LIVING IN THE LIMINAL:
A STUDY OF HOMELESSNESS IN CLEVELAND, OHIO

A thesis submitted
to Kent State University in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of Arts

by
Sarah K. Shaw
August 2011
Thesis written by
Sarah Kerr Shaw
B.S., Ohio University, 2009
M.A., Kent State University, 2011

Approved by

Richard Feinberg, Advisor

Richard Meindl, Chair, Department of Anthropology

John R. D. Stalvey, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ........................................................................................................... v

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION .................................................................................................................. 1

   The Culture of Poverty ........................................................................................................ 2

   Homelessness as an American Phenomenon ................................................................. 8

II. SITE SELECTION AND METHODS .............................................................................. 14

III. OVERVIEW OF ARCHETYPES .................................................................................. 20

III. CLEVELAND’S SHELTER SYSTEM ........................................................................... 31

IV. INTERVIEWS .................................................................................................................. 38

   Charlie ............................................................................................................................. 38

   Sam ................................................................................................................................. 43

   Joe ................................................................................................................................. 48

   Jack ............................................................................................................................... 53

V. FINDINGS ....................................................................................................................... 56
VI. CONCLUSION ................................................................. 60

NOTES .................................................................................. 64
APPENDIX A Megan’s Law .................................................................. 66
APPENDIX B Map of Cleveland Shelters ........................................... 69
APPENDIX C Informal Interview Questions ...................................... 70
WORKS CITED ......................................................................... 71
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Richard Feinberg for his guidance and support, and for his willingness to share his gift for finding order in chaos. I am grateful to the Kent State Anthropology Department faculty, Amanda Mullett and my graduate student cohort for their succor and their humor. I am forever indebted to my mother, W. Sue Shaw, for her unwavering love and for believing in me even when I did not believe in myself. This work is dedicated to the memory of Stephanie Sprang.
Chapter I

Introduction

Of all the preposterous assumptions of humanity over humanity, nothing exceeds most of the criticisms made on the habits of the poor by the well-housed, well-warmed, and well-fed.

— Herman Melville (Moncur 2010)

As Peter Metcalf notes, the field of anthropology was described by an anonymous 19th century wit as “the pursuit of the exotic by the eccentric” (Metcalf 1978:6). This quote brings to mind an image of anthropologists traveling to far-flung destinations in search of undocumented people with strange rituals. However, many contemporary anthropologists have begun to study the “exotic” in our own backyards. This can be seen clearly in Philippe Bourgois’s studies of Harlem crack dealers (2003) and homeless heroin addicts in San Francisco (2009). Despite their geographical proximity, the homeless are as alien to many Americans as the Gimi of New Guinea.

I undertook this study in order to explore the ways homelessness has changed since the Great Depression. In the 1930s, Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal was instrumental in the creation of a number of new social service programs designed to help combat the crushing poverty and homelessness brought on by the depression and the increasing
urbanization of the United States (Degler 1970). I hypothesized that 80 years of social service programs had had an effect on homelessness and how it is viewed by mainstream Americans. In so doing, I hope to contribute a greater understanding of the lives and culture of people engaged in a daily struggle with poverty to the store of anthropological knowledge of human behavior and some of the perceptions created in reaction to it.

The Culture of Poverty

Although direct studies of homelessness, such as Bourgois’s, are relatively new to the field of anthropology a great deal of study has been dedicated to some related issues, such as poverty. Not all people living in poverty are homeless. However, many people who are homeless live in poverty. Anthropologists such as Oscar Lewis, David Schneider, Raymond Smith and Elliot Liebow have addressed the issue of poverty, both in the United States and abroad.

When discussing poverty and anthropology, the work of Oscar Lewis has a special place. Lewis spent much of his career studying poverty, as reflected in his works The Culture of Poverty (1966), A Study of Slum Culture (1968), Five Families: Mexican Case Studies in the Culture of Poverty (1962). Lewis describes the culture of poverty, which he refers to both as a subculture and a culture, as an adaptation that can develop among groups of poor people who experience the following conditions:
(1) a cash economy, wage labor and production for profit; (2) a persistently high rate of unemployment and underemployment for unskilled labor; (3) low wages; (4) the failure to provide social, political or economic organization, either on a voluntary basis or by government imposition, for the low income population; (5) the existence of a bilateral kinship system rather than a unilateral one; and finally, (6) the existence in the dominant class of a set of values that stresses the accumulation of wealth and property, the possibility of upward mobility, and thrift and that explains low economic status as the result of personal inadequacy or inferiority. (Lewis 1968:4-5)

Lewis believed that once the culture of poverty develops it is self-perpetuating because of its influence on children. He notes:

By the time slum children are age six or seven they have usually absorbed the basic values and attitudes of their subculture and are not psychologically geared to take full advantage of the changing conditions or increased opportunities that may occur in their lifetime. (Lewis 1968:6)

Lewis observed that the culture of poverty is characterized by 70 different traits that may or may not be related, exist to a greater or lesser degree in any given population, and individually to not indicate the presence of the subculture. Some of these traits include matrifocality (mother as head of household), legitimization of short-term hedonism and
indulgence in impulsive behavior. However, he was careful to note that there exists a difference between poverty and the subculture of poverty:

In making this distinction I have tried to document a broader generalization; namely, that it is a serious mistake to lump all poor people together, because the causes, the meaning and the consequences of poverty vary considerably in different contexts… the subculture of poverty is part of the larger culture of capitalism, whose social and economic system channels wealth into the hands of a relatively small group and thereby makes for the growth of sharp class distinctions. (Lewis 1968:20)

Lewis’s work on the culture of poverty had a tremendous impact on American racial politics. It provided the basis for Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan’s report to President Lyndon Johnson, *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action*, colloquially known as the Moynihan report. This report was intended as “a call for federal action to create, among other things, jobs for black, male heads of households in the inner city” (Harvey and Reed 1996:469). However, many critics of the report thought that it placed the blame for poverty on those who were living in it. This “blame the victim” criticism had also been applied to Lewis’ work.

In his book *Culture and Poverty: Critique and Counter-Proposals* (1968) Charles Valentine offers a systematic analysis of both the Moynihan Report and Lewis’s concept of the culture of poverty. Of the Moynihan report, Valentine notes:

It must be made clear that neither this document nor the resultant
Presidential speech contained any proposal for a concrete program of action to implement the declared objectives. As far as public policy is concerned, both pieces are limited to recommendations or declarations of rather general aims. (Valentine 1968:31-32)

As for Lewis’s culture of poverty, Valentine notes:

Ultimately, he is saying that the alleged culture patterns of the lower class are more important in their lives than the condition of being poor and, consistently, that it is more important for the power holders of society to abolish these lifeways than to do away with poverty — even if eradicating poverty can be done more quickly and easily. (Valentine 1968:1974)

Valentine’s critiques were supported by a number of social scientists. The echo of these critiques could be heard outside of academic circles, resulting in a public backlash against those perceived to be blaming victims of poverty for their own circumstance.

Other anthropologists have also addressed the culture of poverty. In 1973’s *Class Differences and Sex Roles in American Kinship and Family Structure*, David Schneider and Raymond Smith adopt Talcott Parson’s definition of culture:

A system of symbols and meanings, which, while they enter into and form an integral part of action processes, are nonetheless analytically separable from action and can be studied in isolation from it. (Schneider and Smith 1973:4)
They use this definition as the framework for their study of American kinship.

Schneider and Smith propose that, at the cultural level, there is consistency in how kinship systems are enacted in America. However, they suggest that variation in American kinship on the social level is based in class differences. They describe American social classes not as entities distinct from one another, but rather as a graded continuum, with little mobility at either extreme. Schneider and Smith postulate that, in American culture, this lack of mobility is not due to a social restriction on movement from class to class, but on the actions of the individual; it “is thought to depend upon his actions and their conformity to class standards” (Schneider and Smith 1973:25). They observe that class standards are difficult to identify, because the classes lack clear markers. Schneider and Smith therefore identify the different classes based on the motivation of their decisions as viewed from the middle of the spectrum. They assert that lower-class values emphasize security, middle-class values emphasize rationality, and upper-class values emphasize tradition. Schneider and Smith also offer several examples that characterize American kinship as demonstrated by the lower class. These include:

- The “composition of lower-class households can be more diverse without being considered unusual” (Schneider and Smith 1973:53).
- Because planning is difficult for lower-class families, emphasis is placed on flexibility.
- The emphasis in child rearing is conformity and submission rater than independence as a vehicle for achievement.
In *Tally’s Corner* (1967), Elliot Liebow offers an ethnographic account of the lives of several lower class African-American men in an economically depressed area of Washington, DC in the early 1960s. Although written years before *Class Differences and Sex Roles in American Kinship and Family Structure*, this ethnography demonstrates several of the characteristics observed in Schneider and Smith’s research, but it also demonstrates some variation, despite the fact that the research was conducted in different cities and in different parts of the country.

First, *Tally’s Corner* demonstrates diversity of household composition. Some of the men live with their wives and children; others live alone, while their mothers or extended families raise their children. For example, John lives with his wife and six children. Sea Cat is married, but lives separately from his wife and children. Tally has an illegitimate child with Bess, who raises the baby with only peripheral help from Tally. Sweets and Tonk both have daughters who are being raised by the men’s mothers.

The lower class emphasis on flexibility is also demonstrated in *Tally’s Corner*, especially in relation to work. Most of the men did not work in consistent, full-time positions. Many would change jobs regularly, mainly in search of higher pay. Some of the men placed a higher value on their sexual relationships than their working ones; others only worked when absolutely necessary. Liebow notes:

Thus, the man-job relationship is a tenuous one. At any given moment, a job may occupy a relatively low position on the streetcorner scale of real values. Getting a job may be subordinated to relations with women or to other non-job considerations; the
commitment to a job one already has is frequently shallow and tentative. (Liebow 1967:35)

Liebow’s work demonstrates some variation from Schneider and Smith’s, particularly in the areas of independence and submission. In his introduction of his study participants, Liebow describes Leroy as “generally considered weak and immature, a ‘boy’ who ‘talked big’ and who, when competing with men, women or a job, would probably back down before the confrontation or be the loser of it” (Liebow 1967:27), demonstrating Schneider and Smith’s assertion that members of the lower class are raised to be submissive to those of who are more powerful. By contrast, Liebow describes Sea Cat as a person who “distains the ordinary, frequently choosing to see a special quality, talent or property in ordinary people and ordinary events” (Liebow 1967:25), indicating that Sea Cat seeks out and asserts individuality and independence.

**Homelessness as an American Phenomenon**

Homelessness is a large and growing problem, both in the US and worldwide. Although it is difficult to determine the exact number of homeless people worldwide, the United Nations Human Settlements Programme “estimates that 1.1 billion people live in inadequate housing conditions in urban areas alone, while an estimated 100 million have no housing whatsoever” (UNDPI/NGO 2010). In the United States, according to the National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty (2009:5), before the current
economic crisis “approximately 3 million people experienced homelessness yearly. If current trends continue, another 2 million will become homeless in the next two years.” It is well worth noting that these figures are estimates. Homeless populations are notoriously hard to count accurately; because of both their transient nature and inconsistencies in the way data on the homeless are collected. Some studies do not count areas where “there seemed little likelihood of finding homeless people (‘low probability’ blocks)” (Burt 1996:20). Other studies, such as the US Census, “explicitly excluded people sleeping in vehicles” (Burt 1996:19).

Homelessness is nearly as difficult to codify as it is to quantify. Definitions of homelessness vary by their source and application. A general definition, such as “having no home; without a permanent place of residence” (Webster 2000), scarcely scratches the surface of the issue. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development defines a homeless person as:

1. an individual who lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence; and

2. an individual who has a primary nighttime residence that is
   a. a supervised publicly or privately operated shelter designed to provide temporary living accommodations (including welfare hotels, congregate shelters, and transitional housing for the mentally ill);
b. an institution that provides a temporary residence for individuals intended to be institutionalized; or
c. a public or private place not designed for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings. (USDHUD: 2011)

Although this text aims to define a homeless person, and by implication, homelessness, it raises almost as many questions as it answers, such as how to define “fixed,” “regular,” “adequate,” and “temporary.”

Sociologist Martha Burt takes a broader view in her essay “Homelessness: Definitions and Counts,” where she divides the homeless in five categories: “adults, children and youth sleeping in places not meant for human habitation,” “adults, children and youth in shelters,” “children in institutions,” “adults in institutions,” and “adults, children and youth living ‘doubled up’ in conventional dwellings” (Burt 1996:17). She also notes:

Members of the first two categories would be considered “literally homeless”—that is, living on the streets or in shelters. The remainder are considered “at imminent risk” of literal homelessness—that is, if their current precarious housing arrangements fail, or if an institutional stay comes to a predictable end, they have neither prospects nor resources to keep themselves from literal homelessness. A more expansive definition
of literal homelessness might include the institutionalized who have no usual home elsewhere, the most unstable group among the precariously housed, or both. (Burt 1996:17)

While Burt’s categories are more comprehensive than the HUD guidelines, they still address only the physical conditions of homelessness.

Anthropologist Kim Hopper and Social Worker Jim Baumohl take a more theoretical approach and attempt to explicate not only the physical conditions of homelessness, but also the conceptual difficulties it implies. Their definition begins by addressing the intangible connotation of the word “homeless”: “…we also invoke the word to indicate something poignant and diffuse: the absence of belonging, both to a place and with the people settled there” (Hopper and Baumohl 1996:3). They further describe homelessness as a liminal state, both physically and cognitively:

_Liminality_ (from the Latin word for threshold) is a term anthropologists use for a variety of _states of passage_, through which designated members of a given culture travel at specified times. For the duration of passage, such people are “betwixt and between,” suspended between the familiar social niche they have left behind and the one they have yet to assume. Because they occupy no fixed status in the liminal state, they are considered ambiguous beings— even dangerous— and their presence is subject to ritual regulation. Special precautions are taken to separate them from ordinary social life. (Hopper and Baumohl 1996:4)
Indeed, it is the ambiguity of those in a liminal state that separates them from the mainstream, creating an “other” that many deem dangerous. I suggest that this “other” is a product of the human tendency to think in terms of binary oppositions, such as “us vs. them.”

Arnold van Gennep first developed the concept of liminality in his influential work, *The Rites of Passage*. Liminality is the second of the three stages of ceremonies “accompanying and individual’s ‘life crises’” outlined by van Gennep (1960[1908]:vii); the first and third are separation and incorporation, respectively. Van Gennep was the first to argue that during the period of liminality, an individual’s characteristics are ambiguous. Mary Douglas interpreted van Gennep’s approach to liminality thus:

> He saw society as a house with rooms and corridors in which passage from one to another is dangerous. Danger lies in transitional states, simply because transition is neither one state nor the next, it is undefinable. The person who must pass from one to another is himself in danger and emanates danger to others. (Douglas 1966:96)

Victor Turner goes further, describing the behavior and attitude of those in a liminal state:

> Liminal entities… may be represented as possessing nothing… Their behavior is normally passive or humble; they must obey their instructors implicitly, and accept arbitrary punishment without complaint. It is as though they are being ground down to a uniform condition to be fashioned
anew and endowed with additional powers to enable them to cope with their new station in life. (Turner 1969:95)

Therefore, it is unsurprising that classifications have arisen to discern those in a dangerous liminal state. Following this propensity, mainstream American culture has created a set of archetypes of the homeless other, perhaps as a means of widening the division between them and us. Here I use the term archetype not in the Jungian sense of innate patterns of the psyche (Jung 1959:4), but rather in the more literary sense of a generalized type used to describe a larger group. I chose the term archetype over the term stereotype because the latter carries a pejorative connotation that I do not wish to reinforce. What follows is an examination of these archetypes and how they have changed since the Great Depression, as well as a surprising finding concerning another set of related archetypes, those that are created by the homeless in the liminal state and applied to mainstream society.
Chapter II

Site Selection and Methods

I chose Cleveland as the site for this study for two primary reasons. First, I needed a field site that was accessible from Kent, Ohio, where I was living. It would have been ideal for me to spend my fieldwork period actually living on the streets of my chosen location. However, because of economic considerations and issues of personal safety and legality, I chose to commute to my field site.

Second, the relatively large population of Cleveland in comparison to other cities in Northern Ohio, both overall and in estimated homeless population made it the most desirable of the potential sites. According to the Northeast Ohio Coalition for the Homeless, Cuyahoga County, including Cleveland, had an estimated 1,283,925 residents in 2008, the last year for which statistics are currently available. This reflects a population over twice that of Summit County, including Akron (542,562), and almost three times that of Lucas County, including Toledo (440,456) (NEOCH 2009). Also in 2008, Cuyahoga County had an estimated 20,414 homeless persons, Summit County an estimated 6,782 and Lucas County an estimated 8,193 (NEOCH 2009).

NEOCH also provides available demographic information for the Cuyahoga County homeless. Of those entering emergency intake shelters in 2009:
• 69% were African-American, 26% were Caucasian, and about 4% reported their race as “other”.

• 7% were veterans.

• 2,397 were single, 217 were adults with children, and 493 were children.

• 47% were previously living with friends or family, 11% were previously living in another shelter, 5% were living in rental housing, and 4% were in prison.

• 64% were homeless for the first time, 18% for the second time, 8% for the third time, and 10% for the fourth or more time. (NEOCH 2009: 15-22)

After I selected Cleveland as my field site, I submitted a comprehensive research proposal to the Kent State University Institutional Review Board. As part of my proposal, I requested permission to use a verbal script to obtain informed consent in lieu of the standard written consent form. The written consent would be the only document linking the participant to the study, so I felt that eliminating it would provide an added dimension of confidentiality for my participants. However, I did require participants who were willing to be audiotaped to sign a separate consent form. The Review Board approved my proposal (#10-194) on July 6th, 2010.

Once the Institutional Review Board approved my proposal, I was faced with the task of recruiting study participants. I originally intended to volunteer at a shelter for the homeless as a means of meeting potential study participants, but after reading the work of oral historian Daniel Kerr, I reconsidered. Dr. Kerr has interviewed close to 200 homeless

> While many of us may view the shelter as a fairly benign institution, in Cleveland the emergency shelters are typically referred to as ‘open penitentiaries’ by their residents and shelter workers are viewed in a similar light as prison guards or wardens. (Kerr 2002)

I therefore chose to volunteer with a day “drop-in” program instead.

I contacted three day drop-in programs, two in downtown Cleveland and one in East Cleveland. Only one, the Saint Cortona Center, was accepting volunteers. The Saint Cortona Center in downtown Cleveland offers a variety of services to the homeless and working poor. They provide hot meals twice a day, shower facilities, clothing, and daily activities, among other services. After meeting with the volunteer coordinator I was assigned to work in the art room. Paula (not her real name), who is also a volunteer, administers the art program. Three days a week the room is open to any who wish to use it. Art supplies are primarily acquired from the Zero Landfill program, or purchased with donations to the program.

I also attempted to make arrangements to spend a few nights in the women’s intake shelter in order to gain more first-hand experience and identify a wider range of study participants. I contacted the shelter’s director and explained my study and its purpose; she agreed to allow me to spend the next three nights at the shelter. However, when I arrived the next day, she informed me that I would have to undergo a background check and
fingerprinting before I could stay because the shelter was run by the city, I am not homeless, and I am a student. I agreed, but she said she was unwilling to go to the trouble.

Study participants were chosen based on a number of criteria that I established and that had been approved by the Institutional Review Board. These criteria included: age of more than 18 years, either currently homeless or homeless within the last year, no obvious mental impairment and willingness to participate. Those under 18 were excluded because of the potential difficulty of obtaining informed consent from a parent or guardian. During the course of my fieldwork, I met and interacted with around 20 homeless men and two women. Many of them I only met once and never had an opportunity to get to know them better. Some I excluded as study participants because of obvious impairment, either due to mental illness or substance abuse. Others seemed highly distrustful of me and avoided speaking to me at any length.

The ethnographic information that follows was collected from four participants of the Saint Cortona Center art program. Although it was not a deliberate choice, all four are African-American men. St. Cortona’s programs support a diverse demographic range of people; however, all but 1 of the participants of the art program at the time were African-American. These were the people whom I got to know best, and the ones most willing to share their experience with me. Over the course of a six-week study, I spent approximately 250 hours working and talking with these men, who were gracious enough to share their lives and stories with me. I will refer to four study participants as Charlie, Joe, Sam and Jack.
Data were collected using participant observation, as well as one formal interview with each study participant. Since I was unable to live in a shelter, my participant observation took place primarily at the St. Cortona Center. I worked alongside my study participants to collect materials, make art and try to involve others in the project. I also spent a good deal of time with my participants outside of St. Cortona, mostly in public parks because that was where my participants spent most of their time outside of the shelter. Interviews were conducted mostly in the public parks. Before each interview, I reviewed the script for informed consent with the study participant, answered any questions, and gave the study participant a copy of the script. I also had those who agreed to audio taping sign a separate consent form. Although I had a few questions prepared to guide the interviews, I found I did not really need them. All four of the men shared their stories in the degree of detail with which they were comfortable, and I was pleased to find they were fairly open with me. I have attempted to substantiate as much information gained from the study participants as possible through the use of public records, such as the state sex offender registry and legal records. Despite my efforts corroborate the information I was given, I had to rely heavily on the presumed honesty of my participants. While I cannot be completely certain of their candor, I feel confident that they were sincere in their efforts to openly share their stories.

To protect the anonymity and privacy of study participants, the names of people and specific locations have been changed. When direct quotations are used, pseudonyms are as well in order to preserve the privacy of study participants. Only people, (e.g. elected or
appointed officials) and locations (e.g., Cleveland) that are widely known to the public bear their true names.
Chapter III

Overview of Archetypes

Although the reasons for homelessness are many and varied, my research has led me to the conclusion that five primary archetypes exist. These are The Bum, The Addict, The Nut, The Unlucky and the Ex-Con. These archetypes have a long history in American culture, and are reflected in some of the great literary works of the twentieth century. I have chosen characters from the work of John Steinbeck as exemplars of each of these archetypes.

Two twentieth century events played a large part in shaping American perceptions of homelessness: the Great Depression and the Oklahoma Dust Bowl. These events directly led to a previously unprecedented increase in the number of homeless people in the US. In addition, they were important in the formation of American mainstream archetypes of the homeless and an important influence on Steinbeck’s work. The start of the Great Depression is usually pinpointed as October 29, 1929, or “Black Tuesday” when the Dow Jones Industrial Average plummeted (Taylor 2011). This tremendous loss precipitated a huge change in American culture. Almost overnight, the excesses of the roaring twenties were gone, replaced by unemployment, suicide, bread lines, poverty and of course homelessness. Thus, a vicious cycle began: the loss of capital resulted in businesses closing, which in turn resulted in job scarcity and difficulty of
displaced workers finding new jobs, resulting in lower wages and job competition, leading to loss of consumer buying power, which ultimately led to the closure of more businesses. As Nick Taylor notes:

By 1932 the unemployment rate had soared past 20 percent. Thousands of banks and businesses had failed. Millions were homeless. Men (and women) returned home from fruitless job hunts to find their dwellings padlocked and their possessions and families turned into the street. Many drifted from town to town looking for non-existent jobs. Many more lived at the edges of cities in makeshift shantytowns their residents derisively called Hoovervilles. People foraged in dumps and garbage cans for food. (Taylor 2011)

Then president Hoover lost his bid for reelection to Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932. Unlike Hoover, Roosevelt thought it was the job of the federal government to address the ever-expanding social crisis. He proposed several pieces of new legislation to address the social ills caused by the depression, which became known collectively as “The New Deal.” Some of the programs created by New Deal Legislation were temporary, such as the Civil Works Administration and the Works Progress Administration, which offered temporary jobs to millions. Others, such as the Social Security Administration, have been modified since their creation but exist to this day.

The Great Depression did not begin to subside until the early 1940s. Economic recovery was spurred by increased industrial production due to America’s involvement in
World War II. However, it would be 1954 before the stock market was back to pre-Depression levels (Taylor 2011).

Concurrently, natural and industrial forces created another blow to an economically depressed America, the Oklahoma Dust Bowl. Decades of farming techniques that loosened the soil, severe drought and high winds created tremendous dust storms throughout the Great Plains region of the United States between 1932 and 1940 (Hurt 1981). As part of an oral history project produced by Wessels Living History Farm LeRoy Hankel, who was living in Nebraska at the time, recalls the dust storms:

Everything was dirty you know, with dust blowing all over. And then in '34 when the dust storms started from the west at North Platte was what I was told. And I'll tell you that looked like the worst storm you ever saw. It was just a cloud coming right over, that's what it looked. And it was all black. I've heard up to 100 mile per hour wind. I don't know if it was that strong. Myself, I don't think it was. But a car stopped at Frazier's. He was driving ahead of it. He said, 'You know, that storm started behind me about North Platte.' And he said, 'I outrun it until here.' And he said, 'I just had to stop.' But the whole sky in the west, as far as you – just a black cloud. That's the way it looked. But it was all dirt and that's all we got out of it. We got all dirt. Dave Frazier had his truck sitting out in front of the store there and it even blew that about 30-40 feet – just right down the street. (Wessels 2003)
These storms destroyed farms and their crops, causing financial disaster for the region’s farmers. Some were sharecroppers, tenants who farmed the land and gave much of their crop to the landowner. Others lived on small family-owned farms. Neither escaped the ravaging effects of the dust storms. Without the income generated by crops, many farmers and sharecroppers were unable to pay the leases on their farm equipment, replant, or often, even feed their families.

As a result, thousands of residents of the area joined a mass migration of economic refugees from the drought that blanketed the Midwest and became colloquially (and derogatorily) known as “Okies”, although not all were from Oklahoma (Hurt 1981:98). Most headed west in search of jobs, which were already scarce because of the Great Depression. This increased competition for jobs and often drove wages below what was necessary to live on. It also created a rift between the Okies and the residents of western states, such as California, who feared losing their jobs to the newcomers and becoming displaced themselves.

Like the Californians who feared the migration of the Okies, some contemporary Americans view the homeless as shiftless, lazy people who simply prefer not to work and instead attempt to live off of the benefits provided by the government, social service agencies and whatever other means are available to them. Popular conservative radio and television host Bill O’Reilly gives voice to this opinion. In response to a 2006 appeals court decision in California that ruled police officers could not arrest people for loitering in homeless camps in Los Angeles, O’Reilly declared:
The ACLU wants to force society to house people who will not support themselves, who will not do it, because they want to get drunk, or they want to get high, or they want — *they don't want to work, they're too lazy.* They say, "OK, that's a person's choice. The government should give them a house, and food, and walking-around money, and everything else."

That's what it's all about. This is the hidden agenda. (Media Matters 2006)

[Emphasis added]

This view has given rise to the archetype The Bum. In *Cannery Row,* John Steinbeck creates a number of characters that fit this archetype, most notably Mack. “Mack was the elder, leader, mentor, and to a small extent the exploiter of a little group of men who had in common no families, no money and no ambitions beyond food, drink, and contentment” (Steinbeck 1945:10). This short introduction to Mack reveals the primary signifier of this archetype, that is, lack of ambition. It also implies several of the other qualities associated with this archetype, such as the quest for gratification at the cost of other pursuits.

Another common view, also suggested by O’Reilly, is that most homeless are drug or alcohol addicts, giving rise to the archetype The Addict. This view may be attributed in part to the fact that some addicts appear to be homeless because of the amount of time they spend on the street and the fact that some panhandle to support their habit. A 2007 study by Gallup for Fannie Mae notes that 26% of those surveyed believed drug and alcohol abuse to be the primary cause of homelessness (Gallup 2007:20). However, not all addicts are homeless and not all homeless are addicts. Steinbeck
provides an excellent example of this archetype in Danny Taylor, Ethan Hawley’s childhood friend in *The Winter of Our Discontent*:

Danny Taylor, a restless, unsteady ghost, wanting to be somewhere else and dragging there and wanting to be somewhere else. Danny, the town drunk. Every town has one, I guess. Danny Taylor – so many town heads shook slowly from side to side – good family, old family, last of the line, good education. Didn’t he have some trouble at the academy? Why doesn’t he straighten up? He’s killing himself with booze and that’s wrong because Danny’s a gentleman. It’s a shame, begging for money for booze. (Steinbeck 1961:48)

This description of the public view of Danny Taylor well reflects how many people view The Addict. There is a long-standing perception that those who suffer from substance abuse problems are merely indulgent, not suffering from a physiological illness; that they could change their circumstance through sheer force of will to be sober. Psychiatrists Robert Drake and Michael Wallach describe what is known as the moralistic view of addiction:

Our culture has long taken a moralistic view of psychoactive substance use, as reflected in popular themes of bad behavior, bad character, and moral culpability. The moralistic view of substance abuse has often dominated public policy and underlies current efforts to “get tough” on drugs by emphasizing control and punishment…In recent years we have seen increasing public concerns about violence, vagrancy, and misuse of
welfare funds, which have led to mandatory restraints and financial controls. (Drake and Wallach 2000)

The third, and likely most common, archetype is the Nut. The relatively high visibility of homeless people with mental illness contributes to the view that many, if not most, homeless people are mentally ill. This viewpoint is so prevalent that even elected or appointed officials believe the statistics of mental illness among the homeless to be much higher than they actually are. A prime example can be found in my interview of Naytoya Walker Minor, the Chief of Public Affairs for the City of Cleveland. At the very beginning of our interview, Chief Walker cautioned me that, because most of the homeless were mentally ill, it would be unlikely that I would be able to find study participants. She seemed both surprised and unbelieving when I told her that I had already spoken to several homeless people who do not suffer from mental illness.

The current state of the economy is a contributing factor in the number of homeless who suffer for mental illness. Between 2009 and 2011, the state of Ohio cut almost $58 million in services for the mentally ill (Candinsky 2011). These dramatic cuts have resulted in an inability to access medication and psychiatric care for many patients with diagnosed mental illnesses.

Steinbeck provides an example of this archetype in Lennie Small, one of the main characters in 1937’s Of Mice and Men. Lennie suffers from some sort of undiagnosed developmental disability and is unable to care for himself. Steinbeck never gives a detailed explanation for Lennie’s disability. George, his caretaker and companion, who often speaks for Lennie in an effort to conceal his condition, refers to Lennie as a “crazy
“An’ whatta I got,” George went on furiously. “I got you! You can’t keep a job and you loose me ever’ job I get. Jus’ keep me shovin’ all over the country all the time. An’ that ain’t the worst. You get in trouble. You do bad things and I got to get you out.” His voice rose nearly to a shout. “You crazy son-of-a-bitch. You keep me in hot water all the time.” He took on the elaborate manner of little girls when they are mimicking one another. “Jus’ wanted to feel that girl’s dress — jus’ wanted to pet it like it was a mouse - Well, how the hell did she know you jus’ wanted to feel her dress... All the time somethin’ like that – all the time. (Steinbeck 1937:24)

The fourth archetype, one that is growing both in popularity and concern, is The Unlucky. The current economic recession and high foreclosure rates, 1 in 593 during the month of April, 2011, strike a reasonable fear in many (RealtyTrac 2011). The Unlucky is the person who has lost his job due to some stroke of bad luck. He is unable to find a new job, cannot pay his mortgage, is foreclosed upon, and suddenly finds himself homeless. This archetype tends to be the most frightening for many people, because they realize on some level that these things could happen to them, as evidenced by a Gallup poll for Fannie Mae. This poll found that 28% of those surveyed responded, “that there
has been a time when they, themselves, were worried that they may not have a place to live” (Gallup 2007). This is possibly the least vilified of all of the archetypes. However, the time that a person may fit this archetype is relatively short; in a mere few months he may find himself as another archetype, such as the Bum. Only one of my four study participants fits this archetype.

Although many of Steinbeck’s characters typify this archetype Pa Joad, of Steinbeck’s 1939 work *The Grapes of Wrath*, epitomizes not just the archetype but also the way people may move from being seen as unlucky to another archetype. At the outset of the novel Pa Joad, the head of a family of Oklahoma sharecroppers, finds himself and his family faced with eviction from the land they have worked and lived on for generations. He makes the difficult decision to take his family to California in search of work, like many of his neighbors, because he has little choice. By the end of the novel Pa Joad is, along with thousands of others, defeated and broken. Steinbeck sums up the attitude of many Californians to the wave of displaced thus:

They were hungry, and they were fierce. And they had hoped to find a home, and they found only hatred. Okies — the owners hated them because the owners knew they were soft and the Okies strong, that they were fed and the Okies hungry; and perhaps the owners had heard from their grandfathers how easy it is to steal land from a soft man if you are fierce and hungry and armed…And the laboring people hated Okies because a hungry man must work, and if he must work, if he has to work,
the wage payer automatically gives him less for his work; and then no one

  can get more. (Steinbeck 1939:256-257)

The fifth archetype, The Ex-Con, is perhaps newer to the zeitgeist of
contemporary homelessness than the other four. Those who have served time in prison
often face a number of challenges when they are released, such as family or community
ostracism and difficulty in finding housing or work. These problems are so common that
some states or counties publish guides to help address some of these issues, such as
Cuyahoga County’s publication, “Going Home to Stay: A Guide for Successful Reentry
for Men and Women” (Strategy 2009). Three of my four study participants fall into this
archetype, because their incarceration was a direct cause of their homelessness.

Once again, a character from The Grapes of Wrath typifies many of the issues
associated with this archetype. At the beginning of the story Tom Joad, recently released
from prison where he was serving a sentence for killing a man in a fight, returns to his
family to find that although they are happy to see him they fear the ways prison may have
changed him. This is demonstrated by the first interaction between Tom and his mother
upon his return home:

  She said in confusion, “I knowed Purty Boy Floyd. I knowed his ma.
  They was good folks. He was full of hell, sure, like a good boy oughta
be.” She paused and then her words poured out. “I don’ know all like this
– but I know it. He done a little bad thing an’ they hurt ‘im, caught ‘im an’
hurt him so he was mad, an’ the nex’ bad thing he done was mad, an’ they
hurt ‘im again. An’ purty soon he was mean mad… He wasn’t no boy or no man no more, he was jus’ a walkin’ chunk a mean-mad. But the folks that knowed him didn’t hurt ‘im. No matter how they say it in the paper how he was bad – that’s how it was.” She paused and licked her dry lips, and her whole face was an aching question, “I got to know, Tommy. Did they hurt you so much? Did they make you mad like that?” (Steinbeck 1939:82)

These archetypes are not intended to encompass all homeless people or their circumstances. Rather, they represent common views of homelessness in American society. They also provide some insight into a few of both the real and imagined causes of homelessness.
Chapter IV

Cleveland’s Shelter System

Because of the variations in state and local laws that apply to homeless shelters, it is impossible to describe shelters across the country in general terms, although some similarities do exist. Like many American cities, Cleveland has had shelters for the homeless in some form or another since the 19th century. During the Great Depression, homeless men were “referred” by police and social workers to the Wayfarer’s Lodge, an overcrowded shelter on Lakeview Avenue run by Associated Charities. The Wayfarer had a lumberyard where men were required to chop wood for a minimum of one hour in order to receive a meal and a bed for the night. This requirement was a method used by Associated Charities to distinguish the “deserving” from the “undeserving” poor. Men who declined a referral to the Wayfarer’s Lodge were arrested (Kerr 2011). The Wayfarer had a strict registration system and was considered a way to confine and control the homeless.

Then, as now, shelters were segregated by gender. The conditions at the Wayfarer were deemed unfit for occupation by women, so in 1930 the Friendly Service Bureau of the Cleveland Women’s Christian Association took over responsibility for housing
homeless women (Kerr 2011:61). In *Derelict Paradise*, Daniel Kerr describes how indigent women were put to work as domestic servants in wealthy homes in Cleveland:

In the name of “relief and rehabilitation,” the YWCA noted, “the girl is sold to the employer.” When the bureau could not “sell” the women, they placed them in private lodging houses and boarding homes, YWCA rooms or inexpensive hotels, or they provided relatives with money to support the women. Additionally, they kept their support of women confidential in order to “preserve the girl’s sense of her own ability to take care of herself.” But these arrangements were deemed inappropriate for the “problem cases,” who were sent to sleep in the empty cells at the Women’s Police Bureau. (Kerr 2011:61)

For those who wished to avoid the Wayfarer’s Lodge or the “help” of the YWCA, there were often only two alternatives. The first option, for those that had some income, was taking up residence in a single room occupancy hotel (SRO). SROs were often dilapidated, overcrowded buildings where, for a fee, a person could rent a small room at a daily or weekly rate. The city highly discouraged these “flophouses” in favor of the Wayfarer or the YWCA, shuttering or razing SROs at every opportunity (Kerr 2011). SROs were a better choice for many working poor than the shelter, because at least they had freedom from the regulations and judgments imposed on them at the shelter.

The other alternative was to build a shack in one of the city’s shantytowns. As the depression deepened, shantytowns cropped up all over Cleveland; they were found on the
lakefront, in Kingsbury Run, on Whiskey Island at the mouth of the Cuyahoga River as well as along the riverfront. Although the conditions were cramped and unsanitary, many preferred the shantytowns to the shelters. First, the shantytowns were self-governed, giving the residents some measure of control over their circumstances. Second, the squatter settlements developed a cooperative non-market economy, which enabled residents to get by without relying on the Wayfarer or on hard to find wage-paying jobs. Residents built their shelters from scraps and scoured the junkyards for wood to burn for fuel. Meals were often cooked communally, with residents adding what they could collect from the trash or generous Clevelanders. Residents also fished, grew small garden plots and hunted small birds as a means of subsistence (Kerr 2011).

Unsurprisingly, city officials saw the camps as blight on their beautiful city. Although they routinely tried to raze the camps, the residents often fought back forcing the city to back down to avoid riots. However, the Torso Murders in the mid-1930s gave the city a good excuse to destroy the “jungle camps.” A still unidentified killer murdered at least 12 people, leaving their dismembered bodies near the homeless camps. Although most of the victims were never identified, police believed them to be homeless based on their stomach contents. The city’s safety director, Elliot Ness, ordered the camps to be emptied and burned, on the pretense that depriving the Torso Murderer of victims would end the slaughter. Residents of the camps were told to report to the Wayfarer; only 12 of the 300 evicted actually did (Kerr 2011:70). Instead, the men created new shantytowns along the river.
Since the depression, housing options for the homeless have changed, but not all for the better. Gone are the SROs, lost to the construction and increased gentrification of Cleveland over the last 30 years according to Doug, one of the program directors at St. Cortona. The “jungle camps” still exist, although on a much smaller scale and they move more frequently. One of my study participants, Sam, agreed to help me try to find the current camp. As we drove around Cleveland checking likely locations, he told me about what is now known as “the compound” or “tent city”:

I don’t see the big deal, they ain’t bothering nobody. Cops come and bust up the camp; they jus’ move somewhere else… Some of ‘em don’t like the shelter rules; they can’t get drunk and do drugs there. Some got kicked out of Shoreline for fighting. I see why they live at the compound; I don’t ever want to do it, myself.

Despite Sam’s assistance and the fact that we drove around for 2 hours trying to locate the compound, we were unable to find it.

The shelters themselves have also changed. According to the Street Card, a pamphlet produced by NEOCH that outlines the resources available to the homeless, there are currently 15 shelters in Cleveland (NEOCH 2010) [See appendix B]. Each shelter is run by a different organization, although they are all linked.

In 2009, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which authorized $1.5 billion for the Homeless Prevention Act, was signed into law by president Obama. Administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, these funds
are used for homeless prevention and rapid re-housing (Office of Homeless Services 2011). Some highlights of the program are:

· The purpose of the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program (HPRP) is to provide homelessness prevention assistance to households who would otherwise become homeless—many due to the economic crisis—and to provide assistance to rapidly re-house persons who are homeless as defined by Federal law and HUD guidelines. HUD expects that these resources will be targeted and prioritized to serve households that are most in need of this temporary assistance and are most likely to achieve stable housing, whether subsidized or unsubsidized, after the program concludes;

· The funds under this program are intended to target two populations of persons facing housing instability: 1) individuals and families who are currently in housing but are at risk of becoming homeless and need temporary rent or utility assistance to prevent them from becoming homeless or assistance to move to another unit (prevention), and 2) individuals and families who are experiencing homelessness (residing in emergency or transitional shelters or on the street) and need temporary assistance in order to obtain housing and retain it (rapid re-housing).

(Office of Homeless Services 2011)
In Cleveland when people become homeless, they may report to either the men’s intake shelter (Shoreline) or the women’s intake shelter. The shelter staff then attempts to move the client to another, specialized shelter or into transitional housing as quickly as possible. Cleveland’s specialized shelters include domestic violence shelters, a shelter for pregnant women, a shelter for women with children, a shelter for disabled men (The Scene) and two shelters for those with substance abuse problems.

Although the rapid rehousing program is well-intentioned, and to some degree effective, it is complicated by the fact that different shelters are run by different organizations and therefore have different requirements and regulations. For example the women’s intake shelter is run by a secular non-profit, Mental Health Services. Women may then be referred to the shelter for women with children, which is known as the “Downtown Arm of the Church” (Mission 2011). Paula and Doug, both volunteers at the St. Cortona drop in center, both tell me that many of the women in this shelter feel a great deal of pressure from shelter employees to participate in the “spiritual guidance” and “daily chapel service” in return for assistance. At Shoreline, run by Lutheran Ministries, men can earn special privileges by participating in “communities”—small groups that gather on a daily basis for group therapy and prayer. One of my study participants is a member of one of these communities. Another is not; he says he doesn’t like the idea that he has to pray in order to watch television.

Although rapid rehousing has lessened the congestion of the intake shelters, Shoreline remains the largest men’s shelter in Ohio, according to Doug. Between 400 and 500 men stay there every night. Since the implementation of rapid rehousing in 2009, the
proportion of new homeless staying at Shoreline has decreased. However, it does little to help the men who were already there and do not fall into a special interest group.
Chapter V

Interviews

Charlie

Charlie grew up in Cleveland, spending some of his early years in Columbus and Dayton. He is the third generation of what he calls a “typical black family from the South.” His family originally moved to Ohio for economic opportunity. At the time of the move, the family had a matriarchal structure with Charlie’s grandmother acting as the head of the family. This structure persisted until Charlie was in his late teens, when the economic and educational success of some family members resulted in a fracturing of family unity.

Charlie tells me his family has a long history of alcoholism. For many members of his family, Charlie included, Monday through Friday was the time to work, Friday night and Saturday were time to drink, and Sunday was time for church. At 23, Charlie stopped drinking, began working as a resident manager at a facility for substance abuse, and enrolled in college to study accounting. However, much of his time and energy were consumed with his struggle to maintain sobriety. This struggle was exacerbated by lack of family support, as most of his family was still drinking. After he finished college and began his career, it became less of a struggle for Charlie to stay sober.
Charlie married at age twenty-five and began working as a counselor’s assistant. Although he earned an Associate’s degree in Accounting, Charlie has never utilized this degree. He feels that many of the concepts of honesty emphasized by his alcohol treatment program were contradictory to the principles taught by his accounting program. He continued to be promoted within the field of substance abuse treatment and ultimately became the project director of a substance abuse treatment complex. Charlie’s wife, Karen, was five years his senior. He had a daughter with a high school girlfriend; Karen also had children from a previous relationship. They were together about ten years, but did not have children together.

Charlie worked at the treatment facility for twenty-one years (1979-1990). He lost his job due to his arrest. In 1983, many of the facility’s clients were former crack dealers. They would tell stories about female crack addicts who would prostitute themselves to support their habits. These stories stayed with Charlie, although his preoccupation with his own life and career prevented him from acting on them. In 1987, he was in his car at a stoplight when a prostitute approached him and offered to perform a variety of sex acts for $15. He took her up on her offer. He says street prostitution is very different than what is portrayed by Hollywood. Basically, it boils down to the prostitute doing as little as she can for as much money as possible, while the client or “trick” is trying to get as many sex acts as possible for as little money as possible.

Guilt quickly set in; he feared the damage that would be done to his career, family and marriage if anyone found out. At first, the guilt kept Charlie from repeating this behavior for four or five months. Over the course of the next few years, the time between
his solicitations grew shorter and shorter. Charlie developed a sex addiction that rivaled his former dependence on alcohol.

His arrest was the result of an accusation of rape by a prostitute in 1989. He believes that she exaggerated what had happened between them to avoid trouble with her pimp. She pressed charges, but after filing the complaint she vanished. The prosecution did not notify Charlie or his attorney of her absence; if he had not taken a plea bargain, it is likely that he would have avoided prosecution because there was no complaining witness. Charlie was given probation and a suspended sentence on the charge of second degree attempted rape. He did not understand that any misdemeanor conviction would result in him being required to serve his full sentence.

Karen’s first reaction was shock. She had no idea that Charlie was frequenting prostitutes. Neither did his daughter, who was 14 at the time. She lived with her mother’s family at the time of the incident and was largely unaware of what was going on with her father because they rarely spent much time together.

Charlie spent one year on probation before being arrested on a misdemeanor prostitution charge. Since the new charge was a misdemeanor, he simply paid a fine and the charge was settled. However, since the arrest violated his probation, he was sent to prison to serve the three to fifteen year suspended sentence for his original conviction. Due to Ohio’s 1996 switch to definite term sentencing\(^1\), Charlie served fourteen years. He was at the Orient Correctional Facility for five years and served the remainder of his sentence at Southeastern Correctional in Lancaster. He was considered a relatively low risk offender, so he was not required to serve his time in a maximum-security prison.
While incarcerated, Charlie was a model prisoner. He re-entered substance abuse counseling and spent a great deal of time reflecting on why he had made the decisions he had made, why he had sacrificed so much and ended up in prison. He came to the conclusion that he was facing the same issues he had been when he was drinking but his addiction had manifested in a different manner, namely through sex. “Addiction is addiction; … all these different labels, for some it’s booze, for some it’s drugs, for some it’s sex. But really it’s just trying to numb out.”

Charlie was abruptly released from prison in February of 2004, after his lawyer asked for his case to be reviewed in light of the 2002 Layne Decision.² At the time of his release, he had no formal release plan. Karen had divorced him while he was in prison, and he was estranged from most of his family. Charlie did not think Megan’s Law was fair; he was of the opinion that the sex offender registry did not help the perpetrators or their victims. He says:

Society is told that this is a bad person and he needs to be punished and whatever we do to him, it ain’t enough, not realizing that basically, if I set you up for failure and you are a perpetrator and you still have all that pain and anger and all that other kind of stuff, I’m basically just assigning you to a new victim under the guise of “we helping the victim and punishing the perpetrator.” Really you’re just creating more victims out of the victim and the perpetrator.
Charlie did not register as a sex offender, in violation of Ohio law. He stayed with a series of friends, but could not obtain state identification, so he could not find legal employment. He survived on what he calls “underground resources.” However, Charlie found this lifestyle difficult and tiring.

In October of 2006, Charlie surrendered himself to police for violation of Megan’s Law. He was charged with second-degree escape. The judge who heard his case sentenced him to finish the last year of his original sentence and one year on the escape charge concurrently. While in prison, he developed a painful nerve condition and clinical depression. At the end of his sentence, Charlie still had nowhere to go. After his release, he went to Shoreline on the advice of prison authorities. He maintains his objections to the sex offender registry, “the public thinks all the people on the registry is pedophiles or rapists.” Still, he registered as required.

Charlie stayed at Shoreline for two years. While there, he applied and was approved for food stamps, medical care through Care Source, and Supplemental Security Income. Because of these programs, Charlie was able to find an apartment. He currently pays about half of his monthly SSI income in rent, the other half covers utilities and other expenses. He works the occasional odd job to supplement his income, but is careful to stay below the $2000 a year limit set by the Social Security Administration. He knows that if he is caught making more than this amount he will at best see a cut in his benefits; at worst, he could be sent back to prison. Since moving out of the shelter, Charlie has begun to rebuild his relationship with his daughter and get to know his granddaughter. He feels fortunate to have found the help he needs to deal with his addictions and stay off of
the street. When asked what he would like people to know about homelessness, Charlie replies:

They can’t get out if they want to. People point and say “look at ya, you just lazy, don’t care about nothing”, it’s like blaming the uh, it’s like puttin’ them in their circumstance, their situation then turnin’ around and sayin’ “look how worthless they is”.

Sam

Sam grew up in the Lakeview district of Cleveland. He is the youngest of 3 children, with one brother and one sister. When he was sixteen, his first child was born. He had hoped to attend Kent State on a football scholarship after completing high school, but by the time he graduated he had another child on the way with a different woman. Instead of pursuing college, he joined the Army. The Vietnam War was drawing to a close and Sam was stationed in Germany. He served for three and a half years, his full contract, before his discharge.

Upon his return to Cleveland Sam began working in factories, first for a cloth manufacturer and then for a series of three box factories. He married and later had two more children. After fifteen years of factory work, he earned his STNA certification. Sam’s first client was an acquaintance who had lost his legs in an accident. Sam describes this job as being easy; he mostly cooked and picked up marijuana for his client. He says they spent most days smoking marijuana, drinking, watching ESPN and eating
cheeseburgers. This informal relationship allowed Sam to develop a close friendship with his client, who died a couple of years after Sam began caring for him. His client’s death hit him hard, but Sam signed up with a placement agency to find another STNA assignment. The first job he was assigned was in North Olmsted, a predominantly white community just under twenty miles west of Cleveland. He took the bus to North Olmsted, but then got lost. A police officer stopped him and inquired why he was there. He told the officer that he was on the way to a job assignment and the officer drove him to the address. However, when he arrived the lady of the house told him that he was “too big.” Sam took this to mean that he was “too black.” He turned around and returned to Cleveland. This turned out to be his last assignment as an STNA; the agency never sent him to another job.

He then began working temporary positions through staffing agencies. Most of his jobs were day long, manual labor positions, such as ditch digging or garbage collection. He worked these types of positions for three years. By this time, Sam was divorced and his children were adults. He lived alone in an apartment, but was not able to make enough money with temporary jobs to pay his rent. He was evicted, so he began to stay at Shoreline. When asked about his impressions of the shelter he replies:

Like a, you got mentally ill, people who just got out of jail, I’d say 65% of the people just people lost jobs and don’t have no where else to stay. Everybody think the people at Shoreline either mentally ill or just got out the joint, but that ain’t necessarily true. It’s like, most of the people there, most of the people I know, they just can’t find a job, they workin’ outta
temp agencies, they ain’t got enough money to keep a stable place and pay rent, so they go down there. A lot of the women down there at the women’s shelter work if they can find work, but it’s hard to find work, especially with the way the economy is in Cleveland. It’s just hard to find work… When you say shelter, they automatically look at you like, “what’s wrong wit you?” even though there’s nothin’ particularly wrong with you.

Sam reports that there are a lot of men at Shoreline who were just released from prison and a lot who are mentally ill. This does not bother him, but the homosexual residents of Shoreline do bother him. He is uncomfortable with the homosexual behavior he has witnessed there, particularly in the showers. He says, “It’s almost like the joint, ‘cept you can leave when you want to.” However, he thinks Shoreline is better than the shelters he has heard about in other cities, like Chicago or New York. He thinks this is both an advantage and a disadvantage; he feels some men get too comfortable staying at Shoreline: “you see a guy walking around with a bathrobe and slippers, you like, ‘dude, you got really too comfortable here’.” Sam says this comfort level is why the men must leave the shelter by eight A.M. On the weekends they may return at one P.M.; on the weekdays they must wait until four. Since the St. Cortona center is only open during the week, and the art program only Tuesday through Thursday, I ask Sam where he goes when the center is closed and he can’t be at Shoreline. He says that he usually goes to the park, but some men go to Tower City or the library. He says this is fine during the summer, fall and spring, but in winter the cold is too unbearable be outside. He tells me he will go to the library when he can no longer handle the cold because Cleveland’s other
drop-in centers are not within walking distance and he rarely has bus fare. Sam, like many others, makes sure to return to Shoreline by four every day to ensure that he gets a bed and doesn’t have to sleep on the floor.

Currently, Sam works part time at the St. Cortona center and receives a small stipend when funds are available. He is saving up for his own apartment, which he hoped to have by Christmas of 2010, because he did not want to spend another holiday in the shelter. Unfortunately, he was unable to meet this goal. When I ask Sam about the possibility of staying with a family member, he tells me that both of his older sons have asked him to stay with them, but Sam refuses their offers. “They my children. I’m s’posed to take care of them, they ain’t s’posed to take care of me.” He recently received a letter notifying him of an open apartment in a complex in downtown Cleveland, but he doesn’t want to live there because the place has a reputation for drugs, gangs, and violence. He would prefer to live on Cleveland’s west side, but has been unable to find affordable housing there.

Sam feels a great deal of frustration at how the homeless are treated. He says social service agencies, particularly when it comes to health care, are ineffective at helping the homeless:

The thing of it is, lots of people just want a job. They ain’t askin’ for a handout or nothin’ like that, they just need a job. That’s all. They say all this stimulus money comin’ down, but I can’t see it… Lots of homeless is sick, but won’t go to a hospital. They’ll get some guy out of college who don’t know how to find the homeless people who need help. He’ll put
some flyers up at the homeless shelter, they’ll tell you that, uh, come here or there and we got care for ya. But a lot of these guys don’t know where to go to find these homeless people, people that’s sick. They don’t know how to come up to the park and find these people, they don’t know how to go over in the back of that building and find these people. And I know they ain’t goin’ to the compound to find people, where they might get killed if they go to the compound, ‘cause everybody can’t go in the compound. But they don’t know where to go, they don’t know how to go find these people out behind the boxcars and all that. I think if you want to find the homeless, you got to get a homeless person to go find the homeless people, ‘cause they know where to go’…There’s a guy that’s over there back behind that building, a guy back in the alley, has a big sore on his leg, like about this big, it keeps getting’ bigger and bigger, now he won’t go to a hospital. “Why don’t you go to the hospital man?” “I ain’t goin’ down there.” You get somebody to take him, you gonna have a problem. There used to be a guy who went under the bridge, but even he can’t go everywhere.

Although others reported getting housing assistance while staying at Shoreline, this has not been Sam’s experience. Of living in the shelter, Sam says “It’s like bein’ on an Indian reservation”, referring to his feeling of forced segregation from mainstream society. He says that most of the shelter staff is only interested in helping the residents
with substance abuse problems or those who are gay. He feels that those who do not fall into a special interest group get left behind:

I heard guys go over there to mental health, and they say “well, you not mentally ill, you’re not on drugs.” What, I gotta go get high to get a place? I don’t know. They tell you “you can find a job.” I say “tell me where.” I was going to this one place, this girl was s’posed to be helpin’ me find a job, right? She got laid off! Kinda defeats the purpose… The rich just keep gettin’ richer and the poor keep gettin’ poorer…It’s not a matter of white and black anymore, it’s a matter of rich and poor. I see it all the time. It used to be, you look at homeless shelters, you only see black people in there, but now it don’t make no difference what color you is, I seen Puerto Ricans, blacks, whites, in the homeless shelter. I mean, it’s not ‘cause it’s their fault, they’d work if they could work, but they ain’t no work.

As of this writing, Sam is still staying at Shoreline.

Joe

Joe grew up in Detroit, the fourth of five siblings. His mother died when he was very young; primarily his father raised him. After his wife’s death, Joe’s father remarried and moved to Cleveland, where he fathered an additional four children. After his father’s move Joe and two of his siblings stayed with an aunt in Detroit. When he was fifteen or sixteen, he began going back and fourth between Cleveland and Detroit. His family was
devoutly Christian, but as Joe grew into his late teens he began to rebel against the values with which he was raised, although he remained relatively close relationships with most of his family. He dropped out of high school, but later earned a GED.

In his late teens and through his twenties, Joe heavily abused alcohol and drugs, primarily marijuana. When he was twenty-nine, he had a girlfriend who hosted card and casino games out of her house in Cleveland. One night, while running a game of craps at his girlfriend’s ad hoc casino, Joe got very high on alcohol and marijuana. After an argument with one of the players Joe became, in his words, “unreasonable and out of control.” Joe beat the man and took his money. The man left, but returned later, when Joe was standing at the front door of the house. He shot at Joe from a car; the bullet struck Joe in the right side of his head. Upon entering his skull, the bullet fractured into four pieces. He was rushed into surgery, then spent several days in a coma. When he awoke, he was suffering from retrograde amnesia, a condition often caused by an acute brain injury that results in loss of memories from before the injury (Squire et al 2008:1164). His sister had to tell him who he was and what she knew of what had happened. Over the next few days, as he passed in and out of consciousness, Joe’s father reintroduced him to his family. One of the few things that Joe recalls from this time is that he thought everything was funny. He spent about two months in the hospital before his doctors released him.

Although not immediately apparent, Joe has suffered long term effects from his shooting. He is now partially blind in his right eye. The blindness was not diagnosed when he was initially in the hospital, and at first he did not really understand what was
going on; it seemed as though objects and people appeared out of nowhere. He also developed a seizure disorder that he refused to acknowledge for many years, but it is now being treated with medication. However, the cognitive delays Joe has experienced since the shooting have been the most difficult for him to deal with. He has much more difficulty reading and learning than he did before; it simply takes him longer to process information. This is likely due to anterograde amnesia, a condition common in people who suffer medial temporal lobe damage, which is characterized by “a deficit in learning new material” (Squire et al 2008:1164).

For some time after the shooting, Joe felt lucky to be alive and that his life needed to change. It was not long, however, before Joe was arrested and sent to prison. Although he told me why he was arrested he asked that I not write in detail about it, so I will describe his crime only as a sexually motivated offense. He prefers not to talk about his twenty years in prison, except for his educational experience while there. He had the opportunity to earn a degree, through Wilmington College, which he took advantage of. As a result of his cognitive delays, he found it very difficult to keep up with his classes. However, he persevered and earned an Associate’s degree in Human Services. Although he could have continued his education and earned a Bachelor’s degree, the level of frustration he experienced while pursuing his Associate’s was sufficient to dissuade him from moving forward.

While he was in prison, Joe’s father and one of his brothers died. Joe’s relationships with his other family members deteriorated as a result of his conviction, incarceration and requirement to register as a sex offender. Consequently, when Joe was
released from prison none of his family members were willing to take him in. The parole board assigned him to a residential facility, but when he arrived there he found there were no open beds. The facility referred him to the Salvation Army, where he stayed for a short period of time before moving to Shoreline.

Joe spent over five years at Shoreline. He describes his time there as positive, although it was not without its difficulties. His tenure at Shoreline marked his first real exposure to homelessness, including fights between residents, residents suffering from mental illness, and homeless people who were so resistant to staying in shelters that they preferred to sleep in the street, even in winter. Although surrounded by desperation and despondency, Joe was determined to make his stay at Shoreline productive. At first, he kept to himself, but eventually he began to attend church regularly and formed a gospel a cappella group with four of the shelter’s other residents. They now regularly perform at local churches. Joe has a beautiful singing voice; he & his group would often have impromptu practices in and around St. Cortona. He also began to participate in St. Cortona’s art program and saved money when he was able to find work. Initially he worked as a laborer, but because of the cognitive effects of his injury he was unable to keep pace with production and would inevitably lose his job.

Through Shoreline, Joe began to learn about the social services that are available to him. It was during this time that he says he “learned to set aside his pride and ask for help.” He discovered that he might be eligible for Supplemental Security Income (SSI). However, he was intimidated by the stories he had heard from other shelter residents about their difficulty in gaining approval for this benefit, so he did not immediately
apply. In 2008, Joe decided to apply with Paula’s help. Because of his medical history, he was immediately approved. He also applied for and was awarded rent assistance by the Emerald Development and Economic Network (EDEN) of Cleveland, whose self-declared mission is “to develop, provide, and encourage the availability of safe, decent, affordable housing and housing support services for persons who are low-income, mentally ill, and/or disabled” (EDEN 2011). EDEN subsidizes 87% of the rent on Joe’s apartment and the Home Energy Assistance Program, which is funded through the Ohio Department of Development, helps with his utilities.

Although no longer homeless, Joe continues to participate in the St. Cortona art program. Social service programs have made it possible for him to survive without full time employment, but he still takes the occasional odd job when it is available. At the end of our interview, I asked Joe what he would like people to know about homelessness. He replied:

They are people, just like us, just like everybody. There are some people that just are down on their luck, people who just didn’t, couldn’t make it in society and gave up. People like myself I was a person who gave up and didn’t try to reason with anybody who had reason. You know somebody who had made a lot of sense, I’d say “I don’t want to hear it, yeah right, life goes this way” and I didn’t know how life goes I was just tryin’ to experience it. You know, I didn’t want to take good advice in other words. Some people like that, you know. But you know what I want everybody to know is a place like Shoreline, a building like that is wonderful for
someone who don’t have. You know, they can get them a place. You always have somebody who takes whatever program and use it or misuse it, but those programs, and I’m not just saying Shoreline period, programs like that, they’re places that help people. Really, really help people, ‘cause I, they really helped me, I know that. They helped me so much. You know, they helped me to get my place, there’s a lady that’ll be down to my place to take me to EDEN for the first time this year, she really cares about what’s in my house and how it looks and now I’m moving on with life and I’m keeping what she helped me with, the living and everything. I’m trying to improve it and everything and I’m trying to do something for Joe, and she’s concerned about that.

Jack

Jack was born in Atlanta, into a strict Southern Baptist family. When he was eleven his parents separated, and he moved to Akron with his mother, older brother and younger sister. The family lived in Akron for three years and then moved to Cleveland. After completing high school, Jack began working as a machinist at a machine shop, where he stayed for nine years. At 27, Jack married, but the relationship was short lived. Jack tells me that after about a year of marriage, he was arrested for robbery. I have since
discovered that his conviction was for rape as well as robbery. He was sentenced to a twenty-seven year term, which he served at the Marion Correctional Institution.

Once he left his natal home, Jack stopped being a practicing Baptist. However, while in prison, he began to practice his faith again. Jack says it was his religious beliefs that kept him sane through his time in prison. In fact, Jack says that he spent much of his time in prison proselytizing to other inmates. Since his release, religion has remained a very important part of his life.

Near the end of his sentence, Jack was faced with the task of coming up with a release plan. While he was in Marion, his mother and sister had both died. He had not seen his father since his family left Atlanta. The only other relative that he had was his brother. Jack called him, but he refused to speak to Jack and told him never to contact him again. This left Jack with no good options for a release plan. However, because of the Layne decision, the parole board was required to release him in 2010.

Upon his release in May 2010, Jack had no choice but to go to a homeless shelter. He was 65 and had not held a job in twenty-seven years. He ended up at the Scene, where he stayed until June. At this point he was forced to move to Shoreline. Jack was required to register with authorities under Megan’s Law immediately after his release. The address he gave was for the Scene, but he neglected to change his address with authorities after he moved to Shoreline. Three months later, when Jack attempted to apply for SSI, word of this violation of his release terms reached authorities. Jack was sentenced to a thirty-day term in the county jail.
Since his first release, Jack has been active with the St. Cortona art program. His goals include finding permanent housing and increasing his involvement with his local church. As of this writing, Jack is staying with Doug, a former program director at the St. Cortona center. When I asked Jack what he would like people to know about homelessness, he replied:

People got to get back on they feet. They got to take advantage of the programs they got and, you know, go back to school. This ain’t a real good place to be. Experience is a good teacher.
Chapter VI

Findings

This research has resulted in two sets of findings. First is the emergence of a sub-set of the Ex-con archetype. Second is the existence of archetypes of the mainstream as constructed by the homeless.

As noted earlier, the Ex-con is a long-standing archetype of American homelessness. However, there is a new sub-set of this archetype that has emerged over the last two decades. I call this sub-set the Sex Offender. Three of my four study participants, Charlie, Joe and Jack, fall into this category. While this sub-set has a great deal in common with the more inclusive archetype of the Ex-con, there are characteristics that distinguish Sex Offenders from the others.

First, while most Ex-cons are considered deviant, Sex Offenders are usually more vilified than other types. Many members of the mainstream, and often members of the offender’s own family, fear that recidivism is a foregone conclusion. Both popular media and “watchdog” groups who claim to protect the public reinforce this viewpoint. Even if a family member might otherwise be willing to provide a home for an offender, mandatory public reporting of the addresses of sex offenders under Megan’s Law often
serves as a deterrent because the family may fear ostracism or even retribution from their community for housing the offender.

Second, the Ohio Revised Code requires that registered sex offenders live more than 1,000 feet from schools, preschools and daycare centers (Lawriter 2007). This limits available housing options, as there are over 100 public schools in the Cleveland Metropolitan School District alone (CMSD 2008).

Because of these factors, some Sex Offenders choose not to register, in violation of both state and federal law. Because they are breaking the law, they cannot apply for state issued identification, social service or job training programs, or legal jobs. This forces them to live on the underground economy and risk arrest at any time. Charlie’s story illustrates the difficulties and consequences of this choice. As of this writing, there are 159 registered sex offenders using Shoreline’s address (State of Ohio 2011).

Even though three of my study participants were subject to the sex offender registry, only one discussed it in any detail. The other two were uncomfortable with the stigma attached to being listed on registry.

Perhaps because of the implied liminal state of homelessness, or perhaps because of my own ethnocentric bias, I was surprised to find that the homeless have archetypes of their own which concern the mainstream. These archetypes also spring from the binary opposition of self and other and it appears to serve a function similar to that of the aforementioned set. In both cases, the use of these archetypes serves to distance the observer from the observed, sometimes to the point of dehumanizing the observed. In this way, these archetypes can be seen as “additional powers to enable them to cope with their
new station in life” (Turner 1969:95). These archetypes are the Do-gooder, the Indifferent, the Hostile, the Politician and the Friend.

   The Do-gooder is a person who is well intentioned and attempts to help others when it is convenient to do so. However, assistance is only offered sporadically and or conditionally. Examples of the Do-gooder include those who volunteer at a soup kitchen once a year, usually on a holiday, and claim for the rest of the year to be advocates for the homeless due to their one day of service. Also included in this archetype are those who provide conditional assistance; for example, they will provide meals only to those who express a belief in a particular religious ideology. Although my study participants expressed gratitude for any help offered, they all remained wary of the Do-gooder.

   The Indifferent represents those that seem to ignore the homeless completely. The apathy of the Indifferent may be due to a fiscal or emotional inability to provide assistance, or simply a lack of desire to do so. Interestingly, my study participants seemed to be as dispassionate towards the Indifferent as the Indifferent are towards them.

   The Hostile are growing concern, both to the homeless and to society at large. The Hostile are those that harbor, at minimum, a resentment towards the homeless or at maximum, are violent towards them. According to the National Coalition for the Homeless, in 2009 there were thirteen reported hate crimes against homeless people in Ohio, six of which were fatal. This represents a 600% increase in hate crime deaths of the homeless over 2008 (NCH 2010). Hate crimes against the homeless seem to be skyrocketing around the country. In the 2009, a homeless man was doused in gasoline and set on fire in Los Angeles, a homeless Army veteran in Boston was beaten to death in
front of a crowd of onlookers, and a homeless man in Jacksonville, North Carolina was stabbed to death with a broken beer bottle (Lichtblau 2009). While all of my research participants mentioned this archetype, they were all reticent to discuss it at length.

The Politician is an oft-discussed archetype among the homeless. This archetype represents any number of elected officials and shelter or program directors whose motivation for helping the homeless appears to be anything but altruistic. Politicians are characterized by the desire for status and notoriety, and their plans to end homelessness are the vehicle for them to gain both. My study participants were in agreement that the Politician often does more harm than good, and that programs and services that are directed by them are generally ineffective.

The final, and by far most positive, archetype is the Friend. The Friend is characterized by a genuine desire to provide material or emotional support, or sometimes both, with no ulterior motive. The Friend does not see homeless people; he or she simply sees people. Paula, the director of the art program at the St. Cortona Center, is an excellent example of the Friend. All of my study participants expressed a great deal of gratitude towards Paula and other Friends, not just for their support, but also for the fact that they treat the homeless with humanity above all else.

This work is not intended to serve as a comprehensive overview of all of Cleveland’s homeless. Rather, it is intended to provoke serious thought and dialogue about how we view each other and ourselves in the hope that we may get one step closer to solving the problem of homelessness.
Chapter VII

Conclusion

This research challenges Lewis’s claim that the poor are mired in a pathological, self-perpetuating culture of poverty. All four of my participants came from economically disadvantaged but relatively stable natal families. Only two of the four have now adult children, but none of them currently live in poverty. All the children have attended college, some hold master’s degrees and all make well above median income, according to their fathers. Although all four of my study participants live under the conditions Lewis lists as being ideal for creating a subculture of poverty, my observations have led me to believe that they and their families are not part of a subculture of poverty. For example, Lewis notes that gregariousness and “frequent resort to violence in the settlement of quarrels” (Lewis 1961:xxvi) are psychological characteristics of a culture of poverty. In the over 200 hours I spent with Charlie, Sam, Joe, and Jack, I did not note gregarious behavior. In fact, all four were fairly guarded and introverted. In addition, none resorted to violence as a means of settling disputes during my field period. In fact, Sam and Joe both noted that they try to avoid physical confrontation out of fear of physical injury, which would further complicate their already precarious health.

This does not absolutely preclude Lewis’s theories; as he noted, not all people who are poor are part of the culture of poverty. He notes:
Because of the advanced technology, the high level of literacy, the development of mass media, and the relatively high aspiration level of all sectors of the population, especially when compared to underdeveloped nations, I believe that although there is still a great deal of poverty in the United States...there is relatively little of what I would call the culture of poverty. (Lewis 1968:17)

However, my study participants do exhibit a number of the traits Lewis lists in *The Children of Sanchez* as indicators of a culture of poverty. For example, Lewis notes that “unemployment and underemployment, low wages, (and) a miscellany of unskilled occupations” (Lewis 1961:xxvi) are economic characteristics one would expect to find in a culture of poverty. Three of my study participants, Charlie, Sam, and Joe, could easily be classified as underemployed, since all of them have some education beyond high school but work only sporadically and at unskilled jobs. Sam noted that the reason he was evicted from his last apartment was because, although he was working, his wages were too low to cover his rent. Jack is currently unemployed.

As predicted by Schneider and Smith, all my study participants exhibited a high degree of flexibility, in both their family relationships and in other areas, but they also exhibited a strong desire for stability. Charlie notes that his natal family had a matrifocal structure, headed by his grandmother. After his mother’s death, Joe alternately lived with his father and his aunt. After Jack’s parent’s divorce, Jack and his siblings were raised by his mother. All were constantly planning, to a greater or lesser degree, but, as Schneider
and Smith would lead us to expect, their plans were little more than fantasy because they had no means to enact them. Sam often told me about his plans for decorating his apartment, when he was able to get one. Although this does reinforce Schneider and Smith’s belief that the lower class are generally flexible, it also exhibits an aspiration to participate in a middle class lifestyle, where the luxury of planning can be enacted. My study participants exhibited a high degree of independence. In fact, Joe credited it with being the reason he had difficulty getting off of the streets. He found that he had to subvert his individuality to a degree to increase his social status, thereby becoming more submissive rather than more independent.

One could argue that despite the variation found in the stories of my study participants, they have one important thing in common; they have failed to meet the standards for success set by mainstream society. Their stories could be seen as tales of the failures of four men. However, I think that rather than demonstrating failure, their stories demonstrate the human ability to adapt to adverse conditions and survive.

Although the limited scope of this research does not allow me to reject Lewis’s conclusions outright or fully embrace those of Schneider and Smith, it does provide some insight into how their theories are enacted in contemporary urban America. It also presents a host of related research possibilities. For example, a study of homeless women could provide a different perspective on homelessness and poverty, one that may address issues of matrifocality, gender, power and independence. A long-term study of homeless children could provide evidence to support or disprove Lewis’s theory of socialization into the subculture of poverty. A comparative study of urban homeless and rural
homeless could provide insight into the ways poverty impacts people, and their communities, in different settings. I am certain many of these issues will be addressed as anthropologists continue to explore the “domestic exotic.” One thing is for certain; the growing problem of homelessness will necessitate further study.
Notes

1. Definite, or determinate, sentencing is defined as “a prison or jail sentence for a specific time (say, two years), currently used for misdemeanors and most felonies in Ohio” (OSBA 2007). This type of sentencing does not allow for judiciary discretion or parole.

2. In 2002, Wiley Layne sued Ohio Adult Parole Authority on the grounds that he was denied parole based on a crime he was charged with, but not convicted of, by the state of Ohio. The Supreme Court of Ohio found that this denial of parole violated Ohio law, and Layne was released. The court further recognized “the APA has wide-ranging discretion in parole matters. *State ex rel. Lipschutz v. Shoemaker* (1990), 49 Ohio St.3d 88, 90, 551 N.E.2d 160. R.C. 2967.03 vests discretion in the APA to grant a parole to any prisoner for whom parole is authorized, if in its judgment there is reasonable ground to believe that paroling the prisoner would further the interests of justice and be consistent with the welfare and security of society" However, that discretion must yield when it runs afoul of statutorily based parole eligibility standards and judicially sanctioned plea agreements. Therefore, we hold that in any parole determination involving indeterminate sentencing, the APA must assign an inmate the offense category score that corresponds to the offense or offenses of conviction. We further
emphasize, as did the court of appeals in *Randolph*, that the APA, when considering an inmate for parole, still retains its discretion to consider any circumstances relating to the offense or offenses of conviction, including crimes that did not result in conviction, as well as any other factors the APA deems relevant” (*Layne v. Ohio*, 97 Ohio St. 3d 456 [2002]).

3. “Social Security is responsible for two major programs that provide benefits based on disability: Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI), which is based on prior work under Social Security, and Supplemental Security Income (SSI)… Supplemental Security Income (SSI) is a program financed through general revenues. SSI disability benefits are payable to adults or children who are disabled or blind, have limited income and resources, meet the living arrangement requirements, and are otherwise eligible. The monthly payment varies up to the maximum federal benefit rate, which may be supplemented by the State or decreased by countable income and resources” (SSA 2011).

4. State Tested Nursing Assistants (STNA) work with physically or mentally disabled patients, often in a home setting. They perform a variety of tasks, such as assisting their clients with bathing, shopping, cooking and eating.
Appendix A

In 1994, President Bill Clinton signed the Jacob Wetterling Act into law. This law requires states to create registries of those who have been convicted of crimes against children or sexually violent offenses. It further requires states “to establish more rigorous registration requirements for highly dangerous sex offenders (‘sexually violent predators’)” (Matson and Lieb 1997:9). The act also requires those who have been convicted of crimes against children or sexually violent offenses to register their address annually for a period of ten years post release; sexually violent predators are required to register every three months for the rest of their lives. Congress amended the Wetterling Act in 1996 with the addition of Megan’s Law: “A designated state or local law enforcement agency ‘…shall release relevant information that is necessary to protect the public concerning a specific person required to register…’” (Matson and Lieb 1997:9); thus the entire piece of legislation came to be known colloquially as Megan’s Law. Ohio enacted Megan’s Law in 1997. Details of Ohio’s law can be found below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Subject to Notification</th>
<th>Notification Process</th>
<th>Information Included</th>
<th>Assessing Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual predators:</strong> a person who is convicted of a sexually violent offense and is found by the court to be a sexual predator. <strong>Habitual sex offenders:</strong> a person previously convicted of one or more sexually oriented offenses and sentencing judge determines community notification is necessary for that individual. The act applies to anyone released after January 1, 1997, regardless of when the individual was sentenced.</td>
<td>Written notice of a habitual sex offender or sexual predator is provided to the following persons within the specified geographic notification area (defined in administrative rule as the entire school district in which an offender resides): local law enforcement; all occupants of residences adjacent to the offender’s place of residence; the executive director of the public children services agency; the superintendent of each board of education of a school district; the appointing or hiring officer of each nonpublic school; the director, head teacher or elementary principal of each preschool program; the administrator of each child day care center; and the president or other chief administrative officer of each institution of higher education.</td>
<td>Notification shall include the offender’s name, address, sexually oriented offense of conviction, and a statement that the person has been adjudicated as a sexually violent predator or habitual sex offender.</td>
<td>**Sexual Predator status determined if a person is convicted of a sexually violent offense and also is convicted of a sexually violent predator specification that was included in the indictment, count in the indictment, or information charging the sexually violent offense. The conviction of the specification automatically classifies the offender as a sexual predator. In all other cases, the judge who is to impose sentence upon an offender convicted of a sexually oriented offense may conduct a hearing to determine whether the offender is a sexual predator. In making the determination, the judge shall consider all relevant factors, including the offender’s age and prior criminal record, the age of the victim, whether the offense involved multiple victims, whether drugs or alcohol were involved in the offense, whether the offender participated in available programs for sex offenders, any</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mental illness or mental disability, offender’s demonstrated pattern of abuse, and whether the offender displayed cruelty or made threats of cruelty. No levels of risk for *habitual sex offenders* determined by conviction. For offenders sentenced prior to the effective date, the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction makes a recommendation to the sentencing court. For offenders sentenced after the effective date, the court makes the determination prior to sentencing.

(Matson and Lieb 1997:41)
Appendix B

Only 10 of Cleveland’s 15 homeless shelters are marked on this map. The addresses of the other 5, mostly domestic violence shelters, are kept confidential to protect the safety of their residents.

Map by Amanda Mullett
Appendix C

Informal Interview Questions

The questions below are intended to start interviews with informants.

It is not intended to be a comprehensive list, just a starting point.

Wording may vary slightly.

1. Please describe the circumstances that led to your current housing situation.

2. Do you currently use any social services?
   a. If so, which ones?
   b. If not, why?

3. What services, if they were available, do you think would help your situation?

4. How do you feel about your current situation?

5. What, if any, things have you done to change your situation?

6. What would you tell others about homelessness if given the opportunity?
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