Failed women and illegitimate citizens:

The transformations of the private sphere and the gendered citizenship of

homeless women in Budapest

By

Katalin Ámon

Submitted to

Central European University

Department of Gender Studies

In partial fulfillment for the degree of Master of Arts in Gender Studies.

Supervisor: Professor Allaine Cerwonka

Second reader: Professor Éva Fodor

Budapest, Hungary

2013

Where you've fallen, you will stay.
In the whole universe this one
and only place is the sole place
which you have made your very own.

The country runs away from you.
House, mill, poplar – every thing
is struggling with you here, as if
in nothingness mutating.

But now it's you who won't give up.
Did we fleece you? You've grown rich.
Did we blind you? You watch us still.
You bear witness without speech.[1]

---

[1] János Pilinszky: On the Wall of a KZ Lager. English version by Clive Wilmer and George Gömöri.

Abstract

This ethnographic research in a shelter for homeless women in Budapest aims to broaden the perspective of feminist political theories about citizenship showing that their concept of citizenship is largely based on the access to private sphere which poor women do not dispose of. First, I argue that the welfare system in form of individual assistance is aimed at the normalization of homeless women resulting in transparent privacy and therefore in a reduced private sphere. Then I explain how the lack of material resources forces women in to the economy of intimacy of the shelter and leads to the loss of ownership of their own body. In the last chapter, I analyze how homeless women's transparent privacy and the economy of intimacy transform homeless women's citizenship who are perceived as both failed women and illegitimate citizens because of their lack of domestic sphere. Contrary to "culture of poverty" discourses, however, I point out that homeless women's transformed private sphere does not mean that they identify with a homeless "subculture", but espouse to dominant social norms to make a distinction between themselves and other homeless women through discourses of voluntary and undeserving homeless people.

Table of Contents

Introduction

People who lose their home are perceived with public anxiety often resulting in coercive measures against homeless people. Homelessness has been a major concern of the current Hungarian government and local authorities. Politicians have been talking about "giving back" the subways to the citizens implying that homeless people are not part of the concept of citizenship. Political statements, debates and interviews have been dominated by images of homeless people drinking, defecating, urinating and having sex in public spaces. An amendment to the Fundamental Law has been passed including the following passage: "Law or local government decree may outlaw the use of certain public space for habitation in order to preserve the public order, public safety, public health and cultural values" (Fourth Amendment to Hungary's Fundamental Law, English Translation, February 08, 2013).

Political concerns do not address homelessness primarily as a social problem caused by poverty and lack of affordable housing, rather they represent the fear from the "homeless body" in Kawash's (1998) term. The "homeless body" is a threatening material and moral antithesis of the social order. It is an embodiment of the concerns about the threats against public order controlled by the community of citizens (Kawash 1998).

Homelessness is thus conceptualized as opposed to citizenship. Political supporters of punitive politics argue for the interest of citizens as opposed to homeless non-citizens, while the political opponents arguing for social help for homeless people and structural changes instead of their criminalization, frame their arguments in terms of rights for social care. Citizenship is thus the political frame in which the issue of homelessness is discussed.

Citizenship has been a controversial concept in feminist thought: on the one hand, citizenship is meant to secure the civil, political and social rights for citizens (Marshall 1963, Lister 1997); on the other hand the social contract behind the concept of citizenship implies a sexual contract which excludes women from the public sphere and full citizenship (Pateman 1988). In spite of

the fact that in liberal political theory citizenship is interpreted as being universal, this idea of universality mostly ignores the inequalities affecting women, non-heterosexual and poor people (Okin 1987).

Similar processes can be traced in the case of homeless women. In the melting pot of the "homeless body" discourse, the gender of the homeless person disappears. However, homeless women are still affected by the sexual contract, including the denial of the ownership of their own body. The sexual contract, according to Pateman (1988), is the "hidden" contract beyond the social contract, which secures men's exclusive access to public sphere and their political right over women, particularly to their bodies.

The intersection of homelessness and gender have not yet been analyzed in the framework of citizenship. Lister (1997) used the term gendered citizenship to highlight gender-based inequalities and possible solutions remaining in the framework of citizenship, while Tosi (1996) referred to people living in extreme urban poverty with the term of restrictive citizenship, since these people experience a lower degree of citizenship in terms of civil, political and social rights. Gendered citizenship means that women are relegated to the private or domestic sphere which leads to different forms of gender-based inequalities including the sexual division of labor and the sexual oppression of women (Lister 1997).

Berlant (1997) uses the concept of intimate public sphere to shows that private life is not a realm separate from the public sphere, but it is governed and constructed by the dominant political discourses. All theories on citizenship, nonetheless, assume a certain degree of privacy and a certain amount of private property of which the citizens dispose and through which they can participate in the public sphere.

Feminist analyses of women's citizenship and welfare provisions do not explore the different construction of private sphere, but focus on the ways women's needs are constructed in the political discourses and the ways the paternalistic welfare state supervises and controls women (Fraser 1990, Haney 2002, Smith 2007). Although I concentrated on the needs-construction and

welfare paternalism in the beginning of my research, the more time I spent in the shelter, the more concerned I became that the analyses about poor people's citizenship do not take into account that the access to privacy and private property are privileges in both material and abstract terms. In the case of homeless women, assumptions about privacy and the notions of citizenships have to be rethought.

Consequently, in my ethnographic research I have focused on shelter-using homeless women in Budapest, because they are directly connected to state apparatuses which have a major role in defining and constructing the notions of citizenship and their needs and the conditions under which these people can live. In this study, I examine how homeless women's gendered citizenship is constructed in order to understand the notions of gendered citizenship of women living in poverty who do not have a private, intimate or domestic sphere.

The main questions of my research are: How does homelessness compromise the citizenship status and rights of homeless women? How does the homelessness of the women disrupt the notion of private sphere which liberal citizenship is based on? What does women's homelessness show us about the private as a realm necessary for women's status as legitimate citizens?

In chapter 1, I explain why intimacy/privacy is crucial in the ideas about citizenship and gender and why citizenship is a useful term in the analysis of the situation of homeless women. Then I describe the methodology of the research reflecting on my own position as a researcher. In chapter 3, I analyze the construction and the practices of intimacy/privacy in the shelter. In chapter 4, I elaborate on the economy of intimacy and the lack of resources in the shelter and the relationships produces. In the last chapter I reflect on how these constructions and practices and the produced system influence the notions of citizenship and gender.

3

Chapter 1

Privacy, citizenship and shelter-using homeless women

The concept of citizenship has been critiqued by feminist scholars for relegating women to the private sphere and excluding them from political decisions and institutions and legitimizing various forms of gender-based violence by treating it as a personal or private issue. The use of the term citizenship as a basis of conservative politics emphasizing the individual's responsibilities and civic duties and his/her perfect autonomy in taking decision on his/her life has also been critiqued for blaming the socially disadvantaged for their situation and arguing for the reduction of welfare provisions. In this chapter, however, I only focus on the role of the private sphere in the construction of proper citizenship and explain why citizenship is a relevant conceptual framework for the analysis of homeless women's situation.

1.1 The notions of citizenship and the feminist critiques of the private sphere

Although the concept of citizenship originates back to the 17th century Anglo-Saxon liberal political theory, contemporary analyses rely on Marshall's (1963) conceptualization of the ideal type of citizenship in terms of civil, political and social rights. In his model, civil rights are the rights indispensable for the freedom of a person; the political rights are necessary for the participation in political decision-making, while social rights include the right to economic security and welfare. The concept of social rights became a theoretical basis for Esping-Andersen's (2004) classification of welfare regimes. He argues that welfare provisions have a decommodifying effect on the working class which becomes less dependent from market forces.

What is problematic in Marshall's (1963) and Esping-Andersen's (2004) analysis of citizenship and welfare, is that they do not address any issues related to gender and sexuality (Okin 1987, Lister 1997, Evans 1993). Pateman (1988) argues that the liberal political theory from which Marshall departs, relies on a division of private as a female and public as a male domain and

includes an implicit sexual contract which only protects the freedom and property of men. Women were perceived as too emotional and irrational for the participation in the political community and needed to be governed by men in political, social and bodyily terms (Pateman 1988).

The public sphere is therefore a male-fashioned template, although it is presented as universal and gender-neutral (Lister 1997). The sexual division of labor secured by the family wage disables women's political participation and independence from male patronage and vulnerability to poverty, while the conceptualization of sexual violence as private or personal issue legitimates male violence against women (Hartmann 1997, Evans 1993, Lister 1997). Thus, Lister (1997) argues, the decommodification of the working class through welfare provisions is not enough: a defamilialization is needed with welfare practices freeing women from the sexual division of labor. The social institution of family and the family discourse, however, have great effective and symbolic power (Evans 1993), therefore the state's interest is to maintain the control on the citizens' private sphere.

1.2 Poor people's citizenship and the state's biopower

Since the beginning of industrialization, poor people have been perceived as having personal and moral defects, including being prone to criminality (Hertz 1981). The first forms of social help therefore were characterized by punitive elements aimed at gaining control over the "paupers" in the name of "public good" or "national wealth" (Smith 2007). The state interest is the production of docile and productive workforce (Foucault 1995) and even if its punitive approaches fail to "correct" poor people, they are efficient because they provide a "morality play" of productivity for the other members of the society (Smith 2007). The disciplinary mechanisms of the state are primarily targeted at the body not only creating docile bodies, but also normative subjectivities (Foucault 1995).

5

The biopower of the state, including population management, especially in the case of the poor, is aimed at "wringing the greatest possible utility out of each individual at the lowest possible cost" (Smith 2007: 38). Through biopower and biopolitics, the state can either foster life or disallow it to the point of death (Smith 2007), which leads us back to the issue of citizenship and welfare states.

Discursive power is particularly relevant in what Fraser (1990) defines as "needs-talk". In welfare states there are contested political claims about what people's needs are. According to Fraser (1990), there are two major sets of late-capitalist institutions which depoliticize certain needs: the domestic institutions which personalize and/or familialize specific needs locking them out from public and political discourses; the official-economic capitalist system institutions which economize needs and interpret issues as impersonal market imperatives, matters of "private" ownership and tematize them as technical and not political questions. These institutions enclave social issues in specific sets of discourses and produce specific subjectivities and subjects of knowledge, including gendered subjectivities. Thus, as Fraser (1990) points out, the welfare system is more than a social institution providing material aid for the needy, but also "a tacit, but powerful interpretive map of normative, differentially valued gender roles and gendered needs" (1990: 208). Fraser's (1990) analysis shows that the constructions of private issues can be productive forces in both discursive and material terms creating normative gendered subjectivities and citizenship.

1.3. Conceptualizations of citizenship and the private sphere

The concept of citizenship itself is enclaved in normative discourses. According to Berlant (1997), the conservative conceptualization of citizenship in dominant discourses in the United States creates an "intimate public sphere": "as a condition of social membership produced by personal acts and values, especially acts originating in or directed toward the family sphere" (1997: 5). Conservative politics privatizes citizenship as sacred, while dominant political

discourses relying on a culture-based conceptualization of nation and identity, produce rhetorics and practices of citizenship based on heterofamilial norms and therefore a "privatized intimate core of national culture" (Berlant 1997: 5). Evans (1993) makes similar points in his analysis of "citizenship machinery". He argues that the new right conceptualization of citizenship based on the ideas of the civic responsibilities, duties of the individuals and families and private autonomy in economic terms is aimed at the creation and management of moral aliens and non-citizens.

Lister (1997) takes a less negative account of the different aspects of citizenship. She points out that citizenship can be conceptualized in terms of duties and in terms of rights as well. Although the new right emphasized the former and it is true that, as Young argues, that the citizenship of the dominant groups is the recognized one, the framework of citizenship itself has a potential to change this hierarchy. The private, which is a particularly relevant aspect of citizenship for my study, is not exclusively a subject of topdown material and discursive domination. As Young pointed out, the private is: "that aspect of his or her life and activity that any person has the right to exclude from others. The private in this sense is not what public institutions exclude, but what the individuals choose to withdraw from the public view" (Lister quotes Young 1997: 121).

Lister (1997: 36) rightly argues for a rights-based reconceptualization of citizenship, because "citizenship as rights enables people to act as agents". The new right discourses referring to citizenship as a source of duties and moral expectations, do not rely on a rights-talk and when they do, as in the case of Hungarian discourses on the criminalization of the homeless (Ámon 2012), they do not interpret rights as universal. A universal conceptualization of citizenship as rights is what Taylor (1992) calls the politics of equal dignity which makes a universal claim that every citizen, every human being should be equally respected, and that there is a universal human potential that everybody shares.

In addition, Piven (1990: 250) argues about the tension between welfare rights and state control that:

"On the one hand, there is the possibility of power and autonomy; on the other, dependence on a controlling state. But these polarities are unreal: All social relationships involve elements of social control, and yet there is no possibility for power except in social relationships."

Thus, a certain level of social control is always present in social relations, but social relations and state provisions can also be sources of power.

1.4. The homeless body and its citizenship

Homeless people are perceived as the "homeless body", the embodiment of a moral antithesis of citizenship (Kawash 1998) which is rooted in the anxiety about the lack of privacy that homeless people do not only experience, but also represent. Douglas (2010) argues that if somebody has no place in the social system, he/she becomes a marginal being, a person who is associated with disorder and impurity and through these associations is represented as a threat to the order of society.

The most common argument for the disciplinary mechanisms against the "homeless body" is that the public has to be kept clean and ordered. The idea of cleanliness and healthiness are attached to the desire for a gentrified urban middle-class subjectivity and citizenship. Cleanliness, understood for both of the outside and inside, has been considered as one of the basic middle-class values and responsibilities because of the assumption that the physical has influence on the moral (Perrot 1990). In adddition, cleanliness is understood as a symbolic marker of social boundaries (Douglas 2010).

Citizenship is not only based on cleanliness, but also on sedentarism (Malkki 2001). Any form of territorial displacement is seen as pathological and displaced people are perceived as dangerous characters who lack of moral and social responsibility and therefore represent a threat to the order of society (Malkki 2001), because they might destroy its existing patterns and are associated with abnormality, mental disease or wrong social attitudes (Douglas 2010). In the case of

homeless people, the lack of sedentarism and the exposure of their private life to the public provokes such reactions.

The reaction to this danger is twofold: the exclusion of the homeless body from the public space and its regulation through the sheltering industry in Lyon-Callo's (2004) terms. The sheltering industry aims to dissolve public anxiety with the creation of docile bodies: bodies which are "subjected, used, transformed and improved" through disciplinary processes based on rational calculations (Foucault 1995: 136). Homeless people's status therefore can be described as a form of 'restrictive citizenship' (Tosi's 1996). The social help they need and their rights to specific services and benefits becomes attached to the fulfillment of certain obligations and duties (Tosi 1996). Getting help from society, thus, becomes a terrain of normalization.

Gowan (2010) argues that sin-talk and sick-talk are the normalizing discourses which became dominant in social interventions against homelessness. According to sin-talk, homelessness is rooted in moral laxity, deviance (primarily laziness and hedonism) and thus the solution for it is the exclusion of the homeless persons from public spaces and their confinement (Gowan 2010). Sick-talk assumes that someone's homelessness is rooted in individual pathologies he/she developed and social assistance needs to aim to treat that pathological state (Gowan 2010). These two dominant discourses are interrelated.

Since in modern Western societies disciplinary mechanisms are targeted at the body of the individuals (Foucault 1995), "the body – seemingly stable, ahistorical, and sexed – became the epistemic foundation for prescriptive claims about social divisons of labor, power, and privilege" (Daston-Vidal 2004: 357). Human biology and medicine are parts of an "anthropology" which defines health and pathologies necessarily in a normative context (Canguilhem 2008). Thus, medicalization of homelessness is based on normative concepts, while normativity is often interpreted as rational, objective, serving the public good, public order or public health.

In the second half of 1970s the number of homeless people living on the street increased and as a reaction emergency shelters and soup kitchens were opened (Gowan 2010) and the

neoliberal state emerged characterized by privatization, marketization and economic deregulation in the name of productivity (Lyon-Callo 2004). As a result, welfare provisions were reduced, and the image of the "undeserving poor" became dominant in the political discourses on poverty stigmatizing poor people for idleness and not following the social norms (Gans 1992).

As part of the "undeserving" discourse, sick- and sin-talk have dominated the "emerging homelessness industry" and these discourses rapidly spread to the academia and the media (Gowan 2010). These pathologies are mapped on the homeless body and the homeless care's role is to detect, diagnose and treat them (Lyon-Callo 2004). Being under the medical gaze, the homeless people themselves start to observe pathologies in their own behavior and blame themselves for their situation (Lyon-Callo 2004). Thus, social work and the mixture of sin-talk and sick-talk by identifying diseases in the homeless body produce normative subjectivities and normative knowledge on these subjectivities.

1.5 Women's homelessness and the homeless care institutions in Hungary

Although there were unofficial homeless shelters functioning during the 1980s due to the increase in poverty and unemployment (Papp 1992, Iványi 1998, Győri 2008), the first homeless care institutions in Budapest were opened during the years of transition after the homeless protests in 1989-1990 (Gyuris et el. 2004). Since then, however, there has been no state interest in creating an overall strategy, the homeless care system is still aimed at "firefighting" (Gyuris et al. 2004).

The system is primarily based on night shelters, temporary shelters and workers' shelters. Due to the lack of affordable housing and a decent income it is very difficult to step out from these institutions (Gyuris et al. 2004). The homeless care institutions aim to provide services, shelter, social work and certain health services for homeless people. In order to apply for social benefits or to search for a job, homelesse persons need to go to separate offices for people without

permanent address. Since welfare provisions became increasingly workfare-centered in the last five years (Ferge 2012), most homeless people have to maintain regular contact with these offices.

Based on the homeless survey and interviews with roughless people living in public spaces in 2007, the causes and conditions of women's homelessness are different from those of men's (Győri 2008). While homelessness is often framed as a solitary situation, most of the women lived in a relationship or joined a group of homeless people. Women are more likely to make a living from begging than men and they are less likely to be employed either as a legal or as an illegal worker. The women tend to be less educated than men; three times more women did not finish the 8 years of primary school than men (Győri 2008). Although these statements are rather descriptive, knowing that most of the homeless people are more than 40 years old (Győri 2008), both ageism (see Nagy 2010) and the lack of education can play a role in women's homelessness.

Gal and Kligman (2000) argued that welfare allowances for women during state socialism made women more dependent from the state and less dependent from men. Due to the lack of benefits and job opportunities, however, homeless women are still dependent on other persons' income, which explains why they are more likely to have partners or join a group of homeless people.

1.6 The conceptualization of homeless women and their citizenship

Although welfare provisions are also tools for gendered and sexual regulation, these gendered norms in welfare practices are primarily targeted at women as mothers (Lister 1997). As Anthias and Yuval-Davis (1989) argue, women are primarily important for the state because of their role as the reproducers of the nation in biological and cultural terms. McClintock (1993) also points out that the family has been a naturalized metaphor for social hierarchies, including women's role as men's companion and reproducers. This provied with an explanation for why the welfare state has particular interest in supporting women who fulfill the reproductive role and why there is not enough attention paid to homeless women.

11

There are only two studies (Moss and Singh 2012, Szoboszlai 2012) and an unpublished research (Buzás and Hoffmann 2012) which directly address women's homelessness in Hungary. These tend to frame homeless women as victims having psychological problems, while not explaining the larger framework of their situation on terms of social and gender relations. Szoboszlai (2012) explicitly states that while men's homelessness is usually due to structural reasons, women's homelessness happens due to "the dysfunctions in the family, deviant behavior, conflicts in relationships" (Szoboszlai 2012: 144). She concludes that in order to help homeless women, preventive measures have to be taken and the dysfunctions of the families have to be solved, because the main goal is to keep women in the family, since this is the only safe place for them.

Szoboszlai (2012) first explains in her research how women were abused as children and partners, but she concludes from her findings that the social institution of the family needs to be strengthened. The same discourse can be traced in the annual homeless survey of 2007 (Győri 2008) which indicates the increase in divorces since the 1980s as a cause of homelessness instead of the lack of affordable housing for single men and women. This pro-family discourse reflects that researchers see women's place in the family assuming that it is a safe place for them.

This perception of women's homelessness confirms Golden's (1995) analysis of the conceptualization of homeless women. She argues that while homeless men are stigmatized for not working, homeless women are also stigmatized for violating sex-based norms because they do not have a home. This discourse has its origins in the 19th century perception of poor women, when poorly-dressed women, who lost their home, were presented as the antitheses of true women. They were depicted as prostitutes or promiscuous because of the social anxiety about their lack of home. This lack was perceived as the loss of sexual control of society on these women and the home was presented as the only safe and morally acceptable place for them (Golden 1995). This reflects how women's proper citizenship is tied to their belonging to the

private sphere and how homelessness is perceived as a state which automatically transforms women's citizenship.

To sum up, the conceptualization of citizenship by liberal political theorists can be rightly critiqued by feminist political theorists for relegating women to the private sphere, for governing private life by setting up normative criteria for proper citizenship and for restricting poor people's access to certain benefits by labeling them undeserving. These critiques, however, are also implicitly based on a rights-talk and they still assume a certain degree of privacy necessary for participation in the social life.

Homeless women's citizenship is restricted in both social and gendered terms. Homeless people are perceived with public anxiety, labeled as undeserving and channeled into workfare programmes and the sheltering industry. Having less job opportunities, homeless women become vulnerable to poverty and dependent on their male partners and the state as well. Their citizenship is distinct from both of homeless men's and non-homeless women's because of the lack of the private sphere they experience in the mass shelters and their perception with anxiety for not having a home or private sphere.

Chapter 2

Institutional ethnography and the homeless women in the shelter

This research is based on an institutional ethnography, a method which shows "how people's doings in the everyday are articulated to and coordinated by extended social relations" (Smith 2005: 36). It relies on the assumption that knowledge is socially organized and, in order to understand the functioning of specific social institutions and the social relations they create or reinforce, the researcher has to investigate the problems, issues and concerns raised by the people who belong to or use those institutions (Smith 2005).

Based on this principle, I built my research on the experience and perspective of homeless women using or refusing to use the services of the shelter. For three weeks I did participant observation in different parts of the shelter and I conducted semi-structured interviews with seven homeless women (one of these was a group interview with a couple). Two of the women live in public spaces, but use day centers. Three live in the termporary shelter, two in the night shelter.

During the interviews I asked homeless women about the ways they perceive homeless care in Hungary and in the shelter; how they became homeless; their intimate relationships and relationships in the shelter; their thoughts on private or intimate sphere, citizenship and homelessness.

In order to understand the ways service providers perceive women's homelessness and their own role as service providers, I also interviewed an employee from the local government responsible for social issues. I conducted three semi-structured interviews with a social worker, a manager and the employees of the methodological department.

14

2.1 Ethnographic site

The research was carried out in the temporary and night shelter of the Dózsa György út shelter of Budapesti Módszertani Szociális Központ és Intézményei (Methodological Social Center and Related Institutions of Budapest). The Dózsa György út shelter of BMSZKI has diverse services for homeless women: a mixed temporary shelter, a night shelter only for women which has three different parts: the Szuterén night shelter is only available from 4 pm to 8 am, the 24 hour shelter is available for 22 hours and a temporary part preparing for a placement to a temporary shelter. The shelter also has a day center, a job search office and a crisis shelter for mothers.

Based on the annual reports of the temporary shelter and the night and crisis shelter for mothers (BMSZKI 2012), the night shelter hosted 486 women; the crisis shelter 85 women. The reports show that 160 women moved in throughout the year to the temporary shelter. In the night shelter the number of the homeless women between the ages of 51-60 and 36-50 increased. Homeless women between 51 and 60 were employed in the past for at least 15-25 years and had a profession, but due to the automatization and the transformation of the required skills on the job market, they lost ther jobs, but are not old enough to get benefits for the eldery, and their health condition usually does not enable them to do illegal work either. Most of the women between 36 and 50 arrived from the countryside to Budapest due to the lack of the social services available in their region. These women were living on social benefits, which were insufficient for making a living. In the temporary shelter women could either live alone or with their partner in one bedroom if they were found eligible for a shelter place based on their income.

2.2 Interviewees

The women I interviewed were recommended by the social workers of the night shelter, temporary shelter and the day center except one of them whom I knew as an activist. This

enabled me to have a more diverse group of interviewees, but it also increased the chances of interviewing people who are more sympathic for the social workers. However, the shelters are, all in all, private spaces for the women, where I would have not felt comfortable to bother them by asking for interviews. The social workers also warned me about the fact that many of their residents have serious mental illnesses and therefore it would not be feasible to interview them.

Most of my homeless interviewees were women in their 40s and 50s except for two who were in their 30s. The sources of their income were diverse, but none of them was employed legally. One was employed illegally as a nurse and one did public work through her social benefit. Two women lived from social benefits; one gained some money from dumpster diving. One earned money from begging, while another, who claimed to have no income, collected bottles. There was only one woman who declared not to have any income.

Apart from one interviewee who recently left her boyfriend, all of the women had partners; one of them was married. Two of the women formed a couple, but, although they were defined as lesbian by the social workers, one of them being transsexual, the transsexual member of the couple identified herself as bisexual, while her partner as heterosexual.

There were only three women who had no children; the other four had two children who were either adults, lived in foster care or the woman did not know where they stayed. Two of the childless women were the couple living together who claimed not to want any children. Another lost her children while she was pregnant because her husband battered her during pregnancy.

There was only one interviewee who had not even spent one night in a shelter. Four out of my seven interviewees had already spent their nights in public spaces. One was from Transilvania, three were from the countryside and three from Budapest.

To add the social workers' and the decision makers' perspective to my research, I interviewed a manager from the shelter and a social worker; both of them were young women. I also conducted interview with a local government employee who has great experience with homeless care and citizens' complaints on homelessness.

2.3 Positionality

The fact that I am a young student with a middle-class background must have influenced my perception by the homeless women and the shelter staff as well, however, it did not become a source of authority. Homeless women often referred to me as "little girl" or "darling", as they did to other middle-class people they encountered, since they saw us as having less life experience.

My activism in the past one and a half year in the City is For All group also had a decisive role in the way I was perceived by the people, since both the social workers and the homeless women knew me as an activist. They asked help from me to find housing and in these cases I tried to provide them with the information I knew. The fact that one of the women used to be an activist in our group made the participant observation easier, since she was eager to show around in the shelter and tell about her problems there.

Chapter 3

Transparent privacy, self-reliance and homeless women's private sphere

The concept of citizenship relies on an assumption of private sphere or personal life which Berlant (1998b: 553) calls

> "a home base of prepolitical humanity from which citizens are thought to come into political discourse and to which they are expected to return in the (always imaginary) future after political conflict."

Berlant (1998b) argues that the construction of privacy through the institutions of intimacy, including the family, romantic relationships, friendship, etc. are necessary for the construction of citizenship itself. The boundary-making between the private and the public serves as a basis for the boundary between moral and economic persons and the boundary between individuals and members of a collective. Moreover, legitimate citizenship is understood through the public/private division: a proper intimate life is a precondition for legitimate citizenship, while the private life itself is constructed in a way that it responds to an imagined ideal of proper citizenship (Berlant 1998). In this sense, privacy does not only refer to domesticity, but also to relationships and personhood.

Homeless women, however, do not have the precondition of proper citizenship: they do not have a home or a private sphere in either spatial or abstract terms. The shelter serves as a place where homeless women's citizenship becomes normalized, but at the same time, the shelter, being a mass institution, becomes a public sphere where privacy in the "normalized" sense cannot exist.

Privacy or private sphere is conceptualized as a contrast to collective life (Berlant 1998a) which can refer to a person's own life, space and personhood, but also to intimate relationships. In this chapter I show how the normalizing practices of the shelter targeted at the private sphere of the women concentrating on the meaning of private sphere as private space in both spatial and

18

abstract terms, while I explore the intimate relationships and women's private sphere in chapter 4.

3.1 Like a prison, like a hospital, like Auschwitz

Most of the women and the social workers described the shelter as a mass institution using metaphors like the prison, the hospital, a storage facility or even Auschwitz. All of these spaces to which they compared the shelter are disciplinary institutions of modernity aimed to produce modern subjects through power mechanisms directed on their bodies (Foucault 1995). For homeless women these mechanisms included the lack of privacy in spatial terms.

I explained in chapter 1 that benefits and services for poor people since the 19th century were provided through coercive institutions using both punitive and medicalizing measures (Gowan 2010). I also showed that modern, normative subjectivities are produced through these institutions (Foucault 1995). Even the shelter guests and workers compared the shelter to these coercive and medicalizing spaces. The strongest picture is one of Auschwitz, which came up twice during my research. Once an old woman referred to the shelter this way, because she had to wait in front of the night shelter at 4 o'clock in line, even if the weather was very cold because the shelter is only open from 4 pm. I found the metaphor of Auschwitz particularly relevant, because, similarly to the other bases of comparison, it can also be analyzed in the framework of modernity as a biopolitical institution which took the production of modern subjects and the state's biopower to extremes (Bauman 1989).

By talking about prisons and hospitals they did not only refer to the architecture: the small rooms in the temporary shelters with thin walls through which you can hear everything your neighbor does and the sleeping halls for ten people in the night shelter where everybody can see you and hear and which are filled with hospital beds. The homeless women also meant their constant supervision by the social workers and their roommates. Homeless women are registered, classified and supervized in many ways.

19

One of these ways is what Foucault (1995) calls the distribution of individuals in space and the partitioning of people, which means their allocation to specific places. There was a hierarchy between the different parts of the shelter which were also functioning as ranks for the people living there. The bottom of this hierarchy was the night shelter which people had to leave during the day time. One interviewee living there told me that "moving forward" to the 24-hour night shelter was interpreted as being dependent on whether someone has income and can make the first steps towards moving to a temporary shelter, but she said it actually signified someone's position in the shelter. A social worker also believed that placements did not only happen based on what is better for the homeless people, but also on who is liked by the social worker and who is not.

The other disciplinary mechanism was the temporal elaboration of time, which was rigorously policed by the social workers, especially in the night shelter. The shelter opened at 4 pm and women had to gather in the opposite side of the iron gate. One time, a woman who was standing inside was yelled at by the social worker for standing on the wrong side. The women can enter the shelter in every half an hour, but if they arrive just a couple of minutes later, they have to stand at the opposite side of the iron gate until another half an hour passes. When they enter, they have to go to the social worker's office first and take the key to their lockers. In the 24-hour shelter there is a 2-hour "break" when the women have to leave the shelter because of "disinfection cleaning".

Homeless women's private issues rapidly became public because of the lack of private sphere in spatial terms in the shelters. Everything the women did and said in the shelter, was transparent. If they had personal issues they wanted to discuss with the social workers, there were other homeless people present in the office. The lack of privacy caused many conflicts between the homeless women and the social workers and between the homeless women themselves, but the homeless women mostly complained about the constant presence of other people in the space and the fact that they cannot leave these spaces if they do not want to listen to the other women.

In the interviews, this phenomenon was conceptualized as a loss: they described it as being incapable of hearing their own thoughts, of avoiding thoughts and stories they did not want to hear and having some moments and space on their own. Thus, being coerced into and living in a mass institution is experienced as a loss in privacy.

3.2 Women's tactics of privacy

De Certeau (1984) calls the set of regulating institutions in the city strategy and defines the resistance against it as tactics. The women's tactics were practices of constructing a normalized private sphere in their own terms. In the interviews the private sphere was defined in different ways by the women. An interviewee defined it in spatial terms: she said she woke up early every day and went to the toilet, closed the door and smoked her first cigarette alone. Another woman used the term for romantic relationships and added that "smart people do not talk about it in public", making a clear distinction between the private and the public sphere in terms of information sharing and self-reliance. Another interviewee defined it as bodily processes which we do not do in public but in the toilet.

In spatial terms, women were trying to make everything they owned personalized. The women in the temporary shelter were collecting knick-knacks or had a lot of flowers or stuffed animals. They covered their doors with colorful wrapping paper. Women from the night shelter had fewer opportunities, but they also tried to have personalized private property usually in form of key rings with small stuffed animals on it.

Private property was collected even if it was not functional just to have something of one's own:

> "For a homeless person a dish collected while dumpster-diving is as sacred as for a person who can buy expensive dishes. For a homeless person a curtain collected during dumpster-diving, which she/he can decorate her/his small ghetto with, is as sacred as for a person who can buy a curtain for 20-30 thousand forint. For a homeless person a small cupboard is sacred, which was thrown out by someone, because she/he can already put her/his little swag somewhere. Thus, this is all the property we have. This is what we are protecting, this is ours, that's what we can declare as our private property. And if the bulldozers come and

destroy it with cruelty, in an inhuman way, I say the world has no soul. And the leaders who order it, have no soul." (Éva, homeless woman living in a squat referring to the ongoing demolitions of shacks built by homeless people)

Éva was referring to the fact that homeless people try to preserve the function of their private property even if they have no home. Moreover, they use them to create the spatial divisions of the home on a smaller scale. Private property is a foundation for privacy (Reynolds 2010), hence a crucial element of citizenship. However, the private property of homeless people is not considered as such, because homeless people themselves are constructed as non-citizens (Kawash 1998).

The lack of private sphere was the reason for Éva not using shelters. She was trying to create a private sphere through the spatial arrangement of her properties:

> "We spent a lot of time on street with my husband which means that... A lot of people know these huge checked bags (...). We carried them with us all night and day long; there were three of them; we were holding one from two sides and another one in the middle. We had a police identification when they asked what we were carrying in the bags and I told them: the kitchen, the bedroom and the bathroom. He almost took us to the police station and he made us take out everything on the street. He didn't bother about me being ashamed by my stuff or not, having the right or not. I have to add, we just began homelessness, I wasn't aware of my rights. We had to take out everything and, frankly, he was surprized, because in one of the bags there were indeed spices, dishes, food and in the other the sponge, the blankets, the pillows, in the third one the clean clothes, the detergents, the laundry and the bath products. So, literally, we had the bedroom, the kitchen, the bathroom with us (laughing)."

Éva's use of private property along boundaries of spatial functions shows that these practices of private property and thus the construction of a private sphere are considered crucial by homeless people for their human integrity and they think about the disprespect toward their property as a shameful experience and a violation of their rights. Women in the shelter and homeless people from other insitutions often complained about similar disrespect toward their private property by the social workers or cleaning staff who threw out things they left in the night shelter because they had nowhere else to put them.

Homeless women's tactics of privacy through private property, like the decoration they put on their doors in the temporary shelter, were to some extent appreciated by some of the shelter staff,

but social workers in general saw women's agency in something which they usually referred to as "moving forward".

3.3 Making homeless women "move forward"

Neoliberal welfare systems are dominated by the ethics of care which does not rely on the idea of social justice, but on the idea of charity and individual help (Lister 1997). This approach is enabled by the existence of private sphere which provides space for "a privatized ethics of responsibility" which is, again, aimed at the creation of a boundary between moral and economic persons (Berlant 1998b: 554). As I argued in chapter 1, a mixture of sin-talk and sick-talk dominates the homeless care institutions and social help for homeless people therefore is aimed at the elimination of individual pathologies and abnormalities. This process is targeted at the individual's private sphere in not only spatial, but also in abstract terms. It also implies a very specific understanding of agency.

The shelter itself is a terrain of normalization through distributive power. Foucault (1995: 140) argues that "discipline proceeds from the distribution of individuals in space" which means that the very space people are assigned to in society is a result of power mechanisms. Willingness to move in to a shelter and move forward to a temporary shelter was equated with willingness to move forward in life and solving the homeless person's problems in the discourses of the social workers I interviewed. The same hierarchy between people living in public spaces and shelters came up often in the interviews with homeless women too: they depicted homeless people in public spaces as "csöves" ("bum") who prefer to be free from the regulations of the shelter and saw shelter life as a negotiation of less freedom and social help.

This hierarchy is also set up with coercive measures through public space control aimed to push out homeless persons from public spaces or at least decrease homeless people's visibility there.

According to Zsuszsa, one interviewee, who used to live in a tent in a park:

"I used to live in many places, until Sarlós[2] appeared. To that point, the cops and the public space authorities unofficially tolerated it, because they already knew us and didn't say anything about the fact that the tent was there. I was there with my puppy. Sarlós appeared and immediately all of the tents had to be taken down. And now it isn't even allowed to sleep in the (..) park. But there are many people who sleep there, you know, they just do it in a smart way. The public space authority does not come from about 7 or after 7 pm, then they put their beds down. So there was a silent agreement with the public space authority that, since all of the tents had to be taken down, I waited until the last scout left, then, around 7 pm I put down my bed, I went to bed early and I woke up at 6.30-7 am; I hang out my clothes just like here (in the day center), and by the time the public space authority arrived, we were sitting there in line just like people at a picnic."

This fragment from the interview does not only show that the attempt to push out homeless people from public spaces necessarily fails and the authorities are aware of that, but also the fact that in practice, these measures are aimed at preventing homeless people from creating a private sphere for themselves within the public space and the citizens' encounter with that sphere. If they perform the proper public space use, the middle class picnic-like way of using the park, and they are not observed, however, they are not bothered by the authorities.

Homeless people are also directly coerced to go to a shelter. An employee at the local government of the 13th district responsible for social affairs argued for a system providing uncrowded shelters where people's private property is safe, but even if she acknowledged in the interview that it was understandable that a lot of people did not want to live in shelters, she still thought that "there is a limit how far someone can decide whether he/she wants to live in public space". Therefore if homeless people in the district are reported by the residents or have already been warned several times by the police/public space authority, the local government sends out the authorities accompanied by a social worker in order to "convince" the person to go to a shelter. If he/she does not want to do that, he is offered a shelter place for the last time, but then he/she is sent away and the local government "picks up the trash" after him or her.

Coercion primarily happens when "citizens" report homeless people in their neighborhood. Like in the case of Zsuzsa, who was reported by a person who rented an apartment and offered a

---

[2] She misunderstood Budapest's mayor's name which is István Tarlós. Sarlós is also a word joke; sarló means sickle.

place for her and her dogs, but when she ran out of food they shared before, the person put her on the street with her dogs and called the public space authority on her:

> "(she said) that there is a homeless bum out there; she is harrassing the passers-by (...). The most serious issue was that I couldn't get the puppies vaccinated (...), thus, on the 18th of January they took them to an animal shelter, on the 18th of January last year, and I was, not literally, thrown into the night shelter (on Dózsa György út). So, I wouldn't have come by myself. (She stops.) I wouldn't have even thought about it."

The story shows that losing private sphere results in a hierarchy in which the homeless person ceases to be treated as a citizen who can move freely and the response to it is motivated by the public anxiety because of the violation of the public sphere for using it as private sphere and non-sedentarism. Despite her emotional attachment to her dogs, the animals are no longer considered as her private property, because she has no private place in which she can keep them. The shelter in this situtation is seen as the only possible solution for normalizing homeless people's citizenship.

Regardless of discussing homeless people living in public spaces or in shelters, in the conversations with the social workers it was not clear to what extent they think homeless people should be coerced to do something. Using the unclear term of "moving forward" they were referring to the expectation from the homeless women to be in constant move in the system, although they admitted that only a few women manage to rent an apartment and leave the shelter for their whole life.

"Moving forward" had the meaning of "going through the motions", being active and showing interest in the activities and physically moving around, not staying at one place during the day time. They defined the aim of "moving forward" and doing social work, as searching for a job, housing, thus, being involved in the community, the public sphere, including getting out from the shelters. This attempt is rather controversial: they use coercive methods, like not letting women in to the shelter in the day time, making participation in the activities mandatory for people who want to use the day center, but they admit that these methods themselves make the

25

women's situation more difficult, since they have to organize their daily routine based on the shelters', day centers', job center's, benefit center's, etc. timetable.

Spending their days in the system affects the women's bodily integrity. A social worker explained that they can observe how newcomers in the shelter lose their bodily integrity in the last days:

"After one week one can see how he/she runs down. Very, very, very soon."

She referred to the fact that while due to the lack of job and housing opportunities women do not have many chances to "move forward" from the sheltering system, the sheltering system itself and women's circulation in it has a negative effect on their bodies. While "moving forward" is aimed at motivating women for having agency and progress, their distribution and circulation in the homeless care system results in a loss of bodily integrity and privacy.

3.4 Self-reliance and transparent privacy

As mentioned above, the shelter rules and the social work in the shelter was aimed at making homeless women "move forward". This "moving forward" was also defined as making women capable of self-development and responsible citizens instead of doing something for them. Especially in the interviews made with women before they occupied the temporary shelter places, the social workers focused on the extent of self-reliance they can expect from the homeless women making individual social work depending on that.

Gaining citizenship is conditioned by showing self-reliance (which is the final aim of social work too) and by self-emancipation (Castronovo 2001). Self-reliance is always attached to the capability to control bodily fluids and thus to the self-emancipation from the body (Castronovo 2001). The concept of self-reliance in the shelter includes the expectations of "moving forward", cleanliness, coherence and transparency in abstract and bodily terms.

Cleanliness as a signifier of the acceptance of middle class values (Perrot 1990) and social boundaries (Douglas 2010) was one of the issues emphasized by both the social workers and the

homeless women. Homeless women, nevertheless, were often made feel dirty because of their lack of private sphere, where proper cleanliness is usually achieved. In the 24-hour shelter the women were complaining that they were initially told they could be in the shelter all day long, but it turned out that a two-hour "disinfection cleaning" was scheduled in the morning. They offered to buy their own detergent, but they were told it was inflammable, therefore the women felt that they were not allowed to clean their own space and they were considered "persons after whom the place has to be disinfected" because of their uncleanliness. One interviewee from the temporary shelter complained about an employee at the job center for homeless people, who used disinfectant after consulting each client, because she had to touch the same objects they did. Homeless people's private property, if they do not take it with them or leave it outside of their locker, was also removed for public health reasons. The very bodies of these women are thus treated as a public health issue because of their homelessness.

According to Castronovo (2001), democracies enabled the encounter of different social groups in the same space, which caused anxiety about diseases and harmful habits spreading among people. There is a "phobic reaction to publicness that (...) both informs and derives from hygienic discourses that emphasized a modern, bourgeois sense of virtue over the classical republican virtù or political devotion to the public good" (Castronovo 2001:80). Cleanliness, both outside (appearance) and inside (health, soberness) (Perrot 1990), therefore has a crucial role in proper citizenship.

In the shelter, gaining information about people's private sphere and their life-story or at least the story of their homelessness was of great importance, especially in the temporary shelter where people who move in need to participate in a life-story interview, in which the social workers look for "ruptures" or in other words, incoherence, which shows how effectively they can resolve their life problems and "move forward", as a social worker told me. Coherence in their narrative about their own life was thus perceived as an evidence of self-reliance and hence proper citizenship.

27

3.5 The rank

A handbook for social workers written by Soós (2005) draws the attention of the future social workers that they have to map the problems of a "client" even if he/she does not talk about them. Social workers in the shelter were mostly looking for symptoms of alcohol consumption as a symptom of the lack of self-reliance. In the temporary shelter, residents had to go to the reception to pick up their keys and if the recpetionists considered them too drunk, they were told to wait an hour in the hall or outside the building. Alcohol consumption was thus followed by public humiliation, since the resident had to spend some time in public view until she/he could get to his/her room. Zsuzsa told me in her interview that once, after drinking her "daily amount of wine", she walked in to the night shelter and the social worker felt the alcohol in her breath and told her: "Your breath smells so terrible!" During participant observation, a guest came in to the social worker's office to pick up her keys and some toilet paper (which also had to be asked from the social worker). The social worker confronted her for being drunk and she tried to defend herself by saying "I did not drink!". The social worker, holding the keys in her hand, looked at her, and while the homeless woman was reaching out for them, the social worker was holding back the keys for a couple of seconds restraining the woman from getting the key and going away and repeated her name a couple of times with a doubtful tone, indicating that she does not believe her. Thus, visible drunkness, even if someone tries to treat it as a private issue, is made public in the interactions. As argued above, privacy can also be defined as a right to hide and being drunk and proving not to be self-reliant in the shelter is followed by a deprivation of that right.

But making private issues public to show the lack of self-reliance had other forms as well. People in the shelter and the day center had to go to the social worker's office to ask for a certain amount of toilet paper, sanitary products, food, because, as a social worker argued, when they left these things in the kitchen or bathroom of the shelter, they got stolen. The consequence of that

was a system in which the women had to ask for everything. Whether they can get enough from something, was primarily decided based on their perceived self-reliance by the social worker. They either gave more to some women than to others or they denied that they had something. Self-reliance was thus a precondition for getting something.

Foucault (1995) calls this disciplinary mechanism the rank. The rank shows people's place in a hierarchy, but this hierarchy is never fixed and therefore nobody can feel safe about his/her own position. This rank was important for the homeless women's self-perception and their perception by the others too. In the distribution of women in the shelter, those who got moved to the 24-hour night shelter, were perceived as more privileged. One interviewee who stayed in the other night shelter, felt that she was considered worse or less "normal" person than those who had the chance to move. There was no accurate system of setting up the ranks; the function of the rank relied in the fact that some of women were made to feel less "normal" which shows how disciplinary mechanisms form the self-understanding of homeless women and the knowledge about each other (see Foucault 1995).

In addition, the fact that the women always had to ask for something from the social workers, made their very private issues public to the shelter staff and the other women as well. This was the case for menstruating women, who had to ask for sanitary towels from the social workers in front of everybody. They always tried to explain either what they needed those things for or why they asked that amount of those; they had to convince the social workers that they are in need of those, because of the expectation of self-reliance.

The distribution of sanitary towels in the night shelter shows how the rank based on self-reliance affected transparent privacy. A woman liked by the social workers needed towels and she got a whole pack which she left on the table while she was talking to the social worker. Another woman also needed towels, but she only got two. The woman who had more towels, went to the table, lifted up her pack of towels and said "those are mine", not because the woman mistakenly would have taken some from that pack, but because she wanted to show her privilege and thus

the difference between them. This towel-distribution practice based on the rank had other consequences for the less privileged women. A woman complained about the fact that she only got two towels for a day and although she told the social worker she needed more, she said they had no more. In the end, she had to throw out a pair of trousers, because they were ruined. This is an extreme example of how shelter-life makes private issues transparent.

The expectation of transparency also has an infantilizing effect on the women in the shelter. Apart from asking for every little thing from the shelter staff, women in the night shelter often came to the social worker's office to complain about the others both because of the fact they were bothered by someone and because of the rank they could modify through their complaints. They approached the social worker with a childish tone like in the following dialogue: "Mrs. Sz. is taunting us!" "What can I do about it? She is drunk.", but the social worker went to the sleeping hall to warn the "taunting" woman to stop. Supporters of welfare paternalism, a welfare system based on entitlements and permanent supervision of the beneficiaries argue that controlling mechanisms make the recipients less dependent on welfare (Mead 1997). But in the shelter, transparent intimacy, including the expectation of transparency, self-reliance and the rank has an infantilizing effect on the women.

Conclusion

Homeless women's private sphere is a realm at which disciplinary mechanisms are targeted, both in the public space and in the shelters. Shelters are compared by the homeless women to mass institutions aimed at the creation of modern subjects. Although shelter-life does not provide with many opportunities to experience privacy in both spatial and abstract terms, the women have many, primarily private property related tactics to construct a private sphere in their own terms. However, for shelter staff agency is conceptualized through an expectation of "moving forward" or "going through the motions": being in move within the shelter-system,

searching for job and housing, not sitting at one place, although the chances to move out from the shelter-system are very low.

Self-reliance is the major expectation from the women, since this sign of individual responsibility is a corner stone of modern citizenship. Women are expected to be clean from outside and inside cleanliness and alcohol constumptions being the main concerns in the shelter. Self-reliance is also constantly supervized: women have to be transparent about their life, including their life story and their bodily processes. Based on self-reliance they gain different ranks in the system which influence their self-perception and their perception by other women. Although the expectations from the women are not clear for them, the normalization practices aimed to create normal, self-reliant citizens from the women through complete transparency transform the private sphere of the women resulting in a loss of bodily integrity and infantilization. This is what I called transparent privacy. In the following chapter I expand on this term by explaining how intimate relationships in the shelter and their interrelations with the lack of resources is organized and perceived in the shelter.

Chapter 4

The economy of intimacy and the normalization of the private sphere

Intimacy and intimate relationships are publicly mediated realms of the private sphere and therefore intimacy is a set of normative practices and relationships through which legitimate citizenship is constructed (Berlant 1998b, Zelizer 2005). Boundary-making between the private and public sphere through intimate relationships and the construction of intimacy as a safe haven for women are central elements of gendered citizenship. Feminist critiques have argued against the conceptualization of the private sphere as a safe place and showed that the private sphere is a terrain of exploitation and exclusion from the public sphere for women (Lister 1997). But in the case of homeless women, who have no private sphere in spatial terms, this division is more problematic, because in losing the domestic or private sphere, they also lose the position of "true women" (Golden 1995). Since privacy is essential for proper citizenship, not being "true woman" leads to a perception as illegitimate citizen.

In the previous chapter I showed that transparent privacy and the normalization of the private sphere are targeted at the normalization of women as citizens. But there is another realm in which this normalization takes place, namely in the intimate relationships. Because of the transparent privacy homeless women experience and which is expected from them, all their relationships are visible to the public, and are subjects of normalization. The lack of resources and the shelter-life create an economy of intimacy and resources very different from the one experienced in the domestic sphere of non-homeless persons. The domestic or private sphere is commonly understood as the opposite of the economic sphere (Zelizer 2005). There is great public anxiety concerning the interference of intimate and economic relationships, although, as Zelizer (2005) argues, all our intimate relationships are interrelated with economic ones; for example, intimacy can be purchased through economic transactions, and disposal of private property is a major concern in family relations.

32

Most of the homeless women I interviewed had the same anxiety towards this interference, but because of the lack of resources, they felt it was more difficult for them to have truly intimate relationships. Their homelessness is thus interpreted as a loss in intimacy in this sense as well. In addition, homeless women violate a sexual norm by not having a domestic sphere (Golden 1995) for which they are seen as less self-reliant, as I showed in chapter 3. In this chapter I argue that homeless women are no longer perceived as true women and are forced into relationships they would not have if they had a private sphere. They become part of the economy in which traffic in intimacy and goods and services are interrelated, while they lose their connections to their intimate relationships they had before their homelessness. Both of these happen due to their lack of resources. The ways homeless women perceive their relationships and themselves and the social workers see the women, are shaped by heteronormative expectations: lesbian relationships are perceived with more suspicion, while violence against women by men is conceptualized as a private issue and in some cases it is even romanticized. The economy and the loss of integrity because of their incapability to live according to the dominant norms means that they do not only become failed women, but also illegitimate citizens.

4.1 The economy of intimacy

Since homeless women have to live on very tight resources, the shelter becomes a space where they can purchase what they need. Not having a domestic sphere, it is also the primary space of intimacy for them. These two elements of shelter-life, the material needs and the need for intimacy are intertwined.

As mentioned in chapter 3, most homeless women have to make a living from a couple of thousands of forint each month or even less. But shelter regulations, especially in the night shelter also made women dependent on each other. The social workers were aware of the fact that women were forming couples or small groups and shared their daily tasks. These relationships often became sexual, but in many cases women simply shared their duties, because

they could not have made a living otherwise. They shared food, coffee, cigarettes, etc. Those who disposed of money or other things expected other women to provide them with small services in exchange to those things: watching their bags while they are collecting bottles or making the morning coffee. According to a social worker some women formed a group with a more accurate division of labor: one of them collects the bottles, while others take care of the food, occupy a place in the shelter or carry the bags with them.

These relationships also included a traffic in intimacy. Most of the women I interviewed described the desire of homeless women for intimacy and love, but they always added that this desire served as a basis for exploitation. As one of the women explained:

> "I see this often. There are two women, they are friends; there are also lesbian couples, but also just friends. The whole thing is rooted in the fact that we are social animals. She wants to belong to someone. And this is so humiliating. I don't have to do anything with you; we are just roommates, but you know that you have a coffee maker and this week you also have a quarter kilo coffee. You know that I don't have any and I would drink it, because... I would drink it. And you do it once, twice, for the third and the fourth time; you wake me up at 5.30, you keep poking me saying "get up and make some coffee!". (...) I feel like starting to cry when the other woman, yes, she does it for her."

The quote shows how much the desire for intimacy and the traffic of goods is interrelated: the two women started to have a relationship because one of them had coffee. Women had to get into intimate contact with people they did not choose to be their friends or partners, but the financial and emotional motivations were stronger than the shame they felt about it. The interviewee was frustrated about the fact that the boundaries between intimate and economic relationships became blurred, which she perceived as a loss of integrity, as her narrative shows: she framed the exchange of coffee and coffee-making as being humiliating for the woman who had no coffee.

Simultaneously, homeless women in the shelter experienced a loss in their former intimate relationships. The loss of domestic sphere resulted in the loss of the relationships it implies. Except two of them, all the women had two children, but none had a close relationship with these children. Their children under 18 lived in foster care and, since all the women I interviewed

about these issues used to live in the countryside, they did not have enough money to see their children. But even if their children were adults, their relationships became very distant. All of them indicated the lack of money as a reason: the women lost their role as providers, which loosened the ties between them and their children. This confirms Zelizer's (2005) critique against the perception of intimate relationships as innocent, non-economic relations and it shows that it is not homelessness which makes intimate relationships economic ones; it only transforms the private sphere in which these relationships take place.

4.2 Exploitation and heteronormativity

Although some relationships were indeed more exploitative than others, the relationships in the shelter were perceived through a heteronormative lens by which I refer to the fact that the "tacit sense of normalcy" (Berlant 1998b) was the measure used by the women and the social workers for their relationships.

During the research I was told that a lot of lesbian women were living in the shelter and some of them had long-lasting relationships, but the majority turned to other women out of desperation. Two interviewees said that some homeless women were so eager to be loved and to have an intimate relationship with someone that they started a relationship with lesbian women. They considered this kind of behavior as a weakness. One of them also told me a story of a woman who spent some of her time in a mixed shelter and another in a women only shelter and she had a boyfriend in the former and a girlfriend in the latter. Not just in her narration, but also in the social workers', except from the employees of the methodology department, they perceived fluid sexualities with suspicion: incoherence in homeless women's narratives and their life story was described as problematic, because incoherence was a sign of the lack of self-reliant which is a crucial element of proper citizenship.

Incoherence in sexuality was perceived as a sign of desperation in another social worker's view. She defined the social worker's role as being to intervene in these cases, because these

relationships are of exploitative nature for the person who is actually "not a lesbian". What makes this logic particularly relevant is that, although a lot of relationships are indeed exploitative, she only referred to the lesbian ones. These relationships were also framed as if the previously lesbian woman seduced the "non-lesbian" woman, which is a typical stereotype of homosexual relations (Schielt and Westbrook 2009). Thus, the "truly" lesbian woman is framed as the seducer and the partner as the woman who lacks self-reliance because she is too desperate to make right personal decisions.

Long-lasting relationships were the most appreciated, even if the woman was beaten by her partner. One woman in the shelter told the social worker how much she loves her boyfriend and that even if he slapped her a couple of times, "it was in the beginning of the relationship; he was jealous". The social worker turned to me and asked ironically "Do you hear that? Slapped a couple of times?" indicating that she would not refer to this in such an easy manner, but then she she showed appreciation for that relationship and also asked me whether I have a "serious relationship". Being in a relationship is thus romanticized and appreciated, even if it contains violence.

In some cases lesbian relationships were also perceived as "normal" ones, if they were long-lasting and thus in line with heteronormative values. Although heterosexual relationships from the start were seen with less suspicion, long-lasting lesbian relationships could be normalized and not exploitative, but the distinction was always made through boundary-making between truly intimate or exploitative relationships. This shows that the heteronormativity is an integral part of the normalization process.

4.3 Homeless women's sexual citizenship

Sexual relationships are also intertwined with social hierarchies based on class and gender. Evans (1993) uses the concept of sexual citizenship to highlight sexuality's embeddedness in social relations. Sexuality is crucial in the construction of proper citizenship, being "the most

important source of identity for modern subjects, and therefore the ultimate means of their complete subjection" (Evans 1993: 11).

Normalized sexual citizenship in the shelter mostly appeared in the form of internalized heteronormativity. Homeless women tried to preserve the practices of the domestic sphere, especially cooking for the other women or men in the shelter. If they had male partners, no matter if they lived in the public space or in a shelter, the women always did the "housework": preparing food, making the laundry, cleaning, etc. However, this phenomenon never came up as a form of exploitation, since these were heteronormative and therefore "normal" practices.

The same holds for violent relationships. Although homeless women's status as victims is often emphasized in the literature on homelessness (Desjarlais 1997, Glasser and Bridgman 1999, Szoboszlai 2012), it is not analyzed in the context of sexual citizenship, showing the material conditions in which violence and exploitative relations are embedded. Evans (1993) argues that sexual divisions between the people are produced and maintained through their access to material resources. Women's weak labor market position, the family wage, the sexual division of labor and unpaid housework and caring work reinforce the material dependency of women on men and men's access to women's bodies. Or, as in the case of the women in the shelter, their dependency on each other, the shelter and in some cases, men.

The women I talked to were already in dependent situations before they became homeless and almost all of them experienced domestic violence. Okin (1987) argues that the family is the primary realm of socialization for gender roles and social justice. Women lived in unequal relationships and thought about violence and men's access to their body as self-understood and natural:

> "I used to live in a marriage (...). And it happened that, for the peace of the family, because my dear (she refers to her ex-husband in a sarcastic way) was very obsessed with it (with sex) and you know, you kind of have to allow him to do it. Just to make him shut up, not to annoy you any more. And I can't imagine anything more humiliating."

The way she talks about how in a marriage a woman has to provide access to her body for the husband is very similar to the woman's narrative about her violent partner who "just" hit her out of jealousy. But even if the woman perceived violence as an abnormal issue, the romanticization of the relationship still existed in her narrative:

> "It is a paradox issue. For 17 years I stood at the window. If he didn't come home after work, I knew he will be drunk. In that time I had only one foxhound. If the dog hid under the armchair, I knew he was tottering. Which meant that battering was coming. If the dog was frisking its tail in the hall, I knew he was sober. So I lived my life watching the dog. I was watching the corner from the window where he had to turn to our street, because I was waiting for him. I was always waiting. But when he entered the door, in that moment, depending on his state, I became very different, because... Because I was full of fear when he was drunk, even if I knew he was going to beat me up, that fear that evolved in me... That can't be explained. From trembling to crying... to being incapable of talking... (...) he was kind of a man who dissolved my self. (...) So I had no self on my own, I had to give in to his will, because he hit me anyway. He dissolved everything in me about which I could tell that was me. I wasn't me, I was his puppet. And when I left, it sounds stupid, but for months I was standing at the window and waiting the same way like before. And for months I was crying; it doesn't matter if he beats me up, just let him come home. It took a long time, very long time, until I said, it's so good that nobody hits me. But you know, the weird thing is that it still hurts. (...) He grew so huge in my eyes when I was a kid that even as an old person I forgot the bad things, I try to get over the memories and after so many years only the nice things remain in my head."

This narrative of a violent relationship which the woman left shows that even if the violence is acknowledged the story is romanticized. It also implied that the man did not only have access to her body, but also to her mind; he gained overall control on her until she could not imagine her life without the husband. But the material conditions are again intertwined with these issues;she mentions that as a child she admired him. Earlier she explained that she grew up in foster care and getting married in a young age, beyond the fact that marriage was self-evindent, the woman's fate in her story, it was also a way of mobility to live in a house instead of a mass institution.

4.4 Homeless women and the violation of sexual norms

Although a lot of women I interviewed had violent or exploitative relationships before their homelessness, becoming homeless made them even more vulnerable. Women are indeed perceived as prostitutes or promiscuous by other man because of their lack of home, as Golden

(1995) argues, and because they are conscious about the fact that they are in need of money or food. Especially the homeless women using day centeres told me they were constantly approached by men who offered them coffee and after a while the men claimed that they wanted sex in exchange. They framed this as an expectation from the men; if they accepted the coffee but refused to have sex, the man did not understand why they declined the offer. The women said they were looked at "as if they were stupid" or were called "whores".

But homeless women had the same perception and used the same blaming discourse when they talked about other homeless women who were often framed as less self-reliant and having less of "self-respect". They talked about women from the shelter who often changed their partners in a derogatory way, but they especially blamed women who engaged in sex for small things like a glass of wine or a sandwich, although they also admitted that the women had to be very desperate if they did it. Their major concern seemed to be that they would also be considered as prostitutes. A woman told me that once a couple of men were shouting in front of the shelter "Come out, whores!", but she considered it "fair", because so many women have sex for only "one deciliter of wine". She accepted that the lack of self-reliance in this way was extended to all of the women experiencing homelessness, but she was also bothered by it.

Despite the internalization of the "not true women" discourse, women living in public space and shelter-using women acknowledged that women could not be alone if they were homeless, especially not on the street. One of the women living in public space was raped by a man who offered her shelter for a night when the weather was very cold. Another woman told me that the men in another shelter or in the day center would constantly harass her if she had no partner and it is better to have only one person "who scares away the rest". The women who admitted the need for men openly declared that their relationship, although it has intimate aspects, is primarily about sharing resources, including protection from the man. Women thus because of the lack of resources lose the ownership of their own body in the economy of intimacy.

4.5 The "gender neutrality" of the system

The social worker I interviewed acknowledged that exploitative relationships exist, but the only step she thought they could make was to talk to the women about whom they suspected that experienced or experiences violence. There was even a workshop organized on identifying the symptoms of PTSD (post-traumatic stress disorder) in homeless women. This shows that they conceptualized the issue of gender-based violence as a personal issue resulting in psychological disorders which have to be diagnosed by the social workers which is the dominant approach in tackling gender-based violence through social work (Fraser 1990).

However, most of the social workers and the homeless women I interviewed argued that there were no crucial differences in women's and men's homelessness and that women should not be treated differently. Although women's vulnerability was acknowledged, their disadvantages were treated as private issues, even if these issues were more public than in the case of a non-homeless woman. Some social workers were even reluctant to believe that many homeless women suffer sexual violence. The methodological leaders of the institution told me that some social workers did not believe that homeless women could get raped "because of the way they looked like". This point of view shows that gender-based violence is conceptualized by some social workers as an intimate sexual act which requires a certain level of attraction that homeless women could not achieve because of their lack of proper appearance. But it also shows that homeless women are seen as the "homeless body", the gender-neutral antithesis of modern middle-class citizenship (Kawash 1998).

The spatial organization of shelter-life was also based on this false gender neutrality. Although heteronormativity dominated the life in the shelter in many ways, heterosexual relationships were also policed. The institutional system treated them as non-existent: the residents in the temporary shelter could go to each other's room if both members in the relationship were residents. Women in the night shelters, who mostly had homeless men as partners, did not have any private space

for sex. Even if some shelters have spaces, so called "intimate rooms" for couples, they have to go to the social worker's office to ask for the key. The privacy and the intimacy thus is transformed into public issue because of the required transparency of the act. All in all, the supposedly "gender-neutral" social work results in a conceptualization of gender-based violence as a personal issue, while the perception of the homeless body as gender-neutral leads to doubts about whether homeless women can have sexuality.

Conclusion

The concept of modern citizenship is constructed through practices of intimacy interrelated with economic preconditions. Heteronormative understanding of citizenship makes homeless women and the social workers accept certain relationships as exploitative and therefore a public issue, while the issue of gender-based violence is associated with the private sphere. Most of the women try to maintain the practices of domesticity, even if the home has never been a safe haven for them. Violent relationships, even if the violence is acknowledged, are interpreted in a romantic framework. Although many homeless women experience violence in the domestic sphere, homelessness makes women more vulnerable to sexual assaults and exploitative relationships. Shelter staff conceptualizes these problems primarily as personal issues and because of the perceived gender neutrality of the women, some of them even deny their existence.

Since proper practices of intimacy and sexuality define legitimate citizenship, women accept and maintain these social relations. They are very often frustrated by the fact that they are not perceived as true women. The transparent privacy they experience and the lack of domestic sphere do not transform their self-perception, their perception of homelessness and their burdens related to domesticity. Proper private sphere practices are the basis of distinction-making between respected and disrespected, self-reliant and non-reliable homeless women in the shelter. This discourse is in line with the deserving and undeserving citizens discourse which was crucial

41

in homeless women's self-understanding and understanding of homelessness, but also legitimate citizenship, as I explain in chapter 5.

Chapter 5

"Being homeless in my homeland" – Homeless women's citizenship

Homeless women's private sphere is expected to be transparent, yet due to the lack of resources and a desire for domesticity and intimacy they construct an economy of intimacy in the shelter. They therefore live in a reduced and transformed private sphere, which has consequences on both of their self-perception and the perception of other homeless women as citizens. This transformed privacy transforms the homeless women's citizenship, because they are deprived of the rights to privacy and the ownership of their own body and they are perceived as failed women and illegitimate citizens.

Instead of an individualistic culturalist understanding of this phenomenon, however, the notions of transformed citizenship have to be analyzed as part of a structural and political process, as argued in chapter 1. Too often, the transformed private sphere of poor people is explained with a "culture of poverty" discourse rooted in Oscar Lewis' (1966) research in which he states that poor communities develop a pathological subculture (characterized by tolerance of criminality, psychological disorders, addictions, weak ego, etc.) which prevents them from material reintegration into society. While he acknowledges that the causes of poverty are structural, he concludes that due to their pathological culture, changing their material conditions would not resolve the problems of poor people. Very similar discourses can be traced in the literature on homelessness, including the reference to homelessness as "lifestyle" (cf. Feldman 2004) or "subculture" (Győri 2008).

The "culture of poverty" theory is widely critiqued, not only for its theoretical controversialities and lack of empirical evidence, but for its use in blame-the-victim discourses (Bourgois 2001, Small et al. 2010) which still dominate the discourse on homelessness, and the discourses of homeless women in my research. Although the "culture of poverty" claims that

poor people no longer identify with the dominant social norms (Lewis 1966), the homeless women I interviewed have adopted the discourses on deserving and undeserving homeless, the social norms related to cleanliness, self-reliance and proper forms of intimacy and thus gained a great role in policing these norms in the shelter. They were keen to make a clear distinction between "voluntary" and "involuntary" homeless people, the homeless people living in public spaces and in shelters and true and failed women. Although most pointed out that the boundary between homeless and non-homeless people is not clear, sedentarism as a norm appeared in most of their answers about citizenship. All argued that homelessness did not change their self-perception, but their discourses on pregnant homeless women (see section 2) reflected a strongly biopolitical understanding of their existence as one that should not be reproduced.

In this chapter, I explain what kind of transformed citizenship can be traced in these normative boundary-making discourses while calling attention to the fact that homeless women's transformed citizenship is not rooted in a "subculture" or "lifestyle", but in the transformation of their private sphere.

5.1 The "voluntary" and "involuntary" and the "undeserving" and "deserving" homeless

Whether someone could be blamed for her/his situation was always present in the homeless women's narratives during my research. Most argued that they did not feel bad about their homelessness because it was not their fault, but that of a family member or the lack of job opportunities. One of them, who felt homelessness was her fault because of a bad decision, told this as if it was necessary to confess. What is common is the need of making it clear whether someone is to be blamed for his/her homelessness or not.

When my interviewees spoke about other homeless people, they often mentioned people who choose to be homeless. They frequently told me about people who have a large pension or the have an apartment that they rent and move into a shelter where they get everything they need and

they do not have to do anything for it. The same issue appeared in the literature arguing that it is very difficult for the shelters to filter who is genuinely needy or a "stowaway" in the shelter (Győri 2008). One interviewee also mentioned that in a workshop for social workers one of the employees talked about a woman living in a night shelter who spent all of the money for cheap plane tickets and travelled to European cities. The social workers were furious about the fact that she did not spend her savings to pay for a temporary shelter and "move forward" in the shelter system. Being a "stowaway" thus is related to the "moving forward" expectation too.

However, behind the "stowaway" discourse there is also a larger scheme of boundary-making between what Feldman (2004) calls "truly" and "falsely" homeless. He argues that in the discourses about homeless people in public spaces there is also a distinction between voluntarily and involuntarily homeless. In these discourses homeless people who choose not to use a shelter are considered voluntarily homeless, because they have the chance to obey the law if they move into a shelter. This "falsely" homeless discourse is rooted in a perception of homelessness as bare life: as if homeless people's only needs were eating, sleeping and breathing, and shelter, even if it offers minimal services and is perhaps degrading, is a better option (Feldman 2004). Living in the public space is an outlaw situation which, apart from its perception as a voluntary act, is also associated with idleness.

This was also present in homeless women's stories about the "voluntarily" homeless people and the people who "liked living on the street". The women living in shelter often called these people "stupid" or referred to them as "csöves" which is a derogatory word commonly used for homeless people living in public spaces. But being a "csöves" did not only have the meaning of living on the street. One interviewee, who made a sharp distinction between "csöves" and other homeless people, herself used to spend some nights on the street. What she meant by "csöves" was that they are people who refuse to use the shelter, a place for normalization and regulation, because they preferred freedom and very often because they preferred drinking and hanging around instead of following the rules of a shelter. They also breached the social norm of

45

cleanliness: the women I interviewed often depicted in detail people who did not take care of themselves at all and were sitting in their own waste. For homeless women thus being "csöves" had two interrelated notions: being voluntarily homeless and breaching the social norms of self-reliance and cleanliness.

The former notion is related to the notions of freedom and agency. The explanation for living in public space of the two women I interviewed was based on freedom: they did not want anybody to tell them what to do and pass judgments on them. In a nutshell, they refused the expectation of transparent intimacy and the conceptualization of agency by the social workers. The latter, the norms of self-reliance and cleanliness were related to the dilemma of who is a deserving and who is an undeserving person. My interviewees often emphasized that most homeless people do not deserve help or should be offered only one chance in life. Most of them talked about social housing as a solution and complained about the number of empty houses, but they also added how few homeless people would deserve those places because of their lack of self-reliance. The voluntary and undeserving discourses thus shape the way homeless women perceive people living in public spaces, shelters and self-reliance.

5.2 The undeserving homeless women

The undeserving discourse also shapes homeless women's perceptions of the other women with whom they lived together. My informants voiced strong criticisms about the other women: about the way they behaved, dressed, and talked. Since disciplinary mechanisms are targeted at individuals, and the rank they establish creates hierarchies (Foucault 1995), shelter life has an atomizing effect on the women. Although the economy of intimacy produces relationships, these relationships and transfers usually clash with the dominant social norms related to the boundary between intimacy and economy. The undeserving discourse about other women emphasized in the interviews therefore had a similar function to taste in signifying symbolic social hierarchies in society as a basis of distinction between social classes (Bourdieu 1984). In this case, because of

the transparent privacy in the shelter, the whole private sphere of these women became a basis of distinction. The clash of the social norms and the economy of intimacy in the shelter makes women keen to draw a boundary between themselves and the other women.

Although all the women need to be involved in the economy of intimacy in the shelter, they make a distinction between themselves and others based on their improper private sphere practices, often related to sexuality and reproduction. The major concerns about other women were their promiscuity, their stories about prostitution and their clothing. My interviewees depicted homeless women in a way that confirmed Golden's (1995) analysis: as not true women who engage in sexual relationships for a small amount of money or food and drink, who change their partners on a daily basis, who drink, and who are unclean. These issues serve not only as a basis for distinction, but also as markers for deservingness and undeservingness. One interviewee told me a story about a drunken homeless woman sitting on the stairs of the temporary shelter who was spat a passer-by. My interviewee explained that she did not stand up for the woman or help her in any way, because she deserved what happened to her. I observed the same attitude in the answers when I asked about the social workers' attitude: my interviewees often emphasized that the women in the shelter would not have deserved their help because of their lack of self-reliance.

Because of their homelessness, my interviewees also had to make unwanted transgressions of both spatial and social boundaries. In the interviews the first occasions of these transgressions were always presented as shameful and they were usually related to cleanliness: the first time picking in the trash, the first time using the public space as a toilet, the first days in public space menstruating and not having sanitary towels, etc. These transgressions are not only seen as shameful because of the distinction-making, but also because the women truly identify with the norms of self-reliance.

Discourses on undeservingness and distinction-making both aimed at boundary-making between legitimate and illegitimate citizens do not only concern women's private sphere.

47

Idleness, the "unwillingness to work" was very often presented in the interviews with the same anxiety. This shows that women are not only expected to have a proper private sphere, but also to participate in the public sphere through work. The interviewees therefore always emphasized how many years they spent working and the fact that they always had a job before they became homeless. Since being "only" a housewife has always been an option exclusively available for upper middle-class women and the image of women as both workers and mothers/housekeepers is dominant (Gal and Kligman 2000), homeless women do not perceive domesticity as their only role as a woman. As explained in chapter 4, the homeless women's relationship with their children usually breaks down because they cease to fulfill the providing role. The women in my research often expressed frustration about not being able to send gifts or travel to their children or grandchildren. Concerns about not having a job and not being able to provide show that homeless women's anxiety is caused by being incapable of living according to social norms both related to their productive (work) and reproductive (providing, caring) roles.

My interviewees talked in a derogatory way about women who had no intention of working or who neglected their children, even if they themselves were very often unable to fulfill these roles. When I was waiting for the night shelter to open with some of the women, one of them said that a woman in their sleeping hall started giving birth there and that she was in the 8th month of her pregnancy, but did not talk about it to anyone. The woman's comment on this issue was that "well, she will only get three or four days with the baby" referring to the fact that if a shelter-living homeless woman has no place secured in a shelter for mothers, she is not allowed to take the baby out of the hospital. The other women did not show any empathy towards this woman either; although they did not openly blame her, they did not question the fairness of this procedure, but implicitly, they questioned whether a homeless woman, a "failed" woman is entitled to have a baby, as the following example shows too.

In other cases, they talked about pregnant homeless women in a derogatory way. When a woman during the research saw another woman about whom she could not decide whether she

48

was pregnant or just looked like it, she commented: "Am I seeing right?" in a blaming tone, then she explained how irresponsible it is to give birth to a child in this "csöves" world. In this context the notion of "csöves" was extended to the whole system in which homeless people live, which was interpreted as a world inherently separate from the normal, non-homeless world. It was a world which was not meant to be maintained or reproduced by the women who are part of it. Women thus do not only perceive themselves as reproducers of a community or social group (the way women are perceived as reproducers of the nation as Anthias and Yuval-Davis (1989) argue), but also of a certain way of existing. Being a "csöves" is equated with improper private sphere practices which a homeless woman cannot avoid because of the economy of intimacy. But the homeless women in the shelter are still aware of this fact and argue for an internalized biopolitics, implying that the homeless women who have a baby should have known they are also undeserving to reproduce. This does not only transforms their private sphere practices, but their gendered citizenship as well, because they are expected to restrain themselves and be self-reliant also in a way that they refuse to reproduce, because the citizens they reproduced would be part of the "csöves" world and therefore not be legitimate citizens.

Undeserving discourses serves thus the purpose of making a distinction inside the economy of intimacy which contradicts the norms related to proper citizenship. It concerns private sphere practices and participation in the public sphere through work as well, but is also related to the women's role as reproducers and thus their citizenship.

5.3 Homeless women, homeland and citizenship

Despite the fact that homeless women felt it wrong to reproduce their form of citizenship, when I asked what citizenship meant to them, they all related it to nationality and one's duties to the nation. They either pointed out that those who deny their belonging to their nation are bad people or said that leaving someone's homeland was not a nice thing to do, but in some cases it was forgivable. One framed "being homeless in my own homeland" as a dilemma. What

49

common was that all of them associated citizenship with Hungary through the nation. One interviewee was from Transylvania emphasized during the whole interview that she was not homeless in her country, only in Hungary, which she admitted made her more confident about her situation. They did not relate citizenship to rights, but implicitly it was framed as a duty to love and stay in one's homeland, even it is controversial to be homeless there. Through this idealistic understanding of the nation they expressed a notion of sedentarism which is a crucial element of normal citizenship, since people not having a home are perceived as pathological (Malkki 2001). Although homeless women cannot fully achieve sedentarism, they identify with the sedentarist norms, but they do not mean it as being housed, but as belonging to the nation and thus to the community of citizens. This perception contradicts the current Hungarian discourse on the criminalization of homelessness which conceptualizes homeless people as the antithesis of legitimate citizens (Ámon 2012) because they are not housed.

Most women I interviewed, however, made a distinction between homeless and non-homeless people in terms of citizenship, because they tended to call homeless people "csöves", "homeless" or even "colleagues" showing their common situation compared to other, non-homeless people and to call non-homeless people "civilians". Being a "civilian" here could also be understood as "right", non-homeless citizen and also a person who is not part of and does not know the homeless world. As mentioned in chapter 2, women during my research often referred to middle-classed women as "little girls" or to me as "darling" which not only indicated age difference, but also lack of experience. While they were telling me about shelter life, they emphasized how different it is from the world outside that system, but they were also keen to show the knowledge they had gained in the shelters and in public spaces. They were eager to express that they know what non-homeless people do not know.

However, despite of the distinction of civilians and homeless people, when I asked about the meaning of homelessness, many talked about people who live in rented apartments and do not know that they are actually homeless too, because they do not own their home. The importance

of ownership in the interviews was related to the feelings about homelessness as a precarious situation. Thus, homeless women generally associate homelessness with a precarious citizenship and not with the physical condition of being housed. The interviewees often told me that people who live in this precarious situation do not know that they are practically homeless, which again shows that homeless women think of themselvess having more extensive knowledge about the citizens, who consider themselves "normal" because they are housed, but are in fact precarious citizens.

In spite of the fact the women I interviewed depicted a negative image about the homeless "world", all of them told me that they did not think that they have become different women since they became homeless. One of them told me: "no one is born homeless" indicating that homelessness is a situation and not a form of existence. Although this seems to contradict to their perception of homeless women as possible reproducers, they saw their subjectivity as being unchanged by their condition. Thus they made a distinction between not being legitimate citizens because of their private sphere practices and their own subjectivity. The social norms they emphasize through the undeserving and voluntarily homeless discourse and sedentarism are therefore not only aimed at making a distinction, but also preserving the self-perception they had before they became homeless.

Conclusion

Although poor people are often accused for adopting a "culture of poverty" resulting in disrespect towards social norms, homeless women are keen to make distinction through the dominant voluntarily homeless and undeserving discourses based on social norms of self-reliance and proper private sphere practices. These discourses are not only aimed at making distinction from women in the same situation, but also making boundaries between true and not true women and proper and improper citizenship.

Citizenship is also conceptalized through private sphere practices and participation in the public sphere by working. The lack of a proper private sphere results in an internalized biopolitics and a self-perception as not appropriate reproducers. However, homeless women distinguish between participation in the nation in idealist terms and having legitimate citizenship. Their discourses of legitimate citizenship are also aimed at showing their self-perception which is still legitimate and intact by the condition of homelessness.

Although the "culture of poverty" theory assumes that the wrong social condition of poor people is rooted in their incapability of identifying with dominant social norms, homeless women drew the same boundaries between voluntary and involuntary homeless, deserving and undeserving and responsible and irresponsible homeless women as the dominant political discourses. In spite of this, their self-perception as women and citizens did not change: they continued to see themselves as citizens belonging to the community of citizens despite the dominant political actors' description of homeless people as non-citizens.

Conclusion

Homeless women's status disrupts the notion of citizenship conceptualized through the division of public and private, because their financial situation and the coercive measures in both the public spaces and the shelters transform the public sphere they can experience. They are deprived of privacy as a right not to be observed by other people, but they also become involved in new practices of privacy.

I have used the term transparent privacy for the private sphere experienced by the women in the shelter. This mass institution is aimed at the normalization of the women through disciplinary mechanisms such as women's distribution in different services and places and rank based on transparency about their life, self-reliance, heteronormativity and cleanliness. Although women use different tactics, primarily through their private property, to resist this coercion, this is not perceived as agency by the shelter staff. Their private property, although it is a basis of citizenship, is not acknowledged, because women are not seen as citizens in the shelter system, but as subjects of normalization. The social workers define agency through the concept of "moving forward" in the system, even if it rather has a meaning of going through the motions than actual improvements in life. Transparent privacy leads to a loss in bodily integrity and the infantilization of the women.

Women are not only perceived as improper citizens, but also as failed women, because of their lack of the domestic sphere. Not having enough financial resources, they need to participate in the economy of intimacy in the shelter in that they have to transgress the social norm of not mixing intimate and the economic relations. They do not only rely on the state in economic terms, but also on the women in the shelter and their partners. Perceived as failed women, they are generally associated with prositution and promiscuity, and are assaulted by men on a daily basis, which forces them into relationships for protection similarly to the ways non-homeless

women are relegated to the private sphere. The lack of domesticity therefore results in a lack of ownership of their own bodies. Sexual and partner-based violence is treated as a personal issue of the women and is often denied because homeless women are not perceived as true women.

Despite the transformation of their private sphere, women identify with the dominant social norms of self-reliance, cleanliness and sedentarism. They are eager to distinguish themselves from other homeless women whom, in line with the political discourses about homelessness and supporters of welfare paternalism, they perceive as undeserving and often voluntarily homeless. They conceptualize citizenship as a duty to the nation and their duty as homeless women as being responsible in a way that they restain themselves from reproduction. However, their self-perception remained the same after they became homeless, which means that their perception of citizenship and their own subjectivity have not changed, contrary to what is often argued in "culture of poverty" and other paternalist discourses, but the transformation of their private sphere prevented them from fulfilling their own and society's expectation of legitimate citizenship.

This research shows that a rights-based reconceptualization and an attempt which takes into account the transformed private sphere of homeless women is necessary to understand homeless women's situation and their citizenship. It also highlights that theories on citizenship underestimate the role of the private sphere as a right that we assume as "universal", but homeless women, hindered by the sexual contract as women and disadvantaged because of the lack of social rights as poor people, not just do not have, but their normalization to be proper citizens occurs through the deprivation of this privacy.

Feminist critiques of liberal political theory conceptualize the private sphere as a space of oppression for women and normalization of people's sexuality. By explaining the transparent intimacy and the economy of intimacy in the shelter homeless women experience, I did not aim so much to show that feminist critiques often ignore the significance of private sphere as a right, as that the way we perceive homeless women and their situation highlights the boundaries of the

54

private sphere and citizenship in general. Society's eagerness to make the private sphere of the poor people transparent, however, leads to an inequality in transparency and privacy which further reproduces material inequalities, and in the case of women, their lack of ownership of their own body.

The findings of my research contradict the understanding of poverty as a set of individual pathologies and therefore the conceptualization of social help in terms of attempts aimed at the normalization of poor people. The transformations in people's material situation transform their private sphere, but this does not necessarily lead to a different perception of social norms. Moreover, people can be espouse to social norms so as to make a distinction between themselves and other poor people, because they do not want to identify with that situation. Welfare paternalism, by promoting more control on poor people's private lives, results in a further deprivation of their private sphere and agency. Social help based on a misconceptualization of poor people as illegitimate citizens and subjects of normalization or criminalization therefore will necessarily fail. In so far as our perception of homeless women's private sphere is a reflection on our own citizenship, the failure of our social care system reflects a failure of our understanding of citizenship.

Bibliography

Ámon, K. (2012). *The criminalization of the homeless in Hungary: The patterns of Legitimation and Implementation and the Discourses on Homelessness*. Unpublished term paper, Corvinus University of Budapest, Institute of Sociology and Social Policy.

Anthias, F. and Yuval-Davis, N. (1989). *Woman, Nation, State*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Bauman, Z. (1989). *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Berlant, L. (1998a). Intimacy: A Special Issue. *Critical Inquiry*, *24*(2), 281-289.

Berlant, L., & Warner, M. (1998b). Sex In Public. *Critical Inquiry*, *24*(2), 547-566.

Berlant, L. G. (1997). *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City: Essays on Sex and Citizenship*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bourgois, P. (2001). Culture of Poverty. In Smelser, N. J. and Baltes, P. B. (Eds.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (pp. 11904-11907). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Budapest Módszertani Szociális Központ és Intézményei Dózsa Éjjeli Menedékhely, Dózsa Lábadozó, Családok Átmeneti Otthona, Anya- és Gyermek Krízis és Átmeneti Szállás 2011. évi szakmai beszámoló (Methodological Social Center and Related Institution of Budapest Dózsa Night Shelter, Dózsa Medical Center, Temporary Shelter for Families, Crisis and Temporary Shelter for Mothers and Children Professional Report for 2011). Available: http://www.bmszki.hu/beszamolok (Accessed: June 04, 2013).

Buzás, E. and Hoffmann, K. (2012). Nők a társadalom peremén (Women at the Margins of Society). Unpublished research. Available: http://www.bironokegyesulete.hu/tanulmanyok/N%F5k_a_t%E1rsadalom_perem%E9n.ppt (Accessed June 04, 2013).

Canguilhem, G. (2008). *Knowledge of Life*. Fordham: Fordham University Press.

Castronovo, R. (2001). *Necrocitizenship: Death, Eroticism and the Public Sphere in the Nineteenth-Century United States*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Daston, L. and Vidal, F. (2004). *The Moral Authority of Nature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Certeau, M. D. (1984). *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Desjarlais, R. R. (1997). *Shelter Blues: Sanity and Selfhood Among the Homeless*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Douglas, M. (2010). *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. New York: Routledge.

Esping-Andersen, G. (2004). Mi a jóléti állam? (What Is the Welfare State?). In Ferge, Zs. (Ed.) *A Jóléti állam (The Welfare State)* (pp. 116-132). Budapest: T-Twins.

Evans, D. T. (1993). *Sexual Citizenship: The Material Construction of Sexualities*. London: Routledge.

Feldman, L. C. (2004). *Citizens Without Shelter: Homelessness, Democracy, and Political Exclusion*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Ferge, Zs. (2012). *Vágányok és vakvágányok a társadalompolitikában: válogatott tanulmányok (Ways and Dead-ends in Hungarian Social Policy: Selected Articles)*. Budapest: L'Harmattan.

Fodor, É. (2002). Smiling Women And Fighting Men: The Gender Of The Communist Subject In State Socialist Hungary. *Gender & Society*, *16*(2), 240-263.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (2nd Vintage Books ed.). New York: Vintage Books.

Fraser, N. (1990). Struggle Over Needs: Outline of a Socialist-Feminist Critical Theory of Late-Capitalist Political Culture. In Gordon, L. (Ed.) *Women, the State, and Welfare* (pp. 199-225). Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press.

Gal, S. and Kligman, G. (2000). *The Politics of Gender After Socialism: A Comparative-historical Essay*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gans, H. J. (1992). Mire szolgálnak az érdemtelen szegények? - avagy a legalsó osztály szerepe

Amerikában (What Do the Undeserving Poor Serve For? The Role of the Underclass in America). *Esély*, *3*, 3-17.

Glasser, I. and Bridgman, R. (1999). *Braving the Street: The Anthropology of Homelessness*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Golden, S. (1995). Lady Versus Low Creature: Old Roots of Current Attitudes Toward Homeless Women. In Freeman, J. (Ed.) *Women: A Feminist Perspective* (pp. 481-493). Mountain View: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Gowan, T. (2010). *Hobos, Hustlers, and Backsliders: Homeless in San Francisco*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Győri, P. (2008). Fedél nélkül élők (Roughless People). In Győri, P. and Vida, J. (Eds.). *Az utcák népe (Streetfolk)* (pp. 5-141.) Budapest: Menhely Alapítvány/Budapest Módszertani és Szociális Központ és Intézményei.

Gyuris, T., Horváth, O. and Oross, J. (2004). *Hajléktalanellátás. Segédanyag a szociális szakvizsgához (Homeless care. Help material for the final exam of social workers)*. Budapest: Nemzeti Család- és Szociálpolitikai Intézet.

Haney, L. A. (2002). *Inventing the Needy: Gender and the Politics of Welfare in Hungary*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hartmann, H. (1997). The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism. Towards a More Progressive Union. In Linda Nicholson (Ed.) (pp. 97-122) *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory*. New York and London: Routledge.

Hertz, S. H. (1981). *The Welfare Mothers Movement: A Decade of Change for Poor Women?*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.

Iványi, G. (1997). *Hajléktalanok (Homeless People)*. Budapest: Sík Kiadó.

Kawash, S. (1998). The Homeless Body. *Public Culture*, *10*(2), 319-339.

Lewis, O. (1966). *La Vida: A Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty - San Juan and New York*. New York: Random House.

Lister, R. (1997). *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. New York: New York University Press.

Lyon-Callo, V. (2004). *Inequality, Poverty, and Neoliberal Governance: Activist Ethnography in the Homeless Sheltering Industry*. Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press.

Malkki, L. (1997). National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity Among Scholars and Refugees. In Gupta, A. and Ferguson, J. (Eds.) *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology* (pp. 52-74). Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Marshall, T. H. (1963). *Sociology at the Crossroads*. London: Heinemann.

McClintock, A. (1993). Family Feuds: Gender, Nationalism and the Family. *Feminist Review*, *44*, 61-80.

Mead, L. M. (1997). *The New Paternalism: Supervisory Approaches to Poverty*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Moss, K. and Paramjit, S. (2012). Women rough sleepers who are the victims of domestic abuse: Final report. *Empowering Women Rough Sleepers to protect themselves from Violence on the Streets*, *December*. Available:

http://www.womenroughsleepers.eu/sites/default/files/WRS%20FINAL%20REPOR T.pdf (Accessed: June 04, 2013)

Nagy, B. (2010). *Active ageing and gender equality policies: The employment and social inclusion of women and men of late working and early retirement age, National Report, Hungary*. Unpublished report.

Okin, S. M. (1989). *Justice, Gender, and the Family*. New York: Basic Books.

Papp, Zs. (1992). 40 év - avagy a szocialista magyar út és néhány sajátossága (40 years: The Socialist Hungarian Path and Some of its Peculiarities). *Szociológiai Szemle*, *3*, 103-126.

Pateman, C. (1988). *The Sexual Contract*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Perrot, M. (1990). *A History of Private Life*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Piven, F. F. (1990). Ideology and the State: Women, Power, and the Welfare State. In Gordon, L.

(Ed.) *Women, the State, and Welfare* (pp. 250-264). Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press.

Reynolds, P. (2010). Disentangling Privacy And Intimacy: Intimate Citizenship, Private Boundaries And Public Transgressions. *Human Affairs*, *20*(1), 33-42.

Schilt, K. and Westbrook, L. (2009). Doing Gender, Doing Heteronormativity: "Gender Normals," Transgender People, And The Social Maintenance Of Heterosexuality. *Gender & Society*, *23*(4), 440-464.

Small, M. L., Harding, D. J. and Lamont, M. (2010). Reconsidering Culture and Poverty. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *629*(6), 6-27.

Smith, A. M. (2007). *Welfare Reform and Sexual Regulation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, D. E. (2005). *Institutional Ethnography: A Sociology for People*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Soós, Z. (2005). *A szociális munka alapjai (The Foundations of Social Work)*. Pécs: Comenius.

Szoboszlai, K. (2012). Nők fedél nélkül (Roughless Women). In Fehér, B. and Szoboszlai, K. (Eds.). *"A megértés útjai": Hajléktalan sorsok, traumák és a segítő kapcsolat ("The Ways of Understanding": Homeless Destinies, Traumas, and the Helping Relationship)* (pp. 97-147.). Budapest: Menhely Alapítvány/Budapest Módszertani és Szociális Központ és Intézményei.

Taylor, C. and Gutmann, A. (1992). *Multiculturalism and "The Politics of Recognition": An Essay*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

The Fourth Amendment to the Fundamental Law of Hungary. English Translation, February 08, 2013. Available: http://lapa.princeton.edu/hosteddocs/hungary/Fourth%20Amendment%20to%20the %20FL%20-Eng%20Corrected.pdf (Accessed: June 04, 2013).

Tosi, A. (1996). The Excluded and the Homeless: The Social Construction of the Fight Against Poverty in Europe. In Mingione, E. (Ed.) *Urban Poverty and the Underclass: A Reader* (pp.

83-105). Oxford: Blackwell.

Zelizer, V. A. (2005). *The Purchase of Intimacy.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.