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This study examines the attitudes of local elected officials regarding quality of life ordinances that impact the street homeless in Atlanta, Georgia, and San Francisco, California. The case study approach was employed. A closed and opened-ended questionnaire was employed to obtain data. Content and aggregate data analysis was also performed.

Although the data indicates that there is political representation for the homeless in Atlanta and San Francisco, it is not substantive. That is, even though local government in Atlanta and San Francisco acknowledges the need and its willingness to build additional affordable housing, more energy, time, and resources must be utilized for the creation of affordable housing if governmental figures realistically expect to assist the homeless in securing permanent affordable housing. The data shows, however, that in addition to creating affordable housing, local government in Atlanta and San Francisco
has devoted a significant amount of energy, time, and resources to control the behavior of the street homeless.

The data analysis also shows that it is the residential and business communities leading the charge for enactment and strong enforcement of quality of life ordinances in both cities. This finding is consistent with Robert DeLeon’s study of local governance in San Francisco. DeLeon argues that San Francisco politics is best understood within the context of pluralism. My study basically shows that pluralism is at work regarding quality of life ordinances in San Francisco. On the other hand, this finding comes in opposition to what Clarence Stone found in his study of Atlanta. Stone concluded that Atlanta governance is best understood within a regime. Even though my study does not confirm that regime theory is inadequate in explaining governance in Atlanta, it does highlight that the residential and rank and file have a strong and significant voice in ensuring the creation and enforcement of quality of life ordinances in Atlanta.

The data analysis also suggests that a relationship exists among council members who believe that the primary cause of homelessness in Atlanta and San Francisco, respectively, stems from personal defects and those who support quality of life ordinances. This finding is consistent when analyzing the attitudes of San Francisco Mayor Willie Brown regarding quality of life ordinances. Of respondents supporting quality of life ordinances, all indicated that the primary cause of homelessness in their respective cities falls within the personal perspective. At the other end of the spectrum, respondents who stated that the primary cause of homelessness is structural indicated opposition to quality of life ordinances.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

Homelessness in the United States, Atlanta, Georgia, and San Francisco, California, in particular, has existed for decades. Yet, due to the marginal effects of which neo-homelessness has become an overbearing dilemma for numerous American citizens. Neo-homelessness connotes numerous ethnic, racial and age groups residing without stable housing that range from drug addiction to government urban renewal practices. According to Carol L. M. Canton in *Homelessness in America* (1990), America got its first view of the conditions of homelessness during the colonial era. Although today’s homeless population is represented by those who are extremely poor, male, female, single, young, and/or racial minorities, it is still a largely homogenous group.¹ They are without adequate funds to secure permanent housing.

For this project, homelessness is conceptualized as including those persons who are without a permanent place to call home. Within this group, the street, shelter, and crowded homeless are accounted for. However, the shelter homeless are counted in terms of those persons who seek assistance through the Metro Atlanta Task Force for the

¹Anne B. Shlay and Peter H. Rossi, “Social Science Research and Contemporary Studies of Homelessness,” *Social Science Reviews* 18 (1992): 133.
Homeless and San Francisco’s Coalition for the Homeless. Both homeless organizations play integral roles in providing access to their respective city’s shelters. The street homeless are basically those homeless folk whose permanent or temporary place of residence is the street, in a literal sense. Crowded homeless folk live mostly with family and/or friends.

Based upon the findings of a study of homelessness in Atlanta that I conducted between 1993-95, blacks and women with children are the fastest growing category of the homeless population requesting assistance through shelters. The findings of this earlier study also illustrates that the African American homeless population in Atlanta is powerless in terms of getting government to not only listen to their concerns but also in locating low-income housing. I concluded that local government was addressing only the needs and demands of the commercial industry and not the homeless and homeless advocacy groups. These findings come in light of a city that has a black mayor, a black city council president, and city council that is 56 percent black.

Historically, African Americans due to their oppressed nature have generally looked upon black political leadership to enhance their lot. African American professors J. Owens Smith, Mitchell F. Rice, and Woodrow Jones Jr. state that “an understanding of how groups struggle to obtain a position of power to influence the authoritative allocation of values and resources is a critical political variable in the study of black politics.” Take housing as an example,
Housing is both a consumer and a durable good—we value it for its services in the present and as an asset in the future. In their ability to acquire housing as either a consumer or a durable good, throughout their history in this nation, African Americans have faced limited choices—both of type and location. These limits have resulted, first, from their status as slaves and, later, from zoning ordinances, federal statutes and programs of housing assistance, and court rulings, all of which have combined to relegate the majority of African Americans to segregated neighborhoods with a limited range of housing options that are decent, safe, sanitary, and appropriate to their needs. Racial discrimination in the processes of renting and purchasing homes, another infringement on the housing choices of African Americans, continues today.3

But more pointedly, “African Americans are heavily over-represented among homeless families, and whites are significantly under-represented. Nationally, over half (58 percent) of homeless families are African American (compared to 12 percent in the general population).”4 Specifically, in comparison to their general population rates in Atlanta and San Francisco, African Americans account for 25 percent over-representation of homeless families in Atlanta.5 African American families account for 336 percent over-representation of the homeless in San Francisco.6

---


6Ibid., 299.
Thus, one can conclude that African Americans are not only homeless but also encounter racial discrimination when locating housing. Furthermore, African American political leaders normally provide tangible benefits to the black community. African American professor, Georgia A. Persons, Georgia Institute of Technology, states that:

Early black elected officials were frequently tied into the white-dominated political machines of their day and were thereby able to deliver benefits to many of their supporters. Their relationship to their followers was a kind of patron-client relationship in which these black leaders functioned as brokers in a network of relationships: delivering a limited black vote in support of select white candidates at the local and state level; delivering particularistic benefits such as jobs and access to social service benefits to many of their black constituents; and attempting to utilize their access to the political process to advance the collective status of blacks nationwide.7

Noteworthy contemporary African American elected officials in Atlanta and the state of California have used their constitutional and informal powers to enhance the lifestyles of blacks. Former African American mayor Maynard Jackson informed local banking officials in 1979 that he would withdraw the city’s revenues from its banks and deposit them in out of state banks if blacks and women were not appointed to its board of directors.8 At the time African Americans and women were denied the opportunity to serve on the board of directors. In order to maintain the city’s business, local banks complied with Jackson’s wishes.9 Former African American Atlanta City Council


president, Marvin Arrington, openly fought against redlining practices in Atlanta. Professors Smith, Rice, and Jones also highlight that Willie Brown, San Francisco’s first and only African American mayor, while serving as Speaker of California’s House of Representatives placed “blacks on committees so that they could protect civil rights issues and programs that significantly affected the black community.”

These findings are best understood within the context of the African American experience in America. “Too often, students of black politics try to extrapolate black’s present day political behavior without trying to connect it to their past experience. Consequently, they are forced to make the elementary assumption that black’s present day conditions have no relation to their past.”

Nevertheless, the findings of my earlier Atlanta study indicate that the major causes of homelessness in Atlanta are structural. The data prove that not only are homeless persons within the city experiencing homelessness due to urban renewal practices but that an entire “poor” and black community was displaced due to the 1996 Olympics and

9Ibid.

10Ibid., 2.


12Ibid., 5.
gentrification processes. In fact, the research shows that urban renewal practices implemented by the city have a history that has existed for over two decades and contributes to explanations of why some people become homeless.

In sum, my earlier research indicates that the conditions of homelessness in Atlanta have been primarily induced by the political system. The solution to this problem is found at its sources: city and federal government policy. That is, solutions to Atlanta’s homeless problem can only occur by altering some of the city’s current practices and public policies. Federal intervention (via increment subsidized housing) is also extremely critical in moving people into a safe and comfortable home environment. However, Atlanta city government passed quality of life ordinances that major studies indicate unfairly target the street homeless. San Francisco also has a very visible homeless population and the city government’s response to the street homeless seems similar to that of Atlanta. For instance, Mayor Willie Brown “announced a new show of force against homeless campers in Golden Gate Park, promising helicopter flyovers to find campsites and more ground sweeps.”[13] But why are city officials in Atlanta and San Francisco responding to the street homeless in this manner?

These actions by city government and law enforcement officials should not be viewed as isolated events but as outcomes of the perceptions of city officials on the causes of homelessness. There are basically two camps in reference to comprehending the

---

causes of homelessness. The personal and structural perspectives represent these two camps. Advocates of the personal perspective maintain that homelessness is the consequence of personal behavioral problems such as alcoholism, mental illness, and apathy. For instance, some researchers indicate that problems associated with mental disorders and substance abuse should be of primary concern to policymakers if they are actually attempting to solve the conditions of homelessness. Even dating back to the Reagan presidency, Ronald Reagan alleged that the homeless are homeless and without shelter because they lack the motivation to do otherwise and that this is a permanent problem. It is alleged here that due to this analysis of the causes of homelessness, city government has relied on the criminal justice system as a means of solving homelessness. However, the assumption that elected officials in Atlanta and San Francisco are biased in their response to the homeless is empirically examined in this research. Atlanta and San Francisco public official’s attitudes about the causes of homelessness and their reasoning in support of quality of life ordinances in each city is explained.

The structural approach to understanding homelessness incorporates things that are beyond the immediate control of the individual homeless person or homeless group. Within this perspective one does not ignore the fact that the lack of affordable housing and welfare cutbacks mandated by the Personal Responsibility Act contributes to the state

---


of homelessness. In a *Washington Post* article, Maria Foscarinis maintains that there are more homeless than shelter beds, affordable housing, jobs, and mental health facilities to aid the homeless.\(^{16}\) Thus, homelessness is viewed as a problem that transcends personal problems.

However, the personal perspective dominates our understanding of homelessness. Consequently, quality of life ordinances are used as a crime prevention mechanism. Allegations have been made that the street homeless are unfairly held accountable for laws that "ordinary" citizens are not. This process is conceptualized as the criminalization of homelessness. The criminalization of the street homeless denotes the process of arresting and convicting the homeless for low-level crimes as a consequence of their homeless status instead of the crimes that have been committed.\(^{17}\) Embedded within this conceptualization is the probability that if non-homeless persons committed identical low-level crimes they would more than likely not be arrested or convicted.\(^{18}\) Crimes that the street homeless are held accountable to, range from begging in public spaces to sleeping or sitting in open spaces.\(^{19}\) Based upon this definition and while many cite that


homelessness overall is on the rise, the criminalization of the homeless is also on the rise.\textsuperscript{20}

Lastly, the fact that quality of life ordinances were passed by city governments is not as important as the claim that the provisions of these ordinances and mayoral executive decisions are enforced primarily against street homeless folk. In Atlanta someone can be sentenced to six months in jail for committing a low-level crime such as window-washing in open spaces (begging). The National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty in its 1996 report, \textit{Mean Sweeps: A Report on Anti-Homeless Laws, Litigation and Alternatives in 50 United States Cities}, indicate that San Francisco ordinances that relate to public drunkenness impact primarily the street homeless in terms of citations and arrests. Even dating back to its 1991 report, \textit{Go Directly to Jail: A Report Analyzing Local Anti-Homeless Ordinances}, the National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty report that between 1988 and 1990 more than a thousand homeless people were arrested for begging in open spaces.

\textbf{Statement of the Problem}

Atlanta city government has not been that substantially different in its response to the street homeless than any other metropolitan governmental entity. Dating back to Maynard Jackson's third term as Mayor, he and the business community (Central Atlanta Progress) created an "Hospitality Zone" which comprised the downtown business district and in

which vagrancy ordinances would be enforced to deter the homeless from congregating in this area.\textsuperscript{21} This zone was implemented to attract not only conventions but tourists as well.\textsuperscript{22} The criminalization of the homeless in Atlanta include:

Sweeps of downtown areas and enforcement of an ordinance which proscribes "aggressive" begging, and restricts loitering and crossing parking lots without a car in the lot; washing car windows for money is also prohibited. Anti-vagrancy, sleeping, and loitering ordinances, and restrictive park codes are also enforced against homeless people.\textsuperscript{23}

For instance, the Atlanta City Council passed a panhandling ordinance on July 15, 1991 which "prohibits 'aggressive begging,' sleeping in vacant buildings and loitering in parking lots."\textsuperscript{24} Those in violation of this ordinance could serve a maximum jail sentence of 60 days including having to pay a $1,000.00 fine.\textsuperscript{25} It has also been reported that the Atlanta government increased its efforts to criminalize the homeless since it was awarded the 1996 Olympic Games.\textsuperscript{26} On the other hand, Atlanta politicians have indicated that the


\textsuperscript{22}\textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{23}\textit{Ibid., 27.}


\textsuperscript{25}\textit{Ibid.}
fundamental purpose of quality of life ordinances is not to target the behavior of a particular group of folk (street homeless). They argue that the intent of these laws is to protect all citizens within Atlanta’s jurisdiction.\textsuperscript{27} However, the Atlanta Task Force for the Homeless disagrees.\textsuperscript{28} The results of a study entitled, \textit{The Criminalization of Poverty}, published by the Atlanta Task Force for the Homeless on January 6, 1995, shows that during 1993:

58 homeless people were arrested in the four days before 13,000 members of the American Society for Microbiology held their convention on May 16 - 19. During the convention, 65 homeless people were arrested.

On June 26, 22 homeless individuals were arrested in the downtown business district -- just 24 hours before 1,500 delegates arrived in town for the 1993 Meeting Planners International (MPI) convention. The MPI convention is considered crucial by the downtown convention and hospitality industry because meeting planners decide eventually where to hold large-scale, national exhibitions and conventions.

Between July 10 - 15, more than 47,000 conventioneers visited downtown Atlanta for 4 different trade shows, including the National Gift and Accessories Market and the Christian Booksellers Association. Three days prior to these shows, a total of 50 homeless individuals were arrested; most in the Central Business District.


\textsuperscript{27}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{28}Atlanta Task Force for the Homeless, \textit{The Criminalization of Poverty} (Atlanta, GA: Atlanta Task Force for the Homeless, 6 January 1995).
In other words, this process is normally implemented prior to the arrival of major civic events in an urban area\(^{29}\) that are of primary interest financially to the business community. The methodology employed to obtain the data from the aforementioned study entailed a common address that the street homeless provides when arrested in Atlanta.

In San Francisco, the actions of the Board of Supervisors and mayoral executive decisions by the past three mayors, including current African American Mayor Willie Brown, are not diametrically different from the actions taken by Atlanta city politicians and law enforcement officials when dealing with its visible street homeless population. For instance, it is commonly known that the top industry in San Francisco is tourism.\(^{30}\) So how does a city attempt to balance its street homeless population problems with its number one money making machine? Simple, arrest them (street homeless) for congregating in public areas where tourism is rampant.\(^{31}\) As indicated earlier, Mayor Brown has advanced a double attack on the street homeless in San Francisco. Mayor Brown has initiated plans, incorporating the use of air sweeps, via helicopters and ground sweeps to prevent the street homeless from occupying public space in Golden Gate

\(^{29}\)Ibid.


Park.  But what is even more interesting is that prior to Mayor Brown taking such a stance in addressing the problems of street homelessness, he openly refused to acknowledge that San Francisco has a homeless problem.  Yet in responses to my self-administered questionnaire and Mayor Brown’s 1998 State of the City Address, he now clearly views homelessness as a major problem that San Francisco’s government must address.

Between April and June 1994, the San Francisco Coalition on Homelessness reported that while African Americans represented only 11 percent of San Francisco’s total population, they accounted for 49 percent of families living in shelters. During this same period, African American women comprised 50 percent of those living in shelters while black men comprised 43 percent. Moreover, while whites comprised 49 percent of San Francisco’s total population, they represented only 23 percent of families living in public shelters. Thus, homelessness in San Francisco appears to be a problem that primarily impacts the lives of African Americans. It is clear that the African American


33Rob Morse, “Stick a Fork in Him, He’s Done,” San Francisco Examiner, 7 November 1997.


35Ibid.

36Ibid.
community in both Atlanta and San Francisco not only represent the majority of the homeless but, are also disproportionately subject to the enforcement of quality of life ordinances. But are quality of life ordinances realistically needed? That is, are public officials just in creating and administrating these ordinances.

Numerous factors account for the enactment and enforcement of quality of life ordinances. Many indicate that there is a middle-class backlash against the homeless congregating in certain public spaces. Some maintain that it is the attitudes and behavior of police officers that is at fault. Others maintain that municipalities are attempting to make their cities "look great" to attract industry, and tourism. Similarly, claims have been advanced that the business community within a city dominates or significantly influences public policy. Within this argument it is alleged that the business community demands the removal of the homeless from the business area. Still, some state that the homeless congregating in certain open spaces pose a public safety threat.

This research attempts to compare and contrast factors that influence urban elected officials in Atlanta and San Francisco when deciding whether or not quality of life ordinances should exist. The primary purpose of this dissertation is five-fold. One aim is to determine whether or not there is political representation for the urban poor and homeless (street homeless) by elected officials in Atlanta and San Francisco? This study also seeks to determine whether or not there is political representation beyond symbolism for the urban poor and homeless (street homeless) by elected officials in Atlanta and San Francisco? The next two aims attempt to determine if there is a relationship between
salient factors that determine whether or not elected officials in Atlanta and San Francisco support quality of life ordinances and their beliefs about the causes of homelessness in their respective cities? Lastly, this study seeks to address a normative issue; should the "street homeless" be disproportionately subject to laws that the nonhomeless are not?

**Significance of Research**

The first two aims of this research are critical since the demographics indicate that the homeless (sheltered homeless) in both San Francisco and Atlanta are primarily African American and/or minority and that the political leadership primarily consists of blacks and/or minorities. At least in San Francisco, Mayor Brown occupies a key position as mayor, which provides him with veto power over legislation passed by the Board of Supervisors (see Article 3, Section 3.103, Veto Power, San Francisco City Charter). Moreover, quality of life ordinances were major campaign issues during the 1997 mayoral and city council campaigns in Atlanta. The evidence also reveals that for the last three mayoral campaigns in San Francisco, the campaigns were, in part, decided based upon the mayor's or mayoral candidate's agenda for addressing the conditions of homelessness in the city. This research attempts to determine the agenda of elected officials regarding the issue of homelessness and street homelessness in particular, in areas where homelessness appears to be a problem suffered primarily by African Americans and/or minorities.

The demographics of homelessness in Atlanta indicate that Atlanta's homeless population is comprised disproportionately of African Americans; at least those homeless persons that can be enumerated. According to statistics supplied by the Atlanta Task
Force for the Homeless, African Americans comprised nearly 90 percent of all those requesting housing shelter during 1995. The homeless shelter requests during February 1997 were nearly identical to those in 1995 when examining race. Moreover, between 1990-1996, 47 percent of San Francisco’s African American street homeless population died due to homicide in contrast to 32 percent for whites. Latinos represented 19 percent while Asians and Native Americans represented only 1 percent of homicide deaths, respectively. However, the literature states that black elected officials have begun to deracialize their campaigns and modes of governance. This research attempts to determine if governance via deracialization exists, how prevalent it is, and how such modes of governance impact the street homeless in Atlanta and San Francisco.

The next two goals attempt to discover what has not been systematically discovered. As stated earlier, there are numerous theories or lines of reasoning that can shed light on why cities adopt quality of life ordinances, yet the notion of cause has not been systematically added to this debate nor empirically examined. Although some folk maintain that the street homeless are disproportionately held accountable for violating quality of life ordinances due to their homeless status, homeless status should not be equated with what one believes causes homelessness. Within this research, I examine this possible explanation via survey research and secondary information. The findings not only expand our understanding of this aspect of homelessness but also determine whether

---

or not there are overwhelming biases by local officials in this process as opposed to common themes such as economic development and community safety.

Without doubt, the last aim is a critical one because it attempts to answer a normative question in reference to what ought to be done in terms of balancing street homeless problems with the general community's concerns. The empirical evidence clearly illustrates that the homeless are arrested disproportionately for violating quality of life ordinances compared to general arrests population records. Empirical analysis, however, is good for discovering what is, but one must also be able to move beyond what is and attempt to understand what ought to be if one wants to actually add pertinent knowledge to the debate regarding the street homeless and local political elected leadership. This is one of the fundamental purposes of this research. This is significant because it attempts to address the manner in which we should respond to the "street homeless," on the local level, despite national trends of criminalizing the homeless. The constitutional basis of the criminalization of the homeless is fundamental to an adequate understanding of the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the democratic principles of the American Constitution. Anytime actions by the state or citizens come into conflict with the provisions of the Constitution, investigation is necessary; the fundamental principles of democracy are being questioned.

---

Using Atlanta and San Francisco as case studies provides an understanding of a national problem being addressed on the local level in two different regions. However, I am cognizant of the limitations of the case study approach. The results of this research can only be used to offer explanations regarding elected officials and quality of life ordinances in Atlanta and San Francisco. In other words, I know that it is not "good scholarship" nor prudent to transpose the findings of this research onto other municipalities or nationally without first systematically studying those areas because the fundamental tenets of the case study approach prevents me from doing so.

In addition, the majority of the studies that focus on homelessness, including the street homeless in America center on urban areas and this study of homelessness and sub-national elected political leadership in Atlanta and San Francisco is similar in that respect. This study also provides a framework that leads to a systematic understanding of why quality of life ordinances are needed. However, the difference between this study and earlier ones lies in the fact that both mayors and council members are being interviewed systematically in two major cities regarding this issue for the first time. According to the literature, at least the literature that I have read, homeless advocates, religious leaders, police officers, community leaders, business leaders, lawyers, and mayors are the only individuals that have been systematically interviewed regarding quality of life ordinances. Interviewing elected officials in Atlanta and San Francisco is very important because these elected officials have constitutional power to actually make binding decisions.
regarding not only the street homeless but; the conditions of homelessness in general within their respective cities.

Thesis Statement and Research Questions

The objectives of this research project consist of addressing and answering five questions regarding “street homelessness” in the cities of Atlanta and San Francisco. The thesis statement follows:

Even though common themes such as public safety and economic development may provide validity to the enactment and enforcement of quality of life ordinances (QOLs) in Atlanta, Georgia, and San Francisco, California, QOLs are best understood by examining the influence of the residential and business communities in both cities. Moreover, council persons that support quality of life ordinances tend to believe that the primary causes of homelessness stems from personal pathologies.

The research questions are listed below.

1. What type of representation is there for the urban poor and homeless (street homeless) by elected officials in Atlanta and San Francisco?
2. What role does symbolism play in the representation of the urban poor and homeless (street homeless) by elected officials in Atlanta and San Francisco?
3. What salient factors determine whether or not elected officials in Atlanta and San Francisco support quality of life ordinances in their respective cities?
4. Is there a relationship between elected officials in Atlanta and San Francisco who believe that the primary causes of homelessness in their respective cities are personal and those who support quality of life ordinances in their respective cities?
5. Should the "street homeless" be disproportionately subjected to laws that the general community is not?

The attitudes or opinions of Atlanta and San Francisco elected officials regarding quality of life ordinances serve as the dependent variable. On the other hand, the independent variables comprise the respondent’s race, gender, political experience in current position,
level of education, and beliefs about the primary causes (structural factors or personal attributes) of homelessness in Atlanta and San Francisco (also see Figure 1. in Chapter 3).

According to some local officials, quality of life ordinances are basically measures that seek to preserve peace, law, and order through the creation and strict enforcement of ordinances that prevent activities such as panhandling and window-washing on public streets. In essence, it is maintained that these ordinances were and are created to prevent crime and to protect life and property. They argue that these principles predate the founding of America and are embedded in the U.S. Constitution that was written in 1787. Nonetheless, this research attempts to determine if these ordinances actually seek to preserve law or seek to punish the street homeless.

Methodology

The case study approach is utilized for this study. This study examines only the attitudes of elected officials in Atlanta and San Francisco in regards to quality of life ordinances. The technique used to complete this research project consists of aggregate data analysis, content analysis, and survey research. The questionnaire is attached (see Appendix 1).

As stated earlier, this research is a continuation of a research project that I began in 1993. During the 1994 and 1995 academic school year, I administered questionnaires to Atlanta’s city council members regarding quality of life ordinances. Although years have passed, an additional quality of life ordinance (urban camping) has been passed in Atlanta. Nevertheless, the response rate to my survey was very low, considering the time
frame in which I administered it. But the questions asked served as a pretest to the questions I ask for this dissertation project. Additional questions were added to the questionnaire as well as initial questions removed. For this project, only the mayor and elected council members in Atlanta and the Board of Supervisors in San Francisco were interviewed via mailed questionnaires since they have constitutional power to make public policy in their respective cities.

A detailed description of the study's research plan and methods employed is provided in Chapter Three. The following chapter offers an overview of the relevant works that address the nature of quality of life ordinances and its impact on the street homeless and society in general. But first, it presents a critical historical analysis of city governments traditional method of addressing the needs of its urban poor and homeless population. Special attention is given to examples in Atlanta and San Francisco. Chapter Two also provides a discussion regarding black elected officials, an analysis of their modes of governance, and what issues are of paramount concern to them when addressing the needs of the urban poor. Chapter Four presents interview findings based upon surveys administered to elected officials in Atlanta and San Francisco. Chapter Five addresses the normative question of what ought to be in terms of dealing with the street homeless problem in Atlanta and San Francisco. It provides conclusions drawn based upon the data obtained and analyzed. This chapter also provides implications, conclusions and recommendations reached via data analysis.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW:
EVOLUTION OF ATLANTA AND SAN FRANCISCO POLITICAL LEADERSHIP AND HOMELESSNESS

Background

In the 21st century, just as all major metropolitan areas are struggling to achieve economic and social stability local governments in Atlanta, Georgia, and San Francisco, California are no different. The National League of Cities indicates that the “major factors affecting America’s cities,” include the “new” economy, limited revenue capacity, the movement of people and business, suburbanization and sprawl, education and changing city government roles and relationships. Moreover, urban residents are demanding more governmental services while arguing for lower taxes; citizens are arguing that racism is still an American reality that must be eliminated; drug and gang-related crime should be halted; poverty needs to be eliminated; and that a clean and healthy environment should be maintained. Furthermore,


Land is important to city governments, for it is crucial to their economic and political well-being. City governments control land uses within their boundaries. They frequently use a comprehensively plan (often called a general or master plan) to guide them. The plan typically divides the city into sections for commercial, industrial, and residential uses. In addition, a city might set aside areas for recreation and open space.3

Thus, local elected officials have to address numerous concerns. Consequently, scholars and nonscholars alike, frequently grade the actions and policies of government.

Yet one should always bear in mind that there are limitations in public policy resolving public issues. According to Thomas R. Dye,

It is questionable that policy analysis can ever provide solutions to America’s problems. Ignorance, crime, poverty, racial conflict, inequality, poor housing, ill health, pollution, congestion, and unhappy lives have afflicted people and societies for a long time. Of course, this is no excuse for failing to work toward a society free of these maladies. But our striving for a better society should be tempered with the realization that solutions to these problems may be very difficult to find.4

Dye not only discusses the restraints of governmental power but also illustrates how disagreements and subjectivity over problem conceptualization and operationalization can limit the effectiveness of public policy.5 The problems inherent in public policy making and analysis that Dye articulates are evident when examining political leadership in

5Ibid., 14.
Atlanta and San Francisco, and even more, when examining quality of life issues in both cities.

The dilemma of government is striking a balance between order, freedom, and equality. For instance, when examining homelessness in Atlanta and San Francisco public officials face challenging alternatives. Unlike the era of "Hoovervilles," local government must not only develop effective means of reducing homelessness and poverty but must also maintain order when residents, business owners, and tourists complain that their safety and livelihoods are in danger by an increasingly and highly visible street homeless population. Even so, arguments have been advanced that the homeless should have the freedom to assemble in public spaces and their equality should not be disproportionately subjected to the enforcement of local laws. Nationwide, local governmental response to homelessness during the early part of the 20th century was somewhat different than it is today. For instance,

The Great Depression of the early 1930s left many people in the United States unemployed, without income, and eventually, without homes. Although a number of these homeless became transients who slept in various outdoor places, others—many with families—developed ramshackle, temporary communities. These communities came to be known as "Hoovervilles," named for the president at the time, Herbert Hoover, whom many blamed for the crisis. By 1932, virtually every major city had a Hooverville. Typically, these shantytowns were built on empty lots and derelict lands on the outskirts of cities or towns. They consisted of informal arrangements of shacks built of whatever residents could find—scraps of wood and cardboard, fence posts, and frames of run-down cars and trucks. Contrary to the common stereotype of the homeless as transient males or skid row bums, most of the residents of Hoovervilles were

adult women and men who had been employed but lost their jobs and homes as a result of the Great Depression. Many had previously held blue-collar jobs. Residents varied from the very young to the elderly. Entire families settled in Hoovervilles, including numerous children. Although life differed from place to place, many residents found odd jobs around the cities and worked in return for clothes, food, or occasionally, a little money.  

Today, however, the perception of the causes of homelessness has changed. Economic distress and the lack of affordable housing are not the only primary causes of contemporary homelessness. Folk are homeless due to mental illness, drug usage and addiction. In addition, the behavior of the street homeless has caused public concern. Consequently, “a growing number of American cities are approving ordinances that restrict the movement of homeless people and to reduce services to help them.” Not only are major cities taking a tougher approach to eliminating a highly visible street homeless population but; Atlanta and San Francisco public officials are leading the charge. This approach normally results to complaints from residents and the business community that state that street homeless behavior impedes the quality of life within cities.  

---
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contrary to the era of Hoovervilles when “the police often visited the Hoovervilles but seldom interfered with life there. Crime rates tended to be very low.”

Atlanta Council members passed an urban camping ordinance that “makes it illegal ‘to sleep, to lie down, to reside or to store personal property’ within the city’s parks, sidewalks and other public places.” This measure surfaced in response to black and white residents and business owners who were and are disgusted with the behavior of the street homeless. In San Francisco, local citizens and merchants are leading the charge against a visible street homeless population. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors increased their efforts to eradicate drinking and sleeping in parks and street homeless movement within Civic Center Plaza. Civic Center Plaza is located within San Francisco’s business district. Moreover, “San Francisco officials are looking to crack down drinking and sleeping in nearby United Nations Plaza and in tourist-packed Hallidie.”

---
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Instead of only reporting on the direction in which city officials in Atlanta and San Francisco are moving regarding the street homeless, one must also critically and comprehensively examine the manner in which these officials reach such policies. Theories of urban politics quickly come into play. Nonetheless, it seems that local residents and the business community have dominant influence on the enactment and enforcement of quality of life ordinances in both cities.

**Urban Theoretical Perspectives**

Theories provide a way of understanding complex behavior, statements, and policy that may appear simplistic on the surface. Theories also allow one to place complex behavior, statements, and policy within an understandable analytical context. Dye states:

Understanding public policy is both an art and a craft. It is an art because it requires insight, creativity, and imagination in identifying societal problems and describing them, devising public policies that alleviate them, and then in finding out whether these policies end up making things better or worse. It is a craft because these tasks usually require some knowledge of economics, political science, public administration, sociology, law, and statistics.\(^\text{16}\)

It is no wonder why theories have existed for decades that attempt to shed light on the manner in which public officials enact and enforce public policy. Traditionally urban political decision making and public policy could be best understood by examining it within a pluralist or elitist fashion. This however is no longer the case. Urban scholars have now advanced that urban politics can be better explained within the context of

\(^{16}\text{Thomas R. Dye, } \text{Understanding Public Policy, } 8^{\text{th}} \text{ ed. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1995), 15.}\)
regimes or Marxist thought. A brief description of the main theories of urban politics follows.

According to the pluralist model of democracy "government by the people" simply denotes "government by people operating through competing interest groups."\(^{17}\) "The two major mechanisms in a pluralist democracy are interest groups and a decentralized structure of government that provides ready access to public officials and that is open to hearing the group's arguments for or against government policies."\(^{18}\) Robert Dahl is considered the father of pluralist thought.

Despite criticisms of Dahl as a 'faulty methodologist' for using only urban redevelopment, public education, and political nominations as criteria for determining who rules in his New Haven study\(^{19}\) there are benefits of pluralist theory. For Dahl,

The political system was not oligarchical because policy success depended upon 'a capacity for anticipating what the organized interests, the political stratum, and the voters in general would tolerate or support.' The system might be stratified but it was also differentiated: different groups/elites wielded different degrees of influence in different policy areas at different times. In other words, there was a plurality of political institutions, elites, organized interests, individuals, and voters involved in decision making. Twenty-five years after the publication of *Who Governs?* Dahl still saw a pluralist process: 'New Haven was


\(^{18}\)Ibid.

and is a community in which a diversity of groups exist and bear on the making of public policy.' But what Dahl also conceded upon reflection was that the New Haven study was a 'case study of one city at one time.'

Two things can be inferred from this quote. Aspects of pluralism are prevalent in both Atlanta and San Francisco in regard to quality of life ordinances. Newspaper accounts indicate that residents and merchants, as interest groups, are demanding local government to crackdown on the behavior and visibility of the street homeless. This comes in light of homeless advocacy groups demanding that local government should do otherwise. But within the pluralist frame of reference, both sets of interest groups are competing to influence street homeless public policy, but local residents and the business community are winning on this particular issue.

On the other hand, elitist thought involves a small, stable but distinct group controlling the political decision making process. Proponents of elite theory argue that salient political decisions are determined "by an identifiable and stable minority that shares certain characteristics, usually vast wealth and business connections" (see Table 1.). This small and limited group possess "power" due to its control over "key financial, communications, industrial, and government institutions." Table 1. shows that elites do not trust the depthness of public opinion and shun radical change. But what is more

---
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important, “their power derives from the vast wealth of America’s largest corporations and the perceived importance of the continuing success of those corporations to the growth of the economy.”

Even though C. Wright Mills is considered the father of elitist thought, Floyd Hunter illustrates its application on the sub-national level. That is, in Atlanta during the early 1950s.

**Table 1. Fundamental Tenets of Elite Theory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elites advocate incremental change</th>
<th>Elites are not significantly swayed by majority opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elites seek to maintain the status quo</td>
<td>Elitism presumes that majority opinion lacks adequate insight and cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal values are determined by a few folk</td>
<td>Elites advocate private ownership, individualism and restrained government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society is divided between have and have-nots</td>
<td>Elites more than likely come from and represent the interests of those in the upper socioeconomic status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite thoughts and perceptions determine policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---
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Despite criticisms levied against Hunter because of his methodological approach, reputational analysis, to understanding community power that many argued predetermined his conclusions. Aspects of elitism are indeed present in Atlanta city politics. Alan Harding concludes, “Hunter’s seminal study offered ‘scientific’ evidence that local representative democracy in the U.S. was just a smokescreen for dominant economic interests.” Moreover, he argues that the major criticisms against Hunter “were hardly insurmountable and did not invalidate the reputational method Hunter had pioneered.”

On a larger scale and despite claims by scholars that elitism does not exist in American life, Hunter illustrates that if elitism does exist in American politics it can clearly be seen on and at the local level. In sum, both pluralism and elitism contain an element of clear winners and losers in the influence of public policy. Another perspective in the debate is regime theory.

Regime theory, which scholars argue is more valid in attempting to understand late 20th and early 21st century models of local governance, also examines community power in detail. Gerry Stoker argues that:

---
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Regime theory holds substantial promise for understanding the variety of responses to urban change. Its emphasis on the interdependence of governmental and non-governmental forces in meeting economic and social challenges focuses attention upon the problem of cooperation and coordination between governmental and non-governmental actors. While significant differences persist from country to country, it is clear that the need for some form of public/private cooperation exists in all advanced capitalist societies. Growing competition between cities for investment, and the role of business interests in local decision making have increasingly shaped the urban terrain. Decentralization and shifting responsibilities within the state, increased financial constraints, and the development of privatized services utilizing both for-profit and non-profit organizations, have also created additional complexities for local governments. Urban governments are increasingly working through and alongside other interests. This concern with ‘governance’ emerges in a range of policy areas: economic development, human capital and training programmes, crime prevention, environmental protection and anti-drug campaigns. Because of its emphasis on the way governmental and non-governmental actors work across boundaries, regime theory is especially relevant, given the shifting role of urban government. Regime theory provides a new perspective on the issue of power. It directs attention away from a narrow focus on power as an issue of social control towards an understanding of power expressed through social production.27

Unlike Richard DeLeon in his study of San Francisco governance, Clarence Stone in his study of Atlanta politics illustrates the basic themes of regime governance. Although Stone qualifies regime theory by explaining its degree of elitism, he does not depart from Dye’s understanding of the limitations of public policy making. Stone states:

All governmental authority in the United States is greatly limited—limited by the Constitution, limited perhaps even more by the nation’s political tradition, and limited structurally by the autonomy of privately owned business enterprise. The exercise of public authority is thus never a simple matter; it is always enhanced by extraformal considerations. Because local governmental authority is by law and tradition even more limited than authority at the state and national level, informal arrangements assume special importance in urban politics. A regime

thus involves not just any informal group that comes together to make a decision but an informal yet relatively stable group with access to institutional resources that enable it to have a sustained role in making governing decisions. What makes the group informal is not a lack of institutional connections, but the fact that the group, as a group, brings together institutional connections by an informal mode of cooperation. There is no all-encompassing structure of command that guides and synchronizes everyone’s behavior. There is a purposive coordination of efforts, but it comes about informally, in ways that often depend heavily on tacit understandings. Because localities have only weak formal means through which coordination can be achieved, informal arrangements to promote cooperation are especially useful. These informal modes of coordinating efforts across institutional boundaries are what I call “civic cooperation.”

Stone acknowledges that private concerns are not exclusive to the business community. Labor-union officials, party functionaries, officers in non-profit organizations or foundations, and church leaders are not automatically excluded from the decision making process. In other words, Stone argues that regimes are not fixed. This is where I believe regime theory is different from elitism. Moreover, Stoker indicates that a stable hierarchical structure is definitely not the basis of regime theory.

---
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However, Stone maintains that “the downtown business elite is the key to regime durability and effectiveness in Atlanta.” Stone qualifies this statement by outlining the manner in which Central Atlanta Progress (CAP) influences political decision making in Atlanta. He argues that CAP’s influence stems informally and does not rule as it pleases. In other words, Atlanta business elite power is restricted because it is scattered among coalition members, its need to adapt to changing political trends, and its ability to maintain itself despite individual member’s selfish desires. Stone concludes that Atlanta has a regime whereas DeLeon argues that San Francisco is without a regime.

Yet an unconventional approach to the study of urban politics exist. Despite Christopher Pickvance’s criticism that Marxist theory as an analytical model, which seems to be oversimplistic due to its sole reliance on class interchanges as the way of comprehension; “the starting point for all Marxist theories of urban politics is the view that urban political institutions are part of the state apparatus, and hence are inescapably marked by the role which the state plays in capitalist society.” Marxist theory, however, does not appear to shed any insightful light on understanding complex decision making

---
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processes in Atlanta and San Francisco. And in addition to understanding models of governance advanced by scholars, elected officials must still adhere to the limits of their formal constitutional powers as stated in state constitutions and local charters.

**Constitutional Government in Atlanta and San Francisco**

In addition to theories of urban governance one cannot ignore constitutional design issues. Unlike the American Constitution, state constitutions and city charters are precise. Vagueness is not a virtue in state and municipal constitutions. State constitutions and local charters establish sub-national governmental structures. Without governmental structure chaos would exist. Although I disagree with philosopher Thomas Hobbe’s advocacy for absolute government, it is logical to emphasize the necessity of government to ensure order.\(^36\) In fact, “maintaining order is the oldest objective of government.”\(^37\)

Charters in Atlanta and San Francisco establish the structure of government and outline and restrict governmental power in both cities. Governmental responsibility to education, order, and the implementation of state functions is the essential purpose of any local governing authority.\(^38\) The first purpose is evident in Atlanta’s charter that states,

---


among other things, that “the city shall have all powers necessary and proper to promote the safety, health, peace, and general welfare of the city and its inhabitants.”

Examples include the ability to collect taxes and borrow money. Similar statements and identical meanings can be found in San Francisco’s charter. In reference to the second purpose, both the Georgia and California constitutions grant Atlanta and San Francisco home rule.

For instance, in Georgia:

The method used for granting charters is by special act of the General Assembly, which is authorized to provide by law for the self-government of municipalities. The charter provides the framework of city government; names the government officials; prescribes the manner of their election; fixes their terms of office; and usually lays down rules concerning such things as city finance, bids and contracts, and other matters. The governing authority of a city has the power to adopt ordinances and amend the charter either by action of the governing authority itself or by petition of the people and referendum.

San Francisco’s charter basically states the same. The preamble of San Francisco’s charter states:

In order to obtain the full benefit of home rule granted by the Constitution of the State of California; to improve the quality of urban life; to encourage the participation of all persons and all sectors in the affairs of the City and County; to enable municipal government to meet the needs of the people effectively and efficiently; to provide for accountability and ethics in public service; to foster social harmony and cohesion; and to assure equality of opportunity for every resident: We, the people of the City and County of San Francisco, ordain and establish this Charter as the fundamental law of the City and County.

---
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Article 11, section 3a of California’s Constitution states that “For its own government, a county or city may adopt a charter by majority vote of its electors voting on the question.” Both Atlanta and San Francisco charters establish precise governmental structure and power. Additionally, political decisions and laws passed in Atlanta impact citizens within the city. San Francisco political decisions and laws impact citizens in the city and county. Thus, San Francisco’s charter establishes a consolidated government whereas Atlanta’s charter does not. San Francisco’s consolidated form of government got its start in 1856.42

Although there are three basic forms that local governments can take legally, both Atlanta and San Francisco operate under strong mayor council systems. “The strong mayor system has both a mayor and a council; in this case, however, department heads are appointed by and report directly to the mayor. Theoretically, this makes accountability easier to determine, since it is clear whom reports to whom. The mayor, in addition, normally has a veto, which enhances his or her power.”43 Both Bill Campbell and Willie Brown possess appointment and veto power. “The mayor, often with the help of his or her own staff, prepares and administers the budget, enjoys almost total administrative authority, and has the power to appoint and dismiss department heads.”44 Under the


strong-mayor system, the relationship and interactions between the mayor and council is comparable to the interactions of the U.S. presidency and Congress. Nonetheless, three key variations exist under the strong-mayor council systems in Atlanta and San Francisco in reference to mayoral and/or council powers.

First, Atlanta’s charter states that the Mayor can recommend actions that the City should take regarding the city’s general welfare. San Francisco’s mayor, on the other hand, is constitutionally responsible for “submission of ordinances and resolutions by the executive branch for consideration by the Board of Supervisors.” San Francisco’s mayor can “speak and be heard with respect to any matter at any meeting of the Board of Supervisors or any of its committees, and shall have a seat but no vote on all boards and commissions appointed by the Mayor.” Clearly, Atlanta’s mayor is not as constitutionally strong as San Francisco’s mayor. Second, the President of the Atlanta City Council is elected for four years in an at-large election. Article 2, section 2.116 of San Francisco’s charter states that it is the responsibility of the Board of Supervisors, by a
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majority of the council, to elect a president. The President serves for two years but must be an elected board member. This provision became effective on the first day of the year two thousand. The Board is stronger constitutionally than the Atlanta City Council in determining not only who serves as President but in determining the composition of standing and special committees and the assignment of legislation.49

Prior to this provision, the President of the Board would be determined “by the member who received the highest number of votes at the preceding Supervisorial election.”50 Nonetheless, the President of the Atlanta City Council “shall preside at meetings of the council but shall not be a member of that body and shall vote only in the case of a tie vote within the council.”51 Third, Article 2, section 2-101 of Atlanta’s charter states that 12 Atlanta city council members are to be elected in separate districts whereas the remaining 3 are to be elected at-large. Article 2, section 2.100 of the San Francisco City Charter states that all 11 members of the Board of Supervisors are to be elected in separate districts. Thus, San Francisco’s council is not only stronger in terms of constitutional power but also smaller in number or size. Charters in Atlanta and San Francisco provide the formal powers of elected officials and decision making capacity that include the enactment and enforcement of quality of life ordinances. Nevertheless, political governance in both cities is unique due to race and poverty.

49San Francisco City Charter, art. 2, sec. 2.116.

50Ibid.
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Historical Political Decision Making in Atlanta

Even though Dr. Rufus Early Clement was elected as the first African American to Atlanta’s school board in 1953, black presence in key political positions within Atlanta city government did not occur until the election of Maynard Jackson as vice mayor in 1969.

On May 13, 1953, Clement was nominated (tantamount to election) in a citywide primary to the Atlanta Board of Education as the representative from the third ward. That he was able to defeat his white opponent by a margin of ten thousand votes reflects credit on the thousands of fair-minded white citizens who cast aside the question of race and voted for the one whom they regarded as best qualified. This marked the first time since December 7, 1870, that Atlanta had elected a Negro to a municipal office.

This comes in light of William Finch and William Graham, having been elected to Atlanta’s city council in 1870 under the ward system. Yet at the dawn of the 21st century an African American has served as mayor of Atlanta since Maynard Jackson was initially elected in 1973. Moreover, Atlanta City Council members are primarily black (56 percent). Due to the presence or symbolism of blacks occupying these key political positions, the Southern Center for Studies in Public Policy in its 1993 issue of the Status
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of Black Atlanta observed that “Atlanta often is referred to as the Mecca for blacks in the United States – the place where African Americans should visit to learn how to ‘Do The Right Thing’ to gain political and economic power.”

Such reasoning also stems from the language of earlier non-elected African American political leaders such as Booker T. Washington, Martin Luther King, Jr., and Malcolm X. Although Washington and Malcolm X focused primarily on black economic empowerment and King focused on civil and political rights, each one of them advocated the betterment of blacks. Georgia A. Persons in “Towards a Reconstituted Black Politics?” states that “the early black mayors who ran against white candidates and white power structures were almost involuntarily political insurgents who were able to mobilize black voters by issue positions and a call for black political empowerment which conveyed a message of social reform.” For instance, during Jackson’s first term as mayor, he “pushed Affirmative Action policies which brought more blacks into city government and assisted black businesses to obtain city contracts through ‘joint ventures’ and Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) set aside programs.” In other words, a black elected political leader would deliver tangible goods to the black community. The Wall Street Journal quoted African American professor, Ronald Walters, stating, “if an


African American leader is not able to deliver for the community, black folks won’t get much besides the position.”\textsuperscript{58}

Today, however, the tone has changed. Keeping in tune with Dye and the limitations of public policy making, William E. Nelson and Winston Van Horne state that “a careful inquiry into the political world of black elected administrators clearly indicates that the election of black public officials will not necessarily result in substantial improvements in the life situation of masses of black people.”\textsuperscript{59}

As stated earlier, Stone concludes that Atlanta political governance is best understood within the context of regime theory. Stone states:

The extent to which the business elite has successfully restricted the range of selective benefits distributed under the auspices of public authority gives the regime in Atlanta a distinctive character. By linking the control of selective benefits to the private sector, the business elite has maintained itself as the centerpiece in the community’s network of civic cooperation. Thus, the kind of discipline that enables the regime to execute highly complex tasks of coordination is present but is not directly connected to the electoral sector. It is largely in the hands of the business sector, which concentrates the capacity to promote regime durability and effectiveness in private hands and links it closely to local investors.\textsuperscript{60}


During Maynard Jackson’s first term as mayor, for instance, his actions to encourage and ensure city Affirmative Action policies did not come without a price. Jackson was coerced into having weekly meetings with representatives of CAP after CAP criticized Jackson’s Affirmative Action policies and outlined possibilities of business disinvestment in the city.61 “By the time his second term of office was over, central business district revitalization once again dominated the city's development agenda, and the number of neighborhood planners had dwindled.”62 Jackson’s leadership was diluted due to the business community’s possession of and willingness to use selective incentives to its advantage.63

After Jackson there was Young. Andrew Young was elected as Atlanta’s second African American mayor in 1981.64 After winning the mayor’s seat without the backing of Atlanta’s business community, Stones states that Young acknowledged in the Atlanta Constitution that “he could not govern without the confidence of the business community.”65 Bob Holmes of the Southern Center for Studies in Public Policy also
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states that "despite his lack of white support, Mayor Young indicated in his inaugural speech that he wanted to work closely with white businessmen, and throughout his administration he supported the major programs put forth by the business community, such as a one cent increase in the sales tax, use of community development block grants to rebuild Underground Atlanta, two controversial road projects, Route 400 and the Presidential Parkway, and construction of the Georgia Dome."66 In fact, Holmes reports that "it was during Young's tenure between 1981-1989 that the condition of blacks worsened. There was no stimulation of economic development in poor Southside neighborhoods, nor any effort to revitalize the major black business center on Auburn Avenue."67

Moreover, Stone states:

The downtown elite also underwrites policy analysis through the sponsorship of Research Atlanta, a non-profit organization engaged in timely studies of issues. The major newspaper is an integral part of the business elite, and it can play up or play down an issue. Similarly, it can give editorial endorsement, or it can ridicule a proposal and berate its backers. Through the Metropolitan Community Foundation, other foundations established by individual business leaders, and various ad hoc efforts (some of which are guided by CAP), the downtown business elite is engaged in an array of projects and programs. In short, if one is seeking credit, donations, technical expertise, prestigious endorsements, organizational support, business contacts, media backing, or in-depth analysis of problems, then very likely one is thrown into contact with the civic network that emanates from the activities of the downtown business elite. The easiest way to attain an objective is to enlist the support of this far-reaching network. That also


means that the objectives most easily attained are the ones the downtown business elite will support.68

Following Young, Jackson surfaced again. Atlanta electoral votes gave Maynard Jackson another mayoral victory in 1989. However, Holmes indicates that even though Jackson referred to himself as “Action Jackson,” Jackson’s proposals to effectively address homelessness and affordable housing did not measure up.69 Holmes states that although black Atlanta elected officials initially “had to confront the major civil rights/desegregation issues facing middle-class blacks as well as the economic plight of poor blacks, the 1990s problems involved a crumbling infrastructure, a crime epidemic, escalating property taxes, growing homelessness, deteriorating housing, and a widening economic gap between black and white residents in the city.”70

Business dominance in Atlanta city politics really stems from the administration of white American, William B. Hartsfield. After being elected in 1936 and following the devastating effects of the Great Depression, Hartsfield turned to the Atlanta business community to help cover city expenses.71 Bill Campbell’s administration has not departed


from his African American predecessors reliance on Atlanta’s business community influence in governance. Clearly, Jackson, Young and Campbell have followed in Hartsfield’s footsteps.

According to Persons and within the context of local black political leadership, “strategies and styles began to change at different electoral junctures in the institutionalization of black mayoralities. As mayoral contests evolved to pit one black politician against another, the collectivist tenor of the electoral strategy began to dissipate with a shift toward individual black politicians crafting situation-specific strategies directed toward the individual goal of winning elective office.” In other words, an argument is advanced that due to the increase of blacks competing against one another for the same local political position, emphasis has shifted away from providing tangible goods to the black community to just getting elected.

This frame of reference raises a very important question. Are local black political officials and office seekers conforming to the shrewd methods of Niccolo Machiavelli’s Prince to win political office, at the expense of black progress? Persons states that “In terms of its manifestation of the changing relationship between black political leaders and mass-level blacks, deracialization as an electoral strategy advances and serves the maintenance needs of black politicians. It offers greater assurances of entry into and longevity in the political game. To their primary support base of black voters, black
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politicians deliver what they can, largely symbolic benefits and rewards." Yet a rationale has been advanced that a city will not have the capacity to maintain itself if a racial strategy by African American politicians is employed since blacks, whites, and other ethnic groups comprise a city. As stated earlier, African Americans represent less than 11 percent of San Francisco’s population. The remaining ethnic groups comprise only 33 percent of Atlanta’s population.

Historical Political Decision Making in San Francisco

Local governance historically has been somewhat different in San Francisco. As stated earlier, DeLeon concludes that San Francisco has an antiregime. DeLeon defines the antiregime as:

to protect community from capital. It is a regime with the power to thwart the exercise of power by others in remaking the city. The primary instrument of this power is local government control over land use and development. In San Francisco, these growth controls have achieved unprecedented scope in the types of limits they impose on capital. They are used to suppress, filter, or deflect the potentially destructive forces of market processes on urban life as experienced by people in their homes, neighborhoods, and communities.
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That is, “big business” in San Francisco has restricted influence in determining public policy in contrast to the residential and small business community. DeLeon states that “the antiregime is protective, defensive, and reactive. In the domain of land-use and development planning, its unwritten constitution can be reduced to a single word: no.”

DeLeon cites an example in which community merchants and residents, through petitions, rallies and demonstrations, were successfully able to prevent the Thrifty Corporation in 1987 from building a national chain drug store that would come at the expense of traffic congestion and competitive drugstores and prices. Moreover, “in early 1991, neighborhood activists formed a group called “Save the Market Task Force” to block plans by the Bernal Heights Community Foundation to build a 120-unit affordable housing project for low- and very low-income families in an area directly adjacent to the city’s well-known Framers Market.” Thus, DeLeon states that “in the current anti-regime, the ‘power to’ impede tends to negate the ‘power to’ create.”

In sum, DeLeon concludes:

1. Downtown business elites are divided and no longer speak with a single voice regarding development strategy or public affairs;
2. Threats of business disinvestment have done little to reverse slow-growth policies, intimidate public officials, or induce a more hospitable “business climate” as defined by business elites; and
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3. The small business community in particular has acquired elevated status and influence because of its growing size and anticipated pivotal role in a reconstructed public-private partnership. But what is more important and relative to homeless policy in San Francisco is that homeless policy or proposals have dictated local political leadership over the last decade. *The San Francisco Chronicle* reports that “San Francisco’s homeless policy is actually the result of three different mayors of the ‘90s at work.”

In addition to addressing problems associated with homelessness and providing basic public services to San Franciscans, Mayor Willie Brown was recently faced with winning reelection; something that his past two predecessors were unable to do due to their homeless policy initiatives. For instance, despite the construction of two multiservice centers to house and counsel the homeless under Mayor Art Agnos’ administration, he lost his reelection bid to Frank Jordan in 1992 because public perception was that he was “too soft on the homeless.” Nevertheless, Mayor Frank Jordan was defeated by Willie Brown in 1996 during his reelection bid because he was perceived as “too harsh” on the homeless. Under Jordan’s administration, “Matrix” was created and rigidly enforced. Under the provisions of this program, “police officers issued thousands of citations for
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low-level crimes such as sleeping outside or blocking sidewalks, and routinely moved people along. Yet Jordan’s administration devised a program that assisted folk receiving welfare benefits secure shelter in low-rent hotels. Jordan also developed “Continuum of Care,” which not only assisted folk locate long term permanent housing but which also treated folk suffering from substance abuse. Nonetheless, “matrix” is still in existence. Even though Willie Brown “got an affordable housing bond measure passed,” he has expanded the principles of “Matrix.”

Yet DeLeon reports that Agnos’ immediate predecessor Diane Feinstein shares some of the blame when examining poverty and the need for affordable housing in San Francisco. Despite San Francisco’s antiregime climate, African Americans still suffer. Prior to Agnos’ administration, it was common knowledge that when one referred to urban redevelopment in San Francisco, one really meant ‘Negro removal,’ along with the absence of affordable housing and adequate paying jobs for the African American community. That is, San Francisco practiced gentrification. In fact, it was during Agnos’ administration that the charge was brought that the city was attempting to “move
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all African Americans out of San Francisco" with its South Bayshore redevelopment plan.  

In conclusion, it is clear that elected officials in Atlanta and San Francisco not only have to provide public services with limited revenue capacity but also have to balance policies that impact order, freedom and equality. It can become frustrating. Stone argues that Atlanta politics is best comprehended via regime theory. On the other hand, DeLeon argues that San Francisco governance falls within pluralism and antiregime theory. However, DeLeon does acknowledge that elitism did exist in San Francisco during the early 1990s. San Francisco’s charter establishes a consolidated government whereas Atlanta’s charter does not. San Francisco’s charter also provides for a stronger local government. Yet homeless policies and initiatives in Atlanta and even more in San Francisco have influenced the outcome of local elections. Lastly, African American elected officials are faced with the challenge of balancing campaigning and governance when it comes to issues that affect African Americans in jurisdictions in which they have capacity to make public policy. But what justifies the necessity of quality of life ordinances in Atlanta and San Francisco.

Necessity of Quality of Life Ordinances

As stated in Chapter 1, numerous factors may account for the enactment and enforcement of quality of life ordinances. The Atlanta Constitution indicates that there is
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a middle-class backlash against the homeless congregating in certain public spaces. The National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty maintains that it is the attitudes and behavior of police officers that is at fault. The National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, the Atlanta Task Force for the Homeless and the San Francisco Coalition for the Homeless also maintain that municipalities are attempting to make their cities "look great" to attract industry, and tourism. Similarly, claims have been advanced by the National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty that the business community within a city dominates or significantly influences public policy. Within this argument it is also alleged that the business community demands the removal of the homeless from business areas. Still, some Atlanta and San Francisco elected officials argue that the homeless congregating in certain open spaces pose a public safety threat.

The aforementioned possible explanations of why there is a need for quality of life ordinances can be best understood within three distinct theoretical frameworks; the legal, unjust, and just. The legal frame of reference is based upon one’s interpretation of the U.S. Constitution. According to the legal perspective, quality of life ordinances, which are also conceptualized as antihomeless laws “violate equal protection, due process, the right to travel, the right against cruel and unusual punishment, and the right to privacy." In other words, claims are being made that the very nature of quality of life ordinances violate the fundamental principles of the 14th, 5th, 8th, and 4th Amendments. In
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accordance with such beliefs, numerous cases have been filed on behalf of the street homeless in regards to quality of life ordinances at the local, state, and national levels. However, when examining the “big” picture, the rulings of the courts are sending a conflicting message in reference to whether or not quality of life ordinances violate provisions of the American Constitution. That is, some state and local courts have ruled that quality of life ordinances are constitutional whereas others have ruled that they are not.\(^91\) In San Francisco, most cases are dismissed.

_The Atlanta Journal/Atlanta Constitution_ reported on January 1, 1998 in “‘Quality of Life’: One-third Get off for Violating these City Ordinances,” that a Georgia State University Criminal Justice Statistical Bureau study found that a third or more of folk arrested in violation of quality of life laws only had charges dismissed by Atlanta Municipal Court judges. Obviously, this is a matter that the national judicial branch should involve itself in because the basic tenets of the U.S. Constitution are at stake. In fact, since there is not a national definitive decision that state and municipal courts can use as a guideline when ruling on quality of life measures, the Supreme Court should enter this debate and provide some type of national leadership. The Supreme Court controls its own docket. However, until such a time that a decision is made a lack judicial leadership in this area will persist.

According to the unjust perspective, quality of life ordinances are not needed, should not be enforced, and should possibly be repealed. Explanations for this perspective

\(^91\)Ibid., 488.
include claims that the creation and enforcement of the aforementioned ordinances “precipitate incivility to poor people, restrict free speech, are ineffective and unravel trust and charity from the fabric of community.”  

92 For a more explicit example, homeless advocates in San Francisco conceptualize the strict enforcement of quality of life ordinances as an “evil” approach to addressing the needs of those without permanent homes.  

93 These advocates also maintain that even the homeless indicate that they are subject to these laws because they lack permanent housing and that government actions addressing homelessness is misguided in terms of helping folk escape poverty.  

94 Understanding the need for quality of life ordinances within this perspective basically means punishment based upon homeless status. Although similar to the legal approach, it places sole emphasis on morality. Even though elected officials are faced with moral issues, they take an oath to uphold provisions of constitutions as first priority. Local charters are the source of their formal power.

In addition to the aforementioned unjust claims, the National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty advances that quality of life ordinances are not only inhumane but are “ineffective, counterproductive, impose unnecessary burdens on the criminal
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justice system, fiscally inefficient and a waste of scarce resources, and are subject to legal challenge.95 Counts of ineffectiveness and adverse results stem from claims that the creation and enforcement of quality of life ordinances do not address the root causes or reasons for becoming homeless but instead highlight behavioral problems among the homeless that the conditions of homelessness inevitably bring.96 Thus, the individual pathology theory tends to focus on the characteristics of a person’s behavior solely, instead of examining the housing market, economic system, or social structure. Marta Elliot emphasizes that much research has been conducted on the conditions of homelessness that concentrates on personal problems, such as mental illness, that some homeless persons may possess.97 Adherents of this theory contend that a high percentage of people are without homes because they are addicted to drugs or mentally ill.

Furthermore, researchers Alice S. Baum and Donald W. Burnes maintain that credible data is prevalent that details the extent of alcoholism, mental illness, and drug addiction among homeless persons. They championed in their study that “what we saw instead were people frustrated and angered by personal lives out of control. They were entrapped by alcohol and drug addictions, mental illness, lack of education and skills, and
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self-esteem so low that it was often manifested as self-hate."98 According to Meredith Van Ry in *Homeless Families: Causes, Effects, and Recommendations*, two other models are consistent with this theory. They include the victimization and vulnerability models.99 The victimization model explains that when one encounters stressful events that one cannot control at an increasing rate, one becomes hopeless in attempting to survive future stressful events that life will bring. On the other hand, although similar in nature, the vulnerability model purports that due to the absence of appropriate social skills and a social support system, one does not only know how to mediate between life and events that occur but also the outcomes of such life experiences.

But according to Richard Ropers, contemporary homelessness cannot be explained by using the personal pathology theory but instead by looking at the economic, social and political processes that are changing as society transforms.100 The structural causes of homelessness focus on numerous theories and policies. This approach is also looked upon as a macro level explanation for the causes of homelessness.101 The incomes theory, government cutback theory, affordable housing theory, deinstitutionalization and
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noninstitutionalization theories, the holistic theory, and urban renewal represent the structural perspective. Although the proponents of the aforementioned theories disagree in terms of specifics when addressing the root causes of homelessness, they all tend to suggest that homeless persons as a group should not be blamed for their homeless condition. Instead, they maintain that the causes of homelessness are the direct result of structural changes within American society.

For instance, the government cut-back theory advocates that homelessness is the result of federal cutbacks in social policy funding.\(^{102}\) Federal cutbacks for the construction and maintenance of public housing is also cited. In this instance, cutbacks in federal appropriations (social programs) during the Ronald Reagan and George Bush presidential years are normally acknowledged. In essence, reductions in federal appropriations for employment and training programs, income maintenance assistance and food stamps illustrate that fewer people in need could be assisted.

Moreover, the affordable housing theory maintains that homelessness is the result of a lack of housing, in particular, affordable housing that is accessible to low-income people.\(^{103}\) Another aspect of this theory deals with housing policy.\(^{104}\) Proponents of this theory commonly highlight that downtown revitalization and gentrification processes
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have increased the price of urban low cost housing that the “poor” cannot afford. Furthermore, theories of deinstitutionalism and noninstitutionalism indicate that social policy has been created to eliminate the state mental hospital’s role as the primary place of care for the chronic mentally ill. Instead, adherents of this theory state that policies in favor of community-based treatment were established.\textsuperscript{105} Community-based programs involve discharging long-term patients from state mental hospitals and limiting the admission of new patients. Therefore, in retrospect to Baums’ and Burnes’ thesis, homelessness may not significantly result from folk being mentally ill but instead because they are denied adequate mental care in the first place.

Nonetheless, the street homeless that are arrested for violating city laws for committing low-level crimes cause unnecessary problems for officers who lack the training to deal effectively with those arrested that do suffer from alcohol and substance abuse problems that trained professionals should be addressing.\textsuperscript{106} The implication, again, is that this approach fails to not only address the fundamental causes of homelessness but also shifts responsibility of adequately attempting to solve homelessness to an untrained police staff.

Arguments have been advanced that indicate that quality of life ordinances are inefficient and a waste of scarce resources because of the higher costs associated with
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incarceration and due to the fact that such an approach does not provide “long-term benefits” to solving the overall conditions of homelessness.\textsuperscript{107} For instance,

In 1993, the average cost of detaining one person for one day in jail in the U.S.--excluding the police resources utilized in the arrest process--was over $40 per day. According to HUD figures obtained in an evaluation of its Supportive Housing Demonstration Program, the cost of providing transitional housing, which includes not only housing and food but also transportation and counseling services for the same year was approximately $30.90 per person per day.\textsuperscript{108}

There is also a legal aspect within the unjust perspective. Because homeless folk have taken their oppositions to quality of life ordinances to court throughout the nation and the fact that courts within this country have ruled quality of life ordinances unconstitutional in some cities and states, claims have been advanced that these laws have not only violated the civil rights of the homeless but they are also costly, neglect to address the basic problems of homelessness, and target municipalities and law enforcement departments to “legal liability.”\textsuperscript{109}

According to the just perspective, quality of life ordinances are needed and should be enforced because a panhandler’s behavior is “unpleasing to urbanites, uncivil, and detracts from downtown business.”\textsuperscript{110} In Atlanta, for instance, supporters of Atlanta’s urban camping ordinance have openly indicated their desire to prevent folk from sleeping, defecating and urinating in the Midtown area where they frequent.\textsuperscript{111} Once the Atlanta

\textsuperscript{107} Ibid., 49.

\textsuperscript{108} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{109} Ibid., 49-50.


\textsuperscript{111} Alfred Charles, “Homeless ‘Camping’ Targeted: Ban on Sleeping in Public Urged as Crackdown Grows,” \textit{Atlanta Constitution}, 19 November 1996.
City Council approved the urban camping measure, city residents and the business community openly expressed gratitude to city government once, African American mayor, Bill Campbell refused to veto the measure;\textsuperscript{112} thus, allowing it to become law. Additional reasons within this perspective include general public health and safety, prevention of crime and economic issues. The prevention of crime argument is primarily based upon the broken windows theory. This theory maintains that by holding the homeless accountable for low-level crimes, this process sends a message to the homeless not to commit more serious or heinous crimes.\textsuperscript{113} The analogy of this theory is as follows:

The name [broken windows theory] derives from an analogy to a broken window that, left unrepaired, suggests abandonment and invites a passerby to break more windows; conversely, repairing the window signals that someone cares and deters further damage. Based on this theory, some cities are arresting and jailing homeless people for offenses such as sleeping in public and begging.\textsuperscript{114}

Yet “the homeless rarely commit serious crimes. Rather, they generally come to the attention of police due to public intoxication, panhandling, or exhibiting behavior that is problematic—but not criminal. It appears that public fear of the homeless as a contributing factor to crime is based predominately on the mere presence and appearance of street people and not on a quantifiable link between homelessness and crime.”\textsuperscript{115}
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The whole issue concerning economics is based upon attracting wealth to a city and maintaining it via business and tourism. However, it is argued that economic development within a city can be hindered by the activity of the street homeless. It is reasoned that if customers or tourists that frequent a particular business come into contact with homeless persons occupying public spaces and panhandling around these businesses it will not only force customers to stop shopping in these commercial areas but will also motivate businesses to relocate outside of the city; thus, taking away revenue that would have normally contributed to the city’s economic base. In other words, the street homeless occupying these public spaces would inspire limited economic growth within a city instead of contributing to and enhancing economic development. Despite Richard E. DeLeon’s analysis in *Left Coast City: Progressive Politics in San Francisco, 1975-1991* that San Francisco politics is without a regime, local governments across the country are reinventing “the city as a tourist destination.” San Francisco and Atlanta are no different. Reports indicate that the street homeless are primarily held accountable to quality of life ordinances when tourist and conventions are in town.
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Nevertheless, one must also examine the just perspective from a civil rights point of view. Regardless of economic development one should not ignore the constitutional rights of the street homeless in regards to economic interests. This is especially true in cities governed primarily by blacks and/or minorities, which is the case in Atlanta and San Francisco. Black elected officials should be aware that it was indeed the economic interests of white America that created the U.S. Constitution in such a way that excluded blacks as humans and citizens and provided no equal rights until the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments. Black incorporation did not occur until some 78, 80, and 83 years respectively, after the ratification of the Constitution. Following these amendments, civil and voting rights acts were needed to ensure African American political incorporation. Even during colonial democracy, political participation or voting was restricted to white males who owned property.\textsuperscript{118} Clearly, citizens should not allow economic interests to interfere with the basic notions of equal rights. If so, at the dawn of the 21st century, we only perpetuate a system of have and have-nots that precedes the ratification of the U.S. Constitution; however, this system would now be perpetuated by white males of wealth as well as blacks with political power.

Since the increase of homelessness and the enforcement of quality of life ordinances is occurring throughout the U.S., African American elected local officials, who occupy key political positions in terms of deciding how to address not only the problems of the
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street homeless but the overall problems of homelessness in particular, have a duty to substantively represent the interests of the poor.

Black elected officials, in Atlanta and San Francisco, are faced with solving a homeless problem that is faced by a primarily African American community. It would seem appropriate that since it is generally common knowledge that blacks tend to vote for blacks, black elected officials should adequately represent the interests of its citizenry. Within this perspective, its citizenry should and does include a homeless population that is primarily African American. This comes in light of the primarily African American Atlanta City Council (56%) “fighting” to uphold the city’s Affirmative Action policies that are under constitutional threat. As previously stated, “earlier research has shown that the presence of a black mayor leads to increased minority employment in city government.”119 Yet Affirmative Action benefits middle-class African Americans more than low-income blacks. But even more importantly, even though Atlanta and San Francisco have African American mayors, the voting population is somewhat different in San Francisco. In 1998 African Americans represented only 10.9 percent of San Francisco’s population.120 In comparison, African Americans represented 67 percent of
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Atlanta’s population in 1998.¹²¹ Thus, public elected officials in San Francisco must seek and maintain support from a diverse group of folk to attain and maintain public office.

Campaign and governance styles, primarily since the 1989 elections, have surfaced in San Francisco, Atlanta and other municipalities, which place societal problems and civil rights issues within the context of economic or nonracial terms. Of the more than 350 African American U.S. mayors during the last decade of the 20th century, they “consider themselves problem solvers, not crusaders; political pragmatists, not ideologues.”¹²² That is, African American mayors no longer view their role as one dimensional in which they advocate and fulfill a black agenda only. According to Lucius Barker and Mack Jones, if black elected officials continue to deracialize their governance, it only serves to maintain blacks in a lower position¹²³ economically and politically. Inductively, the street homeless do not stand a chance of remedying themselves from the conditions of homelessness because their interests are being ignored to satisfy the economic interests of the commercial elite. Barker and Jones also indicate that the commercial industry’s pursuance of private goals that deracialized campaign styles and governance allow for, is an inevitable duty¹²⁴ that Charles Beard in *An Economic Interpretation of the*  
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Constitution of the United States would probably conclude as the basis of American government. But if black elected officials continue to ignore the interests of the urban black street homeless in favor of representing the interests of the commercial industry a process of “the routinization of black political participation in more of a system supporting than a system challenging fashion”\textsuperscript{125} will continue.

In sum, black elected officials are faced with the challenging task of adequately representing the interests of the black urban poor within their municipalities instead of doing what Barker and Jones refer to as the “routinization of black political participation.” In other words, black elected officials must establish innovative and effective methods that allow for balance when representing the interests of the urban poor (street homeless), commercial elite and general community.

\textsuperscript{125}Ibid., 322.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

It is evident that the case study approach is utilized for this study. Case studies need not only be single because multiple-case studies are also conducted in scholarly research despite the extensiveness of them.\(^1\) Ann Majchrzak states that “case studies allow for the identification of behaviors and other variables that were not expected to be related to the social problem. Case studies also promote examination of the process by which an intervention or policy action has been implemented.”\(^2\) This study examines only the attitudes of elected officials in Atlanta and San Francisco in regards to quality of life ordinances. The questionnaire is attached (see Appendix 1). Descriptive statistical analysis was used to determine if there is a relationship between elected officials in Atlanta who believe that the primary causes of homelessness in Atlanta are personal and those who support quality of life ordinances. In addition to Mayor Willie Brown, only San Franciscan Board of Supervisors Amos Brown and Sue Bierman returned completed surveys. Yet their responses are useful in meeting the objectives of my research endeavor.


For instance, Western Michigan University, Professor of Political Science Alan C. Isaak states that:

A variation of the historical approach is used by those political scientists who might be labeled historians of the present. They give detailed descriptions of contemporary political events, in the narrative style of the historian. The results are often called case studies. The well-done case study’s realistic portrayal of politics is no doubt useful.³

Moreover, “surveys (even small ones) may provide useful input for the policymaking arena.”⁴ Nevertheless, a descriptive and analytic comparison and contrast of their responses is provided in Chapter Four. Replicas of Amos Brown’s and Sue Bierman’s completed surveys are located in Appendices 4 and 5, respectively. Newspaper accounts and other public documents were used to gauge public opinion among the Board of Supervisors about the homeless in San Francisco. Robert K. Yin argues in Case Study Research: Design and Methods that “after some early data collection and analysis, an investigator has every right to conclude that the initial design was faulty and to modify the design.” Yin also argues that case studies can incorporate both quantitative and qualitative data.⁵ This dissertation is written based upon quantitative and qualitative evidence.


As stated in Chapter 2, this research is a continuation of a research project that I began in 1993. During the 1994 and 1995 academic school year, I administered questionnaires to Atlanta City Council members regarding quality of life ordinances. More than four years has passed, an additional quality of life ordinance (urban camping) has been passed in Atlanta. Nevertheless, the response rate to my survey was very low, considering the time frame in which I administered it. But the questions asked served as a pretest to the questions I ask for this dissertation project. Additional questions were added to the questionnaire as well as initial questions removed. For this project, only the mayor and elected council members in Atlanta and Board of Supervisors in San Francisco were interviewed via mailed questionnaires since they have the constitutional power to make public policy in their respective cities.

Research Design

The Atlanta City Council members were interviewed in Atlanta whereas the mayor and San Francisco Board of Supervisors were interviewed in San Francisco. Although both mayors Bill Campbell and Willie Brown were mailed questionnaires regarding quality of life ordinances that impact the street homeless in Atlanta and San Francisco, only Mayor Brown returned the completed questionnaire. Mayor Campbell, instead, had Sue Ellen CrossLea, Director, Office of Human Services, to forward a letter on his behalf (see Appendix 2). The letter reads, in part, “the Mayor chose not to sign the so called
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'quality of life' ordinances passed by the City Council. They became law without his signature."

The attitudes of the elected officials regarding their ranked responses supporting quality of life ordinances are measured according to question 12 (see Appendix 1). The elected officials' race, gender, political experience in current position, level of education, and beliefs about the causes of homelessness in reference to the official's ranked responses supporting quality of life ordinances in Atlanta and San Francisco are measured according to questions 25, 24, 27, 26, and 17 (see Appendix 1 and Figure 1.).

**Limitations of Research Design**

The results of this study would be strengthened if I had received a higher response rate from the Board of Supervisors. Analyzing and reporting the survey results of only Amos Brown and Sue Bierman is insufficient for making scholarly generalizations in reference to the enactment and implementation of quality of life ordinances in San Francisco. Over a seven-month period, efforts were consistently made to gauge the opinions of the eleven Board of Supervisors. Methods including snail mail, E-mail and faxes were employed. Yet due to time and cost constraints, I concluded my data collection process without receiving a majority response from the Board of Supervisors. Nonetheless, the data that I was able to obtain does provide salient information in reference to how two members of the council view the merits of quality of life measures in San Francisco. Through newspaper accounts and Internet databases I was also able to
gauge what two other board members thought regarding the aforementioned ordinances. Thus, this information is still useful to the overall objectives of this research. As previously stated, Ann Majchrzak in *Methods for Policy Research* states that “surveys (even small ones) may provide useful input for the policymaking arena.” Robert K. Yin in *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* argues that data collection in a “good” case study relies not on a single method but various sources. These sources include letters, memoranda, agendas, announcements, written reports of events, administrative documents, formal studies or evaluation of the same “site” under study and newspaper clipping and articles in print.6 This research is based upon an infinite number of sources, including the legislative history of quality of life ordinances in San Francisco. “The most important use of documents is to corroborate and augment evidence from other sources.”7 Moreover, San Francisco Mayor Willie Brown’s completed questionnaire and 1998-1999 state of the city addresses added reliable insight regarding this subject matter.
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Atlanta City Council
members reasoning for supporting quality of life ordinances

Figure 1. Visual Display of Independent and Dependent Variables (Independent Variables located on the left whereas Dependent Variable located on right. Note: Visual Display of Question 12 in Conjunction with Questions 25, 24, 27, 26 and 17 (Questions 25, 24, 27, 26 and 17 located on the left whereas question 12 located on right).
Interview Procedure

Questionnaires were administered via standard mail to elected officials in Atlanta and San Francisco from October 1998 to April 1999. In addition to the questionnaire, post cards, E-mail and faxes were employed over this seven month period. The cover letter, questionnaires and follow-up post cards were mailed to officials in both cities with a self-addressed and stamped envelope addressed to Robert Wilkes, Jr., Department of Political Science, Clark Atlanta University, Atlanta, Georgia, 30314. The cover letter provided a brief description of the study and instructions for completing the survey. The questionnaire consists of 27 open and closed-ended questions.

The post read, in part, the following.

A few days ago you should have received your copy of the “1998 Survey Investigating the Attitudes of Local Elected Officials Regarding Quality of Life Ordinances That Impact the Street Homeless in Atlanta, Georgia, and San Francisco, California.” I sincerely hope that you will complete and return the survey. Your responses are critical to the success of my dissertation research project.
CHAPTER IV

ATLANTA AND SAN FRANCISCO GOVERNANCE
AND THE HOMELESS PROBLEM

This chapter describes and provides an analysis of why Atlanta and San Francisco local elected officials support quality of life ordinances in their respective cities. The impact of race, gender, political experience in current position, level of education and beliefs about the primary causes of homelessness in conjunction with the ranked responses of the Atlanta Council members supporting quality of life ordinances is explained (see Chapter 3, Figure 1). But first, a comparison and contrast is provided regarding African American mayors Bill Campbell and Willie Brown. Their impact on homeless policy is key to understanding how the homeless are treated in Atlanta and San Francisco. Following this discussion, a comparison and contrast of the attitudes of Supervisors Amos Brown and Sue Bierman is summarized. Lastly, the attitudes of the Atlanta City Council is quantitatively summarized and analyzed.

Mayors Campbell and Brown

Table 2. compares and contrasts Atlanta mayor Bill Campbell and San Francisco’s mayor Willie Brown. Both mayors are African American and govern relatively large urban centers. Table 2. also illustrates that despite the fact that both mayors serve in similar terms both held political office before running for mayor. One might assert that
Mayor Bill Campbell is on the rise politically since having won the mayoral election twice in Atlanta and after serving as a relatively “unknown” city council member. Yet, one might also conclude that even though Mayor Willie Brown rose to prominence as Speaker in California’s state legislature, he is also taking a step forward politically as mayor of San Francisco. Mayor Brown is continually chronicled in major newspapers and magazines; thus, Brown is receiving increasing public visibility that could lead to a higher elected political position in the 21st century.
Table 2. City and Mayor Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Bill Campbell</th>
<th>Willie L. Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>• Atlanta</td>
<td>• San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Governing</td>
<td>• South</td>
<td>• West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Population</td>
<td>• 450000</td>
<td>• 734676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Experience Before</td>
<td>• City Level</td>
<td>• State Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected As Mayor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>• African American</td>
<td>• African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term of Office</td>
<td>• Second</td>
<td>• Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td>• Democrat</td>
<td>• Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Education</td>
<td>• Post College</td>
<td>• Post College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>• Male</td>
<td>• Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variable “term of office” listed in Table 2 is important. As stated in Chapter 2, both Atlanta and San Francisco Charters require term limits. Bill Campbell is ineligible to run for mayor in the 2001 election. On the other hand, Willie Brown sought and won reelection in November, 1999. Thus, Brown possess the opportunity to have a greater impact on homelessness in San Francisco in the 21st century than Campbell in Atlanta. Surprisingly, even with lameduck status, Campbell refuses to take a clear and open stance on homelessness. Not only by refusing to respond to my questionnaire but also by refusing to sign into law or veto quality of life ordinances in Atlanta, Campbell is vague when it comes to homelessness.

On the other hand, in Mayor Brown’s response to my questionnaire he indicates that affordable housing is the most important problem confronting San Francisco that he must address as mayor. Public transportation and homeless services follow in that order (see Appendix 3, question 3). This response comes in light of Brown’s October 26, 1998 State of the City Address that transportation was the most pressing problem that he must address followed by homelessness. Two things can be inferred from the mayor’s responses. One, mayoral decision making and conceptualization of city problems are not static. Mayor Brown delivered his state of the city address slightly more than four months after he returned my questionnaire. Problem conceptualization is always a major concern in political decision making but prioritizing problems is more than likely always under challenge. Two, Mayor Brown’s change in perspective may have been inspired by San Francisco’s November 1999 mayoral election. For instance, The New York Times reports
that “only 3 of every 10 voters surveyed in a recent poll by *The San Francisco Chronicle* said they were inclined to back him for a second term. That amounts to a radical decline for a Mayor who breezed into office with the support of two-thirds of the electorate.”¹ In other words, Brown was losing political support that stemmed from his response to street homelessness and the need for affordable housing, among other things. *The New York Times* also reports that:

San Franciscans are obviously upset. They are upset, the poll found, with Mr. Brown’s seeming inability to make the buses and trains run on time or to get the homeless off the streets. And they are upset at downtown traffic jams, a lack of public parking, litter, mediocre schools and the mayor’s arrogance. But others are inclined to say that the very qualities that enthralled voters in the first place, Mr. Brown’s glamour and glitz, have begun to grate on a city where homelessness is so prevalent and two-thirds of the residents are renters who may never be able to afford to buy in San Francisco’s exorbitant housing market.² Yet Brown was reelected to office. Furthermore, Brown states that when making decisions relative to homelessness, he compromises between his best judgment and what the majority wants (see Appendix 3, question 4). Brown also states that having elections makes government attentive to what people think “a good deal” (see Appendix 3, question 23). Nonetheless, Mayor Brown indicates that affordable housing is most needed in San Francisco. Across America, for instance,

Rents generally rise faster than incomes, and renters as a class have lower incomes than homeowners. For example, in 1989 constant dollars, gross rents (median contract rent plus fuel, utilities, and some other costs) rose from $363 in

---


²Ibid.
1970 to $402 in 1993. During this same period, renters' median income fell from $18,915 to $15,618. Consequently, the median percentage of renters’ income devoted to housing rose from 20.5% in 1970 to 26.8% in 1993. American housing data for 1993 indicated that 6.9 million renter households were paying 50% or more of their income for housing, of whom 4.1 million were paying 70% or more. Such extreme housing cost burdens often result in eviction and eventual homelessness—the ultimate housing affordability problem.³

It can be deduced from the above statement that affordable housing is the key and starting point to reducing homelessness in general and removing the street homeless in particular off the streets. In San Francisco, for instance, The Center for Common Concerns reports that “at least 27,000 new dwelling units are needed annually to accommodate growth between 1990 and 2010.”⁴ “The average rent for a 2 bedroom unit increased 110 percent”⁵ between 1980 and 1990 in San Francisco. In fact, “San Francisco is the least affordable housing market in the U.S.”⁶ It is also reported that of the more than 9 thousand families placed on waiting lists for public housing in November 1993, 4 thousand were labeled homeless.⁷


⁵Ibid., 25.

⁶Ibid., 28.

⁷Ibid., 27.
Table 3 displays that among policies advanced by Brown to combat homelessness, affordable housing is among the top four. Yet Table 3 illustrates that Brown not only supports quality of life ordinances but also believes that the street homeless are represented substantively in San Francisco public policy. Brown does not view quality of life ordinances as unjust. They are just. For instance, Brown states "we're not trying to relocate the lawbreakers, we're trying to end the lawbreaking." Brown states in his 1999 State of the City Address that:

There has been some concern expressed recently that this administration is somehow committed to trampling the civil rights of our city's homeless population. Let me assure you that nothing could be further from the truth. Few in our city are more committed to the cause of universal civil rights than I am. But those who are homeless—either through misfortune or choice—are not the only ones with rights. Throughout this city, there are men and women who own and operate small businesses. They work hard to make a go of it, and they provide jobs for others. Yet far too many of them are forced each work day picking up trash and washing away excrement left overnight. That same scene gets replayed in neighborhoods where families are trying to raise children and secure a decent quality of life for themselves. So, while we'll continue to beef up homeless services, work toward regional approaches to the homeless problem, and pressure state government to do its part, we're also going to enforce laws against urinating in public, sleeping in parks, and blocking public sidewalks, because that is the best approach for safeguarding the rights, liberties, and quality of life of all San Franciscans.  

---


That is, Brown argues that it is the behavior of the street homeless in San Francisco that is under scrutiny. Brown states that:

Over the last four years, we’ve dramatically increased services to the homeless. We’ve allocated $14 million in the last three years to implement substance abuse treatment on demand. We’ve dedicated over $2.5 million this year alone for expanded mental health services; we provide nearly 1,500 emergency shelter beds every night, and we’re master leasing residential hotels and moving people out of shelters and on the road to self sufficiency. Yet the problem of homelessness persists, and many feel it’s getting worse. In part, because we’ve built an array of services that are attractive to the homeless, so they just keep coming. More than half the people now on our streets have been here for less than one year, which means that we’re moving people through the system on a regular basis, but more follow.\(^\text{10}\)

In particular though, Table 4. outlines why Brown supports quality of life ordinances.

\[^{10}\text{Ibid.}\]
Table 3. Excerpts from Mayor Brown’s Completed Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Mayor Brown’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Groups and individuals you consult when resolving street homeless issues</strong></td>
<td>• San Francisco Coalition on Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• California Homeless and Housing Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Homeless shelter directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Local business community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Quality of Life Ordinances in San Francisco</strong></td>
<td>• Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Believe street homeless are represented substantively in San Francisco public policy</strong></td>
<td>• Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policies Brown thinks would help alleviate the conditions of homelessness in San Francisco</strong></td>
<td>• Affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Substance abuse treatment on demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mental health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Job training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policies advanced by Brown that he thinks would help alleviate the conditions of homelessness in San Francisco</strong></td>
<td>• Affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Substance abuse treatment on demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mental health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Job training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Robert Wilkes self-administered survey  
Note: Characteristics are listed according to questions 8, 10, 14, 19, and 20 in ascending to descending order.
Table 4. shows that it is the business community followed by the residential community leading the charge to pass quality of life ordinances. Such a response also fits within DeLeon’s conceptual framework of San Francisco political decision making. As stated in Chapter 2, DeLeon argues that pluralism is at work in San Francisco.

In terms of federalism, Mayor Brown states that it is best to have a national program that guarantees poor people in all states a minimum standard of living (see Appendix 3, question 21). This comes in light of the national trend, at the turn of the century, of devolution. The national government now allows states and cities to become creative and innovative in addressing public concerns. This trend can clearly be seen with the passage of the Personal Responsibility Act. However, the “poor” and homeless are paying the price. Stemming from Ronald Reagan’s presidency, the “shift from publicly funded affordable units to more reliance on the private market led to a decline of 1 million rental units through the decade, while demand for these units increased to 2 million households.”

Moreover, “the Federal Housing and Urban Development appropriations for subsidized housing fell from $32.2 billion in 1978 to $9.2 billion in 1988.”

---


12Ibid., 24.
Table 4. Why Mayor Brown Supports Quality of Life Ordinances

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The business community indicates its desire to prevent the homeless from congregating around their business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The residential community indicates its desire to prevent the homeless from congregating around their neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The street homeless are a public safety threat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To promote economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To attract tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The street homeless lack the motivation to work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Robert Wilkes self-administered survey  
Note: Data stems from question 12. Data listed in ascending to descending order.
Table 5. displays that Mayor Brown does not believe that the primary causes of homelessness are fixed across America. Two thoughts can be inferred from Brown’s response. One, despite arguing that the national government should play a more activist role in assisting the “poor” and homeless locate and maintain affordable housing, Brown articulates that he understands the primary causes of homelessness in San Francisco best. According to Brown, it is alcoholism and drug addiction that is at root to homelessness in San Francisco. Yet Brown states that possible effects of the Personal Responsibility Act is the root cause of homelessness nationally. Two, the primary causes of homelessness in San Francisco fit within the personal pathology framework, according to Brown (see Chapter 1). Even though affordable housing is needed in San Francisco, it is not the primary cause of homelessness; at least not to Brown. In fact, it is not the primary cause of homelessness across America. Table 5. shows that it is the least. Yet Table 3. shows that Brown thinks that the availability of affordable housing would help alleviate homelessness in San Francisco. In sum, Mayor Brown acknowledges that both personal and structural factors contribute to the state of American homelessness, but personal attributes are more explanatory when comprehending and alleviating this public policy issue.
Table 5. What Mayor Brown Believes are the Primary Causes of Homelessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Alcoholism and drug addiction</td>
<td>• Possible effects of the Personal Responsibility Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possible effects of the Personal Responsibility Act</td>
<td>• Alcoholism and drug addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of affordable housing</td>
<td>• Lack of affordable housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Robert Wilkes self-administered survey
Note: Data stems from questions 16 and 17. Data listed in ascending to descending order.
In terms of actual political decision making in San Francisco, Brown states that advocates of social and civil rights organizations influence him the least when voting on homeless policy (see Table 6.). Thus, grassroots interest groups have limited influence when it comes to homeless issues and public policy in San Francisco. Grassroots interest groups also have finite resources. Professors Kenneth Janda, Jeffrey M. Berry and Jerry Goldman state that “the strengths, capabilities, and influence of an interest group depend in large part on its resources. A groups’ most significant resources are its members, lobbyists, and money, including funds that can be contributed to political candidates.”

Yet Professor Thomas E. Patterson, argues that grassroots interest groups effectiveness is measured according to the degree of public support regarding a specific policy issue.

Clearly, it is the general and business communities that have the greatest impact on Mayor Brown. This response falls within the context of DeLeon’s analysis that a dominant business elite is absent in San Francisco politics. Pluralism is at work. But what role does the Board of Supervisors play in this pluralistic system of governance?

---


Table 6. Groups that Influence Mayor Brown’s Decision Making the Most When Voting on Homeless Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Business community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Advocates of social organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Civil rights organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Robert Wilkes self-administered survey
Note: Data stems from question 18. Data listed in ascending to descending order.
San Francisco Board of Supervisors

As stated in Chapter 3, of the eleven Board members, only Reverend Dr. Amos C. Brown and Sue Bierman returned completed questionnaires. Councilmen Brown is the sole African American serving on the Board. Sue Bierman is one of four women serving on the Board. Despite not having run for his political position and unlike Bierman, Amos Brown will serve as Supervisor, at least, until January 8, 1999.15 Supervisor Brown received his position via appointment by African American mayor Willie Brown.16 Thus, the only African American serving as a Supervisor stems from executive appointment power exercised by Mayor Brown. On the other hand, former community activist Bierman was reelected to office in November 1996 after having been initially elected Supervisor in 1992.17 Table 7. displays that while Supervisor Bierman opposes quality of life ordinances, Supervisor Brown does not.

According to the San Francisco Chronicle, Supervisor Brown sponsored the latest crackdown on open space drinking.18 During the latter part of January 1999, “the board

15Amos C. Brown, Member, Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco (San Francisco, CA: San Francisco CitySpan, 1999) [database on-line]; available at http://www.ci.sf.ca.us/bdsupvrs/brown.htm.

16Ibid.

17Sue Bierman, Member, Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco (San Francisco, CA: San Francisco CitySpan, 1999) [database on-line]; available at http://www.ci.sf.ca.us/bdsupvrs/bierman.htm.

voted for Supervisor Amos Brown’s plan to place U.N. and Hallidie plazas under the park code. That will allow the city to outlaw sleeping after 10 p.m. and not only arrest people for public drunkenness but also for the mere drinking of alcoholic beverages.\(^\text{19}\) Amos Brown states that “there is an ongoing concern about public areas that they should be available for our citizens to enjoy free of trauma, stress, insult or negative activity.”\(^\text{20}\) Table 7. also indicates that in opposition to Sue Bierman, Amos Brown believes that the street homeless are represented substantively in San Francisco public policy. For instance, Amos Brown states that “the city spends $60 million on homeless programs and has a right to expect homeless people to behave.”\(^\text{21}\) Supervisor Brown concludes that it is very difficult to help San Francisco’s homeless population when some refuse available shelter and treatment.\(^\text{22}\) Table 7. illustrates that Supervisor Brown thinks that drug treatment and mental illness institutions are paramount when it comes to lessening the conditions of homelessness in San Francisco. Structural problems such as the lack of affordable housing and adequate paying jobs are secondary. Supervisor Brown’s perceptions of the conditions of homelessness in San Francisco are nearly identical to Mayor Brown’s

\(^{19}\text{Edward Epstein, “Homeless Lose Ground: Crackdown at Plazas, Union Square Spruce-up Okd,” } San Francisco Chronicle, 26 January 1999, A17.\


\(^{21}\text{Edward Epstein, “Homeless Lose Ground: Crackdown at Plazas, Union Square Spruce-up Okd,” } San Francisco Chronicle, 26 January 1999, A17.\

\(^{22}\text{Ibid.} \)
perceptions; the man who appointed him. Thus, both mayor Willie Brown and Supervisor Brown view quality of life ordinances as just in San Francisco.

Yet Board of Supervisors Tom Ammiano, Leland Yee and Sue Bierman opposed Amos Brown’s proposal. According to the three supervisors, such legislation only forces the street homeless to relocate from one part of the city to another. They state that “in the case of the business improvement district, private interests will take over public sidewalks and streets.” John D.R. Clark, Board of Supervisors legislative analyst, states that “while this ordinance intends to increase the safety and enjoyment of certain parks for responsible park users, it may also result in increased numbers of persons being funneled into the jail or other criminal justice programs.”

Sue Bierman believes that structural developments are needed to alleviate the conditions of homelessness in San Francisco. Table 7. shows that Bierman highlights the need for outreach programs and new housing. However, Bierman does acknowledge that there is a substance abuse problem among the homeless. Table 7. illustrates that even though Bierman has advanced policies that would control rental evictions, provide city support of shelters and support for low-income housing development, she has also

---

23Ibid.

24Ibid.

advocated for a larger budget for the health department for substance abuse treatment. Unlike Supervisor Brown, substance abuse is not the primary cause of homelessness for Bierman. Clearly, Bierman as well as Ammiano and Yee view quality of life laws as unjust in San Francisco.

As previously stated, the viewpoints regarding the significance of quality of life ordinances among the aforementioned supervisors are indeed important because they lead to a better understanding of the necessity of this type of legislation. Even though disagreement about the necessity of quality of life ordinances in San Francisco is prevalent among board members, it is ultimately the board’s responsibility to determine this type of policy through compromise and majority rule. That is, it clear that some of the members of San Francisco’s board of supervisors support quality of life ordinances based upon their understanding of the nature of homelessness. But they also realize that as elected officials, with constitutional powers stemming from San Francisco’s charter, that they must, as best as they can, address this public policy issue. It is an issue that is important to numerous San Francisco residents.
Table 7. Board of Supervisors Brown and Bierman: Excerpts from Completed Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Board of Supervisor Amos Brown</th>
<th>Board of Supervisor Sue Bierman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Groups and individuals you consult when resolving street homeless issues** | • The National Coalition for the Homeless  
• San Francisco Coalition on Homelessness  
• Homeless persons  
• Homeless shelter directors  
• Local business community | • San Francisco Coalition on Homelessness  
• Homeless Persons  
• Housing advocates, those who build housing |
| **Support Quality of Life Ordinances in San Francisco**              | • Yes                                                                                          | • No                                                                                             |
| **Believe street homeless are represented substantively in San Francisco public policy** | • Yes                                                                                          | • No                                                                                             |
| **Policies A. Brown and S. Bierman think would help alleviate the conditions of homelessness in San Francisco** | • Drug treatment  
• Mental illness institutions  
• Affordable housing  
• Jobs | • More outreach to homeless or near homeless people with services  
• Encouraging new housing development |
## Table 7. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Board of Supervisor Amos Brown</th>
<th>Board of Supervisor Sue Bierman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies advanced by A. Brown and S. Bierman that they think would help</td>
<td>• Rec center for homeless</td>
<td>• Advocating for larger budget for health department for substance abuse treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alleviate the conditions of homelessness in San Francisco</td>
<td>• Treatment programs for drugs and mental illness</td>
<td>• Control of rental evictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Affordable housing</td>
<td>• City support of shelters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Jobs</td>
<td>• Support for low income developments (housing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Robert Wilkes self-administered survey  
Note: Characteristics are listed according to questions 8, 10, 14, 19, and 20 in ascending to descending order.
Table 8. explains why Supervisors Brown and Bierman are in opposition when it comes to quality of life ordinances. On a scale of 1 to 5, Brown indicates that the particular influence of the residential and business community is least important in comparison to ensuring public safety for all. Common themes such as promoting economic development and attracting tourism rank second and third, respectively. Supervisor Brown differs from Mayor Brown in this respect. On a scale of 1 to 7, Bierman indicates that even though quality of life ordinances are subject to legal challenge it is the least most important reason why she opposes them. On the other hand, the most important reasons are: 1) They do not address the root causes of homelessness; 2) They violate homeless folk’s civil rights and liberties provided in the Constitution; and 3) They unfairly target the homeless. Thus, for Bierman quality of life laws are not only unjust but also pose legal challenges for public officials in San Francisco.
Table 8. Why Supervisor Brown Supports and Supervisor Bierman Opposes Quality of Life Laws in San Francisco

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board of Supervisor Amos Brown</th>
<th>Board of Supervisor Sue Bierman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The street homeless are a public safety threat</td>
<td>1. They do not address the root causes of homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To promote economic development</td>
<td>1. They violate homeless folk civil rights and liberties provided in the Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To attract tourism</td>
<td>1. They unfairly target the homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The business community indicates its desire to prevent the homeless from congregating around their businesses</td>
<td>3. Enforcement is too costly, fiscally inefficient, and a waste of scarce resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The residential community indicates its desire to prevent the homeless from congregating around their businesses</td>
<td>3. They place an unnecessary burden on the police staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. They are subject to legal challenge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Robert Wilkes self-administered survey
Note: Data stems from question 12. Data listed in ascending to descending order.
In reference to the primary causes of homelessness, it has already been established that Supervisor Brown believes that the primary cause of homelessness in San Francisco is personal while Supervisor Bierman believes it is structural. Table 9. highlights that although Amos Brown cites the lack of affordable housing as the second most important cause of homelessness, his perception of homelessness and its causes is the same throughout the nation. With the exception of his listing the lack of affordable housing, two of his top three cited causes of homelessness are personal. Downsizing among major corporations in San Francisco and across the nation is the least primary cause. Furthermore, Supervisor Brown acknowledges that it is best to have a national program that guarantees poor people in all states a minimum standard of living (see Appendix 4, question 21).

Sue Bierman on the other hand lists the lack of affordable housing as the primary cause of homelessness not only in San Francisco but in America as well. On a scale of 1 to 8, Bierman ranked alcoholism and drug addiction third in San Francisco. Table 9. also shows that Bierman ranked alcoholism and drug addiction fourth across the nation. The lack of motivation to work is considered the least primary cause in San Francisco. Downsizing among major corporations is listed as the least primary cause in America. Thus, Bierman views homelessness and its causes in San Francisco and the United States as similar but not the same. Consequently, Bierman argues that it is best to allow each state and city to develop its own program to care for the poor (see Appendix 5, question 21). Sue Bierman advocates devolution.
Table 9. What Supervisors Brown and Bierman Believe are the Primary Causes of Homelessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Amos Brown</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Alcoholism and drug addiction</td>
<td>1. Alcoholism and drug addiction</td>
<td>1. Alcoholism and drug addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of affordable housing</td>
<td>2. Lack of affordable housing</td>
<td>2. Lack of affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lack of motivation to work</td>
<td>3. Lack of motivation to work</td>
<td>3. Lack of motivation to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Downsizing among major corporations</td>
<td>5. Downsizing among major corporations</td>
<td>5. Downsizing among major corporations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Sue Bierman</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of affordable housing</td>
<td>1. Lack of affordable housing</td>
<td>1. Lack of affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Downsizing among major corporations</td>
<td>7. Possible effects of the Personal Responsibility Act</td>
<td>7. Possible effects of the Personal Responsibility Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of motivation to work</td>
<td>7. Downsizing among major corporations</td>
<td>7. Downsizing among major corporations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Robert Wilkes self-administered survey
Note: Data stems from questions 16 and 17. Data listed in ascending to descending order.
In conclusion, despite Supervisor Brown indicating that affordable housing followed by homelessness and public safety, respectively, are the most important problems confronting San Francisco that he must address as an elected official, his main focus is not affordable housing. Table 8. displays that for Supervisor Brown the most important reason for his support of quality of life ordinances is that the street homeless are a public safety threat. Yet he ranks public safety third among the most important problems confronting San Francisco. It is clear that Supervisor Brown and Mayor Brown distinguish the need for affordable housing and the primary causes of homelessness.

Supervisor Bierman not only indicates that there is a homelessness problem in San Francisco but that it is the most important problem that she must address as a board of supervisor. She indicates that this problem stems from structural issues, such as rising costs for rental units.

Atlanta City Council Members

Of the eleven (11) council members who completed and returned my questionnaire, all or one hundred percent (100%) indicate that a homelessness problem is prevalent in Atlanta. Yet Figure 2. illustrates that 90.9 percent of Atlanta Council members support quality of life ordinances. This is in opposition to 9.1 percent who oppose quality of life ordinances. And only 9.1 percent support repealing quality of life ordinances in Atlanta.
Race, gender, political experience in current position, level of education, and beliefs about the primary causes of homelessness in Atlanta are described in reference to the dependent variable. That is, and as stated previously, the analysis in this section examines the attitudes of the elected officials regarding their ranked responses supporting quality of life ordinances measured by question 12 (see Appendix 1). The elected officials’ race, gender, political experience in current position, level of education, and beliefs about the causes of homelessness in reference to the officials’ ranked responses supporting quality of life ordinances in Atlanta are measured according to questions 25, 24, 27, 26, and 17 (see Appendix 1 and Figure 1.).

A majority (54.5%) of those council members returning questionnaires state that the street homeless are also represented substantively in Atlanta city public policy. Figure 3. shows that only 36.4 percent state that the street homeless are not represented substantively in Atlanta city public policy. Nonetheless council members indicate that the
primary reason for their support of quality of life ordinances stems from the general community’s reaction to the problem.

Figure 3. Atlanta City Council perspectives on homeless policy based upon how substantively the street homeless are represented in city public policy.
Figure 4. illustrates that nearly 55 percent of the residential and business communities combined support quality of life ordinances (also see Table 10.). The residential community ranks the highest at 36.4 percent. Over 70 percent comprise not only the residential and business communities but also rank and file folk. But if economic development were combined with the influence of the business community it would equal that of the residential community at 36.4 percent. Thus, on the surface the residential community appears to have the most influence on the existence of quality of life ordinances. However, no single group dominates the process of influencing Atlanta Council members to support quality of life ordinances. This analysis is cross referenced with the councils’ response despite 100 percent indicating that they consult with organizations before voting on policy relative to homelessness. In fact, 72.7 percent indicate that they combine using their own best judgment with doing what the majority wants.

Only 18.2 percent list the business community as the most important group influencing homeless policy. The general community ranked at 54.5 percent while 27.3 percent stated that they use their own opinion. Focusing on this narrow issue of homelessness in Atlanta reveals pluralism at work instead of Stone’s regime politics. Table 10. also illustrates that the characteristic “rank and file to use public spaces for intended use” was added to the questionnaire by two council members. Attracting tourism and the perception that the street homeless pose a public safety threat and lack the motivation to work were not cited as important factors for supporting QOL ordinances.
Figure 4. Atlanta City Council most important rationale for supporting quality of life ordinances. Data treated as nominal data.

Table 10. Most Important Reason for Support of Quality of Life Ordinances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business community</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose quality of life ordinances</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow rank and file to use public spaces for intended use</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The numbers listed in the column defined value were randomly selected to explain the value label in SPSS. SPSS was used to compute the frequencies and percentages. Data nominal.
Figure 5. and Table 11. show that the business community’s influence is ranked as the second most important reason for supporting quality of life ordinances. The business community’s influence ranked at 45.5 percent. Factors such as public safety and “the city belongs to all” leveled out at 9.1 percent, respectively.

Moreover, Table 11. shows that the influence of the residential community is cited as the second second most important reason for supporting quality of life ordinances. When combined the business and residential community commands 72.8 percent why council members support Atlanta quality of life legislation. Tables 10. and 11. clearly show that when combined the influence of the business and residential communities average over 50 percent. It is obvious that aspects of Stone’s regime politics is apparent when examining secondary influential indicators of quality of life ordinances. Interestingly, economic development is a non-factor when examining the second most important reason for supporting quality of life ordinances.

Table 12. clearly shows that economic development is cited as the third most important factor in support of quality of life ordinances by the Atlanta City Council. Economic development ranked at 45.5 percent. At 18.2 percent, homelessness as an infringement on public safety is the second third most important reason for these ordinances.
Figure 5. Atlanta City Council second most important rationale for supporting quality of life ordinances. Data treated as nominal data.

Table 11. Second Most Important Reason for Supporting Quality of Life Ordinances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeless area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public safety threat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business community</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose quality of life ordinances</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City belongs to everyone</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The numbers listed in the column defined value were randomly selected to explain the value label in SPSS. SPSS was used to compute the frequencies and percentages. Data treated as nominal data.
Table 12. Third Most Important Reason for Supporting Quality of Life Ordinances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless area public safety threat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business community</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose quality of life ordinances</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City belongs to everyone</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The numbers listed in the column defined value were randomly selected to explain the value label in SPSS. SPSS was used to compute the frequencies and percentages. Data treated as nominal data.
Figure 6. illustrates that the majority of the Council (81.8 percent) indicate that alcoholism and drug addiction contributes to the cause of homelessness the most in Atlanta. That is, the data show that over 80 percent of the Atlanta City Council believe that the primary cause of homelessness is personal. Only 18.2 percent state that the primary cause of homelessness is structural. Figure 7. illustrates that 72.7 percent believe that alcoholism and drug addiction is the primary cause of homelessness nationally. It is clear that the majority of the council believes that the primary causes of homelessness in Atlanta and the nation stem from the same personal defect. Thus, homelessness is not only best understood within the personal theoretical framework but also should be resolved using methods that stem from this framework. This finding is also consistent with not only the opinions of San Francisco mayor Willie Brown and Board of Supervisor Amos Brown but also the American public. For instance, Patti Stang and Marcy E. Mullins in *Help for the Homeless, USA Today*, March 8-10, 1996, report that 72 percent of the American populace state that the best way to help a person overcome homelessness relies on strengthening ones’ personal attributes. Nevertheless, 27.3 percent of the council argue that the primary cause of national homelessness is structural (see Figure 7.).
Figure 6. Atlanta City Council beliefs regarding the primary causes of homelessness in Atlanta. Data treated as nominal data.
Figure 7. Atlanta City Council beliefs regarding the national primary causes of homelessness. Note: -affordable housing connotes the lack of affordable housing. -mental institutions connotes the closing of mental institutions. Data treated as nominal data.
Figure 8. shows that 54.5 percent of the Atlanta City Council states that the lack of affordable housing, which is structural, is the second most important cause of homelessness in Atlanta. Figure 8. also displays that 18.2 percent state that effects of the Personal Responsibility Act is the second second primary cause of homelessness in Atlanta. Thus, 72.7 percent state that the second most important cause of homelessness in Atlanta is structural. The significance of this finding is that when making policy, policymakers tend to rank the importance of factors contributing to the need of such policy. Even though the council acknowledges that structural factors lead to the state of homelessness, it’s secondary. Therefore, structural factors become secondary in policy creation and implementation regarding the homeless. The data in Table 13. shows that downsizing becomes a significant factor when focusing on the third most important cause of homelessness in Atlanta. However, the Atlanta City Council states that the third most important cause of homelessness in Atlanta is structural (81.9 percent).
Figure 8. Atlanta City Council beliefs regarding the second primary causes of homelessness in Atlanta. Note: PRA connotes Personal Responsibility Act. Data treated as nominal data.
Table 13. Third Most Important Cause of Homelessness in Atlanta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of affordable housing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of the Personal Responsibility Act (PRA)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downsizing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The numbers listed in the column defined value were randomly selected to explain the value label in SPSS. SPSS was used to compute the frequencies and percentages. Data treated as nominal data.
When examining race, even though the Council is majority African American 54.5 percent of the respondents were white. The remaining 45.5 percent were African American. Women accounted for 54.5 percent of the respondents whereas 45.5 percent were men. When combining race and gender, African American women, white women and white men represented 27.3 percent of all respondents, respectively. Only 18.2 percent of the Council’s African American male population responded to the questionnaire. The majority of the Council (63.6 percent) is serving in their second term or more. The remaining 36.4 percent are in their first term. In regards to educational attainment, 45.5 percent hold a bachelors degree whereas 27.3 acknowledge that they possess professional degrees.

Figure 9. illustrates that African American council members are more influenced by the residential and business communities in regards to supporting quality of life ordinances than white council members. African American council members also cite economic development more often than white council members. However, Figure 9. displays that opposition to quality of life ordinances in Atlanta stem from African Americans on the Council. Nonetheless, whereas more than 30 percent of whites are influenced by the rank and file, not a single African American council member is influenced by this group when supporting quality of life ordinances.
Figure 9. Atlanta City Council members rationale for supporting quality of life ordinances by race.
Figure 10. illustrates that when examining gender and support for quality of life ordinances in Atlanta, men absolutely support the aforementioned ordinances. Opposition is among the women on the Council. Economic development and the residential community at 40 percent, respectively, influence male council members the most. Economic development is a non-factor among women sitting on the council. Figure 10. also illustrates that women tend to listen to the residential and business communities the most.

Figure 11. shows that opposition to quality of life ordinances is among African American women sitting on the Council. Economic development and the influence of the rank and file are non-factors among African American women on the Council when providing support for quality of life ordinances in Atlanta. African American women are equally with White men and White women when being influenced by the residential community. It is African American men who are influenced the most by the residential community. Figure 11. shows that economic development is a key factor among men only on the Council when supporting quality of life ordinances. However, economic development is more important among African American men on the Council. White men indicate that even though they support quality of life ordinances, it does not stem from the influence of the business community. It is African American and White women who listens to the business community.
Figure 10. Atlanta City Council members rationale for supporting quality of life ordinances by gender.
Figure 11. Atlanta City Council members rationale for supporting quality of life ordinances by gender and race.
Figure 12. illustrates that among council members serving in their first term, 75 percent indicate that they support quality of life ordinances in Atlanta based upon the influence of the residential community. Opposition to quality of life ordinances stems from council members serving less than a term. Among council members serving more than a term, they are evenly split (29 percent) regarding the influence of economic development, the opinions of the business community, and rank and file folk. The influence of the residential community follows at 14 percent among council members serving more than a term. It seems that council members in their second term or more are less likely to listen to the residential community when supporting quality of life ordinances.

Figure 13. illustrates that council members holding professional degrees are evenly split at 33 percent each when citing economic development, residential community, and rank and file influence as indicators for supporting quality of life ordinances. Council members possessing professional degrees are also less likely to be influenced by the business community. However, the residential community at 60 percent influences council members holding bachelors degrees the most. Economic development and the input of the business community follows at 20 percent, respectively, among this cohort. The influence of the rank and file is a non-factor among council members holding a bachelors degree.
Figure 12. Atlanta City Council members rationale for supporting quality of life ordinances by political experience.
Figure 13. Atlanta City Council members rationale for supporting quality of life ordinances by education and/or professional level.
Figure 14 illustrates that among council members indicating that the lack of affordable housing is the primary cause of homelessness in Atlanta, one hundred percent oppose quality of life ordinances. The lack of affordable housing is structural. This finding connects with my initial thesis that council members that believe that the primary causes of homelessness in Atlanta are personal are also supporters of quality of life ordinances. Yet among council members that do support quality of life ordinances the influence of the residential community (over 40 percent) is most prevalent.

Figure 14. Atlanta City Council members rationale for supporting quality of life ordinances based upon their beliefs regarding the primary cause of homelessness in Atlanta. Note: -affordable housing connotes lack of affordable housing. -mental institutions connotes closing of mental institutions.
In conclusion, the data illustrate that there is political representation for the homeless in Atlanta and San Francisco. The data show, however, that in addition to creating affordable housing opportunities, local government in Atlanta and San Francisco has devoted a significant amount of energy, time, and resources to control the behavior of the street homeless.

The data also shows that it is the residential and business communities leading the charge for enactment and strong enforcement of quality of life ordinances in both cities. The rank and file also have a strong and significant voice in ensuring the creation and enforcement of quality of life ordinances in Atlanta.

Moreover, this data analysis also suggests that a relationship exists among council members who believe that the primary cause of homelessness in Atlanta and San Francisco, respectively, is a personal problem and those who support quality of life ordinances. This finding is consistent when analyzing the attitudes of San Francisco Mayor Willie Brown regarding quality of life ordinances. Of respondents supporting quality of life ordinances, all indicated that the primary cause of homelessness in their respective cities is personal. At the other end of the spectrum, respondents that stated that the primary cause of homelessness in both cities, respectively, is structural, all opposed quality of life ordinances.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:
THE STREET HOMELESS SHOULD BE TREATED HUMANELY

Balancing the demands and concerns of the street homeless and residential and business communities in both Atlanta and San Francisco is a challenge. This comes in light of an African American mayor in Atlanta coupled with a Council dominated by blacks. It is no easy task in determining how homelessness should be effectively addressed in San Francisco after analyzing statements made by African American mayor Willie Brown and Supervisor Amos Brown. The features of homelessness in both cities, however, is that African Americans represent the majority of the homeless.

The evidence shows that the residential and business communities are the significant forces behind Atlanta and San Francisco government enacting and enforcing quality of life ordinances. Although Clarence Stone in his study of Atlanta governance illustrates that Atlanta is best understood within regime theory, understanding governance in Atlanta within the narrow scope of quality of life ordinances paints a different picture of the situation. It is the residential community leading the charge against the street homeless rather than the business community. In reference to San Francisco, the evidence illustrates that pluralism is at work even when examining a narrow issue such as street homeless behavior. Robert DeLeon illustrated this in his study of San Francisco governance during the early 1990s. The residential community in San Francisco has been able to consistently
defeat undesirable activities of not only the street homeless but, of "big" business as well regardless of who serves as mayor or who composes the Board of Supervisors. Thus, Stone's analysis of Atlanta politics may not describe Atlanta governance in totality whereas DeLeon's analysis of San Francisco politics may.

Mack Jones and Georgia Persons argue that African American politicians are deracializing their electoral and elective strategies to ensure elect-ability. While all elected political figures should attempt to represent the interests of all that reside within their jurisdictions regardless or race, gender, or socioeconomic status, African American elected political leadership in both Atlanta and San Francisco have a duty not to ignore the basic needs of its poorest African American constituency. Supporting Affirmative Action only is not sufficient.

African American elected officials should govern based upon a keen understanding of the myths and symbols of American ideals. The enforcement of quality of life ordinances affects a primarily African American homeless population. The data illustrates that housing and/or rental costs are increasing at higher rates than personal income levels in both Atlanta and San Francisco. This pattern can also be seen across America. One could also infer that among those homeless who are alcoholics and drug addicts, the lack of affordable housing would still be an obstacle to locating and maintaining a roof over their heads if they sobered up.

Although the data illustrate that there is political representation for the homeless in Atlanta and San Francisco, it is not substantive. That is, even though local government in
Atlanta and San Francisco acknowledge the need and its willingness to build additional affordable housing, more energy, time, and resources must be utilized for the development of affordable housing if governmental figures realistically expect to assist the homeless secure permanent housing. The data show, however, that in addition to creating affordable housing opportunities, local government in Atlanta and San Francisco has devoted a significant amount of energy, time, and resources to control the behavior of the street homeless. This trend must be reversed.

The data also shows that it is the residential and business communities leading the charge for enactment and strong enforcement of quality of life ordinances in both cities. This finding is consistent with Robert DeLeon's finding of local governance in San Francisco. DeLeon argues that San Francisco politics is best understood within the context of pluralism. My study basically shows that pluralism is at work regarding quality of life ordinances in San Francisco. On the other hand, this finding comes in opposition to what Clarence Stone found in his study of Atlanta. Stone concluded that Atlanta governance is best understood within a regime. Even though my study does not substantiate that regime theory is inadequate in explaining governance in Atlanta, it does highlight that the residential and the rank and file have a strong and significant voice in ensuring the creation and enforcement of quality of life ordinances in Atlanta.

The data analysis also suggests that a relationship exists among council members who believe that the primary cause of homelessness in Atlanta and San Francisco, respectively, is a personal problem and those who support quality of life ordinances. This
finding is consistent when analyzing the attitudes of San Francisco Mayor Willie Brown regarding quality of life ordinances. Of respondents supporting quality of life ordinances, all indicated that the primary cause of homelessness in their respective cities is personal. At the other end of the spectrum, respondents that stated that the primary cause of homelessness in both cities, respectively, is structural, all opposed quality of life ordinances.

Lastly, the homeless should be treated humanely in both Atlanta and San Francisco. The provisions of the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights extend to the street homeless. Regardless if one argues that the causes of homelessness are personal and/or structural, the street homeless should not have their civil liberties and rights violated just because the residential and business communities demand their removal off public streets. The concept of reason must be adequately understood and applied when restricting the behavior and movement of the street homeless in Atlanta and San Francisco. But more importantly, public elected officials should never ignore the symbolism built into American ideals when governing.

The implications of this research are evident. As long as elected officials continue to listen to the residential and business communities, the enforcement of quality of life ordinances will continue in Atlanta and San Francisco. If the street homeless do not openly and consistently rebel against government in Atlanta and San Francisco for its quality of life ordinances, violations of civil liberties and rights will continue. Without the building of additional affordable housing more folk will remain homeless in both cities.
But most importantly, if the public elected officials in Atlanta and San Francisco allow their personal biases to control their enactment and enforcement of quality of life ordinances, they may never reach and implement a viable solution to homelessness because they have ignored its root cause.

Despite homelessness stemming from personal and/or structural conditions, homeless folk should be treated humanely. But how does this occur when residents and the business community demand that government strengthen its laws against the behavior of the street homeless? As stated in Chapter 4, the residential and business communities in both Atlanta and San Francisco argue that the street homeless invade their liberty in public spaces. Yet by strengthening and enforcing laws that restrict the movement and behavior of the street homeless, American ideals of liberty, equality, and due process of law become invisible to the homeless. In addition to city charters and state constitutions, the Bill of Rights, equal protection and due process clauses of the 14th Amendment extend to the homeless as well.

The Declaration of Independence, which influenced the Founding Fathers in writing the US Constitution, in part, reads:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to affect their safety and happiness.
In addition to espousing natural rights and a republican form of government, the Constitution that the Framers wrote in 1787 is still alive. Its been amended only 27 times. Yet, Professor Thomas E. Patterson, of the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, argues that “America’s ideals have been nurtured through generations and have been a source of conflict as well as consensus. In practice, they have often meant different things to different people.”¹ That is, people view problems, events, and situations through different lenses. This perceptual difference is normally attributed to factors such as age, race, gender, socioeconomic status, level of education, and religious preference. Thus, people and politicians view the conditions of homelessness differently.

In general, 83 percent of Americans indicate that in teaching America’s history to children it is essential/very important to emphasize that “with hard work and perseverance, anyone can succeed in America.”² Then there are the American homeless which the Homebase/Regional Support Center for Homelessness Policy and Programs argues that “throughout California and across the United States, growing numbers of homeless people are sleeping, panhandling and otherwise meeting their daily needs in public spaces such as parks, doorways and sidewalks. The utilization of public areas for this purpose has often not been a matter of choice. Rather, homeless people have been


²Ibid., 11.
compelled to live in public areas because of an inadequate supply of affordable housing and emergency shelter space.\textsuperscript{3}

But what is American political culture? Patterson in \textit{We the People} argues that it encompasses liberty, self-government, equality, individualism, diversity, and unity. More specifically,

Liberty is the principle that individuals should be free to act and think as they choose, provided they do not infringe unreasonably on the freedom and well-being of others. Self-government is the principle that the people are the ultimate source of governing authority and that their general welfare is the only legitimate purpose of government. Equality holds that all individuals have moral worth, are entitled to fair treatment under the law, and should have equal opportunity for material gain and political influence. Individualism is a commitment to personal initiative, self-sufficiency, and material accumulation. This principle upholds the superiority of a private-enterprise economic system and includes the idea of the individual as the foundation of society. Diversity holds that individual differences should be respected and that these differences are a source of strength and a legitimate basis of self-interest. Unity is the principle that Americans are one people and form an indivisible union.\textsuperscript{4}

It is a fact that the homeless, homeless advocacy groups, residents and the business community espouse these ideals, and they seek redress in reference to quality of life issues via indirect democracy. Patterson argues, for instance, that:

America's ideals have had a strong impact on its politics. Ideals serve to define the boundaries of action. They do not determine exactly what people will do, but they have a marked influence on what people will regard as reasonable and


\textsuperscript{4}Thomas E. Patterson, \textit{We the People: A Concise Introduction to American Politics}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} ed. (Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Education, 2000), 3-5.
desirable. If people believe, as Americans do, that politics exists to promote liberty and equality, they will attempt to realize these values through their political actions. Yet liberty is not an absolute right. That is, government is not absolutely refrained from infringing on one’s freedom. In reference to the movement and behavior of the street homeless in Atlanta and San Francisco, what would constitute a constitutional basis for non-national governments restricting the liberty of the street homeless? When the street homeless sleep in public spaces and solicit funds from the public they are not unreasonably infringing on the liberties of others. Despite being annoyed, the public can ignore the behavior of the street homeless and/or consistently refuse to give money. On the other hand, since Atlanta and San Francisco governments have enacted and are enforcing laws that restrict the street homeless from sleeping and begging in open spaces, it is the liberties of the street homeless that are ultimately being infringed upon.

Moreover, HomeBase argues:

If a law is found to deprive someone of a fundamental right, it can be invalidated under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution. Laws which impact discriminatorily against the poor may thus be overturned if they can be shown to also deprive indigent persons of a fundamental right. If the activities of homeless persons in public spaces can be framed as fundamental rights protected under the Fourteenth Amendment (or state equivalents) then laws which deprive persons of those rights can be challenged.

---

5Ibid., 6.

For instance, "since the court has upheld the right to travel as a fundamental right, *Shapiro v. Thompson*, advocates have begun to argue that anti-homeless laws interfere with the right of intrastate travel by discouraging homeless people from migrating to jurisdictions where restrictive legislation is enforced." Although the Supreme Court has not ruled on the constitutionality of panhandling, the 9th circuit appellate court ruled that panhandling is protected by national law. California is located in the ninth district whereas Atlanta is located in the eleventh. *HomeBase* also states that "the U.S. Supreme Court has held that any statute that criminalizes one's status or condition violates the cruel and unusual punishment clause of the Eighth Amendment."

Furthermore, ensuring American equality and diversity has always been a challenge in American practice. It took a Federal Act (VRA '65) despite the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments, to theoretically incorporate African Americans into American political culture and to ensure African Americans the right to vote. The 19th Amendment was needed to incorporate women into the American fabric. Additionally, "not until 1965 was discrimination against the Chinese and other Asian people effectively eliminated from

---

7Ibid., I-17.

8Ibid., I-23.

9Ibid., I-27.
U.S. immigration laws." But in reference to the American poor, ensuring equality, diversity and liberty is even more of a challenge.

Kenneth L. Karst argues that:

Among a people of plenty, the poor are apt to be seen as deviant, as outsiders. Our acculturation to the norms of individualism uses poverty as a negative identity: don’t be a loser; work hard so you won’t be poor. Believing in America as a land of opportunity, we are ready to view the poor as people who deserve their poverty because they have chosen not to try. The availability of work for every able-bodied person who really wants a job is one of the enduring myths of American history. For one who is able-bodied, pauperism—the failure to be self-sustaining—is seen as a moral failing. The long association of social welfare programs with the control of deviance, and the visible departure by many poor people from middle-class norms of dress, speech, and day-to-day behavior, reinforce the characterization of the nonworking poor as the Other. 

Patterson also acknowledges that the cons of American ideals are not only mythic but “are symbolic positions taken by a people to justify and give meaning to their way of life." Interestingly, of the ten Atlanta city council members supporting quality of life ordinances in Atlanta, all ten believe that the primary cause of homelessness stems from alcoholism and drug addiction. Mayor Willie Brown and Supervisor Amos Brown were no different in their analysis of the causes of homelessness in San Francisco. Among those opposing quality of life ordinances, the causes of homelessness are structural.

---


In conclusion, the street homeless should be treated humanely. Current practices of Atlanta and San Francisco governments are infringing upon the liberties of the street homeless. If current practices against the street homeless in Atlanta and San Francisco continue, they should openly rebel via protest against these practices on City Hall on a daily, monthly, and yearly basis. That is, they should sleep, eat, rest, beg, etc. in the doorways of City Hall in Atlanta and San Francisco. Such behavior and tactics fall within not only the meaning of the Declaration of Independence and U.S. Constitution but also within the ramifications of pluralism. It is the end result of pluralism in both cities that is giving way to the existence of quality of life ordinances.
APPENDIX 1

QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED
1998 Survey Investigating The Attitudes of Local Elected Officials Regarding Quality of Life Ordinances That Impact The Street Homeless in Atlanta, Georgia and San Francisco, California

Administered By:
Robert Wilkes, Jr.
Doctoral Candidate
Political Science Department
Clark Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

October 1998
Clark Atlanta University

Investigator: Robert Wilkes, Jr., Doctoral Candidate
Political Science Department
Ph#404.880.8718 Email: RWILKES400@AOL.COM

Purpose of Survey

I am Robert Wilkes, Jr., doctoral candidate, from Clark Atlanta University Department of Political Science. As a partial requirement for a Ph.D. in Political Science, I am investigating the attitudes of elected officials regarding ordinances (quality of life) that impact the street homeless in Atlanta, Georgia and San Francisco, California. According to the literature, quality of life ordinances were major campaign issues during the 1997 Atlanta’s mayoral and city council elections as well as the past three local elections in San Francisco. Consequently, I am attempting to determine if and why there is or is not a need for quality of life ordinances in your city.

My dissertation prospectus is entitled “An Analysis of Local Elected Political Leadership and City Ordinances in Regard to “Street Homelessness” in the Cities of Atlanta and San Francisco.”

To obtain the information that I am looking for in regard to the quality of life ordinances in your city, I will be asking you some questions. You should be able to complete this questionnaire within 20 minutes.

The results of this research will be placed in the dissertation section of the Robert W. Woodruff Library, Atlanta University Center, Atlanta, Georgia.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION
Interview Form For
Mayors\City Council Members\Board of Supervisors

1. I am elected
   (Circle only one answer)
   1. By district, if so indicate district number
   2. At-large

2. I am
   (Circle only one answer)
   1. Mayor
   2. City council member
   3. Board of Supervisor member

3. Rank the most important problems confronting your city that you must address as an elected official?

   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________

4. When you make decisions on issues relative to the homeless, do you
   (Circle only one answer)
   1. Use own best judgment
   2. Do what majority wants
   3. Merger of 1 and 2

5. Do you consult with other organizations or persons when deciding on policies that impact homelessness in your city?
   (Circle only one answer)
   1. Yes
   2. No
6. Do you consult with other organizations or persons when deciding on quality of life ordinances?  
(Circle only one answer)  
1. Yes  
2. No  

7. What groups and individuals do you feel it is necessary to consult when resolving street homeless issues in your city? (Only Atlanta elected officials should answer question #7)  
1. Atlanta Metro Task Force for the Homeless  
2. Georgia Coalition to End Homelessness  
3. The Southern Regional Coalition  
4. The National Coalition for the Homeless  
5. Homeless persons  
6. Homeless shelter directors  
7. Local business community  
8. If other, who?  

8. What groups and individuals do you feel it is necessary to consult when resolving street homeless issues in your city? (Only San Francisco elected officials should answer question #8)  
1. San Francisco Coalition on Homelessness  
2. California Homeless and Housing Coalition  
3. The National Coalition for the Homeless  
4. Homeless persons  
5. Homeless shelter directors  
6. Local business community  
7. If other, who?  

9. Is there a homeless problem in your City?
(Circle only one answer)
1. Yes
2. No
If so, what is it?


10. Do you support quality of life ordinances in your city?
(Circle only one answer)
1. Yes
2. No
IF YOU ANSWERED YES, GOTO QUESTION 12

11. Do you oppose quality of life ordinances in your city?
(Circle only one answer)
1. Yes
2. No
IF YOU ANSWERED YES, GOTO QUESTION 13

12. Rank the reasons why you support quality of life ordinances in your city
(From 1-7 rank in order of importance with 1 very important and 7 least important)
   ___ To promote economic development
   ___ The street homeless are a public safety threat
   ___ To attract tourism
   ___ The street homeless lack of motivation to work
   ___ The business community indicates its desire to prevent the homeless from congregating around their businesses.
   ___ The residential community indicates its desire to prevent the homeless from congregating around their community.
   ___ Other, list and rank ____________________________

13. Rank the reasons why you oppose quality of life ordinances in your city
(From 1-7 rank in order of importance with 1 very important and 7 least important)
   ___ Enforcement is too costly, fiscally inefficient, and a waste of scare resources
   ___ They do not address the root causes of homelessness
   ___ They violate civil rights and liberties provided in the Constitution
   ___ They are subject to legal challenge
14. Do you believe that the street homeless are represented substantively in policies in your city? (Circle only one answer)
   1. Yes
   2. No

15. Do you support the repealing of quality of life ordinances in the city where you serve as an elected official? (Circle only one answer)
   1. Yes
   2. No
   IF YES, WHY __________________________
      __________________________
      __________________________
   IF NO, WHY __________________________
      __________________________
      __________________________

16. Rate in order of importance from 1 to 8 (1 very important and 8 least important) the primary causes of homelessness nationally.
   ___ Alcoholism and drug addiction
   ___ Lack of affording housing
   ___ Possible effects of the Personal Responsibility Act
   ___ Lack of motivation to work
   ___ Downsizing among major corporations
   ___ Other, list and rate
17. Rate in order of importance from 1 to 8 (1 very important and 8 least important) the primary causes of homelessness in your city.
   ___ Alcoholism and drug addiction
   ___ Lack of affording housing
   ___ Possible effects of the Personal Responsibility Act
   ___ Lack of motivation to work
   ___ Downsizing among major corporations
   ___ Other, list and rate

__________________________

__________________________

18. When voting on homeless issues, rate in order of importance from 1 to 8 (1 very important and 8 least important), the influences of the following groups of people before voting on a particular piece of legislation.
   ___ Business community
   ___ General community
   ___ Advocates of social organizations
   ___ Civil rights organizations
   ___ Your own opinion
   ___ Street homeless
   ___ Homeless persons
   ___ Other, list and rank ____________________________

19. What type of local policies do you think would help alleviate the conditions of homelessness in your city? (Rank in order of importance with 1 meaning most important)

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

20. What type of local policies have you advanced that you think would help alleviate the conditions of homelessness in your city?

__________________________
21. Which comes closest to your view about the way that the government should provide assistance to the poor?
(Circle only one answer)
1. It is best to have a national program that guarantees poor children in all states a minimum standard of living.
2. It is best to allow each state and city to develop its own program to care for the poor

22. Is it important that all citizens be allowed to express their political opinions, no matter how unpopular the opinions are to most Americans?
(Circle only one answer)
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Strongly disagree

23. How much do you feel that having elections makes the government attentive to what people think?
(Circle only one answer)
1. A good deal
2. Some
3. Not much

24. What is your sex?
1. Male
2. Female

25. What is your race?
1. Black
2. White
3. Hispanic
4. Asian
5. Other, please list ___________________
26. What is your highest level of education?  
(Circle only one answer)  
1. High school diploma 
2. Two-year college degree 
3. Some two-year college 
4. Four-year college degree 
5. Some four-year college 
6. Post college degree 
7. Other, please list ____________________

27. How long have you been an elected official in your city in your current position?_________ If you have served in another elected position in your city government or any other government, please discuss below.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Please check if you would like a copy of the survey results O

If you have additional comments in regard to the questions asked, feel free to use the space below.

Please return the completed survey form to:
Robert Wilkes, Jr.
Department of Political Science
Clark Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION
APPENDIX 2

MAYOR BILL CAMPBELL’S LETTER
February 5, 1999

Mr. Robert Wilkes, Jr.
Department of Political Science
Clark Atlanta University
Atlanta, Ga. 30314

Dear Mr. Wilkes:

Mayor Campbell has referred your letter and survey form to me for response. The Mayor literally received hundreds of requests for appearances, interviews, and letters requesting some kind of support or action every day. He, therefore, is not able to fill out your rather extensive survey.

I would, however, like to clarify some issues that you may not be aware of given the phrasing of your questions. First, the Mayor does not vote on any policy issues in the City of Atlanta. The City Council does. Second, the Mayor chose not to sign the so called “quality of life” ordinances passed by the City Council. They became law without his signature.

I hope you find this information useful.

Sincerely,

Sue Ellen CrossLea

SEC:ar
APPENDIX 3

SAN FRANCISCO MAYOR, WILLIE L. BROWN, COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE
FEBRUARY 1999

(ANSWERS IN BOLDFACE)
1998 Survey Investigating The Attitudes of Local Elected Officials Regarding Quality of Life Ordinances That Impact The Street Homeless in Atlanta, Georgia and San Francisco, California

Administered By:
Robert Wilkes, Jr.
Doctoral Candidate
Political Science Department
Clark Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

October 1998
Purpose of Survey

I am Robert Wilkes, Jr., doctoral candidate, from Clark Atlanta University Department of Political Science. As a partial requirement for a Ph.D. in Political Science, I am investigating the attitudes of elected officials regarding ordinances (quality of life) that impact the street homeless in Atlanta, Georgia and San Francisco, California. According to the literature, quality of life ordinances were major campaign issues during the 1997 Atlanta's mayoral and city council elections as well as the past three local elections in San Francisco. Consequently, I am attempting to determine if and why there is or is not a need for quality of life ordinances in your city.

My dissertation prospectus is entitled “An Analysis of Local Elected Political Leadership and City Ordinances in Regard to “Street Homelessness” in the Cities of Atlanta and San Francisco.”

To obtain the information that I am looking for in regard to the quality of life ordinances in your city, I will be asking you some questions. You should be able to complete this questionnaire within 20 minutes.

The results of this research will be placed in the dissertation section of the Robert W. Woodruff Library, Atlanta University Center, Atlanta, Georgia.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION
Interview Form For
Mayors\City Council Members\Board of Supervisors

1. I am elected
(Circle only one answer)
   1. By district, if so indicate district number __________
   2. At-large

2. I am
(Circle only one answer)
   1. Mayor
   2. City council member
   3. Board of Supervisor member

3. Rank the most important problems confronting your city that you must address as an elected official?

   Affordable housing

   Public Transportation

   Homeless services

4. When you make decisions on issues relative to the homeless, do you
(Circle only one answer)
   1. Use own best judgment
   2. Do what majority wants
   3. Merger of 1 and 2

5. Do you consult with other organizations or persons when deciding on policies that impact homelessness in your city?
(Circle only one answer)
   1. Yes
   2. No

6. Do you consult with other organizations or persons when deciding on quality of life ordinances?
(Circle only one answer)
   1. Yes
   2. No
8. What groups and individuals do you feel it is necessary to consult when resolving street homeless issues in your city? (Only Atlanta elected officials should answer question #7)
   1. Atlanta Metro Task Force for the Homeless
   2. Georgia Coalition to End Homelessness
   3. The Southern Regional Coalition
   4. The National Coalition for the Homeless
   5. Homeless persons
   6. Homeless shelter directors
   7. Local business community
   8. If other, who?

8. What groups and individuals do you feel it is necessary to consult when resolving street homeless issues in your city? (Only San Francisco elected officials should answer question #8)
   1. San Francisco Coalition on Homelessness
   2. California Homeless and Housing Coalition
   3. The National Coalition for the Homeless
   4. Homeless persons
   5. Homeless shelter directors
   6. Local business community
   7. If other, who?

9. Is there a homeless problem in your City?
   (Circle only one answer)
   1. Yes
   2. No
   If so, what is it?
   Did not provide a response

10. Do you support quality of life ordinances in your city?
    (Circle only one answer)
    1. Yes
    2. No
IF YOU ANSWERED YES, GOTO QUESTION 12

11. Do you oppose quality of life ordinances in your city?
(Circle only one answer)
1. Yes
2. No

IF YOU ANSWERED YES, GOTO QUESTION 13

12. Rank the reasons why you support quality of life ordinances in your city
(From 1-7 rank in order of importance with 1 very important and 7 least important)
4 To promote economic development
3 The street homeless are a public safety threat
5 To attract tourism
6 The street homeless lack of motivation to work
1 The business community indicates its desire to prevent the homeless from congregating around their businesses.
2 The residential community indicates its desire to prevent the homeless from congregating around their community.

Other, list and rank

13. Rank the reasons why you oppose quality of life ordinances in your city
(From 1-7 rank in order of importance with 1 very important and 7 least important)
____ Enforcement is too costly, fiscally inefficient, and a waste of scarce resources
____ They do not address the root causes of homelessness
____ They violate civil rights and liberties provided in the Constitution
____ They are subject to legal challenge
____ They unfairly target the homeless
____ They place unnecessary burdens on the police staff
____ Other, list and rank

14. Do you believe that the street homeless are represented substantively in policies in your city?
(Circle only one answer)
1. Yes
2. No

15. Do you support the repealing of quality of life ordinances in the city where you serve as an elected official?
1. Yes
2. No
(Circle only one answer)
IF YES, WHY


IF NO, WHY Public spaces should be inviting and usable by all members of the public

16. Rate in order of importance from 1 to 8 (1 very important and 8 least important) the primary causes of homelessness nationally.
   2 Alcoholism and drug addiction
   3 Lack of affording housing
   1 Possible effects of the Personal Responsibility Act
      _____ Lack of motivation to work
      _____ Downsizing among major corporations
      _____ Other, list and rate

17. Rate in order of importance from 1 to 8 (1 very important and 8 least important) the primary causes of homelessness in your city.
   1 Alcoholism and drug addiction
   3 Lack of affording housing
   2 Possible effects of the Personal Responsibility Act
      _____ Lack of motivation to work
      _____ Downsizing among major corporations
      _____ Other, list and rate

18. When voting on homeless issues, rate in order of importance from 1 to 8 (1 very important and 8 least important), the influences of the following groups of people before voting on a particular piece of legislation.
   2 Business community
   1 General community
3 Advocates of social organizations
4 Civil rights organizations
5 Your own opinion
   ____ Street homeless
   ____ Homeless persons
   ____ Other, list and rank ________________________________

19. What type of local policies do you think would help alleviate the conditions of homelessness in your city? (Rank in order of importance with 1 meaning most important)

   Affordable housing

   Substance abuse treatment on demand

   Mental health services

   Job training

20. What type of local policies have you advanced that you think would help alleviate the conditions of homelessness in your city?

   All of the above

21. Which comes closest to your view about the way that the government should provide assistance to the poor?
   (Circle only one answer)

   1. It is best to have a national program that guarantees poor children in all states a minimum standard of living.
   2. It is best to allow each state and city to develop its own program to care for the poor

22. Is it important that all citizens be allowed to express their political opinions, no matter how unpopular the opinions are to most Americans?
   (Circle only one answer)

   1. Strongly agree
   2. Agree somewhat
   3. Neither agree nor disagree
   4. Disagree somewhat
   5. Strongly disagree
23. How much do you feel that having elections makes the government attentive to what people think?  
(Circle only one answer)  
1. A good deal  
2. Some  
3. Not much

24. What is your sex?  
1. Male  
2. Female

25. What is your race?  
1. Black  
2. White  
3. Hispanic  
4. Asian  
5. Other, please list ____________________

26. What is your highest level of education?  
(Circle only one answer)  
1. High school diploma  
2. Two-year college degree  
3. Some two-year college  
4. Four-year college degree  
5. Some four-year college  
6. Post college degree  
7. Other, please list ____________________

27. How long have you been an elected official in your city in your current position? 3 yrs  
If you have served in another elected position in your city government or any other government, please discuss below.  

**31 years in California State Assembly**  
**15 years as Speaker of the Assembly**  

Please check if you would like a copy of the survey results ☐  

If you have additional comments in regard to the questions asked, feel free to use the space below.
Please return the completed survey form to:

Robert Wilkes, Jr.
Department of Political Science
Clark Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION
APPENDIX 4

SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISOR, AMOS BROWN, COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE

(ANSWERS IN BOLDFACE)
1998 Survey Investigating The Attitudes of Local Elected Officials Regarding Quality of Life Ordinances That Impact The Street Homeless in Atlanta, Georgia and San Francisco, California

Administered By:
Robert Wilkes, Jr.
Doctoral Candidate
Political Science Department
Clark Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

October 1998
Clark Atlanta University

Investigator: Robert Wilkes, Jr., Doctoral Candidate
Political Science Department
Ph#404.880.8718 Email: RWILKES400@AOL.COM

Purpose of Survey

I am Robert Wilkes, Jr., doctoral candidate, from Clark Atlanta University Department of Political Science. As a partial requirement for a Ph.D. in Political Science, I am investigating the attitudes of elected officials regarding ordinances (quality of life) that impact the street homeless in Atlanta, Georgia and San Francisco, California. According to the literature, quality of life ordinances were major campaign issues during the 1997 Atlanta’s mayoral and city council elections as well as the past three local elections in San Francisco. Consequently, I am attempting to determine if and why there is or is not a need for quality of life ordinances in your city.

My dissertation prospectus is entitled “An Analysis of Local Elected Political Leadership and City Ordinances in Regard to “Street Homelessness” in the Cities of Atlanta and San Francisco.”

To obtain the information that I am looking for in regard to the quality of life ordinances in your city, I will be asking you some questions. You should be able to complete this questionnaire within 20 minutes.

The results of this research will be placed in the dissertation section of the Robert W. Woodruff Library, Atlanta University Center, Atlanta, Georgia.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION
Interview Form For
Mayors\City Council Members\Board of Supervisors

1. I am elected
(Circle only one answer)
   1. By district, if so indicate district number
   2. At-large

2. I am
(Circle only one answer)
   1. Mayor
   2. City council member
   3. Board of Supervisor member

3. Rank the most important problems confronting your city that you must address as an elected official?

   Affordable housing

   Homelessness

   Public Safety

   Jobs

   Parks, dog, woman and children activities

4. When you make decisions on issues relative to the homeless, do you
   (Circle only one answer)
   1. Use own best judgment
   2. Do what majority wants
   3. Merger of 1 and 2

5. Do you consult with other organizations or persons when deciding on policies that impact homelessness in your city?
   (Circle only one answer)
   1. Yes
   2. No
6. Do you consult with other organizations or persons when deciding on quality of life ordinances? (Circle only one answer)
   1. Yes
   2. No

7. What groups and individuals do you feel it is necessary to consult when resolving street homeless issues in your city? (Only Atlanta elected officials should answer question #7)
   1. Atlanta Metro Task Force for the Homeless
   2. Georgia Coalition to End Homelessness
   3. The Southern Regional Coalition
   4. The National Coalition for the Homeless
   5. Homeless persons
   6. Homeless shelter directors
   7. Local business community
   8. If other, who?

8. What groups and individuals do you feel it is necessary to consult when resolving street homeless issues in your city? (Only San Francisco elected officials should answer question #8)
   1. San Francisco Coalition on Homelessness
   2. California Homeless and Housing Coalition
   3. The National Coalition for the Homeless
   4. Homeless persons
   5. Homeless shelter directors
   6. Local business community
   7. If other, who?

9. Is there a homeless problem in your City?
(Circle only one answer)
1. Yes
2. No
If so, what is it?

Did not provide a response

10. Do you support quality of life ordinances in your city?
(Circle only one answer)
1. Yes
2. No
IF YOU ANSWERED YES, GOTO QUESTION 12

11. Do you oppose quality of life ordinances in your city?
(Circle only one answer)
1. Yes
2. No
IF YOU ANSWERED YES, GOTO QUESTION 13

12. Rank the reasons why you support quality of life ordinances in your city
   (From 1-7 rank in order of importance with 1 very important and 7 least important)
   2 To promote economic development
   1 The street homeless are a public safety threat
   3 To attract tourism
   6 The street homeless lack of motivation to work
   4 The business community indicates its desire to prevent the homeless from
      congregating around their businesses.
   5 The residential community indicates its desire to prevent the homeless from
      congregating around their community.
   ____ Other, list and rank ________________________________

13. Rank the reasons why you oppose quality of life ordinances in your city
   (From 1-7 rank in order of importance with 1 very important and 7 least important)
   ____ Enforcement is too costly, fiscally inefficient, and a waste of scare resources
   ____ They do not address the root causes of homelessness
   ____ They violate civil rights and liberties provided in the Constitution
   ____ They are subject to legal challenge
   ____ They unfairly target the homeless
   ____ They place unnecessary burdens on the police staff
   ____ Other, list and rank ________________________________
14. Do you believe that the street homeless are represented substantively in policies in your city? (Circle only one answer)
   1. Yes
   2. No

15. Do you support the repealing of quality of life ordinances in the city where you serve as an elected official? (Circle only one answer)
   1. Yes
   2. No

   IF YES, WHY __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

   IF NO, WHY Did not provide a response

16. Rate in order of importance from 1 to 8 (1 very important and 8 least important) the primary causes of homelessness nationally.
   1. Alcoholism and drug addiction
   2. Lack of affording housing
   4. Possible effects of the Personal Responsibility Act
   3. Lack of motivation to work
   5. Downsizing among major corporations
   ____ Other, list and rate

   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

17. Rate in order of importance from 1 to 8 (1 very important and 8 least important) the primary causes of homelessness in your city.
   1. Alcoholism and drug addiction
   2. Lack of affording housing
   4. Possible effects of the Personal Responsibility Act
   3. Lack of motivation to work
   5. Downsizing among major corporations
   ____ Other, list and rate
18. When voting on homeless issues, rate in order of importance from 1 to 8 (1 very important and 8 least important), the influences of the following groups of people before voting on a particular piece of legislation.

1. Business community
2. General community
3. Advocates of social organizations
4. Civil rights organizations
5. Your own opinion
6. Street homeless
7. Homeless persons
8. Other, list and rank ______________________________

19. What type of local policies do you think would help alleviate the conditions of homelessness in your city? (Rank in order of importance with 1 meaning most important)

   Drug treatment
   Mental illness institutions
   Affordable housing
   Jobs

20. What type of local policies have you advanced that you think would help alleviate the conditions of homelessness in your city?

   Rec Center for homeless
   Treatment programs, drugs, and for mental illness
   Affordable housing
   Jobs

21. Which comes closest to your view about the way that the government should provide assistance to the poor?
(Circle only one answer)

1. It is best to have a national program that guarantees poor children in all states a **minimum standard of living**.

2. It is best to allow each state and city to develop its own program to care for the poor

22. Is it important that all citizens be allowed to express their political opinions, no matter how unpopular the opinions are to most Americans?

(Circle only one answer)

1. **Strongly agree**
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Strongly disagree

23. How much do you feel that having elections makes the government attentive to what people think?

(Circle only one answer)

1. **A good deal**
2. **Some**
3. Not much

24. What is your sex?

1. **Male**
2. Female

25. What is your race?

1. **Black**
2. White
3. Hispanic
4. Asian
5. Other, please list ____________________

26. What is your highest level of education?

(Circle only one answer)

1. High school diploma
2. Two-year college degree
3. Some two-year college
4. Four year-college degree
5. Some four-year college
6. **Post college degree**
7. Other, please list ____________________________

27. How long have you been an elected official in your city in your current position? 2 years If you have served in another elected position in your city government or any other government, please discuss below.

**Member of Board of education and community college honary board**

Please check if you would like a copy of the survey results O

If you have additional comments in regard to the questions asked, feel free to use the space below.

Please return the completed survey form to:

Robert Wilkes, Jr.
Department of Political Science
Clark Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION
APPENDIX 5

SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISOR, SUE BIERMAN, COMPLETED QUESTIONNARIRE

ANSWERS IN BOLDFACE
1998 Survey Investigating The Attitudes of Local Elected Officials Regarding Quality of Life Ordinances That Impact The Street Homeless in Atlanta, Georgia and San Francisco, California

Administered By:
Robert Wilkes, Jr.
Doctoral Candidate
Political Science Department
Clark Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

October 1998
Clark Atlanta University

Investigator: Robert Wilkes, Jr., Doctoral Candidate
Political Science Department
Ph#404.880.8718 Email: RWILKES400@AOL.COM

Purpose of Survey

I am Robert Wilkes, Jr., doctoral candidate, from Clark Atlanta University Department of Political Science. As a partial requirement for a Ph.D. in Political Science, I am investigating the attitudes of elected officials regarding ordinances (quality of life) that impact the street homeless in Atlanta, Georgia and San Francisco, California. According to the literature, quality of life ordinances were major campaign issues during the 1997 Atlanta’s mayoral and city council elections as well as the past three local elections in San Francisco. Consequently, I am attempting to determine if and why there is or is not a need for quality of life ordinances in your city.

My dissertation prospectus is entitled “An Analysis of Local Elected Political Leadership and City Ordinances in Regard to “Street Homelessness” in the Cities of Atlanta and San Francisco.”

To obtain the information that I am looking for in regard to the quality of life ordinances in your city, I will be asking you some questions. You should be able to complete this questionnaire within 20 minutes.

The results of this research will be placed in the dissertation section of the Robert W. Woodruff Library, Atlanta University Center, Atlanta, Georgia.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION
Interview Form For
Mayors\City Council Members\Board of Supervisors

1. I am elected
   (Circle only one answer)
   1. By district, if so indicate district number _________
   2. At-large

2. I am
   (Circle only one answer)
   1. Mayor
   2. City council member
   3. Board of Supervisor member

3. Rank the most important problems confronting your city that you must address as an elected official?

   Homelessness

   Substance abuse

   Decent paying jobs

   Illness in particular areas (cancer & asthma)

   Transportation

4. When you make decisions on issues relative to the homeless, do you
   (Circle only one answer)
   1. Use own best judgment
   2. Do what majority wants
   3. Merger of 1 and 2

5. Do you consult with other organizations or persons when deciding on policies that impact homelessness in your city?
   (Circle only one answer)
   1. Yes
   2. No

6. Do you consult with other organizations or persons when deciding on quality of life ordinances?
(Circle only one answer)
1. Yes
2. No

7. What groups and individuals do you feel it is necessary to consult when resolving street homeless issues in your city? (Only Atlanta elected officials should answer question #7)
   1. Atlanta Metro Task Force for the Homeless
   2. Georgia Coalition to End Homelessness
   3. The Southern Regional Coalition
   4. The National Coalition for the Homeless
   5. Homeless persons
   6. Homeless shelter directors
   7. Local business community
   8. If other, who?

8. What groups and individuals do you feel it is necessary to consult when resolving street homeless issues in your city? (Only San Francisco elected officials should answer question #8)
   1. San Francisco Coalition on Homelessness
   2. California Homeless and Housing Coalition
   3. The National Coalition for the Homeless
   4. Homeless persons
   5. Homeless shelter directors
   6. Local business community
   7. If other, who?

**Housing advocates, those who build housing**

9. Is there a homeless problem in your City?
(Circle only one answer)
   1. Yes
   2. No
If so, what is it?

**Rising costs for rental units, folks who are mentally, substance abusers, lack low and no income housing**
10. Do you support quality of life ordinances in your city?
(Circle only one answer)
1. Yes
2. No
IF YOU ANSWERED YES, GOTO QUESTION 12

11. Do you oppose quality of life ordinances in your city?
(Circle only one answer)
1. Yes
2. No
IF YOU ANSWERED YES, GOTO QUESTION 13

12. Rank the reasons why you support quality of life ordinances in your city
(From 1-7 rank in order of importance with 1 very important and 7 least important)
   _____ To promote economic development
   _____ The street homeless are a public safety threat
   _____ To attract tourism
   _____ The street homeless lack of motivation to work
   _____ The business community indicates its desire to prevent the homeless from
     congregating around their businesses.
   _____ The residential community indicates its desire to prevent the homeless from
     congregating around their community.
   _____ Other, list and rank ________________________________

13. Rank the reasons why you oppose quality of life ordinances in your city
(From 1-7 rank in order of importance with 1 very important and 7 least important)
   1. Enforcement is too costly, fiscally inefficient, and a waste of scare resources
   2. They do not address the root causes of homelessness
   3. They violate civil rights and liberties provided in the Constitution
   4. They are subject to legal challenge
   5. They unfairly target the homeless
   3. They place unnecessary burdens on the police staff
   6. Other, list and rank ________________________________

14. Do you believe that the street homeless are represented substantively in policies in your city?
(Circle only one answer)
1. Yes
2. No

15. Do you support the repealing of quality of life ordinances in the city where you serve as an elected official?
(Circle only one answer)

1. Yes
2. No

IF YES, WHY *They violate the rights of less fortunate people.* See # 13 for reasons

IF NO, WHY ____________________________________________

__________________________________________

16. Rate in order of importance from 1 to 8 (1 very important and 8 least important) the primary causes of homelessness nationally.

4 Alcoholism and drug addiction
1 Lack of affording housing
7 Possible effects of the Personal Responsibility Act
6 Lack of motivation to work
7 Downsizing among major corporations
___ Other, list and rate

______ Other, list and rate

17. Rate in order of importance from 1 to 8 (1 very important and 8 least important) the primary causes of homelessness in your city.

3 Alcoholism and drug addiction
1 Lack of affording housing
4 Possible effects of the Personal Responsibility Act
8 Lack of motivation to work
5 Downsizing among major corporations
___ Other, list and rate

______ Other, list and rate

18. When voting on homeless issues, rate in order of importance from 1 to 8 (1 very important and 8 least important), the influences of the following groups of people before voting on a particular piece of legislation.

2 Business community
2. General community
1. Advocates of social organizations
1. Civil rights organizations
2. Your own opinion
2. Street homeless
2. Homeless persons
___ Other, list and rank ________________________________

19. What type of local policies do you think would help alleviate the conditions of homelessness in your city? (Rank in order of importance with 1 meaning most important)

- More outreach to homeless or near homeless people, with services
- Encouraging new housing development

20. What type of local policies have you advanced that you think would help alleviate the conditions of homelessness in your city?

- Advocating for larger budget for health department for substance abuse treatment.
- Control of rental evictions
- City support for shelters
- Support for low income developments (housing)

21. Which comes closest to your view about the way that the government should provide assistance to the poor?
(Circle only one answer)
1. It is best to have a national program that guarantees poor children in all states a minimum standard of living.
2. It is best to allow each state and city to develop its own program to care for the poor

22. Is it important that all citizens be allowed to express their political opinions, no matter how unpopular the opinions are to most Americans?
(Circle only one answer)
1. Strongly agree
2. Agree somewhat
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree somewhat
5. Strongly disagree

23. How much do you feel that having elections makes the government attentive to what people think?  
     (Circle only one answer)  
     1. A good deal  
     2. Some  
     3. Not much  

24. What is your sex?  
     1. Male  
     2. Female  

25. What is your race?  
     1. Black  
     2. White  
     3. Hispanic  
     4. Asian  
     5. Other, please list ________________________

26. What is your highest level of education?  
     (Circle only one answer)  
     1. High school diploma  
     2. Two-year college degree  
     3. Some two-year college  
     4. Four-year college degree  
     5. Some four-year college  
     6. Post college degree  
     7. Other, please list ________________________

27. How long have you been an elected official in your city in your current position? 6 yrs  
If you have served in another elected position in your city government or any other government, please discuss below.

Elected member, San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee

Appointed member for 16 years on San Francisco City Planning Commission

Please check if you would like a copy of the survey results 0

If you have additional comments in regard to the questions asked, feel free to use the space below.
Please return the completed survey form to:

Robert Wilkes, Jr.
Department of Political Science
Clark Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION
APPENDIX 6

CODE BOOK
FOR 1998 SURVEY INVESTIGATING THE ATTITUDES OF ELECTED OFFICIALS REGARDING QUALITY OF LIFE ORDINANCES THAT IMPACT THE STREET HOMELESS IN ATLANTA, GEORGIA
List of variables on the working file

Name

ELECTED  how council person elected
Print Format: A8
Write Format: A8

Value  Label
1  district
2  at-large

POSITION  elected position
Print Format: A8
Write Format: A8

Value  Label
1  mayor
2  Atlanta City Council member
3  Board of Supervisor

PROBLEMS  most important problem confronting city
Print Format: A8
Write Format: A8

Value  Label
1  traffic/transportation
2  waste and fraud in government
3  general fund budget
4  housing development
5  provide adequate services without raising taxes
6  economic development
SECONDPRO second most important problem confronting city

Value | Label
1 | traffic/transportation
2 | environment
3 | city administration
4 | protection of forested single family neighborhoods
5 | infrastructure
6 | crime and perception of crime
7 | make city inviting to people and business

THIRDPRO third most important problem confronting city

Value | Label
1 | traffic/transportation
2 | environment
3 | city administration
4 | infrastructure
5 | water/sewer rates

DECISION how officials make homeless policy decisions

Value | Label
1 | use own best judgment
2 | do what the majority wants
3 | merger of 1 and 2

CONSULTH consult organizations or persons relative to homeless policy

Value | Label
1    yes
2    no

CONSULTQ  consult organizations or persons relative to QOL issues
        Print Format: A8
        Write Format: A8
        Value Label

1    yes
2    no

HPROBLEM  homeless problem in the city
        Print Format: A8
        Write Format: A8
        Value Label

1    yes
2    no

SUPPORTQ  support or oppose QOL ordinances
        Print Format: A8
        Write Format: A8
        Value Label

1    support
2    oppose

WHYSUPP  most important reason for support of QOL ordinances
        Print Format: A8
        Write Format: A8
        Value Label

1    economic development
2    homeless public safety threat
3    attract tourism
4    homeless lack of motivation to work
5    business community influence
6    residential community influence
7    oppose QOL ordinances
allow rank and file to use streets

WHYSUPA second most important reason for support of QOL ordinances
Print Format: A8
Write Format: A8

Value   Label
1    economic development
2    homeless public safety threat
3    attract tourism
4    homeless lack of motivation to work
5    business community influence
6    residential community influence
7    oppose QOL ordinances
8    city belongs to everyone

WHYSUPB third most important reason for support of QOL ordinances
Print Format: A8
Write Format: A8

Value   Label
1    economic development
2    homeless public safety threat
3    attract tourism
4    homeless lack of motivation to work
5    business community influence
6    residential community influence
7    oppose QOL ordinances
8    city belongs to everyone

WHYSUPC fourth most important reason for support of QOL ordinances
Print Format: A8
Write Format: A8
Missing Values: '9'

Value   Label
1    economic development
2    homeless public safety threat
3  attract tourism 
4  homeless lack of motivation to work 
5  business community influence 
6  residential community influence 
7  oppose QOL ordinances 
8  city belongs to everyone 
9  no answer 

**WHYOPPOS** most important reason for opposing QOL ordinances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>fiscally inefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>don't address root causes of homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>violate civil rights &amp; liberties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>subject to legal challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>unfairly target homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>burden to police staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>support QOL ordinances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHYOPPA** second most important reason for opposing QOL ordinances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>fiscally inefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>don't address root causes of homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>violate civil rights and liberties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>subject to legal challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>unfairly target homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>burden to police staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>support QOL ordinances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHYOPPB** third most important reason for opposing QOL ordinances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>fiscally inefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>don't address root causes of homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>violate civil rights and liberties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>subject to legal challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>unfairly target homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>burden to police staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>support QOL ordinances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. fiscally inefficient
2. don't address root causes of homelessness
3. violate civil rights & liberties
4. subject to legal challenge
5. unfairly target homeless
6. burden to police staff
7. support QOL ordinances

WHYOPPC  fourth most important reason for opposing QOL ordinances
Print Format: A8
Write Format: A8

Value  Label
1  fiscally inefficient
2  don't address root causes of homelessness
3  violate civil rights & liberties
4  subject to legal challenge
5  unfairly target homeless
6  burden to police staff
7  support QOL ordinances

SUBSTANT  street homeless substantively represented
Print Format: A8
Write Format: A8
Missing Values: '9'

Value  Label
1  yes
2  no
9  no answer

REPEAL  support or oppose repealing of QOL ordinances
Print Format: A8
Write Format: A8

Value  Label
1  support
2  oppose

PRICAUSN  most important cause of homelessness nationally
alcoholism and drug addiction
lack of affordable housing
effects of PRA
lack of motivation to work
downsizing
closing of mental health institutions

PRICANA  second most important cause of homelessness nationally

alcoholism and drug addiction
lack of affordable housing
effects of PRA
lack of motivation to work
downsizing

domestic violence
no answer

PRICANB  third most important cause of homelessness nationally

alcoholism
lack of affordable housing
effects of PRA
lack of motivation to work
downsizing
domestic violence
no answer

PRICAUNC  fourth most important cause of homelessness nationally

alcoholism
lack of affordable housing
effects of PRA
lack of motivation to work
downsizing
domestic violence
no answer
Missing Values: '9'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>alcoholism and drug addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>lack of affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>effects of PRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>lack of motivation to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>downsizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>minimum wage to low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>no answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRICAND fifth most important cause of homelessness nationally
Print Format: A8
Write Format: A8
Missing Values: '9'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>alcoholism and drug addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>lack of affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>effects of PRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>lack of motivation to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>downsizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>no answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRICAUSL most important cause of homelessness in Atlanta
Print Format: A8
Write Format: A8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>alcoholism and drug addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>lack of affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>effects of PRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>lack of motivation to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>downsizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>closing of mental institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRICAULA second most important cause of homelessness in Atlanta
Print Format: A8
Write Format: A8
PRICAULB: third most important cause of homelessness in Atlanta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>alcoholism and drug addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>lack of affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>effects of PRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>lack of motivation to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>downsizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>domestic violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>no answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRICAULC: fourth most important cause of homelessness in Atlanta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>alcoholism and drug addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>lack of affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>effects of PRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>lack of motivation to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>downsizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>domestic violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>no answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>alcoholism and drug addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>lack of affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>effects of PRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>lack of motivation to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>downsizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>minimum wage is too low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>no answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRICAULD fifth most important cause of homelessness in Atlanta
Print Format: A8
Write Format: A8
Missing Values: '9'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>alcoholism and drug addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>lack of affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>effects of PRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>lack of motivation to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>downsizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>no answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOISGROU most important group influencing homeless policy
Print Format: A8
Write Format: A8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>business community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>general community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>advocates of social organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>civil rights organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>own opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>street homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>homeless persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOISGRA second most important group influencing homeless policy
Print Format: A8
Write Format: A8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>business community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>general community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>advocates of social organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>civil rights organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>own opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>street homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>homeless persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOISGRB  third most important group influencing homeless policy
  Print Format: A8
  Write Format: A8
  Missing Values: '9'

  Value   Label
  1        business community
  2        general community
  3        advocates of social organizations
  4        civil rights organizations
  5        own opinion
  6        street homeless
  7        homeless persons
  9        no answer

FEDERALI  federalism and assistance to the poor
  Print Format: A8
  Write Format: A8
  Missing Values: '9'

  Value   Label
  1        best to have national program
  2        let each state & city develop own program
  9        no answer

CITIZENI  citizens should be able to state opinions even if unpopular
  Print Format: A8
  Write Format: A8

  Value   Label
  1        strongly agree
  2        agree somewhat
  3        neither agree nor disagree
  4        disagree somewhat
  5        strongly disagree

CAMPAIGN  impact of elections on government attentiveness to citizens
Print Format: A8
Write Format: A8

Value   Label
1       a good deal
2       some
3       not much

GENDER   official’s gender
Print Format: A8
Write Format: A8

Value   Label
1       male
2       female

RACE     official’s race
Print Format: A8
Write Format: A8

Value   Label
1       Black
2       White
3       Hispanic
4       Asian

EDUCATION officials level of education
Print Format: A8
Write Format: A8
Missing Values: '9'

Value   Label
1       high school diploma
2       two-year college degree
3       some two-year college
4       four-year college degree
5       some four-year college
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