



**WESTERN
MICHIGAN**
UNIVERSITY

The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare

Volume 16
Issue 4 *December*

Article 11

December 1989

A Response to Critics of The Truly Disadvantaged

William Julius Wilson
University of Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>



Part of the Social Work Commons

Recommended Citation

Wilson, William Julius (1989) "A Response to Critics of The Truly Disadvantaged," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 16 : Iss. 4 , Article 11.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol16/iss4/11>

This Article is brought to you by the Western Michigan University School of Social Work. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



**WESTERN
MICHIGAN**
UNIVERSITY

A Response to Critics of *The Truly Disadvantaged*

WILLIAM JULIUS WILSON

University of Chicago

I appreciate the thoughtful comments by the authors of those papers that focused on my book, even though I disagree with many of the arguments. I was especially pleased with Edna Bonacich's accurate interpretation of my arguments in the first several pages of her article. And I was impressed with Andrew Billingsley's comprehensive discussion of what he takes to be the "three distinct, yet overlapping phases or central themes in" my work. I wish I were able on this occasion to discuss this broader coverage of my scholarship, but for sake of brevity, I shall only focus on the criticisms of *The Truly Disadvantaged*. My response will not include an attempt to "answer" each of the critical comments seriatim, rather it will focus on those points that allow me to highlight and clarify the most important arguments in the book. In the process I hope to correct several of the more serious misinterpretations and distortions of my thesis.

The Truly Disadvantaged: A Correct Interpretation

When the first reviews of *The Truly Disadvantaged* appeared in late October 1987, I felt that the timing of the publication of this book could not have been better. One of my purposes was to challenge the dominant themes on the underclass reflected in the popular media and in the writings of conservative intellectuals, not by shying away from using the concept of "underclass," not by avoiding a description and explanation of unflattering behavior, but by attempting to relate the practices and experiences of inner-city ghetto residents to the structure of opportunities and constraints in American society. And one of my principal arguments was that the vulnerability of poor urban minorities to changes in the economy since the early 1970s (the periodic recessions of the 1970s and early 1980s, the

downward slide in real wages, economic cutbacks, plant closings, and the relocation of manufacturing and other goods producing firms from the central city to cheaper labor sites [including sites abroad] and to the suburbs and exurbs) has resulted in sharp increases in joblessness, in the concentration of poverty, in the number of poor single-parent families, and in welfare dependency, despite the creation of Great Society programs and despite antidiscrimination and affirmative action programs.

Also, I argued that the effects of changes in the economy are most clearly felt in the concentrated poverty areas of the ghetto. The steady exodus of higher income families, together with the sharp rise in joblessness, has transformed the social structure of these neighborhoods in ways that severely worsen the impact of the continuing industrial and geographic changes of the American economy since the 1970s: periodic recessions, wage stagnation, and the restriction of employment opportunities to the low-wage sector. I pointed out that today the dwindling presence of middle- and working-class households in the ghetto makes it more difficult for the remaining residents of these communities to sustain basic formal and informal institutions in the face of high and prolonged joblessness and attendant economic hardships. And as the basic institutions decline, the social organization of inner-city ghetto neighborhoods disintegrates, further depleting the resources and limiting the life-chances of those who remain mired in these blighted areas.

One of the terms I use to help describe this process is "social isolation," which implies that contact between groups of different class and/or racial backgrounds is minimal and/or intermittent and thereby enhances the effects of living in a highly concentrated poverty area. These "concentration effects," reflected in a range of outcomes from labor-force attachment to social dispositions, are created by the constraints and opportunities that the residents of inner-city ghetto neighborhoods face in terms of access to jobs and job networks, involvement in quality schools, availability of marriageable partners, and exposure to conventional role models. Accordingly, I argued that the factors associated with the recent

increases in social dislocation among the ghetto underclass are complex and cannot be reduced to the easy explanations of racism and racial discrimination advanced by those on the left or of the welfare state promoted by those on the right. I argued that although the inner-city ghetto is a product of historic discrimination and although present-day discrimination undoubtedly contributed to the increasing social and economic woes of the ghetto underclass, to understand the sharp increase in these problems since 1970 requires the specification of a complex web of other factors, including shifts in the American economy.

In this connection, I asserted that the War on Poverty and race relations visions failed to relate the fate of the truly disadvantaged to the functioning of the modern American economy and therefore failed to explain the worsening conditions of inner-city minorities in the post-Great Society and post-civil rights periods. Liberals whose views embody these visions have been puzzled by the recent increase of inner-city social dislocations and have lacked a convincing rebuttal to the forceful but erroneous arguments by conservative scholars and policy makers that attribute these problems to the social values of the ghetto underclass. And I attempted to show that the growing emphasis on social values deflects attention from the major cause of the rise of inner-city social dislocations since 1970—changes in the nation's economy.

I further argued that any significant reduction of the problem of joblessness and related social dislocations in the inner-city ghetto will call for a far more comprehensive program of economic and social reform than what Americans have usually supported or regarded as desirable. In short, It will require a radicalism that our major political parties have been unwilling to consider. I therefore proposed a social democratic policy agenda that highlights macro-economic policies to promote balanced economic growth and create a tight labor market, public sector employment programs for those who have difficulty finding jobs in the private sector, manpower training and education programs, affirmative action programs, a child support assurance program, a child care strategy, and a family allowance program.

Finally, I argued that an important feature of this program is that it would improve the life chances of truly disadvantaged groups such as the ghetto underclass and at the same time attract and sustain the support of more advantaged groups of different racial and class backgrounds because it includes and would highlight specific universal programs.

The Truly Disadvantaged has been credited not only with stimulating a whole new round of empirical research on life in the inner-city ghetto, but also with encouraging scholars to reenter the field of urban poverty and to address openly various life experiences in the ghetto including self-destructive behavior. It has also drawn a good deal of criticism of the kind reflected in this volume. Let me react to some of this criticism and in the process put my arguments in proper perspective.

Critical Response to the Authors

One of the sections in Andrew Billingsley's thoughtful paper is entitled "Blacks as Main Cause of the Underclass." This section seriously distorts my arguments because Billingsley surprisingly misinterprets a statement I made about the demographic changes in black neighborhoods. Billingsley quotes the following statement from *The Truly Disadvantaged*: "The extraordinary increase in both the poor and nonpoor populations in the extreme poverty areas between 1970 and 1980 was due mainly to changes in the demographic characteristics of the black population." This statement was meant to convey a statistical association indicating that the increase in poverty concentration was reflected in the remarkable change in the racial composition of neighborhoods; in other words, that nearly all of the increase in the concentration of residents in extreme poverty areas was accounted for by blacks and Hispanics. Billingsley however erroneously interpreted it as a causal statement. He argues "Our own view, as we have noted elsewhere, is that it is not likely that the problem of concentration of low-income Blacks in inner cities and the problems they experience can be explained [emphasis added] by 'the demographic characteristics of the black population,' as Wilson argues. The explanation lies elsewhere, and lies outside the inner city and outside the Black population altogether. In our

view, there are much more powerful social, economic, and technological forces at work which offer a better explanation." Now I wonder what book Billingsley is talking about because *The Truly Disadvantaged* makes the same point with even greater clarity. For example in chapter two I state that "Although present-day discrimination undoubtedly has contributed to the increasing social and economic woes of the ghetto underclass, I have argued that these problems have been due far more to a complex web of other factors that **include shifts in the American economy—which have produced extraordinary rates of black joblessness that have exacerbated other social problems in the inner city**—the historic flow of migrants, changes in the urban minority age structure, population changes in the central city, and the class transformation of the inner city" (Wilson, 1987, p. 62) [emphasis added]. Any careful reader of *The Truly Disadvantaged* will know that I never argued that "Black flight from the inner city is the **primary cause** of the concentration of low-income blacks there and the attend social problem," as Billingsley asserts [emphasis added]. Indeed I pointed out, "the class transformation of the inner city cannot be understood without considering the effects of fundamental changes in the urban economy on lower-income minorities, effects that include joblessness and that thereby increase the chances of long-term residence in highly concentrated poverty areas" (Wilson, 1987, p. 62).

Several of the authors in this volume suggest that my policy prescription is designed, as Geschwender puts it, to "increase the numbers of Afro-American men who could afford to marry and support a family, thereby, reducing the number of female-headed families and decreasing the number of persons living in disadvantaged circumstances." Echoing the sentiments of Carole Marks and, to a lesser extent, Bonnie Dill, Geschwender goes on to state that "it is simply not the case that all women who head families do so because of a shortage of what Wilson calls 'marriageable men.' Some do so by choice, and would like the opportunity to achieve a decent standard of living without having to buy a husband as part of the package. The program that Wilson proposes does not address this issue and would, if enacted, do very little to improve their circumstances. Nor

is it, by itself, likely to produce very substantial gains for disadvantaged two-parent families.”

To put it bluntly, this is a serious misinterpretation of my analysis and policy recommendations. Let me elaborate. Chapter four of *The Truly Disadvantaged* includes a discussion of Daniel Patrick Moynihan’s recommendations to aid poor families, outlined in his 1986 Harvard University Godkin lectures, which call for enlarging personal and dependent tax exemptions, establishing a national benefit standard for child welfare aid, and indexing benefits to inflation. It is stated in *The Truly Disadvantaged* that

these are all constructive suggestions, but they need to be included in a more comprehensive reform program designed to create a tight labor market that enhances the employment opportunities of both poor men and women. Such an undertaking will do far more in the long run to enlarge the stability and reduce the welfare dependency of low-income black families than will cutting the vital provisions of the welfare state. We emphasize the need to create employment opportunities for both sexes, even though our focus in this chapter is on the problem of black male joblessness. To identify black male joblessness as a major source of black family disintegration is not to suggest that policymakers should ignore the problems of joblessness and poverty among current female heads of families. (Wilson, 1987, pp. 105–106)

It is important to note that black male joblessness was emphasized in *The Truly Disadvantaged* because I was trying to challenge the conservative argument that the increase in black solo parent families was due primarily to a “welfare ethos,” an argument most prominently associated with Charles Murray who has maintained that welfare generosity is the fundamental cause of black family dissolution. To strengthen the case against Murray, Kathryn Neckerman and I develop a “male marriageable pool index” (i.e., the number of employed men per 100 women of the same race and age) in order to show that black women unlike white women were facing a shrinking pool of marriageable, i.e., employed men and that the decline in the pool of marriageable men was greatest in the inner city and accounts in large measure for the sharp increase in poor female headed families. Data collected more recently by

researchers on my large research project on poverty, joblessness and family structure in the innercity neighborhoods of Chicago dramatically reveal the importance of male joblessness and family formation. For example, in Oakland, Grand Boulevard, and Washington Park—the traditional black belt neighborhoods of Chicago—there were roughly 70 employed adult males for every 100 adult females in 1950, a ratio which was about equal to the city wide figure of 73 percent. By 1980 that proportion had slipped to 56% in Chicago, but plunged to 29% in Washington Park, 24% in Grand Boulevard, and only 19% in Oakland (Wacquant & Wilson, 1989, pp. 70–102).¹ Moreover, on the basis of a survey of inner-city parents in Chicago, researchers on our project were able to document that inner-city employed fathers are two and a half times more likely than nonemployed fathers to marry the mother of their first child (Testa et al., 1989, pp. 79–91).

To repeat, the focus on black male joblessness was to help explain the sharp rise of poor female-headed families in the inner city. This emphasis on family formation is important because female headed families are overwhelmingly impoverished families, families that are far more likely to experience persistent poverty in the United States. In Sweden, by contrast, since the poverty rate of single-mother families is very nearly equal to the poverty rate of married-couple families—both are extremely low—and since an adequate child care system to support working mothers is available, the growth of solo-parent families is not problematic. But this is not Sweden, and the factors that contribute to the rise of impoverished single-parent families cannot be ignored in the public policy debate here.

Nonetheless, several of the authors in this volume, erroneously interpreted my association of the sharp rise of black single-parent families with male joblessness to mean that I was only concerned about the job situation for men and that my policy prescription is limited to men. This is not the case. Let me quote another paragraph from chapter seven of *The Truly Disadvantaged*.

Comprehensive economic policies aimed at the general population but that would also enhance employment opportunities among the truly disadvantaged—both men and women—are

needed. The research presented in this study suggest that improving the job prospects of men will strengthen low-income black families. Moreover, underclass absent fathers with more stable employment are in a better position to contribute financial support for their families. Furthermore, since the majority of female householders are in the labor force, improved job prospects would very likely draw in others. (Wilson, 1987, pp. 150–151)

Moreover, after discussing the need for a child support assurance program, I state in the same chapter that:

low-income single mothers could combine work with adequate child support and/or child allowance benefits and therefore escape poverty and avoid public assistance. Finally, the question of child care has to be addressed in any program designed to improve the employment prospects of women and men. Because of the growing participation of women in the labor market, adequate child care has been a topic receiving increasing attention in public policy discussions. For the overwhelmingly female-headed ghetto underclass families, access to quality child care becomes a critical issue if steps are taken to move single mothers into education and training programs and/or full- or part-time employment. (Wilson, 1987, p. 153)

I think I have made my point, so let me turn to some of the other major criticisms of my book.

On the front page of the October 26th *New York Times Book Review* there a drawing that reflects the title of the Robert Greenstein's review of *The Truly Disadvantaged*. Greenstein's long review was entitled "Prisoners of the Economy," and it presents in clear, accurate and forceful terms my central thesis that inner-city blacks and inner-city neighborhoods have been victimized by changes in America's advanced capitalist economy. Anyone who has read Greenstein's review and has the chance to read the reviews by Gomes and Fishman and, especially, by Newby in this volume might very well conclude that these latter authors have read an entirely different book.

Newby states that of the "nearly 400 bibliographic references in *The Truly Disadvantaged* one is hard put to find any reference to works about the so-called underclass by progressive scholars." If by "progressive scholars" he is referring to

those who are likely to take the approach represented in his article or in the article by Gomes and Fishman, he is right. However, my view of progressive scholars is more broad and would include the works of people like Barry Bluestone and Benjamin Harris, Chester Bowles and Herbert Gintis, Ira Katznelson, Michael Harrington, and Theda Skocpol all of whom I did cite. I find the work of the "progressive scholars" that, I assume, Newby has in mind as irrelevant to the major issues described in *The Truly Disadvantaged*. They either deny the reality of the unique problems in the inner city that I have described, or they use abstract arguments, based on categorical models or assumptions about the "way the world works," and general concepts like "working class" that fail to capture the reality of life and experience in the inner-city ghetto. And I think that this is particularly true of a good deal of Marxist scholarship of which Newby is a prime example. Let me elaborate.

Newby quotes from the appendix of *The Truly Disadvantaged* which indicates that there has been an increase in poverty among both poor whites and poor blacks. He then states that "Clearly, these figures show that the problem is not restricted to a 'socially isolated' black, so-called, 'underclass.' Instead, these figures, for both blacks and whites, show a more general decline in the capacity of capitalism as a system to provide work for the populace, and not some set of phenomena peculiar to blacks." If one is concerned only with general poverty rates, Newby is correct in emphasizing that both whites and blacks have experienced significant increases in rates of poverty. But there is another dimension of poverty that is not reflected in these statistics but that is described in considerable detail in *The Truly Disadvantaged*, namely the concentration of poverty—a dimension that Newby strangely ignores.

As I discussed in *The Truly Disadvantaged* there has been a sharp increase in the concentration of poverty in the nation's large metropolises. I illustrated this by focusing on the five largest cities based on the 1970 population census (i.e., New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Detroit) where close to half of the total poor population in the fifty largest cities live. I pointed out that although the total population in

these five largest cities declined by 9% from 1970 to 1980, the poverty population rose by 22%. However, the population residing in poverty census tracts increased by 40% overall, by 69% in high poverty areas (i.e., areas with a poverty rate of at least 30%), and by an astonishing 161% in extreme poverty areas (i.e., areas with a poverty rate of at least 40%).

I noted that poverty areas, of course, include both poor and nonpoor individuals and that the increase in the poor population in the poverty areas of these five cities was even more severe than that in the total population. More specifically, the number of poor living in poverty areas swelled by 58% overall, by 70% in high-poverty areas, and by an enormous 182% in extreme poverty areas. And I pointed out that these extraordinary increases reflected mainly changes in the demographic characteristics of the minority population. Whereas only 15% of poor blacks and 20% of poor Hispanics lived in **nonpoverty** areas in the five large central cities in 1980, 68% of all poor whites lived in such areas. And whereas 32% of all poor Hispanics and 39% of all poor blacks lived in the extreme poverty areas, only 7% of all poor whites lived in such areas. As I argue in *The Truly Disadvantaged*, if one were to conduct a study that only compared the responses of poor urban blacks with those of poor urban whites without considering the effects of living in highly concentrated poverty neighborhoods, that is without taking into account the different residential areas in which poor whites and poor blacks tend to reside, one would reach conclusions about human capital traits, attitudes, norms, and behavior that would be unfavorable to poor blacks but favorable to poor whites. Associated with the sharp increase in the concentration of poverty is the precipitous rise in the concentration of joblessness, the large growth in the concentration of single parent families, the substantial increase in the concentration of families on welfare, etc.

This is what I mean when I talk about the incredible social transformation that has taken place in the inner-city ghetto, a transformation that is not duplicated in the urban white neighborhoods, a transformation that captures the dynamic interaction of class subordination and racial isolation. And careful readers of *The Truly Disadvantaged* know that I relate the trans-

formation of the inner-city ghetto first and foremost to changes in the organization of America's advanced capitalist economy, changes that have unleashed powerful pressures that have, in combination with the exodus of higher income blacks from many inner-city neighborhoods, broken down the previous structure of the ghetto and set off a process of "hyperghettoization" (Wacquant & Wilson, 1989, pp. 8–25).² Marxist scholars like Newby are not capturing this reality in their writings. They are talking in general terms about an exploited working class as if the experiences of the various groups subsumed under this concept are similar. In contrast, I use the term 'underclass' to capture the unique reality of inner-city ghetto residents. I am fully aware, because of the pervasive and rising influence of conservative ideology, that recent discussions of the plight of ghetto blacks have been couched in individualistic and moralistic terms. The ghetto poor, in other words, "are presented as a mere aggregation of personal cases, each with its own logic and self-contained causes. Severed from the struggles and structural changes in the society, economy, and polity that in fact determine them, inner-city dislocations are then portrayed as a self-imposed, self-sustaining phenomenon. . . . Descriptions and explanations of the current predicament of inner-city blacks put the emphasis on individual attributes and the alleged grip of the so-called culture of poverty (Wacquant & Wilson, 1989, p. 9).

And Newby is right, I do use the term "social pathology" to describe some of the behavior and traits in the inner-city ghetto. I hasten to point out, however, that the use of this term is not based on the writings of conservative analysts, as Newby implies, but on the work of two of the most influential liberal scholars of the inner-city ghetto—Kenneth B. Clark and Lee Rainwater. In the mid 1960s these scholars highlighted problems of poverty, joblessness, and family structure in the ghetto, but they also discussed the problems of crime, sexual exploitation, teenage pregnancy, alcoholism, drug addiction, and other forms of self-destructive behavior (Clark, 1964 and 1965; Rainwater, 1966 and 1970). As Lee Rainwater noted in his now classic article ("Crucible of identity: The Negro Lower Class Family"), individuals in inner-city ghettos creatively

adapt to this system of severely restricted opportunities “in ways that keep them alive and extract what gratification they can find, but in the process of adaptation they are constrained to behave in ways that inflict a great deal of suffering on those with whom they make their lives and on themselves.” And after describing these patterns of behavior in graphic descriptive terms, scholars such as Clark and Rainwater emphasize strongly the *ultimate source* of ghetto social dislocations—*structural inequality* in American society.

However, such candid and important work on the inner city came to a screeching halt in the aftermath of the Moynihan report on the black family. And this controversy effectively discouraged liberal scholars from writing about or conducting serious research on ghetto social dislocations for more than a decade. The subject was, therefore, left free for conservative writers who, without the benefit of actual field research or first-hand knowledge of the ghetto provided their own peculiar explanation of these problems. Whereas Newby and several of the other authors in this volume do little more than complain about the use of the concept of ‘underclass,’ in *The Truly Disadvantaged* the dominant themes of conservative scholars were challenged not by shying away from using the concept “underclass,” not by avoiding a description and explanation of unflattering behavior, but by attempting, as did writers such as Kenneth B. Clark and Lee Rainwater, to relate the practices and experiences of the truly disadvantaged to the structure of opportunities and constraints in American society.

Let me conclude with a discussion of some of the central policy issues in *The Truly Disadvantaged*. Edna Bonacich correctly observes that the book attempts to speak to the nation’s political leaders. I should add that it is also designed to speak to groups that I hope would eventually form a progressive coalition for change. In this connection, several of the authors in this volume have reacted critically to my argument that a reform program to address problems such as joblessness has to be framed in universal terms in order to attract the broad based support needed to mobilize resources to effect change. Bonnie Thornton Dill argues that little progress would be made on my reform program because it is not linked to an active

political constituency and the debate surrounding the program would be limited to an arena that only includes policymakers, government officials, and politicians. Robert Newby puts it more bluntly: "Professor Wilson . . . proposed 'hidden agenda' which will have 'universal appeal' and, I assume, be voted on, passed, and signed into law by those same Democrats and Republicans who just 15 pages before would find such programs to be too 'radical.'" Once again I must quote from chapter 7 of *The Truly Disadvantaged* to set the record straight.

I am reminded of Bayard Rustin's plea during the early 1960s that blacks ought recognize the importance of fundamental economic reform . . . and the need for a broad-based political coalition to achieve it. And since an effective coalition will in part depend upon how the issues are defined, it is imperative that the political message underline the need for economic and social reforms that benefit all groups in the United States, not just poor minorities. Politicians and civil rights organizations, as two important examples, ought to shift or expand their definition of America's racial problems and broaden the scope of suggested policy programs to address them. They should, of course, continue to fight for an end to racial discrimination. But they must also recognize that poor minorities are profoundly affected by problems in America that go beyond racial considerations. Furthermore, civil rights groups should also recognize that the problems of societal organization in America often create situations that enhance racial antagonisms between the different racial groups in central cities that are struggling to maintain their quality of life, and that these groups, although they appear to be fundamental adversaries, are potential allies in a reform coalition because of their problematic economic situations. (Wilson, 1987, p. 155)

The point implied in this paragraph is that it is the development of this reform coalition not the Democrats and Republicans in Congress who will ultimately determine whether the kind of economic and social reform program I have described and recommended will become a reality.

Finally, I ought to react to the frequent observations in the critiques of my book that I am opposed to race-specific programs to address the plight of ghetto underclass in part because I feel that racism is not the cause of the emergence of

the ghetto underclass. Both conclusions are false. Nowhere in *The Truly Disadvantaged* will any careful reader find support for these arguments. I should like to reemphasize the point that *The Truly Disadvantaged* is really an attempt to challenge the conservative thesis that the sharp rise of poverty, joblessness and related social dislocations in the inner-city ghetto since 1970 was due to the liberal policies of the welfare state. The book was not written to account for the historic **emergence** of the ghetto (in which racial segregation is severely implicated, of course), rather the main purpose of the book was to explain the incredible growth of concentrated poverty and other problems in the inner-city ghetto after the passage of the most significant anti-poverty and anti-discrimination legislation in the nation's history (i.e., since 1970). And I focused on the vulnerability of poor urban minorities to changes in the economy since 1970 and the effects of the exodus of higher income minorities from the inner-city ghetto during this period. In short, racism created the inner-city ghetto, but the sharp increase in social dislocations in ghetto neighborhoods since 1970 is related to a complex set of factors that in many ways transcend the issue of race. However, as noted in *The Truly Disadvantaged*, racism and racial discrimination continue to plague the experiences of the impoverished urban minorities. That is why I include, not exclude, race specific programs such as affirmative action in my suggested program of social and economic reform. Indeed, my criticism of programs such as affirmative action is not that they are not needed, but that they alone are insufficient to address the problem of impoverished inner-city ghetto residents. Let me quote for the final time from *The Truly Disadvantaged*:

As long as a racial division of labor exists and racial minorities are disproportionately concentrated in low-paying positions, antidiscrimination and affirmative action programs will be needed even though they tend to benefit the more advantaged minority members. Moreover, as long as certain groups lack the training, skills, and education to compete effectively on the job market or move into newly created jobs, manpower training and education programs targeted at these groups will also be needed, even under a tight-labor market situation . . . For all these rea-

sons, a comprehensive program of economic and social reform would have to include targeted programs, both means tested and race-specific. However, the latter would be considered an offshoot of and indeed secondary to the universal programs. The important goal is to construct an economic-social reform program in such a way that the universal programs are seen as the dominant and most visible aspects by the general public. As the universal programs draw support from a wider population, the targeted programs included in the comprehensive reform package would be indirectly supported and protected. (Wilson, 1987, p. 154)

Andrew Billingsley wonders how my reform program relates to the problems analyzed in the first half of *The Truly Disadvantaged*. I think it is self-evident.

References

- Clark, K. B. (1964). *Youth in the ghetto: A study of the consequences of powerlessness and a blueprint for change*. NY: Harlem Youth Opportunity (HAR-YOU) Report.
- . (1965). *Dark ghetto: dilemmas of social power*. NY: Harper and Row.
- Rainwater, L. (1966). Crucible of identity: The Negro lower-class family. *Daedalus*, 95(Winter), 176–216.
- . (1970). *Behind ghetto walls: Black families in a federal slum*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Testa, M. et al. (1989) Employment and marriage among inner-city fathers. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 501(January), 79–91.
- Wacquant, L. J. D. & Wilson, W. J. (1989). Poverty, joblessness, and the social transformation of the inner city. In P. H. Cottingham & D. T. Ellwood (Eds.), *Welfare Policy in the 1990s* (pp. 70–102). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.

Notes

1. The ratios for 1950 were computed for all males and females over fourteen and the ratios for 1980 for all males and females 16 and over.
2. On this point Wacquant and Wilson state that the “ghetto has lost much of its organizational strength . . . as it has become increasingly marginal economically; its activities are no longer structured around an internal

and relatively autonomous social space that duplicates the institutional structure of the larger society and provides basic minimal resources for social mobility, if only within a truncated black class structure. And the social ills that have long been associated with segregated poverty—violent crime, drugs, housing deterioration, family disruption, commercial blight, and educational failure—have reached qualitatively different proportions and have become articulated into a new configurations that endows each with a more deadly impact than before.”