



*Empowering People Through
Information and Technology*

Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies
Network of Alliances Bridging Race and Ethnicity - NABRE™
1090 Vermont Avenue NW, Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
www.jointcenter.org



Working Interdependently for
Just and Inclusive Communities

Maggie Potapchuk

**HOLDING
UP
THE
MIRRORED
IMAGE**

Holding Up the Mirror:

Working Interdependently for Just and Inclusive Communities

By Maggie Potapchuk

NABRE/Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies

Washington, DC
2002

NABRE (Network of Alliances Bridging Race and Ethnicity) is a program of the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, which informs and illuminates the nation's major public policy debates through research, analysis, and information dissemination in order to: improve the socioeconomic status of African Americans and other minorities; expand their effective participation in the political and public policy arenas; and promote communications and relationships across racial and ethnic lines to strengthen the nation's pluralistic society.

Opinions expressed in Joint Center publications are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the staff, officers, or governors of the Joint Center or NABRE or of supporting organizations.

Copyright 2002 by the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies.
All rights reserved.

Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies
Network of Alliances Bridging Race and Ethnicity
1090 Vermont Avenue, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-4961
Phone: 202-789-3500
www.jointcenter.org/nabre

The Joint Center gratefully acknowledges the support of the Annie E. Casey Foundation in making this publication possible.

FOREWORD

In 1999, fifteen prominent organizations, diverse in their missions and constituencies but united in their desire to combat racism, came together at the invitation of the Joint Center to form a planning committee that would shape and guide the conception of NABRE (Network of Alliances Bridging Race and Ethnicity). Over an eighteen-month period they helped to create this growing alliance, which now numbers more than 160 organizations that work on race relations and racial justice issues in communities around the country. As it nears the end of its second year of operation, now guided by a Steering Committee of 28 prominent organizations, NABRE is helping to link organizations, both online and offline, so they can share ideas, learn from each other's experiences, build effective local coalitions, and energize a widening circle of allies.

One of the key concepts conceived by the planning committee was NABRE's organizational framework which recognizes that there are a range of approaches—from dialogue to direct action—to dealing with race relations and racial justice issues

and acknowledges the important role each plays in dismantling racism. The How-To Forum from which this publication emerges was convened by NABRE to examine this concept in greater depth and to explore ways in which groups from across the spectrum of approaches in communities can collaborate in addressing racial issues of common concern.

We are grateful to the Annie E. Casey Foundation for its generous assistance in making the How-To Forum and this publication possible and we are grateful to the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation for its assistance in launching NABRE. We hope both the Forum and this book will be of value to local groups as they strive to build alliances that will magnify the impact of their work. ●

Eddie N. Williams

President

Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies





PREFACE

On Saturday, August 18, 2002, thousands of people rallied in Washington, D.C., in support of reparations for centuries of slavery and racial discrimination. The purpose of the rally was to raise public awareness about the case for reparations and to build a united front to make the case.

However, despite the fact that virtually everyone attending the rally supported the concept of reparations, there were times during the day when some people could be heard contemptuously belittling others because they disagreed with their approach to achieving their common goal. Some were labeled as being too confrontational; others were labeled as being too focused on changing individual hearts and minds; still others were labeled as being too interested in working with the power structure.

These anecdotes illustrate the reason for and importance of NABRE's How-To Forum, entitled *Creating Collaborative Approaches to Address Racial Injustice in Communities*. Those of us engaged in actively trying to combat racism need to widen the circle of allies engaged in such activities. We need to recognize that people of goodwill may have different levels of knowledge and sophistication about issues of race, and furthermore that their experiences and personalities may lead them to embrace different tactics in fighting racism and to join different types of organizations.

NABRE believes that there are key roles for a wide range of organizations engaged in working to combat racism, through different approaches. NABRE further believes that the various approaches are interdependent and enrich each other. If an organization acknowledges that racism remains a significant problem in society and if it is willing to act on that belief in a constructive manner, it merits our respect.

Consider, for example, what it might mean if organizations with different approaches worked together to make the case for reparations. They could reach a range of different audiences with messages that are tailored to the needs, interests, and sophistication of each audience. Or consider the case of a community that is addressing a racial profiling issue. If one group was organizing people at the grassroots level to advocate for institutional change, another was engaging a different group of people in dialogue to raise their individual awareness about the issue, and a third group was making the case to the community's public and private sector leadership, all three would reach far more people than any single group could do. And if they were working in a coordinated manner, they would reinforce each other's messages and dramatically increase the likelihood of significant and sustainable change. That is quite a contrast with a situation in which three such groups were sniping at each other and wasting valuable time, energy and resources because they didn't like a particular approach.

This publication chronicles the proceedings of the How-To Forum. But more importantly, it provides insights into the various approaches, helping us to take the key step of learning more about and increasing our understanding of these approaches and the perspectives that drive them. With this foundation of understanding established, we can proceed to the next steps of engaging national and local race relations and racial justice organizations in

- refining their understanding of the different approaches;
- developing core principles of engagement in communities;



- *creating models for collaboration; and*
- *helping organizations to adapt these models to their own circumstances.*

The outcome of taking these next steps will be organizations from across the spectrum working in common cause in communities across the country, whether the issue is education, law enforcement, economic empowerment or the host of other issues that define race relations in the United States today. Together, they can form a critical mass of allies, sustaining a relentless momentum for creating just and inclusive communities and a just and inclusive society.

We look forward to hearing from you, as readers, so that we can all benefit from your feedback as we forge ahead. ●

Michael R. Wenger
Director, NABRE



CONTENTS

Foreword by Eddie N. Williams	i
Preface by Michael R. Wenger	iii
Introduction	3
1. Overview of the How-To Forum	5
2. Holding Up the Mirror: Organization Reflection	11
3. The Race Relations and Racial Justice Spectrum of Approaches	19
4. Clusters of Approaches: Individual, Intergroup, Institutional	29
5. Perspectives on Working Across the Spectrum: Why Is It Important?	33
6. Next Steps: Working Interdependently Across the Spectrum	47
 Bibliography	 55
Appendices:	
A. NABRE Background	59
B. NABRE Organizational Framework	63
C. How-To Forum: Advisory Committee, Invitees, and Participants	67
D. How-To Forum: Information About Participating Organizations	69
Author's Acknowledgements	79
Feedback Form	81



One of the themes of this publication is about holding up the mirror to our organizations and reflecting on our work and our effectiveness. That process must start with us as individuals. Therefore it might be useful to share a snippet of my own journey of reflection, which brought me to realize the importance of working interdependently across the spectrum of approaches for combating racism and building an inclusive society. I write this informed by many different perspectives and related experiences. They include that of a reporter for the How-To Forum convening, that of an anti-racism activist in a community-based organization, and that of a practitioner in an intermediary institution.

Before coming to the Joint Center, I worked for a community-based social justice organization in the Midwest. The program had many components, including dialogue groups, workshops, training institutes, and a collaboration council. Our analysis was based on anti-racism theory and also reflected other approaches, including prejudice reduction and democracy building.

Collaborating with key people in our community was one of our major thrusts, so it was important to create relationships with peer race relations and racial justice organizations. When I sought collaboration with my colleagues in organizations that used similar anti-racism analyses and processes, I could appreciate their approach to the work. We spoke a similar language, we did similar exercises in workshops, and we had a common vision. There were ongoing discussions of what worked and how to respond to different levels of resistance. When I heard a negative comment about their work, I usually defended them because I knew the intent of their interventions and the outcomes they sought. We complemented each other and trusted each other to send work and share ideas.

At the same time, there were “other” organizations and consulting groups with which I did not have much contact. I knew who they were through their work in the community, and because we sometimes competed for the same contracts or grants. From community members I heard both positive and negative comments, but I was less likely to defend their work since I questioned their interventions and how they used them. When we did discuss the work, I found myself needing to clarify terms. We had similar visions, but our processes for creating change looked very different. I was frustrated with the “other” organizations and could not figure out how to engage them thoughtfully in a collaborative effort to dismantle racism. They likely had some concerns about the work my organization did as well.

Like most community-based organizations, we faced the same daily operational issues: trying to look unique to funders by creating our own niche in the community; showing what we could accomplish versus another organization’s particular strategy; meeting the challenge of recruiting people to attend our program; and responding to comments like “Why should I go to yours and not _____” or “I went to _____ organization’s training so I am done.” We had to market to potential clients, showing them that our methods were the best and most appropriate for their current need. Sometimes we did not have time to do an assessment. All of these challenges and demands raised the barriers to collaboration higher.

But I was uncomfortable. Was I walking my talk of trying to be inclusive in my work? What did I need to do to change the way I perceived other organizations? The answers were consistent. I needed to know more about what other organizations were doing and why they were doing it. Soon after I joined the NABRE staff, the NABRE Planning



Committee adopted an organizational framework that said that each approach has a role in dismantling racism and that NABRE will support and be a convener of the spectrum of approaches. The adoption of that framework highlighted the need for this How-To Forum to initiate dialogue among race relations and racial justice organizations.

Organizing *Creating Collaborative Approaches to Address Racial Injustice in Communities*, as the How-To Forum was named, provided an opportunity for me to revisit the perspectives I had on different approaches and to explore how groups could support and collaborate with each other. It also helped reinforce for me the reality that each organization plays a role in dismantling racism. Differences between approaches typically have less to do with interventions and more to do with the principles and values of an organization's work. It was my

responsibility to delve deeper, to understand why an organization had chosen a certain set of interventions to promote change in a community or organization.

This publication is a call to colleagues in race relations and racial justice organizations across the nation to examine why they do what they do. With each of our organizations becoming clearer about the work, we then can be prepared to take the next giant leap – working interdependently together to create racially just and inclusive communities.

I invite you to join the dialogue and think about how we can work together. Please take the opportunity to read, reflect, and respond. ●

Maggie Potapchuk

Senior Program Associate, NABRE

INTRODUCTION

What Is NABRE?

NABRE, the Network of Alliances Bridging Race and Ethnicity, grew out of work done by President Clinton's Initiative on Race in identifying and highlighting promising racial reconciliation practices in communities across the country—from dialogues and joint community improvement projects to efforts to challenge institutional racism. While the identification of such practices was encouraging and energizing to leaders and participants, a common concern heard was the sense of isolation felt by many who are engaged in these activities. Often, they are not aware of other racial reconciliation and racial justice activities in their own communities, and they often lack the mechanisms necessary to communicate with similar organizations in other communities. Such isolation hastens “burn-out” among leaders, and it limits the ability to form alliances that can strengthen impact.

The persistence of racial and ethnic injustice and our nation's ongoing demographic transformation require that we intensify efforts to bridge racial and ethnic divisions throughout our nation. Local race relations and racial justice organizations committed to these efforts are often frustrated by inadequate resources as well as this sense of isolation. They also must often contend with a lack of public awareness of the pervasiveness and persistence of racial injustice. NABRE (pronounced “neighbor”) was created to address this sense of isolation and to foster alliances that can strengthen efforts to build a just and inclusive society. A program initiative of the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, the nation's preeminent think tank focused on issues of race, NABRE is guided by a Steering Committee of 28 national and local organizations. (See Appendix A for more information.) NABRE's mission is:

To cultivate and nurture race relations and racial justice organizations committed to building alliances that break down barriers of race and ethnicity in all sectors of communities and to build a relentless momentum toward a more inclusive and just nation.

Why a How-To Forum?

As NABRE was moving from concept to reality it was supported by the guidance of a Planning Committee of 15 diverse national organizations. As the transition from a Planning Committee to a Steering Committee was upon us, the Planning Committee held a two-day retreat to discuss the organizational framework, composition of the Steering Committee, and operating procedures.

The Planning Committee created and approved an Organizational Framework for NABRE that specifically seeks to bring together race relations *and* racial justice organizations under one umbrella. The intention is to break down barriers between the groups so they can be more effective at breaking down barriers in their own communities. The Framework states:

- *We believe that NABRE can facilitate the connecting of organizations from different points on the spectrum so they can work cooperatively toward a common vision of dismantling racism through exploring their interdependence and identifying opportunities for collaborative activities.*
- *If NABRE is to embrace the “spectrum connection” role, it must infuse all of its work with this assumption. Therefore, NABRE's meetings, programs, communications and decision-making*



processes must actively aim to support dialogue among the differing voices, approaches and strategies along the spectrum.

(The full text of NABRE's Organizational Framework can be found in Appendix B.)

NABRE's goal is to create a community of leaders in racial reconciliation, race relations, and racial justice organizations and empower them to sustain efforts necessary to bridge our racial divisions. However, these leaders approach their work from very different perspectives. The spectrum of approaches ranges from those that increase individual awareness and understanding, to those that strengthen leaders' skills and knowledge, to those that actively confront institutional racism and challenge white supremacy. These various approaches, all focused on the same ultimate goal of eradicating racism, emerge from different theories, styles, experiences, and strengths.

Too often, groups utilizing different approaches coexist uneasily in communities, at times even working at cross-purposes with each other. NABRE aims to promote a process in which groups engaged in different approaches will recognize their common vision, understand the different approaches and the perspectives from which they have emerged, acknowledge their interdependence, and appreciate the value of collaborating and leveraging their different approaches to address issues of common concern in their communities.

The How-To Forum — *Creating Collaborative Approaches to Address Racial Injustice in Communities* — provided an opportunity for the participants to hold up a mirror to their own reactions to the

different approaches, seek clarity on why organizations use various interventions, reflect on their own approach and outcomes, and finally work together on a case study to begin thinking about how to work interdependently across the spectrum. This publication hopes to accomplish the following:

- *Provide an overview of the How-To Forum proceedings, including organization reflection questions.*
- *Share nine descriptions of race relations and racial justice approaches, including a comparative chart.*
- *Describe three clusters in which the approaches congregate and describe their similarities, differences, and outcomes.*
- *Share perspectives from the participants — how the organization reflection questions were used, whether they were a helpful tool, and why it is important for race relations and racial justice organizations to work interdependently across the spectrum.*
- *Provide some next steps for consideration.*

One of the mantras of this book is *we want your feedback*. We hope this publication will launch a rich discussion about the spectrum of approaches, how to work interdependently together, and what next steps we need to pursue. So at the very end of this book is a feedback form. Please take the time to share your opinions, perspectives, and critiques. NABRE will share your feedback with the larger community of practitioners, activists, and academics through our web site. ●



- *Complete form on last page or*
- *email nabre@jointcenter.org*

1.

OVERVIEW OF THE HOW-TO FORUM

This section provides an overview of the process and content of the How-To Forum that took place. While the event was attended by 18 organizations from different geographic areas and representing different approaches, and while much was accomplished, it became clear in the course of the process that to create a how-to template would be premature. At the Forum itself we began the vital discussion concerning how to work interdependently and we reached consensus on the importance of working together. Overall, participants found that they would need more time to deconstruct their approaches and to learn adequately about each other's theories of change and types of interventions. There was much enthusiasm for building on this Forum with a series of local forums to engage organizations with a shared history of facing common community issues as the next step in creating a how-to template.

PURPOSE OF THE HOW-TO FORUM

The How-To Forum was designed to help organizations in the following ways. First, it would bring together local and national leaders of organizations that practice different types of approaches regarding broad issues of racial harmony, racial justice, and social change. Second, it would assist the broad spectrum of organizational and community leaders in understanding the perspectives of people who use different approaches to address issues of race. Third, it would guide participants in discussing how these approaches could be used strategically by practitioners and community leaders to work toward the vision of an equitable and inclusive community. And finally, it would lead to the publication of this document, to be distributed

to organizations and civic leaders to assist in learning more about the spectrum of approaches and for organizations to reflect on why they do the work.

PLANNING FOR THE FORUM

The planning of NABRE's How-To Forum began in July 2001 after receipt of a generous grant from the Annie E. Casey Foundation. The first steps were extensive web research and journal searches on race relations and racial justice organizations, academic leaders and institutes, and different approaches. Web sites were the main sources of information about organizations, but their content varied significantly and they could not always be relied on for analysis of an organization's approach.

At this point, we were still creating a list of different approaches using two initial criteria: that each approach has both a theory of practice and a critical mass of organizations with a track record who use the approach. Practitioners from across the country were contacted for their opinions of which organizations "represented" particular approaches. This provided an inside view of the perceptions of organizations and made differences in language more apparent. For instance, an organization might be seen as a prejudice reduction type organization because of its activities in the field, but its internal materials and web site content might lead some to consider it an organization with an anti-racism approach.

In the race relations and racial justice field, one could find theorists who helped to define a particular approach with some consistency of descriptions, but fail to find an academic comparative analysis.¹ We found one article and one book



that provided “analyses” of different approaches, but both had clear and strong agendas for a particular approach, and therefore only some of the descriptive information could be used.² A manual for a national church organization provided some helpful descriptions, but they were written in the context of creating a training workshop design.³ Another publication that included some descriptions and analysis, published by the Applied Research Center, did define a typology of anti-racist activity.⁴

Fortunately, we found two nearly completed doctoral dissertations during the planning of the How-To Forum. Each provided a unique comparative analysis of the different approaches. Conversations with these researchers, Ilana Shapiro and Norma Smith, along with reading sections of their dissertations, provided much-needed insight and information to help frame the spectrum of approaches.⁵ The research process affirmed the lack of a common language and understanding of the different approaches, which is one of the root causes for the tension between groups.

The next step was identifying an Advisory Committee representing diverse approaches across the spectrum and working in varied sectors. The plan was to have individuals who represent the range of approaches seated on the Advisory Committee, so that our conference calls with them could become mini-labs to identify some of the issues, tensions, and challenges that might occur during the Forum while also guiding the event’s planning. The Advisory Committee had three major tasks: (1) Create criteria for deciding which organizations to include (e.g. approaches, sectors); (2) Recommend organizations and facilitators; and (3) Guide the design by sharing expectations and concerns.

After interviewing several candidates recommended by the Advisory Committee, co-facilitators were selected. Each was chosen as someone who brought something different to the process. One works with NABRE and is a seasoned race relations practitioner familiar with the various approaches. The other works on race and power issues and has facilitated

consensus-building activities but was unfamiliar with the various approaches. With their different perspectives and experience, the facilitation team created an important layer of accountability for the process as well as with each other.

DESIGNING THE FORUM EVENT

Our original plan for the first evening of the Forum was for each organization to give a short presentation explaining its work to the group. It seemed important for everyone to know more than the content on an organization’s website and pamphlet in order to have substantive discussions regarding collaboration. The facilitators called a sample group of participants to learn about their expectations and hopes for the Forum. Participants felt very strongly that they did not want each organization to do a “dog and pony show,” but to have deeper conversations.

With this information, we instead asked each participant to give us basic information about his or her organization (this is available in appendix D). We still needed to learn much more about each other’s organizations to understand why each of us does what we do, why we do it, and the outcomes of the work. We created a set of Organization Reflection Questions to help participants deconstruct their approaches. Since we only had two and a half days for the Forum, this level of reflection was needed so discussions could begin as soon as the participants arrived. Our intent with these reflection questions was to:

- *Provide information to support our discussions throughout the process;*
- *Provide an opportunity for participants to dialogue and reflect with their colleagues within the organization prior to the Forum; and*
- *Provide us with the information needed to create a comparative analysis of the approaches, which was lacking in the literature.*

The next section offers more detail on how these organization reflection questions were used by



participants.

THE FORUM

From February 20-22, 2002, 18 organizations gathered along with NABRE staff, facilitators, and observers, at Belmont Conference Center in Elkridge, Maryland, to attend this first How-To Forum. (Appendix C provides a list of invited and attending participants of the NABRE How-To Forum.) The first night we spent time learning about each other by responding to such questions as these:

- *What personal beliefs and values drive you to use your approach?*
- *Do you have a role model or hero/shero on whose shoulders you stand when you do this work?*
- *What do you need from your fellow participants to feel trust and to communicate deeply and honestly with one another throughout this Forum?*

This last question helped the facilitators gather the guiding principles that would support our time together. Some of the principles agreed upon by the group were:

- *Honoring differences without judgment;*
- *Mutual respect;*
- *Confidentiality;*
- *Seeking clarity to avoid our own "spin";*
- *Being conscious of our internal voices and what they say about us;*
- *Giving each other the benefit of the doubt;*
- *Using the same rigor to examine our own work as we use to examine others'.*

The next morning we revisited some of the issues that were raised the night before and needed further clarification. Among the issues raised were

NABRE's approach and its role in the process, how people were chosen, and why the event was being held on grounds that were perceived to be a former plantation. We also spent significant time talking about our aspirations, our expectations, and our unspoken concerns. The aspirations we discussed helped set a tone for the rest of our time together, as participants began to see their similar visions and the different ways they arrive at them. Some of the aspirations were expressed in these words:

- *"We will . . . build toward racial justice and get beyond the people who normally gather in rooms like this, and we will widen the circle of allies."*
- *"Everyone is intentional about building a learning community."*
- *"Willing to look at some new paradigms in what we are doing . . . the world is changing rapidly so I don't want to get stuck in the same paradigm."*

Examining our unspoken concerns helped us to see commonalities in our perceptions of the field and helped us begin to look at each other as part of a whole instead of in separate camps. Among the concerns mentioned:

- *"Danger that we could perpetuate the problem by 'professionalizing' the process."*
- *"Our unspoken hierarchy of approaches."*
- *"Being liberal is not synonymous with social consciousness."*
- *"To get a better sense of some of the contradictions we are engaged in and the mixed messages we send."*
- *"Issues of competition for money and human resources as well. How do we have staying power without compromising principles of the work we are trying to do?"*



During the afternoon we spent most of the time in small groups. It was important for organizations that do similar work to have time to understand each other's work and break down stereotypes and misperceptions and mitigate possible competitiveness between one another. It was equally important for organizations that work across the spectrum to understand approaches and learn about actual and possible outcomes and how different interventions are chosen. Therefore, three clusters of the field were identified prior to the Forum as a way to frame the discussion. The three clusters, which provided a vehicle to help participants describe the focus of their organizations' activities, are these:

- *Fostering individual/interpersonal learning and change;*
- *Building inclusive leaders and communities that include people of all races;*
- *Promoting institutional and cultural change to eradicate systems of racism.*

While planning the Forum, it was assumed that each organization invited represented an approach or two based on the research we had done on their work. We wanted to make sure there was a diversity of participants from across the spectrum of approaches. It was interesting to learn how groups identified themselves at the Forum. It was challenging for some of the groups to decide which cluster they belonged to. Some participants were basing their decision on their organizational vision rather than the type of activities they engage in or the theory of change they follow. Their selection of clusters offered the first sign that a hierarchy of approaches was invisibly at work, since most organizations wanted to gather in the third cluster. The third cluster is typically considered the ultimate outcome for the work but for some organizations their work is the means to that end. With feedback from the participants, all three clusters were renamed as described in Section 4 of this publication.

Finally, it was time to see if we could apply what

we had learned about each other's organizations and work with the relationships we had built to address two real-life case studies. One case study focused on education and schools and the other on racial profiling. Participants had a rich discussion learning what each organization could contribute and brainstorming principles of engagement for organizations to collaborate across the spectrum. Just hearing about different ways of looking at a community issue was insightful. Many participants were surprised and pleased to discover the ways they could work together, which even included encouraging each other to think of different ways of conducting their work to resolve these community issues. The value of the case studies was reflected in some of the comments we received:

- *"Case Studies helped me better understand what the different groups do and how they fit into the pie."*
- *"Case study process helped us walk the walk of collaboration if only for a few hours. Pivotal for the day's dialogues."*
- *"I enjoyed the case study process . . . if the goal of the exercise was to tease out possible ways to collaborate – I got it. Pleasantly surprised that many of the groups had similar approaches."*

Although participants enjoyed the challenge of actually working on a common issue together, they also became acutely aware of the places where this process might break down. Breakdowns can occur around issues like collaboration norms, definitions of oppression, lack of understanding of the types of interventions, and the timing for introducing an intervention into a community change process. Other concerns identified by the participants:

- *"Who is going to lead the proposal, whose organization's name is going on the proposal, who will get the check?"*
- *"If we had gone further, the emphasis on different parts of the strategy is where we would have disagreed."*



- *"How organizations connect with surface issues and how that relates to the distribution of labor among the groups."*
- *"On the front end we saw that there would be some long-term issues about how we stay engaged in the process."*

FINAL THOUGHTS ON THE FORUM

Going into this process of planning the Forum, we were unsure of the degree of tension between groups, but we soon learned that participants were anxious, curious, and excited to finally have this discussion with each other. Many participants became invested in the Forum and wanted to return to their communities and see how similar discussions could occur.

We learned a lot about each other's approaches, although participants probably left with more questions about each other's work. It took a while to dismantle some of the stereotypes that were held about different organizations and/or approaches. Once the trust was built, more time was needed to understand each other's interventions and theories of change. As mentioned earlier, the field lacks comprehensive information about all of the approaches in the spectrum, so some practitioners may be only familiar with three or four at most.

Participants walked away with much more clarity

about the commonalities between each other's work and about their similar visions. As mentioned, the unofficial hierarchy of approaches that places institutional change and community organizing at the very top was felt at the Forum. It played out in the defensiveness shown by some groups and became most apparent when each participant had to choose a cluster. The perceived hierarchy may be considered by some as a standard for the field but it can also be divisive, causing harm to the work's effectiveness.

Although we made much progress in our discussions together and important connections were made, it was also clear that more research and discussion must take place before a how-to booklet to replicate this process can be completed. There was significant interest among participants to follow up on this process by

- *replicating the process locally with organizations that have a history together;*
- *bringing youth who work in race relations and racial justice organizations to participate in a similar process to clarify their perceptions and gain new insights; and*
- *convening another gathering of national organizations that work in different camps to build a strong and enduring infrastructure of collaboration across the spectrum. ●*



Notes

1. People use various terms to encompass the work of many organizations, from "field" to "movement," although some are averse to either term. Some people are concerned that use of the term "field" would "professionalize" the work. Others are concerned that the lack of accountability structures and organizational connections mean we cannot even assume we have a common vision and therefore a genuine "movement." In this publication, we chose to use the term "field" to describe the spectrum of organizations that do this work; it is important to note that NABRE is not advocating for "professionalizing" the field, but rather encouraging accountability among organizations.
2. Patti DeRosa, "Diversity Training: In Search of Anti-Racism" (Peacework No. 240, April 1994) and Elizabeth Lasch-Quinn, *Race Experts: How Racial Etiquette, Sensitivity Training, and New Age Therapy Hijacked the Civil Rights Revolution* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2001).
3. Resources for a National Dialogue on Anti-Racism: For Martin Luther King, Jr. Day 1997 and Beyond (*The Episcopal Church*, 1996).
4. Gary Delgado, Basil R. Browne, and Madeleine Adamson, *Anti-Racist Work: An Examination and Assessment of Organizational Activity* (Oakland: Applied Research Center, 1992).
5. Ilana Shapiro, *Mapping Theories of Practice and Change* (Doctoral Dissertation, Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University, 2002); and Norma Smith, *From Challenging White Supremacy to Managing Diversity: A Preliminary History of Anti-Racist and Diversity Training* (Doctoral Dissertation, The Union Institute Graduate College, 2001).

2.

HOLDING UP THE MIRROR: ORGANIZATION REFLECTION

To-Do List

- Write grant proposal due next Friday.
- Refigure budget based on revenue from fundraising event.
- Write editorial for newspaper on yesterday's article.
- Call board members to seek their support in recruitment activities.
- Attend community center meeting.
- Prepare for presentation for the next coalition meeting.

Sound familiar? And that was yesterday's list; it didn't include the impromptu staff meeting, the one-on-one support to the new secretary, and the trip to the grocery store to pick up the refreshments for an evening meeting. So when do we have time to say, Wait a minute, why are we doing this? What are we accomplishing? And where is the time to do it outside a strategic planning process when so many other decisions are being made like budget, staffing, and funding plans?

We need the physical and mental space, with all of our colleagues present, to think about what are our actual outcomes, what's working, what's not working, and whether it's really making a difference. The importance of this self/organization-reflection process is evident. The issue is typically

not should it be done, but when do we have the time to do it.

The How-To Forum provided an opportunity for each of the participants to go through a self-reflection process, and in many cases, an organizational reflection process. (The actual reflection questions used can be found next in this section.) Obviously, depending on each person's "To-Do" list, every process was different. Some were only able to individually reflect, some talked to a few staffers or board members, and others discussed these reflection questions at a staff meeting or even at a retreat.

A few of the participants at the Forum shared what happened in their organizations when they went through this process. Many shared how imperative it is to understand why we do what we do and to take some time "being the critic" in order to be more effective in the field. Some of these stories are shared in this section.

We encourage you to carve out some time and have staff, board members, and community members go through this process and see what you find out about your work. Let us know how it went, what reflection questions you would change or add, and how it may have helped your organization. Complete the feedback form on the last page or just email us at nabre@jointcenter.org.

The following are the questions given to the Forum participants to prepare for the Forum.



Organization Reflection Questions

Each organization that works on race relations and racial justice issues can be found somewhere on the spectrum of “approaches” or “models.” In an effort to strengthen cooperation and collaboration between and among the organizations whose approaches differ, NABRE has attempted to name and define the various points along the spectrum of approaches.

For the purpose of dialogue and learning, we have clustered the emerging spectrum of approaches under three broadly defined headings. The clusters generally represent the constituencies toward which the approach focuses its work. These clusters are not meant to create static interpretations of racial justice/race relations work; rather, they are offered as a tool for learning and communicating with one another.

The three general clusters of approaches we have identified are:

- *Fostering individual/interpersonal learning and change*
- *Building inclusive leaders and communities that include people of all races*
- *Promoting institutional and cultural change to eradicate systems of racism*

We invite you to consider the reflection questions below privately and with your colleagues. As you discuss questions that relate to your organization’s “approach,” please refer to the broadly defined categories above.

1. *If your approach achieved the “perfect outcome,” what would that be? What would it look like?*

2. *What do you believe are the actual outcomes of your approach? What are the key barriers that can or do prevent your approach from achieving the intended outcomes?*
3. *What are the gaps in your approach? What has your approach not achieved that you believe is achievable?*
4. *What does your approach assume about human nature that informs the types of programs and activities you do? (e.g., People are changeable; people are unchangeable; it’s more important to change attitudes; it’s more important to change behaviors.)*
5. *Does your organization’s approach to racial justice/race relations work view people as individuals, as group members, or as both?*
6. *Do your programs and activities focus on individuals, groups, institutions/systems, or culture? If your approach addresses all four levels, can you approximate the percentage of time your programs focus on each of the four levels?*
7. *What are the primary constituencies your programs and activities are designed to reach? (e.g., youth, civic leaders, elected officials, neighborhood residents, grassroots organizers, etc.) What assumptions or beliefs lead you to emphasize these constituencies?*
8. *When, how and with whom is your approach most effective?*



9. *What does your approach assume about the process of change? (e.g., we must change attitudes before we change behaviors; we must change behaviors and attitudes will follow; we change when it hurts too much not to change; we change because we choose to change; we must experience emotional or psychological pain in order to change; we must experience cognitive dissonance before we change, etc.)*
10. *What does your approach assume about time and progress in learning? (e.g., is learning linear, cyclical, historically-oriented, present-oriented, and future-oriented?)*
11. *What does your approach assume about human learning and activity? Do your programs and activities emphasize "being," "doing," or "becoming?"*
12. *What assumptions does your approach make about people with significant power? People with little power?*
13. *What is the ultimate outcome your programs and activities are designed to achieve?*
14. *How does this outcome contribute to the overall movement toward justice and equality for all people? How does your approach fall short of contributing to the overall movement toward justice and equality?*
15. *How does your approach define oppression? Do you view oppression hierarchically? Are all oppressions equal? Please explain.*
16. *What does your organization do to revolutionize your approach so that it responds to current and future realities?*
17. *Who and what informs your organization's thinking about future goals, priorities and intended outcomes?*



Participants' Thoughts on the Organization Reflection Questions

Most of the participants were able to take the time to complete the organization reflection questionnaire, which significantly helped the Forum's process by participants being prepared to discuss their organization's work. We asked a few participants to share how they used the questionnaire and to respond to all or some of the following questions:

- *How did you use the Reflection questions?*
- *What was the benefit of using these questions?*
- *Would you recommend that other organizations use the questions?*
- *What is the importance of deconstructing what we do and why we do it?*

Melanie Harrington
American Institute for Managing Diversity

We compared, challenged, and explored alternative approaches to complicated issues and walked away with a better insight into our own organizations.

As a nonprofit organization with a public interest and a charitable aim, an organization must constantly assess whether its mission, vision, and approach are making a difference.

A thoughtful review of what we are, why we exist and how we make change is always a valuable exercise.

As the leaders of our organization went through the series of reflection questions, we shared and revisited the concepts that helped to define the way we have chosen to serve the public. Going through a similar set of questions with other organizations during the NABRE How-To Forum was exhilarating. We were able to pull ourselves, for a moment, out of our own worlds and connect with others who are also attempting to "make change." We compared, challenged, and explored alternative approaches to complicated issues and walked away with a better insight into our own organizations.

One of the most compelling exercises at the Forum brought together in groups representatives from different organizations, each group to formulate a plan that would address a case study problem. The organizations had varying approaches to social justice, diversity, managing diversity, anti-racism etc. The groups' attempt to develop a process for meeting the objectives of the exercise helped each participant to realize the unique value that another organization can bring to the work. Moreover, it caused members of the group to explore opportunities for collaboration in ways that probably would not have been considered but for the earlier deconstruction activities.

Jesús Treviño
Arizona State University*

Approximately five years ago, Arizona State University embarked on a journey to create a fully funded, staffed, and comprehensive center on campus that would promote positive intergroup relations and improve the campus climate for diversity. Hence, the ASU Intergroup Relations Center (IRC) was born. On August 1, 2002, the staff of IRC and the ASU community celebrated the five-year anniversary of the creation of the Center. The mission of the Center is to work with faculty, staff, and students in a number of areas: diversity training and awareness; conflict de-escalation; community building; intergroup relations research; advocacy around issues of diversity; and structuring interaction between groups.

After five years of working in the "trenches," I found NABRE's reflection questions timely and very beneficial to examining our work past, present and future. It was an opportunity to ask the hard questions: Are we making a difference through our work? Are we truly making "change" or is our work not change, but merely "more of the same"? Where do we need to change? What do we need to do differently? My staff and I went through the questions debating our responses, challenging our notions of the work; listening to our critics; and examining our original charter and philosophical and theoretical foundations.



Much of our work at ASU challenges students, staff, and faculty to get out of their comfort zone in order to reach new insights about power, oppression, privilege, and other aspects of intergroup relations. Meeting individuals from around the country who are using different approaches and different theoretical and philosophical assumptions was the “mirror” that we needed to push us out of our comfort zone and to reflect on our work at ASU. I was impressed and humbled by the tough work that others are doing around the country to address intergroup relations in a variety of settings.

As a result of this process, we were able to validate some aspects of our own approach. We concluded that some of the strategies being used by others do not fit within the context of our Center and the ASU community. For example, focusing only on racism would be too narrow for us and violate our charge of focusing on the intersection of many other social dimensions—including gender, sexual orientation, religion, nationality and biracialness. We are not opposed to work that focuses only on racial dynamics and we do see the value in it. The point is that our focus is much broader.

On the other hand, we are well aware of the concern that focusing on many dimensions beyond race is used by some to avoid dealing with their racism. I asked my staff to reexamine and strengthen the techniques and exercises that we already use to address this concern (e.g., “owning it”; sitting with your “ism”).

The work of creating awareness of, and change in, intergroup relations is complex, primarily because we are dealing with human social behavior, psychology, and history. In working with complex phenomena, it is crucial that we continuously question and deconstruct our training and educational approaches. The world is constantly in flux and therefore calls for dynamic and changing approaches to diversity training and education. The events of September 11 and their aftermath, for example, have already impacted our training as well as our entire Center. Domestic issues around

race, gender, sexual orientation, and other dimensions that we normally address do not explain “9/11.”

Reexamining our work is also important in order to avoid inadvertent outcomes. For example, focusing on the multiple dimensions (e.g., race, gender, sexual orientation) within the context of training might negatively impact college and university services for ethnic/racial minorities. That is, administrators, faculty, and staff may conclude that those services are not valuable or needed because of the emphasis on many different groups. In reality, it is not a replacement, not one approach versus the other. Rather, it is both approaches.

*Note: Jesús Treviño, Ph.D. was ASU’s representative at the How-To Forum and has taken a new position as Associate Provost for Multicultural Affairs at the University of Denver.

Saadia Williams Knoxville Project Change

Knoxville Project Change (KPC) is a multicultural, multiracial organization, and I intentionally reached out to members of our board with this in mind to explore the questions. I selected one white and two black members. The questions provided us the opportunity to do several things. First, they provided us with a very structured way in which to examine our approach to the

I found NABRE's reflection questions timely and very beneficial to examining our work past, present and future. It was an opportunity to ask the hard questions: Are we making a difference through our work? Are we truly making "change" or is our work not change, but merely "more of the same"? Where do we need to change?

I'd recommend that other organizations, especially those in the same locale, use the questions as a means for continued self-reflection and growth, to increase their knowledge of work in the field, to explore best practices either within their own cluster of work or from other clusters, to stay connected with one another, and to look for collaborative opportunities.



work in our community. Secondly, they invited us to explore our own level of understanding about our approach. Thirdly, they afforded us the opportunity to share in a deeper, more meaningful way our personal experiences and perspectives on the issue. Fourthly, they enabled us to recognize that other approaches to the work exist. In many ways the dialogue generated from the exploration was synergistic, cooperative, respectful, and mutually beneficial.

The questions provided us with a way of connecting with each other, sharing knowledge, and building relationships. We also were able to gain mutual insights and observe differences in our approaches. Where differences existed the questions gave us the chance to clarify our own level of understanding. The questions caused me to pause and reflect upon whether any biases toward a particular cluster were warranted. And again, I paused after being brought face to face with practitioners from other organizations that embrace other approaches.

In my opinion, the importance of deconstructing what we do and why we do it is for evaluative and funding purposes. Moreover it is a well recognized fact that in this field we lack cohesiveness, and that this disconnect needs to be addressed. Also doing this affords us the opportunity to examine the field as a

An important outcome of this exercise was helping us understand how and where we fit into the spectrum of race work.... By deconstructing what we do, our staff can more clearly explain our role, thus making local decisions more productive.

whole, assess what work needs to be done to ensure its growth, and reduce duplicative efforts. Lastly, if we can demonstrate to the funding community that we as practitioners in fact understand the various types of approaches regarding broad issues of race relations, racial justice and social change, and that we know when and how to strategically apply these methodologies in a collaborative manner with organizations that work differently, we will be in a stronger position to not only advocate on behalf of our

field of work, but to strengthen the infrastructure, creating more opportunities (funding) to further the work.

John Landesman, Study Circles Resource Center

To be honest, when I first received the reflection questions I started getting that sinking feeling. I had about a dozen phone calls to return, emails that I hadn't yet read, reports to complete, and the last thing I had time for was two pages of academic questions about what we do and why. But, I had committed to attending the conference and knew I needed to complete the assignment. I'm glad I did.

Reflecting on the questions and working through answers with my colleagues turned out to be a very worthwhile use of our time. Most of us have too much to do to contemplate how and why we do it. But, at Study Circles Resource Center our job is to teach local people how to organize, when and why to use this process, and how to explain it to others in their community. Taking a fresh look at our work makes us better at what we do.

I sent the questions out to the whole staff to review, and invited staff at all levels to send me their comments. I then spent time answering the questions for myself: *When, how and with whom is your approach most effective? What does your approach assume about the process of change? What is the ultimate outcome your programs and activities are designed to achieve?* These are the kinds of questions we deal with every day, yet rarely have the opportunity to talk about among staff.

Several members of the staff emailed me answers to the questions they thought most important. Three of us talked together about all the questions and answers. Most useful were the questions where we had different answers from one another. Discussing them together helped us think deeper about the issues and clarify our thoughts. After the How-To Forum, the whole Community Assistance team met to review the questions together. Again, this helped all of us become clearer about what we do and why.



An important outcome of this exercise was helping us understand how and where we fit into the spectrum of race work. We tell local and regional leaders that study circles address one aspect of the work. While effective, study circles obviously cannot solve all the problems. By deconstructing what we do, our staff can more clearly explain our role, thus making local decisions more productive.

Most organizations that participated in the How-To Forum – or that will be reading this publication – are staffed by committed, hardworking individuals who care deeply about the effects of race on our country and neighbors. Yet quick change and direct outcomes are often difficult to measure. Taking time out to reflect and deconstruct helps organizations gauge if they are meeting their goals, understand whether or not their assumptions are still relevant, and clarify their roles in an ever changing environment.

Most of us at the How-To Forum recognized that each of us works on different aspects of race and uses different methods. We also realized, however, that we all have the same long-term goal. We need to know how each of us fits into the spectrum of this work so that we can better help the outside world that often feels confused about our collective work. Better understanding these questions helps all of us accomplish our goals. ●



- Complete form on last page or
- email nabre@jointcenter.org



3.

THE RACE RELATIONS AND RACIAL JUSTICE SPECTRUM OF APPROACHES

This is an overview of nine race relations and racial justice approaches. These thumbnail sketches, which illustrate what each approach seeks to accomplish, are supported by a comparative chart whose concept was originally created by Dr. Ilana Shapiro in her doctoral dissertation, “Mapping Theories of Practice and Change: A Comparative Analysis of Interventions and Programs Addressing Racial and Ethnic Tension in U.S. Communities.”⁶ The following list of approaches is a work in progress and may look much different after more discussion and debate. In assembling this list I benefited from reviews by several people. The fact that their advice was sometimes conflicting only reiterates the ongoing need to have these discussions with one another.

The descriptions are not meant to box organizations into a particular type of approach but, rather, are offered to improve clarity in our work and to begin to create a common language for describing it. For each approach, the “best of” was held up as a model for that description. You will probably find your own work represented in a few different approaches. There is much overlap between the approaches. Some of this is due to collaboration or cross-pollination of the work, and some due to approaches that are outgrowths of other approaches. It may be surprising that some approaches that have different strands are being grouped together. These strands were grouped if they were connected by a theory, or by a similar worldview or problem-framing. Also, you will see the same interventions mentioned throughout the different approaches, such as dialogue, training, and community organizing. Though these commonalities exist, by delving further into an approach

you can see why a particular intervention is being used based on the approach’s intervention framing.

After these descriptions, the comparative chart follows. There are two sections that describe each approach’s strengths and limitations. They are based on a review of the literature and comments from practitioners. *The strengths and limitation sections are the most crucial in thinking about working interdependently.* Understanding our complementary overlaps and the limitations of different approaches can help us think through ways to work interdependently and when to reach out to our colleagues for their approach on a community issue.

NABRE invites you to provide us with feedback on these descriptions. Tell us what approach you think is missing or share your concern over why an approach is included or create a different description for your approach. In order for us to continue to improve our effectiveness and to understand our differences regarding how and why we do this work, we must create our own learning laboratory to dialogue, to challenge, to assess, and to create an accountability amongst ourselves. These descriptions are shared in the hopes it will promote reflection and discussion.

ANTI-RACISM

The Anti-Racism approach views issues of prejudice and diversity through the lens of racism. In this context, racism is defined as a *system* of disadvantage for people of color supported by a system of advantage for the privileged group – whites.



The Anti-Racism approach views white privilege or “unearned privilege” around which all racist systems revolve and internalized oppression (internalizing the ideology of white supremacy) as two key corollaries of its analysis. Anti-Racism work embraces individual change in the service of meeting its goal – changing social and institutional systems.

Practitioners who use this approach focus on assessing social and organizational systems to identify how they support white privilege and perpetuate racist values, practices, and assumptions.⁷ Then they seek to implement strategies that dismantle racist structures and replace them with equitable, just, and racially and culturally inclusive practices, and policies. Some of the interventions used are race caucuses, awareness building, experiential exercises, coalition building, community organizing, and change agent skill-building.

Some organizations within this category take their analysis a step further by viewing racism as a historical and contemporary global system (of economic, geopolitical, and social policies) rooted in the myth of white superiority. These groups mostly work in race caucuses and describe their work as Anti-White Supremacy. Other organizations utilize this same approach within a broader analysis, and work on issues of other targeted and privileged groups – this is typically referred to as Anti-Oppression. Though the Anti-Racism analysis makes clear connections with all forms of oppression, one of the ongoing debates by practitioners within this approach as well as in others, is whether racism itself is at the top of the hierarchy of oppression in the United States.

Over the years, the term Anti-Racism has become something of a catch-all when speaking about racial justice work. Some organizations introduce white privilege and internalized racism as part of their work but do not build on it with their organization and community change processes. Horace Seldon, founder of Community Change in Boston, MA, emphasized this point further: “Organizations that call themselves anti-racist must include sustained action to change a system, policy, or institution, and be committed to multi-racial efforts.”⁸

CIVIL RIGHTS ADVOCACY AND ANTI-DISCRIMINATION

Civil rights history is rich with organizations, leaders, and actions taken to fight for equity and justice. Its interventions have evolved over the years, as attacks on civil rights in this country have continued. Organizations that use this approach work to create new laws and better policies that support equal rights and justice, monitor organizations’ compliance, increase individuals’ awareness of laws, and educate the public on barriers of access for people of color and other identity groups.⁹

This approach specifically rests on the achievements of the civil rights movement and addresses the legal and civil rights barriers that still exist. The civil rights movement has been described as reminding Americans “of their commitment to true egalitarianism (and as a movement that has) posited a universal standard of conduct, and placed in the forefront of public interest the quality of democratic civic life. It rested on historical truths about America’s pluralism and its racial crimes. It rested on moral truths about harmony and justice.”¹⁰ Organizations that were a part of that legacy and new ones that have evolved from the movement continue to use this as their context for accomplishing their work.

Organizations using the Civil Rights Advocacy and Anti-Discrimination approach are diverse in their level of interventions. Some focus on legal compliance and education about current law and policies. Others advocate for better policies and laws and focus on structural change for increased access, equity, and the elimination of barriers and the racialization of policy issues (e.g. health care, education, housing). Their interventions can range from EEO and anti-harassment training and compliance monitoring to community organizing, public policy advocacy and development, litigation, protests, coalition building, and direct political activism. Some organizations also are using technology to mobilize individuals around a particular issue, like protesting judicial appointments.



COMMUNITY BUILDING

Community Building applies a systems approach to supporting self-determination and improved outcomes for residents of neighborhoods and communities. Typically, community-based organizations work with government, schools, and other institutions to identify targets for change, create joint plans, and implement strategies designed to build the capacity of neighborhood organizations, resident groups, and leaders. Racial equity and issues of inclusion always arise in this work, though they are not always addressed explicitly.¹¹

In this approach, community builders deal with power and race every day in their work, yet they are in an early stage of integrating it into their work. They are currently addressing a paradox which was described in one research study of community building this way: "We found on one hand, a high level of consciousness and concern about the strength of power elites in the U.S. and globally, and about the perpetuation of racist attitudes and the ways in which those individual attitudes translate into actions at the community, institutional, and political levels. On the other hand, community initiatives that are typically concentrated in metropolitan communities of color are with rare exception described as very quiet on these topics."¹²

Within this approach there are several expected outcomes: relationships are built between institutions and power brokers, individual skills are enhanced, and policy change is initiated for sustainable institutional change. The interventions used can include leadership development for community members and civic officials, community organizing, coalition building, skills training, and discussions about internalized racism.

One of the developments in this approach in the late 1980s was the creation of comprehensive community initiatives (CCI), which are place-based initiatives that require collaboration from different sectors in the community. These initiatives are described by Cornelia Swinson, who was the first director of the Rebuilding Communities Initiative at the Germantown Settlement in Philadelphia: "It's

about how a neighborhood integrates and manages those issues, and it's about building and maintaining relationships to transform the way a community works. It's about finding sustainable solutions to problems of chronic poverty, neglect, and disenfranchisement by developing the capacity of the neighborhood's most valuable resources – the skills and strength of those who call it home."¹³

CONFLICT RESOLUTION

This approach described here focuses on resolving conflicts and tensions in communities rather than interpersonal conflicts. Racism is viewed as a latent conflict. One intervention model commonly used in racial and ethnic conflicts is interactive problem-solving. This model "begins with an analysis of the political needs and fears of each of the parties and a discussion of the constraints faced by each side that make it difficult to reach mutually beneficial solutions to the conflict."¹⁴ The goals of this type of intervention include:

- *Learning to solve the problem jointly rather than as a fight to be won;*
- *Improving openness, communication, and intergroup expectancies;*
- *Reducing misperceptions and destructive patterns of interaction;*
- *Building a sustainable working relationship between the parties.¹⁵*

It is important in this process to bring all parties together to surface the issues and multiple perspectives and build on shared interests to resolve the problem.

This approach is sometimes viewed as value-neutral, and therefore some may challenge its place in the spectrum of approaches on race relations and racial justice. But a closer look at the field shows that there are strong beliefs among its practitioners on "how to improve the world we live in and about



how people ought to relate to each other . . . A true adherence and commitment to democracy, personal empowerment, and social justice . . .”¹⁶ An emerging concern within this approach is to address the value-neutral critique and discuss the role power and cultural dynamics play in conflict and the need to update processes to respond to these dynamics.

This method is not limited to offering mediation and resolving disputes through a small group of professional facilitators and mediators. It has a strong commitment to providing opportunities for training – developing problem-solving, negotiation, and communication skills, training facilitators, and working with youth to understand alternatives to conflict. Its aims are broad, to be a “vehicle for transforming citizenry, communities, and the private and public institutions of contemporary democratic society.”¹⁷ The conflict resolution field uses many different types of interventions: alternative dispute resolution, arbitration, conciliation, consensus-building, facilitation, mediation-arbitration, mini-trial, negotiation, ombudsmanship, adjudication, and visioning.¹⁸

DEMOCRACY BUILDING

A popular intervention of this approach was put in the spotlight by President Clinton’s Initiative on Race. Intergroup dialogue became an important vehicle to increase individual awareness of the complexities of racial issues, work on intergroup tensions and community problems, and affirm the importance of diversity issues to meet the larger goal of deliberative democracy. This method goes beyond dialogue and engages citizens to become involved in the civic structure. Creating empowered citizens is described by Paul Martin Dubois and Jonathan Huston in *Bridging the Racial Divide: a Report on the Interracial Dialogue in America* as follows: “It is a positive effort on the part of the citizenry to take initiative and responsibility for talking about building a just, multicultural society.”¹⁹

Interventions used by organizations with the Democracy Building approach vary from intergroup dialogue, public forums, deliberative public processes, leadership development, skill building, community visioning, to coalition building. Each of these interventions works toward a similar end of engaging citizens, identifying common ground and community assets, and developing a joint action to create a new civic infrastructure that may help in addressing future community issues. The foundation of the work is the belief that if citizens have appropriate public forums and intergroup dialogue skills then they will recognize their interdependence and find cooperative ways to address common concerns.²⁰

After the 1992 civil unrest, Henry Cisneros, who was just nominated to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, spoke about the importance of democracy building at a national conference in Los Angeles. “The truth is we are going to have to do some things differently,” he said. “In the age of diversity, we will have to govern differently. We will have to build communities differently. It means using the institutions of government, the structures and facilities of government to bring people together. . . . Schools, libraries, cable television stations, voter registration efforts, all of them must be redesigned to give people a place to gather, to speak, to have voices heard, to come together. Government accountability must include an assessment of whether or not it is being sufficiently inclusive, not just efficient but inclusive.”²¹

INTERGROUP RELATIONS AND EDUCATION

Intergroup relations programs can vary. Some programs use didactic interventions (cognitive, verbal, and intellectual types of training), while others use interactive interventions (action oriented and experience-based training).²² In this approach there are three strands: Valuing Differences, Intercultural Training/Cultural Competency, and Multicultural Education. They are grouped together because they share a common theory – contact theory. Contact theory has been revised over the years but



is based on the concept, "prejudice may be reduced by equal-status contact between majority and minority groups in the pursuit of common goals. The effect is greatly enhanced if this contact is sanctioned by institutional supports and if it is of the sort that leads to the perception of common interest and common humanity between members of two groups."²³ Though these three strands have taken the contact theory in different directions, this commonality merges them.

Valuing Differences defines diversity in its broadest parameters and includes not only the basic identity groups but also one's life experiences. Interventions include "celebrating diversity" events, experiential projects, and presentations, so participants will have "a greater understanding of exactly who we are – culturally, demographically, and ethnographically . . ."²⁴ There are two outcomes described for this strand: each person is seen and appreciated for one's assets and uniqueness and relationships are created and maintained between people who are different.

Another strand is Intercultural or Cross-Cultural Training which seeks to create an intercultural mind-set and skill-set through coordinating knowledge, attitude, and behavior in a sequential curriculum in order for development to occur.²⁵ One of the newer offshoots of this intervention is Cultural Competence, which focuses on individual change but also establishing new institutional standards. "Cultural competence is the integration and transformation of knowledge about individuals and groups of people into specific standards, policies, practices, and attitudes used in appropriate cultural settings to increase the quality of services; thereby producing better outcomes."²⁶

Multicultural education programs which are predominantly found in primary and secondary schools but also in higher education, are described as having a "transformative, action-oriented curriculum . . . best implemented when students examine different types of knowledge in a democratic classroom where they can freely examine their perspectives and moral commitments."²⁷

MANAGING DIVERSITY

The basic definition for the Managing Diversity approach is "a comprehensive managerial process for developing an environment that works for all employees."²⁸ Though it includes individual and interpersonal interventions, its focus is requiring "a fundamental change in the corporation's way of life."²⁹ Managing Diversity defines diversity broadly and operates on the assumption that human differences are good and need to be leveraged to make best use of people in the workplace.

Typically, interventions in this approach are directed toward individuals who have managerial responsibility. Frequently, managers are trained to facilitate, negotiate, and mediate employee interactions to ensure that personal differences, insofar as they benefit the organization's larger goals, are expressed in positive, respectful, and productive ways.³⁰ The Managing Diversity approach advocates the use of employee support groups and networks as vehicles for expressing difference and communicating specific employee needs in the work setting. Its belief is that change is a two-way street and requires mutual adaptation by the organization and the individual.

Some organizations just focus on the individual and interpersonal interventions of the Managing Diversity approach, while others assess organizational systems, practices, and behaviors in an effort to embrace value and manage diversity throughout the entire organizational structure. One corporation that has been held up as being furthest along on the path of equity,³¹ South African Breweries,³² describes its process as "a holistic, comprehensive strategy that attempts to align employment equity and the management of diversity with all of the other aspects of people management in the organization. . . . [it] is not [a] half-hearted series of adhoc interventions 'tacked' on to the human resources function. Rather, it is the philosophy and process on which all other people management policies and procedures rest and by which they are assessed."³³



PREJUDICE REDUCTION

The Prejudice Reduction approach is grounded in the assumption that prejudice is learned beliefs and attitudes that affect behavior. Logically, if prejudice is a learned behavior, it can be unlearned. Though other approaches may have this same belief, this approach's actual focal point is on unlearning prejudice by helping individuals to understand how stereotypes, misinformation, and generalized personal experiences (e.g., "what happens to me happens to everyone who looks like me") can lock prejudicial thinking into place.

The Prejudice Reduction approach often employs processes for healing the pain of prejudice and acknowledges that such pain is present for the person who expresses prejudice, the person who receives prejudice, and the person who observes the prejudicial experience of another.³⁴ Discharging these emotional wounds empowers people to respond to act against oppression and build compassion among group members, which can lead to future alliances.

Part of this process is sharing stories about negative experiences of prejudice and oppression as well as stories of pride about the identity groups one belongs to in life. One way to address a negative experience is by illuminating the fallacies of generalized experience. Those who use the Prejudice Reduction approach use several types of interventions apart from caucuses and workshops including learning how to be an ally, forming intergroup coalitions, skill building, and leadership development.

Through skill building, participants learn how to redirect prejudicial habits of thinking and behaving and then learn how to encourage others to do the same. Learners are encouraged to "break the cycle of socialization" by relearning accurate information, rejecting stereotypes, and refusing to spread misinformation to others.³⁵ This approach focuses on the individual but with the intent of producing institutional change. The belief is that institutions are made up of people and groups and by building a critical mass of informed, aware and skillful leaders, change will happen.

RACIAL RECONCILIATION AND HEALING

This approach views racism as a "spiritual disease" with which people of all races are infected. Racial healing, therefore, involves a moral and spiritual process. This approach links personal transformation to societal change. It works to move beyond the paradigm of victims and victimizers, allies and enemies. It involves working with all sectors of the community in acknowledging shared history through honest, respectful, and inclusive telling of everyone's story.

One of the major themes of this approach, as with others, is developing unexpected and creative partnerships that can eventually transcend barriers of race, religion, economics, and politics. It calls everyone to take responsibility for building a common future.³⁶ Typically there are three steps to this process, "First, everyone with a stake in new community relationships must be invited to the table and be actively encouraged to participate in the process of transformation. Second, there must be honest acknowledgement of shared racial history. This can lead to forgiveness and a new level of understanding, so that all can work for change. And third, each individual must take personal responsibility for the change process."³⁷ Interventions include dialogue, public forums on history, and experiential exercises.

The intended outcome of acknowledging and repenting of past wrongdoings and of building relationships is for different identity groups to come together to work on community issues. The process of reconciliation can be challenging and is summed up this way by Michael Ignatieff, the author of *The Warrior's Honor*: "Reconciliation means breaking the spiral of intergenerational vengeance. It means substituting the vicious downward spiral of violence with the virtuous upward spiral of mutually reinforcing respect. Reconciliation can stop the cycle of vengeance only if it can equal vengeance as a form of respect for the dead. Without an apology, without recognition of what happened, the past cannot return to its place as the past."³⁸



- Complete form on last page or
- email nabre@jointcenter.org



Notes

6. Shapiro, Mapping Theories of Practice and Change. (Note: Dr. Shapiro welcomes inquiries about her research and may be contacted by email at ilana.shapiro@conflicttransformation.org.)
7. Tammy Bormann, An Organizational Framework for The Network of Alliances Bridging Race and Ethnicity (unpublished NABRE draft document), p. 6.
8. Horace Seldon, quoted in DeRosa, Diversity Training, p.4.
9. Compliance organizations and civil rights advocacy organizations may not seem appropriately linked together at first glance, but each type conducts its work through a legal/justice rubric.
10. Lasch-Quinn, Race Experts, p. xv.
11. Thank you to Sally Leiderman of the Center for Assessment and Policy Development, for providing guidance and language in describing the Community Building approach.
12. Rebecca Stone and Benjamin Butler. Exploring Power and Race (Chicago: Chapin Hall Center for Children, 2000), pp. 119-120.
13. Winton Pitcoff, Shelterforce Special Report — Comprehensive Community Initiatives — Redefining Community Development. (Orange, New Jersey: National Housing Institute, 1999), p. 31.
14. Susan Cross, "Three Models of Conflict Resolution: Effects of Intergroup Expectancies and Attitudes" (*Journal of Social Issues*, Fall 1999), p. 5.
15. Cross, "Three Models of Conflict Resolution," p. 5.
16. Kevin Avruch, Peter W. Black, and Joseph Scimecca, Conflict Resolution: Cross-Cultural Perspectives (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991), p. 248.
17. E. Franklin Dukes, Resolving Public Conflict: Transforming Community and Governance (New York: Manchester University Press, 1996), p. 7.
18. Thank you to Ilana Shapiro for providing guidance on describing the Conflict Resolution approach.
19. Paul Martin Du Bois and Jonathan Hutson, Bridging the Racial Divide: A Report on the Interracial Dialogue in America (Brattleboro, Vt.: Center for Living Democracy, 1997).
20. Thank you to Martha McCoy and Ilana Shapiro for providing guidance and language on the Democracy Building approach.
21. Henry G. Cisneros, "Social Contract for the Year 2000: Diversity as an Asset" (keynote speech to the National Civic League's 98th National Conference on Diversity, November 13, 1992 in Los Angeles, CA).
22. Walter G. Stephan and Cookie White Stephan, Improving Intergroup Relations (Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 2001). p. 16.
23. G. W. Allport, The Nature of Prejudice. (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1954), p. 267.
24. Lewis Brown Griggs and Lente-Louise Louw, editors, Valuing Diversity: New Tools for a New Reality (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1995), p. 8.
25. Janet M. Bennett and Milton J. Bennett, Ph.D., Perspective on Diversity, Developing Intercultural Sensitivity: An Integrative Approach to Global and Domestic Diversity (paper presented at the Diversity Symposium 2001 at Bentley College, Waltham, MA), p. 6.
26. Mark A. King, Anthony Sims, and David Osher, "How is Cultural Competence Integrated in Education?" From the web site, http://cecp.air.org/cultural/Q_integrated.htm, accessed August 2002.
27. James A. Banks, editor. Multicultural Education Transformative Knowledge and Action: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives (New York: Teachers College Press, 1996), p. 5.
28. R. Roosevelt Thomas Jr., Beyond Race and Gender (New York: AMACOM, 1991), p.10.
29. Thomas, **Beyond Race and Gender**, p. 12.
30. Bormann, "An Organizational Framework for The Network of Alliances Bridging Race and Ethnicity," p.4.
31. Linda Human, Steve Bluen, and Richard Davies. Baking a New Cake: How to Succeed at Employment Equity (Randburg, South Africa: Knowledge Resources Ltd., 1999), p.147.
32. This designation was given prior to the merger between South African Breweries and Miller Brewing Company.
33. Human, Bluen, and Davies, Baking a New Cake, p. 146.
34. Bormann, "An Organizational Framework for The Network of Alliances Bridging Race and Ethnicity," p.4.
35. The cycle of socialization was created by Bobbi Harro and is described in Maurianne Adams, et al, editors, Readings for Diversity and Social Justice (New York: Routledge, 2000), pp. 15-21.
36. Bormann, "An Organizational Framework for The Network of Alliances Bridging Race and Ethnicity," p. 5.
37. Karen Elliott Greisdorf, "The City that Dares to Talk" (For A Change, Feb./March 2002), p. 5.
38. As quoted in Michael Henderson, Forgiveness: Breaking the Chain of Hate (Wilsonville, Oregon: BookPartners, 2000), p. 15.





chart



4.

CLUSTERS OF APPROACHES: INDIVIDUAL, INTERGROUP, INSTITUTIONAL

As mentioned earlier in the Overview, the Forum participants were asked to choose a cluster of approaches based on those we studied. Though it was a challenging exercise for some, it proved to be helpful in understanding the clusters' differences, similarities, and outcomes. Based on the discussions at the Forum and afterwards, the three clusters were redefined as follows:

- *Provide individual and/or interpersonal awareness.*
- *Develop intergroup relationships.*
- *Promote institutional change.*

Organizations find themselves working in all three clusters at different points in time, but for the most part, the approach of a given organization is centered on a single cluster. It can be very difficult for one organization to do all of the above well at the same time. The cluster discussion was an opportunity to see how our organizations fit together in the bigger picture and to discuss how we can leverage each other's work in ways that benefit all of our goals and meet the needs of the community in which we work.

Participants spent time at the Forum meeting with other organizations that self-identified as part of the same cluster, in order to discuss both what they did have in common and how they differed and to listen to each other's outcomes. The chart that follows is based on these discussions and a review of the Organization Reflection questionnaire completed by each participant.

The framework of these three clusters will help in the planning of how organizations can work together on community issues. NABRE continues to explore how to introduce different interventions into a community change process and believes that it is important to seek answers to the following questions—

- *How does an organization know when to introduce a particular approach in a community change process? What needs to be present in a community for an approach to be effective?*
- *If each of these clusters of work is present in a community and working collaboratively, will a more significant level of change occur in that community?*
- *Do we need to change the way we assess a community issue so we can learn when and how to phase in different approaches/clusters?*

The second chart in this section, created by Ilana Shapiro as part of her dissertation, provides a thoughtful analysis of the three clusters, which she labels as, *Individual, Intergroup, and Structural*. ●



	CLUSTER ONE: Provide individual and/or interpersonal awareness	CLUSTER TWO: Develop intergroup relationships	CLUSTER THREE: Promote institutional change
SIMILARITIES AMONG ORGANIZATIONS WITHIN EACH CLUSTER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Develop individual competencies, awareness, knowledge and skills. ■ Focus on both individual and organizational development. ■ Believe in the need to meet people where they are and pace the work of individual change. ■ Believe that people are changeable – can learn and unlearn. ■ Believe that oppression is not hierarchical. ■ Believe in developing teams to bring about institutional change. ■ Build a critical mass of people concerned, aware, and skilled on the issues. ■ Work at changing attitudes with the expectation that behavioral change will follow. ■ Focus on skill building to increase people's effectiveness. ■ Emphasize the significance of individuals in creating change, reminding people about their own power. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Include personal reflection about their identity prior to discussing being a change agent or ally. ■ Experience similar challenges in monitoring and supporting people who use their curriculum and materials. ■ Agree on the importance of measuring outcomes. ■ Believe changing behaviors effectively will lead to making change on larger issues. ■ Prepare people to be change agents and hold up models for them. ■ Believe in working with people in power as well as with those currently without power. ■ Focus on racism first in the list of "isms" [a majority voted for this point]. ■ Recognize the need for allies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Operate from an understanding that we respect people/constituencies we serve and the organizations built by the people. ■ Believe that people are capable of change. ■ Emphasize the importance of being accountable to constituencies. ■ Stress the importance of measuring change on the community level. ■ Create and sustain actions in the long term. ■ Recognize the importance of structural changes within one's own organization to practice what we preach. ■ Believe real, organized action is indicator of success. ■ Emphasize a clear powerbase of people regardless of funding. ■ Involve oppressed people throughout the entire process. ■ Measure outcomes in relation to institutional change. ■ Meet people where they are and be conscious of the various points of entry.

* This chart reflects a discussion of the similarities, differences, and outcomes by the How-To Forum participants in each of the three clusters, as well as the Organization Reflection questionnaire completed by participants. The list represents a limited discussion and does not reflect full consensus amongst each cluster but rather the experiences, perspectives, and insights of a group of practitioners and activists.



	CLUSTER ONE: Provide individual and interpersonal awareness	CLUSTER TWO: Develop intergroup relationships	CLUSTER THREE: Promote institutional change
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONS WITHIN EACH CLUSTER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Approach increasing the capacity of organizations and skill building in different ways. ■ Use different language and terminology. ■ Apply different theories in each approach. ■ Employ different strategies e.g. long-term strategies vs. immediate-outcomes interventions. ■ Draw on different audiences for their work. ■ Work differently at the level of changing hearts vs. changing behaviors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Apply different theories in their work and intervene at different points in the change process. ■ Use different language and terminology. ■ Hold different beliefs and assumptions in doing the work. ■ Employ different strategies to engage major institutions in the community to effect change. ■ Connect differently with the work—some through a healing and spirituality connection, others through a racism and prejudice lens. ■ Draw on different audiences—some work with all different types of identity groups and others focus only on racial and ethnic groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Use different strategies e.g. confrontational intervention vs. proactive approach; and engage large stakeholders with power vs. investing in people who are oppressed. ■ Invest different levels of resources to follow-up with constituencies. ■ View conflict differently e.g., race-based vs. identity-based. ■ Begin working with a community differently e.g., using a set analysis and response vs. being responsive to community needs. ■ Employ different methods for accumulating resources to facilitate institutional change.
OUTCOMES OF ORGANIZATIONS BY CLUSTER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Increase participants' skills in designing interventions and knowing what questions to ask. ■ Deal with tension constructively. ■ Engage participants so that after a program they want to do this work or are renewed to do it. ■ Promote individuals believing in their relevance and significance to create change and broaden the concept of "we." ■ Increase capacity to value suffering of anyone's experience. ■ Acknowledge that everyone has been hurt by racism. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Develop diverse self-sustaining teams to promote community inclusiveness across sectors. ■ Create allies to speak out for a group they don't belong to. ■ Bring key and diverse folks to the table. ■ Build individuals to be inclusive leaders and change agents. ■ Create action plans with groups for long-term change. ■ Establish cooperative processes based on principles. ■ Show evidence of deeply changed lives in terms of attitudes and behaviors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Develop and sustain a community based accountability framework. ■ Discuss user friendly anti-racism framework and disseminate it at multiple levels. ■ Build organizational capacity to apply and sustain in day-to-day operations an overall vision of change. ■ Move beyond training organizations to providing technical assistance. ■ Accept, apply, sustain anti-racism approach. ■ Change how we articulate issues and do this in measurable terms.



Clusters: Level of Analysis Created by Ilana Shapiro¹			
	INDIVIDUAL	INTERGROUP	STRUCTURAL
FOCUS OF ANALYSIS	Individual attitudes, assumptions, identities, feelings, and behaviors	Racial, ethnic, and cultural group relations	Systemic oppression in institutions, policies, and practices
ISSUES	Prejudice, bias, stereotype, bigotry; internalized oppression/privilege; resistance and defenses; feelings of anger, guilt, fear, etc.; individual racism	In-groups/out-groups; group separation and polarization; community conflict; diversity, leadership; ethnocentrism, cultural racism	Racial privilege/oppression; racial disparity, stratification; disenfranchisement, injustice; institutional and structural racism
THEORY AND RESEARCH TRADITIONS	Psychology, Counseling	Social Psychology, Cultural Studies	Sociology, History, Political Theory, Macro-Economics
THEORIES OF CHANGES	Individual Change: Introspection and education Social Change: Individual influence within personal and professional spheres; critical mass of transformed individuals	Intergroup Change: Small group contact; sharing personal stories and experiences Social Change: Respectful, trusting relationships; cooperative networks, alliances and coalitions	Social Change: Community organizing, activism and advocacy; common analytic framework for change; united social movements; institutional and policy change
INTENDED OUTCOMES	Personal awareness and healing; new interpersonal skills and behaviors; individual cognitive, emotional, and behavioral transformation	Appreciate differences; recognize common ground; improved communication; cooperative planning and problem-solving; accountable leadership; participation; inclusion	Accountable institutions; self-determination in communities of color; equity, justice, access and opportunity; integrated communities

¹ Ilana Shapiro, Mapping Theories of Practice and Change: Comparative Analysis of Programs Addressing Racial and Ethnic Tensions in U.S. Communities. (Doctoral Dissertation, George Mason University) 2002, Figure 5.4.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: SPECTRUM OF RACE

	<i>Anti-Racism</i> *	<i>Civil Rights Advocacy & Anti-Discrimination</i>	<i>Community Building</i>	<i>Conflict Resolution</i> *
Key Words	Racial oppression, white privilege, power, social justice, internalized racism	Discrimination, employment, equity, compliance, legal rights, monitoring, justice, barriers	Social capital, capacity building, institutional change, place-based, families	Conflict analysis, cooperation, communication, problem-solving
Problem Framing	People act within and sustain a whole system that gives power and privilege to whites and denies the same to people of color.	If laws and civil rights are being reversed and inequitable policies are being created, and organizations are not complying with current law, than a just society will not be created for all people.	Neighborhoods are distressed because of disinvestment by banks, governments, etc., and sometimes the lack of organized efforts by residents to continually fight for community improvement given few lasting successes.	Many communities are paralyzed by racial and ethnic tensions. Existing U.S. conflict resolution mechanisms are inadequate for dealing with these deep-rooted, long-standing racial and intergroup conflicts.
Intervention Framing	Provide analytical framework for examining systemic forces at work in the community (cultural, economic, institutional, political, etc.).	Create new laws, policies, and regulations that help to remove barriers in all sectors of society. Keep organizations accountable and increase people's awareness of the barriers that still exist.	Build citizen & organization capacity to solve problems in neighborhoods by self-determination and organizing. Form new relationships, increase citizen engagement, and create new systems through policy changes.	Promote creative/alternative ways of thinking about the problems and practical processes and skills for collaborative problem-solving.
Worldview**	"The world is controlled by powerful systems with historically traceable roots. Once people are shown how they benefit from or are battered by those systems, they can work together to change the systems."	"The world is filled with barriers to access for people of color in all aspects of society. Equitable laws and policies need to be created. By monitoring organizations, fighting for changes, and educating others, the world will become a more equitable place for all."	"The world is filled with systemic disinvestments in places which create poor living conditions and despair among some residents. Through reinvestment, new relationships, and institutional change, better places for families to live can be created."	"The world is filled with people stuck in their ways of dealing with racial and ethnic tensions. When people come together and identify their underlying interests and needs, they can creatively solve their common and separate problems."
Theoretical Traditions	Sociology, political science, history, liberation theory	Law, political science, public policy	Sociology, community development, planning, social work	Political science, social psychology, negotiation, management
Methods	Analytical framework for understanding structures of privilege and oppression combined with community organizing and training.	Carry out advocacy and public policy work to change laws and policies to eliminate barriers. Create political pressure through strategies and protest. Increase the public's knowledge of barriers to access.	Provide skill building; leadership development, community organizing, policy and institutional change processes.	Provide skills training in communication, negotiation, and problem-solving. Identify stakeholders' needs and interests. Develop processes for cooperative interaction and joint problem-solving.

* This chart is based on Ilana Shapiro's original work. Single-asterisked columns here closely follow her writing in *Training for Racial Equity Programs* (New York: The A

** World View quotations in the *Prejudice Reduction* and *Anti-Racism* columns are reproduced from J.M. Shearer, "Race Relations: Three Paradigms" (Conciliation Quarterly 1970)

*** Special thanks to Ilana Shapiro for providing the language in the *Democracy Building* column for *Worldview*, *Methods*, and *Intended Effects*.

RELATIONS AND RACIAL JUSTICE APPROACHES*

<i>Democracy Building***</i>	<i>Intergroup Relations and Education</i>	<i>Managing Diversity</i>	<i>Prejudice Reduction*</i>	<i>Racial Reconciliation and Healing*</i>
Citizen participation, dialogue, public process, diversity, social capital, civic engagement	Diversity, differences, understanding, cross-cultural, cooperation, education, intergroup, multicultural	Differences, organizational systems, diversity, awareness, business case	Prejudice, past wounds, healing, emotion work, stories, pride	Historic traumas and injustices, acknowledgement, healing
People are separated and disenfranchised. They do not have public forums or opportunities to dialogue to address community problems. Institutions do not regularly engage citizens in decision-making processes.	Racial prejudice and bias are entrenched in our institutions and societies. People need assistance in developing skills and increasing knowledge for interacting and understanding those who are different from themselves.	Diversity is a challenge in organizations. Managers are sometimes overwhelmed and lack the skills to respond. Institutional structures have not been created with diversity in mind.	People engage in oppressive acts or hurt others because they have been oppressed or hurt.	Traditions of division and inequity have traumatized and victimized certain groups. Lack of acknowledgement and forgiveness hold destructive patterns of interaction in place.
Construct deliberative public processes to promote cooperation, build skills, and engage citizens across sectors.	Provide skill-based training, awareness-building activities, and structured interactive experiences to change attitudes and behavior of different cultures and ethnicities and improve intergroup relations.	Obtain top level commitment, train managers, assess organizational barriers, and create an ongoing process so the organization can adapt to the changing workforce and the diverse workforce can understand the organization.	Undergo cathartic experience, become aware of own oppression, and build alliances with others across barriers of race, ethnicity and culture.	Allow groups to tell and hear each others' histories and encourage acknowledgement, repentance and forgiveness of injustices.
"The world is filled with diverse perspectives on complex issues. When people have appropriate public forums, processes, and skills for dialoguing about these issues they will recognize their interdependence and find cooperative ways to address common concerns."	"The world is filled with systems of inequality. When people have the skills and knowledge necessary, they can change their attitudes and behaviors and eventually institutions will be transformed."	"The world is filled with organizations that are uncomfortable with diversity. If there is leadership commitment, trained managers, and organizations' barriers are removed, then the mission of the organization will be furthered."	"The world is filled with wounded people who are doing their best with the resources they have available to them. Once people understand their own oppression and are tied into a healthy network, they can act as agents of change."	"The world is filled with groups that are traumatized by historic events. When the oppressing group acknowledges and apologizes for these injustices and wounds, individual and social healing, reconciliation, and transformation can occur."
Political science, social capital, public policy	Psychology, anthropology, cultural studies, social studies	Organizational development and behavior, social psychology	Psychoanalysis, liberation theory, re-evaluation counseling	Spirituality and religion, group psychoanalysis, history
Establish intergroup dialogue, community visioning, and public forums. Recognize common ground, identify community assets and needs, promote cooperation, and develop joint action.	Use skills training, interactive experiences, awareness-building activities, and multicultural curricula to promoting positive intergroup relations.	Engage top management in the change process, train managers, create employee support structures, and assess organizational barriers to differences.	Emotional work, personal awareness, and the sharing of personal stories are important ingredients for healing and transformation.	Share stories/histories of groups' traumas and glories. Encourage symbolic expressions of repentance, remorse and forgiveness.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: SPECTRUM OF RACE

	<i>Anti-Racism*</i>	<i>Civil Rights Advocacy & Anti-Discrimination</i>	<i>Community Building</i>	<i>Conflict Resolution*</i>
Intended Effects	Social change and justice; redistribution of power and resources; critical consciousness; empowerment for activism.	Elimination of barriers to housing, employment, voting, health care etc., and an informed public who will uphold these basic and civil rights.	Empowered citizens who have better institutions, more resources, and skills to face future issues.	Identification and inclusion of appropriate stakeholders; problem and needs analysis; creative, joint problem-solving; cooperative action planning.
Strengths	Provides analytical framework for understanding systemic and historic issues of racial privilege and oppression and seeks to organize a critical mass.	Fights for inclusive policies and laws that provide access and equity for people of color. Educates people about the laws and the need for further changes.	Creating a critical mass of empowered citizens. Builds capacity of community organizations.	Inclusive, process-focused approach empowers participants to determine content and direction of work. Gives work a pragmatic focus.
Limitations	Can stimulate guilt and anger in people who belong to the privileged groups when not prepared for analysis. May get stuck in a binary analysis (Black-White/Us-Them).	Does not typically include working to change awareness and behaviors of the decision makers involved in the policy process. May create an "us versus them" paradigm for creating change.	Structural analysis of race and other root issues of equity are not always addressed. Can feel like a "blame the victim" approach unless disinvestments are highlighted.	Often mixes racial/ethnic issues with other community issues (e.g. economic development; crime and violence; etc.). Does not always acknowledge power imbalances.

* This chart is based on Ilana Shapiro's original work. Single-asterisked columns here closely follow her writing in *Training for Racial Equity Programs* (New York: The A
 ** World View quotations in the *Prejudice Reduction* and *Anti-Racism* columns are reproduced from J.M. Shearer, "Race Relations: Three Paradigms" (Conciliation Qu
 *** Special thanks to Ilana Shapiro for providing the language in the *Democracy Building* column for *Worldview*, *Methods*, and *Intended Effects*.

RELATIONS AND RACIAL JUSTICE APPROACHES

<i>Democracy Building***</i>	<i>Intergroup Relations and Education</i>	<i>Managing Diversity</i>	<i>Prejudice Reduction*</i>	<i>Racial Reconciliation and Healing*</i>
Engaged citizenry; increased skills to interact and communicate with people who are different; collaborative relations; new civic infrastructures.	Heightened individual and cultural awareness; respect for differences; improved intergroup relations; improved cross-cultural skills.	An organization that assesses its practices, supports its managers, and creates an inclusive environment to further its mission.	Personal healing, awareness, and alliances within and across groups.	Honest conversation between groups, personal transformation, intergroup/public healing and reconciliation.
Citizens take cooperative action to solve community problems. Public community processes engage citizens.	Individuals have strengthened understanding and skills for cross-cultural situations. Interactive experiences can lead to improved intergroup relations.	Creates skilled managers. Initiates change processes for organizations to be more inclusive and promote the benefits of diversity in the workplace.	Works with individuals' emotions, thoughts, and behaviors to overcome oppression and guilt.	Works with spiritual and symbolic dimensions of groups' historic wounds and injustices.
Does not always acknowledge the power imbalance. The issue of race sometimes gets buried and is not dealt with as the root to some of the issues.	Focuses on educating about others and not on the individual's own role in the system. Race and ethnic issues and power imbalances sometimes gets lost in the process.	Key issues of oppressed groups can get diluted and this can soften the reality of how oppression manifests itself within an organization.	Emotional work is not appealing to everyone. Underestimates the impact of larger systemic and historical forces.	Religious principles are not appealing to everyone. Need improved practical tools for promoting change.

5.

PERSPECTIVES ON WORKING ACROSS THE SPECTRUM: WHY IS IT IMPORTANT?

As we move forward in this process of thinking about how we can work interdependently across the spectrum of approaches, we need to understand more about the barriers as well as the hopes of this work occurring in communities across the United States. NABRE invited several participants to share their thoughts, concerns and perspectives on some or all of the following questions:

- *Why do you think it is important that we work interdependently across the spectrum of methodologies?*
- *What will be the benefits? What will be the challenges? What are your hopes?*

Tammy Bormann and Benjamin Butler Facilitators of the How-To Forum

We entered the Forum experience with some trepidation about the willingness of organizations across the “spectrum of approaches” to challenge their own assumptions about the validity and necessity of alternative approaches to the work of this broadly defined field. To our surprise and delight, we found that Forum participants were willing to think broadly and creatively about ways that their seemingly disparate approaches could complement, support and inform one another.

In one striking example, participants were working on a case scenario that called for them to create a plan for organizational collaboration around a particular community problem. At one point, a member of the group stated that she didn’t believe her organization, based on its mission and approach, would have much to offer. In response,

another participant (whose organization’s commitments and priorities were likely to be perceived at the opposite end of the “spectrum”) suggested ways that her organization could make essential contributions to the community collaboration. Not only did he identify opportunities for unprecedented collaboration between organizations thought to be thoroughly unaligned, but he informed her thinking about the purpose and role of her own organization.

This incident was one of several similar ones that we observed during the formal and informal portions of the How-To Forum. We observed a spirit of inquiry and possibility. In fact, many Forum participants were willing to change their perceptions and beliefs about the work of other organizations once they began to engage with individuals representing approaches they had previously only heard or read about.

Articulating a Common Goal. The clearest challenge to effective collaboration among organizations in the racial reconciliation and racial justice movement is the articulation of a common goal. What is the movement seeking to achieve? This

question is fundamental to developing a strategy for collaboration along the spectrum of approaches to this work. It proved to be a difficult point of inquiry for participants in the How-To Forum, however. Their struggle came not from an unwill-

In fact, many Forum participants were willing to change their perceptions and beliefs about the work of other organizations once they began to engage with individuals representing approaches they had previously only heard or read about.



ingness to seek a common outcome, but from a need to examine more carefully the interpretations, theories and principles that form the foundation of their specific approaches to the work.

DEVELOPING A COMMON LEXICON.

It is often noted in this movement that there are as many interpretations of the term racism as there are activists, educators and practitioners. Disparate interpretations and definitions continue to confound the internal dialogue. One often hears, "Well, what do you mean when you say racism?" Despite the exhaustive process of self-reflection and organizational analysis that participants engaged in prior to attending the Forum, they still struggled to decipher the meaning of commonly used terms in their dialogue with one another.

It is clear to us as facilitators and professionals in the community development and social justice fields that the lack of a commonly accepted lexicon is a significant hindrance to the achievement of racial reconciliation and social justice goals—however they might be articulated. In fact, without a clear sense of meaning and interpretation of key terms, organizations and individuals often find themselves at odds with one another because they perceive their goals to be divergent.

It is not uncommon to hear statements that relegate one approach to lesser importance than another: "You are about changing individuals and we're about changing systems" or, alternatively, "You intellectualize the work and we personalize it." The assumption behind these statements is that individuals and systems are unrelated to one another and that there is an inherent hierarchy in one approach

versus the other. Moreover, they reflect the struggle between the "head and heart" argument and the "structure and process" argument. Herein lies the destructive hierarchy of

racial reconciliation and racial justice work. Without dismantling the internal hierarchy about "real" work and learning to view the work as phases of personal growth, group empowerment and structural change, organizations will continue to miss important opportunities to expand, enhance and inform their own work by collaborating with others who approach the work differently.

SELF-KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THEORIES AND ASSUMPTIONS.

Before organizations can engage in a fruitful dialogue about a common lexicon, they must come to know themselves more fully. Participants in the How-To Forum spent significant time prior to the program meeting with their own colleagues to examine the theories, assumptions and principles that guide their particular approach to racial reconciliation and racial justice work. Many participants reported that it was the first time they had ever done this. As they sought to understand their own organizational motivations for approaching the work in a certain way, they learned to articulate these assumptions and theories to their colleagues in other organizations.

As we facilitated this internal/external education process during the Forum, it became apparent that the core of learning was right here. Before lexicon, before collective outcomes, before Principles for Collaboration must come thorough self- and mutual education. Forum participants needed more time to ask important and often taboo questions of organizations both like their own and unlike their own. In their evaluations and informal comments, participants asked for another chance to engage this dialogue to deepen the learning they began during the Forum.

The heart of collaboration lies, we suggest, at the core of this conversation.

IDENTIFYING THE PRINCIPLES OF ENGAGEMENT.

What does it mean to collaborate? What is appropriate organizational behavior in a collaborative relationship? What shared assumptions and

What is appropriate organizational behavior in a collaborative relationship? What shared assumptions and beliefs about this work are incontrovertible? What do we want to guard against?



beliefs about this work are incontrovertible? What do we want to guard against?

These are questions we probed with some success during the How-To Forum but they too demand significantly more attention. We observed that while Forum participants were accustomed to establishing ground rules for engagement within their communities and educational programs, they found it more challenging to establish their own principles. They challenged themselves to identify issues on which they could all agree issues of fairness and appropriate behavior. In the end, we suggest, these Principles of Engagement will rest heavily upon the quality of dialogue that ensues around the issues of common lexicon, collective outcomes and meaningful self- and mutual education. When these issues become clear, the Principles of Engagement will emerge naturally and collaboratively.

Collaboration needs the one luxury that is most difficult to secure: time. Forum participants and others in this field need the unrestrained, unfettered time to engage these questions honestly, thoroughly, and thoughtfully.

People who toil in the field of racial reconciliation and racial justice often process their learning most effectively with words and image—they need time to explore, to probe, to seek understanding and to welcome inquiry. With sufficient time, capable facilitators, and an environment conducive to learning, we believe that organizations and the individuals who people them can make great strides toward establishing authentic collaborations—and the Principles to guide them—that are capable of achieving racial equity and racial justice in this country.

Ilana Shapiro

Alliance for Conflict Transformation

The wide range of philosophies, practices, and goals of programs addressing racism in the U.S. reflect different analyses of the problem and recognize dif-

ferent starting points for change. Cooperation and coordination among these diverse programs offer important opportunities for developing multifaceted, comprehensive interventions, reaching a wider range of people and building a united movement for social change. Such cooperation, however, should be built upon a clear articulation and differentiation of the core theories, methods, and intended outcomes that shape practice. Such an analysis of programs, theories of practice, and change could highlight the complimentary dimensions of programs, identify conditions under which different approaches may be most useful, and promote reflective practice.

A comparative analysis reveals many overlapping and complimentary goals and methods across programs.³⁹ For example, all programs recognize that racism is a complex, deep-rooted, long-standing problem, yet all are relatively hopeful about creating personal, relational, and structural change. Sharing values about inclusion, participation, accountability, respect, and humanism, these programs help empower and inspire participants to change themselves and take leadership roles in changing their respective communities and organizations.

Even though practitioners and programs often have different priorities, perspectives, and experiences, and although they may draw upon dissimilar theories and processes, many cooperative efforts in U.S. communities already demonstrate how this diversity can be used constructively. Coordinating and sequencing inter-

ventions can make this possible. Most programs provide necessary, though not sufficient, efforts to address the complex and deep-rooted tensions among racial and ethnic groups. Cooperation and coordination among these intervention efforts pro-

At times, however, the underlying assumptions of programs directly contradict or compete with each other.... Some suggest that transformed individuals should lead structural change to build more equitable and inclusive institutions and policies, while others suggest that creating inclusive and equitable structures will lead to the transformation of individuals who live and work within them.



vides communities and organizations with a multi-dimensional analysis of racial conflict, and more comprehensive approaches to resolution. By providing opportunities for programs to initiate and shape these strategic alliances and collaborative activities themselves, coordination can transcend the limits of the individual components.

At times, however, the underlying assumptions of programs directly contradict or compete with each other. For example, programs differ in whether they believe the starting point for change is at the indi-

vidual, intergroup, or structural level. Some suggest that transformed individuals should lead structural change to build more equitable and inclusive institutions and policies, while others

suggest that creating inclusive and equitable structures will lead to the transformation of individuals who live and work within them. Programs differ in their emphasis on cultural differences or power differentials as the source of conflict, and they have goals that are distinctly different such as justice, healing, tolerance, or reconciliation. Further, some highlight the commonalities shared by different racial groups, while others stress groups' differences, just as some programs focus on the specific dynamics of racism, while others address the common dynamics among many forms of oppression.

These differences provide important opportunities for evaluating the relative validity of competing theories and the effectiveness of divergent methods in applied settings. They offer opportunities to refine and revise practice where core assumptions are unfounded, and improve both theory and practice for building more equitable and inclusive communities. Understanding and testing these different theories of practice and change also allows one to discover the conditions under each approach is most useful.

Finally, clarifying the core assumptions and philosophies guiding programs' intervention design also

promotes more reflective practice. This can help practitioners make more deliberate choices in matching their intervention strategies to their problem analyses and intended outcomes. Articulating programs' implicit assumptions enables practitioners to better reflect upon their theories of practice and change and fosters awareness about their active construction of interventions, the plurality of practice, and the variety of frames available to them. This may help practitioners move beyond interventions that are unconsciously based on what is most familiar to them, limited to their professional background, or founded on unexamined beliefs about prejudice, racial conflict, and racism.⁴⁰ Encouraging reflective practice helps interveners make conscious choices about their programs, even when such choices are confined by a host of practical concerns such as what participants will accept or allow and what is attractive to funders.

Working in demanding and competitive environments, race relations and racial justice practitioners rarely have opportunities to cooperate and learn from each others' efforts. Addressing racial and ethnic tensions within the shifting landscape of changing demographics and intergroup realignment requires fresh approaches that build upon existing promising practices and integrate a variety of approaches. Cooperation and coordination among approaches and methods to dismantle racism should build upon existing successes and foster sustained activities that interrupt the racial dynamics still dividing and damaging our communities. Coordination among programs must meet a dual challenge: respecting and maintaining each effort's unique perspective and contribution to the field while fostering agreement on broader long-term goals for social change.



Khatib Waheed
Aspen Institute Roundtable for
Comprehensive Community Initiatives

Working interdependently across the spectrum of modalities is important for several reasons. The first is that both individuals and organizations undoubtedly choose diverse pathways to enter into the discourse on race, ethnicity, class, gender, age, sexual orientation, and religion based upon a specific set of identified issues and conditions. Sometimes there is an appropriate alignment between the identified issues/concerns and the choice of modality selected. At other times there is not an appropriate alignment. In either case my belief is that the journey towards gaining deeper understanding of the range and depth of the various forms of oppression and discrimination is long, arduous and quite possibly lifelong.

No one modality is thoroughly sufficient of itself to support the successful completion of that journey. Instead they often build upon one another in complimentary ways. For example, the prejudice reduction theory of practice might hold a worldview that says, "The world is filled with wounded people who are doing the best that they can with the resources they have available to them. Once people understand their own oppression and are tied into a healthy network, they can act as agents of change." While the anti-racism theory of practice might hold a worldview that says, "The world is controlled by powerful systems with historically traceable roots. Once people are shown how they benefit from or are barred by those systems, they can work together to change those systems." One can begin to see how each of the two theories is a necessary part of the journey and that the two are complimentary to each other, yet neither is sufficient to complete the journey.

Furthermore, even when the two are combined they are not adequate or sufficient because there is no built-in strategy to manage the inevitable conflict that will and does occur between the worldviews and/or individuals. Nor is there a framework to

give structure to a strategy that might speak to some notion of further inclusion. As a follow-up, an even more integrated progression of the aforementioned effort might include some form of the following theories and practices:

- *Conflict management;*
- *Healing and reconciliation;*
- *Democracy building.*

It is the comprehensive integration of these approaches, starting with the customer's initial interest and needs, that will provide the emotional, cognitive, spiritual, and structural support necessary to complete the personal and communal journey to social justice, equity, democracy building and the ending of oppression.

The second reason for working interdependently across the spectrum of modalities is that this provides an additional opportunity to work towards greater inclusion and democracy at both the provider and customer levels. The larger and better-funded organizations tend to access more of the training and technical assistance work within a particular community. Meanwhile, the smaller and lesser-known organizations tend to re-

main locked out of many opportunities to work and to share their skills, knowledge and experience. Both tend to try to do more than they are really capable of doing, often mixing their theories and practices in order to better market themselves, while in reality they often lack the staff, theoretical knowl-

The larger and better-funded organizations tend to access more of the training and technical assistance work within a particular community. Meanwhile, the smaller and lesser-known organizations tend to remain locked out of many opportunities to work and to share their skills, knowledge and experience. Both tend to try to do more than they are really capable of doing, often mixing their theories and practices in order to better market themselves, while in reality they often lack the staff, theoretical knowledge, experience and/or resources to do all that they can do very well.



edge, experience and/or resources to do all that they can do very well.

The third reason for working interdependently across the spectrum of modalities is to build the capacity among anti-racism trainers and technical assistance providers to engage neighborhood leaders, residents, and parents of children and families of color residing in impoverished neighborhoods to better address the impact that race and race relations have on their outcomes. Currently there is little or no deliberate activity occurring across the country to bridge the gap between the anti-racism training and technical assistance providers and those who are engaged in community building. Nor is there much evidence of large-scale anti-racism training and technical assistance being provided directly in the neighborhoods with the residents of color impacted by poverty and

racism. In large measure, the market has determined where the work of anti-racism trainers and technical assistance providers apply their skills and expertise. Clearly there are few neighborhoods in poverty possessing the financial ability to hire these trainers and providers.

One of the more fundamental challenges is to determine how to generate and sustain additional support (public will) and resources that will facilitate building the overall capacity among trainers and technical assistance providers engaged in one or more of the various modalities at the national and local levels.

There are numerous challenges associated with this important effort. One of the more fundamental challenges is to determine how to generate and sustain additional support (public will) and resources that will facilitate building the overall capacity among trainers and technical assistance providers engaged in one or more of the various modalities (i.e. prejudice reduction; anti-racism; and conflict resolution) at the national and local levels in order to:

- *Raise the awareness among a critical mass of trainers and technical assistance providers regarding the need for and benefits of working*

more interdependently and addressing the turf issues;

- *Raise the awareness among foundations and among federal, state and local funders of the need for them to work interdependently across the various programs, projects, and initiatives in order to improve outcomes for children and families of color in poverty;*
- *Continue the mapping of the field to identify willing partners and best-practice models;*
- *Link partners familiar with applied research and evaluation to local and national issues, indicators, and outcome measurements; and*
- *Engage neighborhood leaders, residents, parents and youth in more place-based training and technical assistance opportunities that are connected to the places where they live and play.*

Essentially, my hope is that NABRE will receive favorable responses from the field as well as the necessary resource and financial support from funders to move this very important agenda forward. Additionally, my hope is that my aforementioned responses are plausible, doable, and measurable and are shared by others in the field. Lastly, but most importantly, my hope is that our joint efforts (through NABRE, Aspen, and many others) will contribute significantly towards making a positive impact upon the **United States'** political, economic, social and cultural landscape in ways that improve the conditions of well being for children and families of color and those who are living in poverty.

Ruben Lizardo **California Tomorrow**

With firsthand experience contending with the myriad challenges and complexities that are inherent in collaborations involving diverse interests and communities, I do believe organizations and leaders working to improve race relations and address structural inequality in the U.S. should consider working interdependently in communities. As pio-



neering efforts within this emerging field are refined and strengthened, a rational argument for such collaboration emerges. If successful, collaboration across the spectrum of methodologies in this field promises benefits and advances that are both strategic (related to strengthened methods and models) and practical (opportunities to put our vision and values into practice and achieve improved outcomes of program objectives).

On the methodological level, although there are numerous approaches within this field (e.g. diversity training, conflict resolution, community organizing, and etc.), the experiences of the last 25 years of diversity efforts have resulted in the development and refinement of two clear strands of work—one aimed at changing individuals and one aimed at changing institutions—that are achieving success. At the same time, proponents and practitioners of these various approaches have discovered the limits of their respective efforts along with their successes.

For example, organizations like California Tomorrow which seek to bring about systemic change, are finding that systems do not change simply because a policy change is mandated from above (through internally driven reform) or secured from below (through policy advocacy and/or organizing). Indeed, since institutions are inventions of human vision, will, and action, they cannot change without change at the individual level. Despite this basic reality, a majority of the organizations that work to achieve change shy away from strategies that have proven effective in helping individuals alter their personal values, beliefs and practices.

Meanwhile, organizations that do seek to bring about changes at the individual level are finding that system-level values and practices assert a pervasive influence over individual beliefs and behaviors. The best of such organizations teach their program participants to recognize the institutional values and practices that undergird individual biases and prejudices, individual acts of discrimination and harm, or the inter-group conflicts they

seek to ameliorate. Those organizations are also finding that although they may succeed with individual participants, those participants must still find ways to operate within institutions whose values are often antithetical to their new outlooks. Despite this reality, most organizations tend to provide participants with strategies and tools primarily designed to assimilate and sustain changes in individual beliefs and behavior.

Although there are obvious benefits of pooling resources to simultaneously support both individual and institutional change, to date very few collaborations between organizations with successful track records have taken place. I believe that this is because inter-organizational collaboration, like any other social endeavor involving diverse constituencies, is easier said than done. Most of our organizations are made up of individuals with strong beliefs and convictions, who have as much trouble learning to “appreciate” other perspectives and “work” with diverse approaches as the communities we work with on these same matters.

Meanwhile, the communities we live in, work with, or serve are faced with myriad opportunities and challenges stemming from dramatic demographic changes amidst equally fundamental political and economic transitions. An example of this is a community I have worked – Watts in Los Angeles. Formerly a majority African American community, Watts is now majority Latino, with both groups struggling to overcome myriad challenges associated with persistent and pervasive poverty. Struggling to keep pace with exponential increases of demand on their resources and services, the leadership of

Although there are obvious benefits of pooling resources to simultaneously support both individual and institutional change, to date very few collaborations between organizations with successful track records have taken place.... Most of our organizations are made up of individuals with strong beliefs and convictions, who have as much trouble learning to “appreciate” other perspectives and “work” with diverse approaches as the communities we work with on these same matters.



Watts' major public, private, and community institutions have had little opportunity to reform their internal systems to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse client/constituency base. Meanwhile, African-American and Latino youth and adults are expected to learn ways to communicate, relate to, and collaborate with one another as neighbors, classmates, parents, consumers, and leaders.

Although the media has a tendency to focus on Watts when tension, conflict, and violence occur, each day leaders and residents of Watts are coming together to find ways to work together for the betterment of their community. Watts' indigenous leaders are engaged in: training, leadership development, cultural exchanges, conflict resolution, community organizing, externally driven policy reform, internally driven organizational/institutional reform, and plain old "getting to know your neighbor" type of activities. Those remarkable civic and grassroots leaders deserve strong and sustained support. If it is to be effective, that support must be as complex and multidimensional as the dynamics that are being tackled by the local leaders in Watts.

For reasons of practical application, I believe that this collaborative work should take place in specific places with specific community leadership that chooses to collaborate with two or three organizations. In the case of my organization, I believe our capacity to assist school, city, non-profit organizational, and community leaders who seek to improve educational outcomes for youth and adults would be greatly enhanced through collaboration with intermediary organizations with proven track records in the following areas:

- *Developing sustainable diversity training models to build the capacity of individuals to learn to work cooperatively with others in order to address systemic inequality in their neighborhood and workplaces;*
- *Developing and sustaining a variety of community conflict resolution models for moving individuals and groups from conflict to collective*

action to address root causes of intergroup competition and conflict;

- *Developing the organizational leadership and infrastructure to engage youth and community leaders in a range of community action and organizing efforts; and*
- *Developing accessible and effective approaches to building the viable organizational infrastructure needed to sustain community-building work for the long haul.*

To this mix California Tomorrow would be adding our experience, strategies, and tools for building peer learning networks and coaching and facilitating organizational and institutional change around diversity and equity issues. Because our approach to both levels of work is grounded within a structural inequality analysis, of course we would want to work with organizations that also seek to address structural inequality.

We would also need to devote serious attention to determining which communities and organizations are ready to commit to the process of collaboration:

- *learning how to work on concrete matters while dealing with the need to tend to the building of a collaborative;*
- *learning how to agree on the end product while learning how to experiment with the ways to get there;*
- *learning how to give and accept critical feedback (personal and organizational); and*
- *finding ways to fund our efforts collaboratively and to integrate one another's work into our core fundraising strategies (i.e., to share our outcome agendas).*

Given the urgent realities facing so many of our communities, I would hope that any such collaboration would be based on the potential of helping community and civic leaders to improve race relations through strategies that seek to undo structural



inequality. In concrete terms, I would look for evidence of strengthened capacities to build mutually beneficial relationships and sustain effective collaborations; and on the other hand, evidence that the new relationships and collaborations are beginning to make some headway in dealing with underlying structural inequalities.

Paul Marcus
Community Change, Inc.

When we look at the abolition movement in the class I co-teach at Boston College, "The History and Development of Racism in the U.S.," we do an exercise in which we post on the wall around the room a number of ways people were involved in the movement. These include things like education, writing/speaking, politics, revolution, forming alternative communities, moral suasion, working in the legal system and many more. We then ask students to choose what they would do if they had been a part of the abolition movement. Knowing that it is often a difficult choice, we ask the students to choose only one area. As they stand in groups in front of the signs, we ask them why they made their choices. Very quickly, they begin to see connections between the different areas and they soon realize that movements are not monolithic. They are interconnected webs of people and groups working for a similar end.

The abolition of enslavement was certainly a clear and definable goal. This is not the case today. There is not a clear and definable focus as there was for the abolition movement or the civil rights movement of the 50s and 60s. Today, many of us are clear that the "ism" part of racism implies that we live in a society that is structured and organized on race and that this structure benefits whites at the expense of people of color leading to gross inequities. However, since the majority of whites and some people of color believe that race is no longer a significant issue and that we have solved the "race problem," building a movement for racial and economic justice is more difficult.

This is also true as we look across the spectrum of methodologies of people and groups working for racial justice. Is it possible for organizations that focus on managing diversity in corporations to work with those who understand racism as oppression and believe

that white dominated institutions need to be dismantled? Will a stand taken by one organization be considered too "radical" by others who are concerned that such a stand will have a negative influence on their funders? Can we talk with one another? If we do, will we really hear each other?

Let me be clear about where I stand. This land we call "America" has always been diverse. It was prior to the arrival of the first Europeans and continues to be so today. For me, the issue is not about "managing diversity," it is about equity. Racism is not something people do, it is a system in which one group, whites, are advantaged, at the expense of all other groups. For any real change to occur, I believe that we need to abolish this cultural, institutional, and individual system of advantage.

I also believe that there is no one way to do this. Like any movement, it will involve many approaches across the spectrum of methodologies. It is necessary to work both on behavior and attitudes together. While we can pass legislation and laws to effect behavioral changes, ultimately we need a change in our fundamental attitudes about race, dealing with the internalized superiority of whites and the internalized inferiority of people of color.

There is much to be learned from the myriad of people working for racial justice in this country. If we have any hope of building a meaningful and effective movement for racial and economic justice, we need to be talking with and learning from each other. For me, movement building involves

There is much to be learned from the myriad of people working for racial justice in this country. If we have any hope of building a meaningful and effective movement for racial and economic justice, we need to be talking with and learning from each other. For me, movement building involves community building.



community building. The NABRE How-To Forum created the space where people working with groups across a spectrum of approaches could come together to listen to and learn from each other.

When I left Boston to come to the forum, I was curious, but not sure if it would be a worthwhile use of time. Unfortunately, organizations doing this work very often stake out claims of having the “right” analysis. This can prevent us from really hearing about and understanding the work done by other groups. Also, while I understand the importance of power and collaboration, I also know that true collaboration takes a tremendous amount of work and can sometimes move small non-profits further from their goals rather than advancing them.

Through this process we learned that in many instances we could collaborate directly. We also discovered the importance in having this discussion. Having a better sense of what each organization did made us aware of places where we had common ground for collaboration or coalition building. It also allowed us to be able to share the workload. We discovered the importance of being intentional about taking the time to have this discussion.

approaches, looked at a real-life scenario to explore how we could collaborate. Through this process we learned that in many instances we could collaborate directly. We also discovered the importance in having this discussion. Having a better sense of what each organization did, made us aware of places where we had common ground for collaboration or coalition building. It also allowed us to be able to share the workload. We discovered the importance of being intentional about taking the time to have this discussion.

To my surprise, I returned from the conference energized and inspired to continue this work on a national level and to replicate this process on a local level. During the two days, organizations with similar approaches met. We shared our perspectives with the larger group composed of representatives using different approaches and finally, working across

These types of dialogues are important – now more than ever. As I look around Boston and the country, I believe that there is a groundswell of a movement building. This past April, 1500 people showed up for a conference on White Privilege at a small college in Iowa. A week later, 500 people attended a conference on Whiteness organized by a student at Hampshire College. Keep in mind that for many years there has been a great deal of resistance (mostly by whites) to any discussion of the topic of white privilege. A multi-racial group representing a number of Boston non-profits has been meeting to explore ways in which we can collaborate in our work and build an antiracist movement in Boston. Also notable is the planning group for the 2003 White Anti-Racists’ Convention. In November, 50 people from across the country will attend the White Anti-Racist Leadership Conference in New Orleans to plan for the 2003 convention.

It is exciting to see more and more whites taking leadership, responsibility and action, but we must do so being accountable to and taking leadership from people of color. The hope and hazards of the movement I am seeing rest on the commitment of white anti-racists to insist on accountability to communities of color and a commitment to transparency and non-defensive listening and self-monitoring.

To be committed to anti-racism work and the creation of a just society means understanding that the work is long-term and multigenerational. Progress is sometimes incremental, and we often do not see the immediate results of our work. Given this, it is heartening to feel this sense of a groundswell of more and more whites moving beyond the limited understanding of racism as prejudice based on race to a broader systemic understanding.

We need to continue to reach out and find each other in order to build this strong interconnected, interdependent web that we can call a movement. With its national scope, NABRE is uniquely positioned to be a catalyst in this process.



Yoke-Sim Gunaratne Cultural Diversity Resources

Many of us know well the controversy and ongoing debate over the effectiveness of diversity training versus dismantling racism. Critics of diversity training complain that it is “soft” and “fluffy”, that it is superficial and does not change institutionalized, systemic racism. Dismantling racism, they say, truly examines racism as the prejudice-plus-power which rests with the white folks. Hence developing an anti-racist identity for an organization is necessary to achieve meaningful change. Critics of anti-racism question not only how but whether we can dismantle racist institutions. Don’t we have to work with individuals with power? And don’t we need to start with diversity training to increase awareness and understanding?

Cultural Diversity Resources has taken the approach of customizing training to meet individual or organizational needs. We may focus first on diversity training to prepare individuals who have not been exposed and who are not ready to take on dismantling racism training. Providing dismantling racism to such individuals who are both defensive and feel threatened with this type of training is like forcing a baby to run before it can even walk. Training should be customized and sensitized to meet different needs. After some diversity training, individuals are encouraged and referred to experienced trainers on dismantling racism. The training program should be seen as a continuum, with diversity training at one end moving towards dismantling racism as the ultimate goal at the other end. Diversity and dismantling racism trainers need to work in collaboration as partners to achieve a more equitable and just system.

Many nonprofit organizations develop programs and services as one way to reduce racial and social inequality. The aim of such services is to provide basic needs and services for economically and socially disadvantaged individuals. Our organization provides community interpreter services to refugees with limited English proficiency. This helps to increase accessibility, awareness and understanding of the public and social services from which they would otherwise be excluded or underserved. Other

programs provide advocacy to avoid eviction, educate on tenancy rights and responsibilities, help to find jobs or upgrade jobs, or improve personal and/or professional skills through workshops. These services are all needed by individuals before they can engage more actively in changing laws or organizing for change.

The cycle of poverty has to be broken before individuals can be physically, socially and mentally ready to engage in helping others. However, we are also aware of the need to support the efforts of those who are trying to change laws and processes that work against developing a more just and equitable society.

There are activists who feel strongly that the focus should be advocacy to change laws, and community organizing to challenge the establishment. There is definitely a place and need for these activities. However, social justice has to be done in the context of collaboration, cooperation, and/or confrontation when needed depending on each case scenario. Just as one size does not fit all, so one approach or solution does not fit all.

Organizations and individuals who provide services to the underprivileged and those who advocate for more active challenges to the establishment need to get together to discuss strategies that will be mutually beneficial in meeting their goals. For example, those who are disadvantaged should be exposed and trained on community organizing techniques and understanding the politics of power as they work to improve themselves. The work towards racial and social justice should tap into different strategies and approaches, bringing together all those who are involved for a good fit to solve the problems at hand.

After some diversity training, individuals are encouraged and referred to experienced trainers on dismantling racism. The training program should be seen as a continuum, with diversity training at one end moving towards dismantling racism as the ultimate goal at the other end. Diversity and dismantling racism trainers need to work in collaboration as partners to achieve a more equitable and just system.



Michael Paige
Intercultural Communication Institute

The short answer as to why it is important that we work interdependently across the spectrum of methodologies is that we will be able to do our work more effectively and have a greater impact on society. Consider that a wealth of knowledge and experience has been gained over the past 20 years by a variety of organizations and many individuals regarding the achievement of a more equitable society; better intergroup relations (especially race relations); the reduction of racism, sexism, homophobia and other forms of prejudice, discrimination and oppression; taking greater advantage of our

diversity; and promoting the intercultural competencies that enable us to participate more effectively in a pluralistic society. The problem is that these organizations and individuals have not been communicating with each other sufficiently well so as to be constantly learning from their respective experiences.

Ultimately, working interdependently, at least on certain projects, will give our organizations the chance to expand their perspectives, use their models and approaches in new areas and with new audiences, reexamine their philosophical assumptions, frame their work in new ways, and find perhaps even more creative solutions to the vexing problems we are facing.

The richness of the experience and knowledge base acquired by the participating organizations was made abundantly clear at the NABRE How-To Forum. It also seemed that there were important gaps in the amount of understanding our organizations had of each other's work. In the case of our own Intercultural Communication Institute, for example, we found that others have only limited familiarity with the intercultural theory and pedagogical frames of reference that guide our efforts. An important case in point is Milton Bennett's developmental model of intercultural sensitivity (1993) and its application to large-scale organizational change as well as personal transformation. I imagine that there are many such stories of valuable sharing – explaining oneself and learning from others – that have come from Forum participants.

The scenario exercise that involved us in discussing what our respective approaches would bring to solving a particular community problem was a very useful exercise in practicing the art of cooperation, idea sharing, and strategizing across organizations. It also modeled a process of interdependent practice that is all too often lacking. It was also a frustrating activity in that there was far too little time to express our views, particularly where those viewpoints were not yet well known.

Ultimately, working interdependently, at least on certain projects, will give our organizations the chance to expand their perspectives, use their models and approaches in new areas and with new audiences, reexamine their philosophical assumptions, frame their work in new ways, and find perhaps even more creative solutions to the vexing problems we are facing. For example, the experiences gained from community development activities might have important implications for corporate human resources professionals working with diversity training programs.

The benefits could be new, more powerful approaches to social change, organizational development, and personal change consistent with a movement toward a more equitable society. The challenges to such cooperative endeavors will be many. First, practitioners have worked very hard for many years to establish themselves, develop credible organizations, acquire their expertise through years of trial and error, and eventually find their niches. Having carved out some turf, it is difficult sometimes to work interdependently with organizations that may not share your assumptions or fully understand your approaches. And does cooperation mean compromise of fundamental principles? If we think the answer is yes, we may not want to cooperate. There is also a certain amount of distrust of others' goals and intentions that can accompany cooperative ventures, and the standards we apply to our partners may be so stringent as to make joint ventures impossible.

At a minimum, I hope that NABRE will be a mechanism for information sharing and for helping organi-



zations come together to work on particular problems. I also hope NABRE will be a voice in the U.S. for social justice, equality, and cultural pluralism.

Taquienna Boston **Unitarian Universalist Association**

The goal of the Unitarian Universalist Association's (UUA) Journey Toward Wholeness initiative is to transform our association of congregations into an anti-oppressive, anti-racist multicultural faith community. We view the process of transformation as developmental for institutions as well as individuals. Our experience working with congregations in this effort has taught us that institutions are at varying levels of readiness to engage anti-oppression and anti-racism work, which requires having diverse paths or stepping-off points on this journey of transformation.

Recognizing that organizations as well as individuals evolve through a succession of stages in internalizing awareness, identity, processes, and practices that reflect anti-oppression values, the Journey Toward Wholeness uses an organizational continuum to help our congregations identify their present stage or status. This continuum to becoming an "anti-racist, anti-oppressive multicultural" institution includes lists of resources for each stage, which congregations can use to further their transformation.

The resources we identify include those provided by the UUA and those provided by other organizations committed to institutional transformation as well as personal transformation. No one institution has all the expertise or resources necessary to assist individuals and organizations in making such change. Collaboration makes available to organizations working to dismantle racism and other forms of oppression an array of resources – expertise, consulting and training, curricula, etc., – to offer their constituents while deepening their own resources in their own area of expertise. In addition, mutuality in the collaboration allows organizations to learn from one another.

If the collaboration is to be truly transformative, the organizations engaged in it must reflect on how the resources and work of each complement one another. Groups need to go beyond simply listing the resources of various organizations for their constituents. They also need to have

first-hand experience in using those resources, and they need to reflect together on how their tools, techniques and philosophies can support each others' work.

One of the learnings I took away from NABRE's How-To Forum was the understanding that despite difference in emphasis – individual/personal, building community and leadership development, systemic and institutional change – all the groups embrace the goal of transforming institutions and systems. This is the common goal that links our efforts. The recognition that individuals and organizations are at varying stages of readiness to engage the work makes it imperative that there be many paths or stepping-off points to reach that common goal. No one organization can do it all. We need each other. ●

Collaboration makes available to organizations working to dismantle racism and other forms of oppression an array of resources – expertise, consulting and training, curricula, etc., – to offer their constituents while deepening their own resources in their own area of expertise. In addition, mutuality in the collaboration allows organizations to learn from one another.



Notes

39. *Shapiro*, Mapping Theories of Practice and Change.
40. *Donald A. Schön*, The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action (New York: Basic Books, 1983).

6.

NEXT STEPS: WORKING INTERDEPENDENTLY ACROSS THE SPECTRUM

On the last day of the Forum, participants brainstormed next steps to be taken if we are going to further the message about working interdependently together and creating a common vision:

- Replicate this process on the community level, identify steps and lessons learned, and distribute the information to community-based organizations.
- Develop a video on being an ally.
- Research how to stage work in communities.
- Create a similar process for youth who are involved in the work.
- Collect information on lessons learned and best practices from foundations that fund this work, and utilize this information in a follow-up How-To Forum.

NABRE hopes to stimulate further dialogue, research, and the creation of processes in communities across the country to better enable race relations and racial justice organizations to work interdependently together. The discussion of capacity-building for our field has escalated over the past few years.⁴¹ Earlier this year NABRE, along with our colleagues from Project Change, the Aspen Institute Roundtable, and the Institute for Democratic Renewal, initiated a bulletin board discussion on just that issue. The questions raised were:

- In what ways can individuals and groups engaged in such activities cooperate and collaborate in order to both strengthen their own

activities and make the whole greater than the sum of the parts? How can we avoid the traditional “turf battles” that weaken our respective organizations and others?

- What are the gaps in race relations/racial justice activities? How can they be filled?
- How can we most effectively use the emerging information and communication technologies to foster greater communication and cooperation among individuals and groups engaged in race relations/racial justice activities?
- What “big” ideas do people have for making significant progress towards racial and ethnic justice and inclusion?

Though each of the above questions is important, the How-To Forum focused on the first question. Described below are some answers to that question. You have been invited in the course of this book to share your feedback on the organization reflection questions, the spectrum of approaches and the three clusters. Once again, we invite you to share your ideas with us concerning the concepts below. We will post them on our web site so we can continue the discussion in the hope that it will lead us to making these ideas a reality.

PEER ACCOUNTABILITY

Sometimes, the strong feelings we have in favor of one approach over another engender confusion. Sometimes we assume “effective” work is whatever the approach our organization is using, instead of



examining the effectiveness of another organization's approach in a given situation. During the How-To Forum we took the initial steps toward creating Principles of Engagement for working interdependently. The other discussion that needs to occur concerns what constitutes effective work. What does effective work look like? How can we promote it? How can we support each other to accomplish it?

Because of strong feelings about different approaches, we sometimes respond to the work of a peer organization by assuming its ineffectiveness and not taking the time to learn more about the organization's approach and analysis. One of the unanticipated discoveries at the How-To Forum was that we all have a similar vision for our work – dismantling structural racism. That common vision needs to be our focal point as we discuss what is effective, learn and share with each other to improve our work, and create and maintain relationships to offer feedback and support. We promote accountability in the communities in which we work; we need to do the same with ourselves and with each other.

INTERNAL ACCOUNTABILITY

To create accountability with each other, we must start with our own organization. Earlier in this publication we shared a set of organizational reflection questions. We encourage you to use them or other questions to create a discussion among the key people in your organization. Here are some additional questions to consider:

- *Are we reaching the outcomes we want?*
- *What are the barriers and gaps and how are we responding to them?*
- *How are we supporting our program staff to do this work every day?*
- *What is the accountability process within the organization? What roles do our board, cli-*

ents/participants, and the community we serve play in our accountability process?

- *What is our evaluation process and how do we know we are reaching our benchmarks?*
- *What is the process for assessing whether we should work on a particular issue or with a particular organization?*
- *What skill standards and principles have been created for staff and contract workers?*

To connect with each other, it is important for organizations to first seek clarity in their own work. Then our deliberative discussions to develop a common language, increase our understanding of each other's approaches, and create a collective vision will bear fruit.

ASSESSMENT

Assessment needs to become a more important step in our work. Sometimes we don't have the time. Sometimes our priority is "getting the contract." And sometimes we don't know how to effectively assess our work. The better we understand the variables that determine how effective our approach or intervention is the more integrity our work has. A statement often heard is "they did more harm than good." What does that mean? Was it because it was not a good fit? Was it because an assessment was not done or the analysis was off? Clarity in our work will lead us to be even more effective. Quantitative and qualitative data are very important to insure we are providing value-added and effective work in our communities.

Crucial to the assessment process is learning more about the stages communities go through as they work to become more inclusive and equitable. NABRE is committed to this research. With more clarity about what these stages are and what is needed to enable a community to move to the next stage, we can be more effective at introducing and sustaining a particular intervention or approach.⁴²



NABRE is currently working on two research projects. The first is an *Assessment Primer for Race Relations and Racial Justice Organizations*. This publication will include guidelines on how to conduct a self-assessment of programs; models on how to align mission, objectives, and activities; and information on how to conduct a program evaluation.

Additionally NABRE has teamed with the Center for Assessment and Policy Development and Project Change to begin work on a Community Change Assessment Toolbag. The Toolbag will help organizations assess progress and document the results of their activities; support planning, self-assessment and midcourse changes in their set of interventions; and meet the evaluation needs of funders at an appropriate level of rigor.

WORKING WITH FOUNDATIONS

To say the philanthropic world has changed since 9/11 would be an understatement. With the fluctuations in the economy as well, it is difficult for organizations to plan long-term projects unless they have already secured funding. These two facts alone present a challenge to organizations seeking future funding to address issues of race, never a particularly popular topic in mainstream circles. There are several other variables that have affected funding:

- *Some foundations are reluctant to fund because they are not confident that results can be measured.*
- *Some foundations are concerned about the risks of funding organizations that work on race because of the controversies and pressures that often arise.*
- *Nevertheless foundations are learning that even with other types of projects—like housing, criminal justice, or education—that do not address racism specifically, typically the issue of race still comes up. They are learning that in order to create systemic change on a particular is-*

sue, race needs to be addressed up front or it will enter through the back door.

By building strategic partnerships with foundations, race relations and racial justice organizations can increase foundations' knowledge, build their skills, support their learning process through our research, and utilize foundations' resources and influence to further the work we do and its impact on communities. It will be important as we discover how to work interdependently together for foundations to create ways to support and encourage this process and to create alternate ways to distribute grants for these types of collaboration.

LEARNING COMMUNITY

Organizations in the field can sometimes be territorial. In part this is because we are competing for funding from the same players. Territoriality, however, leads to resistance to share best practices and lessons learned. Strategically, we need to work to become a learning community.

Racism has its permutations, and they do not emerge independently. The issues facing organizations in Oakland, California, this year may arise in Cleveland, Ohio, three to four years from now. A clearinghouse is therefore needed so we can better identify, collect, and share lessons learned – as well as convene forums—to learn about trends in other places across the country. It behooves us to work creatively and purposefully toward creating this learning community.

One place to start is to define what learning community means. One of the key writers on this subject is Peter Senge, who offers five "learning disciplines" to create a learning organization. If we broaden the following descriptions, it will help us think about the necessary infrastructure to build a learning community for race relations and racial justice organizations:



Personal Mastery—learning to expand our personal capacity to create the results we most desire, and creating an organizational environment which encourages all its members to develop themselves toward the goals and purposes they choose.

Mental Models—reflecting upon, continually clarifying, and improving our internal pictures of the world, and seeing how they shape our actions and decisions.

Shared Vision – building a sense of commitment in a group, by developing shared images of the future we seek to create, and the principles and guiding practices by which we hope to get there.

Team Learning—transforming conversational and collective thinking skills so that groups of people can reliably develop intelligence and ability greater than the sum of individual members' talents.

Systems Thinking—a way of thinking about — and a language for describing and understanding — the forces and interrelationships that shape the behavior of systems. This discipline helps us see how to change systems more effectively and act more in tune with the larger processes of the natural and economic world.⁴³

LEXICON OF TERMS

The variant uses of language are a significant barrier to each of us in understanding one another's work. We do not have a common dictionary. When an organization uses a term such as "anti-racism" or "multicultural," the meaning may vary from one organization to another. The resulting misunderstandings may hurt our credibility or promote resistance from the people we are working with or trying to reach. Though there may seem to be higher priorities than creating a glossary of terms, our effectiveness is affected by the lack of one.

One next step would be to convene a group of people who represent different approaches to take on the challenge of formulating a common lexicon. This would also reinforce the process of becoming a learning community. Project Change and the Institute for Democratic Renewal (as well as other organizations) have taken a lead on this and offer a glossary in their latest publication, *A Community Builder's Toolkit*.⁴⁴ Until we can accomplish this, it will be more difficult to achieve the desired level of mutual respect and sense of interdependence among race relations and racial justice organizations.

COMMON VISION

At the Forum it was surprising to witness the similarities in our vision to dismantle structural racism. But a long road lies ahead to achieve a truly common vision. The sooner we are able to create this common vision, the sooner we can leverage the power of the hundreds of race relations and racial justice organizations that can prioritize their resources, focus their activities, and move collectively to reach our goals and eventually make our vision a reality.

Earlier, we referred to a bulletin board discussion about capacity-building for the field. Keith Lawrence of the Aspen Institute has several ideas about arriving at this common vision: "Right now there's a growing mass of well-intentioned people and organizations attentive to race; but many are going in different directions. If we're going to have focused, directed, movement I don't see how we can avoid some overlaying of all this activity with some sense of a kind of strategic proposal, even as we continue the networking and broad consciousness raising. Without that leadership it will be difficult to identify movement goals and build consensus around them. And, yes, this will implicitly establish some priorities for our work. Priorities don't have to mean exclusion for anyone or any methodology. And, they will help us figure out the staging that we need."



COLLABORATION ACROSS THE SPECTRUM

The participants at the How-To Forum discussed the creation of a set of Principles of Engagement that would be the foundation for collaboration across the spectrum. This discussion needs to happen locally with organizations that have a history together and are apt to be working together in the same community on a common issue. NABRE is working toward convening local gatherings and use the principles that were discussed at the How-To Forum as a basis for deeper discussion at the local level.

What follows are ideas discussed by How-To Forum participants, as well as with other practitioners in different settings and can set the tone as we move toward collaboration discussions across the spectrum:

- *Our commitment to leave our egos, our territorial perspectives, our judgmental selves, and our "one right way only" thinking at home;*
- *Our commitment to the bigger picture and our understanding that we can't accomplish our vision by ourselves;*
- *Our commitment to examine our own work with the same rigor we apply to examining others' work;*
- *Our commitment to look for opportunities to build new relationships and alliances;*
- *Our commitment to seek clarity first and then provide feedback as we learn about each other's approaches;*
- *Our commitment to develop a system of checks and balances and to have frank discussions face to face;*
- *Our commitment to be open to finding multiple ways to address a problem and respect the equal importance of each way;*
- *Our commitment to work with all the players within the community and not to be exclusive in that makeup of the group;*

- *Our commitment to not be competitive during the collaborative process and to work through differences and concerns;*
- *Our commitment to respect the fact that each of us is in a learning mode; and*
- *Our commitment to dismantle the hierarchy of approaches and seek to understand each approach's role in creating a more just and inclusive community.*

"THE MOVEMENT"

Throughout this book we have referred to race relations and racial justice organizations' work as the "field." But the real next step is for us to begin looking at our work as a "movement." We do not seek to rejuvenate the civil rights movement of the 1960's, but to create a new movement based on all we have learned since then, including taking full advantage of the technological revolution. We need to be bold and work strategically together. We cannot afford to work alone any longer in our silos. We must come together to create a relentless momentum toward inclusive and just communities and organizations.

The next steps identified here will be important as we figure out how to work better together through reflecting on our own work and learning about others'. Bill Moyer, in his book about social movements, *Doing Democracy*, shares this perspective:

Ken Wilber and others point out that human society is made up of three interconnected and interdependent parts: individual, culture, and social systems and institutions, the "I," "we," and "it." They are different aspects of the same whole; consequently, one can't be transformed for long without the requisite changes in the other two. Therefore, even if a society's social systems and institutions were transformed to the peaceful paradigm, the change would not last, without a parallel



transformation of that society's individuals and culture. Similarly, the good society is unlikely to develop without individual change because, outside of dictatorships, social system and institutional change usually follows personal and cultural change on the part of at least some of the population. Finally, to achieve personal and cultural change in society, social activists have to lead by example, demonstrating the desired alternative we seek.⁴⁵

So we again ask, "What do you think?" We invite your ideas, concerns, and feedback.



- Complete form on last page or
- email nabre@jointcenter.org



FORUM PARTICIPANTS' NEXT-STEP IDEAS

"It is not uncommon to hear statements that relegate one approach to lesser importance than another. The assumption behind these statements is that individuals and systems are unrelated to one another and that there is an inherent hierarchy in one approach versus the other. Moreover, they reflect the struggle between the "head and heart" argument and the "structure and process" argument. Herein lies the destructive hierarchy of racial reconciliation and racial justice work. Without dismantling the internal hierarchy about "real" work and learning to view the work as phases of personal growth, group empowerment and structural change, organizations will continue to miss important opportunities to expand, enhance and inform their own work by collaborating with others who approach the work differently."

*Tammy Bormann and Benjamin Butler
Facilitators for the NABRE How-To Forum*

"Encouraging reflective practice helps intervenors make conscious choices about their programs, even when such choices are confined by a host of practical concerns such as what participants will accept or allow and what is attractive to funders. Working in demanding and competitive environments, race relations and racial justice practitioners rarely have opportunities to cooperate and learn from each others' efforts."

*Ilana Shapiro
Alliance for Conflict Transformation*

"Currently there is little or no deliberate activity occurring across the country to bridge the gap between the anti-racism training and technical assistance providers and those who are engaged in community building. Nor is there much evidence of large-scale anti-racism training and technical assistance being provided directly in the neighborhoods with the residents of color impacted by poverty and racism."

*Khatib Waheed
The Aspen Institute Roundtable on
Comprehensive Community Initiatives*

"We would also need to devote serious attention to determining which communities and organizations are ready to commit to the process of collaboration:

- learning how to work on concrete matters while dealing with the need to tend to the building of a collaborative;
- learning how to agree on the end product while learning how to experiment with the ways to get there;
- learning how to give and accept critical feedback (personal and organizational);
- finding ways to fund our efforts collaboratively and to integrate one another's work into our core fundraising strategies (i.e., to share our outcome agendas)."

*Ruben Lizardo
California Tomorrow*



"If we can demonstrate to the funding community that we as practitioners in fact understand the various types of approaches regarding broad issues of race relations, racial justice and social change, and that we know when and how to strategically apply these methodologies in a collaborative manner with organizations that work differently, we will be in a stronger position to not only advocate on behalf of our field of work, but to strengthen the infrastructure, creating more opportunities (funding) to further the work."

*Saadia Williams
Knoxville Project Change*

"Taking time out to reflect and deconstruct helps organizations gauge if they are meeting their goals, understand whether or not their assumptions are still relevant, and clarify their roles in an ever changing environment. . . . We all have the same long-term goal. We need to know how each of us fits into the spectrum of this work so that we can better help the outside world that often feels confused about our collective work. Better understanding these questions helps all of us accomplish our goals."

*John Landesman
Study Circles Resource Center*

"If the collaboration is to be truly transformative, the organizations engaged in it must reflect on how the resources and work of each complement one another. Groups need to go beyond simply listing the resources of various organizations for their constituents. They also need to have first-hand experience in using those resources, and they need to reflect together on how their tools, techniques and philosophies can support each others' work."

*Taquiena Boston
Unitarian Universalist Association*

"As we facilitated this internal/external education process during the Forum, it became apparent that the core of learning was right here. Before lexicon, before collective outcomes, before Principles for Collaboration must come thorough self- and mutual education. Forum participants needed more time to ask important and often taboo questions of organizations both like their own and unlike their own. In their evaluations and informal comments, participants asked for another chance to engage this dialogue to deepen the learning they began during the Forum."

*Tammy Bormann and Benjamin Butler
Facilitators for the NABRE How-To Forum*

Notes

41. Some of these next steps were discussed at three events earlier in 2002: (1) *The Aspen Institute Roundtable's meeting*, held January 16-18 at the Wye Conference Center; (2) *A collaborative discussion between Project Change, Aspen Institute Roundtable, the Institute for Democratic Renewal and NABRE* held in New York City on March 21; and (3) *The Institute for Democratic Renewal's event, "Renewing Democracy Through Interracial/Multicultural Community Building,"* held in New York City on March 22.
42. For more information on some initial research on community stages, see the following NABRE publication, Maggie Potapchuk, *Steps Toward an Inclusive Community*. (Washington D.C.: Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, 2001).
43. Peter M. Senge, et al. *The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook*. (New York: Doubleday, 1994), p. 6.
44. *A Community Builder's Toolkit*, produced by the Institute for Democratic Renewal and Project Change Anti-Racism Initiative, in consultation with the Center for Assessment and Policy Development (Claremont, CA: Institute for Democratic Renewal, 2001), p.32.
45. Bill Moyer, with JoAnn McAllister, Mary Lou Finley, and Steven Soifer, *Doing Democracy: The MAP Model for Organizing Social Movements*. (Gabriola Island, British Columbia: New Society Publishers, 2001), p. 197.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Frank. *Unearthing Seeds of Fire: The Idea of Highlander*. Winston-Salem: John F. Blair, 1986.
- Adams, Maurianne, Warren J. Blumenfeld, Rosie Castañeda, Heather W. Hackman, Madeline L. Peters, and Ximena Zúñiga, editors. *Readings for Diversity and Social Justice*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Adams, Maurianne, Lee Anne Bell, and Pat Griffin, editors. *Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice: A Sourcebook*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Alvarado, Cecilia, LaVita Burnley, Louise Derman-Sparks, Eric Hoffman, Linda Irene Jiménez, June Layzon, Patricia Ramsey, Annette, Unten, Beth Wallace, Barbara Yasui. *In Our Own Way: How Anti-bias Work Shapes Our Lives*. St. Paul: Redleaf Press, 1999.
- Annie E. Casey Foundation. *The Path of Most Resistance: Reflections on Lessons Learned From New Futures*. Baltimore: Annie E. Casey Foundation, 1995.
- Anthias, Floya, and Cathie Lloyd, editors. *Rethinking Anti-Racisms: From Theory to Practice*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Avruch, Kevin, Peter W. Black, and Joseph A. Scimecca, editors. *Conflict Resolution: Cross Cultural Perspectives*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1991.
- Banks, James A., editor. *Multicultural Education: Transformative Knowledge and Action*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1996.
- Bendick, M. Jr., M. L. Egan, and S. Lofhjelm. *The Documentation and Evaluation of Anti-Discrimination Training in the United States*. International Migration Papers 29. Geneva: International Labour Office, 1998.
- Blackwell, Angela Glover, Stewart Kwoh, and Manuel Pastor. *Searching for Uncommon Common Ground*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 2002.
- British Columbia Ministry Responsible for Multiculturalism and Immigration, Community Liaison Branch. *"Working Strategies for Community Anti-Racism Initiatives."* 1997.
- Chang, Hedy Nai-Lin. *Community Building and Diversity: Principles for Action*. Oakland, California: California Tomorrow, 1997.
- Chaskin, Robert J., Prudence Brown, Sudhir Venkatesh, and Avis Vidal. *Building Community Capacity*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter, 2001.
- Chesler, Mark, and Jay Moldenhauer-Salazar, "Diversity, Organizational Change and Social Justice: What's Happening in Conferences and Books." *Diversity Factor*, Spring 1998.
- Chisom, Ronald and Michael Washington. *Undoing Racism: A Philosophy of International Social Change*. New Orleans: The People's Institute Press, 1997.
- Cox, Taylor Jr., and Ruby L. Beale. *Developing Competency to Manage Diversity: Readings, Cases and Activities*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc., 1997.



- Cross, Elsie, Judith H. Katz, Frederick A. Miller, Edith W. Seashore. *The Promise of Diversity*. New York: Irwin Professional Publishing, 1994.
- Cross, Susan. "Three Models of Conflict Resolution: Effects on Intergroup Expectancies and Attitudes." *Journal of Social Issues*, Fall 1999.
- Delgado, Gary. "The Last Stop Sign." Text published at the Applied Research Center web page, <http://www.arc.org/Pages/Mchange.html>, accessed June 2001.
- Delgado, Gary, Basil R. Browne and Madeleine Adamson. *Anti-Racist Work: An Examination and Assessment of Organizational Activity*. Oakland: Applied Research Center, 1992.
- DeRosa, Patti. "Diversity Training: In Search of Anti-Racism." *Peacework*, April 1994 (Issue No. 240).
- Diversity Symposium 2001: Perspectives on Diversity*. Papers presented by Janet M. Bennett, Ph.D., Milton J. Bennett, Ph.D., Richard S. Gaskins, and Lani Roberts, Ph.D., at Bentley College, Waltham, MA., June 27-29, 2001.
- Du Bois, Paul, and Jonathan Huston. *Bridging the Racial Divide: A Report on Interracial Dialogue in America*. Brattleboro, VT: Center for Living Democracy, 1997.
- Dukes, E. Franklin. *Resolving Public Conflict: Transforming Community and Governance*. New York: St. Martins Press, 1996.
- Fisher, Robert. *Let the People Decide: Neighborhood Organizing in America*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1994.
- Gladwell, Malcolm. *The Tipping Point*. New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2000.
- Gordon, Jack. "Rethinking Diversity." *Training*, January 1992.
- Greisdorf, Karen Elliott. "The City that Dares to Talk." *For a Change*, February/March 2002.
- Griggs, Lewis Brown, and Lente-Louise Louw, editors. *Valuing Diversity*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1995.
- Guarasci, Richard, Grant H. Cornwell and associates. *Democratic Education in an Age of Difference: Redefining Citizenship in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1997.
- Hansell, Linda. "Putting Contact Theory Into Practice: Using the PARTNERS Program to Develop Intercultural Competence." *Electronic Magazine of Multicultural Education*, Fall 2000, Vol. 2, No. 2 (<http://www.eastern.edu/publications/emme>) accessed September, 2001.
- Henderson, Michael. *Forgiveness*. Wilsonville, Oregon: BookPartners, 1999.
- Houle, Kristin, Rona Roberts, Vivian Elliott, Steve Kay, Biren Nagda. *Toward Competent Communities: Best Practices for Producing Community-Wide Study Circles*. Produced for the Topsfield Foundation, Inc., by Roberts & Kay, Inc., Lexington, KY, 2000.
- Human, Linda, Steve Bluen, and Richard Davies. *Baking a New Cake: How to Succeed at Employment Equity*. Randburg, South Africa: Knowledge Resources Ltd., 1999.
- Institute for Democratic Renewal and Project Change Anti-Racism Initiative. *A Community Builder's Tool Kit: 15 Tools for Creating Healthy, Productive Interracial/Multicultural Communities*. Claremont, California: Claremont Graduate University, 2001.
- James, Carl, Arnold Minors, Alok Mukherjee, Gail Posen, Barb Thomas. *Anti-Racist Train the Trainer Programs: A Model*. Prepared for the Ontario Anti-Racism Secretariat Ministry of Citizenship, 1992.
- Kivel, Paul. *Uprooting Racism: How White People Can Work for Racial Justice*. Gabriola Island, British Columbia: New Society Publishers, 2002.
- Kubisch, Anne C. Patricia Auspos, Prudence Brown, Robert Chaskin, Karen Fulbright-Anderson, and



- Ralph Hamilton. *Voices from the Field II: Reflections on Comprehensive Community Change*. Washington, D.C.: The Aspen Institute, 2002.
- Lasch-Quinn, Elisabeth. *Race Experts: How Racial Etiquette, Sensitivity Training, and New Age Therapy Hijacked the Civil Rights Revolution*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2001.
- Law, Eric H. F. *The Wolf Shall Dwell With the Lamb: A Spirituality for Leadership in a Multicultural Community*. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 1993.
- Leiderman, Sally A., and Davido M. Dupree. *Project Change Evaluation Research Brief*. Unpublished document. Center for Assessment and Policy Development, 2000.
- Loden, Marilyn. *Implementing Diversity*. Chicago: Irwin Professional Publishing, 1996.
- Mayer, Bernard. *The Dynamics of Conflict Resolution*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 2000.
- Minors, Arnold, Alok Mukerjee, and Gail Posen. *Pursuing Equity Continuously Adds Real Value: A Framework for Selection of Change Agents*. Toronto: Partners in Equality, 1995.
- Mock, Karen and A. Laufer. *Race Relations Training in Canada: Towards the Development of Professional Standards*. Toronto: Canadian Race Relations Foundation, 2001.
- Mouton-Allen, Dianne, and Patricia Rockwell. "Diversity Trainers: A Survey of Programs and Methods." *International Journal of Diversity and Synergy* (a publication of the National Association for Diversity Management), October 1999, Volume 1, Issue 1.
- Moyer, Bill, with JoAnn McAllister, Mary Lou Finley, and Steven Soifer. *Doing Democracy: The MAP Model for Organizing Social Movements*. Gabriola Island, British Columbia: New Society Publishers, 2001.
- MultiCultural Collaborative, *Race, Power and Promise in Los Angeles: An Assessment of Response to Human Relations Conflict*. Los Angeles: MultiCultural Collaborative, 1995.
- National Conference for Community and Justice. *Intergroup Relations in the United States: Seven Promising Practices*. New York: National Conference for Community and Justice, 1999.
- Omi, Michael, Gary Delgado, and Rebecca Gordon. *Confronting the New Racisms: Anti-Racist Organizing in the Post-Civil Rights Era – Executive Summary*. Prepared by the Applied Research Center for the C.S. Mott Foundation, January 2000.
- Pitcoff, Winton. *"Shelterforce Special Report — Comprehensive Community Initiatives: Redefining Community Development."* Orange, N.J.: National Housing Institute, 1999.
- Plantz, Violet. "Know your Audience: Matching Cultural Diversity Training with Stages of Cultural Consciousness." *MCS Conciliation Quarterly*, Fall 1995.
- Potapchuk, Maggie. *Steps Toward an Inclusive Community*. Washington D.C.: NABRE, Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, 2001.
- Resource for a National Dialogue on Anti-Racism: For Martin Luther King, Jr. Day 1997 and Beyond*. The Episcopal Church, 1996.
- Rivera, Felix G., and John L. Erlich. *Community Organizing in a Diverse Society*. Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1998.
- Rothman, Jay. *Resolving Identity-Based Conflict*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1997.
- Saunders, Harold H. *A Public Peace Process: Sustained Dialogue to Transform Racial and Ethnic Conflicts*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- Schoem, David, and Sylvia Hurtado. *Intergroup Dialogue: Deliberative Democracy in School, College, Community and Workplace*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 2001.



- Schoene, Lester P., and Marcelle E. DuPraw. *Facing Racial and Cultural Conflict: Tools for Rebuilding Community*. Washington, D.C.: Program for Community Problem Solving, 1994.
- Seldon, Horace. "The De-radicalization of Anti-racism." *Sage Race Relations Abstracts*, Institute of Race Relations. Vol. 25, No. 1, 2000.
- Senge, Peter M., Richard Ross, Bryan Smith, Charlotte Roberts, and Art Kleiner. *The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook*. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- Shapiro, Ilana. *Mapping Theories of Practice and Change*. Doctoral Dissertation, Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University, 2002.
- Shapiro, Ilana. *Training for Racial Equity and Inclusion: A Guide to Selected Programs*. New York: Aspen Institute, 2002.
- Smith, Norma. *From Challenging White Supremacy to Managing Diversity: A Preliminary History of Anti-Racist and Diversity Training*. Doctoral Dissertation, The Union Institute Graduate College, 2001.
- Smith, Tom W. *Intergroup Relations in a Diverse America*. New York: American Jewish Committee, 2001.
- Stephan, Walter G., and Cookie White Stephan. *Improving Intergroup Relations*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 2001.
- Stone, Rebecca, editor. *Core Issues in Comprehensive Community-Building Initiatives*. Chicago: Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago, 1996.
- Stone, Rebecca, and Benjamin Butler. *Core Issues in Comprehensive Community Building Initiatives: Exploring Power and Race*. Chicago: Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago, 2000.
- Thomas, David A., and Robin J. Ely. "Making Differences Matter: A New Paradigm for Managing Diversity." *Harvard Business Review*. September-October, 1996.
- Thomas, R. Roosevelt, Jr. *Beyond Race and Gender: Unleashing the Power of Your Total Work Force by Managing Diversity*. New York: Amacom, 1991.
- Thomas, R. Roosevelt, Jr. *Redefining Diversity*. New York: Amacom, 1996.
- Umemoto, Karen. *Towards a Human Relations Infrastructure in California*. Unpublished paper, 2001.
- Walsh, Joan. *Stories of Renewal: Community Building and the Future of Urban America*. A Report from the Rockefeller Foundation. New York: Rockefeller Foundation, 1997.
- Winbourne, Wayne, and Renae Cohen, editors. *Intergroup Relations in the United States: Research Perspectives*. New York: National Conference for Community and Justice, 1999.

APPENDIX A: NABRE BACKGROUND

NETWORK OF ALLIANCES BRIDGING RACE AND ETHNICITY
AN INITIATIVE OF THE JOINT CENTER FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC STUDIES

BACKGROUND

NABRE, the Network of Alliances Bridging Race and Ethnicity, grew out of work done by President Clinton's Initiative on Race in identifying and highlighting promising practices in racial reconciliation in communities across the country—from dialogues and joint community improvement projects to efforts to challenge institutional racism. From September 1997 through September 1998, the Initiative identified and highlighted more than 350 such practices.

While the identification of such practices was encouraging and energizing to leaders and participants, a common concern heard was the sense of isolation felt by many who are engaged in these activities. Often, they are not aware of other racial reconciliation and racial justice activities in their own communities, and they do not have the mechanisms necessary to communicate with similar organizations in other communities. Such isolation hastens “burn-out” among leaders, and it limits the ability to form alliances that can strengthen the impact of such activities.

NABRE (pronounced “neighbor”) was created to address this sense of isolation and to foster alliances that can strengthen efforts to build a just and inclusive society. A program initiative of the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, the nation's preeminent think tank focused on issues of race, NABRE is guided by a Steering Committee of 28 organizations.

NABRE'S MISSION

Racial and ethnic injustice and our nation's ongoing demographic transformation require that we

intensify efforts to bridge racial and ethnic divisions throughout our nation. However, local race relations and racial justice organizations committed to these efforts are often frustrated by a sense of isolation, inadequate resources (both human and financial), and a lack of public awareness or understanding of pervasive and persistent injustice. NABRE's mission is:

To cultivate and nurture race relations and racial justice organizations committed to building alliances that break down barriers of race and ethnicity in all sectors of communities and to build a relentless momentum toward a more inclusive and just nation.

ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK

NABRE believes a wide range of approaches to race relations and racial justice work, from raising individual awareness to working on intergroup relations to confronting institutional racism, all play a vital role in dismantling racism and creating just and inclusive communities. NABRE applies this framework to the way it operates, including hiring staff and consultants, designing programs, and recruiting and supporting members.

HOW NABRE SUPPORTS ITS MEMBERS

Making full use of the new communications avenues created by the information technology revolution, as well as more traditional means, NABRE offers its 160+ members the opportunity to participate in:

- An interactive web site featuring an online directory of members, lessons learned, resources, chatrooms and bulletin boards;



- *Conferences designed to enrich the experiences and networking capacities of members;*
- *How-To Forums to explore promising practices and generate fresh thinking;*
- *Outreach activities to widen the circle of allies and foster stronger community-based coalitions*

HIGHLIGHTS

Interactive Web Site

NABRE's signature function is its interactive and constantly expanding web site, which includes an online directory of over 160 organizations searchable by categories, descriptions of lessons learned on issues of common concern and key resources, and an escalating—level bulletin board and chat—room activity.

Youth Network

To provide an opportunity for young people engaged in race relations activities to link to and learn from each other, we have established Youth NABRE as a companion network to NABRE. We are currently supporting bulletin board discussions hosted by nine organizations that work with youth. The topics have included *Dealing with Stereotypes*, *The Generation Gap*, and *The Digital Divide*.

Regional Conferences

Conferences are designed to enrich the experiences and networking capacities of members by enabling them to interact with counterparts from other communities, share information, and build a common commitment to race relations and racial justice work. We recently hosted an Upper Midwest Regional Conference on Building Inclusive Communities, attended by nearly 200 people and out of which is emerging a regional network of race relations organizations.

Community Impact Assessment Tools

There is compelling anecdotal evidence that various community-based programs are having a posi-

tive effect on racial and ethnic relations and on promoting inclusive and informed decision-making. NABRE is working with its members to design self-assessment tools and provide guidance in their use. The first step, an Evaluation Primer and Workbook, is now in draft form.

How-To Forums

NABRE convenes "how-to" forums to bring together leaders of diverse organizations to generate fresh thinking on a specific issue, discuss ways to bridge racial and ethnic divisions, and to develop action-oriented recommendations for their peers. Our most recent one was the How-To Forum entitled, "Creating Collaborative Approaches to Address Racial Injustice in Communities," discussed at length in this book.

Research

NABRE conducts and publishes research on key issues. Its first publication, *Steps Toward An Inclusive Community*, features a tool that assists local leaders in assessing the inclusiveness of their communities and shares lessons learned from how the city of Clarksburg, West Virginia, confronted a threat from the Ku Klux Klan.

Outreach

To widen the circle of allies working to foster racial healing and improve race relations, NABRE reaches out beyond those currently engaged in such work to help build broader community-based coalitions. For example, NABRE has

- *worked with AOL/Digital City to demonstrate how online dialogues on race can strengthen local coalitions and stimulate action on local issues of race. The first pilot project took place in Boston on the topic of "Civil Rights and Security: The Dangers of Profiling" and was conducted in cooperation with the Greater Boston Civil Rights Coalition. The second pilot is now being conducted with students in cooperation with the Miami-Dade County School System.*



- worked with *Wisdom Works, Inc.*, producer of *Tutu and Franklin: A Journey Towards Peace*, to catalyze outreach activities in approximately 125 communities around the country in conjunction with the PBS airing of the documentary.
- developed a partnership with the *Television Race Initiative* to work with our members to conduct outreach activities around the PBS showing of subsequent documentaries on race, including *Two Towns of Jasper* and *The New Americans*.

THE NABRE STEERING COMMITTEE

Anti-Defamation League
 Arab American Institute
 Asian Pacific American Institute for Congressional Studies
 Association of American Colleges & Universities
 Black Leadership Forum
 California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc.
 Hope in the Cities
 Joint Center for Political & Economic Studies
 Leadership Conference on Civil Rights
 Leadership Education for Asian Pacifics
 MultiCultural Collaborative
 NAACP
 National Association of Counties
 National Civic League
 National Conference for Community and Justice
 National Congress of American Indians
 National Council of Churches
 National Council of La Raza
 National Italian American Foundation
 National League of Cities
 National Urban League
 Oregon Uniting
 People's Institute for Survival and Beyond
 Pew Center for Civic Journalism
 Poverty and Race Research Action Council
 Southern Poverty Law Center
 Study Circles Resource Center
 Workplace Diversity Network

NABRE FUNDERS TO DATE

John S. and James L. Knight Foundation
 W. K. Kellogg Foundation
 Lucent Technologies Foundation
 Annie E. Casey Foundation
 AOL Time Warner Foundation
 Appalachian Regional Commission
 National Education Association
 Ford Motor Company
 DaimlerChrysler
 Motorola Foundation
 Joyce Foundation
 Mitsubishi Motors
 Kovler Foundation
 Otto Bremer Foundation



APPENDIX B: NABRE ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK

AN ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE
NETWORK OF ALLIANCES BRIDGING RACE AND ETHNICITY
AN INITIATIVE OF THE JOINT CENTER FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC STUDIES

ASSUMPTIONS SUPPORTING THE NABRE ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK

The NABRE Framework as Central Organizing Construct

This NABRE Organizational Framework is the central construct around which NABRE operates. The Framework is the benchmark for NABRE programming, staffing, governance, and membership.

NABRE Member Commitments That Support the Organizational Framework

A potential NABRE member must, at a minimum, express two fundamental commitments to be eligible for membership:

- 1) *Acknowledgement that racism is a particularly significant social problem in which the organization is investing time, staffing, and funds; and*
- 2) *Willingness to engage in multiracial and cross-cultural coalitions and/or collaborative efforts to fight racism.*

NABRE members may be identity-based constituency groups (e.g., National Italian American Foundation, National Urban League, National Council of La Raza, National Congress of American Indians, Leadership and Education of Asian Pacifics); interracial/intercultural groups (e.g., National Conference for Community and Justice, Hope in the Cities, Study Circles Resource Center); advocacy groups (Poverty and Race Research Action Council, Southern Poverty Law Center, Black Leadership Forum, Leadership Conference for Civil Rights), or sector-based groups (Association of American Col-

leges and Universities, National Council of Churches), among others.

NABRE Creates a Network Within the Spectrum

The NABRE Organizational Framework encompasses a spectrum of approaches found in the field of race relations and racial justice work. We believe that NABRE can facilitate the connecting of organizations from different points on the spectrum so they can work cooperatively toward a common vision of dismantling racism through exploring their interdependence and identifying opportunities for collaborative activities.

If NABRE is to embrace the “spectrum connector” role, it must infuse all of its work with this assumption. Therefore, NABRE’s meetings, programs, communications, and decision-making processes must actively aim to support dialogue among the differing voices, approaches, and strategies along the spectrum.

NABRE Acknowledges the Multi-Level and Multi-Perspective Nature of Racism

As an organization, NABRE acknowledges and embraces the assumption that racism functions in the world community on individual, group, institutional, and cultural levels. At each of these levels, racism (indeed, all oppressions) and counter-racist activities are construed through a multiplicity of perspectives, including intellectual, emotional, social, political, and spiritual. It is common for individuals and organizations to align their race relations and racial justice activities with the perspectives through which they view racism. Hence, some



organizations seek to address racism through intellectual study, research and publication; others address racism through political action and social advocacy; still others speak to the spiritual dimensions of human oppression and seek to inspire reconciliation on human and spiritual levels. NABRE embraces the spectrum of work of all the voices, commitments and activities represented in all of these perspectives.

NABRE Emphasizes the Dynamic Flow Within the Spectrum

As a facilitator for connecting organizations within the spectrum, NABRE is uniquely positioned to emphasize the “dynamic flow” that occurs between the points on the spectrum and to provide substantive opportunities for divergent organizations to learn with and from one another. In this context, NABRE members can explore the strengths, shortcomings, and interdependence of their approaches.

NABRE Extends the Spectrum to Expand the Field

NABRE’s mission calls it to extend the boundaries of the spectrum to support organizations whose missions may not be specifically focused on race relations and racial justice work but whose values lead them to embrace this work (e.g., Scouts, Rotary Clubs, Junior League, etc.). For these organizations, NABRE or NABRE members may provide organizational coaching or mentoring services; introductory forums that bring experienced organizations into engagement with inexperienced organizations for learning; or some form of associate membership level. Full membership in NABRE, of course, would require an organization to embrace the two fundamental member commitments identified earlier along with the previously established NABRE guiding principles.

THE NABRE ORGANIZATIONAL FRAMEWORK

NABRE: Dialogue, Learning and Collaboration Across the Spectrum

In our effort to determine how to render the notion of the “spectrum connector” operational in the organizational life of NABRE, there emerged the idea that NABRE could provide dialogue, learning, and collaboration support among organizations all along the spectrum. Organizations that acknowledge that racism is a “particularly significant social issue” and are invested in responding to that fact would be welcome as a NABRE member and full participant. NABRE would be responsible for facilitating dialogue, learning, and collaboration among the different organizations across the spectrum.

Believing that dialogue must be purposeful beyond its own existence, the Steering Committee believes that NABRE embraces an organizational structure which purposefully seeks to achieve the following objectives:

- *NABRE member organizations must represent different approaches that encompass the spectrum and come together in face-to-face or electronic exchanges to define, communicate, and discuss their ideologies and approaches regarding broad issues of racial harmony, racial justice, and social change. The purpose of such discussions is to bring organizations across the spectrum together for learning, growth, and collaboration.*
- *NABRE aims to facilitate purposeful dialogue about specific issues (e.g., affirmative action, racial profiling, reparations) wherein NABRE members will educate one another about the wide variety of perspectives and responses they bring to address these issues in their work. This sort of exchange would be expected to occur in all formal NABRE programs (online chats, public forums, or conferences) as well as during NABRE Steering Committee meetings.*



- *NABRE encourages organizations from across the spectrum to identify the strengths and shortcomings of their particular approaches and to be willing to discuss these in an effort to enhance their own work.*
- *NABRE will take a leadership role in promoting to NABRE members from across the spectrum the importance of acknowledging the interdependence of their approaches in the larger movement toward social justice and equality. With this understanding, members will be encouraged to identify ways to learn with and about their colleagues on the spectrum in an effort to strengthen their own work and the work of other organizations.*
- *The perspectives that emerge from NABRE's Organizational Framework are not held only for the benefit of NABRE members. Rather, NABRE seeks to capture them in a written or electronic form of communication and to distribute them to educate and inform local and national policy makers; NABRE members; funders; and organizations that are interested in embracing race relations and racial justice work.*



APPENDIX C: FORUM PARTICIPANTS

HOW-TO FORUM: ADVISORY COMMITTEE, INVITEES, AND PARTICIPANTS

The following is a list of invited participants to the How-To Forum. Those listed with an asterisk (*) were unable to attend the event, and those listed with the “#” served as Advisory Committee members.

1. Susan Batten, *The Annie E. Casey Foundation*, Baltimore, MD
2. Larry Bell, *National Coalition Building Institute*, Washington, DC
3. Taquiena Boston, *Unitarian Universalist Association*, Boston, MA
4. Delia Carmen, *The Annie E. Casey Foundation*, Baltimore, MD
5. Rob Corcoran, *Hope In The Cities*, Richmond, VA
6. Yoke-Sim Gunaratne, *Cultural Diversity Resources*, Moorhead, MN
7. Melanie Harrington, *The American Institute for Managing Diversity*, Atlanta, GA
8. Jennifer Holladay, *Southern Poverty Law Center*, Montgomery, AL
9. Daniel HoSang, *Center for Third World Organizing*, Oakland, CA*
10. Mareasa Isaacs, *The Annie E. Casey Foundation*, Baltimore, MD
11. John Landesman, *Study Circles Resource Center*, Pomfret, CT #
12. Roberta Joyner, *Partners for Democratic Change*, San Francisco, CA*
13. Eric Law, *Consultant*, Palm Desert, CA*#
14. Rubén Lizardo, *California Tomorrow*, Oakland, CA #
15. Paul Marcus, *Community Change, Inc.*, Boston, MA
16. Scott Marshall, *National Conference for Community and Justice*, New York, NY
17. R. Michael Paige, *Intercultural Communications Institute*, Portland, OR
18. Kimberley Richards, *People’s Institute for Survival and Beyond*, New Orleans, LA
19. Loretta Ross, *National Center for Human Rights Education*, Atlanta, GA*
20. Jay Rothman, *The Action Evaluation Research Institute*, Yellow Springs, OH
21. Ilana Shapiro, *Alliance for Conflict Transformation*, Arlington, VA #
22. Makani Themba-Nixon, *Consultant*, Columbia, MD*#
23. Benjamin Torres, *MultiCultural Collaborative*, Los Angeles, CA
24. Jesús Treviño, *Arizona State University, Intergroup Relations Center*, Tempe, AZ #



25. *Khatib Waheed, The Aspen Institute, New York, NY #*
26. *Ron Wakabayashi, U.S. Department of Justice, Los Angeles, CA *#*
27. *Charmaine Wijeyesinghe, Consultant, Delmar, NY *#*
28. *Saadia Williams, Knoxville Project Change, Knoxville, TN*

NABRE Staff

- *Sheila Collins, Online Community Manager*
- *Maggie Potapchuk, Senior Program Associate*
- *Michael Wenger, Director*

Consulting Team

- *Tammy Bormann, Consultant, Facilitator*
- *Benjamin Butler, Community Development Associates, Inc., Facilitator*
- *Damien Heath, MOSAICA: The Center for Nonprofit Development and Pluralism, Process Observer*

Notes

Leslie Mantrone, Cornerstone Consulting, was an observer at the How-To Forum by invitation of the Annie E. Casey Foundation. The Annie E. Casey Foundation staff were present only during the case study discussion. Tammy Bormann also was a member of the How-To Forum Advisory Committee.

APPENDIX D: INFORMATION ABOUT PARTICIPANTS

NABRE HOW-TO FORUM: CREATING COLLABORATIVE APPROACHES TO ADDRESS RACIAL INJUSTICE IN COMMUNITIES

Alliance for Conflict Transformation

3100 Mapu Place
Kihei, Maui, Hawaii 96753

Contact Person:

Ilana Shapiro, Ph.D.
703-691-8261
ilana.shapiro@conflicttransformation.org
www.conflicttransformation.org

Mission:

The Alliance for Conflict Transformation, Inc., (ACT) is a nonprofit 501(c)(3) organization committed to preventing and transforming intergroup conflicts and addressing economic, political, and social issues affecting identity groups within the U.S. and international communities. ACT recognizes that conflict is an inseparable part of human interaction and is embedded in relations at the individual, interpersonal, community, institutional, and international levels. When addressed effectively, conflict can be an important vehicle for positive social change. ACT helps transform destructive conflicts by addressing underlying needs and concerns, building sustainable relationships, and changing the contexts and conditions that foster violence. ACT professionals use multi-faceted approaches to develop better understandings of the psychological, socio-cultural, political, historical, and economic dimensions of conflict situations and create uniquely suited, cooperative interventions that transform understandings, relationships, and outcomes.

Goals:

- *Design innovative programs to address the unique conditions of social conflicts based on a wide range of assessment tools and intervention strategies;*
- *Implement sustainable conflict transformation initiatives that are grounded in local needs and assets;*
- *Integrate conflict resolution theory, applied research, and practice to create more informed programs;*
- *Develop personal and professional networks and partnerships that build community and foster cooperative change; and*
- *Provide proactive, educational services to prevent conflict escalation and violence, based on "lessons learned" and "best practices" from conflict zones around the world.*



American Institute for Managing Diversity, Inc.

50 Hurt Plaza, Suite 1150
Atlanta, GA 30303

R. Roosevelt Thomas, Jr. D.B.A.,
President and Founder

Contact Person:

Melanie Harrington
404-302-9226
mharrington@aimd.org
www.aimd.org

Mission:

Through research, education, and public outreach, AIMD seeks to improve dialogue and illuminate action options that lead to quality decisions about diversity. AIMD is a nonprofit diversity think tank working to advance the understanding of Diversity Management.

Goals: (Partial List)

- Continue to facilitate a public dialogue about diversity from its broadest perspective;
- Continue to foster quality decisions about diversity that lead to the fulfillment of personal, organizational, and societal objectives;
- Continue to provide a process or framework for making quality decisions about diversity challenges;
- Continue to provide access to information, research, education, and tools that help build diversity management awareness, understanding and skills among the public;
- Work with corporate, nonprofit, religious, government, community, and national leaders through our Diversity Leadership Academy;
- Increase our inventory of AIMD published Diversity Management Tools;
- Utilize the internet and the world wide web to create easier and greater access to AIMD education and research offerings;

- Increase contributions to support organization infrastructure growth, sustain and develop current programs, and kick-off the development and implementation of derivative programs;
- Reach broader and larger audiences with the powerful news about the critical importance of managing effectively in the midst of diversity; and
- Continue to produce innovative cutting-edge public education initiatives.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation

701 St. Paul Street
Baltimore, MD 21202

Douglas W. Nelson, President

Contact Person:

Mareasa Isaacs
410-547-6600
mareasai@aecf.org
www.aecf.org

Mission:

The Annie E. Casey Foundation is a private charitable organization dedicated to helping build better futures for disadvantaged children in the United States.

Goals:

The primary mission of the foundation is to foster public policies, human service reforms, and community supports that more effectively meet the needs of today's vulnerable children and families. In pursuit of this goal, the Foundation makes grants that help states, cities, and neighborhoods fashion more innovative, cost-effective responses to these needs.



The ARIA Group, Inc. (Nonprofit arm: Action Evaluation Research Institute)

1050 President Street
Yellow Springs, OH 45387

Jay Rothman, Ph.D., Executive Director
jrothman@ariagroup.com

Contact Person:

Vaughn Crandall
937-767-8162
www.ariagroup.com
Nonprofit web site: www.aepro.org

Mission:

The ARIA Group, Inc. is a training, consulting, and conflict resolution intervention firm committed to helping organizations and communities understand conflict as an opportunity rather than an obstacle, and engage conflict to achieve creative and collaborative solutions to enhance relationships. One of our most powerful tools is an integrated and participatory evaluation methodology called Action Evaluation, which is designed to enhance commitment and ownership of a project among key stakeholders in conflict resolution, organization, and social change efforts.

Goals:

The ARIA Group's goal is to provide a range of services using the ARIA and Action Evaluation techniques, including tools such as our online database, to businesses and nonprofit organizations. As part of our business, we develop relevant products such as books, workshops, and training programs.

Arizona State University, Intergroup Relations Center

P.O. Box 871512
Tempe, AZ 85287-1512

Contact Person:

Kris Ewing, Interim Director
480-965-1574

Note: Jesús Treviño, Ph.D. was ASU representative at the How-To Forum and has taken a new position as Associate Provost for Multicultural Affairs at the University of Denver. His contact information is, 303-871-2942, jtrevino@du.edu.

Mission:

The mission of the Intergroup Relations Center (IRC) is to promote positive intergroup relations among students, faculty, and staff and improve the campus climate for diversity at ASU. In pursuing its mission, the IRC focuses on (1) intergroup dynamics within the context of an institution of higher education and (2) promoting change in intergroup relations at the personal, group, and structural levels. The process of change is to be participatory and collegial. The core assumption that guides the work and activities of the IRC is that diversity is an asset and can be utilized to enhance the growth of the ASU community as well as to achieve specific educational outcomes.

Goals

- 1: *Education and Training* Rationale: There is a need to educate and train students, staff, and faculty in intergroup relations and the management of intergroup conflict. The assumption that positive cross-group interaction will take place on its own is erroneous. The process of understanding and interacting with people who are different is difficult and stressful. Thus, interaction must be structured and individuals must be given incentives for interacting across diverse groups.
- 2: *Resources and Data Collection* Rationale: The campus community requires easy access to two different information bases on intergroup topics: first, from published sources, and sec-



ond, from ongoing events at ASU. Published materials providing context for understanding local events and indicating possible solutions need to be collected and cataloged; further, the community needs local data regarding the number and type of intergroup relations incidents at ASU, and the diversity-related programs across campus. Moreover, it is imperative that resources at ASU be maximized by avoiding duplication of services and programs.

- 3: *Research and Curriculum Development*
Rationale: Careful research can clarify complex and controversial issues, particularly in relation to issues of race/ethnicity, gender, class, sexual orientation, disability status, and other social categories; IRC databases will facilitate this much-needed research and ensure that it addresses local concerns. Sound research can also help to craft activities and interventions that help to develop cultural competence in various arenas, and are adaptable to various pedagogical settings within the university.

The Aspen Institute Roundtable on Comprehensive Community Initiatives

281 Park Ave., South 5th Floor
New York, NY 10010

Anne Kubisch & Karen Fulbright-Anderson,
Co-Directors

Contact Person:

Khatib Waheed
314-389-5029
khatibwaheed@mindspring.com
www.aspenroundtable.org

Mission/Goals:

The Roundtable on Comprehensive Community Initiatives is a forum in which people engaged in the field of comprehensive community initiatives (CCIs)—including foundation sponsors, directors, technical assistance providers, evaluators, and public sector officials—could meet to discuss the lessons that are being learned by initiatives across

the country and to work on common problems they are facing.

Comprehensive Community Initiatives (CCIs) are neighborhood-based efforts that seek improved outcomes for individuals and families as well as improvements in neighborhood conditions by working comprehensively across social, economic, and physical sectors. Additionally, CCIs operate on the principle that community building—that is, strengthening institutional capacity at the neighborhood level, enhancing social capital and personal networks, and developing leadership—is a necessary aspect of the process of transforming distressed neighborhoods.

California Tomorrow

1904 Franklin Street, Suite 300
Oakland, CA 94612

Greg Hodge & Laurie Olsen, Co-CEO's

Contact Person:

Rubén Lizardo
510-496-0220, X304
rubenl@californiatomorrow.org
www.californiatomorrow.org

Mission:

Founded in 1984, California Tomorrow is a non-profit organization dedicated to contributing to the building of a strong and fair multiracial, multicultural, multilingual society that is equitable for everyone. California Tomorrow believes building such a society involves embracing diversity as our greatest strength and promoting and working for full participation and equitable access to our society's structures and resources – social, economic, educational, and political.

Goals/Activities Related to Focus of***How-To Forum:***

- The Walking the Walk Network Project, which brings together leaders of community initiatives and organizations to build their own



organization's capacities to address diversity and equity in their internal and external work.

- The Leading By Example Peer Network Project, through which California Tomorrow is facilitating an inter-organizational dialogue and providing capacity building resources to four community foundations engaged in organizational change initiatives to strengthen their inclusion and equity principles and practices.
- The K-12 Equity Center School Change Project, our most mature and developed effort that focuses framing, facilitating, and coaching teacher-led schoolwide change efforts to address equity and diversity issues in public schools.

Community Change, Inc.

14 Beacon Street, Room 605
Boston, MA 02108

Carol Rinehart, Co-Director

Contact Person:

Paul Marcus

617-523-0555

pmarcus@communitychangeinc.org

www.communitychangeinc.org

Mission:

Community Change promotes racial justice and equity by challenging systemic racism and acting as a catalyst for anti-racist learning and action.

Core Values:

- *Racism is a system of oppression and white privilege.*
- *Dismantling institutional racism is possible, and systems thinking and action is necessary to bring about that change.*
- *Whites must take responsibility for racism.*

- *It is a critical part of the process to build and maintain respectful, authentic personal and organizational relationships across difference.*

- *Personal transformation and systems change are inextricably linked.*

- *Strategic collaboration is necessary to achieve our goals, and we are committed to action.*

- *Understanding the historical context of the present is necessary to create change.*

Cultural Diversity Resources

810 S. Fourth Avenue, Suite 147
Moorhead, MN 56560

Contact Person:

Yoke-Sim Gunaratne

218-236-7277

cdr@i29.net

Mission:

To build communities that value diversity.

Goals:

- *To increase understanding of the value of diversity in the community.*
- *To eliminate the barriers to community participation experienced by diverse populations.*



Hope in the Cities

1103 Sunset Avenue
Richmond, VA 23221

Contact Person:

Robert L. Corcoran
804-358-1764
rscorcoran@aol.com
www.hopeinthecities.org

Mission:

Hope in the Cities is a national network of individuals and organizations committed to racial reconciliation and justice. Its mission is to create more just communities through reconciliation among racial, ethnic and religious groups based on personal and institutional transformation.

Goals:

- *To create models of sustained community dialogue involving all sectors and leading to concrete action for reconciliation and justice.*
- *To demonstrate that public acknowledgment and healing of historic wounds is critical to effective reconciliation.*
- *To identify and develop skills and attitudes that enable community leaders to generate effective teamwork among all sectors.*
- *To develop the capacity of a network of volunteers and associates for facilitation, mediation, and team building.*
- *To relate the struggle for reconciliation in U.S. cities to the challenges in conflict situations worldwide.*

The Intercultural Communication Institute (ICI)

8835 S. W. Canyon Lane
Portland, OR 97225

Contact Persons:

Dr. Janet M. Bennett and Dr. Milton J. Bennett
612-626-7456
ici@intercultural.org
www.intercultural.org

Mission:

The Intercultural Communication Institute (ICI) is a nonprofit, private foundation designed to foster an awareness and appreciation of cultural difference in both the international and domestic arenas. ICI is based on the belief that education and training in the area of intercultural communication can improve competence in dealing with cultural difference and thereby minimize destructive conflict among national, ethnic, and other cultural groups. ICI has an ethical commitment to further education in this area.

Goals:

The goals of ICI are consistent with its mission. It seeks (1) to support the development of intercultural education and training, (2) to support research in the area of intercultural relations, and (3) to prepare a future generation of interculturalists.

Knoxville Project Change

3615 Martin Luther King Jr. Ave.
Knoxville, TN 37914

Contact Person:

Saadia L. Williams
865-522-7111
prj.chg@kornet.org
www.knoxvilleprojectchange.org

Mission:

The mission of Knoxville Project Change is to empower the Knoxville community, to reduce racial prejudice, and to improve race relations.



Goals:

- *Dismantle institutional policies and practices that promote discrimination.*
- *Promote inclusion in the leadership of key community institutions.*
- *Stop and prevent overt or violent acts of racial and cultural prejudice.*
- *Strengthen the infrastructure for social justice work.*

MultiCultural Collaborative

315 W. 9th Street, Suite 315
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Contact Person:

Bong Hwan Kim
213-624-7992 ext. 11
bhkim@mcc-la.org
www.mcc-la.org

Mission:

The Multicultural Collaborative's mission is to identify, develop, and promote creative models of intergroup collaboration that advance social justice, equity, and community in Los Angeles.

Goals:

- *Broaden and deepen diverse networks of individual and organizational leaders working on social justice issues.*
- *Build and strengthen the capacity of diverse individuals, organizations, and networks to collaboratively move toward social justice.*
- *Increase the visibility of, and promote the need for, intergroup/inter-ethnic community-building efforts geared toward social justice.*

National Coalition Building Institute

1120 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 450
Washington, DC 20036

Cherie Brown, Executive Director

Contact Person:

Larry Bell
202-265-9498
ncbidc@hotmail.com
www.ncbi.org

Mission:

To train leadership teams in an array of settings, including high schools, colleges, and universities, corporations, foundations, correctional facilities, law enforcement agencies, government offices, and labor unions in anti-racism/conflict resolution/ally-building skills.

Goals:

Establish leadership for diversity teams throughout the world to be a resource in their communities for change and justice. Currently NCBI has 50 city-based leadership teams, known as NCBI Chapters, 30 organization-based leadership teams, known as NCBI Affiliates, and over 65 college/university-based teams, known as Campus Affiliates.

The National Conference for Community and Justice (NCCJ)

475 Park Avenue South, 19th Floor
New York, NY 10016

Sanford Cloud Jr., President and CEO

Contact Person:

Scott Marshall
212-545-1300
smarshal@nccj.org
www.nccj.org

Mission:

The National Conference for Community and Justice, founded in 1927 as the National Conference of Christians and Jews, is a human relations orga-



nization dedicated to fighting bias, bigotry, and racism in America. NCCJ promotes understanding and respect among all races, religions, and cultures through advocacy, conflict resolution, and education.

Goals:

Empower leaders to create institutional change that transforms communities to be more inclusive and just. Work with established and emerging leaders in six sectors: Faith, Economic Opportunity, Education, Youth, News Media and Advertising, and Government.

Network of Alliances Bridging Race and Ethnicity – NABRE

An Initiative of the Joint Center for Political & Economic Studies

1090 Vermont Avenue, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005

Michael Wenger, Director

Contact Person:

Maggie Potapchuk
202-789-3500
mpotapchuk@jointcenter.org
www.jointcenter.org/NABRE

Mission:

Racial and ethnic injustice and our nation's ongoing demographic transformation require that we intensify efforts to bridge racial and ethnic divisions throughout our nation. However, local race relations and racial justice organizations committed to these efforts are often frustrated by a sense of isolation, inadequate resources (both human and financial), and a lack of public awareness or understanding of pervasive and persistent injustice. NABRE's mission is: To cultivate and nurture race relations and racial justice organizations committed to building alliances that break down barriers of race and ethnicity in all sectors of communities and to build a relentless momentum toward a more inclusive and just nation.

How We Support our Members:

Utilizing communications opportunities created by the information technology revolution, as well as traditional means of communications and interaction, NABRE will provide community organizations and local leadership with mechanisms that will enable them to:

- *learn from each other's experiences in confronting common challenges;*
- *share ideas that work and the circumstances under which they work;*
- *effectively measure their progress and gather information to guide long-term planning;*
- *support and sustain each other in their efforts to address racial and cultural intolerance and injustice; and*
- *expand and broaden the base of support for their community activities and inspire and recruit new leaders in communities throughout the country.*

People's Institute for Survival and Beyond

7166 Crowder Blvd., Suite 100
New Orleans, LA 70127

Contact Person:

Ron Chisom
504-241-7472
www.thepeoplesinstitute.org

Mission:

To build a multicultural, anti-racist movement for social change.

Goals:

- *To be a part of the movement for social justice and equity by assisting the understanding of issues of race and racism.*
- *To develop anti-racist leadership.*
- *To develop accountable relationships.*



- *To network with others working for social transformation.*
- *To participate in the development of an anti-racist and humanistic culture.*
- *To apply the history of struggle and resistance to the current movement for social justice.*
- *To understand militarism as applied racism.*

Southern Poverty Law Center

400 Washington Avenue
Montgomery, AL 36104

Joe Levin, President

Contact Person:

Jennifer Holladay
334-956-8200
jholladay@splcenter.org
www.tolerance.org

Mission:

To fight hate and promote tolerance through education and litigation.

Goals:

- *To protect the Constitutional guarantees of access and opportunity granted to all members of our society, especially the disadvantaged and oppressed, through the American judicial system.*
- *To equip educators with skills, tools, and resources as they prepare the next generation of Americans for life in a welcoming, multicultural democratic society.*
- *To uncover and expose racist, extremist activity that threatens our collective sense of community and our individual right to personal safety.*

Study Circles Resource Center

697 Pomfret St., Box 203
Pomfret, CT 06258

Martha McCoy, Executive Director

Contact Person:

John Landesman
202-775-0730
johnl@studycircles.org
www.studycircles.org

Mission:

Established in 1989, SCRC is a project of the Topsfield Foundation, Inc., a private, nonprofit, nonpartisan foundation dedicated to advancing deliberative democracy and improving the quality of public life in the United States.

Goals:

The Study Circles Resource Center is dedicated to finding ways for all kinds of people to engage in dialogue and problem solving on critical social and political issues. SCRC helps communities by giving them the tools to organize productive dialogue, recruit diverse participants, find solutions, and work for action and change.

Unitarian Universalist Association

1320 18th St., NW, Suite 300B,
Washington, DC 20036

William G. Sinkford, President

Contact Person:

Taquiena Boston
Director, Identity Based Ministries
202-296-4672
tboston@uua.org
www.uua.org

Mission:

The Journey Toward Wholeness (JTW) is an initiative of the Unitarian Universalist (UU) Association to become an anti-oppressive, anti-racist multicultural religious association working to eradicate racism



and all forms of oppression in UU institutions and communities.

Goals:

- *The goal of the JTW initiative is to increase and transform the racial and social justice work of the association into efforts that are based on an understanding of how privilege functions in society and in our religious association.*
- *JTW promotes Unitarian Universalists engaging in authentic partnerships with people of color and other marginalized groups as we work to dismantle racism, homophobia, ableism, and all oppression by building community and social change.*

AUTHOR'S ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Producing this book and organizing the How-To Forum has been a challenging learning experience for me. It was enlightening doing the research and discussing the issues with colleagues and friends, all of whom were so generous with their ideas, insights, critiques, and advice. My deep appreciation goes to the many people who contributed to the How-To Forum and the creation of this publication.

As mentioned in Eddie Williams' foreword, the NABRE Planning Committee are the visionaries who conceptualized the organizational framework of NABRE, which embraces the spectrum of race relations and racial justice approaches and believes each approach has a role for dismantling racism. This framework emerged out of the Planning Committee's retreat, whose facilitators, Cyndi Harris and Anthony Neal, created a thoughtful design, which helped us formulate the concept and come to consensus. A sub-committee was then formed that took the idea and brought it to fruition, Tammy Bormann, David Campt, Lorna Gonsalves, Michael Wenger, and Ray Winbush. Their accomplishment was invaluable.

A special thanks goes to Mareasa Issacs of the Annie E. Casey Foundation for recognizing the significance of the concept and the importance of helping groups find ways to collaborate on the issue of race in communities. I appreciate her support and leadership.

I would like to thank the How-To Advisory committee for asking hard questions, raising issues, and sharing their insights, contacts, and resources. Also deserving much thanks are the How-To Forum participants, who because of their candor, their trust of the process, and their generosity enabled all of us to learn more and figure out more ways to create just and inclusive communities. I especially thank the

several participants who made contributions to this book – their opinions, insights, and wisdom I am sure you will find helpful and provocative. Facilitating for facilitators is always a challenge. Tammy Bormann and Benjamin Butler did an excellent job facilitating, as was reflected in the affirmation and compliments received from their colleagues. I treasured our discussions, especially co-creating the design with them. I also want to thank Damien Heath from Mosaica for sharing his observations and insights.

When the process and design for the Forum was percolating, there were several people who let me talk through ideas, share their brainstorm, and challenged my thinking. For these contributions I would like to thank, Shakti Butler, Carolyn Cushing, Cyndi Harris, Bill Potapchuk, Jarrod Schwartz, Norma Smith, Shirley Strong, Makani Themba-Nixon, and Khatib Waheed. And I must thank several people who provided feedback on the content of this book – helping me find clarity, offering thoughtful critiques, sharing ideas and language, and giving their support. They are Benjamin Butler, Cyndi Harris, Sally Leiderman, Bong-Hwan Kim, Rubén Lizardo, Martha McCoy, and Charmaine Wijeyesinghe.

The NABRE staff team was, as always, very supportive of this project. I want to thank Sheila Collins for her encouragement, Muriel Warren for her dedication in coordinating logistics, Albert Sims, our Summer 2001 intern from Rice University, who did research on the approaches, and finally Michael Wenger, who was enthusiastic about the concept from the beginning and worked steadfastly to make it happen, as well as providing helpful feedback and encouragement.

The Office of Development and Communication at the Joint Center played a vital role in rolling out this



publication and did so with a commitment to quality. For this I would like to extend my appreciation to Denise Dugas for her leadership, David Farquharson for his creativity and dedication, and Marc DeFrancis for his helpful editing and counsel.

There are three people to whom I extend my deepest appreciation, who played a significant role in the How-To Forum event and publication. First, Ilana Shapiro, who was so gracious sharing her doctoral work. I valued our conversations about the spectrum of approaches, which helped lead to my own clarity. Her ideas significantly enriched the Forum, this publication, and my work. Second, Tammy Bormann, who has been the torchbearer of NABRE's organizational framework. She made a noteworthy impact on the event and publication. Her skillful co-facilitation, her thoughtful and encouraging feedback throughout the process, her advice on reframing some of the "next steps," and her leadership and friendship all were vitally important to this project.

Finally, I would like to thank Gene Mitchell, my life partner, who throughout this project not only provided his steady support and encouragement, but also shared his wonderful editing skills and kept me focused on what was really important.

This book is dedicated to my Dad, William Potapchuk, who encouraged my curiosity and showed me what it means to be passionate about my beliefs. ●

Maggie Potapchuk



FEEDBACK FORM

We hope this publication will launch a rich discussion about the spectrum of approaches, how to work interdependently together, and what next steps we need to pursue. Your feedback is important to us as we begin this dialogue. Please take the time to answer any or all of the questions on this form. NABRE will share your feedback with the larger community of practitioners, activists, and academics through our web site, so the dialogue can begin on-line. Please let us know if you would like your feedback to be shared on our website.

Name: _____

Organization: _____

You have my permission attribute my comments with my name and organization on your website.
☐ Yes ☐ No

We appreciate your taking the time and sharing your ideas, concerns, issues and opinions.

ORGANIZATION REFLECTION QUESTIONS

1. Did you use the Organizational Reflection Questions? If so, with people in what roles?
2. Were the questions useful? Which questions were most useful? Which questions were least useful?
3. Any questions you would like to add?
4. What questions would you want to ask other organizations about their approach?

SPECTRUM OF APPROACHES

1. Which approach(es) did you identify with your work? Would you make any changes to the description(s)?



2. Would you add any approaches? How would you describe them?

3. Are you surprised by any that are included? Why?

NEXT STEPS

1. What are your reactions to the next steps listed?

2. What do you think need to be next steps to build our capacity to work more collaboratively together?

NABRE'S ROLE

1. What role do you think NABRE can play in helping race relations and racial justice organizations work interdependently together across the spectrum?

2. What resources or technical assistance would help your organization be more effective working collaboratively?

GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE PUBLICATION

1. How can this resource publication be improved?

2. Please share any other feedback.

RETURN TO:

Fax — 202-789-6391

Mail — NABRE-HTF, 1090 Vermont Ave., NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20005

Email — nabre@jointcenter.org