

Leadership and Diversity

A Case Book

By

Barbara J. Nelson

Barbara J. Nelson
Leadership and Diversity: A Case Book
Los Angeles: UCLA
Second Printing, December 2004

Leadership and Diversity: A Case Book
Copyright 2004 by Barbara J. Nelson

Chapter 2, “Diversity and Public Problem Solving: Ideas and Practice in Policy Education” is reprinted here with the generous permission of John Wiley and Sons. Reproduction beyond fair use for an individual requires the written permission of the publisher.

Copyright in all original works of authorship in this publication is owned by Barbara J. Nelson. These materials may be used, reproduced, or reprinted, provided such use is for non-commercial or personal use only and the following copyright notice appears in all copies: *Leadership and Diversity: A Case Book. Copyright 2004 Barbara J. Nelson.* The literary works contained in this publication may not be modified in any way. All rights in photographs, artwork, and other graphic material are reserved.

ISBN 0-9658871-9-7

The Leadership and Diversity Web site may be found at: <http://www.spa.ucla.edu/leadership>

**In Memory
of**

**Donald E. Stokes
1927-1997**

Table of Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>vi</i>
<i>History as Prologue</i>	<i>viii</i>

I. PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

Teaching Leadership and Diversity	3
Chart 1: A Summary of the Cases	14
Diversity and Public Problem Solving	15

II. SIMULATIONS

Race and Representation: Redistricting Northview	37
Democracy and Divisions: A New Constitution for Cyprus	43

III. CASES

Mission Expansion: The Origins of the YWCA's Anti-Racism Campaign	55
Leadership Succession: The Lucy Prince Community Center	67
Half a Loaf: Initiating a Comparable Worth Wage Policy for Public Employees	75

IV. MINI CASES

Inclusion and Exclusion: The Family and Medical Leave Act	83
Social Entrepreneurship: Founding the Lakeland Black Women's Leadership Conference	85

Acknowledgments

My first thanks go to Michael Lipsky, formerly of the Ford Foundation—for believing in the importance of a more inclusionary policy education, for funding the project, for patience as my own leadership responsibilities lengthened the time the project took, and for his support for the publication and distribution of this book with Ford Foundation funds. I had the opportunity to publish this book with a fine conventional publisher. But when I asked Michael if the Foundation would agree to use its funds to publish and distribute the book, he quickly agreed to a plan that would lead to greater adoption. My great thanks go to him, and to the publisher of the other press for his kind understanding.

I would like to thank the teachers and participants in the National Diversity and Public Problem Solving Summer Schools, which were held in 1994 at the University of Minnesota and in 1995 and 1996 at Radcliffe College. The scores of participants, who were faculty members in professional schools and foundation executives, brought their talents and commitments to the improvement of professional education and social investment. I would like to give special thanks to the extraordinarily gifted teachers who taught with me in the summer programs: Rose Brewer, Ron David, Linda Kaboolian, Eric Jolly, and Riv-Ellen Prell.

Each summer several students and staff members participated in the Project as research assistants and administrators. My warm thanks go to Sarita Ahuja, Rachel Garlin, Clare Gravon, Laurie Kroose, Susan Smith, and Michelle Tse.

Special thanks go to the graduate students who co-authored several of the original versions of the cases. In fond remembrance I thank Susan Bloom, Alissa Hummer, Lisa Kennedy, and Rita Ulrich.

The cases published here have been taught to hundreds of graduate and undergraduate students, public officials, foundation executives, and interested citizens. They have all contributed to making the cases better and, indirectly, to the teaching notes. My thanks go to all of them.

I would like to offer my appreciation to Bill Parent and Karen Kovacs-North of the UCLA School of Public Policy and Social Research who participated in the publication of this book with their expert understanding of the policy process and case teaching.

Selene Garcia Baldenegro has my thanks, as always, for her expert administrative assistance.

Stan Paul designed and produced this book with his usual style and grace.

My family supported me tremendously during the writing of this book. Writing a book while being a dean is very demanding. My greatest love and thanks go to Mandy Carver, who was there from beginning to end. While I wrote this book I experienced three deaths in my family, all timely, in some sense, in the cycle of life, but all a source of great loss. I know that my beloved father, Bernard J. Nelson, would have loved this book as much as he loved all the other ones. And he would have read every word and discussed every idea with me. I miss him, Flora Sargous, and George Knox, more than I can say.

This book is dedicated to the memory of the late Donald E. Stokes, longtime dean of the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton University, my first academic boss, who started me on this journey by asking me what I thought of case teaching.

History as Prologue

This casebook reflects the history of higher education in America. In the 1830s, American colleges were in deep conflict over whether they should teach French, Spanish, and German, the languages of diplomacy and trade, as well as Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, the languages of religious and classical scholarship. The aspirations of successful merchants fed this conflict. They wanted a college education for their sons in order to improve their commercial opportunities as well as their minds. After the sons of merchants came working men, well-to-do women and their sisters from ordinary backgrounds, African Americans excluded from white institutions, veterans who paid in service for the opportunity to study at low cost, and immigrants from all over the world. For almost 200 years colleges and universities have been debating whom they should educate and what should be taught. The questions of inclusion in policy education belong to this long tradition.

The National Diversity and Public Problem Solving Project began with a conversation with Michael Lipsky of the Ford Foundation in 1991. We sat next to each other at a conference and I mentioned to him my interest in directing a program that would begin to make the content of policy education more reflective of the whole world, its people, problems, and solutions. The Ford Foundation had supported curriculum transformation programs in many liberal arts disciplines. These efforts had created demand on the part of incoming masters students for a more inclusive policy education. I knew that the curricula of policy schools with their emphasis on *realpolitik*, practical skills, and professional norms would be much harder to change than liberal arts education. Michael and I talked about these problems. Eighteen months, two letters and a proposal later, the National Diversity Project began.

The National Diversity and Public Problem Solving Project ran from 1993 through 2003 and had homes in the University of Minnesota, Radcliffe College, and UCLA. Its overall purpose was to improve the critical reflection on and creative response to teaching about the great social divisions—race, ethnicity, religion, gender, and class—in policy education.

The Project had three main objectives. The first was to conduct three summer institutes for faculty in professional schools and ultimately foundation executives, held in 1994, 1995, and 1996. In these institutes faculty and foundation executives did what is rarely done in such sessions. They focused on the research about social cleavages including history, theories, concepts, and empirical research. Armed with this knowledge, the participants discussed pedagogy, research design, and methods of social investment through targeted philanthropy and research support. This was a far cry from the early “how do I keep my class from exploding” approach to diversity in professional schools.

The second objective was to disseminate the pedagogical lessons from the summer institutes. In addition to the “Diversity and Public Problem Solving” article, the instructors in the summer institutes and I gave dozens of speeches and workshops on curriculum reform in policy and professional education, in the United States and abroad. Perhaps the most interesting of these presentations included being called as an “expert witness” in the “trial of public affairs education,” which was “indicted” on charges that included giving too little attention to diversity.

The third objective was to publish the cases developed or modified for the summer institutes. I had taught these cases in the Diversity and Public Problem Solving summer institutes, in courses at the University of Minnesota, Harvard, UCLA, at the Public Policy and International Affairs Summer Program at UC Berkeley, and in many workshops. I had revised them a number of times, a practice all too infrequent in case writing. My final task was to revise them for publication and to write teaching notes, a task I had avoided because I guessed, rightly, how time consuming it would be. It was during the writing of the teaching notes that my growing emphasis on leadership became clear to me. I also realized that the cases would be easier to use if I situated them in the larger philosophy of leadership education I had developed in part from teaching them. Leadership and diversity are intimately connected, as the casebook shows.

TEACHING LEADERSHIP AND DIVERSITY

Barbara J. Nelson

Why is this book titled *Leadership and Diversity*? It is the final product of a 10-year project that did not have “leadership” in its title. The National Diversity and Public Problem Solving Project was a curriculum enhancement venture with a different purpose: to improve the critical reflection on and creative response to teaching about the great social divisions—race, ethnicity, religion, gender, and class—in policy education. During the long life of the project, it became clear that reorienting the way diversity is understood in policy education is intimately connected to improving the status and understanding of leadership education. Hence a book titled *Leadership and Diversity*.

This chapter shows how leadership and diversity are connected in policy education. Argued succinctly, attention to diversity requires attention to structural inequality. Remedying structural inequality requires leadership plus a challenging mix of public recognition of structural problems, civic will, and thoughtful—sometimes bold—action. Diversifying policy education requires adding new actors to public life: women and people of color, those who are poor or remote from the centers of power, and those from persecuted religions and sexual orientations. Teachers and students alike need to look behind cases about open housing laws, building dams, and social security solvency to some of the most troubling aspects of U.S. and world history, including slavery, genocide, and unbridled markets. Including all these actors and topics—and the controversies they open up—enlarges public life and policy education. This work is demanding and important. If successful, the connection between leadership and diversity encourages those who have careers in the public interest to consider both immediate possibilities and long term needs as they solve policy problems. Politics may be the art of the possible, but democratic politics also have greater purposes—dignity, community, freedom, opportunity, fairness and the entire panoply of conflicting political demands that makes government by the people worthy and difficult. A joint focus on leadership and diversity helps public servants and citizens simultaneously to live in the world and change it.

This chapter on leadership and diversity is paired with an earlier article, “Diversity and Public Problem Solving,” published in the *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* and reprinted here as chapter 2.¹ Its purpose is to assist faculty in skillfully incorporating knowledge about social structures, processes, and cultures into public policy classrooms. Chapter 2 makes a very important point: the worst thing that can happen in a classroom is not that one student calls another student (or worse, the professor) a racist, sexist, or an anti-Semite and the class spins out of control. The worst thing that can happen is that the professor does not know enough about, say, race—about the history of the idea, its application in policy, and the way it is experienced by different groups of people—to make the interruption a teachable moment grounded in ideas as well as a good command of group dynamics.

This book also includes seven cases written or modified for the National Diversity Project.² These cases cover many topics and are mostly set in the public and nonprofit sectors, although one is oriented to private sector employment. The lessons are about

leadership, decision making, and tough choices—topics that are relevant across sectors. The titles of the cases give a flavor of their substance. A guide for teaching the cases is found in the companion volume, *Leadership and Diversity: A Case Book Teaching Notes*. The cases are:

- Race and Representation: Redistricting Northview
- Democracy and Divisions: A New Constitution for Cyprus
- Mission Expansion: The Origins of the YWCA’s Anti-Racism Campaign
- Leadership Succession: The Lucy Prince Community Center
- Half a Loaf: Initiating a Comparable Worth Wage Policy for Public Employees
- Inclusion and Exclusion: The Family and Medical Leave Act
- Social Entrepreneurship: Founding the Lakeland Black Women’s Leadership Conference

I was motivated to write the cases by my frustration with the dearth of women and people of color as the protagonists of cases, a problem that time has only partially erased. In some ways it is easy to understand the lack of cases on U.S. domestic and international policy featuring the decision making of women and people of color. They are represented in senior management and leadership positions in proportions well below what their educational attainment would predict. From this perspective, there are fewer stories to tell.

The limited number of stories was never the biggest obstacle to an inclusionary policy education. The greater problem was the lack of standing, so to speak, of non-elite actors. Could non-elite actors be exemplars in elite education? Could a black man preaching in a country church and eating dinner in a church basement represent the drive to high stakes power, influence, and analysis that was at the heart of the creation of policy education?

The early case writing featuring people of color and women could not square this circle. Some cases emphasized the failure and pathology of nontraditional actors in traditional settings. The most famous of these cases describes “the problems of an African American woman manager” who was floundering at her job and in her work relationships.³ Cases are written so that students can learn from failures as well as successes, so emphasizing the negative is an appropriate educational device. But if there are not very many cases representing minorities or women, and those cases emphasize how unwelcome or unsuccessful they are in public life, it will not take students long to discover the larger message.

If anything, international policy cases are worse, especially when it comes to women. Sally Kenney reported that of the 248 cases in the Pew Case Studies in International Affairs, only one featured a female protagonist, Margaret Thatcher, and that case charted her demise as party leader. None of the other cases contained a female protagonist, offered a gender analysis, or included a feminist institution.⁴

When case writing began to include underrepresented groups in less problematic ways, some of the first “new awareness” cases emphasized triumphs and successes. Colin Powell was right when he said, “I am the Secretary of State. You may take me as you see me, a proud American representing his country, and by the way, I’m awfully proud to be black.

And I want, as a black person, to be an example and inspiration to not just other black youngsters coming along, but to all youngsters who may think that because of their background or where they came from or origins, somehow they can't achieve their dream."⁵ But if pathology is a pedagogical problem so is exceptionalism. Neither is a good basis from which to make policy education more diverse.

There had to be a way to make the people who did not vote at the Constitutional Convention the heroes not only of their own lives, but a regular part of the educational experience of all students. Contrary to common belief, it is not hard to develop cases featuring nontraditional protagonists or focusing on policy conflicts with particular interest to politically or economically marginal groups. It was easy to find cases to write for the National Diversity Project.

Perhaps my favorite story of finding a potential case in everyday situations stemmed from an observation that became "Mission Expansion: The Origins of the YWCA's Anti-Racism Campaign." When I lived in Minneapolis, I belonged to the YWCA close to my home. I was one of more than a million people who belonged to local YWCAs or participated in their programs every year. Above the main desk of my local Y, and on every piece of paper, was the slogan that the mission of the YWCA was to "eliminate racism wherever it exists and by any means necessary." Every time I saw that phrase I wondered how an organization started in the 19th century by white women to create the bonds of sisterhood in Christian social uplift came to have the elimination of racism as its main goal. The goal was so important that it was posted over the door to the gym. Anti-racism and step aerobics! This transformation of mission and method seemed at least as worthy of inquiry as how the horse cavalry became tank brigades or how the March of Dimes turned its focus from polio to birth defects.⁶ The cases used in the National Diversity and Public Problem Solving Project came from noticing anomalies like these and from looking for situations where "atypical" protagonists performed "typical" leadership tasks. As Robert Kegan reminds us, "the single greatest source of growth and development is the experience of difference, discrepancy, anomaly."⁷

Case Teaching

Case teaching is one of the hallmarks of professional education, and in the last 15 years a lively conversation has arisen about the purpose of cases in policy education—how to write them, how to teach them, and for students, how to prepare to discuss them.⁸ I define a case as a secular parable—a story with lessons. The story can be complete (a retrospective case) or require the student to finish it (a decision forcing case). Most cases allow the student to assess how well the protagonist has responded to the problem he or she faces given the organizational and political setting in which the conflict occurs. Cases also provide practical lessons for action. Given the fast and often unforgiving pace of public life, it is important for public servants to have a repertoire of problem solving skills. Case education provides part of this repertoire.

The key to case teaching is not the story, but the ability of the professor to help students draw out the multiple and often conflicting lessons in the case. The analytical lessons learned from policy cases depend on understanding how problems are defined, how people work in groups, how institutions function, and how politics and the economy are structured. The best cases are taught as part of modules that have strong roots in

institutional knowledge and policy history. Evaluating the actions of the protagonist of the case depends on locating his or her problem within this larger context.

The artistry learned from policy cases goes beyond discovering academic generalities. Learning the lessons of a case also depends on imagining the protagonist as a physically embodied person in a larger social system. The teacher and the students need to know and interrogate the standpoints of the actors, their sense of their tasks, their values, and their place in history.⁹ Where in culture and society do the people faced with these problems stand? How do they act out their human agency? How do they come to grips with the limitations of structural power arrangements? Who are their confidants, allies, opponents, and patrons?

A feminist Haggadah I read several years ago became a pivotal resource in understanding the perspectives of the actors in public policy cases. A Haggadah is the religious service that tells the story of the freeing of the Hebrew slaves in pharaonic Egypt, typically recounted as the story of Moses leading his people to freedom. It is read at the Seder, the ritual meal of the Passover holiday. Ordinarily the Biblical character Lot and his family are not part of the Haggadah, but the feminist Haggadah found a place for Lot's wife. This Haggadah imagined Lot's wife not from the point of view of Lot, or the sinful city of Sodom, but as her own person.

A quick review of the fate of Lot's wife is helpful.¹⁰ God saw the wickedness of Sodom and sent angels to alert Lot, a righteous man, to leave the city with his family. Only Lot's wife and two unwed daughters left with him; his married daughters and their husbands stayed behind. Lot tarried so long that he hardly had time to escape and he asked God if, instead of fleeing to the mountains, his family could go to the little town of Zoar that was not as far away. God agreed and commanded that no one fleeing the city look back, lest the person be swept away in the city's destruction. Lot's wife looked back and was turned into a pillar of salt. In the traditional Jewish and Christian discussion of this text, Lot's wife is almost always seen as justly punished for violating God's directive and for not fully putting the lure of wickedness behind her.¹¹ The lesson of the story is about obedience and vigilance against sin.

As part of the reading of the Haggadah the diners at the Seder read a series of statements praising God's goodness, saying "dayenu"—"it would have been enough"—after each gift is mentioned. The traditional Haggadah begins by saying that if God had merely saved the Jews from slavery, it would have been enough. The service goes on to thank God for the Torah, the Sabbath, and other divine gifts. In the feminist version, one of the dayenus reads, "If Lot's wife had been remembered for her compassion as she looked back, it would have been enough." Think about Lot's wife this way, leaving her other children behind, knowing the entire city will be destroyed. Was there nothing she could do that would help bring the city back to righteousness and save her children and her community? The lesson about Lot's wife from the feminist Haggadah is about compassion, grief, and tenacity.

Seeing Lot's wife as compassionate rather than as a sinner is a stepping stone to understanding the link between diversity and leadership. It is now commonplace to notice that Lot's wife is not even known by her name. Lot's wife surely argues for public policy cases where nontraditional actors are made the center of the story.

But where does leadership come in? Here again, a little foray into the "original case" is helpful. The chapter before Lot's story tells of God's announcement that the aged Sarah, Abraham's wife, will have a son, usually understood as a demonstration of God's power, his comfort for the childless Sarah, and his foreshadowing of the covenant with Israel. God then tells Abraham that he is going to destroy Sodom because of its wickedness. Abraham argued with God, first asking God to spare the city if there were 50 righteous inhabitants, ultimately bargaining God down to saving the city if it had 10 righteous residents. Modern Judaism often interprets this bargaining as a sign of God's gift of free will, and recognition that humans ultimately come to know God through their human and inquiring nature.

The end of Lot's chapter is not so appealing. Lot's two daughters sequentially got their father drunk so that he would impregnate them, making sure that his lineage was not lost. A conventional interpretation is that the wickedness of Lot's wife led his daughters to this act. Had Lot's wife not looked back, she might have born him a son (notice the daughters were not sufficient unto the day) even though her other children were of marriageable age. In any event, the taint of the wickedness of Sodom and of Lot's wife's disobedience remains.

Let us imagine that the angels came to visit Lot's wife instead of Lot. Such a retelling is not unusual or even a modern invention; it is a common religious and cultural practice across the globe. Judaism has the Midrash, both the codified exegesis of the Torah and the tradition of individual interpretation. Jews and Christians have written extensively about the unnamed women of the Bible, from Lot's wife to the women at the empty tomb of Jesus, imagining the details and the consequences of their assumptions. In another setting, traditional Korean Buddhist temple parables provide, in their interpretation, lessons for leadership.¹²

Following this practice, we imagine that the angels reveal themselves to Lot's wife and that saving a deeply flawed city and its inhabitants is the public policy objective. Once she knew God's purpose, Lot's wife might have done what all the men in the passages before have done. They negotiated a better settlement. Abraham convinced God to agree to save the city if there were 10 rather than 50 righteous residents. Lot convinced God to let his family flee to a closer place. Maybe Lot's wife could have bargained too. First she would have had to strengthen her own position, something Lot was singularly unable to do. Maybe she could have gotten her sons-in-law to believe the angels' message. Then she could have argued that counting Lot, herself, their two unmarried daughters, their two married daughters, and their husbands, there were eight people, who if not righteous themselves, were living in a righteous household and could with diligence have been a force for good, sparing the city. After all eight is not so different from 10. Maybe God would have replied to Lot's wife that a righteous community requires a critical mass, that there is a tipping point for righteousness, and 10 was the number. Lot's wife could then have asked God for a waiver, like in the Medicaid cost containment experiments, or a time extension, to find and cultivate additional righteous people. "You are just locked into your wicked ways," God

might have said, to which Lot's wife might have replied, "Holy One, you have given me the chance for life if I leave now. If I cannot work with my neighbors to create a minimum of 10 righteous people in the new time allotted, I am willing to suffer the fate of the city." In this way personal and collective incentives would have been nicely aligned. In this scenario, Lot's wife might have led the redemption of Sodom. Nameless, her talents are lost to her community, and her community is literally lost because of it. Voiceless, she cannot ask God for a last sight of her dying children.

The story of Lot's wife, told from her perspective, demonstrates the importance of imagining and practicing responsible power as part of the remedy for inequality and exclusion. Exercising power responsibly is an attribute and an objective of leadership. The reason that there are so few cases about women and people of color is, in part, that they have been structurally excluded from full participation in political and economic life. Changing this history requires many social and political remedies. Some have been implemented, with more or less success. The role of freedom, equality, opportunity, fairness, obligation, community, and assistance in making these changes requires serious debate in public and in the academy. Regardless of which policy paths are chosen, any remedy that responds to structural inequality requires us as educators to name, with humility and determination, the imperfections as well as the successes of the social landscape. Then we can train effective leaders who are committed to redressing the deepest as well as the most urgent problems. Without leadership education, there is little attention to the form of society as well as its immediate problems.

Imagining responsible power is not only daydreaming or book learning. Imagining is a kind of doing that also includes thinking, writing, engaging in the classroom discussions and exercises, and learning from protected settings like internships and role-playing. Imagining responsible power means learning how to set a visionary course; knowing yourself; listening to others, including those often forgotten; organizing yourself; building consensus; motivating others to work with you and each other toward goals that can be developed and held in common; garnering resources; and assessing and acting on threats. These are the tasks of leadership more than management or analysis. The great advantage of policy education in America is that it allows students to imagine themselves as responsibly powerful, substantively knowledgeable, and practically and analytically skilled. Knowledge and skill are not sufficient preparation for careers in the public interest, especially for those new to the table.¹³

Leadership Education

"Leadership" is a term like "representation" or "mobilization." Each is not quite a transcendental noun like "peace" or "virtue," in part because "leadership" and its friends are *directly* linked to action as well as to states of being. Leadership, representation, and mobilization also suggest fluid social processes encompassing individuals, working in groups, situated in institutions, all of which vary from culture to culture and society to society. These words also conjure important values, aspirations, and fears. Not surprisingly, all of these terms have many definitions.

Perhaps the most political definition of leadership, the one most connected to the drive for political and military power and the ability to use it, is found in James MacGregor Burns's *Leadership*. "Leadership over human beings," he writes, "is exercised when persons

with certain motives and purposes mobilize in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of the followers.”¹⁴ The view from the motives of the leader is well presented by the Defense Leadership Centre of the British Defense Academy. It defines military leadership as “the projection of personality and character to get subordinates to do what is required of them and to engender within them the confidence that breeds initiative and the acceptance of risk and responsibility.”¹⁵ A more social definition, with an emphasis on the leader’s goals, is offered by John W. Gardner who writes that “Leadership is the process of persuasion and example by which an individual (or leadership team) induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader or shared by the leader and his or her followers.”¹⁶ Warren Bennis gives a valuable road map for developing personal leadership potential when he describes four essential qualities of leadership: engaging others by creating shared meaning, a distinctive voice (sense of self), integrity, and adaptive capacity.¹⁷

A definition I find particularly useful, in part because it is paired with a definition of management, is provided by John Kotter: “Management is about coping with complexity...Leadership, in contrast, is about coping with change...Leading an organization to constructive change begins by setting a direction—developing a vision for the future (often the distant future) along with strategies for producing the changes needed to achieve that vision.”¹⁸ These definitions are useful because they emphasize roles that have tasks. While Kotter was writing mostly about CEOs and other top leaders, the definitions fit leadership at any level of an organization, and can be applied to assignments as well as positions. Also, Kotter recognized that leaders often have managerial roles, especially in small organizations.¹⁹

Lot’s wife could readily have applied Kotter’s definition of leadership had the angels come to her first. In my invented retelling of the story, Lot’s wife had a new vision, a city with a critical mass of righteous inhabitants, who could save themselves and improve their community through bringing more and more people to righteous living. She understood the big picture and the overall methodology. Moreover, she could not manage herself out of her problem. No amount of planning, budgeting, or ordinary problem solving—attributes we can see in her actions as she welcomed the angels and prepared to leave the city—was going to save her married daughters, their husbands, or her home. Nor would these activities change the city.

Let me be clear. Lot could have done these things, indeed he was better positioned to do so. He was already talking to God. What he lacked was the vision, the vision captured by his wife looking back and what we imagine motivated her to do so. I do not think, in contemporary parlance, that Lot’s wife’s essential womanliness caused her to look back. Lot could have had the compassion, grief, and tenacity we ascribe to his wife, the “crucibles” that forged her new vision. Let us assume he did have these attributes and he convinced God to let him remain in Sodom or go back to the city. His wife might then have been an extraordinary manager, busily demonstrating righteous living and keeping God’s timeline in mind. We would still want to know her name. We might even want to write a case about her. But we learn the most about how to make her story useful in including the voiceless and those new to public responsibilities by letting her imagine and exercise responsible power, by letting her lead or contribute to leadership. Moreover, Lot’s wife deserves the credit and the opportunity. She looked back.

Leadership and Teaching the National Diversity Cases

It is surprising how much resistance to teaching leadership courses and content there is in policy schools. For many faculty members, leadership is classified in the realm of the “natural,” like gender and race. That view is wrong for each concept. Leadership can be studied like any other complex social process, including representation and mobilization. Each has a literature that starts at the intrapsychic, and moves to individual attributes, individual actions alone and in groups, group behavior, institutional forms and activities, and social organization. Leadership courses take many forms. Some emphasize the role of leadership in the policy process from agenda setting through decision making, implementation, and evaluation. Others concentrate on the unique role of leadership in setting social and organizational directions, and its links with strategic planning. Still others examine the place of visionary leadership in social critique. A biographical approach to the lonely offices of the presidency and the Supreme Court has great appeal with students, and provides a good entrée into understanding political systems. Leadership can also be a topic in other courses ranging from decision theory to political institutions to moral philosophy.

The cases written for the National Diversity Project can be used in leadership courses, but mostly they can be used the way that all cases are used—to introduce problems of public life and to evaluate ways of solving them. The leadership component is the frosting, the way the case connects the immediate problem with the larger social structure. The leadership component and often the managerial considerations as well, help students to understand themselves, organizations, and society better.

The cases in this book take several forms. There are two role-playing simulations, requiring bargaining and negotiation within and among teams. These are “Race and Representation: Redistricting Northview” and “Democracy and Divisions: A New Constitution for Cyprus.” There are three retrospective cases, written to provide a good understanding of the historical and social setting of the problem as well as the conflicts confronting the actors. These are “Mission Expansion: The Origins of the YWCA’s Anti-Racism Campaign,” “Leadership Succession: The Lucy Prince Community Center,” and “Half a Loaf: Initiating a Comparable Worth Wage Policy for Public Employees.” The book concludes with two mini-cases, which are much shorter and contain less background information but are well suited for handing out in class. These are “Inclusion and Exclusion: The Family and Medical Leave Act” and “Social Entrepreneurship: Founding the Lakeland Black Women’s Leadership Conference.”

The cases were not written to make up for overall deficiencies in case writing. I did not choose to write a particular number with female protagonists and another number with African American or Latina/o protagonists. Rather, they were written to be used in syllabi that included many other assignments. In my experience case teaching works best when cases are bracketed by articles that include organizational and social theory and institutional structure and behavior. It is very difficult to teach a case like “Half a Loaf: Initiating a Comparable Worth Wage Policy” without sufficient attention to policy making in state legislatures, its setting, or incrementalism versus structural change, one of its major points.

Another distinctive characteristic of the cases in this book is that some are summarizing, disguised, or fictitious. In public policy education, the vast majority of cases reveal the name of the institution and actors being described. By and large, this is a good

idea, because it allows students to bring to their discussion a larger, though not shared, knowledge of the topic and organizations, and permits public scrutiny of the accuracy of the case. One of the cases in this book, “Mission Expansion: The Origins of the YWCA’s Anti-Racism Campaign,” falls into this category.

There are times, however, when summary, disguise, or invention might be more helpful, as long as such instances are explained. Both of the simulations, “Race and Representation: Redistricting Northview” and “Democracy and Divisions: A New Constitution for Cyprus,” are what I call summary cases. Each is based on the sum of real-life negotiations, but does not tell a specific story. The rules for redistricting in the reapportionment case come directly from a state where redistricting is done by a commission, not by the state legislature. I did extensive interviews in this state. The message of the case, however, does not depend on knowing the particular state. The redistricting simulation is an exercise where simplification is more useful for teaching than a long description of real negotiations. The same is true for designing a new constitution for Cyprus. There are lots of descriptions of (mostly failed) efforts to bring Greek and Turkish Cypriots to various agreements. There is an equally interesting literature on writing constitutions in divided societies. The combination of these literatures led to a simulation about drafting a new Cypriot constitution, something that, at this writing, has not yet occurred.

The book contains three disguised cases, that is, factually true cases where the organizations and the actors are disguised. These are “Leadership Succession: The Lucy Prince Community Center,” “Half a Loaf: Initiating a Comparable Worth Wage Policy for Public Employees,” and “Social Entrepreneurship: Founding the Lakeland Black Women’s Leadership Conference.” The “Leadership Succession” and “Social Entrepreneurship” cases feature African American organizations. Their leaders felt more comfortable if the organizations were disguised. Wanting to be included in the educational process, they nonetheless felt that the balance between being studied and being respected was achieved better in a disguised case. This was not surprising given the history of scrutiny of organizations of color and the fear of emphasis on pathology. The anonymity made participants more willing to be frank about the problems as well as the successes of their organizations. In “Half a Loaf,” which covers a legislative conflict about incremental or structural change and who gets credit for particular victories, two of the participants felt that their positions were jeopardized if the case were not disguised. Cultural respect and protection of informants are as important as accuracy, and disguised cases, if they follow all the other norms of honesty in cases, have proved, in my experience, to be just as useful as undisguised cases.

One case, “Inclusion and Exclusion: The Family and Medical Leave Act,” is totally fictitious. The case describes a group of neighbors, each having different life cycle problems, only some of which are covered by the Family and Medical Leave Act. The purpose of the case is to demonstrate differential treatment of various types of families and family members under the FMLA. There was no existing narrative that combined all the points necessary to demonstrate the way that firm size, gender, and sexual orientation are built into the legislation. The mini case is more a policy analysis exercise than a decision making case, but it also demonstrates that the accommodation of family needs often depend on leadership within firms, rather than the protection of the law.

“Chart 1: A Summary of the Cases” (which follows this chapter) provides a quick description of each case and gives its sector and setting; main policy, leadership, and organizational issues; and the names of the major actors, their organizational positions, and relevant social attributes. This chart can help teachers decide where the cases might fit into specific courses.

The teaching notes found in the companion volume expand on the information in the summary chart. The teaching notes were written to make adopting a new case easier. To link the teaching notes to the cases, each note begins with the same abstract that opens the case in this volume and ends with the same preparation questions that follow the case. The teaching notes also include a discussion of the policy, leadership, and organizational issues embedded in the case; plus, teaching tips and recommended readings. The section on policy, leadership, and organizational issues connects the immediate problem facing the protagonist to larger questions of leadership, social change, public philosophy, and democratic governance. The suggested readings for each case can be used by themselves or as an example of the type of readings that might be useful for putting this case in a larger context. The preparation questions can be used as a before-class assignment, to start in-class discussions, or both. But the teaching notes are just a beginning. The many talents and interests of the professors who teach these cases will amplify their usefulness in making policy education more inclusive. The responses of students will, as always, add the magic of new interpretations.²⁰

Endnotes

¹ Nelson, B.J. (1999). “Diversity and Public Problem Solving: Ideas and Practice in Policy Education.” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 18(1), 134-155.

² The cases published here are revised from their original texts, and they have been renamed to distinguish them from earlier versions. Many of the cases were co-authored with graduate students. They participated as work for hire, so that I could revise the cases as time and experience dictated. This arrangement worked well and it is my pleasure to acknowledge their contributions to these cases.

³ Golden, O. & Warrock, A. “Taking Charge: Rose Washington and the Spofford Juvenile Detention Center.” (1989). *Case Studies in Policy and Management*: John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

⁴ Kenney, S.J. (2001). “Using the Master’s Tools to Dismantle the Master’s House: Can We Harness the Virtues of Case Teaching.” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* Winter, 20(2), p. 349. In contrast see, Geske, M. and Clancy, M. (2000). “Sexploitation? Sex Tourism in Cuba.” *Pew Case Studies in Public Affairs*, Georgetown University.

⁵ “Be Heard: An MTV Global Discussion with Colin Powell.” <http://usinfo.state.gov/usa/blackhis/t021502.htm>

⁶ Katzenbach Jr., E.L. (1958). “The Horse Cavalry in the Twentieth Century: A Study in Policy Response.” *Public Policy*, 8, 120-149. See also Wertelecki, W. (1989). “Of Dreaming on Solid Grounds and Silent Triumphs of One Man: A Story about Josef Warkany.” *American Journal of Medical Genetics*, 33, 522-536.

⁷ Kegan R. (1994). *In Over Our Heads*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, p. 210.

⁸ Chetkovich, C., & Kirp, D.L. (2001). “How Novitiates Are Trained to Be Masters in the Public Policy Universe.” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 20(2), 283-314 and the responses to this article in the same volume including: Lynn, Jr., L.E. “The Customer Is Always Wrong,” pp. 337-340; Ferguson, G. “A New Kind of Conversation,” pp. 340-343; Brock, J. “Are Cases Taught, or Do Cases Teach Themselves,” pp. 343-346; Kenney, S.J. “Using the Master’s Tools to Dismantle the Master’s House,” pp.

346-350; and the reply by Kirp, D.L. and Cetkovich, C. "Public Policy Cases as Rorschach Blots," pp. 351-352. See also: Lynn, Jr., L.E. (1999). *Teaching and Learning with Cases: A Guidebook*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House; Zimmerman, P. "Case Development and Teaching: Communicating the Results." John F. Kennedy School of Government; Gomez-Ibanez, J.A. (1986). "Learning by the Case Method." John F. Kennedy School of Government; Boehrer, J. (1995), "How to Teach a Case." John F. Kennedy School of Government; Robyn, D. (1986). "What Makes a Good Case." John F. Kennedy School of Government; Kennedy, D. & Scott, E. (1985). "Preparing Cases in Public Policy." John F. Kennedy School of Government; Husock, H. (1993). "Democracy and Public Management Cases." John F. Kennedy School of Government.

⁹ Harding, S. (1993). "Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What is Strong Objectivity?" In L. Alcoff and E. Potter (eds.), *Feminist Epistemologies*. New York: Routledge, 49-82.

¹⁰ Genesis 19:1-38.

¹¹ The traditional view of the lack of resolve of Lot's wife is affirmed in the Christian Bible (Luke 17:32) when Jesus says to remember Lot's wife when he enjoins those who have chosen to follow him not to look back at their old ways.

¹² On the use of interpretation and commentary in religious and secular learning see, "Question 3:32. What is Midrash?" <http://www.faqs.org/faqs/judaism/FAQ/03-Torah-Halacha/>; Tribble, P. (1984). *Texts of Terror*. Philadelphia: Fortress; Aschkenasy, N. (1998). *Women at the Window: Biblical Tales of Oppression and Escape*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press; Hebblethwaite, M. (1994). *Six New Gospels*. Boston: Cowley Publications; and Kim, W.C. and Mauborgne, R.A. (1992, July 1). "Parables of Leadership." *Harvard Business Review*, 123-128.

¹³ Nelson, B.J. (2002). "Education for the Public Interest." Plenary Address to the National Association of Public Affairs and Administration Conference. Los Angeles, CA. (October 17, 2002).

¹⁴ Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row, p. 18.

¹⁵ "Definition of Military Leadership." *British Defense Doctrine* (2nd ed., 2001), The Defence Leadership Centre, Defence Academy, xxi-xxiv. Retrieved from: <https://da.mod.uk/DLC/Research/>.

¹⁶ Gardner, J. (1990). *On Leadership*. New York: Free Press, p.1.

¹⁷ Bennis, W.G., & Thomas, R.J. (2002). "Crucibles of Leadership," *Harvard Business Review*, 5-11.

¹⁸ Kotter, J.P. (2001). "What Leaders Really Do." *Harvard Business Review*, 3-11.

¹⁹ Because Kotter's definitions are role specific, they can also be applied outside of formal organizations and in understanding moral leadership. See Colby, A. (1992). *Some Do Care*. Detroit: Free Press.

²⁰ My thanks go to Frederick Borsch, Mandy Carver, Ron David, Linda Kaboolian, Bill Parent, and Riv-Ellen Prell for their helpful comments on this chapter.

DIVERSITY AND PUBLIC PROBLEM SOLVING: IDEAS AND PRACTICE IN POLICY EDUCATION

Barbara J. Nelson

Think about your worst teaching nightmares, including those that have not actually happened yet.

Please keep reading, even though you are experiencing cognitive dissonance, or even acute anxiety.

Why are these bad experiences? The answer is not usually class preparation, because we all know that preparation is only a small part of success. Rather, the reasons for classroom meltdown tend to cluster in two groups: either nothing in our training prepared us intellectually and practically for the topic at hand, or the class is in some fundamental way out of control. Often the class is out of control *because* our training has left us groping for what to do next. Few topics raise as much fear about effective teaching as race, ethnicity, religion, class, and gender.¹ Even the meanings of these concepts are contentious, although several widely-used definitions are given in the Appendix. But intellectual conflict over definitions is not what faculty fear most. Rather, they fear name-calling, long discussions about feelings, and, often worst of all, the silence of avoidance.

Let me give some examples. They range from comments that jolt a class discussion, to difficulties teaching particular materials, to the professional costs of innovative pedagogy. The speakers are all faculty in policy programs across the United States. In order to talk about the examples later, I have given the actors stage names.

Comments:

I was discussing the history of AFDC, noting that originally Mothers' Pensions were only available for widows or wives whose husbands had deserted them. Now most mothers who receive AFDC were never married to the father of the children getting benefits. I then mentioned the differential rates of nonmarital births among whites, blacks, and Latinas. A young African-American woman, "Ann Atkins," a very recent college graduate, gasped and said, "No, that can't be true. It can't be true that 66 percent of black children are born to unwed mothers."²

"Beth Brown," a faculty member at an Ivy League university

The class was just about to discuss the link between protest and policy change. The students had read the entire Browning book.³ I had copied a chart on the board, showing the differences in policy successes of blacks, Hispanics, and whites in several communities. A white male student, "Carl Curtis," began his discussion by shouting "Diego Duarte [the head of Chicano Studies] would whip you across the face for using 'Hispanic' instead of 'Chicano.'" The whole class exploded. The comment was so violent, a direct attack and a cowardly—and untrue—attempt to hide behind the authority of a "real" member of the group whose interests were supposedly being promoted. Diego was horrified when I told him.

"Ellen Edwards," a faculty member at a large public university

One of my colleagues, "Fred Farber," was trying to make a point about multicollinearity. He said jokingly, "Two variables that measure the same thing are like two men trying to make love; too much similarity means the thing won't work." Later a gay student, "Gina Girendella," came to me to complain about Farber. She said that she had been so angry she had just stopped listening. She couldn't learn any more.

"Hsu Han," a faculty member at a private urban university

From *Leadership and Diversity: A Case Book*. UCLA. Copyright 2004 by Barbara J. Nelson.

Materials:

I frequently teach “The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb” case where Henry Stimpson tells, in 1947, about how the decision was made in the Truman White House to drop the bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.⁴ I teach the case as part of a section on executive decision-making. I also want students to *Think in Time*, as Neustadt and May say.⁵ Student reactions are very complicated: anger, grief, ethnic wariness in terms of how much attention to give to race, and a palpable condescension toward the unenlightened and immoral leaders of the past. In particular, Japanese students and Japanese-American students often have very different reactions. There is no way to teach this case as a simple example of decisionmaking under uncertainty.

“Ise Inman,” faculty member at a large public university

Professional Costs of Innovative Pedagogy:

You cannot imagine how strong the message is not to be too sympathetic to minority students or minority interests. [The culture of my policy program suggests that] they are seen to be low status members of a high-status profession. It’s fine when I cover ethnic conflict as a question of foreign policy, which is one of my specialties. But I have been told directly not to make too many links with U.S. domestic ethnic issues. As a result, it is almost impossible to bring a reasonable, balanced view of ethnicity to our curriculum as a whole. Making progress on this subject is like trying to move a boulder an inch with a spoon as a lever.

“John Jenkins,” a faculty member at an Ivy League university

These examples help to explain an interesting finding. In hundreds of interviews I asked policy faculty what topics in policy education they found hard to teach. No one ever said Q-sorting. Most often the response was a specific topic, not methods, even among those who specialize in methods courses. Policy faculty rarely cited race, ethnicity, religion, class, or gender because, as further questioning revealed, they were not teaching much about these subjects directly.

When asked specifically about these topics, the vast majority of faculty reported, *sotto voce*, that they were uncomfortable teaching about them and that they did not know what to teach or how students would react. Most faculty hoped that their syllabi passed muster on the face validity test of having inclusive content, but if they felt safe enough to speak honestly, they talked of active avoidance. One faculty member put it well, saying that a typical mode for dealing with group conflict is “withdrawal and aversion of eyes, not discussing the undiscussable . . .” He noted that both faculty and students employed strategies of avoidance. Some faculty expressed fear. One said that faculty “don’t discuss race, gender, or sexual orientation in the classroom because they’re afraid to. . . . It’s like driving without a seat belt; the risk is ever-present and eventually one’s luck may run out.” A few felt that there was not anything to teach, that there was no scholarly content, just political cant.

Thus, the lived response to “race talk,” for example, is mostly evasion, fear, or dismissal.⁶ This response, common if not universal, means that as a profession we cannot quite find the scholarly or personal voice to teach about a set of issues that permeate every public problem we engage. This difficulty poses a serious limit to the effective preparation of our students. Our intellectual hesitation in grappling with these topics poses a problem for students because our research is the scholarly foundation of their training. Our uncertainties about classroom discussions give them short shrift as they prepare to work in a world where more kinds of people and more kinds of viewpoints will be part of the policy process.

This article focuses on the questions that all these experiences raise: *Why do we have such trouble teaching well about the great social fault lines of our times, and what can be done to enhance our engagement with these topics?* The answers to these questions are inextricably linked. Said plainly, we have trouble teaching these topics as much because we do not know enough about them as because we lack preparation to deal with conflict in the classroom. Enhancing our engagement with these topics begins with understanding that we cannot fully depend on our disciplinary training to provide us with sufficient information and then inventing practical curricular and classroom strategies to provide the needed content and techniques.

For the vast majority of us who do not specialize in the origins and consequences of social hierarchy, we rely on what we learned in our Ph.D. programs in political science and economics (or from the newspaper) to guide our approach to discussions of race, ethnicity, religion, class, and gender. Our founding disciplines, like the other social sciences, have not given these topics much systematic attention until very recently. The first section of this article analyzes how political science and economics, the disciplines from which most policy faculty are drawn, have approached questions of social hierarchy over the last century. This discussion has at its core a practice-based understanding of epistemology, one that says that the everyday assumptions and activities of social research provide important insights into the nature and grounds of knowledge.⁷ This section will show that policy programs are the intellectual heirs of behavioral individualism in the disciplines and the resultant inattention to group issues, including inattention to conflicts based upon group power and hierarchy.

As such, policy educators must reach widely to find the sources that will illuminate these intellectual questions. So too, we need to invent many of the classroom techniques that will work in our settings. The second section of this article presents 10 suggestions for improved teaching. Many articles about diversity and pedagogy focus mostly on classroom techniques.⁸ This article takes a somewhat different perspective, one that emphasizes that intellectual investment is equally as important as good techniques. The curricular approach and classroom techniques presented here derive from the work of the National Diversity and Public Problem Solving Project, a national demonstration project for curricular transformation on diversity issues in policy programs. The project had several components, including three summer institutes for university professors designed to improve teaching about policy problems infused with group conflicts. Many of the suggestions were developed for or in the summer institutes.

Finding Voice, or Why Conversation Is So Difficult

The civic conversation about race, ethnicity, religion, gender, and class is strained at best. In 1992 President Bill Clinton called for a national dialogue on race, but the advisory board he appointed to lead the discussion immediately divided over whether their efforts should “move beyond the ‘black-white paradigm.’ ”⁹ This episode is a visible manifestation of the paradoxical history of group conflict in the United States. American history includes prodigious efforts to live up to ideals of equality, respect, and inclusion coexisting with organized state brutality and socially condoned disregard from human dignity. Coming to terms with this contradictory history is very demanding, and we live in fairly unforgiving times for sustaining honest and difficult dialogue, both in universities and in political life.

Legacies: “We Bear the Nineteenth Century Like an Incubus”¹⁰

The social sciences have been a part of constructing as well as studying social groups for over a century, but most of this work has not been very self-reflective. Recently, however, there has been a new and impressive interest in the social and intellectual origins of the social sciences, with Ross’s *The Origins of American Social Science* providing an extraordinarily detailed sociogram of ideas, people, and institutions.¹¹ Each of the social science disciplines has engaged in this historical analysis as well. Farr, Dryzek, and Leonard analyzed the history of ideas that define American political science in *Political Science in History*.¹² Galbraith’s *Economics in Perspective* presented a critical history of economic ideas located in their place and time.¹³ Screpanti and Zamangi’s *An Outline of the History of Economic Thought* reviewed the history of economic ideas with more attention to theories than their origins.¹⁴ Similarly, the history of race and gender as social constructs has received a great deal of attention. These topics have been addressed by Hannaford¹⁵ in *Race: The History of an Idea in the West*, by Harding^{16, 17} in *The “Racial” Economy of Science and Is Science Multicultural?*, by Schiebinger¹⁸ in *Nature’s Body: Gender and the Making of Modern Science*, and by Russett¹⁹ in *Sexual Silence: The Victorian Construction of Womanhood*. Policy scholars have been largely absent from the production of this historical scholarship and mostly inattentive to its findings, creating a chasm between scholars who study the social organization of knowledge for action in the past and those who engage in that process today.

Speaking broadly, the history of the social sciences in America can be divided into four periods: the Victorian age of Social Darwinism, the pre–World War II rise of scientism, the postwar ascendancy of behavioralism, and the post-behavioral crisis of summation. Each period had a complicated set of racial, ethnic, religious, class, and gender assumptions, which, like the wall of a great defensive city, was built over, rather than replaced by each succeeding occupier.²⁰ The cusp of change from the Victorian to the scientific period was the 1910s, and the cusp of change from the scientific to the behavioral period was 1940 to 1955. The crisis of summation began in the 1970s and took its current form in the 1980s.

Victorian Social Science

The origins of the social science disciplines are inescapably Victorian. Political science and economics, like their sister disciplines of sociology, anthropology, and psychology, were founded during the heyday of Social Darwinism and in the shadow of *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896).²¹ All subscribed to the racial segregation of professional societies common in this period. All reflected in their mainstream journals the popular views on race relations and the secondary political and economic place of women.²²

Social Darwinism built on earlier naturalistic approaches to social hierarchy, especially the racial classifications that began with Linnaeus and Buffon. Prior to Darwin, it was widely believed that the races of humankind (defined then as visibly differentiated, geographically located, and biologically distinctive clusters of human beings) were created separately, either by God or by Nature.²³

Darwin changed all that. *The Origin of Species*²⁴ established the concept of natural selection and the definition of a species as a successfully interbreeding community. By articulating that all humankind was one species, Darwin decimated the notion of a biologically separate creation for women and the “lesser races.” But the unity of humankind did not level human social hierarchy. Natural selection, the engine of the one species theory

of humanity, also became the causal mechanism for creating hierarchy within one species.¹⁹

Social Darwinism rested on well-accepted practices of measuring brains, breasts, and penises in order to establish the hierarchy of quality within one species and to demonstrate the innate value of particular groups.^{23,19} This frenzy of mismeasurement reported that African men had larger penises than European men, and that African women had more pendulous breasts than European women. The same research claimed that African men and women had smaller brains than Europeans of their sex. These findings were interpreted as a sign of vital evolutionary energy being invested in physical rather than intellectual capabilities in Africans. As such, Europeans were innately smarter than Africans and therefore worthy to rule over them, just as men of each race were smarter than their women and therefore worthy to rule over them. This type of research was also practiced on other groups—Asians, Jews, Italians, the Irish, and American Indians—demonstrating the “biologized” concepts of race, ethnicity, religion, and the fluidness of their definitional boundaries. The fact that this research looked and sounded like the rest of the science of this period made the results enormously persuasive.²⁵

Victorian economists and political scientists depended on this work, although they did not usually engage in the measurement activities themselves. Examples are useful. Francis A. Walker, one of the founders of economics and later the president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, explicitly stated that he depended upon others to do the measurement of racial characteristics from which he drew economic conclusions.²⁶ In his *Political Economy* he discussed the efficiency of the individual laborer. He wrote that the endowment of physical force (that is, strength applied to work) “varies greatly, not only as between individuals of the same community, but as between communities, races and nations. Into the causes of the differences in this respect existing, it is not necessary to enter. *That inquiry belongs to the physiologist and the ethnologist*” (p. 47, emphasis added). His views on the sources of the strength of laborers were dynamic and complex, however. A laborer’s strength was a product of individual and racial endowments plus the quality of food, housing, and sanitation, and a hopeful temperament.

Early political scientists were enmeshed in the racial and sexual science of their era as well. John Burgess, the founding editor of the first political science journal, *Political Science Quarterly*, wrote in his second treatise *The Reconciliation of Government with Liberty* that he worried about universal manhood suffrage because the course of government would no longer be directed by the “intelligent and capable” (p. 284).²⁷ If, as Burgess believed, intellectual capacity was shaped by “race” and expressed by economic success, then his views did not bode well for the full integration of non-European men into American political life. Burgess’s exclusion of women from the polis was purposeful as well. In 1923, after women won national suffrage, Burgess continued to express his reservations about whether women should vote, fearing that the vote might turn women away from charitable work, leaving a hole in the social fabric that only government could mend.²⁸

Because it is easy to disavow the obvious racism and graphic sexuality of the mismeasurement endeavor, and because the arguments about the components of labor power or the consequences of women’s suffrage appear archaic, it is tempting to think that there are no lingering consequences from Victorian social science. But this period gave the social sciences their most defining characteristic: the view that white Protestant, employed

(often, well-to-do) men were the normative subjects of inquiry, and that the actions of all other groups should be judged against them. *The Victorian period established the normative “who” in economics and political science.* These norms were rarely successfully challenged until the 1970s.

Interwar Scientism

Interwar scientism is the least well understood era of the American social sciences. In this period an often mechanistic and naïve scientific method gained ascendancy in the social sciences, and the achievement of scientific standing through the use of these methods was an end in itself.¹¹ During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, social science journals rarely published articles on issues of power politics *within* nations and, as such, there was little attention to race and class in mainstream journals. But practical topics that emphasized consensus, such as race and labor relations, did have some representation in the scholarly literature. In the interwar period, the increased importance of theory drove these topics out of disciplinary journals. Walton, Miller, and McCormick argue that this loss was greater than it might appear at first glance.²⁹ The loss of attention to race relations meant a considerable reduction in coverage about race in any manner.

Scientism asked which image of science—physical or biological—the social sciences should emulate. Physics was appealing to those whose interests were fixed and universal laws. Economics would develop a more physics-oriented view of its scholarly endeavor.³⁰⁻³³ Some interwar political scientists took a physics-oriented view of the discipline, but most did not. A hard look at political life did not make such mechanistic laws likely.^{34,35} Biology appeared more useful. In natural selection biology had a well-established general principle, a law if you like, that could also explain change. The opportunity for generalization that explained change, rather than a belief in biology as destiny, made biology a major metatheoretical model for political science in this period.

It would be easy to make too much of the metatheoretical links between physics and economics, and biology and political science. Both disciplines had subscribers to both models of scientific inquiry, and both models were often badly conceived and misapplied. Nonetheless, it is important to note the epistemological consequences of the major model each group of scholars chose. Economists, like Newtonian physicists, came to see economic activities as having a deep structure that could be described by universal laws. Political scientists, like early Darwinians, came to see political life as complex and fairly indeterminate, that is, politics was littered with lots of low probability events that could vastly change the direction of political life.³⁶

The Behavioral Revolution

World War II changed the way social scientists viewed social hierarchy. Nazi ideology and practice, and ethnic violence in the Asian theater had demonstrated the all-too-easy movement from biological theories of social hierarchy, to ideologies of national superiority, and ultimately to mass murder. At the end of the war, when the extraordinary destruction became well known, social scientists reconsidered their approaches to group hierarchy and social differences. Solely biological explanations of group differences became increasingly scientifically suspect and unpopular, although they did not disappear.^{29,37} Neither did many of the professional practices of social exclusion were directed at minorities and women.

The absence of new theoretical framework to explain group hierarchy did not become a pressing problem, however, largely because of the change in research focus and topics occasioned by the rise of behavioralism. The practical problems posed by World War II, like the earlier demands of depression-era policymaking, changed the way that social science research was done. DeLeon and Overman³⁸ have written persuasively about the boost the war effort gave to the theory and practice of operations research and sampling techniques.

Perhaps the greatest contribution of behavioralism was its promulgation, early in the post-war period, of the idea that *sets of prescribed social relationships*—organizations, political parties, firms, markets, or states—could be studied scientifically and generalized about. The classics of early behavioralism, such as Hebert Simon's *Administrative Behavior*³⁹ and David B. Truman's *The Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion*,⁴⁰ searched for robust ways to conceptualize and analyze people in institutions, institutions themselves, and relations among institutions.⁴¹

The rapid application of statistical methods to economics and political science in the mid-1950s changed the direction of behavioralism, greatly reducing the emphasis on studying groups. The statistics, mostly borrowed from psychology, used individual traits (education, income) to explain individual actions (voting, purchasing). As behavioralism extended its reach, methodological individualism had a chilling effect on the study of all group activities, because the locus of inquiry rolled relentlessly downhill. Perhaps more troubling, empiricism came to be defined as statistical analysis rather than a system of inquiry based on meticulous design, rigorous observation, and careful analysis.

The most successful challenge by political scientists and economists to behavioralism was not in greater attention to groups, but in the expansion of the historically normative, though still primarily individualistic, “who.” Julie Nelson's research on the exclusion of women's nonmarket work from conventional economic investigations was typical of scholarship in both the disciplines.^{31,42} She argued that if economics shifted its emphasis from production to provisioning, it could effectively include nonmarket work, and as a result would pose more complete questions. Her analysis was part of a wide-ranging critique of the adequacy of the assumption of a universalistic actor in social science research.^{43,44}

But economics was undergoing another transformation, one not shared with political science, but important to understanding the difficulty in focusing attention on group dynamics: the mathematicization of economics, and its subsequent move away from empirical research. Nobel Prize winner Gerard Debreu³⁰ noted in his address as president of the American Economics Association that in 1990 more than 40 percent of the pages of the *American Economic Review* were devoted to “mathematics of a more elaborate type” (p.1). He went on to say that “economic theory could not follow the role model offered by physical theory. Next to the most sumptuous scientific tool of physics, the Superconducting Super Collider whose construction cost is estimated to be on the order of \$11 billion, the experiments of economics look excessively frugal. Being denied a sufficiently secure experimental base, economic theory has to adhere to the rules of logical discourse and must renounce the facility of internal inconsistency. In its mathematical form, economic theory is open to an efficient scrutiny for logical errors” (pp. 2–3).

Blinder did not see this move away from practical research in the same positive light.⁴⁵ He argued that academic economists were in danger of becoming “Nero-Classical Economists” fiddling as they “disengaged themselves from the practical policy concerns that affected the lives of millions” (p.3). Friedman extended the argument when he said that economists in policy schools needed to be attuned to the political realities of existing policies, the availability and reliability of data, and the organizational capacity to implement policy proposals.⁴⁶

The Crisis of Summation

Political science and economics are currently experiencing a double crisis of summation. First, the research results of individually focused behavioralism do not easily sum to useful knowledge about groups. This scholarship has rarely yielded long-term, empirically grounded, engageable (a somewhat different notion than testable, which applies to hypotheses), finely nuanced explanations of large systems, systems that in real life include groups of different power, status, organization, and purpose. Said another way, behavioralism has failed to assist social scientists to move up the levels of analysis. Second, mathematical theorizing about large systems often rushes by significant differences in group experiences in a premature search for universal truths. Mathematically elegant formulations of economic or political systems are constantly challenged on the basis that they do not adequately represent the variation of group experiences.⁴⁷

The recognition of the crisis of summation and the response to it differs in the founding disciplines of the policy sciences. Political science has seen a renaissance of attention to group behavior and to large-system theorizing, including a great deal of attention to research design for large-scale comparisons and research methods that examine “squishy,” or highly indeterminate, problems.⁴⁸ The increased attention to groups, especially political parties, interest groups, social movement organizations, and bureaucracies, is partially the result of large-scale regime changes, economic globalization, and the impact of electronic media on political systems designed 100 years ago for nationalistic industrial democracies. Some of this work has followed the formal modeling approach of economics, but much of it has looked for new conceptual, empirical, and statistical insights.

Economics, squeezed by mathematicization and behavioral individualism, has had fewer options. In many ways, the policy school movement has provided an antidote to the antipragmatism that arises from excessive interest in mathematical economics for its own sake.⁴⁶ The interest that policy school economists share with business school economists in organizational behavior adds importantly to theoretical and empirical advances. And economists have been much more likely than any other group of social scientists to be tapped for high appointed office by both parties.^{49,50} But economists interested in practical problems, let alone interested in group hierarchy, suffer from status loss within the central value structure of their discipline. They pay a higher social price for their interest in diversity than do political scientists, a price composed not only of acquiring expertise in topics in disfavor within the discipline but also justifying their interest professionally.

Policy Education and Diversity

Policy education is the recipient of these intellectual traditions about social hierarchy, power, and diversity. In particular, policy education is the heir to the behavioral individualism and the lack of scholarly emphasis on group behavior of its founding

disciplines. In addition, our own professional roots in operations research and applied microeconomics bind us most strongly to the disciplinary intellectual traditions *least* connected to the study of race, ethnicity, religion, class, and gender.^{38,51}

The historic disciplines in which most of us trained are not likely to provide us with an adequate grounding for dealing with diversity and public problem solving. Interestingly, much of the new research on these topics within the social sciences has not crossed into our curricula, except occasionally as individual scholars infuse their courses with the new materials in their research specialties. Our profession has not taken a look at the whole curriculum since the early 1980s.⁵² The teaching literature designed to enhance classroom discussions in the liberal arts offers only partial answers for policy education. Policy education is professional education. The world is always in our classrooms in ways not found in the disciplines.^{53,54} Thus, if we want constructively to engage the intellectual and practical questions of group conflict and hierarchy in our distinctive classroom settings, we will need to devise at least some of the answers ourselves.

The National Diversity and Public Problem Solving Project

In response to this need, the National Diversity and Public Problem Solving Project, funded primarily by the Ford Foundation, was initiated in 1993. Its objectives are to enhance the research on social group conflict and policymaking and, through case writing and teacher training, to be a national demonstration project for curricular transformation on diversity issues in policy and other professional schools.⁵⁵

The intellectual perspective of the National Diversity Project, as it came to be known, is important. The emphasis was not on increased tolerance or improved cultural knowledge, valuable as they are theoretically and in effective policy practice. Similarly, the emphasis was not on identifying and rooting out racism, discrimination, or other social practices that deny human dignity, even though these too are important considerations. Rather, the question at the heart of the project was more fundamental to the academic endeavor: *How, in theory and practice, does the policy process balance universal, group, and individual claims?*

The project has three parts: a three-year demonstration section (now completed) on curriculum development, a research agenda, and a plan to share the curricular and research findings. A major task of the curriculum development effort was designing a summer school to enhance the teaching of policy faculty interested in these topics. Each summer from 1994 through 1996 the project ran a two-week institute that examined theoretical, empirical, and case-related material dealing with race, ethnicity, religion, class, and gender as they applied to defining and solving policy problems.⁵⁶ Most participants in the summer schools were faculty from policy, social work, and nursing schools and from economics, political science, sociology, and psychology departments. Faculty came from Ivy League schools, large land grant universities, historically black universities, and liberal arts colleges. Two summers we also had several directors of academic or foundation research programs. Each faculty member brought a syllabus whose content and teaching he or she wanted to enhance through participation in the summer school. Research directors and foundation executives brought a research or program plan they wished to improve.

The summer school was one of several activities designed to enhance the capacities of teachers, scholars, and organizational leaders to deal effectively with questions of diversity and public problem solving. The project also conducts workshops, sessions at national conferences, and consultations with universities and policy programs, nonprofit organizations, and firms. These programs formed the basis for the following suggestions for enhanced teaching. Together they emphasize crafting a syllabus and preparing to teach in a manner that allows us to step beyond our traditional disciplinary approaches to these questions. The list begins with ways of knowing and ends with ways of teaching.

Ten Suggestions for Enhanced Teaching

1. *Recognize that we are already teaching about these topics.* This statement is the response to the much-made comment that “these topics don’t come up in my class.” The issues that arise from the great social fault lines in the United States are in all of our courses, all of the time. As faculty we are like the person of old who did not know he spoke prose every day. All but one of the examples given at the beginning of the article happened in courses that did not focus on social hierarchy. Even courses on statistics are not immune. The issue at hand is the quality of what we teach, not whether we teach it.

2. *Invest in intellectual preparation.* In the long run, good intellectual preparation is more important than good classroom technique. This suggestion runs counter to the first reactions of many faculty members, whose greatest fear is a classroom outburst like Carl Curtis’s purposefully disruptive comment on the use of the term “Chicano” rather than “Hispanic.” These comments are very rare, in fact. Most faculty members have had perhaps only one or two truly awful comments in a lifetime of teaching. Most reactions are more like the “demographic denial” of Ann Aikens, who could not believe that 66 percent of black children were born out of wedlock, or the silence of Gina Girendella who stopped participating when she felt that being gay was ridiculed in class.

We need two kinds of skills to respond to these situations. The first is the obvious need for good teaching skills in guiding effective classroom conversation (see suggestion 9). But it is equally important to have adequate substantive knowledge. *Good conflict management skills get us out of trouble; good substantive knowledge keeps us out of trouble.* The best preparation for answering the substantive aspects of questions on race, ethnicity, religion, class, or gender is to include a variety of materials on social hierarchy throughout the syllabus and in many discussions.

To respond to Ann Aikens, Professor Beth Brown talked about the history of nonmarital birthrates, the way that sexual license and nonmarital births are conflated in the public mind and its negative consequences for African-Americans, and the adequacy of the census figures. Similarly, to respond to Carl Curtis, Professor Ellen Edwards talked about the politics of identity, the Census Bureau’s efforts to name a diverse category of people, and the time in which the book had been written. In both instances, the faculty members used the ABC rule (Affect Before Content) when they responded to a challenging situation, dealing with emotions before getting to substance. Getting to the substance is crucial, however. Students report that when they evaluate faculty members on their abilities to deal with difficult moments in the classroom, they fully expect that teachers will deal with ideas as well as feelings.

3. *Fortify teaching with conceptual vitamins.* One of the worries faculty have about responding to the need for increased knowledge about social hierarchy is that there seems to be an infinite number of topics to master. For instance, more than one summer school participant was concerned that, to know about Latinos and Latinas, they also had to know about Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Central Americans, and South Americans—both immigrants and native born, both men and women. This worry was not exclusive to those outside the group. One participant of Mexican background acknowledged that he knew much less about other Latinos than he did about Mexicanos and Chicanos. As a whole, faculty were worried about being criticized for not having enough specific knowledge.

A wide conceptual repertoire helps to reduce this worry and increase classroom effectiveness because conceptual depth lets us reason by analogy. Quite consciously, the summer institutes developed a series of techniques to extend conceptual repertoires. Each of the sections on social categories (for example race) included material explicitly about the concepts that defined the category. Sometimes the material was included in the readings, such as Nnoli's short essay on ethnicity.⁵⁷ Other times we included a major part of the conceptual material in the discussion.

Using an example from the beginning of this article, Professor Ilse Inman implicitly fortified her teaching of the Stimpson decision to bomb Hiroshima and Nagasaki with conceptual vitamins. Inman included the following questions in the discussion of the case: What do we mean by race and ethnicity? Are today's definitions the same as those used 50 years ago? How was race used as a rationale for the Second World War? She prepared carefully for this discussion, but she did not assign most of the materials she covered because experience had taught her that students had a better grasp of racial and ethnic issues, even though they were difficult to discuss, than they had of war, mass destruction, or decision making at this level of responsibility.

4. *Insist that social categories be understood on multiple dimensions.* One of the important ways to assess the rigor of the conceptual material on social groups is to evaluate how thoroughly the issue of group membership is treated. A social group is a social construction. It can be based on an observed characteristic, like sex, on often unobserved characteristics, like religion or sexual orientation, or on characteristics like race or ethnicity, which are frequently indeterminate. But more importantly, group membership is experienced in a variety of ways: by self-identification, by the identification of others, by beliefs, by actions, and by values.⁵⁸

Within these modes of membership are many kinds of experiences. Some gay men may experience a great deal of hatred or discrimination as a result of their sexual orientation; others may not. Similarly, multiple group membership means greater variation in experiences. For example, the religious practices of immigrant Guatemalan Pentecostals are quite different from the religious practices of immigrant Guatemalan Catholics. Likewise, Guatemalan and Irish Catholics often express a shared theology in quite different cultural forms.

5. *Include individual experiences.* Just as adding materials on concepts deepens the analytical quality of a syllabus, including materials that convey the day-to-day experiences of individuals creates richer understanding of policy problems. It is important not just to include statistical materials about Korean-Americans, or Jews, or displaced women clothing

workers, but also to bring their voices into the classroom, as Rosen does in *Bitter Choices*, a 1987 analysis of plant closings in the garment industry.⁵⁹ This approach implies a willingness to use a wider variety of sources than are currently found in some policy courses, sources that include ethnographies, histories, congressional testimony, court transcripts, novels, biographies, movies, and the like. Ethnographic materials have the great advantage of creating shared examples within the class that do not depend on making students represent the groups to which they belong. As a matter of technique, it is helpful to present ethnographic material at the same time as conceptual and empirical material.

Another way to provide concrete examples is to do what Geraldine Brookins, a participant in the summer school (now a vice president of the Kellogg Foundation), did in her class on Child Development and Public Policy. She had the class “create a child.” One by one class members gave the fictional child personal and social characteristics. The first student decided the child’s ethnicity, the second its sex, the third its family structure, the fourth its economic position, and the like. This child was then a reference point for many discussions. Indeed, the first discussion was whether the child should be “representative” of the modal qualities of the various groups to which he or she belongs. Brookins then was able to ask interesting discussion questions such as “What might have been this child’s experience if she had recently immigrated from Vietnam instead of being a Chicana?” It was a very effective teaching device.

6. *Provide enough voices.* Policy faculty often do not know the literature that can bring individual experiences into the classroom. My interviews frequently showed that faculty could not think of more than one or two writers who could provide the voices of people experiencing a particular social problem. One of the questions I asked of those who taught social or labor policy courses was “What books or material would you use to bring the personal experiences of the urban poor into the classroom?” Wilson’s *The Truly Disadvantaged* was the hands-down choice.⁶⁰

This was somewhat surprising, even contradictory. On one hand, *The Truly Disadvantaged* does not use an ethnographic or personal narratives approach. Hence, it does not create the strong sense of place and person invoked by ethnography. On the other hand, the book is analytically powerful and immensely well written. Its greatest success is bringing alive the collective experience of the urban poor. For many faculty members, however, Wilson was the nearest representative of individual voices that they knew. Few could name any other author when asked for additional examples.

Thus, we face two pedagogical challenges in providing enough voices. First, we need to know the sources. Second, we have to know how to teach this material effectively. In particular, we need to develop the skills to teach about the reality of individual experiences in ways that capture both their unique and their general lessons.

In my experience, searching for the representativeness of a story is not a particularly effective way to use ethnographic or other individualistic material. Rather, personal narratives can be used to interrogate received wisdom for its conceptual and historical vigor. For instance, McBride’s *The Color of Water: A Black Man’s Tribute to His White Mother* could be an important addition to a class on urban poverty, not because McBride’s experience of growing up poor in New York City is necessarily typical, but because his experience helps us

question the large categories of analysis we use everyday, not the least of which is “who is black?”⁶¹

7. *Expect questions about universalism and objectivity.* Attention to studying groups and group membership often brings accusations of a retreat from the universalism and objectivity of science. The perspectives of members of groups who were not part of the Victorian “who” of the social sciences are often assumed to be narrow and self-interested. Professor John Jenkin’s reading of his program’s hostility to minority students is partially a reflection of this process. This “excessive” self-interest is ascribed most insistently to members of the nonhistorical “who,” but it is often attached to scholars of these groups regardless of their own group membership. According to this reasoning, self-interest is a doubtful part of the academic endeavor because it stands in opposition to the distance and point-of-view-lessness of the dispassionate scientist, qualities that are assumed to be necessary to ascertain the universal truth.

Sen and Harding have done some of the most important work on these questions. In his essay “Objectivity and Position,” Sen argued that only by knowing one’s own position could one attempt the process of accurate observation, itself necessary for any process that leads to generalized knowledge. Sen was quite insistent that determining one’s own position could not be thought of as a “scientific nuisance,” but rather the psychological and methodological beginning of understanding. In his essay, he distinguished between positional and transpositional objectivity. He wrote that “any attempt at non-positional objectivity has to start with knowledge based on positional observations and *then* go beyond that, and in that sense this is really an idea of *trans*-positional objectivity (rather than one that does without positional objectivity altogether).”⁶²

Harding looked at the issue from a different perspective. She argued that acquiring generalized social knowledge rests on the practice of “strong objectivity,” which requires the researcher to ask at every turn: How universal are my assumptions, my methods, and my findings? Strong objectivity is achieved when scholars design their research questions by imagining different sets of socially situated actors confronting the same problem. Harding argued persuasively that this approach yielded greater conceptual and empirical depth than trying to establish the investigator as a person without a point of view. In many ways, Harding turned the assumption of scholarly distance on its head. She held that the skills of positional analysis and the scientific and social imagination to place oneself in other people’s shoes lead to greater scientific rigor.⁶³

8. *Decenter the normative self.* In psychological terms, Sen and Harding require us to decenter the normative self, that is, to understand that the way we see the world may not be the way others see it. Neither decentering the normative self nor strong objectivity require giving up our preferences for states of the world, even states that just so happen to be the ones we occupy. Rather, the practice of decentering the normative self means understanding that our lives or our group’s experiences are not the center of understanding around which all knowledge is arrayed.

We began the diversity summer school with a series of “decentering” exercises. Before classes began, we read Roberts’s *Who We Are: A Portrait of America Based on the Latest U.S. Census*.⁶⁴ During the first class, we had a slide show that put the American experience as

presented by Roberts into a world context by comparing data on a range of measures: religion, GDP per capita, unemployment, and deaths in childbirth. This approach can be used easily in policy courses by regularly moving up or down the geographical scale in presenting data. For instance, how does Chicago compare with the state, or Illinois with the country? The same technique works well in comparing social groups. For the approach to work well, however, it needs to be done regularly. If the data do not exist (for example, good data on the family incomes by religious denomination are difficult to get), this too becomes part of the policy and analytical discussion.

9. *Create guidelines for classroom dialogue.* Each year the participants in the summer school discussed and adopted a set of guidelines for effective classroom dialogue developed by one of the summer school teachers, Linda Kaboolian. In certain ways, these rules embody an approach to discussion that acknowledges but decenters the normative self. These rules are predicated on the notion that when important work is to be done in classrooms, as in the halls of power, it is necessary to promote engaged discussion, a kind of conversation that is different than talking for emotional release without a larger analytic agenda or winning points in a polarized debate without necessarily listening to one's adversary. The power of these guidelines is in the fact that they encourage discussion by establishing conversational rights and obligations. They do not establish any forbidden topics or opinions. They are most effective when they are presented, discussed, sometimes altered, and then mutually acknowledged by the teacher and the students.

The obligations of classroom dialogue include taking responsibility for your opinions by speaking in the "I" voice when presenting a general evaluative opinion. This means students and faculty alike must make evaluative statements in a way that does not deny who holds the opinion. Thus, a student has an obligation to say "I think that the policies of a Catholic president will be controlled by the Pope to the detriment of the independence of the nation" rather than "Catholics are all under the thumb of the Pope and disloyal to the country." So too, teachers and students have a general obligation to stay in the discussion even when they are conflicted or angry.

The rights of classroom dialogue include being able to clarify one's own position and to ask for the clarification of the views of others. This is done quite straightforwardly with simple questions like "What do you mean by Papal control?" or "Does your concern about Papal control apply generally, or to a specific policy arena like birth control or school funding?" The tone of the question should be inquiring rather than antagonistic. In turn, members of the class have the right to clarify their own positions. Similarly, they also have the right to change their minds and not be typecast as the holder of an initial position forever. Participants in the summer institutes found this right—to change one's mind—the most unfamiliar and for many the most useful.

Kaboolian and others on the summer school teaching team agreed that teachers had additional obligations. First, the teacher had the obligation to keep the classroom safe from personal attacks. Second, the teacher needed to frame a difficult situation by stating what the analytical and social tasks confronting the class were. Third, if necessary, the teacher must recognize and respond to the emotional content of the discussion. From our earlier examples, we note that Professor Brown was accomplished in responding to the emotional content—fear of stereotyping and implied accusations of sexual license—in Ann Aiken's

shocked response to the level of nonmarital births among black women. Again from our examples, Professor Jenkins, who has been warned against being “too sympathetic to minorities” might find himself cross-pressured in meeting this obligation.

Summer school teachers and participants also agreed that there were some situations when it was sensible to choose not to begin a conversation in class. Gina Girendella chose not to engage Professor Fred Farber when he used an antigay remark to make a point. She did not think the situation was conducive to successful dialogue, a judgment with which Professor Hsu Han concurred. Girendella was afraid of retribution on her grades, which Han thought was an unlikely, although an understandable, fear. With the permission of Girendella, Han brought the incident to the attention of the associate dean, who discussed this and other reported teaching complaints with Farber.

The Farber example demonstrates how discussions of diversity and public problem solving extend beyond the classroom. The associate dean met with Farber to discuss improved teaching techniques. Farber then had the opportunity to explain himself in a quiet and professional setting. There was a lot at stake for Farber. Did he just make a tasteless joke, as one summer school participant responded when discussing this case? How many faculty could pass the test of never having misjudged how to say something in class? Where was the associate dean when all the other complaints came in? Or had Farber compromised the basic assumption of fairness in the treatment of students?

The Farber example surfaces another, and often more prevalent problem. Gina Girandella’s withdrawal from participation alerts us to the need for mechanisms that prevent and respond to avoidance. One technique that promotes better dialogue in class is to hold small group discussion in class before moving to full class discussions. The size of all but the smallest seminars creates a set of fairly stylized encounters when we hold full class discussions. I have found that the intellectual and interactive quality of most full class conversations is notably improved by giving students a question or a case exercise and a fixed amount of time in class to discuss it among themselves in small groups. This technique also increases the likelihood that students who come from cultures where volunteering is not the norm have a safer place to contribute to learning. By rotating the first reporters from each group, students practice and observe the responsibility of including all viewpoints, which helps to decenter the normative self.

10. Avoid the nightmare scenario. Every teacher has them—fears about the worst thing that can happen in class. In the Diversity Summer School, we did an exercise where each participant wrote down his or her worst fear about classroom incidents dealing with diversity. The most frequently expressed fear was that one member of the class would call another member a bigot. The first thing to note is that participants reported that this situation was quite rare, especially in its most volatile version of one person calling another a racist. The group reported that these events were less likely in graduate courses than in undergraduate courses. Participants also noted that if there had been good coverage of social hierarchy, especially with adequate attention to concepts and individual voices, these events were less likely to occur. In these courses, students felt recognized, and they trusted the teacher to use techniques of constructive dialogue.

The solutions to really awful situations are as varied as the situations themselves.

Each is likely to have a very specific context. If you know what you fear most, make a simple plan to respond if it happens, perhaps even discussing it with a colleague. The feeling of being prepared helps to prevent the event because the solution will most likely have prevention built into it. In most situations the following ground rules will help: name the situation, retain leadership (this is crucial), and respond to emotions and ideas. In the incident where Carl Curtis shouted that the head of Chicano Studies would whip Professor Ellen Edwards across the face for using Hispanic rather than Chicano, Edwards responded with considerable force that “it is inappropriate to use an image of whipping anyone across the face in this classroom.” She named what was happening and kept in charge of the situation. She then commented that everyone was probably upset, but that she would respond to the larger analytical question of how groups name themselves and are named by others. The situation was too explosive to have much more of a discussion then. At the end of the class, Edwards publicly said that she wanted to see Curtis in her office immediately.

Faculty members have developed a variety of techniques to deal with very difficult situations. One mentioned flicking the lights on and off at a particularly charged moment as a way quickly to cool down emotions and allow a more balanced discussion to develop. Perhaps my favorite technique was used by a South African physician who was leading interracial education groups during the transition from the apartheid regime to democratic governance. Whenever the conversation became very fraught, he asked the class to sit on the floor. He remarked that it is much harder to have a screaming match sitting on the floor than it is sitting on chairs or standing. Plus, having been invoked once or twice, the request to sit on the floor became a sign for the need for responsible discussion.

Final Comments

As faculty in policy programs, we have already chosen to step beyond our disciplinary training, both in asking different research questions and in educating students to solve public problems. This observation links the curriculum development components of the National Diversity and Public Problem Solving Project to the ongoing creation of a new profession. It is within our norms to take the initiative to discover improved ways to engage questions of social hierarchy and group conflict. The historical analysis presented here makes the case for the necessity of an indigenous effort within policy education to prepare our students for the ways race, ethnicity, religion, class, and gender will manifest themselves in policy problems, policy solutions, and workplaces. The 10 curriculum and classroom suggestions begin the dialogue on enhancing policy program content and techniques.

Appendix

Conceptual Definitions of Race, Ethnicity, Religion, Class, and Gender

Race:

Virtually all scholars believe that the popularly understood “races” of humankind are a social, not a biological, construct. In writing about the origins and array of human biological variation in *The History and Geography of Human Genes*, Cavalli-Sforza, Paolo Menozzi, and Alberto Piazza state that “all populations or population clusters overlap when single genes are considered, and in almost all populations, all alleles are present but in different frequencies. No single gene is therefore sufficient for classifying human populations into systematic categories” (p. 19).⁶⁵ Smedley describes the historically located, but socially powerful, racial classification system of Linnaeus, Buffon, and others as “folk” science (p.6 et passim).⁶⁶

Omi and Winant describe race as “a pre-eminently *sociohistoric* concept” (p.28, emphasis in original).⁶⁷ Instead of race they talk about “racial formations,” by which they mean the social process of investing groups with positive or negative traits on the basis of their appearance and especially their relationship to the historical categories of race.

Ethnicity:

Nnoli emphasizes contact between groups as essential for the definition of ethnicity. “A phenomenon associated with contact between cultural-linguistic communal groups within societies, ethnicity is characterized by cultural prejudice and social discrimination. Underlying these characteristics are the feelings of pride in the in-group, common consciousness and identity of the group, and the exclusiveness of its members” (p. 280).⁵⁷

Horowitz offers a long analytical definition of ethnicity. “Ethnicity is based on the myth of collective ancestry, which usually carries with it traits believed to be innate. Some notion of ascription, however diluted, and affinity deriving from it are inseparable from the concept of ethnicity . . . [E]thnic membership transcends the range of face-to-face interactions, as recognized kinship need not. So conceived, ethnicity embraces groups differentiated by color, language, and religion; it covers ‘tribes,’ ‘races,’ ‘nationalities,’ and castes” (pp. 52–53).⁶⁸

Religion:

Marty and Appleby note that the concept of religion “eludes precise definition,” but they continue by saying that “religion has to do with what concerns people ultimately, and provides them with personal and social identity. Religion leads adherents to prefer myth and symbol, along with rite and ceremony, over other forms of expression. And religion tends to imply some sort of cosmic or metaphysical backdrop to stipulate certain behavioral correlates” (p. vii).⁶⁹

Reese defines religion as proceeding “from the Latin *religare* (to bind fast), typically the term refers to an institution with a recognized body of communicants who gather together regularly for worship and accept a set of doctrines offering some means of relating the individual to what is taken to be the ultimate nature of reality” (p. 488, italics in original).⁷⁰

Class:

Wright states that “the diverse definitions of class can be analyzed in terms of three nested theoretical dimensions: (1) Whether class is fundamentally understood in gradational or in relational terms; (2) If class is understood in relational terms, whether the pivotal aspect of class relations is located in the market or in production; (3) If class relations are primarily located within production, whether production is analyzed above all in terms of the technical division of labor, authority relations, or exploitation” (p. 4).⁷¹

Gilbert and Kahl begin by defining class in the most general way, that is, as social strata organized hierarchically with each stratum “having interests or goals in common with equals but different from, and often conflicting with, those groups above or below them” (p. 3).⁷² They use nine variables—occupation, income, wealth, personal prestige, association, socialization, power, class-consciousness, and social mobility—to locate individuals and groups within a class structure and to determine the fluidity of such a structure.

Gender, Sex, and Sexual Orientation:

Gender and Sex Distinguished: Chowdhury and Nelson gave a straightforward definition of the distinction between gender and sex when they wrote that “Gender is defined as the social construction of the relations between women and men and among various groups of women or men. Sex is defined as the biological

differences between and among women and men” (p.10).⁷³

Sexual Orientation: Gonsiorek and Weinrich define sexual orientation as “erotic and/or affectional disposition to the same and/or opposite sex” (p.1).⁵⁸ They note that sexual orientation has often been confused with three other concepts: biological sex, the genetic material encoded in chromosomes; gender identity, the psychological sense of being male or female; and social sex role, the adherence to the culturally created behaviors and attitudes deemed appropriate for men and women.

Endnotes

¹ In this article, I am using “gender” as shorthand for the constellation of topics that include gender, sex, and sexual orientation.

² Blum, L.M. & Deussen, T. (1996). “Negotiating Independent Motherhood: Working Class African American Women Talk about Marriage and Motherhood,” *Gender and Society*, 10(2), 199–211.

³ Browning, R.P., Marshal, D.R., & Tabb, D.H. (1984). *Protest Is Not Enough: The Struggle of Blacks and Hispanics for Equality in Urban Politics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

⁴ Stimpson, H.A. (1947/1984). “The Decision to Use the Atom Bomb,” in A. Gutmann and D. Thompson (eds.) *Ethics and Politics: Cases and Comments*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers, 4-15.

⁵ Neustadt, R.E. & May, E.R. (1986). *Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision Makers*. New York: Free Press.

⁶ Washington, M.H. (1988). *Invented Lives: Narratives of Black Women, 1860–1960*. New York: Doubleday.

⁷ Chowdhury, N. & Nelson, B.J. (1994). “Research design and practice: Methodological issues in feminist comparative political research” in B.J. Nelson and N. Chowdhury (eds.), *Women and Politics Worldwide*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

⁸ Briggs, X. & Gentile, M.C. (1997). *Things We’ve Learned So Far: A Note on Teaching and Learning in “Diversity” Issues*. Teaching note, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

⁹ Harwood, R. (1997, July 21). Opportunity and the New Diversity. *Washington Post*, A21.

¹⁰ The opening line of Charles Tilly’s^{10a} important book *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons* (p.1).

^{10a} Tilly, C. (1984). *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

¹¹ Ross, D. (1991). *The Origins of American Social Science*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

¹² Farr, J., Dryzek, J.S., & Leonard, S.T. (eds.). (1995). *Political Science in History: Research Programs and Political Traditions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

¹³ Galbraith, J.K. (1987). *Economics in Perspective: A Critical History*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

¹⁴ Screpanti, E. & Zamagni, S. (1993). *An Outline of the History of Economic Thought*. (D. Field, Trans.). Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press.

¹⁵ Hannaford, I. (1996). *Race: The History of an Idea in the West*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press.

¹⁶ Harding, S. (ed.). (1993). *The Racial “Economy” of Science: Toward a Democratic Future*. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press.

¹⁷ Harding, S. (1998). *Is Science Multicultural? Postcolonialisms, Feminisms, and Epistemologies*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 49-82.

¹⁸ Schiebinger, L. (1993). *Nature’s Body: Gender in the Making of Modern Science*. Boston: Beacon.

¹⁹ Russett, C.E. (1989). *Sexual Science: The Victorian Construction of Womanhood*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

²⁰ In this context, race should be understood in its dual 19th and early 20th century form, that is, race is simultaneously used to mean biologically definable, color-based, phenotypically clustered groups of humanity and also used to mean quasi-biologically defined ethnic groups, that is, peoples whose origins were in a specific place and who shared a language and culture.

²¹ *Plessy v. Ferguson* [163 U.S. 537 (1896)] established the “separate but equal” principle in race relations. It was overturned by *Brown v. Board of Education* [347 U.S. 482 (1954)].

²² There is less attention to religion and class than in, say, sociology, where these were more typical topics.

²³ Gould, S.J. (1981). *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: Norton.

²⁴ Darwin, C. (1872). *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. London: John Murray.

²⁵ Brown, J. (1991). “Mental Measurement and the Rhetorical Force of Numbers.” In J. Brown and D.K. van Keuren (eds.), *The Estate of Social Knowledge* (pp. 134-152). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.

²⁶ Walker, F.A. (1887). *Political Economy*. New York: Holt and Company.

²⁷ Burgess, J.W. (1915). *The Reconciliation of Government with Liberty*. New York: Scribner.

²⁸ Nelson, B.J. (1989). “Women and Knowledge in Political Science: Texts, Histories, and Epistemologies.”

Women and Politics, 9(2), 1–25.

²⁹ Walton, Jr., H.W., Miller, C.M., & McCormick II, J.P. (1995). “Race and Political Science: The Dual Traditions of Race Relations Politics and African-American Politics.” In J. Farr, J.S. Dryzek, and S.T. Leonard (eds.), *Political Science in History: Research Programs and Political Traditions* (pp. 145-174). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

³⁰ Debreu, G. (1991). “The Mathematization of Economic Theory.” *American Economic Review*, 81(1), 1–7.

³¹ Nelson, J.A. (1993). “The Study of Choice or the Study of Provisioning? Gender and the Definition of Economics.” In M. Ferber and J.A. Nelson (eds.), *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

³² Robbins, L.C. (1935/1952). *An Essay on the Nature and Significance of Economic Science*. London: Macmillan.

³³ Silk, L. (1987). “Less than Physics, More Than a Beanbag.” [Review of the book, *Economics in Perspective: A Critical History*]. *New York Times Book Review*, 92(43), pp. 27.

³⁴ Nelson, B.J. (1996). “Public Policy and Administration: An Overview.” In R.E. Goodin and H.D. Klingemann (eds.), *The New Handbook of Political Science*. (pp.551-592). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

³⁵ Somit, A. & Tanenhaus, J. (1967). *The Development of American Political Science: From Burgess to Behaviorism*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

³⁶ Scientism had other important social meanings, quite apart from its organization of inquiry. It became a tool in consolidating the social science disciplines within the liberal arts by supporting a centrist political agenda. The drive for higher scientific and social status widened the gap between the knowledge disciplines and the active professions—like social work—whose status was already compromised by its appeal to women. Interestingly, political science and economics practiced a greater degree of social exclusion than other social science disciplines. Political science and economics accepted fewer women, Jews, and immigrants to their ranks than sociology, anthropology, and psychology.¹¹ African Americans were virtually excluded from economics and political science, as conducted at major research universities and in mainstream professional organizations.

³⁷ Dryzek, J.S. & Schlosberg, D. (1995). “Disciplining Darwin: Biology in the History of Political Science.” In J. Farr, J.S. Dryzek, and S.T. Leonard (eds.), *Political Science in History: Research Programs and Political Traditions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

³⁸ DeLeon, P. & Overman, E.S. (1989). “A History of the Policy Sciences.” In J. Rabin, W.B. Hildreth, and G.J. Miller (eds.), *The Handbook of Public Administration*. New York: Marcell Decker.

³⁹ Simon, H. (1947). *Administrative Behavior*. New York: Macmillan.

⁴⁰ Truman, D.B. (1951). *The Governmental Process: Political Interests and Public Opinion*. New York: Knopf.

⁴¹ The list of political classics of the behavioral era comes from James Farr and Raymond Seidelman’s “Introduction” to the section on the political science debates of 1945 to 1970 in their edited volume *Discipline and History: Political Science in the United States* (p. 202).^{41a} The books listed here do not comprise the whole of the classics as listed by Farr and Seidelman. The early behavioralist research had extraordinary political as well as analytical power. The subsequent classics of behavioralism—Anthony Downs’s *An Economic Theory of Democracy*^{41b}, Angus Campbell, Warren E. Miller, and Philip E. Converse *The American Voter*^{41c}, V.O. Key’s *Public Opinion and American Democracy*^{40d}, and Gabriel Al Almond and Sidney Verba’s *The Civic Culture*^{41e}—paid notably less attention to institutions. By 1961 Robert Dahl’s *Who Governs?*^{41f} was atypical in not having a microeconomic model or survey-based analysis at its heart. This research was used by social scientists like John Gaus and E. Pendleton Herring to articulate the unity of the social sciences with the natural and physical sciences in a common system of inquiry bound together by one overarching scientific method.^{41g} This “one science, one method” argument shielded the social sciences from the McCarthyist charge of having a leftist political agenda while also supporting the inclusion of the social sciences in scientific funding.

^{41a} Farr, J. & Seidelman, R. (eds.). *Discipline and History: Political Science in the United States*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

^{41b} Down, A. (1957). *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper.

^{41c} Campbell, A., Miller, W.E. & Converse, P.E. (1960). *The American Voter*. New York: Wiley.

^{41d} Key, V.O. (1961). *Public Opinion and American Democracy*. New York: Knopf.

^{41e} Almond, G.A. & Verba, S. (1963). *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

^{41f} Dahl, R.A. (1961). *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

^{41g} Ball, T. (1994). American Political Science in its Postwar Political Context. In J. Farr and R. Seidelman (eds.), *Discipline and History: Political Science in the United States*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

⁴² Nelson, J.A. (1995). “Feminism and Economics.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9(2), 131–148.

⁴³ Keohane, N.O. (1981). “Speaking from Silence: Women and the Science of Politics.” In E. Langland and W. Grove (eds.), *A Feminist Perspective in the Academy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- ⁴⁴ Sapiro, V. (1979). "Sex and games: On Oppression and Rationality." *British Journal of Political Science*, 9, 385–408.
- ⁴⁵ Blinder, A. (1988, May). "The Challenge of High Unemployment." *American Economic Review*, 78, 1–15.
- ⁴⁶ Friedman, L.S. (1991). "Economists and Public Policy Programs." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 10(2), 343–359.
- ⁴⁷ Krueger^{47a} makes a similar point when she suggest that two goods, two factor models of international trade were not realistic enough to predict the importance of export led growth in economic development (pp. 11–12). The early trade models were not parsimonious; they were simplistic.
- ^{47a} Krueger, A.O. (1997). "Trade Policy and Economic Development: How We Learn." *American Economic Review*, 87(1), 1–22.
- ⁴⁸ Dunn, W.H. (1997). "Probing the Boundaries of Ignorance in Policy Analysis." *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(3), 277–298.
- ⁴⁹ Reich, R.B. (1997). *Locked in the Cabinet*. New York: Knopf.
- ⁵⁰ Lawyers outstrip economists, but professionally trained economists are more frequently appointed to high national posts than other social scientists.
- ⁵¹ Stokes, D.E. (1996). "The Changing Environment of Education for Public Service." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 15(2), 158–170.
- ⁵² Crecine, J.P. (ed.). *The New Educational Programs in Public Policy: The First Decade*. Greenwich: JAI Press. 1982.
- ⁵³ Price, D.K. (1965). *The Scientific Estate*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- ⁵⁴ Radin, B.A. (1997). "The Evolution of the Policy Analysis Field: From Conversation to Conversations." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 16(2), 204–218.
- ⁵⁵ Light, P. (1994). "Removing the Barriers to Minority Recruitment." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. 13(1), 164–179.
- ⁵⁶ The summer school changed in two ways, one planned and one circumstantial. The first summer the program was available only to University of Minnesota faculty. Due to the demand for national participation, the second and third summers were open to faculty from across the country. The second change was unplanned. The project moved with me to Radcliffe College where the second two summer schools were held. The project is now housed in the School of Public Policy and Social Research at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA).
- ⁵⁷ Nnoli, O. (1993). Ethnicity. In J. Krieger (ed.), *The Oxford Companion to Politics of the World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 280-284.
- ⁵⁸ Gonsiorek, J.C. & Weinrich, J.D. (1991). The definition and scope of sexual orientation. In J.C. Gonsiorek and J.D. Weinrich (eds.), *Homosexuality: Research Implication for Public Policy*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1-12.
- ⁵⁹ Rosen, E.I. (1987). *Bitter Choices: Blue-collar Women In and Out of Work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- ⁶⁰ Wilson, W.J. (1987). *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- ⁶¹ McBride, J. (1996). *The Color of Water: A Black Man's Tribute to His White Mother*. New York: Riverhead Books.
- ⁶² Sen, A. (1992). *Objectivity and Position*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press. p.1.
- ⁶³ Harding, S. (1993). "Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What Is Strong Objectivity?" In L. Alcoff and E. Potter (eds.), *Feminist Epistemologies*. New York: Routledge.
- ⁶⁴ Roberts, S. (1993). *Who We Are: A Portrait of America Based on the Latest U.S. Census*. New York: Times Books.
- ⁶⁵ Cavalli-Sforza, L.L., Menozzi, P. & Piazza, A. (1994). *The History and Geography of Human Genes*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- ⁶⁶ Smedley, A. (1993). *Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- ⁶⁷ Omi, M. & Winant, H. (1992). "Racial formations." In P.S. Rothenberg (ed.), *Race, Class, and Gender in the United States*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- ⁶⁸ Horowitz, D.L. (1985). *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- ⁶⁹ Marty, M.E. & Appleby, R.S. (1991). Introduction: The Fundamentalism Project: A User's Guide. In M.E. Marty and R.S. Appleby (eds.), *Fundamentalisms Observed*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- ⁷⁰ Reese, W.L. (1980). *Dictionary of Philosophy and Religion: Eastern and Western Thought*. Sussex: Harvester Press.
- ⁷¹ Wright, E.O. (1979). *Class Structure and Income Distribution*. New York: Academic Press.
- ⁷² Gilbert, D. & Kahl, J.A. (1987). *The American Class Structure. A New Synthesis*. Chicago: The Dorsey Press.
- ⁷³ Chowdhury, N. & Nelson, B.J. (1994). "Redefining Politics: Patterns of Women's Political Engagement from a Global Perspective." In B.J. Nelson and N. Chowdhury (eds.), *Women and Politics Worldwide*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

RACE AND REPRESENTATION: REDISTRICTING NORTHVIEW

Barbara J. Nelson

Abstract

This role playing, active case is set in the fictional city of Northview, which is made up of 80 perfectly symmetrical and homogenous blocks, separated into white Republicans, black Democrats, and white Democrats. The recent census shows population growth that results in the addition of a congressional seat, bringing the new total to four. Two of the three incumbents, a Democrat and a Republican, are running again, and a Republican representative is retiring. The staff of the members of the state's Redistricting Commission are wrestling into place the new congressional district boundaries. The members of the Commission are state senators and representatives with strong partisan agendas, but the chair is politically neutral. The staff—the roles participants play—represent the interests of their employers. The objective of each staff member is to redistrict Northview in a way that satisfies both partisan and civic needs, which are frequently hard to determine and often in conflict. The stylized rules of fairness and distribution mimic court decisions that constrain redistricting. Staff members have to decide what they want to achieve, what they have to protect, and where they might be willing to compromise, and together, redraw the map. In the process they grapple with issues of race and representation in society and in political parties.

Case Study

This is a case study about legislative redistricting. It is also an example of legislative policy making where race and ethnicity are important considerations in the politics and the content of policy making. The case uses a simulation format where the model of redistricting is less complex than real redistricting situations. In particular, in this example only two racial or ethnic groups are used (black and white), population density is equal through the area, each neighborhood (a “block” on the map) is homogenous, and a limited number of political criteria need to be met.

Each participant in the simulation is given the role of staff to one of the members of the Redistricting Commission. The main task of the staff member is to develop a plan to redraw the Congressional districts for the city of Northview. These plans must reflect the political and partisan preferences of each staff member's boss, an appointed member of the Commission. Although in reality the Courts impose a number of criteria on redistricting, the only two judicial considerations imposed on the Redistricting Commission is that the plan must *stay within existing political boundaries* and *provide fair representation of minorities*. The meaning of the first requirement is easy within the context of Northview. The Plan may not break up blocks (see the map) or extend the borders of districts beyond the city limits of Northview. The second criterion is much more difficult to discern. The Court says that minorities may not be systematically disenfranchised. Interpretation of this ruling has varied over time.

Northview is a city made up of 80 uniformly inhabited blocks. Forty of the blocks are inhabited solely by white Republicans; 20 are inhabited solely by black Democrats; 20 are inhabited solely by white Democrats. (Northview represents a racial, ethnic, and partisan configuration similar to many large cities, with a center city comprised mostly of people of color and a predominantly white periphery. This exercise can be run the opposite way, with a white center city and a periphery composed of people of color, a model that might approximate Manhattan.)

Northview Political Information

Northview has grown in the last decade, and will get four congressional seats, one more than in the last redistricting. Two of the three incumbents will run in the next election.

1. Republican Xavier Xenon from block 13 will not run again.
2. Democrat Yvette Young of block 50 will run again.
3. Republican Zbig Zawicky of block 70 will run again.
4. The Democrats on the Commission want to save Young's seat, the Republicans want to save Zawicky's seat, and both parties would be happy if the other incumbent's new district was much more difficult to win.

Role Playing

In this state redistricting is done by a Redistricting Commission with 10 legislative members, and one outside member. The Constitution provides that the Governor appoints five members of the legislature to the Commission and the Senate Majority Leader appoints five members. The Governor and the Senate Majority Leader must agree on the eleventh member, who is "neutral." The neutral member is the Chair and casts a deciding vote if there is a tie. The Republicans control the Governorship and the Democrats control both houses of the legislature. Each legislative member of the Commission is staffed by someone who already works for the legislator. For example, a legislator with a partisan leadership position is staffed by a person from that party's leadership staff. Members representing committees are staffed by committee staff. Individual members are staffed by personal staff. The neutral member is staffed by the Legislative Research Office, known for its fair and impartial research.

The redistricting commission has put the task of proposing the final plan in the hands of five staff members—two Republicans, two Democrats, and one from the Legislative Research Office. These staff members have been briefed extensively about the preferences of those whom they represent. All staff members are white with the exception of Ken Kettering, who staffs the Senator who chairs the Legislative Black Caucus. All Commissioners are white except for the Chair of the Legislative Black Caucus.

Neutral Staff (from the Legislative Research Office)

Abraham Able, of the LRO, staffs the neutral member

Republican Staff

Carol Charles, staffs the House Minority Leader

Fred Fenton, staffs the strongest Republican Representative from the white suburban area of Northview

Democratic Staff

Jane Jenson, staffs the Chair of the House Judiciary Committee

Ken Kettering, staffs the Chair of the Legislative Black Caucus, a Senator from central Northview

Redistricting Assignments

You have been assigned one of the staff roles. You should try to find a strong solution to the redistricting request because you know that you may have to bargain away from that position. After redistricting Northview according to your role assignment please jot down on the bottom of the map the reasons you redistricted the way you did. It is important to note that there are dozens of ways that each staff member could redistrict Northview. There is no one right answer for any role. The rules for drawing redistricting plans are listed below, as are the rules for determining the final redistricting plan.

Rules for Drawing Redistricting Plans

1. Each district must have 20 blocks in it. All the blocks in a district must be contiguous. Blocks may not be subdivided.
2. A party wins a district if it has at least 11 blocks.
3. Black and white Democrats make coalitions to insure that a district will be considered Democratic.
4. In districts controlled by the Democrats, a black Democrat will be elected if blacks control the coalition, and vice versa. Among Democrats, if there are an equal number of black and white blocks in a winning coalition, either a black or white member might be elected.
5. A district is considered competitive if it has an equal number of Republicans and Democrats.
6. Do not consider what might be done in the redistricting of the rest of the state as you redistrict Northview.

Rules for Redistricting Northview

1. There are 5 people in each redistricting group, one from each role.
2. A final redistricting plan requires 3 of 5 votes to be enacted.
3. Redistricting is essentially a political activity. If the political members of the group cannot decide on a plan, that is, if 3 of the 4 political representatives cannot agree, the staff person from the Legislative Research Office votes to make a majority.

Preparation Questions

1. If a group has historically been denied equal voting rights, should there be some recompense through redistricting? For how long? For which groups? Why? With what consequences?
2. Role playing in this simulation reveals several important qualities of staff work. A staff member is an agent of his or her boss, the principal. What responsibilities do agents have to their principals? How much individual autonomy should or do the staff members in Northview have? In addition, how do staff members manage the tension between overall social fairness and advantage for their group or party?

3. What are the consequences of the necessity for multiracial coalitions for Democrats in Northview? What are the consequences of not needing multiracial coalitions for the Republicans in Northview? Do these consequences effect partisan strategy? Do partisan strategies effect policy making over the long term?
4. Within your role, what should your opening position in the redistricting negotiations be, knowing that you will probably need to bargain away from that solution? Why?

The City of Northview

1	2	3	4	5	6	xxxxxx xxx7xx xxxxxx	Xxxxxx xxx8xx xxxxxx
9	10	11	12	13 X	14	15	16
17	xxxxxx xx18xx xxxxxx	19	20	21	xxxxxx xx22xx xxxxxx	23	24
25	26	xxxxxx xx27xx xxxxxx	xxxxxx xx28xx xxxxxx	29	30	31	32
33	34	xxxxxx xx35xx xxxxxx	xxxxxx xx36xx xxxxxx	xxxxxx xx37xx xxxxxx	xxxxxx xx38xx xxxxxx	39	40
41	42	xxxxxx xx43xx xxxxxx	xxxxxx xx44xx xxxxxx	xxxxxx xx45xx xxxxxx	xxxxxx xx46xx xxxxxx	47	48
49	50 Y	xxxxxx xx51xx xxxxxx	xxxxxx xx52xx xxxxxx	xxxxxx xx53xx xxxxxx	xxxxxx xx54xx xxxxxx	55	56
57	58	xxxxxx xx59xx xxxxxx	xxxxxx xx60xx xxxxxx	61	62	63	64
65	66	67	68	69	70 Z	71	72
73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80



Black Democrats



White Democrats



White Republicans

DEMOCRACY AND DIVISIONS: A NEW CONSTITUTION FOR CYPRUS

Barbara J. Nelson and Susan Bloom

Abstract

Cyprus is a nation with serious ethnic and religious divisions. Its population is comprised of 81 percent Greeks (who are Greek Orthodox) and 18 percent Turks (who are Muslim). They share their island, but not much else. Independent only since 1960, the country was divided in 1974 when Turkey invaded after the Greek Cypriot military, in alliance with the Greek military government, staged a *coup* with the aim of annexing Cyprus to Greece. Only Turkey recognizes the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, as the northern portion declared itself in 1983. Over the past three decades there have been scores of discussions held to encourage the reunification of Cyprus. The European Union (and before it the European Community) has been crucial to these discussions, holding the biggest carrot, entry into the European Union for Cyprus and Turkey. This is a much-desired economic and political goal for both countries.

Cyprus has accomplished this goal. On April 16, 2003 the European Union voted membership for Cyprus, along with nine other countries—but not Turkey. Cyprus was unlike any other country voted EU membership. It was a divided island nation with two governments. The Turkish Cypriot portion garrisoned 40,000 Turkish troops. As a result of these special circumstances, the European Union was very specific about what political and geographic entity it brought into its fold. It voted membership to the entire island of Cyprus, but recognized the Greek Cypriot government of the southern 60 percent of the country as both the only legitimate government and the government representing the entire island. In this the European Union was consistent with its long-standing and definitive policy that it would not recognize Cyprus as two countries.

In 2004, a proposal crafted by the Secretary General of the United Nations to create a bi-zonal, federated country, was defeated, with 75 percent of Greek Cypriots voting against and 65 percent of Turkish Cypriots voting in favor. Still, the European Union and most Cypriots want to make a single Cyprus a reality. One of the most important tasks will be writing a new constitution for a reunified Cyprus. The new constitution will determine whether ethnically divided Cyprus can work effectively in daily life as one country, a question that has parallels for all deeply divided nations. This simulation provides the opportunity for Greek and Turkish Cypriots, working with Greek and Turkish counterparts and the European Union, to try to determine the basic constitutional principles of a united Cyprus.

Case Study

Cyprus: Gateway to Territorial Ambitions. Cyprus, the largest island of the eastern Mediterranean, lies 900 kilometers east of Greece and 60 kilometers south of Turkey. The island has always had the troubling distinction of being strategically valuable because it is a gateway to many territorial ambitions. Its invaders are legendary, including the ancient Greeks, the pharaohs, the Roman empire, the rising Arab world, Richard the Lionhearted, the Knights Templar, the Franks, the Egyptians, the Venetians, the Ottoman Turks, and the British.

In the nineteenth century, Cyprus held two attractions for Britain. Cyprus's geographical location was of great military value, but Britain also wanted control of Cyprus as part of the Great Game. Early in the 19th century Britain, France, and Russia allied against Turkey to establish an independent Greece. Later in the century, however, Britain became opposed to Russia's self-proclaimed role as the protector of Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire. A strong Russia, projected south to the Mediterranean, upset the balance of power from Britain's perspective. British rule of Cyprus began in 1878, the result of a deal with the Ottoman Turks to support them against Russia. Cyprus became a British crown colony in 1925 and an independent republic in 1960 in the wave of post World War II decolonization. The British had perhaps the most benign approach to religion of any external ruler, giving internal control of religious issues to each community. Over its long history Cyprus had been home to Latin-rite Christians, Greek Orthodox Christians, and Muslims, among others. At different times its rulers represented each of these faiths, with exclusionary and sometimes violent consequences for nonbelievers. Although Greeks comprised the vast majority of the island's population, they did not fare well under Turkish rule.

Unstable Independence. The newly independent Republic of Cyprus was inherently unstable. The island was divided between Greeks and Turks separated by language, religion and culture; lumbered with a cumbersome constitution; and hampered by an underdeveloped economy. Cyprus was soon engulfed in communal violence. The situation became much more complicated in 1974, when elements of the Greek Cypriot military, in alliance with the military government of Greece, staged a *coup* whose aim was to annex Cyprus to Greece. Turkey invaded the island, taking control of the northern two-fifths. In 1975 Turkish Cypriots declared their region the Turkish Federated State of Cyprus. In 1983 the name was changed to the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. Regardless of name, no other country besides Turkey recognized the independence of this section of Cyprus. The rest of the world recognizes the Republic of Cyprus as having sovereignty over the entire island. After decades of failed negotiations, the island remains divided. Both communities operate independently of one another, separated by the imaginary "Green Line" and the very real United Nations peacekeeping force.

The proportion of the Greek and Turkish populations on Cyprus has remained roughly the same as it was when the country was divided, although the Turkish sector has had steady out migration. In 2001, the Republic of Cyprus estimated that there were 639,500 Greek Cypriots or 81 percent of the total population living in the government-controlled south, 60 percent of the island. The Turkish Cypriots estimated their population at 203,000 or 18 percent of the total population, living in the northern section, in an area comprising about 40 percent of the island. The Greek Cypriot population also includes about 9,000 Maronites, Armenians, and Latin-rite Christians who were asked to choose between the two populations and chose to identify with the Greek Cypriot community. The Greek Cypriot community is wealthier. In 2002, the per capita income of Greek Cypriots was US\$16,000 compared to US\$5,300 for Turkish Cypriots. This difference reflects not only historic differences in wealth, but also the effects of isolation on Turkish Cypriots, much to the dismay of young members of that community.

Cyprus's Relations with the European Community and the European Union. The rise of the European Community (EC)—which became the European Union (EU) in 1993—offered some leverage to solving Cyprus's ethnic and international problems. Because of Cyprus's status as a former crown colony, Britain was its largest trading partner. The Cypriot economy, especially its agricultural sector, was deeply dependent on this special trading relationship. Shortly before the events of 1974, Cyprus had negotiated an Association Agreement with the European Community. The original application dated back to 1962, following Britain's application for full membership in the EC. In 1970, Cyprus's government resubmitted its bid when it appeared that the United Kingdom would assume membership into the Community, as it did in 1973. The EC-Cyprus Association Agreement was signed in 1972. In brief, the agreement allowed Cyprus to retain its access to the United Kingdom market and to receive preferential treatment for many of its exports in exchange for reducing its tariffs on imported EC goods by 35 percent over five years ending in 1978. While the Greek coup and subsequent Turkish invasion disrupted the economy and the Association Agreement timetable, the relationship struggled forward.

The economic needs of Cyprus gave the European Community and the European Union real but limited leverage in trying to find a political solution to the divided island—a successful multi-ethnic unified Cyprus. Cyprus, that is, the internationally recognized, government of the Greek portion of the Republic of Cyprus, wanted to be a full member of an integrated Europe. The European Community made it clear that reunification would be the price. Cyprus saw the Association Agreement as a crucial first step—necessary for economic reasons, but important for political ones as well. Since 1975, the EC and then the EU, plus the United Nations, and several countries have sponsored many of rounds of talks aimed at reunifying the island and providing ethnic, religious, and linguistic protections. Direct negotiations between Turkish and Greek Cypriot leaders began in 1977 (after a hiatus of 14 years), but face-to-face negotiations came and went over the years. None of the talks came to fruition. Throughout this time the EC and EU used economic incentives to promote reunification and to raise the standard of living on Cyprus, itself felt to be a motivation for reunification. The inducements offered by the EC and EU were the Association Agreement, a later customs union, and direct aid valued at several hundred million dollars and designed to improve both communities.

But a reunified Cyprus was never just a matter of solving internal differences, with the judicious assistance of European money. Superpower conflicts during the Cold War influenced how much effort international organizations or interested countries would make to encourage Cypriot reunification. Both Greece and Turkey are members of NATO. Greece was a charter member, joining in 1951 and Turkey became a full member in 1952. Neither could be offended to the point that it would withdraw from the alliance.

Ethnic conflict on Cyprus was also deeply connected to its regional situation. Cyprus's internal politics were buffeted by the notable imperfections of Greek and Turkish democracy, the significant economic instabilities of both countries, the rocky international relations between them, and their European ambitions. Greece acceded to the European Community in 1981. Turkey has continually been thwarted in its ambition to become a member of the EU, although it does have a longstanding Association Agreement with the EU and a more recent customs union, established in 1995. Turkish troops in Cyprus are cited as one of the many reasons blocking Turkey's membership, the others being its less

than stable or transparent government, economic corruption, and debate about whether Turkey is historically a part of Europe. The question of whether Europe can encompass a Muslim country is often discussed in the press and the halls of power.

Changing Europe and the Prospects for a Reunified Cyprus. The European institutions that have promoted the reunification of Cyprus have changed dramatically in the last four decades. In particular, the political integration of Europe has increased to include a great many more countries. A single currency is used by the vast majority of western European countries. Military integration is slower, both in the number of countries participating, and the effectiveness of action. These changes influence the likelihood of Cypriot reunification as well as its shape and timing.

The European Community was created after World War II to unite European countries peacefully in order to rebuild their economies. In 1952 Belgium, France, (West) Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and The Netherlands pooled their coal and steel sectors into a single market without national barriers and administered by a supranational body, the European Coal and Steel Community. The Rome Treaties established the European Economic Community and the European Atomic Energy Community in 1958. In 1967 these groups merged into a single framework called the European Community. The United Kingdom, Ireland, and Denmark joined the Community in 1973, increasing membership to nine. In 1979 the European Parliament was directly elected by universal suffrage. Greece entered into the EC in 1981. In 1985 the members of the EC agreed upon a comprehensive plan to create a single market by the end of 1992. Spain and Portugal joined the EC in 1986. In 1987 Turkey applied unsuccessfully for membership in the Community. The Maastricht Treaty, designed to create a much more integrated Europe, went into effect in 1993, and with it the EC changed its name to the European Union. In 1995 Austria, Finland and Sweden joined the European Union. The strengthened EU provided the framework for a more integrated European economy and for the establishment of a single currency in 12 member states in 2002.

In 2003, European Union membership included Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Ireland, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. The fall of the Soviet Union created a great demand for membership in the European Union by the former satellite countries neighboring Russia. In the spring of 2003, the European Union voted to invite Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia to become members on May 1, 2004. The countries were not economic powerhouses. Together the candidate countries had a combined GDP roughly equal to five percent of the total existing GDP in the European Union.

Until recently, Cyprus's accession to the EU was predicated on resolving the political conflict between Greek and Turkish Cypriots. The Commission, which began to soften its prerequisite for a unified Cyprus in 1997, moved in 2002 to allow the accession of the Republic of Cyprus with or without an accord to reunite the island.

Intensive reunification discussions, however, still took place as the date for the vote on EU membership drew closer. In February 2003, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan proposed to reunify the island in a loose, Swiss-style federation of two component states.

Under the plan, the Turkish Cypriots would have had to give up less than a third of the 37 percent of the territory they controlled. Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Denkash, however, rejected the power-sharing plan and insisted that his government be internationally recognized as an independent state. While the Greek Cypriots endorsed the plan, they continued to press for the right to reclaim about 30,000 former homes in the north that have been occupied by Turkish Cypriots since 1983.

In the run-up to the U.N. referendum, there was strong popular political pressure on Denkash to work toward reunification. The rejection of the original Annan proposal led to large demonstrations in the streets of the Turkish northern territory. In May 2003, in an unexpected move, Denkash lifted a travel ban that has been in effect since 1974 and Turkish and Greek Cypriots have been able to cross the UN-patrolled “dead zone” that separates the two sectors.

Role Playing Simulation

Objectives of the Simulation. This simulation examines two questions. First, what would a reunified Cyprus look like constitutionally and administratively? One of the reasons that reunification is so difficult is that “the devil is in the details.” Fair, workable, and respectful political systems are difficult to construct in countries with deep communal divisions. Second, what can the European Union, with its complicated relationships with all the actors, do to promote the reunification of Cyprus now that Cyprus has become a member?

The task of the simulation is to design the outline of a constitution for a reunified Cyprus. The simulation assumes that there have been back channel discussions among all the parties, with a basic agreement that Cypriot reunification would follow the European Union approach by creating a bi-zonal, single federal government with single citizenship. In this instance a federal government means that there would subnational units (cities and regions within zones) that would have some independent powers.

Simulation Roles and Decision Context. Five senior and accomplished diplomats are meeting in Brussels to draft the principles for a new constitution for a reunified Cyprus. Eduardo D’Amico, of Italy, is the European Union Special Envoy to Cyprus. Christos Leptos is the Greek Cypriot Deputy Foreign Minister. Fazil Mehmet is the Turkish Cypriot Deputy Foreign Minister, representing the internationally unrecognized Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. George Spiro is the Greek Deputy Foreign Minister for Mediterranean Affairs. Fatima Abadan is the Deputy Foreign Minister of Turkey. These representatives are known as the Brussels Constitutional Working Group.

The representatives were invited to undertake this important task by the President of the European Union, who felt that the publication of mutually agreed upon constitutional principles offered another opportunity for progress toward Cypriot reunification. Unlike many other negotiations, the Turkish Cypriot contingent has agreed to send a representative. While it is difficult to impose direct sanctions on members—in this instance Greece and Cyprus—for not helping the reunification process, the EU does exercise some economic leverage on its member nations. The distributional policies of the EU send funds to less well-developed members of the Union. Greece knows that its EU aid package is most likely tied to increasing cooperation with the Cypriot constitutional discussions. Similarly, the Greek Cypriot government knows that it must show progress to have access to monetary aid

beyond that promised in the accession process. But the Greek Cypriot government knows that a united Cyprus will require power sharing. When reunification comes, the territorial reach of the national government will be greater, but governing will require communal accommodation, something the Greek Cypriot government has not had to do in the period of division.

The EU has more leverage over Turkey. Although Turkey and the European Union have a custom's union, the European Union has the ability to raise the costs of Turkish goods in European markets by a number of non-tariff mechanisms including policies of sectoral adjustment and assistance to new member countries, many with low wage work forces. Similarly, Turkey has a continued interest in receiving EU investments in economic infrastructure, which in the first five years of the customs union totaled approximately US\$2.2 billion. The loss of European market share or investment income would cause hardship in the already struggling Turkish economy, which exports 52 percent of its goods to Europe.

Background Briefing for Diplomats. All the participants in the constitutional negotiations have significant experience with regional economic and political issues. In addition, they would have received special briefings on the problems of the 1960 Cypriot constitution and the administrative arrangements that supported its civil service and armed forces. The information those briefings contained is summarized below.

Economic Conditions. The economic situation of each of the parties involved in the Cyprus situation is quite different. In 2002, the population of Greece was 10.6 million. Its GDP was US\$113 billion and the GDP per capita was US\$10,670. The population of Turkey was 66.7 million. Its economy was roughly twice as large as Greece, with a GDP of US\$200 billion, but the per capital GDP was one third of Greece, or US\$3,060. Cyprus, with less than a million people, presented a very different picture. Its GDP was estimated at US\$10.5 billion (the total for both sections), and the GDP per capita for Greek Cypriots was approximately US\$16,000 compared to US\$5,300 for Turkish Cypriots. Cyprus was the wealthiest of the new nations entering the EU in 2004.

Past Cypriot Constitutional Arrangements. The flawed 1960 Cypriot constitution offers a lesson to the representatives in Brussels. Cyprus was proclaimed an independent republic on August 16, 1960. The Greek Cypriots, while not entirely pleased with the agreement, preferred independence to partition. The Turkish Cypriots, on the other hand, were more satisfied with the situation. They had staved off the *enosis* movement (a political campaign to bring the island under Greek rule), secured certain privileges and authority for their minority community, and were guaranteed by the constitution the ability to block key legislation through the use of the veto.

The constitution institutionalized “communal dualism” in all spheres of government activity.¹ The executive branch was structured for the separate, respective community elections of a Greek Cypriot President and a Turkish Cypriot Vice President. The Council of Ministers was composed of 10 members including seven Greek Cypriots appointed by the President and three Turkish Cypriots appointed by the Vice President. While Council decisions were to be decided by absolute majority, both the President and the Vice President

had the power separately or jointly to veto decisions on foreign affairs, defense, and security. Not surprisingly, the veto was exercised regularly, causing controversy, conflict, and gridlock.

In 1960, the population of the island was approximately 80 percent Greek, 18 percent Turkish, and 2 percent belonging to other groups. The legislature, called the House of Representatives, had 50 seats divided 70 percent (35 seats) for Greek Cypriots and 30 percent (15 seats) for Turkish Cypriots. Each community elected its own members. Most laws were passed by a simple majority, although legislation on changes to electoral procedures required majorities from each community's delegation. Communal Chambers were also established to act as independent, legislative bodies within their own communities; their legislative power extended into many matters including religion, education, culture, personal status, and taxation for areas they deemed were not adequately funded by the House of Representatives.

The constitution also specified the ethnic ratio of the civil service and the armed forces. Like the legislature, the civil service was to be comprised of 70 percent Greek Cypriots and 30 percent Turkish Cypriots. The Greek Cypriot community felt that this division was unfair. The armed forces were to consist of 60 percent Greek Cypriots and 40 percent Turkish Cypriots. This division was intended to calm the fears of Turkish Cypriots that a mostly Greek Cypriot army would pose a domestic danger to the Turkish Cypriot community.

Shortly after Cyprus had gained independence it became clear that the Constitution was problematic in content and rigid in application. In November of 1963 the legislature considered abolishing the Presidential and the Vice Presidential right to veto as well as the separate communal majority votes in the House, and proposed allocating public service positions according to the actual population ratio. The Turkish Cypriots rejected the amendments outright. Several of their positions of privilege or power would have been modified or eliminated, and the Turkish Cypriot community was unwilling to give up these controls. The rise in communal violence and the ultimate partition of the island brought systematic efforts at constitutional reform to an end.

Determining New Constitutional Principles

The President of the European Union has written a *note d'instruction* outlining the subject areas on which the Brussels Constitutional Working Group are to concentrate. Their task is to determine basic constitutional principles for the executive, legislative, and bureaucratic branches of a reunified Cyprus. The group must also set the date and agenda for the next round of talks. The issue of territorial control by specific communities has been set aside and the participants have agreed not to bring this topic into the current discussions. The members are all aware that the back channel discussions have agreed to the basic European Union conditions for Cyprus's reunification, including a bi-zonal, single federal government with single citizenship. In this instance a federal government means that there would be subnational units (cities and regions within zones) that would have some independent powers. The constitutional principles need to answer the following questions.

EXECUTIVE:

1. Is/are there single or multiple executives?
2. Is/are the executive/s elected directly or by the parliament? That is, will Cyprus have a presidential or parliamentary executive?
3. Does/do the executive/s have veto power?
4. How long are the terms of office? (The EU representative told you that a decision on this question is optional.)

LEGISLATIVE:

5. Is the system unicameral or bicameral (or something else)?
6. Will there be chambers for each community?
7. How many members will the legislature have and how will they be elected?
8. Over what issues, if any, will executive(s) have veto power?
9. How will the issue of local autonomy be handled?

BUREAUCRATIC:

10. How will public service positions be allocated?
11. What will the make-up of the military be?
12. What will the make-up of the police force be?

Playing the Simulation and Negotiation Rules

1. The simulation takes four to five hours to play. It can be played in two sessions, the first taking approximately 1.5 hours and the second approximately 2.0 to 3.0 hours.

2. Each person has been assigned one of the roles mentioned in the case. Please read the role and review the case during the time allotted. Do not share your role information with others not playing your role. Please wear a name tag with your role name, e.g. "Christos Leptos," and position, e.g., "Greek Cypriot."

2. Timing of the simulation:

30 minutes	Introduction to the case. Reading of roles and review of the case. Questions.
60 minutes	Meeting of alliances, e.g., Greek Cypriots with Greeks, and Turkish Cypriots with Turks. During this time the representative from the EU will come by to confer with each member of the alliance separately and with the alliance members together.
15 minutes	Break
90 minutes	Negotiate the constitutional principles for Cyprus. During this time the EU delegate can call a 5-minute time out from the negotiations to speak with any party or parties. He can call as many or as few as he likes with whomever he likes. The negotiations do not proceed during a time out called by the EU representative. Each alliance has two 5-minute time outs it can call to speak to each other. Any member of an

alliance can call a time out. But once both of the alliance time outs have been used, regardless of which partner called them, the alliance cannot call any more time outs. Negotiations proceed during alliance time outs. In other words, the negotiations proceed when the EU member is there but not when he is absent. The outcome of the negotiations is a joint communiqué on constitutional principles and the date and agenda for the next round of negotiations.

30-60 minutes

Debriefing the case. Five-minute presentations of each constitution. General discussion of issues in constitutional conflict resolution.

Preparation Questions

1. Cyprus poses an interesting problem for democratic governance. It has two deeply divided ethnic groups, Greeks and Turks, with a history of violence between them. What do the Greeks of Cyprus feel their power and status is? What do the Turks of Cyprus feel their power and status is?
2. The ethnic and religious divisions on Cyprus reinforce themselves, that is, Greeks tend to be Orthodox and Turks tend to be Muslim. But in other countries deep divisions cut across each other. For example, the Chinese in Malaysia have often been politically oppressed, but they are, as a community, wealthier than ethnic Malays. How do reinforcing social cleavages (the technical term for the situation on Cyprus) effect the prospects for developing constitutional principles?
3. What issues do you think will be important to Greek Cypriots in terms of constitutional principles? To Turkish Cypriots? Why?
4. What responsibilities, if any, do perpetual majorities have toward perpetual minorities in countries with high levels of communalism? Why? Are these responsibilities, if any, the same in countries where communalism is less strong? Where there are crosscutting social cleavages?
5. How do the Greek and Turkish Cypriot representatives know whether this is a moment for great change, or whether it is business as usual? How much is this decision determined by the preferences of the Greek and Turkish representatives? How should they act if they want to make great change? If they want to prevent it?
6. Turkish Cypriots have had the same leader, Rauf Denktash, for the three decades since the island was invaded and partitioned in 1974. What role, if any, should such a leader have in a united Cyprus? If he does not take a role, what does he do next? What are the consequences on leadership development of antagonistic communalism coupled with international isolation?

Endnotes

¹ Joseph S. Joseph, *Cyprus: Conflict and International Concern*, New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 1985, p. 36. The discussion of the governmental branches and the constitution draws heavily from Joseph's account.

MISSION EXPANSION: THE ORIGINS OF THE YWCA'S ANTI-RACISM CAMPAIGN

Barbara J. Nelson and Alissa Hummer¹

Abstract

In 1970, a group of 500 African American women active in the YWCA met immediately before its national convention to develop strategies that would help black women become more involved in programs and policies in the YWCA, and importantly, to make the YWCA a greater force against racism. This group developed the "One Imperative," a resolution that would make the elimination of racism a priority over all other issues for the YWCA. Most resolutions that come to a vote at national conventions of the YWCA go through a year-long vetting process that involves lengthy discussions in local chapters. The One Imperative came from the floor, an allowed but seldom used decision mechanism. Helen Claytor, the first black national president of the YWCA, faced an issue that was sure to change the organization profoundly, and which might split it apart. After considerable discussion, the delegates voted overwhelmingly to "To thrust our collective power toward the elimination of racism wherever it exists and by any means necessary." The case describes how a group of African American women working inside a well-established organization founded by middle-class white women moved the elimination of racism to the top of the organization's agenda, a profound change of mission.

Case Study

On April 15, 1970, the National Convention of the YWCA passed a resolution "To Thrust Our Collective Power Toward the Elimination of Racism Wherever it Exists and By Any Means Necessary." This action was the culmination of over a century of activities on behalf of racial justice by the YWCA. Passed at a time when the country was divided by war, drugs, sexism, and poverty, the resolution to eliminate racism nonetheless stood alone as the primary focus of the energies of the YWCA.

Background

The YWCA has had a long and often progressive history of fighting racism and working toward equality. One of the first tasks undertaken by the newly formed YWCA in the mid-1850s was to help former slaves adjust to freedom and to provide them with charity in a variety of forms. The first black branch of the YWCA was opened in Dayton, Ohio in 1889 and the first branch for American Indians was opened in Chilocco, Oklahoma in 1890. The laws and social customs of the day required separate branches for white and "colored" girls, and many women of the YWCA did not question these divisions. Nonetheless, the religious purpose of the YWCA led its members to build Christian friendship among all

¹ The authors wish to thank staff and board members of the National YWCA for their generous assistance in the research done for this case study. Quotations come from the following sources: National Board of the YWCA of the USA, *Report. YWCA 25th National Convention. 1970. Houston. Texas* (New York, 1970) and D. Sabeston and M. Hiller, *Toward Better Race Relations* (New York: The Woman's Press, 1949). Some quotes were modified slightly to conform spelling. The research was supported by the Center on Urban and Regional Affairs of the University of Minnesota, in honor of the WOMEN OF COURAGE photographic exhibit of black women leaders of the twentieth century.

young women and to provide them a decent environment, regardless of the color of their skin.

By the early 1900s, the YWCA was beginning to move from its emphasis on moral protection toward social-action. YWCA programs were set up in inner cities to help young women and girls who worked in the pre-World War I industrial centers secure decent housing and to provide them with wholesome activities. These programs led the YWCA to join the struggle for better working conditions, higher wages and protective legislation. These efforts were especially important for African American women who had moved to the cities from rural areas and for newly-arrived white immigrant women. The YWCA's belief in putting Christian values into social action led members to pay particular attention to the needs of these vulnerable women.

The first formal demand by African American women to be integrated into the YWCA on a basis of full equality came in 1920. Several black women told the National Board that blacks needed to be able to represent their own interests, that full recognition should be given to black leadership, and that they should be able to form independent organizations. This request was largely ignored because of fears of community backlash and many of the African American women involved in this effort split off from the YWCA to join other organizations.

However, at this same time, the Student Association of the YWCA was working on integration on its own. The Student Association integrated its staff and worked to coordinate activities between student groups on black and white campuses. Through the 1920s and 1930s the bulk of activity on racial equality came from the student groups, but there was some movement in community YWCAs and on the national level as well. Largely due to student pressure, the 1932 Convention urged local YWCAs to "foster right public opinion which shall be effective against the menace of lynching and mob violence in every form." And in 1934 the Convention declared that all associations should support federal efforts toward inter-racial cooperation and assurance of the protection of African Americans in exercising their basic civil rights.

One of the most progressive actions taken by the YWCA was the adoption of the Interracial Charter in 1946. This document was developed after pressure was brought by the Student Association for a study to be conducted of segregation and discrimination in association and community life. The Student Association insisted that organizational integrity be at the core of the Interracial Charter. The basic recommendation was "that the implications of the YWCA Purpose be recognized as involving the inclusion of Negro women and girls in the main stream of Association life, and that such inclusion be adopted as a conscious goal." Not quite willing to flout the social norms of the day, however, the National Board made compliance with the Interracial Charter largely voluntary. This changed in the 1950s when the YWCA decided not to recognize any chapter that remained all white.

Clearly, one of the goals of the Interracial Charter and the recommendations that implemented it was to have the YWCA move away from its practice of "doing something for" blacks and move toward the races working together. The strong emphasis in the Charter that blacks be included on all decision-making bodies and be actively sought out for

discussions relating to programs that affected them reflected the desire of the YWCA to understand and meet the needs of its black members. The Charter even took special care to include a recommendation that associations “recognize the fallacy of assuming that a Negro group is a homogeneous group any more than is an undifferentiated group of white people.”

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s the YWCA was very active in the Civil Rights Movement and more African American women and women of other minorities began to assume positions of leadership within local associations. The Atlanta YWCA integrated its cafeteria in 1960 and became the first public facility to do so in that city. The YWCA continued programs to increase voter registration and even undertook a campaign to raise funds for bail money for civil rights sit-in demonstrators. At the 1963 centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation, the National Board launched a two-year Action Program to develop a strategy to achieve, within a given time span, real integration within YWCA programs and membership.

The YWCA Office of Racial Justice was established in 1965 and the Board granted \$200,000 for a massive campaign against discrimination in the YWCA and society. In 1967 Helen Claytor was elected as the first African American President of the National YWCA. In 1968 the Black Affairs Committee was formed and the YWCA came out strongly in support of immigrant farm workers and the grape boycott. Racial Justice Institutes were held across the country in 1969 and these laid the groundwork for black women to begin to mobilize within the YWCA. The momentum of all of this activity peaked at the 25th National Convention in 1970 where the YWCA adopted the “One Imperative”—the resolution to eliminate racism.

The adoption of the One Imperative, however, did not follow the usual orderly route of YWCA resolutions. Resolutions normally emerge from regional conferences held in the year before the convention at which member associations can discuss the issues of the day and recommend action areas (“imperatives”) to the National YWCA’s attention. The national Public Affairs Committee selects and fine-tunes these suggested imperatives and they become the Program for Action for the following convention. Copies of these imperatives are sent to all associations prior to the convention so that they can be discussed locally and the delegates can get a sense of how their local members feel about them.

In contrast, the One Imperative was the spontaneous product of a pre-convention Conference of 500 black women of the YWCA who met in the three days just prior to the 1970 national convention in Houston, Texas, to discuss the issues that the whole assembly would be addressing. The One Imperative was the outcome of the Conference discussions and there was no time to try to send it through formal channels, nor any wish to delay consideration.

The Conference of Black Women of the YWCA

The Conference of Black Women was one of the products of the Racial Justice Institutes held in 1969. The Black Caucus had demanded that, “Since the National Board does not know the meaning of racial injustice, we feel it is imperative to establish a National Black YWCA Conference so that all Black people in the YWCA can establish a platform on what is to be done to make the YWCA relevant for Black people.”

Starting early in 1970, Dorothy Height, the YWCA's Director of Racial Justice, began sending invitations to black members of YWCAs all across the country. The Conference of Black Women was to be the first time a racial group had met separately since the YWCA began to integrate fully in the 1940s. All African American members were welcome to come, and almost 700 applications flooded in. The only thing that prevented some women from attending the Conference was a lack of funding.

The agenda was informal and the idea was to develop strategies that would help black women become more involved in program and policy, and better able to shape the communities in which they lived. The conference focused on objectives such as developing a sense of black consciousness, developing a perspective for relevance, and devising strategies and setting priorities.

The conference established a sounding board—a place for African American women to come and share their common concerns, frustrations, anger, and ideas. The format allowed everyone to speak her mind regardless of topic. Contributions ranged from demands that they all stage a walkout at the convention to fears about the separateness of the conference replacing the emphasis on successful integration that was usual in the YWCA. No one was sure what would come of the conference—maybe they would all leave the Y, maybe they would stay, maybe they would change it into a more equitable organization. Ellen Dammond, chair of the Conference, remembers that one of the nagging questions was how the YWCA could have such high ideals and still have *de facto* separate black and white branches.

One of the tasks of the Conference of Black Women was to examine the imperatives that were scheduled to be debated and voted on at the national YWCA convention. These imperatives set the direction of the YWCA for the coming triennium. Dorothy Height felt that they should be looked at from a black perspective. One of the reasons for holding the conference just before the convention was to have something to bring to the convention floor, and the Imperatives for Action were a good place to start.

About halfway through the three-day conference, the belief was voiced that racism ran through all of the imperatives that were being studied, and attention was then focused on drafting a resolution that would make the elimination of racism a priority over all the other issues. For the remainder of the conference and into the first two days of the convention, black women worked almost around the clock to fine-tune the resolution and prepare for its presentation.

One of the major concerns of the group was making sure that the resolution was legal under YWCA bylaws and that supporters followed all of the correct steps in introducing it and leading debate on it. They knew that if they violated the YWCA's parliamentary procedures they could lose the resolution on a technicality. Those familiar with the YWCA's Constitution and by-laws were consulted regularly to make sure conference participants were operating within legal bounds. Speakers were coached not only on how to present the resolution but also on parliamentary rules and procedures.

Fortunately for the Conference of Black Women, the Student Assembly as well as the Young Women Committed to Action also met prior to the convention and the black

women were able to lobby them early and secure their whole-hearted support. Later, these groups would help to lobby convention delegates for support for the One Imperative. The participants in the Conference of Black Women were aware that only 347 of their numbers would be staying on for the convention as voting delegates and that they would need a lot of support from other women in the YWCA if the resolution was to pass.

Even though the focus of the One Imperative was on institutional racism, black women felt they needed a statement, a real commitment from the YWCA to focus on racial equality. Much progress had already been made. Black women and other women of color had been integrated into all of the YWCA programs by mandate. There were no longer any all-white branches. There were many women of color in staff positions and on the National Board. But there were few women of color in high decision-making positions. Integration was not enough when a white majority made decisions.

Despite the outward focus of the One Imperative, the Conference of Black Women knew that the YWCA could not successfully “thrust [its] collective power behind the elimination of racism” if there were racial imbalances within the organization. They hoped that by placing the elimination of racism at the top of the Y’s agenda they would achieve two goals: that there would be a more equal distribution of power within the YWCA, and that the collective power of the whole organization would be put to work improving racial conditions in communities and institutions. Many of the conferees considered the One Imperative an ultimatum and were prepared to walk out if the resolution was not passed at the convention. Meanwhile, women from across the U.S. and the world were gathering in Houston for the national convention.

The Convention

More than 2,700 women (1,454 of them voting delegates) attended the 25th National Convention. There had been a movement in previous years to diversify the delegates, to bring in more women of color and more young women and to move away from the white, middle-class group that usually participated. The makeup of this delegation reflected some progress in that direction. In fact, one delegate later complained about the presence of “younger women in hippie attire, without shoes, with unkempt hair, munching sandwiches.”

Most delegates were aware that something was afoot because of the lobbying being done by black women and their supporters but most were not sure exactly what was underway. All had received the convention workbook weeks before and were familiar with the issues that were going to be addressed. One of the imperatives scheduled for consideration under the Latina and Asian Program for Action was to “combat racial injustice” and several white delegates wondered what other resolutions black women were developing. Many non-black delegates were nervous because they did not know what was coming, and some black delegates later said they thought this was due to a lack of trust between the groups, especially between black and white women. Delegate Violet Ifill later recalled that the black women did not discuss the One Imperative much with the other delegates, but “It wasn’t a matter of being secretive, it was a matter of our being united.” Many white women were also made nervous by the black women meeting separately and coming forward with a resolution that had not traveled the usual channels; they were not used to having groups work outside of the general YWCA structure and saw this as an attempt to undermine established procedures.

For the first two days, the convention was run according to its printed schedule. It opened on Monday with general housekeeping duties and the keynote speech by Andrew Young. On Tuesday, YWCA President Helen Claytor convened the session with a speech about the structure, meaning, and goals of the YWCA. She had attended the Conference of Black Women but would not join in the talk of walkouts and ultimatums. She had been elected, she later said, as president of the whole YWCA, not just of the black women. She agreed with the goals of the One Imperative and supported its submission to the Convention, but her primary loyalty was to the entire body of the YWCA.

Claytor spoke of the YWCA celebrating its diversity and demonstrating its unity; of how the Y was passionately concerned with change, and of the pressures for self-determination in meeting the needs of different groups. She also noted the pre-convention meetings held by the Y-Teens, the Student Assembly, and the Conference of Black Women, and said, "I would be completely surprised if within the context of these presentations [which followed]...there appeared no tension, no sign of struggle...because we bring to one another our own deepest concerns...concerns which may threaten to tear us apart." Conflict must be recognized as a creative reality of the day, she noted, and if the YWCA could work through these tensions it would become even stronger and better equipped to meet the needs of its diverse membership.

Next, representatives of the groups that met prior to the convention gave short reports introducing their groups and their focus, and outlining what had been discussed at their meetings. Ellen Dammond spoke for the Conference of Black Women and the members of that group stood during her presentation. She noted that the previous groups were all officially constituted parts of the convention, but African American women were not and had met for the first time to develop strategies by which they could become more involved in the YWCA. Black women met, Dammond said, to deal with questions urgent to their survival and liberation. "We cannot wait—the here and the now of our reality is pain filled. Deeds must match words. We are solidly united in determination to close the gap between the YWCA ideals as stated in the Purpose and YWCA practices. We demand that it put its full forces behind one issue inherent in all of the imperatives. That imperative is the elimination of racism." By the time she had finished reading her report, all of the gathered delegates were standing along with the black members. Wednesday morning found the convention ready to address the Program for Action, 1970-1973, and this is where the convention schedule changed. The Program for Action program consisted of a series of imperatives that set program and policy goals for the whole organization for the coming triennium. These imperatives were the issues that emerged at the regional conferences held the year before the convention.

The chair of the Program Committee and past national president, Beth Marti, introduced and read the Program for Action. She was just beginning to make a motion for adoption of the Program when President Claytor asked her to wait, saying that there was a resolution coming to the floor that would bear on all of the imperatives, but it was not quite ready for distribution. The program chair agreed and discussion shifted to a resolution to make the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., a national holiday.

After debate on and passage of the King holiday resolution the chair of the Program Committee then read the resolution of the National Conference of Black Women of the YWCA (the “One Imperative”). This resolution demanded that the YWCA “thrust its collective power behind the elimination of racism,” that it set up annual meetings of a group similar to the Conference of Black Women, that the national board sanction local associations not making progress in integration, that central associations recognize the autonomy of branches in black communities and grant them adequate financial support, and that there be more black staff and representation at all levels of the YWCA. Beth Marti, a white woman, read the resolution with such conviction and power that many black women later stated that they could not have presented it better themselves and they felt her delivery was instrumental in placing the resolution in a positive light from the beginning. Debate was then opened.

Ellen Dammond, as chair of the Conference of Black Women, spoke to the need for the resolution. She noted the years of work and deep devotion that many African American women had given the YWCA and their desire to work within the existing structure. Many felt that the spirit of what the YWCA stood for, which was present when they gathered together as delegates, was lacking in the communities in which they lived. They felt that for the YWCA to make real progress in racial equality it had to be truly integrated on all levels so that delegates could go back to their local associations and move with the strength and purpose of the whole YWCA behind them.

The first delegate to speak from the floor did not object to the resolution “in its totality” but questioned the “by any means necessary” phrase: “I hope that we can avoid any divisive measures, which might be difficult to live with at home....I would like to know just what the words ‘by any means necessary’ imply.” In doing so, she introduced one of the two issues that would dog the One Imperative not only through its adoption but also in the debates at subsequent conventions when it was being re-affirmed. Many delegates at the 25th convention were afraid of the implications of “by any means necessary.” Would they be called to disobey laws, shoot people, or violently overthrow the present social system or government? The other continuing issue of debate was the constant effort at all subsequent conventions to add the elimination of sexism or ageism to the One Imperative.

The 1970 convention took place following the violent unrest of the 1960s and many delegates were afraid that the YWCA was being forced to step out of its traditional place in social activism, toward a more radical and possibly violent role. Despite many reassurances that the YWCA was not advocating radicalism, that of course “by any means necessary” meant only activities that fit within the YWCA’s purpose, and that the phrase was added not as a call to arms but to emphasize the Y’s commitment to this goal, many remained doubtful and felt the YWCA was moving too far afield of its founding vision.

Several non-black delegates and observers later recalled that many women did not really understand the resolution or what its implications were. Others thought they did but resented what they saw as a take over of the convention by the Conference of Black Women. Most recognized that the One Imperative required a shift in the balance of power, and while they may not have objected to the goals of the Imperative they “were

uncomfortable with the potential change in power relations.”

Many non-black delegates were also confused or made uncomfortable with what they saw as a change in the direction of YWCA programs and policies. Until this point, the emphasis had always been on full integration as the best way to eliminate discrimination and inequalities. This new imperative would mandate separate meetings for black women and a shift toward autonomy for predominately black branches rather than working for more integration. Did this mean that a hundred years of efforts toward integration had been wrong?

The members of the Conference of Black Women and their white supporters, on the other hand, felt that autonomy and self-determination were the only ways that people of color could have true representation in decision making. They were impatient with the pace of change. To stay within the YWCA, African American women wanted a true integration of equals, made possible by a more vigorous attack on the Y's own inequalities in the distribution of assets—ranging from program funds to leadership to control of local buildings. The practical difficulties and ideological ambiguities of local control of physical resources did not receive much attention, however. The strategy of beginning this change was to make the elimination of racism the paramount objective of the Y.

Debate over the One Imperative lasted several hours. Several white delegates worried about the separation embodied in the resolution and expressed reassurance that they did not have these kinds of problems locally, and, implicitly, that the One Imperative would cause problems in their communities. A white delegate from Tennessee stated, “I cannot understand so much feeling between the different races. We do not have this at home. We have our central branch, and we have one for the black women, but they're welcome at our place.” Other white delegates spoke for the resolution asking their fellow delegates to not nit-pick small points but to understand the necessity and scope of what was trying to be accomplished. “...As a white person, I would like to thank the black women who are trying to make...our society better...I think I can assume how the black women feel to have to stand here and confront us. It must be very painful for them to have to do that...It is much more difficult to confront your friends...They are giving us the greatest opportunity that many of us will ever have to come together as whole, honest and feeling human beings....”

Many African American delegates spoke fervently and eloquently of the need for the One Imperative. A member of the National Board said, “...Because words have not been matched by action in the past we are at this place...I think we sense integration and are not willing to accept it...I don't want to commit myself to another set of words and not be able to act upon them.” A black delegate from Chicago said, “The reason the black women felt impelled to meet was because we have been divided as we have attempted to integrate into the YWCA, and we...have to take off some of the blinders which have been put on us as we attempted to be together. We want to stay in the white YWCA...and help move it. We want to help achieve the goal, which it has had for so long. We have long suffered from others speaking for us.”

As debate continued, at least one African American woman spoke to what was buried just below the surface, that “some horrendous suggestions are coming from black women, not in the traditional form, and this is not being coped with.” This speaker voiced

what was not being said out loud—the fears of some white women that black women were making a power grab by meeting separately and demanding reforms.

Finally, after several unscheduled hours of debate on this resolution, the chair of the convention asked that further debate be postponed so that the delegates could get on to scheduled resolutions. At this point, an African American delegate from Salt Lake City stood and said that the time for action had come, that everyone had been talking and not really listening, and that in debating a word or a sentence they were moving away from action. She moved that the resolution be adopted, and on a voice vote it was adopted almost unanimously.

Many women knew that they were voting for themselves a course of action that was bound to be unpopular with their communities, but the scope and the immediacy of the resolution and the intensity of its supporters convinced many to vote for it. Others, perhaps, were afraid to be seen objecting to it. The women who had come to the convention hoping for a strong show of support for women's liberation also had to take a back seat, but despite these reservations, the One Imperative was soundly approved.

At this point, the chair of the Program Committee was charged with rewriting the Program for Action to reflect the change that had been voted on. Beth Marti and her committee worked far into the night to make the changes and brought the new Program back to the floor the following morning.

The updated and revised Program for Action, 1970-1973, was then opened for debate and most discussion centered on whether the spirit of the resolution from the Black Women's Conference was captured in the new Program. Dorothy Height was called on once again to clarify the intent of the resolution. She noted, "We are not talking of how individual people feel about each other. We are really talking about institutional structures that in themselves have affected the whole society and within this context we have assumed the necessity for working to combat racial injustice. What we are working on is the impact of racism on the whole society. We are not talking about race relations. We are talking about the society." After minimal debate, the revised Program was adopted.

The next day, the convention moved on to deal with what the YWCA called its Public Affairs Program, an ongoing set of issues and programs on which the Y continuously works. These are different from the resolutions, which are stated convictions of a particular convention. One of the sections of the Public Affairs Priorities was "To Combat Racial Injustice." This priority began, "The future health of mankind depends on uprooting the cancerous effects of white racism. So insidiously has racism infected the world's institutions that only a reordering of power relationships can achieve a just society." The priority went on to list 15 specific areas where attention needed to be focused toward combating racial injustice. These included empowerment of minorities in self-determined social change, economic support of black businesses, employment programs, and enforcing open housing regulations.

Debate on this section focused primarily on the specific mention of blacks, to the exclusion of other people of color. Speakers from communities with large Latina/o or Asian American populations wanted their needs included as well. Several suggested replacing

“black” with “minority”; “Let’s get away from the racism we show when we say ‘the white racism, and “the black minority’—let’s say ‘all minorities.’” This suggestion was strongly opposed by delegates who noted that the racial crisis in the country was primarily a black-white one and that removing “black” took away the focus of the priority. “...There are many communities in this country where the YWCA, regardless of our intent here, would find it very convenient to avoid their full responsibility to the black community.”

A delegate from Houston offered this reaction. “Ladies, for four days we at the convention have been practicing a subtle form of racism, all of us, black and white, against those of us who are neither black or white. I have heard it said that our friends with Spanish surnames will have to come along and take their own place just as those of us who are black and those of us who are white have taken ours....Pass this amendment immediately so that we will assist our sisters of other minorities as long as they need it in order to take their place with us.” In the end, a motion was passed to add “and other minorities” wherever “black” was mentioned.

A great deal of debate followed, mostly on fairly minor editing changes and the section was adopted on an overwhelming show of hands. Immediately after the passage of the Priority to Combat Racial Injustice, a resolution was introduced regarding American Indians. It called for another goal to be added to the just-passed section on Racial Injustice: programs to aid the Indian communities in recognizing their rights to live and act within the framework of their culture. The debate that followed centered around the need for individual minority groups to be recognized separately within the section on Racial Justice. This resolution passed on a 553 to 420 vote.

Next, Mexican-American women took the floor. They introduced a resolution asking that the YWCA support an economic boycott of products which distorted and downgraded the image of Mexican-Americans, urge local associations to become sensitized to the existence and needs of Mexican-Americans in their communities, and work harder to support bilingual education and greater job opportunities. A Latina delegate railed against what she saw as a common sentiment in the YWCA—that many did not feel that Mexican-Americans met the qualifications for leadership. “When our goals are achieving freedom, justice, peace and dignity for all people, you dare to tell us we are not concerned; as for our qualifications for leadership, when we are not even included, how can you prejudge us?” After a few more comments in favor, the resolution passed easily.

After the Convention

As a way of seeing that the One Imperative was made part of YWCA life, a device called an “Action Audit for Change” was created at the convention. This audit was a way for local associations to measure their progress in working to eliminate racism. It was not only a measure but also a means to guide suggestions for changes that would help the program along. The first part of the audit was an examination of the association itself and the second part looked at the surrounding community.

A few local chapters, primarily in the South, felt that they could not comply with the requirements of the One Imperative and dropped their affiliation with the YWCA. One disgruntled delegate called the convention a “social workers meeting” and voted against most of the resolutions. But most Ys took the One Imperative to heart and started doing

what they could to meet its goals. Efforts were not limited to local chapters, however. The national board and staff also undertook a program of change to comply with the intent of the imperative.

One of the requirements of the One Imperative called for greater representation of blacks and other women of color on all staffs and boards. Little voluntary movement occurred, especially at the upper-level positions, so YWCA Executive Director Edith Lerrigo called a special meeting. The outcome was that everyone at the national level offered her resignation so as to allow a more equitable distribution of power to begin at the top. This created several openings for women of color, and while some of the original, mostly white, staff and board were brought back, a major restructuring took place. The leadership change caused great pain for many of the women who were not rehired or reappointed, even though some expressed pride in YWCA's ability to make such a dramatic move. After the restructuring was completed, the national board put pressure on local associations to put more women of color in positions of leadership on the local level.

In the ensuing years, the YWCA undertook a variety of programs to combat racism. Some were aimed specifically at the Y itself, such as the workshops aimed at helping whites in the YWCA face the ways that institutional racism benefited them without their necessarily knowing it. Other programs were designed to help staff and members work toward full integration in program and decision making. The YWCA also developed programs that are focused more outwardly, such as establishing black women's resource centers, holding Web of Racism institutes, and fighting racism in higher education. The focus of anti-racism programming changed over the next years to meet current needs, but always remained a core activity.

At subsequent Conventions, the One Imperative was reaffirmed in its original form, despite efforts to add sexism or ageism to this primary focus. In 1985, the One Imperative was added to the YWCA Constitution as part of its mission statement. Later, the YWCA revised its mission statement, now a declaration that acknowledges its Protestant roots, its acceptance of a rich diversity of faiths and values, its commitment to the betterment of the lives of women and girls through a women-governed and owned organization, and its fundamental commitment to the elimination of racism. Its short mission statement, at the top of every document, is "to empower women and girls and to eliminate racism."

Preparation Questions

1. What was the status of African American women in the YWCA in 1970? How did the history of segregation in the YWCA and the Y's efforts to change itself and the outside world set the stage for the events leading up to the introduction of the "One Imperative"? What was the status of other women of color and what implications does the answer have on the conditions that led to the One Imperative?
2. The demand for local control of resources embedded in the One Imperative recognizes *de facto* and *de jure* neighborhood segregation. How well do the proponents in the Conference of Black Women recognize this fact? How well does the national executive recognize this fact? What are the short-term and long-term organizational consequences of demand for local control?

3. What was Helen Claytor's role in the success and shaping of events? Beth Marti's role as Program Committee Chair and past president? Dorothy Heights's as the convenor of the Conference of Black Women? Ellen Dammand's role as the Chair of the Conference of Black Women?
4. Could this resolution have developed by other means? From the top?
5. Are there general lessons arising from this case for chief executives facing a public ground swell for change? What factors should chief executives consider when confronting such a change? When and how should they support or resist such initiatives?
6. In general, how should leaders deal with the tension between responsiveness to constituents and continuity of organizational purposes?
7. What advice would you give Helen Claytor, the national YWCA President, and Edith Lerrigo, the Executive Director, about how to implement the One Imperative in a federated organization with a good deal of local autonomy?

LEADERSHIP SUCCESSION: THE LUCY PRINCE COMMUNITY CENTER

Barbara J. Nelson and Lisa Kennedy

Abstract

The Lucy Prince Community Center (a pseudonym) is located in “River City,” a large city in the Midwest.¹ The Prince Center began its organizational life in 1924 as a settlement house for African Americans. While it always had black executive directors, its board and financial affairs were in the hands of whites until the mid-1960s. At that time Arthur Hobbs, a new executive director, led the transformation of the Lucy Prince Community Center from a white controlled to a locally controlled organization, which meant in the first instance, greater control by African Americans. In this period, the Prince Center also grew in size, became less dependent on local charitable dollars, more integrated into federal funding sources, experienced competition from a more radical black group and from white ethnic groups interested in its physical resources, and moved to a new location. This case is about the intertwined dynamics of leadership change, organizational self-determination, and changing missions. It covers the history of community control and its immediate consequences.

Case Study

Before the change in attitudes and law brought about by the civil rights movement, African Americans were routinely denied access to most professions and accommodations and many African American organizations were nominally or actually led by whites. Until the mid-1960s, both the NAACP and the National Urban League had whites serving as presidents of their boards of directors. These individuals, strongly opposed to racism themselves, provided important connections to the white establishment and the funding and “respectability” it represented.

The Lucy Prince Settlement House was founded in 1924 to meet some of the economic and social needs of River City’s black community. It had a predominantly white Board of Directors until the 1960s, and in 1952 elected its first African American Board President. This position alternated back and forth between black and white Presidents until 1966 when the decision for permanent black leadership was made.

History

The Lucy Prince Settlement House was founded in 1924 by the Women’s Christian Association (WCA) of River City “to promote the physical, mental, social and moral well-being of the Negroes of [River City].” Originally envisioned as a residence for young black women, a 1920 study convinced the WCA of the need for social facilities for all young blacks in the city. At that time, River City had only about 4,000 blacks out of a total population of 380,000. Because of its northern Midwest location, few African Americans had drifted to the area until the development of manufacturing in the late 1800s brought increased chances for

¹ The name of the settlement house as well as the names of all the individuals in this case have been changed. Lucy Prince House was named in honor of Lucy Terry Prince (1733-1821), an African American poet and civil rights advocate of the colonial and republican period.

jobs in the city and the growth of the railroad made transportation more available. In 1920, most of River City's hotels and recreational facilities were closed to blacks and existing settlement houses were located in mostly white immigrant areas, separated from the black community by both distance and discriminatory practices. The black population of River City was located in five separate pockets throughout the city and Prince House was in the midst of the largest. Initially located in a former Hebrew school, Prince House moved to an expensive new facility five years later in 1929.

In this first stage of its organizational life, Prince House was a classic settlement house modeled on such famous institutions as Jane Addams's Hull House in Chicago and the Henry Street Settlement in New York. One of the aims of the settlements was to provide a "home-like" atmosphere complete with living rooms, kitchens, and game rooms. The mostly female settlement house workers saw themselves as links between the world of the poor and that of the well-to-do. They were known as "Residents" since most lived in the settlement houses in order to be nearer to the populations they served. Their modest goal was no less than the mental, physical and moral development of those they sought to help.

Just as other settlement houses viewed themselves as bridging the gap between rich and poor, Prince House saw itself as bridging the gap between black and white. A 1930 Statement of Purpose described the House's aims as follows:

To encourage better race relations, and better working opportunities for Negroes. To help the boy or girl who has found himself without food, shelter or friends, as well as the girl or boy who only needs encouragement and recreational advantages. Also...[to serve as] a bureau of information about race matters.

Many of those who grew up around Prince House between 1930 and 1950 still recall the center as their second home. Programs were available for everyone from infants to the elderly. The Prince House nursery school was always crowded and later became a prototype for Head Start programs. For young children there were after school sports programs, art classes, and boys and girls clubs. The football and basketball teams consistently did well in city competitions and the popular boxing program produced several Golden Gloves champions. Monday through Thursday afternoons, students would attend classes in African American history and literature in the settlement house library, while Friday night was the weekly dance. Without Lucy Prince the outlook for poor black children living in the neighborhood would have been much bleaker. Said one former volunteer, "It was a place for kids to receive attention and love." Many adults still recall the special emphasis the Boy's Workers put on developing manners, morals, and character in (often fatherless) young boys. As these children grew up and became successful, even though they moved away from the Lucy Prince neighborhood, most retained a sense of allegiance to the Center. Many returned to teach classes, coach sports and help in fundraising activities. More than a few of the members of the Board of Directors in the 1960s were such alumni of Prince House.

Prince House's programs also extended to the neighborhood adults for whom there were social clubs, performance groups, and classes in practical arts. The House also provided meeting rooms for organizations such as the NAACP and the Urban League as well as space

for weddings and other social gatherings that could not be accommodated in the small black churches. Prince House offered other needed services for the black community. Until 1962, blacks were routinely denied access to hotels in River City and Prince House's upper floors lodged many prominent blacks visiting River City, among them Paul Robeson, A. Philip Randolph, and Marion Anderson. Black students denied the use of State University dormitories could also stay at Prince House while they were pursuing their degrees. Homeless families could find a place to stay for a few weeks and the Prince House staff operated a clothes closet and employment service for those in need of help.

The programs of Prince House were by no means limited to blacks. Many poor white youngsters also participated in the nursery school and after-school programs, while records for the 1950s show the house as the meeting place for two lodge groups, a Talmud Torah class, and a Latvian Social Club. In 1960, primarily due to the proximity of a large public housing project, half of the children participating in the Center's programs were not black. A large number of the House's adult volunteers and teachers were also white.

By being open to the black community, however, Prince House brought together blacks who were otherwise segregated into separate pockets throughout River City. By serving as a focal point for the African American community and by providing facilities to meet, the Prince House served as an incubator for many minority and civil rights organizations in River City such as the Urban Coalition (formed in the 1960s) and the NAACP. Noted one Board member, Prince House "was the center for black people in [River City]...It developed history in the city."

In 1960, recognizing that the "Settlement House" title was becoming a bit outdated, the name of the organization was changed to the Lucy Prince Community Center. The name change signaled the second stage of Prince Center's organizational life. More than the name changed; the focus of the Center's programs, its leadership, governance, funding, and location changed as well. The advent of the War on Poverty in 1964 started a whole new era for well-established settlement houses. For the Prince Center and other centers formerly dependent on private funds, this new antipoverty program made several million dollars of federal funding available for community-based programs. The War on Poverty was particularly targeted at educational and training programs rather than the social and recreational opportunities that had characterized the Center. Between 1960 and 1970, Prince Center would find itself more and more the administrator of specific federal and local programs: Head Start, a summer youth program, and the like. The culmination of this trend would come in 1970 when the Center moved into new quarters that it shared with a local elementary school on land administered by the local park board. The new building featured few of the living rooms and meeting areas that had made the "home-like" atmosphere of the old settlement house. Now the Prince Center was characterized chiefly by the concrete, institutional look of a public school and its programs were targeted at particular groups such as teenage mothers or victims of abuse. Referral services to other government agencies characterized a large part of its work. One Board member described the later Prince Center as a "sterile, big place with lots of money and lots of records."

Leadership

For the first decade after the Prince House was founded, the Board of Directors of the organization was composed almost entirely of white women, most of them members of the Women's Christian Association. Typical of the well-to-do club women of their day, most came to the job with a strong desire to "do good" for their less fortunate brethren. One early history of the Settlement cheerfully noted:

A very interesting feature of [Lucy Prince]...is the eager interest, which the upper class of white people have manifested. Seemingly they have vied with each other in giving to the institution the most loyal support and superior equipment possible. As a result, [Lucy Prince] stands as the most up-to-date institution of its kind in the [west.]

This loyal support did not extend to the Settlement's very popular first Head Resident, Miss Benita Grand, who was forced by the Board to resign in 1937 because of her heavy involvement in civil rights activities. One later Executive Director noted that the local black community was expected to act "graceful and grateful to the founders."

Eventually a few men (mostly successful local businessmen) were asked to join the Board, but it was not until the late 1930s that the Board selected its first African American member. The first male (white) President was chosen in 1940. Following a national trend at mid-century, the presidency of the Board became a male job—the last female board President in the settlement mold served from 1943-1946. Black membership on the board slowly increased until the mid-1960s when blacks comprised about 50 percent of the positions. Most of the black board members were representative of a very small group of black professionals in River City—doctors, lawyers, publishers and funeral home directors. The first African American Board President was an attorney chosen in 1952. From 1957 to 1962, two blacks and one white served short terms in that office. In 1961, a white attorney, Howard Wolfson, who had been active at the Center and on the Board for several years, was chosen for the position. Although Lucy Prince was set up to serve the poor in its neighborhood, by 1965 only about 10 percent of the board members were from the lower or middle class; the rest, both black and white, were what Wolfson termed "affluent."

The Board of Directors functioned in much the same way as Boards of other community organizations. It was responsible for approving policy and overseeing operations and, like most boards, an important part of its job was fund raising. The President of the Board in particular often served as the liaison between the center and outside funding agencies. To a large extent, however, the day-to-day activities of the Center as well as the establishment of new policies were the responsibility of the Executive Director. (The Executive Director had originally been known as the Head Resident, but this changed when the first man took over leadership of the Settlement in 1942 and chose not to live there.) Reflecting its major constituency, the Executive Directorship was seen as a black job.

Like most Boards of nonprofit organizations, some members were more active than others in attending meetings and taking part in the activities of the Center. Many members were chosen because of their active volunteer involvement in the Center's activities: the Men's Club (a fund raising group), sports programs, and the nursery school. Many others, however, were chosen for their connections to other established institutions (corporations,

government, churches) in the River City area. As a result, board meetings were often poorly attended and sometimes months would go by without a quorum being reached. In the early 1960s board meetings averaged about 20 participants, even though board membership hovered between 33 and 36.

Board membership was self-perpetuating and members averaged a long tenure in the group. Board terms were three years in length and individuals usually served as many terms as they wished. It was not unusual for a member to serve for more than a decade. Each year a nominating committee produced a slate of Board members and officers, which was usually accepted at the Center's annual meeting without challenge.

In 1965, the Lucy Prince Community Center selected a new Executive Director. The former Director chose to step down to take over the leadership of a similar center in another city. In contrast to his predecessor who was a long-time resident of the area and who evinced a low-key management style, the new Executive Director, Arthur Hobbs, was an outgoing young social worker recently arrived in River City. He immediately made his mark for being energetic, forceful, and outspoken. Although he tended to take a stronger leadership role with the Board than had his predecessor, the Board warmly received him because he promised to be an effective manager and provide a positive role model for the young African American men and women in the community. They also hoped that he would be more successful dealing with funding agencies that were becoming ever more critical of the Center's operations.

One of Hobbs's earliest goals was a transformation of the Board. Only about one in five of the board members lived or worked in the area of the Center; as the successful black board members who had grown up around the center became more affluent, many had moved out to more appealing neighborhoods in the suburbs. The new Executive Director felt that there should be more Board members representing the local community. At the same time, political quarrels between Board members loyal to both sides of the then-split state Democratic party were also disruptive to Board activities, so more diverse political representation was sought for the Board.

The second issue confronting the Board and the Executive Director in 1965 was the Center's relationship with the local United Fund. Funding struggles between the Center and the United Fund had been a constant source of conflict for much of the 1960s. All but five percent of the Center's funding came from the United Fund and a prerequisite of this funding was that the Center could not actively raise funds elsewhere. (This was the standard procedure for all groups receiving United Fund resources.) Wolfson recalled that every year while he was President of the Board, the United Fund wanted to cut back the Center's funding and that bargaining with the agency was his primary recurring responsibility. The United Fund, Wolfson noted, was "always critical of our operation. In the early sixties they started an unbelievable campaign against us." In 1960, the Fund wrote a lengthy report severely critical of the programs and management of the Center. It was also in great part due to pressure from the Fund that the previous Executive Director had been asked to resign in 1965.

One issue that galvanized the Board more than any other, however, was the fight against outside pressure to merge with other community centers. Only a short distance away

from Prince House, two other long standing settlement houses served poor, white and mostly immigrant neighborhoods. Now, however, urban renewal threatened them both. One was slated to be torn down completely. The other would be cut off from its neighborhood by the construction of a new freeway. Meanwhile, the Prince Center building was in need of serious renovation. Built over an underground stream, the house's north wing was settling and there was general agreement that saving the building would be close to impossible. The Boards and Directors of the other settlements proposed a merger with Prince Center to preserve their own programs (and jobs.) Noted one member of the Prince Center Board, "They [the other settlements] hoped they could move over here and take over." The Prince Center Board of Directors, however, remained firmly opposed to the idea. "We would have lost all the identity of Prince House. We were the only black settlement house and didn't want to lose that," added one Board member. The United Fund was also strongly behind the merger idea. At the same time it was also encouraging the settlements to take advantage of the War on Poverty funding (much of which was distributed through the United Fund in River City) which was geared toward more "storefront" operations and targeted programs.

By 1966, other events in River City had started to catch up with the Center. Blacks in River City and across the nation became more and more vocal in expressing their unhappiness with unequal access to housing and job opportunities. Tensions rose to the point where there were small-scale riots in the poorer sections of the city in the summers of 1966 and 1967.

Meanwhile, settlement houses were being viewed with suspicion as agents of social control rather than as advocates on behalf of the poor. One historian noted "The War on Poverty also fed charges that settlements failed to serve the really poor... [Critics noted that] social service agencies tended to reflect the values of their controlling well-to-do board constituencies more than they reflected the values of the poor they were supposed to help." Traditional black organizations, according to Hobbs, were being challenged by younger, more radical groups. Near the Lucy Prince Center, a more activist organization calling itself "The United" opened up a center for black youth adding radical politics and philosophy to its recreational programs. To many Board members, "The United" was a threat to their philosophy and way of coping with minority problems. Wolfson reflected the views of many on the Board, saying that "We felt that only Prince House was capable—had the training and experience to handle the black question in the area." "But," Hobbs added, "old line established organizations needed a different kind of leadership if they were going to make it through the '60s." Even if there had been a long history of black Board Presidents, it would still have seemed to many blacks, both within Prince Center and outside, that the organization was controlled by, and reflected the values of, white society.

Slowly the funders also espoused the idea that minority organizations ought to be led by minorities. Although there were never any words spoken to that effect, both Wolfson and Hobbs got the impression that the United Fund thought a black President of the Board would be best. Thus, when Wolfson decided to step down in 1965, he went to speak with Hobbs and accepted the Executive Director's suggestion that an African American should be the new President. As part of his efforts to transform the Board, Hobbs felt strongly that it was time for the President of the Board to be a representative of the Center's black constituency.

The nomination of James Thompson to succeed Wolfson did not come as a surprise to most people. Many years later, most Board members recalled Thompson as the leading candidate for the job. Thompson grew up in the Prince House neighborhood, starting in the Settlement's day-care program as a toddler. As a young adult he coached the championship boxing team and since sports then brought some revenue into the Center, Thompson was eventually asked to join the Men's Club. Because of his life-long involvement with Prince Center, Thompson was a strong supporter of its continued independence. He was a very likeable, easy-going man and in an era characterized by a great deal of controversy, the selection of James Thompson was a non-controversial choice with which everybody was happy. Thompson himself viewed the decision as a culmination of the goals of the original founders. "Most of them were aware that they would have to pass on the leadership... [They] felt that black people had to determine their own destiny."

One of the goals of the settlement house, according to Thompson, had been the development of leadership skills in young African Americans. Using the few black professionals in River City in the 1930s and 1940s, the settlement's Boy's Workers "instilled character and leadership in us. They started talking about black leaders taking over and running that agency." When Thompson became President, "It was like becoming boss of our own home...In the '60s, the energy of black leaders came into focus." Before the 1960s, Thompson noted, the attitude of whites had been, "We want to do something for you." Now blacks were responding, "No longer are we going to say you can come and help—we will help ourselves."

Thompson's personal popularity held even through the turbulent years that followed. Conflicts with the United Fund continued until 1968 when Executive Director Hobbs directly challenged the Center's allocation from that agency and won his appeal. Further, after the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. "things entirely changed—there was so much [more] money out there for blacks." Meanwhile, the War on Poverty programs were substantially changing the type of programs being offered by Prince Center. The Center became an important player in the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and Pilot City programs in River City. Not only did Prince Center administer such programs as Head Start and a summer youth jobs program, but Thompson, Hobbs and others connected with Prince Center were important players in the history of these programs in River City. Thompson was the President of the River City Mobilization of Economic Resources Board (the Office of Economic Opportunity's local supervising body) and Hobbs was active in the Pilot City program and eventually helped to found the River City Urban Coalition. As Thompson noted, "the little Lucy Prince Center was magnified one hundred times by all the programs it helped to start and founded."

In addition to the OEO and Prince Center Boards, Thompson was involved with many other community organizations and in the early seventies was the Democratic Party's candidate for U.S. House of Representatives. It was his seat on the River City School Board (he would later become its President), however, that would have the greatest effect on Prince Center. In 1970 Prince Center relocated to a new facility connected to a local elementary school. This merger was facilitated to a great extent by Thompson's leadership role in Prince Center and the School Board. The school and the community center each maintained their own buildings and offices, but were connected by a shared gymnasium and other common space. The whole complex was located on local Park Board land. While the new building

solved the question of Prince Center's continued independence, the Center now shared decisions about its facilities and programs with the School Board and the Park Board. With this change Lucy Prince House entered its next stage of development. Arthur Hobbs, Howard Wolfson, and James Thompson had succeeded in bringing the management and governance of Prince House under black leadership, and providing greater community representation. In the process, the new community center had become a mixed organization that kept its nonprofit status and its emphasis on local control but was deeply linked to public funds and public buildings.

Preparation Questions

1. Greater control of the Lucy Prince Community Center by the local community was a leadership goal of Arthur Hobbs, its Executive Director. How much of his programmatic plan depended on leadership succession, including solidifying his own power and moving toward African American board leadership?
2. The Lucy Prince Community Center is an early example of mixed sector social problem solving, where a nonprofit and two public entities, the School Board and the Park Board, work together to provide services. What organizational consequences flow from mixed sector solutions? What do the leaders of organizations need to keep in mind as they find partners across sectors?
3. Arthur Hobbs knew that the Lucy Prince Community Center served a multi-racial, multi-ethnic constituency. Even in the 1960s, more than half of the youngsters involved in its programs were not black and many volunteers were white. But the black community saw local control of the Prince Center first and foremost as a question of black participation. Why?
4. In communities with "ethnic succession," that is, waves of settlement by different ethnic groups, a community center (or a religious institution) that supports a particular group may find that it is a fixed and important community resource surrounded by people from different backgrounds. This is true, for example, of the Little Tokyo Service Center and the Korean Youth and Community Center, both located in downtown neighborhoods in Los Angeles that are becoming increasingly Latina/o. What should organizations like these do to prepare for their futures? Do organizations that serve non-English speaking clientele have different challenges in this regard than those that serve English speakers? What obligations do organizations have to their neighborhoods as well as their historic constituencies?
5. How do past and current patterns of funding—government contracts, user fees, foundation grants, and charitable giving—influence community groups as they try to define community control?

HALF A LOAF: INITIATING A COMPARABLE WORTH WAGE POLICY FOR PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

Barbara J. Nelson

Abstract

The Republican Governor of “Freedonia” has appointed a Commission to investigate whether state wage policies incorporate gender, race, or ethnic biases, and to recommend action if such bias is found. Supporters of the Commission, in and out of government, want the state to perform a comparable work job analysis to see if jobs with the same difficulty and responsibility held disproportionately by women or minorities are paid in the same range as jobs held disproportionately by men or whites. The bill that comes before the legislature does not propose a comparable worth analysis, but instead offers to raise the floor on the wages of full-time employees to the federal poverty level. The Democrats who control both houses of the legislature have to decide whether to support the bill. The proposed legislation does not embrace the structural change advocated by supporters, but it does give higher wages to those at the lower end of the public pay scale. To get this gain, Democrats must accept that the Republican governor will take a good deal of the credit. Is this “half a loaf”? And if so, is it enough?

Case Study

In the United States, with its history of weak unions, wage gains result as much from public policy as they do from collective bargaining. In the period between 1975 and 1995, comparable worth, or pay equity as it is also called, was a major policy initiative designed to reduce the wage gap between men and women, and whites and people of color. During that period more than 20 states passed comparable worth legislation and hundreds of municipalities and school boards adopted policies that made pay equity a standard for setting wages in the public sector. Labor advocates and women’s groups continue to give comparable worth wage policies their active support. In 2001, Senator Tom Harkin (D-Iowa) and Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton (D-DC) introduced national pay equity legislation, the Fair Pay Act, which would cover both the public and private sectors, with an exemption for small businesses. The Fair Pay Act languished in a Congress, and a country, not fundamentally supportive of proactive wage measures, especially in the private sector. Beyond legislation, however, a number of unions, including the American Federation of Teachers, include comparable worth as a regular demand in contract negotiations.

This case, set in the fictional state of “Freedonia” (but representing a real example) presents the kinds of issues politicians confront when legislation attempts to make structural changes in economic, gender, and race relations. A Republican governor responds to a state equitable compensation task force by proposing to raise the wages of all full time state employees who make less than the federal poverty level to that standard. The Governor is supported, somewhat unusually, by the main public employee unions. In contrast, most Democrats in the legislature (they control both houses) want to hold out for a serious analysis of the state’s job classification and compensation schemes and a full-fledged comparable worth wage policy. What should the Democrats do as elections approach?

Defining the Policy

Comparable worth wage policy has technical components that are part of the policy conflict, making a definition important to understanding the issue. A comparable worth wage policy requires establishing equivalent pay ranges for *different* jobs that are judged to be equal based on technical evaluations of skill, effort, responsibility, and working conditions. This policy values female-dominated jobs like secretaries as equivalent to male-dominated jobs like delivery van drivers, and urges that the wages of the secretaries be raised to those of delivery van drivers. Individual secretaries and van drivers would make different wages depending on their performance, tenure, and the like. But if the overall set of job characteristics were rated the same, the jobs would have roughly the same pay characteristics.

At the beginning of the comparable worth movement, supporters took existing job evaluation systems used by employers and compared equally rated female-dominated or minority-dominated jobs to those held predominantly by men or whites. Within most firms, research showed lower wage rates for female-dominated and minority-dominated jobs when compared with equally valued jobs held by men or whites. This analysis was used as the basis for comparable worth pay policies to improve the wages of women and minorities within these firms. As a result, large-scale job evaluation systems, once quite common in private- and public-sector human resource management, are used much less frequently, having been deployed to make equity arguments.

A Conflict Played Out in Dueling Regression Lines

Comparable worth policy was and is played out in an atmosphere of dueling regression lines. Few policy areas, with the possible exception of environmental issues, have as many scholars arrayed to provide policy makers with analysis that proceeds from different assumptions. The conflict arises, in part, over the interpretation of the wage gap between men and women and whites and minorities. In 2000, white women working full time made, on average, 72 percent of the wages of white men working full time. Black men earned 78 percent of white men; black women 64 percent; Hispanic men 63 percent, and Hispanic women, 52 percent. Differences in human capital and work history explain up to two-thirds of the male-female and white-minority wage gap.

Proponents of comparable worth say that the rest of the wage gap is due largely to discrimination, including the discrimination that pays jobs less because they tend to have mostly female or minority incumbents. Proponents of comparable worth argue that the 1963 Equal Pay Act and Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act do not fully address the wage problems of minorities and white women because they did not do the same work as white men. Men and whites predominate in jobs like doctors, lawyers, engineers, professors, plumbers, and electricians. Women and people of color predominate in jobs like nurses, teachers, secretaries, retail clerks, domestic workers, and gardeners. The wage gap caused by occupational segregation gives employers a discriminatory bonus, in the form of a lower total wage bill. Only structural change that removes the discriminatory bonus will create a sufficient impetus for individual employers to change their wage rates.

Opponents of comparable worth believe that wages should be established not by the value of a job to the firm or jurisdiction, but rather by what the market pays for each type of job. Lower wages in female- or minority-dominated jobs come from crowding, that is, from too

many people chasing too few jobs, not from discrimination or stereotyping. On an individual level, opponents say that pay equity policies discourage women and people of color from searching for higher paid jobs. On a structural level, opponents further argue that wages accurately reflect the marginal productivity of each worker. Any move away from market wages places employers in the private sector at jeopardy of no longer being economically competitive in the production of their goods and services. Wage increases either will be taken from profits, making the firm less desirable for investment, or will be reflected in higher prices, which will make the firm less competitive in the marketplace. Instituting a comparable worth wage policy in the public sector wastes scarce tax dollars.

The Politics of Comparable Worth in Freedonia

Freedonia, a state with a population of six million, has a mixture of aging industrial firms, newer service industries, and an economically stable agricultural sector. A number of Democratic legislators in the Freedonia House and Senate began to work for a comparable worth wage policy for state employees. Supported by labor activists and, indirectly, by women's rights activists, the legislators requested a study on the topic by the state's permanent Women's Equity Commission. In January, the Republican Governor, Alan Aiken, appointed a Task Force on Equitable Compensation in State Employment to investigate whether state employment wage practices incorporated gender, race, or ethnic biases, and to recommend policies against any biases that were found. The Governor appointed the Task Force in good faith, being a supporter of equitable compensation. He also had his eyes focused on his reelection campaign coming in November. At that time, the Governor and the entire House of Representatives would stand for reelection. No Senators would stand for reelection at that time. Both houses of the legislature were controlled by the Democrats.

The Task Force was created by law and was required to file an Interim Report to the legislature within six months of being established. The Task Force's longevity depended on the response of the legislature. Specifically, the act establishing it said, "the Task Force shall cease to function if appropriate legislative action has not been taken within five months of the submission of the Interim Report. The Task Force shall resume operations once appropriate legislative action has been taken; provided, however, that if appropriate legislative action has not been taken within 12 months after the expiration of the five-month period referred to above, the Task Force shall terminate." The Task Force was quite large, with seven people representing the Administration, two members from the House of Representatives, two members from the Senate, two members from the large public employees unions, and eight public members. No official representatives from women's rights organizations or civil rights organizations were appointed.

During the months it met, the Task Force struggled with many issues including how to determine if racial and ethnic minorities were disproportionately represented in certain job classifications, and how job evaluation could be done on the state classification system. In the midst of these technical and political discussions, Beth Baker, the Civil Service Department's member on the Equitable Compensation Task Force, presented the most detailed proposal for positive action. She reported that over five percent of state workers employed full-time made less than the federal government's poverty line for a family of four. Approximately 90 percent of these workers were white women or minorities. At Governor Aiken's request, Baker proposed that the Task Force suggest legislation requiring that state job classifications where full-time

workers made less than the federal poverty line have their pay increased to the federal poverty standard.

On June 1st the Task Force presented its Interim Report to the legislature. The report included the “Baker bill” creating a floor on state wage rates at the federal poverty level. In addition, the Task Force reported that it had issued a request for proposals from firms interested in conducting a job evaluation study for Freedonia. The Task Force was also discussing compensation plans with the Civil Service Commission and the Department of the Treasury.

June is the end of the legislative session in Freedonia. Before the legislature broke for summer recess (which lasted until after the election), the House passed the Baker bill and sent it to the Senate. In the Senate, the bill faced political opposition. Democratic state senator Cynthia Clark, an important black Senator and a member of the Equitable Compensation Task Force, opposed the bill. Clark felt that the bill did not really represent a comparable worth wage policy, that the same policy (no wages less than the poverty line) could have been achieved by collective bargaining, and that by separating low wages from the issue of comparable worth, the state would not ever adequately address the question of the value of state job classifications.

Democratic party officials, all of whom supported comparable worth, agreed with Clark, adding that the passage of this legislation would allow a Republican governor to take credit for what had originally been a Democratic policy initiative just weeks before the gubernatorial election. The campaign director for the Democratic gubernatorial candidate feared that the Governor would send a letter taking credit for the increases to the 5,000 employees who would receive Baker-bill pay raises. The letter would have accompanied the workers’ paychecks.

The largest public employee unions, CWA (the Communication Workers of America) and AFSCME (the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees) both supported the bill. They felt it made great gains for their workers, and moreover, Don Davis, the political director of CWA, was concerned that if the Senate did not vote on this bill, the legislative requirement to take “appropriate action” might not be met, and the Task Force might go out of business. But the most powerful argument made by the unions was that any delay in making the raises available to the poorest of state employees worked a severe economic hardship on these employees. Waiting for a fully blown comparable worth policy was not fair, the unions argued, to the hospital aides and child care attendants whose full-time labor did not bring them above the poverty line.

Both CWA and AFSCME are traditionally supporters of democratic candidates in Freedonia. In this election, however, AFSCME endorsed incumbent Republican Governor Aiken, and CWA officially stayed neutral. It was widely believed in Freedonia that Governor Aiken would win reelection handily, perhaps bringing a Republic majority to the House of Representatives.

After the political forces did battle in the Senate, it was clear that the Senate would pass the Task Force’s bill raising state wages in Freedonia to the federal poverty limit. The only question remaining was that of timing: should the bill be brought to a vote before the June recess or after the November elections, in the session held before new officials were sworn in? Opponents of the June vote agreed that if the vote were taken in November, the bill would be

amended to make the raises retroactive to July 1st, the date the raises would have begun if the bill had passed in June.

Preparation Questions

1. Why did the Governor choose the strategy of a Task Force on the issue? What do you think the Governor wanted to happen?
2. How independent is Beth Baker, the representative of the Civil Service Department to the Equitable Compensation Task Force?
3. Are the Democrats' concerns about Republican credit for "their" issue justified?
4. What is the role of the unions in this issue? Ordinarily, these unions support Democrats, who want to push for a full comparable worth wage policy. Why are they supporting the Baker bill? What should the Democrats in the legislature take from the union's support of the Baker bill?
5. Should the Democrats in the legislature pass the Baker bill before or after the election? Is the Baker bill "half a loaf"? And if yes, is it enough?
6. Is an increase in wages to the federal poverty limit an example of comparable worth as it was discussed early in the case? What is the federal poverty line for a family of four? How does it compare to the yearly wages of a worker making the minimum wage, calculating yearly gross income as 2000 hours of work?
7. Can structural issues of gender and racial inequality be dealt with effectively in legislative settings? Should they? What legislative strategies support or retard structural change? What future does comparable worth have in Congress or in state legislatures beyond the northern and western states where it has already been adopted?

INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION: THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT

Barbara J. Nelson

Abstract

The purpose of this case is to examine how sex, gender, and sexuality are built into public policy, in this instance, labor policy in the form of the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA). This mini-case asks whether three families are covered by the FMLA as they face family and medical problems. The families are Rose and Tomás Martínez and their children, his divorced sister Patricia Santa Cruz and her son, and the Martínez's neighbors, Mark Chan and David Lee. All have different marital, work, and health insurance circumstances. Using the Department of Labor's summary of the legislation, the analytical task of the case is to determine which adults can invoke the protections of the FMLA as they face changing family circumstances. The case raises questions about the costs and benefits of this legislation to individuals, families, firms, and society.

Case Study

Rose and Tomás Martínez are happily expecting their first child. Rose was a widow with two children, Gabriella and Albert, when she married Tomás. Their blended family is working quite well. Because Gabriella and Albert knew their father and are close with their father's family, there are no plans for Tomás to adopt the children. The family, including Tomás's widowed mother Maria, live in a middle-class neighborhood in Los Angeles.

Tomás Martínez is an Assistant Principal in the St. Anne parish school system, which employs 100 people. The three principals and the five assistant principals are the highest-paid employees in the school district. Tomás makes \$85,000 a year and his health insurance covers himself and his mother. Rose Martínez works as the purchasing agent for Sanchez Brothers Construction Firm. She makes \$33,000 a year and her health insurance covers herself and her two children by her previous marriage. Sanchez Brothers is a small firm of eight employees whose income is very sensitive to the business cycle. There are only two people who work in the office, Rose and another woman who is the secretary/bookkeeper. Sanchez Brothers contracts with many labor unions for skilled workers throughout the year—at least 100 unionized workers do contract work with the company in a good year. The company also contracts for unskilled, non-unionized workers on a daily basis as needed through a commercial hiring hall. About 30 unskilled workers do some work for Sanchez Brothers every year.

The Family and Medical Leave Act protects the jobs of certain employees who have personal or family medical needs, including protecting the jobs of some workers who are taking time off for the birth or adoption of a child. Rose would like to stay home with her baby for three months, but wants to return to work after that time. She and Tomás have also talked about the possibility of Tomás staying at home six weeks and Rose staying at home six weeks. Is Rose eligible to stay home with the baby and receive FMLA protections? Why? Is Tomás? Why? What personal strategies would you recommend to Rose and Tomás to be able to stay home all or part of the 90 days they would like to spend with their

newborn? How are sex, gender, and sexuality built into labor relations and the labor force in this case?

Tomás's sister Patricia Santa Cruz is divorced with two children. She lives in an apartment not far from her brother and sister-in-law. She works as a salesperson in Downtown Department Store, a national chain employing 2,000 people. She makes \$26,000 per year and has health insurance. Her older son, Miguel broke his leg playing pee-wee football and will require two operations and a great deal of physical therapy. She would like to take time off, at least eight weeks, to be with him during his hospital stays and to participate in his physical therapy. Is Patricia eligible for leave under FMLA? Why? What personal strategy do you suggest for Patricia to maximize the amount of time she can spend with Miguel during his recovery? How are sex, gender, and sexuality built into labor relations and the labor force in this case?

Tomás and Rose's next door neighbors are Mark Chan and his partner David Lee. Mark is an electrician and a member of the California Electrical Workers Union. He makes \$60,000 per year and his health insurance comes through the union. David is a writer who also works part-time as a waiter. He makes \$15,000 a year and has no health insurance. In the last two years Mark has worked more than 170 days each year under contract to Sanchez Brothers as they built a shopping mall. His mother has developed a serious stomach disorder that will require surgery and then a permanent move to a nursing home. She lives 150 miles away. Mark knows that the surgery and move will probably take six weeks. Is Mark covered under the FMLA? Why? If David wants to take three weeks off to help Mark and his mother, is he covered by the FMLA? What personal strategy do you suggest for Mark and David? How are sex, gender, and sexuality built into labor relations and the labor force in this case?

Preparation Questions

1. Which of the family members who wish to take time off for medical or family reasons are eligible under the act? Why or why not? Among those who can take time off from their jobs, which do you think will avail themselves of this option?
2. What leverage does Rose Martinez have with Sanchez Brothers construction? What leverage does Tomás Martinez have with his school system? Can Mark Chan expect assistance from his labor union?
3. What do you expect the leaders of each of these organizations to do for their employees or union members and why? How will they cope with the loss of labor and the disruption to the continuity of work?
4. What advantages does the FMLA, in its current form, offer to covered employees? To their firms?
5. What disadvantages does the FMLA, in its current form, impose on covered employees? On their firms?
6. What are the social costs and benefits of expanding the FMLA? Who would oppose or support extension and why?

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP: FOUNDING THE LAKELAND BLACK WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE

Barbara J. Nelson and Rita Ulrich

Abstract

A 35-year-old African American administrator in a state university outreach center attends a workshop on women and leadership. She comes away from the meeting believing that African American women, a small minority in the community and at the university, warrant a leadership program of their own, and she sets out to establish the Lakeland Black Women's Leadership Conference. She is faced with building an organization from scratch—needing to form an alliance with an existing similar but racially integrated program, already located within the university in which she works. The case is about social entrepreneurship, organizational creation, and separatism as a societal and organizational issue.

Case Study

How do you build an organization from scratch? Where do you start when there are limited organizational role models to follow, when the very nature of the organization you envision is different from many other organizations? These were questions Tamara Davies faced when she set out to establish an organization where black women could develop their own leadership potential.

Tamara Davies was an energetic, 35-year-old administrator for the Community Outreach Program of the Extension Service at Lakeland State University, a large university located in a predominantly white Midwestern city. The Community Outreach Program was an office of 35 full-time people and 40 freelancers that produced communications products—mostly popular articles, reports, and booklets—on a wide range of topics for use by citizens of the entire state. Davies's formal training was in journalism. Her job at the Community Outreach Program was assistant project manager in Community Resources, responsible for operations and project management. At the same time, she was also working on completing her Ph.D. in Mass Communications through the university.

Davies first began thinking about organizing a program specifically for black women after participating in a seminar on women and leadership that began in September, at the beginning of the school year. The seminar was an informal breakfast series offered through the Leadership Center attached to the university's School of Public Administration. It was the Center's first program designed specifically for women. The Lakeland Women's Service Committee, a local women's organization, had provided seed money to the Leadership Center to begin developing a leadership curriculum for women.

While the course dealt with gender questions, Davies felt that it did not speak to the experiences of African American women. It devoted a lot of time to topics such as women's experiences in re-entering the workforce, which did not necessarily apply to black women. It did not examine the ways in which issues affect women from various social, economic, and cultural backgrounds. Nor did it necessarily consider those issues which black or other

women of color might define as most important. When Davies raised issues that focused on blacks, it seemed to change the dynamics of the group.

“It wasn’t that my ideas and questions were rejected,” she recalled, “but it just wasn’t a comfortable fit. With different ethnic groups coming together there just wasn’t enough time to cover it all—everyone’s different kinds of experiences. You have to do a lot of explaining before other people can begin to understand your feelings. The issues might even be the same, but the focus is different.”

Part of the difficulty stemmed from the fact that Lakeland was a community where ethnic minorities form a relatively small proportion of the population. Blacks accounted for only 5 percent of the urban population and the total minority population in the city was just over 10 percent. In Lakeland, most whites had very little day-to-day contact with members of minority groups.

In speaking with other black women, Davies found that they had experienced frustrations similar to hers. But she also learned that their experiences were as diverse as they were similar. More important, African American women were interested in being able to share their thoughts with each other. The interest was clearly there, so Davies began to look for ways to develop this shared interest into an organized program which could meet the needs of a diverse group of black women.

She started by talking with Nadine Scott, a white woman on staff at the Leadership Center who had helped to organize the breakfast seminars. Scott explained that the Center’s programming funds were very limited, but she was interested in Davies’s idea. Scott arranged with the Lakeland Women’s Service Committee to devote some of the funds they had provided for the general women’s leadership program, along with a limited amount of her own professional time, toward developing a program for black women.

Davies and Scott had numerous discussions over several months in which they developed a list of potential participants in a program for black women, and worked out some preliminary ideas for the organization. Davies’s training in journalism and communications had made her accustomed to working independently. She originally felt that she could organize a program without forming a committee. Scott suggested forming an Advisory Group in order to develop a wider network of contacts and to draw upon a larger group of people in forming ideas and getting work done. Davies agreed with Scott, observing that “the Lakeland model is to do things by committee.” Davies was able to use her contacts from the Center and previous jobs in community organizations to identify potential program participants. She contacted “every black woman I could think of.”

Twenty-five people came to the first Advisory Group meeting to talk about whether there was a need for a special leadership program for black women, and how it might work. The response from participants was an enthusiastic yes. Ruth Preston, a black community leader with ties to Lakeland State University, agreed to chair the Advisory Group. The Leadership Center agreed to act as a host, providing the program with office space, administrative and advisory support, and some limited funds.

The Advisory Group moved somewhat slowly. It first convened in January and eleven months later it adopted a name—the Lakeland Black Women’s Leadership Conference. During that time it had sponsored a citywide conference for black women. The group raised enough funds to organize a second event by the following April—a workshop on personal power and leadership. These events, together with a number of other educational activities, generated considerable response from black women. In its first two years, over 300 women had become involved in one or more of the program’s activities.

Most of the program participants were African American women, but within this group there was considerable diversity. The ages ranged from young women and students to seniors and retired women. The Advisory Group reflected the overall diversity of program participants. It included entrepreneurs, educators, mental health workers, business consultants, managers, secretaries, health professionals and social workers.

Although the response to the program from black women was enthusiastic, the nascent Black Women’s Leadership Conference and its Advisory Group faced a number of problems. As one of 18 programs offered at the Leadership Center, the black women’s initiative had to compete for limited funds. Money for the conferences and other activities had to be raised from foundations. The Advisory Group also found that some people in the community, and some funders, were uncomfortable with a program designed specifically for black women. Other funders simply did not see a need for it. This made fundraising difficult, because each time a proposal was made the group had to justify not only the specific event but also the existence of the entire program. Davies and Advisory Group members responded to this skepticism by noting that the success of their activities indicated that other leadership programs offered throughout the university and in the community had not fully met the needs of black women leaders.

A second area of tension involved the program’s relationship to the Leadership Center. Although its association with the Center had given the program some stability and legitimacy, some members felt that the Center had not supported it as much as it could. Part of this may have reflected the position of the Leadership Center within the university. The Leadership Center was part of the university’s School of Public Administration, but was separate from its academic programs. It had considerable independence, but at the same time, the Leadership Center did not receive regular funding from the university, nor was it likely to in the future. Thus the Leadership Center also had to look to the foundations for its support.

When Davies began writing funding proposals for the Lakeland Black Women’s Leadership Conference, she was unsure of the funding process within the School of Public Administration. Not always knowing the proper channels made it difficult for her to move ahead with plans and maintain the momentum already begun.

In spite of these difficulties, Davies never considered organizing the program outside the Leadership Center within the School of Public Administration. Nor did she consider establishing it outside the university. She felt that there were not enough culturally specific programs within the university and that the university needed this kind of programming. She also pointed out that the Lakeland Black Women’s Leadership Conference provided many advantages for the university. It created additional links to the larger community and,

through activities such as documenting black women's experiences and exploring new dimensions of leadership, it also served in a modest way as a place for applied research.

Davies's long term view of the organization was for it to eventually become independent of the Leadership Center. She saw it as developing into a center in its own right, directly attached to the School of Public Administration. This would give the Lakeland Black Women's Leadership Conference greater visibility and a stronger identity, one of Davies's main goals.

Student Preparation Questions

1. Tamara Davies wants to start a separate organization for black women leaders in a community with a successful mixed, but mostly white, women's leadership program. How does Davies define the advantages and disadvantages of a separate black women's leadership group? How does Nadine Scott view this group? Are their views congruent or divergent, and with what consequences? What are the views of potential funders?
2. When is separate better? For individuals? For groups? For institutions? When is it worse?
3. What is the likely long-term future of the Lakeland Black Women's Leadership Conference if the organization continues on its current course?
4. If you were Ruth Preston, what advice would you give Tamara Davies about the next stages in organizational development?

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Barbara J. Nelson is the first permanent dean of the UCLA School of Public Policy and Social Research. Prior to her appointment as Dean and Professor of Policy Studies, she was Vice President and Distinguished Professor of Public Policy at Radcliffe College where her portfolio included academic programs and strategic planning.

Her fields of expertise include conflict mediation in civil society, social and economic policy, organizational theory and behavior, and social movements. She is the author of six books and over 60 articles and book chapters. *Leadership and Diversity: A Case Book* (2004) demonstrates how linking leadership and diversity improves policy education and policy making. *The Concord Handbook: How to Build Social Capital Across Communities* (written with Linda Kaboolian and Kathryn A. Carver, 2003) provides the ideas and best practices for starting and sustaining organizations that successfully bring together people from groups with historic conflicts. Nelson and co-author Najma Chowdhury won the 1995 Victoria Schuck Award for *Women and Politics Worldwide*, bestowed by the American Political Science Association for the best book in the field of women and politics. In 1989, Nelson and historian Sara Evans won the Policy Studies Organization's prize for the best book in the field of policy analysis for *Wage Justice: Comparable Worth and the Paradox of Technocratic Reform*. Nelson is also the author of *Making an Issue of Child Abuse: Political Agenda Setting for Social Problems* (1984) and *American Women and Politics* (1984).

Nelson has worked or done research in 24 countries, and has made major contributions to policy making and civic life in the United States and abroad. She is the Director of The Concord Project, which conducts research and provides executive education on building bridging social capital—the human and organizational resources that span social differences. She was a founding member of the Minnesota Supreme Court's Task Force on Gender Equity in the Courts. She consulted with the Swedish Government on its Parliamentary Commission on Power and Democracy, and has worked with several United Nations organizations on questions of economic development and political participation. She is a Member of the Board of the Public Policy and International Affairs Program, and the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, and is a former board member of the Community Investment Cabinet of the Los Angeles United Way, the Center for the New West, Radcliffe College, the American Political Science Association, and the National Council for Research on Women. She was a Kellogg National Leadership Fellow and has held visiting fellowships at the Rockefeller Foundation's Villa Serbelloni in Bellagio, Italy and the Russell Sage Foundation.

Before her appointment at Radcliffe, Barbara Nelson served on the faculties of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University and the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota, where she was Director of the Center on Women and Public Policy. She earned her B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. in political science at the Ohio State University, where she was elected to Pi Sigma Alpha, the political science honorary society.