

FINAL

ETHNOGRAPHIC EXPLORATORY RESEARCH

REPORT #6

**HYPOTHESES AND ETHNOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF
CONCEALMENT IN THE UNDERGROUND ECONOMY:
THE ECONOMIC AND IDEOLOGICAL DYNAMICS OF THE
CENSUS UNDERCOUNT**

Final Report for Joint Statistical Agreement 88-24

March 30, 1990

Submitted by:

**Philippe Bourgois
Principal Investigator**

**Research Institute for the Study of Man
New York, New York**

Sponsored by:

**Center for Survey Methods Research
Bureau of the Census
Washington, DC 20233**

Leslie A. Brownrigg, Technical Representative

This research was supported by a Joint Statistical Agreement with the Bureau of the Census. The views, opinions, and findings contained in this report are those of the author and should not be construed as an official Bureau of the Census position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	1
The Research Site.....	1
Subjects of the Study.....	3
Methodology.....	6
Summary of Ethnographic Findings.....	8
Widespread Distrust of "Big Government": The Implications for Confidentiality and the Notion of Community Benefit.....	10
ETHNOGRAPHIC PROFILES OF AT-RISK INDIVIDUALS AND HOUSEHOLDS.....	14
Wanda's Household.....	14
Maria's and Manny's Household.....	20
Mrs Rivera's Household.....	24
TESTABLE HYPOTHESES.....	27
HYPOTHESES RELATING TO THE PROTECTION OF HOUSEHOLD RESOURCES.....	27
Additional Ethnographic Comment on Hypotheses Relating to the Protection of Household Resources.....	34
The Vulnerability of Housing Authority Projects.....	41
The Vulnerability of Boarders.....	44
The Diversity of Factors Contributing to the Undercount.....	49
HYPOTHESES RELATING TO IDEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL RESISTANCE.....	51
Proxies and Indices Predicting the Census Undercount.....	64
ADDITIONAL HYPOTHESES.....	74
Trends for Further Consideration.....	78
Enumerator Ethnicity.....	80
CONCLUSION.....	81
REFERENCES.....	82

INTRODUCTION

The hypotheses and the data and conclusions presented are the result of anthropological participant-observation fieldwork undertaken in Spanish Harlem, New York. The Joint Statistical Agreement covered the period between October 1988 and January 1990. I (the principal investigator) lived full-time in the community with my family for all of 1989. In the report I have also drawn on additional fieldwork data that I have been collecting since March of 1985 when I first moved into Spanish Harlem and began fieldwork on street culture.

The Research Site

Spanish Harlem, also referred to as "El Barrio" or East Harlem is a 200 square block neighborhood on the upper East Side of Manhattan in New York City. It is bounded on the south by 96th Street, on the west by Fifth Avenue, on the east by the East River, and on the north by the Harlem River. According to the 1980 census 120,000 people lived in the neighborhood and 29 percent were at 75 percent of the poverty level. More dramatically 48 percent were at 125 percent of the poverty level.

The neighborhood is profoundly affected by urban blight. Abandoned buildings, vacant garbage-filled lots, and rubble strewn sidewalks abound. Drug trafficking also takes place openly on street corners. At the same time, in the middle of this economic and social crisis there are the beginning signs of urban gentrification, especially along the southern reaches of the community which borders on the wealthiest neighborhood in all of New York City.

The block that I live on is opposite a large public housing project with one

of the highest murder rates in Manhattan. According to 1988 statistics collected by the New York City Housing Authority the population of this housing project was 5 percent white, 35 percent black, 57 percent Puerto Rican, and 3 percent "other". Many of the stores in the surrounding streets have bilingual Spanish/English signs and some of the advertisements are exclusively in Spanish. Although there is a high proportion of African-Americans in the neighborhood, the community is identified by both residents and outsiders as specifically Puerto Rican. In fact, the Hispanic cultural hegemony is so firmly Puerto Rican that in the project's statistics, non-Puerto Rican Hispanics are lumped into the residual 3 percent "other" category along with "Asians and Pacific Islanders." Although there are many more Puerto Ricans in New York City living outside El Barrio than inside it, the neighborhood is still considered New York's quintessential Puerto Rican community.

The neighborhood is visibly poor. If one adjusts for the high cost of living in New York City, then the majority of its residents would easily fall into the ranks of the "working poor." In 1988, the average gross family income in the projects opposite my tenement was \$10,500. African-American households earned on the average \$2,000 more than Hispanics. At the same time, the population around my apartment is surprisingly stable. The average household in the projects has spent 18.5 years in public housing and there is close to an 18 year waiting list for newcomers desiring to reside in New York City Housing Authority projects. This helps cement a definite--even if embattled--sense of local level community cohesion among residents.

There is an active street scene on the block where I live. It includes several drug sales spots--including one indoor crack house, two outdoor crack

copping corners (where the drug is bought and sold at the retail level in the open air 24 hours a day) and one indoor powder cocaine sales point. There are several neighborhood grocery stores, known locally as "bodegas", where men and women congregate and where "numbers runners" take orders for illegal offtrack betting. There is one large supermarket but there are also several vacant lots and abandoned buildings on the block. In short this is a more or less typical block within East Harlem. There are many safer and less drug-ridden blocks but there are also some more dangerous, drug-infested, and overwhelmingly abandoned blocks throughout the neighborhood. The block I live on is considered neither especially "bad" nor "good" by residents in the surrounding neighborhood.

Subjects of the Study

The majority of East Harlem residents live in working class and/or working poor households. Most individuals are documented, are not involved in illegal activity or in substance abuse, and do not receive public subsidy. They are struggling to raise families at relatively low wages and they purposefully minimize their contact with individuals in the three special populations listed below. They abhor substance abuse and are honest. The vast majority of these stable, working class households will probably be reported accurately in the Census. The premise of this research is that the individuals at highest risk for the Census undercount are not in this category. That is why the emphasis in this report is on the situation of the three special populations listed below rather than on the working poor or the working class. Indeed I studied this majority sector of East Harlem's population primarily for its comparative value to shed light on the contrasts between working class household arrangements and those of the more marginal residents who are surviving in what is generally a

more precarious economic situation that is sometimes accompanied by illegal or semi-legal activity.

The special populations I focused most intensively upon can be divided into three groups who will be interacting with the Census in distinct manners. Of course many individuals pass from one category to the other depending upon changes in their life cycle or due to exogenous crises--loss of a job, apartment fire, newly found employment, et cetera. Similarly, many households are composed of several individuals from different categories--one member may work stably at a legal job, another might receive public assistance, while still a third could be selling drugs on the corner.

1) Individuals intensively involved in the underground economy;- with special emphasis on what has been the most dynamic and destructive sector of the illegal/informal economy in the neighborhood since 1985: the retail crack/cocaine trade. I have, however, also collected extensive material on "legal" aspects of the underground economy i.e., individuals who work "off the books", or who have established unofficial businesses that are not taxed, who work as street corner car mechanics, handymen and similar occupations.

2) Families dependent on public subsidy for their economic survival. This includes residents in New York City Housing Authority projects, recipients of food stamps, recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), recipients of Social Security Insurance (SSI) et cetera.

3) Undocumented new immigrants, primarily from Senegal (West Africa), Mexico, and to a lesser extent from Ecuador and the Dominican Republic.

Household and gender relations as well as income networks have been central foci of the study. I have also systematically collected data on the relationships that participants in "street culture" have with mainstream institutions. According to the terms of my JSA I was instructed to "generate and test hypotheses concerning how habitual concealment of income sources and individuals affects census survey coverage," in order to "document the cultural dynamics of concealment of income and individuals." This has involved analyzing "how the dependency of the community economy on underground illegal transactions and public assistance leads residents to conceal income sources and certain individual household members." My research set out to examine "expressions and behavioral examples of motives for concealment." It also sought "documentation of gender and generational relationships in the underground and public assistance economy," including "intrahousehold distributions of income and benefits." This has involved comparing "socioeconomic patterns of stable households with households that are disintegrating as domestic units" and examining "the ideology of membership in households titularly headed by grandmothers or mothers with children" (Joint Statistical Agreement 88-24).

The ethnicity of the majority of my respondents is Puerto Rican. Most are under 30 years of age and are second-or even third-generation Harlem residents who prefer to speak English. Most of those who are over 30 years of age were born in Puerto Rico and feel most comfortable speaking Spanish although many are perfectly bilingual. The second largest group is composed of native-born Americans of African descent (approximately 30 to 35 percent of the population). There is also a significant presence of elderly native-born Americans of Italian descent (approximately 5 percent).

The bulk of the undocumented population is composed of French and Wolof-speaking West Africans and Spanish-speaking Mexicans. This latter group has been growing dramatically since I initiated my fieldwork.

Methodology

To collect my data I relied primarily on participant-observation techniques and life history interviews. I conducted fieldwork in English, Spanish, and French and even used some words in Wolof in my interaction with the Senegalese immigrants. I did not use an interview schedule. I essentially used a "snowball sampling" technique, although I made special efforts to become closely acquainted with key, representative individuals and households from all of the population groups listed above. Indeed, the necessity of accessing all the diverse sectors of the neighborhood raised an interesting methodological problem as individuals from working class households were sometimes reluctant to trust me after they had seen me befriending known "hoodlums." My status as an "outsider" helped me break the boundaries between the mainstream, working residents of the community and those participating intensively in the underground economy. I was able with some difficulties to bridge both worlds despite the fact that I spent slightly more of my time on the street, at night among men in their 20s engaged in illegal or off-the-books activities.

Given the extreme polarization of ethnic and class relations in the US inner city, my "outsider" status introduced tensions in my research. Indeed, this is a profound fact of life for any social research in America where ethnicity is virtually never neutral. I was cut off from important dynamics in the community and excluded from some personal relationships. At the same time this "outsider"

status also worked in my favor in many instances providing access to dimensions of community and personal interaction off-limits to an "insider." It also played a central role in physically dangerous moments when I was confronted with violence on the streets late at night.

Although the personal relationships I formed were overwhelmingly positive, I had to be acutely conscious of how my own ethnic and class markers might be a factor in altering social interaction around me and influencing my data collection. Indeed, this fact became one of my most interesting methodological tools. I was able to use my own "outsider" status, therefore, as a means for examining and testing the limits and dynamics of ethnic and class interaction.

I talked with literally hundreds of people from all the heterogeneous sectors composing the neighborhood. I was careful to obtain the informed consent of anyone who figured in more than a peripheral manner in my study. I was very specific and clear about the nature and goals of my research: "I am trying to figure out why so many people in this neighborhood do not get counted by the Census." Indeed, by being specific and honest about the purpose of my study I was able to obtain better quality information. I was also careful to inform everyone that their cooperation in talking to me was strictly voluntary. They were always free to withdraw from participation in the study at any moment without hesitation and without countervailing pressure.

In general I received a warm welcome from community residents when I explained the purpose of my study. Several of my respondents took a close, personal interest in my research and went out of their way to be especially helpful. I was able to discuss the ideas presented in this report and even read

sections of the report to several key respondents who provided comments and critiques. They helped me generate new ideas and data. Indeed I am very appreciative of the invaluable help and contributions of my respondents. Their consideration and patience was crucial to the success of my research and my well-being on El Barrio's streets.

Summary of Ethnographic Findings

The motives and dynamics for why my target population may be concealed from the Census can be divided into 5 broad categories:

1) Protection of income and housing.

This applies especially to people receiving public support and/or residing in Housing Authority projects or in apartments with lease restrictions. It also includes a significant proportion of people involved in some aspect of the underground economy.

2) Legal protection.

This applies to individuals and households that rely on the underground economy for their primary source of income. The most active sector of the underground economy was street level drug sales, especially crack, cocaine and heroin. Fear of detention and deportation also applied to the undocumented new immigrants.

3) Logistical/cultural incompatibility with the household categories defined by the Census.

This is the broadest, and perhaps the most complicated dimension of the

undercount. It includes a wide variety of households. Those individuals and households that are most marginal to the mainstream economy-- especially the homeless--are most likely to be logistically and/or culturally "invisible" to the Census.

4) Ideological resistance to mainstream society.

This may be one of the most important dimensions to the undercount and essentially reflects on a deeper level the motives for concealment contained in categories 1 and 2. There is as well a significant presence of working poor and working class operating in this dynamic.

5) The breakdown of the public sector in the inner-city and the abandonment of the neighborhoods by the private sector.

This is a macro-structural variable that refers to the neighborhood's overall relationship to mainstream America. It involves both an ideological and an economic/logistical component and lies behind much of the mistrust that local residents have of any government project which claims to be in their interest. It also refers to the logistical deterioration of many basic public services in the inner-city.

I have separated these dimensions of the undercount into separate categories and I have developed hypotheses for testing their incidence so that their implications can be fully appreciated. In real life, however, there is a great deal of overlap between all five dimensions; they are in no way mutually exclusive.

Widespread Distrust of "Big Government"--the Implications for Confidentiality and the Notion of Community Benefit

Perhaps most central to virtually every single one of the above cited dynamics promoting the Census undercount is distrust. There is a profound mistrust among a significant proportion of the general inner-city population of mainstream society in general, and the Federal government in particular. People simply do not believe that confidentiality will be respected, nor do they believe that any greater benefits will accrue to them or to the community if a more accurate Census is achieved. As a high-level official in the New York Housing Authority told me, "People simply won't believe that government doesn't talk to itself." This distrust is observable ethnographically because distrust of mainstream society and a cynicism towards government and towards the possibility of honest, effective public service is a frequent subject of conversation. Its most common manifestation is the widely held belief--even by working class and working poor Spanish Harlem residents--that there exists a "Master Plan" on the part of government and private corporations to displace and marginalized poor, non-white residents from the neighborhood. Significantly this is often expressed in explicitly ethnic or racial terms reflecting a deeper tension running through the fabric of American society. For example, during the past year extensive renovations were undertaken in the Housing Authority projects: new windows, new roofs, new sidewalks, new showers. On several occasions by different people I was told that the reason the Housing Authority projects were being renovated was because "some Jews" had bought them up and were going to turn the projects into "coops" and "throw out all the poor blacks and Puerto Ricans". In other words when the public sector does make a concrete

investment to better the lifestyle of poor inner-city residents the reaction of a significant number of the impoverished residents directly affected by the improvements is disbelief that this could possibly be happening for their sake. In fact, positive public sector actions were reinterpreted as boding-imminent doom.

A more neutral but related version of the widespread disbelief in the possibility of any altruism on the part of the public sector is the comment that I frequently heard that the renovation of the projects was being undertaken for the sake of "mafia contractors". Believers in this conspiracy theory would point to the fact that a disproportionally high percentage of the workers on these projects were whites--the implication being that they were of Italian descent and connected with mob contractors. The most extreme expression of mistrust of government and mainstream society is the belief among a small but vociferous minority of Harlem residents that "genocide" is being wrought against the black race. In Spanish Harlem this belief is more frequently held by African-Americans than by Puerto Ricans but different, sometimes milder versions of this conspiracy theory are expressed by Puerto Ricans especially in reference to 1) why drugs are so prevalent in the community; 2) why the drug laws have suddenly being toughened "now that so many of our people are addicted" to crack/cocaine; and 3) why AIDS is so prevalent in the minority community. Another, frequently heard question which is posed by working class residents is why the police do not clean up the neighborhood or why arrests are not made more rapidly and effectively when a local Puerto Rican or African-American youth is killed in the neighborhood with the implication that the perpetrators would have been captured rapidly in a wealthy, white neighborhood.

I can also point to manifestations of this profound distrust which are easily accessible without the extended, participant-observation ethnographic method that is necessary for collecting the above mentioned conspiracy theories. Most obvious are the posters on the walls of the bricked-up abandoned buildings with the word "Genocide!" written in red ink. Underneath the headline is the roughly drawn form of a black family pictured from behind struggling into the distance with their possessions on their backs desperately fleeing for their lives. More neutral and perhaps more objective indications of distrust of the public sector is the low rates of voter registration in the neighborhood and the low rate of voting by those who are registered. The low voting ratio was particularly surprising in the Nov. 7, 1989 election in New York because the mayor who was elected is African-American and there were significant racial tensions and accusations during the campaign.

On several occasions when I explained the purpose of my research for the Census Bureau to participants in street culture I was accused of being either an undercover policeman or even a "CIA-FBI agent" writing reports "for Washington." It is only because of my long-term residence in the community in a tenement with my family that I have been able to break down the initial barriers of distrust that many residents have for outside representatives of mainstream society.

Even though most people do not believe in "the Plan" or in the "genocide conspiracy" many are vaguely influenced on some level by at least a fleeting mistrust or disbelief in the benevolence of the government. When pushed on these issues, stable, working class heads of households point to the garbage strewn across the sidewalk, or the rows upon rows of abandoned city-owned buildings, or the vacant, city-owned lots which have been piled high with

garbage for years on end; or the physically decaying public schools or even the post offices. Although most will begin by blaming the vandalism and violence of local residents they also tend to believe that their community suffers from public sector neglect and callousness.

From the Census Bureau's perspective these beliefs which essential question the integrity of government organization make it hard to effectively persuade people to trust in the confidentiality of their responses and, more importantly, prevent people from believing that the community will be benefited by a more accurate Census. Finally these beliefs also reduce the sense of local residents that they have a social responsibility and that they will share in the common public good that mainstream America benefits from. People say "What have the politicians ever done for us?" or merely, "What's in it for me?" or more aggressively "How do I know what they will do with this information?" In short there is an important undercurrent of anger--or when internalized, depression--in people's personal experience of the community's relationship with mainstream society.

Related to this ideological dynamic of mistrust is a more active cultural resistance to mainstream society among a significant minority of inner-city residents which may actually lead them to distort the census figures. This dynamic although related to that of mistrust is dealt with in greater detail in the ethnographic data presented to support the hypotheses relating to ideological and cultural resistance. The issue was also raised in an earlier written report I presented entitled, "Summary of Recommendations to CAPP" (Bourgeois 1989).

EIHNNOGRAPHIC PROFILES OF AT-RISK INDIVIDUALS AND HOUSEHOLDS

Perhaps the best means to demonstrate the complicated way in which the various motives and factors contributing to the census undercount operate is to present three profiles of households at high risk of being undercounted. (All names have been changed to protect confidentiality.) The advantage of these profiles is that they reveal how people cycle in and out of undercount situations and how the various reasons for the undercount are actually interrelated or--to put it in more complex theoretical terms--are overdetermined.

An additional lesson that comes out of these profiles is that there is nothing absolute or permanent about an individual or a household that is undercounted. It is a dynamic process which changes as the economic, legal, health, housing, marital, logistical situations of the various members of a household change. Through these profiles we can see how families dependent on public subsidy find themselves scrambling at the not-always-legal-margins of the underground economy to find the extra income that keeps them functioning. These informal income-generating strategies increase the household's likelihood of needing to conceal a family member. The profiles also enable us to see how difficult it is for working poor families to maintain stability and how easy it is with the new patterns of inner-city substance abuse for a household to be suddenly ripped apart, both physically and emotionally.

Wanda's Household

Currently Wanda subsists on AFDC and food stamps and lives in a two-bedroom tenement apartment. She has three children ranging in ages from 1 year to 13

years. She is not married and has no husband or stable, live-in boyfriend. She has four boarders in the apartment: Papo, his wife, their newborn, and Papo's wife's first child by another man. The landlord visits the building several times a week and has a personal relationship with the tenants.

Unlike residents in public housing Wanda does not have to hide her boarders from her landlord, nor are there any restrictions on her lease imposed by the landlord to limit the number of inhabitants. However, Wanda is dependent upon AFDC as her primary source of support and would suffer a reduction in her allowance if it were known that Papo's family pays for part of the rent and contributes to food expenses. Similarly Papo's common-law wife receives AFDC and would jeopardize her allowance if it were known that she lives with Papo. Currently there is a tension between Wanda's and Papo's wife's interests with respect to their living status. Both receive housing allowances from welfare. Both would prefer not to have it known that they live together and both would definitely not want Papo's whereabouts known. Wanda is the primary leaseholder and is the "owner" of the apartment. She has the most power and picks up the mail. If she were to answer the Census mail return form she would definitely not list Papo and would probably not list Papo's wife. Should the mail return not be mailed in and should a Census enumerator knock on the door either Wanda or Papo's wife or one of the five children will answer the door. Papo works nights as a disc jockey and would almost surely be asleep and missed by the Census enumerator. The apartment is small and the enumerator might not press for additional information on the presence of a doubled-up family living in the apartment should Wanda answer the door and say she and her children are the exclusive residents. At the same time, Wanda does not have to fear retribution

from her landlord if Papo and his wife's presence are revealed publically. Her only concern is with the Human Resources Administration (HRA) cutting her allowance. If the literature on confidentiality accompanying the mail return or the follow-up enumerator's presentation is convincing to her she may be willing to risk listing Papo and his family as boarders. If Papo's wife answers the door she may be less willing to risk her more tenuous status in the household and she may list herself as Wanda and report her children as Wanda's.

An additional factor possibly reducing the likelihood of Papo and his family being counted is that Papo does not consider himself to be a permanent resident at Wanda's. In fact he is ashamed of the situation and keeps telling everyone that he is looking for an apartment, but that he is still "staying temporarily" at Wanda's. Wanda needs Papo's extra income, but her apartment is small and at times she complains about Papo's presence and his lack of a permanent job. She also refers to the arrangement as temporary and sometimes even refers to Papo as visiting. Her two older children also refer to Papo as "staying with us for a while" and they are definitely hostile to the arrangement because the room occupied by Papo, his wife, and their two children used to be their room. They are now forced to sleep in the kitchen, a fact which they do not like to admit publicly.

Papo has been "staying" at Wanda's "temporarily" for over four years. His residence has not been consistent, however, a fact which could allow Wanda's household to define his presence in a manner inconsistent with the Census Bureau's category of "permanent resident". On three occasions prior to meeting his current common law wife Papo initiated relationships with different girlfriends and he actually moved his possessions out of Wanda's apartment and

moved into the apartment of one of his new girlfriends. None of those relationships lasted for more than a few months and he soon moved back. Shortly after he met his current girlfriend (who just had his baby) his economic situation improved dramatically and for a six-month period they actually moved out of Wanda's apartment to a transient hotel in another neighborhood.

Had the Census occurred during this period it is somewhat likely that Papo would have been counted, as his relationship with his wife was going well. Papo's wife was pregnant, and he was making a relatively good sum of money as a disc jockey in three different clubs. His goal was to get his wife off welfare and set his family up permanently in their own housing. Significantly he called the tiny studio hotel room in which they had previously lived "our apartment" in contrast to the manner in which he now refers to his present living arrangement at Wanda's. About four months after moving into the hotel, Papo's powder cocaine habit got the better of him and he lost two of his disc jockeying jobs. He and his wife were evicted from the hotel for non-payment and moved back to Wanda's. Wanda felt obliged to accept them back despite the fact that she had just given birth to a third child because Papo's wife was seven months pregnant with Papo's baby and her first child (by another man) was only barely a year old. She also needed the extra income that Papo had agreed to pay and the child-care services offered by Papo's wife.

Prior to 1985 when I first met Papo he was in upstate New York serving a two-and-a-half year jail sentence for managing a cocaine shooting gallery. Had the Census occurred at this moment he would have been counted, assuming there were no irregularities in the prison system's records (Fleisher 1989). Had the Census been taken in the two years prior to Papo's arrest he would have been

counted in his previous wife's family with whom he lived when he was selling cocaine prior to being jailed. Had it been taken three years prior to his arrest he probably would not have been counted because he was legally employed at an entry-level bank clerk job but living with his first common-law wife who was receiving welfare at the time. He asserts that he was able to get his wife and son off welfare when he began dealing drugs "and no longer had to be cheating" in order to survive. Furthermore during this period there were some logistical and cultural ambiguities as to his household status as he was legally married to another woman, who lived in another neighborhood and to whom he contributed token amounts of money and by whom he had another young child. This would have increased the likelihood of his not being reported by either wife, since not only would their welfare benefits have been endangered; but he was also splitting his own time between the two households.

Five years prior to his arrest Papo definitely would not have been counted by the US Census because he was a radio operator in the Panamanian armed forces. He has a dual Panamanian/American citizenship. His mother is Panamanian and his father is Puerto Rican. He was born in Puerto Rico, but came to Harlem to live for the first time upon his discharge from the Panamanian army four years ago.

It is likely that both of Papo's first two wives will not be counted by the Census in 1990 because both of them have become severe crack addicts and have been evicted from their apartments and lost custody through family court proceedings of their children (one each) by Papo. Both children are now in different foster homes and will be counted by the Census because the families who are sheltering them in foster care receive a state subsidy for taking care of the children. The difficult situation faced by Papo's first two wives is

especially significant as it illustrates the changing tenor of gender relations and family structure in the inner-city and the context for new patterns of substance abuse. (See Trends for Further Consideration.)

Papo asserts that he is not surprised at how violently his ex-wives became addicted to crack. Both of them have in fact become what is referred to disparagingly on the street as "crack whores" or "skeezers". These are free-lance prostitutes who sell their bodies merely for the cost of one dose of crack--as low as three dollars. Papo says that when he had first met them they had been "good traditional women" dedicating themselves to "manteniendo el hogar" [maintaining the household]. He refers to their transition into crack addicts as if they had been afflicted by a disease striking inner-city women: they decided they could hang out on the street, that their children were not important, that they could make money on their own and that they did not need to respect men. In fact, he is referring to the restructuring of gender relations occurring in the inner-city. Women now have more rights throughout America and the inner-city is no exception. Tragically for some of these newly liberated women the right to participate in street culture ends in substance abuse and results in an inability to maintain a functional mother-child relationship. Wanda's situation is also an example of the changing nature of gender relations. Three different men have fathered her three children because she will not tolerate living with a man who does not treat her "correctly." Indeed she is the one who took the initiative in throwing out her previous boyfriends. While this provides her with greater personal autonomy and prevents her from getting physically or psychologically abused it also increases the economic fragility of her household and increases the household's vulnerability to

undercount as she seeks out boarders and new boyfriends to help her make ends meet.

Finally, there is the ambiguous situation of the father of Wanda's last son. He is a relatively successful street-level cocaine dealer. He visits regularly, spending the night and contributing money for Pampers and clothes for his one-year-old son. Wanda will not report him as a household member because he only stays over once or twice a week and he would also jeopardize her AFDC allowance. He lives most of the time at his mother's, but he will most likely not be counted there because his mother fears he may be apprehended for his drug dealing and besides he spends several nights a week at Wanda's and accepts full responsibility as the father of Wanda's last child. To a certain extent, consequently, he is more a part of Wanda's household than his mother's on an ideological level. To add further to his ambiguous household status he spends time traveling in his car to make drug connections and sleeps several nights a week in hotels outside New York or in his car.

Maria's and Manny's household

I first met my neighbors, Maria and Manny, in 1985 when they appeared to have a stable household. Maria had just obtained legal custody of her daughter's twin two-year-old babies. Indeed, Maria was a pillar of stability in her family. Although Maria received AFDC she would not have been loath to report her husband Manny because he was on methadone maintenance at the time and actually qualified for his own welfare check. During this period the welfare rules in New York were more lenient than they are today. The new workfare program which obliges adult men and women with grown children to work or go back

to school did not exist.

In early 1986 with the dramatic influx of crack on the block, Maria became addicted. She managed to hold onto her apartment for another two years by turning it into a "crack den." People would bring their cocaine to her apartment and she would cook it up into crack form. The landlord finally evicted her and she moved into an abandoned building around the corner that had been taken over by crack addicts. There was no light or running water in this building and the windows were boarded up from the outside. It also had an extremely dangerous reputation and several people were thrown off its roof in arguments about money owed for drug deliveries. In short, there is a high likelihood that the building would be missed in the initial address count that determines where Census forms are mailed and should an exceptionally brave or zealous enumerator have tried to follow-up at a later stage it is likely that the enumerator would not have successfully collected reliable statistics on the crack addicts living in the hallways and in the abandoned apartments. Incidentally this is not the type of abandoned building that would be included in the S-Night count of the homeless on March 20 since it is a wild drug scene rather than a place recognized as a locale where the homeless congregate. In other words it is a "crack house" rather than a homeless refuge.

Maria and Manny were unable to maintain themselves in the unheated crack building, moving out in desperation in mid-winter. The twins were taken in by the parents of the father, who established official custody and Manny ended up in a men's shelter in the South Bronx while Maria moved in as a boarder in the apartment of a friend in the housing projects opposite the abandoned building. When I asked her if she would be counted in a Census survey she became very

nervous and said, "Of course not, we have to be very careful and keep it all secret." The apartment was in Maria friend's name and she could be evicted for allowing her to live there. She did explain that she contributed \$100 to the monthly rent (she was still receiving her welfare allotment) and if this became known to the housing office the rent would be raised.

Indeed Maria and her friend are at high risk of being thrown out because they have turned their apartment into a crack den, cooking up into the form of crack the cocaine brought to them by crack addict friends and acquaintances in return for free use. According to an informal policy the New York Housing Authority pursues evictions for overcrowding only in cases when the families residing in an overcrowded apartment are "trouble makers." The only other categories of "boarder" or "doubled-up family" that the Housing Authority actively pursues are young men and women living with elderly relatives in housing projects built to house the elderly. While the Housing Authority has been flexible on the issue of overcrowding, they do use the threat of eviction to keep tenants in line and they also raise the rent to reflect the increased income brought in by doubled-up families when they discover them. Rentals are calculated at 30 percent of gross income (often reaching 45 percent of net income) with maximum ceilings for higher-income families.

While she was living at her friend's house in the projects Maria would definitely not have been counted. Manny at the men's shelter may or may not have been counted because his sleeping patterns were somewhat irregular. He left his methadone treatment plan and began selling heroin full-time. During the warm summer months he would fall asleep on the street corner, nodding out in a heroin daze at the spot where he sold during daylight hours.

Manny was arrested and sent to Rikers Island pending trial. Although one would presume that as a jail inmate he would be counted in the Census, I am not convinced this is invariably the case, especially now, given the overcrowding crisis in the penal system. Due to overcrowding Manny was shuffled three times from jail to jail in the New York municipal system. I went to visit him three times in jail and on one of those occasions they were not able to locate him because a mistake had been made in the record book which failed to list his transfer. This was despite the fact that I had his correct inmate identification number.

Upon his release from jail six months later Manny got a job, found an apartment with working-class friends in Queens and reunited with Maria who was easing out of her crack habit. He was working for a major company and was covered on a pension plan. Since the family he was staying with was working class and independent of any public subsidy Manny and Maria would have had a better chance of being counted in the Census had it been taken during this period. This period of stability, however, only lasted two months at which point Manny was fired and he and Maria were thrown out of their friends' apartment. Currently Manny and Maria are homeless. Manny is selling heroin full-time and Maria is back to her crack addiction and is pregnant. Unless Manny is arrested between now and the 1990 Census he will most likely be missed. Maria who sometimes stays with a working-class uncle in Brooklyn may or may not be counted depending upon whether or not she is on a crack binge or in a period of relative stability, and whether or not she has been thrown out of the household for stealing from her uncle.

Mrs. Rivera's Household

Lee's grandmother, Mrs. Rivera lives in a Housing Authority project with her two grandchildren, Lee and Richie on the lease. In addition, an employed older daughter of hers with an eight-year-old daughter double up in the apartment unofficially. In all likelihood Mrs. Rivera will list everyone in her household on the Census mail return because, although she does not speak English, she has considerable experience in dealing with bureaucracies and is well-liked by the management of the Housing Authority project. She is not intimidated by public authorities and does not perceive herself to be in a precarious situation liable to eviction should her daughter's doubled-up family be discovered. Because of the respect granted her in the Housing Authority project, management, even if they knew about her daughter's extra income, would probably look the other way when it came time to certify her household's income. Significantly in other less respected households (like the one Maria stayed in for a while) there is a strong probability that the entire doubled-up family would be omitted from the Census return because the household senses its vulnerability to eviction or rent increase and it is not worth it to them to take what they perceive as a gamble on the Census Bureau's alleged pledge of confidentiality.

If the Census had been taken this summer, however, there is a chance that Willie, Mrs. Rivera's youngest grandson, would have been left out. Willie who is only 14 was arrested for prolonged truancy and told that he would be sent away to a juvenile delinquent home in the fall. Willie, is indeed a youth heading for serious trouble. He hangs around a "posse" of teenagers who are currently involved in gang warfare that left five people dead last week. He also hides in his grandmother's apartment the Uzi automatic weapon that his

posse owns collectively. Following Willie's apprehension by truancy officers, Willie's father (who is employed full-time as a janitor and who lives with a new wife and two young children in a neighboring Housing Authority project) agreed to take Willie into his household to provide him with some discipline for the rest of the summer. It was felt that the grandmother was too soft on Willie and that he needed a strong man to be overseeing him. Willie, of course, was violating Housing Authority guidelines by moving into his father's apartment because his father's household was already pushing the maximum allotment of residents per room allowed by the guidelines. Furthermore, there was some ambivalence in the family about Willie's legal problems. Everyone condemned his truancy and was worried about the fact that he frequented violent friends. Nevertheless, nobody wanted him to be taken away and sent to a juvenile delinquent school outside the city. This might, therefore, have encouraged the two households to maintain some ambiguity as to Willie's real permanent residence on the Census form. There was also ambiguity as to Willie's actual residence since he was only staying at his father's house temporarily for the summer and he was scheduled to go away to school in the fall. At the present time Willie has moved back into his grandmother's apartment and the Board of Education is allowing him to return to his old school.

Meanwhile, however, the situation of his older brother, Lee has become more complicated. Lee had been working off the books as a delivery boy for a Korean drycleaners in the neighborhood. About half way through the summer, however, he began using crack and reacted by becoming suicidal. He also became violent in the projects and began jeopardizing his grandmother's standing and respect with the Housing Authority management. His grandmother mobilized the extended family

for help and Lee was sent down to Miami to live "for a while" with an aunt who is married to a psychiatrist and who agreed to keep Lee out of trouble. It is not at all clear how long this "visit" to Miami will endure or which family, if any, will claim Lee as their permanent resident.

TESTABLE HYPOTHESES

In the following section I propose a series of hypotheses to be tested at the alternative enumeration sites in 1990. I have interwoven ethnographic data into the discussions following the hypotheses.

HYPOTHESES RELATING TO THE PROTECTION OF HOUSEHOLD RESOURCES:

HYPOTHESES GROUP A. CENSUS UNDERCOUNTS WILL BE CAUSED BY LOW INCOME HOUSEHOLDS CONCEALING UNREPORTED SOURCES OF INCOME TO PROTECT HOUSEHOLD RESOURCES.

I. Households dependent upon "welfare" (food stamps and/or AFDC and/or General Assistance) will conceal three categories of household members: 1) individuals who earn income (legal or illegal) which is not reported on the welfare application; 2) adult males; 3) adult females who do not have any children.

Possible proxy variables identifying welfare dependence

This hypothesis can be restated in more general terms to identify neighborhoods with high rates of public support to predict overall neighborhood vulnerability to undercounting by finding proxy variables indicating the prevalence of public support. For example, the importance of public support is visible in local supermarkets. Business is much higher on "check day" or "mother's day", the dates of the month when welfare checks and food stamp allotments arrive. This is an easily observable phenomenon. A brief conversation with the managers of the supermarkets in a neighborhood provides a

rough idea of the importance of food stamps in the local economy. In New York welfare payments arrive via computer at check-cashing offices. The concentration of check-cashing offices, therefore, becomes a sign of a high reliance on welfare payments in a neighborhood as does the length of the lines at the check cashing offices on "check day". Alternatively one could consult the administrative records of HRA at the local level which can provide the addresses (by zip code or by street number) of welfare clients. Special measures must be taken to access these confidential records but in the city of New York, the City Planning office and the New York City Housing Authority have been able to access them for their studies (cf. New York City Housing Authority 1989).

Explanation of the hypothesis

In order to maintain household income below the cut-off point imposed by the Health and Human Resources Administration, households conceal the presence of members who earn income. This applies not only to spouses, lovers, and companions but also to children, grandchildren, boarders, and anyone else who might be living in the household and contributing resources to it. Other household members who are of working age but have no income may also be concealed so as to avoid having to justify their use of time or to avoid having to enroll in a program which impinges upon their lifestyle--whether it be substance abuse, personal depression, illiteracy, language skills et cetera.

In testing this hypothesis we should construct a hierarchy that specifies which "category of household member" is most likely to be concealed. This hierarchy will also enable us to test other related hypotheses on the importance

of participation in the underground economy. Category number 1--unreported income earners--is the most general. It does not specify gender or kinship status and can, therefore, coincide with categories 2--adult males--or 3--adult females without children. Of course we would expect to find that adult males are the most undercounted. We can document more about the actual dynamic--the most proximal, root cause of the motivation for concealment--however, if we also find patterns which demonstrate that adult males who are not earning income tend to be more frequently reported than those who earn income or who form part of the "discouraged unemployed".

In testing the hypothesis we may also be able to differentiate between adults who earn income reported to the IRS versus those who earn their money in the underground economy. We can also differentiate between the welfare regulations and enforcement mechanisms of the different states to see if these alter the incidence and patterns of the undercount. If we see a significant number of adult childless women in "welfare families" who are not counted when they are income earners versus childless women not earning income versus mothers with live-in children we will be able to test the importance of outside income as a factor in motivating concealment. This can be compared to concealment motivated out of fear of being forced to go to work or having one's lifestyle impinged upon versus a deeper gender dynamic being determinant.

Another way of documenting this network of motivations for concealment is to look at what types of adults are reported in "welfare families". It will be especially significant if we can show that those males who have an official reason for not working in the legal economy--such as those with medically recognized "handicaps", those qualifying for Social Security Insurance, those

enrolled in methadone maintenance, alcohol treatment, etc. are counted more frequently. We may even note that individuals who are legally employed are less frequently reported than those who earn their income in the underground economy, in contradiction to hypothesis B I.

It may be worth disaggregating the different types of public subsidies ("welfare") and checking for patterns of concealment/compliance. Do food stamps and Aid to Families with Dependent Children lead to over reporting children? One might expect that AFDC families are the most vulnerable to the undercount because of the nature of the rules governing able-bodied adults in families receiving the bi-weekly AFDC check as compared to the more relaxed food stamps rulings and the less personally intrusive and stigmatized character of a medicaid review. The nature of the enforcement and even the rules governing eligibility will change dramatically from state to state.

It may also be possible for ethnographers to access statistics from local public hospitals and from Medicaid to compare to the Census figures from their block. We can also detect patterns of public subsidy within families. For example, some children will be covered by medicaid, others not; some receive food stamps, others not; some are covered by the medical plan of an absent parent, others not; some families receive court-ordered child support, others not; et cetera.

NOTE: In addition to testing at the alternative enumeration sites, this hypothesis can also be tested statistically by analyzing the distribution of social services (food stamps, welfare payments, Medicaid, public hospital reports etc.,) in a particular neighborhood or city and comparing these figures

to those obtained by the Census. For example, at the block level, Housing Authority public housing projects have the percentages of households on public assistance broken down building by building according to their own internal surveys. Public schools also maintain records of which children reside in public housing because they receive extra tax dollars for these children due to the fact that the Housing Authority projects do not pay City and State taxes. HRA, of course also keeps a record of residence addresses of its clients. When appropriate, these administrative records can be accessed and compared to the figures obtained in the alternative enumerations and/or compared to the statistics collected by the Census in selected Housing Authority buildings.

II. The undercount will be especially high for households residing in public housing projects or in housing that receives a public subsidy.

Explanation of the Hypothesis

Rent in public housing is often determined as a percentage of income. The easiest way to lower a household's income is not to declare a member of the household who earns income--especially if that person is legally employed.

The leases in public housing place strict limits on the number of individuals allowed to live in a unit. The dramatic shortage of affordable housing in New York City has obliged many households and individuals to double up and overcrowd public housing units.

In testing this hypothesis throughout the country we may be able to differentiate how patterns of concealment in subsidized housing change according to the housing market for the city or neighborhood. Rental housing market

indices are readily available and are frequently published in local papers. We may be able to choose one figure (such as the rental unit vacancy rate, or the average figure for percent of income spent on rental housing) as variables to compare to concealment rates. For example, if we found there to be more concealment in regions where the housing market is tightest we then have a better grasp on the actual motivations behind the dynamic of concealment.

This hypothesis can be most effectively tested if more than one of the alternative enumeration sites includes households in public housing projects. As noted above, the records of the public housing authorities can provide a useful bank of comparative statistics.

III. Households living in buildings or complexes where the landlords or managers have strict occupancy rules will be disproportionately undercounted.

Explanation of the Hypothesis

Although this hypothesis could apply to middle-and even upper-income households (Manhattan luxury cooperatives, for example) we would expect it to be most pronounced among lower-income households where the imperative to overcrowd is mandated by urgent economic factors. It should be possible for the ethnographers at all the research sites to find out the restrictions on housing in the units they enumerate. As in the case for households in public housing, the tests for this hypothesis may correlate with neighborhood or regional indicators of the existence of an affordable housing shortage as defined by the local cost of living and income levels.

Another way of testing this hypothesis in addition to the alternative

enumeration sites might be to compare Census results in cities with different rental ordinances. Of course, there may be other factors affecting the results such as the tightness of the housing market or the unemployment rate.

IV) Boarders will be undercounted.

Explanation of the Hypothesis

Many households throughout the country, but especially low-income households subsisting on public support or residing in public housing supplement their income by taking in boarders or doubling up families. Because the income received from these boarders might jeopardize the qualification of a household for public subsidies and because the boarder might violate the occupancy rate permitted on the lease, these boarders will sometimes be concealed from official representatives.

Another factor promoting the undercount of boarders is that they tend to be more often marginally employed and more often involved in the underground economy than the rental and homeowner population. To protect their fragile resource base they sometimes prefer not to be documented. They also tend to be less stable; often relying temporarily on boarding to bridge a family crisis, sudden termination of employment (i.e., economic crisis), or to escape the law. Their relationship to the household may be ambiguous and a cause of uncertainty, awkwardness, or even shame.

The phenomenon of the boarder is so common in the Puerto Rican community in Spanish Harlem that a "Spanglish" word has emerged for boarding: "bordeando". With the decrease in low-income housing in New York City, and the erosion of the

buying power of the welfare subsidy the proportion of boarders in the population has probably increased since the 1980 Census.

Boarder status will be noted on the Census and on the alternative enumerations. The prevalence of the undercounting of boarders, consequently is testable at all the sites. The ethnographers will then have to use participant-observation techniques to determine which conflation of factors--lease restrictions, unreported income to welfare agencies, participation in illegal activity, residential ambiguity, residential instability etc.--is the most direct cause of the undercount.

Since the Census form asks about boarding status it should be possible to identify neighborhoods where large proportions of individuals are reported as boarders and submit these neighborhoods to closer examination.

ADDITIONAL ETHNOGRAPHIC COMMENT ON HYPOTHESES RELATING TO THE PROTECTION OF HOUSEHOLD RESOURCES:

Welfare Regulations

There is extraordinary diversity within families--especially two-and three-generation households--as to which members receive public support and which do not. I have noted that some males are official members of households receiving public subsidy and have no fear of jeopardizing their spouse's support, while others are secretive or even paranoid. In one case the husband of a woman with six children all receiving welfare explained to me that he had nothing to fear because his wife had been reassigned to different social workers so many times that all trace of him had been lost in the files despite the fact

that he was still receiving a welfare check. He had received letters ordering him to report for workfare several months ago, but the correspondence mysteriously stopped and the checks continued to arrive bi-weekly. As for the issue of court-ordered child support, some men claim they work in the underground economy solely to avoid having a percentage of their paycheck automatically withdrawn and sent to their estranged wife and children. Other men have no fear of this; it depends on the nature of their relationship with the estranged mothers of their children and/or whether or not their social security numbers are known.

My ethnographic data reveals that perceptions about and practices for obtaining public support are extremely complex. The personal humiliation caused by a social worker at the welfare office is a frequent subject of conversation. Many individuals--especially men--who operate in the underground economy and who would qualify for public support refuse to apply for it because of the stigma and because of the loss of personal autonomy that involvement with the HRA bureaucracy entails.

The complicated and changing rules for qualifying for welfare are not always fully understood. For example, one young man who grew up on public support and is now intensely involved in the underground economy told me that the reason social workers no longer visit homes to check for missing husbands and extra income earners is because the welfare office ran out of money. This person's interpretation is significant as he is especially likely to be undercounted because there are two generations in his household who have a material interest in concealing one another. He lives with his mother in a housing project and his mother receives welfare but supplements her check with an off-the-books job

in the sewing industry. Significantly He claims his first memory as a child was watching his mother hide the evidence of his step-father prior to a social worker's visit. It obviously marked him deeply and was extremely humiliating. This can explain in large part his hostility and distrust towards anyone "snooping into his business" and his anger at mainstream society's attempt to document his living situation. "It's nobody's business but mine's!" "What do they care about me?" "I don't want to be nobody's number!"

I explored this complicated dimension of psychological humiliation that inner city residents experience when they apply for welfare by accompanying a friend and serving as a translator when she went through the initial stages of an application. From the perspective of the Census Bureau what I observed pointed to the fact that individuals who have had to deal frequently with public institutions in these settings during the course of their lives will tend not to place much faith or value in providing government officials with accurate statistics about their households. I purposefully spent extra time in the office making friends with the caseworkers and one of them took me aside and essentially explained to me how to "cheat the system" i.e., what kinds of income and living arrangements I should reveal if my friend wanted to qualify for welfare and what other ones should be concealed. The caseworker who actually followed my friend through the initial screening subjected the person to an awkward psychological confrontation at one point, asking her in a harsh tone why she was so nervous and why she had no "visible means of support". Watching this at close quarters as a participant-observer anthropologist documenting the operation of a complicated screening process was more nerve-racking than I had expected. I had no reason to take the caseworker's confrontational/manipulative

tone personally, but the person I was accompanying desperately needed the financial support for her daily survival and was extremely nervous and did taken the caseworker's questions as a deep personal insult and humiliation. She was angry and bitter then and continues to apply her resentment to any institution of mainstream society seeking to document her "private life".

I repeated the same ethnographic procedure in an application for "indigent status" at the local municipal hospital. The process was noticeably less negative and hostile than the experience in the welfare office, although the confrontation over "visible means of support" was repeated with the exact same terminology being used by the social worker who undertook the screening. Significantly after a grueling three-hour wait and interview the person I was accompanying was terminated because she had not brought the appropriate papers with her. This second experience, although not confrontational, did allow me to appreciate the effect on an individual's psyche of having to deal with multiple bureaucracies and essentially "beg" unsuccessfully for services. I was able to understand better why someone on the margins of society who has initiated dozens of these kinds of complicated face-to-face petitions to hostile bureaucracies in an effort to obtain desperately needed survival services might develop a "bad attitude" towards anyone asking them to reveal their household arrangements or their income.

The most dramatic confrontation between an individual in need of services and the bureaucratic rigors of the documentation process was the case that I witnessed of a woman dying of AIDS who had been rejected from Medicaid. She had been cut off from Medicaid because she had moved to her mother's home to die and had not received the Medicaid renewal forms that had been sent to her old

address. I was at the AIDS patient's home as she was making a telephone call to a social worker. The social worker explained that her case was especially complicated because by having moved to her mother's home to die she had become her mother's financial responsibility and her mother was employed. This technically disqualified her from Medicaid. (In fact the social worker made arrangements to extend the AIDS patient's medical benefits via a somewhat complicated compromise of shifting her to SSI benefits.) This painful confrontation with "government" bureaucracy is obviously extreme; few people witness scenes so full of pathos. Nevertheless this extreme example illustrates how profoundly negative the experience of a poor person in need can be when they are asked by government agencies to document their household arrangements.

On another ideological level, there is a great deal of ambivalence on the street towards welfare, a fact which may lead individuals to almost unconsciously deny their involvement in a household that receives welfare even though they do, in fact live in that household. Often one hears disparaging comments on the street about families being dependent upon welfare and often the person making the comment grew up in a family that relied--or even still relies--on welfare. I have heard hard core drug dealers and petty thieves righteously assert that they would never accept welfare even though in one case the same person making the emphatic statement had a child by an ex-wife whom he did not support economically and who relied on welfare. This person lived with his mother who paid for all his food expenses and also received welfare, but he was proud that he did not receive "any public support, not even Medicaid". In other words while some young men in the underground economy see welfare as a smart system to "rip off" many have internalized the stigma associated with

receiving welfare and see it as an assault on their manhood. They deny their dependence on it even when their children, mothers, and wives receive regular checks and provide them with food and shelter.

Finally the guidelines for receiving welfare are recognized by virtually all the social work settlement house workers and the neighborhood poverty advocacy organizations as unrealistic. I interviewed dozens of social workers and advocates and every single one of them had a confrontational attitude towards government agencies. In fact, they were considerably more militant and angry than many of the people actually receiving welfare whom I interviewed. They took it as common sense that one cannot play by the rules with the government especially when it comes to income and household documentation. If families followed the rules of welfare to the letter they would be starving and walking around in rags. The system obliges them to hide alternative sources of income and forces them to seek remuneration in the underground economy. Some see their jobs as explaining to people what not to tell the government. In other words the logic of the public support system obliges clients to conceal. This kind of a setting makes it hard for Census enumerators to collect reliable information. There is no premium or value associated with "the truth". It is not seen as immoral or a breach of public duty to lie to government officials.

A poignant example of the catch-22's involved in welfare guidelines that will encourage people to falsify their household arrangements and income levels is the case of a 50 year old married man with three children who became sick and lost his job. His employer provided no health or unemployment benefits. He applied for welfare and qualified but then admitted to his caseworker that he had an old van (with a book value of less than \$2,000) and intended to make a

few extra dollars delivering newspapers with his son. His caseworker promptly closed his file saying he had to sell the car and come back once he had spent the money or he would not qualify for welfare. Another woman had her checks taken away for several months when she let her caseworker know that her mother had visited her for Christmas and given her \$1,000 cash as a present. These kinds of stories are common on the street. In the minds of most of the affected people it will be hard to separate one branch of the Federal government from the city government and people may associate the Census with just another "nosy government agency" akin to the HRA.

On another level, the negative experience--sometimes bordering on the absurd--that people have with the welfare office makes them believe that the statistics they provide the government are useless and that government is inherently ineffective. Even among those people who are not especially angry at "the system" there is a generalized sense that the HRA's rules and regulations are nonsensical and arbitrary. By logical extension they ask why should any other government agency be any different? What difference will it make in the larger schema if one takes a Federal government survey or census seriously?

One evening on the street I had steered the conversation to the issue of welfare and its rules and regulations. People began cracking "welfare jokes" i.e., telling stories of the outrageous scenes they had witnessed waiting in line at the welfare office. They told of clients shrieking and cursing at unwilling caseworkers and vice versa. One person claimed that the way they decided if you qualified for welfare was whether or not you filled out the forms correctly. The forms, according to this person, are so outrageously complicated and nonsensical that if you fill them out correctly the caseworker will

automatically disqualify you because you are obviously "too smart to be on welfare".

The Vulnerability of Housing Authority Projects

Residents of Housing Authority projects have their household membership and income certified once a year. This is done by means of a mail return. If a household does not comply its rent is automatically raised to the ceiling amount which is relatively high by inner city standards (\$495 for a two bedroom). According to officials at Housing Authority headquarters the enforcement of the lease provisions and income provisions is left up to the discretion of the on-site project managers. In practice this makes residents especially nervous as the guidelines sometimes appear to be enforced arbitrarily. Furthermore the recently streamlined administrative procedures for evicting households from housing projects are now extremely rapid, especially in comparison to the complicated legal procedures that protect tenants in New York City's landlord/tenant court.

In some housing projects the management's office double checks income and residence statistics by calling up the children when the parents are out and asking them for the data. In one case of a family I have known for several years, the mentally retarded adult son of the woman heading the household answered the phone when the management office called. The entire family got in serious trouble when he revealed that a friend of his older sister had come to live with the family and was employed. Management did not evict the family but did retroactively raise their rent to include 30 percent of the new resident's extra income. I also heard other stories of family quarrels resulting in the

injured party reporting to Housing Authority management out of spite that a given household was violating the terms of its lease. Often one hears negative comments about nosy neighbors. In some housing projects where management has been active in enforcing rules and regulations there is an undercurrent of profound neighborly mistrust. Neighbors suspect one another of "dropping dimes" to the housing administration and getting their rents raised or their loved ones evicted. These kinds of negative atmospheres punctuated by a nagging fear of personal betrayal over control of access to basic household data makes it difficult for people to feel comfortable with even the most anonymous forms of the Census--mail returns, telephone follow-ups et cetera. Furthermore, on a deeper psychological level it makes people resentful of their vulnerability to being documented.

As with the welfare rules, the Housing Authority guidelines for the number of people allowed to live in an apartment are unrealistic. For example there is supposed to be a separate bedroom for each child of the opposite sex living in the same Housing Authority apartment. For example, a mother with a male baby is supposed to have a two bedroom apartment. Given New York City's housing crisis this use of space is absurd. Even middle-class families in the City do not have this kind of luxury. It is impossible to require an impoverished mother with a young child who is struggling to survive on welfare not to invite relatives or a boarder in to take advantage of the extra bedroom. As in the case of welfare--perhaps to a slightly lesser extent--it is understood and accepted that the rules and regulations of the Housing Authority have a right to be broken and that it is "normal" to falsify household statistics.

The Housing Authority itself has been documenting a dramatic pattern of

increased economic stress among its working poor tenants. For example the percentage of evictions due to non-payment by working families has risen dramatically in the last five years. It is only to be expected that this kind of economic pressure will result --in irregular household arrangements as people desperately try to make ends meet. For example, the Housing Authority managers have been reporting dramatically increasing rates of "doubling up" i.e., families moving into already occupied apartments and sharing the rent. An internal study conducted by the Housing Authority compared their data to the administrative records of HRA and the Board of Education (all of which keep records of how many of their clients/students live in housing projects). They arrived at an estimated figure of 20 percent doubled up apartments. This means 35,000 families are doubling up--an estimated 100,000 individuals. These people are at extremely high risk for being undercounted given that they have already been concealed from one "government" mail return "Census". To add credibility to the Housing Authority estimates of overcrowding, the statistics on vandalism, graffiti, crime, and maintenance repairs have risen in close proportion to the 20 percent overcrowding rate (New York City Housing Authority 1989).

The dimensions of the working poor housing crisis cannot be overestimated. Currently there is a waiting list of 88,638 families requesting access to the Housing Authority's projects. Only 8,000 apartments are vacated each year. The total number of apartments in the entire system is 178,000. The official vacancy rate is .1 percent. Similarly in the section 8 subsidized housing program there is a waiting list of 79,289 families and there are only 43,421 units in the entire section 8 system. Obviously with these kinds of extraordinary pressures on the subsidized housing market it is only to be expected that there will be

irregular arrangements within public housing units that will be resistant to documentation.

The Vulnerability of Boarders

In the profile of Wanda's household in the first part of this report I noted in some detail the case of Papo her boarder. Similarly in Maria and Manny's household profile I noted how Maria became a boarder when her household fell apart and she became addicted to crack. I was able to come to know well six other households which included these kinds of boarders (as distinct from doubled-up families which Papo's case evolved into). The salient characteristic of these boarders is their mobility. All of them have changed their residence--some of them twice--since my fieldwork began. Not only the boarder, but in many cases the household hosting the boarder is also vulnerable to undercount because the phenomenon of including a boarder in one's household is often an indication of economic stress.

The most dramatic case was that of Jackie's household. Her husband's 65 year-old adopted grandfather boarded illegally in her housing project apartment. She lives alone with him and her three children. Her husband is in jail but is on work release and comes home on weekends. Since her husband's jailing, Jackie has been depending solely on her welfare check and the SSI check of her boarder who also provides valuable services as babysitter and cook allowing Jackie to go to school to get a high school equivalency certificate.

Suddenly due to a complicated family quarrel Jackie's grandfather-in-law all of a sudden left the household and went to live with another daughter of his. This sudden loss of SSI income caught Jackie by surprise and she began selling

crack to supplement her welfare check. She was arrested soon after. When asked by people why she went and sold drugs she merely replies: "I lost Jacob's check and I was hurtin'. I got to feed my babies!"

Currently her case is pending but should she be sent off to jail her household will break down in a manner that might make it complicated for the Census to document. Her children will either be picked up semi-officially by relatives or put into foster homes. It is possible that the children will be taken by relatives in already overcrowded housing projects. They might even be split up among several different relatives. These relatives might not be able to obtain the legal rights to adopt the children and may actually hide them if HRA attempts to place them in a foster home. By the time of the Census, Jackie will probably be in jail and it is possible that her children might be missed by the Census because of their ambiguous, newly transformed household status in a relative's house. In fact, some of them might actually be hidden from HRA because of the difficulty in qualifying for foster parent status. Jackie has a history of hiding her children from HRA because of past instabilities in her life.

In the two other cases of boarders whom I came to know well they resided in working households in the projects. The boarders were thrown out by the host because of their irregular lifestyle and their inability to pay their share of the rent. The boarding arrangement had been initiated primarily as a favor to the boarders rather than because of an urgent cash need on the part of the host.

The fourth boarding arrangement that I documented in detail was that of a

crack addict who half way through my fieldwork had to flee the household he was living in when he stole several hundred dollars in crack from the head of the household who is the founder of a local crack franchise. The crack franchise owner did not charge the boarder a rental fee. He maintained the boarder in his home in order to supervise him closely. The boarder worked for him rehabilitating abandoned buildings in order to set up new crack sales spots. By providing him with housing he had greater control over the addict's irregular and unpredictable lifestyle. This gave him greater access to the addict's artificially cheap labor. It was almost a system of peonage which the addict at times recognized and accused the crack franchise owner of "keeping me like a slave". After fleeing the arrangement the former boarder registered himself in a drug rehabilitation program where he would most likely be counted if he is able to keep off of crack. Recently, however, I heard he had gone back to binging on crack and was once again on the street and homeless where he will probably not be counted. Significantly he still receives mail at his mother's apartment. His important identity papers are at his mother's. When I asked him if he had Medicaid he said his mother kept his Medicaid card in her apartment. He had not, however, visited his mother in several months and she would not construe him as living in her household on the Census.

A fifth boarding arrangement that I documented was that of a single working woman in her early 20s who was staying with a single mother with three children--two of whom were employed adults--in a housing project. The boarder had fled an over-protective and abusive father. The housing arrangement lasted several years and then the relationship between the young woman and her parents improved and she was able to move back home. In this particular case,

tremendous tensions had arisen in the boarding arrangement because the Housing Authority found out about the woman and started factoring her salary into the rental calculation (30 percent of a household's gross salary) when in fact the boarder had not been contributing any money to the household. The household had taken the boarder in strictly as a favor, in what is considered in the community as the Puerto Rican tradition of helping out a "girl in need" who is not "well understood" by her parents.

The last example of a boarding arrangement that I am familiar with is outside of my neighborhood in an upper-middle-class household. It is worth noting because although the host family will look like it is well-off economically, in fact the household is in a state of relative economic stress due to a separation of the married couple that used to live in the apartment. The wife who remained in the apartment rents out one of the empty rooms to another upper-middle-class person who only uses the apartment twice a week because of commuting arrangements at her job which requires mobility. There is some ambiguity, therefore, in the boarder's status since she spends only a minimal amount of time in the household. There is also a dimension of class snobbery on the part of the head of the household who would not want to admit that she is under any kind of economic stress and would ever take in a boarder. Finally, there is also a regulation in her cooperatively owned building which prohibits owners from renting rooms to boarders. The complicated legal housing regulations in New York City (cooperatives, condominiums, section 8, rent stabilized, rent controlled, alternative management programs, homesteading, etc.) foment irregular situations in which host households violate the terms of their leases. These complicated settings provide the incentives to households of all

economic strata to conceal problematic or ambiguous household members.

Before ending this discussion on boarding it is important to understand that the traditional definition and logistics of boarding in the Puerto Rican community have been evolving as the housing crisis and the economic crisis for the working poor of New York has exacerbated. Over the past few decades the standard definition of a boarder has been that of a single male living alone with another family receiving board and lodging in return for a weekly payment. It was an arrangement that was suited to the Puerto Rican immigrant experience. Ideally it was temporary. It was supposed to last for several years or months until the immigrant male became established. He was then supposed to find an apartment and send for his family members waiting for him in Puerto Rico or he was supposed to establish a new family in New York. It often, therefore, reflected a moment in a man's life cycle--either youth in the classic case of new immigrants or old age in the case of someone like Jackie's retired adopted grandfather. When women were boarders it tended to be adolescents or young women in their 20s who had been thrown out of their families for behavioral reasons, or a woman fleeing an abusive spouse.

Today, as the new term "doubling-up" or "doubled-up families" or "couch people" illustrates, the traditionally defined concept of boarding has changed genders, ages, and most importantly includes children. In the case of doubled-up families, according to the Housing Authority statistical cross-check, the classic profile of both the host and the doubled-up family is that of a single mother with 2.7 children. There is not the same cultural definition within the Puerto Rican community to account for doubled-up families as there has been for the case of the new immigrant male, the fleeing young woman, or the

elderly retired adoptive grandparent. Although the traditional boarder situation was never considered desirable per se, it was culturally understood and accepted. This made it somewhat easier psychologically for people to talk about it "to strangers" e.g., the Census Bureau. The growing phenomenon of the doubled-up family, however, is more of a crisis arrangement and is less likely to be talked about in public as if it were a "normal", acceptable situation. When one combines this ideological awkwardness—not to say shame—of the doubling-up phenomenon with the fact that many of these doubling arrangements are in housing projects or in buildings with some kind of lease restrictions then one can predict that a significant proportion will be hidden from the Census.

Finally there is also going to be downright confusion with the Census Bureau's category of "boarder". Will people consider a doubled-up family to be boarders? Will someone who has been taken in temporarily as a favor but is not being charged rent be considered a boarder?

The Diversity of Factors Contributing to the Undercount

As was illustrated in the profiles at the beginning of this report individuals and households will cycle in and out of at-risk-of-undercount situations. For example, Julio an unemployed young adult living in public housing projects at my field site would not have been reported to the Census at the beginning of my fieldwork. This would not have been because of his underground economy income which he does not share with his mother who subsists on welfare but because he was not on the lease in his mother's public housing apartment and because he had an outstanding court date due to violation of

probation. At the current stage of my fieldwork, however, he probably would be counted in the Census because the sister whose bedroom he was sharing--and who was legally on the lease obliging him to be concealed--moved out to get married. This allowed his mother to declare him to the public housing authorities as a permanent resident substituting for his sister. At about the same time a judge settled his legal complications by officially labelling him as a "discouraged unemployed worker" and then cancelling his outstanding warrants.

HYPOTHESES RELATING TO IDEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL RESISTANCE

HYPOTHESES GROUP B. CENSUS UNDERCOUNTS WILL BE CAUSED BY IDEOLOGICAL/CULTURAL RESISTANCE TO AND ALIENATION FROM MAINSTREAM SOCIETY.

1. Individuals who generate their income within the underground economy will be undercounted in disproportional numbers.

Explanation of the hypothesis

This hypothesis could fit in Group A relating to the protection of resources. I have included it in this second section, however, because my ethnographic data suggests that the underlying motivation for why criminals, street entrepreneurs, et cetera. will be missed by the Census in disproportional numbers is related more complexly to an ideological/cultural dynamic than to a strictly "logical economic" one. It is important to understand here how the dynamism of the underground economy has spawned what can be called a "street culture of resistance" to mainstream society. In other words, protection of resources alone is not enough to account for the Census undercount in the inner city.

On a theoretical level this hypothesis requires a reinterpretation of the relationship between ideology and material reality and between culture and economy. The reality of economic marginalization and/or of intensive participation in the underground (largely illegal) economy creates an ideological (or a cultural) dynamic which encourages individuals and households to resist their documentation by the Federal government. Most obviously this is expressed in an alienation from mainstream society and "legitimate authority"

which is often expressed in specific and very articulate language. More subtly this expresses itself in mistrust, anger, and a violently "dignified" presentation of self.

The hypothesis itself (not the ideological versus the economic dynamic causing the concealment) can be tested at the alternative enumeration sites if the ethnographers collect information on the income-generating strategies of the individuals who were missed and/or of the households who omitted one or more adult members. Other measures can also be obtained to provide rough estimates on a block or neighborhood level which give an idea of involvement in the underground economy. These would be a disproportionately large presence of healthy adults in the streets late at night and evidence of street entrepreneurship (everything from illegal drug sales to off-the-books car repairs). These subjective measures could then be compared to undercount rates for the block or the neighborhood. Statistical methods could also be used such as obtaining figures on outstanding bench warrants, paroles, criminal sentencing patterns, arrest rates etc.. Local police precincts may already have arrest records broken down by sub-areas such as the unit patrolled by a single squad car. Their statistics on arrests could be correlated block by block to patterns in the Census undercount. It would be best to have several alternative enumeration sites in the same city or even the same precinct to test this since enforcement patterns may vary from police department to police department and even from precinct to precinct.

Another strategy would be to calculate the rates of labor force participation--especially for males. Because there are significantly fewer women engaged in the underground economy, if we subtract the number of males

counted by the Census from the number of females and adjusted for those dead, in prison, or in the military we could obtain a very rough idea of the total male pool which is potentially contributing to the underground economy and which might be participating in "street culture". To a certain extent low tax reports in regions with high costs of living also measure involvement in the underground economy.

II. Distortions in the Census will be caused by inner city residents actively misreporting out of anger at and resistance to mainstream society.

Explanation of the hypothesis

One way of differentiating between households attempting to protect resources for straightforward economic/survival reasons versus households resisting mainstream society would be to verify in the alternative enumerations for errors indicating active distortion as opposed to errors resulting from simple omissions of income earners or convenient deletions of the identity of people not listed on leases. These active distortions might take the form of names misspelled in an obviously comic or political manner, or listing ages that are outrageously out of synchrony with reality. It may be interesting to compare the patterns of distortion on the mail return vs those from the face-to-face follow-up interview.

Ethnographic Material

This hypothesis is premised on ethnographic research that suggests that street culture is best understood as a "culture of resistance" to marginalization, ethnic discrimination, and economic exploitation rather than as

an expression of social disorganization or as the aggregated summation of the attitudes of psychologically disfunctional individuals. In other words street people are not failures; they have simply pursued an alternative career path--which is frequently self-destructive. Those most active in street culture will be hostile to all formal institutions, especially if they are based outside the community. They will use the Census interview or their response to the mail return as an opportunity to vent anger and get revenge for what they perceive to be their situation of oppression.

Significantly within street culture there is a high proportion of individuals who are perceived to be failures. For example, heroin addicts involved in methadone maintenance programs are held in low status. They tend to be older people who have given up on the rigors of the underground economy. They no longer have the aptitude and strength to survive by scrambling on the street. They are sometimes lumped into the same category as winos and others obviously broken down. They are no longer vulnerable to legal sanction and they have already lost much of their personal autonomy.

Within the logic of "street culture", the Federal Government is not an ally to work with. As noted in the introductory sections to this report, when challenged on this issue, people will point out the inferior services provided to their community by local governments as justification for their hostility to the Federal Government: lack of garbage collection, insufficient police presence, inferior infrastructure, poor maintenance at public institutions (post offices, municipal hospitals etc), and the blatant decay of the public schools. The many negative experiences an individual may have had in his/her life with ethnic discrimination and economic marginalization also profoundly alienate

him/her from all of mainstream society and especially from the Federal Government. This alienation is frequently expressed on an individual level as a personal anger against "the system". I have already addressed these issues in some detail in the above discussion of the ethnographic basis for why people who have applied for welfare, Medicaid, housing subsidies etc. might be motivated to resist further documentation of their household arrangements and income levels.

Indeed, as noted in the introduction, it is common to hear on inner city streets a deeply felt "conspiracy theory" which claims that there exists a conscious and systematic strategy on the part of the Federal government and the rich to make living conditions intolerable for the poor and the non-white. Some residents might be angry enough to sabotage actively an undertaking that is billed as "good" for mainstream society. They feel that "the Man" has persecuted them since youth. Now they not only want "to get some of mine's", but also revenge.

This anger is not usually "politicized" or even expressed in oppositional terms such as "Them," the oppressive enemy and "We," the victims. For example, the young man cited in an earlier section whose first childhood memory is of his mother concealing his stepfather's presence from a social worker, angrily asserted that he never wanted to be "counted by nobody under no conditions. Why should I? There's no money in it for me. I don't want to be their statistic. What do they care about me anyhow?" He asserts that his mother feels the same way and will rip up the Census mail return form, slam the door on any follow-up enumerators, and hang up on any telephone surveys.

To appreciate fully the importance of the resistance dynamic it is important to place it in the context of the objective world of work that youths face while growing up in Harlem. The job market is the underlying economic dynamic which gives the ideological phenomenon of hatred and resentment of the white-dominated world its dynamism. In my "Summary of Recommendations to CAPP" I provided suggestions for how to overcome this resistance through public relations (Bourgeois 1989). Nevertheless, it is not realistic to think that an ideological phenomenon that emerges out of such a deeply rooted economic reality can be overcome by "convincing raps".

In a nutshell the problem is that an increasing number of Harlem youths are refusing to work for minimum--or just above minimum wages. They are refusing to "sling a mop for the white man". Inner city street culture is best understood as a vibrant culture of resistance to poverty and marginalization which contradictorily leads to self-destruction. For example, the crack street seller/addict is the contemporary expression of a very traditional version of the American Dream: rags to riches through private entrepreneurship a la Horatio Alger.

More and more young men and women in the inner city are refusing to accept minimum wage, entry level jobs. They are also denying with a vengeance mainstream society's denigration of their ethnic identity and personal pride. This street culture of resistance to a white dominated and economically exclusive mainstream society, however, contradictorily also becomes the inner city's vehicle for self-destruction as the crack economy ends up destroying not only the individuals engaging in it but the entire community around it.

In New York City the insult of working for entry-level wages amidst extraordinary opulence is especially painfully perceived by Spanish Harlem youths growing up in abject poverty only a few blocks from all-white neighborhoods commanding some of the highest real estate values in the world. As messengers, security guards, or xerox machine operators in the corporate headquarters of the Fortune 500 companies they are brusquely ordered about by young white professionals who sometimes make monthly salaries superior to their yearly wages and who do not even have the time to notice that they are being rude to their underlings. In the world of substance abuse street scramblers never have to experience the silent, subtle humiliations that the entry-level labor market--or even merely a daily subway ride downtown to the rich neighborhoods--invariably subjects them to. They prefer, consequently, to seek out meaning and upward mobility in a context that does not oblige them to come into contact with people of a different, hostile ethnicity wielding arbitrary power over them.

In contrast to entry level employees in the service sector, street sellers have a great deal of autonomy and power in their nightly routine. So long as they maintain the established hours and meet the sales quotas, the boss' messenger comes only once or twice a shift to drop off drugs and pick up money. During their working hours they are often surrounded by a bevy of "thirsty" friends and hanger-oners--frequently young teenage women in the case of male sellers--willing to run errands, pay attention to conversations, support in arguments and fights, and provide sexual favors upon demand because of the relatively large amounts of money and drugs passing through their hands. In fact, even youths who do not use drugs will hang out and respectfully attempt to

befriend the dealer just to be privy to the excitement.

In the process of scrambling for money and meaning they destroy themselves and their community. On one level this destruction is physical—murder, assault, and addiction. On a deeper level it engenders an undercurrent of terror pervading all corners of the community and even poisoning interpersonal relations. Most importantly from the Census Bureau's perspective is the fact that the rage that forms the basis for inner city street culture with its refusal to play by the demeaning rules of the white man creates a celebration of marginalization. This prevents many self-respecting inner city residents from sharing in any aspect of mainstream society's institutions because even a marginal participation would oblige them to tolerate some dose of racism and a depreciation of their cultural identity in an admission that the culture from which they come doesn't allow them to "make it" in mainstream America.

III. Individuals engaged in illegal activities will prefer to be concealed from the Census for fear of detection and will not believe in the Census' claim of confidentiality.

Explanation of the hypothesis

In the alternative enumeration sites we could test this by having the ethnographers find out which of the missing people at their sites were delinquent with the law and conversely, how many people engaged in illegal activities were duly counted. The individuals in question might have outstanding bench warrants; they may have failed to report to probation or parole officers, or they might have failed to report for incarceration following sentencing in court. All of these statistics are available through official

channels. We are also interested, however, in those who have not been apprehended but who fear arrest because of their lifestyle and prefer anonymity.

Another way of testing the magnitude of the factors of fear and mistrust as they relate on the level of personal identification is to run a test Census in which names are not collected. Perhaps nicknames could be used, or better yet an anonymous identifier code. Another option would be to run a test Census using outreach workers and specially skilled enumerators who will purposefully increase the amount of time they spend in each household explaining exactly what confidentiality means. Confidentiality needs to be defined in very specific terms that are demonstrably related to the situation of the specific individual or household being censused. Otherwise "confidentiality" sounds like a rather grandiose--almost theoretical--term with nebulous insinuations.

Ethnographic Material on the Problem of Confidentiality and Mistrust

The second half of this hypothesis raises the issue of concealment as it is related to fear and distrust of the Census Bureau's claim of confidentiality. This is a serious problem for the Census and is an important part of the dynamic motivating people to underreport or refuse to participate (hence the emphasis of the Group A hypotheses). People will not believe the Census Bureau's assurances that the information being collected is confidential. As a high level official in the New York Housing Authority told me "People can't believe that government doesn't talk to itself." They have had or have heard about negative experiences with the different public bureaucracies; they are much more apt to subscribe to "conspiracy theories" about government repression and injustice than are members

of the middle class. They take it as self-evident that "money and power talk". For example, people involved in illegal activities laugh at me when I try to explain to them that the Federal Certificate of Confidentiality that was granted to me from the National Institute on Drug Abuse for my research will protect my interviews with them from court subpoena. They think I am naive and to justify their cynicism and caution they refer to specific experiences of being arrested and having their constitutional rights violated. They call it being "jerked by the system" and they fear that if they believe the assurance of confidentiality of the Census they are carelessly exposing themselves to the possibility of--yet once again--being "jerked."

There is a sense among participants in "street culture" that the Federal Government is an alien entity to be taken advantage of--or at best to be avoided--rather than an ally to work with and believe in. This is reinforced by the blatant decay of the public sector throughout the inner city. It is also the logic that emerges out of their overpowering daily experience with economic and ideological marginalization from the America displayed on television. They feel hated, humiliated, and ripped off by the American Dream. In short there is a profound sense of alienation from all of mainstream society but especially from the Federal Government.

Street culture's ideology of fear may contribute to the Census undercount simply because of the deep pervasiveness of fear and mistrust throughout the inner city even among individuals who scorn street culture and the underground economy. Many people are scared to open their doors for fear of assault. For example, a young Puerto Rican man who was playing the role of a Census enumerator, echoed the thoughts of a middle-aged woman staring through the

keyhole at him on Census day when he would be knocking on her door: "Quien es este Boricua, parece un maton; me puede robar. Ve te al carajo! [Who's that Puerto Rican dude, he looks like a thug; he might rob me. Go to hell!]"

For many people minimizing public knowledge about themselves is simply common sense "street smarts". In fact, one of the maxims for successful survival "in the street" is to keep to oneself, not to ask questions, and not to give out information unnecessarily. One's best friends are "me, myself, and I." This is done both for self-protection and also because knowing more than one needs to know can be dangerous. One does not want one's income, one's address, or one's lovers and family members to be common knowledge to prevent possible blackmail, retaliation, and to guard against engendering new obligations.

It is a common practice to exaggerate how broke one is so that a "thirsty" crack addict friend or relative will not get angry or violent when one refuses to give them money. Because street culture requires one to participate in the sharing of resources--lending money, bailing out acquaintances and family members in need, et cetera--it is safest for as little as possible about oneself to be public knowledge.

For example, a crack dealer I interviewed shares a bedroom with his older sister but does not know what her source of income is even though he knows that it is legal. She does not know how much he makes although she knows that it is related to crack. In justifying their mutual secrecy to me he told me "It's a good thing too because the other day she asked to borrow some money and I could just tell her 'it ain't there.'"

Another example, of how secretive participants in the underground economy can

be even in their intimate household contexts is illustrated by the case of Leticia, a 27 year old legally employed woman, who lives with her father and mother in a housing project. To my surprise I found out that her father had been sent to jail and two buildings that he owned had been confiscated by the police. When I spoke to Leticia about this she assured me that she had not had any idea that her father was a large-scale drug entrepreneur. I believe her because she had always told me that her father was poor and I had visited her home in the housing projects which revealed itself to be frugally maintained. Leticia had not even known that her father owned two buildings. Nevertheless, Leticia had been living with her father at the time of his arrest. She had known that he spent a lot of time outside of the household and often did not return for days on end but she thought along with her mother that it was because her father was visiting his girlfriend's home.

In my "Summary of Recommendations to CAPP" I noted that many hard-to-reach street people have very close and tight bonds with their mothers or grandmothers with whom they often live. This powerful mother/child bond is essential to the survival of a large sector of participants in the more marginal networks of the underground economy. It can either be a point of access to censusing hard to reach people or a point of resistance. If these mothers and grandmothers suspect that their children will be prejudiced by the information they reveal about them on the Census form there is no way to persuade them in the name of "public duty" or "community welfare" to fill out an accurate return. In most cases the mothers will be conscientious, law-abiding citizens while their son or daughter might be the most hard-core street criminal/murderer. Nevertheless the bond between them is one of total loyalty on the part of the mother. In many

cases the mother may even have been hurt, betrayed, or burglarized by her child. Despite all odds she sticks by her son.

I have documented the power of this relationship on the street on repeated occasions. In fact, in one case I was interviewing a 19 year-old crack addict who had smoked every day for the past three and one-half years. He still lived with his mother and when I turned the interview onto the subject of what would happen to him if his mother died he broke down crying and we had to end the conversation. Similarly on another occasion I interviewed two young men who have participated in extensive crime and violence since their youth and who by all definitions would be considered "tough" and "dangerous". On their own initiative they began talking about their mothers with whom they each resided. (In one case the young man actually resided with his grandmother but referred to her as "my moms".) Their voices and faces assumed expressions of tenderness and they started talking with awe and love about how great their mother was to them and how they could not survive without her. In fact, this was the first time I had ever heard a public admission of dependence and vulnerability on the part of these two hard-core street-frequenters.

Finally the dynamic of concealment also applies at the neighborhood level to a self-protective ideology of exclusion of outsiders by the often tightly knit street frequenters who hegemonize violent street culture. Only one week before writing this report four young men were shot to death in the housing project opposite me and one young woman was seriously wounded. The youngest victim was 10 years old and the oldest was 17. One of the weapons used was an Uzi. The killings were part of a turf battle between two teenage "posses". A large number of youths in the neighborhood know exactly who the perpetrators are but the

police have been unable to crack the case. There is a sense of neighborhood solidarity among the youths, even those who have killed one another's best friends believe the authorities have "no business getting involved".

PROXIES AND INDICES PREDICTING THE CENSUS UNDERCOUNT.

I. Neighbourhoods with high levels of vandalism will be undercounted.

Explanation of the hypothesis

Vandalism of public and private property is a good, immediately observable index of the ideological dynamic of alienation and resistance which will encourage misreporting to Census interviewers. This relates back to the discussion in the Group B hypotheses of resistance, alienation, and anger. Vandalism is one of the few immediately visible expressions of this complicated subjective phenomenon. We could develop flexible but standardized measures to categorize the level of vandalism present at each alternative enumeration site. It will be particularly interesting to see if this index or proxy coincides with cases of purposeful, active distortion of Census data (see Hypothesis II in Group B), as opposed to simple omission to protect resources. In other words vandalism comes close to being an "objective" measure of anger and resistance.

The proxy of vandalism can be specified more precisely in a more easily standardized measure such as presence of graffiti. Indeed, several of the youths whom I anticipate might be missed by the Census such as Willie, Julio, and Lee are responsible for a lot of graffiti. It is not only a means of venting anger, as in the case of vandalism, but it more subtly is a marker of belonging to a youth-oriented street culture. Indeed, within street culture

there is almost a sub-culture of truly talented graffiti painters. Virtually everyone under 25 who participates in the underground economy or merely in street culture has a minimal "tag"--or personalized initial--which they put up in the building they live in and on the corners that they frequent. Outsiders can often not even decipher the letters in the tags because they have been culturally stylized. Taggers, however, can always read one another's work; indeed that is the whole point of a tag--to mark one's presence or ownership of a locale. Graffiti is a proxy for an active street culture which implies adherence to the ideology of resistance to mainstream society and means that a disproportional number will be participating intensively in the underground economy.

Of course graffiti could be broken down further as a proxy into different types with different meanings. Some is specifically political like the "genocide" poster discussed in the introductory section. Some is vandalistic like the type that covers elevator windows, signs etc.; some is artistic like the full blown portraits, sometimes hundreds of square feet in size, that adorn the bricked up facades of abandoned buildings. These spray paintings are often commissioned by local businesses as advertisements on their store fronts. Finally some graffiti solely consists of isolated personal "tags".

II. Neighbourhoods with inferior public services will be undercounted.

Explanation of the hypothesis

This is an easily indexed measurement: garbage on the street, student/teacher ratios and the quality of basic maintenance in public schools, post offices, hospitals in run-down condition, badly paved streets and sidewalks, prevalence

of graffiti, et cetera. The measure of inferior public services is especially interesting since it provides documentation of the breakdown of the public sector in the inner city. The Census Bureau by definition has to overcome this breakdown since its mandate is to assign an equally important number to everyone, rich or poor, black or white. Indeed Europeans would argue that ultimately the disproportionately high Census undercount in the United States as compared to other industrialized western nations is a result of America's "underdeveloped" public sector. The post office might be a particularly good proxy to use in evaluating the quality of a neighborhood's public sector. The post office is a good neutral institution that is generally well-run and penetrates to all corners of the United States. Furthermore, the quality of the postal services impinges directly on the accuracy of the Census when forms are lost in the mail or never delivered. Schools are also an especially good proxy because they reflect local tax bases as well as Federal and state sector commitments. The amount spent on the education of each pupil, for example might be a good indicator.

III. Public evidence of large-scale substance abuse/addiction will correlate with higher levels of Census undercount.

Explanation of the hypothesis

Substance abuse is one of the best indexes of poverty, marginalization, and alienation from mainstream society. Drug addicts are disproportionately involved in the most illegal aspects of the underground economy. Many addicts are homeless and many are marginal members of households which subsist on public support. Substance abuse/addiction is a potential proxy for some of the

dynamics noted in the hypotheses of category B. Although substance abuse occurs at all levels of society and can be precipitated by any number of personal motivations, publicly displayed substance abuse in the inner city might be a possible index for alienation and anger and, to a lesser extent, for resistance. It might also be an index of the size of the local underground economy. Widespread public substance abuse causes crime and creates neighborhoods dominated by fear. It also tends to be accompanied by residential mobility which has been found to correlate with the level of Census undercounts. Over the past several years, I have been able to watch several blocks become denuded of inhabitants and several buildings become abandoned as street-level drug sales proliferated in the vicinity.

In testing this hypothesis we will be interested in public manifestations of substance abuse. By definition, therefore, this is an observable phenomenon which each ethnographer can document at his/her site--whether it be alcoholism on an Indian reservation or intravenous narcotics use in an inner city. For example, at my fieldwork site, massive substance abuse is immediately and publicly apparent from the sound of crack vials crunching underfoot. When the evidence of substance abuse--discarded syringes, crack vials, and physically destroyed human beings--overflows into the public domain in any given locale it can be assumed that abuse is "out of control" and impinging on the immediate community sufficiently to have an effect on Census coverage.

IV. The police records for narcotics arrests broken down into subareas according to squad car patrol units will correlate with levels of Census undercount.

Explanation of the hypothesis

This hypothesis is a more specified version of the previous one and may apply more consistently to urban settings where narcotics are more generally available. Police departments keep detailed records of cocaine arrests per squad car area (generally two blocks in concentrated urban settings such as San Francisco or New York).

In fact, cocaine arrests may be the best single variable to measure given contemporary patterns of drug abuse. Crack/cocaine addiction is more disruptive to an individual's stability than is heroin due to the psycho-pharmacological effects of the drug and due to the compulsive binge patterns of use. My ethnographic research has documented that Crack/cocaine addicts are significantly more unstable than heroin addicts and this is supported by preliminary laboratory findings on the drug's pharmacological characteristics (Bourgois 1990; New York Times June 25, 1988:1,30). Heroin is an opium derivative which pharmacologically calms the individual imbibing it. Cocaine/crack is a stimulant which keeps the addict awake, depriving him/her of sleep and in the long-term is capable of inducing psychosis, extreme paranoia, hallucinations etc. Individuals addicted to crack/cocaine fall apart physically, emotionally, and economically significantly faster than heroin addicts. This is reflected in the changing patterns of violent crimes found in inner cities over the past four years since the rise in crack and in cocaine

use.

A disadvantage with a drug arrest index or a public intoxication index is that the police may enforce the law differentially, especially in poor, non-white neighborhoods. An arrest rate sometimes merely indicates that the police happen to be attempting to clamp down on drug sales. It does not automatically offer an objective index of substance abuse. For example, the upper west side and the lower east side of New York City will have relatively high cocaine arrest rates but this represents the gentrification process (low income ethnic minority populations being replaced by young upward mobile professionals) more than an absolute figure on public substance abuse. To control for differential law enforcement, therefore, this otherwise useful proxy measure should be combined with another index such as that of public sector maintenance. The same caveat could apply for any other police record index that might be used as a proxy for vulnerability to the Census undercount, such as aggravated assaults, murders, public intoxication. Murder rates are probably better than most other crime indexes as a proxy measurement because murders are more likely to be reported than muggings, burglaries etc..

V. Rates of HIV infection among heterosexuals will correlate with the Census undercount.

Explanation of the hypothesis

It is possible to obtain hospital statistics on HIV infection of intravenous drug users. Similarly emergency room statistics in public hospitals can be accessed and may be especially useful since the public health sector (not to mention the criminal justice system) is often the only "mainstream institutional

contact" for intravenous drug users, and other members of the most marginalized cohort of the inner city which is at highest risk of being undercounted. Specifically HIV infection rates for heterosexual adults and newborn infants is a potential proxy for intravenous drug use and for intensive involvement in the underground economy.

VI) Housing loss (due to abandonment, fire, or vandalism) will correlate with the Census undercount.

Explanation of the hypothesis

The Census Bureau already has some statistical support for this hypothesis. The goal in testing this hypothesis at the alternative enumeration sites will be to differentiate between undercounting caused by households living in marginal/abandoned structures which were missed entirely by the Census process (beginning with the prec canvassing conducted the previous year) versus those who were undercounted for other reasons for which housing loss is merely a proxy. Indeed, abandoned housing is a good proxy for marginalization. For example, on the micro--block by block level--within the inner city, patterns of marginalization can be documented in the statistics on housing loss and housing quality. Drug blocks tend to be abandoned first by those residents who are not involved in substance abuse. Simply put, people within the inner city try to move out of the worst blocks. Individuals most marginal to society or most involved in the underground economy are usually the last to move off the block or out of a decaying or condemned building.

Ethnographic Material

Just during the four years since I moved into the neighborhood I have been able to document the relationship between building abandonment and the prevalence of illegal activities occurring on the block in front of the buildings or in the very same buildings. For example, on the most notorious crack block in the neighborhood a half dozen streets away from where I live, three of the buildings on the block have become abandoned since 1985 and two of the already abandoned buildings have been torn down by the city. The block only has four buildings still standing and there is a gaping, garbage strewn lot in the middle of it.

Similarly another building that had been taken over by crack dealers (the one inhabited for a short time by Maria's household after she was evicted from the tenement next to me) has since been cemented shut and the two buildings next to it are also abandoned. There are some suspicious businesses still operating in the neighboring buildings that people refer to as money laundering operations for high level organized crime. I have been wary of investigating these buildings for obvious reasons. Indeed it might be dangerous for a Census enumerator to become too informed about the comings and goings in these buildings.

To further document the meaning of abandonment I have collected oral histories from elderly residents of the blocks that today are either entirely vacant or mostly vacant. Significantly the most abandoned blocks are the ones that 10 or 15 years ago were the centers for street-level, retail heroin distribution. Today these abandoned blocks are no longer the sites for drug

dealing because all the buildings have been ripped down and there is no physical space to shelter or hide illegal activity.

From a more logistical perspective, high rates of decayed housing will oblige households to move repeatedly as the buildings they inhabit literally fall apart from under them. It is possible, therefore, for these obligatorily mobile households to fall through the cracks of the Census if their move takes place right at the point when the prec canvassing takes place, or when the mail returns are sent out, or when the follow up enumerations occur.

Finally abandonment also captures the larger-scale dynamic of public sector breakdown and private sector abandonment that marks a neighborhood in crisis. Landlords are no longer trying to make money off of their buildings and are no longer paying taxes. The city which confiscates these buildings has not attempted to rehabilitate them or build new ones on the empty lots.

VII Blocks where there are children out on the streets after dark will be vulnerable to undercounting.

Explanation of the hypothesis

Young children on the street late at night is a proxy for several different dynamics which may be contributing to the undercount. Most obviously the presence of children indicates that there will be more complicated household dynamics than in the case of childless households or households composed of only one person. By definition this provides a risk for missing people. Not only are there people to be missed but their relationships to one another revolve around procreation which is more fraught with potential complications and

permutations than are childless household arrangements.

Children on the streets may be indicative of the fact that parents work night schedules. This makes the households potentially more vulnerable to undercounting since maintaining an exceptional work schedule might make the household less accessible for follow-up enumerations. It also may be a sign of marginal employment in the legal sector. It may also be an indication that the parents operate in the underground economy and work on a night schedule. It may also denote that the parents are involved in substance abuse as addicts--especially cocaine and crack users--often stay up all night. Children on the streets at night is also sometimes the sign of a family in the throes of an acute crisis whether it be economic, emotional, or logistical. In a more neutral or culturally relative context it may merely be the sign of a non-traditional household structure which the Census form may not be able to accommodate or communicate accurately with. Regardless of whether the households are involved in the legal economy or the underground economy, operating on a night schedule may facilitate their being missed or inaccurately reported on the Census.

ADDITIONAL HYPOTHESES:

I. PROPORTIONALLY THE SINGLE BIGGEST CATEGORY OF UNDERCOUNTED INDIVIDUALS WILL BE UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRANTS.

Explanation of the hypothesis

The ethnographers at the alternative enumeration sites could try to collect data on immigration status. At the national level the absolute number of undocumented undercounted by the Census will not be as large as the total number of ethnic minority males between the ages of 20 and 30 years who will be missed. Nevertheless the situation of the undocumented is extremely important because they tend to congregate in specific neighborhoods and buildings and can represent a severe strain on the resources of an already poor community ill equipped to deal with them. If there is no official documentation of this complex population which has very pronounced and specialized needs there can be no long-term planning or resource allocation.

Ethnographic Material

My ethnographic research indicates that in many cases extraordinarily high proportions of undocumented households will not be counted. For example an undocumented Mexican who shared his apartment with 27 other adults in a five bedroom apartment told me that the person filling out the Census mail return will only include the five people listed on the lease. If an enumerator should knock on the door to verify, the person answering the door will only report the number of individuals who happened to be visible to the enumerator at that moment. The undocumented population is also characterized by high levels of

fear and distrust of the Federal Government and of any outsiders whatsoever. Many undocumented immigrants come from countries with repressive regimes and they have a deep fear and distrust of surveys. Furthermore, language barriers and social marginalization prevent them from being easily reached by CAPP.

The best sites to test hypotheses on the undocumented are regions where the Immigration and Naturalization Service is especially active in enforcement such as the Southwest or southern California. These are more polarized regions where the fears of the undocumented will be at their highest. My interviews with undocumented people in New York reveal that fears of apprehension by the INS are not a daily concern. Nevertheless, when I interview the undocumented they become exceptionally nervous when I begin asking how many people live in their apartment or building. I sometimes encounter more expressions of fear and concern from the undocumented than from street criminals.

In a setting like New York where there is not extensive INS activity the bulk of the undercount of the undocumented may be caused by cultural miscommunication (see the reports of Ann Rynearson and Alex and Carol Stepick). Significantly there is also an element of shame at living in overcrowded conditions. For example the Senegalese I have interviewed seem to be less afraid than the Mexicans of detection by the INS but they become extremely defensive when I ask them about overcrowding. Some of the Senegalese I have interviewed take it as an insult when I suggest that they might live under more crowded conditions than the average New Yorker. One interviewee even turned my question into a racist diatribe saying that my perception that the undocumented lived under overcrowded conditions was due to the fact that some immigrants from "lower cultural backgrounds like the Haitians" live "piled up on top of one another like

animals". He then added that putting four people in one room simply was not humanly possible. When I pushed him on that figure it turned out that he was living in an apartment with three people to a room in which the kitchen counted as "a room". I would not be surprised if some Senegalese households underreport members not because they are worried about their legal status but because they do not feel it is dignified to live under such crowded conditions in America.

II. Census undercounts will result from the ambiguous residence patterns of individuals marginal to mainstream society.

Explanation of the hypothesis

The ethnographers at the alternate enumeration sites should be able to document cases of individuals who are missed by mistake because of the ambiguous definition of their permanent residence. This is self-evident in the case of the homeless. A more complex but less visible dimension of this category of the Census undercount is composed of people who have ties to several households at once and who may not be considered a permanent resident by any one of them. Other cases could include the phenomenon of men who cultivate serial residences. They purposefully apportion their time between several households whether it be for protection, legal evasion, or simply because of the nature of their social networks. The interesting issue here will be to differentiate between individuals who are resisting versus those who are concealed versus those who are simply missed because their logistical framework is so different from the one understood by mainstream society. The concept of a permanent address is culturally relative. It is embedded with cultural constructs and definitions that are by no means universal or self-evident--hence the inner city

street term "I stay at . . ." rather than the mainstream "I live at . . ."

Ironically this category of missing persons ranges from individuals who are extremely socially disorganized--such as the homeless alcoholics--to people who are extremely organized--such as drug dealers who strategically rotate their residences. The standard phrase "cultural diversity" must be fully recognized here to appreciate the fact that the categories and definitions used by the Census will not be universally applicable or intelligible for households and individuals operating in very distinct frameworks.

Inaccuracies will be caused by the cultural miscommunication caused by the use of the the Census bureau's categories and definitions which are alien to households and populations operating in different social frameworks. People do not have to be new immigrants or "exotic" to have very different definitions of household membership. For example, there is a small cohort of young males in my neighborhood who pride themselves on not being employed and maintaining themselves as "gigolos". This is a frequently used term by young men on the street. I have even heard one man say proudly "I am a gigolo just like my father." The ideal is to have a gigolo relationship with several different households at once and to move around from household to household. While very few men actually achieve this ideal there are some who approximate it. The permanent residence status of these individuals thereby becomes ambiguous.

III. Census undercounts will be caused by enumerators avoiding marginal residences and especially drug dens, due to distaste and perceived danger.

Explanation of the hypothesis

Ethnographers at all the sites will be able to determine if there are buildings or structures that pose a danger to uninitiated outsiders who attempt to enter and ask personal questions. This is the type of housing at high risk of being missed by enumerators. For example, in Spanish Harlem there are abandoned or semi-abandoned drug buildings/shooting galleries that are clearly visibly dangerous for the uninitiated. Sometimes there are even armed guards in the hallways. Everyone, regardless of ethnicity, class, gender etc. is wary of entering an abandoned but inhabited drug building. It would be unrealistic to expect Census workers to enter these places and obtain accurate counts. They would be risking their lives. In addition to risking assault, the Census enumerator may have to wade through human feces and other filth in the hallways etc. Not only danger, consequently, but also a natural distaste may keep the Census enumerator at bay.

Trends for Further Consideration

The undercount may be proportionally higher in 1990 than it was in 1980 if marginalization and the breakdown of the public sector fuels the undercount.

The statistics on income distribution indicate that there has been a growing polarization between rich and poor during the decade of the 1980s. The very poor are relatively poorer than they were ten years ago; and there are more households living below the poverty line. The real value of the minimum wage

has dropped significantly. A higher proportion of people are employed in non-union jobs or in part-time positions which do not offer employee benefits. Finally there has been a reduction in public sector services, especially in the major urban centers where the most marginalized inner cities are located.

Changing patterns of substance abuse will correlate with changes in the demography of the census undercount

Crack addicts and heroin and cocaine intravenous users will be undercounted in disproportionately high numbers. The replacement of heroin by cocaine and crack as drugs of choice in the inner city will exacerbate the Census undercount.

The traditional gender bias of the census undercount is in the process of a transformation which will lead to higher levels of undercounting of both males and females.

The increased participation of women in the underground economy and in street culture will exacerbate the Census undercount and decrease the proportion of men vs women who are undercounted.

Historically men have always been more involved in the more clandestine, less legal dimensions of the underground economy (for example drugs sales). Women have also more frequently been accessible to mainstream institutions and especially to the Census interviewer since they are in charge of raising the children and maintaining the household. They tend to fill out the mail returns and/or answer the door on Census day. Women have been the focus for household stability and they are most likely to maintain the links with mainstream

society. The dramatic rise in the proportion of female crack addicts and intravenous cocaine users reveals a transformation not just in patterns of substance abuse but in the structure of the underground economy and consequently in household stability. The rising statistics on babies born addicted to cocaine (available from hospitals) or babies abandoned by their mothers (available from family court) document the growing instability of the inner city family and the decline of its so-called matrifocality.

Significantly this rise in female addiction, and household instability is part of a greater emancipation of women occurring throughout our society. Increasing numbers of inner city women are now able to seek careers and "actualization" in the underground economy. They are not as confined to the home and to child care as the previous generation was. We will only see the beginning of this trend in 1990; it should be more pronounced by the year 2000.

Enumerator Ethnicity

An inner city resident will have a better chance of counting "missing men" and women. Being able to communicate in the local language, accent, colloquial expressions and sharing common understandings and assumptions that lead to the Census undercount allow the insider to document the "missing" more effectively than an outsider could. This ranges from inspiring trust, to knowing what kinds of questions to ask, to being able to perceive that someone is being concealed or is an occasional resident.

Conversely it could be argued that an inner city resident will not necessarily inspire greater confidence in the household being interviewed. An outsider--especially a white, middle-class person with a "radio announcer

accent"—will not be suspected of being a potential burglar and may carry a greater degree of credibility among some inner city residents. Patterns of racism and internalized racism are such that some people will believe and trust a middle class white more easily than a fellow inner city resident. For example an African-American street person told me (paraphrase) "I hate you because if I ask you the time of day and a black brother the time of day and you both give me different times, I'll believe you instead of him." There is, of course, a great deal of diversity and internal inconsistency with respect to this issue.

CONCLUSION

Despite my emphasis on the role of ideological resistance and inner city mistrust of mainstream society, I hope to have shown that the problems faced by the Census are not simply the result of a "bad attitude" on the part of the most marginalized residents of segregated, poverty neighborhoods. It is a much deeper problem that involves on the one hand the redefinition of the American Dream and on the other hand brutal economic realities.

In the long-run the dimensions of the Census undercount that my fieldwork has examined cannot be "solved" without addressing America's most urgent and growing social problem: its increasingly segregated and increasingly concentrated foci of persistent urban poverty. This may require us to look closely at our economic and political model and redefine the vitality of our public sector.

REFERENCES

Bourgois, Philippe. 1989. "Summary of Recommendations to CAPP." Mid-term paper presented to the Census Bureau under JSA 88-24.

Bourgois, Philippe. 1990. "In Search of Horatio Alger: Culture and Ideology in the Crack Economy." Contemporary Drug Problems. In Press.

Fleisher, Mark. 1989. "Statement of Working Hypotheses: An Ethnographic Evaluation of Street-to-System Cycling of Black, Hispanic and American Indian Males." Mid-term report submitted to the Center for Survey Methods Research of the Census Bureau.

Joint Statistical Agreement 88-24. 1988. "Concealment in the Underground Economy: The Economic and Ideological Dynamics of the Census Undercount in the Inner City." Joint Statistical Agreement 88-24 between the Census Bureau and the Research Institute for the Study of Man.

New York City Housing Authority. 1989. "Summary of Overcrowding in Authority Apartments." Manuscript 7pp. Department of Research and Planning, New York City Housing Authority.

Rynearson, Ann and Thomas Gosebrink. 1989. "Census-Related Behavior of Southeast Asian Refugees." A preliminary report submitted to the Center for Survey Methods Research of the Census Bureau.

Stepick, Alex and Carol Stepick. 1989. Mid-Term Report on Haitians in Miami and the Census Undercount. Submitted to the Center for Survey Methods Research of the Census Bureau.