

Higher Ground: Faith Communities and Community Building

We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny.

—Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Most Americans are now well aware of the devastating chain of circumstances that has undermined once robust inner-city communities over the past two decades.¹ The story has probably been documented most thoroughly by William Julius Wilson,² who discusses not only the disappearance of manufacturing jobs, which had offered the most promising career paths for many inner-city residents, but also the flip side of expanded opportunity. As the effects of fair housing laws enabled them to do so, middle-income African-Americans moved to the suburbs.

The youth left behind were deprived of role models, exposure to the world of work, and linkages to social institutions and friendship networks. Add the crack cocaine epidemic and the easy availability of firearms, and there is little wonder that gang violence and other scourges emerged.

But this essay is not about pessimism. Quite the contrary, it is about the remarkable hope being rekindled in communities across America. Faith communities are at the center of this good work. That is the topic I want to explore.

When I say faith communities, I mean churches, mosques, temples—religious institutions of all faiths. Religious institutions have a unique potential to contribute to community rebuilding.

I begin by explaining why I think this is true. I then examine some concrete examples of religious institutions taking advantage of this potential. Finally, I draw lessons that I believe should guide future faith community initiatives. My purpose is to celebrate the impressive accomplishments of religious institutions in our cities—accomplishments that far too few Americans have heard about—and to consider how those contributions can be sustained and enhanced.

A Unique Potential

Why do faith communities have such a special role to play in inner-city communities? It is because of four features that they alone combine. Other institutions may have two or three of these features, but not all of them. Let me illustrate them with an account of the circumstances of St. Peter Claver Catholic Church in the Sandtown-Winchester community in western Baltimore, Maryland.

Faith Communities Are Still There

Sandtown-Winchester in many ways typifies the devastation of hard-hit urban neighborhoods. A recent article described drug addicts loitering around the church, prostitutes soliciting in the square across the street, and boarded-up buildings looming nearby “like tombstones for times past” (Brady, 1995).

Thurgood Marshall grew up in this neighborhood, and Billie Holliday sang in its clubs. It is centered around what was once a thriving African-American business district. Most of the clubs and businesses of those days vanished long ago, but St. Peter Claver was there then, and it is still there now.

St. Peter Claver was dedicated in 1888, the year Peter Claver (a 17th-century Catalonian Jesuit who dedicated his life to ministering to African slaves in the port of Cartagena in what is now Colombia) was canonized, and it is still thriving. Deborah Holly, president of the parish council, says that St. Peter Claver’s buildings are constantly in use. “We have a heritage of more than 100 years, and that means something in a community where some people can’t see past tomorrow. St. Peter Claver is a beacon of hope. With all the activity, the lights on at night, it is a sign that things still happen here.”

St. Peter Claver’s pastor, Rev. Robert Kearns, believes that the church’s buildings are symbols of hope: “Bricks and mortar are the cement that hold a community together.”

Community Is Central to the Mission of Charity

For Christians, the ministry of Jesus—meeting physical as well as spiritual needs—is the model that has always driven the church’s commitment to community. But there are parallels in other religions as well. One of the five pillars of Islam is *zakat*, the tradition of giving a portion of one’s assets to the poor. The tradition of charity in the Jewish faith is often thought of as *tzedakah*, although the strict translation of the term is “justice.”

This commitment is illustrated at St. Peter Claver in a number of ways. At the most basic level, there is charity—immediate help to those in need. Natalie Mercer, St. Peter Claver’s parish youth minister, says, “If they are hungry, we get them something to eat. If they need a place to stay, we try to find them a room.”

Commitment is exhibited by broader efforts such as the outreach orientation of the church school and the church’s active involvement in BUILD (Baltimoreans United in Leadership Development), a church-based civic action group that has

developed 300 new low-cost town houses in the area. Moreover, it is evident in the community orientation of ceremony:

The children of the neighborhood poured out of the alley street walk-ups on Palm Sunday as Kearns and the leaders of five other area churches marched with a drum and bugle corps, handing out palms to all in their path... (At Easter) joyous music will waft out of the wooden doors—not so much up to the heavens as around the neighborhood (*USA Today*, April 14, 1995).

Faith Communities Have Unique Resources

Inner-city religious institutions are seldom well-off financially, but they do have resources in their inherent strengths as institutions and in their linkages to the world outside—for example, in support provided by their denominations nationally. Perhaps most important, however, their leaders typically represent a rare source of organizational skill. They are people who think actively about the problems of their communities and have the ability to conceive of solutions, mobilize support, and provide follow-through.

Reverend Kearns at St. Peter Claver is a good example. He was a key force in the development of BUILD housing, and he is clearly a believer: “It works—I’d swear to that on a Bible. Homeowners have a stake in their community. Just look at the decks and the awnings. You might think you are in the suburbs.... The buds are coming out.... New life.” The pastor of another church in the coalition says of Kearns, “You can’t just stay in the pulpit. Father Kearns is a beautiful priest.... He works for the community, not just one church.”

Faith Communities Touch the Soul

There is little disagreement that the problems of inner-city neighborhoods go far beyond simple lack of material wealth. The youth of these areas need values and moral structure to hang onto. They need reasons to believe that there are things worth living for—the understanding of value in life itself over the long term. They need nurturing. Few institutions other than the faith community and the family can provide youth this kind of support.

Natalie Mercer says that although the church can’t always help financially, “we can always listen. Sometimes they need a friend to talk to, or shake hands with, or hug them. Sometimes what they need most is an embrace, a sign that you are not afraid of them, that they are human.” William Monroe, a property owner across the street from St. Peter Claver, believes the church is good for his business: “It lets people remember that even with all the violence, good things still happen here.”

Because it never left the neglected streets of western Baltimore, and because of its continuing devotion to the community, St. Peter Claver has a credibility and influence there that would be hard for any other institution to match, no matter how well intended.

What Faith Communities Are Accomplishing

While their commitment has always been a powerful force in American life, inner-city religious institutions have now fundamentally expanded the meaning and horizons of that commitment. C. Eric Lincoln notes that the African-American church has begun to “re-focus its attention on the critical needs of the whole individual and the whole community, rather than on just spiritual or religious needs.” (Lincoln, 1994.) John M. Perkins calls it a movement “beyond charity.” (Parkins, 1993.)

As mayor of San Antonio, I witnessed many indications that a new movement is underway along these lines. Since becoming Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in 1993, I have made a special effort to learn more about this movement and to give it support. In April 1994 I was privileged to meet with African-American church leaders at the Harvard Divinity School. That same year, I attended the Hampton University Ministers’ Conference, the largest conference of African-American clergy leadership in the country. I have also been able to sit with rabbis of many Jewish sects, priests and nuns of Catholicism, and imams and other leaders of the Islamic faith. In March 1995 I held a town meeting in New York City, attended by leaders of a broad variety of faith groups.

What I have learned is indeed impressive—both the breadth and intensity of the initiatives that have been mounted and their effectiveness. There has been no national census of church-based community outreach activities, but a study in Denver suggests that they are now widespread: 60 to 75 percent of the 80 African-American churches surveyed there provide at least one community service (Center for Policy Research, 1993). Of 333 identified programs, nearly half (148) were targeted to adults and families and commonly involved the distribution of food and clothing. The many programs for children (106) involved youth activities, tutoring services, scholarship assistance, drug and alcohol education, and before-school and after-school child care. Community development activities (59) included church-sponsored voter registration drives and candidate forums, as well as the operation of credit unions and housing development.

In the sections that follow, I want to note a sampling of the more expansive development efforts of religious institutions.

Housing

A large share of recent faith community initiatives have focused on improving housing and the community’s physical appearance. That is not surprising, because the need for new and rehabilitated housing—both as decent shelter and as a symbol of revitalization—is great, and systems to provide outside financial support are well established. New or renovated housing can improve the area immediately around the church, mosque, or temple and thereby help restock the congregation. Still, these ventures require religious institutions to learn to run a new business—a business that demands considerable professionalism. And many have done well at it.

- In Chicago, Illinois, Antioch Missionary Baptist Church has, with HUD assistance, rehabilitated and developed 177 apartments and 120 townhouses

in the Englewood community. It has also purchased parcels for future housing and business development.

- In Brooklyn, New York, Bridge Street African Methodist Episcopal Church joined with 10 local churches to redevelop a 40-block area in their community. The church collected \$1.3 million in tithes and offerings in 1992, with \$600,000 going to renovation and construction. The efforts included renovating 40 housing units and building 22 duplexes in partnership with the Enterprise Foundation and the New York Partnership.
- In Queens, New York, Allen African Methodist Episcopal Church, led by Rev. Floyd Flake, a member of Congress, has used a \$10.7 million HUD grant to build a 300-unit senior citizens housing project. It has also established a school and clinic and bought and rehabilitated more than 15 storefronts, bringing new businesses and jobs into that community.
- In Oakland, California, copastors J. Alfred Smith, Sr., and his son, J. Alfred Smith, Jr., led Allen Temple Baptist Church in sponsoring these projects: a 75-unit housing development for the elderly, 51 additional unrestricted units, a credit union with \$1 million in assets, a blood bank, and other initiatives vital to community service (McCarthy, 1995).
- In Indianapolis, Indiana, the Mid-North Church Council, working with the Mapleton-Fall Creek Neighborhood Association, established the Mapleton-Fall Creek Housing Development Corporation in 1985. With a grant from the Lilly Endowment, the corporation works with residents on housing rehabilitation. So far, more than 200 homes have been repaired, remodeled, or renovated. The council has also given special emphasis to job training in construction trades, personal counseling, and other social services. For low-income purchasers, one-on-one counseling sessions are required to help families learn how to improve their credit record and design a budget (Kriplin, 1995).
- In Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, a dozen churches, including Zion Baptist and White Rock Baptist, are working with the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) grassroots organization to provide local low-income residents with homeownership loan counseling. Some of these churches are serving as sites for buyer seminars.

Community Building

Many religious institutions that have ventured into community building cut their teeth on housing projects, and they gained valuable management and development skills along the way. But most congregations recognize that the needs of the community are broader, and today's efforts are more likely to be characterized by a mix of activities that include new approaches to service provision, expanding access to credit and, above all, economic development.

Rev. Alicia Byrd, project director for the Leadership Development Program of the Congress of National Black Churches, notes:

. . . the one area that African-American pastors and laypeople were slow to develop was using the church as stimulus for communitywide economic

development.... That's because some church-goers worried that the speculation and investment required for revitalization efforts were 'worldly pursuits.' People in the black church now understand that money isn't a necessary evil. Rather, money is spiritual, especially when you can get it to work for you and make more resources for the community (Winston, 1995).

Interest in this movement has advanced far enough that Gregory J. Reed has written a useful guidebook on techniques that can be applied: *Economic Empowerment Through the Church* (Reed, 1994). Today, concrete examples abound.

- In Cleveland, Ohio, Cory United Methodist Church, under the leadership of Rev. Orlando Chaffee, has established a credit union with some \$1.7 million in assets and 1,100 members, providing financial services to neighborhoods bereft of banks. Chaffee stresses that credit unions can teach basic financial and organizational skills, as well as issue loans to avert crises or to start small businesses (Delloff, 1995).
- In Wiscasset, Maine, six churches have partnered with a community development corporation (Coastal Enterprises) to establish the Genesis Fund. The fund secures loans, grants, and donations from small congregations and religious denominations—funds that can then leverage private resources for community initiatives (Kriplin, *op. cit.*).
- In south central Los Angeles, First African Methodist Episcopal Church, working with a \$500,000 grant from the Walt Disney Company, has set up a program to make low-interest loans to minority entrepreneurs and finance the creation of jobs for community residents. The Atlantic Richfield Company also donated \$500,000 to the program.
- In east Austin, Texas, Ebenezer Baptist Church and four other African-American churches have partnered with the city's Economic Development Department to revitalize the dilapidated commercial corridor in their community. In 1988 they started the East Austin Development Corporation, which is creating a daycare center, commercial space, a senior center, and housing for the elderly. Church members' contributions of time and money have been the foundation for gaining outside financial support (Winston, *op. cit.*).
- In Mendenhall, Mississippi, the small congregation of the Mendenhall Bible Church has built a business complex in the community that contains a health clinic, law office, school, and recreational facilities.
- In Detroit, Michigan, Rev. Charles G. Adams of Hartford Memorial Baptist Church is immediate past president of the Progressive National Baptist Convention and a leading advocate of an expanded role for the church in economic development. The 8,000-member church in the city's northwest section has already transformed 10 blocks of once-blighted land into the site of commercial franchises that provide jobs and services. The church's next project is to turn another 15 acres into a shopping center (Winston, *op. cit.*).
- In Detroit, Michigan, St. Anne Catholic Church is working with the Hubbard/Richard community organization to develop a 120-unit residential property. The church, located in a concentrated Mexican-American community,

is also helping the neighborhood develop a welcome center to spur economic growth. The center will be situated at the foot of the Ambassador Bridge that connects the United States and Canada and will feature a Hispanic market and provide information to tourists.

- In Atlanta, Georgia, churches in the Vine City community, in partnership with other community leaders, formed a development coalition in the late 1980s that has secured 200 jobs for community residents at the new Georgia Dome stadium and attracted a commitment of \$1.5 million in housing construction funds.
- In Harlem, New York, Abyssinian Baptist Church is the central force behind the Abyssinian Development Corporation, which started with housing but is now involved in a wide range of community development activities. These include developing a Head Start Center, finishing renovations of the Renaissance Ballroom Complex (an arts facility with a theater, a catering hall, and possibly a restaurant), and partnering the development of the first supermarket in Harlem (Winston, *op. cit.*).
- In Waterbury, Connecticut, the Naugatuck Valley Project (NVP) is a non-profit consortium of 66 organizations, including churches and synagogues as well as labor unions and civic groups. The churches in NVP played the critical role in mobilizing and providing referrals for the consortium's Valley Care Cooperative, a service organization that provides healthcare assistance to low-income elderly people in their homes. Valley Care was patterned after a successful worker-owned home care agency in the South Bronx, New York (Kriplin, *op. cit.*).

Building Community Leadership

It has generally been understood that the number of local nonprofit housing developers in America's cities mushroomed in the 1980s. Christopher Walker, however, has made us aware that something even more impressive occurred during that decade: A number of intermediaries arose, providing urban community forums, networking, technical assistance, financial support, and representation (Walker et al., 1995). These support institutions began to transform what had been a highly fragmented array of small, nonprofit housing providers into something approaching a full-fledged "production sector" on a national scale. The institutions included national organizations such as the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) and the Enterprise Corporation, as well as new, metropolitan-scale institutions that facilitated the work of local nonprofits.

Something such as this is happening in community building as well. With respect to faith community involvement, one of the most impressive contributions has been the Lilly Endowment's Religious Institutions as Partners in Community Based Development program, which has provided financial support, information, and networking.³ At the same time, the Ford Foundation has supported church-based social justice initiatives (including community development), through the Congress of National Black Churches. The Pew Charitable Trust has made a large grant to World Vision, the evangelical agency, to foster housing ministries.⁴

Also important was the establishment in 1993 of the National Community Building Network (NCBN), a 22-city network of community-driven intermediaries.⁵ NCBN holds meetings, promotes interchange between its members, shares information on approaches and techniques, and serves as an advocate in national policy forums on issues relevant to community building. Religious institutions have played a prominent role in community initiatives in all of these cities, and their representatives are key players in the intermediaries that form NCBN.

Lessons and Prospects

Soon after I came to HUD, I established the Religious Organizations Initiative in the Special Actions Office, Office of the Secretary. The mission of this initiative is to provide extensive outreach to the faith community and to engage religious institutions as partners in forwarding the priorities we have established for HUD. My colleagues who oversee this initiative have talked with, and made themselves accessible to, hundreds of religious leaders across the country, visiting conferences and conventions, listening to questions and ideas, and exploring ways that HUD's programs can further their community-building efforts.⁶

I believe this initiative is paying off—not only by the concrete assistance we have been able to offer but also by simply providing a voice, a face, someone religious leaders feel they can reach out to in government. Government clearly benefits as well, because we have learned from their experiences.

In the remainder of this essay, I discuss two themes that are important to the future of this movement: The benefits of religious institution partnerships in community-building strategies and the value of leaders of faith communities reaching out to link inner-city neighborhoods to metropolitan opportunities. These themes reflect successful practices of actual community initiatives we have learned about, and I highlight them for consideration in others now being designed.

The Benefits of Faith Community Partnerships in Community Building

A fundamentally new approach to community building is now being applied in a few American cities, and I believe it is going to spread. This new approach has probably been articulated most clearly by John McKnight and John Kretzmann (McKnight and Kretzmann, 1993), who contrast it to traditional “needs-driven, dead end” thinking that results in long-term dependency. In that paradigm, city agencies and other outsiders assess a community's needs and problems and then use their existing programmatic tools to address those needs. Individual agencies regard community residents as “clients” and deliver services to them with little semblance of coordination.

The new approach can be most simply characterized by three features. First, it is driven from the bottom up: Communities organize themselves, establishing true partnerships across institutions and between institutions and residents, and play the commanding role in designing and implementing development strategies. Second, it is comprehensive: The community develops a strategy that cuts across and sets priorities among opportunities (for example, in social services, crime

prevention, education, job creation, and housing) traditionally separated under the old paradigm. Indeed, the fragmentation of these specialties is now seen as one of the causes of the disappointing performance of many urban improvement efforts of the 1980s. Finally, it is asset based rather than needs or problem based. The community identifies assets upon which it can build, ranging from the skills and entrepreneurial ideas of residents to manifestations of culture and the strengths of local associations and institutions, including churches.

These themes, which are increasingly influencing the policies of inner-city communities, represent a powerful change from the past. They are the foundation of the work of the NCBN. At HUD we strongly endorse them, and they are the basis of Vice President Gore's approach to community building with the Empowerment Zone/Enterprise Community program. HUD's efforts to simplify and consolidate the plans that local jurisdictions must prepare as a basis for funding also build on these themes.⁷

A good example is the Boston Persistent Poverty Project, sponsored by the Boston Foundation, which was oriented wholly around these themes (Boston Persistent Poverty Project, 1994). The project entailed a multiyear effort in which representatives of Boston neighborhoods examined their circumstances and potential through activities ranging from formal research to roundtables and focus groups. The resulting strategy has motivated comprehensive community building in several neighborhoods. One effort the strategy has expedited is the Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative, which has organized a job bank; moved mountains of illegally dumped debris from vacant lots; taken steps to ensure regular street cleaning, begun a sizable housing development program; acquired a substantial amount of vacant land for prospective development; and established a local agency collaborative to develop greater accountability, cooperation, and an integrated approach among human-service providers.

Clearly, all of this is not new to the many religious institutions involved in community building. Indeed, in many of the church-based initiatives I noted earlier this approach has already been reflected, because church leadership helped to invent it. It is worth emphasizing here, however, for two reasons. First, it may help to give a better sense of direction to religious institutions that are now just beginning to consider how to expand activity in their communities, and it may offer guidance on midcourse corrections to initiatives already underway. Second, it highlights the benefits of partnering in community building—an approach that permits the faith community to play its special role most productively.

Community building is a big job; no single institution can manage all of it effectively. Religious institutions often express the concern that, as they take on more responsibility for their community's well-being, they will be stretched too thin and dragged into secular activities for which they are not well prepared. The new approach suggests that religious institutions should not try to do it all themselves. The role they are often best prepared to play is that of a catalyst, an agent that creates and stimulates leadership in other organizations.

Community builders already recognize the benefits of partnering with religious institutions. For example, Van Johnson, the city economic development officer

who worked with church groups in the east Austin, Texas, initiative cited earlier, states:

I would never again attempt to help people with economic revitalization unless it was under the umbrella of a church, and the church helped. It makes no sense, particularly in the black community, to leave the church out. The church is the most important institution we have. It holds most of the resources that our community needs (Winston, op. cit.).

Reaching Out to the Metropolitan Area

My final theme is the value of church leaders reaching out to link inner-city communities to metropolitan opportunities. The problems that beset these communities are largely the result of powerful national forces that are beyond their immediate control.

Community building should begin with an asset-based approach—making the best of what you have. But taking that approach does not mean a community must struggle in isolation or proceed without linkage to, or help from, the outside. There is a strong likelihood that more support from new sources will need to be mobilized in the future. If congressional cuts to social programs continue, traditional religious and secular charities will not be able to take up the slack (Goodstein, 1995).

The new approach to comprehensive community building does not eschew external help, but it does require some care in structuring the terms under which it is given. McKnight and Kretzmann argue that “the development approaches outlined here deserve help and support from interested individuals and organizations outside the community,” but they decry outsiders’ traditional approach of estimating a community’s needs and problems and then attempting to address them directly. They suggest instead that outsiders condition their support on the community, developing an asset-based strategy that it owns and believes in. Outside agencies can then provide support in a manner that gives the community considerable latitude in deciding how best that support will be applied. Instead of the old idea of citizen participation in government initiatives, they advocate sensitive and facilitative government participation in citizen initiatives (McKnight and Kretzmann, op. cit.).

If inner-city communities are helping themselves in these ways, the rest of the metropolis ought to be more willing to assist them. But community leaders must present their case effectively and serve as credible and visible spokespersons for their cause. There is need for more “voice,” not only in mobilizing resources but also in safeguarding the interests of these communities in metropolitan policy decisions. I believe that this is a role faith community leadership is ideally suited for, and that they should consider expanding their initiatives at this level as well as internally.

ABLE (Atlantans Building Leadership for Empowerment), a group formed by African-American and white religious leaders, may be worth watching in this regard. According to the *Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, ABLE aims to become a third force in Atlanta’s power structure:

ABLE has been working for three years, quietly and below the political radar, to build an organization of engaged citizens with power enough, in numbers and commitment alone, to sit at the table with business and government in negotiations for the community's destiny.... ABLE has already succeeded in bringing together people who rarely enter each other's homes in Atlanta. Such people have met in more than 2,000 meetings—one-on-one or in larger groups, in homes and churches, for research, or just getting to know each other (*Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, November 19, 1994).

Religious leaders play an important role by promoting positive metropolitan linkages externally, and they should also do so within their own communities. I am disturbed when people try to make strategic options appear to be in conflict, when in fact they can be made to blend with a reasonable sense of balance. "People policies" and "place policies" are not polar opposites. I know of no serious integrationist who really thinks it would be best to move all low-income households out to the suburbs, thereby obliterating the vital community assets and institutions that remain in the city. Alternatively, I know of no serious community builder who thinks it appropriate to build a wall around the community to deny residents permission to leave or to require local workers to accept jobs only from firms located within the community's boundaries.

Healthy communities prepare their young residents to take advantage of the best opportunities they can, wherever they may be located. Because these communities have sustained important internal assets, many residents will stay, but it is to be expected that some will leave. A sizable number of workers will commute every day to jobs outside the community, but with strong assets in their neighborhoods, they will spend much of their disposable income in locally owned businesses.

Healthy communities also attract "new blood" from outside—an important point that warrants more emphasis in community-building practice today. Policies resulting in gentrification have, for good reason, become anathema to community builders. But inner-city communities must attract middle-income families back into their neighborhoods and they must do it on their own terms and without displacement.

One example is instructive. A large group of middle-income professionals who have moved away from the Fairfax community in Cleveland, Ohio, return there every Sunday to attend church. These people still feel strong links to their old neighborhood. A few years ago, local churches and other neighborhood leaders decided to create an atmosphere that would bring these families back to the community. They did so by developing attractive middle-income housing and giving special attention to security issues. They then targeted an aggressive marketing campaign to former residents. This strategy has proved successful in attracting suburban residents to Fairfax, and I would think it would be worthy of consideration elsewhere.

I began this essay with a sobering assessment of conditions in our Nation's inner cities, but I also cautioned the reader to eschew pessimism. It is the work of the faith communities I have described that inspires much of my optimism about the future of our cities.

With the continued help of the varied and vital faith communities and their institutions, I believe that we will truly reach the higher ground, fulfilling the words of the Old Testament prophet Isaiah:

And they shall build the old wastes,
they shall raise up the former desolations,
and they shall repair the waste cities,
the desolations of many generations (Isaiah 61:4).

Notes

1. This essay was first published in February 1996. The Department wishes to acknowledge the contributions of G. Thomas Kingsley, director, Center for Public Finance and Housing, The Urban Institute; and Dr. Suzan Johnson Cook, HUD-Church Liaison, Special Actions Office, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and senior pastor at Mariner's Temple Baptist Church, New York, for making this essay possible.
2. William Julius Wilson, *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987). For amplification, see Adele V. Harrell and George E. Peterson, eds., *Crime, Drugs, and Social Isolation: Barriers to Urban Opportunity* (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press, 1992).
3. Evaluations of this program have been conducted by David M. Sheie. See his *Religious Institutions as Partners in Community-based Development: Findings from Year One of the Lilly Endowment Program* (1991); and *Better Together? Religious Institutions as Partners in Community-based Development* (Minneapolis, MN: Rainbow Research Inc., 1994).
4. Discussed in Lilly Endowment, Inc., *Religious Institutions as Partners in Community Based Development*, Progressions: A Lilly Endowment Occasional Report (Indianapolis, IN: Lilly Endowment, Inc., February 1995).
5. The cities in the network include: Atlanta, Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Hartford, Kansas City, Little Rock, Los Angeles, Memphis, Miami, Milwaukee, New York, Oakland, Philadelphia, Phoenix, San Antonio, San Juan, Savannah, and Washington, D.C. The network can be accessed through its secretariat at the Urban Strategies Council, 672 13th Street, Suite 200, Oakland, CA 94612.
6. I am privileged that Dr. Suzan Johnson Cook and Anna Forbes Towns accepted my offer to serve as HUD-church liaisons. Dr. Cook, a White House Fellow assigned to the White House Domestic Policy Council, is senior pastor at Mariner's Temple Baptist Church in New York. She is also a former Harvard Divinity School professor and a New York Police chaplain. Ms. Towns, a lawyer who works in the HUD Office of Special Actions, has a rich background in the African-American church.

7. See the President's Community Enterprise Board, *Building Communities Together. Guidebook for Community-Based Strategic Planning for Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, January 1994); and American Institute of Architects, *Vision/Reality: The Consolidated Plan* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, March 1994).

References

- Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, November 19, 1994. "Ready, Willing, and ABLE."
- Boston Persistent Poverty Project. February 1994. *To Make Our City Whole: A Report on the Work of the Strategy Development Group of the Boston Persistent Poverty Project*. Boston, MA: The Boston Foundation.
- Brady, Erik. April 14, 1995. "A Beacon of Hope: From Urban Desolation to Restoration," *USA Today*.
- Center for Policy Research. 1993. *Community Outreach in Denver's Black Churches*. Denver, CO: Center for Policy Research.
- Delloff, Linda-Marie. February 1995. "Credit Union Links Church with 'Money Matters,'" *Religious Institutions as Partners in Community Based Development*, Progressions: A Lilly Endowment Occasional Report. Indianapolis, IN: Lilly Endowment, Inc.
- Goodstein, Laurie. February 22, 1995. "Churches May Not Be Able to Patch Welfare Cuts," *Washington Post*.
- Kriplin, Nancy. February 1995. "Building Community Beyond 'Bricks and Sticks,'" *Religious Institutions as Partners in Community Based Development*, Progressions: A Lilly Endowment Occasional Report. Indianapolis, IN: Lilly Endowment, Inc.
- Lincoln, C. Eric. 1994. "Foreword: The Progressive Mission of the Black Church," in Gregory J. Reed, *Economic Empowerment Through the Church*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- McCarthy, E. Lance. 1995. "A Proposal to Get F.I.T: Economic Empowerment through the African-American Church," *Black America 1995: A New Beginning*. Washington, D.C.: The National Center for Public Policy Research.
- McKnight, John L., and John P. Kretzmann. 1993. *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path Toward Finding and Mobilizing Community Assets*. Evanston, IL: Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research, Northwestern University.
- Perkins, John M. 1993. *Beyond Charity: The Call to Christian Community Development*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

Reed, Gregory J. 1994. *Economic Empowerment Through the Church*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.

Walker, Christopher et al. April 1995. *The Status and Prospects of the Nonprofit Housing Sector*. Report prepared for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Winston, Diane. February 1995. "Black Church Expands Communitarian Tradition," *Religious Institutions as Partners in Community Based Development*, Progressions: A Lilly Endowment Occasional Report. Indianapolis, IN: Lilly Endowment, Inc.