

Clearinghouse REVIEW

September–October 2013
Volume 47, Numbers 5–6

Journal of
Poverty Law
and Policy

PURSUIING RACIAL JUSTICE

★ ★ ★ ★ ★ IN THE ★ ★ ★ ★ ★
21ST CENTURY

A Legal Services Imperative
Structural Racialization
Racial Impact Statements
Racial Equity Impact Analysis
in Minneapolis
Immigrant Rights as Civil Rights
Intent Doctrine and the
Brain's Bias
Geographic Information Systems
Affordable Care Act's Tools
School-to-Prison Pipeline
Fair Housing Act's Discriminatory
Effects Standard
Environmental Justice
TANF
LGBTQ Advocacy
African American Men
Mississippi Center for Justice
Advocates for Basic Legal Equality
Legal Aid Foundation of Los
Angeles' Race Equity Initiative
Voting Rights
Racial Justice Training Institute

UNDERSTANDING

STRUCTURAL

RACIALIZATION

By john a. powell

john a. powell
*Director of the Haas Institute
for a Fair and Inclusive Society and
Robert D. Haas Chancellor's Chair
in Equity and Inclusion*

University of California, Berkeley
460 Stephens Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720-2330
510.643.2820
powel008@gmail.com

I think that understanding structural racialization is one of the key issues for anyone doing civil rights, antipoverty, or social justice work in the United States today: whether as a policy evaluator, an attorney, a social worker, an activist, a pastor, a philanthropist, or a legislator. So I'm especially excited to write an essay for this issue of CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW. Many of us come at a systemic understanding of racial harm through the idea of disparate impact, or through the outcomes of policies rather than their intentions. And that's important. And in this essay I will talk about persistent racial disparities and the structures that recreate them. But, at its core, I assert that a structural racialization analysis is not only about how racialized disparities are produced, as important as this is. It is about how racialized sensibilities and concerns, both conscious and unconscious, have continued to create our sociopolitical structures, and also affect our understanding of ourselves and our communities. These sensibilities affect us all.

At the beginning of my legal career, I worked in a legal services office in Seattle. It was easy enough there, a region in the 1970s with an extremely small nonwhite population, to believe that we at legal services were bringing a racial analysis to our work simply because most of our clients were not white. In areas of the country where a majority of the targeted population is white, there may be the assumption that race and racial stratification is not a big issue. But both beliefs are wrong. Working effectively on behalf of clients of color, and noticing demographic disparities, is not the same as having a solid racial analysis, and whites are not exempt from the harms of racialized structures. For example, in an insightful book *Fighting Poverty in the U.S. and Europe*, the authors show how racialized concerns help severely limit our social welfare system in the United States and have an impact on other important issues such as taxation and education policy.¹ Once in place, these structural arrangements have a profound effect not just on people of color but on whites as well.

¹ALBERTO ALESINA & EDWARD L. GLAESER, *FIGHTING POVERTY IN THE U.S. AND EUROPE: A WORLD OF DIFFERENCE* (2004).

Further, I suggest a framing mechanism that offers both insight and tools to address the differences between different types of poverty, between black poverty, Native American poverty, and white poverty, between dispersed poverty and concentrated poverty, and that can get at the essential differences between being “low-income” and being “poor.” This demands that we move far beyond a view of disparities or marginalization along purely socioeconomic status, class (or racial) lines and toward a dynamic view of how structures shape the way institutions and individuals interact with each other over time and how the socioeconomic sea in which we swim shapes our individual and collective senses of self and community.

We can learn a lot about a society by looking at how it defines and structures belonging on one hand and exclusion on the other. John Rawls famously tells us that if we want to know if a society is just or fair, we look at its institutional arrangements.² Such an examination tells us not just about the excluded other but about the very foundation and ethos of a society, its moral fabric, its identity. Poverty is fundamentally about belonging, more than any strictly material definition.

In this short essay I will not be able to develop fully all my claims.³ But I hope to pique your interest to investigate further the idea that race is central in not just understanding racial disparities but in understanding our economy, the arrangement of our institutions, and the strains of extreme dysfunctional individualism in American culture.

Structural Racialization

This structural racialization frame requires us to move far beyond the idea of racism as a psychological condition, an attitude, a prejudice—some event that occurs in the mind of an actor that pre-

disposes the actor to take an action that is racist. Rather, we need to engage the full range of structures, of historical patterns, of what Charles Tilly calls “durable inequality.”⁴ As well, we need to examine and confront theories of justice that engage with unconscious (or implicit) racial bias. In looking at unconscious bias, we are seeing the reflection of social assumptions and social structures, not individual deviance.

Moving toward a system of justice and analysis that does not focus on the individual self as a rational actor in the world is difficult for nearly anyone born in the West in the twentieth century. So is moving toward a system that looks at circular causation, which attempts to disrupt easy binaries and either/or constructions. Part of the reason I use the term “racialization,” rather than “structural racism,” is to suggest, first, that determining what is or is not racist is problematic (especially when it comes to humans!). I prefer the term also because it suggests a continual process, a dynamic process that is unfolding in time.

We need to take the focus off intent, and even off conscious attitudes and beliefs, and instead turn our focus to interventions that acknowledge that systems and structures are either supporting positive outcomes or hindering them.

This is not to say that we should ignore the individual, just understand the individual differently. An individual is in many ways a “constituted being,” shaped by structures, with conflicting feelings and beliefs around race and other matters, and most of this conflict is happening on an unconscious level. Structures not only distribute opportunity but also help create self-identity and community identity. There is a powerful interaction between social and economic structures and culture. There is a powerful interaction between structures and our un-

²JOHN RAWLS, *A THEORY OF JUSTICE* (1971).

³For further discussion, see, e.g., my *The Race and Class Nexus: An Intersectional Perspective*, 25 *LAW AND INEQUALITY* 355–428 (2007); *Poverty and Race Through a Belongingness Lens*, *POLICY MATTERS*, April 2012, at 1, www.nwaf.org; *RACING TO JUSTICE: TRANSFORMING OUR CONCEPTIONS OF SELF AND OTHER TO BUILD AN INCLUSIVE SOCIETY* (2012).

⁴CHARLES TILLY, *DURABLE INEQUALITY* (1998).

conscious beliefs about others and ourselves. Structures provide meaning, and meaning and our values re-create our structures.

A structural theory of racialization gives us the language and vocabulary necessary to talk about and understand why racial disparities persist in almost every area of well-being even as *de jure* segregation is largely a thing of the past and most white Americans claim not to hold racist viewpoints.⁵ It not only offers a way of understanding racial disparities in our post-civil rights movement America but also allows us to examine how racial concerns often have an impact on the formation and operation of structures. These structures may or may not produce disparities. For example, the recent shift of power to corporate “persons” hurts all nonelites.⁶ But it is often racial concerns and anxiety that drive the support for the policies that further concentrate wealth and power.

When we examine issues such as states’ rights, federalism, the willingness by some to destroy the country’s credit instead of “giving Obama” a victory, the old southern strategy, the new southern strategy, the fear of “Obamacare,” and other recent legislative debacles, we must have race in play. None of these issues can be adequately understood without addressing the centrality of race.

In his work on structural racism, Eduardo Bonilla-Silva points out that, for much of its history, social science has been concerned with racism as a faulty belief structure.⁷ In this belief structure, “racism” is the reason why certain people, organizations, or institutions take actions that are harmful to people of a certain racial group. Yet, when we examine the social problems that plague most central cities in the United States today, it is impossible to ignore race, but explanations that rely on discrimination fall short; we still do not collectively have

the vocabulary to formulate the questions we need to ask. Too often we still focus on intent—needing to find proof of racism before we will agree that an institution or structure can have unjust outcomes. Yet it is precisely these questions that become not only irrelevant in a structural racialization frame but actively obfuscatory. The extent that racism is still conceived of within an individual and intent-focused framework is the same extent that we are still unable to understand the reality of what race is and how it functions.

In many ways, our laws have not yet caught up with this framing either. Time and time again we have seen the courts struggle to find a racist behind the curtain, struggling with the concept of disparate impact. The faulty position is that unless there is conscious intent or bias or both, there is no Constitutional racial injury. On the other hand, this is not the position that the U.S. Supreme Court takes related to free speech, religion, or many other areas. Upcoming affirmative action and fair housing decisions will likely once again suffer from defining racialized harm and remedies in this narrow way, and may hold racist intent up as somehow more salient than outcomes that disproportionately harm communities of color.

This is backward. Racist intent, in terms of psychological manifestations of race-specific negative attitudes, can be seen as an outcome of structures that produce a racially organized society, rather than the sole cause of that racial organization. A structural racialization framework asserts that most deleterious racial effects in the United States today come from the interactions of institutions and structures along with social bias, rather than from individual prejudicial intent. Self-perpetuating patterns, cumulative causation, vicious cycles that will persist until interrupted even without racialized input: these are our sites of analysis and intervention. As Nils Gilman puts it,

⁵Nils Gilman, *What Katrina Teaches about the Meaning of Racism*, UNDERSTANDING KATRINA: PERSPECTIVES FROM THE SOCIAL SCIENCES (June 11, 2006), <http://bit.ly/16C2Plg>.

⁶For a more thorough examination of corporate power, and its relationship to both the public and private sector, see my article with Stephen Menendian, *Beyond Public/Private: Understanding Corporate Power*, POVERTY AND RACE, NOV.–DEC. 2011, <http://bit.ly/15mzhDs>.

⁷Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, *Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation*, 62 AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW 465–80 (1997).

long after white people cease to actively hate ... minorities ... there persist social patterns, where people live, what social organizations they belong to ... and so on ... that are bearers of the racist past even though they may not ... be populated by active bigots [today]. This social and economic exclusion on the basis of race is what “racism” is really about.”⁸

Without a structural racialization framework, it is too easy to write off the racial disparities that we cannot explain by prejudice alone as somehow natural or just or inevitable. From a legal standpoint, these racial disparities cannot be proactively remedied. However, within a structural racialization framework, we can show how the disparities themselves, their durability, and their interactions perpetuate themselves in racially disparate ways. For example, the massive wealth disparities in the United States will continue to perpetuate themselves if left unchecked. If we can agree that racialized wealth disparities are, in fact, unjust, then simply leaving these disparities alone to perpetuate themselves indefinitely is not an option. This is true regardless of whether there are currently racist policies creating wealth disparities, or whether the disparities, because of how wealth functions in a capitalist economy, are perpetuating themselves.⁹

Racial Identity, Class Identity, and More

If we accept that race is socially constructed, we should ask how and why it

has been constructed in ways that marginalize, exclude, and harm.¹⁰ Again, there are many good treatments of this important question. I have asserted elsewhere that whiteness in America was defined in opposition to blackness, and this paradigm had an impact on both the hard edge of whiteness and how the country would later treat other nonwhites.¹¹

Every election season, various columnists ask why working-class whites support programs that will harm them and reject programs that would help them. There is a concept used in law called the spite fence: when a person is willing to inconvenience and even injure himself to spite his neighbor. So, one could imagine that some whites would rather go without insurance than to have to be in a program that associates them with the “other.” While this may seem extreme, consider the substantial inconvenience and harm many whites were willing to accept instead of attending integrated schools. Similarly there is strong evidence that many low-income whites are unwilling to tax the rich in part because they fear the money will go to the “undeserving” poor even though the lack of public resource will cause them harm as well.¹²

Although I think there is much to the spite fence metaphor, I believe it is incomplete. Whiteness as it took shape in Colonial America was about not only the right to police and exclude the racial other but also the right to identify with the elite landholding class.¹³ It is this second part that spite fence does not address. There is an aspirational aspect of whiteness that identifies with the ruling class, even though the gap between middle-class and lower-class whites and the ruling class is huge.

⁸Gilman, *supra* note 5, at 4.

⁹See, e.g., Karen K. Harris & Kathleen Rubenstein, *Eliminating the Racial Wealth Gap: The Asset Perspective*, 45 CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW 74 (July–Aug. 2011).

¹⁰By socially constructed, I refer to the fact that race is, as Manning Marable puts it, “first and foremost an unequal relationship between social aggregates, characterized by dominant and subordinate forms of social interaction, and reinforced by the intricate patterns of public discourse, power, ownership and privilege within the economic, social and political institutions of society” rather than a biological reality or a fixed categorization system (MANNING MARABLE, *BEYOND BLACK AND WHITE: TRANSFORMING AFRICAN-AMERICAN POLITICS* 186 (1995)).

¹¹See *my Dreaming of a Self Beyond Whiteness and Isolation*, 18 WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF LAW AND POLICY 13, 39–42 (2005).

¹²See, e.g., Dorothy Brown et al., *The Undeserving Poor?: Welfare, Tax Policy, and Political Discourse* (Washington and Lee University, Public Law Research Paper No. 04-02, April 2004), <http://ssrn.com/abstract=530223>.

¹³See STEVE MARTINOT, *THE RULE OF RACIALIZATION: CLASS, IDENTITY, GOVERNANCE* (2003).

In today's political climate, the elites have been willing to activate racial resentment to limit government, cut taxes, and create regulations to create new structures that expand their wealth. This racial resentment has been activated in such a way that not only have specific policies and programs become racialized, but the very idea of a common or a "shared good" is under attack.

Space and Race

Key in understanding structural racialization is an understanding of how space and opportunity play out in the United States. Where one lives affects educational opportunities, job opportunities, wealth creation, health risks, access to public services, investment by public and private investors, and other factors affecting one's quality of life. The existence of black ghettos is particular to the United States, and poor black people are, in fact, the only group in this country that can be classified as hypersegregated.¹⁴ While racial segregation persists at all income levels, and economic segregation exists regardless of race, poor African Americans are much more likely to live in areas of highly concentrated poverty than poor whites, and this disparity continues to increase.

In 1960 a poor black child was about three times more likely than her white counterpart to live in an area of concentrated poverty. By 2000, that had grown to be seven times more likely, and by 2010 it was approaching nine times more likely in some communities. Three out of four residents in neighborhoods of concentrated poverty are black or Latino, and the number of children in concentrated poverty continues to grow.¹⁵ Segregation, both class and racial, remains largely static, even as the location of pockets of poverty has long begun to shift from our cities to our inner-ring suburbs.¹⁶

The racialized sorting mechanism of space does not exist by itself. It is created by the effects of myriad interactions between many seemingly "race-neutral" policies: transit policies, development policies, educational funding policies, and other fiscal and zoning policies that support sprawl. However, these arrangements in fact have their root in explicitly racist policies. In this way we can speak of the effects of those policies still "echoing around" in the system, whether or not the original racist inputs exist.

We can draw threads straight through from the racist Federal Housing Administration policies of the 1930s, to the accumulation and passing down of wealth over the past two to three generations. We can look at the Federal Highway Act in the 1950s and see the government subsidization of white space in the growing suburbs and notice how white flight (and the creation of white-controlled municipal jurisdictions) was occurring in tandem with the civil rights movement and the demand for black political power. We can see urban renewal programs that destroyed mostly black-occupied housing near central business districts, and even some of those business districts themselves. We can look at the effects of exclusionary zoning policies and land use restrictions today that discourage the creation of affordable housing in the suburbs and see how these create lily-white ex-urban enclaves with little-to-no affordable rental housing. Even as racialized concentrated poverty has shifted to inner-ring suburbs over the past decade, we see the growth of exurban subdivisions supported by subsidized infrastructure, gas subsidies, highway construction and widening at the expense of public transit, and other means.

None of these many policies was somehow "natural." While some were overtly racist in their intent, others are neutral

¹⁴DOUGLAS S. MASSEY, *CATEGORICALLY UNEQUAL: THE AMERICAN STRATIFICATION SYSTEM* (2007); SHERYLL CASHIN, *THE FAILURES OF INTEGRATION: HOW RACE AND CLASS ARE UNDERMINING THE AMERICAN DREAM* (2004).

¹⁵See the excellent report, Kids Count, Data Snapshot on High-Poverty Communities: Children Living in America's High-Poverty Communities (Feb. 2012), <http://bit.ly/x2GbVE>.

¹⁶Daniel T. Lichter et al., *The Geography of Exclusion: Race, Segregation, and Concentrated Poverty* (National Poverty Center, Working Paper No. 11-16, May 2011), <http://bit.ly/17XABL1>.

and rational, within the small context in which they are proposed. Only when taken together and seeing their effects—a separate and unequal America—can we see that the racial stratification in the United States was created and is maintained through structural forces.

The effects of concentrated poverty are many and reinforcing. If we view opportunity (educational opportunity, health opportunities, employment opportunities) as a web, it is clear that housing sits at the center of that web, and where we live is a key factor in our access to opportunity structures. These same opportunity structures feed back on themselves, many of them self-reinforcing or self-perpetuating loops—held in place long after the original racist inputs have been eliminated from our policies, or despite our attempts to address them through affirmative action policies, limited tax-sharing programs, and other means.

More on Opportunity and Causation

Just as we move beyond an intent and individual-based (or even institutional-based) framework for understanding how racism can function in the United States, we also must move beyond linear and isolated notions of cause and effect. In complex social systems, everything is connected to everything else in multiple ways. Understanding how a system is functioning is not a matter of trying to separate out causes and effects but instead understanding that everything is both a cause *and* an effect.

In systems modeling, practitioners often speak of “closing the loops.”¹⁷ In practical terms this means that when we look at how A affects B, we also look at how B affects A. In a structural racism frame, this means looking at how all domains of opportunity affect one another—how segregation from some forms of opportunity increases the likelihood of segregation from other forms of opportunity, how

cultural norms perpetuate themselves intergenerationally, and how social welfare policies undercut their intended outcomes.

Furthermore, we are used to thinking of linear causality, yet nearly all effects in the world operate nonlinearly. A little fertilizer might make your grass grow a little better, a little more, might make it grow a lot better, and even more might poison it so it doesn’t grow at all. That’s a nonlinear curve, not a linear response. In terms of the racialized effects of systems, it means they can be cumulative, and highly nonlinear. Being isolated from four domains of opportunity may not just be four times worse than being isolated from one domain of opportunity; it may be one hundred times worse!

Generally we think of causes as something close in time and space to their effect, but this need not be true. And the courts have struggled here as well. In *Bakke*, for example, Justice Powell rejected the proposition that affirmative action could be used to remedy societal discrimination because that type of discrimination was in some ways unquantifiable—it was remote, free-floating.¹⁸ But this free-floating discrimination, or discrimination in many other arenas, was exactly what caused the need for affirmative action in the first place! It was just that Justice Powell was not looking at causation from a systems perspective, certainly not from a cumulative perspective. If he had, it would have been clear that the school disparities that feed the medical school disparities at issue in the case are intimately connected with a web of disparities—funding, taxation, location, tracking, housing, health—that are connected with a history of intentional harm.

Conclusions

The challenges before us are political *and* economic *and* spiritual. We need to understand and articulate the interrela-

¹⁷Systems scientists often use various ways of modeling complex systems to understand them better. These can involve simple pen-and-paper sketches of causal connections, all the way to computer-aided simulations of mutually dependent equations.

¹⁸*Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265 (1978).

tionship between these domains better. We cannot and should not try to separate questions of structures (politics), stuff (economics), and being (spiritual) completely. Too often we assume that economic questions are largely ones of production and distribution, politics is simply a way of making decisions, somewhat broken, usually done in statehouses or in Washington D.C., and that our spirituality is a private affair.

At best, we assume that our selves are isolated and rational actors, our religion gives us values, and our values implore us to get stuff in better ways, or use politics to change the way we get stuff. We might think that our values are why we care about racial justice, and transforming structures is one way that we work for racial justice. This is too simple. I suggest that we are being created by the structures in which we live, in complicated, contradictory, and largely unconscious ways. Working to transform these structures is inquiring into the nature of ourselves, and transforming ourselves.

I talk about this as a spiritual project because it involves reexamining the self, and re-creating structures that will in turn re-create our communities and ourselves. This process is one that occurs in our relationships—to one another and to the world in which we live.

We need to create structures that recognize not only our situatedness but our “sharedness”—that is, structures that can nurture our differences while creating communities of shared vulnerability and solidarity. As Ken Jones has written, we need this outer work of building new social and political structures to support the transformational inner work that we need to do, which will in turn support the outer work.¹⁹ So again, I suggest that we are doing spiritual work.

The separation of religion and politics has always been murky at best. The misguided liberal attempt to move politics into a purely secular sphere has, under-

standably, not worked. We need to recognize that the domain of the existential, of inquiry into the nature of self and existence, is implicated in all of the political work we do, if we want that work to be transformational. We also must admit that some of the move toward privatizing spiritual practice has been because spiritual questions and value questions sometimes seem irreconcilable. They scare us. In many ways, privatizing our spirituality was a tacit admission of failure. We could not resolve these tensions, so we pushed them into a private sphere.

Achieving racial justice at a time when inequality is increasing, poverty is worsening, climate change is having disparate effects on poor communities, financial crises are disrupting credit markets, and globalization is radically changing the labor market is a huge challenge. At the heart of this challenge is moving toward a vision of a radically inclusive society. Amartya Sen writes, “It is not so much a matter of having exact rules about how precisely we ought to behave, as of recognizing the relevance of our shared humanity in making the choices we face.”²⁰ Truly we are not just deciding if we are our brother and sister’s keeper, but who our brothers and sisters are. Who is fully human? Who is part of our imagined community? We must begin to redefine the self away from being an isolated being, in opposition to the “other,” toward being in relationship with that “other.”

In advocating a structural racialization framework for understanding racial justice work, I hope to push us to interventions that are transformational and sustainable. This isn’t to say all of our actions need to be huge—transactional change fits into a transformational strategy. But we must have our eyes on using even the smallest changes to restructure our society toward inclusion—creating communities of opportunity across multiple frameworks, and recognizing our situatedness in the solutions we propose.

¹⁹KEN JONES, *THE NEW SOCIAL FACE OF BUDDHISM: A CALL TO ACTION* (2003).

²⁰AMARTYA SEN, *DEVELOPMENT AS FREEDOM* 283 (2001).

Lastly we need to recognize that democratic belongingness requires the power to participate meaningfully in the process of remaking structures and policies and dissenting against policies that cause harm. I am not speaking, strictly, of voting here, but of having the ability to experiment and transform structures, with the sense of experimentation and freedom about which Roberto Mangabeira Unger writes so eloquently.²¹ Amartya Sen is famous for asserting that in a democracy there can be no famine. I assert that in a democracy there can be no entrenched racial disparities (or any longstanding group disparities along socially constructed lines)—that these disparities

themselves are both a cause of a lack of decision-making power and an effect of a lack of that power.

My hope is that this special issue of CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW spurs you to action guided by love, and focused on a radical inclusion that will allow us together to transform the social and economic structures that shape our lives, and indeed our very selves.

Author's Acknowledgment

I would like to thank Eric Stiens, M.S.W. (Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society) for his contributions to this article.

²¹See especially ROBERTO MANGABEIRA UNGER, *THE SELF AWAKENED: PRAGMATISM UNBOUND* (2007).



Subscribe to CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW!

CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW: JOURNAL OF POVERTY LAW AND POLICY is the advocate's premier resource for analysis of legal developments, innovative strategies, and best practices in representing low-income clients. Each issue of the REVIEW features in-depth, analytical articles, written by experts in their fields, on topics of interest to lawyers who represent low-income people. The REVIEW covers such substantive areas as civil rights, family law, disability, domestic violence, housing, elder law, health, and welfare reform.

Get Your Online Subscription Today!

- CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW: JOURNAL OF POVERTY LAW AND POLICY is published online six times per year.
- Your subscription includes online access to the current issue and the archive of articles published since 1967. With this online access—your “site license”—your organization’s entire staff will enjoy fully searchable access to a wealth of poverty law resources, accessible from any computer or mobile device.
- Newly subscribing individuals and nonprofit programs are entitled to special discounts on our Training Programs.
- Each subscriber receives *Clearinghouse Review News*, a monthly e-newsletter that covers matters of interest to poverty and public interest law practitioners.

Please fill out the following form to receive more information about subscribing to CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW.

Name _____

Organization _____

Street address _____ Floor, suite, or unit _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

E-mail _____

Subscriber	Annual Price
<input type="checkbox"/> Nonprofit organization	\$300–\$1,800 (varies with size of operating budget)
<input type="checkbox"/> Law school library	\$500
<input type="checkbox"/> Individual	\$400

Please e-mail this form to subscriptions@povertylaw.org.
Or fax this form to Subscriptions at 312.263.3846.

Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law
50 E. Washington St. Suite 500
Chicago, IL 60602

CUT HERE