

THE CONSTRUCTION OF POVERTY AND HOMELESSNESS IN US CITIES

I. Susser

Anthropology Department, Hunter College, City University of New York, 695 Park Avenue, New York, NY, 10021

KEY WORDS: underclass, increasing inequality, poor households, gender conflict, inner city

ABSTRACT

The review focuses on analyses of the creation of culture among poor populations in the United States whose lives have been structured by residing at the center of the global economy. Literature is examined concerning the changing construction of labor, space, time, and identity in the new poverty. Throughout, the review examines the generation of poverty and questions of gender, race, political mobilization, and resistance. This outline of current research provides a framework for an analysis of the violence and conflict generated by the lowering of wages and the reduction of leisure time.

Introduction

As poverty increases worldwide and the gap between rich and poor grows ever greater, the poor have become invisible, marginalized, or excluded from public view. This change has been little considered in the anthropological literature (156, 245). While there has been some significant research in the field (see below), the level of interest has yet to reflect the increasing inequality and poverty generated within the global economy of advanced capitalism.

While the immiseration of the American worker, deindustrialization, and the shift to service industries are everywhere reported, theory about growing poor populations in the midst of corporate wealth is less common. As large populations in Africa, Latin America, and other areas are consigned to sweatshop conditions; below-subsistence wages; and a decline in already inadequate health, sanitation, and social services, theories of advanced capitalism have focused on the growth of cyberspace, tourism and shifting worlds, iden-

tities, and perceptions. While identifying these issues as theoretical challenges, anthropologists have rarely viewed the increasing poverty among both urban and rural populations as requiring the same level of analysis.

Homeless populations in the United States are not large, according to the general census (26, 87, 89–91, 96, 123). However, they are one of the few highly visible and public signs of the increasing poverty of millions of Americans. They have emerged as a symbol of the new poverty in the United States (84–86, 141, 201, 247). Political concern for housing the homeless, or at least removing them from the streets and subways, stems from the need to make the increasing inequality to which the majority of the residents are subject invisible, individual, and private (141, 142, 201). Consequently, studies of the homeless in the United States address how poverty is represented as well as how the poor are treated and the way they live their lives.

Recent concerns about the so-called underclass must be viewed in the same context. While the underclass constitutes only about 11% of the poor population of the United States (33), literature about the underclass by sociologists, psychologists, political scientists, educators, social workers, and health providers constitutes by far the largest proportion of research about poverty in this country in the past decade (4, 33, 41, 44, 97–99, 101, 103, 105, 106, 134, 156, 172, 219, 234–237, 245, 246, 249, 253). Once again, this group may be more visible and more subject to public scrutiny. Almost by definition members of the underclass are in direct conflict with public institutions, either through substance abuse, the criminal justice system, mental institutions, foster care, vagrancy and homelessness, or at the very least in their need for public assistance (4, 33, 219). Other poor people who manage to avoid interaction with public institutions are labeled the “deserving” poor and are left out of discussions of the underclass. This distinction between the deserving and the undeserving poor is an old one and can be traced back several hundred years (175, 234). In social science its roots may be found in familiar categories such as the “hardliving” poor, whose lives contrast with those apparently able to maintain middle-class norms more successfully (95, 179). Such disparaging contrasts were criticized in ethnographies of the late 1960s and early 1970s that demonstrated the situational basis for “hustling” and many of the other characteristics described as “hardliving” norms (121, 203, 231).

Concerning poverty in the global economy and its place in current theories of advanced capitalism, we can identify two opposing conceptualizations of the poor in the postmodern world, or the new world “disorder” (30). First, there is the view that the poor are irrelevant to the global economy. Not only are the poor invisible, but their labor is no longer viewed as necessary. Deindustrialization in the core countries is a reflection of a decreasing need for manual workers worldwide, which presages a reduction in the needed work force to fewer, more highly educated people who will be involved in the new

informational technology. Low-skilled service workers will still be necessary but not in the numbers of the previously industrialized work force. The export of industry to poorer countries represents not only a search for cheaper labor but also an overall reduction in the central importance of that labor within world capitalism. Thus, from this theoretical perspective, the structural adjustment policies of the International Monetary Fund and similar policies pursued in the United States and Europe result from an abandonment of populations whose labor and health is no longer necessary to production in the global economy (29, 30, 186, 221).

The opposing view is that labor in industrial production is still crucial and central to the global economy. However, the export of production from the center to the less media-visible periphery, and the development of the informational service economy, is an outright assault on working-class populations. The departure of industry from the strongly unionized welfare states that constituted the core of modern capitalism represents the ongoing search for cheaper, weaker, unorganized labor associated with less regulated state intervention. This is one more step in the battle for control of production and the extraction of profit (16, 68, 69). In addition, the shift to hiring more women, as well as the creation of an uneven post-Fordist work force in the United States and parts of Europe, can be incorporated into this argument (13, 82, 153, 178).

While the first view implies that many workers are no longer needed and that massive populations of poverty are a drain on and a threat to nation-states and the world economy, the second view suggests a massive reserve army of labor—the poor—that depresses all workers' wages. This reserve army is available to be integrated into the work force and then to be discarded in relation to the needs of the global economy (234).

To assess the adequacy of these two views, we need to consider what in fact constitutes an effective reserve work force at different historical periods with different effects on inequality, poverty, and social welfare (15, 195, 225). Nation-states, employers, and working-class movements define differently over time the categories of people available to work. As social programs and regulations shift, so too do the people who can be viewed as reserve labor. For certain historical periods in the United States, women, children, and the elderly have been legislated out of the work force. At other times they have been recruited to fill employment needs. Such changes can be perceived in the history of laws about child labor, in protective legislation for women, and in the conflicting and historically fluid approaches of feminists, unions, and the state to such regulation (107, 140, 182). Massive social upheaval by people demanding work and security for the aged during the Great Depression led to the introduction of mandatory retirement through the Social Security Act of 1935 (157). The abolition of mandatory retirement in the 1990s and current incen-

tives for early retirement in the face of downsizing of corporations and other institutions such as hospitals and universities illuminate how broader political issues interact with the characterization of a work force.

Changing patterns of prisons, military recruitment strategies, the enforcement of immigration laws, and societal handling of the mentally ill and definitions of mental illness, institutional labor, slavery, indentured servitude, and racial discrimination are other areas where the availability of labor and its cost are periodically redefined (38, 46, 69, 84–86, 103, 165, 170, 171, 244, 245). Thus, cultural definitions of available labor are historically produced by nation-states, class conflict, and social movements. Such constructions of legitimate dependency and community responsibility, institutionalized in state regulation and cultural expectations of age, gender, and other social identities, constrain the ability of industries to lower wages by hiring indiscriminately the least-protected workers.

Consequently, we can view the departure of industries from core industrialized countries not according to problematic ethnocentric notions of deindustrialization but as an expansion of the industrial work force. Workers in areas previously restricted to agriculture and the extraction of raw materials have been recategorized as candidates for industrial employment. In particular, these new developments target women as industrial workers. These women are some of the least-protected workers in international labor. They are frequently subordinated, sometimes assaulted in their own households, historically excluded from most forms of paid employment and education, and situated in the poorest regions of the world (13, 47, 50, 154, 158, 178, 208). This massive expansion in the incorporation of global labor, the breakdown of household definitions of gendered labor (75, 117, 157, 205, 217), and the increasing gender-specific patterns of immigration from poorer countries to the core (54, 58, 226) must be carefully considered before theorists accept arguments based on a reduction in the need for labor as a result of the informational technology of advanced capitalism.

Since the early twentieth century, the routines of Fordism included the concept of a “fair day’s wage.” Fordism was predicated on the maintenance of a presumed nuclear household, the reinforcement of specific gendered interactions, and enforcement of segmented hiring patterns that traced and retraced ethnic and racial hierarchies (1, 60, 70, 71, 82, 114, 144, 145, 165, 171). Class conflict under Fordism produced unions that fought successfully for an expanded social wage, job security, occupational safety, health benefits, and seniority policies. Nevertheless, industrial unions were themselves threaded with the racial and sexual presuppositions of corporate hegemony, as well as refutations of such ideology (7, 31, 37, 78, 176, 177, 182). Today we find flexible accumulation accompanied by a growing informal economy, enfeebled unions, less security for most workers [including middle-income profes-

sionals (155)], the shrinking of the welfare state, and escalating poverty (82, 101, 120, 128, 166, 187, 236). Under these conditions the hegemonic construction of the white male worker that was encoded as part of the charter of industrial unions has collapsed. Unions were weakened by their own failure to incorporate different visions of race, gender, and the poor of the developed and underdeveloped worlds into the voices of class conflict (6, 31, 60, 82, 83, 182). The definition of who could work was changed by the export of industry, and the work force was expanded to include women and members of poor third-world nations. As a result, unions centered in the urban heartland of capitalism and based on the gendering and racial discrimination of Fordism were unequipped to fight the destruction of their standard of living. This is the context in which poverty becomes central to workers in core countries and the periphery in the twenty-first century.

Theoretical Approaches to Reinvention of the Social Order

What concepts have social researchers and more specifically, anthropologists offered in understanding the new social order and poverty and homelessness? Within the metropolises there are ethnographic studies of the effects of deindustrialization and the shift to a service economy (151, 159, 202, 211). Some of the most graphic and penetrating studies of the new poverty concern health and disease in the United States (10, 108, 118, 160, 196, 198, 210). Among third-world workers there are studies of the new industries, which are often situated in marginal environments—borderlands—outside the regulatory control of specific nation-states and which are thus able to avoid established patterns of class conflict and state compromise (13, 50, 153, 154, 158, 178, 212, 218, 233). Studies of transnationalism and migration both locally and transcontinentally, as well as the postmodern emphasis on shifting populations and travel, connect these two parallel examinations of poverty (106a, 116, 188, 205).

Recent research has promoted and stimulated a reexamination of the role of the ethnographer and his/her differentiation from those studied under currently shifting postmodern conditions both within anthropology and within the global economy, which are as many have noted, directly related (152). Finally, ethnographers have endeavored to represent the voices of the poor in the contemporary context.

Labor Shifts in the New Global Economy

The significance of low-paid employment and US deindustrialization in the creation of poverty and homelessness is well established (16, 45, 94, 102, 163, 237, 245). This perspective is frequently stated at the beginning and end of ethnographies about homelessness and urban poverty. However, because participant observation conducted over one to several years captures only imme-

diated processes, it tends also to contribute to the reification of the instant in terms of identities and categories that occupy the space and time of the field-work. Poor people appear poor rather than unemployed or underemployed. Homeless people appear homeless rather than displaced. Even when the departure of industry can be documented and the rise in real estate costs traced, ethnographers seldom capture the before and after effects.

Several ethnographies document what might be termed the making of poverty in the United States: *From Tank Town to High Tech* (151), *Norman Street* (211), and *The Magic City* (159). These monographs describe the reduction of “stable” working-class households to poverty through the departure of industry and capture the impact of such changes on local politics, health, and general living conditions.

Poor communities are also forming among migrants without access to capital. New Asian immigrants, similar to Haitians, Mexicans, and others, are being recruited to fill the low-paid employment created by the new global economy (50, 67, 111, 115, 116, 168, 239, 250, 252, 253).

The shift toward hiring women service workers is also addressed in recent ethnographic research. *Caring by the Hour* documents the experiences of poor black women workers in a North Carolina city (181). Sacks documented the breadth of the women’s work requirements, the limited options for promotion, and the participation of such previously excluded groups in political mobilization. Other ethnographies of the new low-paid service workers (162, 183, 202) portray a work force with reduced control, fewer benefits, and less security than is found in ethnographies of US labor from the 1950s through the 1970s (25). However, they belie earlier theories that women, because of the dual work day and their household responsibilities, would be unable or unwilling to mobilize around work concerns (7, 17, 215).

The core of the new US work force has become the low-paid worker outside the unions who lives either in the “postmodern” family or alone and also subordinated by gender, minority, and immigrant status (182). The potential of these groups for unionization or political mobilization constitutes one of the central questions in determining the directions of the new global economy.

Poverty and the Construction of Space in the New Global Economy

Global changes have not only affected the work place but the construction of space in the global economy as well. Class conflict in the United States since the 1950s has taken place in battles over the boundaries, services, and maintenance of working-class communities. Real estate decisions, housing discrimination, gentrification, and urban development policies structure the visibility of poverty and the experiences of the poor (130, 199, 200). As has been extensively demonstrated, poor neighborhoods reflect mortgage restrictions and a

losing battle for scarce public services such as schools, road repair, and health care (27, 28, 150). The spatial construction of poverty is manifest in the division of communities. The destruction of housing for the building of expressways, the bypassing of public transportation, and the creation of suburban loans, enclosed shopping malls, and recreational centers epitomized by the much analyzed Disneyland/World phenomena separate middle-income purchasers from the poor (34, 193, 194, 256; see S Low, this volume). All of these semipublic environments marginalize the poor and represent areas of contestation over the resegregation of social interaction by class and income (2, 49, 184, 193, 194, 199, 241, 256).

Urban renewal policies followed by gentrification in the 1970s and 1980s have isolated the urban poor in enclosed and practically invisible communities (130, 200). Such invisible and relatively powerless communities concomitantly become sites of last resort for methadone clinics, housing for the mentally ill, and—partially as a consequence of the well-known phenomenon of Not In My Backyard (NIMBY)—industrial waste disposal plants (200). The separation of the poor has occurred more slowly in minority communities but may be increasing as minority members of the middle class find ways to enter better-off suburbs and city neighborhoods (235–237, 245).

Homeless people in the United States are significant not for their numbers but because they represent the incursions of increasing impoverishment into public space—particularly space occupied or desired by middle-income and even wealthy people (11, 12, 124, 125, 141, 142, 201). Homeless people frequent railroad stations, public parks, and public transportation. In New York City, they have set up covered shelters outside the United Nations. In Los Angeles, they congregate on the beaches of Venice (247). Unlike in Martin Luther King Jr's time, when the Poor People's March built a shantytown outside the White House, the homeless people in central tourist spots in Washington, DC; New York City; and San Francisco are not constructing their shelters to make a political point. The political point emerges from their visible need.

The poor have been generally excluded from cyberspace (29, 30, 79, 201, 222). As informational technology enwebs the household into the wider net of the corporation (29), the poor and homeless drop below the threshold of societal communications. However, the overall impact of these changes remains to be evaluated; some poor people have adapted new technologies to their own purposes (30, 79). Artists address the irony of homeless people in cyberspace in the creation of Poliscar, a vehicle for a homeless person to park on the street and live in that is equipped with information technology (201).

Time Out and Out of Time in the New Global Economy of Poverty

People's experience of time has changed in the new global economy. The categorization of time under capitalism was first raised by EP Thompson in his classic paper on nineteenth-century England (227). Since Thompson and others relate the defining of time precisely to emerging industrial employment, the changing forms of employment under post-Fordism might be expected to change the concepts and usage of time for the 1990s (48, 61, 82, 180).

Concepts and uses of time have become social markers in a class-stratified society. Oscar Lewis, in his culture of poverty description, discussed present orientation (119, 230), and others have used similar markers to define the underclass (4, 245). Such discussions also appear in the AIDS prevention literature: Homeless people's evaluation of their lifespan may be shorter and may reduce their commitment to efforts at HIV prevention through safer sex and clean needles (32, 196, 198, 223). Similarly, time is the ultimate issue in debates about teenage pregnancy and class-based fertility patterns (59, 207, 214).

Researchers argue that time created for and by homeless people takes on different meanings for the homeless than for the rest of the population. Poor people must keep institutional time requirements, yet when they arrive they must wait. This embodies the unequal power relationship between the poor and service providers (118, 211, 224, 230). Because poor women are the mediators between their households and institutional services, their experience of waiting and unequal control over time may be much greater than men's. In addition, since women are frequently responsible for the transport and needs of children and the organization of reciprocal kin networks based on the needs of many people with conflicting time requirements, they become less able to meet the time schedules of institutions whether they be employers, schools, or the welfare office (118, 211, 224, 230).

For the homeless, time is not usually determined by a regular work schedule, yet it is clearly constricted and defined by institutional events (72, 74, 124, 248). A reversal of time occurs among homeless people dependent on institutionalized work schedules for food and shelter. Many services for homeless people are staffed by employees who only work weekdays. On weekends, finding food and shelter is much more problematic, and homeless people are frequently alone, cold, and hungry, waiting for weekdays to restart their social life (72). A similar reversal occurs between night and day. Public places, lobbies, and hallways are used in the daytime by those with homes as they go to work or enter various commercial establishments. At night, homeless people repopulate coveted niches in the deserted central city (124). In another rever-

sal, "seizing the moment" becomes more important for homeless people than maintaining reliable routines (124). Without routine employment and a paycheck, people must continually be ready to react to each random or unscheduled opportunity as it arises. As a result, institutional routines are flaunted, and homeless people are categorized by service-agency providers as unreliable and without concepts of time. As is so often the case, the social creation of behavior among the poor is treated as evidence of individual unworthiness. People who are homeless reconfigure both time and space as they negotiate survival (180, 238). Thus the new urban poverty carries with it time hierarchies, time resistance, and time restatement as part of the re-creation of class and inequality under global capitalism.

Re-Creating Gender in the Context of the Poverty and Homelessness of the New Global Economy

Poverty and homelessness are clearly gendered (71, 161, 192, 213, 215–219, 221–223). However, it is once again important to remain cautious of static and reified conceptions. Gender among US poor people in the 1990s is an area of open battle sometimes resulting in fatalities. Both men and women have re-stated, re-created, and resisted the stereotypical portraits of earlier periods.

Because employment, public assistance, social security, and credit differentiate experiences by gender, poverty and homelessness have always differed between men and women (1, 3, 71, 107, 140, 203, 205). However, entitlements, employment, and institutional constraints have also altered dramatically since the 1970s. The past two decades have witnessed crucial change and struggle in the definitions of gendered responsibilities by the state, in the expectations between men and women, and in the structuring of households.

Poor men and women share poverty and the responsibilities for households and children. While they may find common ground and common interest in relation to employment and state policies, even in these areas their opportunities and losses differ: Women may benefit from housing programs, while men may have more access to job training. In addition, men and women battle and are battered in struggles over household structure and control of children and resources. Relations between men and women are important determinants of the experiences of poverty and homelessness and need to be examined. We have to analyze the conflicts that run from the state through the household and the intensifying of those conflicts in the 1990s.

It is no longer sufficient to talk of male or female domination or subordination among poor people in the United States. Arenas of power for men are contradicted by other arenas of power or access to resources for women. The complexity of the interactions, rather than equalizing relations between men and women, often leads to escalating conflict.

Decades of Change: The Feminization of Poverty or the Disappearance of Men?

In the mid-1980s problems began to be formulated in terms of the “feminization of poverty” (192). As single-headed households became more common, the fact that working women earned less than men who might previously have supported the household, combined with the failure of many men to actually pay child support, resulted in a majority of households headed by women below the poverty line (44, 96, 245, 255). Concomitantly, there was an increase in the proportion of children being reared in poverty.

Along with the recognition of the feminization of poverty arose a focus on violence against women. A leading and rising cause of injury and death for women 15 years and older was violence from their male partners (77a). Ethnographies of the 1980s and 1990s document violence and fear, both of which need to be analyzed more systematically according to the changing experiences of men and women and changing expectations of gender (22, 136–138, 171, 189, 190, 205).

By the 1990s, concern began to center around the exclusion and disappearance of poor men (38, 161, 219). Rapidly increasing incarceration rates for poor and minority men, as well as growing disease and homicide rates, contributed to this formulation. Figures suggested that while men battered and brutalized women, men were more likely to kill one another. In addition, it became clear that poor men were excluded from public assistance funds, less likely to find employment, and less likely than poor and minority women to finish school.

Although the gendering of poverty was evident, the lives of poor men and women were so interconnected that the experience of each bore directly on the other. From the 1980s, as more men were excluded from employment and public assistance or disappeared through incarceration or death, more women became responsible for poor households (38, 96, 148, 245). In the light of these points of strain, domestic violence between men and women became a growing issue.

As noted above, it is not enough in the context of the new poverty to speak of one gender hierarchy. Eligibility for public assistance, housing subsidies, and low-paid service employment often favors women over men (161, 203, 211, 224). While men have lost some of the advantages that used to accrue from access to better paid industrial employment, they may still have access to more forms of income in manufacturing, the informal economy, and the illegal drug world, as well as more freedom from the costs, responsibilities, and possible entrapment of child care (22, 51, 117, 250). Just as with concepts of time and space, concepts of gender have to be reworked to fit the circumstances of the new poverty within different sectors of the global economy.

Homelessness is also experienced differently according to gender (35–40, 66, 161, 217, 219). Women lucky enough to keep their children from foster care are more likely to be assigned private rooms and services available in a rundown hotel (109, 219). Men and women without children or separated from them find themselves assigned to large sex-segregated shelters (217, 219, 223). As a result, homeless women without children excluded from services for women with children are likely to be the most brutalized group of all. They are subject to the miseries, deprivations, and dangers of homelessness and, above and beyond this, to assault by men if they spend time alone on the streets (66, 122).

Even children experience poverty differently by gender. Jagna Sharff in her research on the Lower East Side of Manhattan developed an early analysis of gendered poverty in discussing the experience of poor Latino children. She suggested that poor boys find themselves recruited into the illegal and frequently fatally attractive world of the drug trade because it is the only viable occupation for providing income for an extremely needy household. That is, early on, boys in poor households are expected to and try to live up to the male role of provider. Poor girls, Sharff argued, are more likely to be kept home to do domestic tasks and are channeled into schooling. They are less likely to be drawn into the competitive and dangerous territory of drug dealing (189). Women may use the drugs, but they do not as readily profit from them and are therefore less likely to be killed in battles over control of trade (189, 240, 243).

Sharff's formulations were originally stated according to child-rearing patterns and reinforcements for gender differentiation within poor households, which reflected limited options available in the wider society. She also argued that some young boys might be allowed to adopt less aggressive strategies to avoid high-risk assigned roles. She did not address behavior of girls wishing to broaden their options in this constrained environment, but it might be fair to view early pregnancy as one method available to girls in this situation. The originality and challenge of Sharff's analysis was marred by a possible interpretation that perhaps families chose these routes for their children and encouraged the criminality of boys, or that poor families did not desire the same professional routes of advancement for their children as middle-class families (for a different view, see 98, 100). In contrast, when Sharff's research is viewed as a description of systematic channeling through both pressures on poor families and societal expectations and opportunities for boys and girls, her analysis is supported by work concerning the gendering of childhood experience in homeless shelters (219) and opens important avenues for further study.

A more textured analysis of variations in opportunities by gender and their impact on the construction of households and child rearing would appear to be

the next challenge confronting research on poverty in the United States. As Castells noted, the restructuring of gender in the global economy is one of the central features of the informational society (30). However, gender is being rewritten differently according to class within this new society, which we need to rethink (30, 217, 219, 222).

Identity, Race, Class, and Gender

The political economy of poverty of the 1980s focused on “class, race, and gender.” Similarly, within cultural studies race and gender were characterized as significant identities. However, in an examination of the literature of urban poverty and homelessness, we find somewhat separate traditions of analysis for gender and for race. We find parallel historical analyses of employment segregation, as in views of the segmented work force of Fordism. Both women and minorities were excluded from the higher paying, unionized jobs that carried seniority, security, and benefits (44, 70, 78, 80, 114, 140, 250).

However, the impact of such exclusions on households and class experience was very different by gender and by race. Women were not excluded from housing or from providing a future for their children until the proliferation of single-headed families and the so-called feminization of poverty. Only an analysis that ignores identity, community, household, and social movements beyond the work place and in fact ignores the gendering of social life can view race and gender as parallel identity processes operating in similar ways within a class-based society. As Anna Tsing noted in an entirely different context, “This work rejects the notion that gender asymmetries are parallel to those of race, class, and nationality, for race, class and national hierarchies are themselves everywhere constructed in gendered ways, and gender divisions are established with ‘communal’ materials” (229:18). However, while they are not parallel processes or similar hierarchies, race and gender interact within a class system and as some have argued the existence of both complex hierarchies in combination has contributed to the maintenance of inequalities (80, 148, 182, 208).

Race

There is the issue of race (63, 76, 77, 81, 103, 129). Then there is the gendering of race (43, 62, 148, 149), and then there is the issue of a racial and gendered system in relation to class dynamics. All these issues bear directly on analyses of urban poverty and homelessness of the 1990s.

In terms of race, analyses of the underclass, of homelessness, and of urban poverty document the disproportion of people of color who find themselves in these populations. However, in terms of numbers, as has often been mentioned but rarely remembered, most poor people in the United States are not

people of color. Nevertheless, as with the homeless, race has become a visible and politically useful metaphor for the new poverty.

Some studies of poverty simply identify the racial composition or racial identity of the people studied and move from there to the circumstances of poverty or homelessness with little attention to the impact of color on the experience (other than perhaps to refer to the history of racial discrimination in the United States). One might consider those researchers to be using race as a shorthand classification for probable history or opportunities without providing an analysis of race itself (11, 218, 219).

Other studies of poverty focus on the racial hostilities in poor neighborhoods and the experiences of racial discrimination of certain populations. While such studies do not focus specifically on the concept and experience of race, they begin to examine the cross-cutting issues of race and poverty in a more dynamic, analytical way (19, 136, 137, 203, 205, 209, 211). For example, Mercer Sullivan compared the experiences of teenage men in three neighborhoods. He documented the intersecting forces of neighborhood segregation, social networks, racial discrimination in employment, and the structure of the drug economy to explain why young white men find their way out of adolescent criminal behavior while minority adolescents find themselves trapped and defined by the records of their youth (209).

Steve Gregory and Roger Sanjek's edited collection on race is a recent effort to confront and "historicize" the concept of race in Western capitalism. They provide a political economy of identity by including articles on Jews, Egyptians, and other groups associated with contested racial categories (76). Other researchers have focused on the significance of the gendering of poverty and race (148, 149).

Perhaps conceptualization of the interplay of poverty, gender, and race can be advanced through a more detailed examination of four ethnographies that address poverty among men and women in different contexts: Philippe Bourgois's recent research among young men in East Harlem, New York City (22–24); Jay MacLeod's research among working-class teenagers (127); Elijah Anderson's perspective on young men in a Northeast city (4, 5); and Jagna Sharff's analysis of women and men's lives on the Lower East Side of New York City (189, 190).

These ethnographies together force us to confront central questions concerning the ethnographic enterprise among the poor of US urban cities. It is difficult to document the misery of the poor in the contemporary United States without falling into the problem of either romanticizing or minimizing the devastation or of painting such distress, victimization, and brutalization that the description becomes fuel for political assaults upon the poor themselves. Sharff's description of young men dealing and dying in the drug trade on the lower East Side of Manhattan in the 1970s and Bourgois's descriptions of the

sale of crack in El Barrio, East Harlem (in northern Manhattan) in the 1990s are similarly graphic and disturbing. Such works might be assailed for presenting the worst and neglecting positive portraits of hardworking or politically active people in the same neighborhoods. However, the struggle to portray people involved in the most condemned activities of our society in human and comprehensible ways must also be recognized as one of the strengths of the anthropological method in both research sites (22).

Each ethnography rewrites gender such that simplistic stereotypes disintegrate in the light of the research. Bourgois described one woman who shot her partner and then became a crack dealer with power largely because, just as with the men, people believe that she will act if double-crossed (22). She does not have to fear violence because, like a man, she has established that she can fight back. This adoption of the “macho role” and its reflection also in her relationship with her new partner can be viewed as a reversal of gender expectations. This woman does not represent most women in El Barrio. However, her experience dramatically demonstrates the situational nature of gender roles as well as illuminates through contradiction a material basis for the continuity and power of machismo.

Sharff outlined women adopting stereotypic roles as they go out dancing, dressed in sophisticated middle-class styles with the explicit intentions of hypergamy. Later, she describes one such woman finally acquiring unionized work and no longer forced to depend on such futile strategies to support her five children (190). Once again, the manipulation of gender roles as situational strategy emerges from descriptions of women’s struggle to support households, rear children, and survive in poverty in the urban United States (14, 228). Nowhere in these ethnographies do we find the stereotypic portrait of the modest Latina woman, trapped by traditional values and unable to change to confront the dangers of poverty and mortality facing herself and her kin. In fact, we find in some descriptions women empowered by organizing in their neighborhoods, fighting for more services, or simply trying to maintain what they have (14, 132, 212, 213, 215, 218, 228).

Anderson, a sociologist, wrote about young men and women and the expectations and behavior of youth in poverty (4, 5). While he provided direct quotes, his work does not fit the methodological and ethnographic model of much anthropological research (25a, 232), which leaves room to doubt the conclusions. Many perceptions from outsiders, such as older residents, are quoted as substantiation for generalizations about cause and effect. Generalizations such as: “Often...teenagers lack interest in school, and in time they may drop out in favor of spending time with their street-oriented peers” (5:92) contrast dramatically with descriptions of the humiliation and misery of school experiences that provide a less pat explanation for the same phenomenon (22, 110, 127). Bourgois, Sharff, and MacLeod (22, 127) are careful to

describe individuals, follow situations, trace events creating a body of literature and thick description clearly judged by anthropological standards. Anderson's adoption of participant observation follows no such disciplinary tenets. He summarizes and quotes without describing in their full context and varied interconnections the people and events from which his evaluations are derived.

Despite methodological differences, Anderson identified some reversal of gender roles: Young women look for young men by whom to become pregnant and then leave them and set up independent households on the public assistance check (5:126). He quotes some men as saying such "new" women are "just out to use you" (5:126). The young women described by Anderson as trapped by their middle-class dreams are similar to those described by Ruth Sidel (191), and they support Delmos Jones's emphasis on achievement aspirations among the poor (98, 100). However, generalizations, as well as lack of context or discussion of resistance and agency, tend to fuel discussions that blame the victim or emphasize the individual problems of the poor without sufficient attention to the structural constraints of unemployment and racism within which people create their lives.

Jay MacLeod (127) used the concept of habitus to conceptualize the social reproduction of race and class (18, 65). This approach differs from the approach of Anderson and others because it allows for variation, agency, and resistance. In terms of issues of social reproduction, MacLeod argued that class is not enough because "the way in which individuals and groups respond to structures of domination is open-ended" (127:139). In discussing the lives of two friendship sets of teenage boys, one black and one white, MacLeod argued: "[A]lthough social class is of primary importance, there are intermediate factors at work that, as constitutive of the habitus, shape the subjective responses of the two groups of boys and produce quite different expectations and actions." (127:140). Is the concept of habitus necessary? Does it mean more or less than socialization, social context, or environment? MacLeod discussed the complex interaction between hegemonic ideas of gender (differentiated by class, although he did not discuss this), structural unemployment, and individual and family history. This he calls habitus. Whatever the label, such conceptualizations allow for more flexibility and difference than a simple class analysis. They avoid laying the blame on families implied in theories of the underclass and the culture of poverty without neglecting the accumulation of social or cultural capital or lack thereof that children acquire from family experiences.

In discussing unemployed white teenage youth, MacLeod emphasized the significance of gender in providing the macho image that allows young boys to build respect among their own group and to validate violence and marginality according to that societal standard. The image of mother is one area in

which young girls can find validation no matter how they fare at school or in the job market (127). Thus, gender again frames the options also defined by poverty and race. In response to similar conditions of school failure and unemployment, young men can opt for validation in the macho image while young girls can see motherhood as a route to success.

Political controversy surrounds ethnographies of poverty, race, and gender because of the implications of the research for the possibilities of social change (5, 22, 127, 190). Not only do ideologies of family and gender vary by class (169, 203, 217, 219), they are also associated with different forms of political mobilization. They reflect varying conceptualizations of inequality, race, nationalism, sexual orientation, and resistance, (17, 62, 149, 213, 215, 251). For example, Leith Mullings noted that for African Americans an integrationist approach to race relations in the United States incorporates the ideologies of middle-class nuclear families (although since this is contested among men and women of the US middle class, we must wonder which concept of gender roles in the nuclear family may be adopted). Nationalist or Afrocentric mobilization against racial discrimination involves an idealization of past traditions that invokes the complementarity of male and female roles and reinforces a male/ female gender hierarchy. A transformative or revolutionary approach seeks to change society and the basis for class inequality as well as that of race and gender and attempts to combat gender hierarchies along with discrimination by race (149). The representation of gender in ethnography cannot be seen apart from the political impact of such analysis and is clearly contested terrain.

As this review of recent ethnographies of poverty indicates, the transformation of gender as it interacts with the historically changing construction of poverty and race, shifting gender hierarchies, and escalating gender conflict are marked features of the global economy in the 1990s.

Collapsing Time and Space: Relocating Populations and Shifting Identities Among the Poor and Homeless in the New Global Economy

In line with the growth of the global economy, not only resident minorities are poor but also many migrant populations. Members of many new immigrant groups are poor, work for below minimum wage, have little access to benefits, and live in inner cities (55, 67, 111, 115, 116, 252, 253).

Studies of US poverty such as Carol Stack's *Call to Home* (205) discuss return migration among African Americans. Other studies describe children being sent back to Puerto Rico for discipline and other reasons (22, 190). Many discussions of international migration focus on similar phenomena (54, 188, 226). Studies of the homeless also portray a constantly shifting population, as people move across streets, shelters, cities, mental institutions, detoxification

centers, and jails and are then relocated in apartments in new neighborhoods (124, 125, 220, 248). In connecting the experiences of poor immigrants with discussion of urban poverty issues, we can begin to capture the complex and conflicted movement of the poor and the working class associated with the integration of the global economy (115).

Movement across nations, between nations, and through urban areas, as depicted in the homeless literature, must be incorporated into views of the “post-modern” poor and working class. This is true whether one perceives such movement and flexibility according to the flexible economy and the associated flexible bodies (82, 131), the informational society (29, 30), or whether one accepts the prevailing paradigm of an unstructured, unexplainable, constantly shifting and jumbled postmodern world.

The Voices of the Poor and the Creation of Culture in the New Global Economy

Discussions of the culture of the poor have been controversial since the culture of poverty debates of the 1960s (101, 119, 134, 147, 216). However, ethnographies of the US urban poor echo with the voices of suffering and defeat as well as with defiance, resistance, and agency. As Setha Low has noted, neighborhood residents still rally to religious festivals and local parades (126). Women and men still mobilize to protect or demand homes, work, and services for themselves and their children (14, 126, 133, 135, 205, 211–213, 215, 218, 228). Nevertheless, a consistency emerges in the experiences described and the struggles of poverty in the 1990s. Women describe the miseries of raising children in poverty, with little help and many problems. Children report on their own brutalizing experiences at home, in school, and on the streets. Men describe their efforts to work and go straight and the losses of respect and future that underlay their turn to street life. Whether the ethnographer is Anderson, Bourgois, Sharff, MacLeod, or Stack, many of the experiences and the descriptions cry out in similar ways. The ethnographers’ differences surface in the focus on agency and community resistance (14, 126, 132, 205, 211, 213, 215, 218, 228), self-destructive resistance (22, 127), and survival (190) versus misery and defeat (5). No ethnography leaves any doubt about the daily suffering in US inner cities.

Reflections and Mirrors in Ethnography in the New Global Economy

As Carol Stack wrote in a discussion of feminist ethnography, “[W]e are accountable for the consequences of our writing, fully cognizant that the story we construct is our own” (206). Ethnographers of poverty of the 1990s have similarly reexamined their own histories and interactions with the people they describe. Stack, contrasting her work of the 1970s with that of the 1990s,

claims a sense of liberation. No longer constrained to locate logical sequences and objective reports, she is able to identify the contradictions in daily life and to enter her discussions from a variety of perspectives.

June Nash suggests that the hesitancy of contemporary anthropologists to conduct fieldwork almost inevitably results in objectification. Other ethnographers begin to reconsider the construction of their own white and female identities (42, 56, 152, 182). Patricia Zavella noted the difficulties of being partly of one group and partly of others and always in a hierarchical relation with informants. While *in* a group, as a middle-class academic she is not *of* that group. She wrote about the cross-cutting identities of sexual orientation and the way in which this structures her Latina, feminist, middle-class discourse (251).

However, as ethnographers grapple with the issues of reflexivity and the incorporation of voices, the hierarchies of "otherness," and the imposition and creation of identities of color, gender, nation, and foreignness, certain messages emerge clearly.

Current research has yielded visions of the ongoing assault on the lives of the poor and working class in US society as well as the resilience and humanity of those hidden from view in the new global economy. With all the imperfections of representation, the voices that emerge from these works need desperately to be heard. Perhaps they can be heard more fully and in all their contradictions when the anthropologist constructs herself/himself in the same text. However, with the increasing assault upon the living standards and employment security of working people, in which academics are also included, the idea of the other may not be as salient as many fear. The question that Kim Hopper, Kostas Gounis, Stack, Merrill Singer, and others rightfully ask is not whether we can describe the lives of the poor but how we can fight against the misery we see created (73, 88, 92, 93, 197, 206).

Any *Annual Review* chapter, as well as any article cited in an *Annual Review* chapter, may be purchased from the Annual Reviews Preprints and Reprints service. 1-800-347-8007; 415-259-5017; email: arpr@class.org

Literature Cited

1. Abramovitz M. 1988. *Regulating the Women*. Boston: South End
2. Abu-Lughod J. 1994. *From Urban Village to East Village*. Oxford: Blackwell
3. Adler JS. 1992. Streetwalkers, degraded outcasts, and good-for-nothing huzzies: women and the dangerous class in antebellum St. Louis. *J. Soc. Hist.* 25(4):737-55
4. Anderson E. 1989. Sex codes and family life among poor inner city youths. *Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* 501:59-78
5. Anderson E. 1990. *Streetwise: Race, Class*

- and Change in an Urban Community. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
6. Anglin M. 1992. A question of loyalty: national and regional identity in narratives of Appalachia. *Anthropol. Q.* 65(3): 105–16
 7. Anglin M. 1993. Engendering the struggle: women's labor and traditions of resistance in rural southern Appalachia. In *Fighting Back in Appalachia*, ed. S Fisher, pp. 263–81. Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press
 8. Deleted in proof
 9. Bailey T, Waldinger R. 1991. The changing ethnic/racial division of labor. See Ref. 143, pp. 43–79
 10. Balslem M. 1991. Cancer control and causality: talking about cancer in a working class community. *Am. Ethnol.* 18(1): 152–73
 11. Basch L, Schiller N, Szanton C. 1994. *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments, and Deterritorialized Nation States*. Langhorne, PA: Gordon & Breach
 12. Baxter E, Hopper K. 1981. *Private Lives/Public Spaces: Homeless Adults on the Streets of New York, New York*. New York: Commun. Serv. Soc. NY
 13. Benaria L, Roldan M. 1987. *The Crossroads of Class and Gender*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
 14. Benmayor R, Torruellas R, Juarbe A. 1991. *Puerto Rican Women and a Culture of Empowerment*. Presented at the NY Acad. Sci., April, New York City
 15. Blim M. 1996. Cultures and the problems of capitalisms. *Crit. Anthropol.* 16(1): 79–93
 16. Bluestone D, Harrison B. 1982. *The Deindustrialization of America*. New York: Basic Books
 17. Bookman A, Morgen S, eds. 1988. *Women and the Politics of Empowerment*. Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press
 18. Bourdieu P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
 19. Bourgois P. 1989. If you're not black you're white: a history of ethnic relations in St. Louis. *City Soc.* 3(2):106–31
 20. Deleted in proof
 21. Deleted in proof
 22. Bourgois P. 1995. *In Search of Respect: Selling Crack in El Barrio*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
 23. Bourgois P. 1995. The political economy of resistance and self-destruction in the crack economy: an ethnographic perspective. *Ann. NY Acad. Sci.* 749:97–118
 24. Bourgois P, Dunlap E. 1993. Exorcising sex-for-crack: an ethnographic perspective from Harlem. In *Crack Pipe as Pimp: An Ethnographic Investigation of Sex-for-Crack Exchange*. New York: Lexington Books
 25. Burawoy M. 1979. The anthropology of industrial work. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 8: 231–66
 - 25a. Burawoy M, ed. 1993. *Ethnography Unbound*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
 26. Burt MR. 1992. *Over the Edge: The Growth of Homelessness in the 80's*. New York: Russell Sage Found.
 27. Castells M. 1977. *The Urban Question*. London: Arnold
 28. Castells M. 1983. *The City and the Grassroots*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
 29. Castells M. 1989. *The Informational City*. London: Blackwell
 30. Castells M. 1996. The net and the self: working notes for a critical theory of the informational society. *Crit. Anthropol.* 16(1):In press
 31. Cohen L. 1990. *Making a New Deal*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
 32. Connors M. 1992. Risk perception, risk taking and risk management among intravenous drug users: implications for AIDS prevention. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 34:591–601
 33. Corcoran M, Duncan GJ, Gurin G, Gurin P. 1985. Myth and reality: the causes and persistence of poverty. *J. Policy Anal. Manage.* 4(4):516–36
 34. Davis M. 1990. *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*. New York: Verso
 35. Dehavenon A. 1989–1990. Charles Dickens meets Franz Kafka: the maladministration of New York City's public assistance programs. *Rev. Law Soc. Change* 17(2): 231–54
 36. Dehavenon A. 1990. *The Tyranny of Indifference*. New York: Action Res. Proj. Hunger, Homelessness, Fam. Health
 37. Dehavenon A. 1992. *Promises! Promises! Promises! The Failed Hopes of New York City's Homeless Families in 1992*. New York: Action Res. Proj. Hunger, Homelessness, Fam. Health
 38. Dehavenon A. 1993. Not enough to go around: an etic model for the cross-cultural study of the causes of matrifocality. In *Where Did All the Men Go? Female-Headed Households Cross-Culturally*, ed. J Mencher, A Okongwu, pp. 53–69. Boulder, CO: Westview
 39. Dehavenon A. 1995. A retrospective on two and a half decades of East Harlem research. *Ann. NY Acad. Sci.* 749:137–51
 40. Dehavenon A. 1995. *Out in the Cold: The Social Exclusion of New York City's Homeless Families in 1995*. New York: Action Res. Proj. Hunger, Homelessness, Fam. Health
 41. di Leonardo M. 1992. White lies: rape,

- race, and the myth of the Black underclass. *Village Voice* 38:1–7
42. di Leonardo M. 1994. White ethnicities, identity, and Baby Bear's chair. *Soc. Text* 41:165–91
 43. Dill B. 1988. "Making your job good yourself": domestic service and the construction of personal dignity. See Ref. 17, pp. 33–53
 44. Eggers ML, Massey DS. 1992. A longitudinal analysis of urban poverty: blacks in US metropolitan areas between 1970–1980. *Soc. Sci. Res.* 21(2):175–203
 45. Erickson J, Wilhelm C, eds. 1986. *Housing the Homeless*. New Brunswick, NJ: Cent. Urban Res.
 46. Estroff S. 1981. *Making It Crazy*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
 47. Etienne M, Leacock E, eds. 1980. *Women and Colonization*. Hadley, MA: South Press/Bergin & Garvey
 48. Fabian J. 1983. *Time and the Other*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
 49. Fainstein S. 1994. *City Builders*. Oxford: Blackwell
 50. Fernandez-Kelly P. 1981. *For We are Sold Me and My People*. Albany: State Univ. NY Press
 51. Fernandez-Kelly P. 1990. Delicate transactions: gender, home, and employment among Hispanic women. In *Uncertain Terms: Negotiating Gender in American Culture*, ed. F Ginsburg, A Lowenhaupt-Tsing, pp. 183–95. Boston: Beacon
 52. Deleted in proof
 53. Deleted in proof
 54. Foner N. 1987. *New Immigrants in New York*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
 55. Foner N. 1995. Contemporary immigration: issues and perspectives. See Ref. 52, pp. 245–52
 56. Frankenberg R. 1995. Whiteness and Americanness: examining constructions of race, culture and nation in white women's life narratives. See Ref. 77, pp. 62–77
 57. Deleted in proof
 58. Gailey C. 1992. A good man is hard to find: overseas migration and the decentered family in the Tongan Islands. *Crit. Anthropol.* 12(1):47–74
 59. Geronimus AT. 1992. Clashes of common sense: on the previous child care experience of teenage mothers-to-be. *Hum. Organ.* 51:318–29
 60. Gerstle G, Frazier S. 1989. *The Rise and Fall of the New Deal Order*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
 61. Giddens A. 1981. *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
 62. Gilkes CT. 1988. Building in many places: multiple commitments and ideologies in black women's community work. See Ref. 17, pp. 53–77
 63. Gilroy P. 1993. *Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
 64. Deleted in proof
 65. Giroux H. 1983. *Theory and Resistance in Education*. London: Heinemann
 66. Golden S. 1990. Lady versus low creature: old roots of current attitudes toward homeless women. *Frontiers* 11(2–3):1–7
 67. Goode J, Schneider J. 1994. *Reshaping Ethnic and Racial Relations in Philadelphia: Immigrants in a Divided City*. Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press
 68. Gordon D. 1978. Capitalist development and the history of American cities. In *Marxism and the Metropolis*, ed. W Tabb, L Sawers, pp. 25–63. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
 69. Gordon D. 1988. The global economy: new edifice or crumbling foundations. *New Left Rev.* 172:14–64
 70. Gordon D, Edwards R, Reich M. 1982. *Segmented Work, Divided Workers*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
 71. Gordon L. 1994. *Pitied but Not Entitled*. New York: Free Press
 72. Gounis K. 1992. Temporality and the domestication of homelessness. See Ref. 180, pp. 127–49
 73. Gounis K. 1996. Urban marginality and ethnographic practice: ethical dilemmas and political implications. *City Soc. Annu. Rev.* In press
 74. Gounis K, Susser E. 1990. Shelterization and its implications for mental health services. In *Psychiatry Takes to the Street*, ed. N Cohen, pp. 231–55. New York: Guilford
 75. Grasmuck S, Pessar P. 1991. *Between Two Islands: Dominican International Migration*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
 76. Gregory S. 1992. The changing significance of race and class in an African American Community. *Am. Ethnol.* 19(2):255–75
 77. Gregory S, Sanjek R, eds. 1994. *Race*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press
 - 77a. Grisso J, Schwarz D, Miles C, Holmes J. 1996. Injuries among inner-city minority women: a population-based longitudinal study. *Am. J. Public Health* 86(1):67–70
 78. Gutman H. 1976. *Work, Culture and Society in Industrializing America*. New York: Vintage
 79. Hakken D, Andrews B. 1993. *Computing Myths, Class Realities*. Boulder, CO: Westview
 80. Harris M. 1987. *Why Nothing Works: The Anthropology of Daily Life*. New York: Simon & Schuster
 81. Harrison FV. 1995. The persistent power of "race" in the cultural and political econ-

- omy of racism. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 24:47-74
82. Harvey D. 1990. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
 83. Hobsbawm E. 1964. *Laboring Men*. Garden City, NJ: Anchor
 84. Hopper K. 1987. The public response to homelessness in New York City: the last hundred years. In *On Being Homeless: Historical Perspectives*, ed. R Beard. New York: Mus. City NY
 85. Hopper K. 1989. The ordeal of shelter: continuities and discontinuities in the public response to homelessness. *Notre Dame J. Law Ethics Public Policy* 4(2):301-23
 86. Hopper K. 1990. Public shelter as "a hybrid institution": homeless men in historical perspective. *J. Soc. Issues* 46(4):13-29
 87. Hopper K. 1991. Homelessness old and new: the matter of definition. *Housing Policy Debate* 2:757-813
 88. Hopper K. 1991. Research for what? Lessons from the study of homelessness. *Bull. Am. Acad. Arts Sci.* 44:13-31
 89. Hopper K. 1991. Symptoms, survival, and the redefinition of public space: a feasibility study of homeless people at a metropolitan airport. *Urban Anthropol.* 20:155-75
 90. Hopper K. 1992. Counting the homeless: s-night in New York. *Eval. Rev.* 16(4):376-88
 91. Hopper K. 1995. Definitional quandaries and other hazards in counting the homeless: an invited commentary. *Am. J. Orthopsychiatry* 65:340-46
 92. Hopper K, Baumohl J. 1994. Held in abeyance: rethinking homelessness and advocacy. *Am. Behav. Sci.* 37:522-52
 93. Hopper K, Cox L. 1982. Litigation in advocacy for the homeless: the case of New York City. *Dev. Seeds Change* (2):57-62
 94. Hopper K, Susser E, Conover S. 1987. Economics of makeshift: deindustrialization and homelessness in New York City. *Urban Anthropol.* (14):183-236
 95. Howell J. 1973. *Hard Living on Clay Street*. New York: Anchor
 96. Jencks C. 1994. *The Homeless*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
 97. Jencks C, Peterson PE. 1991. *The Urban Underclass*. Washington, DC: Brookings Inst.
 98. Jones DJ. 1993. The culture of achievement among the poor: the case of mothers and children in a Headstart program. *Crit. Anthropol.* 13(3):247-67
 99. Jones DJ. 1994. Culture, domination and social complexity. *High Plains Anthropol.* 14(2):19-33
 100. Jones DJ. 1995. The anthropology of lower income urban enclaves. *Ann. NY Acad. Sci.* 749:189-203
 101. Jones DJ, Susser I, eds. 1993. The widening gap between rich and poor. *Crit. Anthropol.* 13(3):211-15
 102. Jones DJ, Turner J, Montbach J. 1992. Declining social services and the threat to social reproduction: an urban dilemma. *City Soc.* 6(2):99-114
 103. Jones J. 1992. *The Dispossessed: America's Underclasses from the Civil War to the Present*. New York: Basic Books
 104. Deleted in proof
 105. Katz M. 1989. *The Undeserving Poor*. New York: Pantheon
 106. Katz M. 1993. *The "Underclass" Debate: Views from History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
 - 106a. Kearney M. 1995. The local and the global: the anthropology of globalization and transnationalism. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 24:547-65
 107. Kessler-Harris A. 1982. *Out to Work*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
 108. Koegel P. 1992. Understanding homelessness: an ethnographic approach. In *Homelessness: A Prevention-Oriented Approach*, ed. RJ Jahiel. Baltimore: John Hopkins Univ. Press
 109. Kozol J. 1988. *Rachel and Her Children*. New York: Crown
 110. Kozol J. 1992. *Savage Inequalities*. New York: Harper Collins
 111. Kwong P. 1987. *The New Chinatown*. New York: Hill & Wang
 112. Deleted in proof
 113. Deleted in proof
 114. Lamphere L. 1987. *From Working Daughters to Working Mothers*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press
 115. Lamphere L, ed. 1992. *Structuring Diversity: Ethnographic Perspectives on the New Immigration*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
 116. Lamphere L, Stepick A, Grenier G. 1994. *Newcomers in the Workplace: Immigrants and the Restructuring of the US Economy*. Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press
 117. Lamphere L, Zavella P, Gonzalez F, Evans P. 1993. *Sunbelt Working Mothers*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press
 118. Lazarus E. 1990. Falling through the cracks: contradictions and barriers to care in a prenatal clinic. *Med. Anthropol.* 12:269-87
 119. Lewis O. 1966. The culture of poverty. *Sci. Am.* 215:19-25
 120. Lichter D, Eggebeen DJ. 1992. Child poverty and the changing rural family. *Rural Sociol.* 57(2):151-72
 121. Liebow E. 1967. *Tally's Corner*. Boston: Little Brown
 122. Liebow E. 1993. *Tell Them Who I Am: The*

- Lives of Homeless Women*. New York: Free Press
123. Link BG, Susser E, Stueve A, Phelan J, Moore RE, Struening E. 1994. Lifetime and five-year prevalence of homelessness in the U. S. *Am. J. Public Health* 84:1907–12
 124. Lovell A. 1992. Seizing the moment: power, contingency, and temporality in street life. See Ref. 180, pp. 86–107
 125. Lovell A. 1994. The dispersed city: homelessness, mental illness, and urban space. *Curr. CNRS* 81:170–72
 126. Low SM. 1996. A response to Castells: an anthropology of the city. *Crit. Anthropol.* 16(1):In press
 127. MacLeod J. 1987. *Ain't No Making It: Leveled Aspirations in a Low-Income Neighborhood*. Boulder, CO: Westview
 128. Mann C, Albelda R. 1988. Jobs, fathers and the states: welfare policy and the new federalism. *Rev. Radical Polit. Econ.* 20 (2–3):61–67
 129. Marable M. 1995. *Beyond Black and White*. London: Verso
 130. Marcuse P. 1985. Gentrification, abandonment and displacement: connections, causes and policy responses in New York City. *J. Urban Contemp. Law* (28):193–240
 131. Martin E. 1996. The society of flows and the flows of culture: reading Castells in the light of cultural accounts of the body, health and complex systems. *Crit. Anthropol.* 16(1):49–57
 132. Mathieu A. 1990. *Parents on the move*. PhD thesis. New School Soc. Res., New York
 133. Maxwell A. 1988. The anthropology of poverty in black communities: a critique and systems alternative. *Urban Anthropol.* 17(2–3):171–91
 134. Maxwell A. 1993. The underclass, social isolation and concentration effects: “the culture of poverty” revisited. *Crit. Anthropol.* 13(3):231–45
 135. Maxwell A. 1996. A home by any means necessary: government policy and squatting in the housing projects of a mid-Atlantic city. In *There's No Place Like Home: Homelessness and the New Faces of U. S. Poverty*, ed. A Dehavenon. Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey
 136. Merry S. 1981. Defensible space undented: social factors in crime control through environmental design. *Urban Aff. Q.* 16(4):397–422
 137. Merry S. 1981. *Urban Danger: Life in a Neighborhood of Strangers*. Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press
 138. Merry S. 1995. Gender violence and legally engendered selves. *Identities* 2(1–2):49–73
 139. Deleted in proof
 140. Milkman R. 1987. *Gender at Work*. Chicago: Univ. Ill. Press
 141. Mitchell D. 1992. Iconography and locational conflict from the underside: free speech, People's Park, and the politics of homelessness in Berkeley, California. *Polit. Geogr.* 11(2):152–69
 142. Mitchell D. 1995. The end of public space? People's Park, definitions of the public, and democracy. *Ann. Assoc. Am. Geogr.* 85(1): 108–33
 143. Mollenkopf J, Castells M, eds. 1991. *The Dual City*. New York: Russell Sage Found.
 144. Montgomery D. 1979. *Workers Control in America*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
 145. Montgomery D. 1987. *The Fall of the House of Labor*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
 146. Deleted in proof
 147. Mullings L. 1989. Gender and the application of anthropological knowledge to public policy in the United States. In *Gender and Anthropology*, ed. S Morgan, pp. 360–82. Washington, DC: Am. Anthropol. Assoc.
 148. Mullings L. 1995. Households headed by women: the politics of race, class and gender. In *Conceiving the New World Order*, ed. F Ginzburg, R Rapp, pp. 122–39. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
 149. Mullings L. 1996. *On Our Own Terms*. New York: Routledge
 150. Mullings L, Susser I. 1992. *Harlem Research and Development Report*. New York: Manhattan Borough Pres. Off.
 151. Nash J. 1989. *From Tank Town to High Tech*. Albany: South. Univ. NY Press
 152. Nash J. 1995. The anthropology of stranger and native. *Ann. NY Acad. Sci.* 749: 205–16
 153. Nash J, Fernandez-Kelly P. 1984. *Women, Men and the International Division of Labor*. Albany: South. Univ. NY Press
 154. Nash J, Safa H. 1986. *Women and Change in Latin America*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey
 155. Newman K. 1988. *Falling from Grace*. New York: Free Press
 156. Newman K. 1992. Culture and structure in *The Truly Disadvantaged*. *City Soc.* 6:3–25
 157. Olson L. 1982. *The Political Economy of Aging*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
 158. Ong A. 1987. *Spirits of Resistance and Capitalist Discipline*. Albany: South. Univ. NY Press
 159. Pappas G. 1989. *The Magic City*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press
 160. Pappas G, Queen S, Hadden W, Fisher G. 1993. The increasing disparity of mortality between socioeconomic groups in the

- United States: 1960–1986. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 329(2):103–9
161. Passaro J. 1996. *Men on the Street, Women in Their Place: Homelessness, Race and "Family Values."* New York: Routledge
162. Paules GF. 1991. *Dishing It Out.* Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press
163. Perlo V. 1988. Deterioration of black economic conditions. *Rev. Rad. Polit. Econom.* 20(2/3):55–59
164. Deleted in proof
165. Piven F, Cloward R. 1971. *Regulating the Poor.* New York: Vintage
166. Portes A, Castells M, Benton L, eds. 1989. *The Informal Economy.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press
167. Deleted in proof
168. Portes A, Zhou M. 1993. The new second generation: segmented assimilation and its variants. *Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* 530:74–96
169. Rapp R. 1987. Urban kinship in contemporary America: families, classes and ideology. In *Cities of the United States*, ed. L Mullings, pp. 219–43. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
170. Rhodes L. 1991. *Emptying Beds.* Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
171. Richie E. 1995. *Compelled to Crime.* New York: Routledge
172. Ricketts E, Sawhill I. 1988. Defining and measuring the underclass. *J. Policy Anal. Manage.* 7(2):316–25
173. Deleted in proof
174. Deleted in proof
175. Rosner D. 1982. Health care and the "truly needy": 19th century origins of the concept. *Milbank Mem. Fund Q.* 60:355
176. Rosner D, Markowitz G. 1987. *Dying for Work: Worker's Safety and Health in Twentieth-Century America.* Indianapolis: Indiana Univ. Press
177. Rosner D, Markowitz G. 1991. *Deadly Dust.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
178. Rothstein F, Blim M, eds. 1992. *Anthropology and the Global Factory.* New York: Bergin & Garvey
179. Rubin L. 1976. *Worlds of Pain.* New York: Basic Books
180. Rutz H, ed. 1992. *The Politics of Time. Ethnol. Soc. Monogr. Ser. 4.* Washington, DC: Am. Anthropol. Assoc.
181. Sacks K. 1988. *Caring by the Hour.* Chicago: Univ. Ill. Press
182. Sacks K. 1996. *Race, Class, Gender and the Jewish Question.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press
183. Sacks K, Remy D. 1984. *Our Troubles Are Going to Have Trouble with Us.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press
184. Samson C. 1994. The three faces of privatization. *Sociology* 28(1):79–97
185. Deleted in proof
186. Sassen S. 1991. *The Global City.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
187. Sassen S. 1991. The informal economy. See Ref. 143, pp. 79–103
188. Schiller N, Basch L, Blanc-Szanton C, eds. 1992. *Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration.* New York: NY Acad. Sci.
189. Sharff J. 1987. The underground economy of a poor neighborhood. In *Cities in the United States*, ed. L Mullings, pp. 19–50. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
190. Sharff J. 1996. *King Kong on 4th Street.* Boulder, CO: Westview
191. Sidel R. 1990. *On Her Own: Growing Up in the Shadow of the American Dream.* New York: Viking
192. Sidel R. 1992. *Women and Children Last.* New York: Basic Books
193. Sieber RT. 1990. Selecting a new past: emerging definitions of heritage in Boston Harbor. *J. Urban Cult. Stud.* 1:101–22
194. Sieber RT. 1991. Waterfront revitalization in postindustrial port cities of North America. *City Soc.* 5:120–36
195. Silver H. 1993. National conceptions of the new urban poverty: social structural change in Britain, France and the United States. *Int. J. Urban Reg. Res.* 17(3):336–54
196. Singer M. 1994. AIDS and the health crisis of the US urban poor: the perspective of critical medical anthropology. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 39(7):931–48
197. Singer M. 1995. Beyond the ivory tower: critical praxis in medical anthropology. *Med. Anthropol. Q.* 9:80–106
198. Singer M, Flores D, Davison L, Burke G, Castillo Z, et al. 1990. SIDA: the economic, social and cultural context of AIDS among Latinos. *Med. Anthropol. Q.* 4:73–117
199. Smith N. 1992. New city, new frontier: the lower east side as wild, wild west. In *Variations on a Theme Park*, ed. M Sorkin, pp. 61–93. New York: Noonday
200. Smith N. 1996. *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City.* London: Routledge
201. Smith N. 1996. Spaces of vulnerability: the space of flows and the politics of scale. *Crit. Anthropol.* 16(1):63–79
202. Stacey J. 1990. *Brave New Families.* New York: Basic Books
203. Stack C. 1974. *All Our Kin.* New York: Harper & Row
204. Deleted in proof
205. Stack C. 1996. *Call to Home: African Americans Reclaim the Rural South.* New York: Basic Books
206. Stack C. 1996. Writing ethnography: feminist critical practice. In *Feminist Dilemmas*

- in *Fieldwork*, ed. D Wolf, pp. 96–106. Boulder, CO: Westview
207. Stein Z. 1985. A woman's age. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 121:327–42
208. Stoler A. 1989. Making an empire respectable: the politics of race and sexual morality in the twentieth century colonial cultures. *Am. Ethnol.* 16:634–60
209. Sullivan M. 1990. *Getting Paid*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press
210. Susser E, Valencia E, Conover S. 1993. Prevalence of HIV infection among psychiatric patients in a large men's shelter. *Am. J. Public Health* 83:568–70
211. Susser I. 1982. *Norman Street: Poverty and Politics in an Urban Neighborhood*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
212. Susser I. 1985. Union Carbide and the community surrounding it: the case of a community in Puerto Rico. *Int. J. Health Serv.* 15(4):561–83
213. Susser I. 1986. Political activity among working class women in a U. S. city. *Am. Ethnol.* 13(1):108–117
214. Susser I. 1986. Work and reproduction in sociologic context. In *Reproduction and the Workplace, Occupational Medicine: State of the Art Rev.* 1(3):517–39. Philadelphia: Hanley & Belfus
215. Susser I. 1988. Working class women, social protest and changing ideologies. See Ref. 17, pp. 257–72
216. Susser I. 1989. Gender in the anthropology of the United States. In *Gender and Anthropology*, ed. S Morgen, pp. 343–60. Washington, DC: Am. Anthropol. Assoc.
217. Susser I. 1991. The separation of mothers and children. See Ref. 143, pp. 207–25
218. Susser I. 1992. Women as political actors in rural Puerto Rico: continuity and change. See Ref. 178, pp. 206–20
219. Susser I. 1993. Creating family forms: the exclusion of men and teenage boys from families in the New York City shelter system, 1987–91. *Crit. Anthropol.* 13(3): 267–85
220. Susser I. 1995. *Fear and violence in dislocated communities*. Presented at Annu. Meet. Am. Anthropol. Assoc., 94th, Washington, DC
221. Susser I, ed. 1996. *Special Issue on Anthropological Perspectives on the Informational Society*. *Crit. Anthropol.* 16(1)
222. Susser I. 1996. The shaping of conflict in the space of flows. *Crit. Anthropol.* 16(1): 39–49
223. Susser I, Gonzalez M. 1992. Sex, drugs and videotape: the prevention of AIDS in a New York City shelter for homeless men. *Med. Anthropol.* 14:307–22
224. Susser I, Kreniske J. 1987. The welfare trap: a public policy for deprivation. In *Cities in the United States*, ed. L Mullings, pp. 51–68. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
225. Susser M. 1993. Health as a human right: an epidemiologist's perspective on the public health. *Am. J. Public Health* 83:418–26
226. Sutton C, Chaney E, eds. 1987. *Caribbean Life in New York*. New York: Cent. Migr. Stud.
227. Thompson EP. 1969. Time, work-discipline and industrial capitalism. *Past Present* 38:56–97
228. Torruellas RM. 1995. "Mi Sacrificio Bien Pago": Puerto Rican women on welfare and family values. *Ann. NY Acad. Sci.* 749:177–87
229. Tsing A. 1993. *In the Realm of the Diamond Queen*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
230. Urciuoli B. 1992. Time, talk and class: New York Puerto Ricans as temporal and linguistic others. See Ref. 180, pp. 108–26
231. Valentine B. 1978. *Hustling and Other Hard Work*. New York: Free Press
232. Van Velsen J. 1969. The extended-case method and situational analysis. In *The Craft of Social Anthropology*, ed. A Epstein, pp. 129–49. London: Soc. Sci. Paperback
233. Vélez-Ibáñez CG. 1995. The challenge of funds of knowledge in urban arenas: another way of understanding the learning resources of poor Mexicano households in the U. S. Southwest and their implications for national contexts. *Ann. NY Acad. Sci.* 749:253–80
234. Vincent J. 1993. Framing the underclass. *Crit. Anthropol.* 13(3):215–31
235. Wacquant L. 1994. The new urban color line: the state and fate of the ghetto in post-fordist America. In *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*, ed. C Calhoun, pp. 231–76. Oxford: Blackwell
236. Wacquant L. 1996. Red Belt, Black Belt: racial division, class inequality and the state in the French urban periphery and the American ghetto. In *The New Poverty and the Underclass in Advanced Societies*, ed. E Mingione, pp. 234–74. Oxford: Blackwell
237. Wacquant L, Wilson W. 1989. The cost of racial and class exclusion in the inner city. *Ann. Am. Acad. Polit. Soc. Sci.* 501:8–25
238. Wagner D. 1993. *Checkerboard Square*. Boulder, CO: Westview
239. Waldinger R. 1986–1987. Changing ladders and musical chairs: ethnicity and opportunity in post-industrial New York. *Polit. Soc.* 15:369–402
240. Waterston A. 1993. *Street Addicts in the Political Economy*. Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press

241. Williams B. 1988. *Upscaling Downtown: Stalled Gentrification in Washington, D. C.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press
242. Deleted in proof
243. Williams T. 1989. *The Cocaine Kids: The Inside Story of a Teenage Drug Ring.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley
244. Wilson WJ. 1980. *The Declining Significance of Race.* Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
245. Wilson WJ. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged.* Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
246. Wilson WJ. 1991. Another look at the truly disadvantaged. *Polit. Sci. Q.* 106:639–57
247. Wolch J, Dear M. 1993. *Malign Neglect.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 378 pp.
248. Wolch J, Rowe S. 1992. On the streets: mobility paths of the urban homeless. *City Soc.* 6(2):115–40
249. Wright SE. 1993. Blaming the victim, blaming society or blaming the discipline: fixing responsibility for poverty and homelessness. *Soc. Q.* 34(1):1–16
250. Zavella P. 1987. *Women's Work and Chicano Families.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press
251. Zavella P. 1994. Reflections on diversity among Chicanos. See Ref. 77, pp. 199–212
252. Zavella P. 1996. Living on the edge: everyday lives of poor Chicano/Mexicano families. In *Mapping Multiculturalism?* ed. A Gordon, C Newfield. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press. In press
253. Zavella P. 1996. The tables are turned: immigration, poverty, and social conflict in California communities. In *The New Nativism*, ed. J Perea. New York: NY Univ. Press. In press
254. Deleted in proof
255. Zinn M. 1989. Family, race and poverty in the eighties. *Signs* 14(4):856–74
256. Zukin S. 1991. *Landscapes of Power: From Detroit to Disneyworld.* Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press