Labor and Community
LIVING WAGE, LIVE ACTION

by Robert Pollin

This past summer, security workers at LAX airport in Los Angeles began their first-ever union organizing drive. They were motivated, labor activists say, by the city’s foot-dragging in implementing a living-wage ordinance that had passed the previous year and guaranteed a minimum of $7.25 an hour (rising with inflation every July 1), plus health benefits and twelve paid days off. Workers unaccustomed to challenging income and power inequities suddenly felt emboldened by the experience of that earlier drive, which, like similar efforts taking off elsewhere in the country, began with the simple premise that no one who works for a living should have to struggle in poverty.

As of 1997, 7.3 million American families were officially poor, and in 66 percent of them at least one person had a job. At the current minimum wage of $5.15 an hour, someone who works full time for fifty weeks earns only $10,300 a year — below the national poverty threshold for a family of two. A “traditional” family of four with one wage-earner falls nearly 40 percent below the line. True, this family is eligible to receive an earned-income tax credit, food stamps and Medicaid, but the need for such programs to support a full-time worker’s household only underscores the fact that $5.15 an hour is not close to being a living wage.

In opposition to this state of affairs the living-wage movement was initiated four years ago by unions, community groups and religious organizations. It has succeeded in passing living-wage ordinances — higher minimum-wage standards for workers affected by the measures — in seventeen cities. Now organizing campaigns are pressing forward in twenty-four other municipalities.

There are a number of lessons from these campaigns, not least that even in an expansion, real wages will not rise without strong, creative organizing efforts. The real value of the minimum wage is 30 percent below what it was in 1968, even though the economy is 50 percent more productive than it was thirty years ago, and even after the seven-year “Clinton boom.” Now it looks as if we’re coming to the end of that boom.

Given the September 22 defeat of Senator Kennedy’s bill to raise the minimum wage by a dollar over two years, it’s clear that, in a weakening economy, workers can win higher wages and better conditions only if they fight effectively.

The living-wage movement has been strategically astute since its inception. It has emerged primarily at the level of municipal politics because organizers correctly assessed that their efforts have a greater chance of suc-
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Welcome... new PLANNERS NETWORK members!


Thank You

renewing members!


...and Special Thanks

sustaining members!

Alan Rabowitz, Barbara Radner, Ken Readon, Jan R. Reine, Wan Wiedew.

PN NEWS

PN MEET AT ACSP RAISES FUNDS

Ken Readon’s animated fundraising appeal brought in $700 in contributions for PN at the annual conference of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP) in Pasadena, California on November 6. Readon’s PN Sunday preacher, appealed thinly to the guilty feelings of the faculty members whose notion of social responsibility is to pay the student rate. This, along with the $2,100 we received since the last issue of PN, will help meet PN’s annual deficit of approximately $5,000. But we’re still thousands of dollars short. If you make more than $500 a year, won’t you join the PN Sustainer list and send us a check for $100 or more? PN’s only source of funds is member contributions.

The PN meeting, attended by 8 Steering Committee members, included discussions of PN finances, the newsletter/publication, fundraising and chapter development, and was followed by a reception.

FEBRUARY PN STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

There will be a full-day meeting of the PN Steering Committee on February 27, 1999 at Pratt Institute in Brooklyn, New York. New York area members are welcome to attend; call the PN office for details.

PN MEET AT ACSP RAISES FUNDS

Ken Readon’s animated fundraising appeal brought in $700 in contributions for PN at the annual conference of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP) in Pasadena, California on November 6. Readon’s PN Sunday preacher, appealed thinly to the guilty feelings of the faculty members whose notion of social responsibility is to pay the student rate. This, along with the $2,100 we received since the last issue of PN, will help meet PN’s annual deficit of approximately $5,000. But we’re still thousands of dollars short. If you make more than $500 a year, won’t you join the PN Sustainer list and send us a check for $100 or more? PN’s only source of funds is member contributions.

The PN meeting, attended by 8 Steering Committee members, included discussions of PN finances, the newsletter/publication, fundraising and chapter development, and was followed by a reception.

FEBRUARY PN STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

There will be a full-day meeting of the PN Steering Committee on February 27, 1999 at Pratt Institute in Brooklyn, New York. New York area members are welcome to attend; call the PN office for details.

BACKTALK: PN NY’S NEW READING AND DISCUSSION GROUP

A half dozen of us met October 11, to read from The Sex of Architecture, by Diana Agrest. We dug into planning, architecture, film, text, and sex. The backtalk flew around the table. Come join the heat and help us select more books to inspire planning and play, too. Under consideration: A Tale of Two Cities by Charles Dickens, and Toward Cosmopolis by Leonie Sandercock. For more information contact PNer Peggy Dye at (212) 864-6438.

The next meeting will be in a round-robin format:

Wednesday, December 9, 6-7:30 pm
Housing Works Cafe/Bookstore
120 Crosby, bet. Houston & Prince,
Manhattan (Subways: B, D, F to B’way-Lafayette or B to Bleecker)
Phone: (212) 334-3324

ARE WE PROGRESSIVE PLANNERS?

By Ruth Yabes

What should Planner’s Network and progressive planners be doing? How can I possibly answer that question since I don’t feel I am a true progressive planner, I am embarrassed to admit this, but I don’t think I am alone among PN members.

The classes I teach have not been as successful as I wish in drawing the community into the curriculum or bringing the curriculum to the community. And although I know that the connections between labor and the community are important and I want to learn about them, I am not familiar with the issues raised in the upcoming PN Conference, “Working for a Decent Living.”

So what should I do? I clarify and humbly acknowledge that I have much to learn about progressive planning, and ask PN and progressive planners to help me and others who are in the same boat. I need to do my homework. I will read this newsletter and previous issues and make them required reading in my various classes, as suggested by Keith Pezzotti at the recent PN meeting at ACSP, in order to “connect students who do not necessarily think of themselves as progressive with progressive planners,” as Owen Urey suggested in the last PN. As an educator, I appreciate applications that are to do with the business of learning about and embracing progressive planning issues in our classrooms, our practice, and our communities.

Ruth Yabes teaches in the School of Planning and Landscape Architecture, Arizona State University, 602-965-7188, <Ruth.Yabes@asu.edu>.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, URBANA-CHAMPAIGN CHAPTER NEWS

A group of students at the University of Illinois were so inspired by the mission of Planners Network and by the example of the New York chapter that they decided to start a local chapter in Illinois. In the Fall of 1997, six students began soliciting the interest of students who were focused on social equity planning and progressive action. The group managed to amassed twenty students to partake in community service projects, recruit speakers, and visit local examples of good practice. Activities over the last year included a speaker series on equity issues, a trip to the Woodlawn neighborhood in Chicago to view revitalization efforts, a Masters student research discussion series, and various local volunteer efforts.

In May of 1998, PN-Illinois lost several key members to graduation. A smaller group was chosen to continue the efforts of PN-IL. The three main objectives of this group are:

• Influence academics on behalf of planning students interested in issues of equity and social justice;
• Serve as a link with local groups doing progressive planning work; and
• Spread the word about PN National.

To meet its second objective, the group has started a Web page that serves as a communication link between planning students and groups doing progressive planning and community work in the city.
Send your PN Update to us today! You can email Membership Editor Dalila Hall <dabhall@pratt.edu>, send a fax to her at (718) 636-9709, or write a postcard or letter and send it to our national office: PLANNERS NETWORK 379 DeKalb Avenue Brooklyn, NY 11205

Welcome... new PLANNERS NETWORK members!

Thank You renewing members!

...and Special Thanks sustaining members!
Alan Rabinowitz, Barbara Rahder, Ken Reardon, Jan J. Reiner, Wien Wiesel.

PNN NEWS

PN MEET AT ACSP RAISES FUNDS

Ken Reardon's animated fundraising appeal brought in $700 in contributions for PN at the annual conference of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP) in Pasadena, California on November 6. Reardon's PN's own Sunday preacher, appealed briefly to the guilty feelings inherent in faculty members whose notion of social responsibility is to pay the student rate. This, along with the $2,100 we received since the last issue of PN, will help meet PN's annual deficit of approximately $5,000. But we're still thousands of dollars short. If you make more than $50,000 a year, won't you join the PN Sustainer list and send us a check for $100 or more? PN's only source of funds is member contributions.

The PN meeting, attended by 8 Steering Committee members, included discussions of PN finances, the newsletter/publication, fundraising and chapter development, and was followed by a reception.

FEBRUARY PN STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

There will be a full-day meeting of the PN Steering Committee on February 27, 1999 at Pratt Institute in Brooklyn, New York. New York area members are welcome to attend; call the PN office for details.

PN NY CONTACT INFORMATION:

To find out more about PN NY's activities and learn how you can volunteer with the organizing committee, call or write:

Tina Chin, Co-chair, (212) 854-9564, <jc070@columbia.edu>
Kevin Huang, Co-chair, (718) 783-0499, <KilHuang599@aol.com>

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, URBANA-CHAMPAIGN CHAPTER NEWS

A group of students at the University of Illinois were so inspired by the mission of Planners Network and by the example of the New York chapter that they decided to start a local chapter in Illinois. In the Fall of 1997, six students began soliciting the interest of students who were focused on social equity planning and progressive action. The group managed to amass twenty students to partake in community service projects, recruit speakers, and visit local examples of good practice. Activities over the last year included a speaker series on equity issues, a trip to the Woodlawn neighborhood in Chicago to view revitalization efforts, a Masters student research discussion series, and various local volunteer efforts.

In May of 1998, PN-Illinois lost several key members to graduation. A smaller group was chosen to continue the efforts of PN-IL. The three main objectives of this group are to:

- Influence academics on behalf of planning students interested in issues of equity and social justice;
- Serve as a link with local groups doing progressive planning work; and
- Spread the word about PN National.

To meet its second objective, the group has started a Web page that serves as a communication link between planning students and groups doing progressive planning and community work in the city.

ARE WE PROGRESSIVE PLANNERS?

By Ruth Yabes

What should Planners Network and progressive planners be doing? How can I possibly answer that question since I don't feel I am a true progressive planner. I am embarrassed to admit this, but I don't think I am alone among PN members. The classes I teach have not been as successful as I wish in drawing the community into the curriculum or bringing the curriculum to the community. And although I know that the connections between labor and the community are important and I want to learn about them, I am not familiar with the issues raised in the upcoming PN Conference, "Working for a Decent Living."

So what should I do? I qualify and humbly acknowledge that I have much to learn about progressive planning, and ask PN and progressive planners to help me and others who are in the same boat. I need to do my homework. I will read this newsletter and previous issues and make them required reading in my various courses, as suggested by Keith Perzelli at the recent PN meeting at ACSP, in order to "connect students who do not necessarily think of themselves as progressive with progressive planners," as Gwen Urey suggested in the last PN. As an educator, I appreciate Kathy Kapp's suggestions that we become advocates for progressive planning education, and I will seek ways to implement her three proposed changes: 1) link theory to practice, 2) take seriously students with practical experience, and 3) embrace diverse communities in the planning curriculum. So, if you are like me and are worried that you aren't "progressive" enough, let's agree to stop apologizing or feeling embarrassed or guilty and get down to the business of learning about and embracing progressive planning issues in our classrooms, our practice, and our communities.

Ruth Yabes teaches in the School of Planning and Landscape Architecture, Arizona State University, 602-965-7288, <Ruth.Yabes@asu.edu>
Support for local organizing is important for the future of PN. While networking with progressives in other contexts is an important source of support and new ideas, most of us work within a local or regional context.

Barbara Rahder

Promote International Networking and Local Action

by Barbara Loevinger Rahder

The value of Planners Network for me is the opportunity it provides for networking with progressive planners, academics, and activists in other places, and the support and ideas that these contacts offer my work locally. In thinking about where PN might develop in the future, I’d like to see these strengths built on through more international networking and local organizing, including more organizing within planning schools.

Encouraging more international links is important for a couple of reasons. Networking with progressives in other countries can provide PN with a broader perspective on planning issues and strategies to address these issues. Learning about the experiences of progressive planners in other contexts can stimulate new thinking about what might be possible in your own country or local area. Hearing about organizing efforts and local actions, as well as policy initiatives, undertaken in different settings — sometimes within very different political systems — helps us imagine other possible futures. This is not to say that networking and discussion of national urban policy within the U.S. aren’t needed, but there is also much to be gained by opening up the sometimes introspective focus of PN to consider these issues within a broader, more international or global framework.

It seems reasonable to concentrate this international networking, at least initially, with neighbors — Canada, the U.S. and Mexico. One might even argue that NAFTA (The North American Free Trade Agreement) makes this a necessity. We need to discover the progressive opportunities for planning within this new trade environment before these possibilities are wiped out by the corporate agenda.

Canadian membership in PN has been growing over the past few years. The series of recent PN articles and editorials has encouraged us to think about organizing a local Toronto chapter. I’d like to see PN explore similar links in Mexico and other countries, and support local organizing efforts as part of this strategy.

Support for local organizing is important for the future of PN. While networking with progressives in other contexts is an important source of support and new ideas, most of our work within a local or regional context. Organizing locally is an important means of promoting a progressive local agenda, or at least resisting the onslaught of neo-liberal thinking. It is not enough to have a network of spatially isolated progressives — either within the U.S. or across North America — though this is better than nothing. It is better to have a network of local chapters in which we can exchange ideas and experiences, and provide support and encouragement for planning practices that emphasize social and environmental justice.

I support Cathy Kump’s call (in the previous issue of PN) for PN to become a more vocal advocate for progressive planning education. In my experience, planning students are among those most interested in organizing and getting involved in Planners Network locally. They are eager, energetic, and interested in developing the knowledge and skills that will allow them to promote a more sustainable and socially equitable environment. PN could play an important role in advocating on their behalf and ensuring that planning education keeps pace with their changing needs.

Barbara Rahder is a PN Steering Committee member and Associate Professor in the Faculty of Environmental Studies at York University in Toronto.

7TH GENERATION
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that belongs to the public.

Truth is, it’s only cleaner and more orderly in the neighborhoods where three-piece suits define the fashion. In the neighborhoods without a Starbucks, where tourists never tread, most improvements can be traced to the hard struggles and efforts by people who live and work there.

The inflated Giuliani reputation, a product of Madison Avenue, not Bedford Avenue, covers up the fact that crime declined at the same rate under his predecessor, Mayor David Dinkins, and the downward trend is a national one. Were it not for the Wall Street boom, the City would be broke and the pain from Giuliani’s service cuts would be unbearable.

The biggest omission in the Giuliani fairy tale is the degree to which he has become the hero for the bare majority of white folks in New York City — and the big majority in the ‘burbs — while arousing deep distrust among African-American, Latin and other minorities. With less than half the eligible voters showing up at the polls, he got 80% of the white vote and less than 20% of the black vote.

The Mayor has been the darling of right-wing elements in the mostly white police force and has resisted even moderate calls for an independent police review commission to investigate police brutality. At a 1992 City Hall rally, he egged on a group of rowdy, beer-soaked cops yelling racial slurs. He sharply criticized David Dinkins, the city’s first African-American mayor, for restraining the police during the Crown Heights riots. The rather mild-mannered New York Times columnist Bob Herbert, commenting on the army of police sent to occupy Harlem during the peaceful “Million Man March” this year, said the Mayor “abused the power of his office by turning a large section of Harlem into a police encampment. By doing that he humiliated thousands of perfectly peaceful and law-abiding residents whose only offense was that they are black... Rudolph Giuliani would never, but never, treat an entire neighborhood of white people the way he treated the people in the vicinity of Lenox Avenue.”

This is the Mayor who reportedly told a Washington Post reporter, when asked about African-Americans and Latinos, “they’re alive, aren’t they?”

Giuliani’s nightstick is not only for blacks. A recent peace deal to clamor for support community initiatives that don’t have City Hall’s explicit blessing. And any person or organization that criticizes the Mayor will not get that blessing. For example, the city’s largest non-profit provider of housing for people with AIDS was cut off by City Hall because they criticized the Mayor.

Here are a few samples of this administration’s record. While blabbering about the “quality of life,” Giuliani has set out to take over thousands of community gardens for housing sites — in the city with the lowest ratio of open space per person in the country. His administration is closing down the city’s last landfill and planning to truck most solid waste through low-income waterfront neighborhoods already saturated with noisy facilities. At the same time he has cut recycling and waste reduction efforts. His energetic enforcement of welfare “reform” has cut off a major source of income in some neighborhoods, and put welfare recipients to work for the city with unlivable wages and no job protection. His budget this year included less money for education and mass transit, despite a $1 billion surplus. In Albany and Washington, he has gone along with and even cheered budget cuts that affect education, health care and social services.

So it’s Giuliani time! The hero of Manhattan’s Upper East Side, arguably the richest neighborhood in the world, is hopping around the country looking for Republican support for a possible run for national office. He fits right in with the Republican tough guy image. He’s New York’s Betty Robertson, full of populist rhetoric, meaning nothing and unyielding before the powerless.

PHILOSOPHY

"Freedom is about authority. Freedom is about the willingness of every single human being to cede to lawful authority a great deal of discretion about what you do and how you do it."

—Rudolph Giuliani

memorize the murder of Matthew Shepard, a gay man in Wyoming, who was attacked by an army of police because the murderers stepped off the sidewalk into the street.

Giuliani’s distaste for first amendment rights of speech and assembly seem to stem from a twisted philosophy of government. Newsday quoted the Mayor as saying: "Freedom is about authority. Freedom is about the willingness of every single human being to cede to lawful authority a great deal of discretion about what you do and how you do it."

Neighborhoods and Planning

For community development efforts in neighborhoods this mayor has been a disaster. His administration routinely ignores the 59 advisory community boards, and has done nothing to support community-based planning. Far from "reinvigorating" government, the imperial Pooh-bah has chased out independent civil servants and installed only loyalists. Consequently, few agency heads will stick their necks out to support community initiatives that don’t have City Hall’s explicit blessing. And any person or organization that criticizes the Mayor will not get that blessing. For example, the city’s largest non-profit provider of housing for people with AIDS was cut off by City Hall because they criticized the Mayor.

Here are a few samples of this administration’s record. While blabbering about the “quality of life,” Giuliani has set out to take over thousands of community gardens for housing sites — in the city with the lowest ratio of open space per person in the country. His administration is closing down the city’s last landfill and planning to truck most solid waste through low-income waterfront neighborhoods already saturated with noisy facilities. At the same time he has cut recycling and waste reduction efforts. His energetic enforcement of welfare “reform” has cut off a major source of income in some neighborhoods, and put welfare recipients to work for the city with unlivable wages and no job protection. His budget this year included less money for education and mass transit, despite a $1 billion surplus. In Albany and Washington, he has gone along with and even cheered budget cuts that affect education, health care and social services.

So it’s Giuliani time! The hero of Manhattan’s Upper East Side, arguably the richest neighborhood in the world, is hopping around the country looking for Republican support for a possible run for national office. He fits right in with the Republican tough guy image. He’s New York’s Betty Robertson, full of populist rhetoric, meaning nothing and unyielding before the powerless.

Seventh Generation
Support for local organizing is important for the future of PN. While networking with progressives in other contexts is an important source of support and new ideas, most of us work within a local or regional context.

Barbara Rahder is a PN Steering Committee member and Associate Professor in the Faculty of Environmental Studies at York University in Toronto.
LABOR AND COMMUNITY

Not an Easy Marriage

By Maryann Leshin

The prospect of bringing together labor and community at the PN 1999 Conference brings to mind several critical discrepancies between the agendas of these two groups. I see labor and community from the perspective of someone who has worked for affordable housing and community development for the past two decades, a one-time union organizer, and the wife of a union organizer and activist. While I wholly support such a collaboration, and in fact view it as an ideal to strive toward, I’m pretty skeptical about it because of what I have seen in the San Francisco Bay Area. The issues that divide labor and community in practice are: prevailing wages, local hiring practices, NIMBY, and the utilization of nonprofits.

Prevaling Wages

Should nonprofit housing developers pay prevailing wages, or should they be able to pay lower wages to help make housing affordable? This issue has led to razor sharp conflict between unions and nonprofits. For affordable housing developers, their projects mean much needed housing, with the added bonus of creating construction jobs. However, if they pay the prevailing wage in the Bay Area, that adds 20-30% to the cost of building affordable housing. Prevailing wage can mean the difference between a project moving forward or going bust. The prevailing wage can be avoided if non-federal sources are used — this is more likely as federal funding declines. These new funding sources include tax credits, tax exempt bond financing, and local grants and loans for prededvelopment and front end financing. And many local governments are more than happy to skirt state prevailing wage requirements.

Local Hiring Practices

Requirements that nonprofit builders hire local workers, low-income and homeless people may not be consonant with the union agenda for hiring, particularly in the

While the union movement’s electoral agenda is generally in sync with progressive planners, there are many defining “lines in the sand” which need to be confronted in an open way...

Building trades. Community housing developers are not tuned into the hiring hall ethic and don’t understand the process. To many of us it appears exclusionary. Yet there is so much opportunity to expand the ranks of the union movement and at the same time meet larger community economic development goals. I haven’t seen it in the Bay Area (though there may be efforts underway or success stories that I personally haven’t heard about). This seems like a ripe area for joining labor and community with a win-win result. However, without a deliberate meeting of the minds of leadership from both sectors, efforts to move forward in this arena will likely get bogged down in petty feuds and bickering.

NIMBY

When it comes to affordable housing, I don’t think we can assume that the rank and file union agenda is necessarily opposed to NIMBY (Not-In-My-Backyard) exclusionary sentiments. I worked for a city where the president of the fire fighters union advocated against making a loan to a nonprofit developer in his home town because of their work in converting a disilpitated, abandoned hotel into housing for people with disabilities (including AIDS and substance abusers). I believe the key issue for him was the prospect of declining property values. For union members with moderate incomes — a valid accomplishment — low-income housing can run counter to their interests as new property owners and the concomitant middle class values. Education on the subject of nonprofit low-income housing and its impact on property values would be a place to start. There are lots of opportunity for coalscing here. There are plenty of union members among the ranks of folks seeking affordable housing built by nonprofits, especially among health care workers, janitors, farm workers, teachers, and many public sector workers. It was a personal joy for me to know that a member of my husband’s union was purchasing a below market rate condo for first time home buyers built through the city program I developed! We need to articulate this commonality.

Unionization of Nonprofits

Few nonprofits support the notion of seeking out union labor or insist on using a union bug. Some do, but I have seen more that do not, and many that just provide lip service. This can create a wall between labor and community. In the Bay Area there have been a few battles over the unionization of nonprofits.

Unionization seems to be a dirty word in my world of nonprofit housing and community development. As my husband puts it, if management is treating folks right, they’re not going to want a union. Or as I think of it, if management is treating folks right, a union presents itself as no threat to continuing in that mode.

While the union movement’s electoral agenda is generally in sync with progressive planners, there are many defining “lines in the sand” which need to be confronted in an open way before just assuming that we’re all on the same page. I can’t say I have any easy answers, but until the two groups start talking to each other about these issues, understand why each takes specific positions, and find common ground, the notion of being part of one big happy left family is only an academic one.

Maryann Leshin lives in San Leandro, California, where she works for a nonprofit community development financial institution.
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What about Fascism?

The Honorable Mayor is quick to denounce those who sing the epitaph of fascism his way, citing prejudice against Italian-Americans. He may be right about some of the criticism. Not everything that’s undemocratic is fascist, and most fascists aren’t Italians.

But fascism is not an Italian thing, nor is it popular among Italian-Americans. Consider the rarely discussed anti-fascist and progressive traditions in Italy and among Italian-Americans. The first Italian-American mayor of New York, Fiorello LaGuardia, who had a brush and uncial style like Giuliani, was an early and consistent opponent of fascism and a strong supporter of civil liberties, the New Deal and social reform. For every right-winger like Al D’Amato and Rudy Giuliani there’s a liberal like Mario Cuomo and Geraldine Ferraro.

Also, fascism is institutional, national and systemic, and cannot be installed in one city or by one person. The victims of apartheid and Nazism understand the horrors of living in a fully militarized state based on terror and the repression of working class people.

Having said all this, Rudolph Giuliani and his Republican comrades across the country have taken us a big step towards fascist rule. Even more alarming than Giuliani’s support for the reactionary elements in the police and government, his breaches of constitutional freedoms of speech and assembly, and his plays to racist sentiments, is the absence of any serious challenge to him from the financial establishment that can make or break a politician. Wall Street elites appear to be perfectly content to be represented by this nasty fellow. The press is gentle and intimidated. Historically, fascism has overcome democracy when the ruling class loses its ability to rule through democratic means, and government violations of human rights and freedom are condoned.

Another warning is the support given Giuliani by large sections of organized labor. The main municipal union, District Council 37, backed Giuliani in exchange for a pledge that there would be no layoffs. The price we paid the municipal workforce has declined by several hundred thousand dollars due to attrition and buy-out schemes. And the union will not organize workfare employees who are replacing city workers. Many fascist regimes have historically assumed a corporatist form, general support from both business and unions. Something to keep in mind in our discussions about labor and community at the Planners Network ‘99 Conference. Yes, it can happen here. African-Americans understand fascism after living for 200 years in slavery and another 100 years under Jim Crow, racism, all is at the core of the U.S. experience with fascism. Rudolph Giuliani is now a front-runner for the New York Senate seat soon to be vacated by Daniel Moynihan, and is testing the national waters for a possible run for higher office. If he comes to your town, I hope you’ll greet him with the same iced coffee he shows us here at home.

—Tom Angotti

PLANNERS NETWORK NY NETWORK FORUMS

<www.plannersnetwork.org/ny.html>

All forums held on Fridays at the Pink Bulling, 8W & Lafayette, Manhattan.

Doors open at 5:30 for refreshments.

DECEMBER 4, 1999

The Privatization of Municipal Services

Differing Strategies, Differing Goals.

JANUARY 8, 1999

The Privatization of City Planning

The Role of Public, Private, and Nonprofit Sectors.

(see Events listings on page 12 for further details.)
LABOR AND COMMUNITY
Not an Easy Marriage

The prospect of bringing together labor and community at the PN 1999 Conference brings to mind several critical discrepancies between the agendas of these two groups. I see labor and community from the perspective of someone who has worked for affordable housing and community development for the past two decades, a one-time union organizer, and the wife of a union organizer and activist. While I wholly support such a collaboration, and in fact view it as an ideal to strive toward, I’m pretty skeptical about it because of what I have seen in the San Francisco Bay Area. The issues that divide labor and community in practice are: prevailing wages, local hiring practices, NIMBY, and the utilization of nonprofits.

Prevaling Wages
Should nonprofit housing developers pay prevailing union wages, or should they be able to pay lower wages to help make housing affordable? This issue has lead to razor sharp conflict between unions and nonprofits. For affordable housing developers, their projects mean much needed housing, with the added bonus of creating construction jobs. However, if they pay the prevailing wage in the Bay Area, that adds 20-30% to the cost of building affordable housing.

Prevaling wage can mean the difference between a project moving forward or going bust. The prevailing wage can be avoided if non-federal sources are used — this is more likely as federal funding declines. These new funding sources include tax credits, tax exempt bond financing, and local grants and loans for predevelopment and front-end financing. And many local governments are more than happy to skirt state prevailing wage requirements.

Local Hiring Practices
Requirements that nonprofit builders hire local workers, low-income and home- less people may not be consonant with the union agenda for hiring, particularly in the building trades. Community housing developers are not tuned into the hiring hall ethic and don’t understand the process. To many of us it appears exclusionary. Yet there is so much opportunity to expand the ranks of the union movement and at the same time meet larger community economic development goals. I haven’t seen it in the Bay Area (though there may be efforts underway or success stories that I personally haven’t heard about). This seems like a ripe area for joining labor and community with a win-win result. However, without a deliberate meeting of the minds of leadership from both sectors, efforts to move forward in this arena will likely get bogged down in petty feudal battles.

While the union movement’s electoral agenda is generally in sync with progressive planners, there are many defining “lines in the sand” which need to be confronted in an open way...

NIMBY
When it comes to affordable housing, I don’t think we can assume that the rank and file union agenda is necessarily opposed to NIMBY (Not-In-My-Backyard) exclusionary sentiments. I worked for a city where the president of the fire fighters union advocated against making a loan to a nonprofit developer in his home town because of their work in converting a dilapidated, abandoned hotel into housing for people with disabilities (including AIDS and substance abusers). I believe the key issue for him was the prospect of declining property values. For union members with moderate incomes — a valid accomplishment — low-income housing can run counter to their interests as new property owners and the concomitant middle class values.

Education on the subject of nonprofit low-income housing and its impact on property values would be a place to start. There are lots of opportunity for coalescing here. There are plenty of union members among the ranks of folk seeking affordable housing built by nonprofits, especially among health care workers, janitors, farm workers, teachers, and many public sector workers. It was a personal joy for me to know that a member of my husband’s union was purchasing a below market rate condo for first time home buyers built through the city program I developed! We need to articulate this commonality.

Unionization of Nonprofits
Few nonprofits support the notion of seeking out union labor or insist on using a union bug. Some do, but I have seen more that do not, and many that just provide lip service. This can create a wall between labor and community. In the Bay Area there have been a few battles over the unionization of nonprofits.

Unionization seems to be a dirty word in my world of nonprofit housing and community development. As my husband puts it, if management is treating folks right, they’re not going to want a union. Or as I think of it, if management is treating folks right, a union presents itself as no threat to continuing in that mode.

While the union movement’s electoral agenda is generally in sync with progressive planners, there are many defining “lines in the sand” which need to be confronted in an open way before just assuming that we’re all on the same page. I can’t say I have any easy answers, but until the two groups start talking to each other about these issues, understand why each takes specific positions, and find common ground, the notion of being part of one big happy labor family is only an academic one.

Maryann Leshin lives in San Leandro, California, where she works for a nonprofit community development financial institution.
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PLANNERS NETWORK NY NETWORK FORUMS

www.plannersnetwork.org/ny.htm

All forums held on Fridays at the Pack Building, Bway & Lafayette, Manhattan.
Doors open at 5:30 for refreshments.

DECEMBER 4, 1999
The Privatization of Municipal Services
Differing Strategies, Differing Goals.

JANUARY 8, 1999
The Privatization of City Planning
The Role of Public, Private, and Nonprofit Sectors.
(See Events listings on page 12 for further details.)
cess when they attempt to change municipal laws rather than those of states or the federal government, where business has a great capacity to use its money and lobbying clout. Various local campaigns are gaining strength through building national connections. This past May, the first National Living Wage Campaign Training Conference, sponsored by labor groups in Denver and Houston, brought together people from thirty-four cities to discuss strategy and consider ways to coordinate their work. But a local focus is still central to building grassroots support.

Organizing at the municipal level is one of the most effective tactics for fighting the trend toward outsourcing — contracting out government services to private firms. Because private contractors pay lower wages and offer fewer benefits, outsourcing saves cities money by driving down the living standards of workers. In Chicago, for example, outsourcing of public sector jobs from 1989 to 1995 meant income losses of between 25 and 49 percent for watchmen, elevator operators, cashiers, parking attendants, security guards and custodians whose jobs were privatized. Forcing private firms with city contracts to pay living wages at least weakens the incentive for cities to achieve budget cuts on the backs of their workers.

The first living-wage victory was in Baltimore in 1994. The ordinance there stipulated that firms holding service contracts with the city pay a minimum of $6.10 an hour, rising to $7.20 as of July 1998 and after that moving in step with inflation. A single mother working full time at $7.20 an hour would thus be able to live with her child above the poverty line. However, a family of one jobholder, one homemaker and two children would still be in poverty. The Baltimore “living wage,” in other words, is not much of a living, though in light of the precipitous

fall in the real value of the national minimum wage, it was a major breakthrough.

Within four years of the Baltimore ordinance, living-wage laws passed in New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Boston, Milwaukee, Jersey City, Durham, Portland, Oregon, and eight other cities. Municipalities with ongoing campaigns include Philadelphia, New Orleans, Albuquerque, Knoxville and Santa Cruz. Proposals vary, but the basic idea is the same almost everywhere: If private firms win city contracts, they must pay their workers substantially better than the sub-poverty wage of the national minimum.

Living-wage laws targeting city contractors will, however, affect only a small proportion of low-wage workers. Some organizers have thus taken a more obvious approach, pushing for laws that would apply to all workers in a municipality, regardless of who their employer is, just as national or statewide minimum-wage laws apply to virtually all workers within a geographic area. Recently, organizers in the Seattle area have advanced these more ambitious proposals but were soundly defeated at the polls. At least in part, they lost because of their ambitious scope, which invoked even an more determined opposition. So how are living-wage organizers and labor activists to span the range of possibilities before them? And how are they to answer their critics?

Will Living-Wage Laws Backfire?

Opponents of minimum-wage laws — of which the municipal living-wage ordinances are one variant — have long argued that such laws actually hurt their intended beneficiaries, pricing unskilled workers out of the job market and so causing unemployment among the poor. [see Pollin, “Barley Minimum,” April 6].

Against municipal living-wage laws in particular, opponents pressure from two other arguments: that these will place severe strains on the already overstretched budgets of cities, perhaps forcing painful cuts in other benefits to low-income families; and that they will discourage firms from locating in municipalities, thus increasing unemployment and poverty in these areas.

Blustering politicians are usually the most visible mouthpieces for such views. In Los Angeles, then-deputy mayor for economic development Gary Mendonsa said a living-wage law there would mean “entire industries could be wiped out or move overseas.” Such fulminations can be easily dismissed. But can we be confident that the critics are completely wrong?

The answer depends, first, on the specifics of any given ordinance. The LA law, for example, affects employees of three types of private businesses: those holding city service contracts of more than $25,000, such as accounting or janitorial companies; concessionaires on city property, such as LAX; and firms receiving city subsidies of more than $1 million. This law, as it applies only to city contractors and subsidy recipients, resembles those passed in Baltimore, Boston, Portland and Chicago.

My colleague Stephanie Luce and I have estimated that, at the outside, this ordinance will raise the pay of 7,600 full- and part-time workers in LA. Over a year, the income of a full-time living-wage worker will rise to $3,600. These increases will be spread among the roughly 1,000 firms that are obligated to comply with the law, making the cost per firm about $24,000. But since these 1,000 firms produce about $4.6 billion in goods and services in a year, the extra $24 million in their combined wage bill amounts to only about 0.5 percent of their annual budgets.

The health benefits to workers and the paid days off provided under the ordinance will together amount to another $28 million. A final likely, though not mandated, effect of the law will be that fringe benefits for wage increases for workers in the affected firms who now earn more than the $7.25 minimum wage will rise. This ripple effect of wage increases is likely to pertain to workers earning perhaps as much as $9.25 once their lower-paid co-workers get a raise.

When we add these additional costs to the basic mandated wage increases, the sum still comes to only about 1.5 percent of the total annual budget of the affected firm. Indeed, for about 85 percent of the firms involved, the total annual increase in costs will be less than 1 percent of their budgets.

City Budgets Won’t Go Bust

Most companies faced with a cost increase of 1 percent or less would be willing to absorb the cost if it were the only condition on which they could keep winning city contracts. Some may refuse to absorb these increases, but competitors seeking the same contracts would likely step into the breach. This means that, through intelligent bargaining, a city government can purchase essentially the same quality of services from most private firms after the passage of a living-wage ordinance with virtually no impact on its budget.

For the roughly 15 percent of firms that will experience cost increases over 1 percent, a city should expect to absorb some of these increased costs if it wants to maintain a stable level of services. Here too the impact should be negligible. If, for example, LA’s city government allowed companies to pass on all increases above 3 percent of their total budgets, the new costs to the city would amount to less than 0.5 percent of its $3.4 billion budget.

Will firms simply exit the city rather than face the higher costs? In fact, there is nothing in the Los Angeles ordinance or its equivalents elsewhere that encourages this behavior. That’s because these ordinances apply to all firms with city contracts, regardless of where they are located. The same rules for city contracting, including adherence to the living-wage ordinance, apply to companies whether they are in LA, an adjacent city like Santa Monica, or anywhere inside or outside the United States.

Moreover, consider that many companies already pay their workers higher minimums and still compete successfully. They do so because they have much lower turnover and absenteeism and higher morale. A living-wage ordinance encourages more companies to operate along this high efficiency/high morale path, thereby diminishing the cost increases they face. Considering all these factors, it is not hard to understand the striking result that emerged in both Baltimore and LA after their initial year of experience with living-wage ordinances. In both cities, the law on the books had no significant impact on contracts. To understand this, Mark Weisbrot and Michelle Sforza of the Preamble Center for Public Policy interviewed business owners in Baltimore affected by the ordinance.

These owners were actually positive about how the living-wage law affected bidding. One company manager said, “We feel more able to compete against businesses who were drastically reducing wages in order to put in a low bid.” All these estimates of the impact of living-wage laws do, however, make it clear that the ordinance that the affected city contractors will abide by the law. This will not happen automatically. In LA the mayor’s office vehemently opposed the ordinance, and has sought to exempt as many contractors as possible. This and experiences elsewhere make it clear that living-wage supporters cannot assume their job is done once a law has been passed.

Would a Citywide Living-Wage Law Work?

The very features that make the LA proposal and its equivalents so manageable are also those that limit their potential. Getting raises for 7,000 low-wage workers in a city is a major accomplishment. But 2.4 million other low-wage workers in the LA area are still not covered by the ordinance. What would be the impact of a more sweeping municipality-wide law, such as those that were proposed but defeated in Denver and Houston and the one that is now getting off the ground in New York? Peter Phillips, an organizer in Sonoma County, California, told me at a recent conference that this sort of proposal was the one that made sense for his area. With either proposal, he urged, the organizers would have to launch an ambitious educational campaign. But only a few hundred workers would get raises through a contractors-only proposal, while several thousand would benefit through the municipality-wide approach.

In LA a countywide minimum wage of $7.25 would bring raises to some 2.4 million workers. At the same time, the impact per firm, on average, would not be significantly different from that of the contractors-only law now in place in the city. In terms of creating incentives for firms to offer higher wages, the countywide ordinance would be substantially different. This is because, under such a proposal, affected firms could afford paying higher wages by moving outside the municipal boundaries.

In any case, therefore, is how many firms would actually leave rather than pay a living wage, and what would be the effect of their departure? In fact, even here, if a mass exodus are unnourishing. Most companies facing significant cost increases under a countywide ordinance would not relocate. A high proportion of these are restaurants, hotels or retail outlets, and are tied to their existing locations. Indeed, only one type of firm would have a strong incentive to relocate. These are manufacturers that are not tied to their locations and that employ a high percentage of low-wage workers. Some of these may choose simply to raise wages rather than incur the costs of relocation. But even if we assume that all such manu-
cess when they attempt to change municipal laws rather than those of states or the federal government, where business has a great capacity to use its money and lobbying clout. Various local campaigns are gaining strength through building national connections. This past May, the first National Living Wage Campaign Training Conference, sponsored by labor groups in Denver and Houston, brought together some thirtyfour cities to discuss strategy and consider ways to coordinate their work. But a local focus is still central to building grassroots support.

Organizing at the municipal level is in some ways the most effective tactic for fighting the trend toward outsourcing — contracting out government services to private firms. Because private contractors pay lower wages and offer fewer benefits, outsourcing saves cities money by driving down the living standards of workers. In contrast, in the manufacturing of public sector jobs from 1989 to 1995 meant income losses of between 25 and 49 percent for watchmen, elevator operators, cashiers, parking attendants, security guards and custodians whose jobs were privatized. Forcing private firms with city contracts to pay living wages at least weakens the incentive for cities to achieve budget cuts on the backs of their workers.

The first living-wage victory was in Baltimore in 1994. The ordinance there stipulated that firms holding service contracts with the city pay a minimum of $6.10 an hour, rising to $7.20 by July 1998 and after that moving in step with inflation. A single mother working full time at $7.20 an hour would thus be able to live with her child above the poverty line. However, a family of one jobholder, one homemaker and two children would still be in poverty. The Baltimore “living wage,” in other words, is not much of a living, though in light of the precipitous fall in the real value of the national minimum wage, it was a major breakthrough.

Within four years of the Baltimore ordinance, living-wage laws passed in New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Boston, Milwaukee, Jersey City, Durham, Portland, Oregon, and eight other cities. Municipalities with ongoing campaigns include Philadelphia, New Orleans, Albuquerque, Knoxville and Santa Cruz. Proposals vary, but the basic idea is the same almost everywhere: If private firms want city contracts, they must pay their workers substantially better than the subpoverty wage of the national minimum.

Living-wage laws targeting city contractors will, however, affect only a small proportion of low-wage workers. Some organizers have thus taken a more obvious approach, pushing for laws that would apply to all workers in a municipality, regardless of who their employer is, as just as national or statewide minimum-wage laws apply to virtually all workers within a geographic area. Recently, organizers in the state of Hawaii advanced these more ambitious proposals but were soundly defeated at the polls. At least in part, they lost because of their ambitious scope, which invited an even more determined opposition. So how are living-wage organizers and their opponents to market a range of possibilities before them? And how are they to answer their critics?

Will Living-Wage Laws Backfire?

Opponents of minimum-wage laws — of which the municipal living-wage ordinances are one variant — have long argued that such laws actually hurt their intended beneficiaries, pricing unskilled workers out of the job market and so causing unemployment among the poor [see Pollin, “Barely Minimum,” April 6]. Against municipal living-wage laws in particular, opponents have worried that state-wide proposals from several states, perhaps forcing painful cuts in other benefits to low-income families; that they will discourage firms from locating in municipalities, thus increasing unemployment and poverty in these areas. Blustering politicians are usually the most visible mouthpieces for such views. In Los Angeles, then-deputy mayor for economic development Gary Mendoza said a living-wage law there would mean “entire industries could be wiped out or move overseas.” Such fulminations can be easily dismissed. But can we be confident that the critics are completely wrong?

The answer depends, first, on the specifics of any given ordinance. The LA law, for example, affects employees of three types of private businesses: those holding city service contracts of more than $225,000, such as accounting or janitorial companies; concessionaires on city property, such as LAX; and firms receiving city subsidies of more than $1 million. This law, as applying it does only to city contractors and subsidy recipients, resembles those passed in Baltimore, Boston, Portland and Chicago.

My colleague Stephanie Luce and I have estimated that, at the outside, this ordinance will raise the pay of 7,600 full- and part-time workers in LA. Over a year, the income of a full-time living-wage worker will rise by $9,600. These increases will be spread among the roughly 1,000 firms that are obligated to comply with the law, making the cost per firm about $24,000. But since these 1,000 firms produce about $4.6 billion in goods and services in a year, the extra $24 million in their combined wage bill amounts to only about 0.5 percent of their annual budgets.

The health benefits to workers and the paid days off provided under the ordinance will together amount to another $28 million. A final likely, though not mandated, effect of the law is that firms might find wage increases for workers in the affected firms who now earn more than the $7.25 minimum. This ripple effect of wage increases is likely to pertain to workers earning perhaps as much as $29.25 once their lowerpaid co-workers get a raise.

When we add these additional costs to the basic mandated wage increases, the sum still comes to no more than 1.5 percent of the total annual budget of the affected firm. Indeed, for about 85 percent of the firms involved, the total annual increase in costs will be less than 1 percent of their budgets.

City Budgets Won’t Go Bust

Most companies faced with a cost increase of 1 percent or less would not be willing to absorb the cost if it were only the condition on which they could keep winning city contracts. Some may refuse to absorb these increases, while competitors seeking the same contracts would likely step into the breach. This means that, through intelligent bargaining, a city government can purchase essentially the same quality of services from most private firms after the passage of a living-wage ordinance with virtually no impact on its budget.

For the roughly 15 percent of firms that will experience cost increases over 1 percent, a city should expect to absorb some of these increases if it wants to maintain a stable level of services. Here too the impact should be negligible. If, for example, LA’s city government allowed companies to pass on all increases above 3 percent of their total budgets, the new costs to the city would amount to less than 0.5 percent of its $3.4 billion budget.

Firms will simply exit the city rather than face the higher costs? In fact, there is nothing in the Los Angeles ordinance or its equivalents elsewhere that encourages relocation. That’s because these ordinances apply to all firms with city contracts, regardless of where they are located. The same rules for city contracting, including adherence to the living-wage ordinance, apply to companies whether they are in LA, an adjacent city like Santa Monica, or anywhere inside or outside the United States.

Moreover, consider that many companies already pay their workers higher minimums and still compete successfully. They do so because they have much lower turnover and absenteeism and higher morale. A living-wage ordinance encourages more companies to operate along this high efficiency/high morale path, thereby diminishing the cost increases they face. Considering all these factors, it is not hard to understand the striking result that emerged in both Baltimore and LA after their initial year of experience with living-wage ordinances. In both cities, the law on the books had no significant impact on contracts. To understand this, Mark Weisbrot and Michelle Sfloros of the Preamble Center for Public Policy interviewed business owners in Baltimore affected by the ordinance.

These owners were actually positive about how the living-wage law affected bidding with other firms for city contracts. One bus company manager said, “We feel more able to compete against businesses who were drastically reducing wages in order to put in a low bid.” All these estimates of the impact of living-wage laws do, however, suggest a cautionary lesson: that the affected city contractors will abide by the law. This will not happen automatically. In LA the mayor’s office vehemently opposed the ordinance, and has sought to exempt as many contractors as possible. This and experiences elsewhere make it clear that living-wage supporters cannot assume their job is done once a law has been passed.

Would a Citywide Living-Wage Law Work?

The very features that make the LA proposal and its equivalents so manageable are also their limitations. Getting raises for 7,000 low-wage workers in a city is a major accomplishment. But 2.4 million other low-wage workers in the LA area are still not covered by the ordinance. What would be the impact of a more sweeping municipality-wide law, such as those that were proposed but defeated in Denver and Houston and the one that is now getting off the ground in New York? Peter Phillips, an organizer in Sonoma County, California, told me at a recent conference that this sort of proposal was the one that made sense for his area. With either proposal, he argued, the organizers would have to launch an ambitious educational campaign. But only a few hundred workers would get raises through a contractors-only proposal, while several thousand would benefit through the municipality-wide approach.

In LA a countywide minimum wage of $7.25 would bring raises to some 2.4 million workers. At the same time, the impact per firm, on average, would not be significantly different from that of the contractors-only law now in place in the city. In terms of creating incentives for firms to raise wages, the countywide ordinance would be substantially different. This is because, under such a proposal, affected firms could afford paying higher wages by moving outside the municipal boundaries.

In short, therefore, is how many firms would actually leave rather than pay a living wage, and what would be the effect of their departure? In fact, even here, a mass of fears are exuded. Most companies facing significant cost increases under a countywide ordinance would relocate. A high proportion of these are restaurants, hotels or retail outlets, and are tied to their existing locations. Indeed, only one type of firm would have a strong incentive to relocate. These manufacturers are not tied to their locations and that employ a high proportion of low-wage workers. Some of these may choose simply to raise wages rather than incur the costs of relocation. But even if we assume that all such manufact
facturers did relocate just outside the county limits, the main loss for the Los Angeles County government would be the loss of tax revenues. Stephanie Luce and I estimate that the number of firms likely to leave would generate a loss in county tax revenue of between $50 million and $60 million. This is no small amount, but it is still less than 1 percent of the total wage increases that workers would enjoy with a $7.25 minimum wage. The county would likely experience some additional losses, such as a decline in property values due to firms leaving their existing locations. But all those costs would also total less than an additional 1 percent of the wage increases received by workers. Meanwhile, the workers would have more money to spend, which would reduce consumer prices and thus reduce the overall economic impact of the wage increase.

Why Not a National Living Wage?

The viability of the living-wage proposals, whether applied to government contractors alone or to all companies in a region, invites consideration of an even more ambitious proposal: a national living wage of $7.25. If that sounds outlandish, it is only because the perceptions of greed have so dominated US economic policy discussions for a generation. After all, in today's dollars, the minimum wage was $7.37 thirty years ago when the economy was 50 percent less productive. If the minimum wage had kept pace with productivity over the intervening years, it would today be $11.07. If nothing else were to change in the economy, bringing all workers up to at least $7.25 would require only small adjustments in income distribution. Just to illustrate the degree of redistribution necessary, the wage increases needed to bring all minimum-wage workers up to $7.25 would be equal to a reduction of only 6.6 percent in the incomes of the richest 20 percent of households, from roughly $106,600 to $100,000.

However, even this small sacrifice by the well-off could be avoided if the economy's rate of growth increased. But to think seriously about accelerating growth means confronting the commitment of Wall Street and the Federal Reserve to an economy whose real growth is slow, even while financial markets are allowed to expand at dizzying - and ultimately destabilizing - rates.

As the nineties boom economy appears to be ending, it is important to be clear on just how weak - from the standpoint of real productive growth as opposed to speculative financial excess - this expansion has been. On average, national income grew only 2 percent between 1990 and 1997. This is in contrast to an average income growth rate of 4.4 percent in the sixties and an average of 3 percent in the seventies and eighties, widely considered to be decades of poor economic performance. What if the growth rate rose to an average of only 3 percent per the next ten years? In that situation, all workers earning less than $7.25 could be raised to this new minimum and there would still be an additional $3,000 per year to distribute equally to all other workers, on top of what they would otherwise receive were the economy growing at 2 percent.

This growth solution is obviously much more complicated than this simple illustration can convey. For one thing, a new financial regulatory structure is clearly needed to channel funds away from stock run-ups and into productive activity. But even if new regulations could dampen speculative excesses, rapid growth still presents problems from the standpoint of businesses. Workers gain confidence because of the better wages and greater job security that result from a faster-growing economy, and this can lead to further demands for full employment, higher wages and improved working conditions. Businesses want to prevent workers from gaining this bargaining strength, and the job of national policymakers is to articulate the self-interested position of business for slow growth, as if it were the only sensible policy for everyone.

Such thinking was cogently expressed before Congress in July 1997 by Federal Reserve chairman Alan Greenspan. Testifying that the economy's performance in 1997 was "extraordinary" and "exceptional," he noted that a major factor contributing to this outstanding performance was "a heightened sense of job insecurity and, as a consequence, subdued wage gains.

Thus, for Greenspan, the "economy is doing well when workers can't get raises. Could it be more clear that the real barriers to achieving a national minimum wage of $7.25 are not economic but political? But how can political power be mobilized in support of economic justice? Here we return to the central importance of the living-wage movement. Organizers are clear that their agenda includes more than passing local ordinances, even while the ordinances themselves represent major victories. Tammy Johnson, until recently with Progressive Milwaukee, an affiliate of the New Party, says that because of living-wage campaigns, "the phrase 'living-wage job' is in the vocabulary in a way it wasn't two or three years ago. When jobs are being created, people will ask, 'Is it a livable wage job?'" The director of the LA Living Wage Coalition, Madeline Janis-Aparicio, says the goal of the campaign has been, first, "to directly affect the lives of workers who are getting a raise." But she also sees the campaign as "a tool for union organizing, for confronting the problem of wage inequality and for expressing a certain level of dignified treatment of workers." That such a campaign can spark further demands on the part of workers is illustrated by the LAX union organizing drive. The living-wage proposals gaining ground will directly contribute only modestly toward eliminating poverty. But their importance far exceeds their immediate measurable impact. As more cities gain experience with these laws over the next few years, their limitations as well as strengths will become evident. The process of political and economic education will then provide a platform from which to launch more ambitious egalitarian-an wage and employment programs and to deepen the movement for economic justice in this country.

This article is reprinted with permission from the November 23, 1998 issue of The Nation.
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facturers did relocate just outside the county limits, the main loss for the Los Angeles County government would be the loss of tax revenues. Stephanie Lucie and I estimate that the number of firms likely to leave would generate a loss in county tax revenue of between $50 million and $60 million. This is no small amount, but it is still less than 1 percent of the total wage increases that workers would enjoy with a $7.25 minimum wage. The county would likely experience some additional losses, such as a decrease in property taxes due to firms leaving their existing locations. But all those costs would also total less than an additional 1 percent of the wage increases received by workers. Meanwhile, the workers would have more money to spend, which would provide more local demand, thereby reducing the overall output of the city's economy.

Why Not a National Living Wage?
The viability of the living-wage pro-
positions, whether applied to government contractors alone or to all companies in a region, invites consideration of an even more ambitious proposal: a national living wage of $7.25. If that sounds outlandish, it is only because the perceptions of greed have so dominated US economic policy discussions for a generation. After all, in today's dollars, the minimum wage was $7.37 thirty years ago when the economy was 50 percent less productive. If the minimum wage had just kept pace with productivity over the intervening years, it would today be $11.07. If nothing else were to change in the economy, bringing all workers up to at least $7.25 would require only small adjustments in income distribution. Just to illustrate the degree of redistribution necessary, the wage increases needed to bring all minimum-wage workers up to $7.25 would be equal to a reduction of only 6.6 percent in the incomes of the richest 20 percent of households, from roughly $106,600 to $100,000.

However, even this small sacrifice by the well-off could be avoided if the economy's rate of growth increased. To think seriously about accelerating growth means confronting the commitment of Wall Street and the Federal Reserve to an economy whose real growth is slow, even while financial markets are allowed to expand at dizzying speeds. But even if new regulations could dampen speculative excesses, rapid growth still presents problems from the standpoint of businesses. Workers gain confidence because of the better wages and greater job security that result from a faster-growing economy, and this can lead to further demands for full employment, higher wages, and improved working conditions. Businesses want to prevent workers from gaining this bargaining strength, and the job of national policymakers is to articulate the self-interested position of business for slow growth, as if it were the only sensible policy for everyone.
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LA Living Wage Coalition, Madeline Janis-Aparicio, (213) 486-9880
Campaign for a Sustainable Milwaukee, Bill Dempsey, (414) 445-0525
Greenpeace Minnesota, Jennifer Smith, (651) 641-6199
New Haven Living Wage Campaign, Andrea Cole, (203) 624-5616
Oakland Living Wage Campaign, Jim Davenport, (510) 893-3181
Portland Jobs With Justice, Nancy Haque, (503) 236-5573
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December 4, 1998: Partners Network Forum — "The Power of Planning: Services - Differing Strategies - Difficult Goals." The current push for privatization is notable for its consistent tendency to facilitate the reduction of wage rates for workers, to eliminate essential services, and to limit public participation in government decision-making. The panel will look at the differing policy goals of privatization as they impact on specific public services, including social welfare management, municipal hospital care, and professional services. Modernization: Donal O’Keeffe, Director, Mark, Program Director, West Warren Environmental Action; Marshall Chadwick, Commissioner, on the Public’s Health System; Sereeda Govan, Second Vice President, Civil Service Technical Association, AFT/MEC. All Network forums take place to meet 21 of the Pack Building, (Pratt’s Manhattan Campus), the corner of Lafayette and Houston Streets, open from 6:30 pm and refreshments are served. No RSVP required. Come as you are. Suggested donation at the door: $5 students, $8 others.

February 10-11, 1998: International Council for Caring Communities, Inc. has announced the rescheduled dates for the International Conference in support of the 1998 International Year of Older Persons entitled “Caring Communities for the 21st Century: Villages and Cities for All Generations.” The conference will be held at United Nations Headquarters. For information contact Nancy Lewis at (212) 445-4122, FAX (212) 779-0901 or E-MAIL: icccconf@mwp.com.

February 9-13, 1998: The planning students from the Department of Urban & Community Planning of the School of Urban & Community Planning at the University of Quebec in Montreal, and Concordia University are hosting the 28th edition of the Canadian Association of Community Planning Students' National Conference Montreal. The title of this year's conference is Internationalization. A New Planning Reality: Students from Canada and the United States are invited. Abstracts due by December 11, 1997. For more information, contact: CACPC Conference, McGill University, School of Urban Planning, Macdonald-Harrington Building, 6th Floor, 81 Sherbrooke Street West, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H2S 2C8 (514) 384-4075, or www.rvcq.ca/cacpc.


March 25-28, 1998: The Second Cultural Environments Movement Conference will be held at the University of Athens, OH. CIDS is a soon-to-be international grassroots coalition of over 250 organizations and 6,000 individuals working for gender equity and general diversity in many mass media ownership, employment and representation. It helps produce and distribute the Media Violence Index and the Women’s Value Index. For more info (215) 526-6134, cids@libertynet.org or <www.cest.org>. April 5-9, 1998: Urban Planning and Environmental History is hosting its third International Conference. The theme of this conference will be "A Better Environment for Future Generations." The working title of the conference is "Becoming More Effective: "Meeting the needs of developing countries and enhancing environment quality. A program includes paper presentations, poster sessions, exhibitions, competitions, technical tours and more. Details and online registration is available at http://www.meetings.net/conferences."

April 7-8, 1998: The Development Society of Southern Africa (DSSA) is pleased to announce a call for papers for the Second Annual International Conference on 7-8 April 1998 in Johannesburg, South Africa. The theme is "The Southern African Development Socioeconomic Challenges for the New Millennium". Conference paper and participation proposals from South Africa, Namibia, Botswana, Zimbabwe, Lesotho, Eswatini and South Africa. For more information contact: Conference Secretariat, PO Box 163, 2125 Randburg, South Africa (011) 797-0600, FAX (011) 797-0591 or <www当之@sdss.org.za>.

June 23-26, 1998: Rail to Trails Conservancy’s Second International Trails and Greenways Conference and Exposition. More than 2,500 trail and greenway advocates and experts will come together to share ideas, trade information, and tips on walking and bicycling. An area that is also an invited submit proposal for a presentation. Contact Susan Doherty (202) 974-5151, <cs dodherty.onreadystatechange() >.
RESOURCES

EVENTS

December 4, 1996—Flanner Network Forum — The Public Sector: Unique Services—Struggling Difficulties. The current push for privatization in the public sector is causing a great deal of concern and debate. The purpose of this discussion is to highlight some of the issues and examine the potential benefits and drawbacks of privatization.

January 9, 1998—Flanner Network Forum — The Privatization of City Planning: The Role of Public, Private, and Nonprofit Sectors. The City Planning Department is organized into several departments, each with its own responsibilities.

April 5-9, 1996—Urban Planning and Housing Management is its third International Conference on Planning, Urban Management and the Environment. The theme of the conference is "The Challenge of Urban Planning for the Future Generation." The workshop aims to bring together urban planners, architects, and other professionals from around the world to discuss the future of urban planning and development.

April 7-8, 1996—The Development Society of Southern Africa (DASA) is pleased to announce the 12th biennial conference on "Confronting Globalization: The Failure of International Economic Policies and Measures." The conference will be held in Pretoria, South Africa.

February 10-11, 1996—International Council for Caring Communities, Inc. has announced the rescheduled dates for the International Conference in support of the International Year of Older Persons entitled "Caring Communities for the 21st Century: Villages and Cities for All Generations." The conference will be held at the University of Chicago.

February 9-13, 1996—The planning students from the University of Cape Town, the University of Zimbabwe, and the University of Pretoria in South Africa are hosting the 24th annual conference of the Canadian Association of Geographers. The conference will be held in Cape Town.

March 6-28, 1996—The Second Cultural Environment Movement Conference will be held in Beijing, China. This conference will bring together cultural experts from around the world to discuss the future of cultural development and the challenges faced by cultural organizations.

March 15-17, 1996—Urban Land Institute co-sponsors 2nd Annual Partners for Smart Growth Conference in Austin, TX. For more info, call 800-999-3306.

June 23-26, 1996—Rally-to-Table Conference of the International Trade and Greenpeace Conference in Washington, DC. The conference will bring together over 1000 trade and green economy experts and advocates who will come together to share ideas, network, and shape the future of sustainable trade.

June 25-26, 1996—The New Planner is a newsletter sponsored by the American Planning Association and written by and for new planners. It is published 3 times a year, fall, winter, and spring. Begin your subscription in April and participate in the planning profession, and provide vital legal and篓sistance to the New Planner. It is always edited by a student chapter of the APA.

July 1, 1996—The Georgia Announces seventeen conferences on educational programs in the University of Chicago and Cuba.

July 20-23, 1996—The Ethics of Globalization: The Future of Urban Planning and the International Trade and Greenpeace Conference in Havana. The conference will bring together 5000 urban planners and will be held in Havana.

July 20-23, 1996—The People's Development Forum will be held in Havana.

July 20-27, 1996—The New Planner will be held in Havana.


August 14-20, 1996—The Poverty and Transport is a key protein on the African Agenda. This paper presents the case for an integrated transport strategy and the major issues and problems that need to be addressed.

August 20-26, 1996—The Making the Land Useable, Air Quality Connection — UTRAC is a project that challenges auto-oriented transport projects and auto-depend

PUBLICATIONS

The New Encyclopedia of Housing includes contributions from nearly 200 housing experts, including architects, sociologists, and urban planners.

The Civil Engineering, the Netherlands, Inquiries Ant Nolde, Community Law Center (213) 301-96


The Community Self-Reliance newsletter seeks to evaluate the development experiences of communities around the world. The newsletter is practical, informative, and useful for people working in communities and organizations.

The Poverty and Transport is a key protein on the African Agenda. This paper presents the case for an integrated transport strategy and the major issues and problems that need to be addressed.

The Making the Land Useable, Air Quality Connection — UTRAC is a project that challenges auto-oriented transport projects and auto-depend
dents patterns in Portland, Oregon. UTRAC created an alternative map and transportation plan for Washington County, Oregon, published research on the impacts of pedestrian-friendly design, and produced a set of design and community definitions. UTRAC is a tie-up organization for UTRAC.

The Civil Engineering, the Netherlands, Inquiries Ant Nolde, Community Law Center (213) 301-96

The Poverty and Transport is a key protein on the African Agenda. This paper presents the case for an integrated transport strategy and the major issues and problems that need to be addressed.

The Making the Land Useable, Air Quality Connection — UTRAC is a project that challenges auto-oriented transport projects and auto-depend
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MISSISSIPPI
Jackson State University Department of Urban and Regional Planning is seeking a faculty member for the tenure-track faculty. The newly established department will offer graduate degree programs at the master's and doctoral levels. PhDs or terminal degree is required of all applicants (ACRP preferred). Salary commensurate with qualifications and experience. The position is in Community Development, Planning, Research and Extension. For more information, send letter of application, current vita, 3 letters of reference, and official transcripts of all graduate and undergraduate work to: Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Jackson State University, MS 39212, Jackson, MS 39211.

NEW JERSEY
The Center for Urban Policy Research (CUPR) at Rutgers University is seeking a Post-Doctoral Fellow for a one year non-renewable appointment. Applicants are expected to have completed all requirements of the doctoral program and have a strong interest in urban and regional issues and socio-economic analysis. The Center for Urban Policy Research, 121 Kean Hall, New Brunswick, NJ 08901. Verbal inquiry to John J. Kasarda, Director of Urban Policy Research, College of Business Administration, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08901. Please include a current resume and a letter of interest and 3 letters of recommendation to: John J. Kasarda, Director, Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University, 121 Kean Hall, New Brunswick, NJ 08901.

TEXAS
The City of Dallas, Texas, is seeking an Urban Planner for the Citizen's Development Department. The City of Dallas is an Equal Opportunity Employer. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply. Salary range for the position is $33,000 - $50,000, depending on experience. For more information, please contact: Frederic D. Hughes, Director, Planning and Development, 200 S. Houston, Dallas, TX 75201, phone: (214) 670-5250, fax: (214) 670-5251.

ILLINOIS
Chicago Mutual Housing Network is seeking an Executive Director. CMH is a federation of housing co-op organizations and believes that the community development process should be led by community groups. The Chicago Mutual Housing Network is an umbrella organization that provides support to its member cooperatives. Interested persons should apply by sending a letter and resume to: Illinois Housing Development Authority, 525 South Dearborn Street, Suite 1900, Chicago, Illinois 60605. Submit letter and resume by February 1, 1998.

JOBS
Director of Engagement & Review Programs at CERES. Required experience: strong working knowledge of business and at least one more level of CERES familiarity with, and commitment to, CERES’s external engagement challenges our society faces; graduate degree in business or communications; good understanding of CERES. Submit letter and resume to: koon@ceres.org.

MISSOURI
Department of Housing and Community Development is seeking Managed Housing Program Coordinator. The Managed Housing Program Coordinator will be responsible for: (1) oversight of Managed Housing Program operation; (2) ensuring that all program activities comply with Federal, State and local laws and regulations; (3) preparing and maintaining accurate and complete documentation of program activities; (4) providing staff with program policy, procedure, and guidelines; and (5) maintaining positive working relationships with program participants, staff, and other stakeholders. For more information, contact John Greiman, Program Manager, (573) 522-6030, or visit the Missouri Housing Development Commission web site at http://www.mhdc.state.mo.us.


comes to our cities in the 21st century. And if we don’t get it right, our cities will be left behind.

The site at http://www.adps.org has a new website that has information, visual images, and links. Visit the site at http://www.adps.org.

The City of Dallas, Texas, is seeking an Urban Planner for the Citizen's Development Department. The City of Dallas is an Equal Opportunity Employer. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply. Salary range for the position is $33,000 - $50,000, depending on experience. For more information, please contact: Frederic D. Hughes, Director, Planning and Development, 200 S. Houston, Dallas, TX 75201, phone: (214) 670-5250, fax: (214) 670-5251.

TEXAS
The City of Dallas, Texas, is seeking an Urban Planner for the Citizen's Development Department. The City of Dallas is an Equal Opportunity Employer. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply. Salary range for the position is $33,000 - $50,000, depending on experience. For more information, please contact: Frederic D. Hughes, Director, Planning and Development, 200 S. Houston, Dallas, TX 75201, phone: (214) 670-5250, fax: (214) 670-5251.


comes to our cities in the 21st century. And if we don’t get it right, our cities will be left behind.

The site at http://www.adps.org has a new website that has information, visual images, and links. Visit the site at http://www.adps.org.

The City of Dallas, Texas, is seeking an Urban Planner for the Citizen's Development Department. The City of Dallas is an Equal Opportunity Employer. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply. Salary range for the position is $33,000 - $50,000, depending on experience. For more information, please contact: Frederic D. Hughes, Director, Planning and Development, 200 S. Houston, Dallas, TX 75201, phone: (214) 670-5250, fax: (214) 670-5251.
Looking to fill an open position with someone who can help link to the right person. Send your job announcement to the national office and email it to -pr@pratt.edu-.

If you can format your announcement in the style we use, that will save the volunteer time. Please limit listings to 50 words.

Note: Many job announcements are edited for length. For full information, contact employers.

**JOBS**

**ILLINOIS**
Chicago Mutual Housing Network is seeking an Executive Director. CMHN is a federation of housing-on-the-go providers, providing training and technical assistance, sponsors neighborhood development projects, and advocates on behalf of mutual housing. Candidates must have experience with co-housing development, resident training, fundraising, and non-profit management. Salary mid $40s. For full job description, contact: Sarah, CMHN, 214-924-0354, email: sn@chicagomhn.org, send to CCHC, 2301 W. Bloomingdale Avenue, Chicago, IL 60647, Fax (773) 278-9296, <link Chand@, org>.

The Organization of the Northside (OSN) is a 25-year-old community organization on Chicago's northside. It is offering a position to a one-person minority Internship in Community Organization. The position is open to students of color who are interested in exploring a career in community organizing. Full-time is preferred but part-time applicants will be considered. Mostly stipend is $400. Contact: Sarah Jane Key, Executive Director, OSN, 512 N. Clark Street, Chicago, IL 60607 (773) 769-2332, Fax (773) 769-0729.

AOHR Housing Corporation seeks a Project Coordinator for its Little Rock and Chicago offices to develop affordable housing for low-income people. Duties include coordination of property development, fundraising, hiring, and administrative support. Qualifications: housing development, strong communication skills with persons of diverse economic and racial backgrounds, highly motivated, and management experience. Resume and salary expectations to: Personnel, 707AOHR Housing Corporation, 1200 W. Harrison Street, 2nd Floor, Chicago, IL 60603.

**LOUISIANA**
Louisiana Public Health Institute is seeking an Executive Director. Requirements: graduate degree in public health or related field, at least five years of work experience, 3 of which are in management, demonstrated excellence in interpersonal, negotiation, oral and written communications, entrepreneurial abilities, successful experience in fundraising. Including grant development and collaboration with various public/private entities, and willingness to travel inside and outside the state. (Fax) 504-568-8744 or send letter of application, current vita, 3 letters of reference, and official transcripts of all graduate and undergraduate courses to: Louisiana Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Community, State and Regional Planning, Jackson State University, 8850 Higwood Road, Box 23, Jackson, MS 39211.

**MISSISSIPPI**
Jackson State University Department of Urban and Regional Planning seeks a full-time Assistant Professor to teach in the tenure track faculty. The newly established department will offer graduate degree programs at the master's and doctoral levels. PhD or terminal degree is required of all applicants (ACP preferred). Salary commensurate with qualifications and experience. The position is currently available. Send letter of application, current vita, 3 letters of reference, and official transcripts of all graduate and undergraduate courses to: Appalachian State University, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Jackson State University, 8850 Higwood Road, Box 23, Jackson, MS 39211.

**NEW ENGLAND**
The Center for Urban Policy Research (CUPR) at Rutgers University is seeking a Post-Doctoral Fellow for a one-year non-renewal appointment beginning September 1, 2000. The post-doctoral fellow will work on a project of interest, a resume, and 3 letters of recommendation by December 15, 1999 to Norman Gleckman, Director, Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University, 33 Livingston Avenue, Suite 406, New Brunswick, NJ 08901. Salary $30,000.

The Tri-City Peoples Corporation is seeking a Director of Community Development with five years experience in housing and community revitalization. Preferred candidates will have skills and experience to form partnerships and leverage community resources to expand housing and economic development opportunities for the West Side Community of Newark. Salary $40,000-$50,000. Send cover letter and resume to: Tri-City Peoples Corporation, 675-681 South 19th Street, Newark, NJ 07102.
JOBS

New Mexico

The Community and Regional Planning Program of the University of New Mexico School of Architecture and Planning is seeking a tenure-track assistant or associate profes-

sor at the Associate or Professor level beginning with the 1999/2000 school year. Send a let-
ter of application, resume, and bibliography to the names and addresses of at least 5 professionals by January 15, 1999. University of New Mexico, School of Architecture and Regional Planning, 2141 Cherry Avenue, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 87131.

New York

The Columbus University Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation is seeking candidates for a position of Assistant or Associate Professor of Urban Design and Urban Planning for a seat at the Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation. Review of applicants will begin on January 18, 1999. Send to: Bemard Tschumi, Dean, Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation, 400 Henry Hall, New York, New York 10012.

Planners Network Conference June 17-20, 1999
Lowell, Massachusetts

It is a critical time for work and work-ers in the United States. Most workers are putting in longer hours, at lower wages, in less stable jobs. Inequities and education are widening, and gender inequity persists as well. New, harsh work requirements and time limits work to reduce welfare recipients into dead-end jobs.

Anti-immigrant policies intensify the sec-

ond-class status of undocumented work-
ers. At the same time, the U.S. labor movement is being revitalized, and community-based cam-
paigns such as those for living wage ordi-
nances have scored many successes.

At this critical juncture, the June 1999 Planners Network conference will explore the intersections and connections between community work. There are many opportunities for successful, well-supported campaigns:

Community and labor initiatives/organizing can both be more effective if they collaborate, but too often these different approaches are discon-
ed or even working at cross purposes.

Successful community economic development depends on expanding exper-

imentation. This conference can accomplish that. Environ-
mental planning, for example, can be an important tool for the successful campaign.

Virginia

The best practices and work support committees, a Latino/Asian-American worker organizing and community development organization in Alexandria, is seeking a field worker to develop and maintain with fire and social network. A job description for the position is available on the web at www.vcd.org.

Oregon

The U.S. Conference of Mayors requests applications for their fifth-annual Oregon Intern Program. Applications are due by March 1, 1999. For information contact: Mira Brown, Oregon Inter-

nematological Community Development Organization is looking for a Project Director. Must have strong leadership experience and excellent written and verbal communica-
tion skills, five years experience administering job training programs, and computer literacy. Supervise and administer a federally funded adult training initiative and assist with the develop-
ment of measures to increase service capacity. Salary $30,000-$40,000. Contact: cdo@prodig.com, P.O. Box 270-1001.

Pennsylvania

Philadelphia Jobs Initiative, a nationally recognized community development financial institution, seeks a Director of Jobs Initiative Program. The position is part of a six-city national foundation initiative work-
ing to expand the employment opportunities of low-income communities with jobs. Candidates must have experience in the development, evaluation, and analysis of community development and economic inclusion initiatives, and a strong desire to work in community-based organizations. Salary: $40,000-$50,000. Respond to: CFMID Mark Alexander, Hope Community, 174 East 104th Street, New York, New York 10029.

The Fiveth Avenue Committee, a Brooklyn-based non-

profit, community development corporation seeks a Senior Asset Manager to lead a growing property management department. Responsibilities include: field management, property compliance, site maintenance, rent collection, property management, and building codes. The position requires the ability to work with a wide range of property owners, tenants, and community leaders. Salary: $35,000 per year. Send a letter of interest, resume, and references to the Fiveth Avenue Committee, 105 Third Avenue, Brooklyn, 11210.

The Neighborhood Economic Development Advocacy Project (NEDAP) seeks a Research Coordinator for the New York City Community Reinvestment Task Force, a citywide network that advocates for fair banking practices in low-income and neighborhoods and communities of color, trade regulatory agencies and legislative developments, and promotes regulatory accountability. Qualifications: BA, excellent communication skills, demonstrated commitment to social and economic justice. Applications due by January 31, 1999. Send a letter of interest, resumes, and references to: Nancy K. Ratner, Fiveth Avenue Committee, 105 Third Avenue, Brooklyn, 11210.

The Neighborhood Economic Development Advocacy Project (NEDAP) seeks a Research Coordinator for the New York City Community Reinvestment Task Force, a citywide network that advocates for fair banking practices in low-income and neighborhoods. Responsibilities include: field management, property compliance, site maintenance, rent collection, property management, and building codes. The position requires the ability to work with a wide range of property owners, tenants, and community leaders. Salary: $35,000 per year. Send a letter of interest, resume, and references to the Fiveth Avenue Committee, 105 Third Avenue, Brooklyn, 11210.

The Neighborhood Economic Development Advocacy Project (NEDAP) seeks a Research Coordinator for the New York City Community Reinvestment Task Force, a citywide network that advocates for fair banking practices in low-income and neighborhoods and communities of color, trade regulatory agencies and legislative developments, and promotes regulatory accountability. Qualifications: BA, excellent communication skills, demonstrated commitment to social and economic justice. Applications due by January 31, 1999. Send a letter of interest, resumes, and references to: Nancy K. Ratner, Fiveth Avenue Committee, 105 Third Avenue, Brooklyn, 11210.

Job opportunities Expand and implement organi-

The Neighborhood Economic Development Advocacy Project (NEDAP) seeks a Research Coordinator for the New York City Community Reinvestment Task Force, a citywide network that advocates for fair banking practices in low-income and neighborhoods and communities of color, trade regulatory agencies and legislative developments, and promotes regulatory accountability. Qualifications: BA, excellent communication skills, demonstrated commitment to social and economic justice. Applications due by January 31, 1999. Send a letter of interest, resumes, and references to: Nancy K. Ratner, Fiveth Avenue Committee, 105 Third Avenue, Brooklyn, 11210.
NEW YORK

The Columbia University Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation is seeking candidates for the position of Assistant or Associate Professor of Urban Planning and Urban Design. This is an ope-

it is a position that provides an environ-
ment for academic and professional growth.

Applications are encouraged to apply.

ORKING FOR A DECENT LIVING

Bridging the Gap Between Labor and Community

Planners Network Conference, June 17-20, 1999
Lowell, Massachusetts

It is a critical time for work and work-

ers in the United States. Most workers are putting in longer hours, at lower wages, in less stable jobs. Inequalities and skill education and training are widening, and gender

influence persists as well. New, harsh

work requirements and time limits have left

workers desperate to find dead-end jobs.

Anti-immigrant policies intensify the sec-

ond-class status of undocumented work-

ers. At the same time, the U.S. movement is

more revitalized, and community-based cam-
paigns such as those for living wage ordi-
nances have scored many successes.

At this critical juncture, the June 1999
Planners Network conference will explore

networks and connections between communities.

There are many opportunities for

such connections. Community and labor ini-

atives/organizing can both be more effective

if they collaborate, but too often these different approaches are disconnect-
ed or even working at cross purposes.

Successful community economic develop-

ment depends on expanding experi-

encing employment. This can encompass

anything from commercial area develop-

ment to skill training, to living wage ordi-
nances. Residents in a given community

can influence and manage their local com-

munity. Yet, transportation and communication options also affect what jobs are available to a given community. Environmental

planning often confronts widespread

problems that affect both jobs and environmental

protection. Immigrant communities,

which are often poorly organized, can suffer.

And in some cases, global trends in manufacturing can have a significant impact on local communities. Simply put, work is becoming more

difficult for everyone, and the search for decent work is more critical than ever.

The University of Lowell's campus is home to innovative programs focusing on eco-

nomic and social development and environ-

mental stability. The University is in close contact with community groups and local government officials, and all other stakeholders are

invited to participate.

The University's Lowell Campus is home to innovative programs focusing on economic and social development and environmental stability. The University is in close contact with community groups and local government officials, and all other stakeholders are invited to participate.
PLANNERS NETWORK
SUSTAINER CAMPAIGN

Over the last ten months, a good number of PNers have stepped forward to help Planners Network as Sustaining Members with contributions of $100. The Sustainer Campaign has raised $4,000 of the $5,000 we need to cover our annual deficit — a budget shortage that results partly from not holding an annual conference this year.

1998 has been an extraordinary year of strength and growth for PN. With our new by-laws, our new, member-elected Steering Committee, new local "chapters" of PN forming in Illinois and elsewhere, a dynamic conference on Labor and Community planned for next June, and an expanded staff of volunteers working on this newsletter, PN is set to make 1999 even better.

Recent issues of the newsletter have featured a wide array of "Whiter PN" commentaries in which members have initiated new projects and articulated new objectives that are invigorating PN. This check, you send today makes it possible for PN to support these new activities and to sustain and continue PN’s growth as a strong voice for progressive, community-based planning. Member contributions are PN’s only source of income, and the average contribution is $25.

Our goal is 50 Contributions of at least $100 each.

With $1,000 left to reach our goal, we need just ten more Sustaining Members. Won’t you consider becoming one of them? Your contribution to PN is tax-deductible. Send a check to:

PLANNERS NETWORK
Attn: Dalila Hall
379 DeKalb Avenue
Brooklyn, New York 11205

FOR MORE THAN TWENTY YEARS, Planners Network has been a voice for progressive professionals and activists concerned with urban planning and social justice. PN’s 1,000 members receive this bimonthly magazine, network online with PN-NET, and take part in the annual conference. PN also gives progressive ideas a voice in the mainstream planning profession by organizing seminars at annual conferences of the American Planning Association and the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning.

The PN Conference has been held annually each spring since 1994. These gatherings combine speakers and workshops with exchanges involving local communities. PN conferences engage in discussions that help inform political strategies at the local, national, and international levels. The 1999 conference will be held June 17-20 in Lowell, MA (see pages 11 and 17). Recent conferences have been held in Washington, D.C., East St. Louis, Ill., Brooklyn, NY, and Pomona, CA.

Whether face-to-face, in print, or over the internet, PNers are part of a network that shares progressive ideas and experiences. Join Planners Network and make a difference while sharing your ideas and enthusiasm with others!

Annual financial contributions are voluntary, but we need funds for operating expenses. The Steering Committee recommends the following amounts as minimums for Network members:

$15 for those with incomes under $25,000, students and unemployed
$25 for those earning between $25,000 and $50,000
$45 for those earning over $50,000
$100 for organizations and libraries

Sustaining Members — if you earn over $50,000, won’t you consider helping at this level?

THE PLANNERS NETWORK

The Planners Network is an association of professionals, activists, academics, and students involved in physical, social, economic, and environmental planning in urban and rural areas, who promote fundamental change in our political and economic systems.

We believe that planning should be a tool for allocating resources and developing the environment to eliminate the great inequalities of wealth and power in our society, rather than to maintain and justify the status quo. This includes opposition to racial, economic and environmental injustice, and discrimination by gender and sexual orientation. We believe that planning should be used to ensure adequate food, clothing, shelter, medical care, jobs, safe working conditions, and a healthful environment. We advocate public responsibility for meeting these needs, because the private market has proven incapable of doing so.

Mail This Form To:
PLANNERS NETWORK
379 DeKalb Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11205

Name ____________________________________________
Organization ____________________________
Street __________________________________________________________________________
City __________________ State __________ Zip Code __________
Email ____________________________________________
Telephone ______________________________ Fax __________________

Yes! I want to join progressive planners to work for fundamental change.
I’m a renewing member — Keep the faith!
Enclosed is my check payable to PLANNERS NETWORK for $______

NOTES: Your contribution is tax-deductible!

International members, please send a check in U.S. funds as we are unable to accept payment by credit cards or in other currency at this time.

Thanks!

MOVING?
Please make sure to let PN know if your address changes. It saves us money and helps you don’t miss an issue!

Your Participation Wanted!
Future issues will cover energy policies, planning and race, and other topics.

Please submit articles, notes, updates, and resources typed and double-spaced. Feature articles of 500 to 1,500 words are always welcome. Submissions on disk or by email are greatly appreciated. All electronic submissions should be in ASCII text. Send your submissions, resources or job listings to the editors at <pln@pratt.edu> or the address given at left. All updates should be directed to Dalila Hall, <dhalil@pratt.edu>.
PLANNERS NETWORK
STUARter CAMPAIGN

Over the last ten months, a good number of PNers have stepped forward to help Planners Network as Sustaining Members with contributions of $100. The Sustainer Campaign has raised $4,000 of the $5,000 we need to cover our annual deficit—a budget shortfall that results partly from not holding an annual conference this year.

1998 has been an extraordinary year of strength and growth for PN. With our new by-laws, our new, member-elected Steering Committee, new local “chapters” of PN forming in Illinois and elsewhere, a dynamic conference on Labor and Community planned for next June, and an expanded staff of volunteers working on this newsletter, PN is set to make 1999 even better.

Recent issues of the newsletter have featured a wide array of “Whiter PN?” commentaries in which members have initiated new projects and articulated new objectives that are invigorating PN.

Your participation is critical in making this possible for PN to support these new activities and to sustain and continue PN’s growth as a strong voice for progressive, community-based planning. Member contributions are PN’s only source of income, and the average contribution is $25.

Our goal is 50 Contributions of at least $10 each.

With $1,000 left to reach our goal, we need just ten more Sustaining Members. Won’t you consider becoming one of them? Your contribution to PN is tax-deductible. Send a check to:

PLANNERS NETWORK
Attn: Dalila Hall
379 DeKalb Avenue
Brooklyn, New York 11205

Moving

Please make sure to let PN know if your address changes. It saves us money and helps you ensure you won’t miss an issue!

Your Participation Wanted!

January/February 1999, Number 133 — Deadline: January 4, 1999
March/April 1999, Number 134 — Deadline: February 26, 1999

Future issues will cover energy policies, planning and race, and other topics.

Please submit articles, notes, updates, and resources typed and double-spaced. Feature articles of 500 to 1,500 words are always welcome. Submission on disk or by email are greatly appreciated. All electronic submissions should be sent as ASCII text. Send your submissions, resources or job listings to the editors at p@planners.org or the address given at left. All updates should be directed to Dalila Hall, <dhall@planners.org>.

For more than twenty years, Planners Network has been a voice for progressive professionals and activists concerned with urban planning and social justice. PN’s 1,000 members receive this bimonthly magazine, Network online with PN.NET, and take part in the annual conference. PN also gives progressive ideas a voice in the mainstream planning profession by organizing sessions at annual conferences of the American Planning Association and the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning.

The PN Conference has been held annually each spring since 1994. These gatherings combine speakers and workshops with exchanges involving local communities, PN conferences engage in discussions that help inform political strategies at the local, national, and international levels. The 1999 conference will be held June 17-20 in Lowell, MA (see pages 11 and 17). Recent conferences have been held in Washington, D.C., East St. Louis, IL, Brooklyn, NY, and Pomona, CA.

Whether face to face, in print, or over the internet, PNers are part of a network that shares progressive ideas and experiences. Join Planners Network and make a difference while sharing your ideas and enthusiasm with others!

Annual financial contributions are voluntary, but we need funds for operating expenses. The Steering Committee recommends the following amounts as minimums for Network members:

$15 for those with incomes under $25,000, students and unemployed
$25 for those earning between $25,000 and $50,000
$45 for those earning over $50,000
$30 for organizations and libraries

Sustaining Members — if you earn over $50,000, won’t you consider helping at this level?

Mail This Form To:

PLANNERS NETWORK
379 DeKalb Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11205

Name:

Organization:

Street:

City_ State Zip Code

Enclosed is my check payable to PLANNERS NETWORK for$__

Mail this form to:

PLANNERS NETWORK
379 DeKalb Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11205

NOTES: Your contribution is tax-deductible!

International members, please send a check in U.S. funds as we are unable to accept payment by credit cards or in other currency at this time.

Thanks!
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## YOUR LAST ISSUE?

The date on your mailing label indicates when your current membership expires — make sure to renew if this date is coming up soon! If it is already expired, we need to hear from you before May 1st or you won't receive PN anymore. See the inside back page for contribution suggestions. Thanks for your continued support!
A living wage is the minimum income necessary for a worker to meet their basic needs. Needs are defined to include food, housing, and other essential needs such as clothing. The goal of a living wage is to allow a worker to afford a basic but decent standard of living. Due to the flexible nature of the term "needs", there is not one universally accepted measure of what a living wage is and as such it varies by location and household type. The real Living Wage is the only UK wage rate that is voluntarily paid by over 5,000 UK businesses who believe their staff deserve a fair day's pay for a hard day's work. Our employers pay the real Living Wage which is higher than the government minimum - they also make sure all their employees in London receive the London Living Wage. Living Wage UK, London, United Kingdom. 11K likes. We're the independent organisation at the heart of the Living Wage movement. We oversee the real...