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Today’s Outline

- Structural Racialization, Systems Thinking, and Implicit Bias
- The Geography of Opportunity and Opportunity Mapping
- Targeted Universalism and ‘Situatedness’
- Knowledge and Narratives
- The Smart Growth Movement and Race
- Strategies for Moving Forward
The Two Bookends...

Implicit Bias

Structural Racialization
Structural Racialization and Systems Thinking

Our understanding of Opportunity has changed over time....
From a one-dimensional understanding...

- One variable can explain why differential outcomes.

...to a multi-dimensional understanding....

- **Structural Inequality**
  - Example: a Bird in a cage. Examining one bar cannot explain why a bird cannot fly. But multiple bars, arranged in specific ways, reinforce each other and trap the bird.
...to an understanding of processes and relationships

• Understanding the relationships among these multiple dimensions, and how these complex intra-actions change processes
  • Relationships are neither static nor discrete
Opportunity is....

Racialized...

- In 1960, African-American families in poverty were 3.8 times more likely to be concentrated in high-poverty neighborhoods than poor whites.
- In 2000, they were 7.3 times more likely.

Spatialized...

- marginalized people of color and the very poor have been spatially isolated from opportunity via reservations, Jim Crow, Appalachian mountains, ghettos, barrios, and the culture of incarceration.

Globalized...

- Economic globalization
- Climate change
- the Credit and Foreclosure crisis
We are all situated within "opportunity structures".

These structures interact in ways that produce racialized outcomes for different groups, but also in ways that influence racial identity...
Social Cognition
Warmth and Competence

High

Where do you think your group ranks?

Perceived as highly competent, with high warmth

Low

Perceived as incompetent, with low warmth

Warmth

Low

Competence

High

Social Cognition contd.

Warmth and Competence

- **Warmth**
  - High
  - Low

- **Competence**
  - Low
  - High

- **Low Warmth, Low Competence**: Despised: African Americans
- **Low Warmth, High Competence**: Pity: women, elderly, disabled
- **High Warmth, Low Competence**: Competent, but don’t really like them: Asians
- **High Warmth, High Competence**: Your own group, who you identify with

What if two groups are marginalized in similar ways?

What's the relationship between these two groups?

Example: African Americans and Mexican Americans—they are both despised.

We can't assume that these two groups will be in coalition simply because they might hold similar social positions...

Interactions are impacted by members of dominant group and mediated by marginalized groups themselves.
Just because people have a similar position, does not mean they have similar consciousness....
Studies of Intergroup Relations

- Rodriguez and Segura (2004). Latinos and Blacks often share socioeconomic circumstances, but these shared circumstances “lead to shared positions only when the similarity of circumstances and their root causes are accurately perceived. ... [However] middle class Latinos or higher educated African-Americans might not necessarily perceive their own co-ethnics, let alone the other group, as sharing needs and, hence, political interests.” (10)

- “While common circumstances may lead to the perception of shared interests, there is simultaneously a second likely effect – the very high likelihood that these groups will be forced to engage in competition over jobs, over control of labor unions and sectors of the economy, and even over demographic hegemony at the neighborhood level.” (11)

- To the extent it exists, is emerging cooperation the product of genuinely shared values and preferences, or rather the result of circumstances and structured choices?
Intergroup Relations, contd.

- Kaufman (2007). “In the multiethnic city, the minority group that garners the top spot in the political arena gets a disproportionate amount of [these] resources…. In this ‘winner takes most’ system of minority rewards, the prospect of being in the winning coalition is a powerful incentive to coalesce with White voters against competing minority groups.” (87)

- It’s a 3-player game, and the minority group in coalition with Whites always wins.

- McClain et. al. (2006). Study found that “the overwhelming majority of Latino immigrant respondents (78.3%) feel that they have the most in common with whites and the least in common with blacks (52.8%). Curiously, the relatively warm feelings toward whites and the coolness toward blacks among Latino respondents are not mutual.” (579-580)
Example: African Americans and Immigrants (African)

- There is occasional competition over which group is more oppressed.
- "The biggest tool used to divide is ignorance."
  - Immigrants are unaware of the history of the Civil Rights movement and the role of race in the U.S.
  - African Americans often take an anti-immigrant position because they do not understand the forces of globalization.
- The established leadership in both communities can be reluctant to join alliances.
  - Hesitation to support an issue of the other community because they think their constituency is against it
  - Fear of losing the power they possess
- Part of the African American community feels that the increased attention to the immigrants means a lack of attention to their community, and their disenfranchisement.
- "Immigrants are exploited; African Americans are excluded."
Process of Social Stratification: Who gains access to what resources...

Categorization

Inequality

Hoard and Exploitation

Emulation and Adaptation

Conscious and Unconscious (i.e., implicit bias)

Pattern recognition and generalization

This may change over time, but the whole structure is highly inert

Wait! “Conscious or unconscious” categorizations??

Implicit Bias and Structural Racialization
Three Interrelated Sites of Racial Justice

Explicit

Implicit

Structures & Policies
Implicit Bias

- only 2% of emotional cognition is available to us consciously
- messages can be framed to speak to our unconscious
- racial bias tends to reside in the unconscious network
Unconscious Networks

What colors are the following lines of text?

1. Vqeb peow ytro
2. Cvur zxyq brrm
3. Vhrn wwte zytn
4. Xoc jbní oew mne
5. Zre ytu vee mkp
Unconscious Networks

What colors are the following lines of text?

1. Red
2. Blue
3. Yellow
4. Green
5. Brown
Unconscious Networks

- What colors are the following lines of text?

1. Sky
2. Grass
3. Dirt
4. Sunshine
5. Stop sign
Unconscious Networks

- What colors are the following lines of text?

1. Dirt
2. Sunshine
3. Sky
4. Grass
5. Stop sign
Unconscious Networks

- What colors are the following lines of text?

1. Green
2. Blue
3. Brown
4. Red
5. Yellow
Awareness Test

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yrqrkihlw-s
Checkpoint:

- How does the concept of *implicit bias* impact my understanding of systems and structural racialization?

- Where does this fit in with the work I do?

- What does it indicate about changing ‘the system’?
I. Physical opportunity structures...

- We need to think about the ways in which the institutions that mediate opportunity are arranged
  - The order of the structures
  - The timing of the interaction between them
  - The relationships that exist between/among them

The Newtonian Perspective:

A → B → C → D → E

Social phenomena may be understood by breaking down the sum of the constituent parts.

Systems Thinking:

A → C → D
B → E

Causation is reciprocal, mutual, and cumulative.
II. Social opportunity structures...

- People/groups are situated differently in relation to social infrastructure

  - Social Capital
    - Different levels of social capital within and between groups
    - Different geographies of social capital
      - Some may only have access to capital/networks within their immediate neighborhood, but others may have access to capital/networks beyond their immediate environment

  - Organization
    - Some groups are more organized than others and are more able to make collective demands on institutions
    - Some groups may be considered “invisible” in a community
    - Some groups may be organized but keep their efforts internal, they do not project their efforts beyond their immediate group
III. Cultural opportunity structures

- ‘Space’ where symbolic meaning (shared norms, values, goals etc) is experienced and expressed, constructed and confirmed
Ongoing Racial Inequalities

Outcomes: Racial Disparities

Racial inequalities in current levels of well-being
Capacity for individual and community improvement is undermined

Context: The Dominant Consensus on Race

National values
Contemporary culture

Current Manifestations: Social and Institutional Dynamics

Processes that maintain racial hierarchies
Racialized public policies and institutional practices

Adapted from the Aspen Roundtable on Community Change. “Structural Racism and Community Building.” June 2004
The outcome of structural racialization is a highly uneven Geography of Opportunity...

Some people ride the “Up” escalator to reach opportunity. Others have to run up the “Down” escalator to get there.
Who’s to blame?
Historic Government Role

- A series of mutually reinforcing federal policies across multiple domains have contributed to the disparities we see today
  - School Desegregation
  - Suburbanization/ Homeownership
  - Urban Renewal
  - Public Housing
  - Transportation
Today,
Institutions continue to support, not dismantle, the status quo. This is why we continue to see racially inequitable outcomes even if there is good intent behind policies, or an absence of racist actors. (i.e. structural racialization)
Example: Foreclosure Crisis

A Geography of Credit...

From Redlining...

...to Reverse Redlining
“Race or Risk”?

...what about fair credit

Source: United for a Fair Economy
Global financial systems operate outside the scope of US regulations and they are increasingly complex...

Pre Depression: The Two Party Housing Market

Party 1: Homebuyer

Party 2: Seller (and/or) Lending Institution

The Post Depression FHA Era: The Three Party Mortgage Market

Party 1: Homebuyer

Party 2: Lending Institution

Party 3: Government Sponsored Institution (purchases, insures or underwrites loan)

Based on research by Chris Peterson, University of Utah Law School
...From Two Party Transactions to Mortgage Securitization at a Global Scale

Today:
The web of actors and institutions involved in the sub prime lending and mortgage securitization market
What is the Solution?

- **Individual?**
  - Example: Financial literacy for consumers.
  - But even Wall Street investors didn’t know what was going on…

- **System?**
  - Example: The Goldman Sachs SEC charge…
  - But it was not just one hedge fund manager’s fraud.
  - Multiple breaking points in the system
    - 2-tiered delivery system
    - Pre-emption?
    - Enforcement?
    - Credit rating agencies?
    - Etc.
Solutions contd.

- **Rational vs. Reasonable:**
  - Rational: decisions that are good for me (i.e. *transactional*)
  - Reasonable: decisions that are good for the collective whole. They change the system (i.e. *transformative*)

- **Dynamic patterns over time tell us whether something is good or bad.**
  - Example: If doctor tells me one cell in my body died, that doesn’t tell me much about health of my entire body. My body is not only shedding things, but taking things in.
  - Example: Price in housing is increasing--that’s good for me. But if everyone decides to buy, this inflates the bubble and that means economy is going to implode-- that’s bad for society.
What do the Structural Racialization and implicit bias approaches contribute?

- Structural Racialization lifts up the impact of institutional arrangements and policies on group outcomes
  - Cumulative causation—systems interact!
  - Racialized outcomes do not require racist actors

- Implicit Bias moves us beyond a “colorblind” frame
  - Challenges our assumptions

- Both move us beyond the “individual merit” argument
Example: “In the US, Black students do not perform as well as white students on standardized tests.”

- Factually correct
- But what does this sentence suggest?
  - Black students inherently not as capable?
  - SR opens the analysis to impact of housing on schools, concentrated poverty in schools, under-resourced schools
  - Structures “normalize”. So when we are navigating through structures (ex. education system), we do so without actively thinking.
    - Example: We have accepted the normalization of testing in the US.
Example contd.
But what if testing itself is the problem??

- We look at the gap in testing and ways to alleviate that gap.
- Example: Finland has eliminated examination systems that had previously tracked students for middle schools and restricted access to high schools, among other key changes.
- Outcome of changes: graduating over 90% of HS students; consistently high rankings on international standards.
- Point: without SR/implicit bias approach, we misdiagnose the problem.
Checkpoint:

- What do the Structural Racialization and implicit bias approaches suggest in terms of indentifying problems and developing solutions in the work I do?

- How might my understanding of systems inform the work I do?
  - We have a lot of knowledge and experience relating to ‘neighborhood effects’—how has this research been informed by an understanding of how systems interact?

- How are these concepts (systems, neighborhoods, structural racialization) related?
Opportunity Mapping

Showing the Geography of Opportunity
Regional, racial and social inequity often manifest as **spatial inequity**

Mapping shows the cumulative effects of opportunity segregation
Why are maps particularly effective in dealing with issues of equity?
- Maps are naturally the best tools to display this spatial phenomena
- Used to identify the salient opportunity structures, and which groups have access to them, or what possible impediments might exist

Other disciplines and sectors are using mapping to problem solve
- Private industry
Omaha MSA: Race and Poverty

Omaha

Council Bluffs
Historic Redlining & the Opportunity Model
Neighborhood Stabilization Program
Investment and Race
Checkpoint:

- How does this multi-dimensional, multi-scalar understanding of the geography of opportunity inform the work I do?

- How do these maps help my understanding of structural racialization, neighborhoods, and sustainability?
  - What are they missing? How could they be improved?

- How do I go about the hard work of transferring these complex concepts to the critical work that I do?
Group Activity
Targeted Universalism and Situatedness
“Situatedness” is relational...

- **Laws on Wall Street...**

  - “Wall Street Reform”
  - Goldman Sachs
    - Charged with Fraud in structuring and marketing of CDOs tied to Subprime Mortgages

---

...But our traditional approach fails to recognize the connections among these...

- ...have an impact in Cleveland neighborhoods

In other words, hedge fund manager wins if Cleveland loses
Targeted Universalism and Situatedness

- Problem: 3 people are out to sea and a big storm is coming.
- Goal: To reach the people within 6 hours
- Assumption: If we can reach them within 6 hours, we will save them all
Example Contd.

- But the 3 are all in the stormy water in the way…
- Which person would be most likely to survive the 6 hours it would take to reach them??
- If water is a “structure,” (housing, education, etc.) some groups are able to navigate the structure more successfully than other groups…
What about differences in the experience of marginalization within one group?

Example: Asians/Asian Americans are extremely diverse in religion, language, culture

Also extremely diverse in their experiences with ‘the system’

- As a whole, Asian American population fares well (ranks highest in income and education of any group)
- But subgroups within population have very different experiences
  - Example: Cambodian, Laotian, Hmong per capita income below Blacks, Latinos, and American Indians, and half that of whites.
Locating Your Opportunity Structures

- What are the salient opportunity structures in your community?
  - Parks, Schools, Housing, etc.

- Does your group have the resources to access these structures?
  - What is the relationship between your group and other groups?
  - How does access vary within your group?
Difference between individual assets and community assets

- Example: Universal Health care
  - Giving individuals health care insurance does not guarantee improved health outcomes
    - Since the passage of near-universal healthcare in Massachusetts in 2006, emergency room visits in the state have spiked, fed largely by demand from newly insured patients with conditions best treated by primary care doctors. Kowalczyk, Liz.

- What structures matter for health outcomes?
  - Housing, schools, parks, etc.?
  - Is it just proximity to a hospital?
  - How do we connect communities to these assets? Or do we have to build these structures first??
Knowledge and Narratives

Understanding the shifting relationships among/between **structures and people** changes how we think and talk about “race”
Knowledge

- Bounded but not closed

- All knowledge is anchored in relationship to other knowledge

- But not all knowledge is created equal….
  - Example:
    - Historically, Blacks could not testify in court
    - This institutionalized white superiority of knowledge and made knowledge “exclusive”

- Tensions between knowledge
  - Hierarchy
Narratives

- Different narratives for different groups
  - Middle-class Latinos have different structural relationships than poor Latinos,
  - Asian Americans as a group vs. subgroup structural relationships,
  - So they have different stories/experiences of structures…

- This is why giving everyone a voice by creating a space for discourse is critical
  - Creating a new knowledge, shared and more holistic
Checkpoint:

- How are my programs and services accounting for how people are differently situated?
  - Do we create a “space” for dialogue?

- Whose knowledges and narratives are encouraged?

- How could we better understand and monitor our different interventions?
The Smart Growth Movement and Race

Equity and Sustainability
Where we stand today…

- Development of parallel movements
  - “environmental justice” and “sustainability”
- Each movement addresses pieces of our collective environment, inc. social, natural, and built, but not addressing as a holistic set of issues.
- History of mistrust; different orientations in the paradigms
Sustainability Orientations

“Green” Agenda

- Environmental protections, biodiversity, ozone protection

“Brown” Agenda

- Poverty alleviation, infrastructural development, and health and education
“False Choice”

- Smart growth focuses on the built environment, and its impact on the natural environment, but humans are part of that environment
  - *How* and *Where* we grow, and *Who* wins and loses
- Social implications for underserved communities treated as an afterthought
- Taking care of the environment is important, but it can’t be on the backs of marginalized communities
Both movements have leadership and traction in their own right, but the big question is how to come together effectively?

We need to create a movement that is both global in scope and explicitly focused on human rights as the cornerstone of sustainability.

- Expand the scope of sustainability—inclusiveness and equity matter for sustainability.

We need to intentionally link the structures and policies in the two movements, recognize their inter-relatedness.

- Structural racialization analysis
Beyond Collaboration: A New Platform?

- To the extent that the movements hold the same overarching values—healthy, sustainable, equitable communities—then no longer just an issue of collaboration, but of creating a new platform
Checkpoint

How does my foundation approach producing change? Do we:
1. Do what’s “fair” - a lot of people receive a little help
2. Triage – help those who are in the worst situation
3. Transform – figure out what went wrong in order to correct it

How does our approach relate with structural racialization? How could a structural racialization inform/improve our approach?

Where do engagement and empowerment fit in?
Strategies for Moving Forward Together
Changes at Multiple Levels…

I. Our Understanding of Situatedness
II. Orientation of the Movement
III. Our Dialogue
I. Understanding “Situatedness”

- We come from different places. Illuminating people’s different and shared experiences of oppression encourages collective action with others whose experiences may be slightly different.

- Young’s 5 Faces of Oppression: Different groups/people experience one or more of these faces throughout their lives
  - Exploitation
  - Marginalization
  - Powerlessness
  - Cultural Dominance
  - Violence

“Situatedness” and Interests

- Our interests are “situational”
- Not all tensions are personal, some are structural
- Targeted Universalism
  - We may have common goals, but because we are differently situated we may be in sharp contrast.

Solutions?
- **Transactional**: “Discovering” common interests
  - But this operates within the current structure, may limit our choices
- **Transformational**: “Creating” common interests
  - This changes our situatedness, in turn changes our interests and ultimately the structure
Successful Examples

Strategy: Reframing

Portland, OR.

- Chasm between social justice advocacy organizations and the planning community. Recent dialogue changed the frame from “disparities” to a “universal but targeted” frame that moved all groups closer to the target.

- Outcome: Advocacy organizations are now involved in the planning process to develop Metro's regional plan that will shape investment and development over the next 50 years.

Cleveland, OH.

Regionalism and tension between city and inner suburbs. Inner suburbs afraid would lose resources to the city, but city recognized that they needed to work with the suburbs. Reframed from fight over current resources, to future distribution.

Outcome: No current resources would be redistributed between city and suburbs, but future development would be shared more equitably.
Successful Examples contd.
Strategy: Changing the Situatedness

- SEIU Union in LA. and undocumented immigrant organizing
  - Black tensions with Latinos in unions
  - Union concerned that not including undocumented workers in union would decrease its effectiveness.
  - When union included undocumented immigrants into its ranks, this changed the structure of tensions among these different groups
    - No longer Blacks against Latinos, etc.
  - Outcome: “Silent structure” that had been operating was revealed—the real beneficiary from tensions among workers were corporations.
    - Workers’ situations were changed, interests were changed, structure was changed.
II. Changing the Orientation of the Smart Growth Movement

- If we’re going to change, then it has to be a **structural** change
  - Changing how we think about the built environment/space, and people’s relationship with it

- The “Triple Bottom Line”?
  - But there must be an explicit focus on social equity…
Expanding the Scope of Sustainability

“to be environmentally sustainable, cities must also be socially sustainable…”

“unless analyses of development [local, national, or international]….begin not with the symptoms, environmental, or economic instability, but with the cause, social injustice, then no development can be sustainable.”

Connected policy-making

- Policy-making in specific areas (i.e. housing, environment) with an eye to its effect on the policy architecture as a whole
  - Right now we are in policy ‘silos’
- US examples?
  - Sustainable Communities Initiative (HUD, EPA, and DOT)
III. Changing the Dialogue

- How do we talk about race? How do we think about the audience?
- Does the language of the smart growth movement resonate with different communities?
Opportunities for Philanthropy

- Employ/Invest in strategic communications regarding race
  - Help push national dialogue to overcome the common binary of
    (1) we’re in a post-racial world where race ‘doesn’t matter’;
    (2) we’re stuck in the past where race is ‘everything’
  - Emphasize productive discussions around race that thoughtfully
    inform policy design and advocacy

- Collaborate and focus your efforts
  - Allocate your money strategically – a little bit in a lot of places is
    not as effective as focused efforts that can later be replicated
    elsewhere

- Capacity building
  - Increase the participation of marginalized groups in policy design
    - Improve the “power position” of these groups
  - Improve data collection, monitoring, and evaluation of state and
    federal programs
Sustainable Advocacy

- Commitment to the Long Haul
- Clear Vision and Frame
- Bringing It to Scale
- Willingness to Network with Other Movements

In Sum…

Implicit Bias

Structural Racialization

Power
Structural racialization includes a person’s or group’s position in and to physical, social, and cultural opportunity structures. Uneven distribution of resources within these structures creates an uneven geography of opportunity. But this landscape is constantly changing/evolving. Creating a space for dialogue that is inclusive of all groups reveals our different—and evolving—narratives and knowledge.

Opportunity mapping is a way to spatially locate groups’ different narratives and understand different groups’ geographies of opportunity. This understanding has important implications for addressing groups’ “situatedness”.

The philanthropy community has the opportunity to actively engage a new understanding of Situatedness and Structural Racialization to re-orient the smart growth movement towards a new movement explicitly centered on equity and sustainability.