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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines a homeless social policy, entitled *Rebuilding Lives: A New Strategy to House Homeless Men* that aims to end the cycle of homelessness for men in Columbus, OH. Unlike other communities, Columbus adopted a policy to end male homelessness that focuses on the structural causes of homelessness and, subsequently, recommends structural solutions to the problem of homelessness. The ideologies operating within this policy conflict, however, with dominant discourses on poverty (including liberalism and paternalism) that focus on the individual causes of and solutions to social problems. Despite this conflict, *Rebuilding Lives* was approved by the City of Columbus, Franklin County Commissioners, local business leaders, and members of the affected communities. This thesis focuses on the rhetorical strategies used by policymakers to gain their support. I argue that the rhetorical success of *Rebuilding Lives* lies in its ability to reflect audience concerns; its use of appeals to reason and logic, as well as emotions; and its strategic use of language. By focusing on issues related to gender, race, and class, I examine the implications of these strategies for other progressive policymakers, including feminist policy-makers.
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USING THE MASTER'S TOOLS TO END HOMELESSNESS:
SUCCESSFUL RHETORICAL STRATEGIES AND THE STRATEGIC USE OF
LIBERALISM IN REBUILDING LIVES: A NEW STRATEGY TO HOUSE
HOMLESS MEN IN COLUMBUS, OHIO

We have a national infrastructure of shelters, soup kitchens, health clinics, and
transitional housing that can largely manage people while they are homeless. But
this system is unlikely to end homelessness because it does not address the front-
end causes, nor the back-end solutions to the problem. As a nation we can decide
to continue on this path – always fine-tuning and improving our management of
people’s experience of homelessness. Or we can take the next step – ending
homelessness. – Nan Roman, Executive Director, National Alliance to End
Homelessness

Homelessness is among the persistent social problems facing policy makers
today. Similar to other social problems, policies aimed at addressing homelessness have
been structured by an emphasis on the individual causes of homelessness. These causes
include alcohol and/or drug addictions, mental illness, a poor work ethic, and a lack of
marketable skills. While these may contribute to one’s experience of homelessness, they
do not encapsulate the structural causes of homelessness that include a lack of affordable
housing, declining relative wages, and inadequate services to address personal challenges
such as mental health or substance abuse related issues. Arguably, this limited focus has
resulted in a band-aid approach at best, and a continuation of the problem of
homelessness at worst by ignoring, and, consequently failing to address these structural

---

causes.² Amidst this trend, Columbus, Ohio emerged with a groundbreaking policy designed to address the structural causes of homelessness, and consequently offer structural solutions that will end the cycle of homelessness for men. Moreover, policy makers in Columbus won the support of key players in the community including local government, business leaders, and members of the affected communities, which resulted in the successful implementation of this policy.

This thesis explores this policy, entitled Rebuilding Lives: A New Strategy to House Homeless Men (RL), in-depth, as well as the policy-making process used by its proponents.³ In particular, this thesis will examine the following questions: what rhetorical strategies were used to gain broad-based support for this policy, and how were these strategies gendered?

A prerequisite to answering these questions is understanding that homeless social policy is a narrative about the causes of and solutions to homelessness.⁴ This narrative is defined by the policy makers and the process that these individuals use to create the policy, including which individuals are included in the process, the extent of their participation, and the definitions and language used throughout the process. The content and recommendations within policies are heavily dependent upon each of these things. In the case of RL, the policy-making process was orchestrated by the Community Shelter Board, a progressive organization aimed at ending homelessness in Columbus, Ohio. I

---

² Since the enactment of these policies, the rate of homelessness has been steadily increasing in the United States. According to one study, the rate of homelessness tripled from 1981 to 1989 (National Coalition to End Homelessness 2000). Similarly, another study found that, between 1987 and 1997, shelter capacities doubled, indicating significant increases in the number of people homeless in the United States (ibid). Moreover, in 1999, despite these efforts, approximately 700,000 were homeless on any given night (ibid.)

³ Throughout this these, I refer to Rebuilding Lives as RL.

⁴ Social policy refers to “a deliberate attempt by government to promote individual and social welfare in certain specific dimensions using any suitable policy instrument” (Weale 1983).
examine the process used by this organization to create a policy that was consistent with this end.

The narrative used in the process to develop RL focuses on the structural causes of homelessness; therefore, the policy offers structural solutions to homelessness, marking a new shift in homeless social policy. Unlike other policies that focus on "solving" homelessness by monitoring and changing the behaviors of individual homeless persons, this policy recommends the creation of a Housing Stabilization System. Based on extensive research, this system is designed to better meet the needs of homeless men and provide solutions to break the cycle of homelessness in Columbus. The policy recommends the development of additional homeless prevention programs and other shelter diversion programs, a reconfiguration of the emergency shelter system, the development of homeless service provider support systems, and, most notably, the creation of 800 units of affordable, permanent housing.

This narrative of homelessness (both its causes and solutions) is outside of and in opposition to the liberal discourse that has influenced policies and public opinion regarding homelessness by positioning the individual as both the cause of and solution to homelessness. Despite this contradiction and its high costs, RL was approved by the City of Columbus, Franklin County Commissioners, local business leaders, and members of the affected communities.\(^5\) If, as Wendy Brown suggests, liberalism is the "contemporary cultural text we inhabit, a discourse whose terms are 'ordinary' to a very contemporary 'us'," how did progressive policy-makers gain broad-based community support for a policy that is outside of this dominant discourse (Brown 1995: 142)?

---

\(^5\) The estimated development costs for this policy was approximately $38 million, with additional annual operating costs of over $10 million (SPRTF 1998).
order to address this question, I identify the rhetorical strategies used by policy-makers to gain public support for this policy.

My analysis has broad implications for progressive policy makers, including those outside of the field of homelessness. Specifically, my analysis has implications for feminist policy makers, as well as the field of feminist policy studies. Due to the pervasive nature of liberalism, feminist policy makers struggle to gain broad-based support for policies that provide structural solutions to issues impacting women’s equality and, subsequently, challenge this discourse. While offering extensive critiques of liberalism within social policies, the field of feminist policy studies has failed to provide solutions the dilemmas facing feminist policy makers who work within the discourse of liberalism. Through this project, I seek to bridge the gap between the “theoretical” critiques of liberalism developed within feminist policy studies and the “practical” concerns of feminist policy-makers.

In Chapter One, I discuss the theoretical framework guiding my analysis. This framework draws from two separate areas of study. The first of these is homeless social policy. This area of research provides an approach to analyzing the ways in which solutions to homelessness are defined and/or limited by the definitions and language used in the policy-making process. Additionally, this research provides a historical analysis of individualism in homeless social policy. Complementing this area of research is the field of feminist policy studies. This area of research provides a critical perspective on liberalism within social policies and a foundation for understanding the constructions of gender and their implications within these policies.
In addition to discussing my theoretical framework, this chapter outlines my methodology which is grounded in rhetorical criticism and feminist theory. Using this approach, I will examine the traditional questions of rhetorical criticism including: Who is the rhetor? Who is the intended audience? What strategies are used to persuade the audience? This approach is limited, however, as it fails to account for the power dynamics embedded in the policy-making process and the constructions of gender and other categories of difference operating in the policy. Given these limitations, my analysis is further grounded in feminist approaches to studying policy.

In Chapter Two, I discuss the policy-making process used to develop RL. This chapter provides a context for understanding the implications of my analysis. To this end, I will explore the following questions: Why was the policy created? Who defined the policy-making process? Who were the key-players in this process? What were the results of this process?

Chapter Three identifies the rhetorical strategies used to gain support for this policy. These strategies include reflecting audience concerns, appeals to logos, appeals to emotion, and the effective use of language. I discuss these strategies in detail, as well as analyze the implications of each. Importantly, I trace the key words of the liberal discourse throughout this policy, which include responsibility, accountability, self-sufficiency, and cost-effectiveness. I argue that, within RL, these terms are re-defined and function in ways that challenge the liberal discourse. Moreover, I argue that these terms function within this policy to gain public support, serving as mere catch phrases of a discourse that resonates with the public. I also explore the impact of constructions of masculinity on these rhetorical strategies. For example, hegemonic constructions of
masculinity operating in society have contributed to negative public opinions surrounding the delivery of social services to homeless men. As a result, policy makers re-constructed the identity of homeless men in order to overcome these opinions and gain public support.

Finally, I conclude this thesis with a discussion of the broader implications of this analysis for progressive policy makers. In particular, I focus on the relevance of this work for feminist policy makers and the field feminist policy studies. Questions raised here include: How can feminist policy makers gain support for policies that utilize a structural approach to addressing issues impacting women? What rhetorical strategies are necessary in order to gain public approval for feminist social policies?
CHAPTER 1

Theoretical Framework

My personal interests in homeless social policy and my commitment to feminist theory created a desire within me to approach this topic from the perspectives of feminist policy studies, enabling my analysis to explore issues of gender and power as they were operating within the policy-making process and the policy itself. As I conducted a literature review for this project, I became increasingly aware of the lack of research within feminist policy studies regarding homeless social policy. A significant amount research within this field, however, does focus on other social policies aimed at addressing issues related to women’s poverty, including welfare reform. Moving outside of this field into traditional policy studies, I found a small body of literature investigating issues related to homeless social policy. This work, however, includes little discussion of the gendered dynamics of homeless social policies, nor was it conducted utilizing an explicit feminist analysis. My project occupies the middle ground between these two bodies of literature, relying on the ideas and arguments of both feminist policy studies and traditional policy analyses of homeless social policy. In the following sub-sections, I explore three main themes emerging from this literature, including the constructivist
perspective of social policies, individualism and liberalism within social policies, and the
gendered dynamics of social service delivery systems and their subjects.

The Constructivist Perspective to Social Policies: Simultaneously Creating the
"Problem" and the Solutions

Constructivist approaches to social problems and public policies argue that
solutions to social problems within public policies are dependent upon the definition of
that problem used within the policy. Gusfield (1963) provides the foundation for this
approach in his analysis of the shifting definitions of alcoholism as a social problem in
the United States. Here, Gusfield argues that different groups within society define
certain societal phenomena as "problems" that require specific strategies to alleviate.
These groups compete for their definitions to be adopted within the policy. The adoption
of specific definitions is dependent upon the power or authority of each competing group.
Once a "problem" has been identified and defined, public policies are created to address
the perceived problem. The solutions to the "problem" outlined in the policy are heavily
dependent upon the initial construction of the problem itself. The definitions of and
solutions to social problems, therefore, are unstable, depending largely on issues of
power, political climate, and societal structure.

Keith Jacobs, Jim Kemeny, and Tony Manzi (1999) apply the constructivist
perspective to homeless social policy, arguing that strategies used to address
homelessness are dependent upon the particular construction of homelessness used within
the policy-making process. Specifically, their work focuses on the shifting definitions of

---

6 Similarly, many scholars within the field of feminist policy studies have applied this perspective to their analysis of public policies. See Nancy Campbell, *Using Women: Gender, Drug Policy, and Social Justice* (New York: Routledge, 2000). Here, Campbell explores the ways in which drug policies construct the
homelessness that shaped homeless social policy from the mid 1970s to the mid 1990s in Britain. Two competing definitions of homelessness existed during this time. The first of these is the minimalist definition, stating that the causes of homelessness are located within the individual. The structuralist definition, on the other hand, stated that homelessness is caused by factors outside of the individual. Each of these definitions necessitated different responses to homelessness. The minimalist definition focused on policies that monitored and modified the behavior of individuals; while the structural definition focused on structural changes to the economy and housing market. At different points in time, each of these definitions guided public policies on homelessness. Jacobs, Kemeny, and Manzi conclude that definitions and solutions to homelessness, therefore, are unstable and change over time depending on political, cultural, and economic influences. This approach provides a framework for discussing the policy-making process and identifying the approach used to address homelessness within this policy.

**Prevailing Approaches to Homeless Social Policy: Emphasizing Individual Responsibility and Behavioral Modification**

Similar to the work of Jacobs, Kemeny, and Manzi, Gerald Daly (1996) argues that the definitions of homelessness and the language used to describe homelessness have shaped policy responses to homelessness within the United States. He argues that these policies have utilized definitions of homelessness that focus on the individual causes of homelessness (ignoring the structural causes) and, consequently, lack any recommendations or policy strategies that actually end homelessness. Additionally, he argues that the language describing homeless people within policies facilitates the erasure problem of drug addiction among women and, consequently, delimit policy responses to women who are addicted to drugs.
of structural causes of homelessness. For example, many policies refer to homeless people as the homeless. By focusing on the homeless as opposed to homeless persons, policy makers create distance between themselves or community members and homeless persons. Because of this othering, the recognition of collective responsibility for their homelessness (i.e. structural causes of homelessness) is blurred and attention is focused on the individual causes of homelessness.

Others have argued that the questions guiding research on homelessness has impacted the solutions to homelessness offered in public policies. For example, Greg Barak (1991) argues that government research on homelessness focused on determining the actual size of the homeless population, to what extent homelessness is a condition of free will, and to what extent homeless individuals should be helped, punished, or left alone. These questions functioned to limit the extent to which a structural analysis of the causes of homelessness was conducted. Thus, this research constructed an individualist definition of homelessness that guided the government’s initial responses to homelessness, again limiting the extent to which structural solutions to homelessness were recommended in public policies.

Specifically, this research resulted in the enactment of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act of 1987, the government’s primary response to homelessness. The McKinney Act established many new programs to respond to the needs of homeless persons. Many of the government’s policies and programs were simply aimed at providing shelter to homeless individuals. Thus, during the 1980s, America experienced a large increase in the number of homeless shelters (Barak 1991).
The increasing number of shelters as a solution to homelessness is often referred to as a process of shelterization.\textsuperscript{7} Greg Barak states "establishing more and more shelters and providing more and more services for the multiple homeless populations has proven to be as misguided as building more and more prisons and introducing more and more punishments for street criminals" (p. 105). In effect, the process of shelterization (similar to that of incarceration) is only a response to the symptoms of the problem and not the causes. As a result, the rates of homelessness in the United States continued to grow despite increased funding to homeless service providers.

**Feminist Policy Studies**

Many scholars within feminist policy studies have also examined the tendency for social policies to focus on the individual causes of poverty, ignoring the structural causes of poverty. This research differs from the above-mentioned research in two primary ways: first, it examines the ways in which liberalism has structured responses to poverty, and second, it examines the ways in which gender, race, and class constructions impact policy responses.\textsuperscript{8}

**Interrogating Liberal Discourse in Social Policy**

A significant body of literature exists within the field of social policy that critiques the influence of liberal discourse in social policies. According to theorist Wendy Brown (1995), the liberal discourse assumes a subject that is an autonomous, self-directed individual. Consequently, terms such as responsibility, accountability, and self-

---

\textsuperscript{7} The national trend towards shelterization as a “solution” to homelessness is echoed in early responses to homelessness in Columbus, Ohio. During the 1980s and the early part of the 1990s, the primary response to homelessness was emergency shelters. Four emergency shelters were created including Faith Mission, Friends of the Homeless, The Open Shelter, and Volunteers of America. In addition to these four shelters, PSPI was created. PSPI was a 24-bed facility designed to serve publicly inebriated homeless men (SPRTF 1998).

\textsuperscript{8} The majority of this research has focused on the constructions of femininity within social policies.
sufficiency function as markers this discourse. Because the characteristics of the liberal subject assume a masculine subjectivity, many theorists, including Brown, have interrogated the influence and effects of the liberal discourse in practices and policies aimed at the advancement of women, exploring the ways in which solutions to women’s "problems" have been shaped by these influences.

For example, in her examination of the 1987-88 U.S. congressional hearings on welfare reform, Nancy Naples (1997) argues that the terms of the liberal discourse (responsibility, accountability, dignity, and self-sufficiency) operating in these hearings shaped welfare policy by centering on an individualist definition of poverty. Consequently, these policies failed to provide solutions to women's poverty and, instead, emphasized requirements and policies that discipline and punish poor women.

Similar to studies of homeless social policy, feminist policy studies have examined the tendency for social policies to focus on the individual causes of a given social problem. Unlike studies of homeless social policy, however, it explicitly examines the ways in which liberalism has structured responses to social problems such as poverty, providing an overall frame for my analysis.  

Interrogating the Gendered Dimensions of Social Service Delivery Systems and Their Subjects

Feminist policy studies have also examined the ways in which gender, race, and class constructions impact policy responses. For example, Nancy Fraser (1997) examines the gendered dynamics of social service delivery systems in social welfare programs. She argues that social welfare programs operate on a two-tiered delivery system, with one

---

9 As the dominance of liberalism grows in the United States, the effects of this discourse are not limited to welfare policies. Chris Shore and Susan Wright (1997) argue that policies, in general, are increasingly being used to shape individuals.
component focusing on the individual and the other on the household. Moreover, she argues that these two tiers are gendered, as they mirror the sexual division of labor in society.

The first tier of social service delivery is geared toward the individual and generally functions as compensation for labor power. It includes such provisions as unemployment insurance and Social Security. Fraser argues that due to its focus on labor power, this individual component of the system is associated with masculinity. In contrast, the household component of social service delivery functions to compensate family failures. Such services include Temporary Assistance for Needy Families and other welfare-to-work related programs. Importantly, these services that fall under the household component are associated with the family and therefore linked with femininity.

Fraser goes on to argue that in contrast to masculine social services, social service programs characterized as feminine do not operate on the assumption of social services as a right. Instead, individuals must prove their eligibility to receive services. These services are often received only in exchange for complying with behavioral requirements. These services also tend to provide a therapeutic component to address individual deficiencies. As such, these services are viewed as public charity and are stigmatized. Moreover, these services operate as a site of social control and assume a dependent subject.

Fraser and Gordon (1994) provide a genealogy of the construction of dependency and its, subsequent, association with femininity. Fraser and Gordon begin this analysis with an exploration of the construction of independence. Traditionally, independence

---

10 Fraser refers to these components of the feminine welfare service system as the “juridical-administrative-therapeutic state apparatus” (p. 154).
was achieved through wage earning. In order for independence to be achieved, dependents must have also existed. Individuals not earning a wage were considered to be dependent. At this time, the majority of wage earners were men; consequently, the majority of dependents were women. As a result, associations between independence and masculinity and dependence and femininity were created. Individuals in a state of dependency were subsequently feminized, regardless of their sex. Additionally, due to prohibitions of legal and political dependency, any form of dependency was seen as the responsibility of the individual. Because of the overall devaluation of femininity in society, dependency was stigmatized.

At the same time, social policies in the United States, according to Mead (1991) were becoming increasingly paternalistic. These policies were developed and applied to individuals who were considered dependent in society. Under the paternalistic framework, individuals receive aid or services only in exchange for meeting behavioral requirements. Such behavioral rules function to create a structured environment and are often developed to ensure compliance with particular cultural values. In fact, these policies are used to enforce cultural values. These values may include a strong work ethic or maintaining a drug and alcohol free life. Receipt of social services thus becomes dependent upon an individual’s compliance with these behavior requirements.

Paternalist policies, therefore, operate on a modified version of the social contract where the benefits that people depend on, such as cash assistance or shelter, are

---

11 By paternalism, I am referring to “social policies that are aimed at the poor that attempt to reduce poverty and other social problems by directive and social means” (Mead 1991: 105).

12 For this reason, many feminists, including Virginia Sapiro (1990) have argued that paternalist policies have been largely applied to women due to their dependent status in society. However, given Fraser’s (1997) discussion of feminized social services, I argue that any individual, regardless of their sex, that occupies a space within these services is feminized and, subsequently, deemed dependent. Thus, homeless men are considered dependent in society and are also the objects of paternalist policies.
received in exchange for compliance with cultural values. Under this social contract, the need for close supervision is created. To evaluate an individual’s compliance, administrative structures are created to supervise the individual’s activities. Thus, not only do paternalist policies operate on the basis of the enforcement of cultural values, they depend on close supervision and obligatory behavioral requirements. Under this framework, social service provision is neither an entitlement nor a right. Rather, it is laden with social stigma and judgments steeped in individual failure.

It is with this background that I begin my project. Using these perspectives as the theoretical framework for my analysis, I consider how the policy-making process, including the ideologies of policy-makers themselves, impact the narratives used in policies. Additionally, I consider the power dynamics embedded in this process. I interrogate the impacts of these dynamics, as well as pervasive discourses, on the rhetorical strategies used to gain support of RL. Moreover, I consider the constructions of masculinity operating in society and their impacts on the rhetorical strategies used to gain support for a policy aimed at addressing issues related to men who fall outside of these traditional constructions.

To complete this analysis, I have used an approach that is grounded in rhetorical criticism and feminist policy studies. Specifically, rhetorical criticism is the process of identifying the symbols within a given artifact, their function within that artifact, the possibilities and limitations produced by that artifact, and the effect of that artifact on those engaging with it (Foss 1996). Simply put, rhetorical criticism is an investigation of the rhetoric of an artifact. Rhetoric is the use of symbols for the purpose of communication. Here, the rhetorician utilizes certain symbols and combinations of
symbols to convey a particular understanding of a given phenomenon. Therefore, an argument for a particular understanding is embedded in the rhetoric. Rhetoricians use various strategies within their artifact to persuade their audience members to adopt this particular construction. In essence, rhetorical criticism or rhetorical analysis, as I refer to it here, identifies the arguments operating within an artifact, the strategies used to persuade its audience, and the intended and unintended effects of those strategies.

Feminist policy studies, according to C. Ditmar Coffield (2000), is “comprised of an interdisciplinary community of feminist scholars who situate themselves among many disciplines, focusing their research and theorizing on the administration of public policy: its formulation, implementation, and/or evaluation in relationship to women/and or gender, and increasingly, in relationship to conceptualizations of race and class, as well” (p. 15). Within this field, scholars study a multitude of topics using various methodologies. Despite these differences, many scholars share common characteristics in their approach to analyzing policies including examining issues of exclusion and accessibility; examining power struggles in specific communities; taking issues of gender, race, class, and sexuality into account; and questioning the frames, labels, categories, and figures of public discourse into account. In sum, feminist policy studies, as I use it here, is a critical approach to analyzing public policies, which takes into account the multiple axes of power that operate within the policy-making and implementation processes.¹³

---

¹³ The description of feminist policy studies that I articulate here was developed from a broader definition that was discussed in Women’s Studies 626: Gender and Public Policy, a graduate course taught by Dr. Nancy Campbell at the Ohio State University in Spring of 2000.
Methodology

This project is based upon a case study of RL, a policy designed to provide meaningful solutions to homelessness in Columbus, OH. This initiative serves as an illustrative case study for this analysis, because unlike many other initiatives aimed at addressing homelessness, RL focuses on the structural causes of homelessness and, subsequently, recommends structural solutions to homelessness. This policy marks a shift in approaches used to address homelessness. Additionally, the strength of this case lies in its successful use of rhetorical strategies. In 1999, despite its high development and operating costs associated, this policy was endorsed by the City of Columbus, the United Way, the Franklin County Commissioners, and the Columbus community at large. In effect, this policy reflects and addresses the needs of multiple, and often competing, audiences, while simultaneously providing policy recommendations that work towards ending homelessness in Columbus, OH.

Additionally, my interests in RL stem from my direct involvement in the policy-making process of RL. From 1997 to 1999, I worked as a research assistant at the Community Shelter Board (CSB), the principal agency responsible for this policy. Much of my work at CSB focused on the development and implementation of this policy. Specifically, I was a member of the Scioto Peninsula Relocation Task Force Technical Work Group. Here, I conducted research on different approaches used to address homelessness around the United States, analyzed the utilization rates and demographics

---

14 Other communities have requested technical assistance from Columbus as they develop and implement similar policies. Most notably, in 2000, the National Alliance to End Homelessness released a 10-year plan to end homelessness in the United States. In 2000, the National Alliance to End Homelessness released a 10-year plan to end homelessness in the United States. RL served as a model for this plan and was cited as a best practice (National Alliance to End Homelessness 2000).
of individuals using the shelter system in Columbus, and developed policy recommendations based on this information for the final document.

My experiences at the Community Shelter Board has, both, enhanced my analysis and produced challenges for me throughout this research process. Through these experiences, I developed a critical perspective on issues related to homelessness, including its causes and solutions and a historical/contemporary understanding of approaches used to address the problem of homelessness. Additionally, my direct involvement with the Community Shelter Board provided me with “insider” knowledge regarding the policy-making process itself, issues related to that process, and deliberate strategies used to gain public support. In effect, these experiences strengthened my grasp of the general issues related to homelessness and the specific issues experienced in Columbus, Ohio, enhancing my overall analysis and argument.

At the same time, however, my intimate familiarity with these issues and the policy itself made it difficult for me to distinguish between information that is common knowledge and information that is more specified, which requires a more in-depth discussion and explanation. I relied heavily on feedback from my academic advisors and colleagues to overcome this challenge. Additionally, throughout this project, I was aware of how my personal investment and commitment to this policy could potentially limit my ability to critically examine this policy. I relied on the perspectives of my colleagues to interrogate the space I occupied within this research project, allowing me to achieve and maintain a level of passionate detachment with my work.15

15 I would like to thank Dr. Judith Mayne for introducing me to the idea of passionate detachment in Women’s Studies 740: Theorizing Gender and Representation, a graduate class at the Ohio State University in Winter 2001.
The materials that I analyze in this project were collected during my tenure at the Community Shelter Board. My analysis primarily focuses on the policy document itself, *Rebuilding Lives: A New Strategy to House Homeless Men*. Additionally, I examine several publications related to the implementation of this policy, including three editions of *Rebuilding Lives: A Report to the Community*. These community report cards are issued by the Community Shelter Board to inform key stakeholders of the progress of this policy. As the primary public documents related to this policy, these materials reveal the persuasive elements of *Rebuilding Lives*, as well as their continued use throughout the implementation of this policy.

Specifically, to analyze these documents, I rely on two methods of rhetorical criticism.\(^{16}\) The first and more specific of these is cluster criticism, which reveals the meaning and function of key terms in a text by tracing the use of those terms, as well as identifying patterns of terms that appear in close proximity or in conjunction with these terms.\(^{17}\) Specifically, I use this method to determine the meaning and function of the key words of the liberal discourse, which include responsibility, accountability, self-sufficiency, and cost-effectiveness, as they appear within this policy. In sum, this method offers an approach to understanding the relationship between *RL* and the larger discourse of liberalism.

The second and more general of these methods is Neo-Aristotelian criticism which is characterized by an examination of the rhetor, the intended audience, and the

---

\(^{16}\) My understanding and use these methods, which include cluster criticism and Neo-Aristotelian criticism, evolved out of English 897, a graduate level class on rhetoric taught by Dr. Nan Johnson at the Ohio State University, Autumn 2000.

\(^{17}\) For more on cluster criticism see Sonja Foss, *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice* (Prospect Hills, Ill.: Waveland Press, 1996).
strategies used by the rhetor, either intentionally or unintentionally, to persuade that audience of the rhétor's argument. Specifically, within this method, several strategies of persuasion are examined within a text. These include appeals to logos, which utilize empirical evidence and research to appeal to the reason and logic of its audience; and appeals to pathos, which evoke the emotions of its audience.\textsuperscript{18} In sum, this method provided an overall framework for understanding \textit{RL} as a rhetorical artifact.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{18} Traditionally, within a Neo-Aristotelian criticism, appeals to ethos are also examined. These appeals use the character and/or reputation of the rhetor as a strategy for persuasion. I did not include this strategy of persuasion within my analysis because it was not operating within \textit{RL}. This is largely a function of the fact that the Community Shelter Board was not well-known in the Columbus community during the time of this policy-making process.

\textsuperscript{19} For more on Neo-Aristotelian criticism see Sonja Foss, \textit{Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice} (Prospect Hills, Ill.: Waveland Press, 1996).
CHAPTER 2

REBUILDING LIVES: A BRIEF HISTORY AND OVERVIEW OF THE POLICY-MAKING PROCESS

Grounded in feminist policy studies, I am able to expand my discussion of RL beyond the traditional realm of policy studies and rhetorical criticism, which tend to ignore the political, cultural, and historical contexts in which policies are developed and implemented. These contexts, however, drastically impact the policy-making process, as well as the content and approaches included in the policy. In the case of Columbus, Ohio, the political and social context that prompted the development of this policy is important to consider, especially given its relationship to economic redevelopment and the larger historical trend in the United States of displacing poor people in the name of these efforts. Moreover, given this context, it is necessary to explore the power relations operating within the policy-making process, as they impact the rhetorical strategies used in this policy. These contexts, therefore, impact my overall understanding of this policy and, more importantly, the implications of this analysis for progressive policy-makers.

To explore the contexts in which RL was developed and its effect on the content of this policy, I have divided this chapter into three sections. In the first section, I provide background information on Columbus, Ohio, including information on
social services available to homeless men and their relationship to the economic redevelopment efforts of the area. In the following section, I outline the policy-making process used in Columbus, focusing on the agencies and individuals involved in and excluded from this process. In the final section, I provide an overview of the policy itself, demonstrating its move towards a structural approach to addressing homelessness.

**Rebuilding Lives: A Response to the Economic Development of the Scioto Peninsula**

Prior to *RL*, the majority of the services for homeless men in Columbus, Ohio were located in the downtown area. Nearly half of these services were located on the west-side of downtown, Franklinton, an area known as the Scioto Peninsula and characterized as a low-income neighborhood. The Open Shelter and the Volunteers of America men’s shelter, two of the four men’s shelters in Columbus, were located on the peninsula. Incidentally, these facilities served a disproportionate number of chronically homeless men when compared to other shelters in Columbus.\(^{20}\) Additionally, the peninsula also housed the Protective Services for Public Inebriates (PSPI) facility, an emergency shelter for publicly inebriated, homeless individuals. In sum, 194 of the total beds for homeless men, or 40%, were located in this area, with estimates of an additional 150 to 300 homeless men living outdoors. Approximately, 95% of homeless people on the peninsula were single men (SPRTF 1998).

\(^{20}\) In Columbus, as well as other metropolitan areas, two types of homeless men exist. The first are the transitional groups, which make up 85% of all homeless men in Columbus. This group is characterized by only one to two shelter stays and relatively short lengths of stay. These individuals face a short-term problem, requiring a place to stay and food to eat until they are able to stabilize themselves. The remaining 15% are characterized as the chronically homeless. These individuals have multiple shelter stays and stay for extended periods of time. Others within this group move from hospitals to jails to shelters. These individuals have more difficult, long-term problems that require additional services. According to recent research, this group uses more than half of the resources directly devoted to assisting homeless individuals (SPRTF 1998). For more information about these distinctions see Dennis Culhane, et al, “Homelessness and the Provision of Public Shelter in New York City” in *Housing and Community Development in New York City: Facing the Future.* (Albany: State University New York Press, 1999).
In addition to serving as one of Columbus' centers for homeless services, in 1996 and 1997, the Scioto Peninsula became a site for economic redevelopment in Columbus. First, Ohio's Center of Science and Industry (COSI) announced an overall expansion and relocation to the Scioto Peninsula, with estimated costs between $112 and $125 million for this project (Lore, 1997). Similarly, plans were released that outlined the construction of the Nationwide Arena in downtown Columbus, with proposed costs of $126 million (Montooth, 1998). At the same time, the Vets Memorial Auditorium, located approximately two blocks from two of the emergency shelters, was undergoing a massive remodeling venture (SPRTF 1998). Finally, plans to construct the Franklinton Floodwall were released. According to these plans, the floodwall would be expanded to protect the Franklinton neighborhood (Wright, 1997).

Promising additional profits and new opportunities for growth and development in an area that was economically repressed, these plans received support from an array of sources including the business community, public officials, and Franklinton residents. For example, as a direct result of these plans, Franklinton residents recognized new opportunities for economic growth in their neighborhood, as the proposed floodwall would provide added protection from the Scioto Peninsula. This plan alone was projected to increase property values and free an additional 2,800 acres of land for commercial development (Wright, 1997). With vast support, implementation of these plans quickly began and significant amounts of time, energy, and finances were funneled into the Scioto Peninsula to ensure the success of these ventures.

Many stakeholders, however, felt that the success of these efforts was threatened by the concentration of services for homeless people and the consequent visible existence
of homeless people in Franklinton (SPRTF 1998). Groups with large financial investments in the development of this area, including local business leaders and government officials, began to voice concerns about the potential impacts of homelessness on the area’s economic potentials. Similarly, Franklinton residents expressed concerns about the homeless services and homeless individuals in their neighborhood. These stakeholders wanted the services for homeless people, specifically homeless men, and, subsequently, homeless men to be removed from the Scioto Peninsula.

The experience of Columbus is not unique. Across the United States, the very poor are being displaced by economic redevelopment efforts at alarming rates. According to Talmadge Wright (1997), due to recent shifts toward a global economy, many of these cities are struggling to increase their revenues to support their existing population. These cities turn to urban redevelopment to attract new businesses to the downtown area. While these efforts are theoretically undertaken to improve the city for all of its residents, Wright argues that these practices are actually exclusionary. In other words, these efforts do not benefit all residents. Moreover, these efforts reinforce “larger trends of social inequality” by displacing very poor residents, including homeless people, to areas outside of downtown (p. 88). Due to the pervasive nature of these experiences in our society, many view this displacement as a “natural’ by-product of redevelopment” (p. 89). Instead, Wright argues that this displacement is a direct result of political choices.

Interestingly enough, to illustrate this point, Wright (1997) describes the earlier experiences of Columbus, Ohio. During the late 1970s and early 1980s, Columbus was
experiencing a growth in the downtown area. This growth was accompanied by anxieties about homeless people. Similar to current sentiment in Columbus, business leaders protested the existence of a visible homeless population near their investments. According to Wright, these visual images, markers of incivility, are in stark contrast to the consumer aesthetic created by downtown developers, thus, threatening to detract potential shoppers from the area. As a consequence of these concerns or, as Wright refers to them, “conscious political choices,” homeless people and their services were removed from the downtown area and relocated to the Franklinton community (p. 89).

Unlike twenty years ago, the concerns of community stakeholders prompted the City of Columbus to request the Community Shelter Board (CSB) to “develop a plan to address the needs of persons experiencing a housing crisis who may be impacted by the development of the Scioto Peninsula” (SPRTF 1998: 1). In effect, the City of Columbus requested CSB to develop a solution to the dilemma raised by Cleve Ricksecker, Executive Director of Riverfront Commons, an organization involved in the redevelopment efforts of Franklinton. He stated, “[To be financially successful] You need to draw the people in who are afraid of homeless people and environments that look dangerous. It’s a tough dilemma. You need the COSI to redevelop the central city, but how can you do that and at the same time be compassionate to people who are in need of shelter?” (Davies 1998). In other words, the City charged CSB to create a policy that addressed the needs of homeless men, while simultaneously meeting the needs of local government, business leaders, and neighborhood residents.
Who's (Not) in the Policy-Making Process?

The Community Shelter Board (CSB) assumed the role of the lead organizer in the process to develop this plan because of their unique role and positioning within the Columbus community. CSB was created by public and private organizations in 1986 to address the growing problem of homelessness in Columbus by coordinating community-based efforts, fostering collaboration and funding services (Green 1999). In effect, CSB was the local expert on homelessness and housing related issues in this area. CSB served as an intermediary organization between local government and homeless service providers, homeless consumers and homeless service providers, and community members and homeless service providers. This historical positioning of CSB within the Columbus community, and its expertise in the field of homelessness, provided CSB with the relationships and experience necessary to identify and negotiate the needs of all those involved in this policy-making process.

As I have stressed, the significance of RL stems, in part, from its departure from traditional narratives focusing on the individual towards a narrative that emphasizes the structural causes of and solutions to homelessness. While it is not the central project of this thesis to determine why this particular narrative was used to explain homelessness, I do believe that it is an interesting and important issue to consider. As with any policy the answer to that question lies in the values and vision of the people responsible for and guiding the policy-making process. In the case of RL, it becomes important, then, to examine the values of the Community Shelter Board. These values are reflected in the organization's vision, to "provide meaningful solutions and alternatives to combat – and
eventually eliminate – homelessness in Columbus” (Green 1999: 1). As the lead-organizer of this policy-making process, CSB was able to create a process that ensured a final policy that would help realize this vision. To that end, CSB defined the problem of homelessness as structural, both in its causes and solutions, and determined the participation of community stakeholders in this process.

CSB began this process by creating the Scioto Peninsula Relocation Task Force (SPRTF) to begin exploring the connections between homelessness and the economic redevelopment of the Scioto Peninsula. Members of the Task Force represented the interests of CSB, shelter providers, and other social service providers.²² It is important to note, however, that these individuals were not staff members at these organizations; instead, they were members of their executive boards. Many of who, incidentally, were also key leaders in the business community. SPRTF was created to first, determine the needs of homeless individuals, area businesses, and community members; second, conduct research to determine the best approach to address these needs; and finally, develop a plan to “ensure that no one is left behind while others move forward” (SPRTF 1998: 1). In effect, SPRTF served as the central entity responsible for this development of this policy, with the staffing and support provided by CSB.

At the recommendation of CSB, small work groups were developed to meet the goals of the SPRTF in a timely manner. These work groups included: the Core Technical Leadership Work Group,²³ the Core Technical Work Group,²⁴ Columbus Project

---

²¹ To that end, incidentally, one of CSB’s primary goals is “to develop and implement strategies which will increase community awareness about the causes of and solutions to homelessness” (Green 1999: 1).
²² There were no current or former homeless individuals on the Task Force.
²³ Membership in this group included: Barbara Poppe, CSB Executive Director, Terri Weisbrode Green, CSB Associate Director; and Roberta Garber, Roberta F. Garber Consulting.
Advisors,25 and National Project Advisors26 (SPRTF 1998). The membership of these work groups differed significantly from the membership of the SPRTF. They were comprised of local and national experts on homelessness and housing related issues, including direct service providers, advocates, and policy-makers. These groups were responsible for conducting the research and developing subsequent policy recommendations. These recommendations were approved by the SPRTF. The SPRTF was not responsible for the direction or content of RL; it was determined, instead, by individuals who were aligned with CSB's vision to end homelessness. In effect, the SPRTF, comprised largely of leaders of the business community, functioned more as a puppet task force than an active, self-directed policy-making body.

In addition to the SPRTF, CSB involved other groups in the development of this policy. These groups included the homeless service providers, currently and formerly homeless individuals, and community members. Similarly to the role of SPRTF, the involvement of these groups was moderated by CSB to ensure the development of a policy that was consistent with their goals and values. These groups served in a consultant role. For example, at varying stages of research and policy development, the SPRTF conducted presentations with homeless service providers and the Columbus

24 Membership in this group included: Janet Callison, Clarity Consultants; Jeffrey FortKamp, Columbus Department of Trade and Development; Chip Livisay, Consultant; Joe McKinley, United Way Housing Vision Council; Matt Perrenod, Enterprise Foundation; Julie Erwin Rinaldi, ADAMH; Julie Sandorf, Corporation for Supportive Housing; Nancy Smith, CSB; Nancy Tidwell, NRT Associated; Suzanne Coleman-Tolbert, ADAMH; Joe Weisbord, Corporation for Supportive Housing; and Matt White, CSB.

25 Membership in this group included: Kent Beittel; The Open Shelter, Jeffrey Brasie, Volunteers of America; Mary Sue Hamann, Friends of the Homeless; Beth Morrow Lonn, Friends of the Homeless; Sally Luken, Faith Mission; Anthony Penn, Community Housing Network; and Susan Weaver, Community Housing Network.

26 Mary Brooks, Center for Community Change; Dennis Culhane, University of Pennsylvania; Keith Cylar and Charles King, Housing Works; Bob Durston and Rachel Silverman; City of Portland, OR; Frank Noto, GCA Strategies; and Michael and Lynette Richards; Heartland Candleworks.
Coalition on Homelessness to solicit their feedback. Similarly, SPRTF solicited the input of community members through a two-phase community education and input process, soliciting the feedback of over 450 different community members (SPRTF 1998).

**Rebuilding Lives: A Structural Response to Homelessness**

These events offer a unique chance to examine the structure and services available to homeless men in this area and create a solution that does not just relocate them – but helps them rebuild their lives. – Scioto Peninsula Task Force

The work of CSB, the SPRTF, and others culminated in October of 1998 when the SPRTF released a policy entitled *Rebuilding Lives: A New Strategy to House Homeless Men (RL)* to the community detailing their recommendations regarding the homeless services on the Scioto Peninsula. As this quote suggests, instead of containing recommendations that simply relocated homeless persons from the Scioto Peninsula, RL contained recommendations to improve the entire men’s sheltering system. Specifically, RL recommended re-configuring the current system to create a Housing Stabilization System that meets the needs of both transitional and chronically homeless individuals. To ensure successful implementation and operation of this system, RL recommended numerous support systems for service providers including “coordinated intake, assessment, case management and service protocols;” “staff training;” “system and program evaluation processes;” “enhanced communications technology and Management Information Systems technology;” and “other capacity-building assistance” (SPRTF 1998: 34-35).

---


*For a detailed description of these groups see footnote 18.*
Moreover, *RL* recommended strategies to prevent homelessness and end the cycle of homelessness for those men currently entrenched in the shelter system.\(^29\) Working to prevent homelessness, *RL* recommended increasing funds available to homelessness prevention programs, developing community-wide employment initiatives, and, most notably, enhancing initiatives to increase the supply of general population affordable housing in Columbus and Franklin County. To end the cycle of homelessness for men in the sheltering system, *RL* recommended the creation of 800 units of permanent supportive housing (SPRTF 1998).\(^30\)

The recommendations contained in *RL* specifically address two of the leading structural causes of homelessness including the lack of affordable housing and inadequate services for homeless people that exist in the United States. However, it is important to note that *RL* did not address all of the structural causes of homelessness. Specifically, *RL* failed to address, or explicitly mention, the relationship between larger systems of inequality, including racism and classism, and homelessness. This is significant considering that homeless men are disproportionately men of color. Moreover, as *RL* acknowledged, “persons who are chronically homeless are more likely than other homeless persons to be... African American... and they have the highest level of health and substance abuse problems” (SPRTF 1998: p.18). Without recommendations that specifically address the systems of inequality that contribute to the disproportionate number of homeless men of color, the long-term ability of *RL* to end homelessness for *all*

---

\(^29\) *RL* also contained a five-year plan to implement its recommendations, which identified key agencies and their roles/responsibilities necessary to ensure successful implementation. Additionally, it included sources of funds to pay for its development and annual operating costs (SPRTF 1998).

\(^30\) According to the Ford Foundation, supportive housing is an approach that combines “permanent affordable housing with counseling and on-site social services that are available to tenants, but not imposed on them. Supportive housing is built on the conviction that, for most homeless people, services without a stable living environment are meaningless, as is housing without flexible support services” (Sullivan 1995).
men must be questioned. At the same time, however, the significance of $RL$ cannot be dismissed, as its focus, albeit an incomplete focus, on the structural causes of homelessness represents a shift in homeless social policy. $RL$, unlike previous policies aimed at addressing homelessness, did offer strategies that work towards ending homelessness rather than perpetuating its existence.
CHAPTER 3

THE RHETORICAL POWER OF REBUILDING LIVES: REFLECTING AUDIENCE CONCERNS, APPEALING TO LOGIC AND EMOTIONS, AND EFFECTIVELY USING LANGUAGE

The significance of RL, in terms of this project, lies in the fact that policy-makers were able to gain broad-based support for this policy and, eventually, begin implementation despite its conflicts with liberalism, a pervasive discourse in the United States that has impacted public opinion regarding approaches to addressing social problems. In other words, policy-makers were successful in persuading their audience, many of which identify with the ideas of liberalism, to adopt a structural narrative regarding the causes of and solutions to homelessness. The immediate question that arises from this achievement, and the central question of this thesis, is as follows: how did these policy-makers gain broad-based community support for a policy that was outside of the dominant discourse of liberalism?

To answer this question, I conducted a rhetorical analysis of RL and other related documents. Based on this analysis, I argue that the rhetorical power of RL rests in its use of four primary rhetorical strategies including its ability to reflect audience concerns, appeals to logos, appeals to pathos, and its strategic use of language. In the following four sections, I discuss these strategies, paying particular attention to their implications

31 Specifically, these policy-makers persuaded public officials, other funders, the business community, and members of the Columbus community in general to support RL.
for gender and class. It is important to note that, while I discuss each of these as discrete strategies in my analysis, they do not function independently from one another in RL. Instead, much overlap exists between these strategies. These strategies work together, reinforcing one another, to eventually persuade audience members to adopt RL and its narrative.

**Audience Concerns**

To successfully persuade an audience to adopt a particular narrative, a rhetorical artifact must address or, at the very least, reflect the concerns of its intended audience (Foss 1996). To gain broad-based support for RL, therefore, the concerns of local government officials, business leaders, homeless service providers, and Columbus community members at large had to be reflected within the policy itself. Many of these concerns were voiced at Phase II of the Community Input Sessions, which were conducted by the SPRTF to solicit input from stakeholders on the overall direction of the policy and its recommendations. Three major themes emerged from these sessions including issues related to the individual responsibility of homeless men, the entitlement of homeless men to receive social services, and the validity of the policy-making process itself. In the following sub-sections, I explore these concerns and the specific strategies used to address and/or reflect them within RL.

**Building A Better System, Creating Dependency?**

According to a report containing the results of Phase II of the Community Input Sessions, participants expressed concerns that the guiding principles of the proposed Housing Stabilization System would foster a "dependence on the system" (Tidwell 1998). For example, participants expressed concerns regarding proposed recommendations that shelters operate using an open door policy and that supportive housing projects do not
require participation in programming as a condition of stay. These participants recommended, instead, that the policy include stipulations requiring shelters to operate with mandatory work requirements and policies that limit the length of time individuals could stay in a shelter. Additionally, they suggested that the policy detail specific consequences for individuals who do not meet their individual housing outcomes. In effect, these participants recommended that the policy adopt measures to ensure that homeless men “take responsibility” for their individual actions that, presumably, caused their homelessness and that they “are held accountable for their actions” while receiving services.

The concerns of these participants were heavily influenced by liberalism, indicated by their use of the key terms of this discourse and further reflected by their emphasis on the individual within the narrative of homelessness stemming from this discourse. Furthermore, their recommendations reflected their adherence to the ideas of paternalism. Liberalism and paternalism have both influenced public policies and social services aimed at addressing social problems by emphasizing the individual. As I have demonstrated, this influence has historically led to policies that punish homeless individuals and fail to provide any long-term solutions to homelessness. The concerns of these participants, therefore, were in direct conflict with the narrative framing this policy-making process and its over-arching goal to develop a policy that will “provide

---

32 Open door policies require emergency shelters to provide services to all persons who request it, regardless of their previous shelter stays or failed attempts to achieve and maintain housing.

33 For a more detailed discussion on paternalism within homeless service provision see Thomas Main, "Homeless Men in New York City: Toward Paternalism Through Privatization." in The New Paternalism: Supervisory Approaches to Poverty. (Washington, D.C.: Brookinston Institution Press). Due to the increasing influence of paternalism on social service provision, Main suggests that many shelters provide services only in exchange for conformity to behavioral requirements. For example, for individuals to receive services, they must be drug and alcohol free, engaged in case management, and working. Thus, certain cultural values are reinforced.
meaningful solutions and alternatives to combat—and eventually eliminate—homelessness in Columbus” (Green 1999: 1).

To reflect these concerns, RL utilized the catch phrases of liberalism that resonate with its audience including accountability, responsibility, self-sufficiency, and independence. To maintain its focus on the structural causes of and solutions to homelessness, however, the meaning of these terms, and their subsequent effects, were modified by the presence of ideas that assumed collective responsibility for homelessness. For example, RL did emphasize accountability, which was one of the concerns voiced at the Community Input Sessions. In fact, two sections existed within RL that addressed issues related to accountability. These sections were entitled Accountability to the Community and Quality Assurance and Accountability (SPRTF 1998: pgs. xiii and 36, respectively). However, within these sections, RL focused on system-level accountability, rather than the accountability of individual homeless people.

For example, RL recommended several policies that ensured the system’s accountability to the community including mandatory “good neighbor agreements” for all projects created under this policy and “shelter certification” (ibid.). Good neighbor agreements required providers to develop “a communication plan that describes how the provider will communicate with local neighborhood and business concerns... and how issues of concerns will be addressed” (p. 37). Similarly, shelter certification required that providers “demonstrate compliance with operational, customer, community, and funder specifications” (ibid.). Additionally, “to address community accountability”, RL

---

34 Good neighbor agreements are compacts with neighborhoods that establish communication structures and address policies having to do “with site design, operations, and safety procedures” (SPRTF 1998: p. 36). These agreements are designed to enable providers “to develop facility types that meet the needs of clients and coalesce with existing neighborhoods” (ibid.).
recommended releasing six-month report cards to the community; continuing “community dialogue”; and providing “reports to the community” on issues related to homelessness (p. 38). Therefore, accountability, as it appeared within RL, was redefined to focus on the community’s accountability for homelessness. With this definition of accountability, RL maintained its focus on the structural narrative of homelessness while simultaneously reflecting its audience’s concern and utilizing a term that resonated with them, subsequently, increasing support for RL.

Similarly, to address participants’ recommendations to include individual outcome requirements to hold homeless people accountable, RL shifted the discussion to focus on system-level requirements and accountability (SPRTF: p. 21). The discussion began with an emphasis on the need to develop housing outcome expectations for homeless men, reflecting the concerns of its audience. According to RL, “They [homeless men] must be making progress toward achieving housing and self-sufficiency goals in order to remain in the shelter system” (SPRTF 1998: 21). This statement, however, was followed by a discussion of the accountability of the men’s sheltering system. This discussion suggested that the men’s sheltering system would be held accountable for achieving housing outcomes. For example, according to RL, “the men’s system will move to an enhanced outcome-based approach” (21). Again, RL, with its focus on system-level accountability, reflected its liberal audience’s concern while maintaining a structural narrative of homelessness.

Additionally, to reflect its liberal audience’s concerns regarding responsibility and maintain its structural narrative of homelessness, RL discussed responsibility; however, responsibility was redefined to emphasize collective responsibility for homelessness. To
that end, *RL* continually juxtaposed liberal and communitarian definitions of responsibility. For example, according to the *Statement of Principles*, "important goals for homeless households are *self-sufficiency*, community reintegration and *maintaining independence*" (SPRTF 1998: 7 with emphasis added). This passage reflected the liberal narrative of homelessness that emphasizes individual responsibility for the causes of and solutions to homelessness. Embedded in this narrative is the assumption that all individuals have equal opportunities to achieve self-sufficiency. Immediately following this passage, however, *RL* challenged this assumption. *RL* stated, "Persons who are not able to be totally self-sufficient should have access to housing in a humane environment that provides as much independence as manageable" (*ibid*).

Moreover, *RL* modified the liberal narrative by including numerous principles that suggest collective responsibility for homelessness. For example, *RL* stated that "solutions [to homelessness] will require integration of services and a network of service providers working together" (*ibid*.). Similarly, *RL* stated that "solutions to homelessness will be difficult and complies and will require ownership, support and resources from a broad cross-section of community interest groups" (p. 8). Instead of dismissing individual responsibility for homelessness, *RL* included principles that reflected its audience's belief in this narrative; however, these principles were balanced by principles that focused on the responsibility of homeless service providers and the community in ending homelessness.

Similar strategies appeared throughout *RL*. To address its audience's concerns regarding individual responsibility, *RL* stated that a successful delivery system must be founded on "programs [that] *instill a work ethic* and provide access to employment..."
resources” (p. 22 with emphasis added). Here, RL reflected its audience’s concern that individuals are responsible for their homelessness because of their behaviors and poor values, including their unwillingness to work. This concern was also reflected throughout RL by asserting that successful programs must “instill a work ethic”, and promote a “strong work environment” and a “culture of work” (pages xiii, 22, 27, and 32). However, discussion of these concerns existed within the larger context of a collective responsibility for homelessness.\(^{35}\)

For example, within the section entitled Foundations of a Successful Delivery System, RL stated that success, or ending homelessness, was dependent upon “a commitment to and action on a community vision...,” “collaborations among public and private sector service organizations...,” and “high quality training across all staff levels” (p. 22). In other words, according to RL, the responsibility of ending homelessness also lies within direct service providers and the community rather than solely within individual homeless persons themselves. This assumption was reiterated when RL stated, “as the Columbus community grows and prospers, our civic responsibility is to ensure that all individuals share in that success” (p. 61 with emphasis added). Thus, the responsibility of ending homelessness was shifted from individual homeless people to the community. With this definition of responsibility, RL maintained its focus on the structural narrative of homelessness while simultaneously reflecting its audience’s concern and utilizing a term that resonated with them, subsequently, increasing support for RL.

\(^{35}\) Additionally, within RL, these discussions did not focus directly on the individual. Instead, RL focused on the system’s ability to instill a work ethic in individuals by emphasizing employment.
What About Women and Children?

In addition to concerns regarding the responsibility and accountability of homeless men, many participants of Phase II of the Community Input Sessions expressed concerns that the community was creating an extensive plan to address the sole needs of homeless men and, subsequently, was ignoring the needs of homeless women or families (Tidwell 1998). According to Michael Katz (1995), this concern reflects a historical trend in social service provision to distinguish between the deserving and the undeserving poor. He argues that discourses on poverty primarily utilize a vocabulary of "invidious distinction." These distinctions are apparent in the dominant discourse of poverty that operated in the end of the 1980s. At this time, a new image of the poor emerged. Fueled by anxiety and hostility, Americans labeled inner-city African Americans as the underclass. The underclass was characterized by high rates of teenage pregnancy, female headed-households, drug use, and violent crime. The underclass was represented as menacing militants and, therefore, labeled as the undeserving poor. In sharp contrast to the underclass, homeless people were represented as pathetic, objects of charity and, consequently, labeled as the new deserving poor.\(^{36}\) While I agree that "the underclass" has become the undeserving poor in society, I disagree with Katz' monolithic characterization of homeless persons as the new deserving poor. While I agree that some categories of people experiencing homelessness evoke compassion and receive charitable support, others, however, fail to evoke these same feelings or support.

\(^{36}\) While this new classification did increase efforts to address homelessness, these policies did little to offer solutions to end homelessness, as they were created with the hopes of revitalizing charity in the United States.
In terms of homeless services, men are deemed undeserving of aid because of their failure to perform the hegemonic constructions of masculinity in our society. These constructions are based largely on achieving independence and financial security for themselves and their families (Connel 1995). Joanne Passaro (1996) argues that, as a result of racism and classism, many homeless men cannot live up to these traditional constructions. Specifically, as a result of a lack of educational opportunities and pervasive employment discrimination, these men cannot fulfill their societal role as breadwinners.

Moreover, homeless men, in general, cannot achieve independence and, consequently, masculinity because of their dependent position within the homeless service system. According to Fraser (1997), homeless services themselves are feminized because of their association with the household and family. Homeless men, therefore, because of their very location within this system are feminized. Additionally, they are feminized because of their dependence on social services for survival. According to Gordon and Fraser (1994), this dependency is associated with femininity. In effect, homeless men are constructed in opposition to masculinity. As result, according to Passaro (1996), homeless men are not considered successful, and, consequently, not considered “real men” by society’s standards. They are, in effect, emasculated and deemed unworthy of aid and deserving of their homelessness because they have directly failed their gender role.

*RL utilized several strategies to address these concerns. First, in a section entitled “The focus of the Task Force report: homeless single men,” RL specifically discussed its sole focus on homeless men (SPRTF 1998: p.1). Here, relying on empirical evidence, RL*
justified this focus by identifying the gendered nature of homelessness on the Scioto Peninsula. For example, *RL* stated that “...95% of the homeless persons who reside on the Scioto Peninsula are single men” (*ibid*). Similarly, it stated, “...almost all persons living outdoors on the Scioto Peninsula are single men” (*ibid*). Additionally, instead of dismissing the needs of homeless families and single women, *RL* acknowledged them. For example, *RL* stated, “It is the intention of the Task Force and CSB to make use of what has been learned through this process to improve the systems that serve homeless families and women in Columbus and Franklin County” (SPRTF 1998, p. 2).

Moreover, to address its audience’s construction of homeless men as the undeserving poor, *RL* effectively constructed homeless men as being more similar to its audience members than previous policies aimed to address homelessness. In contrast to policies that refer to homeless men as “the homeless,” *RL* referred to homeless men as individuals who are experiencing a housing crisis, consumers, or homeless men. From this frame, homeless men are just people (similar to audience members) who have found themselves in a housing crisis. By blurring the distance between homeless men and its audience, *RL* increased sympathy towards homeless men and, in turn, increased the likelihood that its audience would support it.

Furthering this reconstruction of identity, *RL* actively worked to debunk the stereotypes of homeless men by using empirical evidence to increase compassion for homeless men, and consequently, increase support for the policy. This was most notably done in *RL*’s discussion of the profile of homeless men (SPRTF 16). Here, readers were provided with numerous claims or indicators about homeless men. In many cases, these were in direct opposition to the stereotypes of homeless men and reinforced their
masculinity. These indicators included their housing and employment histories, mental health status, physical health status, and veteran status (16-17). For example, according to RL, “many men in shelters are employed, and most want to work.” This claim addressed the stereotype of homeless men not working or being unwilling to work. Moreover, it addressed concerns regarding homeless men’s compliance with traditional constructions of masculinity, emphasizing their ability and willingness to be breadwinners. Additionally, empirical evidence was provided to support each claim. For example, according to RL, 46% of homeless men in shelters are employed, while “72% of homeless men who are not employed want to work” (p. 16). Similarly, “70% of men in shelters consider themselves to be in good or excellent health” (p. 17). By predicting its audience’s stereotypes of homeless men and directly addressing them with empirical evidence, RL effectively addressed and refuted its audiences (mis)constructions of homeless men. Without these concerns, audience members were forced to support RL.

Skepticism Regarding the Public Policy-Making Process

Finally, according to the results from Phase I of the Community Input Sessions, individuals expressed concerns regarding the validity of the policy-making process (Tidwell 1998). Participants expressed concerns that decisions were made prior to the formation of SPRTF and that the policy-making process was merely a façade. Individuals also questioned whether a “people centered” plan was actually being developed. Community members felt that their concerns were ignored and the concerns of the business community were guiding this process. In addition, direct service providers felt that the needs of homeless people were being compromised based on the needs of local government, business leaders, and community members.
To address these concerns and simultaneously build the credibility of the SPRTF and RL, RL referred extensively to its reliance on solicited input to help develop the final product of this process. For example, readers were provided with a detailed overview of components of the policy “planning process” (SPRTF 4-5). These components included input from community members, current and formerly homeless individuals, and local and national experts. Additionally, RL emphasized that “the Task Force gathered input from the community...” to develop the foundations of this policy (p. viii). Similarly, according to RL, this policy “respond[ed] to our community as well as the needs of homeless individuals” (p. x). This strategy informed readers that the concerns of its audience were taken into consideration, which simultaneously demonstrated that the process was valid and addressed the concerns voiced by participants in Phase I of the Community Input Sessions.

Interestingly, RL reliance on community input continued throughout implementation. In the first report card to the community, under a section entitled Promises Kept, there was a sub-section entitled Respond to Neighborhoods (Community Shelter Board September 2000). This section detailed the progress that was made on Good Neighbor Agreements and emphasized a continued commitment to community input. Similarly, in the second report card to the community, an entire section was devoted to discussing the community’s role in the implementation of RL. In this section, entitled Listening to the Community, the various strategies used to “involve nearby neighbors in the community at large in the planning process” were discussed. These strategies included “seeking input” directly from community members; developing a Community Advisory Council comprised of community members to “advise CSB on the
formation of Good Neighbor Agreements”; and offering presentations to community organizations regarding “the Rebuilding Lives initiative, supportive housing, and the facts on homelessness in central Ohio” (CSB March 2000).

**Appeals to Logos**

As I have demonstrated, many of the key components of *RL*, including its narrative and constructions of homeless men, were outside of the dominant discourses influencing its audience. To overcome these conflicts and gain the support of its audience, *RL* redefined the key phrases of liberalism and reconstructed the identity of homeless men. Additionally, *RL* relied heavily on appeals to logos, or appeals to reason. In *RL*, these appeals were made primarily on the basis of data, literature reviews, model program research, and model program forums. In fact, throughout *RL*, the pertinence of this “information bases” to the policy-making process was stressed repeatedly. For example, the policy stated that, “an extensive information base was developed for the SPRTF planning process” (SPRTF 5). Preceding this passage, *RL* described, in detail, the components of this information base (p. 5). Throughout *RL*, policy-makers stressed the influence of this information base the development of their recommendations. This strategy functioned to increase the reliability and validity of these recommendations, as they were based on the foundations of empirical evidence and input from national experts.

The authority of this “information base” was repeatedly evoked to justify the general recommendation of this policy to create a Housing Stabilization System. For example, the policy stated, “This recommendation is based on what has been learned over the past two years about the characteristics of homeless men in Columbus and about
successful programs to serve this population” (SPRTF 8). Immediately following that passage, the reader was introduced to data, in the form of statistics, regarding homeless men in Columbus that supports this general recommendation. This was reiterated again. Here, the reader was introduced to the details of the study used to determine the needs of homeless men in Columbus (p. 18). According to RL, “these findings [from the typology study] indicate a need to develop systems that address the different needs of the short-term and long-term homeless” (19). The use of research to justify this recommendation was further reiterated; as RL stated, “As the Task Force researched model programs and consulted with experts across the country, they found a number of common characteristics among best program... A successful service delivery system in Columbus will also need to be based on these foundations” (p. 21).

Additionally, the authority of this “information base” was evoked to persuade its audiences to adopt the specific components of the proposed Housing Stabilization System. The reader was provided with six examples of “best practices” based on the “Task Force’s [research of] both local and national model programs...” (SPRTF 13-15). Each example corresponded to a specific component of the recommended system. For each model program, the reader was provided with a general overview of the program and, in most cases, the program’s outcomes. For example, the reader was provided with an overview of the Anishinabe Wakiagun supportive housing program. According to RL, “[this program] has documented a nine-fold decrease in detox admissions and a 25% decline in emergency room usage for its residents, when compared to their use of these services when they were homeless. ...with savings to Hennepin County in 1996-1997 of $250,000” (p. 13). Additionally, in terms of Housing Works, an employment/housing
program for homeless men in New York, readers were provided with the program outcomes. According to *RL*, "Of the persons who have been employed... 100% were employed six months after their initial date of hire, and eighty-one percent were employed one year after the date of hire" (p. 13). The use of model program research as an authority in *RL* allowed readers to know that these strategies have been implemented and were successful in other communities.

Moreover, *RL* relied heavily on these appeals to persuade its audience to accept its recommendation to create 800 units of supportive housing, one of its structural solutions to homelessness. *RL* emphasized the research findings that demonstrated the cost-effectiveness and efficiency of this recommendation. For example, *RL* stated, "Analysis of other housing and service options for homeless men led the Task Force to conclude that, in the long run, supportive housing is the most cost-effective way..." (SPRTF 9). Moreover, "The approach to providing services to homeless men recommended by the Task Force is supported by national experts and research" (9). To support these claims, an extensive literature review was provided. *RL* detailed the findings of numerous, national studies regarding the success and cost-effectiveness of supportive housing (SPRTF 9-12). This was later reiterated, as *RL* stated that, "The research cited above, as well as analysis of other housing and service options for homeless men, led the Task Force to conclude that, in the long run, supportive housing is the most effective way..." (12). Here, the use of research findings functioned to persuade its audience that this approach will also be cost-effective for Franklin County, specifically.

In sum, *RL* cited a total of ten studies that demonstrated the success and cost-effectiveness of supportive housing (SPRTF 9-12). These citations included 8 different
entities. The range in authorities used here functioned to persuade multiple audiences. For example, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development potentially had more appeal to those in local government; whereas, WBNS Channel 10 News may have had more appeal to the Columbus community at large. Despite these differences, the heavy use of empirical evidence functioned to persuade its audiences that supportive housing was the best approach to serve homeless men. Additionally, the use of empirical evidence functioned to increase the credibility and reliability of these recommendations by demonstrating the its consistency with the research. By continually demonstrating this consistency, its audience was unable to dispute the validity of these recommendations, including their structural focus, and, consequently, were forced to adopt them.

In addition to persuading readers to adopt the programmatic recommendations of the Housing Stabilization System, these appeals to logos functioned to persuade its audience to adopt the recommended costs for developing and implementing this system. The "information base" was used to justify these recommendations. According to RL, "cost estimates for the...Housing Stabilization System were based on research undertaken by the Technical Work Group of the Task Force. Data sources included: interviews with administrators of model programs across the country, literature research, interviews with local public sector funders, interviews with local supportive housing developers, CSB data, and expertise of the Technical Work Group consultants and staff" (SPRTF 40). Following this passage, readers were provided with an extensive overview of the costs for RL (40-44). By prefacing these cost estimates with appeals to logos, its audience was forced to accept these cost estimates as truths, for they were based on empirical research and the advice of national experts.
Appeals to Pathos

While relying heavily on its repeated appeals to logos, RL also utilized appeal to pathos, or emotions to gain support. These appeals were most evident in the various phrases used throughout RL. For example, according RL, “There is another cost of the current system for serving homeless persons with long-term needs that is too often overlooked – the human cost” (SPRTF 61). Presumably, RL’s recommended system, however, provided audience members with an opportunity to avoid these costs. Specifically, according to each of the community report cards, “Rebuilding Lives will be the bridge for many between a life of crisis, uncertainty and despair to one of productivity, certainty and health” (CSB March and September 2000, and February 2001). In other words, by supporting RL, audience members had an opportunity to help homeless men achieve the American dream.

Similarly, RL stated, “Some communities have chosen not to address homelessness in any systemic manner; consequently, they tolerate large numbers of homeless men, women, families, and youth living on the street” (SPRTF 1998: p.8). Here, RL relied on the compassion of its audience members to gain support. From this passage, readers inferred that, if RL was not implemented, many people (including women and children) would be forced to live on the streets. Generally speaking, most compassionate individuals view living on the streets as largely unacceptable. Therefore, in order to avoid this from becoming a reality, its audience was forced support RL. In sum, through various emotional pleas for support, RL appealed to its audience’s sense of compassion and charity for the “less fortunate”, increasing support.
Many of the appeals to emotions in RL were targeted to persuade specific audience members. For example, in the letter to the Franklin County Community, RL stated, “These changes [the redevelopment of the Scioto Peninsula] create both a need and an opportunity to better serve homeless persons and ensure that ‘no one is left behind while others move forward’” (SPRTF v). The phrase “no one is left behind while others move forward” appeared repeatedly in the RL (pgs. vii, x, 1, and 7). Additionally, this phrase appeared within each of the three report cards to the community (CSB March and September 2000, and February 2001). Similar appeals are made throughout RL, as it stated, “As the Columbus community grows and prospers, our civic responsibility is to ensure that all individuals share in that success” (p. 61). Again, “With the roadmap that the plan provides, and with everyone working together toward a common goal, we will as a community achieve success. Together we must make this investment to make our community better” (p. 61).

These particular appeals to pathos were most effective in persuading the community members and business leaders associated with the Scioto Peninsula. These audience members received a direct economic benefit from the Scioto Peninsula redevelopment efforts, the very efforts that displace homeless men on the peninsula. In effect, the economic gains of community members and business leaders were a direct result of the losses of homeless men. According to RL, these economic gains provided community members and business leaders with the moral imperative to help the less fortunate, homeless men. RL, therefore, utilized this imbalance of power to successfully persuade these audiences and gain support.
Strategic Use of Language

In addition to its reliance on emotional appeals, RL relied on its strategic use of language to gain support. For example, when discussing housing for late-stage chronic alcoholics, RL referred to the programming as “assisted living for disabled people” (SPRTF 1998: 13,21,23 and 26). This careful use of language structured alcohol and other drug addiction as a disease. This frame received more sympathy and, subsequent, support from audience members. Another, stealthy use of language appeared in the descriptions of treatment housing (p. 14 and 26). These descriptions stated, “residents chose from an array of services and housing types, including housing for abstinent users, housing that guides people through the beginning stages of treatment and programs for job skills” (p. 14). Additionally, this statement appeared, “Treatment options range from abstinence-based programs to programs for persons who are just beginning the recovery process” (p. 26). The italicized portions of these passages reflected a more palatable description of harm reduction programming, programming designed to serve individuals who are actively using alcohol or drugs. Through this strategic use of language, RL effectively avoided the use of a hotly contested word, harm reduction, and, as such, avoided the added controversy associated with such programming.

Another interesting strategy that operated within RL was its continual prefacing of the need for change with the past accomplishments of this community and service system regarding homelessness. For example, the letter to the Franklin County Community stated that “Columbus and Central Ohio have made remarkable progress over the years in providing support and services to individuals experiencing a housing crisis…. While the results have been significant, we are at a critical point that requires us to re-evaluate our
approach and develop plans to meet our changing times" (SPRTF, v). In that same letter, readers learn that the success of \textit{RL} rested on "the same sense of working together that has brought us this far" (p. v). Similar themes were reiterated throughout \textit{RL}. For example, \textit{RL} states, "The Task Force began its work by noting that Columbus and Central Ohio have made remarkable progress over the years in providing support and services to individuals and families in a housing crisis" (7).

Prefacing the need for change with the success of past efforts to address homelessness in Columbus was a successful rhetorical strategy. First, it created a sense of inclusiveness in \textit{RL}. This strategy avoided alienating those people who work in the homeless service system by validating their past efforts. Moreover, it functioned to build the credibility of the existing homeless service system, letting community members and funders know that this system can implement the new plan. Additionally, it enabled community members to take pride in helping "the less fortunate." The focus on continued collaboration enabled community members to share in the responsibility for the success of the system. As such, this strategy functioned to gain the support of community members and homeless system service providers.
CONCLUSION

REBUILDING THE RHETORIC OF FEMINIST POLICY-MAKERS

In this thesis, I have demonstrated the importance of RL within the larger historical and contemporary trends of social policies aimed at addressing homelessness. Shifting away from an emphasis on the individual, RL utilized a structural narrative to describe the causes of and solutions to homelessness. Moreover, RL gained the support of its audience and began implementation of this policy in 1999. This is even more significant, as I have demonstrated that its narrative conflicted with liberalism, a pervasive discourse in our society that emphasizes the individual. I began this project to determine how, given this conflict, RL gained support. Through a rhetorical analysis, I have demonstrated that the rhetorical power of RL rests in its ability to reflect the concerns of its audience; its use of appeals to reason and emotion; and its strategic use of language. My project, however, extends beyond investigating the experiences of Columbus, Ohio, as rhetorical analyses provide us with strategies to improve our own rhetoric or the rhetoric of others. Specifically, my analysis of RL has implications for progressive policy-makers and others who seek to create policies that offer structural narratives, and, subsequently, meaningful solutions to pressing issues of our society within a liberal discourse.
Specifically, my analysis has implications for feminist policy-makers and the field of feminist policy studies. Within feminist policy studies, many theorists have critiqued the use of liberal ideology in public policies designed to address the "social problems" of women. These theorists contest that this ideology functions to disempower women and limits the overall advancement of women. Given its nascent stage of development and prevailing approaches to social policies, much of the work within this field operates from this standpoint of critique. In this project, I am not suggesting that the position of critique is invalid. Nor, am I contesting the critiques of liberalism within public policies that many feminist theorists have provided.

But, in a time when women's economic status in the U.S. is increasingly threatened (especially given the upcoming change in administration and the reauthorization of welfare reform in 2001), it is imperative that feminists channel their energies in research, policies, and strategies that will produce material changes in the current lives of women. Feminist policy-makers often struggle to create policies that affirm and advance women and simultaneously gain the approval of the state and other individuals involved. Often, this is a result of their language and constructions are outside of dominant discourses. To persuade these audiences, policy-makers must use a language that resonates with these audiences. In a society characterized by a liberal discourse, this language, however, often stems from liberalism. Given the critiques of liberalism within feminist policy studies, how can feminist policy makers gain support for their policies?

The field of feminist policy studies must expand to answer this question. My work contributes to this overall expansion by providing feminist policy-makers with an
analysis of RL. This, which demonstrated its rhetorical power, can be used to improve the rhetoric of feminist policy-makers, as well others who are struggling to gain support for policies that are outside of or in conflict with liberalism. Most relevant, the rhetoric of RL provides a framework for reflecting the ideas of liberalism, while still maintaining a structural narrative, and, subsequently, gaining the support of key stakeholders. Instead of avoiding the language of liberalism, feminist policy-makers must consider modifying the meanings of the phrases of liberalism and use them as mere catch phrases to gain support for their policies. To overcome stereotypes, as in the case of RL, feminist policy-makers must reconstruct the identities of women within their rhetoric. To that end, and to support their overall recommendations, feminist policy-makers must rely on empirical research, as these appeals clearly resonate with the American public. In effect, feminist policy-makers must spend the time and energy to improve their rhetoric.

While this improvement may increase support for their policies and, consequently, improve the short-term lives of women, we must consider the long-term ramifications of these strategies. For example, as I have demonstrated, the use of a structural narrative within the policy was a direct result of CSB’s efforts to orchestrate a policy-making process consistent with their values and goals to provide solutions to homelessness. To that end, CSB relied on the power dynamics that are embedded in the policy-making process itself. Here, policy-makers are granted absolute control and power over the process. Moreover, CSB reinforced pre-existing systems of inequality by limiting the participation of and, consequently, silencing members of the Franklinton community, an impoverished neighborhood of Columbus. While CSB exploited these power dynamics to benefit poor people, most policy-makers use this imbalance of power
to serve their own interests. What are the long-term consequences of participating in this process? Are we simply reinforcing the process and its existing power dynamics?

Similarly, RL's heavy reliance on empirical evidence reinforces traditional constructions of knowledge and the hierarchies that exist within these constructions. Specifically, RL's use of "higher forms" of knowledge, including empirical evidence, functioned to erase the concerns and recommendations of the Franklinton community, a community characterized by lower education attainment rates than those of policy-makers. Again, policy-makers involved in RL utilized these hierarchies to benefit homeless people, but what are the long-term consequences of this strategy?

Finally, while RL effectively modified the meanings of accountability, responsibility, and self-sufficiency, can feminist policy-makers aimed at addressing issues specific to women successfully achieve this re-inscription of meaning given the inherent conflict between liberalism and female subjectivity? If so, what are the long-term consequences of utilizing these key terms as catch phrases to gain support for a policy? Does it simply reinforce the power and pervasiveness of liberalism within our society, a discourse that has historically disempowered women?
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