters or articles to:
polsoc@soc.umass.edu

Political Sociology 2006 Section Awards!

Political Sociology Best Book Award Winner

(Joya Misra, chair, Marion Fourcade-Gourinchas, Diane Davis, Robert Fishman, Neil Brenner)

Winner: Eiko Ikegami's *Bonds of Civility: Aesthetic Networks and the Political Origins of Japanese Culture* (Cambridge).

Eiko Ikegami's *Bonds of Civility* is a book of great beauty and intellectual sophistication that pushes the boundaries in political sociology by linking arts and aesthetics to state formation, politics, and state-civil society relations. This pioneering book offers major conceptual innovations, a wealth of rich historical scholarship, and a finely crafted theoretical analysis all of which are put to work in elaborating a complex argument of major significance. In the book, Ikegami demonstrates the emergence of a distinctive style of aesthetic socialization during Japan's Tokugawa period that compensated for the shogunate's meticulous segmentation of civil society. At essence, *Bonds Of Civility* shows how boundary-crossing social networks focused on cultural production and practice rearranged the structures of social connection and hierarchy as well as the communicative style of Japanese society with wide ranging consequences for that country's political and social orders. The committee found the book to be the most complex, nuanced, and scholarly of thirty books we reviewed for the prize. We are certain that this outstanding work will have a great impact on the wider field – as well as within the subfield of political sociology.

Honorable Mention: Georgi Derlugian's *Bourdieu's Secret Admirer in the Caucasus: A World-Systems Biography* (Chicago)

Georgi Derlugian's *Bourdieu's Secret Admirer in the Caucasus: A World-Systems Biography* is a complex, innovative, ambitious and groundbreaking work, which links an ethnography/biography to a larger argument about state (de)formation and globalization. In the book, Derlugian traces the life story of Musa Shanib, an intellectual revolutionary who in the post-Soviet period becomes a nationalist warlord, in order to understand "why and how. . . the end of Soviet developmentalism produce[d] ethnic violence." The book shares important new knowledge on the break-up of the Soviet Union and the rise of Islamic militancy, while brilliantly drawing on the insights of Pierre Bourdieu, Charles Tilly, and Immanuel Wallerstein. As a skilled theoretician interested in applying conceptual frameworks to a host of crucial problems –including globalization, democratization, nationalism, and terrorism – Derlugian's contribution should be applauded.

Political Sociology Best Article or Chapter

(Barb Brents, chair, Nicola Beisel, Donald W. Light, Tim Bartley)

Co-Winner: Douglas Hartmann and Joseph Gerteis, "Dealing with Diversity: Mapping Multiculturalism in Sociological Terms." *Sociological Theory* 23(2):218-240, June, 2005.

The Hartmann and Gerteis paper is a very important paper for thinking about the scholarly literature on immigration and multiculturalism and the current political debate about immigration. By disentangling the cultural and social basis of social cohesion, Hartmann and Gerteis have used the immigration debate to speak to the central issue in sociology - what a society is and what holds it together. This paper provides an extraordinarily well worked out set of dimensions and distinctions that organize and clarify the whole field of multiculturalism. Their model allows researchers or interest groups to move beyond discussions about which kind of multiculturalism is more "progressive" to what are the cultural and structural trade offs.

Co-Winner: Monica Prasad, "Why is France So French? Culture, Institutions and Neoliberalism, 1974-1981." *AJS* 11(2): 357-407, September 2005.

Awards, cont'd ...

Prasad's article is an impressive piece of scholarship and well written. It demonstrates that explaining the "decline of the state" and the rise of neoliberalism does not have to mean getting rid of state-centered theoretical approaches. In fact, the paper provides a nice illustration of what Saskia Sassen has called the state "incorporating the global project of its own shrinking role." It develops a careful analysis of how the character of French political institutions (as contrasted with the U.S.) shaped policy innovation. The paper also shows that instead of state fragmentation only producing veto points that stifle policy change, fragmentation can also produce a particular style of innovation led by upstart policy entrepreneurs. Finally, her point that early points of innovation may be as important as later points of "lock-in" furthers ideas about path dependence in a way that increases the tools political sociologists have for making sense of how history matters.

Political Sociology, Graduate Student Paper Prize

(Steve Pfaff, chair, Gwen Moore, David Fitzgerald, Michael Mulcahy)

Winner: Jon Agnone (University of Washington), "Amplifying Public Opinion: The Policy Impact of the U.S. Environmental Movement"

After two rounds of thorough review by all committee members, our winner is Jon Agnone from the University of Washington. Jon's paper "Amplifying Public Opinion: The Policy Impact of the U.S. Environmental Movement", is an important piece of scholarship in the field of political sociology that deserves to be published, widely read, and cited extensively by everyone interested in the relationship between social movements and legislative outcomes in advanced democracies. All agreed, as one reviewer put it, that it was "a well-done empirical analysis of the impact of protest and public opinion on policy-making". Specifically, reviewers extolled the paper's theoretical clarity and empirical analysis. One noted, "The paper pulls together an impressive dataset to address a key area of social movement research: the relations between public opinion, protest, and policy change. I was particularly impressed by the methodological virtuosity of the paper, and the use of data and methods to contribute to theoretical development." Another stated, "He [Agnone] takes on the contentious issue of the impact of social movements... His analysis of the passage of environmental legislation from 1960-1998 is a sophisticated effort to see how protest might have direct or indirect effects on the political process. Theoretically, his amplification model of policy impact is persuasive and the sophisticated statistical analysis yields evidence in support of it."

Honorable Mention: Brian Dill (University of Minnesota), "Under(developing) Democracy: Mechanisms of Association in Tanzania"

Very narrowly in second place to Agnone's paper was a fascinating piece of political ethnography by Brian Dill of the University of Minnesota entitled "Under(Developing) Democracy: Mechanisms of Association in Tanzania." The committee was unanimous in suggesting that this second-place winner be distinguished with an "Honorable Mention" for the excellence of his submission. Reviewers were impressed by the paper's "broad and deep analysis of the formation of voluntary associations in Tanzania and their relationship to the state." It was regarded as "an important corrective to existing models" and praised for its "extensive observational fieldwork and good sense for inequality and the limits of political mobilization in a developing society." Reviewers also saw Dill's paper as a noteworthy contribution to an emerging public sociology, with one reviewer observing "This paper addresses important theoretical and practical issues, based on fascinating data from extended fieldwork. I found the argument compelling, and the data very impressive" and noting its "contribution to the development of public sociology(s)." Finally, reviewers were united in praising Dill's paper for its impressive fieldwork "fraught with risks and challenges" and which departed from sociology's "well-marked trail".

Section Officers, 2005-2006

Chair: Ann Shola Orloff
Northwestern University
a-orloff@northwestern.edu

Chair-Elect: John F. Myles
University of Toronto

Past Chair: Elisabeth S. Clemens
University of Chicago

Secretary-Treasurer: Lynne Allison Haney
New York University

Newsletter Editor: Gianpaolo Baiocchi,
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
baiocchi@soc.umass.edu
Please send submissions to: polSOC@soc.umass.edu.

Website Editor: John Dale
George Mason University
anthrosoc@gmu.edu

Section Council

Barbara G. Brents
University of Nevada - Las Vegas

Greta R. Krippner
University of California - Los Angeles

Donald W. Light
Princeton University

Gwen Moore
SUNY-Albany

Pamela M. Paxton
Ohio State University

Steven Pfaff
University of Washington
