

THE GEOGRAPHY OF SURVIVAL AND THE RIGHT TO THE CITY:
SPECULATIONS ON SURVEILLANCE, LEGAL INNOVATION,
AND THE CRIMINALIZATION OF INTERVENTION

*Don Mitchell*¹

**Department of Geography
Maxwell School
Syracuse University**

Nik Heynen

**Department of Geography
University of Georgia**

Abstract: The “geography of survival” describes the spaces and spatial relations that structure not only how people may live, but especially *whether* they may live. For very poor people, such as the homeless, the geography of survival is knitted together into a network of public and private spaces and social services. In this article we focus on three trends that are simultaneously restructuring this geography of survival—the rise of automated surveillance (CCTV), innovations in trespass law, and the criminalization of sharing food in public—to assess their impact on homeless people’s geography of survival in particular, and their right to the city more generally. [Key words: geography of survival, homelessness, hunger, surveillance, right to the city, trespass.]

In 2006, requests for emergency shelter by homeless people in North American cities increased by 9%. Twenty-three percent of these requests went unmet, and for families requesting emergency shelter the percentage unmet was 29% (U.S. Conference of Mayors, 2006). According to the most reliable estimates, some 3.5 million people experienced homelessness over the course of the year. A recent study of shelter use estimates that there are more than 800,000 people homeless on any given night. Because of methodological constraints, this likely is an underestimate (NCH, 2007). In 2004, the National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty found in a survey that 21 of 25 cities turned people away when they requested shelter, and nearly all of 50 cities estimated that the numbers of homeless people exceeded shelter and transitional beds (NLCHP, 2004).

Between 1999 and 2004, hunger in the United States increased 43%, according to an analysis of the U.S. Department of Agriculture data (<http://www.centeronhunger.org/pdf/Oct2005Bulletin.pdf>). The New York City Coalition Against Hunger estimated that food insecurity within the city increased by 20% during 2007, with some 1.3 million New

¹Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Don Mitchell, Department of Geography, 144 Eggers Hall, Syracuse, New York 13244; telephone: 315-443-2605; fax: 315-443-4227; email: dmmittc01@maxwell.syr.edu

Yorkers—one in six—unable to afford food at some point in the year. The USDA estimates that 10% of the U.S. population went hungry at some point in 2006 (<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/7106726.stm>). Christmastime news reports in 2007 detailed the increasing inability of North America's volunteer food security system—the regional food banks and networks of pantries—to cope with rapidly growing demand (e.g., Rucker, 2007). In New York's borough of Queens, 76% of food banks and hot-food sites reported that they had to turn people away during 2007 (<http://nyccah.org/files/Queensfinal2007.doc>).

It is obvious that city-run and volunteer shelters, as well as food banks, food pantries, and hot-food sites are inadequate to serve demand. The *ad hoc* institutional arrangements that have been constructed over the past generation to address emergency housing and food needs, have never been a solution to homelessness and hunger, but they have been an important means of alleviation.² They have become a central part of what could be called a “geography of survival” in North American cities. In a political economy marked by ever-increasing inequalities of wealth, where welfare functions of the state continue to be “rolled back” and new modes of discipline “rolled out” (Peck and Tickell, 2002), and where neither shelter nor adequate nutrition are considered human rights, all manner of *ad hoc* arrangements have emerged to address the most basic needs of the homeless, hungry, and poor. But even these are now under threat from decreased funding,³ aging volunteer staffs who are physically incapable of keeping pantries and shelters open as much as they should be,⁴ increasing rents, and other pressures of gentrification that push shelters and other services for the poor out of downtown areas.⁵ Increasingly, stringent rules governing funding have the effect of turning social service agencies into outlaws if they continue to serve the very people who may need their services the most.⁶ Clearly, this *ad hoc* geography of survival is increasingly at risk in North American cities.

And yet, of course, the homeless and hungry do continue to survive when we consider them as a collective artifact of the U.S. urban political economy. But this rendering is

²The literature on the changing urban geography of service provision for the poor is large. The pioneering work of Dear and Wolch (1987; Wolch and Dear, 1993) and the Los Angeles Homeless Project remains a vital starting point.

³The rise of dollar stores, together with better tracking of inventory at supermarkets has, in the past decade, cut deeply into donations of surplus food to food banks and pantries (Henderson, 2004); surplus commodity donations from the USDA have dried up; and there is increased competition for charitable dollars as everything from symphonies and universities to day care centers, research hospitals, community centers, and urban and natural parks have seen state funding evaporate as the Keynesian state has been dismantled.

⁴The executive director of the Syracuse Interreligious Food Consortium says this is one of the biggest challenges her umbrella organization faces. When it does have food to distribute; it too frequently finds it has no where to deliver it to (pers. comm.).

⁵For this dynamic is San Diego, see Staeheli and Mitchell (2008); in Washington, DC, the city government has embarked on a wholesale liquidation of city-owned property, selling much of it, including especially buildings used as homeless shelters, to developers of up-market housing (Wells, 2008).

⁶Antidrug and alcohol policies, often enforced by funding agencies in response to donor demands, are the most obvious example; but there are others. In Columbus, Ohio, for example, the Open Shelter was forced underground—and eventually out—when it maintained its open policy. The consortium of agencies that fund and coordinate homeless programs in Columbus, responding to pressure of politicians, withdrew funding from the Open Shelter when the shelter refused to follow a mandate to not serve “sex offenders.” Open Shelter advocates argued that it was better to have “sex offenders” housed in a relatively stable environment than complete shunned—made completely outcast—but to no avail.

mostly useful when stepping back to consider the structural conditions of our contemporary cities. We know that when we look at individuals within this group, we quickly see that many are barely surviving, and many others do not survive at all under the brutality of U.S. capitalism. Those who survive, do so both because of the *ad hoc* institutional geography that has arisen since the current homeless “crisis” erupted in the late 1970s, and despite it. In other words, people in poverty continue to activate their own geographies of survival, to construct pathways of survival through the urban landscape that link together places to sleep or rest (ranging from relatives’ couches to their own apartments to a relatively dry place under a bridge), locations to eat a meal or forage food, hidden corners of security and safety (soup kitchens, pantries, stores friendly to food stamp recipients, restaurant dumpsters), and even sometimes such relatively permanent fixtures as homeless encampments or shanty towns.⁷ These geographies of survival are structured not only by the changing institutional landscape, but also by an altering legal landscape. Laws (or increased policing) that make sleeping more difficult and dangerous, panhandling riskier, and tending to bodily needs all but impossible, push the homeless as well as the housed poor more deeply into the urban shadows, the hidden abodes of poverty that continue to mark every North American city, no matter how shiny its gentrified appearance.

The saga of survival in North America is not a one-way story of oppression, restriction, and decline, though this side of the story should not be ignored. It is also a story of both coping in the shadowed interstices of the city and of fighting back. As pressures mount on food pantries and traditional shelters, numerous activist groups have arisen to address changing needs. For example, Food Not Bombs—one of the fastest growing activist organizations in the United States and beyond—distributes free meals in public spaces in countless cities, dedicating itself not only to providing meals to the hungry (any hungry person, with no questions of eligibility or requirement that certain rules be followed), but also to a radical critique of the North American food system in particular and the unjust political economy in general. New housing-based “right-to-the-city” movements have arisen to advocate for radically transformed housing policy that starts from what seems to be a quite radical foundation: that *all* people have a right to be in and part of the city, with none priced out (<http://www.righttothecity.org/>, retrieved January 2, 2008). And, of course, poor people—housed and unhoused—find whatever means they must, legal or illegal, temporary or relatively permanent, to pay their bills, rest their heads, and meet their basic needs.

The geography of survival for poor people in North American cities is thus a dialectic. As new legal restrictions arise, as new techniques of governance are devised, as new challenges present themselves in the urban landscape, people in need as well as activists and service providers invent new strategies for coping—strategies that sometimes directly confront the relations of power that structure everyday life, and at other times

⁷Ethnographic studies of homeless men and women in Los Angeles in the 1980s give an excellent idea of the complexity (and ingenuity) of homeless people’s geographies of survival. See the references in text in part II. Duncan’s (1978) examination of the geographies of “tramps,” together with any number of older works on the ethnography of skid row (Sollenberger, 1911; Anderson, 1923; Bahr, 1970; Spradley, 1970), show that the construction of ingenious geographies of survival are nothing new for poor people.

seek only to make life tolerable within them. Our aim here is to examine some recent convolutions in this dialectic, and to provide some speculations about what they might mean for the geography of survival and the right to the city. We focus particularly on three trends that we believe need particular attention. The first is the way in which the rise of automated surveillance—CCTV—is restructuring the geography of survival by exposing to the gaze of police power what were previously more “hidden” urban interstices. The second, related trend concerns innovations in trespass law that seek to more readily close off many of the small spaces of the city that make survival for the very poor and homeless possible. The third, also related, is the criminalization of public food giveaways as city after city in the United States has sought to make it illegal to “share food” in public spaces. Each of these, we think, has potentially profound effects on the geography of survival in North American cities. What we offer, however, are only speculations.⁸ Our goal is to bring to light these trends in order to raise precisely that question: how are transformations in the governance of urban space transforming the geography of survival in North American cities? Before examining the three cases, it is important to first explore what we mean by the geography of survival and how it relates to the right to the city.

THE GEOGRAPHY OF SURVIVAL AND THE RIGHT TO THE CITY

In all the extensive literature on surveillance in the contemporary city, rarely is it asked what role surveillance plays in everyday *survival*. Similarly, with some few exceptions (and most of them, like this, speculative), rarely have examinations of legal geography been rubbed directly against questions of survivability. This is perhaps because, as urban geographers, we have grown unused to raising the most fundamental, most basic questions—not “What is the structure of everyday life in the city?” or “What are the forms of governance of everyday life in the city?,” but “How is it possible for people even to *live* in the city? What does it take?”

The scholarship that has examined the relationship between legal geography and survivability has largely been focused on the abstract issue of the “right to be” (Mitchell, 2003). Based on the influential work of liberal philosopher and legal theorist Jeremy Waldron (1993), who so clearly outlined the fundamental importance of the truism that in order to “be” one must have a *place* to be, this work has argued that legal innovations in North American cities—antihomeless laws—are potentially “genocidal” in that they seek to eliminate all those spaces in which homeless people can be (Mitchell, 1997).⁹ On the other hand, the work of the Los Angeles Homelessness Project in the 1980s and 1990s, among others, examined the coping strategies of homeless men and women (e.g.,

⁸We are deliberate in our mode of presentation; it is a speculation. However, Heynen has engaged in over 15 months of ethnographic work with Food Not Bombs. We choose not to delve into those empirical insights, as we felt they would lead to an imbalance in our essay. It would also undermine our main goal, which is not to create a definitive account of changes in the geography of survival, but through speculating on it, to provoke others—other researchers and other activists—into furthering this analysis empirically, politically, and theoretically.

⁹For an important critique of Waldron’s position, focusing on the limits of Waldron’s liberalism, see Blomley (this issue).

Rowe and Wolch, 1990; Rahimian et al., 1992; and Wolch and Rowe, 1992; see also Snow and Anderson, 1993; Wolch et al., 1993; Wright, 1997; Duneier, 1999; Hopper, 2003), showing how they created networks and followed daily-paths as well as life-paths that allowed them to construct a livelihood and a modicum of safety on city streets. Such paths included soup kitchens and shelters; recycling redemption centers; resting places in parks or empty lots; friends' and relatives' houses and apartments; obscure parking places for the cars they slept in; bars, coffee shops, and other places where they could gather or just quietly sit; and panhandling or scavenging sites. Networks often took the form of constructed "families" of lovers and friends who provided support, some degree of safety,¹⁰ and with whom resources could be shared. The findings of the Los Angeles Homelessness Project were indicative of the kinds of coping strategies, and thus the complex geographies, that must be constructed by people in poverty, and they are anything but extraordinary.

There has been, however, little synthesis between the kinds of on-the-ground ethnographic research that marked the Los Angeles Homeless Project, and the more abstract arguments about the relationship between antihomelessness and the right to be. A focus on the geography of survival could help achieve that synthesis. The concept of a *geography* of survival is not new. The question of how it is possible—or nearly impossible—from some people to inhabit and make a life in the city, the question of the social and structural constraints on accessing even the most basic materials for human survival, was, of course, at the heart of the Detroit Geographical Expedition and Institute (Bunge, 1969, 1971, 1973; Merrifield, 1995; Heyman, 2007). The DGEI and later the Toronto Geographical Expedition (Bunge and Bordessa, 1975) sought to expose those features and structures of the survival of African Americans and children. They sought, through their analyses and interventions, to shift power back into the hands of those most imperiled by the contemporary capitalist and racist city. Simultaneously, the Black Panthers directly raised questions of survival through their free breakfast programs, using these to expose and contest the racism that made hunger a daily reality in the African American ghetto (Heynen, 2009).

With the waning of urban radicalism in the 1970s, and despite an explosion of critical and radical urban scholarship in geography, attention among geographers drifted away from what could be called the "really radical" analyses of imminent survival, especially in the cities of the "developed" world (e.g., analyses focused on excess death, hunger, structural health disparities; Heynen, 2006, 2008). But there is now an opportunity (to say nothing of the pressing need) to reopen analyses of the geography of survival. This opportunity comes in the form of sustained interest in Lefebvre's notion of the right to the city.

For Lefebvre (1996, p. 173), the right to the city is a "superior form of rights: right to freedom, to individuation in socialization, to habitat and to inhabit." These last two—the right to habitat and to inhabit—are, in fact, a necessary condition with respect to the first two. The right to "habitat" (a place and an ability to make a life) and to "inhabit" (to make that place one's own [collectively], to dwell, to have a right *to be* in a place) are necessary,

¹⁰As Rowe and Wolch (1990) show, security for homeless women is particularly fraught. It is not uncommon for women to stay in abusive relationships on the street precisely because *that* abuse is less risky than being on their own.

not contingent.¹¹ When these are not provided, people will, through their instincts of survival, create them. The argument for a right to the city is, of course, geared precisely toward guaranteeing and providing the necessary conditions for habitat and inhabiting so that freedom and the kind of socialization that makes us (individual) humans is possible. The argument for a right to the city is also, however, sharply pragmatic: it takes the form of struggles for rights to housing, to food security, to the materially—really radical—things that make living possible. The “right to the city” has therefore become a “cry and demand” (Lefebvre, 1996, p. 158) around which housing, hunger, and other social activists rallied. Right to the City coalitions are forming in Oakland, Miami, Boston, and other cities (as well as across Europe and Asia) as a means of bringing together activists concerned with the very conditions of urban life and poverty. And the United Nations, together with a wide range of NGOs, have used the “right to the city” as a banner for a number of conferences and initiatives, more or less radical in intent (Mitchell and Villanueva, in press).

The value of the concept of a right to the city is precisely its capaciousness. The fact that it can signify not only a right to *habitat* (as the UN conferences have largely interpreted it) or *La Fête* (the ability to participate in the spectacle and shape it to new ends, a primary concern of Lefebvre), but also a right to the *oeuvre* (the ability to participate in the *work* and the *making* of the city) and the right to urban life (which is to say the right to be *part* of the city—to be present, *to be*). This capaciousness is valuable because it allows for solidarity across political struggles while at the same time focusing attention on the most basic conditions of survivability, the possibility to inhabit, to live.

Lefebvre (1996, p. 158) was clear that a focus on the basic conditions—the geography—of survival was paramount. The right to the city, he argued, was a right “firstly of those who *inhabit*” (original emphasis), and his argument, now more than 40 years old, as to what that means retains immediate relevance and is worth quoting:

Who can ignore that the Olympians of the new bourgeois aristocracy no longer inhabit. They go from grand hotel to grand hotel, or from castle to castle, commanding a fleet of a country from a yacht.¹² They are everywhere and nowhere. That is how they fascinate people immersed into everyday life. They transcend everyday life, possess nature and leave it up to the cops to contrive culture. Is it essential to describe at length, besides the condition of youth, students, and intellectuals, armies of workers with or without white collars, people from the provinces, the colonized and semicolonized of all sorts, all those who endure a well-organized daily life, is it here necessary to exhibit the untragic misery of the inhabitant, of the suburban dweller and the people who stay in residential ghettos, in the mouldering centres of old cities and in the proliferations lost beyond them? One only has to open one’s eyes to understand the daily life of the one who runs from his dwelling to the station, near or far away, to the packed underground train, the office or the

¹¹The U.S. Supreme Court disagrees: while it argues that the “right to travel” implicit in the constitution implies a corollary right to stay put, the state is under no obligation to make it *possible* for someone to either travel or stay put (Mitchell, 1998).

¹²Or at least from their timeshare jets.

factory, to return the same way in the evening and come home to recuperate enough to start the next day. The picture of this generalized misery would not go without a picture of the “satisfactions” which it hides and becomes the means to elude it and break free from it. (Lefebvre, 1996, pp. 158–159)

Such is the geography of everyday life—of surviving—in the contemporary city. And for most of us the compensation is not only that there are certain “satisfactions” attendant upon it, but rather that survival is no harder than this. When we return home to recuperate, there is a stocked refrigerator and liquor cabinet awaiting us, a roof over our heads, and those cops, of culture or otherwise, assuring our safety rather than seeking to drive us out of our resting places. What was and is most crucial for us is grabbing the right to the city to remake what is obviously a geography of alienation.

Not so for the homeless and the hungry. For them, the geography of survival is, as already suggested, another matter entirely. For the homeless across the United States, the cops’ role is far less to assure their safety (and certainly not to contrive for them any sort of culture) but to move them along, to prevent them from sleeping in this park or on that sidewalk, and even to keep advocates and activists from providing them the food that may allow them to survive another day. As Talmadge Wright (1997) has shown in a series of ethnographic studies, the right to the city is less about a geography of alienation (though it certainly is about that), and more about surviving in a vengeful geography of immediacy. Ironically, perhaps no one *inhabits* the city as thoroughly as a homeless man or woman. But this inhabitation is the exact opposite of possessing a *right* to the city. One only has to open one’s eyes to this geography of survival, which is implicit but never explicit in Lefebvre’s discussions of the right to the city, to understand that a different kind of focus on *habitat* is necessary.

That focus is on the role that surveillance/governance, legal innovation, and the criminalization of intervention (as opposed to the criminalization of homelessness itself) in structuring the conditions of possibility for survival. Such a focus leaves aside—strategically and only provisionally—analyses of how and why people become hungry or homeless in the first place, and turns its attention instead to the dialectic of struggle and survival through which the hungry and homeless must live.

THREE TRANSFORMATIONS OF THE GEOGRAPHY OF SURVIVAL

The role of antihomeless laws, stepped-up policing, the privatization of public space, and the pressure to close or move services for the poor and hungry in delimiting the ability of homeless and other poor people to be in North American cities is well known. Nonetheless, homeless people continue to survive. They survive in, and by dint of, the interstices of urban space. Duncan (1978) long ago showed how important “in-between” spaces were to homeless men, the alleys, sidewalks, hidden corners of parks, covered doorways, and abandoned lots that are crucial for the physical reproduction of marginalized populations. So are certain kinds of private spaces, like fenced-off dumpsters or remote parking lots. These sorts of spaces, together with shelters, friends’ rooms or apartments, drop-in centers, dive bars, and the like, comprise homeless people’s urban habitat, their geography of survival. But these spaces (even including a relative’s couch, if it is in a public housing unit) are the ones that broader capitalist society, and perhaps even the

lion's share of urban residents (rushing from train or car to work and back again, eking out whatever "satisfactions" they may), are most nervous about.

During the summer of 2006, for example, the City Council in Minneapolis seriously considered passing a law that would have outlawed "strangers" (other than police, utility crews, and trash collectors) from setting foot in any of the more than 450 miles of alleys in the city (Collins, 2006a, 2006b). According to the urban planner Anne Forsythe, such a proposal made sense because "an alley tends to be blocked off from view.... There's often not a real reason for people to be walking out there except to do antisocial things" (Giles, 2006, p. 1A). These antisocial things include youths hanging out, homeless people urinating or sifting through trash and recycling bins, or, of course, petty thieves trying out car-door handles to see if one has been left unlocked. But the real issues, as Forsythe suggests, are ones of visibility and control. Alleys "tend to be blocked from view" and thereby not legible to authority. As spaces out of control, they are necessarily "anti-social." Or to put that another way, the reason that alleys are valuable to homeless people (and others) is because they are blocked off from view, illegible to authority. Although they may be part of the urban habitat necessary to the survival of homeless people, they are also perceived to be dangerous spaces. The question for authority, then, is how to make alleyways visible and under control. There are at least three possible ways to achieve this: by subjecting alleys to surveillance, by regulating who can be in them (the proposed Minneapolis solution), and by regulating what can be done in them. We look at each of these in turn, and seek to assess their potential importance for the changing geography of survival—and the right to the city—in urban America.¹³

SURVEILLANCE AND SURVIVAL

Urban foraging is a critical survival strategy for homeless and other poor people in North American cities. "Dumpster diving"—searching through garbage dumpsters for reusable goods or relatively unspoiled food—is not only an end-of-term ritual in college towns across the nation (as relatively well-off students dispose of everything from TVs to clothes to furniture as they move out of their dormitory rooms and apartments). It is also a mode of survival (Farrell, 2005). Dumpsters are resource collectors, nodes in some homeless people's geography of survival. As such, they are also contested sites. It is not uncommon in North American cities, therefore, to see dumpsters "protected" not only by razor wire, but also by CCTV cameras. These cameras have many purposes: to deter industrial sabotage and identity theft, to catch restaurant employees who use dumpsters to stash goods stolen from the kitchen,¹⁴ to discourage dumpster diving not only by homeless people but also by "freegans" and others who seek treasure among urban waste (Hopper, 2006), and, sadly, to prevent homeless people from using dumpsters as beds.¹⁵ Such cameras have variable effects. Although their promoters often talk of them in a

¹³In the end, the Minneapolis law did not pass. There was, however, a great deal of support for it. See Collins (2006b).

¹⁴See the ad for "Digital Witness" at <http://video.yahoo.com/video/plau?vid=39701&fr=> (retrieved November 8, 2007).

¹⁵Across North America homeless people are not infrequently injured, and occasionally killed, while sleeping in dumpsters. Compared to other city spaces, dumpsters are often relatively dry, warm, and, indeed, clean.

Foucauldian language of behavior modification—surveillance will encourage employees to self-govern their behavior—they also have the effect of bringing the interstitial spaces of the city into the spotlight, bringing hidden spaces of survival into visibility. Through such surveillance, the geography of survival in the capitalist city is altered and the ability of homeless people to inhabit the city is transformed. Habitat is reworked.

The same is true for the more general use of CCTV in the city. The reasons for its use are many—discouraging crime through self-regulation and thus encouraging a certain sense of safety and security among many users of urban space (Norris et al., 1998; Norris and Armstrong, 1999), allowing for greater police surveillance of protest (Staeheli and Mitchell, 2008), even promoting the city as spectacle (<http://earthcam.com/usa/newyork/timessquare>)—but its effects are differentiated. For the housed, exposure to the unblinking (if not always all-seeing) eye of the surveillance camera may either provide a sense of security or a sense that certain civil liberties, liberties closely tied to the ability to remain anonymous in public or to engage in activities not directly regulated and approved *a priori* by the state, are being undermined. Both are important effects of surveillance. But for the homeless, CCTV has the potential to close off the use of previously available spaces (hidden spaces used for sleeping and bodily functions), to alter the deployment of private and public police as they seek to enforce “quality of life” laws that make it so hard for homeless people to live in and as part of the public, or to transform the diurnal differentiation of the urban landscape (with nighttime spaces subject to 24-hour surveillance).¹⁶

We typically do not think of surveillance cameras in these terms, largely because they are now fixtures of the urban landscape that many of us have come to expect and even desire (Koskela, 2004, 2006). CCTV cameras have proven their worth, as in London in 2004 when the cameras caught would-be and actual terrorists on film, or in many other cities when they expose everyday criminals. CCTV is a huge and popular business. According to the *Boston Globe* (Savage, 2007), “tens and probably hundreds of millions of dollars” have been granted over the past four years from the Department of Homeland Security to install security camera networks in U.S. cities. The *Globe* reported a recent poll that found that 71% of the nation’s population approved of the use of security cameras in public spaces “as a means of fighting terrorism and other crime.” And case law in the United States is making it increasingly clear that in publicly accessible spaces, citizens have no right to privacy: we have no right to absent ourselves from surveillance, except to avoid spaces monitored by cameras, which is, of course, a practical impossibility (Slobogin, 2002).

If it is a practical impossibility for the housed in North American cities to avoid the gaze of CCTV, it is a daily reality for homeless people that more and more of their movements as well as their life-moments are under constant surveillance (shelters are increasingly installing CCTV as a way of monitoring communal—and even private—sleeping areas). In a world where there simply are not enough beds for homeless people in shelters,

¹⁶The fencing and observation of dumpsters is particularly interesting in this regard. At root here is the generalized sense that unobserved dumpsters *enable* the homeless to live outside the gaze of the state and settled society (in a way that a shelter, with its rules of behavior and need to please both funders and the state does not). For some cities, surveillance is not enough. Vancouver, for example, recently debated a law that would require all dumpsters in the city to be locked to assure that no one was able to access and live off the wastes of the commodity economy. That the law was targeted at homeless people was clear from the debate (Pablo, 2007).

apartments, hotels, or other sites off the streets, where fresh rather than discarded food is out of the reach of many, the expectation of many of us housed is that there will be greater *urban* security through surveillance. But this might just further undermine some other people's *human* security—their very ability to survive in the contemporary city. The urban habitat these other people—the homeless—now must inhabit is one of total exposure.

TRESPASS

Surveillance of urban spaces is propelled by many forces, and these have multiple social and political effects. We have speculated above that one effect, planned or not, is to transform the geography of survival for homeless people in the city as more and more interstitial spaces, even including garbage dumpsters, are brought into the center of visibility. But on its own surveillance of urban space is rarely a sufficient mode of regulation. As the proponents of the Minneapolis alley law recognized, many spaces remained too easily beyond the gaze of the state and sedentary society. The goal of the Minneapolis law, therefore, was to regulate who could be in such spaces and to empower the police to arrest all those who seemed not to belong. Had the law passed, any “stranger” in a back alley of the city could have been arrested for trespassing, even though alleys remained, putatively, public property.

To “trespass,” of course, is to “disobey, violate (a law, etc.),” and to “wrongfully enter on a person's land or property.” Figuratively to trespass is to “make an unwarrantable claim, intrude, encroach, (on or upon a person's time, attention, patience, domain, etc.)” (*Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*). This sense of making an unwarrantable claim is important, because to be “warranted” means “permitted by law or authority, authorized, justified, sanctioned” (*Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*). The Minneapolis law sought to ensure that only those who were authorized, who were permitted by law, would set foot in back alleys. This reverses a normal assumption about public space: that people have an *a priori* right to be in it and that exclusions must be justified.

The Minneapolis law may not have been passed, but the reversal of assumptions about public space it encapsulated seems only to be gaining force. In 2004, Hawai'i passed Act 50, a law that empowered police and other “authorized individual[s]” to ban persons from public property for up to a year by issuing a (verbal) “warning statement advising the person that the person's presence is no longer desired on the premises.” According to the *Honolulu Advertiser* (Gosner, 2004), “the state law does not define what conduct would justify a year-long ban or place any limits on which public property, and there are no court hearings or other judicial reviews.” Persons who return to property they are banned from are subject to arrest for trespass. Quite obviously, they are not authorized or permitted by law to be in spaces from which they have been banned. The impetus for the law was to remove homeless people camping on Mokule'ia beaches (Gosner, 2004). But it was also used to ban a man from the Honolulu library because he accessed the Internet to view a gay-oriented chat room (Gosner, 2004). The Hawai'i attorney general defended the law by stating, “the state has a right to protect its interests. The state can't bar somebody because they are exercising their First Amendment rights, but that doesn't mean a trespass statute which allows the state to bar someone for perfectly legitimate reasons, is unconstitutional” (Gosner, 2004). The attorney general went on to say that the law was in line with other trespass policies around the United States.

Though he did not say so explicitly, it is likely that the attorney general—and the state legislature that passed the law—was mindful of the 2003 U.S. Supreme Court ruling that upheld similar banishment policies promulgated in Richmond, Virginia (Mitchell, 2006). In that decision, the Court ruled that it was perfectly legal for public and semipublic authorities to designate certain public streets and sidewalks as “no trespassing zones,” and to authorize their use only for what the Richmond police called “legitimate social and business purposes.” As long as authorities permitted (carefully regulated) First Amendment activities on these streets, it was also acceptable for individuals to be served with so-called “trespass-barment” notices (which could be delivered orally) for any or no reason. Such notices banned their recipients from designated public streets and sidewalks *for life*. If they entered them ever again, they could be arrested for trespassing.

Other jurisdictions are now eagerly adopting similar policies. In March 2006, for example, San Francisco announced new plans to patrol city public housing projects and to arrest and issue banishment notices to “non-residents hanging out on the streets, people outside ‘playing dice,’ and those with criminal records” (Begin, 2007). Seattle has long been issuing banishments to homeless people in its city parks, but police complain that they do not have the resources to enforce them (McNerthney, 2007; see also K. Mitchell, 2007). Nonetheless, according to a legislative analysis prepared for the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in 2002, San Francisco looked enviously on Seattle. In the latter city, police were empowered to arrest for trespassing any person who remained on private property (e.g., doorways, stoops or porches, hallways), whether or not a complaint from the property owner could be obtained. In other words, arrest could be immediate. San Francisco law, in contrast, required both a complaint from a property owner and a written or oral notice be served to the trespasser that “s/he is requested to leave, and further, that such notice must describe the specific area and hours to keep off or keep away” (Forbes, 2002).

The problem with trespass-banishment notices in general, and San Francisco-style trespass laws in particular, at least from the viewpoint of those who seek to more fully regulate who can be where on city streets and publicly accessible property, is that they are targeted. Trespass and banishment notices must be served to and enforced against specified individuals. They require what might be thought of as a much more personal and bodily (i.e., in Foucauldian terms, an almost premodern) form of enforcement. They rely neither on the self-governing nor on the kind of generalized policing that mark modern discipline. Tailored to specific individuals and spaces, they require police and other enforcement agencies to possess an enormous amount of individualized information—knowledge that this specific person cannot be in that specific space. Attractive though they may be to many jurisdictions (in part because they authorize agents—a library security guard in the Honolulu case, housing authority workers or city police in the Richmond case—to make a first banishment and/or arrest), they are also in some respects inefficient—hence the San Francisco Police Department’s complaint that they have for too long had inadequate resources to properly enforce trespassing laws as part of their overall “quality of life” policing (Forbes, 2002; Begin, 2007).

Partially as a means of addressing such inefficiencies, cities in North America are seeking ways to streamline and rationalize trespass enforcement. In San Francisco, the North of Market/Tenderloin Community Benefit District encourages property owners to acquire a “No Trespassing” sign from the Tenderloin Police Station. These “signs”—

photocopied pages on which the property's address and a date can be entered—conform to Municipal Code Section 25, which allows for a general written notice to stand in lieu of individualized notification of trespassing violations. Posting these signs allows police to take action even in the absence of a direct complaint by the property owner (<http://www.nom-tlcbd.org/id74.html>, retrieved January 1, 2008). Such practices are becoming increasingly common (NCH, 2004). In British Columbia, such notices are increasingly popular in both Vancouver and Victoria. As the “Homeless Nation” advocacy group notes, however, these are blunt tools. Just as a homeless person sitting or sleeping in a doorway is trespassing, so is any shopper who enters through the doorway to the store beyond (<http://homelessnation.org/en/node/5834>, retrieved December 31, 2007). But it is to their advantage rather than their disadvantage that they are so blunt, because discretion for enforcement is passed on to the police. Needing neither a formal complaint nor knowledge of a specific banishment, such notices on city buildings allow for a generalized—and thus self-governing—enforcement, as well as for greater efficiency in policing.

In reality, what matters is the combination of these two trends in governing publicly accessible (and often publicly owned) space. Enforcement can be either tailored or generalized as circumstances require, and what is “warranted” in public space can thus be more thoroughly structured. Many claims on property, attention, time, and so forth are, it seems, potentially unwarrantable and therefore unauthorized. As with CCTV surveillance, for many of us such encroachments on our *a priori* right to the city might be minimal. But for those who must live their lives in public, whose very survival is a function of not only moving between, but also staying on, spaces most of us only have to pass by, such developments represent a further transformation and constriction of the interstitial spaces that constitute their geography of survival.

In another example, the city of Fresno, California was enjoined by a court order in 2006 from directly destroying homeless people's personal property, and because of that found they could no longer use their traditional method of moving the homeless on (confiscating and destroying their belongings). After about 25 homeless people were evicted by the California Highway Patrol (some of whom unholstered their guns) from a strip of land owned by the California Department of Transportation, they moved to an empty city-owned lot near a park. In response, the city posted a “Notice of Trespass and Clean-Up” announcing that the city would conduct a sweep on April 5, 2007 that would entail “the removal of all individuals, personal property, junk and/or garbage.” The notice seemed to threaten any individuals remaining at the site on that day with arrest for criminal trespass (a copy of the notice is available at <http://www.indybay.org.newsite/2007/03/29/18385669.php>, retrieved December 31, 2007). As a contributor to the “Indybay” website wrote, “The ordering of homeless people off one property ends up with them going someplace else. All property is owned by someone—it might be public land, owned by an individual or a business. There is no place in Fresno where homeless people can go and be left alone” (ibid.). That, of course, is exactly the point: trespass laws and enforcement are becoming a primary means to sort as well as authorize who can be in what space in the contemporary city.

CRIMINALIZING OF INTERVENTION/CRIMINALIZING SHARING

In July 2006, the Las Vegas City Council unanimously passed a law that made it illegal to provide food in public parks to “indigent” people “for free or at a nominal fee” (Schwartz, 2006f, p. 8B). It remained legal to serve food cheaply or gratis to well-off people. Asked how the police would tell the difference between indigent and nonindigent people, Las Vegas Mayor Oscar Goodman replied: “Certain truths are self-evident. You know who’s homeless” (Schwartz, 2006a, p. 11A). A Council member made it clear that the law was not targeted at well-meaning citizens, but instead at activists who, he thought, tended to enable homelessness: “‘The marshals will get special training on enforcement’, [Council member Steve] Wolfson said. ‘If you brought a couple of burgers and wanted to give them out, you would technically be in violation but you would not be cited’” (Schwartz, 2006a, p. 11A).

The impetus for the law was the arrest, a few months earlier, of two women, Gail Sacco and Lyla Bartholomae, for providing a meal to homeless people in the city’s Huntridge Circle Park. Since there was no ordinance against such activities, the women were cited for holding a gathering of more than 25 people without a permit.¹⁷ They were also banned from entering the park for six months and were warned that if they did they would be arrested for trespassing (Schwartz, 2006b, p. 1B). This banishment was rescinded in response to pressure and a lawsuit filed by the American Civil Liberties Union. But at the same time, the city stepped up its enforcement of park closing hours¹⁸ and developed the new law to prohibit giving away food to poor people. The mayor hired special consultants to train police in detaining homeless people under provisions of Nevada state law and delivering them to a private mental health care facility. Of the facility, he said “If they do not want to treat [them], I want to know why because we give them a lot of funding” (Schwartz, 2006c, p. 1B). That the facility was already filled to capacity did not seem to concern the mayor, who was more intent on joining police at Huntridge Circle Park before 6 a.m. to arrest for trespass homeless people who were sleeping rough. At the time of the arrests he said, “We’re going to help those who can’t help themselves and run those [homeless people] who were able-bodied and sound of mind out of our community. I want potential violators to know, the mayor means business” (Schwartz, 2006g, p. 1B).

Nonetheless, throughout spring and summer 2006, even after the law was passed, activists continued to provide food to the indigent. Strategies of resistance varied. Bartholomae and Sacco continued to provide food to poor people (just not in the park). One long-time activist adopted the strategy of collecting several homeless people in her car, taking them to the market, letting them select their food, paying for it herself, and then returning them to the park so they could have a picnic. The idea was not only to provide needed food, but to visibly assert the right of the homeless to survive in a troubled city (Schwartz, 2006d). The local Food Not Bombs (FNB) chapter, aided by FNB activists from around the western United States, challenged the law directly by continuing to

¹⁷As it turns out, permits are not issued for Huntridge Circle Park.

¹⁸Parks and empty lots are necessary spaces in Las Vegas homeless people’s geography of survival. There are 10,000–12,000 homeless people in the city and only about 700 shelter beds.

set up tables and ladle out free food in city parks. “I wouldn’t call this civil disobedience,” one FNB activist said. “It’s not civil disobedience when you’ve been doing something for years and someone suddenly passes an ordinance that says it is illegal” (Schwartz, 2006e, p. 5B).

In a well-publicized event, a local radio personality also challenged the law. “Back-Seat Beth,” as she is known, brought donuts and water to Frank Wright Plaza near City Hall one morning in late July. She was cited for breaking the law (Ritter, 2006). Knowing there was going to be a well-organized protest of the law that morning, a local television crew showed up at 4:30 a.m. to set up. Fifteen minutes before the park opened at 7:00 a.m., the television reporter, along with a local photojournalist were asked to leave the park. The reporters, who had been there without interference for more than two hours, refused. They were cited for trespassing (Schwartz, 2006d) and thus were not able to film and broadcast the event.

Ten days later, in another organized resistance, protesters, including FNB activists who had driven in from Northern California, gathered in Frank Wright Plaza. Television and other media stood by. Despite the distribution of food to a number of homeless people, the police did nothing. The protesters moved on to Huntridge Circle Park. The TV cameras did not follow (but a print reporter did). Now out of view of the cameras, the police moved, arresting the Californians who were giving out food, but not a local activist (Gail Sacco’s son) who also was “providing food for free ... to indigents.” Neither the officers nor police spokespeople would comment on this selective enforcement (Curtis, 2006, p. 1B). Clearly what was at stake was the visibility of both homeless people and protesters. As the mayor made so clear, “able-bodied” homeless people simply had no right to be in the city; he had vowed, after all, to “run” them “out of our community.”

He was not entirely to get his way. In tandem with direct resistance to the law (which drew a great deal of national attention),¹⁹ the ACLU, joined by numerous advocacy groups, sued the city, seeking that the feeding law be overturned. In January 2007, a judge granted a temporary injunction that barred Las Vegas from enforcing the law; in August 2007, the injunction was made permanent. However, the judge specifically allowed the city to retain its requirement that gatherings of 25 or more receive a permit; upheld the city’s no-trespassing ordinances (that allowed parks to be closed at night or altogether); and allowed the city to set aside some parks for children and their parents or guardians exclusively (which many activists saw as another way of prohibiting homeless people from using them; NLCHP-NCH, 2007, p. 14).

But what is crucial here is the trend that the Las Vegas law exemplifies. Bans on giving out—and even sharing²⁰—food in public have been implemented in numerous cities. Food Not Bombs has been especially targeted, in part because its whole *raison d’être* is to provide “food for free or at a nominal fee” to indigent people. Like squatters’ movements, FNB seeks to directly alter the geography of survival. Dedicated to a radical ethos of both direct action and food decommodification, and as one of the fastest growing

¹⁹Much to the chagrin of the *Las Vegas Review-Journal* (Editorial, 2007).

²⁰The City of Wilmington, NC passed an ordinance in 2007 that made it illegal to “share” food on city streets or sidewalks; Orlando, FL outlaws “sharing” food with 25 or more people without a permit, and restricts organizations to no more than two one-day permits a year (NLCHP-NCH, 2007, p. 2).

activist movements in the world,²¹ FNB has been a frequent target of police action, most famously in San Francisco in the 1980s and 1990s (Ziman, 1997; Crass, 2000), but increasingly in cities as far flung as Orlando and Manila. And because of their seeming radicalism, FNB collectives have been infiltrated by both the FBI and local police (cf. Schwartz, 1994; Ehrenreich, 2002; http://www.aclu-co.org/docket/200406/JTTF_file_sarah_bardwell_12-07-04.pdf, retrieved September 18, 2007).

Founded in Boston as part of the antinuclear movement, FNB is radically decentralized, linked by affinity to the idea that by “working today to create sustainable ways of living that prefigure the kind of society we want to live in . . . we build a caring movement for progressive change” (*East Bay Food Not Bombs*, 1999, p. 2). The East Bay (California) FNB collective describes its work this way:

Food Not Bombs is different in many ways from all the other organizations that run food programs. First, our meals are vegetarian, usually vegan. Second, our meals are served outdoors. This is for a number of reasons: to show the larger public that hunger is a daily problem that people must deal with, and [in their case] to fulfill the mission of People’s Park [Berkeley] as a place where people can go to meet the needs of the body. The weekday meals in People’s Park where most folks sit in little groups on the grass encourage an open, community spirit. It runs counter to the usual practice of hiding poor people away in church basements while they get a meal. (*East Bay Food Not Bombs*, 1999, p. 3)

This last point is the crucial one: FNB seeks to make the geography of survival for homeless and hungry people a visible one—and it was just this visibility that made FNB (as well as Sacco and Bartholomae) such prominent targets in Las Vegas.

Visibility, FNB avers, is vital both to show “the larger public” the contours of the world in which they live, and to foster a sense of “community” among people of different classes. This is not the same as the exclusive “our community” the Las Vegas mayor hoped to create by running the homeless out of town, but rather one that sees cross-class interaction and involvement as a vital first step to the annihilation of class and the creation of a city that all may inhabit. For FNB, serving food in public thus reconfirms one of the basic functions of public space: a space for representation, a space in which urban “others” can be seen and recognized (Mitchell, 1995).

Such goals often run up against more settled notions of what proper uses of public space are meant to be. In Boston in 1993, for instance, numerous FNB activists were cited for trespassing when they refused to stop serving food for free in Copley Square. Supported by nearby churches (who agreed that “we don’t think the homeless should be fed in a basement where nobody will know because they are out of sight,” in the words of the chairwoman of the social action committee of the Boston Community Church; Franklin, 1993, p. 24), FNB activists insisted on “feeding people in the most public way, keeping the problem of homeless people in the public eye” (Editorial, 1993, p. 14). However, as

²¹Over 400 self-identified autonomous FNB chapters listed on FNB’s website, which is maintained by one of the organization’s founders, Keith McHenry. Half of the FNB chapters are in the United States, the other half are spread through the world (<http://www.foodnotbombs.net/>).

the *Boston Globe* editorialized, providing food in the relatively spacious Boston Common might be all right (as long as proper permits were obtained), doing so in Copley Square was not: “The Square is a single open space with few trees. A stand offering free food, if it draws a crowd, could affect the atmosphere of the entire park. Food Not Bombs would do well to go elsewhere” (Editorial, 1993, p. 14). That is to say, too much visibility is apparently not good for “a place where people of all classes meet as equals,” as the *Globe* called the Square (Editorial, 1993, p. 14).

This is why at least 22 U.S. cities since 2003—and at least 15 just since 2006—have either passed new laws restricting free public food distribution or stepped-up enforcement of health and food safety laws to shut down existing distribution programs (NLCHP-NCH, 2007). As with edicts against sitting on sidewalks or falling asleep in parks, such laws are designed to make the homeless—not homelessness—disappear. By further regulating what poor and hungry people can do in public space, they work in tandem (as the Las Vegas case makes so clear) with innovations in trespass law and the widening net of surveillance to construct a city in which (in Waldron’s famous formulation) there is simply no place to be. For their part, homeless people are thus forced to devise ever more creative, and often increasingly illegal, geographies of survival. Understanding precisely how they do this is the task of other research. Our goal has only been to show that they must.

CONCLUSION: VISIBILITY, THE GEOGRAPHY OF SURVIVAL, AND THE RIGHT TO THE CITY

Representing the inequalities that homeless people face is one of the tactics used by FNB, but they themselves no doubt realize this strategy has possible tensions associated with it. Most FNB chapters work hard to produce geographies of explicitly mutual aid by encouraging all who share their food (including, but not exclusively, homeless people) to contribute to preparing meals and assisting in the logistics of sharing them with others. However, some are not interested in FNB’s political ideologies, but rather just need to eat whatever, wherever, whenever and seek the dignity associated with being human. Given this potential for a lack of political consensus, does this mean that FNB members are using homeless people to produce spectacle? An honestly reflexive, if not cynical, engagement with this tension would have to acknowledge that in all direct action politics there is the possibility for misrepresentation. Nonetheless, it might just be possible that the dignity of being human comes at a much higher cost within the geographies of survival than any single direct action group can address.

Notwithstanding these concerns, in his preface to the *Food Not Bombs Handbook*, Howard Zinn (2000, p. x) suggested that “This slogan requires no complicated analysis. Those three words ‘say it all.’ They point unerringly to the double challenge: to feed immediately people who are without adequate food, and to replace a system whose priorities are power and profit with one meeting the needs of all human beings.” Of course (and as no doubt Zinn knows), feeding people immediately is no simple process, and doing it in public is even harder. That is why FNB so obviously targets the existing geography of survival, and through direct action seeks to radically transform it. In this sense, it is not only that organizations like FNB threaten the smooth functioning of the capitalist city—“whose priorities are power and profit”—with their efforts to decommodify food.

Rather it is also that they challenge the structures of visibility and invisibility that construct such a restrictive geography of survival. Closed-circuit monitoring of dumpsters behind restaurants, closing off alleys to “strangers,” eliminating regulations that require there actually be a complaint of trespassing before a citation is issued, arresting the media covering demonstrations, criminalizing free food in public—all these are just so many desperate attempts to construct a structure of visibility that will secure urban space for specific classes (as the Las Vegas edict against providing food to indigents made so clear). In so doing, however, such efforts necessarily imperil the geography of survival for others, especially the homeless and hungry who are now a seemingly permanent part of the North American cityscape. As Kurt Iveson (2007, p. 214) has argued, “the visibility associated with being ‘in public’ has another set of effects beyond enabling participation” in public life:

Most importantly, fields of visibility are bound up with the techniques and technologies of discipline through which ... some ways of being (in) public are normalized. To be “in public” is to have one’s conduct exposed to the normative gaze of others, and exposure to this gaze is one of the technologies of governance which incite[s] us to regulate our own conduct with regard to what is “appropriate” when in public.

But it is also one of the technologies that shapes the geography of survival. If subjection to the normalizing gaze is in fact what many of us want (CCTV is overwhelmingly popular), the costs of such a desire should not be underestimated. The costs are not only the costs of exclusion from collective involvement in being part of the public—a serious enough problem, especially for homeless people (Mitchell, 1995)—but also of the right to *inhabit* and *make* the city.

Human society, Lefebvre (1996, p. 147) averred, is structured through a set of “opposed and compl[e]mentary” needs “the need for security and opening, the need for certainty and adventure, that of organization of work and place, the needs of the predictable and the unpredictable, of similarity and difference, of isolation and encounter, exchange and investments, of independence (even solitude) and communion, of immediate and long-term prospects.” The rise of the surveillant city, legal innovations concerning trespass, the outlawing intervention into the satisfaction of basic needs, the prohibition of even sharing, tends to valorize only one side of these opposed and complementary needs—security, certainty, work (including the work of consumption), and isolation (made tolerable through voyeurism). It therefore structures the structuring of the city. It shapes the shaping. It inhabits the inhabiting. And in so doing it radically transforms the material basis of life for the poor. By exposing—or seeking to expose—every aspect of homeless people’s everyday life, by denying even the right of solitude and communication (by asserting that the only place for homeless people is the monitored space of the shelter), the trend represented by CCTV and the securitization of the city reinforces a state of affairs whereby homeless people simply have no sovereign place to be. And by spying on or otherwise targeting organizations such as FNB that seek to intervene and transform this state of affairs, by arresting them for things they have done “for years” (as the Las Vegas FNB activist put it), we not only threaten the civil liberties of activists and

the homeless, as well as the opportunity of people to form publics and act in public, we also threaten their very survival and their right to live.

Organizations such as FNB not only seek to mitigate the most appalling features of homeless people's lives (e.g., the struggle for food and bodily security), but in fact to remake the city so that homelessness, a necessary feature of contemporary urban capitalism, is no more. Thus they want to ensure that struggles can soon become focused on civil liberties and public democracy. "Everybody needs a place to go," *East Bay Food Not Bombs* (1999, p. 6) argues, "a place to feel welcome, a place simply to be. In these difficult times, when capitalist racist patriarchy has launched an all-out class war against the most economically, socially and culturally marginalized people of our society, that need is all the more important yet all the more difficult to meet." Homelessness and hunger, as the opening paragraphs of this article attest, continue to increase.

To meet their own needs, homeless and hungry people learn both to live in and reformulate a geography of survival—one that reconfigures their habitat so they may better inhabit the city. FNB and other activist organizations seek to assist in this process of transformation and reformulation. Because of this, their meetings are infiltrated by undercover agents. Against this, cities train their CCTV cameras, assuring that thrown away food stays thrown away and that empty doorways remain empty. Since the urban habitat is increasingly one of total exposure, struggles over the nature of that exposure (e.g., when cameras are to be used, what footage is to be broadcast) become all the more important. They are important for their own sake, but especially because they are central to the new geography of survival in the capitalist city, out of which any decent right to the city will have to be forged.

The "right to the city" presents a capacious ideal. It is a form of rights talk that sets the standard against which all life in the city must be measured (Mitchell, 2003, p. 25). As the efforts of FNB, and more broadly the burgeoning Right to the City Alliances show, there are more connections to be made for thinking about *a geography of survival* within the context of *a geography of direct action*. The value of rights talk has been forged, to a large degree, through direct action struggles to realize how inhabiting urban space lends credence to the egalitarian principles that are central to the right to the city. Although unpacking all sorts of dialectic processes are central to understanding the contradictions within the city that lead to rampant inequality and suffering, so too must we persevere to better understand the dialectics between just ideals and actions that inspire hope and human fulfillment.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, N., 1923, *The Hobo: The Sociology of Homeless Men*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bahr, H., 1970, *Disaffiliated Man: Essays and Bibliography on Skid Row, Vagrancy and Outsiders*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Begin, B., 2007, Newsome announces plan to increase federal housing foot patrols: Goal to rid area of trespassing loiterers. *FogCityJournal.com*, May 6, n.p.
- Blomley, N., 2009, Homelessness, rights and the delusions of property. *Urban Geography*, Vol. 30, 577–590.

- Bunge, W., 1969, *The First Years of the Detroit Geographical Expedition: A Personal Report*. Detroit, MI: Society for Human Exploration.
- Bunge, W., 1971, *FitzGerald: Geography of a Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.
- Bunge, W., 1973, The geography of human survival. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 63, 275–295.
- Bunge, W. and Bordessa, R., 1975, *The Canadian Alternative: Survival, Expeditions and Urban Change*. Toronto, Canada: Department of Geography, York University, Geographical Monographs.
- Collins, T., 2006a, City considers closing alleys to outsiders: Minneapolis could be first big U.S. city to restrict pedestrian traffic in all of its alleys. *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, September 1, p. 1B.
- Collins, T., 2006b, Minneapolis alleys to remain open to all: Before 10–3 vote, the city council debated civil liberties, ridicule and fighting crime. *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, September 2, p. 1B.
- Crass, C., 2000, San Francisco urban politics and Food Not Bombs. *Practical Anarchy Online*. http://www.practicalanarchy.org/fnb_crass2.html
- Curtis, L., 2006, Fed up with protests. *Las Vegas Review-Journal*, August 11, p. 1B.
- Dear, M. and Wolch, J., 1987, *Landscapes of Despair*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Duncan, J., 1978, Men without property: The tramp's classification and use of urban space. *Antipode*, Vol. 10, 24–34.
- Duneier, M., 1999. *Sidewalk*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- East Bay Food Not Bombs*, 1999, pamphlet, no publisher. Available from East Bay Food Not Bombs, The Long Haul, 3124 Shattuck Ave, Berkeley, CA 94609.
- Editorial, 1993, Feeding people in the parks. *Boston Globe*, April 10, p. 14.
- Editorial, 2007, Feeding the homeless in parks. *Las Vegas Review-Journal*, August 27, p. 6B.
- Ehrenreich, B., 2002, An eye for anarchy. *LA Weekly*, June 7, p. 17.
- Farrell, J., 2005, *Empire of Scrounge: Inside the Urban Underground of Dumpster Diving, Trashpicking, and Street Scavenging*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Forbes, E., 2002, *Legislative Analyst Report: San Francisco's "Quality of Life" Laws and Seattle's "Civility" Laws* (File No. 011704). Retrieved from http://www.sfgov.org/site/bdsupvrs_page.asp?id=5100
- Franklin, J., 1993, Two churches back group feeding poor in Copley Square. *Boston Globe*, May 4, p. 24.
- Giles, K., 2006, A back alley approach to fight crime in Minneapolis: The city council is reviewing a proposal to keep strangers out of its 455 miles of back alleys. *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, May 31, p. 1A.
- Gosner, J., 2004, Suit challenges trespass law. *Honolulu Advertiser*, September 8. Retrieved from <http://the.honoluluadvertiser.com>
- Henderson, G., 2004, Free food, the local production of worth, and the circuit of de-commodification: A value theory of the surplus. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, Vol. 22, 485–512.

- Heyman, R., 2007, "Who's going to man the factories and be the sexual slaves if we all get PhDs?" Democratizing knowledge production, pedagogy, and the Detroit Geographical Expedition and Institute. *Antipode*, Vol. 39, 99–120.
- Heynen, N., 2006, But it's alright, ma, it's life and life only: Radicalism as survival. *Antipode*, Vol. 38, 916–929.
- Heynen, N., 2008, Bringing the body back to life through a radical geography of hunger: The Haymarket Affair and its aftermath. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographers*, Vol. 7, No. 1, 32–44. Available at <http://www.acme-journal.org/Volume7-1.htm>
- Heynen, N. 2009, Bending the bars of empire from every ghetto to feed the kids: The Black Panther Party's radical antihunger politics of social reproduction and scale. *The Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 99, No. 2, 406–422.
- Hopper, J., 2006, Charting new territory: The founders of Maphub want to get you off line—And out into the streets. *Pittsburgh City Paper*, February 9. Retrieved from <http://www.cparchives.com/scripts/printIt.cfm?ref=5672>
- Hopper, K., 2003, *Reckoning with Homeless*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Iveson, K., 2007, *Public and the City*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Koskela, H., 2004, Webcams, TV shows and mobile phones: Empowering exhibitionism. *Surveillance and Society*, Vol. 2, 199–215.
- Koskela, H., 2006, The other side of surveillance: Webcams, power and agency. In D. Lyon, editor, *Theorizing Surveillance: The Panopticon and Beyond*. Cullompton, UK: Willan Publishing, 163–181.
- Lefebvre, H., 1996, The right to the city. In E. Kofman and E. Lebas, editors, *Writings on Cities*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 63–181.
- McNerthey, C., 2007, Solutions sought at crime-plagued Steinbrueck Park. *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, June 13. Retrieved from http://seattlepi.nwsourc.com/local/319536_pikecrome13.html
- Merrifield, A., 1995, Situated knowledge through exploration: Reflections on Bunge's "Geographical Expeditions." *Antipode*, Vol. 27, 49–70.
- Mitchell, D., 1995, The end of public space? People's Park, definitions of the public, and democracy. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 85, 108–133.
- Mitchell, D., 1997, The annihilation of space by law: The roots and implications of anti-homeless laws in the United States. *Antipode*, Vol. 29, 303–325.
- Mitchell, D., 1998, Anti-homeless laws and public space II: Further constitutional issues. *Urban Geography*, Vol. 19, 98–104.
- Mitchell, D., 2003, *The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Mitchell, D., 2006, Property rights, the First Amendment, and judicial anti-urbanism: The strange case of *Hicks v. Virginia*. *Urban Geography*, Vol. 26, 565–586.
- Mitchell, D. and Villanueva, J., in press, The Right to the City. In R. Hutchison, editor, *Encyclopedia of Urban Studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mitchell, K., 2007, Trespass law targets the homeless. *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, June 27. Retrieved from http://seattlepi.nwsourc.com/321510_trespasslaws28.html
- NCH (National Coalition for the Homeless), 2004, *Illegal to Be Homeless, 2004 Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.nationalhomeless.org/publications/crimereport2004/meanestcities.html>

- NCH (National Coalition for the Homeless), 2007, *How Many People Experience Homelessness: NCH Fact Sheet #2* (August). Retrieved from <http://www.nationalhomeless.org>
- NLCHP (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty), 2004, *Homelessness in the United States and the Human Right to Housing* (January). Washington, DC: NLCHP.
- NLCHP-NCH (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty-National Coalition for the Homeless), 2007, *Feeding Intolerance: Prohibitions on Sharing Food with People Experiencing Homelessness* (November). Retrieved from <http://www.nlchp.org>
- Norris, C. and Armstrong, G., 1999, *The Maximum Surveillance Society: The Rise of CCTV*. Oxford, UK: Berg.
- Norris, C., Moran, J., and Armstrong, G., editors, 1998, *Surveillance, Closed Circuit Television, and Social Control*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Pablo, C., 2007, Dumpster issue divides city. *Straight.com*, March 1. Retrieved from www.straight.com/node/73033
- Peck, J. and Tickell, A., 2002, Neoliberalizing space. *Antipode*, Vol. 34, 380–404.
- Rahimian, A., Wolch, J., and Koegel, P., 1992, A model of homeless migration: Homeless men in Skid Row, Los Angeles. *Environment and Planning A*, Vol. 24, 1317–1336.
- Ritter, K., 2006, Las Vegas marshals ticket 7, arrest 3 amid homeless protests. Associated Press State and Local Wire, July 31.
- Rowe, S. and Wolch, J., 1990, Social networks in time and space: Homeless women in Skid Row, Los Angeles. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 80, 184–204.
- Rucker, P., 2007, Cupboards are bare at food banks: Drops in donations and farm surplus cause area charities to run short. *Washington Post*, December 8, p. A1.
- Savage, C., 2007, U.S. doles out millions for street cameras: Local efforts raise privacy alarms. *Boston Globe*, August 12.
- Schwartz, D., 2006a, Feeding homeless outlawed. *Las Vegas Review-Journal*, July 20, p. 11A.
- Schwartz, D., 2006b, Law used to thwart homeless helpers targeted. *Las Vegas Review-Journal*, March 21, p. 1B.
- Schwartz, D., 2006c, Mayor plans to clear homeless out of city parks. *Las Vegas Review-Journal*, June 22, p. 1B.
- Schwartz, D., 2006d, Media cited for feeding homeless. *Las Vegas Review-Journal*, August 1, p. 1A.
- Schwartz, D., 2006e, Ordinance doesn't deter volunteers. *Las Vegas Review-Journal*, July 28, p. 5B.
- Schwartz, D., 2006f, "Soup kitchens" targeted. *Las Vegas Review-Journal*, July 13, p. 8B.
- Schwartz, D., 2006g, Team starts parks sweep. *Las Vegas Review-Journal*, July 11, p. 1B.
- Schwartz, S., 1994, S.F. Police, ADL sued again over political spying charges. *San Francisco Chronicle*, January 25, p. A17.
- Sloboggin, C., 2002, Public privacy: Camera surveillance of public places and the right to anonymity. *Mississippi Law Journal*, Vol. 72, 213–315.
- Snow, D. A. and Anderson, L., 1993, *Down on Their Luck: A Study of Homeless Street People*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Sollenberger, A., 1911, *One Thousand Homeless Men*. New York, NY: Russell Sage.
- Spradley, J., 1970, *You Owe Yourself a Drunk: An Ethnography of Urban Nomads*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- Staeheli, L. and Mitchell, D., 2008, *The People's Property? Power, Politics, and the Public*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- U.S. Conference of Mayors, 2006, *A Status Report on Hunger and Homelessness in American Cities*. Washington, DC: U.S. Conference of Mayors.
- Waldron, J., 1993, Homelessness and the issue of freedom. In *Liberal Rights: Collected Papers 1981–1991*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 309–338.
- Wells, K., 2008, Selling Shelters: The Abandonment of Public Property in Washington, DC, 1987–2007. Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Geography, Syracuse University.
- Wolch, J. and Dear, M., 1993, *Malign Neglect: Homelessness in an American City*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wolch, J., Rahimian, A., and Koegel, P., 1993, Daily and periodic mobility patterns on the urban homeless. *The Professional Geographer*, Vol. 45, 159–169.
- Wolch, J. and Rowe, S., 1992, On the street: Mobility paths of the urban homeless. *City and Society*, Vol. 6, 115–140.
- Wright, T., 1997, *Out of Place: Homeless Mobilizations, Subcities, and Contested Landscapes*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ziman, J., 1997, Criminalizing the charitable. *Z Magazine*, June. Retrieved from <http://www.zmag.org/ZMAG/articles/june97zmag>
- Zinn, H., 2000, Introduction. In C. T. Lawrence and K. McHenry, editors, *Food Not Bombs: How to Feed the Hungry and Build Community*. Tucson, AZ: See Sharp Press, ix–x.