

New England Journal of Public Policy

Volume 30

Issue 1 *Wealth, Power, and the Public Interest:*
Building Equity Culture and Civic Stewardship | *Select*
writings by Marcy Murningham

Article 6

3-20-2018

Undimmed by Human Tears: American Cities, Philanthropy, and the Civic Ideal (1992)

Marcy Murningham
marcy.murningham@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umb.edu/nejpp>

 Part of the [Economic Policy Commons](#), [Public Policy Commons](#), [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#),
and the [Urban Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Murningham, Marcy (2018) "Undimmed by Human Tears: American Cities, Philanthropy, and the Civic Ideal (1992)," *New England Journal of Public Policy*: Vol. 30 : Iss. 1 , Article 6.
Available at: <https://scholarworks.umb.edu/nejpp/vol30/iss1/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. It has been accepted for inclusion in New England Journal of Public Policy by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. For more information, please contact library.uasc@umb.edu.

Undimmed by Human Tears: American Cities, Philanthropy, and the Civic Ideal

Commissioned by the Council on Foundations in 1992 at a time when urban concerns had fallen off the national agenda, this article contains summary recommendations of an investigation into the response of grantmakers and urban policy experts after the deadly violence that occurred in Los Angeles that spring. An April 29 state-court acquittal of police officers accused of using excessive force against Rodney King had sparked two days of burning and looting throughout South Central Los Angeles, an area hard-hit by job loss and plant closings that over the previous twenty years had become demographically and economically transformed. Once an almost entirely African American community, South Central Los Angeles was now about half Latino. Many Latinos were recent arrivals to the United States and more than half were undocumented. Meanwhile, the vast majority of legal immigrants came from Asia and Latin America. As Los Angeles moved from being a biracial society to a multiracial one, interracial and interethnic relations had become explosive. That demographic shift occurred in conjunction with severe economic decline and a 16 percent unemployment rate, which primarily affected African Americans and Latinos, setting the stage for outbursts of long-simmering hostility and discord. The Los Angeles uprising, which spilled over from the low-income South Central neighborhoods into wealthier neighborhoods, became the most destructive in U.S. history. Reprinted here are the summary recommendations that emerged from the research, which included structured interviews with forty-seven individuals, including foundation presidents, senior-level philanthropy officials, and four individuals who were prominent experts on urban affairs.

Preface

O beautiful for patriot dream
That sees beyond the years
Thine alabaster cities gleam
Undimmed by human tears!
America! America!
God shed His grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood,
From sea to shining sea!
—Katharine Lee Bates
“America the Beautiful,” 1893

At last it is beginning to dawn upon us, that at some time in the past—when, we are not sure—we became separated from our absolutes. It is from the life of our youth that we discover we have lost our way. . . . Now, it often seems to us, they turn and rend us because we have sought to nourish them with the sense of our failure. . . .

It is time for assessing and reassign resources in the light of the most ancient memory of the race concerning community, to hear again the clear voice of the prophet and seer calling for harmony among all the children of men. At length there will begin to be talk of plans for the new city—that has never before existed on land or sea. At the center of the common life there will be strange and vaguely familiar stirrings. Some there will be whose dreams will be haunted by forgotten events in which in a moment of insight they saw a vision of a way of life transcending all barriers alien to community. . . .

. . . Then the wisest among them will say: What we have sought we have found, our own sense of identity. We have an established center out of which at last we can function and relate to men. We have committed to heart and to nervous system a feeling of belonging and our spirits are no longer isolated and afraid. We have lost our fear of our brothers and are no longer ashamed of ourselves, of who and what we are—Let us now go forth to save the land of our birth from the plague that first drove us into the “will to quarantine” and to separate ourselves behind self-imposed walls. For this is why we were born: Men, all men, belong to each other, and he who shuts himself away diminishes himself, and he who shuts another away from him destroys himself. And all the people said *Amen*.

—Rev. Howard Thurman

The Search for Common Ground, 1971

Men may find God in nature, but when they look at cities they are viewing themselves. And what Americans see mirrored in their cities these days is not very flattering. To any of the awakened senses, urban America can be a depressing experience.

—Paul Ylvisaker

The American City: Mirror to Man, 1966¹

Never lose your capacity to be outraged.

—Paul Ylvisaker

In Simi Valley, a white suburb of Los Angeles, on April 29, 1992, a California state court jury acquitted the four Los Angeles police officers accused of using excessive force in brutally beating Rodney King with night sticks. This not-guilty verdict sparked two days of burning and looting throughout South Central Los Angeles, an area hard-hit by job loss and plant closings that over the past twenty years has been demographically and economically transformed and is now characterized by extreme forms of poverty and linguistic and cultural isolation.

Once almost entirely an African American community, one-half of the population of South Central Los Angeles is Latino, many of whom are recent arrivals to the United States; estimates are that over one-half of these recent immigrants, primarily from Latin America, are undocumented. In Los Angeles County, the percentage of immigrants has almost tripled in the past twenty years, with 32.6 percent of the population being foreign-born. During the 1980s, the vast majority of legal immigrants came from Asia and Latin America: forty-nine percent migrated from Asia, 35.2 percent from Latin America (with 17.7 percent from Mexico alone) and 15.8 percent from Europe, Africa, and the Middle East.² Unemployment is largely

concentrated in South Central Los Angeles, where the unemployment rate is over sixteen percent.

The effects of these social and economic changes over the past twenty years have disproportionately affected the area's Latino and African American youth, who have higher levels of unemployment and school truancy. The resulting anger and alienation have produced a situation where multi-culturalism is often equated with enmity as Latinos and African Americans compete for entry-level jobs in low-growth industries that often pay wages that are below the prevailing rate, and as each group sees the other as contributing to social and economic inequities. In contrast, many immigrants from Asia and Central America have established small retail businesses and appear to embody the American dream: that if you educate yourself and work hard enough, you can get ahead and stay ahead.

The Los Angeles context, then, of the Simi Valley verdict was one in which interracial and interethnic relations were and are potentially explosive and where tension and frustration continue to increase. Moreover, as Los Angeles moved from being a biracial society to a multiracial one, in conjunction with a severe economic decline, which has primarily affected African Americans and Latinos, the stage was set for outbursts of long-simmering hostility and discord, which found ugly expression in the violent days following the jury acquittal. Unlike other urban riots, this one was multiracial and multiethnic and spilled over from the low-income South Central neighborhoods into wealthier neighborhoods, as well. Weapons stores were the first targets, followed by electronics shops, liquor stores (primarily owned by Koreans), and nail parlors; not a single McDonald's was damaged, nor were libraries, schools, or churches.

Throughout the three days of fury, four thousand local police officers, 2,500 state police, four thousand more from the county sheriff's office, and 9,800 from the National Guard were dispatched to the scene. When the frenzy subsided, the result was a form of civic murder that left at least fifty-three people dead, three thousand wounded, four thousand arrests (fifty-one percent being Latino), and over a billion dollars in property damage, half of it uninsured, with a seven hundred percent increase in gun purchases over the subsequent three weeks. It was the most destructive urban disturbance in U.S. history, yet little Federal aid has arrived.

The aftermath of the April violence and looting in Los Angeles continues, sometimes in events that grab headlines—such as the August 5 indictment by the Justice Department of the four police officers charged with the beating of Rodney King, or the efforts of the father of a slain son to find his killer,³ or the story about Peter Ueberroth and Rebuild Los Angeles' efforts to engage business in tackling the problems of the inner city,⁴ or the story about how the process of rebuilding is itself generating racial tensions in small business,⁵ or the appearance by Daryl Gates on a Los Angeles radio talk show,⁶ or the story about African American complaints that they are underrepresented on inner-city rebuilding projects,⁷ or the description of how things have not changed half a year later,⁸ or the series chronicling the intensification of fear and mistrust in Los Angeles neighborhoods.⁹

But by and large, the episode seems to have faded from public consciousness; in an August 25 issue of the *New York Times*, a story recounting the fact that *twenty people were killed in one weekend*—the worst period of violence in the city since the upheaval—was relegated to seven paragraphs on page 15!¹⁰

Perhaps the riots were too anxiety-provoking for comfort, too awful to endure for very long, a sign that something has gone seriously wrong in this country, causing us to disengage. Besides, what happened in Los Angeles happened to “them,” not “us”; it is “they” who must do the

necessary “cultural” and “moral” work for civic prosperity, “they” who must fit “our” framework of what it means to be an American. Contributing to our psychic disengagement is the fact that many of us are preoccupied with day-to-day survival in an economy that continues to languish, a preoccupation that tugs at the pocketbook and nags at the soul, eroding the once-passionate indignation many felt last spring, and reminding us of our apparent failure to live up to the promise of one nation, under God, with liberty and justice for all.

Perhaps it is not unnatural to expect that many people would turn their attention closer to home, once the story faded from the screen and those nearest the events began to carry out their respective missions. After all, there is only so much that the human heart and mind can take—for stress and despair are not restricted to the South Central neighborhoods of Los Angeles. There is plenty of that throughout the nation’s communities to keep a multitude of compassionate people busy for a long time.

But there are also many—both those directly engaged in efforts to rebuild Los Angeles as well as those who, through indirect means, attempt to alleviate the conditions giving rise to urban unrest—who view what happened last April as an opportunity to revisit assumptions concerning the alleviation of poverty, the nature of racial and ethnic divisions, and the viability of American cities as we move forward to the future. Indeed, a colleague of mine named Rev. Dr. James Breeden, a long-time civil rights activist who is Dean of the Tucker Foundation at Dartmouth College, recently commented in his characteristically wry way that the Los Angeles violence represented perhaps the first riots of the twenty-first century. His was a reference to the demographic and circumstantial complexity that makes easy summation of why things happened the way they did difficult to defend. Whether or not Dr. Breeden was correct, we should not forget those who died there—and should resolve that they did not die in vain. There is much unfinished work to do.

For the events of last April—and last August—present us with the opportunity to ask ourselves some tough questions about what we as a nation have become and are becoming, questions about what is important to us and whether or not we are able to fulfill our noble aspirations, questions to which our political rhetoric provides hopelessly anemic answers. In fact, part of the problem in coping with the repercussions of the Los Angeles death and destruction is that we lack a public language, a shared vocabulary, for addressing such questions, for talking about what we thought was violated, what we thought went wrong, and what we need to consider if we are truly committed to living up to our civic ideal.

Our dilemmas, then, are dilemmas related to the urgency of doing something positive about racial and economic disenfranchisement but trying to do so within a public arena that lacks the leadership and language to give our efforts moral legitimacy. Absent, too, is a vision of community that embraces the diverse ways in which we are connected—no longer by shared place as much as by shared interests, values, and experience.

Indeed, we seem to gravitate to smaller groupings as we perceive malice toward all in the broader public square, seeking safety and solitude not in the company of strangers but with those who think and act the way we do. While laudable, such a return to local roots may signal danger, if what gets unraveled is the mantle of civic virtue, of that transcendent “good” that animates our democratic and pluralist society.

Los Angeles showed us the abyss in which all things were permitted—yet individual acts of courage and grace commanded our attention. Nihilism did not reign. But we were reminded that we lack a convincing account of our civic ideal that is morally compelling, politically pragmatic, and institutionally sound, a civic ideal that sustains our diverse communities—with their

distinguished languages and dreams—and enables us to build on what we hold dear, and what we hold in common. We have yet to create the ways and means for engaging in alternative accounts of that transcendent good through which we may order our lives together.

This spring Los Angeles warned us once again, just as we were reminded twenty-five years ago when violence erupted in the urban core, that we have the potential in our cities for creating civil war—a far cry from the *civitas* on which our democracy depends. But it also showed us that we have the power, if not the will, to create and support efforts aimed at the North Star of the City of Our Dreams, at the City of Hope—and that we need to rededicate ourselves to the proposition that as go the cities, so goes America, and that the time has come to elevate our thinking and doing to a higher plane that places our civic ideal, our urban condition, foursquare on the public agenda. To do otherwise imperils our common life and undermines our common human future.

What Patriot Dream?

The task of the coming city is not essentially different: its mission is to put the highest concerns of man at the center of all his activities: to unite the scattered fragments of the human personality, turning artificially dismembered men—bureaucrats, specialists, ‘experts,’ depersonalized agents—into complete human beings, repairing the damage that has been done by vocational separation, by social segregation, by the over-cultivation of a favored function, by tribalisms and nationalisms, by the absence of organic partnerships and ideal purposes.

Before modern man can gain control over the forces that now threaten his very existence, he must resume possession of himself. This sets the chief mission for the city of the future: that of creating a visible regional and civic structure, designed to make man at home with his deeper self and his larger world, attached to images of human nurture and love.

—Lewis Mumford

The City in History, 1961

To determine the impact of the Los Angeles riots on grantmaker’ thinking and practice, the Council on Foundations initiated a sample survey of a select group of community, independent, and corporate foundations. Dr. Marcy Murningham, Visiting Fellow at the John W. McCormack Institute of Public Affairs, was asked by James A. Joseph, Council President, to carry out the investigation. Overall, the project involved a series of structured telephone and face-to-face interviews with forty-seven individuals, most of whom are foundation officials, conducted from July through October, 1992. Within this group, forty-two grantmakers, twenty-three of whom are current or former foundation presidents, shared their thoughts and observations about organized philanthropy, Los Angeles, and the American city. (See Appendix for list of interviewees.) All individuals were asked to answer a series of questions about their organizations’ response to the Los Angeles upheaval, their assessment of what has and has not worked with respect to urban problems, the nature of their institutional collaboration on city issues with other entities, their perceptions of the gaps in and alternative approaches to urban dilemmas, other resources they consider helpful and worth knowing about, and their thoughts as to how the Council on Foundations might play a positive role in responding to the multiple, complex, and interrelated needs of the nation’s cities.

A special word. When listening to the voices of those on the frontlines of the business of

benevolence, one becomes aware of many other voices which echo from the past. Local organizing and ownership, comprehensive and site-specific tactics, the need to restore concerns about alleviating poverty and racial/ethnic division through bold and brave measures—many of these themes which emerged again and again during the interview process seem to be part of a melody that spans the decades. The music may have faded, but the rhythm remains and the beat goes on. Therefore, to place emerging patterns and themes in the historic context of American urban policy, the author also drew upon other distinguished resources. Four individuals with extensive knowledge and experience with respect to urban affairs contributed their wisdom: Dr. Robert C. Wood, Luce Professor at Wesleyan University and former Undersecretary and Secretary of the newly-created Department of Housing and Urban Development in the Johnson Administration, architect of Model Cities, and former Director of the Joint Center for Urban Studies, Harvard/MIT; Dr. Bernard J. Frieden, Professor of City Planning at MIT's Department of Urban Studies and Planning and former Associate Staff Director of the 1965 Model Cities Task Force; Dr. James Adolph Norton, better known as "Dolph", former Director of both The Cleveland Foundation and the now-defunct Greater Cleveland Associated Foundation, former Chancellor of Higher Education in Ohio, and long-time authority on urban policy issues, particularly with respect to metropolitanism; and Mitchell Sviridoff, founder of the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), former Vice President of the Ford Foundation and former Executive Director of Community Progress, Inc., New Haven's 1962 entry into the Ford-sponsored Gray Areas Program, a community development project involving five cities and one state that was initiated by Dr. Paul N. Ylvisaker, then Director of Ford's Public Affairs program.¹¹ The Gray Areas Program is widely viewed as the prototype for the Federal government's antipoverty programs of the 1960s.¹²

I am most grateful to Elizabeth Ylvisaker for granting access to her father's books, files, and papers, which constitute a rich lode of material on, among other things, the importance of cities in our democratic society and the array of challenges and caveats connected to urban vitality. Spanning four decades, noteworthy among the many carefully-kept, hand-written speeches, memorandums, and articles is the report of the 1967 Presidential Task Force on the Cities, appointed by Lyndon Johnson to determine the best Federal approach to the problems of urban blight and racial unrest; Johnson appointed Paul Ylvisaker as Task Force chair. *Undimmed by Human Tears* contains the bulk of the Task Force recommendations, virtually ignored at the time because of other historical exigencies, but lending cogent counsel to current urban policy debates—where, indeed, they are taking place—on what should be done.

Dr. Ylvisaker's poetic musings, sharp insights, and prophetic visions continue to remain remarkably fresh and lend important depth and texture to the issues treated in this study. Many contemporary foundation folk know that Dr. Ylvisaker was a giant in the world of organized philanthropy; what they may not realize is that he was a giant, too, in the field of urban policy whose words and actions made an indelible impression on American public life. His words convey much in the troubling aftermath of Los Angeles—would that he were here now. But no surprise to those who knew him, especially this former doctoral advisee and dear friend, the wand of his genius—long may it wave—continues to guide and inspire those of us who follow his passion. Thus in many respects this treatise has become a tribute—and a thanksgiving—to him.

Ylvisaker and his colleagues cared deeply and were enthusiastic about cities. While no means affording a complete perspective on metropolitan life, these men were part of an era when American cities occupied an important place on the public agenda. Moreover, they were pioneers

in the process of applying interdisciplinary knowledge to the development of a profession, of a discipline—indeed, of what some might consider a calling.¹³ Sadly, this no longer appears to be the case, as what might be called a policy of “urbicide” has dominated the past twenty years. Cities have fallen from favor, particularly in the halls of academe as well as the corridors of financial and political power; urban research, too, declined in the late 1970s and throughout the 1980s, leaving a serious gap in the understanding of municipal issues.

A small test: Go into any large bookstore and ask if there is a section on urban affairs. You will probably not find one. (You will probably not find one for philanthropy and voluntarism, either!) You will be directed to the sociology section, the American politics section, the architecture and landscape section, or some other venue in which “urban” has been absorbed. The urban policy field has lost its luster. This was not the case twenty-five years ago. That was a time when the nation’s attention was riveted on television screens, watching the burning horror that was Watts or Newark or Detroit. During that time, as with today, many, many people were at work, seeking to fashion programs and institutions that would strengthen metropolitan life and respond to human suffering. Many lessons have been learned about that period from the mid-fifties to the mid-seventies, when the perception still existed that we could make a difference, that instead of killing ourselves, we could believe in ourselves.

Those lessons deserve an airing; as the gauntlet gets passed from one generation to another, concerned citizens in the 1990s who share the view that we can make a difference should pay attention to those who have preceded us and learn from their experience. While circumstances have changed and the world has become a different place, the value of better understanding this episode in our nation’s history can only enrich what we consider and dream for today.

In addition to grantmakers and a select group of urbanists, three individuals were interviewed who have extensive knowledge and experience of community-based approaches to criminal justice. Because of the importance and prominence of public safety and law enforcement and due to the relatively low degree of awareness among grantmakers—and the general public—concerning approaches to the topic, their insights are both relevant and timely. The author is grateful to Dr. Robert Trojanowicz, Director of the National Center for Community Policing at Michigan State University and co-author of *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective*;¹⁴ Dr. Francis X. Hartmann, Executive Director of the Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University; and Dr. Albert P. Cardarelli, Senior Fellow, John W. McCormack Institute of Public Affairs, University of Massachusetts at Boston. Their observations shed light on an area worthy of more investigation and support, particularly given the broad-based philanthropic interest in integrating various social and economic self-help activities at the neighborhood level. One should consider public safety as the cornerstone for civic prosperity, constituting the third piece of the evolving community development/human development approach to urban reformation.

Summary Findings

Taken together, yet allowing for some variations in views, the questions directed to foundation officials yielded the following major themes and assertions.

Recommitment to Urban Prosperity

- ◆ The Los Angeles riots are but a recent example of the nation’s continued failure to address problems of poverty, race, ethnicity, and crime, and occurred at a

time when there appears to be little public commitment to the problems of the inner city.

As such, many stated that the tragedy of Los Angeles can serve as a window of opportunity for more positive civic commitment, rather than merely fading from public consciousness as time goes by. Although fully accurate comparisons are hard to make, several respondents said that the lessons learned in Los Angeles about cause and remedy can have important implications for tackling the problems of race and poverty in urban settings throughout the rest of the country, a challenge increasingly being met foursquare by community foundations. Respondents also pointed out that, in the face of this Federal neglect, there are many positive examples of local, community-based initiatives that have evolved over the past twenty-five years and serve as success stories meriting national support.

Continued Relevance and Efficacy

- ◆ The Los Angeles violence affirmed in many instances existing foundation commitments to solving the problems of the central city, yet put on notice attempts to do so that were out of step with changing demographic and cultural realities.

Mentioned here were examples of demographic dissonance or what Paul Ylvisaker termed the “social lag” between so-called community leaders and existing communities. Also mentioned frequently were the complex, confusing, and oftentimes contradictory signs of urban unrest: On the one side, the turmoil generated an outpouring of philanthropic and charitable activity; on the other, the violence also contributed to further tension and division. In several cases, grantmakers said that the upheaval represented a challenge to existing institutional practice, causing foundations to conduct a self-examination process concerning racial and ethnic issues related to the composition of foundation governance and management systems as well as to methods of operation. In some cases, self-examination became soul-searching, as a few foundations considered a fundamental realignment of priorities in the aftermath of the April unrest.

Local Collaboration, Problem Solving, and Sustainability

- ◆ There is a widespread belief that community-based approaches signifying long-term, comprehensive, and collaborative strategies, often including some form of community volunteer service, are the most effective, rather than episodic, short-term methods emanating from afar.

Important here is the paradigm of place versus program as an organizing frame, the idea being that holistic and empowering approaches which concentrate on a particular neighborhood or community are more likely to foster the civic ideal. Cited, too, were the virtues of interdisciplinary and interprofessional approaches—particularly those linking human investment to capital investment—which represent a departure from an earlier era of more narrowly-defined technical virtuosity and professionalism. Of special interest are omnibus initiatives happening on the ground: With important leadership from local community foundations, Los Angeles, Atlanta, Chicago, and Boston (and surely other cities not addressed) have the beginnings of major positive commitments underway which are worth further examination and analysis, yielding significant and relevant knowledge of what does and does not work on the urban front as we move toward the twenty-first century.

Community Development Corporations and Financial Institutions

- ◆ The quiet evolution of community development corporations and similar efforts, aimed at producing affordable housing and other forms of economic development through self-help, micro-enterprise, and partnership methods, represents a powerful and effective means for the alleviation of urban (and rural) ills.

With roots in the Gray Areas Program, yet serving as a philosophical and practical departure from more traditional Great Society antipoverty efforts, these groups constitute an urban success story. Current estimates are that there are two thousand community development corporations located in urban and rural poor areas throughout the country which have built or refurbished over 320,000 homes and apartments for low- and moderate-income households, developed 17.4 million square feet of commercial and industrial space, and created ninety thousand permanent new jobs, thus transforming “communities of despair” into “communities of hope and achievement.”¹⁵ Beyond bricks-and-mortar, however, there was wide acknowledgement among respondents that the human capital or social service dimension of community-based development needs to be integrated into local programs. By extension, this cross-fertilization has implications for national and local-level office and institutional interaction, reinforcing the need for comprehensive, interdisciplinary approaches to capital formation and investment.

Collaborative Partnerships with Existing Institutions

- ◆ There needs to be continued recognition of and engagement with those local institutions-including churches and other traditional agencies such as settlement houses, YMCAs, YWCAs, Girls’ and Boys’ Clubs, and Police Athletic Leagues-already having credibility with urban dwellers and oftentimes possessing a better comprehension of and a positive track record regarding the range of social and economic afflictions stemming from anger and alienation.

Many people expressed the need to curb the impulse to create new institutions, rather than working with existing groups that have sought to repair the torn fabric of civic life. Respondents also pointed out the need for organized philanthropy to critically review existing restrictions, tacit or implied, that may prevent or undermine successful partnership arrangements with these traditional groups, such as those affecting religious institutions or social clubs.

Public Safety, Youth Development, and Interracial, Interethnic Tension

- ◆ Problems associated with public safety, youth violence and youth development (particularly in connection with gangs), and the alleviation of interracial and interethnic divisions are three underdeveloped areas that warrant sustained attention and support.

These points were a central part of a report written for the California-based James Irvine Foundation by Craig Howard of Berkeley’s National Economic Development and Law Center, who was asked to carry out an inventory and analysis of local sentiment in the wake of the civic chaos.¹⁶ The combined effects of fear, limited opportunities for young people, and interracial,

interethnic tensions contribute to potentially explosive neighborhoods and communities. While examples abound of foundation efforts to deal with the multiple and complex problems affecting urban young people, particularly with respect to early intervention or prenatal strategies and at the middle school level, few foundations seem to be dealing with the issue of urban gangs or are involved in the public safety or multiracial arenas. Several respondents described their intentions to do more programmatically along these lines; others expressed an interest in learning more about them. According to many respondents, homelessness, drug abuse, youth gangs, and joblessness are only a few of the grim reminders that we have broken bonds with an entire generation of children and that we need to rethink family preservation and youth development strategies in ways that help to create realistic options for the nation's young. Several of those interviewed said that we also need to acknowledge ways in which youths themselves are offering the kind of leadership we all need, through peer group and community service activities.

Metropolitan Approach

- ◆ In the light of severe financial constraints and the generally low regard grantmakers have for municipal officials and bureaucracies, there is a need to reconsider or transcend existing political and fiscal boundaries. Community foundations are particularly well-situated for this task of metropolitan attention and the linkage of urban and suburban well-being.

Perceptions concerning the shortcomings and turnover of local leadership were mentioned frequently, as were the frustrations experienced by foundations over having to wrangle with civil service bureaucracies. To be fair, this is not an easy time for mayors (or governors), given the deterioration of the urban infrastructure, the dearth of fiscal resources as cities cope with the residue of out-migrating industry and middle class residents, and the presence of state and local budget-busting fixed commitments. But constraints can be a prod for innovation, as some community foundations have discovered in their efforts to deal comprehensively with urban problems. Several respondents, in response to a query concerning metropolitan government, expressed support for reopening the public debate on “metro,” which has a distinguished past.

Robust Leadership on Urban Policy Concerns

- ◆ The Council on Foundations and the broader foundation community can play an important advocacy and educational role in putting concerns about cities back on the public agenda. The Council can also help to fill the information gap by identifying exemplary thinking and practice, both current and past, with respect to urban affairs.

Through its existing programs and philanthropy's emerging infrastructure¹⁷—in addition to its interaction with other national organizations, such as the Urban League, the National Conference of Mayors, and various intermediary organizations concerned with urban revitalization—the Council can promote informed dialogue and debate on matters pertaining to the American city and how it can better embody our civic ideal. Many respondents suggested specific needs, primarily affecting information exchange; some called for commissioned research on particular questions; others called for more aggressive public action, speaking out on the urgency of urban concerns. A few individuals, however, demurred, stating that the Council's mission is to minister to its membership rather than engage in public policy debates. Nevertheless, keeping in mind its third-party role, many respondents stated their belief that this area should be an ongoing project

of the Council because of its importance and relevance to existing philanthropic practice and their commitment to the weal and fairness of American society.

Additional Perceptions

This report treats each of these areas in the context of the responses to the questions posed. However, while sorting through the wealth of respondents' thoughts and perceptions, reflecting on them, and weaving them into a coherent narrative, there are other refrains which come to mind that run across and throughout, creating a sort of conceptual chiaroscuro against which to contemplate wise policy. They include the following perceptions of what is needed.

National Dialogue on Urban Ideals

- ◆ The need for a national dialogue on urban problems that recognizes the delicate balance among national, intermediate, and local approaches to urban needs which are, in turn, related to the complex, changing, and interrelated issues of poverty, inequality, and racial/ethnic divisions.

While most respondents stated the need for a national, as well as regional and local, commitment to cities, the point was also made that what works at the local level does not necessarily form the basis for an effective national urban policy. Although a few individuals had specific ideas about what a Federal urban policy could contain, most respondents were unable to move from an abstract endorsement to a statement of specifics. Indeed, a case could be made that, broadly speaking, urban policy can be inferred by government actions that bear another policy label, such as tax policy, monetary and credit policy, transportation policy, or environmental policy. Urban policy is, after all, complex, and there is certainly no political consensus as to the need, purposes, and function of an explicitly *urban* agenda. In fact, some people are skeptical that a national policy is needed at all.

So, perhaps the question is not whether there *should* be an urban policy, but rather the extent to which such a policy should be *stated* and the extent to which it should attempt to be comprehensive and consistent in dealing with problems of persistent poverty, injustice, and racial/ethnic division.

Those who thought there was a need for an urban policy typically expressed themselves in terms of national government programs—for example, extending low-income tax credits; fostering partnerships among government, the private sector, and low-income communities; and expanding (or reviving) direct subsidies—rather than in terms of national economic or industrial policy. This is not surprising, given the fact that most of us view things through the prism of our own experience and national urban policy has been but an orphan in the storm since 1980.

Moreover, those stating the need for a Federal urban policy continue to debate the most appropriate form of assistance and scope of the problem: Should resources be concentrated on “people” or on “places”? How should attitudes about race and ethnicity be addressed, including interracial and interethnic attitudes among minorities, or between established residents and newcomer groups, as well as whites? What is the connection to labor market dynamics and employment opportunities? What are the effects of social isolation? How do these elements vary from city to city or from region to region? How do you make sure that community empowerment does not lead to local enclavism or further factionalization?

Although community-based development corporations seek to tackle some of these questions, they are not equipped to answer many of them.¹⁸ Moreover, CDCs remain

misunderstood by a majority of the public, some of whom, when they hear the term, think of it as some new bank deposit instrument or the Centers for Disease Control. The existence of various intermediary organizations¹⁹—the most prominent on the national scene being the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC),²⁰ the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation,²¹ and the Enterprise Foundation²²—provide vehicles for broad public discussion of such questions and vehicles for collaboration beyond a given institution or site.

However, when thinking about civic revitalization, one needs to keep in mind that there are different levels and different kinds of need that can be met by different institutional configurations; foundations need to more thoroughly discuss and think through ways in which the intergovernmental and “extragovernmental” systems can and cannot contribute. In addition, foundations need to consider neighborhood interventions within the web-like context of the demographic environment, racial and interethnic attitudes and beliefs, multicultural values, broader economic development objectives, and macroeconomic performance.

Public Safety, Immigration, and Justice

- ◆ Grantmakers need to understand and incorporate issues related to public safety, multiracial, multiethnic divisions, and the cumulative impact of increasing levels of legal and illegal immigration if they are to be seriously engaged in the rejuvenation of American cities.

Most people agree that public safety is a critical aspect of the quality of neighborhood and urban life. The Los Angeles riots were precipitated by the perceived failure of the criminal justice and law enforcement systems, a failure that fed the cynicism many feel about those entrusted with preserving law and order. But ironically, public safety is an area little understood by the foundation world, and yet it is a crucial precondition for any successful renewal effort: The greatest programs in the world mean little if people are afraid to walk out their own front door, afraid of drive-by shootings and random acts of violence, afraid of death and destruction on what seems to have become an urban battlefield.

More often than not, public safety and law enforcement are viewed as the special province of highly-trained professionals operating within a paramilitary-like, hierarchical organization several steps removed from the neighborhood. Yet no field of public service has changed as dramatically or as rapidly as policing. The philosophy and practice of “community policing”, the first major reform in policing in over fifty years, broadens the police mission from a narrow focus on crime to a mandate that allows the police and community residents to work together in new ways to solve problems of crime, fear of crime, physical and social disorder, and neighborhood decay.

Grounded in a philosophy of power sharing, community policing decentralizes responsibility to line officers, personalizes police service in the neighborhood, engages residents more directly, and introduces a proactive element to the traditional reactive mode of law enforcement professionals. With experiments in hundreds of the nation’s cities, grantmakers concerned about the civic ideal need to be aware of and interact with the community policing movement because there is a shared vision there which, if acknowledged, can lead to fuller and effective integration of mutual values and means.

In addition to public safety, an area that deserves far more attention relates to the perceptions and attitudes different racial and ethnic groups have, both of themselves and each other, and how these perceptions and attitudes influence behavior. A traditional gathering place or entry point for the nation’s newcomers, American cities have become far more diverse in

recent years. Because of immigration, these demographic changes often go unnoticed, yet they constitute the core of urban life and influence the extent to which a national urban agenda can be developed.

As downturns in the national economy continue to occur, the idea of civic prosperity becomes more elusive because when times are tough, our tendency all too often is to circle the wagons and hunker down, seeking solace in the comfort of one's own people, rather than be vulnerable to those "others" who are perceived to have a better deal. Thus the subtleties of cultural and linguistic traditions can be misinterpreted, reinforcing division rather than accord and undermining the promise of a livable city. Foundations and concerned others need to reflect upon the forces which impede or enhance racial and ethnic relations, develop ways in which greater public conversation about these matters can occur, and identify incentives with which multicultural, multiracial, and multiethnic communities might respectfully advance the civic ideal.

Metropolitan Governance

- ◆ Now may be the time to revive thinking about metropolitan forms of corporate organization that link urban, suburban, Edge City,²³ and possibly even exurban interests to a shared and workable system of economic and political cooperation.

Foundations, despite their antipathy when dealing with the problems of cities, are going to have to deal with City Hall, as many have learned and as Paul Ylvisaker pointed out years ago. But aside from the uneven quality of local leadership and the inefficiency of bureaucracy, perhaps a more provocative question concerning the political and financial infrastructure of local government is worth posing again: *How might metropolitan approaches to urban problems help or hinder appropriate solutions?*

One often hears that cities lack a powerful constituency, that those with the means, black or white, have fled to the suburbs and those left behind lack sufficient clout to turn things around,²⁴ and that migration patterns often have the effect of politically dividing communities over who controls the central city and the neighborhoods. Indeed, ever since *Milliken v. Bradley*, which set limits on the character of judicial remedial authority when the Supreme Court reversed a lower court ruling that directed interdistrict school desegregation remedies in the Detroit metropolitan area,²⁵ there has been an even greater reluctance to look beyond city borders to solve city problems.²⁶

Nevertheless, the debate concerning the advantages and disadvantages of metropolitan government is a long and noble one;²⁷ consideration of different models of political and economic integration rather than fragmentation could unleash creative thinking about appropriate responses to urban problems affecting many communities, both within and outside the central city.²⁸ Needed here is the recognition that urban blight casts a long shadow into the suburbs, and that an entire area suffers when central cities are in a state of decline. Put another way, healthy central cities can enrich suburbs because they are able to attract new job-providing industries, encourage existing ones to expand, help improve suburban income gains, and help improve the overall quality of life.

Sidebar: In addition to domestic benefits, an inspection of metropolitan approaches to urban problems could prove valuable to foundations with programs in developing countries, where the process of urbanization proceeds apace.²⁹

Indeed, there is international significance to how we deal with the problems of our cities, particularly at a time when many nations look to the United States for support and encouragement as they go about the process of building free and prosperous democratic societies.

Robust Partnerships and Shared Responsibilities

- ◆ The embrasive evolution from unidirectional expressions of “rights” and “entitlements” to reciprocal notions of “partnerships” and “shared responsibilities”

In a sense, this movement coincides with a bipartisan evolution of thinking throughout the last ten years over social policy; it also suggests a reformulation of the role of philanthropy in fostering shared responsibilities, in being more directly engaged in its charitable efforts. Implied here are actions fulfilling what might be called a *civic covenant*—that is, a mutually-agreed upon relationship which is morally compelling, politically pragmatic, and institutionally and economically sound. In contrast to a social contract—which tends to be past or present-oriented, can be broken or renegotiated, is dominated by rules and generally focused on compliance or avoiding injury—a civic covenant is forward-looking, voluntary, periodically renewed, recognizes the need for different levels of accountability, and seeks to achieve an ideal state of being.

The essence of the civic covenant is affirmative and grounded in faith, hope, and trust, rather than being coercive, proscriptive, and based upon fear, dejection, and suspicion. Because of its tradition and history concerning the promise of a better world and better life, organized philanthropy is well-suited to the task of promoting the covenantal paradigm as a means to the civic ideal. Philanthropy’s current emphasis on collaboration and partnership is a step in that direction.

Civic Stewardship and Fiduciary Obligation

- ◆ By way of example, organized philanthropy is uniquely poised to promote public discussion of civic prosperity that puts forth a public language linking money to morality, linking abundance to altruism, linking affirmation to action.

A vacuum exists concerning public discussion of the dilemmas posed by the Los Angeles uproar because the language used to talk about it reflects different convictions, perceptions, and responses. There seems to be no language-beyond a worn-out vocabulary of well-known ideologies-linking moral values and public life through which people can find common ground. For example, in the aftermath of the eruption, there continues to be disagreement in some quarters as to what to call what happened: The term “riots” is the most commonly-used, but there are many people who prefer to use the term “uprising” or “rebellion”³⁰ to describe what they consider actions taken in response to political and economic repression, rather than representing sheer lawlessness engaged in by vandals.³¹ Noted Princeton theologian Cornel West writes that neither of these terms is accurate; in his view, what happened in Los Angeles was a “monumental upheaval [that] was a multiracial, trans-class, and largely male display of justified social rage. For all its ugly, xenophobic resentments, its air of adolescent carnival, and its downright barbaric behavior,” he writes, “it signified the sense of powerlessness in American society.”³²

While the causes and consequences of what happened last April remain complex, and many disputes over interpretation remain intractable, there is one area where common ground might be found and where, at the very least, semantic vocabularies are joined: The language of economic and moral value or religious activity share historical roots and material meaning. Organized philanthropy, particularly with the current popularity of community-based development strategies, program-related investing, and other civic approaches to economic decisionmaking—not to mention its *raison d’être*, which is the union of endowment and charitable mission—is in a wonderful position to utilize this vocabulary as a powerful means of justifying the linkage of money to morality: of linking equity to equity, of connecting endeavors involving the accumulation of wealth and prosperity to the principles of justice, dignity, liberty, and equality.

Appendix

Drew Altman
President

Tyrone R. Baines
Program Director
Paula A. Banks
President

Peter D. Bell
President

Joyce Bove
Vice President, Program and Projects

Lance C. Buhl
Director, Corporate Contributions

Lon M. Burns
Executive Director

Thomas Q. Callahan
Director, Corporate Public Involvement

Albert P. Cardarelli
Senior Fellow

Ira Cutler
Associate Director for Planning & Development

John A. Foster-Bey
Deputy Director of Community Initiatives

Shirley J. Fredricks
President / Executive Director

Bernard J. Frieden
Professor of City Planning

James O. Gibson
Director, Equal Opportunity

Francis X. Hartmann
Executive Director

Marilyn Hartnett

The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation

W.K. Kellogg Foundation

The Sears-Roebuck Foundation

The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation

The New York Community Trust

BP America, Inc.

Southern California Association for
Philanthropy

Aetna

John W. McCormack Institute of Public
Affairs University of Massachusetts at Boston

The Annie E. Casey Foundation

The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur
Foundation

The Lawrence Welk Foundation

Department of Urban Studies and Planning
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

The Rockefeller Foundation

Program in Criminal Justice Policy
Management
Kennedy School of Government, Harvard
Monsanto Fund

Program Officer

Reatha Clark King
President and Executive Director

Christa Kuljian
Program Associate

Thomas W. Lambeth
Secretary and Executive Director

Sally Lancaster
Executive Vice President and Grants Administrator

Jack A. Litzenberg
Program Officer

Melinda G. Marble
Vice President for Program

John E. Marshall, III
President

Cynthia Mayeda
Chair

Curtis Meadows Jr.
President

John M. Mutz
President

Bruce L. Newman
Executive Director

James A. (Dolph) Norton
Former Director

Alicia Philipp
Executive Director

Gloria Primm Brown
Program Officer

Rebecca W. Rimel
Executive Director

Aida Rodriguez
Associate Director, Equal Opportunity

General Mills Foundation

Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation, Inc.

Meadows Foundation, Inc.

Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

The Boston Foundation

The Kresge Foundation

Dayton Hudson Foundation

Meadows Foundation, Inc.

Lilly Endowment Inc.

The Chicago Community Trust

The Cleveland Foundation-Greater Cleveland
Associated Foundation

Metropolitan Atlanta Community Foundation,
Inc.

Carnegie Corporation of New York

The Pew Charitable Trusts

The Rockefeller Foundation

Michael Rubinger
Associate Executive Director

Russell Sakaguchi
*Program Officer, Community Programs,
Environmental Programs, Public Information*

Sandra Salyer
Vice President, Public Affairs

Steven A. Schroeder, M.D.
President

Ruth Shack
President

Jack Shakely
President

Christine Sisley
Executive Director

Edward Skloot
Executive Director

Leonard W. Smith
President

Mitchell Sviridoff
Senior Fellow

Robert Trojanowicz
Director

Constance J. Walker
Program Officer

Lynn Walker
Director, Rights and Social Justice Program

William S. White
Chair, President, and Chief Executive Officer

Eugene R. Wilson
President

Robert C. Wood
*Luce Professor of Democratic Institutions and
the Social Order*

The Pew Charitable Trusts

ARCO Foundation

Mervyn's

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Dade Community Foundation

The California Community Foundation

The Ralph M. Parsons Foundation

Surdna Foundation, Inc.

The Skillman Foundation

The New School of Social Research

National Center for Community Policing
Michigan State University

The James Irvine Foundation

The Ford Foundation

Charles Stewart Mott Foundation

ARCO Foundation

Wesleyan University

Notes

¹ New York: The Sidney Hillman Foundation, 1966. This is a reprint of Ylvisaker's article, entitled "The Villains Are Greed, Indifference—And You," which appeared in a special year-end issue on urban affairs of *Life* magazine, Dec. 24, 1965.

² According to 1990 Census Department figures, 1.5 million immigrants settled in Los Angeles during the 1980s. See "Racial and Ethnic Inequality in Los Angeles: Two Decades of Neglect 1970-1990," background material prepared by Dr. Paul Ong and Dr. Evelyn Blumenberg of the Graduate School of Architecture and Urban Planning, University of California, Los Angeles, June 27, 1992, for a special meeting on the Los Angeles riots of the Neighborhood Funders Group on June 18, 1992.

³ Sara Rimer, "After the Riots: Seeking a Killer and Seeking a Son," *New York Times*, Aug. 9, 1992.

⁴ Richard W. Stevenson, "Patching Up L.A.—A Corporate Blueprint," *New York Times*, Aug. 9, 1992.

⁵ John R. Emshwiller, "Tension Lurks in Los Angeles's Minority-Owned Firms: Blacks, Latinos and Asians Compete for Help with Post-Riot Rebuilding," *Wall Street Journal*, Aug. 6, 1992.

⁶ "Ex-Chief Displays a New Calmness," *New York Times*, Aug. 7, 1992.

⁷ See Seth Mydans, "Blacks Complaining of Neglect as Los Angeles Is Rebuilt," *New York Times*, Aug. 30, 1992.

⁸ Robert Reinhold, "Six Months after Riots, Los Angeles Still Bleeds," *New York Times*, Nov. 1, 1992.

⁹ Seth Mydans, "Angry and Worried in Post-Riot Los Angeles—The Riots' Ashes: A Special Report," *New York Times*, Nov. 14, 1992.

¹⁰ According to police estimates, nine of those deaths were gang-related, including that of a 14-year old girl who was killed in a fight between rival gangs. In addition to those who were killed, twenty-four people were wounded by gunfire or stabbings, including a 19-year old woman in a wheelchair who was shot in the back when she failed to respond to a motorist who asked for directions in South Los Angeles. See "22 Angelenos Killed in Weekend Violence," *New York Times*, Aug. 25, 1992.

¹¹ Other participants included Boston's Action for Boston Community Development (ABCD – Joseph S. Slavet, Executive Director; Slavet is now a Senior Fellow at the John W. McCormack Institute of Public Affairs, University of Massachusetts Boston); the Philadelphia Council for Community Advancement (Samuel Dash, Executive Director); the Oakland Interagency Project in Oakland (Norvel Smith, Coordinator); the United Planning Organization in Washington, D.C. (UPO – James Banks, Executive Director; also involved with UPO was James O. Gibson, an interview respondent and currently Director, Equal Opportunity, The Rockefeller Foundation); and The North Carolina Fund in North Carolina (George H. Esser Jr., Executive Director). The Ford Foundation made these large-scale grants to "help selected cities mount a coordinated attack on all aspects of deprivation, including jobs, education, housing, planning, and recreation. The purpose is to help local government and private organizations confront the human problems of slums and 'gray areas'—changing neighborhoods characterized by family breakdown, low-income residents, and newly arrived groups from rural areas." Locally planned and administered along lines dictated by local needs, the Gray Areas Program focused on "an integrated attack on the causes of poverty and human deterioration rather than the symptoms." According to Ylvisaker, this orientation was part of a movement toward making grants "within range of the municipal firing line" to "help correct the basic conditions which have led to the protest, and to develop the latent potential of the human beings now being crowded and often crushed at the bottom of the community's totem pole." See *American Community Development: Preliminary Reports by Directors of Projects Assisted by the Ford Foundation in Four Cities and a State* (New York: The Ford Foundation, Oct. 1, 1963).

There were two reasons for including a state in the program, according to Ylvisaker: urban immigration originated in rural areas such as North Carolina (Ylvisaker was continually fascinated by migratory population movements) and, "whether we like it or not or whether you expect it or not, the state is where the ground rules of society are set." See also Paul Ylvisaker, "Oral History Project Interview: September 27 & October 27, 1973" (New York: The Ford Foundation, 1974). A close associate of Ylvisaker's during this Public Affairs / Gray Areas period was Louis Winnick, about whom Ylvisaker cared deeply and once said,

“He’s a beautiful guy in my book. Lou brought that toughness of mind, and he and I loved to work together because I’d go out on a flight of invention and, like Mutt and Jeff, Lou would ask the tough questions. We had absolute respect for each other. . . . When we get together, it’s just like two brothers coming together. Lou could understand [my language] and as long as I was around, [he could] tidy things up, because there was a part of me which was a conservative banker and a part of me that’s a dreamer—then we could live together.”

¹² A centerpiece of the Johnson administration’s War on Poverty was Title II of the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act, which authorized federal support for local “community action” agencies that were expected to help the poor build their political and economic futures; the government therefore required these agencies to seek “maximum feasible participation” of the poor in their programs. The Office of Economic Opportunity later diverted a good deal of the community-action program (CAP) funds to Head Start; beginning in 1969, the Nixon administration eliminated the rest, as Nixon moved away from Johnson’s emphasis on antipoverty and categorical grant programs and toward a New Federalism, with funds and responsibility flowing from Washington to the states and to the people. Meanwhile, in 1966, a year after the creation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Demonstration Cities Act was passed—better known as Model Cities—and was to serve as the centerpiece of the Great Society’s urban program.

Model Cities was conceived as an improvement on community action programs because it would experiment with different approaches to urban revitalization in a select group of municipalities; concentrating resources in a sufficiently large, impoverished section of a city over a long enough period of time to make a substantive difference in local problems and the lives of its residents. The idea was that the lessons learned from these various experiments would form the basis of later efforts and would also avoid the errors of uniformity. However, political demands eventually diffused Model Cities’ original ideas for local experiments, and consequently the level of federal funding for each city was reduced as politicians insisted on adding more cities to the list. Moreover, growing restrictions on federal spending due to the Vietnam War further eroded support for Model Cities, as did other economic and public policy developments. Nevertheless, the Model Cities program continued through the first Nixon administration under the community action moniker.

Twenty years later, only Head Start remains, although community action programs continue to exist. At the moment, CAP chief concerns, in addition to Head Start, are energy and the environment. For an overview of urban policy during this period, see Royce Hanson’s *The Evolution of National Urban Policy 1970-1980: Lessons From the Past*, a background paper prepared for the Committee on National Policy, Commission on Sociotechnical Systems, National Research Council (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1982). See also Bernard J. Frieden and Marshall Kaplan, *The Politics of Neglect: Urban Aid from Model Cities to Revenue Sharing* (Cambridge: MIT/Harvard Joint Center for Urban Studies, 1975). The movement of activists during this period from the streets to being players is the subject of Rufus P. Browning, et al., *Protest Is Not Enough: The Struggle of Blacks and Hispanics for Equality in Urban Politics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984). For a fascinating behind-the-scenes look at federal machinations concerning problems of race, poverty, and cities during the 1960s and 1970s, see the chapter on “Washington” in Nicholas Lemann’s *The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration and How It Changed America* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1991).

¹³ For a brief overview of how urban affairs once engaged the nation’s intellectual community in the late 1960s, see the special section “The Embattled Cities” in *Time* magazine, July 28, 1967. Daniel Patrick Moynihan occupies the cover under the label “urbanologist”; inside are brief profiles of, among others, Paul Ylvisaker and Mike Sviridoff.

¹⁴ Robert Trojanowicz and Bonnie Bucqueroux, *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective* (Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co., 1990). This book provides an excellent overview of the history, philosophy, organizational, and professional approach to the community policing movement.

¹⁵ See the May 1992 “Open Letter to President Bush and Governor Clinton,” issued in the wake of the Los Angeles upheaval by the Council for Community-Based Development, a membership organization of corporate, philanthropic, and community leaders formed to focus private sector attention on the

importance of community-based development carried out by nonprofit institutions.

¹⁶ The Howard Report made a series of short-term and long-term recommendations for organized philanthropy to consider that challenged prevailing approaches to economic and social recovery. They include: the articulation and implementation of a human investment strategy; a youth leadership-development approach that concentrates on character and self-esteem rather than a problem-oriented one that focuses only on adolescent pregnancy, gang membership, drug treatment, et cetera; the creation of a community-focused labor force development strategy which includes attention to industrial sector development; the integration of multiculturalism and community development; and the implementation of a community- and problem-oriented police approach to public safety. See *Recovery Strategies for Three Decades of Economic Decline in Los Angeles: Summary Report to the James Irvine Foundation* (Berkeley: National Economic Development and Law Center, 1992).

¹⁷ For an elaboration of the various changes occurring in the field of organized philanthropy over recent decades—such as the emergence of research and study centers focused on philanthropy and nonprofits, the appearance of affinity groups, the growth of regional associations, and the proliferation of various types of foundations, especially community foundations and women’s funds—see *The Infrastructure of Philanthropy*, a report of the Study Group on the Infrastructure of Philanthropy prepared for the Council on Foundations, issued in May 1992.

¹⁸ The ongoing work of William Julius Wilson attempts to provide insight into some of these issues. See his classic *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987) for an exposition on the rise of inner-city problems, which he attributes to the changing class structure of ghetto neighborhoods and broader economic changes producing higher levels of joblessness, particularly for black males. For a series of essays on how empirical and moral assumptions combine to shape welfare policy and perceptions of material hardship and well-being, see Christopher Jencks, *Rethinking Social Policy: Race, Poverty, and the Underclass* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992).

In addition to Wilson’s work on the inner city, an ambitious, two-year multi-city, multiracial, multiethnic study of urban inequality, a project involving fifty research scholars in fifteen universities across the country, is directed toward creating a data base which will illuminate the growing gap between the have and have-nots in urban America. With staff and coordination assistance from the Social Science Research Council Committee for Research on the Urban Underclass, the multi-racial, multi-ethnic research team is conducting linked household and employer surveys—involving approximately nine thousand households and hundreds of employers—in four cities which are sufficiently diverse to enable significant comparisons: Boston, Los Angeles, Detroit, and Atlanta. With funding support from the Ford Foundation, the Russell Sage Foundation, and various community and local foundations, the Multi-City Urban Inequality Project is examining the impact and interplay of three interrelated socioeconomic conditions of so-called persistent poverty in urban America: residential segregation; interethnic attitudes and polarization; and labor market dynamics. Included among the principal investigators are, for Los Angeles, James H. Johnson Jr., Melvin L. Oliver, and Lawrence D. Bobo from the Center for the Study of Urban Poverty at UCLA; and for greater Boston, Barry Bluestone, Miren Uriarte, Chris Tilly, and Phil Moss from, respectively, the McCormack Institute of Public Affairs, the Gaston Institute for Latino Community Development and Public Policy, the Trotter Center for the Study of Black Culture, and the Center for Survey Research at the University of Massachusetts at Boston and Lowell. The University of Michigan and Georgia State are the university partners for the Detroit and Atlanta studies.

¹⁹ Intermediary organizations within the world of community development match capital with nonprofit organizations; they perform many functions, working directly with CDCs and with capital investors. For CDCs, intermediary organizations often provide access to capital, deal-structuring services, education and technical assistance, and other supportive services. For investors, intermediary organizations help to identify targets of opportunity, provide due diligence, and respond to various investor concerns.

²⁰ LISC was launched in 1979 by Mitchell Sviridoff and has become the nation’s largest financial and technical resource for CDCs. Since 1980, LISC has raised over \$650 million from over eight hundred

private companies and foundations. In turn, LISC has invested these funds in approximately nine hundred community development corporations throughout the country, helping them to produce forty-five thousand units of affordable housing and millions of square feet of shopping centers and industrial space. For a thumbnail sketch of current LISC concerns in the aftermath of the Los Angeles violence, see *Toward a New Urban Poverty Policy* (Washington, D.C.: Local Initiatives Support Corporation, June 1992). See also Anne Lowrey Bailey, "Building a Bridge From Big Dollars to Inner Cities," *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, Nov. 3, 1992.

²¹ Chartered by Congress twenty years ago, the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation provides support to the national network of approximately one hundred Neighborhood Housing Services groups.

²² In 1982 the Enterprise Foundation was founded by James Rouse, a seasoned, strong-willed, and effective advocate for the livable city. During the 1960s and 1970s, Rouse was heavily involved in the so-called "new town" movement, particularly popular in post World War II Europe, which was considered to be a more realistic way of addressing the issues of urban concentration than the American tradition of metropolitan sprawl. While he was New Jersey's Commissioner of Community Affairs, Paul Ylvisaker's dream was to build a city of three hundred thousand people out of a 21,300 acre swamp across the Hudson River from Manhattan—what he called a "TVA in the Meadows"; although his dream was not realized, eventually the Meadowlands was constructed, holding a stadium, arena, and racetrack.

The interest in new towns was heightened by a short-lived urban interest group called Urban America, headed by then North Carolina Governor Terry Sanford, which organized seminars and European tours for key members of Congress and other officials. Their efforts led to the publication of a book called *The New City* (New York: Praeger, 1969) and Congressional passage of the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act, which authorized federal loan guarantees to private developers for large-scale planned communities and supplementary grants to state and local agencies to implement new community development projects. Further legislative and funding support came as a result of passage of the National Urban Policy and New Community Development Act of 1970. Buttressed by these laws and the commitment to the problems of cities, Rouse built Columbia, Maryland, which was to be a model of how new growth could exist in harmony with the natural environment, unfettered by economic and racial segregation.

The "new town" movement died out in the 1970s during the Ford administration after an internal HUD evaluation and a GAO report questioned the economic viability of several of the new communities and whether or not they could meet their social objectives; in 1975, the Ford administration suspended new applications to the program. In the late 1970s and 1980s, Rouse became involved with urban waterfront revitalization in towns such as Boston, Baltimore, Norfolk, and New York. The Enterprise Foundation supplies grants, loans, and technical assistance to two hundred community-based groups in its multi-city network. Along with public concern about the homeless and the national affordable housing movement, the Enterprise Foundation played a key role in Congressional passage of the National Affordable Housing Act (NAHA) of 1990, the first major piece of federal housing legislation in over a decade. NAHA incorporates the Bush administration's Homeownership Opportunity for People Everywhere (HOPE) program and other homeownership initiatives, sets aside funding for community housing developers to build capacity, and maintains or consolidates pre-existing housing programs such as new public housing construction. NAHA also includes measures intended to prevent the loss of subsidized housing due to expiring contracts and conversions. Unfunded in 1990, total authorized funding for 1992 dropped from \$9.3 in 1991 to \$8.8 billion.

²³ For a folksy treatment of the new towns emerging beyond the suburbs, see Joel Garreau's *Edge City: Life on the New Frontier* (New York: Doubleday, 1991).

²⁴ Wilson, *Truly Disadvantaged*.

²⁵ See *Milliken v. Bradley*, 418 U.S. 717 (1974), when a divided Court considered the Detroit plan to be in conflict with the belief, articulated in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*, 402 U.S. 1 (1971), that a right and remedy should be defined on the basis of the wrong. Because *de jure* discrimination was found to exist only in Detroit schools rather than in surrounding districts, "[t]o

approve the remedy ordered... would impose on the outlying districts, not shown to have committed any constitutional violation, a wholly-impermissible remedy.”⁴¹⁸ U.S. at 745. In their dissent, Mr. Justices Marshall, Douglas, Brennan, and White held that right and remedy should be defined on the basis of outcomes, thus imposing on state and local officials an affirmative duty to desegregate which utilizes their authority to the fullest.

²⁶ Historically, American voters have resisted attempts to extend the geographic limits of the existing local government to cover its metropolitan region. A major exception is Miami and Dade County, where three Metro referendums were held within twenty-seven cities in 1956, 1958, and 1961, leading to the creation of a metropolitan government that put in water and sewer lines, roads, transportation, a county hospital, the airport, the seaport, and the park system; the Dade County Board of Commissioners serves as the metropolitan “umbrella.” Ruth Shack, currently President of the Dade Community Foundation, campaigned for Metro (which passed by only a few hundred votes), was elected to the County Commission three times, and has extensive knowledge of the pros and cons of metropolitan government: “All of that is in place,” she says, “and now the task is, having built it, how are we going to maintain it?” Baton Rouge held a similar, but less comprehensive, referendum in 1947; and Atlanta held one in 1950. For a treatment of the process and results of metropolitan reform campaigns in three American cities—St. Louis, Miami, and Cleveland—see Scott Greer, *Metropolitics: A Study of Political Culture* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963).

²⁷ A prominent and distinguished advocate for a metropolitan approach—that is, intergovernmental and public-private cooperation—in confronting the problems of urban life was Dr. Luther Halsey Gulick, generally regarded as the “dean of American public administration.” As a scholar and practitioner, Gulick believed that big-city problems belonged on a world-wide stage, and that urban regions “are the brain and the muscle of the nation, if not its food basket. If they are not the source of our power, what is?” In making the case for improving the quality of American city life, Gulick argued that extended metropolitan areas should be developed into self-governing democracies within the structure of the American federal system.

Gulick believed that a “more vigorous and spontaneous community consciousness” would arise from local, rather than state, leadership and coordination of activities and programs aimed at the service and political problems of the metropolitan area; acknowledging that such an assumption was “a matter of hope and faith, not something that can be demonstrated short of two to four generations”, Gulick’s call for the creation of a new local federated metropolitan government—taking into account local variations and, of necessity, facing difficult questions concerning boundary determinations, systems of representation, division of duties, and taxation—carried with it a call for the creation of “teamwork machinery”, involving the intergovernmental system in cooperative approaches which “not only solve [the cities’] big service problems, but will also evolve goals for community action to guide both their governments and their private enterprises toward a better and nobler future.” For a summary overview of this clear and prescient philosophy, see Luther Halsey Gulick, *The Metropolitan Problem and American Ideas: Lectures Delivered on the William W. Cook Foundation of the University of Michigan* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962).

²⁸ “My bias is that the metropolis is bound together by economic and social realities so basic that we’re fooling only ourselves in not giving them more obvious political form. . . . The tough question—and the one left discreetly unasked—is whether the metropolis ought to be more formally recognized as a unified political system. “Metropolis is the evolving frontier.” Paul Ylvisaker, “A House Divided . . .,” Address presented to Allegheny Seminar, Morgantown, West Virginia, April 23, 1961. See also Paul Ylvisaker, “Developments and Trends in Metropolitan Area Problems,” Panel presentation to the International Municipal Conference, Chicago, Illinois, May 11–14, 1960.

In 1959, Ylvisaker mused upon the emergence of metropolitan government and the conditions of its evolution: “The immediate question our 20th Century framers must face is a strategic one: whether to try heroically to create these general instruments of metropolitan government full-blown, or to move gradually toward them through intermediate devices of limited scope and partial jurisdiction. My own

hunch, very likely a reformist's bias, is that public opinion is more favorable to a general and immediate solution than is commonly thought; and I can't help wondering what 1787 might have led to, had the Founding Fathers played it cautiously, merely tinkering with the system in a 'practical, functional' way." Paul Ylvisaker, "Some Criteria for a 'Proper' Areal Division of Governmental Powers," in Arthur Maass, ed., *Area and Power: A Theory of Local Government* (New York: Free Press, 1959).

²⁹ According to a World Bank Policy Paper, rapid demographic growth will add six hundred million people to cities and towns in developing countries during the 1990s, representing roughly two-thirds of the expected total population increase. Of the world's twenty-one megacities expanding to include more than ten million people, seventeen will be in developing countries. For an examination of the fiscal, financial, and real sector linkages between urban economic activities and macroeconomic performance, an analysis which forms the basis for a new policy framework and strategic implications, see *Urban Policy and Economic Development: An Agenda for the 1990s* (Washington, D.C.: The World Bank, 1991).

³⁰ For example, James Johnson's unpublished analysis of the broader external forces which have increasingly isolated South Central Los Angeles from the mainstream of Los Angeles society is called "The Los Angeles Rebellion: A Retrospective View," Center for the Study of Urban Poverty, UCLA.

³¹ I am sensitive to the terminology used in describing what happened last spring; consequently, this report attempts to balance the use of the term "riot" with other terms that describe the death and destruction that occurred.

³² Cornel West, "Learning to Talk of Race," *New York Times Magazine*, Aug. 2, 1992.