
The Politics of Homelessness

A Call to Action

Maria Foscarinis

*National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty,
Washington, DC*

This article reviews the problem of homelessness from the perspective of an advocate who has been working to change national policy. The Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, an important initial step supported by advocates and (now) political leaders, is described as providing too few resources and limited programs. An agenda for policy change is proposed to deal with the dual problems of rapidly dwindling low-cost housing and inadequate income among the poor and homeless. It is hoped that psychologists and other professionals will get actively involved in creating such policy change.

Most people, confronted with homelessness, react by wanting to help (Oreskes, 1989; Toro & McDonell, 1990). Many also react with a sense of outrage at what seems to be a gross social injustice (Gold, 1989; R. L. Associates, 1988). A good number get involved, volunteering at shelters, donating goods, contributing money, and sometimes even offering professional services (American Institute of Architects, 1989; Devine, Mazzaferri, & Mitchell, 1989; Henkoff, 1989; Wohl, 1990). But despite public concern and response, homelessness is increasing (Reyes & Waxman, 1989).

In recent years, the federal government for the first time has provided some significant aid specifically targeted to the nation's homeless poor. Some funds have been distributed to shelters, soup kitchens, and other emergency operations (Foscarinis & Friedman, 1989; Interagency Council on the Homeless, 1989). But despite rhetoric to the contrary, virtually no action has been taken to address the underlying causes of homelessness (Bush, 1989; Hoffman, 1988; Ifill, 1989, 1990a).

Public concern is fueling increasing emergency efforts by both the public and private sectors, but these efforts have not yet been translated into the national, governmental leadership necessary for true, long-term solutions (Ifill, 1990b; Reyes & Waxman, 1989). Indeed, all signs are that there is currently a wide gap between public concern and government response (Plissner, 1989; "Poll Finds US," 1990).

Such gaps are not unique to homelessness. But, perhaps more than other social problems, homelessness is susceptible to this dichotomy between public concern and action (Rich, 1990). Deprived of the basics necessary for human survival, homeless persons are as a practical, and often legal, matter almost completely disenfranchised from the political process ("Voting Rights," 1990). In-

deed, without the involvement of those who are not homeless, effective political organizing concerning homelessness is extremely difficult. Yet, such organizing is necessary to turn public concern into public policy (Kosterlitz, 1987).

When I first arrived in Washington, DC, in late 1985, I became involved in securing an initial response from a federal government that, up to that point, had provided virtually no relief to the nation's homeless (Ifill, 1990b). I began visiting congressional offices in an effort to solicit support for an ambitious legislative proposal. I was quickly informed, often quite bluntly, that although the proposal was sound, on point, and of course, morally right, it was too risky politically. There was an election coming up and homeless people did not vote. Coordination of an active, national network of voting constituents, able to pressure their elected representatives, then became a priority. With the help of this network, as well as the support of many allied groups (including the Children's Defense Fund, Community for Creative Non-Violence, and American Psychological Association), significant headway was possible. One and one half years later, the first comprehensive, albeit emergency, federal response to homelessness became law.

Renewed and increased public pressure is now necessary to press for long-term—not merely emergency—solutions to homelessness. Generalized public concern must be channeled into focused demands for solutions. In the absence of concerted public pressure, leaders in government are unlikely to respond.

This article briefly reviews, from an advocate's perspective, the recent history of homelessness in the United States. The article outlines primary causes of homelessness, summarizes remedial actions taken at the national level to date, and then provides an agenda for moving beyond emergency relief toward permanent solutions. Because progress will require tremendous effort, the article also outlines some strategies that involve all concerned citizens, including psychologists. It ends with a plea. Enough words—including these—have been written. Now is the time for action.

The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Carol Wayman in the preparation of this article.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Maria Foscarinis, National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 918 F Street, N.W., Suite 412, Washington, DC 20004.

The Growth of Homelessness in America

Prior to the 1980s, homelessness was often represented in the form of a single, White, male alcoholic, living on the skid row of a large city (Bahr, 1970; Bogue, 1963; Rossi, 1989). Perhaps too conveniently, this stereotype served to define homeless persons as aberrant, not members of "our" society (Stark, 1987).

But in the past 10 years, this picture has changed in virtually every respect. First, the numbers have exploded. More Americans are homeless now than at any time since the Great Depression (Hopper & Hamberg, 1986). By conservative estimates, upward of 700,000 persons are homeless on any given night (Burt, 1988; Congressional Budget Office, 1990), and according to annual surveys of cities around the country, the rate of growth is averaging about 25% each year (Reyes & Waxman, 1989).

Perhaps even more significantly, homelessness now affects a broad cross-section of the population (Rossi, 1989; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1988). More than one third of the homeless poor are members of families, about one fourth are children, and about one fourth are employed full- or part-time (Jordan, 1988; Reyes & Waxman, 1989). Homelessness is on the rise in suburban and rural areas, as well as in big cities (Enzer, 1983; Drogin, 1989; Hopper, 1989; House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, 1984).

But the most important and dangerous development is also the least visible. According to recent research, growing numbers of impoverished families are doubled- and tripled-up, just a step away from the streets (Rossi, 1989). In New York City, doubled-up families in public housing units alone outnumber those who are homeless by a factor of 20 to 1 (Hopper, 1989). Increasingly, homelessness is simply the last stop on a continuum of deepening poverty (Hopper & Hamberg, 1986).

Recent government data confirm that this phenomenon is both widespread and likely to worsen. According to 1989 Census Bureau figures, almost one half of all poor, renter households and almost one third of all poor homeowners now spend at least 70% of their income on housing (Shapiro, 1989). This means that a very large group of poor persons, almost 10 million Americans, are now at serious risk of homelessness (Leonard, Dolbeare, & Lazere, 1989; U.S. General Accounting Office [GAO], 1990). Any unexpected expense can send any one of these persons over the edge and onto the streets. Indeed, a researcher at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology recently estimated that, if present trends continue, 18 million persons will be homeless by the end of the century (Clay, 1987).

Causes of the Crisis

In Washington, DC, the conventional wisdom is that the causes of homelessness are complex (Interagency Council on the Homeless, 1989). This view has validity, inasmuch as each homeless person reaches the streets through a

complicated and multifaceted individual path (Rossi, 1989). But in political circles, this supposed complexity often operates as a justification for inaction ("Homelessness in America," 1989). Viewed as a social rather than an individual phenomenon, homelessness is not mysterious nor are its causes difficult to fathom (Cuomo, 1983; Hopper & Hamberg, 1986). Indeed, the growth of homelessness should be no surprise. It is the predictable result of government policies.

Housing

From 1981 through 1989, federal housing programs for the poor were cut by more than 75% (Barancik, 1989). Although federal housing programs had never been adequate to meet the needs of all eligible poor persons, by 1989 waiting lists for federal housing programs averaged two years in most major cities. In 67% of 27 cities surveyed, the lists were so long that they were closed (Reyes & Waxman, 1989).

At the same time, urban redevelopment projects, begun in the 1970s, contributed to the destruction of low-cost units in the private housing market (Wright & Lam, 1987). Although these projects may have had some benefits, they also displaced hundreds of thousands of poor persons, without making any provision for replacement housing (C. Hartman, 1988). During the 1970s alone, about one half of the nation's total stock of single-room-occupancy units, a traditional source of inexpensive housing, was destroyed (Hopper & Hamberg, 1986).

In the past few years, the effects of rising housing costs have been felt by most Americans. Members of the middle class can no longer afford, or must delay, the purchase of their own home (C. Hartman, 1988; Stone, 1990). Poor Americans pay increasing proportions of their income in rent (Shapiro, 1989), and the poorest of the poor have been pushed out altogether to the shelters and to the streets.

Income

At the same time that the supply of affordable housing has shrunk, social safety-net programs have been cut as well (Rossi, 1989). During the 1980s, federal programs for the poor—including food programs, welfare benefits for poor mothers and children, and social security benefits for the elderly and disabled—were slashed (GAO, 1985). Millions of needy persons, dependent on these programs as an income source or supplement, had their benefits terminated or reduced (Children's Defense Fund, 1989).

Similarly, working persons have faced increasing hardships. During the past decade, structural economic changes left many without jobs (Hopper, 1989). A low minimum wage, raised for the first time since 1981 in April 1990, has left many working families in poverty (Barancik, 1989). Indeed, full-time work at the current minimum wage of \$4.25 leaves a family of three about \$1,000 below the poverty line.

As a result, over the past decade, poor Americans have had to make do with ever-decreasing resources (Barancik, 1989). For the poorest of the poor, facing decreasing

resources and rising housing costs, homelessness was the predictable result.

Emergency Relief: The Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act

On July 22, 1987, President Reagan signed the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act into law. It was a landmark event, the first comprehensive federal response to homelessness. But President Reagan signed the new law at night. The official White House statement was that he did so in order to show his "reluctance" in approving the measure (Pear, 1987).

Five years earlier, a Reagan administration official had stated publicly that "no one is living on the streets" (*Boston Globe*, June 17, 1982; cited in Hopper & Hamberg, 1986). In 1983, presidential advisor Edwin Meese claimed that soup kitchens were a "free lunch" for persons not truly in need (Engel & Sargent, 1983). And in 1984, President Reagan expressed the opinion that some of those living on the street were there "by their own choice" (Green & MacColl, 1987, p. 162; Roberts, 1988, p. A1). Against this backdrop, enactment of the McKinney Act, with its finding that homelessness is a national crisis to which the federal government must respond, was a truly significant political and legal step forward.

President Reagan was forced to sign a bill he did not support because the political climate surrounding homelessness had changed. But it changed only as a result of extraordinary effort and pressure. As described earlier in this article, the original congressional response to legislation for homeless persons was to dismiss the idea out of hand inasmuch as such persons did not vote. To counter this response, I helped organize a national network of activists, service providers, and concerned citizens who *did* vote and who could be called on to send letters, make calls, and pay visits to their representatives in Congress.

Organizing made a critical difference. Previously indifferent legislators acquired a compassion for the homeless poor after receiving letters from constituents urging them to support legislation for homeless persons. At the same time, the organization of a lobbying campaign in Washington, DC, centered on a specific legislative proposal drafted by advocates, provided a focal point that galvanized the network.

As a result of these efforts, the original legislative proposal was introduced in both houses of Congress in June 1986, with more than 65 cosponsors, including many who had previously scoffed at the idea of legislation designed to help homeless persons. An ambitious bill, the Homeless Persons' Survival Act (1986) addressed three main issues: emergency relief, preventive measures, and long-term solutions. In October 1986, the first small pieces of the bill became law (Havemann, 1986a, 1986b).

In early 1987, advocates began an intensive campaign to secure support for the McKinney Act, which consisted of the first major section of the larger Survival Act (Kosterlitz, 1987). Working with other national groups, I helped organize a lobbying campaign in Washington, DC, while also coordinating the grass roots lob-

bying network. Other activists began a vigil, maintained throughout the winter, on a heat grate in front of the Capitol. In the spring of 1987, Congress passed the bill with large, bipartisan majorities.

The McKinney Act provided and continues to provide significant aid to the nation's homeless poor. It created 20 new programs that operate primarily by allocating federal funds to states, local governments, and private nonprofit organizations. Since 1987, approximately \$2.4 billion in federal dollars have been appropriated to fund McKinney programs.

Most of the McKinney programs are emergency in nature. A series of shelter programs provides funds for the acquisition, rehabilitation, and operation of emergency shelters. Some funds are also available for transitional housing (longer term shelter coupled with supportive services), and a very modest amount of funds are available for permanent housing for single homeless adults. Another group of programs provide funds for health and mental health care for persons in shelters and on the streets. Funded projects include mobile vans and outreach teams. A surplus property program requires federal agencies to make unused property available as facilities for homeless persons.

There is no doubt that these programs meet critical needs (U.S. Conference of Mayors, 1988), but there is also no doubt that they are grossly inadequate. Because the McKinney Act provides almost exclusively emergency relief, it cannot even begin to address the underlying causes of homelessness (GAO, 1990). It is inadequate as an emergency measure as well. For each program funded, there are many more worthy applications (DeParle, 1990a; Foscarinis & Friedman, 1989; U.S. Conference of Mayors, 1988).

Beyond the McKinney Act

Given the McKinney Act's limitations, it is clear that much more needs to be done. Long-term solutions must address the causes, not merely the symptoms, of homelessness. A new agenda must be defined, and a new campaign mounted.

The political landscape has changed since the original campaign was initiated in 1985. Certainly the rhetoric has changed. Members of Congress no longer overtly dismiss legislative proposals to address homelessness ("The Homeless Become," 1987). Members of the executive branch no longer appear in the national media to blame homeless persons for their plight. Indeed, the Bush Administration has expressly acknowledged that homelessness is a "national tragedy" deserving "highest priority" (Ifill, 1989).

These are important changes because rhetoric has enormous symbolic significance and can ignite new leadership. But rhetoric alone cannot house homeless people. The danger is that rhetoric may be mistaken for action, and the public may be misled into believing that true solutions have been offered (Ifill, 1990a; Rosenthal, 1989).

Another threat looms as well. As homelessness acquires legitimacy as a political issue, it may also acquire

acceptability as a social phenomenon. The danger is that politicians, and perhaps members of the public, will begin to label the homeless as just another special interest group clamoring for a piece of the pie.

Such a shift in perception could have serious consequences. The public's perception of homelessness as an acceptable social phenomenon could translate into a perception of emergency measures as acceptable permanent solutions (Bennett, 1990). But emergency measures, although desperately needed, are not effective solutions (Kozol, 1988). Ultimately, the danger is that the legitimization of homelessness will lead to its institutionalization (see Toro, Trickett, Wall, & Salem, 1991, this issue).

The emergence of homelessness as a serious issue on the national political scene also clearly brings enormous benefits. It has catalyzed and been fueled by the involvement of myriad outside organizations in the battle to end homelessness ("The Homeless Become," 1987; Kosterlitz, 1987). No longer limited to a small group of activists, this battle has now become a movement that encompasses professional organizations, activists in other areas, and even members of the corporate sector (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 1990). Although the concern of these groups cannot alone provide long-term solutions to homelessness, properly focused, this expanded constituency could bring enormous pressure to bear on government leaders.

The legitimization of homelessness has removed some of the political riskiness that previously impeded remedial action. It has created potentially powerful new alliances. But these successes also bring with them a new, perhaps more subtle, set of dangers. More than ever before, informed, persistent, and vocal public pressure is needed.

An Agenda to End Homelessness

Any national agenda for long-term solutions to homelessness must address its underlying causes. Given those causes, two basic areas should form the foundation of such an agenda: housing and income. A third area, civil rights, should be included to address the exclusion of homeless persons from the political process. In some cases, existing programs may be expanded to address these areas and, in other cases, new initiatives are needed (Foscarinis, 1990a).

Housing

At the very minimum, funds cut from federal housing programs—some \$25 billion over the past 10 years (Leonard et al., 1989)—should be restored (Mickey Leland Peace Dividend Housing Assistance Act, 1990). In addition, unused existing resources should be mobilized quickly and cost-effectively to increase the supply of low-income housing.

Unused city property. Many cities hold in rem properties. These are buildings that have been foreclosed by city governments, usually for failure of their owners to pay taxes, and have become city-owned property. Typ-

ically, they stand vacant and abandoned. They should be converted into affordable housing for homeless persons.

Unused federal property. The federal government is by far the largest owner of real property in the United States. Across the country, federal agencies hold more than 700 million acres of land and more than 450,000 buildings (Foscarinis, 1990a). As a result of foreclosure proceedings, federal agencies also own more than 100,000 units of single family housing (B. Vento, personal communication, September 8, 1990), and as a result of the Base Closure Act, at least 10,000 units of vacant military housing will become available over the next five years (Foscarinis, 1990a).

Title V of the McKinney Act now requires certain of these properties to be made available for short-term use by homeless persons. This provision should be strengthened and expanded to allow all unused federal property to be converted into permanent housing for homeless persons. Given adequate rehabilitation and operating funds, these properties could provide significant long-term relief.

Income

As a practical matter, lack of adequate income is the other side of the affordable housing crisis. Rising housing costs combined with shrinking incomes force poor persons to choose between paying the rent and putting food on the table. Two aspects of the income problem must be addressed: inadequate wages for the working poor and inadequate welfare benefits for those unable to work.

Wages. Currently, full-time work at the new minimum wage by one wage earner leaves a family of four more than \$3,000 below the poverty line. Taking child care costs into account, the addition of a second wage earner leaves the family barely better off (Ellwood, 1989). Given high housing costs, such families are, if not actually homeless, at serious risk of homelessness (Rossi, 1989). The minimum wage should be increased to a level sufficient to lift working families out of poverty. In addition, job training programs for homeless persons should be expanded (see Foscarinis, Simon, & Wayman, in press; Toro et al., 1991).

Income support. Current income-support programs fail to adequately assist homeless persons. Many homeless persons do not receive benefits to which they are legally entitled, and benefit levels are often inadequate to meet basic needs, including housing (Ely, Donovan, & Hopper, 1988; Foscarinis, 1990b).

Many elderly and disabled homeless persons, eligible for benefits under the Social Security Act, do not receive them. According to the Congressional Budget Office, 35% of all homeless persons are eligible for benefits, but only 4% actually receive them (Congressional Budget Office, 1990; DeParle, 1990b; Tessler & Dennis, 1989). Isolated, without resources, and in some cases mentally disabled, homeless persons are either unaware of benefits or unable to comply unassisted with the complex application process. Although some efforts in this direction are beginning to be implemented by the U.S. Social Security Admin-

istration and other agencies, more outreach should be conducted to ensure that homeless persons receive the benefits to which they are entitled.

Properly implemented, such outreach could help provide a route out of the streets for mentally disabled homeless persons. Disability benefits could be used to help finance supervised permanent housing. Small scale, nonprofit models for such housing are now in place (DeParle, 1990b). Aggressive outreach, coupled with additional housing assistance, is needed to expand such existing efforts to meet the much larger, nationwide need.

Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) is the major federal aid program for poor mothers and their children. In about one half the states, it is also a source of emergency aid, including shelter ("Homeless Mothers," 1990). However, benefit levels are abysmally low. In 1987, median AFDC payments for a family of three were only 47% of the federal poverty level. According to 1988 data, in only one state (Alaska) does the shelter portion of AFDC benefits meet the federal government's own fair market rent levels (Ely et al., 1988). This means that poor families receiving these benefits are necessarily unable to afford housing. They must rent substandard housing, double- or triple-up with other families, or become homeless. Benefit levels should be tied to housing costs.

Civil Rights

In many parts of the country, permanent address requirements bar homeless persons from voting (Smith, 1987; "Voting Rights for Homeless Persons," 1990b). Although persons struggling to meet basic survival needs are likely to be disenfranchised by the objective circumstances of their lives, there is no justification for their legal disenfranchisement. Guaranteeing the right to vote would constitute public acknowledgment that homeless persons are citizens, possessing political rights. Federal law should guarantee a right to vote for all otherwise-eligible homeless persons.

A Strategy for Action

A substantive agenda is a necessary prerequisite to action, but it is not sufficient. The adoption of solutions to social problems does not depend on the merits of a given proposal. It depends on pressure. Of course, the immediate response by many, if not most, politicians to the agenda outlined earlier will be to cite the budget deficit. But it is important to note that many of these proposals seek to provide relief (such as disability benefits) to which homeless persons are already legally entitled or to mobilize resources (such as vacant buildings) that are not currently being used. The Congressional Budget Office publishes data documenting unneeded existing programs, including military expenditures, that could pay for these proposals many times over (R. Hartman, 1988). However, the most important point is that, given a sufficiently acute sense of urgency, the federal government can find the resources. For instance, it has done so for the savings and loan industry. As of this writing, the federal government will

spend over \$500 billion over the next 10 years to bail out this industry (Thomas, 1990).

This takes us back to the starting point of this article. Public concern is not enough. Rather, focused public pressure is necessary to translate legislative proposals into legislative action. Long-term solutions to homelessness require an informed public that is prepared to demand that its representatives in government take meaningful action.

Using the agenda outlined, advocates for homeless people are organizing a campaign for long-term relief beyond the McKinney Act (Foscarinis, 1990a). To join this effort, concerned citizens and members of professional associations should exert as much pressure as possible on elected public officials. Several steps, which will be outlined here, can be taken toward this end. They are as follows:

Educate others. Up-to-date information on pending legislative proposals is available from organizations such as the National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, the National Coalition for the Homeless, and the Low-Income Housing Coalition. Such information should be disseminated as widely as possible through newsletters, conferences, and other available means. This will help to create the informed public that is necessary to exert effective pressure on political leaders.

Contact representatives in government. Members of Congress are eager to hear from their constituents. Concerned citizens should take maximum advantage of their status as voters. By making clear that they care about this issue and that they vote, members of the public can exert significant pressure on their representatives in government.

Organize. Organizational pressure can be extremely effective. Members of the professions should press organizations to which they belong to take a stand on the issue of homelessness. Many professional groups, including the American Psychological Association, have staff engaged in lobbying in Washington, DC. Members should also consider participating themselves in lobbying efforts mounted by their organizations.

Writing about homelessness always seems to me to be a strange undertaking. Of course, as I just emphasized, education is important. Without presuming that this article serves that purpose, I note that the sense of strangeness nevertheless remains. One of the worst things about life in Washington, DC is the seemingly endless proliferation of studies, commissions, and committees. Although I support information gathering, I am also troubled because it seems sometimes to justify the avoidance of action.

Homelessness is not just a "problem." It is human beings living on the streets, eating out of garbage cans, and dressing in rags. It is desperate need amid overwhelming abundance. And each year, it is death in the streets. Homelessness is intolerable in the United States at the end of the 20th century; it should shock our conscience. This fundamental fact, more than any analysis, should guide all of us in demanding solutions.

REFERENCES

- American Institute of Architects. (1989). *The search for shelter: Program update*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Bahr, H. M. (1970). *Disaffiliated man: Essays and bibliography on skid row, vagrancy, and outsiders*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Barancik, S. (1989). *Poverty rate and household income stalemate as rich-poor gap hits post-war high*. Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.
- Bennett, S. (1990). Heartbreak hotel. *Maryland Journal of Contemporary Legal Issues*, 1, 27-96.
- Bogue, D. J. (1963). *Skid row in American cities*. Chicago: University of Chicago, Community and Family Study Center.
- Burt, M. (1988). *Memorandum to food and nutrition service, Department of Agriculture*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Bush, G. (1989, February). *Proposed budget*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Children's Defense Fund. (1989). *A vision for America's future*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Clay, P. L. (1987). *At risk of loss: The endangered future of low-income rental housing resources*. Washington, DC: National Reinvestment Corporation.
- Congressional Budget Office. (1990). *Preliminary cost estimate for the homeless outreach act of 1990*. Unpublished manuscript. (Available from Maria Foscarinis, National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 918 F St., N.W., Suite 412, Washington, DC)
- Cuomo, M. (1983). *Never again: A report to the national governors' association task force on the homeless*. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.
- DeParle, J. (1990a, February 12). Bush homeless plan: "Godsend or false hopes." *New York Times*, pp. A1, B8.
- DeParle, J. (1990b, July 1). Federal cash for the homeless: It's there but tough to get. *New York Times*, p. 11.
- Devine, S., Mazzaferri, K., & Mitchell, J. (1989, summer). *State and local bar association programs*. Chicago: American Bar Association.
- Drogin, B. (1989, March 28). Homelessness: Beyond the big cities. *Los Angeles Times*, p. 1.
- Ellwood, D. (1989). *Poor support*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ely, L., Donovan, S., & Hopper, K. (1988). *Over the edge: Homeless families and the welfare system*. Washington, DC: National Coalition for the Homeless.
- Engel, M., & Sargent, E. (1983, December 11). Meese's hunger remarks stir more outrage among groups. *Washington Post*, p. A1.
- Enzer, H. (1983). *Report to the Nassau Action Coalition*, Nassau County, New York: Hofstra University.
- Foscarinis, M. (1990a, July). *Beyond homelessness: An agenda for the 1990s*. Washington, DC: National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty.
- Foscarinis, M. (1990b, March). *Social security: Broken promise to America's homeless*. Washington, DC: National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty.
- Foscarinis, M., & Friedman, L. (1989, November). *The Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act: An analysis of its current status*. Washington, DC: National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty.
- Foscarinis, M., Simon, M., & Wayman, C. (in press). *A path towards self-sufficiency: Job training for the homeless*. Washington, DC: National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty.
- Gold, A. (1989, October 8). Thousands march on Washington in protest against homelessness. *New York Times*, p. 24.
- Green, M., & MacColl, G. (1987). *Reagan's reign of error*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Hartman, C. (1988). Decent, affordable housing for all. In M. Raskin & C. Hartman (Eds.), *Winning America*. (pp. 190-200). Boston: South End Press.
- Hartman, R. (Ed.). (1988). *Reducing the deficit: Spending and revenue options*. Washington, DC: Congressional Budget Office.
- Havemann, J. (1986a, October 21). Anti-drug bill would require national licenses for truckers. *Washington Post*, p. 9.
- Havemann, J. (1986b, October 28). Reagan signs anti-drug bill. *Washington Post*, p. 9.
- Henkoff, R. (1989, August 14). Is greed dead? *Fortune*, pp. 40-49.
- Hoffman, D. (1988, December 20). Kemp chosen for HUD; "innovative ideas" urged. *Washington Post*, pp. A1, A8.
- The homeless become an issue. (1987, February 7). *New York Times*, p. 8.
- Homeless mothers denied benefits. (1990, June). In *Just Times* (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty), p. 2.
- Homeless Persons' Survival Act (1986). H.R. 5140, S. 2608.
- Homelessness in America—The need for permanent housing: Hearings before the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development*. (1989). 101 Congress, 2nd Session, 5.
- Hopper, K. (1989). The ordeal of shelter. *Noire Dame Journal of Law Ethics and Public Policy*, 4, 301-323.
- Hopper, K., & Hamberg, J. (1986). *The making of America's homeless: From skid row to new poor: 1945-1984*. In R. G. Bratt, C. Hartman, & A. Meyerson (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on housing* (pp. 12-40). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. (1984). *Homelessness in America: Hearings before the subcommittee on housing and community development*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Ifill, G. (1989, January 28). Kemp pledges campaign to help nation's poor. *Washington Post*, p. A4.
- Ifill, G. (1990a, March 21). Kemp pressed on plans to cut housing programs. *Washington Post*, p. A12.
- Ifill, G. (1990b, July 22). The house Mitch built. *Washington Post*, pp. C1-C2.
- Interagency Council on the Homeless. (1989). *Annual report*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Jordan, M. (1988, August 19). In '87, 83% in N. Va. shelters were employed, study says. *Washington Post*, pp. D1, D4.
- Kosterlitz, J. (1987, February 28). They're everywhere. *National Journal*, pp. 492-494.
- Kozol, J. (1988). *Rachel and her children*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Leonard, P., Dolbear, C., & Lazere, E. (1989). *A place to call home*. Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.
- Mickey Leland Peace Dividend Housing Assistance Act of 1990. H.R. 4621.
- National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty. (1990, August). *List of organizations endorsing legislation for the homeless*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Oreskes, M. (1989, August 23). Poverty is perceived as increasing and state of the poor is unimproved. *New York Times*, p. A11.
- Pear, R. (1987, July 24). President signs \$1 billion in homeless aid. *New York Times*, p. 1.
- Plissner, M. (1989, January). *Poll: Expectations—great and not so great—of Bush*. [Press release]. New York: CBS News/New York Times.
- Poll finds US expects peace dividend. (1990, January 25). *New York Times*, p. B9.
- Reyes, L., & Waxman, L. D. (1989). *A status report on hunger and homelessness in America's cities: 1989*. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Mayors.
- Rich, S. (1990, July 19). Giving a hand, not a handout. *Washington Post*, p. A21.
- R. L. Associates. (1988, April). *Poll*. Princeton, NJ: National Housing Institute.
- Roberts, S. (1988, December 23). Reagan on homelessness: Some choose to live in the streets. *New York Times*, p. A1.
- Rosenthal, A. (1989, November 11). Bush offers housing plan to aid poor, homeless and new buyers. *New York Times*, p. 1.
- Rossi, P. (1989). *Down and out in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Shapiro, I. (1989). *Working for less*. Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.
- Smith, E. (1987). Disenfranchisement of homeless persons. *Journal of Urban and Contemporary Law*, 31, 225-239.
- Stark, L. (1987). Blame the system, not its victims. In J. Kneerim, *Homelessness: Critical issues for policy and practice* (pp. 7-11). Boston: Boston Foundation.
- Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, 42 U.S.C. Section 11301 et. seq. (1987; amended 1988).
- Stone, M. (1990). *One third of a nation*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.

- Tessler, R., & Dennis, D. (1989). *A synthesis of NIMH-funded research concerning persons who are homeless and mentally ill*. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Mental Health.
- Thomas, P. (1990, July 31). Thrift bailout to require \$100 billion in next 12 months, Bush officials say. *Wall Street Journal*, pp. A1-A2.
- Toro, P. A., & McDonell, D. M. (1990). *Beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge about homelessness: A survey of the general public*. Unpublished manuscript, State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Toro, P. A., Trickett, E. J., Wall, D. D., & Salem, D. A. (1991). Homelessness in the United States: An ecological perspective. *American Psychologist*, 46, 1208-1218.
- U.S. Conference of Mayors. (1988). *A status report on the Stewart B. McKinney homeless assistance act of 1987*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (1988). *A report on the 1988 national survey of shelters for the homeless*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Government Accounting Office. (1985). *Homelessness: A complex problem and the federal response*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. General Accounting Office. (1990). *Report to the Congress: Homelessness*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Voting rights for homeless persons. (1990, July). *In Just Times* (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty), p. 2.
- Wohl, A. (1990, August). Gimmee shelter: Lawyering for the homeless. *ABA Journal*, 78, 58-62.
- Wright, J. D., & Lam, J. A. (1987). Homelessness and the low-income housing supply. *Social Policy*, 17(4), 49-53.