Urban Affairs Review

http://uar.sagepub.com

Paradigms Of Propertied Citizenship: Transnational Techniques of Analysis
Ananya Roy
Urban Affairs Review 2003; 38; 463
DOI: 10.1177/1078087402250356

The online version of this article can be found at:
http://uar.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/38/4/463

Published by:
⑤SAGE

http://www.sagepublications.com

Email Alerts: http://uar.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://uar.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations http://uar.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/38/4/463

Downloaded from http://uar.sagepub.com by Ralph Kinnear on October 24, 2008

PARADIGMS OF PROPERTIED CITIZENSHIP
Transnational Techniques of Analysis

ANANYA ROY

University of California, Berkeley

The American paradigm of propertied citizenship has far-reaching consequences for the propertyless, as in the brutal criminalization of the homeless. Activist groups, such as the anarchist squatter organization Homes Not Jails, have sought to challenge this paradigm through innovative techniques of property takeovers, invocations of American traditions of homesteading, and Third World tactics of self-help and informality. This study trains a transnational lens on both the paradigm and its subversions. Posing Third World questions of the First World, the author seeks to unsettle the normalized hierarchy of development and underdevelopment and explores lessons that can be learned from different modes of shelter struggles.

Keywords: homelessness; housing; citizenship; transnational; welfare state

PARADIGMS AND TECHNIQUES

Paradigm: 1. A pattern, example, or model; 2. In grammar, an example of a declension or conjugation giving all the inflectional forms of a word. (*Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary* 1983)

Paradigms provide scientists not only with a map but also with some of the directions essential for map-making. (Kuhn 1962, 109)

In January 2002, Justice Anthony Kennedy of the Supreme Court, along with First Lady Laura Bush, visited a public school in Washington, D.C., Schools Without Walls. In discussing what could be learned from the terrorist attacks on 11 September 2001, Justice Kennedy drew attention to the frame-

---

463

work of constitutional rights. He is quoted as having said this: "Property gives you the ability to resist the demands of the state, which is always going to try to control your life" (*New York Times*, 29 January 2002). Kennedy's words express a structure of rights rooted in an American paradigm of propertied citizenship. Such a paradigm is of course a model, defining the elements of model citizenship—in this case, the rights-based relationship between individual and state. It is also a model in a second sense in that it is put forth as worthy of emulation.

But paradigms of citizenship are much more than simply models. Here, Kuhn's (1962) seminal work on paradigms of scientific knowledge is especially handy. Kuhn argues that rather than simply having a particular content, a paradigm is a constellation of beliefs, values, techniques, problem fields, and solutions (pp. 1, 103). Rather than being an accepted model or pattern that is endlessly replicated, it is an object for further articulation and specification (p. 23). In this light, the American paradigm of propertied citizenship can be conceptualized as having four distinct but interrelated dimensions: that it expresses an ontology or way of being in the world, emphasizes a system of values and norms, requires certain epistemologies or ways of knowing, and is constantly articulated and extended. Although Kuhn is concerned with intellectual articulation, and the grammatical use of the term *paradigm* signifies the constant conjugation of inflectional forms, I am applying this meaning to a social articulation that takes place through repeated rounds of sociospatial restructuring, to the everyday social grammar through which the paradigm of propertied citizenship is lived and instituted.

In this article, I study the American paradigm of propertied citizenship by mapping its edges of exclusion: social groups that do not meet its propertied mandates and are therefore rendered marginal in the discourses and practices of citizenship. In doing so, I have selected as a paradigmatic case the example of homelessness in American cities.[1] The homeless body is the "constitutive outside" of propertied citizenship (Kawash 1998, 329), the alien figure that at once violates and thereby reinforces the norms of citizenship.[2] But can such a paradigm be challenged? If so, in what ways? To answer such questions, in the second half of this article, I discuss emerging forms of homelessness activism. My focus is on a paradigmatic case, Homes Not Jails, an anarchist squatter group that has come to be known for its innovative techniques of property takeovers and use of property law in the struggle for a city that accommodates the homeless. What are the implications of such activism? Is this a paradigm revolution? Kuhn (1962, 93, 145), in his discussion of scientific revolutions,[3] notes that 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. If a paradigm constitutes

"normal science," then a crisis disrupts such normalizations. Clearly, homelessness marks a crisis of the American paradigm of propertied citizenship. But is such a crisis sufficient to alter the propertied terms of citizenship? Do modes of propertied activism, as in the case of Homes Not Jails, present an alternative paradigm?

The case of American homelessness and the countercase of Homes Not Jails are paradigmatic rather than representative. They do not cover the gamut of practices or contestations through which the American paradigm of propertied citizenship is manifested. They are paradigmatic in that they exemplify the structures and meanings of the processes at hand. Similarly, in this article, I deploy a paradigmatic technique for the study of such paradigmatic cases: transnational analysis. As discussed below, a transnational framework can bring "Third World" questions to bear on "First World" processes,[4] thereby interrogating norms of citizenship and making possible new intellectual and political pathways. For such a project, I have maintained a focus on American cities as paradigmatic expressions of the First World. My use of Third World examples is mostly related to the issue of informal housing, which I see as paradigmatic of both Third World cities and of the rich intellectual debates that seek to understand them.

The concept of transnationalism is multidimensional, involving empirical realities, methodological mandates, and political and policy activism. The landscape of the world system is increasingly transnational, shaped by intricate webs of networks from hybrid identities to flows of capital that defy political borders (Castells 1998). This is not to say that nation-states or borders no longer matter. The luxury of border crossings is available to only the select few (K. Mitchell 1997b; Roy 2001), and often borders are being virulently reinforced in parochial ways. But it is clear that the transnational is an important trend, requiring empirical study; indeed, in the past decade, social science scholarship has vigorously met the challenge, be it through studies of migration (M. P. Smith 2001; Portes, Haller, and Guarnizo 2002), internationalized economies (Sassen 1991; Sklair 2001), or new forms of urbanism (AlSayyad 2001).

These transnational perspectives have also made important methodological contributions. Although postcolonial theorists such as Spivak (1990) have long argued that the world system requires studying "how what goes on over here," shaped in terms of "what goes on over there," it is the grounded empirical research of late twentieth-century social science that has honed the art of transnational analysis. By studying transborder regions such as Cascadia (Sparke 2000), multisited processes such as Pacific Rim capitalism (K. Mitchell 1997a; Ong 1999), or global commodity chains that stretch from European consumers to informal workers in Latin America (Portes, Castells,

and Benton 1989), researchers have reconfigured the geographic boundaries of methodology. Such analytical techniques are in keeping with Massey's (1993) conceptualization of places as "articulated moments in networks of social relations and understandings" and meet the challenge of a globally configured world.

In recent years, two other forms of transnationalism have been gaining ascendancy. These are of particular relevance to this study and its domain of investigation. First, transnationalism can be an *interrogative technique* that reworks the interface of First and Third Worlds. Unlike comparative methodologies, which search for similarities and differences between two mutually exclusive contexts, transnational examinations can use one site to pose questions of another. For example, in studying informal housing settlements in Texas, Ward (1999) looks across the border and asks why similar settlements in Mexico enable higher standards of living. He poses Third World questions of the First World, thereby unsettling the normalized hierarchy of development and underdevelopment. Such uses of transnationalism as an epistemological method have great potential, as in Fraser and Gordon's (1994) exploration of internationalist meanings of "dependency" in their discussion of welfare reform, Wacquant's (1997) analysis of ghetto studies in the postcolonial sense of a "new urban Orientalism," and Davis's (1990) use of the provocative apartheid metaphor of *bantustans* to map sociospatial segregation in contemporary Los Angeles. Thus, Slater (1992, 324) notes, "I would argue that we can learn from other regions by realizing that it is always the marginal or peripheral case which reveals that which does not appear immediately visible in what seem to be more 'normal' cases."

Second, transnational borrowings have infused new energy into both *policy and political activism.* Increasingly, Third World solutions are being brought to bear on First World problems (Sanyal 1990). For example, there has been a great deal of interest in replicating the success of the Grameen Bank microcredit program. From the Good Faith Fund of Arkansas to microcredit programs in inner cities, such Third World policies seem to promise hope for the thorny dilemma of persistent American poverty (Servon 1999; Bhatt and Tang 2002). In the broadest sense, such border crossings are welcome, for transnational policy making disrupts the teleology of development, which sees Anglo-America as the idealized yardstick against which all else is to be judged.

Related to such borrowings is the emergence of new modes of activism that seek to confront the transborder geographies of globalization and to learn lessons from Third World struggles. Faced with austerity policies that reach across borders, with nation-states that rescale with great dexterity, this new activism goes well beyond the adage of thinking globally and acting locally.

As evident at Seattle, the practices range from "scale-jumping" (Wainwright, Prudham, and Glassman 2000) to developing transnational networks to applying Third World ideas to First World contexts. Homes Not Jails can be seen as part of this new territory of protest and contestation.

But transnationalism must also be approached with care. An important cautionary note is that it cannot simply involve the import of concepts across national borders (Silver 1996). Instead, a reflexive and thoughtful transnational analysis examines the geographic relation between knowledge and action and the historical relation between place and social paradigm. Thus, Auyero (1997, 510) notes,

> Taking Wacquant into the (Argentinian) slum does not mean projecting his empirical findings from the black ghetto of the US to the slum or to other enclaves of urban poverty (favelas etc.). It involves taking heed of his epistemological warnings, and critically translating the methodological principles he suggests for use in a different socio-cultural context.

Similarly, policy and political borrowings cannot simply mimic the successes of elsewhere. Instead, a sophisticated transnational imagination reworks borrowed policies and activisms to take account of the geopolitical histories of each site. Such methodological parameters are particularly important in light of the growing interest in Third World policies and politics. To some extent, transnational borrowings run the risk of promoting a utopian celebration of the Third World. Indeed, in recent years, there has emerged a new optimism about the social capital of poor communities (Roy 2002b). But it would be dangerous to institute this as a Third World model of universal applicability. On one hand, as Ward (1999, 10) points out, such a model bears within it great vulnerabilities and exploitations, a point that I will discuss later. On the other hand, it means maintaining the universalist logic of development. Here, the hierarchy of First and Third Worlds may have been reversed, but the erasure of geopolitical difference continues through the mechanics of imitation and replication.

With such cautionary notes in mind, in this article, I train the transnational lens on the question of American homelessness. By articulating the issue in the crucible of rich Third World debates about shelter claims and rights, I hope to deconstruct its simultaneous normalization and criminalization, how it has been rendered both intimate and distant. In doing so, I will not analyze the political economy of American homelessness. That task is being pursued admirably by a host of scholars, researchers, and activists. I am instead interested in coming to terms with how the idea of homelessness is embedded in a paradigm of propertied citizenship, which in turn sets limits and constraints

on policy and political responses. Third World traditions of squatting, I will argue, evoke alternative paradigms of propertied citizenship. These are not necessarily "better." But they are necessarily different. It is in and through this idea of difference that I want to provoke a different conversation about home and homelessness.

The first section of this article initiates the task of the transnational framework. By looking at the paradigmatic case of American homelessness through the Third World lens of informality, it examines the structure of rights and system of meanings associated with different paradigms of citizenship. The second section extends the transnational analysis by looking at the paradigmatic case of homelessness activism, specifically Homes Not Jails. By analyzing activist strategies in relation to the empirical lessons learned from Third World squatting, it reveals the vulnerabilities of propertied activism as well as of the Third World model of shelter rights. Finally, the third section concludes on the note of imperial frontiers and explores whether transnational methodologies can dismantle such forms of geographical dominance.

RANJAN'S STORY

> Though the world does not change with a change of paradigm, the scientist afterward works in a different world. (Kuhn 1962, 93)

The Calcutta metropolitan region of India is one of the world's largest urban agglomerations. Long notorious for its packed densities, desperate poverty, and crumbling infrastructure, Calcutta has persisted in the popular and intellectual imagination as a "black hole," a city of death and dying.[5] In an urban system constantly fueled by rural migration and running on the motor of informal sector work, many of the city's poorest residents live in informal housing such as slums and squatter settlements. Enjoying the patronage of competing political parties, the informal sector has been at once a source of survival and livelihood for the urban poor as well as a mechanism for ensuring a political constituency for the eastern edges of the world's largest democracy. In recent years, such systems of informality have been challenged by a turn toward liberalization. Eager to participate in global economies, the region's ruling marxist-socialist coalition, the Left Front, has engaged in a perestroika of sorts. This New Communism is particularly apparent in various forms of urban restructuring, including the Left's sustained efforts to replace the informal sector with a bourgeois city, ordered and orderly. As detailed in my previous work (Roy 2002a), the grounded effects of such

liberalization are of course much more complex, involving an intricate choreography of old-style populism and new-style urban developmentalism. But if millennial Calcutta has not seen the spatial annihilation of the informal sector, then at the very least, it is witnessing volatile territorial struggles where the urban poor are rendered increasingly vulnerable.

It is in this context that I want to tell Ranjan's story. In 1997, I was deeply involved in a process of ethnographic research in the squatter settlements of Calcutta. One evening I accompanied a high-ranking politician to a settlement called Patuli. I had already completed many months of fieldwork in the settlement and knew many of the families well. But I had always maintained my distance from the dominant political parties—until now. In many ways, this visit marked the start of a new phase of research that involved direct observation of the processes and institutions of political mobilization. The visit was on the eve of a major election, and the leader wasted no time gathering the crowds around him. He then introduced me thus: "She is a visitor from America, the richest country in the world, a country on whose aid the entire world survives." Fully aware that most of the women in the settlement worked as domestic servants, he turned to me and asked, "How much is a maid's salary in America?" As I attempted to stutter a response, he continued, "Well, it must be at least $500 a month." Singling out a young woman in the crowds, he asked, "You work as a maid, don't you? How much do you earn a month?" "Four hundred" came the quiet answer. "Well, if you were a maid in America, in her country, you would make fifteen thousand rupees a month— imagine that!"

The incident was a mortifying but commonplace element of ethnographic fieldwork. Even though I had been honest with my subjects regarding my project and status, I felt as though I had betrayed them. Suddenly the chasm between imperialist visitor and underdeveloped shantytown loomed large. With these thoughts racing through my head, I stood quietly to one side. A group of young squatter men, perhaps sensing my discomfort, struck up a conversation with me. "Are there people like us there?" asked Ranjan, a lanky 20-year-old with twinkling eyes. He continued,

> I have heard that there are lots of homeless in America. How can that be the case? Why doesn't the government simply allow them to simply take over vacant land like we have? Aren't they citizens? Don't they have rights?

In the face of all my explanations, he insisted, "If one is a citizen, one can't be homeless."

Ranjan's words express a paradigm of citizenship that is markedly different than the American paradigm of propertied citizenship. Articulating a

framework of shelter rights, it creates a space of citizenship for the property-less. And there is something more. If following Kuhn, I have argued that a paradigm implies both a social reality and an epistemology, then Ranjan not only maps a different model of citizenship but also provides a different epistemology for thinking about citizenship, property, and poverty. This epistemology is transnational in nature.

Deprivation, including deprivation of adequate housing, is a concept always forged in a comparative context. I was appalled by the living conditions of squatters in this and other settlements, deeply saddened by their lack of access to what I took for granted as basic goods and services. But I was so overwhelmed by these contrasts that I often failed to notice the intricacies of other comparisons. These young squatters felt that they were better off than they had been in their villages, better off than the homeless of American cities in the one-room, half-built housing units that their families had illegally occupied 12 years ago. But Ranjan takes us beyond the calculus of comparative sufferings. His question is transnational, linking a ramshackle squatter settlement in Calcutta to the shopping-cart-pushing, shelter-searching men and women who struggle on another, distant continent. In broaching the issue of American homelessness in the idiom of Third World claims talk, he highlights its humiliations, thereby eroding the privileges of American democracy. That evening, Ranjan stood at the periphery of the periphery, on the fringes of Calcutta, and asked Third World questions of the First World. In doing so, he unsettled the conventional wisdom of development studies and urban theory, which have regularly posed First World questions of the Third World, which have defined the Third World as a lack, as backwardness, as needing cure.

However, there is more to Ranjan's story than Ranjan's question. Exactly 10 days after our ethnographic encounter, he and 2,500 other squatter families were evicted in an unforgiving demolition drive by Calcutta's leftist government. The squatters who had once settled this remote urban frontier were now cleared to make way for middle-class suburbanites. The very system of informality that had made possible Ranjan's claim to shelter and citizenship had also sealed his fate. Ranjan's question then turns out to contain within it a myth: that of the Third World as a site of housing rights, of a citizenship that guarantees shelter. It reveals what Bourdieu (1992, 7) terms the double life of social structure. The first order involves a distribution of material resources and power; the second order is a system of meanings that functions as a symbolic template for the first order. The significance of Ranjan's story lies in the disjuncture between first and second orders, in his great certainty in the face of the territorialized uncertainty of informal housing. This is a poignantly paradoxical model of shelter. To mine its transnational insights requires what

Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992, 7) call a "double reading": attention to material realities, such as squatting and evictions, as well as to interpretations, such as the claims talk of subject-citizens. In the rest of this section, I discuss three key issues that emerge from a double reading of Ranjan's story: understandings of poverty, frameworks of shelter rights, and the public domain implied by various paradigms of citizenship.

POVERTY AS PATHOLOGY VERSUS POVERTY AS SOCIAL AGENCY

The specter of poverty has always hovered in the shadows of the study of American cities, a sense that ineradicable patterns of sociospatial segregation indelibly mark this landscape. But more recently, there has been the nagging awareness of a persistent "new poverty" that appears to go hand in hand with the global restructuring commonly known as post-Fordism (Marcuse 1996). Such seemingly new debates have coalesced around a few old and contentious keywords, the most notorious of which are *underclass* and *ghetto* (Katz 1989; Wacquant 1997). The bitter arguments over these terms reveal a cumbersome historical legacy of defining poverty as pathology, whether such perceived deviances are seen as cause (Murray 1984) or as symptom (Wilson 1987; Jencks and Peterson 1991).

Such controversies have also marked the debates on homelessness. Over the past years, there has emerged a sophisticated body of research that conceptualizes homelessness as a social process embedded in structures of class and race and as a spatial process linked to the continuous capitalist reshaping of city spaces (Hopper and Hamberg 1984; Dear and Wolch 1987; Hoch and Slayton 1989; Rossi 1989; Gans 1991; Law and Wolch 1991; N. Smith 1992; Passaro 1996; Ralston 1996; Takahashi 1996). And yet, there has also been a stubborn persistence of what Wacquant (1997), in the context of ghetto studies, has called "pernicious premises." Here, homelessness is represented as individual irresponsibility and social deviance, with causality resting squarely in behavioral choices such as alcohol and drug abuse (Baum and Burnes 1993). And more strikingly, it is this latter view that continues to shape and inform homelessness policy. As the American urban poverty debates remain mired in the tropes of social disorganization and moral failure, so American urban policy remains concerned with techniques of managing the pathology of poverty. Measured against the norm of propertied citizenship, the homeless have been seen as particularly aberrant, requiring disciplinary action.

The techniques of management have taken on two primary forms: criminalization and institutionalization. From quality-of-life tickets to a "micro-geography of fortification" (Davis 1990), American city after city

has sought to criminalize homelessness, putting into motion what D. Mitchell (1997) calls the "annihilation of space by law." The homeless body has been thus kept in constant motion, unceasingly displaced, unceasingly penalized (Kawash 1998). Alongside these punitive geographies exist the institutionalized spaces within which homelessness is confined. The reformist interventions are manifested in the bureaucracy of service provision by state and parastatal agencies—shelters, health clinics, and welfare offices. Many of these institutions deploy techniques of incarceration and disciplinary control. Thus, Golden (1992) details the punitive nature of women's shelters in New York, which she likens to nineteenth-century poorhouses and prisons. Equally important is the ongoing medicalization of homelessness and indeed of urban poverty. In the American context, homelessness has been repeatedly inscribed as a public health concern, requiring both containment and technicist intervention.

Such forms of criminalization and medicalization are of course not new. They have geopolitical roots in an Anglo-American modernity that took hold in the transition from the nineteenth to twentieth centuries and whose social technologies were perfected in the context of urban growth and urban poverty (Boyer 1987; E. Wilson 1991; Hall 1996). But their resuscitation at this turn of the century bears renewed attention. Particularly provocative is the way in which these discourses of marginality and practices of marginalization contrast with Third World debates around urban poverty.

The first round of research on the urban poor of Third World cities was in a classic "culture of poverty" genre. Theorists such as Lewis (1962) argued that an economy of marginality and a culture of apathy and deviance characterized the slums and shantytowns of Latin America. By the 1970s, urban researchers from a wide range of disciplines strongly countered such views (Collier 1976; Eckstein 1977; Portes and Walton 1981; Castells 1983; Gilbert and Ward 1985). They provided a "view from the barrio" (Peattie 1968), thereby shattering the "myth of marginality" (Perlman 1976). In varied ways, they argued that the urban poor were an integral part of political and economic systems and that the informal practices of the poor were produced by capitalist production (Portes, Castells, and Benton 1989). In doing so, they showed that the city can only be understood within the context of a world system of domination and inequality (Portes and Walton 1981; Roberts 1995). If the American debates anguish over the dependencies of the poor—on controlled substances and on the state—then the Third World research has inscribed dependency as participation in global capitalism,[6] the constant "development of underdevelopment" (Frank 1979). And if the point of contention in the American debates is the notion of poverty as pathology, then in the Third World debates, the axis of controversy is the extent of social agency

ascribed to the poor. Should the poor be conceptualized as engaged in grass-roots movements that, although potentially transformative, are rarely so within the constraints of the capitalist machine (Castells 1983)? Or should the poor be seen as waging an invisible revolution, such that their practices of survival must be interpreted as heroic entrepreneurship (De Soto 1989, 2000)?

This shift—from concepts of marginality to concepts of the world system, from discourses of social deviance to discourses of social agency—indicate fundamentally different understandings of poverty. Such differences also yield different techniques of managing poverty. If in the American context, I have noted the criminalization and institutionalization of homelessness, then the Third World research has spawned a gamut of policy responses that seek to harness the socioeconomic energies of the poor and creatively formalize the informal sector (Baross 1990; United Nations 1996; Pugh 2000).[7] From sites and services projects that allow the poor to self-construct their homes to microcredit lending programs that provide infusions of capital for informal livelihoods, the Third World policy continuum comprises a rich diversity of responses to the issue of urban poverty. As made evident by Ranjan's story, such understandings and techniques are in turn rooted in different paradigms of citizenship. The American paradigm of propertied citizenship makes few concessions for the poor, turning the propertyless into the shelterless. In contrast, the Third World paradigm rejects the marginality of the poor, giving legitimacy to the shelter claims of the propertyless. Visiting the geopolitical context of American homelessness with this Third World paradigm in hand is thus immensely useful. As embodied in Ranjan's story, on one hand, such a transnational journey opens up new policy vistas and shelter possibilities; on the other hand, it provides a series of cautionary notes about the vulnerabilities of Third World solutions to First World problems. These themes are continued in the remainder of this section.

THE CLAIM TO SHELTER VERSUS THE RIGHT TO SAFE AND SANITARY SHELTER

Ranjan's proud words express the claims of the squatter subject-citizen. For me, his interrogation stands out against another set of words: those of the homeless living in Justiceville, a squatter encampment that existed for a while in downtown Los Angeles.[8] In a documentary that captures the last gasp of the settlement, these men and women ask for public sympathy on the basis of their "humanness," as if their status as human beings was suddenly in question (Glaser 1987). Their plea is in keeping with what Rowe and Wolch (1990, 199) identify as specific notions of subjectivity: the "self-as-homeless."

Such expressions of identity—one claiming membership in democratic citizenship and the other excluded by a propertied citizenship—are in turn rooted in systems of rights. Ranjan's story indicates a domain of Third World informality marked by the ongoing negotiation of shelter claims. Squatting, as a process of land occupation and self-help building,[9] embodies an "expectative property right" (De Soto 1989). That the right to regularized land titles, services, and security of tenure is *expected* is a crucial aspect of the stability of squatting as a form of housing. That the right is always expected and rarely *fulfilled* ensures the populist dynamics of the process, the ability of political parties to constantly mobilize the poor through promises of land, housing, and urban services (Castells 1983). That the right is often *violated* points to the agonizing uncertainty of squatting and other informal settlements. In my research on informal urban development in Calcutta, I have thus characterized squatting as a Faustian bargain, providing access to shelter while sealing the dependence of the poor on fickle-minded political parties and damning them to volatile cycles of land grabs and evictions (Roy 2002a). It is thus that the urban poor of Third World cities are housed, but only tenuously, and that they engage in constant struggle but rarely in revolutionary change. In other words, the paradigm of citizenship associated with squatting, as expressed in Ranjan's story, indicates negotiable claims rather than enforceable rights. Such claims, in addition, produce political consent.

When a transnational lens is trained on the American context, it becomes apparent that in a rationalized urban landscape of housing regulations and codes, there is little room for informality. The American paradigm of propertied citizenship has an important corollary: the right to safe and sanitary shelter. Such a right eliminates the vulnerabilities of informal housing. But as Ranjan's negotiable shelter claims contain the paradox of territorialized uncertainty, so the American right to safe and sanitary shelter paradoxically supersedes the right to shelter. Put bluntly, American cities are free of the populist volatility of squatting and other forms of informality, but they are fraught with the humiliations of homelessness. Such issues are amply evident in instances of American squatting. For example, in the case of Justiceville, although the squatters settled on a privately owned plot of land with the informal permission of the owner, the city government took the owner to court for health and safety violations, thereby setting into motion the inevitable eviction of the squatters. The right to safe and sanitary shelter trumped the right to shelter. In the interviews recorded for Glaser's (1987) documentary, city officials conceded that the homeless would not be "safe" out on the streets but that when within the settlement, they were the responsibility of the city, the implication being that once outside of the housing sector, the homeless no

longer provoke concerns. In being propertyless, they forfeit their right to safe and sanitary shelter.

Here, then, is the paradox of the American context: that the formalization of housing rights has greatly restricted access to the domain of housing. If informality is inherently exploitative, then formality is inherently exclusionary. This is not to say that informal housing does not exist in the U.S. context; rather, its status is fundamentally different than in Third World settings. In his look across the border, Ward (1999) shows how the *colonias* of Mexico gain incremental access to public services and even land regularization, albeit through structures of populism. The colonias of Texas are, however, systematically excluded from state help. In a cruelly ironical example, Ward shows how infrastructure financed by an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) grant reaches to the Cameron Park colonia but not into it (p. 110). Since the houses do not meet building codes, they cannot be serviced. If the houses had met building codes, the overwhelming majority of residents in that colonia would not have been able to afford them. The paradigm of propertied citizenship, as it turns out, only recognizes formal rights of property, marginalizing the shelter claims of the poor and other vulnerable social groups.

PUBLIC VERSUS *PABLIK* DOMAINS

The idea of citizenship is of course inextricably linked to the public domain—to what is considered to be the public interest as well as to a body of citizens conceived as public beneficiaries. In the American context, homelessness has been criminalized and institutionalized in the name of such a public interest and in the attempt to reclaim urban space for legitimate (read: propertied) citizens. The spatial techniques of fortification, eviction, and surveillance that are used to manage the homeless seek to regulate the "conduct of conduct," to "spatialize virtue" (Osborne and Rose 1999, 737). At the same time, as D. Mitchell (1998b, 103) notes, these techniques serve to "spatialize a problem that is not at root geographical, thereby deflecting attention from roots and causes of homelessness into questions about 'order' and 'civility' in public spaces." In the virtuous city, the only public space for the homeless is what May (2000) has termed a spectral geography—a presence rendered ghostly and transient.

This public domain contrasts with a more fluid realm imagined and occupied by Ranjan. Squatting and other informal processes of settlement and shelter unfold in a space of negotiability. A useful conceptualization of negotiability comes from Berry's (1993, 13) work on social and economic

transactions in sub-Saharan Africa: "law as social process, transactions as subject to multiple meaning, and exchange as open-ended and multidimensional rather than single-stranded and definitive." This notion echoes with other concepts such as De Soto's (1989) characterization of informality as governed by "extra-legal" systems of regulation.[10] Neither negotiability nor extra-legality imply chaos. Rather, as critics of the American poverty debates are trying to recover the distinctive social organizations of the condemned ghetto (Wacquant 1997), so the Third World debates have long shown how squatter settlements contain a distinctive set of public norms, that they are more rigorously organized than even the most efficient of homeowners associations in the United States. To identify this public realm, Kaviraj (1997) coins the term *pablik*—an interlingual term that captures how the original English word is pronounced in colloquial Bengali. The "quasi-claims" embodied in various informal practices can be seen as instances of the pablik (Kaviraj 1997, 108) and the various attempts to evict the informal sector can be seen as techniques meant to recover the "public" from the pablik, a reinscription of the city as bourgeois.

In the American context, as the paradigm of citizenship has come to be tied to property ownership, so the homeless have been seen as trespassers in the space of the nation-state. The criminalization of homelessness can only be understood in relation to the preserved and instituted norm, the scaffolding of social meanings through which the paradigm of propertied citizenship is constructed. This norm is that of the suburban, freestanding, single-family dwelling, held in ownership, and it hearkens back to the Jeffersonian utopia of a New World nation of independent farmer-citizens (Kostof 1987). In a discussion of homelessness, Veness (1992, 445) critically examines this American notion of home: "For it is against that taken-for-granted, progress-driven idealization that our definition and management of homelessness begin." If the American Dream is articulated in a landscape of single-family detached suburban dwellings (AlSayyad 1998), then "less homelike" accommodations such as single-room occupancies (SROs) and Skid Row are in turn seen as unworthy alternatives (Veness 1992, 460).

But such public domains not only refer to a public interest and to a public audience but also require a public authority that serves as a sponsor (Vale 2000, 3). The American paradigm of propertied citizenship has thus been systematically sponsored through state practices and policies. A brief discussion of such political and policy genealogies will make apparent how and why this paradigm has come to be normalized and mainstreamed.

THE WELFARE OF THE PUBLIC

The American welfare state was established in 1935 with two distinct sets of policies and beneficiaries. First-track programs of social insurance were intended to primarily serve the normalized subject-citizen (i.e., white, working-class men). The second-track programs of public assistance were feminized, providing means-tested relief for social groups on the margins of citizenship, such as women (Nelson 1984; Rose 1995). If the social insurance programs were seen as a right—and indeed they are not even referred to as welfare—the public assistance programs bore the stigma of dependency and thus of surveillance (Fraser and Gordon 1994). Work policies were similarly devised, with voluntary and well-paid job training occupying the same public domain as social insurance and mandatory, punitive programs such as workfare being tied to public assistance (Rose 1995). American housing policy has similar divides and distinctions. As there has been great anxiety about the provision of public housing, the nagging sense that it violates American bootstrap individualism, so there has been a systematic subsidy to private homeownership. The scale of tax deductions on homeowner mortgages has been phenomenal, but fiscal policy as housing policy has been free of stigma; indeed, in the public imagination, it does not appear as policy at all. The hand of the state has been rendered invisible.

The welfare state has also been deeply racialized. Not only were first-track programs restricted to white citizens, but also the second-track programs were marked by a set of racist exclusions. Until the 1960s, Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) benefits were often denied to black women through "employable mother" rules that channeled them into agricultural or domestic work (Rose 1993; Chang 1994). Similarly, public housing itself was racially restricted. Aimed at the deserving poor, the "submerged middle class" (Bratt 1986, 337), public housing remained overwhelmingly white until the late 1950s (Vale 2000, 8). The integration of public housing was bitterly contested, often through violent defenses of the color line as in the case of the white riots of Trumbull Park, Chicago (Brown 1959/1972), and later through white flight. In a racist system, as these sites became predominantly black, so they were stigmatized. Such discursive devaluation was deepened by the insistent neglect of the state—in the case of public housing, what has been called its "programmed failure" through underresourcing (Meehan 1979).

The current round of welfare and housing reforms must be seen as an attempt to renew such devalued spaces. The new public agenda seeks to

replace the purported "culture of poverty" with upstanding "American" values housed in the ideal American home. For example, the environmental determinism of Hope VI aims to transform the lives of public housing residents through a transformation of their housing conditions. Seeking to woo "working tenants" back to public housing, the Hope VI initiative constructs a landscape of garden-style apartments, townhouses, and single-family homes (Salama 1999). The cover of the 1989 report of the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing, which launched Hope VI, bears an image of a young African-American mother holding a child in her arms, gazing sadly out of her dilapidated apartment. But as she looks into the future she sees herself standing outside a single-family dwelling, sending off her child to school. The darkness around her, and quite literally shaded onto her, has lifted (Rongerude 2001).[11] She has been culturally whitened.[12]

Such restructured public domains are of course not for all members of the public. Hope VI bears no guarantee of the right of return and in fact greatly reduces the stock of affordable housing for the poorest segments of the market. Equally troubling is the growing marketization of the public realm—the promise embodied in workfare, the antidote to welfare, that the market can solve the problem of poverty (Peck 2001). Plucked from national welfare policies and applied at the city level, first by Giuliani during his mayoral regime in New York, workfare seeks to discipline and regulate the homeless body, making access to city shelters and services contingent upon work (*New York Times*, 26 October 1999). But against this ideal of the work ethic remains the brutal reality of advanced forms of marginality, permanent forms of poverty tied to the advanced sectors of the economy (Wacquant 1999). As it turns out, workfare as a response to homelessness merely allows the state to create for itself pools of cheap labor, with homeless workers often earning well below minimum wage (Franklin 1999). For the propertyless, such it seems is the price of gaining entrance to the public domain of propertied citizenship.

THE ACTIVISM OF RIGHTS

> Normal science often suppresses fundamental novelties because they are necessarily subversive of its basic commitments. (Kuhn 1962, 5)

In recent times, there has been a steady resurgence of various rights-based discourses. Facing off against a barbaric capitalism, Harvey (2000) has sought to excavate "spaces of hope," and he has done so through an archaeology of rights. In a post-Seattle era, on college campuses, human rights and labor rights are becoming important axes of mobilization.[13] Welfare and home-

lessness activists are seeking to replace the talk of work ethics and family ethics with rights-speak. D. Mitchell (1998a, 1998b), for example, interprets the criminalization of homelessness as impingements on constitutional rights, showing how this ranges from restrictions on free speech to "cruel and unusual punishment." His assertion is not of the right to shelter but rather quite dramatically of the right to live: "Either a city possesses sufficient safe, sanitary shelter to house its homeless population or it does not. If it does not, then homeless people simply *must* occupy public space" (Mitchell 1998b, 100). Others have presented a fundamental challenge to the apparatus of the welfare state and its discursive divisions. Thus, Vale (2000, 392) argues that "affordable" housing should be conceptualized as "a continuum of rewards affecting all income groups—encompassing and assisting the two-thirds of American households who receive tax benefits for homeownership just as it helps the 2% who receive public housing." He argues that this reinscription of "public housing" will help mitigate the stigma of public assistance and will make apparent the rights of propertied citizenship so safely enjoyed by the favored public.

Can those located outside of the paradigm of propertied citizenship articulate a rights-speak? The right to speak? In a 1980 poem, "Momma Welfare Roll," Maya Angelou dramatically envisions this possibility by presenting a welfare mother who "walks bare-handed into a den of bureaucrats" and demands, as a right, welfare. She *speaks*, stating that they don't give her welfare, she *takes* it. The poem is a satire of the stereotype of the black welfare mother, Reagan's horrific trope of the welfare queen in designer jeans, cruising the ghetto in her Cadillac, buying vodka with food stamps. But it is also a reinscription of welfare as a right, a public right to be claimed, proudly. The power of rights-speak is that it insists on membership in the paradigm of citizenship. This is quite simply Ranjan's assertion that if one is a citizen, one cannot be homeless.

HOMES NOT JAILS

Rights-speak forms the cornerstone of the shelter activism practiced by the anarchist squatter group, Homes Not Jails (HNJ) (www.sftu.org/hnj.html). Formed in San Francisco in 1992 to advocate for the use of vacant and abandoned buildings for the homeless, HNJ has spread to other American cities and has also gained international recognition (Corr 1999). In many ways, HNJ is a paradigmatic challenge to the American paradigm of propertied citizenship.[14] It directly undermines property ownership by squatting in abandoned buildings and thereby claiming living space for the homeless. Arguing a defense of necessity (Corr 1999, 30), it replaces the right to safe

and sanitary shelter with the right to shelter. Not surprisingly, as in the case of Justiceville, HNJ activists have been repeatedly evicted for health and safety violations. For example, in February 2001, a HNJ squat in an abandoned San Francisco high school was put to an end when school district officials argued that the building was full of asbestos, lead, rats, and fleas. The evicted squatters, including 36-year-old homeless Tom Gomez, argued differently: "It beats spending the night in Golden Gate Park. We have the same risk of getting arrested here that we do in the park. But here we have food, it's dry and there's light" (R. Gordon 2001, A11).

The provocative aspect of HNJ's activism is its insistence on challenging the state on its own terms. The group engages in two types of squatting. Symbolic squats are meant to force the state to live up to its own legislative action, notably the McKinney Act and its provisions for the use of "surplus, excess, underutilized and unutilized" federal property for the assistance of the homeless.[15] Covert squats are meant to assert propertied rights for the homeless, specifically through the legal doctrine of "adverse possession," which recognizes the "highest and best use of property" and under stringent conditions makes possible the legalization of squatting (K. Gordon 2001).[16] There are two philosophies that underlie these HNJ tactics. The first is the well-worn Third World idea of "sweat equity" (Corr 1999, 19). For the group, sweat equity serves multiple purposes: It makes possible the upgrading of occupied buildings, it builds community, and it is a rights-speak strategy to assert security of tenure. The second philosophy, homesteading, translates the Third World tactics of self-help and squatting into an American idiom of propertied citizenship. HNJ legitimizes its squats through the invocation of a frontier mythology:

> By invoking the image of America as a land of entrepreneurship and opportunity, Homes not Jails and other urban squatter movements have re-framed the discussion of urban homelessness as a discussion about national identity and national rights, as opposed to sympathy and victimhood. In a sense, then, Homes not Jails has fit urban squatting into the American dream. (K. Gordon 2001, 20)

HNJ carves out spaces of shelter for the propertyless, thereby constructing what Holston (1998) would call "sites of insurgent citizenship." And it goes further—it simultaneously applies and subverts the American paradigm of propertied citizenship. But do such strategies constitute a paradigm revolution? To answer such a question, I train the transnational lens on HNJ, evaluating its tactics on the basis of lessons learned from Third World shelter struggles.

THREE CAUTIONARY NOTES FROM A TRANSNATIONAL SCRIPT

First, rights imply duties. In contexts of great material inequality, the burden of duties can be imposing, even punitive. Such vulnerabilities are amply evident in the Third World model of self-help. In an era of liberalization, the ideology of sweat equity shifts the burden of coping from the state to the poor (Roy 2002b), putting into place a "voluntarist" citizenship. As homelessness policies have been dominated by the trope of the undeserving poor, so recent Third World debates have coalesced around the hope of a self-sufficient informal sector capable of Herculean efforts. These are extreme positions on the same discursive continuum of morality and behaviorism, both serving to legitimate state withdrawal from social commitments. In other words, it is precisely the optimism of certain Third World policy debates that can reinforce the stereotypes of American homelessness. In contrast to such moral-behavioral depictions of self-help, housing scholars have urged the conceptualization of self-help as a mode of housing production that is often commercialized and capitalized (Ward and Macoloo 1992). As Ward (1999, 68) notes, the "popular mode of housing," characterized by citizen participation, self-construction, and self-management, is also a private mode of housing with markets that harness profits, exhibit volatility, and exclude those unable to pay. Here, sweat equity is quite real and costly equity. Such arguments can be applied to the self-help strategies of HNJ. The idea of the homeless taking over abandoned buildings that they then upgrade through their own sweat embodies a voluntarist citizenship lured along by the promise of propertied citizenship.

Second, it is standard knowledge in Third World housing debates that informality, although making possible shelter for the poor, is a process of evictions and exploitations. If I were to retell the story of Ranjan, I would frame it as a narrative of displacement. Ranjan lived in a World Bank–initiated sites and services project on the urbanizing edge of Calcutta. The settlement was initially conceived as housing for the lower middle class, but in the early years, most of the allottees were unwilling to move to this remote site. The construction workers who had built the core units squatted in them, claiming to have provided protection from vandals and of having invested sweat equity through considerable self-help building. By the late 1990s, this remote frontier was very much a part of the expanding metropolitan region, and the original middle-class allottees were eager to reclaim the site. In an unprecedented political deal, it was decided that about one-third of the squatters would be allowed to purchase legal land titles to their units. The question, however, was how that select one-third would be chosen. Each political faction drew up its own list of beneficiaries, and the state, seizing on the opportunity of great

disagreement, cleansed the site of its squatters, thereby reclaiming it for middle-class suburbanites. The very urban populism that had made possible rights to shelter now negated those rights. Similar vulnerabilities are inherent in HNJ squatting tactics. Although the doctrine of adverse possession bears the promise of legalizing squatting, of formalizing informality, it requires the "open and notorious use" of property. And yet, when squats are open and notorious, they are often quickly ended through evictions, thereby short-circuiting the process of adverse possession (K. Gordon 2001). The doctrine requires a process that is impossible to uphold.

Third, the power of HNJ is that it undermines the singular meaning of home that has come to dominate the American landscape. HNJ validates a broad range of shelter options, thereby making possible shelter for the propertyless. But in doing so, it also institutes a two-tier system of standards, where the poor are damned to informality. In replacing the right to safe and sanitary shelter with the right to shelter, HNJ runs the risk of implying that the homeless need only shelter, not safe and sanitary shelter. A recent HNJ squat in Washington, D.C. brought attention to this point. The squat came under critique by local resident and housing activist Iris Arafa, who argued that the group primarily operates in black and Latino neighborhoods rather than white ones. She went on to state that the self-help strategies of the group, its promise of informal housing, was simply not enough:

> I've been out here too long to accept peanuts. This house isn't up to code. I don't want any part of this house. If you're going to take over a house, give me something that's worth at least as much as the panda bears got. (Fears 2001, C08).

Arafa was referring to the $1.8 million pavilion for panda bears at the National Zoo. Luke Kuhn of HNJ responded, "The pandas have more expensive housing than most yuppies, and it's a prison." One could argue that we are all imprisoned by the paradigm of propertied citizenship, but in pushing for propertied rights for the homeless, HNJ inevitably raises the following questions: What kind of rights? Full rights? The rights of a second-class citizenship? Such issues are hotly debated in Third World policy circles where, on one hand, there is recognition of the need to tolerate, even promote, informality; on the other hand, there is concern about the institutionalization of unsafe and unsanitary living conditions for the poor (Ward 1999).

Beyond such cautionary notes that indicate the limitations and vulnerabilities of HNJ strategies, there is also the question of whether such forms of activism can initiate a political and epistemological shift away from the paradigm of propertied citizenship. In the case of HNJ, such a paradigm revolution

seems unlikely. The strategy of sweat equity itself maintains the paradigm of propertied citizenship. This is true not only in the American context but equally in Third World settings where squatting produces a landscape of owner-occupied dwellings,[17] a housing genre that matches the formal sector in basic form although clearly not in tenure, quality, or services. Such forms of mimicry imply that informality is usually conformist rather than radical (Castells 1983). Even Ranjan's rowdy question contains such elements of political obedience. If Pile (1997) notes that geographies of resistance do not simply mirror structures of power but rather invent alternative spaces of life and meaning, then propertied activism seems to more often than not replicate hegemonic spaces and forms, providing a critique bound by the constraints of the master narrative.[18] For example, in the case of Justiceville, squatters carved out personal territories of home, imitating the freestanding, owner-occupied dwelling that constitutes the American norm. After the demolition of Justiceville, activist Ted Hayes continued to push for the idea of a home-less camp that would not only have private and separate dwellings but would also be temporary, aiding the homeless to a propertied transition through an employment program (Glaser 1987). As evident in the earlier discussion of housing and welfare policies, this constellation of a propertied ideal and the work ethic has a well-established history.

Nor do such forms of shelter activism provide new epistemologies of poverty. For example, HNJ maintains the diagnosis of homelessness as a lack of home. What would it mean to replace the term *homeless* with *homeless proletarian*? What would shelter activism then look like? Would the confrontation with wage-labor relations shake the paradigm of propertied citizenship to its very foundations? Such questions can only be answered in light of emerging forms of homelessness activism such as POWER (People Organized to Win Employment Rights), an advocacy group seeking to organize workfare workers. Whether the activist shift from the homeless body to the laboring body will initiate a paradigm revolution remains to be seen.

THE IMPERIAL FRONTIER

As I write, in a post–September 11 era, at a moment of great neo-Orientalism,[19] it becomes clear that critical transnational analysis is more important than ever before. For another type of transnationalism is taking hold. This is the imperial frontier, the transnational replication of the American ideal of propertied citizenship. Thus, a recent tongue-in-cheek editorial satirizes the idea of reforming Afghanistan through "full-contact strategic suburbanization" (Pesci 2001). The author argues that paving over Afghanistan with six-lane

highways will replace Soviet-era tanks with ready markets for SUVs and will lead to the "safe spaces" of housing developments, shopping malls, and Disneyesque theme parks: "Deploy and install all this stuff and the only government that the Afghans will need is a zoning board." There is a chilling truth to this satire, in the ways in which urban form comes to be associated with property ownership and how this, in turn, comes to be linked to liberal democracy. But at this moment of imperialist expansion, it is more important than ever before to note the systematic exclusions of the American paradigm of propertied citizenship. As desire for the Third World model of self-help must be tempered with a series of cautionary notes, so the desire for the American dream must be located within a historical understanding of the brutality of this context. Although transnational policy gurus such as De Soto (2000) at once celebrate the heroic entrepreneurship of the Third World poor and call for formal property systems that are directly modeled after nineteenth-century America, this article shows how both policy components require careful handling. De Soto invokes an American history of homesteading. But this, of course, is a mythicized history, cleansed of its genocidal and feudal elements and packaged as a policy commodity to be consumed within the circuits of transnational consultancies. Against De Soto, it could be argued that the wealth of the American landscape required the whole-scale displacement of indigenous people, that propertied citizenship for the select was made possible through the impossibility of shelter and social citizenship for all. But then this would be a tougher policy sale to make.

In this article, I have sought to dismantle the imperial frontier by locating the issues of poverty and marginalization at the heart of the American Dream.[20] The imperial frontier, as Koptiuch (1991, 87) notes, exists not only in the exotic(ized) far-away but also in the time-space geographies of home. Against an epistemological imperialism, she calls for "Third-Worlding at home"—an analysis of how deprivation exists not only in the distant "elsewhere" but equally "here":

> I have purposely chosen Third World as concept-metaphor to gloss this new practice of Othering here in the U.S. not in order to collapse what are distinctly different historical formations, but as a reminder that Third World is a name, a representation, not a place. (Koptiuch 1991, 88)

The Third World is, of course, a place, and to borrow from Adrienne Rich (1986, 211), it is a place on the map that is also a place in history. But as Koptiuch (1991) points out, it can also be an analytical toolkit, a way of decoding geopolitical difference and of forming new vocabularies for the study of familiar topics. In this article, I have therefore posed Third World ques-

tions of the First World, highlighting the persistent inequalities that have been rendered distant by the paradox of their intimacy.

The imperial frontier is also an urban frontier. The city is a crucial site of imperialist endeavors; it is, in Jacobs' (1996, 4) words, "the spatial order of imperial imaginings." Urban restructuring is often a process of staking claim to the frontier, through practices of settler colonialism and gentrifying desires (N. Smith 1992). The significance of Homes Not Jails is that it appropriates such imperial frontiers, claiming them for America's marginalized social groups. Its challenge, and indeed that of most forms of American squatting, is to supersede the motif of the frontier and to instead confront the processes of proletarianization and impoverishment that give the lie to propertied citizenship. By situating such strategies and their hazards in a global context, a transnational framework exposes the scaffolding of norms and meanings that constitute a distinctive American notion of shelter, property, and citizenship. At the same time, it does not guarantee an optimistic alternative that can be effortlessly borrowed from elsewhere. The hard work of dismantling the imperial frontier as it is drawn and redrawn in urban studies and urban policy only anticipates the further hard work of paying close attention to the intense vulnerabilities of each model of housing and shelter. As in this article, a transnational epistemology provides the cartographic tools for mapping multiple pathways of rights and claims. At times, it even provides the inspiration to undertake a journey that crosses borders, to leave the shores of "normal science" by learning from elsewhere.

NOTES

1. An obvious example of how the homeless have been marginalized in the American polity is the difficulty that the homeless have in registering to vote without a mailing address.

2. The term *constitutive outside* comes from Mouffe (1993, 69).

3. In his work, Kuhn (1962) draws parallels between political and scientific revolutions.

4. My use of the terms *First World* and *Third World* is not meant to gloss over the geopolitical diversity that exists within and across these categories. Rather, it is meant to refer to these concepts as inventions, whose coinage signifies an international project of development launched at a specific historical moment (i.e., during the cold war).

5. The material on Calcutta draws on my extensive research in the region, discussed in detail in my book, *City Requiem, Calcutta: Gender and the Politics of Poverty* (Roy 2002a). The research focuses on processes of rural-urban poverty and how these are in turn linked to the territorialized practices of liberalization.

6. As mentioned earlier, Fraser and Gordon (1994) briefly explore the internationalist meanings of dependency in their discussion of the trope of dependency that dominates the American poverty and welfare debates.

7. I am not suggesting that techniques of criminalization and institutionalization are absent in Third World urban policy, but they are clearly not dominant strategies as they are in the American context. Also, there is incredible diversity within the Third World policy approach, which I am not discussing in any detail given the parameters of this article.

8. Justiceville was a squatter settlement in downtown Los Angeles led by activist Ted Hayes. Lasting for only a short time in 1987, it nevertheless led to the formation of an organization called Justiceville/Homeless USA that went on to create the homeless camp, Dome Village, in downtown Los Angeles in 1993.

9. The invasion of land and self-help building are important, although not necessary, dimensions of squatting. Informal housing is a continuum of land and building practices, within which squatting often involves the illegal occupation of land as well as self-constructed dwellings. However, squatting can also be a highly commercialized process with complex forms of rentier capitalism (Amis 1984).

10. My use of De Soto's (1989, 2000) language of "extra-legality" does not imply that I subscribe to his ahistorical and neoliberal framing of informality.

11. My use of this image is based on Rongerude's (2001) work as well as discussions with her.

12. Ong (1996) notes how various racial-ethnic groups are "whitened" and "blackened" in light of their supposed conformity with normalized work and family ethics.

13. Of course, a rights-based discourse can be appropriated and deployed with great variety. For example, in the face of international criticism, China's leaders have reinscribed human rights as the right to develop, to participate in capitalist development (Ong 1999, 75). Such alter/native formulations contest the hegemony of universalized rights and simultaneously consolidate the hegemony of place.

14. It is also of course a challenge to the prison-industrial complex. For more on such carceral geographies, see Gilmore (1999).

15. The Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (PL100-77) of 1987 is the only major federal legislative response to homelessness. Title V of the McKinney Act imposes requirements on federal agencies to identify and make available surplus federal property, such as buildings and land, for use by states, local governments, and nonprofit agencies to assist homeless people.

16. As discussed by K. Gordon (2001), the American law of adverse possession has three basic components. First, possession of the property must be "open and notorious." Second, it must be "adverse." Third, occupation must be "continuous for the statutory period."

17. As an example, see Dowall's (1991) description of the *katchi abadi* sector in Karachi, Pakistan.

18. Here, I am referring to Gramscian notions of hegemony. For a discussion of critique and resistance, see Scott (1985), Hart (1991), and Roy (2002a).

19. My use of this term refers to Said's (1978) seminal work on Orientalism, the ways in which the Orient is produced and managed by the West—militarily, economically, and discursively.

20. My use of the term *imperial frontier* links urban studies to the rich analyses of postcolonial studies. See, for example, Said's (1993) discussion of empire in *Culture and Imperialism* or Spivak's (1988) critique of the sanctioned ignorance of the history of imperialism.

REFERENCES

AlSayyad, N. 1998. Planning lessons of the American Dream: Historical limitations and democratizing potential. *Prostor* 6 (1/2): 1-12.

———, ed. 2001. *Hybrid urbanism: On identity discourses and the built environment*. Westport, CT: Greenwood/Praeger.

Amis, P. 1984. Squatters or tenants: The commercialization of unauthorized housing in Nairobi. *World Development* 12 (1): 87-96.

Angelou, M. 1994. Momma welfare roll. In *The Complete Collected Poems of Maya Angelou*. New York: Random House.

Auyero, J. 1997. Wacquant in the Argentine slums: Comment on Loic Wacquant's "Three pernicious premises in the study of the American ghetto." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 21:508-11.

Baross, P. 1990. Sequencing land development: The price implications of legal and illegal settlement growth. In *The transformation of land supply systems in Third World countries*, edited by P. Baross and J. Linden. London: Avebury.

Baum, A., and D. Burnes. 1993. *A nation in denial: The truth about homelessness*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Berry, S. 1993. *No condition is permanent: The social dynamics of agrarian change in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press.

Bhatt, N., and S. Y. Tang. 2002. Determinants of repayment in microcredit: Evidence from programs in the US. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 26 (2): 360-76.

Bourdieu, P., and L. Wacquant. 1992. *An invitation to reflexive sociology.* Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Boyer, C. 1987. *Dreaming the rational city: The myth of American city planning*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bratt, R. 1986. Public housing: The controversy and contribution. In *Critical perspectives on housing*, edited by R. Bratt, C. Hartman, and A. Meyerson. Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press.

Brown, F. 1959/1972. From the horror of the slum to the hatred of Trumbull Park. In *A gathering of ghetto writers*, edited by W. Miller. New York: New York Univ. Press.

Castells, M. 1983. *The city and the grassroots*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

———. 1998. *The rise of the network society.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Chang, G. 1994. Undocumented Latinas: The new "employable" mothers. In *Mothering: Ideology, experience, and agency*, edited by E. Nakano Glenn, G. Chang, and L. R. Forcey. New York: Routledge Kegan Paul.

Collier, D. 1976. *Squatters and oligarchs: Authoritarian rule and policy change in Peru*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.

Corr, A. 1999. *No trespassing*. Boston: South End.

Davis, M. 1990. *City of quartz: Excavating the future in Los Angeles*. London: Verso.

De Soto, H. 1989. *The other path*. New York: Harper & Row.

———. 2000. *The mystery of capital: Why capitalism triumphs in the West and fails everywhere else*. New York: Basic Books.

Dear, M., and J. Wolch. 1987. *Landscapes of despair: From deinstitutionalization to homelessness*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

Dowall, D. 1991. Comparing Karachi's informal and formal housing delivery system. *Cities* 8:217-27.

Eckstein, S. 1977. *The poverty of revolution: The state and the urban poor in Mexico*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

Fears, D. 2001. Protesters take over NE house; homeless backers claim building for woman, son. *Washington Post*, 25 February.

Frank, A. G. 1979. *Dependent accumulation and underdevelopment*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Franklin, M. 1999. *Workfare to wages: A bridge to living wage jobs*. Retrieved from http:// arc.org/gripp/publications/POWER/powerPg01.html.

Fraser, N., and L. Gordon. 1994. A genealogy of dependency: Tracing a keyword of the US welfare state. *Signs* 19:309-36.

Gans, H. 1991. *People, plans, and policies*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.

Gilbert, A., and P. Ward. 1985. *Housing, the state, and the poor*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Gilmore, R. 1999. Globalization and US prison growth: From military Keynesianism to post-Keynesian militarism. *Race and Class* 40 (2/3): 171-88.

Glaser, G. 1987. *Justiceville* [video documentary]. Detroit: Glaser Productions.

Golden, S. 1992. *The women outside: Meanings and myths of homelessness*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Gordon, K. 2001. American homesteading as shelter activism. Unpublished paper, Department of City and Regional Planning, University of California at Berkeley.

Gordon, R. 2001. Nine squatters arrested at school site: SF group wanted it for homeless housing. *San Francisco Chronicle*, 14 August.

Hall, P. 1996. *Cities of tomorrow*. Updated ed. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Hart, G. 1991. Engendering everyday resistance: Gender, patronage, and production politics in rural Malaysia. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 19 (1): 93-121.

Harvey, D. 2000. *Spaces of hope*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Hoch, C., and R. Slayton. 1989. *New homeless and old: Community and the skid row hotel*. Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press.

Holston, J. 1998. Spaces of insurgent citizenship. In *Making the invisible visible: A multicultural planning history*, edited by L. Sandercock. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Hopper, K., and J. Hamberg. 1984. *The making of America's homeless: From skid row to new poor*. New York: Community Service Society.

Jacobs, J. 1996. *Edge of empire: Postcolonialism and the city*. London: Routledge Kegan Paul.

Jencks, C., and P. Peterson, eds. 1991. *The urban underclass*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Katz, M. 1989. *The undeserving poor*. New York: Pantheon.

Kaviraj, S. 1997. Filth and the public sphere: Concepts and practices about space in Calcutta. *Public Culture* 10 (1): 83-113.

Kawash, S. 1998. The homeless body. *Public Culture* 10 (2): 319-39.

Koptiuch, K. 1991. Third-Worlding at home. *Social Text* 28:87-99.

Kostof, S. 1987. *America by design*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press.

Kuhn, T. 1962. *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Law, R., and J. Wolch. 1991. Homelessness and economic restructuring. *Urban Geography* 12 (2): 105-36.

Lewis, O. 1962. *Five families: Mexican case-studies in the culture of poverty*. New York: John Wiley.

Marcuse, P. 1996. Space and race in the post-Fordist city: The outcast ghetto and advanced homelessness in the United States today. In *Urban poverty and the underclass*, edited by E. Mingione. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Massey, D. 1993. Questions of locality. *Geography* 78 (2): 142-49.

May, J. 2000. Of nomads and vagrants: Single homelessness and narratives of home as place. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18:737-59.

Meehan, E. 1979. *The quality of federal policymaking: Programmed failure in public housing*. Columbia: Univ. of Missouri Press.

Mitchell, D. 1997. The annihilation of space by law: The roots and implications of anti-homeless laws in the United States. *Antipode* 29 (3): 303-35.

———. 1998a. Anti-homeless laws and public space: Begging and the First Amendment. *Urban Geography* 19 (1): 6-11.

———. 1998b. Anti-homeless laws and public space: Further constitutional issues. *Urban Geography* 19 (2): 98-104.

Mitchell, K. 1997a. Different diasporas and the hype of hybridity. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 15:533-53.

———. 1997b. Transnational discourse: Bringing geography back in. *Antipode* 29 (2): 101-14.

Mouffe, C. 1993. *The return of the political*. New York: Verso.

Murray, C. 1984. *Losing ground: American social policy, 1950-1980*. New York: Basic Books.

Nelson, B. 1984. Women's poverty and women's citizenship: Some political consequences of economic marginality. *Signs* 10 (2): 209-31.

Ong, A. 1996. Cultural citizenship and subject-making: Immigrants negotiate racial and cultural boundaries in the US. *Cultural Anthropology* 37 (5): 737-62.

———. 1999. *Flexible citizenship: The cultural logics of transnationality*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press.

Osborne, T., and N. Rose. 1999. Governing cities: Notes on the spatialisation of virtue. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 17:737-60.

Passaro, J. 1996. *Unequal homeless: Men on the streets, women in their place*. New York: Routledge Kegan Paul.

Peattie, L. 1968. *The view from the barrio*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.

Peck, J. 2001. *Workfare states*. New York: Guilford.

Perlman, J. 1976. *The myth of marginality: Urban poverty and politics in Rio de Janeiro*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Pesci, D. 2001. Afghanistan's next phase: Suburbanization. *Hartford Courant*, 26 November.

Pile, S. 1997. Opposition, political identities, and spaces of resistance. In *Geographies of resistance*, edited by S. Pile and M. Keith. New York: Routledge Kegan Paul.

Portes, A., M. Castells, and L. Benton, eds. 1989. *The informal economy: Studies in advanced and less developed countries*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.

Portes, A., W. Haller, and L. Guarnizo. 2002. Transnational entrepreneurs: An alternative form of immigrant economic adaptation. *American Sociological Review* 67 (2): 278-98.

Portes, A., and J. Walton. 1981. *Labor, class, and the international system*. New York: Academic Press.

Pugh, C. 2000. Squatter settlements: Their sustainability, architectural contributions, and socio-economic roles. *Cities* 17 (5): 325-37.

Ralston, M. L. 1996. *"Nobody wants to hear our truth": Homeless women and theories of the welfare state*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Rich, A. 1986. *Blood, bread and poetry: Selected prose, 1979-1985*. New York: Norton.

Roberts, B. 1995. *The making of citizens: Cities of peasants revisited*. New York: Arnold.

Rongerude, J. 2001. Regulated public environments. Unpublished paper, Department of City and Regional Planning, University of California at Berkeley.

Rose, N. 1993. Gender, race, and the welfare state: Government work programs from the 1930s to the present. *Feminist Studies* 19 (2): 319-42.

———. 1995. *Workfare or fair work: Women, welfare, and government work programs*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press.

Rossi, P. 1989. *Down and out in America: The origins of homelessness*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Rowe, S., and J. Wolch. 1990. Social networks in time and space: Homeless women in skid row, Los Angeles. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 80 (2): 184-204.

Roy, A. 2001. The reverse side of the world: Space, power, identity. In *Hybrid urbanism: On identity discourses and the built environment*, edited by N. AlSayyad. Westport, CT: Greenwood/ Praeger.

———. 2002a. *City requiem, Calcutta: Gender and the politics of poverty in Calcutta*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.

———. 2002b. Marketized? Feminized? Medieval? Urban governance in an era of liberalization. In *Perspectives on urban governance*, edited by J. Tulchin. Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center.

Said, E. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon.

———. 1993. *Culture and imperialism*. London: Chatto and Windus.

Salama, J. 1999. The redevelopment of distressed public housing: Early results from Hope VI projects in Atlanta, Chicago, and San Antonio. *Housing Policy Debate* 10 (1): 95-142.

Sanyal, B. 1990. Knowledge transfer from poor to rich cities: A new turn of events. *Cities* 7:31-36.

Sassen, S. 1991. *The global city*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

Scott, J. 1985. *Weapons of the weak: Everyday forms of peasant resistance*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press.

Servon, L. 1999. *Bootstrap capital: Microenterprises and the American poor*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Silver, H. 1996. Culture, politics and national discourses of the new urban poverty. In *Urban poverty and the underclass*, edited by E. Mingione. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Sklair, L. 2001. *The transnational capitalist class*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Slater, D. 1992. On the borders of social theory: Learning from other regions. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 10:307-27.

Smith, M. P. 2001. *Transnational urbanism: Locating globalization*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Smith, N. 1992. New city, new frontier: The Lower East Side as wild wild west. In *Variations on a theme park*, edited by M. Sorkin. New York: Hill and Wang.

Sparke, M. 2000. From deterritorialization to reterritorialization: Globalization and the imagined geographies of emerging cross-border regions. Paper presented at the IASTE *End of Tradition?* Conference, October, Trani, Italy.

Spivak, G. 1988. Subaltern studies: Deconstructing historiography. In *Selected subaltern studies*, edited by R. Guha and G. Spivak. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press.

———. 1990. *The post-colonial critic*. New York: Routledge Kegan Paul.

Takahashi, L. 1996. A decade of understanding homelessness in the USA: From characterization to representation. *Progress in Human Geography* 20 (3): 291-310.

United Nations. 1996. *Habitat agenda and Istanbul declaration: Second United Nations Conference on Human Settlement*. New York: United Nations.

Vale, L. 2000. *From the Puritans to the projects: Public housing and public neighbors*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.

Veness, A. R. 1992. Home and homelessness in the United States: Changing ideals and realities. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 10:445-68.

Wacquant, L. 1997. Three pernicious premises in the study of the American ghetto. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 21 (2): 341-53.

———. 1999. Urban marginality in the coming millennium. *Urban Studies* 36 (10): 1639-47.

Wainwright, J., S. Prudham, and J. Glassman. 2000. The battles in Seattle: Microgeographies of resistance and the challenge of building alternative futures. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18 (1): 5-13.

Ward, P. 1999. *Colonias and public policy in Texas and Mexico: Urbanization by stealth*. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.

Ward, P., and G. C. Macoloo. 1992. Articulation theory and self-help housing practice in the 1990s. *Urban Studies* 16 (1): 60-80.

Webster's new universal unabridged dictionary. 1983. 2d ed. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.

Wilson, E. 1991. *The sphinx in the city: Urban life, control of disorder and women*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Wilson, W. J. 1987. *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Ananya Roy is an assistant professor in the Department of City & Regional Planning at the University of California, Berkeley. She has a master's degree in city planning and a Ph.D. in city and regional planning from the University of California, Berkeley. Her areas of interest lie in comparative urban studies, international development, social policy, and feminist theory. She is the author of City Requiem, Calcutta: Gender and the Politics of Poverty *(2002). She is currently coprincipal investigator and coeditor on a Ford Foundation "Crossing Borders" research and book project titled* Urban Informality in an Era of Liberalization: A Transnational Perspective *(forthcoming).*