

The University of Chicago
School of Social Service Administration
969 East 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637
773.702.1250
773.702.0874 fax

ssa.uchicago.edu | facebook.com/uchicagossa | twitter.com/uchicagossa

ADVOCATES' FORUM 2013 THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO STUDENTS OF THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

A PUBLICATION BY STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

Advocates' FORUM

2013

DEFINING PROBLEMS. SHAPING SOLUTIONS.



THE UNIVERSITY OF
CHICAGO

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

Advocates' FORUM

2013

A PUBLICATION BY STUDENTS OF **THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO**

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

EDITOR IN CHIEF

Abra Lyons-Warren

EDITORIAL BOARD

Bria Berger

Katie Berringer

Anna Dekleva

Liza Doran

Brooke Fisher

Matt Hiller

Dre Kampfner

Laura Kusek

Abra Lyons-Warren

Liz Mullen

Rachel Narrow

Caitlin Nevin

Claire O'Connor

Aatifa Sadiq

Kathryn Simon

FACULTY ADVISOR

Virginia Parks, Ph.D.

MISSION STATEMENT

Advocates' Forum is an academic journal that explores implications of clinical social work practice, social issues, administration, and public policies linked to the social work profession. The Editorial Board of Advocates' Forum seeks to provide a medium through which SSA students can contribute to public thinking about social welfare and policy in theory and practice. Above all, Advocates' Forum serves to encourage and facilitate an open, scholarly exchange of ideas among individuals working toward the shared goal of a more just and humane society.

EDITORIAL POLICY

Advocates' Forum is published by the students of the School of Social Service Administration (SSA) at The University of Chicago. Submissions to the journal are selected by the editorial board from works submitted by SSA students and edited in an extensive revision process with the authors' permission. Responsibility for the accuracy of information contained in written submissions rests solely with the author. Views expressed within each article belong to the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the editorial board, the School of Social Service Administration, or The University of Chicago. All inquiries and submissions should be directed to:

Advocates' Forum
The University of Chicago
School of Social Service
Administration
969 East 60th Street
Chicago, IL 60637

WEB ADDRESS
http://ssa.uchicago.edu/
advocates-forum-student-journal

© 2013 The University of Chicago.
All rights reserved.

ESSAYS AND ARTICLES

Letter from the Editor.....i
Shared Workforce Development Opportunities:
Connecting Chicago and Mexico
By Oswaldo Alvarez.....1
Policy and Organizing Complementarity in
Community Change Campaigns
By Jody Blaylock..... 9
Neoliberal Urban Revitalization in Chicago
By Julia Conte and Janet Li..... 19
Banks, Courts, and Bureaucrats: Apartment
Foreclosures and Coercive Evictions in Chicago
By Matt Hiller..... 31
Towards a More Affirming Perspective:
Contemporary Psychodynamic Practice with
Trans* and Gender Non-conforming Individuals
By Clare McBee..... 37
Editors and Editorial Board.....53

ON THE COVER

The University of Chicago
School of Social Service Administration
Photographer: Tom Rossiter

FROM THE EDITOR

Each year, *Advocates' Forum* seeks to share students' scholarly work on a range of topics within the field of social service. Not surprisingly, given the qualities common among aspiring social workers, this year's journal includes five articles focusing on timely and important issues. Three—covering coercive evictions, the Hope VI program and Choice Neighborhoods, and the Sweet Home Chicago Campaign—provide insight and survey different ways of thinking about an issue that, since the housing crisis, has grown more critical for individuals and families and more vital for social workers to address. Two more articles also focus on areas of great importance in today's landscape: workforce development and trans* and gender non-conforming individuals. As with all the subjects in the journal, these are topics that reflect changing public opinions toward minority groups and the growing interest and need to implement effective solutions.

Much as the social service field continues to evolve, so too has *Advocates' Forum*, which continues to take steps to improve its practices and reach. This year, the journal implemented a refined submission selection process to more thoroughly assess each submission and provide more comprehensive feedback to authors. In order to better share student ideas with others and to increase discourse, the journal has continued to strengthen its ties with other social work schools.

These changes meant greater responsibilities for the editorial board, which rose to the challenge. I thank all the board members for their diligence and willingness to improve the journal, as well as Associate Professor Virginia Parks, who is *Advocates' Forum's* faculty advisor and an unwavering champion of the journal, and Daniel Listoe, PhD, editing consultant, for his meticulous and holistic work with the authors.

Abra Lyons-Warren
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

If you are interested in writing for the 2014 edition of *Advocates' Forum*, please contact Katie Berringer at kberringer@uchicago.edu or Liza Doran at lizadoran@uchicago.edu.

SHARED WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES: CONNECTING CHICAGO AND MEXICO

By Oswaldo Alvarez

School of Social Service Administration

University of Chicago

Abstract

This paper was inspired by the desire to provide workforce development training programs to undocumented immigrants in Chicago. Based on an analysis of workforce development programs in the United States and Mexico, as well as observations from a field study in the state of Guanajuato, Mexico, the paper distills the areas of best practice within the respective local contexts. It identifies areas for potential collaboration within a newly conceptualized model of bi-national workforce development. The paper thus presents an outline of the necessary considerations for such a bi-national workforce development project to function and improve worker mobility in both countries.

There are an estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants now residing in the United States (Pew Hispanic Center). Many undocumented immigrants work low-skill jobs in the manufacturing, service, and agriculture sectors. Others remain stuck in entry-level positions despite the opportunities for advancement in their respective fields. Although undocumented workers pay taxes under phony social security numbers, they do not qualify for social programs, such as workforce development. Moreover, current workforce development efforts in the United States are generally designed to increase the high- and middle-skilled workforce. So while the private sector hires undocumented immigrants, and there continues to be a large supply of immigrants to fill these jobs, immigration policy prevents the labor market from functioning as fully as it might.

There remains the potential to create truly effective programs that would supplement the existing reliance of companies on immigrant labor. Instead of helping undocumented immigrants in the United States train for middle- and high-skilled jobs, it is possible to train people before they migrate. For example, an individual might train for an occupation that is high growth in the United States while remaining in their country of origin. If the individual then migrated, the skills gained could lead to a job in the United States that pays a sustaining wage. This proposed model would benefit both immigrant communities and the private sector that employs them.

Here it is appropriate to discuss employment issues apart from the specter of the ongoing immigration policy debate. Mexican migration often occurs because of the prospects of earning more in the United States (Passel and D'Vera 2011). In economic terms, migration occurs in spite of legal barriers because the labor market manifests a demand. To meet that demand through a bi-national workforce development program, we must first analyze current efforts in Mexico that develop skilled labor, identifying the particular areas that have the potential to complement international market forces.

This article presents the background necessary to understand the prospects of developing a workforce program in Mexico that would have bi-national implications. It begins by comparing the existing workforce development programs in the United States and Mexico in order to better understand how a program in Mexico might best operate. It includes the results of my own fact-finding trip to the Mexican state of Guanajuato, where I interviewed individuals about the economic prospects of various job sectors. The goal of this article is to contribute to a future workforce development program that would serve two equally important purposes: first, to demonstrate to companies and stakeholders that they may find skilled workers on either side of the border; and second, to increase the labor mobility of individuals seeking family-sustaining employment.

When individual workers have more employment options available to them, they have what is called "labor mobility." In the context of Mexican workers, labor mobility has two different, if related, meanings. It is first attributable to those willing to relocate and take work in areas of industrial growth within Mexico. Second, it is attributable to those workers, both documented and undocumented, willing to immigrate to the United States. This latter group hopes to find that migration provides them with an even wider range of employment options. Labor mobility is not so easily achieved when neoliberal policies allow for the movement of companies across national borders, while immigration laws limit individuals' movement. Too often, those who do find work in the United States are stuck in dead-end

jobs. While immigration reform debates simmer, workforce development is currently in action, affecting the mobility, labor prospects and lives of both Mexican and American workers.

A COMPARISON OF WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

Workforce development in Mexico is primarily about attracting companies to the country. Individual states offer different programs, each state collaborating directly with companies. Each state has a department that offers vocational education, responding to the strong demand for skilled workers created by the incoming companies. This is reflected in the recent implementation of training programs for incumbent workers.

In Guanajuato, for example, the State of Guanajuato Department of Job Training (ICATEG) was created to provide government-funded vocational training as a service to companies. In the case of Guanajuato, ICATEG was designed to meet the needs of precision manufacturers in the automotive industry. For example, American Axle, a foreign company, works with ICATEG to develop relevant curricula for their workers. Additionally, companies can send their newly hired employees for training at ICATEG at minimal cost.

Workforce development training in the United States comes from the federal Workforce Investment Act (WIA) and the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program created by the Trade Act of 1974. Many Americans also receive workforce development training dollars under the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA), assuming they enroll in college-accredited courses that are in essence vocational training. Unlike WIA and TAA, FAFSA is not workforce-development specific.

The WIA funds training for incumbent workers (WIA Title I) and for low-skilled unemployed or underemployed adults (WIA Title II) and provides one-time grants to qualifying individuals who may select their vocational trainer of choice, provided they possess the English and mathematics skills necessary for the program. Universities, community-based organizations, and other educational institutions are all eligible vendors that offer vocational trainings under WIA. The WIA also funds other training such as on-the-job training and customized training. Employers can qualify for an up to 50 percent wage subsidy for an employee receiving on-the-job training while customized training is an individually tailored training program for any given company. In addition to hard-skills vocational training, WIA aims to strengthen the US workforce through case management, soft-skills training (such as resume writing and interview preparation), and hard-skills vocational training. It is designed to encourage

cooperation among states and agencies so as to foster economic growth across regional borders (Mason 2008).

The TAA program works as an extension of unemployment insurance (UI) for individuals affected negatively by outsourcing. It offers up to 78 weeks of additional unemployment compensation after the regular UI funds are depleted (Decker and Corson 1995). Thus, an individual could potentially receive income for 96 weeks. Additionally, if the recipient is in vocational training after the 96 weeks, an extension of 26 weeks (totaling to 130 weeks) is possible. TAA also offers a health coverage tax credit benefit during the time that people are enrolled. Finally, a one-time assistance of \$1,250 is available for job search purposes (Decker and Corson 1996).

Organizations that serve both WIA and TAA recipients are evaluated based on job placement and retention rates. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the vocational training organization to initiate partnerships with companies. In striking contrast to the Mexican workforce programs discussed above, US workforce development programs are mandated to serve disadvantaged individuals rather than companies. This difference may be characterized as a difference in the interpretation of "development"—personal advancement or regional economic growth.

A CLOSER EXAMINATION OF MEXICO'S WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

In the summer of 2010, I conducted a six-week research project in the state of Guanajuato, Mexico. The project had three major objectives: (1) to examine the existing workforce development infrastructure in the state, (2) to compare and contrast these workforce development initiatives to initiatives existing in metropolitan Chicago, and (3) to distill areas of best practice within the respective local contexts, identifying areas for potential collaboration through a newly conceptualized model of bi-national workforce development.

The Bajío region was chosen for this research because of its high levels of international migration and because many migrants use Chicago as their destination. In the case of Guanajuato, the majority of migrants come from rural areas of the state. This dynamic is fueled by the lack of employment prospects in Mexico and the belief that economic survival depends upon emigrating to the United States for work (Passel and D'Vera, 2011). To identify the most promising industries for the proposed bi-national workforce development model, taking into account human capital requirements as well as available resources such as already existing Mexican public policy and programming that addresses workforce development, I focused on the following four preconditions: high employer demand

coupled with the lack of a skilled workforce; jobs that offer family-sustaining wages and opportunities for advancement; jobs not reliant on a four-year college education; and availability of transportation to the job.

In Guanajuato, I met with professionals in the health care sector: a university administrator, a health facility inspector, and a human resources director at a hospital. In the manufacturing industry there I met with individuals in Mexican workforce development, manufacturing training facility administrators, and manufacturing company representatives. I met with two manufacturing employers: Kromberg & Schubert and American Axle & Manufacturing. I also met with representatives from the two governmental departments in Guanajuato that address workforce development: the *Instituto Estatal de Capacitación para el Trabajo del Estado de Guanajuato* (ICATEG) and the *Instituto de Planeación del Estado de Guanajuato* (IPLANEG).

The research presented here is designed to help develop a model for a full-fledged workforce program that connects people from rural areas to Mexico's existing vocational trainings. This program would be modeled on existing workforce development programs in the United States and would ideally offer a similar instructional and certification process. This bi-national program would fill the skilled-worker shortage in both countries. The results would ideally benefit Mexicans on both sides of the border to move more freely between nations and still have family-sustaining employment and allow companies to move without worrying about finding skilled workers.

MEXICO'S MIDDLE-SKILL JOBS IN MANUFACTURING

The greatest potential for individual and economic development exists in those jobs that do not require university level education, but do require some vocational training in order to perform the job. In Mexico, these jobs pay enough for a worker to sustain a family; currently, manufacturing provides the most opportunities for these types of jobs. The health care sector in Mexico, according to my investigations, does not fulfill the preconditions for my model of workforce development. First, the projected availability of health care jobs is low. Second, most health care career paths require a substantial amount of post-secondary education while a job like nursing remains entry-level and low-paying.

Comparatively, manufacturing offers a living wage, and typically comes with benefits such as a Christmas bonus (*aguinaldo*), a savings plan, and a social security/pension. Moreover, manufacturing operates on an Internal Labor Market (ILM) structure in which there is a "mutual dependence between firms and workers" (Jacobs 1994, 205). In other words, jobs are

typically obtained through family or social connections. An ILM structure is advantageous to workforce development efforts because the workforce program itself becomes the connection to the job. By contrast, the health care industries in Mexico have an Occupational Labor Market (OLM) structure. Although this may be healthy for the industry, it leaves less space for a workforce development program because credentialing tends to be dominated by the university system. Universities and medical institutions act as the gatekeepers of recognized credentials—which are generally inaccessible to the residents of migrant towns.

The area of greatest growth in the sector potential is in "precision manufacturing." The growth in the use of Computer Numerical Control (CNC) machines in sectors such as automotive, aerospace, tool making, and plastic production has led many low-income individuals to seek training and certification for their operation. General Motors, Chrysler, and other aerospace companies have expanded their resources, taking control of Mexico's metalworking industry. General Motors in Guanajuato, for example, hires Computer Numerical Control (CNC) operators regularly. CNC operators typically earn between \$4,500 and \$7,000 pesos per month. This is a decent wage, relative to Mexican earnings, where the minimum wage is \$1,740 pesos per month.

The State Institute of Job Training for the State of Guanajuato (ICATEG) is the government entity currently tasked with workforce development for this sector. Those who benefit the most from their programming are companies that train their own employees with government assistance. Individuals who aspire to receive training from ICATEG could enroll, but must pay tuition out of pocket. However, because ICATEG's focus is incumbent worker training, they do not have a job placement department.

In rural areas without a strong manufacturing presence, there are few growth prospects and ICATEG offers training courses like cooking, sewing, hair styling, computer skills, and English. These training courses are not necessarily beneficial for communities at large since they have not been linked with economic development. Classrooms throughout these facilities remain empty because the programs offer few prospects for employment. These spaces are underutilized and could be used as bridge program sites. In the case of manufacturing, a bridge program is one that equips individuals with the necessary skills to understand measurements, quality control, and safety standards. Large and expensive machinery is not needed for the bridge program, as the bulk of the instruction is classroom based. With appropriate levels of funding, these physical ICATEG spaces in rural towns could be transformed to vocational bridge programs that are connected to

manufacturing high growth mid-skilled jobs in both Mexico and the United States.

These potential bridge programs in migrant towns could then be connected to the larger ICATEG sites that have state-of-the-art equipment. The lowest rate ICATEG offers for a CNC training is \$115 pesos per level, and the highest rate is \$250 pesos. The rate is determined based on the person's salary. Each training offered has at least 10 levels—making it at the very least \$1150 pesos (equivalent to \$100 USD) to complete a training.

To put these figures in perspective, a direct investment of \$100,000 USD in ICATEG's existing program would fund training for approximately 1,000 residents of migrant towns in Mexico, increasing labor mobility with respect to jobs available in both nations. The improved cost efficiency could well lead to a Mexican workforce program that benefits US-based companies more per dollar spent than the equivalent workforce trainings within the United States. Indeed, the massive inefficiency of US workforce programming has not gone unnoticed by federal legislators. In early 2013, the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training held a hearing on a number of legislative proposals intended to address flaws in federal job training policies, including the Supporting Knowledge and Investing in Lifelong Skills (SKILLS) Act.

PROSPECTS FOR A BI-NATIONAL PROGRAM

Global development expert Michael Clemens (2010) argues that international agreements ought to consider the development of individuals rather than the development of places. He argues that blocking migration reverses economic and individual development. In this sense, foreign aid that aims to help underdeveloped countries ought to be directed to individuals rather than places. A project to train individuals before they decide to migrate stands a chance to help people from underdeveloped countries truly experience development. A bi-national workforce development proposal is not an immigration policy briefing nor does it aim to change current policy. It simply aims to recognize and work with the existing situation. Furthermore, the proposal recognizes the reality that people continue to migrate whether immigration policy is restrictive or not.

In order to realize an improvement in the overall quality of life for low-income, low-skilled people, it is essential to invest in the development of individuals. Before implementing a ground-level work development program, it is necessary to take stock of the political and economic environment. There is clearly a need for free training that is open to the unemployed and underemployed. The lack of skilled workers in the precision manufacturing sector has contributed to a scenario in which Mexico attracts manufacturing industries that only offer low-skill jobs, such as team assembly. In the US, conversely, it has created a scenario where

companies continue to hire undocumented immigrants that do not have the needed skill-set. Unfortunately, these jobs offer little to no opportunity for those who aspire to grow within the company. Upward mobility in income, career, and lifestyle should be a large component of what is meant by development. To achieve upward mobility, low-skilled and low-income individuals need access to jobs that are part of a career ladder.

This paper argues that a bi-national training program that takes account of the internal labor market structure of the manufacturing industry is needed. A successful international workforce development program must recognize the connection of the international diaspora with its originating population. In practice, this approach to workforce development will utilize existing social and familial networks to overcome barriers to middle-skill employment in both nations.

REFERENCES

- Clemens, Michael. 2010. "A Labor Mobility Agenda for Development." Working Paper 201. Center for Global Development. http://www.cgdev.org/files/1423717_file_Clemens_labor_mobility_FINAL.pdf
- Decker, Paul and Walter Corson. 1995. "International Trade and Worker Displacement: Evaluation of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 48(4): 758-774.
- Jacobs, David. 1994. "Organizational Theory and Dualism: Some Sociological Determinants of Spot and Internal Labor Markets." *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 13: 203-235.
- Passel, Jeffrey S. and D'Vera Cohn. 2011. Unauthorized Immigrant Population: National and State Trends, 2010. Pew Hispanic Center: A Pew Research Project. <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/133.pdf>
- Pew Hispanic Center. 2011. *The Mexican-American Boom: Births Overtake Immigration*. <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/144.pdf>

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Oswaldo Alvarez is a Program Development Specialist at the Chicago Cook Workforce Partnership (CCWP), Cook County's Local Workforce Investment Area. There he leads CCWP's workforce efforts in the manufacturing sector. Prior to joining CCWP, he directed Erie Neighborhood House's workforce development programs, leading the program from its pilot phase to a full department within the agency with over 15 staff members. He graduated from the School of Social Service Administration in 2012 and holds his B.A. from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

POLICY AND ORGANIZING COMPLEMENTARITY IN COMMUNITY CHANGE CAMPAIGNS

By Jody Blaylock

School of Social Service Administration

University of Chicago

Abstract

This paper analyzes the intra-organizational partnerships in the Sweet Home Chicago Campaign for affordable housing. It outlines how this particular community change campaign effectively brought together the policy and community organizing traditions of campaigning. After outlining the general histories of various campaign strategies, it identifies Kristina Smock's model of complementarity as a way of partnering disparate traditions. From Smock's work and the example of Sweet Home Chicago, the paper identifies five elements that mark the potential for a policy-organizing partnership driven campaign.

In the latter half of 2006, the rate of foreclosures in the Chicago area increased rapidly (Smith and Duda 2009). By 2007, 50 percent of renters and 43 percent of homeowners paid more than 30 percent of their income for housing, which is deemed to be unaffordable (Sweet Home Chicago Coalition 2009). From 2007 to 2008, foreclosure filings in Chicago increased 48 percent, with 20,592 foreclosures filed that year. The increase in foreclosures "exacerbated the housing crisis by increasing demand and decreasing the supply of affordable housing" (Sweet Home Chicago Coalition 2009, 4).

This state of affairs intensified community efforts already underway to fight gentrification and promote the preservation and creation of affordable housing (Theodore and Martin 2007). One group undertaking such an effort was the Sweet Home Chicago Coalition, which emerged from a city-wide affordable-housing campaign of the non-profit Chicago Coalition for the Homeless. This coalition pressured the City Council to pass the Vacant

Building TIF Purchase Rehab Program, which allows developers to receive money from tax increment financing (TIF) to purchase and rehabilitate vacant properties for the creation of affordable housing units (Field and Dworkin 2011).

More importantly, the Sweet Home Chicago campaign for affordable housing also created a new model for community change efforts, one that utilized "an equal partnership between the community organizing and public policy departments" (Field and Dworkin 2011, 1). Affordable housing has long been an intractable problem in Chicago, and many prior community efforts, using only an organizing approach or only a policy approach, saw few gains (Field and Dworkin 2011). To increase the potential for success, this campaign required a new model for community change. Thus, policy advocates and organizers forged a new partnership to generate a more powerful change effort. This paper analyzes the policy-organizing relationship that developed during the Sweet Home Chicago Coalition campaign, drawing on the respective literatures on the research and planning tradition, the community organizing tradition, and Kristina Smock's model of complementarity. Policy and organizing will be evaluated for their distinct contributions to the campaign, and then their partnership in this campaign will be evaluated as a case study for an emerging model of policy and organizing complementarity.

A HISTORY OF POLICY AND ORGANIZING TRADITIONS

While there have been many approaches to addressing community problems, two of the most divergent are the research and planning tradition and the community organizing tradition. These traditions have often worked in silos due to the fundamental disparities in their methods, priorities, and models of change.

The research and planning tradition has its roots in the early 1900s Chicago School of Sociology, whose notable members included Ernest W. Burgess, Louis Wirth, and Robert E. Park (LeGates and Stout 1996). These sociologists focused on the application of sociology to local communities, often bringing an ecological model to the forces that shape urban life (Wirth 1938; Burgess 1996; Sampson 1999). One of their lasting contributions is Burgess's theory that the expansion of the city occurs in a series of concentric circles. Concepts of social organization, ecology, and social psychology were integral in the early development of the research and planning tradition (Wirth 1938). Contemporary research and planning efforts for community change do not necessarily call upon these sociological concepts as they were formulated in the early 20th century. Of greater significance and endurance are the methods introduced by the Chicago School of Sociology.

This model for community change is technical, data-driven, and grounded in social science, rationality, and objectivity (Rothman 1995). Its methodology includes needs assessments, data and statistical analysis, and evaluation research; great value is placed on knowledge, and thus it gives primacy to experts rather than to community members for the choice and design of cost-effective community change plans (Rothman 1995). For policy advocates, knowledge is power.

The community organizing tradition began with the work of Saul Alinsky during the Great Depression (Fisher 1984). Finding union organizing to be an effective strategy by which workers could change their workplaces, he began using union organizing tactics in a Chicago neighborhood as a strategy for community members to change their community (Fisher 1984; Norden 1972). Alinsky built the Back of the Yards Neighborhood Council by winning the support of existing community institutions (Fisher 1984). He invoked the self-interest of previously disparate groups, including Catholics, communists, and other neighborhood residents, to unite them for the goal of creating a stronger, more stable, improved neighborhood (Fisher 1984). Together, they won increased wages in the stockyards and experienced organizing successes into the early 1940s (Fisher 1984). Alinsky began doing the same thing in communities around the country, and his work has engendered an entire method of organizing for change. He sculpted concepts and terminology that are widely used today in community organizing: self-interest, leadership development, building power through democratic community organizations, the organizer as a catalyst, and the self-determination of communities (Fisher 1984).

Alinsky was not radical in his ideology. He believed in an interest-group model and emphasized the importance of all people engaging in the democratic process (Fisher 1984; Norden 1972). From his perspective, people hold the power to cause change by putting pressure on a target—the one who has the authority to create the desired change. However, Alinsky was radical in his tactics. He emphasized doing whatever was necessary, held originality sacred, stressed unpredictability, and sought always to apply pressure to the target of the campaign (Fisher 1984; Norden 1972). Tactics include “negotiation, arbitration, protests, and demonstrations; boycotts, strikes, and mass meetings; picketing, raising hell, [and] being diplomatic” (Fisher 1984, 49). Despite the social and economic changes that have transpired since Alinsky’s time and the proliferation of his model in often variegated forms, the core tenets of the community organizing tradition are the same: winning community change requires power, and for organizers, people are power.

THE SWEET HOME CHICAGO COALITION

The Sweet Home Chicago Coalition’s model of equal partnership between organizing and policy brought together Jim Field, the Director of Organizing, and Julie Dworkin, the Director of Policy, at Chicago Coalition for the Homeless (Field and Dworkin 2011; Field, personal communication, December 5, 2012; Dworkin, personal communication, November 28, 2012). Each found that the partnership strengthened their approach and made the campaign more powerful and effective. From the beginning, organizing focused on people power and policy focused on knowledge power—their respective areas of expertise. Each department came to understand its strengths, the strengths of the other department, and ways their strengths could work together in a shared strategy.

The organizing department built people power by creating a coalition. Organizers emphasized strategic coalition partnerships and structure, inviting only organizations that had “a strong organizing culture,” transparent and inclusive decision-making, a sense of campaign ownership, and a minimum of two people designated for campaign management (Field and Dworkin 2011, 5; Field, personal communication, December 5, 2012).

The policy department built knowledge power by engaging in “a year-long research effort to identify new potential funding streams at the city level to dedicate for affordable housing” (Field and Dworkin 2011, 8). TIF funds were identified as a potential source of funding for affordable housing, as they could be used only for certain purposes (including affordable housing) and the city had a large surplus of TIF funds. Following extremely in-depth research of TIF funds, the policy department drafted an ordinance designating 20 percent of TIF funding—almost \$100 million per year—for affordable housing. The coalition introduced this ordinance in the City Council in March 2010 (Field & Dworkin 2011). Coalition staff and leaders were well trained in the complexities of TIF funding, which increased their understanding of the policies and ability to negotiate with the city. Research, trainings, and reports on TIF funding were some of the primary ways in which policy advocates brought power to the campaign (Field and Dworkin 2011).

Following the development of the coalition and the ordinance, the organizing and policy departments strategized together to mobilize power to promote the ordinance. They employed a diverse range of tactics, including policy tactics such as reports about TIFs; organizing tactics such as direct actions; and tactics utilized by both approaches, such as the strategic use of media. Throughout the campaign, policy advocates continued to provide critical research about TIF districts. The policy department was also responsible for continuing to equip the coalition partners with the knowledge it needed to successfully advocate for it (Field and Dworkin

2011). Ongoing communication between organizers and policy advocates was critical to identifying issues on which the coalition needed further research and clarity.

Pure organizing tactics characterized by “strong, aggressive, direct action” were some of the most effective of the campaign (Field and Dworkin 2011, 10). They used relationship-building conversations (one-on-ones) with community members and key stakeholders to build people power and ensure strong turnout at events (Field, personal communication, February 6, 2013). For instance, the coalition brought hundreds of community leaders—in bright red shirts—to the City Council meetings every month for more than a year, putting pressure on the City Council and raising the profile of the campaign (Field and Dworkin 2011). Other direct actions included phone banking, visiting aldermen’s homes, distributing flyers, and protesting. As the campaign involved frequent events and actions, the policy department supported the organizers in managing these events, contributing to a strong partnership between the two departments (Field and Dworkin 2011).

Some of the campaign tactics required the strengths and participation of *both* organizing and policy. One tactic was to build relationships with city officials and negotiate with them (Field and Dworkin 2011). Another overlapping tactic was the use of media. The campaign worked with a media strategist, cultivated a relationship with a member of the *Chicago Sun-Times* editorial board, utilized online media, and had a constant media presence at the monthly City Council meetings (Field and Dworkin 2011). These efforts helped make Sweet Home Chicago part of the discourse in the City Council. Important within this media strategy was an effective framing of the issue. The campaign first used an “affordable housing” frame and terminology. However, this frame did not generate sufficient support in the City Council because many aldermen associated affordable housing with increased crime and decreased property values. Therefore, the coalition changed the frame of the campaign to rehabilitating “vacant and/ or foreclosed properties,” which did not have as many negative associations attached to it and was more effective in gaining Council support (Field and Dworkin 2011).

The broad combination of these tactics made Sweet Home Chicago a powerful and high profile campaign that won two victories. Though the proposed ordinance was never voted on, Mayor Daley introduced an alternative ordinance in response to the pressure for funding affordable housing: the TIF Vacant Building Rehab Ordinance, which was amended and passed on May 4, 2011. While this alternative did not designate TIF funds in every district for affordable housing—one of the goals of the Sweet Home Chicago campaign—it did give the City administration and

aldermen the option of designating TIF funds for affordable housing. This designated money would “allow developers to get up to 50 percent of the cost to purchase and rehab a multi-family vacant property from TIF funds if they made up to 50 percent of the units affordable” (Field and Dworkin 2011, 17). A second victory of the campaign was the passage of an amendment to the city’s existing Affordable Requirements Ordinance. The amendment decreased the income requirements for affordable housing in rental housing developments receiving TIF funds. Consequently, more units are available to families of lower income levels (Field and Dworkin 2011). The work of the Sweet Home Chicago Coalition continues today as policy advocates collaborate with the city to implement the ordinance and make it as effective as possible. Steps have been taken to dedicate specific TIF funds in certain districts for the rehabilitation of vacant properties and to expand the number of TIF districts that have the program. The ordinance has actually become more powerful and closer to the original goals of Sweet Home Chicago in its implementation than it was in its original passage. While the proposed ordinance was never brought to a vote, the campaign brought attention to the issue of affordable housing, won a new program for TIF funding, and paved the way for future work with the city on the issue of affordable housing (Field and Dworkin 2011).

ANALYSIS OF POLICY AND ORGANIZING PARTNERSHIP

Kristina Smock (2004) has proposed a model of community change that goes beyond the traditional divide between community organizing and policy advocacy.¹ In her theory of “complementarity,” organizations with different approaches develop intentional relationships with each other to bolster their ability to address community problems. Their approaches remain distinct and the differences in their value systems, methods, and priorities are acknowledged and valued. Each approach continues to focus on its strengths and areas of expertise, rather than trying to expand and take on the skills and knowledge offered by other approaches. For example, in a complementary relationship, a policy advocacy organization would partner with a community organizing organization to work towards a mutual goal, rather than a policy advocacy organization trying to learn community organizing skills and do both. By recognizing that approaches are quite distinct, practitioners can better understand their own strengths, limits, and boundaries, as well as areas in which other approaches can effectively complement their own model, without merging and diluting their idiosyncratic strengths (Smock 2004).

Smock does not, however, elaborate on how practitioners can create a complementary relationship internally between two departments of an

organization or externally between two organizations.² The partnership between the organizing and policy departments at CCH throughout the Sweet Home Chicago campaign is an exemplary case study for how divergent change models can work together in a complementary relationship. At the beginning, organizing thoughtfully built a strong coalition, with a clear structure and set of principles. Policy determined a specific revenue stream for affordable housing (Field and Dworkin 2011). The overarching media and campaign strategy, which maintained the focus of the campaign, allowed different aspects of the strategy to be implemented by different departments (Field, personal communication, December 5, 2012). Policy provided research, reports, and in-depth trainings about the ordinance and TIF funding. Organizing executed creative, strategic actions and consistently turned out hundreds of people for City Council meetings. Together, they raised awareness about affordable housing in the public, media, and city administration (Field and Dworkin 2011). Organizing and policy became a united and powerful entity by building a truly equal relationship, developing a clear and shared strategy, and by functioning within their areas of expertise. From this case study, five key components emerge as critical to the creation of a complementary partnership, extending Smock's model of complementarity.

Equality. There was genuine equality in strategy, decision-making, and management of the campaign. It was essential that no power imbalance existed between the partners (Field, personal communication, December 5, 2012; Dworkin, personal communication, November 28, 2012).

Cooperation. The personalities of key actors, a spirit of cooperation, and simply the ability "to get along" were significant factors in determining the success and sustainability of the partnership (Field, personal communication, December 5, 2012). With two people co-managing a fast-paced campaign, they had to work well together under pressure and have "each other's backs" (Field and Dworkin 2011, 6).

Communication. Clear and consistent communication was absolutely essential in the day-to-day operations, in the formation of a shared strategy, and in the resolution of disagreements (Field, personal communication, December 5, 2012).

Mutuality. The departments engaged in a joint effort to cultivate a deep and meaningful understanding of the other's strengths, weaknesses, and unique contributions. To this end, the key partners used a five-column chart to develop a mutual understanding of policy and organizing. The five columns were: 1) Pure Policy; 2) Strong Policy/Little bit of Organizing; 3) Policy/Organizing Partnership; 4) Strong Organizing/Little bit of Policy; 5) Pure Organizing (Field, personal communication, December 5, 2012). The use of this chart and intentional discussions about each approach

nurtured a shared consciousness about these questions: What is a pure policy approach? What is a pure organizing approach? How can we best work together? What are our differences? These conversations illuminated areas in which they could complement one another and helped to develop a mutual respect between the departments. All of these components brought maturity, understanding, and complementarity to the relationship, shifting it from a relationship of novelty and incongruence to a "seamless," equal, and powerful partnership (Field, personal communication, December 5, 2012).

Commitment. The final and most important element in ensuring the creation of a successful, complementary partnership is this: all parties involved must want to make the partnership work (Field, personal communication, February 6, 2013). In bringing together two approaches to tackle a tough community problem, many disagreements and misunderstandings might emerge. Additionally, new partnerships can be challenging as each approach tries to determine its place. For example, in policy advocacy, experts or staff members usually meet with city officials to negotiate policies or make a request for their support. However, in community organizing, staff members rarely represent the campaign; leaders—the volunteers directly affected by the campaign—represent the campaign in meetings with city officials. This is just one example of a fundamental difference in priorities that might arise when policy advocates and organizers strategize together. In instances when there are disagreements or roles are unclear, a successful partnership requires organizers and policy advocates who are deeply committed to working through their differences, determining how they can best work together, and creating a stronger complementary partnership.

When five CCH staff members were asked about the outcomes of the partnership between organizing and policy, all five independently reported that it made the organization and the Sweet Home Chicago campaign more powerful. When policy advocates encounter opposition, the only available tactic is to negotiate; there are few ways that they can forcefully push back. Policy advocates benefit from the organizing tactics that can move an initiative forward in the face of opposition. Similarly, organizers benefit from the in-depth research of the policy department. Policy advocates' deep understanding of TIF funding has allowed the coalition to be influential in the implementation of the ordinance, which has made it more meaningful and effective in its implementation than it was in writing. However, the coalition is only influential in the implementation negotiations because of the combination of knowledge power and people power built during the campaign.

Other community change practitioners would do well to consider this model for their efforts. The model of complementarity can be called upon

to assist organizations or departments with different values, approaches, and cultures as they try to work together for a common purpose. For practitioners developing a complementary partnership, this can be used as a case study to inform their efforts. Thought should be given to the five key components that made the complementary partnership within CCH successful: equality, cooperation, communication, mutuality, and commitment. Though the partnership began for the purpose of the Sweet Home Chicago campaign, it has become embedded in the organizational culture of CCH. When asked about how and why policy and organizing partnered, Julie Dworkin, the Director of Policy, commented, "The better question is...can you really be effective without both?" (personal communication, November 28, 2012).

NOTES

¹ Others have also offered models for bringing together different community change approaches. Most notably, Jack Rothman (1995) proposes that there are three basic modes of community practice: locality development, social planning/policy, and social action, which comprises community organizing. He postulates that these modes overlap in practice, and he promotes an "interweaving" and merging of different approaches (Rothman 1995, 46). This emphasizes commonalities rather than the distinct power of different approaches. He claims that practitioners should become familiar with and skilled in all three approaches, and draw from each when appropriate in a community change effort (Rothman 1995). However, Kristina Smock's model best fits the policy and organizing partnership analyzed here, as the partnership brought out the discrete strengths of policy and organizing, rather than merging them into one approach.

² Smock theorizes that complementary relationships between two approaches should not exist within one organization, but instead different approaches should be housed within separate organizations (2004). However, the case study offered here suggests that it is possible for one organization to do both policy and organizing, so long as they remain in distinct departments. Containing both approaches within one organization actually creates an even stronger partnership, one united by a common mission.

REFERENCES

- Burgess, Ernest W. 1996. "The Growth of the City." In *The City Reader*, edited by Richard T. LeGates and Frederic Stout, 89-97. New York: Routledge.
- Field, Jim and Julie Dworkin. 2011. "The Sweet Home Chicago Campaign." Chicago, IL: Chicago Coalition for the Homeless.
- Fisher, Robert. 1984. *Let the People Decide: Neighborhood Organizing in America*. Boston, MA: Twayne Publishers.
- LeGates, Richard T. and Frederic Stout. 1996. *The Growth of Cities*. New York: Routledge.
- Norden, Eric. March 1972. "Saul Alinsky: A Candid Conversation with the Feisty Radical Organizer." *Playboy*.
- Rothman, Jack. 1995. "Approaches to Community Intervention." In *Strategies of Community Intervention*, edited by Jack Rothman, John L. Erlich and John E. Tropman, 26-63. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers.
- Sampson, Robert J. 1999. "What 'Community' Supplies." In *Urban Problems and Community Development*, edited by Ronald F. Ferguson and William T. Dickens, 241-292. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press.
- Smith, Geoff and Sarah Duda. 2009. "The Chicago Region's Foreclosure Problem Continued to Grow in 2008." Woodstock Institute. <http://www.woodstockinst.org/publications/research-reports/5/15/date/DESC/>
- Smock, Kristina. 2004. *Democracy in Action: Community Organizing and Urban Change*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Sweet Home Chicago Coalition. 2009. "Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Funding and Affordable Housing."
- Theodore, Nik and Nina Martin. 2007. "Migrant Civil Society: New Voices in the Struggle over Community Development." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 29(3): 269-287.
- Wirth, Louis. 1938. "Urbanism as a Way of Life." *American Journal of Sociology* 44(1): 1-24.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Jody Blaylock is a second-year social administration student at the School of Social Service Administration in the Poverty and Inequality program of study. In her first-year field placement she provided case management services to adults with disabilities at Access Living of Metropolitan Chicago. In her second-year field placement, she is a policy intern at Chicago Coalition for the Homeless. During her time at SSA, she worked at Community Organizing and Family Issues to develop a pilot program in which parents raised awareness about free summer meals for children.

NEOLIBERAL URBAN REVITALIZATION IN CHICAGO

*By Julia Conte and Janet Li
School of Social Service Administration
University of Chicago*

Abstract

Over the last two decades, Chicago's strategy to revitalize areas of economic decline and concentrated poverty centered on two federal housing programs: Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere (HOPE VI) and its latter incarnation, Choice Neighborhoods. This paper examines the ideological turn from Keynesian New Deal policies to neoliberal revitalization programs and explores the programs' strategies to transform low-income, minority residents into "self-sufficient" market actors who benefit from a revitalized neighborhood's improved amenities. Finally, the paper argues that both policies will not mitigate concentrated poverty, as their neoliberal approach is nominally redistributive. With its ability to intervene in the market and economic processes, government intervention is better positioned to address the economic and racial inequalities that produced such poverty in the first place.

This paper examines Chicago's attempt to revitalize areas of economic decline and concentrated poverty through two US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) programs: Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere (HOPE VI) and Choice Neighborhoods. These programs are decidedly neoliberal, both seeking to transform low-income, minority residents into "self-sufficient" market actors and benefit low-income residents through the "positive economic spillover" of improved schools, more businesses, and other amenities (HUD 2011a, 2). The paper begins by reviewing Keynesian-based approaches to housing policy—approaches later labeled a "government failure," opening the way for neoliberal housing revitalization strategies. Next, it examines HOPE VI as a strategy to address urban decline and assesses its implementation in the context of Chicago's Plan for Transformation. It then explores the Choice Neighborhoods program in terms of its proposed revitalization of Chicago's Woodlawn neighborhood and its proposed strategy of creating "sustainable communities." Finally, the paper argues

© 2013 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved.

that both these neoliberal policies cannot mitigate concentrated poverty given that they are only nominally redistributive and that government intervention remains better positioned to address the economic and racial inequalities that produced urban poverty in first place.

URBAN DECLINE IN US CITIES

In the mid-1980s, the idea of urban decline was widely associated with pockets of racial segregation, concentrated poverty, deindustrialization, and abandoned or dilapidated buildings. It was framed as a problem produced, or exacerbated by, ineffective New Deal housing policies. The Keynesian premise that had emerged around the Great Depression held that unregulated markets are inherently unstable; thus, government intervention was needed to counteract instability by regulating the production and growth of the economy. Stabilizing the economy could be achieved through labor supports, employment, and social service provisions in times of unemployment. The goal was to maintain consumer demand on the micro-level and aggregate demand and economic growth on the macro-level (Caporaso and Levine 1992, 114). The federal government adopted a Keynesian approach when it enacted the following key housing policies in the 1930s.

To prevent home loan default and guarantee adequate financing in the housing market, the federal government established the Home Owners Loan Corporation (HOLC) in 1933, created the Federal Housing Authority (FHA) in 1934, and passed the United States Housing Act of 1937. The HOLC refinanced mortgages at risk of default and appraised neighborhoods to ensure sound private investment; the FHA established minimum standards for home construction and insured private mortgages; and the Housing Act created and funded local public housing authorities (PHAs) to build low-cost public housing (Jackson 1985). These programs met the Keynesian aim of offsetting an unstable market: 40 percent of eligible households signed up for HOLC assistance and the program supplied "three billion dollars for over one million mortgages" (Jackson 1985, 196). The FHA reduced private-market interest rates such that home loans rose from 332,000 in 1937 to 619,000 in 1941. By 1941, over 221 newly established PHAs initiated 300 projects and built 130,000 public housing units.

Such economic policies, however, were not designed to promote meaningful housing opportunities for all Americans, as they inadvertently advanced segregation and intensified poverty among low-income minority groups. In its appraisal system, for example, the HOLC instituted redlining, under which low-income and African-American neighborhoods were given the lowest rating of "D," diverting any private investment in the area,

while homogenous white neighborhoods (i.e., “American business and professional men”) were given the highest rating, “A” (Jackson 1985, 197). The FHA adopted HOLC’s problematic rating criteria in the late 1930s, which favored loans to white, middle-class families intent on building single-family homes in the suburbs.

Discrimination was also rampant in the administration of public housing. While public housing was initially composed of a diverse group of working-class families, its concentration in inner cities and the devolution of power to discriminatory PHAs inevitably led to substandard public housing that was exclusively populated by African Americans experiencing severe poverty (Jackson 1985). The effects of this trend are stark and apparent in Chicago. Alan Hirsch (1998) explains that Urban Renewal slum clearance and prior segregationist housing policies, coupled with white flight, created a “second ghetto” characterized by complete segregation and worse poverty and blight than had previously existed in the “first ghetto.” As racism undermined the economic aims of the Keynesian policies, it created the opportunity for the problem of urban decline to be redefined in the neoliberal framework as government failure.

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PEOPLE EVERYWHERE (HOPE VI)

In 1992, the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing (NCDPH) issued a report on the state of public housing. Reflecting the suppositions of neoliberalism,¹ the report cited ineffective government management and funding as the causes of urban decline. The report found that nationwide, 86,000 units of public housing were “severely distressed,” defined in part by isolation from economic mobility opportunities and private sector development. The report proposed a variety of potential solutions including more stable funding streams (e.g., private management and low-income housing tax credits) as well as corporate, government, resident, and service organization collaboration in the planning, development, and management of housing (HUD 1992). The reconceptualization of urban blight as a problem of government failure, as exemplified in NCDPH’s report, set the foundation for the neoliberal housing revitalization strategies that followed.

In response to the NCSDPH’s report, Congress appropriated \$300 million in the 1993 fiscal year to fund the Urban Revitalization Demonstration project, later to be renamed HOPE VI (HUD 2007). In its requirements, HUD emphasized community revitalization. HUD assessed grantees in four areas: extent of public and private entity involvement, extent of resident involvement/community services, capabilities of the

applicant, and extent of revitalization/potential impact of the plan. Furthermore, HUD required PHAs to document conditions of severe distress, as defined by the number of families living in poverty, rates of serious crime, management barriers, and physical deterioration of the building (Fosburg et al. 1996).

In 1998, Congress passed the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998, which incorporated HOPE VI into Section 24 of the Housing Act of 1937. Funding peaked at \$625 million, and the program solidified its commitment to localized control, resident services, and public-private partnerships. Under the new revitalization grant requirements, as outlined in the 1999 Notice of Funding Availability, HUD stipulated that no more than 20 percent of funding go to resident services, allowed PHAs greater development flexibility by removing the one-for-one hard unit replacement rule—i.e., for every unit of public housing demolished, a new housing unit must be built to replace it—expanded the allowable uses of capital and operating funds, and allowed public funding to go towards project management by private entities. HUD also applied a community-based housing model by modifying the definition of severe distress to include the relationship of the surrounding community to the physical deterioration of a building (Wexler 2001).

HOPE VI was extended another three years under the Program Reauthorization and Small Community Mainstreet Rejuvenation Housing Act of 2003. In that legislation, HUD allowed PHAs already participating in HOPE VI to receive funding and created “Mainstreet Grants” for communities with 50,000 or fewer residents. Consistent with its community-based approach, HUD again broadened severe distress to include the availability of neighborhood transportation, civic and religious organizations, and good schools (HOPE VI Program Reauthorization 2003). As of 2006, HUD awarded the greatest number of total grants—six—to the Chicago Housing Authority (Levy and Gallagher 2004).

HOPE VI did improve both individual living situations (e.g., dwellings with better appliances, architectural design exteriors, and landscaping) and overall neighborhood safety for public housing residents. A HUD-sponsored study found that HOPE VI developments reduced the overall density of housing and reintroduced sidewalks and street grids to connect developments to the surrounding community, incorporated safety design principles, and improved building exteriors (Popkin et al. 2004). In 2001, when residents lived in their original public housing developments, 90 percent of sampled HOPE VI residents reported “social disorder”—drug trafficking, drug use, gang activity, and loitering—as a “big problem.” To take just one social-disorder variable, by 2005, surveys found that those reporting drug sales as a “big problem” had fallen from 78 to 30 percent. In

Chicago, residents of the Madden-Wells development reporting drug sales as a “big problem” dropped from eighty-three to forty-five percent from 2001 to 2005. Similar trends occurred in residents’ reporting of violence (Popkin and Cove 2007; Popkin and Price 2010).²

While such improvements are significant by themselves, it is impossible to ignore that they came through a decrease in the overall stock of public housing: only 78 percent of occupied public housing units were scheduled for replacement. The overall reduction in public housing, which counts Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) as a public housing replacement, is unknown because HCV holders could not be identified as formally residing in a HOPE VI development. Furthermore, HOPE VI promised that market choice, created by the infusion of private entities into the public sector, would yield significant income gains among low-income individuals in public housing. The argument was that introducing private investment and middle- and upper-class residents into HOPE VI neighborhoods should enable resident access to the goods, services, and jobs available to more affluent neighborhoods.

In line with that argument, in 2000, the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) launched its Plan for Transformation, which sought to “build and strengthen communities by integrating public housing and its leaseholders into the larger social, economic, and physical fabric of Chicago” (CHA 2013). Consistent with the tenets of HOPE VI, the Plan enlisted public, private, and nonprofit partners to invest in development funding, resident supportive services, and neighborhood resources (e.g., parks, recreational centers, and local businesses). CHA partners included the MacArthur Foundation, the Chicago Community Trust, and numerous private housing developers (CHA 2009).

Yet, as illustrated by previously mentioned resident outcomes, the private-public-nonprofit collaboration and community revitalization model encouraged by HOPE VI only addressed some symptoms of poverty, such as a crime, while structural economic and social inequalities remained intact. Some HOPE VI residents experienced a slight income increase in the aftermath of this “transformation,” yet most remain unemployed and mired in poverty. While income gains went to already employed residents—from 2001 to 2003, the share of those reporting annual incomes greater than \$15,000 rose 10 percent, while the share of those reporting annual incomes of less than \$15,000 dropped 10 percent—most residents remained poor. In 2003, about 67 percent of residents reported annual incomes less than \$10,000 and 40 percent reported incomes of less than \$5,000. Further, the percentage of residents employed remained constant, moving from 45 percent in 2001 to 46 percent in 2003 (Levy and Kaye, 2004). The factors of poor health, limited access to transportation, and inadequate job training

still act as major employment barriers for HOPE VI residents (Levy and Kaye 2004). As will be discussed, the neoliberal policies outlined above have tended to address the symptoms of poverty rather than poverty itself.

CHOICE NEIGHBORHOODS: A NEW INCARNATION OF HOPE VI

When HUD created the Choice Neighborhoods pilot program in 2010, it intended to build on the HOPE VI components considered successful in alleviating concentrated poverty, including mixed-income developments and public-private partnerships. In addition to public housing, the redevelopment of private and federally-assisted properties were included because, it was argued, changes to public housing policy alone—which was the primary focus of HOPE VI—could not adequately decrease crime and poverty throughout a neighborhood.

Choice Neighborhoods is designed to transform neighborhoods experiencing economic decline into mixed-income communities with improved schools, local businesses, and attractive neighborhood amenities, such as recreational facilities. The public-private partnerships between various community stakeholders—private developers, residents, public housing authorities, and non-profit organizations (NPOs)—are central to this process of transformation. According to HUD, “sustainable communities” will draw middle- and upper-class families who would be economically and socially incentivized to maintain neighborhood stability and pursue community development prospects. Low-income residents, in turn, will be the recipients of the revitalized neighborhood’s “positive economic spillover” of improved schools and other amenities (HUD 2011a).

Upon launching the program in 2011, HUD chose Boston, Chicago, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Seattle as pilot cities. The cities were chosen based on the level and quantity of “severely distressed” housing and how it impacts the neighborhood, the concentration of poverty based on the average median income (AMI) of residents, and the respective neighborhoods’ ability to build on its developmental, commercial, and neighborhood assets (i.e., its “long-term viability”) (HUD 2010). The Chicago neighborhood of Woodlawn was awarded \$30.5 million for its redevelopment efforts and can serve as an illustration of how the program works on a local level.

Woodlawn, located on the South Side of Chicago, is predominantly African American and low-income. Its borders are 60th Street to the north, 67th Street to the south, Lake Michigan to the east, and Martin Luther King Drive to the west. The pilot focuses on Grove Parc Plaza, a low-rise

affordable housing project considered as and surrounded by severely distressed housing, as defined by HUD. According to a report by the Preservation of Affordable Housing (POAH), Woodlawn was chosen as the site of a Choice Neighborhoods pilot due to the organizing efforts of residents (HUD 2011b, 1). The planned demolition of the Grove Parc Plaza housing project led its residents to seek “partners who would rebuild their homes in the community versus scattering their households across the city.” Woodlawn’s revitalization team in charge of planning and redevelopment consists of the following four entities (HUD 2011d, 1):

- 1) Lead applicants and Housing Implementation Entity: POAH and the City of Chicago. POAH is a non-profit organization responsible for implementing the Choice Neighborhoods plan and overseeing the demolition, reconstruction, and rehabilitation of housing units. The City of Chicago will “deploy its administrative, regulatory and financial powers to ensure all [team members’] effective performance of their roles” (HUD 2011d, 1).
- 2) People Implementation Entity: Metropolitan Family Services (MFS). MFS is responsible for implementing various social services, such as housing search assistance, employment and mobility services, and case management services.
- 3) Education Implementation Entity: University of Chicago Urban Education Institute (UEI), in partnership with Woodlawn Children’s Promise Community (WCPC). UEI and WCPC are responsible for revamping the elementary, middle, and high school curriculum in three of Woodlawn’s high-resident-enrollment schools. WCPC also provides after-school programming, technology assistance, and family and social supportive services (in coordination with MFS).
- 4) Neighborhood Implementation Entity: Woodlawn New Communities Program (WNCP). WNCP serves as the liaison between residents and the revitalization team. WNCP is also responsible for attracting business and economic development prospects to Woodlawn, as well as addressing neighborhood needs and issues (e.g., crime).

HUD serves as the funder and facilitator of such partnerships. Its primary role is to dispense funds to a wide range of stakeholders and activities to give “local partners the flexibility they need to deal with the full range of distressed properties that often blight neighborhoods of concentrated poverty” (HUD 2011d, 1). The team tasked to implement Woodlawn’s revitalization managed to turn the initial HUD grant of \$30.5 million into \$230 million in the name of fulfilling the neighborhood’s “long-term viability” (HUD 2011a, 3).

The redevelopment plan calls for making the Grove Parc Plaza into a 420-unit property of mixed-income rental and for-sale units (210 of which will be Section 8 rental units). There will be an additional 400 off-site units (168 of which will be Section 8 rental units). Loans will be provided to 75 home buyers at 80 percent AMI and to small local developers to rehab or renovate 100 units housing, bringing total unit delivery to 995 units (HUD 2011c, 1-2). Housing redevelopment will be accompanied by the creation of recreation and community spaces such as school parks, a large community resource center, and a new MetroSquash athletic and educational facility (HUD 2011c, 6).

In anticipation of criticisms similar to ones levied against HOPE VI—namely, that the program lacked safeguards to ensure that poor communities would be able to stay in their neighborhoods once development took place—HUD devised two strategies for Choice Neighborhoods: 1) strengthen the role of non-profit organizations (NPOs) in the revitalization team to address residents’ needs and promote residents’ voices, and 2) reinforce the “right to return” commitment to residents as well as a strict one-for-one hard unit replacement policy (HUD 2011c, 6).

By granting NPOs the power to make decisions that typically fall under the purview of PHAs and private developers, Choice Neighborhoods seemed to ensure that low-income residents without market-based leverage and power nonetheless had an outlet for their needs. But, the prominent role that NPOs play in Choice Neighborhoods is not a guarantee that residents’ interests will be met. For example, in Woodlawn, one of the NPOs working on the neighborhood’s revitalization is the University of Chicago, which has a historically contentious relationship with Woodlawn and its surrounding neighborhoods that dates back to an urban renewal project in the 1950s that displaced many low-income Black residents (Hirsch 1998). Given this precedent, the University may still have interests in Woodlawn other than merely promoting the interests of low-income residents.

As for the second strategy, to ensure the “right of return” and minimize displacement, the legislation restricted the use of HCVs to “limited cases, where there is an adequate supply of affordable rental housing in areas of low poverty” (Testimony of Secretary Shaun Donovan 2010). However, this “right of return” is only guaranteed for lease-compliant residents whose housing is redeveloped. What about the low-income residents who are not protected by the “right of return”? Furthermore, if one concedes that the mixed-income model works to a degree, and some residents indeed benefit from relationships with their more affluent counterparts, obtain a better job, and become more realized market actors, what about the residents who are not as well-positioned to attain such economic mobility? If we consider Mary Pattillo’s (2007) argument that neighborhood revitalization is “a more

polite term for gentrification since revitalization without the intervention or introduction of the gentry is rare" (8), then such residents will not only find themselves still poor, but actually worse off—disempowered and priced out of their neighborhoods by the very people whose presence is supposed to benefit them—than they were prior to neighborhood revitalization.

CONCLUSION

In its near twenty-year history, HOPE VI changed the way US cities mitigated areas of concentrated poverty—from a “bricks and mortar” improvement of public housing to a neoliberal strategy of community economic development, mixed-income housing developments, and governance structures that brokered private and public interests. While the program improved the safety and housing conditions of some low-income residents, it did not fully address the myriad issues that hinder residents from achieving economic and social mobility such as unemployment and mental and physical health problems. Choice Neighborhoods, created in 2010, sought to better address the aforementioned issues adopting a holistic neighborhood revitalization strategy.

The rhetoric of neoliberalism emphasizes free markets, the exercise of individual liberty, and the efficient allocation of resources³ as a means to poverty alleviation. Yet, it is precisely these emphases that undermine HOPE VI's and Choice Neighborhoods' ability to address the structural economic and racial inequalities underlying poverty. The pursuit of free markets is incompatible with poverty alleviation particularly in the form of wealth redistribution and social justice, as individual liberty runs counter to the “pursuit of social justice, [which] presupposed social solidarities and a willingness to submerge individual wants, needs, and desires in the cause of some more general struggles for, say, social equity” (Harvey 2005). Peterson (1981, 37-38) further explains the tension between market efficiency and redistribution:

Operating efficiently hardly means operating so as to enhance equality. One cannot redistribute wealth without making someone worse off at the same time others are made better off. If a society has great inequalities in the beginning, it does not reduce these inequalities merely by increasing its efficiency. Consequently, the pursuit of a city's economic interests, which requires an efficient provision of local services, makes no allowance for the care of the needy and unfortunate members of the society. . . . Since the person or entity that pays the mean dollar in taxes is likely to be better off than the low-income residents of the community, increased redistribution from the richer to the poorer implies a reduction in the services of the person paying the mean tax dollar receives as a proportion of the amount he pays in taxes.

Instead, HOPE VI and Choice Neighborhoods offers a problematic, nominal form of redistribution: some low-income residents gain access to better quality housing and new amenities offered by the infusion of or proximity to new private capital and economically-advantaged middle- and upper-class residents. But these neighborhood revitalization policies do not provide long-term safety-net supports, which are essential for residents to ward off the effects of gentrification and benefit from the new neighborhood economy. A disconnect between the rhetoric of neoliberal housing policies and its actual manifestation contributes to the persistence of concentrated poverty.

Given its ability to intervene in the market and economic processes, the state is arguably better positioned to address larger structural inequalities than the market itself, which accepts economic volatility and the inevitability of producing winners and losers. While government policies and practices under Keynesianism were at times flawed or misguided, what must be said in defense of those older interventions in the housing of all people was that they demonstrated a much higher and significant regard for the collective welfare than its successor ideology, neoliberalism.

REFERENCES

- Caporaso, James A. and David P. Levine. 1992. *Theories of Political Economy*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Chicago Housing Authority (CHA). 1999. “Moving to Work Agreement.” http://www.thecha.org/filebin/pdf/mapDocs/Amended_Restated_MTW_Agreement.pdf
- . 2009. “The Plan at 10.” Accessed December 1, 2011. http://www.thecha.org/pages/the_plan_at_10/49.php.
- . 2013. “The Plan for Transformation.” Accessed February 27, 2013. http://www.thecha.org/pages/the_plan_for_transformation/22.php.
- Fosburg, Linda B., Susan J. Popkin and Gretchen P. Locke. 1996. *An Historical and Baseline Assessment of HOPE VI, Volume I: Cross-site Report*. Washington: US Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hirsch, Alan. 1998. *Making the Second Ghetto: Race and Housing in Chicago 1940-1960*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jackson, Kenneth, T. 1985. *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Levy, Diane K. and Megan Gallagher. 2006. *HOPE VI and Neighborhood Revitalization: Final Report*. Washington: Urban Institute.
- Levy, Diane K. and Deborah R. Kaye. 2004. "How Are HOPE VI Families Faring? Income and Employment." *Issue Brief No. 4*. Washington: Urban Institute.
- Pattillo, Mary. 2007. *Black on the Block: The Politics of Race and Class in the City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Peterson, Paul E. 1981. *City Limits*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Popkin, Susan J. and Elizabeth Cove. 2007. "Safety Is the Most Important Thing: How HOPE VI Helped Families." *Issue Brief No. 3*. Washington: Urban Institute.
- Popkin, Susan J., Bruce Katz, Mary K. Cunningham, Karen D. Brown, Jeremy Gustafson and Margery A. Turner. 2004. *A Decade of HOPE VI: Research Findings and Policy Challenges*. Washington: Urban Institute.
- Popkin, Susan J. and David J. Price. 2010. "Escaping the Hidden War: Safety Is the Biggest Gain for CHA Families." *Issue Brief No. 3*. Washington: Urban Institute.
- US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). 1992. *The Final Report of the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing*. Washington: US Government Printing Office.
- . 2007. "HOPE VI Program Authority and Funding History." Accessed December 1, 2011. http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/public_indian_housing/programs/ph/hope6/about#4b
- . 2010. "Testimony of Secretary Shaun Donovan: Hearing on Choice Neighborhoods Legislation Before the House Financial Services Committee." Accessed December 1, 2011. <http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/press/testimonies/2010/2010-03-17>
- . 2011a. "Choice Neighborhoods: History and Hope." *Evidence Matters: Transforming Knowledge Into Housing and Community Development Policy*. Washington: US Government Printing Office.
- . 2011b. "Woodlawn Choice Neighborhood: Executive Summary." Unpublished document.
- . 2011c. "Woodlawn Choice Neighborhood: Design." Unpublished document.
- . 2011d. "Woodlawn Choice Neighborhood: Partnerships." Unpublished document.
- Wexler, Harry J. 2001. "HOPE VI: Market Means/Public Ends—The Goals, Strategies and Midterms Lessons of HUD's Urban Revitalization Demonstration Program." *Journal of Affordable Housing* 10(3): 195-233.

ENDNOTES

¹ Neoliberal theory asserts individual freedom is the bedrock of a well-functioning society. The state "should favour strong individual property rights, the rule of law, and the institutions of freely functioning markets and trade" as a means to guarantee individual choice (Harvey 2005, 64).

² In 2001, 75 percent of sampled HOPE VI residents reported "violence"—shootings, attacks, and sexual assault—as a "big problem." Considering the social disorder variable of "violence," surveys found that those residents reporting shootings as a "big problem" dropped from 67 to 26 percent from 2001 to 2005. Further, by 2005 residents across all housing types, (e.g., public housing, voucher holders, unassisted living) experienced similar safety gains (Popkin and Cove 2007; Popkin and Price 2010).

³ In reference to a Pareto efficient outcome: it is a point at which no one can be made better off without making another person worse off.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Julia Conte graduated from the School of Social Service Administration and the Irving B. Harris School of Public Policy in June 2012. She holds a B.A. in political science and economics from Drake University in Des Moines, IA. While attending the University of Chicago, she co-chaired the Community and Economic Development Organization (CEDO) and was a research assistant on the Mixed-Income Development Study. Julia completed her first-year placement at Youth Guidance and her second-year placement at the Corporation for Supportive Housing. She also interned on a community-based anti-violence initiative at Children's Home and Aid.

Janet Li graduated from the School of Social Service Administration in 2012 in the Poverty and Inequality program of study. During her time at SSA, she served as a research assistant at the Mixed-Income Development Study at the University of Chicago. She also completed her fieldwork practica at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Department of Community Planning and Development, and at Chicago Area Project's Career Development and Training Education Services (CDTES). She holds a B.A. in comparative literature from Barnard College, Columbia University.

BANKS, COURTS, AND BUREAUCRATS: APARTMENT FORECLOSURES AND COERCIVE EVICTIONS IN CHICAGO

By Matt Hiller

School of Social Service Administration

University of Chicago

Abstract

Since 2009, over 50,000 rental units in Chicago have gone into foreclosure, predominantly in low-income, minority neighborhoods. Despite paying rent and following the terms of their lease, tenants in foreclosed buildings are often forced out of their homes. Banks that take over foreclosed apartments often attempt to vacate residents through coercive methods such as turning off utilities, neglecting maintenance, and giving tenants misleading information. The paper examines the rights of tenants during the foreclosure process, and the challenges that government officials, social service agencies, and community activist groups face in responding to coercive eviction practices.

According to the Chicago-based Lawyers' Committee for Better Housing (LCBH 2012) over 50,000 rental units—approximately 9 percent of Chicago's housing stock—have gone into foreclosure since 2009, predominantly in low-income, minority neighborhoods such as Austin and Englewood. Despite paying rent and following the terms of their lease, tenants in foreclosed buildings are often forced out of their homes (Johnson 2010). Banks that take over foreclosed apartment buildings generally attempt to vacate residents as quickly as possible, with the objectives of avoiding property management costs and making buildings easier to sell. This occurs despite the fact that many foreclosed buildings are never purchased and fall into disrepair (Johnson 2010; LCBH 2012). To empty the buildings of residents, banks often engage in what LCBH calls “constructive eviction,” a broadly defined set of extralegal practices meant to coerce tenants into moving out. Though legislation exists to protect tenants' rights during the foreclosure process, lack of access to low-cost legal assistance often causes these laws to go unenforced (LCBH 2012).

© 2013 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved.

This paper outlines tenants' legal rights during the foreclosure process and examines common tactics used by landlords and banks in Chicago to circumvent these protections. Next, it examines the social costs resulting from the increase in apartment foreclosures. Finally, it explores how community groups and Cook County government officials shape policy implementation, and how resource shortages limit the extent to which local government officials and private citizens can enforce tenant protections during the foreclosure process.

TENANT LEGAL PROTECTIONS AND COMMON ABUSES

The federal Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure Act and the Illinois Mortgage Foreclosure Law both specify that tenants must be allowed at least ninety days or the remainder of time on their lease (whichever is longer) before the new owner can have them evicted from a foreclosed property (LCBH 2012). Additionally, Chicago's Residential Landlord Tenant Ordinance (RLTO) states that the new landlord is obligated to inherit the prior owner's responsibilities until the time the building is vacated. These responsibilities include maintaining the building to basic standards of livability and ensuring that security deposits are returned. Furthermore, the RLTO stipulates that the new landlord is required to inform clients in writing that the building has switched owners, and must give the name of a person or party in charge of maintenance and rent collection. Without this notice, it is illegal for new landlords to accept rent or evict tenants (LCBH 2010).

When banks foreclose on a property, however, they have tended to hire real estate agents to manage the process of vacating and selling the building. These agents engage in the use of “constructive eviction” which involves denying a tenant the right of possession through “illegal lockouts, board-ups, and lack of utility maintenance” and can also include “misleading, harassing, or threatening communication” to pressure a tenant into vacating the building (LCBH 2010, 5). Because tenants are generally unaware of their rights and do not have the resources to protect themselves, coercive threats often become reality. According to legal scholar Creola Johnson (2010), the vast majority of tenants in foreclosed buildings do not receive their security deposits, and many individuals are forced to leave before ninety days due to uninhabitable living conditions.

Constructive evictions often occur in conjunction with “cash for keys” offers from the agents hired by banks (LCBH 2010). These deals involve tenants forfeiting their security deposits and the right to stay in the building in exchange for a cash payment. However, many tenants accept low payments because they are not aware of their rights and are afraid they will be evicted with no form of compensation (Shah 2011). These agreements

allow the new property owners to vacate buildings in a way that absolves them of liability (LCBH 2010).

The cost to tenants can be very high. Many struggle to afford a new residence (Johnson 2010; LCBH 2010), and barriers to gaining new housing—such as a felony convictions, mental illness, or a previous eviction—can put displaced tenants at high risk for homelessness (Patricia Fron, personal communication, March 12, 2012). Furthermore, rental foreclosures also impose significant costs on local governments. Social service agencies have been forced to expand caseloads to accommodate individuals who need assistance with locating housing. Foreclosed buildings that become abandoned are associated with higher crime rates and decreased investment in communities, which lowers tax revenues and forces local governments to expend reduced resources on policing and criminal justice (Johnson 2010).

ADMINISTRATIVE DISCRETION AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF POLICY

Various theorists have examined the role that administrative discretion plays in the implementation of policy. Political scientist Evelyn Brodtkin (1990) argues that policy outcomes are often shaped by the interpretation, priorities, and values of government officials who exercise discretion when implementing legislative mandates and allocating resources. When implementation involves coordination between multiple actors or agencies, the conflicting priorities among stakeholders may forestall policy dictates from being realized (Pressman and Wildavsky 1984). As the following example illustrates, Cook County Sheriff Tom Dart demonstrated the discretionary power of administrative officials by temporarily refusing to enforce court-ordered evictions.

If the judge orders an eviction, it is the responsibility of the Sheriff's Office to enforce the ruling and remove the tenant. Yet in the time immediately following the 2008 financial crisis, Illinois banks filed a large volume of inaccurate eviction claims, which made it difficult for local courts to adequately assess the legitimacy of individual cases (Podmolick 2010). When enforcing possession orders, Sheriff Dart found that banks often filed evictions against people without following the proper legal protocol. In many instances, tenants had never been informed that the building had switched owners, or that the new landlord had filed for eviction against them (Summers 2009).

Given the frequency of unscrupulous practices and the additional workload imposed upon the Sheriff's Office, Sheriff Dart placed a temporary moratorium on all foreclosure evictions (Summers, 2009).

Pressman and Wildavsky (1984) argue that the discretion of government officials can be used as a form of patronage to strengthen influence and garner support. In this instance, Sheriff Dart's moratorium functioned to not only block implementation of court orders he opposed, but also as a tool to gain favor with constituents and shape a positive image of the Sheriff's Office. According to Dart, the moratorium created an "outpouring of gratitude" from Cook County residents (Summers 2009).

Dart's actions also function as an example of Brodtkin's (1990) argument that discretion by government administrators can be used to advance social policy goals that would be difficult to achieve in a legislative environment. To justify his refusal to implement judicial orders, Dart accused banks of acting unethically and irresponsibly, and stated that following through with eviction orders on their behalf was a drain on already limited government resources. Asserting his position, Dart argued that banks "want taxpayers to fund their investigative work for them. We're not going to do their jobs for them anymore. We're just not going to evict innocent tenants" (Stephey 2008). This contention was adopted by protest groups such as Occupy Chicago and the Chicago Anti-Eviction Campaign, which use Sheriff Dart's statements as justification for their call to end all evictions from foreclosed properties until legislation is passed that creates stronger tenant protections (Chicago Anti-Eviction Campaign 2012).

BEYOND EVICTION COURT

Despite a considerable increase in the number of people displaced from their homes due to apartment foreclosures, eviction filings in Chicago have steadily decreased since 2007, with 2010 having the lowest number of evictions in ten years (LCBH 2010). LCBH (2010) theorizes that banks have chosen to avoid the lengthy and expensive process of evicting tenants through the court system. This allows the banks to shift legal costs onto tenants because the burden falls on renters to prove that the bank has illegally shut off utilities or refused to return a security deposit. Given the discrepancy in access to legal resources between low-income tenants and banks, residents facing constructive eviction confront an uneven playing field when attempting to gain legal redress for their concerns.

Constructive evictions function by forcing tenants to pursue their rights through government channels that are oversubscribed and difficult to navigate, while at the same time exposing them to harsh conditions. To manage caseloads, government programs that provide assistance to individuals with grievances against their landlords typically employ rationing methods (Lipsky 2011), such as strict disqualification criteria or long waits for services. For example, the Chicago RLTO specifies that

tenants have a right to report unsafe or uninhabitable building conditions to city inspectors, and sue for repairs in building court. However, the process of obtaining an inspector's report, filing and winning a claim in building court, and waiting for a landlord to take action following the court ruling can take several months (Patricia Fron, personal communication, March 12, 2012). For a tenant with no heat in the winter, these channels are impossibly slow. The ongoing exposure to freezing temperatures acts as a sensory reminder of the power differential that exists between banks and tenants.

Community action by Occupy groups and the Chicago Anti-Eviction Campaign has often focused on combating evictions that are executed through official channels, with the hope of either exhausting the resources of the Sheriff's Office, or pressuring Sheriff Tom Dart to resume the moratorium on foreclosure evictions (Patricia Fron, personal communication, March 12, 2012). As a result, collective action often involves "occupying" foreclosed buildings despite orders from the Sheriff's Office to vacate the property. However, even if Sheriff Tom Dart reinstated the moratorium on foreclosure evictions, displacement and abuses of tenant rights would potentially continue to occur at a high rate through the use of coercive constructive eviction methods. By shifting eviction strategies away from official channels, banks and landlords have minimized the power and influence of bureaucratic discretion in policy outcomes.

CONCLUSION

Mass displacement of tenants and the non-enforcement of legal entitlements reflect challenges to consumer and citizen rights in an era of government retrenchment and fiscal austerity. Despite a refusal by Sheriff Tom Dart to enforce eviction orders that he deemed illegal or unethical, the practice of mass eviction still occurs, at perhaps a higher and more efficient rate, through the extralegal practice of constructive eviction. The scale of the problem, and a shortage of resources to combat it, enables banks to engage in illegal practices without consequence. Meanwhile, foreclosed and abandoned buildings decrease property values and shrink tax revenues, further reducing the resources available to allow the Cook County government and the City of Chicago to enforce legislation designed to protect tenant rights. As a result, municipal governments lose the ability to implement policy with each new abandoned building.

REFERENCES

- Brodkin, Evelyn. 1990. "Implementation as Policy Politics." In *Implementation and the Policy Process*, edited by Dennis Palumbo and Donald Calista, 107-118. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Chicago Anti-Eviction Campaign. "Foreclosed Homeowners, Tenants to Serve Notice on Sheriff Dart." Accessed January 8, 2013. <http://chicagoantieviction.org/2011/11/foreclosed-homeowners-tenants-to-serve.html>.
- Johnson, Creola. 2010. "Renters Evicted en Masse: Collateral Damage Arising from the Subprime Foreclosure Crisis." *Florida Law Review* 62: 975-1008.
- Lawyers' Committee for Better Housing. 2010. *Tenants in Foreclosure Intervention Project 2010 Report. Banks Avoid Foreclosure Laws, Uproot Renters: A Call for Enforcement of Tenant Protections*. <http://lcbh.org/programs/tenants-in-foreclosure-intervention-project>.
- . 2012. *Three Year Impact Assessment—Apartment Building Foreclosures and the Depletion of Rental Housing in Chicago*. <http://lcbh.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/LCBH-Three-Year-Impact-Assessment-Apartment-Building-Foreclosures-and-the-Depletion-of-Rental-Housing-in-Chicago.pdf>.
- Lipsky, Michael. 1980. *Street Level Bureaucrats*. Reprint, New York: Russell Sage, 2011.
- Podmolick, Mary. 2010. "Sloppy Paperwork The Latest Foreclosure Headache." *The Chicago Tribune*, October 4th. Accessed January 8, 2013. http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2010-10-04/business/ct-biz-1005-foreclosures-20101004_1_loan-servicers-large-servicers-foreclosure-system.
- Pressman, Jeffrey L. and Aaron B. Wildavsky. 1973. *Implementation: How Great Expectations in Washington Are Dashed in Oakland; Or, Why It's Amazing that Federal Programs Work at All, This Being a Saga of the Economic Development Administration As Told by Two Sympathetic Observers Who Seek to Build Morals on a Foundation of Ruined Hopes*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Shah, Purvi. 2011. "Left High and Dry: Water Utility Shutoffs and Tenants in Foreclosed Properties." *Journal of Poverty Law and Policy* 45(7/8): 372-376.
- Stephey, M. J. 2008. "The Sheriff Who Wouldn't Evict." *Time.com*, October 13. <http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1849454,00.html>.
- Summers, Nick. 2009. "Vigilante Or Hero?" *Newsweek*, March 9. <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2009/03/09/vigilante-or-hero.html>.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Matt Hiller is a second-year clinical student at the School of Social Service Administration. He is interested in urban housing policy, as well as the anthropology of mental health and social welfare. His first-year field placement was with the Lawyers' Committee for Better Housing, and his second-year placement is with the Community Reintegration Program at the University of Illinois at Chicago Department of Psychiatry. He also completed an internship with the African Center for the Treatment of Torture Survivors in Kampala, Uganda, as part of the University of Chicago Human Rights Internship Program. Matt holds a B.S. in liberal studies from Middle Tennessee State University.

TOWARDS A MORE AFFIRMING PERSPECTIVE: CONTEMPORARY PSYCHODYNAMIC PRACTICE WITH TRANS* AND GENDER NON-CONFORMING INDIVIDUALS

By Clare McBee

School of Social Service Administration
University of Chicago

Abstract

This paper presents new psychodynamic treatment options for trans* (transgender, transsexual, gender-variant, genderqueer, gender fluid, agender, two-spirit) and gender non-conforming (GNC) clients. It addresses the need for these options by highlighting the pervasive heterosexist and transphobic attitudes within the mental health field, including the history of pathologizing trans* identifications and experiences within psychodynamic theory itself. Its focus is on the recent and ongoing transformations of the field as it relates to trans* and gender non-conforming individuals and suggests how contemporary psychodynamic practice might be used to empower trans* and gender non-conforming clients.

Trans* (transgender, transsexual, gender-variant, genderqueer, gender fluid, agender, two-spirit) and gender non-conforming (GNC) clients have utilized psychotherapy in large numbers ever since German endocrinologist Harry Benjamin published *The Transsexual Phenomenon* in 1966. Mental health practitioners seeking the origins of gender variance have explored the psychoanalytic and cognitive-behavioral aspects of sex and gender development and social learning, conducted studies on the human brain and endocrine system, and utilized feminist theories on the social construction—and oppression—of sex and gender. While many contemporary psychodynamic practitioners do not subscribe to the heterosexist views of gender development instantiated more than a century ago by Freud, when it comes to queer and trans* identities, pathologizing

tendencies are still seen throughout psychoanalytic literature and practice (Lev 2004). This paper provides an overview of the problematic ways psychodynamic practitioners have historically engaged with trans* and gender non-conforming clients. It consolidates recent and ongoing transformations of the field as it relates to gender variance and suggests ways psychodynamic theory can be used to empower trans* and gender non-conforming individuals.

Terminologies for LGBTQ identifications continue to evolve and intersect in complex relationships to race and socioeconomic status. “Transgender” has often been used as an umbrella term for gender-variant identifications, but contained within this classification is a spectrum of experiences and terms (FTM/MTF, transman/transwoman, post-op, pre-op, transsexual, genderqueer, gender f**k, gender non-conforming, drag king/queen, etc.). Some gender non-conforming people of color may not feel that “transgender” adequately represents their lived experiences, because it is felt to be a White, privileged term (ALGBTIC 2009). Recently *trans** has been adopted, the asterisk representing a wide range of gender expressions that do not in some way conform with binary concepts of sex and gender. The term “cisgender” is used to describe a person who is not transgender—one whose birth sex and gendered sense of self are in alignment according to heteronormative formulations of sex and gender. The term cisgender does not speak to one’s sexual orientation, which could still be queer. Cisgender is preferred over “non-transgender” by many trans* people and allies because it disrupts the assumption that anyone—regardless of their identification—has an internal and binary sense of being male or female that matches their birth. With full understanding of the limitations of language, I will proceed by using *trans*/GNC* in an effort to include as many gender-variant identifications and communities as possible.

Clinicians who work with gender variance in the United States rely upon the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-IV), which contains the classification of Gender Identity Disorder (GID), and the *Standards of Care for the Health of Transsexual, Transgender, and Gender Nonconforming People* (7th ed.), published by the World Professional Association for Transgender Health (American Psychiatric Association 2000; WPATH 2011). For adults seeking medical interventions to transition (hormone therapy or surgery), a diagnosis of GID is required in order to gain access to such technologies; if individuals do not meet the criteria for GID by performing the particular narrative of transgender development (the theme of being “trapped in the wrong body” since birth) contained within the DSM, they may be denied access to a medical transition (Lev 2004).¹ Arlene Istar Lev’s (2004) foundational work, *Transgender Emergence: Therapeutic Guidelines for Working with Gender-Variant People and Their*

Families, argues that while the DSM gives no definition of healthy gender/sexual development, it does put forth a classification of deviance based on prevailing notions of normative gender expression, and is thus a mechanism for oppression rather than empowerment. Lev concludes that, “as long as psychology continues to condemn people for their sexual and gender differences, they will continue to manifest mental health problems related not to their differences but to their being labeled pathological” (167).

Psychology’s condemnation can be seen in the description of trans*/GNC people as narcissistic, developmentally and emotionally immature, impulsive, obsessive, withdrawn, schizoid, and borderline (Hansbury 2005; Lev 2004).ⁱⁱ For example, Steiner (1990) tells therapists, “You should be prepared to see individuals who may present physically looking somewhat bizarre, either flamboyantly or inappropriately dressed, or looking like a man in ‘drag’” (96). Chiland (2000) describes trans*/GNC clients this way: “Enclosed as they are within their narcissistic shells, they do not care about their analyst’s inner reactions to what they say” (28). Steiner (1990) encourages therapists to be wary of their clients and to “withstand transsexuals’ demands to know why you have not surgically reassigned them yesterday” (95-96).

Therapists frequently adopt the problematic role of gatekeepers, from whom trans*/GNC clients must obtain a GID diagnosis in order to achieve medical transition. A therapist’s position becomes one of unmerited power; the privilege to determine the “appropriate” application of medical interventions by pre-emptively pathologizing trans*/GNC clients. As Conover (2002) puts it, “[therapists] who operate out of sickness theories about transgender people do not draw their mandate from science but rather from a defense of current cultural traditions. They wrap themselves in the mantle of science to justify their professional status, their control, and their fees” (149). In turn, trans*/GNC patients, who are typically more educated about gender identity development than most therapists, are compelled to perform the particular “transsexual narrative”ⁱⁱⁱ endorsed by the DSM in order to gain access to gender affirming hormones or surgeries (Lev 2004). In the vicious circle of distrust, pathologizing, and disengagement that has developed between (even well-intentioned) clinicians and trans*/GNC clients, a fundamental and precious aspect of the helping process has broken down:

sexual orientation and transgender microaggressions committed by the clinician jeopardize the therapeutic alliance, as they may epitomize the various types of discrimination the LGBT client experiences daily. So, rather than providing an environment for protection, safety, and space to learn and grow in therapy, the practitioner has created the contrary. (Nadal, Rivera and Corpus 2010, 235)

Some clinicians are beginning to understand that trans*/GNC patients exhibit symptomatology of distress due to the effects of developing within a cultural climate that persistently shames and stigmatizes their gender identities—pathology is not inherent to trans*/GNC people, but rather a product of an oppressive and dehumanizing environment (Lev 2004). Trauma is a frequent characteristic of trans*/GNC experiences, often arising as a result of intersecting processes of gender, class, or racial discrimination (Lev 2004; Singh and McKleroy 2011). However, a reformulation of the psychodynamic curriculum on trans*/GNC experiences is already taking place, one largely driven by members of queer and trans*/GNC communities who are also practitioners.^{iv} The DSM-V (due to be released in May 2013) will replace Gender Identity Disorder with “Gender Dysphoria,” which was viewed as a less pathologizing classification. Criteria for Gender Dysphoria will be more flexible and account for the fact that not all trans*/GNC people fall within a particular “transsexual narrative” (American Psychiatric Association 2011). At the same time, Transvestic Fetishism (a paraphilia in DSM-IV) will be renamed “Transvestic Disorder,” and diagnostic criteria will be considerably broadened in a manner that many advocates argue only further pathologizes gender variance (American Psychiatric Association 2012; Blanchard 2010; Winters 2011).

Some advocates maintain that trans*/GNC identities should not even appear in the DSM, while others argue that removing any diagnoses relating to trans*/GNC identities from the DSM would produce additional barriers to accessing trans*/GNC affirming healthcare (Beredjick 2012). The notion that trans*/GNC people could access hormones and surgery “on demand” without a proper diagnosis is unacceptable to most clinicians, but if the diagnostic system fails to account for the authentic lived experiences of many trans*/GNC people, then assessment and treatment practices will be flawed as well (Lev 2004). Therefore, Lev (2004) advocates a clear distinction between trans*/GNC clients who present symptoms of mental disorders that are independent of gender identity development, and those who manifest “symptomatology or sequelae to the difficulties of living as a transgendered person in a dimorphic and transphobic social world” (Lev 2004, 194-195).

Beyond this is the need to address potential unexplored negative countertransference reactions between cisgender therapists and their trans*/GNC clients (Hansbury 2005). In Wachtel’s (2011) model of cyclical psychodynamics, a self-reflective focus on the therapeutic alliance is crucial in order for clinicians to move past the “pathocentric tendency” within the mental health professions of diagnosing and treating problems in order to “consciously and explicitly seek out as well the elements of strength in the patient and the potential to live differently” (83).

FRAGMENTATION: INTERNALIZED TRANSPHOBIA

Trans* affirming psychodynamic perspectives can be useful in understanding the context and meaning of gender variance, as clients examine the impact of their gender transition on self and relational life (Lev 2004; WPATH 2011). Within this contemporary psychodynamic framework, gender identity development is seen as a profoundly relational experience that shapes inner representational models of self and others. In the words of Susan McKenzie (2010, 92): "Is it a boy or a girl? This is the primal question asked at the moment of a child's birth. With the declaration of a child's sex comes a preprinted operations manual describing the outer gender performance of the model and assumptions about its inner workings as well." Early attachment experiences with primary caretakers contribute positively or negatively to the development of a conscious sense of gendered self (McKenzie 2006). From a Winnicottian perspective, development of the gendered self is made possible by accurate mirroring from others (Borden 2009; Winnicott 1965, 1971). Accurate mirroring is then internalized by the subject, as gender comes to be experienced in the maturing body and is elaborated "into a conscious category in the mind, into a gender position" (McKenzie 2006, 413).

The ways in which gendered behaviors are transcribed onto individual bodies and selves are intimately connected to broader cultural patterns of normative behavior. According to Sullivan (1956), "the child has to be educated to a very complex social order, long before reason and the good sense of the whole thing can be digested, long before it becomes understandable—if it ever does" (4). McKenzie (2006) borrows Jung's concept of the collective unconscious and suggests that heterosexist norms are collective "artifacts" produced at the cultural level, transmitted to each generation through collective memory, and subject to historical and ideological shifts. As a collective artifact, gender has no essence, but is rather defined by difference—the space between masculine, feminine, and other—and is "culturally conceived, interpersonally negotiated, and intrapsychically experienced" (Dimen 2002, 49-50).

Due to the collective stigmatization and invisibility of gender non-conformity, trans*/GNC self expressions are not mirrored back (at any stage of development) by social actors (Fraser 2009). Winnicott emphasizes that the "developmental basis for feeling real . . . lies in the true self" (Borden 2009, 98). The development of a gender non-conforming identity, therefore, can have a profoundly destabilizing effect on the subject, because inner representations of self are in direct conflict with the social sphere (McKenzie 2006). Unlike gay, lesbian, bisexual, pansexual, or queer identified people, trans*/GNC individuals who express their authentic gendered selves (whether through behavior, dress, or bodily modifications) cannot remain closeted;

they "must engage in a transaction process with others who will witness and react" to their perceived deviance (Lev 2004, 233). Those who openly demonstrate gender variance may experience shaming and corrective behavior from caretakers, ostracism from peer groups, or possibly even neglect, abuse, discrimination, and hate crimes, or be cast out of their families and homes (Grant, Mottet and Tanis 2011; Witten 2009). Many trans*/GNC individuals who receive negative feedback in response to their non-conforming gender expressions, or are acutely aware of the imagined consequences, may adapt by repressing their true selves and put forth a compliant or false self out of defense (Borden 2009; Ehrensaft 2009; McKenzie 2010; Winnicott 1971). Awareness of potential discrimination may be even more present for trans*/GNC people of color, who must navigate multiple minority identifications (Balsam et al. 2011; Pinto, Melendez and Spector 2008). Hansbury (2005) utilizes a Kleinian perspective to illustrate how some trans*/GNC individuals "describe a wide split within themselves, between the persecuting body-self and the good mind-self" (23). Out of pressure from a social environment that does not accurately mirror their authentic gendered selves, trans*/GNC people repudiate their "not-me," "real," or shadow selves in favor of a "good-me" or "idealized self" (Borden 2009; Jung 1954; Shelley 2008). In such cases, the individual's authentic gendered self (or true self) goes unrecognized (Ehrensaft 2009).

According to Scheman (1999), clinicians who require the performance of a particular transsexual narrative end up facilitating the client's adoption of a compliant/false self:

the only way to be a "certified" transsexual is to deny that you are one, that is, to convince the doctors (and agree to try to convince the rest of the world) that you are and always have been what you clearly are not, namely simply and straightforwardly a woman (or a man). Since you cannot have a history that is congruent with such an identity, you are left without a past. (75)

Lev's (2004) argument that the high incidence of mental illness in trans*/GNC communities is a direct result of having to adapt gender-conforming selves—"It is literally *crazy making* to live a false self" (196; emphasis in original)—is therefore a strong reminder of the risks posed by transphobic clinicians. Winnicott (1971) believes that, in adapting a false/compliant self, the subject sacrifices healthy, creative modes of being and is forced to adopt a "sense of futility" and may feel that "life is not worth living" (65). Trans*/GNC people incorporate and are shaped by the destructive hegemony of heterosexism—this is internalized transphobia at its most insidious level (Shelley 2008; Lev 2004). From her practice, Lev (2004) contends that the symptoms manifested by some trans*/GNC individuals mimic those expressed by clients who have experienced

significant trauma. The vicious circle of stigma, anxiety, and repression/dissociation that many trans*/GNC people endure highlights Rank's (1936) observation that, "All symptoms in the last analysis mean fear" (157). Rather than viewing problems in living that may arise from ego fragmentation as pathology, Hansbury (2005) argues that they should be seen in trans*/GNC individuals as defensive strategies for self-preservation.

Recognizing ego fragmentation and thereby displacing a pathologizing analysis does not, however, automatically foster a strong therapeutic alliance. Fraser (2009) writes that an understanding of the splitting processes in some trans*/GNC experiences has been used to disempower patients who have attempted to utilize psychotherapy:

Many transgender people complained that therapists, who operated from psychodynamic theory indicating that the transgender self is a failure to separate, a defense, a false self or even a psychosis and never potentially a healthy part of the self, did not seem to understand the reality of their lived experience. (128)

Several psychodynamically oriented practitioners who work with trans*/GNC patients have attested to the high level of mental health and functional behavior present within this population, despite the trauma of being forced to present false selves during development—a testament to the resilience of trans*/GNC individuals (Ehrensaft 2009; Fraser 2009; Hansbury 2005; Lev 2004; Shelley 2008). Feminist, queer, and trans*/GNC theorists have deconstructed our understanding of ego and identity development, leading to the notion that identities are fluid, relationally constructed, and constantly in flux (Butler 1990; McKenzie 2010). The relationship between mind and gender has been given special attention in postmodern theory; as McKenzie (2010) writes, "Just as mind is not in us, we are in mind; gender is not in us, we are in gender. We are investing gender with meaning" (108). GNC consumers of therapeutic services seek the same things that anyone else might, "to develop a healthy self and self-in-relation, experience empathy and trust, develop the capacity for intimacy and live an authentic life" (Fraser 2009, 130).

FOSTERING EMERGENCE AND COHESION OF THE SELF

According to practitioners who work with trans*/GNC clients, as well as feedback from clients themselves, the key aims of psychotherapy with gender non-conforming individuals should be fostering the emergence of an authentic gendered self, helping to restore cohesion of self, and modeling acceptance and empathy in order to restore relational integrity (Ehrensaft 2009; Fraser 2009; Hansbury 2005; Lev 2004). This may require therapists

to operate outside of an ego-psychology model in order to explore other options for empowering clients (Lev 2004).

Working from a Jungian perspective, Fraser (2009) fosters individuation in his practice with trans*/GNC individuals by helping the client to develop "a healthy self and find meaning in relation to his or her own ego (the self with a little "s"); to others (e.g., intimate partner, family, friends and community); to work; and to the Self (with a big "S," which some call God or Higher Self)" (129). In Jung's (1954) own words: "My aim is to bring about a psychic state in which my patient begins to experiment with his own nature—a state of fluidity, change, and growth where nothing is eternally fixed and hopelessly petrified" (46).

Lev (2004) adopts an emergence framework in her practice with trans*/GNC clients, by "allowing the false parts of self to recede so that an authentic self can emerge" (207). She views the act of fostering emergence in the familiar language of "coming out" and has operationalized the trans*/GNC emergence process as a progression through six stages: (1) awareness; (2) seeking information/reaching out; (3) disclosure to significant others; (4) exploration of identity and self-labeling; (5) exploration of transition issues/possible body modification; and (6) integration and acceptance of post-transition self (Lev 2004, 235). Lev (2004) explains that trans*/GNC clients may enter psychotherapy at any stage of emergence. The initial awareness stage can be destabilizing and distressing for some clients, while those in the second phase (seeking information/reaching out) typically possess a more integrated sense of self and are seeking to establish supportive relationships with others. Regardless of how trans*/GNC people experience their stages of emergence, Lev outlines primary therapeutic tasks such as normalizing, facilitating linkages to resources, supporting clients' wishes to disclose or not disclose their trans*/GNC status, and encouraging self-exploration (Lev 2004). Lev's emergence paradigm is put forth as a counter-narrative to prevailing concepts of trans*/GNC psychopathology, instead viewing emergence as a normative developmental process and recognizing trans*/GNC identifications as legitimate.

The second aim of therapy with gender non-conforming clients is to restore coherence of self (i.e., resolve ego splitting and fragmentation), which in Fairbairn's framework is achieved by restoring "integrity of the self" and the "capacity for core-to-core connection with actual people in the outer world" (Borden 2009, 83-84). Sullivan's similar conception of the "self as process, shaped by interactive experience in relational life" is equally useful (Borden 2009, 120). From a Jungian perspective, restoring integrity of the self occurs when the shadow—the oftentimes frightening and unacceptable gender non-conforming self—is consciously integrated and wholeness is achieved (Fraser 2009; Jung 1954). The clinician must

help the client reconstruct a cohesive life narrative, which many trans*/GNC individuals have been robbed of, and which is essential to establishing a unified self. As Prosser (1998) writes, "Transsexuality is always a narrative work, a transformation of the body that requires the remolding of the life in a particular narrative shape" (4). This is in striking contrast to traditional psychopathology approaches with trans*/GNC people in which clinicians required post-transition patients to annihilate their past histories entirely and start over as men or women (Cook-Daniels 2006, 2010; Lev 2004).^v

The role of the therapist within this new approach is to reframe the gatekeeping position into one of advocacy by establishing a strong therapeutic alliance (Lev 2004). From Sullivan's perspective, the therapist who works with trans*/GNC patients functions as a "participant-observer" (Borden 2009). Lev (2004) describes how clients "hear themselves into existence" (221) through accurate and supportive mirroring of the client's authentic gender expression (using correct pronouns and names, relating to the client in their preferred gender) (Ehrensaft 2009; Fraser 2009). Winnicott (1971) describes this process as "giving back what the patient brings," rather than simply making interpretations and positioning oneself as an expert (117). Secondly, facilitation of the true self's emergence is achieved through empathic responsiveness and the creation of a holding environment for clients who may experience significant vulnerability and anxiety during the emergence process (Fraser 2009; Borden 2009). Lev (2004) characterizes empathic responsiveness as "relaxed comfort" and "compassionate neutrality" with a patient's preferred gender expression (138; 239). Fraser (2009) argues that, because some clinicians will be personally challenged by moving beyond taken-for-granted binary concepts of sex/gender, a Jungian perspective is useful in working with trans*/GNC clients because it is not as "culture bound and can be contextual and relational, which opens a wider frame in which to connect with the Self" (129). Furthermore, Fraser observes that, "Many clients experience relational naiveté in general and especially in their new gender role" (138). For this reason, invoking Rank's examination of transference and countertransference can be useful in assisting clients to "renegotiate the effects of earlier trauma" and in resolving relational naiveté (Borden 2009, 56). Lev (2004) also urges therapists to be aware of, and incorporate, dialogue regarding political theory and the oppression of trans*/GNC people, as well as the potential spiritual dimensions of gender transition.

CONCLUSION: THE CASE OF WILL

Will^{vi} is a 26-year old Caucasian transman who has expressed gender-variance his entire life, but only in recent years has he transitioned from an identification as a queer female-bodied person to one along the transgender spectrum. In 2011, Will began receiving weekly injections of testosterone and legally changed his name and gender to male. Will's process of self-realization has been characterized by significant challenges: "The world doesn't really work in the way that I see myself, so there's a challenge involved in that inherently." For approximately six years of his childhood, Will was sexually abused by his father.

Will continues to reflect on the ways that his gender identity and childhood sexual abuse—as Will calls them, his "competing narratives of being an abuse survivor and also having a trans* body"—may or may not be connected. At various stages of his development, Will utilized psychotherapy to process the abuse and explore his gender identity in early adulthood. As he undergoes a significant transformation in his social, physical, and emotional selves, Will is establishing a different relationship to the outside world:

More and more people on the phone think I'm a guy. In social dynamics, I have started to walk a line where—even if I don't pass or come off as a cisgender male immediately—it's easier for people to use their imaginations now. My sense of myself socially has never been as important as my sense of my body, so suddenly having to be playing by these rules of gender, I'm like *what now?! But I think this is where a lot of people find comfort in the idea of transgender identity—if not as an innate quality, at least one that is global.*

While he began expressing masculine characteristics as a child, Will's experience was not one of being "trapped in the wrong body" from birth. As Will states, "I know so many trans* people who don't have that formative gender experience—they don't have this moment where they're four and are like *I'm a guy, where's my penis?*" As Will explains: "I was aware of gender very young, but between being allowed to be a tomboy and not having any pushback, and also feeling pretty confused about gender within the context of a pretty dysfunctional family dynamic, I didn't know how to place myself until I was much older."

Now entering the final integration stage of emergence, Will says:

There was some person in me, who was me, that knew what I needed to do but had never done it. And I still feel like the part of me that is more conscious is still trying to explain why I did this ... the only real doubts I have come from the part of me who tries to explain it ... so much of what I've done in the last year has just been *this is what needs to happen now.*

Will indeed discovered a sense of spirituality as predicted by Lev; he feels that this has helped him to overcome some of the isolation and anxiety of transitioning:

Ultimately I think it's about getting over my sense of separateness, which I think is a spiritual crisis that from a young age I've been in . . . which is why I'm so drawn to spirituality, because I think it's a lot of reframing, universalizing, and normalizing of that feeling, and trying to create ways to connect to the world around you and the people around you. For a while with the transition I felt so different and did not know how to not feel so different. I think in the last month or so, I've been experiencing a kind of turn where my accepting of myself in this situation has made me feel like I'm not that abnormal, this is not a crazy situation.

If gender non-conformity were celebrated rather than pathologized, the trans*/GNC emergence process—while still socially and emotionally challenging—would be far less so due to a less hostile cultural environment (Lev 2004). Will's experience demonstrates the immense potential of a psychodynamic framework that affirms and empowers diverse trans*/GNC expressions. This less pathologizing approach to the processes of ego splitting that some trans*/GNC people experience might entail what Dimen (2002) describes as “not merely remembering the other pole but being able to inhabit the space between them, to tolerate and even enjoy the paradox of simultaneity” (56). Will aptly summarizes this approach when he speaks of “gender dissonance” as a universal phenomenon:

Being transgender is having a gender dissonance, not in a pathological way because it's a universal thing . . . the way in which people choose to handle that dissonance—whether they transition hormonally, or whether they wear clothing of the sex they identify with, do a combination of things, or use pronouns—is a relieving of that dissonance in a world that does not recognize trans* people. But being trans* is a natural, or at least a universal experience. I like that because I feel like it allows room for everybody without a hierarchy, and I think that's really important.

In addition to exploring internal representational models (and encouraging authenticity, even ambiguity), psychotherapists are coming to address the “larger social context of oppression and environmental assaults on . . . personhood” that have generated problems in living for gender non-conforming patients (Lev 2004, 196). The process of reformulating sickness theories of trans*/GNC experiences may even lead some therapists to become activists (Fraser 2009). While the everyday reality of transphobia—violence, discrimination and structural inequality—continues to threaten the well-being of trans*/GNC people, Fraser (2009) argues that

psychodynamic practice must expand its engagement with this reality in an empowering manner: “As clinicians, we are responding to what we hear and see in our practice (the lived experience of transgender people) as well as these human rights concerns, fitting the theory to the people and not the other way around” (127). While the field of psychotherapy still has much repair work to do with trans*/GNC communities, McKenzie (2010) expresses hope in the ideological shift that is slowly taking root:

Finding one's initial place on the gender map is not too difficult for those males and females whose interior sense of gender is a good enough fit to their culture's gender myth. They tend to colonize within their territory, digging moats and raising barricades to keep out the misfits. Those of us who are not comfortable, whose gender feelings do not fit the gender myth and assigned gender location, are scouts in the borderlands of gender, sending messages back to those in the comfortable interior. Lately it seems that the messages are better received. (96)

As Will has come to realize, “there's nothing wrong with being trans*. Being trans* is probably what I was born as, or at least something fundamental to my personality, and it's kind of awesome.”

NOTES

ⁱ Some masculine spectrum trans*/GNC people may wish to masculinize without fully transitioning, while some feminine spectrum trans*/GNC people may desire hormones to be more feminine but do not want to undergo gender affirmation surgeries (also known as Sex Reassignment Surgery or SRS). Strict adherence to the GID guidelines would render these individuals ineligible for medical treatment (Lev 2004).

ⁱⁱ “The transsexual is conceptualized as a problematic figure who cannot accept the limits of the body, or who treats the body as a fetish, thus insisting on becoming a ‘real’ man or woman, one who could be complete or whole.” (Gozlan 2008, 541-542)

ⁱⁱⁱ “The transsexual narrative as it has been developed contains all the important rules for constructing an intelligible story. . . . These stories show a temporal ordering of events (e.g., cross-gender identity since early childhood, persistent desire to be the opposite sex), causal linkings (e.g., continued desires throughout adolescence and early adulthood), demarcation signs (e.g., childhood cross-dressing, lack of genital pleasure in adult sexuality), and a ‘valued endpoint’ (reassignment surgery)” (Lev 2004, 216).

^{iv} The American Psychological Association (APA) is addressing this issue via a specialized Task Force on Gender Identity and Gender Variance, which has published several recommendations for conducting empowering practice and advocacy with the trans*/GNC population (APA 2009). See also the Association of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Issues in Counseling (ALGBTIC) *Competencies for Counseling with Transgender Clients* (2009) and Bockting, Knudson and Goldberg (2006).

^v “For many years it was considered part of therapeutic treatment to encourage clients in transition to cut off all ties with their past and consciously reconstruct a false history in their new gender.” (Lev 2004, 222)

^{vi} All quotations and ethnographic content are from an interview conducted on November 22, 2011. The individual's name has been changed, and permission to use interview content in this article has been obtained from the participant.

REFERENCES

- American Psychiatric Association. 2000. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders: DSM- IV-TR*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association.
- . 2011. “Gender Dysphoria in Adolescents or Adults.” *DSM-5 Development: Proposed Revisions*. <http://web-beta.archive.org/web/20121031104641/http://www.dsm5.org/ProposedRevision/Pages/proposedrevision.aspx?rid=482>
- . 2012. “Transvestic Disorder.” *DSM-5 Development: Proposed Revisions*. <http://web-beta.archive.org/web/20121031104022/http://www.dsm5.org/ProposedRevision/Pages/proposedrevision.aspx?rid=189>
- American Psychological Association (APA). 2009. *Report of the Task Force on Gender Identity and Gender Variance*. <http://www.apa.org/pi/lgbt/resources/policy/gender-identity-report.pdf>
- Association of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Issues in Counseling (ALGBTIC). 2009. *Competencies for Counseling with Transgender Clients*. http://www.counseling.org/Resources/Competencies/ALGBTIC_Competencies.pdf
- Balsam, Kimberly, Yamile Molina, Blair Beadnell, Jane Simoni and Karina Walters. 2011. “Measuring Multiple Minority Stress: The LGBT People of Color Microaggressions Scale.” *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 17(2): (2011): 163-174.
- Benjamin, Harry. 1966. *The Transsexual Phenomenon*. New York: Julian Press.
- Beredjick, Camille. 2012. “DSM-V to Rename Gender Identity Disorder ‘Gender Dysphoria.’” *The Advocate*. July 23. <http://www.advocate.com/politics/transgender/2012/07/23/dsm-replaces-gender-identity-disorder-gender-dysphoria>
- Blanchard, Ray. 2010. “The DSM Diagnostic Criteria for Transvestic Fetishism.” *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 39(2): 363-372.
- Bockting, Walter, Gail Knudson and Joashua Mira Goldberg. 2006. *Counseling and Mental Health Care of Transgender Adults and Loved Ones*. Vancouver, B.C.: Vancouver Coastal Health, Transcend Transgender Support and Education Society, and the Canadian Rainbow Health Coalition. <http://transhealth.vch.ca/resources/library/tcpdocs/guidelines-mentalhealth.pdf>
- Borden, William. 2009. *Contemporary Psychodynamic Theory and Practice*. Chicago: Lyceum Books, Inc.
- Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Chiland, Colette. 2000. “The Psychoanalyst and the Transsexual Patient.” *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 81(1): 21-35.
- Conover, Pat. 2002. *Transgender Good News*. Silver Spring, MD: New Wineskins Press.
- Cook-Daniels, Loree. “Trans Aging.” In *Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Aging: Research and Clinical Perspectives*, edited by Douglas Kimmel, Tara Rose and Steven David, 20-35. New York: Columbia University Press, 2006.
- . 2010. “Testimony at Hearing on the Older Americans Act Reauthorization.” *FORGE Transgender Aging Network*. <http://forge-forward.org/wp-content/docs/OAA-reauthorization-2010-trans-elders.pdf>
- Dimen, Muriel. “Deconstructing Difference: Gender, Splitting, and Transitional Space.” In *Gender in Psychoanalytic Space: Between Clinic and Culture*, edited by Muriel Dimen and Virginia Goldner, 41-61. New York: Other Press, 2002.
- Ehrensaft, Diane. 2009. “One Pill Makes You Boy, One Pill Makes You Girl.” *International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies* 6(1): 12-24.
- Fraser, Lin. 2009. “Depth Psychotherapy with Transgender People.” *Sexual and Relationship Therapy* 24(2): 126-142.
- Gozlan, Oren. 2008. “The Accident of Gender.” *Psychoanalytic Review* 95(4): 541-570.
- Grant, Jaime, Lisa Mottet and Justin Tanis. 2011. *Injustice at Every Turn: A Report of the National Transgender Discrimination Survey*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Transgender Equality and National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. http://www.thetaskforce.org/downloads/reports/reports/ntds_full.pdf
- Hansbury, Griffin. 2005. “Mourning the Loss of the Idealized Self: A Transsexual Passage.” *Psychoanalytic Social Work* 12(1): 19-35.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. 1954. *The Practice of Psychotherapy: Essays on the Psychology of the Transference and Other Subjects*. New York: Bollingen Foundation/Pantheon Books.
- Lev, Arlene Istar. 2004. *Transgender Emergence: Therapeutic Guidelines for Working with Gender-Variant People and Their Families*. New York: Haworth Clinical Practice Press.
- McKenzie, Susan. 2006. “Queering Gender: Anima/Animus and the Paradigm of Emergence.” *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 51(3): 401-421.
- . 2010. “Genders and Sexualities in Individuation: Theoretical and Clinical Explorations.” *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 55(1): 91-111.
- Nadal, Kevin, Rivera, David and Corpus, Melissa. 2010. “Sexual Orientation and Transgender Microaggressions: Implications for Mental Health and Counseling.” In *Microaggressions and Marginality: Manifestation, Dynamics, and Impact*, edited by Derald Wing Sue, 217-240. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

- Pinto, Rogério, Rita Melendez and Anya Spector. 2008. "Male-to-Female Transgender Individuals Building Social Support and Capital from within a Gender-Focused Network." *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services* 20(3): 203–220.
- Prosser, Jay. 1998. *Second Skins: The Body Narratives of Transsexuality*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rank, Otto. 1936. *Will Therapy: An Analysis of the Therapeutic Process in Terms of Relationship*. Trans. Jessie Taft. New York: Knopf.
- Scheman, Naomi. "Queering The Center by Centering the Queer: Reflections on Transsexuals and Secular Jews." In *Sissies and Tomboys: Gender Nonconformity and Homosexual Childhood*, edited by Matthew Rottnek, 58-103. New York: New York University Press, 1999.
- Shelley, Christopher. 2008. *Transpeople: Repudiation, Trauma, Healing*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Singh, Anneliese and Vel McKleroy. 2011 "Just Getting Out of Bed is a Revolutionary Act': The Resilience of Transgender People of Color Who Have Survived Traumatic Life Events." *Traumatology* 17(2): 34-44.
- Steiner, Betty. "Intake Assessment of Gender-Dysphoric Patients." In *Clinical Management of Gender Identity Disorders in Children and Adults*, edited by Ray Blanchard and Betty Steiner, 95-117. Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Press, 1990.
- Sullivan, Harry Stack. 1956. *Clinical Studies in Psychiatry*. New York: Norton.
- Wachtel, Paul. 2011. *Therapeutic Communication: Knowing What to Say When*. 2nd Ed. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Winnicott, Donald. 1965. *The Maturational Process and the Facilitating Environment*. New York: International Universities Press.
- . 1971. *Playing and Reality*. London: Routledge.
- Winters, Kelley. 2011. "Transvestic Disorder, the Overlooked Anti-Trans Diagnosis in the DSM-5." *GID Reform Advocates*.
<http://gidreform.wordpress.com/2011/05/26/transvestic-disorder-the-overlooked-anti-trans-diagnosis-in-the-dsm-5/>
- Witten, Tarynn. 2009. "Graceful Exits: Intersection of Aging, Transgender Identities, and the Family/Community." *Journal of GLBT Family Studies* 5(1-2): 35-61.
- World Professional Association for Transgender Health (WPATH). 2011. *Standards of Care of the Health of Transsexual, Transgender, and Gender Nonconforming People*. 7th Ed. <http://www.wpath.org/documents/IJT%20SOC,%20V7.pdf>

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Clare McBee is a second-year clinical student at the School of Social Service Administration. She holds a B.A. in anthropology from Wellesley College and an M.A. in anthropology and women's and gender studies from Brandeis University. For the past ten years, Clare has worked as an ally with trans* and gender non-conforming communities in Boston and Chicago. She spent three years as a community health worker and program manager at PACT Project/Partners in Health, a home-based HIV/AIDS intervention in Boston. She interned at Chicago House and Social Service Agency, where she supported efforts to create employment and housing interventions specifically for the trans* community. She recently completed an internship at Affinity Community Services through the University of Chicago Human Rights Internship Program. Currently she is a Behavioral Health Intern at Howard Brown Health Center.

BOARD BIOS

BRIA BERGER is a first-year combined social administration and clinical student at the School of Social Service Administration, where she currently works as a research assistant. Before moving to Chicago, Bria worked with international refugees and homeless adults in supportive housing in Michigan. Bria's first-year placement is at Inspiration Corporation, where she works as a clinical case manager and group facilitator with low-income adults. Next year, Bria's placement will be at Chicago House in the new employment initiative for trans* adults. Bria holds a Bachelor of Social Work and minor in women's and gender studies from Michigan State University.

KATIE BERRINGER is a first-year clinical student at the School of Social Service Administration. She is currently enrolled in the Graduate Program in Health Administration & Policy as well as the Violence Prevention program of study. Before moving to Chicago, Katie worked with currently and formerly incarcerated women at a re-entry organization in Washington, DC, where she coordinated HIV intervention programs. Katie's current field placement is at the Edwin F. Mandel Legal Aid Clinic at the University of Chicago Law School. Next year, she will be interning in the Department of Trauma at John H. Stroger Hospital of Cook County. She received her B.A. in religion from Carleton College. Katie served as a first-year editor of *Advocates' Forum*.

ANNA DEKLEVA is a second-year clinical student at the school of Social Service Administration and is currently enrolled in the Graduate Program in Health Administration & Policy. Anna comes to Chicago with a background in bilingual social work research in immigrant communities. Her first-year field placement was at Casa Central, where she provided counseling and case management services to parent and youth survivors of domestic and/or community violence. Her current field placement is in the outpatient adolescent psychiatry department at Northwestern Memorial Hospital. Anna hopes to pursue bilingual clinical social work with families and teens in a community setting after graduation. She received a B.A. in English literature from Barrett, the Honors College at Arizona State University.

LIZA DORAN is a first-year social administration student at the School of Social Service Administration with a focus on community organizing. Her previous work experience includes homeless services and youth assistance, and her professional interest is in the prevention of sexual violence. Liza's first-year field placement is at Sarah's Circle, where she is a case manager for homeless women. Next year, she will be the community engagement intern at the Chicago Alliance Against Sexual Exploitation. She holds a B.A. in religion and English literature from Duke University. Liza served as a first-year editor of *Advocates' Forum*.

BROOKE FISHER is a second-year social administration student at the School of Social Service Administration in the Family Support program of study. In her time at SSA, she worked as a research assistant for the Work Scheduling Study and served as co-chair of the Feminist Student Association. Her first-year field placement was at the Midway location of Salvation Army Family and Community Services, and her second-year placement is at the Ounce of Prevention Fund. She holds a B.A. in English literature and a minor in environmental science and policy from Duke University.

MATT HILLER is a second-year clinical student at the School of Social Service Administration. He is interested in urban housing policy, as well as the anthropology of mental health and social welfare. His first-year field placement was with the Lawyers' Committee for Better Housing, and his second-year placement is with the Community Reintegration Program at the University of Illinois at Chicago Department of Psychiatry. He also completed an internship with the African Center for the Treatment of Torture Survivors in Kampala, Uganda, as part of the University of Chicago Human Rights Internship Program. Matt holds a B.S. in liberal studies from Middle Tennessee State University.

DRE KAMPFNER is a second-year clinical student at the School of Social Service Administration in the Violence Prevention program of study. Her primary interest is ecologically-based interventions for youth violence prevention. Her experience includes Multi-Systemic Therapy, CeaseFire, the Family and Community Research Group, and co-authoring a chapter in *Prevention of Gang Violence* published by the National Institute of Justice and Centers for Disease Control. In her first year she was placed at the Chicago Center for Youth Violence Prevention and her second-year placement is at the Institute for Juvenile Research. She holds a B.A. in history from the University of Chicago.

LAURA KUSEK is a second-year clinical student at the School of Social Service Administration. Her professional interests center on mental health, especially pertaining to veterans and their families. Laura's first-year field placement was at Resurrection Behavioral Health, where she engaged drug users who are involved in the criminal justice system and the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services. In her second year, Laura's field placement is at Advocate Lutheran General hospital, where she works in the hospital's inpatient psychiatric units. She holds a B.A. in psychology from DePaul University.

ABRA LYONS-WARREN is a third-year dual-degree student at the Harris School of Public Policy and the School of Social Service Administration in the Poverty and Inequality program of study. Abra completed her field placements at the Lawyers' Committee for Better Housing and the Center for the Study of Social Policy, and during her time at SSA worked for State Representative Barbara Flynn Currie. Prior to attending the University of Chicago, she worked with low-income and homeless individuals in Washington, DC, in a direct-service and advocacy capacity. Abra holds a B.A. in sociology and women's and gender studies from Brandeis University with a minor in journalism. Abra served as Editor of *Advocates' Forum*.

LIZ MULLEN is a second-year social administration student at the School of Social Service Administration in the Community Schools program of study. Before attending SSA, Liz worked with students in Chicago's public schools through positions with AmeriCorps and Woodlawn Children's Promise Community. Her primary interests include child and adolescent trauma, urban education, and the allocation of resources in public schools, particularly those related to mental health. Liz has held field placements at the Legal Assistance Foundation and the Federation for Community Schools. She holds a B.A. in English and sociology with a minor in music from Augustana College.

RACHEL NARROW is a second-year clinical student at the School of Social Service Administration in the School Social Work program of study. Before coming to SSA, Rachel taught English in South America and in urban and suburban U.S. high schools. As a school social worker, she hopes to improve student mental health care by increasing collaboration

between teachers and school mental health professionals. She holds a M.A. in teaching from Simmons College and a B.A. in English and Spanish from Tufts University.

CAITLIN NEVIN is a first-year clinical student at the School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago. The combination of her interests in women's issues and political and moral philosophy motivated her to spend the last two years working at Girls Incorporated of Alameda County (Girls Inc.). Seeking to develop greater insight toward the relationship between feminist theory and direct practice, she has served as a grant writer and AmeriCorps volunteer teaching an after-school literacy program for at-risk girls in Oakland, California. Currently she works as a Head Start intern at The Ounce of Prevention Fund, an organization providing early childhood education services to youth and families in poverty. She holds a B.A. in philosophy from the University of California, Berkeley.

CLAIRE O'CONNOR is a second-year student at the School of Social Service Administration. In her current field placement, Claire serves as an investigative intern at the Office of the Inspector General for the Illinois Department of Child and Family Services. She has previously held positions working with youth in foster care, violence prevention, and socio-emotional education. Claire holds a Bachelor of Social Work from Xavier University, where she was awarded the Charlotte Towle Award, recognizing a passion for ethical social work practice and excellence in academics.

AATIFA SADIQ is a second-year social administration student at the School of Social Service Administration in the International Social Welfare program of study. In her time at SSA, she has worked as a research assistant to help develop multi-media prevention programs for at-risk youth in Kazakhstan. Her first-year field placement was at the Cook County Social Services Department and her second-year field placement is at the International Organization for Adolescence (IOFA). Aatifa holds a B.A. in international studies and sociology from DePaul University.

KATHRYN SIMON is a first-year social administration student at the School of Social Service Administration. She is currently interning at the Edwin F. Mandel Legal Aid Clinic. She holds a Bachelor of Social Work from New York University.

