

Safe Spaces: California Children Enter a Policy Debate

Sandra Meucci and Jim Redmon

Introduction

This stupid experiment of organizing work and failing to organize play has, of course, brought about a fine revenge. The love of pleasure will not be denied, and when it has turned into all sorts of malignant and vicious appetites, then we, the middle aged, grow quite distracted and resort to all sorts of restrictive measures.

— Jane Addams (1910)

In real life, only from the ordinary adults of the city sidewalks do children learn — if they learn it at all — the first fundamental of successful city life: People must take a modicum of public responsibility for each other even if they have no ties to each other.

— Jane Jacobs (1961)

THE ISSUE OF SAFETY IS OFTEN CAST SOLELY AS A PROBLEM OF VIOLENCE AND CRIME. The focus of campaigns is riveted on urban violence, and youth violence in particular. Yet nationally only five percent of all juveniles were arrested in 1992, and of those five percent approximately nine percent were arrested for a violent crime. Despite the fears, fewer than one percent of juveniles are arrested for violent crimes (Shorter, Schaffner, and Schick, 1996). Though juvenile offenders currently account for a smaller percentage of violent offenders than their numbers in the U.S. population would predict (Lubow, 1995), the dramatic increase in homicide rates of young black men has been well publicized, even if not well understood. The response is a variety of “get tough” policies; for example, the intensification of policing crime and imposition of youth curfews are intended

SANDRA MEUCCI (2230 Ward Street, Berkeley, CA 94705), a Guest Editor of this issue and Ph.D. candidate in Sociology, is a teaching fellow and research associate with 20 years experience in research, design, management, and evaluation of new program models for addressing social problems. She is currently performing evaluation research for the California Institute on Human Services and is teaching at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

JAMES REDMON, MSW, MPH (50 Forest Side Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94127) has 16 years of experience in child welfare and family support programs. Currently, his work is in human service program design and development and he is an instructor at U.C. Berkeley Extension’s program on Children and the Changing Family.

to address community safety issues. States have been revamping youth crime laws over the past two years, allowing more youths to be tried as adults and scrapping longtime protections like the confidentiality of juvenile court proceedings. The thrust of these new laws is to get more juveniles into the adult criminal justice system, where they will presumably serve longer sentences under more punitive conditions (Butterfield, 1996).

Campaigns to address youth and “gang” violence typically aim to limit access to guns, restrict television viewing of violent shows, amplify community policing, and impose curfews to get children off the street. Yet regulating their access to weapons of destruction and to each other is merely a palliative measure; it isn’t a solution to a social problem that has much deeper dimensions. Much of what is written about crime and violence avoids addressing economic and political systemic factors that contribute to it, such as spacial isolation of poor people in urban areas, which culminates in violence.

Instead of focusing on the systemic and structural opportunities within urban environments that are associated with violence, youth are demonized as more punitive responses to juvenile offenses prevail. Yet the negative images of urban youth are so widespread that the majority of funds and efforts go to building more youth prisons and stripping away the legal protections for all youth that were instituted in 1899 when the first juvenile court was established.

The need for a policy designed to address children’s safety is clear, but it ought to be informed by an understanding of how children experience its lack. Many children, especially those in low-income urban environments, have come to see violence as an unavoidable part of their social reality (Noguera, 1995).¹ Rather than recognize poor urban children’s lack of control over the exigencies of their lives and come to understand their bid to protect themselves, city councils and national policy initiatives characterize them as needing restraint. By doing so, they entirely overlook the children’s experience of vulnerability in their own terms. Not being able to protect themselves from “bullies” combines with the loss of public facilities, open public spaces for play and recreation, safe swimming, fishing, and tree-climbing “green” places to produce an environment devoid of anything positive for children. They literally have “nowhere to go” and “nothing to do.” Children taking part in the pilot projects reported on here repeatedly described their experience of not having safe spaces and how this lack of safe havens makes children more vulnerable to youth crime, both as perpetrators and victims. By working directly with young people on these problems within their environments, we can forge an alternative analysis of the problem of youth violence and youth safety.

Safety and Safe Spaces

As early as 1910, Jane Addams laments the loss of a world where children have open spaces that invite their exploration and play, and spark their imagination. The

modern city, she says, turns over to commercialism practically all the provisions for public recreation. At first blush Addams seems merely to be articulating a romantic ideal and nostalgia of the classical city replete with theater and stadium, squares, piazzas, pageants, street processions, and amphitheaters. Her concern, though, is larger than that; it is with the way in which industrial development, for over a century, has dwarfed the possibilities for children to flourish and direct their desires toward civic life.

Addams is not alone in noticing the historical trend in the loss of safe, common, public space for recreation and public life. Other historians mark 1910 as the beginning of the changes in children's access to U.S. cities, marking the loss of public spaces for children's use. In that decade the deaths of children from playing in the streets were becoming a scandal (Gaster, 1992). There was no governmental commitment or action to urban and rural development "as if children mattered," but private and religious organizations stepped forward. Organizations such as the Children's Aid Society and Play Schools Association directed their energies toward the "moral development" and Americanization of the immigrant poor. Their efforts began to influence public and political discourse over the streets not being safe for children's play, and this resulted in improvements. By the 1920s, a children's play movement was in full swing. Public education authorities were concerned to develop public school playgrounds; churches and other private organizations offered social programs for poor children; the Boy Scouts of America, Girl Scouts of America, and YMCA, all of which started in the 1920s, were clubs for middle- and upper-class children. In New York City, there were at least designated hours during every day in which up to 60 city streets were closed off for children to play.² These improvements occurred despite the general tendencies within urban planning during the prewar years to serve the bustling central business districts and not to concern itself with the need of children for safe play and streets.

During the 1930s New Deal, the Federal Works Progress Administration (WPA) produced 12,300 public works: thousands of athletic fields, ball courts, ski trails, tennis courts, swimming pools, and outdoor parks. Though the WPA was the halcyon era for producing the infrastructure for public life, other attempts at "green" and public spaces in city planning were made in the 1930s, though less successfully. For example, urban geographer Mike Davis chronicles how lone city planners and landscape designers in Los Angeles tried to redistribute park and open-space resources to the advantage of neglected working-class districts, but the general pattern of speculative development began overtaking the investment of public money in open public space. Hence the area lost its greenbelts and commons-centered, pedestrian-scaled land became the "exploding metropolis," replete with the urban sprawl that today marks it as a national scandal.³

Unfortunately, Davis' Los Angeles scenario has become a common one. This general trend of privatization of public space and diminution of available public

facilities intensifies and compounds the foreclosure of opportunities for children. Children's development and freedom are restricted as public spaces increasingly become unavailable or unsafe to use (Noschis, 1992; Hillman and Adams, 1992). Their encounters with violence are heightened as a result. Yet the prevailing concern over children's safety is expressed as one over crime and violence, not over the lack or loss of safe public space.

The research from our own case study is part of a new and growing body of work (Lynch, 1977; Moore, 1994; Hart, 1997; Stephens, 1994) that is interested in children's understandings and experiences of local and global environments.⁴ There are alternatives to existing punitive and restrictive directions of policy for "safety," and the process of involving children in the definition of the problem is a first step toward building constituencies, social consensus, and proactive policies for safe spaces.

Case Study

This study is based on the work of California children and teenagers,⁵ from nine to 18 years of age. They came together for eight weeks in summer 1995 with adults who guided and assisted them, as needed, to define and explore their most pressing concerns within their environments and to launch a campaign within their community to address the issue. Four community agencies were funded to lead this work, based on ethnic and geographic variation: East Los Angeles (Latino), Richmond (one Southeast Asian and one Latino), and Oakland (multiracial). All four urban-based agencies focused mostly on low-income neighborhoods. Three were existing organizations and one was formed specifically for this pilot study.

The commonality in what the young people uncovered was striking. Each articulated threats in various ways to the existence of "safe spaces" in their lives. Their systematic environmental action research alerted us to how significant and necessary the availability of nontoxic, open *public* space and facilities for youth is for them to feel safe. Moreover, they launched campaigns and programs to create safe spaces and offered solutions that do not depend upon policing, curfews, restrictions, or regulations on them in any way. Rather, their efforts were noteworthy for their proactive, and not reactive, nature to preserve and reclaim safe common environments.

Environmental Safety of the Projects Selected

Richmond: The Asian Pacific Environmental Network in Richmond, which began as part of the environmental justice movement, selected Southeast Asian young teens for leadership development. The girls' families all have taken refuge in the United States, unfortunately in an area that has some of the worst socioeconomic statistics in the country. This area of western Contra Costa County contains over 350 industrial facilities, including waste incinerators, oil refineries,

and pesticide, fertilizer, and other chemical manufacturers (Belliveau et al., 1989). In addition to living in the heart of Richmond's toxic sites, their families also face workplace exposures and contaminants in the soil where they grow much of their food. Among the most vulnerable populations in this area are the newcomers from Laos, who are concentrated in the heart of these toxic sites. This refugee community, which emerged only in the past 10 to 15 years, is extremely poor. The girls' parents are mostly monolingual in one of seven different languages spoken; the girls said they had difficulty even in telling their parents about toxins in their native languages, which lack a word for "chemicals."

Sangre Latina, a theatrical group also in Richmond, has a mission to help young people, many of them former gang members, to use the medium of theater arts to improve their lives. Staff of this project selected eight young Latinos and Latinas, ranging in age from 10 to 17, to develop their awareness and profile, from their own perspective, the physical and mental health "risks" in their environment. These children had all witnessed people being shot, drugs being sold, and "drug houses" being burned to cover evidence. In preparation for a play that they wrote and performed in a prominent Bay Area cultural arts center, they discussed these features of their environment and drew out implications about the way teens and youth were cast as threats to community safety and as perpetrators of the social and environmental problems in Richmond.

Oakland: The Youth of Oakland United community action research project was conducted under the auspices of a well-established national community organizer training institute, the Center for Third World Organizing, which is seven years old and has over 500 member families across the city. Problems in the community around this multiracial, multiethnic, and predominantly low-income group include limited access to quality health care and education, and neighborhood safety. Oakland is a city divided geographically along racial lines. While east and west Oakland are predominately African American, the hill neighborhoods like Piedmont are predominately white.⁶ The health status of the residents is staggeringly different. Simply put, people die at a younger age in Oakland's low-income neighborhoods than they do in the hills (Haan et al., 1987). East and west Oakland experience higher violent crime rates and infant mortality rates that are twice as high as they are in the higher-income areas. Public facilities, such as playgrounds, are located closer to industrial sites and major freeways. A recent survey found high levels of lead contamination in some playgrounds in East Oakland.⁷ The Youth of Oakland United approach was to lead a broad coalition in developing a local city ballot initiative to increase the number of youth development programs in Oakland, which they see as necessary to reverse the escalation of youth crime.⁸

East Los Angeles: East L.A. is made up predominantly of Mexican-Americans and Mexican immigrants. It is a neighborhood that is also home to many industrial factories and businesses that bring toxic waste and air pollution. In a study of

young people who died violently in Los Angeles, 80% showed lung abnormalities (Sherwin, 1990). Air pollution is blown from other more affluent neighborhoods in Los Angeles, bringing with it high rates of asthma and other respiratory illnesses.⁹ In addition, as in Oakland, youth in East Los Angeles are more likely to die violent deaths at an early age. In this community, where members are addressing problems of unemployment and violence, the pilot project was organized by two community health educators working with the Multi-cultural Area Health Education Center and other local organizations. Fifteen young people took part; again, they selected issues relating to safe spaces for their research: the closure of libraries and the widespread use of alcohol in their community.

Tours and Mapping: The Social Landscape of Fear

Adults in each of the programs structured tours of the neighborhood and city environments. They guided children in mapping their environments using methods pioneered by Robin Moore (1989) and others for environmental education, in which realms of value are identified: places that children frequent in their everyday lives and places that are important for other reasons, such as their favorite places or sources of “environmental fear.”

Within Richmond, there was great variety in the tours between the two projects. The theater group visited various residential neighborhoods, San Quentin prison, and the Hilltop Shopping Mall. The girls in the environmental network were guided by environmental groups on “toxic tours,” which ranged from Richmond Harbor and other sites within their own neighborhoods, to North Richmond’s refineries and incinerators, and to Laotian Gardens, where health threats are posed by the high levels of lead and cadmium in the soil, parks, schools, and the city dump. In Oakland, the teens toured the public schools, parks, and recreation centers in the entire city, which they noticed are profoundly demarcated along class and spatial boundaries. In the hills, the facilities are abundant, safe, and usable because that is where wealth is concentrated; in the flatlands, where poverty is concentrated, public facilities, where they exist at all, are dilapidated. In East Los Angeles, the young people mapped the environment sequentially, from their homes to what they witnessed on walking tours from their homes, and to public housing and other public facilities within East Los Angeles.

The tours and mapping provided the children within each group with a common understanding of what they meant when they talked about their community or neighborhood, and their definitions included the social, emotional, and spiritual dimensions of their experience of the environment, as well as physical and economic spatialization. Their first reactions to the question of how to represent their environment were very emotional. For example, one youngster in East Los Angeles early on noted “killing of young people in my neighborhood affects us emotionally”¹⁰ as he made a bid for considering crime as an environmental issue to address. Noticing that “even in East Los Angeles there are differences

in what people see and encounter,” they agreed and expressed sadness that “there aren’t a lot of good role models in ELA...a lot of dropouts and people lacking in motivation.”

The Oakland youth agreed to focus on aspects of their environment that were “deeply felt by all of us,” that “affect us physically, mentally, and emotionally,” that “unite rather than divides us,” and they drew images depicting the rundown conditions of their schools and the violence, thugs, drugs, and diverse people on their neighborhood streets. At home, they described the environment by saying that their parents were “all worked out.”

The Southeast Asian girls said their maps and discussions about identity gave them “a chance to learn about the common parts of our culture,” despite being isolation from each other based on language barriers. Though all were Southeast Asian, the differences between their native languages kept them from feeling that they were in a community. They were Mien, Thaidam, Lao, Khmmu, and Hmong. They spoke of their common experience as first-generation bilingual immigrant children, who at a very early age interpreted for and shared power with their parents. Domestic violence surfaced as an environmental issue for them, as it did for the teens in Oakland.

The first thing the children in the Richmond theater group discussed was their vulnerability to being robbed or assaulted; “The people from here doesn’t make it bad, they come from other communities.” One boy offered at first, “The Blacks are doing it,” and “they break into your house hell of easy.” Another said, “I feel scared to take the bus because I’m afraid of being jumped.” One of the girls pointed out, “It doesn’t matter what race you are, today everybody is killing everybody else; Black with Black and Mexican with Mexican.” Reflecting on why their peers are killing each other, they offered the following ideas: “I think that it is money that is the problem”; and “This neighborhood is taken by Chevron. They want the land for business. The bourgeoisie have trashed this community.” They then began to describe what they saw in their community:

The neighborhood had changed.... What went wrong...guns, drugs, violence... It used to be beautiful and there used to be parks.... It used to be my home, but not anymore.... They want this land for waste...things die and are born all the time.¹¹

They described being scared: “...it feels like being under an avalanche, being cold and shaking: it feels like being in a shower with spiders all over.”

Perhaps unsurprisingly, conflict leading to the formation of gangs was racialized and threatened the safety of the children across all of these communities. As they tried to get beyond immediate racial stereotypes as reasons for the violence, they focused on issues such as the concentrations of wealth and poverty and the unequal allocation of public recreation and education opportunities, the power of large petrochemical companies to lay waste to their land, unresponsive government, and

parents who worked too hard and engaged in violence and alcoholism themselves within the home. To confirm and correct their impressions of the problems within their environments, and before choosing a course of remedial action to these problems, they were encouraged to construct surveys and canvass their peers, parents, neighbors, and community officials.

Participatory Action "Survey" Research

In each project, the youth conducted extensive research through personal interviews, mutually constructed surveys that were completed face to face with the person being surveyed.

The Southeast Asian girls interviewed their peers to gain their impressions of the safe and unsafe places in their neighborhoods. After learning about the water flows throughout the Bay Area, where they toured the estuaries and levies and learned about oil spills, they became concerned about the way toxic waste moves up the food chain and is magnified in the process. The waterways that were polluted, they discovered, were the places where their parents and relatives fished. They were alerted to the Chevron incinerator that burned hazardous waste for the pesticide factory and to the smoke stacks that billowed over the North Richmond residential area. A tour of the "Laotian Gardens," named after the Laotian family who was forced to move from there due to high levels of lead and cadmium in the soil, caused concern over the chemical content of the areas where their families grew their vegetables. So they added questions about fishing and gardening habits to their surveys. Their survey of 100 youth between the ages of 12 and 23 disclosed that 53% went outside their house to play or hang out, while 33% did not go out at all; that 37% hung out in unsafe places and 17% were in a gang. When asked where they did not feel safe because of gang activity, 18% said everywhere, 17% said school, 16% said North Richmond, four percent said their own neighborhoods, and three percent said the streets. The researchers then mapped the clean and safe places in Richmond and San Pablo.

The children in East Los Angeles randomly interviewed students at the high schools and their families and friends about what they considered to be the biggest problem in East L.A. In constructing the survey questions, they grappled with the meaning of the terms and the interconnectedness of the issues, striving for a definition of crime, for instance, that avoided facile answers. Since "poverty, pollution, and discrimination had effects as devastating as drug usage,"¹² the children determined them to be crimes. Initial surveys suggested that people were concerned about the closure of public facilities, especially libraries. Their findings premised that "lack of knowledge and information is at the root of the problems listed.... The library is a place where we can go and it is safe.... We like doing homework there."¹³ Thus, they next gathered information about the county's plan for closure of district hospitals and libraries and discovered that one county hospital and 15 libraries were slated to close in the L.A. area. Reviewing their data,

they began to link issues such as how increasing the hours of libraries might lead to a decrease in teen pregnancy and youth crime. Their governing hypothesis concerning library closures was that the budget deficit of \$1.2 million in East L.A. was responsible. To confirm this, they decided to conduct more research on the location of libraries to be closed, the year of accumulated deficit, and how much money is given to libraries. They also surveyed who uses the libraries. After analyzing the trend data in the city budgets over a 20-year period, they determined that library closures were not directly linked to lack of revenue. Rather, it was that libraries in East Los Angeles were not a priority for spending.

The Oakland youth conducted intensive field research on the need for safe and fun public places for Oakland youth. Teams conducted 300 surveys among youth, citywide.¹⁴ They also interviewed officials at recreation centers and held focus groups. Throughout this extensive field research they came to feel that youth in their neighborhoods are not important in the priority-setting processes of city officials. “They see us as nothing but troublemakers, gangsters” and “they make us look bad.” Their impressions were reinforced by their analysis of the difference between the Piedmont and Oakland city budgets. A \$250,000 difference between cities, favoring Piedmont where many fewer children lived, was found. In contrast to the Piedmont budget, none of the Oakland money was allotted to youth-specific programs. So, the young Oakland researchers met with Councilman Spees about the city budget. One of them explained their work in gathering information on youth recreation centers and surveying other youth around Oakland about their surroundings and recreation activities. They posed questions about the budget and the Councilman’s views on recreation activities. Meetings with Councilman Chang and Councilman Russo followed. Back at the office, with the survey information, brochures of existing youth centers, notes from various interviews, and statistics from the police department spread about the table, they began to organize their findings for their community presentation.

The theater group, *Sangre Latina*, interdigitated between their neighborhood tours, interviews, and script writing. For example, they interviewed a neonatologist about why babies were born prematurely. Incorporating what they learned into a script performed at St. Mary’s Cathedral in San Francisco, one girl portrayed a teen mother who fell in love with a boy who bit her repeatedly, and she had nowhere or no one to go to for help. The next performance was at a youth theater festival in San Francisco, where they became more acquainted with the work of young theater troupes. Their script for the pilot project took shape as the story of a “dysfunctional family” on a television talk show and discussed what in their environment they want to change.¹⁵

Every group organized a crowning community event to present their action research findings. *Sangre* presented their play; the East Los Angeles youth presented a program that included delivering 1,000 signatures on a petition to a City Council member to keep the public libraries open. The Oakland youth showed

the video they made to a packed room of community members and presented a policy statement to the City Council.¹⁶ The Richmond girls presented their survey results to a meeting of their families and friends.

Analysis

The study was designed to engage teenagers in identifying and exploring features of the local social and physical environment that might promote or inhibit their health. Therefore, we asked them to focus on places and people, to look at “place” holistically and remain alert to the cumulative or interactive impact of an individual’s local environment. This was in keeping with recent public health research that establishes the relationship between area and health in ways that go beyond identifying one single feature of the physical environment and disease at a time (Macintyre et al., 1993).

The overwhelming policy finding of our case study is that young people feel a lack of, and wish to create within their environment, “safe spaces” where they can enjoy access to the land and water, greater freedom of movement, and freedom from violence. They want a safe environment in which to play, recreate, and work. The study points to three domains within which safer spaces need to be created: public facilities, public space, and within the home. For the older youth of East Los Angeles, the priority was a facility — public libraries, where they felt safe and could do homework. Among the younger youth there, it was making their homes safer by working with parents on drug and alcohol education. Differences in public recreation areas and schools in their neighborhoods and other more affluent neighborhoods captured the attention of Oakland youth. In Richmond, the Southeast Asian girls’ lives are compromised by toxic pollution and a lack of “clean” open space. The Sangre group brought together their concerns about their inner lives and the violence they face every day, both environmentally and socially.

Regarding public facilities, these young people alerted us to the erosion of what Rodrick Wallace (1996) calls “community ecology,” that is, a program of planned shrinkage of public resources that has severe consequences for public health.¹⁷ The loss of libraries in East Los Angeles and the absence of recreation possibilities for the Oakland youth were linked in their minds with feelings of being more vulnerable to pernicious elements of street life, such as gangs, guns, drugs, and drug dealers. The dilapidated condition of the schools, of concern to the Oakland youth, is a visual marker of other important things missing in the schools as a result of lack of funding, such as sports and recreation possibilities.

Regarding open spaces, the children from the East Los Angeles and Richmond APEN projects said they were afraid to go out of doors and play. This is a dreadful situation, which clearly has consequences for their development. Children need play and interaction with their environment to develop creativity and especially need common spaces with access to ponds, trees to climb, wild animals, and

interaction with many other people (Moore, 1990; 1989). The whole neighborhood, not just the playgrounds, should be in the domain of children to play. They should be included in the world of adults, not isolated. Streets, alleys, all the places where adults go should be part of the child's world. Playgrounds should not be islands, but rather part of the neighborhood.

Unfortunately, urban space is usually planned by adults, with very little concern for, or input by, children. The result is an environment that is very often detrimental to the development of children, not only because of automobiles, homes with obvious safety problems, lead, and other environmental concerns, but also because of the alienation and isolation that the city engenders. We see our project as a step toward analyzing cities for their relationships and capabilities and for children and their promotion of health and wellness, as opposed to illness and disease.

Current policies regarding youth and safety are constructed with too little positive and too much negative attention paid to the space children occupy. Public policy reflects increased restrictions on teen activities (Eubanks, 1994). In particular, curfew laws have been reinstated in many communities, and skateboard laws have been added. Young people are being subjected to increasing regulation on the street, via publicity campaigns and through the role that youth services have been required to play (White, 1990). Also, school and other services are cut to pay for prisons, which young people say only makes youth crime *more* likely!

Conclusion

In every pilot project, it was the notion of safety that the children cared most about. They experienced a lack of places in their lives where they felt safe. The current policy dialogue on the issue of safety is much different; directed at inner-city and minority youth, its focus is on reducing violence and increasing incarceration through tough love and discipline. The youth in our case study did not mention increasing the juvenile justice budget or adding police as solutions to their problems with safety. Their policy solutions focused instead on increasing the number of safe common places where they could congregate and share, having more safe and toxic-free open space, and making home life a more peaceful place. These solutions are proscriptive and prevention oriented, and they represent an innovation in the concept of children's or community safety, a formulation that appreciates the significance of toxic-free neighborhoods, abundant public facilities, public access, community control over development, tax revenues to support public space, etc., to people's felt sense of safety. In one sense, the children are calling for a renewal of a type of public life and community that have been overshadowed by the privatization of social space. Their policy is based on well-being rather than "protection," and on notions of an environment structured to facilitate interaction rather than to prohibit contact by people who fear one another.

NOTES

1. The work of Pedro Noguera (1995) on youth perceptions toward violence is instructive and helps us understand the context in which young people assess their options.
2. *New York Times*, "Play Streets Set Apart" (July 22, 1920).
3. Mike Davis, "How Eden Lost Its Garden: Los Angeles and the Politics of Space." Annual Colloquium Series: The City (Center for Social Theory and Comparative History).
4. See also the work featured in a special issue of *Childhood* 2 (1994: 1–21), edited by Sharon Stephens, and in particular her article (Stephens, 1994) and that of Katz (1994).
5. See Michael Schwab's "Sharing Power: Participatory Public Health Research with California Teens" in this volume.
6. Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports* (1990).
7. *Oakland Tribune* (October 17, 1995).
8. This initiative resulted in the Oakland Children's Fund, approved by voters in the November 1996 election, which sets aside 2.5% of the city's general fund for programs benefiting children and youth for the next 12 years.
9. "Asthma Death Rate," *Los Angeles Times* (July 27, 1990: 21) and University of Southern California "Air Pollution Study" (p. 3).
10. "Monitors' Reports and Youth Assessments," East Los Angeles, *Children and the Environment Research Archive* (Summer 1995).
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid.*
14. They went to the Omega Boy's Club, Centro de Juventud, EBAYC, Sanborn, Project YES, and the West Oakland Health Center.
15. See "Mantel on the Table" in this volume.
16. See "How Oakland Turns Its Back on Teens: A Youth Perspective" in this volume.
17. These consequences include higher rates of violence, low birth weight, and AIDS.

REFERENCES

- Addams, Jane
1910 The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets. New York and London: The Macmillan Company: 6.
- Belliveau, M. et al.
1989 "Richmond at Risk: Community Demographics and Toxic Hazards from Industrial Polluters." Citizens for a Better Environment Report (February).
- Butterfield, Fox
1996 "State Revamping Youth Crime Laws." Youth Law News (May-June).
- Eubanks Owens, Patsy
1994 "Adolescence and the Cultural Landscape: Public Policy Design Decisions and Popular Press Reporting." Paper Submitted to Landscape and Urban Planning (September).
- Gaster, Sanford
1992 "Historical Changes in Children's Access to U.S. Cities: A Critical Review." Children's Environments 9,2.
- Haan, M., G.A. Kaplan, and T. Comacho
1987 "Poverty and Health: Prospective Evidence from the Alameda County Study." American Journal of Epidemiology 125: 989–999.

- Hart, R.
1997 *Children's Participation: Theory and Practice of Involving Young Citizens in Community Development and Environmental Care.* London: Earthscan Publications.
- Hillman, M. and J.G.U. Adams
1992 "Children's Freedom and Safety." *Children's Environments* 9,2.
- Jacobs, Jane
1961 *The Death and Life of Great American Cities.* New York: Vintage Books: 82.
- Katz, C.
1994 "Textures of Global Change: Eroding Ecologies of Childhood in New York and Sudan." Sharon Stephens (ed.), *Childhood* 2,1.
- Lubow, Bart
1995 Annie E. Casey Foundation, July 27, 1994, presentation at NCSL Annual Meeting, New Orleans. Reported in "Links Between Early Childhood Services, Juvenile Justice." *Youth Law News* (January-February).
- Lynch, K.
1977 *Growing Up in Cities: Studies of the Spatial Environment of Adolescence in Cracow, Melbourne, Mexico City, Touca, and Warszawa.* Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Macintyre, Sally, Shelia Maciver, and Anne Sooman
1993 "Area, Class, and Health: Should We Be Focusing on Places or People?" *Journal of Social Policy* 22,2: 213–234.
- Moore, Robin C.
1990 *Childhood's Domain: Play and Place in Child Development.* Berkeley, California: MIG Communications.
1989 "Collaborating with Young People to Assess Their Landscape Values." *Ekistics* 281 (March-April).
- Noguera, Pedro
1995 "Producing and Preventing Youth Violence: An Analysis of Causes and an Assessment of Successful Programs." In the *Wellness Lectures: The California Wellness Foundation and the University of California.*
- Noschis, K.
1992 "Child Development Theory and Planning for Neighborhood Play." *Children's Environments* 9,2.
- Sherwin, Russell P.
1990 "Findings." International Specialty Conference on Tropospheric Ozone and the Environment. Los Angeles, California (March).
- Shorter, Andrea D., Laurie Schaffner, and Shelley Schick
1996 "Out of Sight, Out of Mind: The Plight of Adolescent Girls in the San Francisco Juvenile Justice System." Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice Report (July) (1622 Folsom Street, 2nd Floor, San Francisco, California 94103).
- Stephens, Sharon
1994 "Children and Environment: Local Worlds and Global Connections." *Childhood* 2,1.
- Wallace, Rodrick
1996 "Urban Desertification, Public Health, and Public Disorder: Planned Shrinkages, Violent Death, Substance Abuse, and AIDS in the Bronx." *Social Science Medicine* 31,7: 801–813.
- White, Rob
1990 *No Space of Their Own; Young People and Social Control in Australia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.