

**What Works:
Cost-Effective Investments in
African American Men, Youth and Children**

**Testimony Before the
Black Congressional Caucus**

State of the African-American Male Conference

**Lynn A. Curtis
President and CEO
Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation
Washington, DC**

November 15, 2003

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Summary | 1 |
| Trends | 1 |
| What Doesn't Work? | 11 |
| What Works? | 18 |
| National Policy | 30 |
| The Boys in the Hood or the Boys on the Hill? | 37 |
| Campaign Finance Reform | 39 |
| Voter Democracy Reform | 40 |
| Communicating What Works | 46 |
| Common Ground for Political Alliance | 46 |
| September 11 | 49 |
| Notes and Sources | 54 |

If we seize the opportunity to build a stronger country, we will ultimately prevail in the challenges ahead, at home and abroad. But we cannot win this new struggle by military might alone. We will prevail only if we lead by example, as a democracy committed to the rule of law and the spirit of fairness whose corporate and political elites recognize that it isn't only firefighters and police who are called upon to sacrifice.

Bill Moyers
The Nation
November 19, 2001

Summary

In the late 1960s after the big-city riots in America, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (the Kerner Riot Commission) and the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence (the National Violence Commission) submitted their final reports to President Johnson. With an eye to the future of the African American male, I would like to summarize trends in race, poverty, inequality, crime, prison building and justice in America since the Kerner Commission and Violence Commission, point out policy for the inner city and the truly disadvantaged that has and has not worked, and suggest ways in which we can overcome the disconnect in America between knowledge and action, by replicating what works to scale in politically feasible ways.

Trends¹

Since the 1960s, there have been many indicators of progress for the truly disadvantaged in America. For example, among African-Americans and Hispanics, the middle class has expanded; entrepreneurship has increased and there has been a dramatic rise in the number of

locally elected officials.

Yet there are many more negatives than positives.

In the 1990s, poverty and crime decreased, the economy and job creation were robust, large federal budget surpluses emerged, there was peace and the leaders of the nation won the popular vote.

But the new millennium ushered in a sharp reversal. In 2000, a president was elected who lost the popular vote by over 500,000 votes. In 2001 and 2002, crime and poverty increased. In 2003, America went to war. As a result of that war and of enormous tax breaks to the rich, a joint report by the Committee for Economic Development (a business group), the bipartisan Concord Coalition and the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities concluded that, with continuation of current policies, the record federal debt would rise by \$5 trillion over the next decade. In spite of recent upward trends, as of November, 2003, the number of payroll jobs was 2.4 million lower than in March, 2001, with minorities the hardest hit, as always.

Income: The Superrich and the Rest of America

The rich continue to get richer, at the expense of the rest of America -- middle income, working-level income and poor citizens.

Over the last two decades, there has been an extraordinary increase in the income of the top 1 percent of the population -- at the expense of the rest of us.

During the 1980s, and its trickle down, supply-side economics, the rich got richer and the poor got poorer. The working class also got poorer. The middle class stayed the same, so it lost ground to the rich.

During the 1990s, the large income gaps of the 1980s actually widened. The incomes of the best-off Americans rose twice as fast as those of middle-income Americans, according to the Congressional Budget Office. The gap between rich and working income Americans rose even more. In Washington, DC during the overall economic boom from 1990 to 1999, income in rich (80th percentile) households increased by 8 percent, in middle class (median) households increased by 5 percent and in poor (20th percentile) decreased by 1 percent. The federal government said little about this growing inequality in the 1990s, preferring instead to boast about poverty reductions.

Overall, in the eighties, the top one percent received eight percent of all the nation's income. By the end of the 1990s, the top one percent received fifteen percent of all the nation's income. This is more than the combined income received by the 100 million people with the lowest incomes in America.

In 1980, the average corporate CEO earned 42 times as much as the average factory worker. We know that by the new millennium, and after the union busting of the 1980s, the

average corporate CEO earned 419 times as much as the average worker.

Today, as a result of government breaks to the rich and corporate welfare, conservative Kevin Phillips can write of a “second gilded age” in which the top one-fifth of American households earn over half the income, while the share of the one-fifth of American households earns over half the income, while the share of the one-fifth with the lowest income has fallen.

In America, the top fifth makes 11 times more than those in the bottom fifth; in Japan, the top fifth only makes about four times as much.

Income differences between the haves and the have-nots are growing faster in America than in any industrialized democracy. In countries where reliable information exists, the United States is second only to Russia in having the smallest middle class and highest poverty rates.

At the same time, the poor have been told to pull themselves up by their free enterprise bootstraps through “work first” – without meaningful job training, job creation and child care.

Wealth: The Superich and the Rest of America

Wealth is even more concentrated among the superich than income.

Just one percent of Americans owns 50 percent of financial wealth. Just five percent of

Americans owns 70 percent of financial wealth.

The average level of wealth of an African-American family in America today is about one-tenth of an average white family. Wealth inequality is much worse in the United States than in countries traditionally thought of as “class ridden,” like the United Kingdom.

In particular, the increase in wealth inequality during the Reagan years was unprecedented. The only comparable period in America in the twentieth century was 1922-1929, before the Great Depression. During the 1980s, 99 percent of the wealth gained went to the top 20 percent of wealth holders in America -- and the top one percent gained 62 percent of that. The median wealth of nonwhite American citizens actually fell during the 1980s.

As conservative Kevin Phillips has written, the wealth and greed of the super rich in America today proceeds far beyond the excesses that President Theodore Roosevelt fought against. The top two percent live in a world profoundly different from almost all Americans. Homes cost \$5 to \$10 million -- in communities separated from America by gates, guards, walls and distance. It is a world “where \$5,000 grills, \$3,000 alligator-skin shoes, \$17,500 Patek Phillippe wristwatches, \$63,000 Lexus LX470 sport-utility vehicles and \$14,000 Hermes Kelly handbags are commonplace.”

In this world, millions of dollars casually are shifted into the pockets of the elites as part

of “business as usual” corporate practice. The golden parachute of retired General Electric CEO Jack Welch stands out among the many corporate greed scandals that have come to light. Welch negotiated \$1,414,528 a month, even though his net worth was about \$456M. The retirement package also include a \$86,000 per year retainer for “consulting services,” use of General Electric aircraft and a Manhattan apartment.

Taxes: The Superich and the Rest of America

Much of the increasing income and wealth gap between the superich and the rest of America has been the result of federal tax cuts on the rich and on corporations.

Individual federal tax rates on the richest Americans has declined dramatically over the last 50 years. During the Eisenhower administration, the top marginal tax rate was 91 percent. In the late sixties and the seventies, it was 70 percent. In the mid-eighties it was 50 percent and scheduled to drop to 35 percent by 2006.

Corporate federal tax rates also have declined dramatically over the last 50 years. During the Eisenhower administration, corporations paid an average of 25 percent of the federal tax bill. By 2001, they paid seven percent.

During the same 50 years when taxes on the rich and corporations declined precipitously, investments in public infrastructure declined, so that the United States now has the lowest percentage of GDP invested in public infrastructure of any industrialized democracy. This lack of public

investment, for example in airport security and public health, has helped make America vulnerable to terrorist attacks.

While taxes on the rich and corporations have been declining, taxes on the poor and the middle class have been increasing. For example, at the federal level, taxes on the poorest fifth of the population increased by 10 percent in the 1980s. At the state and local levels, middle-and-low-income families are taxed far more heavily than the wealthy, according to a new study by the Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy. Nationwide, poor families pay over 11 percent of their earnings in state and local taxes, middle-income families almost 10 percent and the richest families just over five percent. Since 1989, state and local taxes have risen for low-and-middle-income taxpayers and fallen for the wealthiest.

Education

What about education?

We know that corporate CEOs make 264 times as much as public school teachers. In the 1960s, corporate CEOs made only a trifling 40 times as much.

We know that today the states spend more on prison building than on higher education, whereas 20 years ago, the opposite was true.

We know that, according to Gary Orfield and his colleagues at the Harvard School of Education, America is resegregating in its neighborhoods and schools. Over two-thirds of all African-American and Hispanic students in urban areas attend predominantly segregated schools. Over two-thirds of those students cannot achieve minimally acceptable scores on standardized tests.

There is ample scientific evidence on what is needed to improve public schools -- such as smaller class sizes, improved training of teachers and well-equipped facilities -- but the federal government refuses to finance these improvements. Instead, as a result of declining tax revenue, many public school districts across the nation are reducing the length of the school year and reducing staff.

Prison Building and Housing

We know that in the 1980s, prison building became our national housing policy for the poor. We more than quadrupled the number of prison cells, while at the same time we reduced appropriations for housing the poor at the federal level by over 80 percent. The sound bite in America today is “two million in the new millennium.” That is the number of people incarcerated in America.

We know that, in the early 1990s, one out of every four young African-American men in America was in prison, on probation or on parole at any one time, according to the Sentencing Project in Washington, DC. That is a stunning statistic. Yet today *one out of every three* young African-American men is in prison, on probation or on parole at any one time in America. In big

cities, the number is *one out of every two*. Similarly, we know from Professor Milton Friedman, the conservative economist, that the rate of incarceration of African-American men in America today is four times greater than the rate of incarceration of black men in pre-Mandela, apartheid South Africa. Nonetheless, the fastest-growing group of male prison inmates consists of Latinos.

One of the key reasons for this is the racial bias in our juvenile and criminal justice systems, including racial profiling by police and mandatory minimum sentences for drugs. For example, sentences for crack cocaine, used disproportionately by minorities, are much harsher than sentences for powder cocaine used disproportionately by whites. As a result of these and related practices, America's prisons are disproportionately populated by minorities.

Prison building has become a job-generating, economic development policy for rural white Americans who now send lobbyists with six-figure incomes to Washington to fight for still more prisons, as part of the emerging prison-industrial complex.

Yet we know, based on some of the most prestigious American studies of prison building to date, for example, by a panel of the National Academy of Science, that the criminal justice response to crime is, at most, running in place. To illustrate, rates of violent crime and fear today are at about the same levels as in the late 1960s, when the Eisenhower Violence Commission released its report and concern over crime captured front pages.

We Have the Knowledge

How can we reverse these trends in unemployment, poverty, income, wealth, inequality, wages, resegregation, education, housing, prison building, racial bias, sentencing and white economic development through the prison-industrial complex?

For years, those who support the rich have claimed relatively little can be done. Erroneously, many Americans have accepted such claims.

For example, after the 1992 riot in South Central Los Angeles associated with the verdict in the first Rodney King trial, a *New York Times*/CBS poll asked a national sample of Americans whether they would be willing to spend more on initiatives that worked in the inner city, especially on education and employment, even if it meant increased taxes. A majority of those polled answered yes. The next question in the poll was, “What is the major obstacle against doing more?” A majority of those polled around the nation said “lack of knowledge.”²

Americans just don't believe we know what works.

But that is not true. To a considerable extent since the Kerner Riot Commission and National Violence Commission convened in the 1960s, we have learned a great deal about what doesn't work and what does work, based on scientific studies and careful evaluations. It therefore would make sense to stop doing what doesn't work and start doing what does work, but at a scale equal to the dimensions of the problem, to paraphrase from the Kerner Commission.

Unfortunately, that seems too rational a policy right now for most American politicians and media.

Let me talk a bit more about what doesn't work and then about what works. My criteria for judging what works are 1) whether a policy or program has proven effective based on scientific evaluation,³ and 2) whether a policy or program reduces inequality in America.

What Doesn't Work?

I already have suggested that trickle-down, supply-side economics doesn't work -- except, of course, for the rich. One part of supply-side economics in the 1980s was the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). We know from evaluations commissioned by the United States Department of Labor that JTPA failed for high school dropouts. Grossly underfunded, JTPA was more a "work first" than a "training first" program. In spite of the "work first" JTPA failure, current "welfare reform" is based on "work first." But the impact of "welfare reform" is equivocal, as the rise in poverty over the last two years demonstrates. Another form of supply-side economics is the Enterprise Zone, which we imported from England. Enterprise Zones are the notion that, for example, if you provide enough tax breaks, corporations will move to South Central Los Angeles and employ the young African-American men who rioted in 1992. It didn't happen. The failure of Enterprise Zones is carefully documented -- for example, by the Urban Institute in Washington, DC and by the United States General Accounting Office. The failure also is well recorded in conservative journals like the *Economist* and *Business Week*. Among other reasons given by corporations for why they would not move back and employ inner-city

youth was the opinion that youth were not adequately trained.⁴ (Hence, the need for “training first,” not “work first,” programs for the hardest to employ.)

I also have suggested that prison building has not been particularly cost-effective. But did not crime decline in America in the 1990s at the same time that prison building surged? F.B.I.-reported violent crime did decline nationally in the 1990's. What were the reasons, based on the best studies and evaluations available? Two leading (and interrelated) reasons were the booming economy and the waning of the crack epidemic. In turn, crime began to increase in the new millennium, as the economy slackened. Community-based groups appear to have been successful in some places, like Boston. The Brady bill, which controlled access to handguns by ex-offenders, appeared to have a national impact. So did community-based, problem-oriented policing (but not “zero-tolerance” policing). Some of the decline in violent crime in the 1990s could in fact be explained by increased imprisonment (estimates are in the range of about five percent to about 30 percent). But the impact of prison building was overstated by politicians and the media, and there was little discussion of the tremendous costs of prison building. (It costs more to go to jail than to Yale.)⁵

Most important, in the new millennium, with over two million Americans incarcerated crime began to increase in 2001 and 2002.

Nor was the fad of “boot camps” successful. The failure of boot camps has been documented well in excellent studies by the University of Maryland that have been published by

the United States Department of Justice, in its National Institute of Justice.⁶

False Rhetoric

So much for a few examples of what doesn't work. From the 1980s to the present, a false political rhetoric has been used to sugar coat policies that don't work. Here I refer to phrases such as volunteerism, partnership, self-sufficiency, empowerment and "faith based." Often, these are helpful concepts at the street level -- if applied with wisdom and discretion. But my concern is with their abuse by political ideologues.

For example, a highly-publicized national summit in the late 1990s on volunteerism was viewed with skepticism by many observers. The summit was held in Philadelphia. At the time of the summit, *The New York Times* interviewed residents in the impoverished Logan neighborhood of North Philadelphia. One resident thought that summit was a bit “naive” because “you need a certain expertise among the volunteers, and in communities like Logan, people don't have the expertise.” The director of a non-profit community program in the neighborhood observed, “Volunteering is really good, but people need a program to volunteer for, and in order to do that, you have to have dollars.” Pablo Eisenberg, former Executive Director of the Center for Community Change and now a Senior Fellow at the Georgetown University Public Policy Institute, concluded that “no matter whether you attract lots of volunteers, money is still the most important ingredient in reducing poverty and helping poor people. You need money even to organize volunteers.” In an article on the new national organization created at the Philadelphia summit, *Youth Today* magazine asked whether the organization was “delivering for youth or fatally flawed.” The executive director of one

Midwest nonprofit community group concluded that, after two years, the new creation was “long on talk and hoopla and short on doing.” A national nonprofit executive director called it “irrelevant window dressing.” Along the same lines, after describing how volunteerism *increases* the gap between rich and poor (because most volunteers tend to stay in their immediate social and economic world), Sarah Mosle concludes a Sunday *New York Times* article by showing that *public resources must drive private volunteerism*: “Government spending causes volunteering. You can't have a volunteer in a school without a schoolhouse. Government institution-building increases volunteering.”⁷

For the military, and today in the wake of \$87 billion for Iraq, we are told endlessly that success is based on large numbers of well-trained professional staff, large numbers of well-trained support staff and a huge amount of high-quality equipment. Yet, when it comes to the inner city and the truly disadvantaged, we are told that there is not enough money for adequate and adequately-paid professional staff, adequate and adequately-paid support staff, and good equipment, like computers and facilities in public schools and at the headquarters of the inner-city, grassroots community-based nonprofit organizations that are responsible for a great deal of what works. Instead, we are told that, for example, a grassroots community group ought to get grants from the public and private sectors for, say, 18 to 24 months. Then it ought to convert into “self-sufficient” operations by using a lot of (often poorly trained) volunteers from suburbia who “are here to help you.” Volunteers should be combined with “partnerships” and “coalition building” among other financially competing and often penurious groups in the inner city. This, we are told, will somehow lead to the “empowerment” of our neighborhoods and our schools.

Well, of course, it doesn't work that way -- as anyone who labors in the trenches knows. This is the rhetoric of politicians who have a double standard. They are not prepared, financially or morally, to invest in our human capital: our children and our youth.

Similarly, it presently is fashionable in the private and public sectors to make grants to “faith-based” nonprofit groups. Yet no scientific evidence exists to prove that “faith-based” nonprofit organizations perform better than secular nonprofit organizations.

Case studies by the Eisenhower Foundation underscore that faith-based groups have some potential, but not at the expense of secular groups. For example, one of the grassroots organizations now receiving Foundation funding is secular, but its vision, energy and creativity come in part from the values of the local chief of police, who is an ordained minister. Yet success by this group also is greatly based on sound management and the hard work of secular civilians and police. Another organization that hosted an Eisenhower replication was secular, but the executive director was an ordained minister. The evaluation of this replication showed mixed results, particularly because management and relations with the community were not as sound as they might have been. A third group with which we replicated was faith based. Importantly to us, the nun who ran it also was a very effective manager and received the cooperation of the police. A final illustration was a group led by another member of the clergy. This replication was an implementation failure, not because of any faith-based status, but because a new police chief would not necessarily agree to assign officers to the program as a

local match.⁸

These case studies suggest that the keys to success are not necessarily based on secular versus “faith based.” More likely, one key is whether a grassroots nonprofit group has sound institutional capacity, for example, in terms of board leadership, staff management and good relationships with the community. Another key is whether the group can change the attitudes and behavior of youth into more positive directions. This requires “tough love,” social support and perseverance. “Tough love” usually involves doing the right thing, which has a moral imperative to it. But such a moral imperative is not by definition linked to a particular religion, as successes like the Argus Community, Delancey Street, the Dorchester Youth Collaborative and Job Corps have demonstrated. (See below.)

To create a more scientific grounding, we need to select a group of randomly selected faith-based grassroots nonprofits and a group of randomly selected secular grassroots nonprofits. Then we need to undertake a long-term evaluation of the two groups, comparing outcome measures before and after a program is carried out.

Immorality

What exactly is “morality?” It usually is raised as a *private* sector issue. For example, grassroots nonprofit groups, we are told, should be driven by a moral imperative. And, if we as parents better teach right from wrong, we also are told there will be much less need for youth development initiatives by grassroots community groups.

Of course parents and nonprofits should teach right from wrong. But what about *public* morality? When it comes to public policy that doesn't work:

- I suggest to you that it is immoral for almost a quarter of America's youngest children to live in poverty.
- I suggest to you that it is immoral to take from the poor and give it to the rich, as does supply-side economics, and for the federal government to increase the growing inequality gap by continuing tax breaks for the rich.
- I suggest to you that it is immoral for CEOs to earn 419 times as much as their workers, and 264 times as much as public school teachers.
- I suggest to you that it is immoral for the states to spend more on prison building than on higher education. I suggest to you that it is immoral for white corporations to profit from incarcerating minorities sentenced with racially biased drug laws.
- I suggest to you that it is immoral for the rate of incarceration of African-American men in America today to be four times

higher than the rate of incarceration of black men in pre-Mandela, apartheid South Africa.

- And I suggest to you that, through lack of campaign finance reform, it is immoral for America to create a one-dollar, one-vote democracy, rather than a one-person, one-vote democracy.

To cast aside what doesn't work and give priority to what does work, we must take the moral high ground.

What Works?

So much for examples of what doesn't work, for the political sugar coating that often encases them, and for their not uncommon lack of morality. It is more hopeful to talk about what works. I want to give just a few interrelated examples. They cover preschool, safe havens after school, public-school reform, training-first jobs programs, community development, community banking and community policing.

Preschool

One of the best examples of what works is preschool. A recent state-by-state study by the RAND Corporation demonstrated that access to preschool increases student achievement, especially in impoverished communities. Earlier, the conservative CEOs on the Committee for Economic Development in New York asserted that, for every dollar invested in preschool, America gets almost \$5.00 of benefits in return over the lifetime of a child who receives

preschool. Those benefits include less involvement in crime, less involvement in drugs, less involvement in teen pregnancy, more likelihood to complete school, and more likelihood to become economically independent. Preschool makes economic sense. Yet less than half of all eligible poor children are enrolled in Head Start because, of course, we are told we don't have the money for our children, especially the almost one in four of the youngest who are living in poverty. At the same time, in many European countries, like France and Sweden, preschool is considered a basic human right.⁹

Naysayers like to argue that, after a child leaves Head Start in America, benefits decline. Of course. If you only partially fund Head Start, decrease the amount of money available to Head Start programs for management and training (as has been the case in recent years) and throw a child back onto the mean streets at age five or six without any corresponding interventions, what do you expect?

Most experts who work with children and youth have learned that we need a continuum of interventions from early childhood through adulthood.

Safe Havens After School

That is one reason why, for children slightly older than preschoolers as well as for preteens, safe havens after school have worked, based, for example, on evaluations by Columbia University and the Eisenhower Foundation.¹⁰ Evolving from the formative Carnegie Corporation report, *A Matter of Time* in 1992, safe havens have become known as places where kids can go after school for help with their homework, snacks, social support and discipline from adult role

models.¹¹ During the week, youth get into the most trouble from 3:30 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. in

America. It does not take a rocket scientist to figure out why social support and discipline by paid adult staff during these hours will have a positive impact.

Public School Reform

But this is after school. There are many good examples of public school reforms that work during school hours. One is the School Development Plan of Professor James Comer at Yale University. Parents, teachers and principals take over the management of inner-city schools, and additional investments in youth, like counseling and mental health services, are available. Evaluations have been positive, for example, in terms of less crime, less drugs, and higher grades in Comer Schools than in comparison schools. Professor Comer has widely replicated his plan, also with evaluated success.¹² Similarly, “full service community schools,” as articulated by Joy Dryfoos in *Safe Passage* and other books, have begun to demonstrate their worth. A good model is Intermediate School 218 in the Washington Heights neighborhood of New York City. Such schools integrate the delivery of quality education with whatever health and social services are judged necessary by a specific community.¹³ For high schoolers, a good example of success is the Ford Foundation initiated Quantum Opportunities program. Well-trained adult mentors work one-on-one with inner-city high school youth, keeping them on track to good grades and high school completion, working out ways to earn money in the summer and providing venues for college education, if youth so choose. The original Brandeis University evaluation showed that Quantum Opportunity students did much better than controls, for example, in terms of less crime, less drugs, less teen pregnancy, better grades, more likelihood to

complete high school and more likelihood to go on to college.¹⁴ (A new evaluation, by Mathematica, Inc., did not show such clear-cut success, and concluded that such high-risk programs need to be very carefully managed, at sufficient levels of investment per youth.¹⁵)

These are all examples of public school reform. Advocates of private vouchers like to say that the issue is choice. That is not so. There are plenty of scientifically proven inner-city public school successes for a school system to choose from, like safe havens, the Comer School Development Plan, full service community schools and Quantum Opportunities. The real issue is accountability. Private schools funded through vouchers are not accountable to the taxpayers whose public sector money finances them.

For example, in Milwaukee, an African-American student who criticized her voucher school as racist was expelled. She sued on the grounds of free speech, but lost. The federal judge who wrote the opinion concluded that “restrictions on constitutional rights that would be protected at a public high school ... need not be honored at a private school.”¹⁶ As this illustration shows, voucher plans can reinforce inequality.

The inequality issue in education is, of course, also greatly linked to money, and expenditure per pupil. The rich, who tend to support vouchers, often say the issue is not money. But what do the rich do? They send their kids to Andover or Exeter -- spending more than \$20,000 a year. If it is good enough for the rich, why isn't it good enough for the poor, the working class and the middle class? What we need is public financing of education that allows

the

annual level of investment per child in American inner cities to be the same as the annual level of investment per child in the suburbs.¹⁷

“Training First” Job Programs¹⁸

When young people do drop out of high school, we know that there are alternatives to the old and failed Job Training and Partnership Act that can get them back on track. These are “training first” initiatives, not the “work first” rhetoric of current “welfare reform,” which has failed in the same way as the Job Training Partnership Act.

One good example of “training first” success is the Argus Learning for Living Center in the South Bronx. Argus begins with tough love for inner-city dropouts, many of whom have drug problems. The priority is on changing attitudes, and then behavior. Considerable initial emphasis is on life skills trainings like how to manage money and how to resolve conflicts. Education and remedial education follow. When participants are ready, they move on to job training, focused on jobs for which there is a demand, like jobs in drug counseling. In the case of one replication of Argus by the Eisenhower Foundation, training is for good jobs repairing telecommunications equipment. After the training and job placement, there is follow-up to ensure retention. Retention is a crucial phase because there often are adjustments that need to be made once a person is in the workforce. Child care and transportation, for example, need to be in place. Sometimes help is needed with how to get along with fellow employees and with

supervisors. Eisenhower Foundation evaluations of Argus and replications of Argus have demonstrated improved earnings, less crime and less drugs for enrollees versus comparison group members.

Another training first success is Job Corps, the intensive public sector training that takes seriously the need to provide a supportive, structured environment for the youth and welfare recipients it seeks to assist. Job Corps features classroom courses, which can lead to high school equivalency degrees, counseling, and hands-on job training. As in individual community-based, nonprofit programs like Argus, Job Corps carefully links education, training, placement and support services. Job Corps centers are located in rural and urban settings around the country. Some of the urban settings are campus-like. Others essentially are "street-based." In the original design, a residential setting provided sanctuary away from one's home. Today, nonresidential variations are being tried. Job Corps participants usually are about 16 to 22 years old, and often at risk of drug abuse, delinquency, and welfare dependency. The average family income of Job Corps participants is less than \$6,000 per year, 2 of 5 come from families on public assistance and more than 4 of 5 are high school dropouts. The typical participant is an 18-year-old minority high school dropout who reads at a seventh-grade level.

In the 1990s, an evaluation by the Congressional Budget Office calculated that for each \$10,000 invested in the average participant in the mid-1980s, society received approximately \$15,000 in returns, including approximately \$8,000 in "increased output of participants," and \$6,000 in "reductions in the cost of crime-related activities." In 2000, an evaluation of almost

10,000 Job Corps participants and 6,000 controls by Mathematica Policy Research found that Job Corps participants were 20% less likely to be arrested, charged or convicted of a crime. If convicted, they served less jail time than control group counterparts, received more post participation non-Job Corps academic instruction and vocational training than control group members, received less in federal benefits than control group members, and were less likely to describe their health as “poor” or “fair.”

A final example is YouthBuild USA, the comprehensive youth and community development program that integrates intensive education, training and placement in construction-related jobs on the communities of the young participants. The program serves unemployed and out-of-school young adults ages sixteen to twenty-four. Most are high-school dropouts and many welfare recipients.

YouthBuild undertook an internal evaluation of a welfare-to-work grant from the U.S. Department of Labor from 1998 to 2001. At 10 YouthBuild sites, trainees were recruited who fit 1996 welfare reform eligibility criteria. The federal criteria required that the majority of trainees had received welfare for 30 months or more or were low income noncustodial fathers. Fifty-four percent of the YouthBuild population for the program met these criteria. The remaining forty-six percent were low income noncustodial parents; nonparents with significant barriers to employment, like poor education or substance abuse; or low-income welfare recipients who had been on welfare for fewer than 30 months.

The YouthBuild welfare-to-work trainees were compared to welfare-to-work trainees in non-YouthBuild welfare-to-work programs, evaluated by Mathematica Policy Research Inc. in 2000. Fifty percent of the YouthBuild trainees were placed in jobs at the end of 9 to 12 months of training -- versus 44 percent for the non-YouthBuild enrollees evaluated by Mathematica. YouthBuild graduates earned an average of \$7.91 per hour in their first job placement, versus \$6.81 per hour for the non-YouthBuild enrollees evaluated by Mathematica.

YouthBuild concluded that, for success with welfare populations, training needs to include multiple components, last for at least 9 months and provide excellent followup services. Many welfare trainees still were struggling with poverty-related problems at the end of the YouthBuild evaluation. The problems centered on substance abuse, mental health, family and childcare responsibilities and housing. These enrollees included were not likely to have benefitted much from a short training program that focused only on job placement, like that provided by the now-defunct Job Training Partnership Act.

In the welfare evaluation, YouthBuild found that more than 50 percent of young adults who were categorized as the “hardest to serve” were able to make major strides in changing their lives in a significant way. They moved from dependency and poverty to join the ranks of the working poor. As with Job Corps, a comprehensive program was able to assist individuals to make a significant change. It was clear that, without child care, food stamps, housing, fuel and other accompanying services, most of those who entered the ranks of the working poor could not hold on to their grants, given the low level of wages and benefits even the most successful were

able to secure.

Without a training first strategy based on the principles of successes like Argus, Job Corps and YouthBuild USA, America's present "work first" "welfare reform" is doomed to failure for those who are the hardest to employ. Nor has the new, disappointing Workforce Development Act understood the importance of training first.

Community Development and Community Banking

Many of the jobs for such training first preparation can be generated by community development corporations in the private, nonprofit sector. Community development corporations were the brainchild of Robert Kennedy's Mobilization for Youth in the late 1960s. Initially, there were 10 such community development corporations -- and now there are over 2,000. A favorite of mine is the New Community Corporation in the Central Ward of Newark, founded in the ashes of the 1960s riot there by Monsignor William Linder, who has received a MacArthur Foundation genius award. The New Community Corporation has generated thousands of economic development and associated services jobs in the Central Ward of Newark. One of its affiliates also owns the only Pathmark Supermarket in the Central Ward. Income streams from this for-profit operation help with the nonprofit operations.¹⁹

The capital for community development corporations often can be secured via community-based banking. Here one model is the South Shore Bank in Chicago. Many banks do not bother with branches in the inner city. When they do, typically a bank will use the

savings of inner-city residents to make investments outside of the neighborhood. South Shore does just the opposite. It uses the savings of the poor to reinvest in the inner-city neighborhoods where the poor live. And South Shore still makes a profit.²⁰

Community-Based, Problem Oriented Policing

My last example of what works is community-based, problem-oriented policing. This essentially means getting officers out of their cruisers and into foot patrols. They work shoulder-to-shoulder with citizen groups to focus on specific problems and solve them with sensitive efficiency.

I am not talking about “zero tolerance” policing, as practiced, for example, in New York City. Such policing, has, of course, created a tremendous amount of racial and community tension.²¹

Opposite to “zero-tolerance” policing are the community-and-youth-sensitive strategies of the Boston Police, as well as the Eisenhower Foundation. On the latter, since 1988 the Foundation has replicated neighborhood police ministations that are housed in the same space as youth safe havens. (Neighborhood ministations were pioneered by the police in Japan, and after-school safe havens have been popularized in America by the Carnegie Corporation.) Grants are made to nonprofit grassroots youth development organizations, and police chiefs co-target at least one officer per site as local match. Officers are trained as mentors for youth. Officers on

foot patrols are accompanied by citizens. The result has been drops in crime at least as great as with zero tolerance, along with improved racial and community relations.²²

Comprehensive Interdependence

Look at how these few examples of what works interrelate, or can be made to interrelate through a wise national policy for the inner city and the truly disadvantaged. Community-based, problem-oriented, policing can help secure a neighborhood. The security can help encourage community-based banking. Community-based banking can provide capital for community development corporations. Community development corporations can invest that capital in ways that generate good jobs for local residents. Inner-city youth can qualify for those jobs if they have been in job training, like that at Argus, Job Corps and YouthBuild USA. Similarly, inner-city youth can stay in high school if they have been involved in human capital investments like the Quantum Opportunities mentoring program. They can get that far if they have been in Comer schools, full services community schools and after-school safe havens. And they can get that far if they have been in preschool. So what you see, when you ask what works based on scientific studies and careful evaluations, is what Lisbeth Schorr, at the Harvard University School of Public Health, calls “multiple solutions to multiple problems.”²³

The solutions then, are not single, narrow and categorical. The solutions are creative, comprehensive and interdependent.

In its work around the nation, the Eisenhower Foundation seeks to replicate multiple solutions whenever possible. For example, in the Carver Terrace neighborhood in Northeast Washington, DC, the Foundation is seeking to replicate and evaluate a safe haven-ministation, Quantum Opportunities, a full service community school and a Delancey Street program.

Replication Is Possible

Importantly, we do have the experience to replicate a program in different locations – and therefore the ability to replicate to scale.

As written up in a special report, the experience of the Eisenhower Foundation has been that replication depends in no small part on:²⁴

- Securing adequate funding over sufficient time (ideally a minimum of thirty-six months);
- Evaluating the replication (not just the model) in a scientific way;
- Creating sound institutional and staff capacity at replication sites;
- Generating professional training manuals and videos;
- Training replication staff systematically and in stages;

- Adhering to strategic workplans and budgets;
- Insuring tenacious quality control;
- Concentrating on underlying principles rather than exact copies; and
- Recognizing that either an entire program or parts of it can be implemented in another location.

National Policy²⁵

Replication of multiple solutions that work is at the core of the national policy proposed by the Eisenhower Foundation in its periodic updates not only of the Kerner Riot Commission and National Violence Commission, but also in its updates of *The Other America*, Michael Harrington's 1962 classic on how to abolish poverty.

School and Job Reform

Our policy concentrates on school and job reform, because that is what evaluations suggest is most important. Public opinion polls support school and job reform. (See the final section on common ground for political alliance.)

So framed, our policy means expanding Head Start preschool to all qualified inner-city

young people. It means replicating to scale proven public education reforms like safe havens, full

service (public) community schools and Quantum Opportunities. It means a new training first program for the hardest to employ, including out-of-school youth and persons on welfare.

To generate jobs, we need a commitment by the federal government to full employment for the inner city. As many of those jobs as possible should be generated by the private sector -- especially through a new national community-based banking program modeled after the South Shore Bank. But many of those jobs need to be created by the public sector. A good many public jobs should be in the repair of decaying urban infrastructure -- a result of the public disinvestment of the 1980s. America is far behind other industrialized democracies in investments in its public infrastructure. The new jobs also should be in constructing and repairing housing for the poor, as does YouthBuild USA. We also need public service jobs, many of which can be used to reform “welfare reform.” There are hundreds of thousands of jobs needed for child care workers, assistance to teachers in inner-city schools, staff for nonprofit grassroots community-based organizations and drivers to get people to work.

Racial and Criminal Justice Reform

To complement this school and job reform, we need racial and criminal justice reform. Here, one model is *The Shape of the River*, by the former presidents of Harvard and Princeton. The book provides some of the most comprehensive, cohort-based evidence on the cost-

effectiveness of affirmative action.²⁶ Neither of the major candidates in the 2000 presidential election did particularly well in prep school. Yet both were admitted to elite Ivy League universities. Affirmative action is an accepted policy among the well-off. To eliminate the present double standard, affirmative action needs to be strengthened for the not-so-well-off.

We also need a new private sector commission to propose how to eliminate the racial biases in our juvenile and criminal justice systems, especially when it comes to drugs and mandatory minimum sentences. We need to acknowledge our defeat in the war on drugs in America. America spends 30 percent of its anti-drug resources on treatment and prevention and 70 percent on law enforcement. In many European countries, the percentages are just the opposite -- 70 percent on prevention and treatment and 30 percent on law enforcement. We need a better balance. One model is the State of Arizona, which held a referendum on the high cost of prison building. Voters decided to begin to divert non-violent offenders from the prison system into community treatment alternatives. An evaluation commissioned by the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona found recidivism rates for people so diverted to be lower and concluded that a considerable amount of money had been saved for the taxpayers of Arizona. If Arizona can begin to move in this direction, then less conservative states, like California and New York, can do the same. Crucially, given that 400,000 to 500,000 persons are coming out of prison each year between 2001 and 2005 and given that there are few plans for educational and job preparation, we need to replicate on a much broader scale the Delancey Street enterprise, begun in San Francisco over 30 years ago. Delancey Street is the premier American initiative for

successfully reintegrating ex-offenders and dramatically reducing their recidivism.²⁷

Financing Reform²⁸

That is the kind of comprehensive and interdependent policy -- focused on education, employment, race and criminal justice -- that we propose. The cost of replicating what works to scale, we estimate, is in the order of \$50 to \$60 billion dollars per year.

The Eisenhower Foundation believes that as much of this cost as possible should be borne by the private sector -- especially when it comes to jobs and training. But we need to be realistic. Given the failures of the private sector in supply-side economics, the Job Training Partnership Act, “work first” welfare reform and Enterprise Zones; given the huge and inequitable salaries of corporate CEOs; and given the enormous amount of corporate welfare that has been secured by high paid lobbyists -- it is inevitable that the public sector must take the lead, at the local, state and national levels.

For its part, the federal government should *raise* funds, but then *re-target* them, not to the states, which have not been particularly successful when it comes to the inner city and the truly disadvantaged, but to the grassroots local level, and especially to private, nonprofit inner-city organizations, which are responsible for so much of what works, based on scientific evaluations.

How do we propose to finance such reform? Obviously, the first step is to create a new foreign and national security policy that removes America from Iraq and reverses the current

priority on domination, pre-emption and unilateralism. This testimony is not the place to detail such policy, but the Eisenhower Foundation will issue a comprehensive set of foreign and national security policy alternatives in 2004.

Beyond the overriding issue of foreign and national security spending, we need to replace present supply-side economic policy with a demand-side strategy. We need to stimulate consumer demand through tax cuts for middle-and-low income Americans, as proposed by the Economic Policy Institute. A demand-side plan also should extend unemployment assistance to the jobless and invest in state and local public needs, like school and low income housing construction. That can put people to work quickly. Particularly through job generation and public infrastructure development, this short term fiscal strategy, including deficit financing, can finance some of the reforms needed to replicate what works to scale.

When we create short term, counter cyclical recovery, we need to more systematically finance what works to scale. For this task, our first priority is on reducing affirmative action for the rich and corporate welfare. With an eye to the British East India Company, our founding fathers warned, in Thomas Jefferson's words, against the antidemocratic "aristocracy of our moneyed corporations." Today that aristocracy is alive and very well, indeed. The taxpayers of America spend somewhere between \$100 and \$200 billion per year on tax breaks and subsidies to the rich and to corporations. For example, in the 1980s, tens of billions of dollars of tax breaks were given out to the rich and to corporations, by way of liberalized depreciation and capital gains allowances. At the same time, we spend tens upon tens of billions of dollars per

year on subsidies to corporations. These are federal grants. We subsidize the nuclear power industry, the aviation industry, the media, big oil and gas, the mining industry and the timber industry. America subsidizes agribusiness to the tune of over \$18 billion per year. We subsidize tobacco companies to give cancer to our children. The new millennium began with a \$1.35T tax cut passed by Congress, mainly benefitting the rich and in spite of growing inequality. Such policies are neither cost-effective nor moral.

Given the extraordinary increases in the income and wealth of the very rich, and the enormous reductions in their taxes since the Eisenhower Administration, the time is long past to increase taxes on the super rich and the corporations that so many of them own.

Tax increases on the super rich should be part of a new Fair Economic Deal for the other 98 percent.

Specifically, to reassert public need over private greed, as did Theodore Roosevelt, we must:

- Repeal the tax cuts for the super rich that were enacted as part of the \$1.35T package at the beginning of the new millennium. (Just like many of the 1980s tax cuts for the rich were reversed.)
- Increase income tax rates on the super rich to 50 percent -- a rate far lower than the 91 percent rate during the Eisenhower Administration.

- Return corporate taxes to those in force during the Eisenhower Administration.
- Create a wealth tax of one percent.

Repealing the tax cuts given the super rich at the beginning of the millennium would return over \$85B per year from the richest five percent of the population.

Returning to a 50 percent top marginal tax rate that would be far below the top rate in the Eisenhower Administration could capture as much as \$90B more per year from the top two percent.

Returning to corporate tax rates in force during the Eisenhower Administration could increase tax revenues by roughly \$110B more per year.

A one percent tax on wealth (with a \$1M exemption) could bring in \$90B per year. Such a tax is of crucial importance because wealth is even more concentrated than income. Most Western European nations tax wealth. The U.S. does tax the only kind of wealth most people own -- homes -- but we do not directly tax ownership of the kind of wealth which is concentrated in the hands of the super rich -- stocks and bonds.

Consistent with much of the Eisenhower administration era, such tax reform could save Social Security and finance healthcare reform, create a new job training, retraining and placement system, finance new college tuition assistance and finance day care provisions -- all for the 98 percent of the population not taxed. And it could finance the replication of what works to scale for the poor and working poor.

Such a financing system is not just sound and just economics. It is an investment in the political future -- because it has the potential to mobilize a majority of suburban and ex-urban middle class citizens, working Americans and the poor -- while renewing the alliances among whites and persons of color that were severed by the racial politics of the 1980s. As we shall see, there is considerable public opinion in favor of fighting back against the class warfare that the super rich and their supporters have declared against the rest of the population.

We also need to finance the replication of what works to scale through reductions in what doesn't work (like prison building and boot camps).

The Boys in the Hood or the Boys on the Hill?

At this point, just take a step back and ask yourself this question. If we really do know a great deal about what *doesn't* work, if we know a great deal about what *does* work, if we have learned a lot about how to replicate what works, if public opinion is in favor of much education and jobs reform, and if (in spite of what our leaders tell us) the richest nation in history has the

means to finance what works to scale, what is the problem?

In part, the problem has been not so much the boys in the hood as the boys on the Hill. Tinged with a racial undercurrent, the problem has been one of political will and political inaction. In recent years, many in Washington have pressed for more funding of what *doesn't* work (like tax breaks for the rich and prison building for the poor) and less funding for what *does* work (like preschool and safe havens).

How Can Citizens Generate Reform?

Given this lack of political will and action in America, what can citizens and nonprofit organizations do to generate reform for the poor and minorities based on what works? In his book *If the Gods Had Meant Us to Vote, They Would Have Given Us Candidates*, and in his book *Thieves in High Places: They've Stolen our Country and its Time to Take it Back*, Jim Hightower²⁹ calls for grassroots citizen leadership. Consistent with this thinking, I would like to suggest three obvious grassroots venues: campaign finance reform, voter democracy reform and communicating what works.

Campaign Finance Reform

We need to follow the State of Maine's example of public financing of campaigns, even if there remain major legal and constitutional obstacles. We need to follow the model of England, with very short campaigns and with public financing of equal amounts of television time for all

of the major candidates. We must eliminate the corrupting influence of big money in America that has created our one-dollar, one-vote democracy. We must control the influence of lobbyists earning 6-figure incomes. We must aim to level the political playing field. If we can begin to make some progress, then perhaps Congress eventually will not be dominated by millionaires, as it is today. Perhaps -- just perhaps -- Congress will have more community activists, teachers, community development corporation directors, community-based bankers, youth development advocates, practitioners of prevention and treatment, public education reformers, persons who seek to eliminate the racial biases of our criminal justice system, and individuals who fight to reduce the prison-industrial complex.³⁰

Voter Democracy Reform

At the same time, the disenfranchisement of the 2000 election must be used to launch a more powerful voter democracy movement. Beyond reforms that, relatively speaking, are easier to make -- like installation of up-to-date voting technology, improvement in the quality of election personnel, expanded registration and greatly increased watchdog activity by nonprofit organizations -- we must, more fundamentally, reform the presidential election system.

We need direct presidential election by popular vote. If the Electoral College cannot be abolished for now, instant runoff voting and proportional representation are the next best options. Instant runoff voting means that, rather than just vote for a single candidate, voters have the option to rank the candidates in order of preference: first choice, second choice, third choice. If a candidate receives a majority of first choices, he or she wins. But if not, the candidate with the fewest votes is eliminated -- thus failing to advance to the runoff -- and a second round of

counting occurs. The process continues until there is a winner.

The other option, proportional representation, allocates electoral votes in proportion to the statewide popular vote, not by the present winner-take-all procedure. Richard Nixon and Franklin Roosevelt supported proportional representation. It already is used in most presidential primaries and most legislative races in most well established democracies world-wide.

A voter democracy movement must remind Americans of their myths. Every culture has myths. Myths may just be part of the truth. Or they may be embellishments of the truth. But they have some truth. In a democracy, myths can be effective in defining ideals and standards -- what ought to be, even if it departs from the present status quo. The myths of the American democracy are that government belongs to the people, that voting is a universal right, that we elect based on one person-one vote, that all citizens are equal, that we are governed by the rule of law, that the Supreme Court is not political and that minority views are protected no matter how abhorrent they are to the majority.

Election 2000 made clear to many that our myths have less truth than we may imagine. When enough people question their myths, a society is in trouble, as already is evident in the precipitous decline that we have seen in voting in America.

Communicating What Works

To help make progress in campaign finance and voter democracy reform, we need to better inform the public that we know what works and how to replicate it to scale. We need a

communicating what-works movement.

The point of departure is how, in the late 1960s, a careful, systematic and well-financed strategic communications plan began to be developed by those who believe in, for example, tax breaks for the rich, prison building for the poor and disinvestment from the inner city.

By the 1990s, the richest American foundations with that view made over \$1 billion in communications, media and related grants to think tanks with that view. The largest such think tank in America has used its money to help develop a staff of over 60 analysts, who, among other tasks, write position papers on themes like tax breaks for the rich, prison building for the poor and public disinvestment from urban areas. The papers often are criticized for their lack of scientific accuracy. But they are well-marketed. They are marketed immediately to every member of Congress and every Congressional principal staff member. They are marketed to newspaper editorial page editors, op ed editors and columnists across the country. They are networked to talk radio and talk television. The think tank also has a television studio on its premises. There, its associates can practice their 7-second sound bites.³¹

If It Bleeds, It Leads. Television has a role in all of this. The media in America is controlled by just a few giant multi-national corporations, like Time-Warner, Viacom, Disney and Ruppert Murdoch's News Organization. Most Americans no longer get their news from newspapers. Most Americans do not get their news from national broadcast television news, from Peter Jennings on ABC, Dan Rather on CBS or Tom Brokaw on NBC. More typically, the

average American gets her or his news from local television, from the local news at 5:00 p.m. or 6:00 p.m. or 10:00 p.m. or 11:00 p.m. Local television managers are not under pressure to produce Edward R. Murrow-type quality on such news programs. But they *are* under pressure to produce profits, as was John Cleese in the motion picture *Fierce Creatures*, when he was pushed hard by a Ruppert Murdock-type parody tycoon. Local television managers know that the local news produces the most revenues. So they have to devise a strategy to keep Nielson ratings high and keep viewers tuned to the commercials on their stations, rather than to the commercials on Channel 7 or 9.³² Under this pressure, what is the strategy typically adopted by a local television manager in America? What is the philosophy?

Too often, the philosophy tends to be, “If it bleeds, it leads.” That is, too often local station executives will lead with negative and sensational news, the day's shootings, assaults, muggings and rapes. Too often, the local television manager will lead with stories that demonize minority youth and welfare mothers. In a 30-minute format, perhaps the first 4 or 5 minutes leads with such negative, sensational news, designed to keep the viewer glued. Then there are commercials, the first positive messages on the newscast. Then there are a few minutes of national and international news. Then the weather lady appears in her well-tailored blue suit. Then there are commercials. Then the plaid sports jock comes on and talks about the latest football or baseball scores. Then there are commercials. At the end, but only if there is time, there are perhaps 30 seconds of “happy news,” like announcements of the latest folk festival on the lakefront. There is rarely any time for in-depth stories on what works. They are considered too boring for good ratings.³³

The Mean World Syndrome. There are local exceptions to “bleeds-leads”

programming, of course. But what is the reaction of the average American viewer to what predominates as this steady diet of negative, and sensational local news? Too often, says Professor George Gerbner, Dean Emeritus of the Annenberg School of Communications at the University of Pennsylvania, the result is the “mean world” syndrome.³⁴ Too often, the average, tax-paying citizen living out in the suburbs concludes that the world is pretty gloomy. And that, therefore, there are few answers in terms of policy -- except, of course, negative solutions, like prison building (which enhances the white prison-industrial complex and so helps make the rich richer and the poor poorer). *That is one reason why, after the South Central Los Angeles riots in 1992, a majority in the New York Times/CBS poll (above) said the major obstacle to doing more was “lack of knowledge.”*

Foundation Funding. What can we do to reverse the “mean world” syndrome, and better communicate what works? We must encourage foundations that embrace solutions that work to better support media and communications funding to grassroots and national organizations, as part of advocacy and capacity building. Many foundations that otherwise support what works have been reluctant to fund communications and media in the past, and the result is that they have been tremendously outspent by foundations that support tax breaks for the rich and prison building for the poor.

More Media Savvy by National Nonprofits. National nonprofit organizations that advocate for what works need to enhance their own capacity to communicate. National nonprofits must secure funds for top-quality communications directors, directors for distribution

of reports and directors of research to provide the facts. Their reports need to be scientifically based, well written and well marketed, on the Internet and for hard copy distribution.

Sophisticated media strategies are essential. Reports need to be widely communicated through more sophisticated uses of the media. For example, the Eisenhower Foundation's updates of the Kerner Riot Commission have achieved saturation media coverage -- on ABC, CBS, CNN, NBC, BET, BBC, NPR and in almost every major newspaper in the country.³⁵

More Media Savvy by Grassroots Nonprofits. While all *national* nonprofits with a what works message need to secure the communications staff necessary for such success, *local* nonprofits also need a capacity to communicate. Much of what works is generated by local nonprofits. But few local groups can afford communications directors. A communicating what works movement must persuade private and public funders to finance such professionals.

Even if it does not yet have a communications director, a local nonprofit organization can provide strategic communications training to its senior staff. Toward this end, the Eisenhower Foundation runs a strategic communications school for local non-profits. We have a long way to go in funding the school and in extending outreach to nonprofits. But we do try to take in about 5 to 10 nonprofit grassroots representatives at any one time. We begin with strategic communications planning and with lessons for how to access print media. We then set a television camera, manned by a wise, award-winning African-American cameraman off duty

from NBC. Each nonprofit participant must first sit in front of the camera and, in a minute or two, present the mission of his or her organization. Then each must undertake a friendly interview with a reporter. Then each must undertake a hostile interview, and finally undergo a press conference in which our trainers are aggressive and sometimes obnoxious. Each round of such training is videotaped, replayed and critiqued in front of all the other participants. It is hard and stressful work. But, not surprisingly, nonprofit organization personnel respond well and learn quickly. We need to encourage nonprofit organizations to innovate communications strategies, including the possibility of putting pressure on local television stations which do not incorporate segments on what works.

Bill Moyers, Tom Paine and the Internet. But we cannot get trapped by simply teaching nonprofit organizations to articulate sound bites better on conventional media, which always will make us play by corporate rules. We must proceed well beyond. What alternatives can we generate? Can we build on the remarks of Bill Moyers, when he left CBS and said that America needs to return to the pamphleteering of Tom Paine? Such low-tech forms of communication can easily be embraced by grassroots nonprofit community organizations, especially if we can create a resurgence of the kind of community organizing we had in the late 1960s. More importantly, can we create high-tech pamphleteering through thousands of new Internet-based community networks, modeled after MoveOn.org., that support and motivate advocacy?³⁶

Youth Media Enterprise. A final illustrative venue to build on is youth media

enterprise, for example, as developed by the Dorchester Collaborative in Boston. The Dorchester Youth Collaborative is a safe haven after school program in a tough African-American, Latino, Cambodian and Vietnamese neighborhood. Many youth who hang out at the Dorchester Youth Collaborative have a great amount of anger. In response, the Dorchester Youth Collaborative began acting clubs. Young people wrote, directed and acted in skits which portrayed their feelings and social concerns. They performed brilliantly. Soon, word got out, and so they began performing at junior high schools and high schools in Boston. Then they got onto local radio and television talk shows, local cable and local public service announcements. Some of the youth registered as actors with the actor's union. The Disney Corporation acknowledged the presentations through an award in Orlando. Blockbuster Video provided public service videos free of charge, prepared by the Dorchester Youth Collaborative. Hollywood got into the act, by financing a full-length motion picture with a cause, titled, *Squeeze*, which had a limited distribution in major cities.

In all of this, note what the Dorchester Youth Collaborative has done. It has created acting as a youth development intervention in the safe haven. But it also has initiated a process in which those who typically are demonized in American society become the message senders.⁵² The Eisenhower Foundation now is replicating such youth media enterprise and advocating that significant portion of the huge public service announcement budget of the national drug strategy be allocated to such replications.

Common Ground for Political Alliance

Ultimately, a communicating what-works movement must convince the American public

that there are solutions that work. The movement must encourage private sector replication of such solutions. More important, the movement must encourage average citizens to elect public officeholders who will carry out what works and who will appoint judges who understand what works.

We need to follow MoveOn.org to advocate for a new voting majority, a new political alliance. The alliance must bring together middle-income Americans (who often need 2 or 3 jobs in the family to make ends meet), wage earners (who must be made more aware that their CEOs earn on the average 419 times as much as they do), and the poor (who suffered in the 1980s, hardly improved in the 1990s and are suffering again today, with the increase in poverty).

All of these groups -- the great majority of Americans -- are affected by the loss of jobs over recent years.

All of these groups share a vulnerability to the technological global marketplace. As Jeff Faux has observed, middle-income people, wage earners and the poor all need education and re-education, job training and re-training, to compete.³⁷ Can we secure a voting majority around government-facilitated education and training? The answer is yes, based on national scientific surveys of voters by Albert H. Cantril and Susan Davis Cantril. The Cantril surveys show voter disagreement philosophically on the role of government in the abstract. But the Cantril surveys also identify voting majorities in terms of voter support for specific, pragmatic government

investments. Such investments include increased spending on Head Start, teacher subsidies, college student aid and job training.³⁸ The Cantril findings fit perfectly into a frame of program-selective public policy based on more of what works and less of what doesn't.

Interrelated with this public need as a common ground is resentment against private greed. Middle-and working-income Americans appear to be resentful of CEOs with excessive salaries and stock options, according to surveys by Alan Wolfe at Boston College. Such rewards are perceived by many middle-and working-income people as disconnected from the efforts that go into securing them. The idle rich and corporate “welfare kings” are perceived by many as not earning their money. This, suggests Wolfe, makes the idle rich politically vulnerable, given the enormous income, wage and wealth gaps that opened in the 1980s and widened in the 1990s.³⁹ Middle-income and wage-earner families, including those with both parents working, may well respond to messages like “reduce affirmative action for the rich” and “get corporations off welfare.”

Existing public opinion suggests that a mobilization of middle income citizens workers and the poor can gain momentum. For example, a 1998 Gallup poll found 63 percent nationally agreed with the statement that “money and wealth in this country should be more evenly distributed.” About 7 in 10 believed “The rich just get richer and the poor get poorer.” Recent national Harris polls found that between 80 and 87 percent believe corporations have “too much power and influence in Washington.” Another poll found that only 15 percent had a “great deal”

or “quite a lot” of confidence in corporations. This was the lowest percent since pollsters started asking the question in 1986. Still another national poll found 38 percent of the public viewing big business as the “biggest threat to America’s future. This also was the highest level ever recorded for the question, which began being asked in 1965.⁴⁰

The Dean of the Yale School of Management and a former Secretary of Commerce, Jeffrey Garter has concluded that there is the potential for a citizen backlash “as radical and as prolonged as the backlash against unbridled corporate power that took place during the first forty years of this century.”⁴¹

The need, then, is to begin to build new political alliances around widespread support of a Fair Economic Deal, education and training and public need over private greed.

September 11

We cannot allow the attacks of September 11 to impede the formation of such new alliances and the replication of what works to scale.

September 11 unleashed a new wave of corporate welfarism and commercial militarism in America. A week after September 11, an editorial in *The Wall Street Journal* encouraged American industry to send out its lobbyists for contracts to fight terrorism from the military-industrial complex that President Eisenhower warned against. The federal government rapidly expanded the military budget. It provided bailouts to the airlines industry, the insurance industry and much of corporate America. At the same time, tax breaks for the idle rich were

enacted, in spite of the continuing lack of proof that such policy trickles down to the great majority of Americans. The notion of replicating what works to scale – especially for public schools and jobs for the poor, working class and middle class – became more remote. Instead, there were more dramatic cuts in what works.

What alternatives are there to the domestic and foreign policy America has been pursuing since September 11?

The cornerstone of American domestic policy must be security. We must begin with explanations for one of the greatest security failures in history. American security agencies failed to uncover the tracks of the attackers – who left those tracks all over America. We need a serious, independent performance review of these agencies, and then a new security policy based on the findings.

As the nation has focused its attention on the dramatic forms of terrorism committed in New York and Washington, the slow terrorism of everyday street crime has been increasing, along with poverty and unemployment – just as crime, poverty and unemployment all declined in the 1990s.

The implication is that domestic policy must equally embrace economic security and security against everyday crime. That returns us to a Fair Economic Deal for middle income Americans, workers and the poor – along with replication to scale of the crime prevention, youth development, public school reform, job training and community economic development

investments that have proven to work.

Post-September 11 foreign policy must begin with the recognition that the Arab-Israeli conflict is the main source of tension between the Muslim World and the West; that American collusion with anti-democratic regimes must stop; that the North Korean threat cannot be given lower priority; that America itself needs to follow the international rules we promote for other nations; and that domination, pre-emption and unilateralism must be replaced by collaboration, prevention and multilateralism.

Such reform must shift American foreign policy from waging war to waging peace. America invests little to address the roots of economic dispossession in Islam's heartlands. It invests little to reduce global infectious diseases that are killing millions. It invests to facilitate the indigenous genius of the Third World. It fails to lead the world in energy renewability and solar energy generation.

Waging peace requires recognition that, as a percent of Gross Domestic Product, American aid is the lowest of the advanced industrial economies. That must change. The Agency for International Development need to be replaced with a new entity that targets investments in human capital to nations with honest governments and a potential for indigenous development. Such indigenous development should be led by nongovernmental organizations

bottom up, not top down. Grassroots, bubble up principles also should become the basis of fundamental reform of the elitist World Bank and International Monetary Fund.

Foreign policy must be linked to domestic policy. Joseph Nye, Dean of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, calls for a foreign policy balance between “hard” power that derives from military and economic strength and soft power that derives from the international appeal of our institutions and values.⁴²

But how can America project genuine soft power when American institutions and values have created the continuing dilemmas of poverty, inequality, racial prejudice, campaign finance corruption and corporate welfarism that challenge the nation from within?

Cannot solutions to these internal dilemmas become both a powerful venue of soft foreign policy and a defense by middle income Americans, working people and the poor against the class warfare that has been initiated by the rich?

No empire in history has successfully balanced hard and soft power. We should try. It is a noble goal. It is a dream as worthy as Martin Luther King’s, and neither should be deferred in the post-September 11 world:

What happens
To a dream deferred?
Does it dry up
Like a raisin in the sun?
Or fester like a sore?
and then run?
Does it stink like rotten meat?
Or crust and sugar over
Like a syrupy sweet?
Maybe it just sags
Like a heavy load.
Or does it explode?

Langston Hughes
Harlem 2

Notes and Sources

1. This section is based on the following sources:

Recent Trends in the New Millennium, the National Debt and Job Creation

John M. Berry, "Job Growth is Greatest Since Recession Ended," *Washington Post*, November 8, 2003, p. A1; The Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation, *Alternatives to American Policy Since September 11* (Washington, DC: Eisenhower Foundation, 2003, available on eisenhowerfoundation.org); Paul Krugman, "A Big Quarter," *New York Times*, October 31, 2003, p. A23; Paul Krugman, "This Can't Go On," *New York Times*, November 4, 2003, p. A29; and Kevin Phillips, *Wealth and Democracy* (New York: Broadway Books, 2002).

Income, Wealth and Taxes

Kevin Phillips, *Wealth and Democracy* (New York: Broadway Books, 2002); Fred R. Harris and Lynn A. Curtis, *Locked in the Poorhouse* (Lanham, New York and Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield, 1998).

National Center for Children in Poverty. Columbia University. *Young Children in Poverty*, March, 1998.

Jeff Faux, "Lifting All Boats," chapter prepared for *To Establish Justice, To Insure Domestic Tranquility: A Thirty Year Update of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence* (Washington, DC: The Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation, 1999); Peter Edelman, "Who Is Worrying About the Children?" *The Washington Post*, August 11, 1999, p. A18.

Center for Community Change, *Newsletter* (Issue 19, Fall 1997); *Federal Register*, Volume 64, Number 105, Wednesday June 2, 1999, p. 29672; Alan Okagaki, *Developing a Public Policy Agenda on Jobs* (Washington, DC: Center for Community Change, 1997). Jerry Jones, *Federal Revenue Policies That Work: A Blueprint for Job Creation to Support Welfare Reform* (Washington, DC: Center for Community Change, 1997). William Julius Wilson, *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor* (New York: Knopf, 1996). Lawrence Mishel, Jared Bernstein and John Schmitt, *The State of Working America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000).

Kevin Phillips, *The Politics and Rich and Poor* (New York: Random House, 1990). Jason DeParle, "Richer Rich, Poorer Poor, and a Fatter Green Book," *The New York Times*, May 26, 1991; Lynn A. Curtis, *Family, Employment and Reconstruction* (Milwaukee: Family Service America, 1995); U.S. Census, *Historical Poverty Tables* (Washington, DC: US Census, 1997); Children's Defense Fund, *The State of America's Children* (Washington, DC: Children's

Defense Fund, 1994); Felicity Baringer, "Rich-Poor Gulf Widens among Blacks," *The New York Times*, Sept. 25, 1992.

Doug Henwood, "The Nation Indicators," *Nation*, March 29, 1999, p. 10. Alan Wolfe, "The New Politics of Inequality," *The New York Times*, September 22, 1999, p. A27; Kenneth Bredemeier, "Widening Gap Found Between Area's Rich, Poor" *The Washington Post*, November 29, 2000, p. E1.

Keith Bradsher, "Gap in Wealth in US Called Widest in West," *The New York Times*, April 17, 1995; Edward N. Wolff, *Top Heavy* (New York: The New Press, 1995); Editorial "The Tide Is Not Lifting Everyone," *The New York Times*, September 30, 1997; and Glenn C. Loury, "Unequalized," *New Republic*, April 6, 1998.

Alan Wolfe, "The New Politics of Inequality," *The New York Times*, September 27, 1999, p. A27.

Education

Gary Orfield, "Segregated Housing and School Desegregation," in Gary Orfield, Susan E. Eaton and the Harvard Project on School Desegregation, *Dismantling Desegregation: The Quiet Reversal of Brown vs. Board of Education* (New York: New Press, 1996).

Robert Suro, "More Is Spent on New Prisons Than Colleges," *The Washington Post*, February 24, 1997; and Beatrix Hamburg, "President's Report," *Annual Report*, 1996 (New York: William T. Grant Foundation, 1997).

Prison Building and Housing

The Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation, *To Establish Justice, To Insure Domestic Tranquility* (Washington, DC, The Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation, 1999; available on eisenhowerfoundation.org).

John Atlas and Peter Drier, *A National Housing Agenda for the 1990s*, (Washington, DC: National Housing Institute, 1992); Lynn A. Curtis, *Family, Employment and Reconstruction*; and *Sentencing Project, Crime Rates and Incarceration: Are We Any Safer?* (Washington, DC: Sentencing Project, 1992).

Mark Mauer, *Young Black Men and the Criminal Justice System* (Washington, DC: Sentencing Project, 1990); Mark Mauer, *Intended and Unintended Consequences: State Racial Disparities in Imprisonment* (Washington, DC: Sentencing Project, 1997); and Vivien Stern, *The Future of A Sin* (Boston;

Northeastern University Press, 1998).

Milton Friedman, "There's No Justice in the War on Drugs," *The New York Times*, January 11, 1998.

Elliott Currie, *Crime and Punishment in America* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 1998); and Editorial, "Crack Sentences Revisited," *The Washington Post*, May 5, 1997; Fox Butterfield, "Racial Disparities Seen As Pervasive in Juvenile Justice," *The New York Times*, April 26, 2000.

James Brooke, "Prisons: Growth Industry for Some," *The New York Times*, November 2, 1997. Also see Steven R. Donziger, *The Real War on Crime: Report of the National Criminal Justice Commission* (New York: Harper Collins, 1996).

Jeffrey A. Roth, "Understanding and Preventing Violence," in *Research in Brief* (Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, 1994); and Richard A. Mendel, *Prevention or Pork? A Hard Look at Youth-Oriented Anti-Crime Programs* (Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum, 1995).

2. Peter Applebone, "From Riots of the '70s, A Report for a Nation with Will and Way for Healing," *The New York Times*, May 8, 1992; Robin Toner, "Los Angeles Riots Are a Warning, Americans Fear," *The New York Times*, June 14, 1992; Fox Butterfield "Racial Disparities Seen As Pervasive in Juvenile Justice," *The New York Times*, April 26, 2000.

3. What do I mean by "scientific evaluation"? The National Research Council has concluded that the vast majority of programs for the truly disadvantaged and the inner city are not evaluated, or receive superficial evaluations that do not allow conclusions to be drawn on whether the program actually worked. By contrast, the Eisenhower Foundation's standards for scientific evaluation are as follows:

- Scientific Research Design: The program was evaluated using a "quasi-experimental" design with comparison groups or an even more rigorous design with random assignment of subjects to program and control groups. Pre-post (before and after) outcome measures were undertaken.
- Targets Populations Most At-Risk: All or most of the persons receiving the interventions were truly disadvantaged in urban areas and were "at-risk" in terms of a combination of factors, including income, dependency, education, employment, earnings, teen pregnancy, delinquency, crime and substance abuse.
- A Focus on Core Problems: The program addressed at least

one of the problems or issues facing truly disadvantaged populations, like poverty, inadequate education, unemployment, crime, drugs, teen pregnancy, dependency and substandard housing.

- **Specific, Measurable Outcomes:** The outcome findings were not equivocal, but clear cut, with all or most of the key outcome variables showing improvements for the treatment groups that were statistically significant vis-a-vis control or comparison groups.
- **Implementation, Modification, Replication:** The program was not an isolated, narrow academic experiment, but it started with, or built up to, broader scale implementation, possibly at multiple sites which later may have been replicated still further. The evaluation included considerable practical information on the day-to-day management of implementation and on how organizational and staff issues impacted on final outcomes.
- **Specification of Program Elements:** The program intervention was articulated in sufficient detail. The demographic, social and risk characteristics of the population served by the program were specified.

These standards for scientific evaluation are comparable to recent reviews of programs in the *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* and by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. However, the Eisenhower Foundation gives more emphasis than such reviews to initiatives, beyond academic research, that have adequate technical designs but that also have been operating for some time in the rough-and-tumble of real-world street life, funding pressure, staff burnout, inadequate salaries and political machinations at the local and federal levels. Academic experiments are limited, in our experience, unless the ideas can be carried out and replicated on the streets.

The Foundation therefore has searched for common-sense programs that foundations, legislators and public sector executives can fund and replicate.

I can illustrate these standards by comparing them to the standards used by others. For example, an excellent review by the American Psychological Association has a number of programs that are academic experiments. But the Eisenhower Foundation has concluded that there is insufficient replication of these experiments and insufficient information on how day-to-day management impacted on outcomes. Similarly, some of the programs recognized in the PEPNET of the National Youth Employment Coalition do not show enough evidence of success, based on our standards of scientific evaluation. (See the website of the National Youth Employment Coalition at www.nyec.org.) Given the need to convince the American public that we do have solid evidence of what works, and that we should replicate such success to scale, programs with insufficient evaluation designs or equivocal findings are not included by the Eisenhower Foundation as examples of models.

For the studies cited in the foregoing, see:

American Youth Policy Forum. *Some Things Do Make A Difference for Youth*. Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum, 1997.

Howell, James C., Editor. *Guide for Implementing the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent and Chronic Juvenile Offenders*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, June, 1995.

National Research Council. *Losing Generations: Adolescents in High-Risk Settings*. Panel on the High Risk Youth, Committee on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1993.

Powell, Kenneth and Darnell F. Hawkins, Editors. "Youth Violence Prevention: Descriptions and Baseline Data from 13 Evaluation Projects." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, Supplement to Volume 12, Number 5, September/October 1996.

Price, Richard H., Emory L. Cowen, Raymond P. Lorion, and Julia Ramos-McKay, eds. *14 Ounces of Prevention: A Case Book for Practitioners*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 1988.

4. Peter B. Edelman, *Searching for America's Heart: RFK and the Renewal of Hope* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2001); Urban Institute, *Confronting the Nation's Urban Crisis: From Watts (1965) to South Central Los Angeles* (Washington, DC: Urban Institute, 1992); William J. Cunningham, "Enterprise Zones," Testimony before the Committee on Select Revenue Measures, Committee on Ways and Means, United States House of Representatives, July 11, 1991; Tom Furlong, "Enterprise Zone in L.A. Fraught with Problems," *Los Angeles Times*, May 19, 1992; "Reinventing America," *Business Week*, January 19, 1993; "Not so EZ," *Economist*, January 28, 1989. "Job Training and Partnership Act: Youth Pilot Projects," *Federal Register*, April 13, 1994.

5. Timothy Egan, "Less Crime, More Criminals," *The New York Times*, March 7, 1999, p. 1; The Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation, *To Establish Justice, To Insure Domestic Tranquility* (Washington, DC: The Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation, 1999); Alfred Blumstein and Joel Wallman, editors, *The Crime Drop in America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Jared Bernstein and Ellen Houston, *Crime and Work: What Can we Learn From the Low Wage Labor Market* (Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute, 2000).

6. Doris L. MacKenzie and Clair Souryal, *Multiple Evaluation of Shock Incarceration* (Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, 1994).

7. Pam Belluck, "Urban Volunteers Strain to Reach Fragile Lives," *The New York Times*, April 27, 1997, p. A1; James Bennett, "At Volunteerism Rally, Leaders Paint Walls and a Picture of Need," *New York Times*, April 27, 1997, p. A1; Bill Alexander, "On and Off the Wagon: America's Promise At Two," *Youth Today*, July/August, 1999; Sara Mosle, "The Vanity of Volunteerism," *New York Times Magazine*, July 2, 2000, p. 22.
8. The Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation, *Lessons from the Street: Capacity Building and Replication* (Washington, DC: Eisenhower Foundation, 2000; available on eisenhowerfoundation.org)
9. Lisbeth B. Schorr, "Helping Kids When It Counts," *The Washington Post*, April 30, 1997; Committee for Economic Development, *Children in Need; Investment Strategies for the Educationally Disadvantaged* (New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1987); Josh Wilgoreh, "National Study Examines Why Pupils Excel," *The New York Times*, July 26, 2000, P. A14.
10. The Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation, *Youth Investment and Police Mentoring* (Washington, DC: The Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation, 2000; available on eisenhowerfoundation.org).
11. Carnegie Corporation, *A Matter of Time* (New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1992).
12. James P. Comer, *Waiting for a Miracle* (New York: Dutton, 1997).
13. Joy G. Dryfoos, *Safe Passage: Making It Through Adolescence in a Risky Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998). Robert D. Felner *et al.*, "The Impact of School Reform for the Middle Years," *Phi Delta Kappa*, March, 1997, 528-50.
14. Andrew Hahn, *Quantum Opportunities Program: A Brief on the QOP Pilot Program* (Waltham, Mass.: Center for Human Resources, Heller Graduate School, Brandeis University, 1995).
15. Patrick Boyle, "The Best Program You Can't Afford," *Youth Today*, September, 2003, p. 1.
16. Barbara Miner, "Target: Public Education," *Nation*, November 30, 1998, p.4.
17. Jonathan Kozol, "Saving Public Education," *Nation*, Feb. 17, 1997.
18. This section is based on Lynn A. Curtis and Fred R. Harris. *The Millennium Breach*. (Washington, DC: The Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation, 1998) and United States Department of Labor, *National Job Corps Study: The Short Term Impact on Participants Employment and Related Outcomes* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, 2000). For evaluation details on the Argus model, see eisenhowerfoundation.org.

19. Michael Quint, "This Bank Can Turn a Profit and Follow a Social Agenda," *The New York Times*, May 24, 1992.
20. Ibid.
21. Janofsky, Michael, "Police Chiefs Say Criticism Is Founded, and Vow to Regain the Public Trust," *The New York Times*, April 10, 1999.
22. The Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation. *Youth Investment and Police Mentoring* (Washington, DC: The Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation, 2000; available on eisenhowerfoundation.org.)
23. Lisbeth Schorr, *Within Our Reach: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantaged* (New York: Doubleday, 1988).
24. The Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation, *Lessons from the Street: Capacity Building and Replication* (Washington, DC: Eisenhower Foundation, 2000; available on eisenhowerfoundation.org).
25. This policy is fully articulated in Fred R. Harris and Lynn A. Curtis, editors, *Locked in the Poorhouse* (Lanham, New York and Oxford:1998).
26. William G. Bowen and Derek Curtis Bok, *The Shape of the River* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998).
27. Christopher Wren, "Arizona Finds Cost Savings In Treating Drug Offenders," *The New York Times*, April 21, 1999, p. A16; Vince Stehle, "Vistas of Endless Possibility: Delancey Street Foundation Helps Felons and Addicts Rehabilitate Themselves into Responsible Citizens," *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, November 2, 1995, p. 59 and John M. Glionna, "Making Rehabilitation Into a Serious Business," *Los Angeles Times*, March 22, 2002.
28. This total has several components, as discussed in more detail in Fred R. Harris and Lynn A. Curtis, editors, *Locked in the Poorhouse* (Lanham, New York and Oxford, 1998):
 - \$7 billion per year is the estimated cost for expanding the existing Head Start program to all eligible poor children.
 - \$15 billion per year for replication of successful public inner-city school reform initiatives is based on estimates by Joy Dryfoos that roughly 15,000 schools in the United States serve disadvantaged urban youth, children and teenagers; that the average number of students per school is about 1,000; and that the average cost per student to implement reforms that work is about \$1,000.

- \$1 billion per year for a Corporation for Youth Investment is a conservative estimate for funding, technically assisting and evaluating safe haven-type and Quantum Opportunities-type replications for a fraction of the children, youth, and teenagers who could benefit from them.
- \$4.5 billion per year for job training reform modeled after the Argus Community would allow training each year for a fraction of the 2,000,000-plus inner-city unemployed who need it.
- \$1 billion per year for a National Community Development Bank is expected to generate a fraction of the 1,000,000 new private jobs that is our goal for the inner city. \$5 billion per year for 250,000 public sector construction and urban repair jobs each year is based on estimates in United States Conference of Mayors, *Ready to Go: New Lists of Transportation and Community Development Projects* (Washington, DC: United States Conference of Mayors, 1993). \$20 billion per year for 1,000,000 public service jobs is based on a minimum wage that averages to \$20,000 per year, with benefits and administrative expenses. This is somewhat higher than the average assumed in Richard McGahey, *Estimating the Economic Impact of a Public Jobs Program* (Washington, DC: Center for Community Change, 1997).
- \$50 million per year for replication of race-specific solutions is a conservative estimate of the cost of significantly expanding proven successes, like the Gatreux program for housing integration.
- \$2.4 billion per year is based primarily on estimates for expanding proven drug treatment for a fraction of those who need it, as calculated in Joseph A. Califano, Jr., "Crime and Punishments -- And Treatment, Too," *Washington Post*, February 8, 1998.

See also Mark Zepezauer and Arthur Naiman, *Take the Rich Off Welfare* (Tucson, Arizona: Odonian Press, 1996); *The New York Times* editorial, "Less Money Than Meets the Eye," July 9, 2000; and Jim Hightower, *If the Gods Had Meant Us to Vote, They Would Have Given Us Candidates* (New York: Harper-Collins, 2000).

29. Jim Hightower, *If the Gods Had Meant Us to Vote, They Would Have Given Us Candidates* (New York: Harper-Collins, 2000). Jim Hightower, *Thieves in High Places: They've Stolen Our Country and Its Time to Take It Back* (New York: Viking, 2003).

30. Jill Abramson, "Money Buys a Lot More Than Access," *The New York Times*, November 9, 1997; Kent Cooper, *Comments for the 30 Year Eisenhower Foundation Update of the Kerner Commission* (Washington, DC: Center for Responsive Politics, 1998); Ruth Marcus, "Business Donations Show Money Follows the Leaders," *The Washington Post*, November 25, 1997; Jamin

B. Raskin, "Dollar Democracy," *Nation*, May 5, 1997; E. Joshua Rosenkranz, "Campaign Reform: The Hidden Killers," *Nation*, May 5, 1997; Fred Wertheimer, "Unless We Ban Soft Money," *Washington Post*, August 10, 1997.

31. Lynn A. Curtis and Fred R. Harris. *The Millennium Breach* (Washington, DC: The Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation, 1998; available on eisenhowerfoundation.org); Tim Weiner, "A Congressman's Lament on the State of Democracy," *The New York Times*, October 4, 1999; David Callahan, *\$1 Billion for Ideas: Conservative Think Tanks in the 1990s* (Washington, DC: National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, 1999); James Ridgeway, "Heritage on the Hill," *Nation*, December 22, 1997.

32. George Gerbner, "Reclaiming Our Cultural Mythology," *In Context*, (1994); 40-42.

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid.

35. For examples of how positive news stories on the Kerner update were "framed" by the print media, see Michael A. Fletcher, "Kerner Prophecy on Race Relations Came True, Report Says," *Washington Post*, March 1, 1998; Alizza J. Rubin, "Racial Divide Widens, Study Says," *Los Angeles Times*, March 1, 1998; "Kerner Commission's Separate and Unequal Societies Exist Today: Report," *Jet*, March 23, 1998; and Domenica Marchetti, "Charities Must Work to Build on Successes in Fight Against Poverty, Report Says," *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, March 12, 1998. (See: What the Media Says About Us.)

For examples of supportive opinion on the Kerner update, see Editorial, "New War on Poverty," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, March 8, 1998; Editorial, "Progress and Need," *Christian Science Monitor*, March 5, 1998; Editorial, "Kerner at 30," *Minneapolis St. Paul Star Tribune*, March 4, 1998; Editorial, "Racial Equity Continues to Elude Nation," *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, March 7, 1998; Editorial, "The Kerner Report, 30 Years Later," *Boston Globe*, March 1, 1998; Barbara Reynolds, "Racial Divides Still Deserves Our Attention," *Detroit News and Free Press*, March 8, 1998; Gregory Stanford, "Still the Chasm: Racial Gap Remains Unbridged," *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, March 8, 1998; Brenda Payton, "Heed the Warnings," *Oakland Tribune*, March 5, 1998; Linda Wright Moore, "Deep Resolve Needed to Bridge the Race Abyss," *Philadelphia Daily News*, March 5, 1998; Dwight Lewis, "Nation's Strides towards Equality Have Been Great, But Far More Is Needed on the Economic Front," *The Tennessean*, March 1, 1998; Gracie Bonds Staples, "Still Separate But Unequal Societies -- And School Districts," *Fort Worth Star Telegram*, March 1, 1998; Charlie James, "Millennium Report Shows It's Time to Close Black-White Economic Gap," *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, March 6, 1998; Jesse Jackson, "Inequality Is Deeply Rooted," *Syracuse Herald Journal*, March 9, 1998; Elizabeth Bennett, "Read Any Good Reports Lately?" *Mishawaka Enterprise*, March 5, 1998; and Editorial, "Kerner Panel Decries Racism, While Industry Seeks Workers," *Waterloo Courier*, March 4, 1998. (See: What the Media Says About Us.)

For examples of how we dismissed naysayers, see Elliott Currie, "Inequality and Violence in Our

Cities," *Wall Street Journal*, March 23, 1998; Lynn A. Curtis, "Kerner Update Used Scientific Evidence," *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, April 9, 1998; Lynn A. Curtis, "A Long Way to Go," *Chicago Sun-Times*, April 26, 1998; and Lynn A. Curtis, "Supply-Side Policies of the 1980s Opened Up a Class Breach," *Washington Times*, April 27, 1998. (See: What the Media Says About Us.)

36. Lynn A. Curtis and Fred R. Harris. *The Millennium Breach* (Washington, DC: The Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation, 1998); *Non-profits and Technology Journal*, "Online Community To Tap for Non-profits," July, 1999, p. 1; and Andrew L. Shapiro, "The Net That Binds: Using Cyberspace to Create Real Communities," *Nation*, June 21, 1999, pp. 11-15.

37. Jeff Faux, "You Are Not Alone," in Stanley B. Greenberg and Theda Skocpol, eds., *The New Majority: Toward a Popular Progressive Politics* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997). John Jeter, "Cities, Oldest Suburbs Becoming Allies," *The Washington Post*, February 22, 1998.

38. Albert H. Cantril and Susan Davis Cantril, *Reading Mixed Signals: Ambivalence in American Public Opinion About Government*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999). See also David Broder, "Voters of Two Minds," *The Washington Post*, September 26, 1999, p. B7.

39. Alan Wolfe, "The New Politics of Inequality," *New York Times*, September 22, 1999, p. A27.

40. Ibid.

41. Ibid.

42. Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *The Paradox of American Power* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

