aptara	ANTI	anti_957	**Dispatch:** 10-11-2011	**CE:** N/A
	Journal	**MSP No.**	**No. of pages:** 21	**PE:** Kirsten

Governing the Homeless in an Age of Compassion: Homelessness, Citizenship, and the 10-Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County Washington

Tony Sparks

Department of Geography, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, CA, USA; sparksto@sonoma.edu

Abstract: In 2001, President Bush announced his intention to "end chronic homeless by the year 2012" as part of his broad "Compassion Agenda". Since then, departmental consolidation, changes in funding allocation, and continued decentralization of services provision have dramatically reshaped the landscape of homeless service provision in the US. In this paper I examine how these roll-out policies reify and re-entrench liberal equations of property with rational self-governance at the local scale. Particularly, I illustrate how tropes of homeless otherness work alongside and through federal neoliberal roll-out policies to exclude homeless voices from the formation of local social policy. In doing so, I attempt to call attention to the mutually constitutive relationship between the spatial management of homeless bodies, tropes of homeless deviance and dependence, and limits to citizenship in the context of neoliberal urban governance.

Keywords: homelessness, social policy, citizenship, urban governance

Introduction

The consumer advisory counsel meeting of the Committee to End Homelessness in King County (CEHKC) was proceeding as usual. The meeting began with an update on the progress of the committee, followed by a discussion on the importance of "enhanced shelters". A key component of the committee's 10-year plan to end homelessness, these shelters emphasize the necessity of on-site counseling, job training and drug/alcohol treatment. The meeting had almost concluded when a hand rose. It was Tom, a large, soft-spoken man, who had a gift for conveying quite a bit of information in few words. "With all due respect," he began, speaking quietly but deliberately, "We lost our homes—not our minds."

For Tom, the problem was simple. The solution to homelessness was housing not services. After all, he confided to me after the meeting, what the committee failed to realize was that in his experience, the problems that "enhanced shelter" attempted to fix were products—not causes—of not having a stable place to live. Further, he felt that the assumption that the solution to homelessness lies in the treatment and counseling of the homeless individual was both a personal affront and a vast underestimation of homeless people in general. There was no time for

Antipode Vol. 00 No. 00 2011 ISSN 0066-4812, pp 1–21 doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00957.x

this elaboration during the meeting however, as the chair, after asking if anybody wanted to respond to Tom's comment and being met with silence, quickly moved to the next order of business.

Tom is not alone in his concerns. The anecdote above occurred during a larger ethnographic project in which I spent 6 months living as a participant-observer in Tent City 3, a semi-formal homeless encampment in Seattle, Washington. Through this work, I sought to better understand how the tent city functioned, for its residents, as a site of social reproduction in an often hostile urban environment. During the course of this research, I conducted 45 semi-structured interviews with homeless individuals residing in Tent City 3. In order to gain a representative sample of tent city residents, interviewees were selected based upon the gender ratio of the camp and the amount of time they had been in residence. Fifteen residents, one woman to every three men, were chosen from each of the following categories of tenure: 0–1, 1–3, and 3 or more months of residency.[1] In these interviews, residents overwhelmingly identified the lack of stable employment and affordable housing as the primary cause of homelessness.

These responses are not surprising. These sentiments echo not only those voiced by homeless people and advocacy organizations across the USA, but also the main findings of the US council of mayors (Lowe 2005; cf Lyon-Callo 2004 Roy 1935; VanderStaay 1992). Indeed, in any other context, Tom's view that a lack of housing is the primary cause of homelessness would appear to be simple common sense. Yet, in a meeting of the CEHKC, these common sense views were met only with silence.

Hoping to make sense of this silence, and hear their general views on homelessness, I interviewed a number of city and county officials involved either directly with the committee or with other local homeless programs. In one of these interviews, I asked an official familiar with Tom and closely involved with the committee, why Tom's comments were not met with more serious consideration. He explained that Tom was exceptional because he was, in this official's opinion, "perfectly fine functioning". That is Tom, because he has no drug or mental disorders, is not only an exception within the homeless community, but ultimately according to this official, "there is no reason for him to be homeless".

While Tom is in fact "perfectly fine functioning", the notion that these characteristics constitute an exception rather than a norm is both questionable and deeply embedded in US homeless policy. As a researcher, I was by no means a detached observer. In addition to participating in the collective day-to-day maintenance and operation of the camp, I frequently attended, along with my tent city peers, community outreach sessions and meetings with city and county officials (such as the one described above). In these meetings, and in the statements of city and county officials, a pattern emerged wherein policy makers eagerly sought input from homeless individuals but their input was often dismissed as irrelevant or "exceptional" when their views diverged from prevailing policy prerogatives. Thus, although Tom's comments appear almost tautologically obvious in most contexts, in the context of the CEHKC, the committee's reaction (or lack thereof) highlights how deeply embedded notions of homeless deviance and dependence serve to marginalize them in the formation of policies that directly affect their lives.

These feelings of marginalization were deeply felt by tent city residents. In interviews, residents often spoke of being treated like "lesser human beings" or "little children". Indeed, in the course of my research, I found that, aside from the tent city's role in attending material needs of its residents (food, shelter bathrooms), residents regarded the autonomy afforded by the tent city as its primary value. For them the tent city provided a site, outside of what I have elsewhere called the "pathologizing gaze of the public" (Sparks 2010:843). Within this autonomous space, residents felt they could produce structures that reflected their own needs and priorities in a way that they could not elsewhere. This ability to function as active agents in the social production of the tent city offered many residents a welcome respite from the demeaning and dehumanizing treatment residents felt they often received in the city's shelters and public spaces.

However, as Tom's experience above illustrates, the agency and autonomy that homeless individuals were able to exercise within the boundaries of the tent city did not extend to the formation of local social policy. In this article, I focus specifically on both the structure and publications of CEHCK to ask: how do presuppositions about the relationship between homelessness and the character of the homeless limit the ability of the homeless to function as full and active citizens in the formation of urban social policy? Following Del Casino and Jocoy's call to "interrogate . . . how historical representations of being homeless . . . are being tied to recent neoliberal representations of citizenship, productivity, and accountability", I answer this question by examining how the historical equation of homelessness with pathology and irrationality continues to both limit and motivate local homeless policy in King County, Washington (Del Casino and Jocoy 2008:192).

Particularly, I illustrate how tropes of homeless deviance and dependence work alongside and through federal neoliberal roll-out policies to exclude homeless voices from the formation of local social policy. To date, much of the geographic scholarship on contemporary homelessness focuses on the how neoliberal withdrawal, devolution, and gentrification result in the spatial isolation and criminalization of homeless bodies (Dear and Wolch 1987; Mitchell 2004; Wolch and Dear 1993). However, state withdrawal and disinvestment has gone hand in hand with state expansion (Brenner and Theodore 2002; Leitner, Peck and Sheppard 2007).

Q1

Although this expansion has resulted in the infiltration of neoliberal logics across the spectrum of state institutions (cf Mitchell 2003; Gilmore 2006), it has been particularly acutely felt within the sphere of social services. The restructuring of Keynesian safety-net programs from welfare to "workfare" has simultaneously reterritorialized and rescaled the geographies of social service provision across the spectrum from welfare, to public housing and homeless policy (Crump 2002; Lyon-Callo 2004; Peck 2001). While the "roll-back" phase produced a vast increase in both the number of homeless and punitive responses, the roll-out phase, particularly from 2001 to the present, has likewise dramatically altered the geographies of homelessness and the spatial management of the homeless (DeVerteuil 2006; Jocoy and Del Casino 2010; Klodawsky 2009; Murphy 2009). This growing body of literature draws attention to how "roll-out" policies discipline and manage homeless bodies. Others have called for more nuanced attention to the diverse experiences

and voices of the homeless (DeVerteuil, May and Von Mahs 2009). Yet, little attention has been paid to the relationship between the spatial management of homeless bodies and the limits to their ability to participate as full and active citizens. This paper addresses this absence by focusing specifically on the mutually constitutive relationship between the spatial management of homeless bodies, tropes of homeless deviance and dependence, and practices of citizenship in the context of neoliberal urban governance.

As many have shown, public participation and democracy take on a complex and often ambivalent character in the context of neoliberal governance. On one hand, decentralization of social programs increased citizen involvement in planning and policy decisions that some have argued provides space for local contestation (Larner and Butler 2007). On the other hand, greater participation does not occur on neutral terrain. Rather, the devolution of state responsibility to the local level produces "neoliberal subjectivities" in which "individuals are empowered to actively make self-interested choices [and] be responsible for their own well-being and risk management" (Leitner, Peck and Sheppard 2007:4; cf Rose 1999). Within this rubric, citizenship and social responsibility are reformulated through the economic relationships of entrepreneurial production and consumption.

As a result, many argue that, in the face of neoliberal restructuring and market-based imperatives, cities are becoming progressively less democratic in terms of citizens' ability to influence urban policy (Brenner 1999; Jessop 1997). Some have illustrated how the expansion of neoliberal ideologies are imbricated within calls for greater democracy and participation in urban affairs (McCann 2001; Purcell 2006). In what follows, I build upon this work by illustrating how neoliberal logics and techniques of poverty management draw upon and reproduce stereotypes of homeless deviance in ways that justify the exclusion of homeless voices from the formation of urban homeless policy.

I begin by briefly tracing how the liberal equation of property and rational autonomy positions the homeless as the constitutive outside of liberal citizenship. From these presuppositions, I argue that vagrancy laws and other strategies of homeless management have historically functioned to reinscribe and re-entrench notions of homeless deviance and dependence upon the urban landscape. In the next section, I explore how neoliberal roll-out policies, at the federal level, draw upon, interpolate and perpetuate notions of homeless deviance and dependence though a lexicon of marketized individualism, personal responsibility, and scientific best practices. Lastly, I illustrate how neoliberal strategies of homeless management operate in CEHCK and its main product, *A Roof Over Every Bed: A Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County*.

The Liberal Origins of the Homeless "Other"

As Tom's proclamation suggests, the category of homelessness signifies, in the last instance, not a set of positive attributes, but a lack or absence. But, this lack is of a dual nature. In the context of Anglo-American liberalism, the performative aspects of home as a site of identity formation, patriarchal self-governance, and social

reproduction are closely bound to the legal concept of property in a relationship Roy refers to as a "paradigm of propertied citizenship" (Roy 2003).

This relationship between citizenship and property highlights a central contradiction in liberal theory in which the inalienability and universality of citizenship are bounded by their relationship to property and labor (Blomley 1998; Macpherson 1964). Locke, in his *Second Treatise*, reconciles this apparent contradiction by arguing that, whereas freedom, property, the capacity for labor, and reason, comprise man's "natural" condition, "God gave the world to men in common; but since he gave it them for their benefit . . . it cannot be supposed he meant it should always remain common and uncultivated. He gave it to the use of the industrious and rational" (Locke 1988:291). While the right to property is universal to all, the possession and management of property becomes the visible manifestation of the owner's rationality and industriousness. In this context, liberal citizenship reveals itself as "performative" insofar as the "natural" proclivities toward property and labor must be rendered visible to the state in ways that reveal the "rational" character of the citizen (Butler 2004; Scott 1998).

Within this performative cartography of citizenship, one's place, or lack thereof, signifies one's fitness for liberal citizenship. Here, the homeless subject emerges as citizenship's "other"—place-less and therefore incapable of liberal autonomy (Arnold 2004; Kawash 1998). As such, the homeless are ultimately defined, not by any particular attribute, but by their difference from a liberal norm. Their lack of private property becomes bound up with the western ideal of "home" in its ideological formulation as a site of social and economic reproduction, identity formation, and stability (May 2000; Veness 1992). Viewed through this conflation, the homeless come to be understood through a lexicon of deviance, embodied by tropes such as "tramp", "beggar", or "bum", which cast them as the lazy, dependent, unpredictable antithesis of rational autonomous individuality (Cresswell 2001; Feldman 2004; Katz 1989).

These attributes appear in the popular, political, and scientific imaginations of the homeless, from the sixteenth century to the present, as a series of behavioral dichotomies distinguishing them from the industrious, self-governing, liberal individual (Pascale 2005; Simon 1992). Reflecting these presuppositions, 500 years of Anglo-American law, policy, and other homeless management strategies consistently re-entrenched and reified the notion that the homeless are unfit for rational self-governance and active citizenship. As a result, the management of homelessness functions as a form of spatial governmentality wherein the assumed irrationality of the homeless necessitates state intervention and management simply because of the places they must, or may not, inhabit (Feldman 2004).

Below, I argue these assumptions, couched in the modern language of pathology, treatment and rehabilitation, combined with the spatial management of homeless bodies, continue to frame the homeless as unfit for rational self-governance and representation. Here, I illustrate the ways in which the "system of values and norms" that maintain a "paradigm of propertied citizenship" and its constitutive Other are "articulated and extended" through the specific rationale and techniques of neoliberal governance in the contemporary moment (Roy 2003:464).

The Management of Homelessness in an Age of "Compassion"—US Federal Policy from the 1980s to the Present

The McKinney-Vento Act of 1987 initiated the roll-out phase of neoliberal homeless policy. Normalized by the Clinton administration's "Continuum of Care", it finds its most complete manifestation in the spatial logic of the Bush administration's attempt to "end chronic homelessness in 10 years". This movement, drawing on tropes of the homeless as deviant and dependent citizens, reinscribes these stereotypes within the discursive terrain of neoliberal norms of citizenship and governance (Del Casino and Jocoy 2008). This reinscription combines the marketized language of benchmarking, best practices, and producer/consumer relations with high-tech surveillance to produce the "new" homeless as entrepreneurial subjects whose failure to adhere to a proper disciplinary regime marks them as non-responsible, non-productive, non-citizens.

For most of US history, local governments and private charities have been primarily responsible for the care and management of the poor. This tradition changed dramatically with the passage of the McKinney-Vento Act of 1987. Arising from a moral panic surrounding "the visible homeless" (Blau 1992), McKinney sought "to use public resources and programs in a more coordinated manner to meet the critically urgent needs of the homeless of the Nation" (42USC11301). Deploying the language of emergency, Congress concluded that:

> The Nation faces an immediate and unprecedented crisis due to the lack of shelter for a growing number of individuals and families ... due to the record increase in homelessness, States, units of local government, and private voluntary organizations have been unable to meet the basic human needs of all the homeless [thus] ... the Federal Government has a clear responsibility and an existing capacity to fulfill a more effective and responsible role to meet the basic human needs and to engender respect for the human dignity of the homeless (42USC11301).

To redress this crisis, the McKinney-Vento act authorized $1.47 billion in emergency aid for homeless programs, making it the first major federal fiscal response to homelessness in US history (Kyle 2005). Administered by a newly created US Interagency Council on Homelessness, these funds were distributed through state and local programs that were required to meet the goals and requirements of the federal statutes. McKinney-Vento represented an unprecedented expansion of federal state power into the realm of homeless care and management at a time when many cities around the country (including Seattle) were actively purging their streets of the homeless in pursuit of both investment and consumer dollars (Gibson 2004).

Since its passage, McKinney-Vento has undergone many changes that decentralized and harmonized homeless management. In 1995, Bill Clinton enacted the first major change under the auspices of a "Continuum of Care". As part of this shift, Congress re-oriented funding away from simple emergency shelter care and towards a "comprehensive and long-term approaches that will help homeless people become self-sufficient" (White House 1998). Substantively, this moved federal funding from a non-competitive needs-based allotment, to a competitive process

wherein localities and non-profits pitched rehabilitative frameworks designed to successfully move the homeless from short-term shelter to long-term housing.

The inauguration of the "Continuum of Care" program was a key turning point in the neoliberalization of federal homeless policy. Opposing Keynesian social welfare strategies, Continuum of Care relied upon individualized, market-based approaches to homeless policy. As a result, "providing housing to poor people was portrayed as increasing their dependence on government and decreasing their drive to become self-reliant individuals able to compete in the global market" (Lyon-Callo 2004:12). This shift resulted in the decentralization of the provision of homeless services and the retrenchment and expansion of the ideological framework of neoliberalism across the federal landscape (Bogard 2003).

In both rationale and method, Continuum of Care operated upon the assumption that homelessness was the result of a personal failing. Responding to concerns by both liberal homeless advocates and conservative critics, the program reflected a growing consensus that simple shelter provision did little to help the homeless. As a result, Continuum of Care reforms shifted federal funding priorities from the provision of a "mat on the floor" to agencies focused on the pathologies of the homeless ranging from mental illness and substance abuse counseling to personal life skills and workforce training (Katz 1989). The effect was the simultaneous normalization and personalization of homelessness. No longer was homelessness a product of economic crises requiring emergency response. Rather, the appropriate remedy was the rehabilitation and training of the homeless individual to the norms of entrepreneurial individualism for a personal problem.

These policies renewed and reinscribed, at the federal level, a deviant view of homelessness wherein the poor are seen as "deficient, given their failure to conform to dominant opinion about what it means to be an autonomous, rational, self-sufficient, member of society" (Schram 1995:18). Dramatic shifts in federal assumptions about the "problem" of homelessness were quickly normalized across the country as cash strapped service agencies shifted their priorities to compete for federal Continuum of Care dollars. As roll-back policies stripped already struggling social service agencies of funding lifelines, roll-out policies offered money with the contingency that local programs reflect federal priorities. The result was the harmonization, across the nation, of neoliberal prerogatives with local service provision.

While the Clinton Continuum of Care programs initiated the simultaneous decentralization of service provision and the expansion of the ideology of homelessness as a personal failing, this movement was accelerated and intensified during the second Bush administration. Bush began his tenure by appointing Mel Martinez Secretary of the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and reactivating the Interagency Council on Homelessness after 8 years of inactivity. The Bush/Martinez plan called for the coordination and consolidation of 15 federal agencies under the aegis of the interagency council "as part of a comprehensive effort to improve the delivery of federal services to homeless individuals and families" (HUD 2001).

The structure of the new ICH differed little from its Reagan-era predecessor. However, whereas the original committee viewed homelessness as a product of

structural upheaval necessitating emergency shelter, the new ICH targeted these policies for being too complacent toward the homeless. According to Martinez, "No longer will we settle for the old approach of merely managing and accommodating Homelessness ... Instead, we will press ahead in developing and implementing innovative new strategies to eliminate chronic homelessness from the streets of America once and for all" (HUD 2002). While the logic and method of the Bush program built upon the "Continuum of Care" approach, the Bush plan expanded and further entrenched both the presumption homeless individuals' pathology and the necessity of their benevolent management.

Broadly speaking, the host of new policies and initiatives, passed under the aegis of a sweeping "Samaritan Initiative", consolidated federal efforts through public/private partnership with the aim of moving homeless individuals from the streets into permanent housing (Interagency Council on Homelessness 2004). The Bush Administration, drawing on the expertise of the Interagency Council on Homelessness, identified both the pathologies of the homeless and their frustrating spatial unfixity as primary barriers to overcoming homelessness. Thus, current federal funding mandates emphasize both the linking of housing with mental health, job training, and substance abuse services, and the need for closer monitoring of both the movements and behaviors of homeless individuals (HUD 2001).

Key to the implementation of these goals was both a reorientation of funding and priorities. The Bush plan emphasized a consolidation of grant programs in addition to changes in the application process allowing for faith-based, non-profit, and public–private partnerships. In terms of federal priorities, the Bush plan shifted from simple shelter provision to a competitive system based on "outcomes". To accomplish these goals, the plan calls for consolidation of both management and funds with the goal to provide essentially one-stop shopping for governments and non-governmental agencies seeking federal funding for homeless assistance (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2003). The results have been to decentralize the provision of homeless services to local governments and non-profits and increase harmonization of local homeless policies according to federal imperatives (US Conference of Mayors 2006).

For instance, one of the primary distinctions of Bush era policies has been to shift funding allocations to a competitive and results-based system that seeks "visible, measurable, quantifiable change. On the streets of your state ... [and] in the shadows of your shelters" (Mangano 2004). In practice, this reorientation of funding allocation combined with the consolidation of funding sources means that organizations and governments competing for funds must show that they are moving people along a rehabilitative continuum from the streets into permanent housing (US Department of Health and Human Services 2003). To do so, cities, states and regions are encouraged to create "10-year plans" to end chronic homelessness in their area by drawing on the best practices of other cities and federal government guidelines (HUD 2007). The creation of these plans, although they occur at the municipal or county level, is in no way simply local. Rather, through the language of best practices and the harmonization of fund allocation, federal procedures and prerogatives appear in these locally produced plans as the main structure and strategy.

In addition to the harmonization of policy across diverse locales, the imperative to produce "measurable and quantifiable change" has extensively increased levels of surveillance and spatial management of homeless individuals. An indispensable tool in this regard is the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). In 2001, Congress mandated that by 2006 all cities receiving federal funding must participate in this new electronic homeless system (Steinbrueck 2001). HMIS is a database designed to "record and store client-level information on the characteristics and service needs of homeless persons in order to, amongst other things, measure the effectiveness of homeless programs" (HUD 2007). Data collected by the program include detailed background information and service needs, such as social security number, name, age, addictions, mental illness, pregnancy, and criminal histories of those seeking access to homeless services (Federal Register 2003). This database, accessible to both private and government service providers, is used to track the homeless individual's "progression" from homelessness to housing.

While this system may be useful, as its proponents claim, in producing an unduplicated count of individuals accessing homeless services, its use as a tool to measure the success of a given program suggests a more insidious outcome. Though the language of rehabilitation and treatment suggests a shift from revanchist to "compassionate" strategies, the offer of compassion serves to justify its obverse. Since 2000, money for need-based simple shelter has continued to decline while money for rehabilitative programs has grown exponentially. In 2003, of the total $1.1 billion slated for homeless programs, $969 million went to rehabilitative programs awarded competitively, while only $150 million was slated for need-based simple shelter (US Department of Health and Human Services 2003). Ultimately, if one simply wanted to get off the streets without having to proclaim one's mental or physical unfitness, there would literally be almost no place to go.

The result inevitably pushes those who refuse, or do not need, treatment into the public spaces of the neoliberal city. In these spaces, the homeless become subject to increased policing and punitive anti-homeless laws that mark the revanchist city. Conversely, those who desire or submit to the disciplinary environment of "enhanced shelter" find themselves enmeshed within an unprecedented regime of surveillance and oversight that continually and ubiquitously reproduces and reaffirms their deviance. Today's homeless are caught in a double-bind wherein they must choose between pathologization and criminalization as a condition of basic survival. This trap marks the inevitable meeting point between rehabilitative and punitive approaches to homeless management. While the latter aims at physical exclusion of bodies from public space, the former, in effect if not in intent, marks the exclusion of the homeless from full citizenship and the public sphere.

In sum, Bush era reforms consolidated the efforts of the federal government with the aim of moving homeless individuals from the streets into permanent housing situations. However, the continuing presupposition of homelessness deviance appears in the details. Reminiscent of stereotypical tropes of tramp, beggar, and bum, yet understood with modern scientific precision, today's homeless person appears, in contemporary policy, as a pathologized individual trapped in a social milieu wherein access to "care" is premised on their own unfitness for rational self-governance, while refusal subjects them to criminal sanction and banishment.

In this sense, American homeless policy represents a particularly powerful "monoculture of knowledge" wherein Western ideals of "modern science and high culture [are the] sole criteria of truth" (Santos 2004:238). The resulting elevation of propertied citizenship to transparent norm narrows the spectrum of credible experience by reducing difference to "the ignorant, the residual, the inferior, the local and the non-productive" (239). Within this monoculture of knowledge, the homeless are always already deviant and dependent subjects.

This status simultaneously justifies state intervention and limits the ability of the homeless to participate as full and active citizens in shaping social policy. In the following section, I illustrate how this monoculture of knowledge motivates and shapes homeless policy in King County, Washington. Through a close reading of King County's *Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness*, I illustrate how the shared presuppositions of federal homeless policy and the Committee to End Homelessness in King County converge to marginalize the voices of those who, like Tom, view homelessness as a problem of housing rather than personal failing.

Responding to Homelessness in King County: The Committee to End Homelessness and the 10-year Plan

In June 2005, in response to federal calls for the production of 10-year plans to end chronic homelessness, CEHCK produced a document entitled *A Roof Over Every Bed: Our Communities Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County*. That same year, the annual "One Night Count" estimated that there were 8336 homeless individuals[2] in a county with a population of just under 2 million residents. This figure, while less than the national 1% homeless rate, called attention to both the growth of the local homeless population and a chronic shortage of available shelter (Lowe 2005; Seattle-King County Coalition on Homelessness 2006).

To address this problem, the City of Seattle, together with King County, created CEHCK. Comprised of housing and homeless advocacy groups, the committee expressly envisioned a more democratic, kinder, and gentler response to homelessness than those of the past (CEHKC 2005a). One of the main components of the "new" approach was its inclusivity and participatory approach.

Advertised as the product of a "community dialogue" held at a Seattle church, the CEHKC distinguished itself as a "democratic organization . . . originated from the community" and consisting of a "broad range of partners" including "homeless or formerly homeless persons, faith-based communities, foundations, businesses, local governments, non-profit human service providers, non-profit housing developers, and advocates" (CEHKC 2005a). Despite the need to meet certain eligibility criteria for competitive federal funds, the committee emphasized inclusivity and broad-based participation by homeless and formerly homeless individuals as key to the planning process. The inclusion of these voices in policy making represents a great leap forward from the top down imposition, in the 1980s, of punitive "civility" laws that sought to simply purge the homeless from Seattle's public spaces (Beckett and Herbert 2008; Gibson 2004). Indeed, some have pointed to increased homeless participation as a way to challenge the marginalization and removal of the poor from urban space (McCann 2001; Ruddick 1990). However, as Tom's comments

and the committee's response outlined at the outset of this article indicate, more participation does not necessarily portend more democracy.

From Citizens to Consumers: The Committee to End Homelessness in King County

Q2

Although the Committee actively sought to include homeless voices in the planning process, underlying assumptions of homeless deviance and dependence effectively silenced those voices. In the design and practices of the CEHKC, assumptions of homeless pathology appear inextricably bound up with neoliberal imperatives of public–private partnerships and corporate-style governance and planning structures. In this sense, the CEHKC appears as a "flanking mechanism" insofar as their efforts to alleviate "social exclusion" function as new forms of coordination and consolidation of neoliberal policies at the local scale (Brenner and Theodore 2002:374; cf Jessop 2002). What appears on the surface to be a kinder gentler response to the punitive strategies of criminalization and banishment of the revanchist city reveals itself as a recuperative strategy aimed at the production of docile homeless subjects. In the last instance, however, the result is the same. Whether through criminalization or pathologization, the result is the substantive exclusion of the homeless from shaping the policies that most directly affect their lives.

The structure of the committee exemplifies this process of exclusion through inclusion. The CEHKC is built upon a three-tiered organizational schema comprised of a governing board, interagency council, and consumer advisory counsel. The governing board includes government officials, faith, and local business leaders. The advisory committee is made up of representatives from non-profit and "faith-based" groups who deal directly with the homeless or with issues of homelessness. Lastly, the aptly named "consumer advisory council" consists of those "who are currently homeless or who have experienced homelessness in the past" (CEHKC 2007). As this structure suggests, the ability to shape and create urban policy is not shared equally.

The corporate-like division of the council into executive, service provider, and consumer, mimics the hierarchies of a market-based economy in ways that reify and maintain existing social inequalities. This is most evident in the roles assigned to each sub-committee. According to the committee's website, the governing board "shapes and sustains the vision and leadership of the plan", while the interagency council "designs changes to current programs; coordinates data collection, analysis and reporting; recommends policy direction; and creates ways to better serve people experiencing homelessness". By contrast, the power of the consumer advisory council, the only sub-committee open to homeless individuals, is limited to providing "needed expertise in understanding how people access services" (CEHKC 2007).

This power structure has a number of consequences clearly evidenced by the relegation of the homeless to the status of "consumers". For instance, the use of overtly marketized language interpellates both the homeless and service providers as entrepreneurialized subjects who will not burden the state or demand entitlements without accepting corresponding responsibilities" (Jessop 2002:465). Yet, the roles of service consumers and providers interpellate these subjects differentially. Service

providers, as such, are framed as active and productive citizens, capable of managing themselves and others, while homeless consumers are framed as unable to provide for themselves, while still responsible for the choice to "consume" the benevolently provided services.

As a result, the structure of the CEHKC reinscribes the "dependent" status of the homeless individual as the passive consumer of benevolent services. Defined in terms of market relationships, the consumer is framed as an individualized subject empowered to choose whether or not to consume the service offered. In this sense, the participatory and democratic structure of the CEHKC reveals a hierarchy based on both the neoliberal imperatives of the marketization of homeless services and the presumed inability of the homeless to function as active citizens in the production of policies that directly affect their own lives.

Old Wine in Neoliberal Bottles: The Reinscription of Deviance in King County's 10-Year Plan to End Homelessness

The importance of both the "responsibilization" and the presumption of the homeless individual's fitness for liberal government lies not in their exclusion from policy formation, but the consequences of either accepting or rejecting these policies. These become evident through a close reading of the plan itself. Like the Committee structure, the committee's product *A Roof Over Every Bed: Our Communities Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County* also distinguishes itself from past homeless management strategies. While prior approaches to homeless in Seattle relied heavily upon shelters and other temporary survival mechanisms, the first goal laid out by the current 10-year plan purports to "end homelessness not manage it" (CEHKC 2005c:ii).

Yet, while the goal of ending homelessness not managing it suggests agreement with Tom's "we lost our homes not our minds" philosophy, the plan might better be understood as a shift from the management of homelessness to the management of homeless bodies. Patricia McInturff, the director of the city's Department of Health and Social Services sums up the rationale for this policy shift by appealing to the well trodden sound-bites of the Federal Interagency Council on Homelessness. "[A] mat on the floor is not good enough" she declares. She further explains that rather than simply warehousing the homeless in shelters, the 10-year plan seeks to shift funding to so-called "enhanced shelters" which provide mental health, counseling and other services on site with the eventual goal of moving people into permanent housing (Galloway 2006).

While prior policy responses sought to manage homelessness through the warehousing of the bodies, the new approach, echoing the priorities of the federal government, relies upon coordination of systems, high-tech surveillance, and disciplinary tactics, to manage the homeless individual according to his or her presupposed pathology. Undoubtedly, the goals of both inclusivity and "ending homelessness" are laudable. Yet as these familiar phrases suggest, rather than being a simply local bottom-up response to homelessness, the approach taken by the CEHKC represents the reproduction, at the local level, of the logic of propertied

citizenship couched in neoliberal language of accountability, best practices, and verifiable outcomes.

Indeed, the remaining eight goals set out by the committee lay out a comprehensive roadmap of management strategies. These strategies include such provisions as prioritizing a "housing first" approach (CEHKC 2005c:ii). A term first coined by Sam Tsemberis, the premises of "housing first" are that housing is a basic right and that homeless individuals are best able to decide which if any services fit their needs (Tsemberist 1999). Ironically, however, the "housing first strategy", as it appears in the CEHKC plan (and many others across the nation), explicitly links rehabilitative services and the management of homeless subjects with housing provision. In the words of the plan, this strategy not only "removes barriers to housing", but also provides services "that engage and support individuals to maintain their health and housing stability" (CEHKC 2005c:ii). While the first part of this statement suggests that the solution to homelessness lies in providing more affordable housing, the second part illustrates the importance, to the committee, of linking housing with mental health, employment counseling, and drug and alcohol treatment. The apparent assumption here, and throughout the document, is that the condition of being homeless resides in some sort of personal or medical failing on the part of the homeless individual.

Ultimately, the entire justification for this intensified management lies in the plans' conflation of the status of homelessness with the individual's capacity for self-governance. Supplementary material for the 10-year plan evidences this conflation. In a section entitled "Factors that create and sustain homelessness", one finds a bulleted list of key factors that the document states were identified "through research and stakeholder input" to be of primary importance in creating and sustaining homelessness (CEHKC 2005b:2). Within this list, one finds roughly equal amounts of structural and personal causes of homelessness. Although structural factors such as poverty, racism, and the lack of affordable housing garner equal attention in these "supplementary materials", these factors only receive cursory mention in the final document. The final version of the 10-year plan devotes less than one page to structural solutions,[3] while over 40 pages of the 52-page document are dedicated to addressing the personal pathologies of homeless individuals.

It is worth noting that a key difference between Seattle's 10-year plan and those advocated by the federal government is the elimination of the distinction between "chronic homelessness" and homelessness in general. In the King County plan, the emphasis on chronic homelessness is replaced by a focus on particular subgroups of the homeless population. Each are characterized by a unique set of circumstances and pathologies that complicate entry into a normalized vision of a "stable housing situation". In one sense, this admission that not all people become homeless for the same reason, or experience it in the same way, reflects recent calls by geographers to more closely examine the diversity of the homeless population and experience (DeVerteuil, May and Von Mahs 2009). Yet, in the 10-year plan, these differences do not simply allow a more nuanced view of homelessness. Rather, insofar as the authors focus only on the "issues" faced by these populations, this accounting for difference reaffirms deviance and dependence as the unifying characteristic of the entire homeless population.

While the exact reason for shifting from chronic homelessness to particular subgroups is unclear, the rhetorical effect of these complex taxonomies simultaneously distinguishes the homeless subject from the general population and places subgroups on a continuum of deviance from a homed norm. For instance, the plan identifies three "primary populations of those who experience homelessness in King County: single adults, families, and youth and young adults" (CEHKC 2005c:i). For both families and single adults the plan mentions a need for more affordable housing options. However, these mentions are brief and offer few specifics. By contrast, the plan pays extensive attention to the personal "needs" of these populations.

For instance, the plan points out that single adults face "overwhelming obstacles to accessing housing" due to not only structural barriers, but also "[p]ersonal issues—such as poverty, mental illness, alcohol and chemical dependency, physical or developmental disability, health status, and experiences of trauma and violence" (CEHKC 2005c:29). To illustrate the scope of this issue, a chart provided on the same page suggests that simply increasing affordable housing is only appropriate for roughly 20% of the single adult population. For the remaining 80%, the plan suggests supportive housing with "moderate" or "intensive" services on site. These services range from intermittent "interventions" to on-site mental health and substance abuse counseling. No rationale or data are given to support this breakdown. However, the language of "supportive housing" and "chronic homeless" suggests this division may have more to do with compliance with competitive funding requirements than any particular characteristics of the population. Whatever the reason, the assumption is clear—the majority of those who lack homes lack the capacity for rational self-governance and therefore require state intervention and management.[4]

Families pose similar issues. As it is for single adults, poverty is identified as the main cause of family homelessness. For families, however, poverty is framed as a personal rather than structural issue. For instance, although most homeless families have one member employed, "they typically lack the skills and education necessary for competitive jobs that provide a living wage, family health benefits, and paid sick leave" (CEHKC 2005c:22). Accordingly, the plan recommends "job training and educational opportunities" as "essential" for this population along with "linkages to case management or a care coordination team—that may include a public health nurse, social worker, and therapist [and] will follow the family until they are stabilized in permanent supportive housing" (CEHKC 2005c:25). Again, though poverty is identified as the main cause of homelessness, the solution lies in disciplinary training and spatial management of homeless individuals through public health, case management and therapy.

Youth pose a somewhat different problem. Rather than simply lacking the proper training to function as responsibilized subjects, the committee fears that the greatest difficulty posed by this population is that they may not be amenable to normalization at all. For youths, the plan states "they have developmental and social needs and challenges in common, and identify more with each other than with other populations" as a primary cause of their continuing homelessness. For CEHKC, the

source of this deviance lies in irresponsible parenting and a breakdown in community supports. The plan states:

> Many [youths] come from families that are impacted by mental illness, chemical dependency, and domestic violence. More are thrown away than run away ... Most youth and young adults on the streets and in homeless programs have experienced multiple and significant breakdowns in the systems that are charged with their care: family, community, school, foster care, and other institutions (CEHKC 2005c:28).

Youth are framed as simultaneously "vulnerable", in need of guidance, and sharing a "keen distrust of adults and systems populated by adults" (CEHKC 2005c:28). Proposed intervention for this complicated group revolves around mentoring and outreach. "While outreach and engagement services are key components of all homeless service delivery systems" the plan states, "they are absolutely essential to affecting change for homeless young people". However, this is no easy task. Rather, "relationship building and engagement activities often take place over several years before significant change in a young person is visible to the external observer" (CEHKC 2005c:28). Thus, youth pose a particularly intransigent problem. Insofar as they both distrust adults and identify "more with each other" than the other groups, the implicit fear is that they might prefer life outside the paradigm of propertied citizenship to its normalizing constraints.

Although youth appear in the plan as a distinct and unique population, they share important similarities with other homeless groups. Ultimately, as these quotes show, the "problems" posed by each homeless sub-population do not arise from a dearth of housing or employment but a lack of proper socialization and self-governance. Ultimately, CEHCK concludes, "given the barriers to housing access described above, we are aware that *an increase in affordable housing is only part of the solution to ending episodes of homelessness*" (CEHKC 2005c:18, emphasis in original). In other words, homelessness, at least in part, is a result of the actions or pathologies of the homeless individual.

While these characterizations are undoubtedly accurate in some cases, it is not their accuracy but their effect that is of interest. In each case, while structural causes are acknowledged, it is personal pathologies that necessitate state intervention and management. Taken as a whole, these "identifications" of the specialized needs of particular homeless groups serve not as pathways to ending homelessness per se. Rather, they function, across groups, as justifications for increased state surveillance premised upon an assumed unfitness for self-governance. "Housing first" in this context, is not simply the provision of stable housing, but rather a complex network of disciplinary mechanisms that produce and manage the "proper" homed individual and its Other.

CEHKC's focus on the personal needs and issues of various homeless populations, like its federal counterpart, reinscribes old stereotypes in new language. While the intent is to capture the diversity of the homeless population, the diversity represented by the individual, family, and youth can far too easily be reduced to tired stereotypes of the pathological bum, dependant beggar, and the intransigent tramp. Although today's efforts to end homelessness in King County take great pains to distinguish themselves from past governmental responses to homelessness,

this kinder gentler approach continues to operate within a framework of homeless deviance. As such, it is perhaps unsurprising that the first step to ending homelessness in King County has been the implementation of a high tech system for monitoring the movements and tracking the disciplinary progress of homeless individuals.

From Poorhouse to Database: The "Safe Harbors" Homeless Management Information System

Again following federal mandate, efficiency and accountability are primary to King County's 10-year plan. As many local officials pointed out, funding for homeless services is dependent upon the ability to show "successful outcomes". Since, the ability to track this process is key to securing both federal and private funds, the first aspect of this plan implemented was a HMIS with the paternalistically Orwellian name "Safe Harbors". This system tracks the homeless individual at the point of contact with a service provider. Utilizing a numeric system of unique identifiers, the HMIS allows a case manager to chart the progress of an individual through a series of benchmarks designed to move the homeless individual from shelter to housing (Safe Harbors nd).

A collaborative effort between the City of Seattle, King County and the United Way, Safe Harbors is meant as an "outcome-based tool" for city, county and private service providers to track recipients of benefits, assess the number of persons receiving care, and improve efficiency of services to the poor. Ultimately, the program seeks to coordinate all public and private social service agencies within King county with the goal of better understanding number, patterns, and habits of homeless individuals (Safe Harbors nd).

Undoubtedly, this system will produce important and useful data. It will also allow Seattle and King County to remain competitive in the race for scarce federal funding. Yet, it is also undeniable that the level of electronic surveillance, benchmarking, and oversight demanded by the Safe Harbors system leaves the homeless individual with little freedom in the organization of daily existence. This system, justified both by the desire for federal dollars, and the need to "better understand" the homeless population, completes the shift from the management of homelessness, to the management of homeless individuals, through high-tech surveillance of their everyday movements and practices.

In the eighteenth century, poor laws attempted to "solve" the homeless problem through the spatial confinement and management of the poor within the disciplinary confines of the poorhouse. Today in King County, as well as many cities and counties around the country, "compassionate" policies that seek to "end homeless rather than manage it" continue this tradition through the expansion and entrenchment of neoliberal policy imperatives at the local level. While early poor laws relied upon indentured servitude and training in Christian temperance, today's solution to homelessness relies upon high-tech surveillance and management of individual behavior couched in discourses of "care". In the context of the 10-year plan, this "care" takes the form of rehabilitation, management, and surveillance of the homeless body in the production of a norm of citizenship in which access

to private property and individual productivity function as markers of rational autonomy. While the techniques are more complex, the intention is the same: to confine, catalogue, and discipline the homeless subject.

Conclusion

Tom's rather common-sense proclamation that "we lost our homes not our minds" ironically marks the limit of state knowledge. Within the monoculture of knowledge produced by the logic of propertied citizenship, the homeless appear in exactly the opposite light—that is, the homeless have no homes *therefore* they have no minds. As non-propertied, non-laboring, "excluded inclusion", the homeless person's necessary presence in public marks him as a pathologized individual *whose very presence* necessitates state quarantine and management (Feldman 2004).

As liberal citizenship's always already deviant or pathological other, the voices, views and practices of the homeless are, by definition, also deviant or pathological. In the language of neoliberal individualism this relationship appears not as a logical expression of propertied citizenship but as a product of "choice". Although the homeless must submit to disciplinary management and rehabilitation in exchange for shelter, it is their choice as "consumers" to admit their deviance and accept benevolently offered services. It is therefore not surprising that those who, like Tom, eschew a rehabilitative approach appear irrational or exceptional. If they rebuff the need for rehabilitation they must, within the logic of propertied citizenship, be criminal, irrational or not homeless. Operating within the paradigm of propertied citizenship, the state, regardless of the level of inclusion, is simply unable to "see" any alternative (Scott 1998).

In this context, the committee's assertion of Tom's exceptionality becomes clearer. If the "normal" homeless subject is unable to express his/her interest outside of the disciplinary regime of pathology and rehabilitation, then Tom's comments must be either the non-representative product of an exceptional subject, or the irrational statement of a pathological subject. Although the committee actively sought the input of the homeless, the assumption of homeless deviance and dependence and the need for federal dollars effectively silenced these voices.

It has not been my intention in this paper to suggest that contemporary attempts to end homelessness are all misguided, ineffective or erroneous. In many ways, contemporary local and federal homeless policies represent a great leap forward from those of the past. Nor has it been my intention to suggest that many homeless people do not struggle against incredible challenges and difficulties, both personal and structural. Rather, by illustrating the ways in which old homeless stereotypes persist in contemporary policy, my aim has been to highlight the ways in which this persistence places particular limits on contemporary policy responses to homeless in the USA.

Ultimately, the power of Roy's invocation of a "paradigm" in her analysis of "propertied citizenship" lies in the contingent and crisis prone nature of paradigmatic thinking (Roy 2003). By illustrating how Tom's assertion that "we lost our homes not our minds" is rendered marginal, exceptional, and deviant

through the presuppositions of contemporary homeless policy, I have sought to both destabilize the current paradigm and to open up space for a broader accounting of new forms, sources and sites of knowledge production and socio-spatial experimentation. Yet, this is only half the battle. As Roy notes, "paradigms are tested only after persistent failure to solve a noteworthy puzzle and also when this sense of crisis has given rise to an alternative candidate for status of paradigm" (Roy 2003:464). While the persistence of homeless on the American landscape would seem to signify an apparent failure of the paradigm of propertied citizenship, new understanding requires rendering visible new spaces, forms, and practices of citizenship that exist both within and against the current regime.

Much good work is currently exploring such possibilities around the world (Appadurai 2002; Gibson-Graham 2005; Holston 2008). However, to date, few of the insights provided by this work have been brought to bear on questions of poverty and homelessness in the majority world (Roy and AlSayyad 2004; Goode and Maskovsky 2001). Such work requires not simply the inclusion of marginalized voices and spaces in policy formation, but an attention to both the *ways* these voices and spaces are marginalized in current policy paradigms, and as sites of creative experimentation from which new forms, practices, and paradigms of citizenship beyond property might emerge.

The material stakes solving the problem of homelessness are high. Of the nearly 8000 residents that lacked stable shelter on the night of 27 January 2006, 2500 sought cover in emergency shelters, while another 2000 were left on the streets unsheltered (Seattle-King County Coalition on Homelessness 2006). That same year, according to the organization Women in Black, 59 homeless people died without shelter on the streets of Seattle.

Tom is, in many ways, lucky. As a resident of a roving, semi-formal tent encampment, Tom has a stable (albeit flimsy) residence, and a supportive network of peers. In this sense, Tom *is* an exception living *by* exception. The tent encampment in which Tom lives exists by grace of a consent decree brokered by the City of Seattle and endorsed by King County as an emergency response to the city's chronic lack of shelter space (CACHE 2004). Yet, temporary and tenuous as it is, Tom and the other residents of Tent City 3 have managed to produce a collectively governed space, outside the disciplinary gaze of the state, in which they can create new spaces and structures of citizenship that reflect their own needs and desires (Sparks 2010). To the state, this space is an emergency response to a temporary crisis. However, to many residents it is a viable alternative to an often demeaning and dehumanizing shelter system. For radical geographers, temporary, informal, even *deviant*, spaces like the tent city, might function as sites from which to glimpse and foster new forms of citizenship beyond the propertied/non-propertied divide.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Matt Sparke, Vicky Lawson, Steve Herbert, Elizabeth Brown and two anonymous reviewers for their very insightful comments on earlier drafts. This article was originally presented as two papers given at the American Pacific Coast Geographers annual meeting in 2007 and the American Association of Geographers annual meeting in 2007 respectively.

Endnotes

[1] The average length of tent city residency is about 1 month.

[2] These numbers are based on a one night sample that combines self-reported numbers from shelters with a manual count of those sleeping "rough" in cars, parks, under freeways, etc. It is widely accepted that all attempts to quantify homelessness vastly underestimate the extent of the problem. This is partly due to definitions of homelessness that do not count precariously or informally housed populations and partly due to the difficulty in accounting for a population that is both highly mobile and has great incentive not to be found.

[3] An interesting side note: King County's 10-year plan lists poverty under personal, rather than structural, causes of homelessness.

[4] It is also worth noting that the appropriate level of "support" needed is determined by a case worker rather than the applicant.

References

Appadurai A (2002) Deep democracy: Urban governmentality and the horizon of politics. *Public Culture*, 14:21–47

Arnold K R (2004) *Homelessness, Citizenship, and Identity: The Uncanniness of Late Modernity*. Albany: State University of New York Press

Beckett K and Herbert S (2008) Dealing with disorder: Social control in the post-industrial city. *Theoretical Criminology*, 12:5–30

Blomley N (1998) Landscapes of property. *Law and Society Review* 32:567–612

Bogard C J (2003) *Seasons Such as These: How Homelessness Took Shape in America*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter

Brenner N (1999) Globalisation as reterritorialisation: The re-scaling of urban governance in the European Union. *Urban Studies* 36(3):431–451

Brenner N and Theodore N (2002) Cities and the geographies of "actually existing neoliberalism". *Antipode* 34:349–379

Butler J (2004) *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London: Verso

CACHE (2004) *Citizen's Advisory Commission on Homeless Encampments: Commission Final Report*. Seattle, King County

CEHKC (Committee to End Homelessness in King County) (2005a) *Background and History*. http://www.cehkc.org/about-background.shtml (last accessed 21 October 2010)

CEHKC (Committee to End Homelessness in King County) (2005b) *Companion Materials—A Roof Over Every Bed in King County: Our Community's Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness*. Seattle: CEHKC

CEHKC (Committee to End Homelessness in King County) (2005c) *A Roof Over Every Bed in King County: Our Community's Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness*. Seattle: CEHKC

CEHKC (Committee to End Homelessness in King County) (2007) *CEH Governance Structure*. http://www.cehkc.org/committees/default.aspx (last accessed 21 April 2011)

Cresswell T (2001) *The Tramp in America*. London: Reaktion

Crump J (2002) Deconcentration by demolition: Public housing, poverty, and urban policy. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 20:581–596

Davis M (1990) *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles.* New York: Verso

Dear M J and Wolch J R (1987) *Landscapes of Despair: From Deinstitutionalization to Homelessness*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press

Del Casino V J and Jocoy C L (2008) Neoliberal subjectivities, the "New" Homelessness, and struggles over spaces of/in the city. *Antipode* 40(2):192–199

DeVerteuil G (2006) The local state and homeless shelters: Beyond revanchism? *Cities* 23(2):109–120

DeVerteuil G, May J and Von Mahs J (2009) Complexity not collapse: Recasting the geographies of homelessness in a "punitive" age. *Progress in Human Geography* 33(5):646–666

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

Q3

Q4

Galloway A (2006) Wolf is at the door for shelters: 300 beds will go if funding is cut to homeless agency. *Seattle Post Intelligencer* 22 March

Gibson T A (2004) *Securing the Spectacular City: The Politics of Revitalization and Homelessness in Downtown Seattle*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books

Gibson-Graham J K (2005) Surplus possibilities: Postdevelopment and community economies. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 26(4):4–26

Gilmore R W (2006) *Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis, and Opposition in Globalizing California*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Goode J and Maskovsky J (eds) (2001) *New Poverty Studies: The Ethnography of Power, Politics, and Impoverished People in the United States*. New York: New York University Press

Holston J (2008) *Insurgent Citizenship: Disjunctions of Democracy and Modernity in Brazil*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

HUD (US Department of Housing and Urban Development) (2001) Martinez to lead new interagency homeless council, outlines new vision to combat homelessness. http://www. hud.gov/news/release.cfm?content=pr01–070.cfm (last accessed 8 January 2011)

HUD (US Department of Housing and Urban Development) (2002) Martinez outlines Bush administration strategy to combat chronic homelessness: Speech to homeless advocates outlines coordinated federal response to homelessness. http://www.hud.gov/news/release.cfm?CONTENT=pr02–080.cfm (last accessed 12 April 2010)

HUD (US Department of Housing and Urban Development) (2007) *Sixth Annual Progress Report on HUD's Strategy for Improving Homeless Data Collection, Reporting and Analysis*. http://www.hudhre.info/documents/ImprovingHomelessData.pdf (last accessed 7 December 2010)

Interagency Council on Homelessness (2004) Samaritan initiative targeted to ending chronic homelessness. http://www.ich.gov/library/samaritan.html (last accessed 10 August 2010)

Jessop B (1997) The entrepreneurial city: Re-imaging localities, redesigning economic governance, or restructuring capital? In N Jewson and S MacGregor (eds) *Transforming Cities: Contested Governance and New Spatial Divisions* (pp). London: Routledge

Jessop B (2002) Liberalism, neoliberalism, and urban governance: A state-theoretical perspective. *Antipode* 34(3):452–472

Jocoy C L and Del Casino V J (2010) Homelessness, travel behavior, and the politics of transportation mobilities in Long Beach, California. *Environment and Planning A* 42(8):1943–1963

Katz M B (1989) *The Undeserving Poor: From the War on Poverty to the War on Welfare*. New York: Pantheon Books

Kawash S (1998) The homeless body. *Public Culture* 10(2):319–339

Klodawsky F (2009) Home spaces and rights to the city: Thinking social justice for chronically homeless women. *Urban Geography* 30(6):591–610

Kyle K (2005) *Contextualizing Homelessness: Critical Theory, Homelessness, and Federal Policy Addressing the Homeless*. New York: Routledge

Larner W and Butler N (2007) After neoliberalism in Aotearoa New Zealand. In H Leitner, J Peck and E Sheppard (eds) *Contesting Neoliberalism: Urban Frontiers* (pp). New York: Guilford

Leitner H, Peck J and Sheppard E (eds) (2007) *Contesting Neoliberalism: Urban frontiers*. New York: Guilford Press

Lowe E T (2005) *A Status Report on Hunger and Homelessness in America's Cities: A 27-City Survey, December 2004*. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Mayors

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

Mangano P (2004) Testimony on H.R. 4057, the Samaritan Initiative Act of 2004 before the Housing and Community Opportunity Subcommittee on Financial Services. http://www.ich.gov/library/mangano-testimony_07–13–04.pdf (last accessed 10 December 2010)

May J (2000) Of nomads and vagrants: Single homelessness and narratives of home as place. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18:737–760

Q5

McCann E J (2001) Collaborative visioning or urban planning as therapy? The politics of public–private policy making. *The Professional Geographer* 53(2):207–218
Mitchell D (2003) *The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space.* New York: Guilford Press
Mitchell K (2003) Educating the national citizen in neoliberal times: From the multicultural self to the strategic cosmopolitan. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 28(4): 387–403
Murphy S (2009) "Compassionate" strategies of managing homelessness: Post-revanchist geographies in San Francisco. *Antipode* 41(2):305–325
Pascale C M (2005) There's no place like home: The discursive creation of homelessness. *Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies* 5:250–268.
Peck J (2001) *Workfare States*. New York: Guilford Publications
Peck J and Tickell A (2007) Conceptualizing neoliberalism, thinking Thatcherism. In H Leitner, J Peck and E Sheppard (eds) *Contesting Neoliberalism: Urban Frontiers* (pp). New York: Guilford
Purcell M (2006) Urban democracy and the local trap. *Urban Studies* 43(11):1921–1941
Rose N S (1999) *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
Roy A (2003) Paradigms of propertied citizenship: Transnational techniques of analysis. *Urban Affairs Review* 38:463–491
Roy A and AlSayyad N (2004) *Urban Informality: Transnational Perspectives from the Middle East, Latin America, and South Asia*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books
Roy D F (1935) "Hooverville: A study of a community of homeless men in Seattle." Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Washington, Seattle
Ruddick S (1990) Heterotopias of the homeless: Strategies and tactics of placemaking in Los Angeles. *Strategies* 3:184–210
Safe Harbors (nd) *Safe Harbors Mission Statement*. http://www.safeharbors.org/ (last accessed 27 September 2010)
Santos B D S (2004) The world social forum: Toward a counter-hegemonic globalisation (part I). In J Sen, A Anand, A Escobar and P Waterman (eds) *World Social Forum: Challenging Empires* (pp). New Dehli: The Viveka Foundation
Scott J C (1998) *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press
Seattle-King County Coalition on Homelessness (2006) *The 2006 Annual One Night Count: People Who are Homeless in King County*. http://www.homelessinfo.org/ONC%20Report%202006.pdf (last accessed 15 May 2010)
Simon H (1992) Towns without pity: A constitutional and historical analysis of official efforts to drive homeless persons from American cities. *Tulane Law Review* 66: 631—577
Smith N (2002) New globalism, new urbanism: Gentrification as global urban strategy. *Antipode* 34(3):427–450
Sparks T (2010) Broke not broken: Rights, privacy, and homelessness in Seattle. *Urban Geography* 31(6):842–862
Tsemberist S (1999) From streets to homes: An innovative approach to supported housing for homeless adults with psychiatric disabilities. *Journal of Community Psychology* 27(2): 225–241
US Department of Health and Human Services (2003) *Ending Chronic Homelessness Strategies for Action*. (The Secretary's Work Group on Ending Chronic Homelessness eds). Washington DC
US Conference of Mayors (2006) *Hunger and Homelessness Survey: A Status Report on Hunger and Homelessness in American Cities, a 24-City Survey*. http://www.usmayors.org/uscm/hungersurvey/2006/report06.pdf (last accessed 6 June 2010)
Vanderstaay S (1992) *Street Lives: An Oral History of Homeless Americans.* Philadelphia, PA: New Society Publishers
Veness A R (1992) Home and homelessness in the United States: Changing ideals and realities. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 10(4):445–468

Waldron J (1997) Homelessness and the issue of freedom. In R E Gooding and P Petit (eds) *Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Anthology* (pp). Oxford: Blackwell

Wolch J R and Dear M J (1993) *Malign Neglect: Homelessness in an American City*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers

Queries

Journal: ANTI
Paper: anti_957

Dear Author

During the copy-editing of your paper, the following queries arose. Please respond to these by marking up your proofs with the necessary changes/additions. Please write your answers on the query sheet if there is insufficient space on the page proofs. Please write clearly and follow the conventions shown on the corrections sheet. If returning the proof by fax do not write too close to the paper's edge. Please remember that illegible mark-ups may delay publication.

Query Reference	Query	Remarks
Q1	Author: Please provide reference details for Mitchell (2004), Macpherson (1964), Locke (1988), Blau (1992), White House (1998), Schram (1995), Steinbrueck (2001), Federal Register (2003).	
Q2	Author: In the section *From Citizens to Consumers: The Committee to End Homelessness in King County*, please check the following sentence and indicate where the opening quotation mark should appear: For instance, the use of overtly marketized language interpellates both the homeless and service providers as entrepreneurialized subjects who will not burden the state or demand entitlements without accepting corresponding responsibilities" (Jessop 2002:465).	

Query	Query	Remarks
Reference		
Q3	Author: Please check the title of the program: 'A Roof Over Every Bed: a Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County' or 'A Roof Over Every Bed: Our Communities Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness in King County' or 'A Roof Over Every Bed in King County: Our Community's Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness'.	
Q4	Author: Please cite the following in the text or remove from reference list: Davis (1990), Smith (2002), Waldron (1997).	
Q5	Author: Please give page numbers for Jessop (1997), Larner and Butler (2007), Peck and Tickell (2007), Santos (2004), Waldron (1997).	
Q6	Author: Because there are two references for Mitchell (2003), please indicate using the author initials, which reference the text citation refers to.	
Q7	Author: Please check the page numbers for Simon (1992).	

MARKED PROOF

Please correct and return this set

Please use the proof correction marks shown below for all alterations and corrections. If you wish to return your proof by fax you should ensure that all amendments are written clearly in dark ink and are made well within the page margins.

Instruction to printer	*Textual mark*	*Marginal mark*
Leave unchanged	··· under matter to remain	New matter followed by ⌐ or ⌐(x2)
Insert in text the matter indicated in the margin	⌐	
Delete	/ through single character, rule or underline or ⊢⊣ through all characters to be deleted	⌀ or ⌀(x2)
Substitute character or substitute part of one or more word(s)	/ through letter or ⊢⊣ through characters	new character / or new characters /
Change to italics	— under matter to be changed	⌣
Change to capitals	≡ under matter to be changed	≡
Change to small capitals	= under matter to be changed	=
Change to bold type	~ under matter to be changed	~
Change to bold italic	≈ under matter to be changed	≈
Change to lower case	Encircle matter to be changed	≠
Change italic to upright type	(As above)	⌐
Change bold to non-bold type	(As above)	⌐
Insert 'superior' character	/ through character or ⌐ where required	Y or Y under character e.g. Y or Y
Insert 'inferior' character	(As above)	⌐ over character e.g. ⌐
Insert full stop	(As above)	⊙
Insert comma	(As above)	,
Insert single quotation marks	(As above)	Y or Y and/or Y or Y
Insert double quotation marks	(As above)	Y or Y and/or Y or Y
Insert hyphen	(As above)	⊢
Start new paragraph	⌐	⌐
No new paragraph	⌣	⌣
Transpose	⌐¬	⌐¬
Close up	linking ⌒ characters	⌒
Insert or substitute space between characters or words	/ through character or ⌐ where required	Y
Reduce space between characters or words	| between characters or words affected	⊤