



Continuum of Carcerality: How Liberal Urbanism Governs Homelessness

After Echo Park Lake Research Collective
UCLA Luskin Institute on Inequality and Democracy

The After Echo Park Lake Research Collective is based at the UCLA Luskin Institute on Inequality and Democracy and brings together university and movement-based scholars with unhoused comrades to study displacement in Los Angeles. We analyze and challenge systems of housing insecurity and scrutinize the investment of public resources in the criminalization of poverty and in carceral housing. Our research is a counterpoint to racial banishment and seeks to advance housing justice in Los Angeles and worldwide. Collective members include Ashley Bennett, Jennifer Blake, Jonny Coleman, Hannah Cornfield, La Donna Harrell, Terrie Klein, Sam Lutzker, Hilary Malson, Jessica Mendez, Carla Orendorff, Gustavo Oztzy, Annie Powers, Chloe Rosenstock, Ananya Roy, Rayne Laborde Ruiz, and William Sens, Jr. **Contact:** ananya@luskin.ucla.edu

Abstract

A distinctive regime of the spatial governance of poverty is underway in Los Angeles, one in which the criminalization of homelessness is yoked to placements in carceral shelter and framed as the right to the housing. In this essay, we uncover the state violence inherent in such liberal urbanism by showing how such placements insert the unhoused into a system of carcerality while promising that they are the path to permanent housing. Seeking to trouble and critique the dominant paradigm of U.S. homeless management, Continuum of Care, we conceptualize a continuum of carcerality that stretches from encampment sweeps to seeming housing solutions. We find that the placements are a ruse, reproducing housing insecurity through exclusion, expulsion, and waiting, a structural condition that we term permanent displaceability. By focusing on an emergent mercenary entity, Urban Alchemy, and its expanding contracts for displacement and security, we show that there is a distinctive political economy associated with the continuum of carcerality. Our analysis is rooted in an ethnographic research methodology that centers the radical praxis of unhoused comrades. To this end, we foreground the demands of a homeless union that formed during the COVID-19 pandemic, UTACH, Unhoused Tenants Against Carceral Housing, which uses the framework of “carceral housing” to hold the state accountable to its promise of housing while refusing the carceral contracts that accompany such a promise. We take up their critique as an example of the ongoing reinscription of the terms of tenancy under conditions of global racial capitalism.

Keywords

Homelessness, carceral, encampment, liberalism, displacement, tenancy, shelter



Prologue: When a tent is better than a hotel room

On May Day 2020, with the city of Los Angeles under a Covid-19 ‘Safer-At-Home’ order, housing justice activists staged the occupation of a suite at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel. One of several downtown hotels that had received large public subsidies or what following Neil Smith (2002, p. 427) can be understood as ‘geobribes,’ the Ritz-Carlton Hotel drew the attention of social movements that were calling for the public acquisition of vacant hotels for the purposes of sheltering the unhoused. Indeed, various legal declarations had made evident that—during a public health emergency—city executives have the power to commandeer private property, a political opening that can be understood as ‘emergency urbanism.’ With such sovereign power unutilized, and with the vast majority of 48,000 unhoused Angelenos unsheltered, the occupation drew attention to what Ruth Wilson Gilmore (2020) has pinpointed as ‘organized abandonment.’ It was led by Davon Brown, resident of a growing homeless encampment at Echo Park Lake, a public park in a rapidly gentrifying neighborhood of Los Angeles. While the encampment had become a refuge, even resisting various evictions by the city, residents were keen on the idea of hotels as housing. They demanded access to a newly established state program, Project Roomkey, which utilizes federal emergency funds for the use of hotel rooms as non-congregate shelter for people experiencing homelessness. In this poignant set of photographs posted to Instagram in April 2020 by the community organization Street Watch LA, various residents of Echo Park Lake hold up signs stating, ‘Mayor Garcetti, I will gladly trade this tent for a hotel room’ (Figure 1).

Echo Park Lake residents finally gained access to Project Roomkey a year later, but under conditions of forced eviction. On 24-25 March, 2021, the City of Los Angeles staged a police invasion of the park, sending 400 battle-ready police officers to evict the encampment. In the weeks leading up to the eviction, the city’s homeless services authority had been mobilized (weaponized might be a more appropriate framing) to offer Project Roomkey placements to residents. By the time of the police invasion, only 15-20 residents remained out of a couple of hundred, with others either having left the park or acquiesced to these placements, which promised a guaranteed path to permanent housing. Indeed, Los Angeles Mayor Eric Garcetti declared the placements as ‘the largest housing transition of an encampment ever in the city’s history.’

But just a few months later, the trail of broken promises was evident. Project Roomkey fell far below the 15,000 rooms it was supposed to provide and several hotels started to close, with residents subject to mass evictions, often enforced by the police. Project Roomkey residents began to speak out against intolerable conditions of isolation, surveillance, and state supervision, dubbing the program Project No Key, and even Project Death Key. As deaths mounted in the hotels, it became clear that it was necessary to scrutinize and challenge the forms of carcerality that governed such spaces and the effects of such carcerality on housing insecurity. It is thus that La Donna Harrell, an unhoused member of our research collective who was expelled from Project Roomkey for ‘non-compliance’ and is now living on the streets, reminds us: ‘That people prefer a tent to a hotel room tells you everything you need to know about Project Roomkey.’



Figure 1

Echo Park Lake residents hold signs declaring that they will gladly trade their tents for hotel rooms. 22 April, 2020. Source: @streetwatchla

Our research collective, the *After Echo Park Lake* research collective, which brings together university and movement-based scholars with unhoused comrades, has undertaken such research on Project Roomkey since its formation in April 2021. As discussed more fully in our monograph, *(Dis)Placement: The Fight for Housing and Community after Echo Park Lake*, at the heart of our research methodologies is an ethnographic method that centers the experiences, aspirations, and organizing of unhoused persons. Over the course of a year, we interviewed 41 residents, in some cases, multiple times and gathered and analyzed community-sourced knowledge of another 43 residents. Ours is currently the only ethnographic account that exists of Project Roomkey, one that has been able to tackle the challenges of disappearance, isolation, and containment. Ours is also currently the only community archive of this state program, a repository of placement lists, carceral contracts, eviction notices, and resident grievances. Such research is a counterpoint to the truth regimes of liberal urbanism, which seek to excuse and legitimize carceral containment.

The interlocutors of such truth regimes are many, and far exceed the familiar figure of the liberal politician. Take for example copwatch activist, @FilmThePoliceLA, who insists: [‘Don’t compare project room key...to jail,’](#) one reason being that [‘there are people that want them as an option until permanent housing can be found’](#) and the other this: [‘Can they leave? Yes or no. That’s a big difference from a jail...’](#) Or take for example, Mark Horvath, founder of Invisible People, a media platform focused on homelessness, who acknowledges that a program like Project Roomkey is not housing but continues to laud it: [‘...Project Roomkey is not a prison. I have been in jail 4 times. I don’t know of a jail cell that has private showers and that you can voluntarily leave...’](#)

Against such truth regimes, our ethnographic and archival research foregrounds the cruel paradox that is ‘carceral housing’ and demonstrates its central role in liberal urbanism. The aspiration for housing, and even for temporary programs such as Project Roomkey, is real, as made evident by the large number of Echo Park Lake residents who accepted such placements. What is key to this regime of poverty governance is that the fulfillment of such aspiration is conditional upon accepting a carceral contract, where containment masquerades as consent. While bearing the promise of housing, such contracts enlist the unhoused in

programs that enforce isolation and containment and enact expulsion if program rules are violated. Recognizing the aspirations for housing that lead people to seemingly consent to such programs, UTACH, Unhoused Tenants Against Carceral Housing, a homeless union founded in 2021 in which several of us are members, has insisted on politicizing ‘carceral housing,’ turning this impossible category into one of collective subjectivation.

At one of the first meetings of UTACH, held in a small public park in downtown Los Angeles, in the shadow of luxury condominium towers, a displaced Echo Park Lake resident, Beth¹ explained her eagerness for Project Roomkey: ‘I am so happy to have my own bathroom, to be able to shower every day in privacy.’ Beth was also intent on ensuring that this placement would lead to permanent housing. Indeed, her expertise in navigating the system became a source of valuable knowledge for other UTACH members for many months. At the same time, sitting by her side, Queen, a member of our research collective who was also displaced from Echo Park Lake said to the group: ‘Those damn showers could be gilded in gold for all I care. I am never going to be bribed by them. That’s just a way of trading away our freedom.’

Liberal urbanism and the centrality of carcerality

The criminalization of homelessness is not new. There is now a substantial body of scholarship demonstrating the expansion of anti-homeless laws that enact spatial exclusion (Mitchell, 1997; Beckett and Herbert, 2010) and foregrounding the mobilization of public health and environmental safety logics for such exclusion (Goodling, 2020; Herring, 2021). We are especially interested in liberal forms of poverty governance that marry spatial exclusion and carceral containment, for example through ‘therapeutic policing that coerces unhoused persons into shelters and services (Stuart, 2016). It is thus that Herring (2021, p. 264) argues that shelters ‘increasingly function as complaint-oriented “services”’ and have become ‘a privileged tool of the police to arrest, cite, and confiscate property of the unhoused.’ Speer (2017, p. 160) designates spaces of homeless management, including sanctioned encampments that combine ‘care’ and ‘custody’ as carceral.

We find that a distinctive regime of liberal urbanism is in the making in Los Angeles, where the promise of housing accompanies displacement. Such a framework, now a hallmark of the Echo Park Lake displacement, is enshrined in the expanded anti-camping law, Los Angeles Municipal Ordinance Section 41.18, which went into effect in Los Angeles in 2021. Here, police enforcement is coupled with outreach to and engagement with encampment residents to ‘facilitate buy-in on housing options.’ Indeed, this ‘Street to Home’ strategy clearly states that ‘an encampment cannot be cleared if the PEH [persons experiencing homelessness] living at the site are not offered a suitable housing and services resources’ (City of Los Angeles, 2021). It is worth noting the two ambiguities that are at work here. First, all that is needed to initiate action against an encampment is an ‘offer of housing’ declaration by the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority. Needless to say, an offer of

¹ Beth is a pseudonym. To learn more about Beth, take a look at Chapter 2 of the monograph *(Dis)Placement*.

housing is not the same thing as a housing placement. Second, at the heart of such liberal forms of poverty governance is the sly redefinition of housing, in this case to include ‘interim housing’ and various types of congregate and non-congregate shelter.

We interpret such ‘offer of housing’ strategies as a mode of poverty governance that undermine the protections against spatial illegalization afforded by the Ninth Circuit ruling on *Martin v. City of Boise* (2018), a landmark lawsuit that prohibits cities from passing anti-camping ordinances if there is a scarcity of shelter beds. Following Rankin (2021, p. 559), we understand such strategies as part of ‘transcarceration’ where the criminalization of homelessness is repackaged. As Rankin notes, ‘post-Martin efforts reframe displacement, forced confinement, and control over unsheltered people not as criminalization, but as compassion.’ It is thus that in California, liberal politicians such as Mark Ridley-Thomas have yoked criminalization to the ‘right to shelter,’ situating such a right in the racial justice traditions of the civil rights movement (see also Blasi, 2019). Ridley-Thomas works closely with Sacramento mayor, Darryl Steinberg (2019), who describes the right to shelter as: ‘Homeless people should have a legal right to shelter and a legal obligation to utilize it’ (emphasis added). Here, then, is the political sphere of liberal urbanism, one where the framework of rights is also the framework of penalty, and one where Black liberal politicians like Ridley-Thomas can invoke the language of civil rights in the service of criminalizing the Black poor.

In California, the right to shelter will soon become the ‘right to housing.’ Set to take effect on 1 January, 2023 in the City of Sacramento, this ordinance entails ‘a first-in-the-nation right to housing and obligation to accept.’ The ordinance explicitly references the *Martin v. City of Boise* decision and imposes the obligation on unhoused people who are offered ‘two or more forms of shelter or housing’ to accept one. Especially noteworthy is the reinscription of terminology pertaining to housing:

The definition of ‘housing’ would include permanent dwellings, such as a house, apartment, or hotel room as well as temporary shelters, including tents, RVs, trailers or tiny homes in City-approved locations. Temporary housing would qualify only if the placement includes a plan for each person to attain permanent housing (City of Sacramento, 2021).

We interpret this distinctive regime of liberal urbanism, one in which the ‘offer of housing’ justifies displacement, as a continuum of carcerality. We use this phrase to trouble and critique Continuum of Care, the dominant paradigm of homeless management in the U.S. today (HUD Exchange). Indeed, we argue that carcerality is central to liberal urbanism. Social scientists have conceptualized the emergence of ‘carceral citizenship’ the U.S., by which they mean the ‘mass supervision’ of the ‘raced and criminalized poor’ (Miller and Stuart, 2017, p.532). While such conceptualizations emphasize that ‘carceral citizenship begins at the moment of a criminal conviction’ (Miller and Stuart, 2017, p.533), we expand carcerality as a system of power that encompasses even those without criminal conviction. Here we follow—and expand—two lines of inquiry. The first is the influential work of historians who have shown how, in the long history of U.S. social welfare provision, places of relief have also been places of policing (Katz, 1986), for example, public housing (Hinton, 2016). The

second is the growing body of scholarship on carceral geographies that, following Foucault, conceptualizes the carceral system as something ‘that reaches far beyond the prison’ (Moran et al., 2018, p. 668).

We seek to contribute to understandings of the spatial logics of carcerality as they pertain to the governance of poverty. In doing so, we build on—and extend—two concepts that are of considerable relevance to regimes of liberal urbanism. One is the concept of ‘spatial churn, which Herring et al. (2020, p.131) develop to show how police enforcement forces ‘homeless people [to] circulate between neighborhoods and police jurisdictions rather than leaving public space.’ Our research foregrounds such forced mobility, or what we call permanent displaceability, as a key feature of homeless management systems. The second is the ‘legal constitution of spaces of dwelling and domesticity into carceral spaces such that there is a ‘carceral continuum’ that extends the carceral state into the sphere of housing (Speer, 2016; Villanueva, 2018, p.979). In keeping with the idea of legal constitution, we pay attention to the contractual nature of carceral housing where the unhoused are refashioned as ‘willing participants’ in a system of legalized violence.

We are especially interested in situating such conceptualizations within an understanding of structures of property. Like mass homelessness, carcerality is not an aberration within liberal urbanism, but one of its key features as it exemplifies the relationship between property, personhood, and police that is foundational to liberalism. Following Baron (2004, p. 273), we conceptualize homelessness as ‘a problem not of poverty but of property.’ The homeless, Baron emphasizes, belong to the legal category of ‘no property.’ In keeping with Blomley’s critique of Baron’s argument, we do not interpret this category of ‘no property’ as one that is outside property but rather that is constituted, as an exclusion, through property as ‘a relational technology that organizes forms of conditional spatial access’ (Blomley, 2020, p. 26). Put another way, if as Porter (2014, p. 398) has shown, property serves as a ‘threshold of recognition’ in settler democracies, then the homeless stand outside such ‘possessory recognizability’ or what Roy (2003) has called ‘propertied citizenship.’ As Singh (2014, p. 1091) has shown, the police is an integral aspect of such propertied citizenship, ‘regulating an unequal ordering of property relations’ by policing ‘those who have no property and who are therefore imagined to harbor a potentially criminal disregard for propertied order.’ Situating this analysis in the long arc of racial capitalism, Singh designates this the ‘whiteness of police’ (ibid.).

In taking up the notion that those (mis)recognized as ‘homeless’ are consigned to the category of ‘no property,’ we, too, are concerned with racial regimes of property. In the U.S., mass homelessness is structured through racial inequality. In the County of Los Angeles, Black people represent over one-third of the homeless population while making up only nine per cent of the overall population. In other words, mass homelessness has to be understood as a form of Black dispossession, one that Roy (2019) has characterized as ‘racial banishment.’ Following Cacho (2012), who relies on the work of Patterson (1982), we interpret racial banishment as a system of ‘racialized rightlessness,’ one that manifests ‘social death’ and often, actual death. As Cacho (2012, p. 5) notes, social death does not mean that

people are ‘excluded from law’s discipline, punishment, and regulation. The point is that they are subject to criminalization but ‘excluded from justice...excluded from law’s protection.’

Pete White, a prominent movement leader in Los Angeles, describes banishment thus: ‘Banishment is when there is no place for you to go. Places for you to go are jail or death.’ White often describes Los Angeles as plantation capitalism, situating racial banishment in both historical and ongoing dispossession. His framing is reminiscent of what Poe and Bellamy (2020), in this journal, building on the path-breaking scholarship of Woods (1998) and McKittrick (2011), have termed ‘plantation urbanism,’ urban formations that reflect and reproduce the afterlife of slavery. In focusing on liberal urbanism, we draw attention in this piece to how liberal rights-based forms of personhood maintain plantation logics of social death.

The political economy of carcerality is of particular interest to us. We find that service providers, including new mercenary entities, hold lucrative contracts for this continuum of carcerality and have a vested interest in brokering displacement and reproducing this structure. They are in charge of the new types of ‘housing’ that have proliferated as federal economic relief funds and state surpluses are deliberately and perversely invested in the continuum of carcerality. Take for example the new Safe Sleep Villages, which are basically tents on the baking-hot asphalt of a fenced-in parking lot with a 24-hour mercenary security force that conducts intrusive searches and imposes curfews at a price point of \$2,663 per person per month (Figure 2).

Figure 2

Safe Sleep Village,
Los Angeles. Source:
Photo tweeted on 28
April, 2021 by
@MitchOFarrell,
Councilmember and
instigator of the Echo
Park Lake
displacement,
[https://twitter.com/mitc
hofarrell/status/1387579
800248672258](https://twitter.com/mitc
hofarrell/status/1387579
800248672258)



Finally, through ethnographic research, we uncover the various forms of rebellion and refusal that unhoused persons and collectivities stage within and against the continuum of carcerality. What does it mean when those who are designated as ‘no property’ claim property rights? Wells (2020, p. 1144), for example, shows how housing justice movements have made

the case for the right to shelter as a ‘property right that could not be taken away without due process and compensation.’ In Los Angeles, unhoused movements, such as UTACH (Unhoused Tenants Against Carceral Housing) have focused on the ‘offer of housing’ as a key site of contestation. Their insistence on using the term ‘housing’ is meant to call out the state’s sleight of hand in conflating shelter with housing while emphasizing the carceral nature of such housing placements. Their insistence on using the term ‘tenant’ is meant to invoke the property rights that accrue to tenancy, a status that is always under erasure when the state is landlord and nonprofit service providers are property managers. We interpret such namings as forms of collective political subjectivation, those in which the distinctions of the homeless management system—between the street, shelter, interim housing, and permanent housing—are exposed as fictional.

Carceral housing as contract

Project Roomkey (PRK) operates as a public-funded suspension of civil, human, and housing rights. In entering the program, one must sign a ‘participant agreement.’ Like most contracts of global racial capitalism, this one gives the appearance of choice and consent. The moment of consent is also the suspension of rights. Participants, with the threat of ‘exit,’ are subject to a long list of arbitrary rules that range from restrictions on personal belongings to curfews to no visitor policies that are arbitrarily enforced. In signing the agreement, participants consent to the regular search of their belongings and the unrestricted right of the service provider staff to enter and inspect their rooms. As evident in this excerpt (Figure 3) from the participant agreement, they are explicitly denied the protection of tenancy, even though many residents have been in PRK for a year now:

Figure 3

Project Roomkey
Participant
Agreement, Los
Angeles Homeless
Services Authority, 2
September, 2021.

CONTRACTED LAHSA SERVICE PROVIDER

Print Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

(Service Provider Staff)

PARTICIPANT(S). I have read and understand the terms of this Agreement and I agree to abide by it. I understand that violations of this Agreement may result in immediate exit/termination from the Project Roomkey – Interim Housing Program. I understand that **NO TENANCY IS CREATED** by my participation in the Project Roomkey Program. I understand that my anticipated last day in the PRK-IH Program is [_____].

Print Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

(PRK-IH Program Participant)

While touted as a housing placement, Project Roomkey has been designed as an emergency program that enforces rightlessness. The prohibition against tenancy is especially noteworthy because it is meant to suspend the protections for residential hotel tenants currently in place in Los Angeles. Won through years of organizing by housing justice

movements such as the Los Angeles Community Action Network, the City of Los Angeles Residential Hotel Ordinance of 2008 states that ‘a tenant is a person who is entitled to occupy and occupies a residential unit for at least 30 consecutive days.’ The recently formed UTACH, which was founded by those displaced from various encampments in Los Angeles, including those at Echo Park Lake, many of whom are now in PRK hotel rooms, challenges this suspension of tenancy in its very naming.

Intrusion and isolation

Our ethnographic research sheds light on the lived experience of carceral housing. Here we highlight two aspects of such experience: intrusion and isolation. Both are encapsulated in a fiercely worded speech given by La Donna Harrell, an unhoused member of our research collective, at a rally organized by UTACH and other movement organizations in protest of the expanded anti-camping law (see Figure 4). We include excerpts here, with their permission:

First I just wanna talk about the programs that they give unhoused people. ... These government programs, even their names are made to put me down. Like, Project Roomkey? It’s called Project Roomkey, yet no one has a room key. ...

These programs are made so we don’t want to go. I can make a tent with as much room as I want, and come and go as I want. ... When they say ‘there’s programs,’ no, nobody wants to go to any of those. Where they can be harassed and demeaned. ... You wanna displace us just to put us in this bullshit? ... And then on top of that, we have all these rules, for what? For not being able to afford rent in California ... in Los Angeles? ... As an adult, I don’t want to have a curfew just because I can’t afford rent. All these hoops and everything. And as I’ve been in Project Roomkey, my case worker has never tried to get in contact with me. ... And that’s the programs that are being offered. Ran by power-tripping, regular ol’ folk, with fuckin’ carceral rules. Even in jail, my sister can come to visit. We get written up if we visit inside the rooms. ... And they wonder why people get isolated and depressed, getting their drugs in, or whatever ... they have a pool there [at the hotel], they have a gym ... we’re not allowed. They even took out the ice machines. ... If you wonder why we don’t want to go to these programs, that is why.

Residents have noted that Project Roomkey should be retitled Project No Key. Denied room keys, they can only enter and leave their hotel rooms with the supervision and permission of security guards, at least two of whom are supposed to be stationed on each floor of each PRK hotel. They are not allowed to lock their rooms at any time. Residents provide anguished accounts of staff entering and searching their rooms while they are out, leaving residents with a deeply disconcerting sense of constant surveillance laced with the implicit threat of punishment. One displaced Echo Park Lake resident who is currently at the LA Grand Hotel, the largest PRK site in Los Angeles, described an especially devastating example of this process:

Figure 4

La Donna Harrell,
Right to Rest Rally, Los
Angeles City Hall, 28 July,
2021 Source: Anthony
Geronimo Orendorff.



I came back [to my room] and my daughter's ashes ... they had unlocked the bottom [of the urn], pulled out her ashes, cut the bag open. And in the process, some of it spilled. So when I came back, I seen her ashes. I see the bag's cut. I'm just not understanding, like, why? ... The thought that I had to have my daughter's ashes vacuumed up, and still keep a mental state of okay, you got to follow rules, you got to make sure you're cordial to everyone, show respect...

This relates to another key aspect of carceral housing: extreme isolation. Residents of Project Roomkey are not allowed visitors, mail, or incoming phone calls on hotel lines. They are not allowed to interact with other residents of the hotel, not even those in the rooms right next door to them. Not surprisingly, many residents have talked about the experience as torture, some even describing it as an experiment in state-supervised torture. The effects of such isolation are visible in the large number of deaths in PRK hotels, many of them from drug overdoses. As one UTACH member and PRK resident recently put it on a Signal thread (UTACH Signal thread, 2021, quoted with permission), 'Project Roomkey was always a prison; now it is also a morgue.' In their report, *We Do Not Forget: Stolen Lives of L.A.'s Unhoused During the COVID-19 Pandemic*, Roy and Rosenstock (2021, p. 4) argue that while such deaths are accounted in state records, notably coroner's data, as individual acts of overdose, they are more appropriately understood as a collective condition of suffering caused by displacement. They ask: 'What does it mean for places of relief and care to become places of death? What does it mean for the very sites that were meant to protect people from the ravages of the COVID-19 pandemic to become spaces of carceral isolation and state neglect?' In the following section, we argue that the effect of such carcerality is permanent displaceability.

Permanent Displaceability

Permanent displaceability is the mode through which unhoused residents of Los Angeles are governed and forced to exist. In contrast to gentrification theories from urban North America and Western Europe, which tend to conceptualize displacement as a process, Oren Yiftachel's (2020) work from the Global Southeast describes the condition of imminent displacement, i.e., displaceability. Displaceability produces marginality through the unhoused's involuntary distancing 'from the full rights to the resources and opportunities of their metropolitan region' (p. 154-155). Related to the concept of 'social death' (Patterson, 1982), displaceability also disregards maintenance of relationships to family and community. Displaceability builds upon the afterlives of colonialism, specifically the identity regimes through which structural oppression is perpetuated, thereby re-constructing urban citizenship as 'separate and unequal' (Yiftachel, 2020, p. 160). Time becomes a tool of governance, as one's displaceable condition becomes seemingly never-ending; hence, permanent displaceability.

Displacement is of course a central component of displaceability. But displacement, as a process, is not a singular moment but rather iterative and prolonged. Our ethnographic research with displaced Echo Park Lake residents reveals long histories of housing and social insecurity. Their forced eviction was a moment of searing trauma, and now, a year later, despite state promises to the contrary, only four have gained access to housing. Six of these displaced residents have passed away and the rest remain in a state of waiting.

Our research also uncovers how this condition of waiting—waiting for the state to fulfill its promises—is a condition of displaceability. Below, we use two ethnographic vignettes drawn from the experiences of displaced Echo Park Lake residents to foreground key aspects of permanent displaceability, which we have conceptualized as swept, violated, waiting, shuffled, separated, disappeared, threatened, punished, and banished.

Alice* and Wesley²: Violated, threatened, separated, and waiting

Wesley and his mother were evicted from their Section 8 apartment while he was in high school. Unable to secure housing together, teenaged Wesley and his mother parted ways, and he slept on friends' couches for several years before finding refuge at Echo Park Lake in early 2020. That summer, his aunt Alice joined him in living at the park; an abusive partner had been stalking her and her family at their homes, and she fled their neighborhood to protect them from his harassment. Wesley set his aunt's tent up beside his and protected her from further harassment and unwanted propositions. Although Alice was thrilled when she received a Project Roomkey placement, her illusion of the hotel as a safe haven was shattered by an attempted intruder one night at 10 pm. The violation to her privacy was prevented only by her unsanctioned locking of her door, against program protocol. When she emerged from her room moments later, she confronted the only person present: a male staff member, who claimed he was trying to empty her trash, then threatened her with exit

² In keeping with our research protocols, these are pseudonyms.

from the program. Through this power play, he demanded her silence in exchange for shelter. Too young to qualify for Project Roomkey, Wesley managed to temporarily gain admission to the program before being forced out. Alice and Wesley, who were separated from their other family members yet maintained familial support as co-residents of Echo Park Lake, were now separated from one another. When we last spoke, they were no closer to housing than when the park closed: he sleeps outside the hotel, awaiting placement in another program, while she waits in her room, alone and unprotected, for housing that may never materialize. The homeless services system entrenches vulnerable people in a permanent state of rightlessness: as they linger in the system waiting for housing, they are further disempowered by violations, threats, and separation from supportive relationships.

Gustavo: Disappeared, shuffled, swept, punished, and banished

The Echo Park neighborhood was the first place Gustavo, an unhoused member of our research collective, arrived when immigrating from Guatemala to the U.S. in the 1980s, and it was where he returned to seek refuge in 2020, after being defrauded and evicted by his employer-landlord. Gustavo's experience of wrongful eviction is an example of the entanglement of systems of penalty and housing insecurity. In a 20 February, 2022 letter to the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Kath Rogers, Staff Attorney with ACLU SoCal, filed a complaint of civil rights violations for the incident. The letter documents that during the financial dispute between Gustavo and his landlord, it is Gustavo's parole officer who informed Gustavo that 'he needed to permanently leave his apartment...within two (2) hours or else he would be arrested.' The complaint thus states:

Mr. Otzoy had a legal right to a civil proceeding about his tenancy matter...However, [the parole officer] unlawfully forced Mr. Otzoy to immediately leave his home under threat of arrest without due process of law. As a result, Mr. Otzoy became homeless in the middle of a global pandemic.

During his year living at the Echo Park Lake encampment, Gustavo drew upon previous activist experiences to secure donations and redistribute them to his neighbors. When the police invaded the park for the mass eviction, he once again harnessed these skills to coordinate a poster campaign. Despite his notable presence at the park, the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, the main public agency in charge of homeless management, has no record of his ever having been there – he has been disappeared from their system. In reality, Gustavo shuffled from a mutual aid-supported motel room, to a tent in MacArthur Park, which was swept shortly thereafter, and eventually into Project Roomkey. When Echo Park Lake re-opened, he joined other organizers in posting flyers in protest of its new, exclusionary fencing. Targeted for his participation, he was assaulted by park rangers and hospitalized. In short sequence, Gustavo was 'exited' from Project Roomkey, found in violation of parole for posting flyers, and arrested. Although he left jail on bail and secured a motel room through a different voucher program with assistance from community advocates, he did so under a new parole condition: he was banned from coming within 500 feet of Echo Park Lake. Six months later, mainly because of a huge turnout by community

organizers, the parole violation charge was dropped by the courts, thereby keeping Gustavo out of jail. But the parole remains in place, and so does the condition of banishment from Echo Park Lake, the sanctuary he once called home.

Brokering displacement, profiting from carcerality

The City and County of Los Angeles manage poverty through a wide array of grants and contracts, outsourcing homelessness services, shelter and housing placements to a vast apparatus of nonprofit organizations. As a new regime of liberal urbanism takes hold with street engagement strategies that yoke police enforcement to offers of shelter and claims of housing placements, so such grants and contracts become even more lucrative. Project Roomkey sites are an example of this carceral contracting, as are organizations deceptively touted as alternatives to policing. Our research hones in on one such emergent organization, Urban Alchemy, which we conceptualize as a mercenary entity not subject to any public oversight or accountability. As the newest organization to find its way into the homeless services industry, Urban Alchemy provides municipal governments with a variety of services such as staffing of mobile bathrooms, litter pick-up, security, outreach, and more recently even case management. Through interviews with organizers and unhoused people who have interacted extensively with Urban Alchemy, as well as a review of correspondence documents between local governments and Urban Alchemy, we argue that they broker displacement and profit from carcerality.

In general terms, a broker is an intermediary who arranges a transaction between multiple parties. As an act of governance, displacement may be conceptualized as a transaction between displaced people and those who displace them, including the state. For high profile transactions such as the eviction of hundreds of unhoused people from Echo Park Lake, however, there is also a broader political transaction that warrants attention, i.e., that between government and a public potentially critical of their actions. Such a displacement requires not only brokerage between government and the displaced, but also between government and the public more broadly. In the case of the former, the brokerage work may be ensuring unhoused cooperation with the displacement process, while in the latter case it may be about selling the displacement to the public. Securing such legitimacy is of course an essential part of liberal urbanism. But we also find that brokerage perpetuates and expands carceral practices by making them seem both necessary and humane to a broad public.

Urban Alchemy began as a project based out of Hunter's Point Family, a non-profit that serves a predominantly Black neighborhood in San Francisco, with programs focused on such issues as environmental health and workforce development. One such workforce development program was Pit Stop, founded in 2014 with the Department of Public Works under its corrupt director Mohammad Nuru (Department of Justice, 2021). Originally premised on employing 'lifers' recently released from prison and on parole, Pit Stop organizes mobile bathroom and hand-washing stations which their employees maintain throughout the day. Because of its dual roles as 1) a jobs program for predominantly poor

Black men to find stable footing in the chaotic (and often demoralizing) period after release from prison and 2) a flexible, relatively cheap social service organization that can provide hygiene and other ‘services’ in response to the homelessness crisis, Pit Stop founder Lena Miller was able to successfully leverage her political connections to secure a row of contracts for Urban Alchemy in San Francisco (including nearby Sausalito), Los Angeles, and most recently Austin, Texas. Their rapid growth, fueled in part by no-bid contracts, is illustrated by an operating revenue for the 2021-22 fiscal year of \$43 million, a fourfold increase from 2019 (Coale, 2022).

Key to this expansion, however, was also an extension of the roles Pit Stop could play for government. Building off the successes of Pit Stop, Urban Alchemy was founded in 2018 and continued to build a similar scope of work, including a program in San Francisco called Tenderloin Clean. This scope began to change, however, as Urban Alchemy took on more contracts with the city, specifically since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. While staffed public bathrooms are an important and scarce resource in places such as San Francisco and Los Angeles, their presence has nonetheless produced local backlash and these programs have become less of a priority for politicians (Bishari, 2021; Ray, 2021). And as public outrage about homelessness grows, quick-fix solutions like security to patrol an area have become increasingly attractive to political elites. San Francisco Mayor London Breed’s use of tent counts as a metric of ‘success’ in combating visible street homelessness (Eskenazi, 2020) exemplifies this quick-fix mentality, whereby the strategic use of sweeps to displace and banish can artificially deflate the count and appease NIMBY (Not In My Backyard) interests (Mark, 2020).

What began as Pit Stop running hygiene stations, then, soon turned into Urban Alchemy keeping public spaces clear of unhoused persons and their belongings, often in coalition with business improvement districts (BIDs), which organize private security, maintenance and lobbying programs on behalf of paying local businesses, and police. In San Francisco’s Tenderloin, Urban Alchemy is receiving an \$8.8 million, two-year city contract plus another \$3 million from UC Hastings College of Law, which has also offered Urban Alchemy pro bono legal services through their Social Enterprise & Economic Empowerment Clinic (Sisto, 2021). The Tenderloin plan, which also includes additional resources for police, is the ‘brainchild of a working group of business associations and community benefit districts’, according to the director of the Mid-Market Business Association and the Mid-Market Foundation, which is administering the city’s grant (Moench, 2021). As noted by one of our researchers who visited the Tenderloin to witness Urban Alchemy’s presence there, the ‘ambassadors’ (of which there are approximately 75 per shift) stand on demarcated street corners in small groups and act as security (Smith and Sjosedt, 2022) to push unhoused people and anyone deemed suspicious to adjacent sidewalks, only for them to then return in the evening after Urban Alchemy leaves.

While no such BID encompasses Los Angeles’ Echo Park Lake, Urban Alchemy’s ‘practitioners’ helped to broker displacement there by making misinformed placement offers for shelters, many of which were already full, as the selection (Figure 5) of Urban Alchemy’s daily reports from Echo Park Lake demonstrates. Unlike in the Tenderloin, Urban Alchemy’s

presence was deceptively light-touch in Echo Park Lake, as they existed primarily for intel and optics. As Street Watch LA organizer Jed Parriot put it, Urban Alchemy employees would walk around the park in groups of three to pick up trash and occasionally say ‘hi’ to people. Along with these practices, which Urban Alchemy has called ‘public space activation,’ came more explicitly carceral activities, such as surveilling camps, including tent counts by street address. These counts have been used by Los Angeles Councilmember Mitch O’Farrell’s office and San Francisco’s Department of Public Works (DPW) to sweep particular locations (Figure 5).

January 16, 2021: "Today we had a few men that wanted to go to Shatto, but the Salvation Army said that they were full... both seniors."

January 19, 2021: "We had a wonderful time interacting with guests today. All was mostly quiet today. We visited with the new family and are building our relationships daily with them and other park guests."

January 20, 2021: "Today has been a great day. One of our residents says he wants to go to Shatto, but every time it's time to go he talks himself out of it. We found out later that currently all the men's beds are taken."

January 23, 2021: "Today was a good day although it was wet. The residents didn't seem to like that. We did population Count and park beautification. The residents are starting to follow our lead and pick up more. Thank you practitioners for your diligence and teamwork."

February 1, 2021: "Today we had our continental breakfast for our guests. We engaged with Chris and he wanted to go to the shelter. **The Shatto Shelter... is full. So we tried to place him at the Echo Park Rec... which was also full.** He wasn't interested in any other shelter. I will follow up with him tomorrow. We did park beautification."

February 3, 2021: "The UA team served Hot Coffee to our guests. I attempted to follow up with Chris again today. We were unable to find him at Echo Park Lake. We engaged with Ros Teer today and I gave her resources for low income housing. No one is willing to go to shelter today... **The 48 bed Max shelter is full.**"

February 4, 2021: "No guests wanted to go to the shelter today. **The Shatto Shelter... is currently full to capacity...**"

February 5, 2021: "**No one was willing to go to shelter today.** We did park beautification, including the park restrooms."

February 6, 2021: "Today we served Hot coffee to our guests. No one in EPL was willing to go to a shelter today. Pam Pacific Winter Shelter [sic]... **Currently full to capacity.** Echo Park Community Center... **currently is full to capacity.** The Shatto shelter... **Currently full to Capacity.** We did outreach and park beautification, including the restrooms."

February 7, 2021: "Today we served Hot coffee and cocoa to our guests. No one from EPL wanted to go to the shelter today. Pam Pacific Winter Shelter [sic]... **currently is full to capacity.** Echo Park Community Center... **currently is full to capacity.** The Shatto shelter... **is currently full to capacity.** Oakwood Recreation Center Winter shelter... **currently full to capacity...** **The tent count is less today. Because the city workers came and picked up some tents today.** Thanks team for a great day..."

Figure 5

A selection of daily reports at Echo Park Lake, sent from Urban Alchemy to the council district’s office.

Like so many other social service organizations, Urban Alchemy’s activities are not unique to their organization; rather, they act on behalf of the city departments who pay them. What makes Urban Alchemy unique is who staffs the organization and how it exploits these staff members’ backgrounds in service of government optics (for an example of how they do this, see Elder and Shanks, 2022). With minimal training (Peltz, 2021), Urban Alchemy staff are placed into locations that may or may not be familiar to them with the assumption that they will foster positive relationships with unhoused people and other neighborhood residents through services and conversation. This does happen, of course, but the assumption that paroled staff will more or less automatically connect with local unhoused residents flattens different, but related, experiences under an essentializing identity politics, whereby racialized class positions are treated as both broad and deterministic. Rather than offering trauma-informed training, which is of little use when one’s role is to displace people, Urban Alchemy expects staff to naturally connect with unhoused people over an imagined

collective trauma of race and class discrimination. The deep irony of this thinking is that Urban Alchemy staff and unhoused people do share similar traumatic experiences from carceral conditions, whether prison or the street, but find themselves still bound up in these same conditions. For both, the elusive promise of inclusion in mainstream society is premised upon accepting the carcerality they have experienced, whether prison or the shelter system, as well as that which they will continue to experience, whether parole or Project Roomkey.

We thus conceptualize Urban Alchemy as a counter-insurgent formation, one in which the use of formerly incarcerated people to present offers of shelter and housing to the unhoused legitimizes displacement and facilitates carceral containment as a strategy of poverty management. Such counter-insurgency is an integral part of liberal urbanism, one in which people experiencing homelessness and incarceration are used to exploit and police one another.

Community against carcerality

The continuum of carcerality stretches from the street to shelter and housing placements. As carceral housing is a key feature of today's regime of liberal urbanism, so are encampment 'clean-ups,' more accurately known in activist circles as sweeps. Sweeps are city-sanctioned sanitation operations backed by police power. Bearing farcical names such as HOPE and CARE+, in Los Angeles, sweeps enact intimidation that in turn undergirds the 'buy-in of housing options.' Take for example this description of an encampment sweep by NBC4 reporter John Cádiz Klemack (2018): 'For some, seeing trash trucks come and crush their belongings into pieces over and over again – it becomes the catalyst they needed to accept the help they're offered.'

The cruel irony is that during encampment sweeps, communities are given between 15-30 minutes to move all of their worldly possessions several city blocks, often times at least a mile away, to be out of a designated cleaning zone. Unhoused residents often lose personal belongings that are critical to their survival ranging from tents/bedding, and food to personal documents such as IDs, Social Security Cards and others crucial for obtaining housing. While such sweeps are legitimized by the 'help' that Klemack references, such help is largely non-existent. As Martinez (2021, p. 9) shows, street-level homeless management is characterized by 'performative productivity,' where the unhoused, mythologized as services-resistant, are subject to invasive protocols, ultimately 'signing up for waitlists that go nowhere.'

In early 2020, unhoused residents at Echo Park Lake began taking a stand against such displaceability, specifically refusing and resisting sweep operations. As the encampment grew, so the City of Los Angeles began scheduling weekly sweep operations in attempts to clear the park, but offered no real tangible answers to the question that residents repeatedly asked: 'Where will we go?' In a letter addressed to the Councilmember, entitled Dear Mitch, Don't Evict Us (Residents at Echo Park Lake, 2020), encampment residents asked for a halt in sweeps and in their stead, real housing solutions. They proposed a good neighbor contract,

which were rules that they would be willing to abide by in order to keep the area clean, safe, and enjoyable for all park-goers for the duration of their stay there. The poignant letter was ignored by the Councilmember, Mitch O'Farrell, who would later instigate the forced eviction of the Echo Park Lake encampment.

Realizing that their plea was not going to be heard, encampment residents joined with community organizers to initiate a new tactic: sweep blockades. These were large-scale protests in which activists put their bodies on the line to form a physical blockade around the encampment to prevent law enforcement and sanitation workers from destroying people's property and disbanding the encampment. For nearly two months, encampment residents and community organizers were able to halt sweep operations and eviction attempts at Echo Park Lake. In doing so, they also created a coalition between housed and unhoused activists against displacement, one that was unusual in the context of vicious NIMBYism.

Our research finds that such sweep blockades created an infrastructure of care and solidarity that then found expression in the building of life-saving infrastructures when the encampment was abandoned by the city during the Covid-19 pandemic. From a community kitchen to a community garden to showers and a job program, these infrastructures created a social economy. Especially important was the cleaning up of trash and resident safety patrols, including through the jobs program, a counterpoint to the city's persistent efforts to criminalize the encampment through racialized narratives of crime and waste. In interviews, now displaced Echo Park Lake residents narrate how such community life, while complex and inevitably fraught with conflict and division, made possible a life free of police enforcement and carceral supervision. 'It was family,' is a common refrain in these interviews. Through forms of self-governance and self-regulation, encampment residents came to keep each other safe. These rules and agreements were straightforward: do not steal from each other and keep drug use inside tents. A now-displaced Echo Park Lake resident explained the rules to us thus:

It's simple like you would have in any community, you don't steal from friends, you look out and you respect one another ... you don't use drugs outside or illicit activity outside your tent, keep it in your tent and you can do whatever you want... You can't shun a person for [drug use], you can't hate a person for that, you can't say you're weak for that. You say you're human and all that happens. And let's try [sobriety] next time.

As our research shows, while programs like Project Roomkey have seen high overdose deaths directly caused by carceral isolation, encampments like Echo Park Lake have been spaces where residents have strived to create a community approach to addiction.

We find such notions of community to be rooted in a sharp critique of racial capitalism. Here is an elaboration of this critique by this now displaced resident who explains one of the key rules that were in place at the Echo Park Lake encampment:

If you want to steal, steal from stores, steal from places that are insured, where you're not hurting anybody. But when you're stealing from someone who's homeless, and they're struggling for everything they got every day ... that's messed up.

Nothing about us without us: The fight against carceral housing

Scholars writing in this journal have provided important expositions of the ‘political infrastructures of care’ (Kapsali, 2020) and of ‘revolutionary care’ (Nelson, 2020). We build on these ideas to foreground the recent formation of the homeless union, Unhoused Tenants Against Carceral Housing (UTACH). Led by displaced residents of Echo Park Lake, many of whom are now in carceral isolation at Project Roomkey sites or expelled from such sites, UTACH presents a crucial challenge to carcerality. Stating that ‘carceral programs and overcrowded shelters’ are not the answer, it ‘demands community self-determination, autonomy, and the same rights as housed tenants in Los Angeles’ (UTACH website). UTACH is also a platform of advocacy, one in which members actively advocate for better living conditions in Project Roomkey as well as for access to housing resources. In such advocacy, they are keenly aware of the danger of being deputized by the regime of liberal urbanism as proxy case-managers and homeless services managers. Instead, UTACH members adopt an ethico-politics that resembles what Nelson (2020) has termed ‘revolutionary care’: ‘nothing about us without us.’ At UTACH meetings, on Signal threads, and at sweep monitoring watches, members help each other navigate the opaque bureaucracy of homeless services and housing programs and vouchers while refusing and reinscribing the contracts of liberal urbanism. These forms of care stand in sharp contrast to the homeless management system, known as Continuum of Care, which our concept of continuum of carcerality is meant to trouble and critique. Following Kapsali (2020, p. 16-17), we view such care practices as a ‘collective world-making,’ one in which people become ‘active political subjects.’ In this concluding section of the essay, we draw attention to two aspects of such collective political subjectivation.

Figure 6

Right to Rest Rally, Los Angeles, 28 July 2021.
Source: Ananya Roy



Continuum of Rage

On 15 September, 2021, Jenn Blake, an unhoused member of our research collective and UTACH member, penned an email to the directors of the Los Angeles Homeless Service Authority (LAHSA) and other service providers. Written in all caps, the email expressed the rage that Blake felt in witnessing yet another encampment sweep. Unhoused for many years, Blake was shuffled between different Project Roomkey sites at the height of the pandemic, and then, because of her persistent advocacy, placed in an apartment through a rent subsidy. While touted as permanent, she has cast scrutiny on the temporary nature of this subsidy and the rent cliff that looms. But on this day, what concerned Blake was the lack of bathrooms at the encampment that was being subject to a sweep in the name of sanitation. Outlining her encounter with LAHSA workers who dismissed the need for bathrooms for the unhoused, Blake wrote to the executives of the Continuum of Care:

REMIND YOURSELF THAT AT THE END OF THE DAY YOU GET TO GO HOME TO A SAFE ZONE WHERE YOU GET TO EAT SHOWER SHIT AND SLEEP PEACEFULLY.

While Blake herself was no longer living on the streets, she saw herself in a continuum with such houselessness. Such identification is a distinctive feature of collective political subjectivation, one in which the distinctions of the homeless management system—between the street, shelter, interim housing, and permanent housing—are exposed as fictional. Blake and other UTACH members know that each of these seemingly distinct categories is just a face of permanent displaceability.

Continuum of Rights

What does it mean when UTACH demands the ‘same rights as housed tenants of Los Angeles’? How should we make sense of the seeming paradox at the heart of its naming: ‘unhoused tenants’? Or that of ‘carceral housing’? We interpret this demand and naming as a reinscription of property rights and relations. If the state-organized violence that is racial banishment is taking place under the sign of ‘housing,’ then UTACH is insistent on claiming such housing while also identifying it as carceral. Articulated amidst the expanding emergency of evictions and rental debt, the claim to housing by the unhoused exposes the utter precarity of such tenancy. After all, in Los Angeles, hundreds of thousands of tenants, mainly Black and brown, stand on the brink of houselessness. Thousands more are imperiled by the housing and land grabs of Wall Street investors and other real-estate speculators. Following Kapsali (2020, p. 18) we read this collective political subjectivation not as an assertion of liberal equality but rather as one of ‘transversal equality,’ a common-ness forged in and through difference.

The framing, ‘unhoused tenants,’ is also as UTACH notes, a stark reminder that ‘for many unhoused communities, the city and service providers are their landlord.’ It is thus that a vital part of UTACH’s work has been the careful reading, storing, and revision of the

carceral contracts of liberal urbanism, including the ‘participant agreements’ of temporary and emergency programs. We share here, with his permission, Benito Flores’s extraordinary line-by-line response to a ‘Participant Temporary User Agreement’ issued to him by the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA). Flores is an organizer with Reclaiming Our Homes, a movement to take back vacant homes expropriated in the 1950s and 1960s by Caltrans, California’s transportation agency, for a freeway project that never materialized. While the reclaimers have successfully occupied some of these homes, and resisted the militarized police forces unleashed to evict them, what they now have to contend with is the transmutation of this occupation into ‘temporary transitional housing’ run by the city. It is this ‘Participant Temporary User Agreement’ that Flores takes apart, asserting a continuum of rights that are denied in this carceral contract of liberal urbanism. We leave you with four excerpts of his refusal as the closing images of this essay.

Participant Temporary User Agreement

We struck out all text that is unconstitutional or against the laws of the State of California or the human rights and write down text (green) to make this agreement adjusted to law.

This Participant **or Tenant, (California Health & Safety Code sec 50801(i) does not prohibit the use of the word Tenant, in fact it talks 2 times about “Rents and service fees” (the idea of eliminating the word “rent” has nothing to do with the law.)** Temporary User Agreement (“Agreement”) is made by and between the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (“HACLA”), through its Management Agent, ~~Beach Front Property Management, Beach Front P. Mngmt is rejected and unacceptable because of its human rights violations~~ and _____ (“Participant(s)”) and is effective as of _____, 2020. The subject of this Agreement is the premises located at _____, Los Angeles, CA, ~~and such other locations that Participant(s) may be provided as emergency transitional shelter (the “Premises”) as part of the Program (defined below).~~

Excerpt 1:

Flores asserts tenancy and rejects the property management company assigned to this deal.

This Program and the operation of the Premises is in response to the **Los Angeles County Shelter Crisis Declaration and the Executive State of Emergency Proclamation** and permission to enter the Program and use the Premises is temporary only. The Participant is ~~not a tenant, subtenant, resident, lessee, boarder or lodger of HACLA~~ **This agreement derives from Calif Health Safety Code sec 50801(i) which talks 2 times about “Rents and service fees” and does not prohibit tenancy.**

with respect to the Premises or the Program. The Participant acknowledges HACLA’s **by mutual agreement with participant** ~~right of control over and access also to the Program unit occupied by the Participant, as well as the right of contractors hired by HACLA to control and access the unit.~~ Participant(s) will sign a Move-In Checklist upon entry to the Premises, which is attached to this Agreement as **Exhibit B. as long as exhibit B is not against the US CONSTITUTION, HUMAN RIGHTS, THE LAW OF THE LAND and common sense.**

Excerpt 2:

Flores rejects the invocation of emergency to suspend tenancy rights and asserts a continuum of rights and ‘common sense.’

2. Program-Interim Transitional Housing Site. You Are a Participant in the Program and as such you are a “participant” in an interim transitional housing site during a declared public health emergency, “California COVID-19 Pandemic” (DR-4482), declared by the Federal government (FEMA) on March 22, 2020 and the Los Angeles County Shelter Crisis Declaration to address general homelessness in Los Angeles County. Participant(s) are expected to work with the Service Provider staff and engage in activities that will facilitate obtaining and maintaining interim or permanent housing and exiting this emergency temporary housing. Those Participant(s) who refuse to work with Service Provider staff may be exited from the Services Program and use of the Premises **as long as The Services Program show a prior percent of success above 50% and are relevant to Participant needs.** with reasonable posted notice not to exceed 30 days unless there is imminent danger to the safety or security of other persons or property, in which case notice is not required. **This is an illegal duplication of the existing law about danger, safety of persons or property, the “reasonable 30 days” are a violation of the constitutional due process.**

Excerpt 3:

Refuting the all-powerful role of Service Provider, Flores inserts performance standards that counter the blame placed on program participants.

23. Guests. A guest is anyone who has not signed this Agreement, is not an Authorized Family Member, and is not associated with Caltrans, HACL A, the Property Manager, Service Provider or their agents, including any security staff. Limited overnight and daytime guests may be allowed on the Premises with proper notice, review and approval by the Management Agent (“Approved Guests”). Approved guests who stay overnight shall be limited to parent/child visitation, licensed or medically required caretakers, or other special circumstances. No more than two Approved Guests are allowed to visit the Premises during non-quiet hours and all parties must practice social distancing during such visits. Participants are responsible for the actions of their guests and any damages or losses to the Premises or the personal property of HACL A or Caltrans caused by such guests. **Family members and friends do not need to be authorized, that is a violation of human rights.**

Excerpt 4:

Finally, in the simplest and yet crucial statement of care over carcerality, Flores fully rejects the prohibition against guests.

References

- After Echo Park Lake Research Collective (2022) *(Dis)placement: The Fight for Housing and Community After Echo Park Lake*. UCLA Luskin Institute on Inequality & Democracy. Available at: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/70r0p7q4>. (Accessed 22 June 2022).
- Baron, J. (2004) Homelessness as a property problem, *The Urban Lawyer* 36(2), pp. 273-288.
- Beckett, K. & Herbert, S. (2010) Penal boundaries: banishment and the expansion of punishment, *Law & Social Inquiry*, 35(1), pp. 1-38.
- Bishari, N. (2021) City’s Popular Portable Toilets Frequently Moved or Closed, *San Francisco Public Press*, June 8. Available at: <https://www.sfpublicpress.org/citys-popular-portable-toilets-frequently-moved-or-closed/> (Accessed 24 February 2022).
- Blasi, G. (2019) Legal right to shelter, *Los Angeles Lawyer*, pp. 30-35.
- Blomley, N. (2020) Precarious territory: property law, housing, and the socio-spatial order, *Antipode*, 52(1), pp. 36-57.

- Cacho, L.M. (2012) *Social Death: Racialized Rightlessness and the Criminalization of the Unprotected*. (Durham: Duke University Press).
- City of Los Angeles (2021) Report back: Street Engagement strategy. Available at: https://clkrep.lacity.org/onlinedocs/2020/20-1376_rpt_cao_7-28-21.pdf (Accessed 22 June 2022).
- City of Sacramento (2021). Mayor introduces right to housing, obligation to accept for unhoused city residents. Available at: <https://engagesac.org/blog-civic-engagement/2021/11/15/t5fwjeigk8hhm57yh82u5jbg8cyyp> (Accessed 22 June 2022).
- Department of Justice (2021). Former San Francisco public works director admits to string of bribes and corruption during years in office. United States Attorney's Office, Northern District of California. Available at: <https://www.justice.gov/usao-ndca/pr/former-san-francisco-public-works-director-admits-string-bribes-and-corruption> (Accessed 24 February 2022).
- Eggers, S. (2021) A statement from unhoused Project Roomkey residents facing eviction, Knock LA. July 15, 2021. <https://knock-la.com/a-statement-from-unhoused-project-roomkey-residents-facing-eviction/> (Accessed 22 June 2022).
- Eskenazi, J. (2020) City's homeless tent count drops sharply from mid-pandemic high, *Mission Local*, October 21. Available at: <https://missionlocal.org/2020/10/citys-homeless-tent-count-drops-sharply-from-mid-pandemic-high/> (Accessed 24 February 2022).
- Gilmore, R.W. (2020) Where life is precious, life is precious. *The Intercept*. Available at: <https://theintercept.com/2020/06/10/ruth-wilson-gilmore-makes-the-case-for-abolition/> (Accessed 22 June 2022).
- Goodling, E. (2020) Intersecting hazards, intersectional identities: a baseline critical environmental justice analysis of homelessness, *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, 3(3), pp. 833-856.
- Henderson, T. (2020) Hotels Not Hospital Beds. We The Unhoused, April 23. Available at: <https://www.dublab.com/archive/theo-henderson-we-the-unhoused-hotels-not-hospital-bed> (Accessed 22 February 2022).
- Herring, C., D. Yarbrough, L.M. Alatorre. (2020) Pervasive penalty: how the criminalization of poverty perpetuates homelessness, *Social Problems*, 67(1), pp. 131-149.
- Hinton, E. (2016) *From the War on Poverty to the War on Crime: The Making of Mass Incarceration in America*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
- Kapsali, M. (2020) Political infrastructures of care: collective home making in refugee solidarity squats, *Radical Housing Journal*, 2(2), pp. 13-34.
- Katz, M.B. (1986) *In the Shadow of the Poorhouse: A Social History of Welfare in America*. (New York: Basic Books).
- Klemack, J.C. (2018) HOPE team dismantles homeless encampments, seeks out services for LA's homeless population, *NBC4*, October 18, 2018. Available at: <https://www.nbctv.com/local/hope-team-seeks-out-services-for-las-homeless/157001/> (Accessed 22 June 2022).
- Levin, S. (2021) Los Angeles police clash with protesters in fight to evict major homeless encampment, *The Guardian*. March 25, 2021. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/mar/25/los-angeles-police-homeless-encampment-clash> (Accessed 22 June 2022).
- Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (2018) Report and recommendations of the ad hoc committee on Black people experiencing homelessness. Available at: <https://www.lahsa.org/documents?id=2823-report-and-recommendations-of-the-ad-hoc-committee-on-black-people-experiencing-homelessness> (Accessed 22 June 2022).
- Lutzker, S. (2021) 'Project No Key' Project Roomkey's punitive policies hamper California's efforts to house the unhoused. *Knock LA*, February 24, 2021. <https://knock-la.com/project-roomkey-punitive-policies-ce8d59c534fb/> (Accessed 5 February 2022).
- Mark, J. (2020) Trove of text messages reveal Mayor London Breed ordered homeless sweeps directly – despite frequent denials, *Mission Local*, May 26. Available at:

- <https://missionlocal.org/2020/05/trove-of-text-messages-reveals-mayor-breed-ordered-sweeps-directly-despite-frequent-denials/> (Accessed 24 February 2022).
- Martinez, D.N. (2021) Homelessness in Southern California: street-level encounters with the state and the structural violence of performative productivity, *Radical Housing Journal*, 3(2), pp. 9-26.
- McKittrick, K. (2011) On plantations, prisons, and a black sense of place, *Social & Cultural Geography*, 12(8), pp. 947-963.
- Miller, R.J. & Stuart, F. (2017) Carceral citizenship: race, rights and responsibility in the age of mass supervision, *Theoretical Criminology*, 21(4), pp. 532-548.
- Mitchell, D. (1997) The annihilation of space by law: the roots and implications of anti-homeless laws in the United States, *Antipode*, 29(3), pp. 303-335.
- Moench, M. (2021) Mayor Breed poured millions into Tenderloin community ambassadors, added police months before crackdown. Has it helped?, *San Francisco Chronicle*, December 30. Available at: <https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/Mayor-Breed-poured-millions-into-Tenderloin-16737386.php> (Accessed 25 February 2022).
- Moran, D., Turner, A., & Schliehe, J. (2018) Conceptualizing the carceral in carceral geography, *Progress in Human Geography*, 42(5), pp. 666-686.
- Nelson, A. (2020) Nothing about us without us: centering lived experience and revolutionary care in efforts to end and prevent homelessness in Canada, *Radical Housing Journal*, 2(2), pp. 83-100.
- Patterson, O. (1982) *Slavery and Social Death*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
- Peltz, J. (2021) 'The fence is never coming down,' and other things urban alchemy told us, *Knock LA*, July 1. Available at: <https://knock-la.com/urban-alchemy-los-angeles-unhoused-outreach-echo-park-lake-fence/> (Accessed 25 February 2022).
- Poe, J. & Bellamy, J. (2020) Plantation urbanism: legacy, property, and policing in Louisville, Kentucky, *Radical Housing Journal*, 2(2), pp. 143-164.
- Porter, L. (2014) Possessory politics and the conceit of procedure: exposing the cost of rights under conditions of dispossession, *Planning Theory*, 13(4), pp. 387-406.
- Rankin, S. (2021) Hiding homelessness: the transcarceration of homelessness, *California Law Review*, 109, pp. 559-613.
- Ray, L.O. (2021) The city is deciding to remove all hand-washing stations at encampments as covid-19 cases surge (again), *LA Taco*, July 13. Available at: <https://www.lataco.com/portable-sink-homeless-removal-la/>. (Accessed 22 June 2022).
- Residents at Echo Park Lake. (2020) "Dear Mitch, Don't Evict Us." *Knock LA*, Available at: <https://knock-la.com/dear-mitch-dont-evict-us-8ed407d86f70/> (Accessed 22 June 2022).
- Reyes, E., Oreskes, B. & Smith, D. (2021) Why did so many homeless people die while staying at one hotel used in Project Roomkey?, *Los Angeles Times*, June 28, 2021. <https://www.latimes.com/homeless-housing/story/2021-06-28/la-homeless-people-died-after-entering-covid-hotel-why> (Accessed 22 June 2022).
- Roy, A. (2020) *Emergency urbanism*, Public Books, November 24, 2020. <https://www.publicbooks.org/emergency-urbanism/> (Accessed 22 June 2022).
- Roy, A. (2003) Paradigms of propertied citizenship: transnational techniques of analysis, *Urban Affairs Review*, 38(4), pp. 463-491.
- Roy, A. (2019) Racial banishment, *Antipode* (Keywords in Radical Geography: Antipode at 50), pp. 227-230.
- Roy, A. & Coleman, J. (2020) People are about to be pushed into homelessness on a large scale. Hotels are key to keeping them off the streets, *The Appeal*, July 17, 2020. <https://theappeal.org/hotels-housing-homelessness-crisis-coronavirus-evictions/> (Accessed 22 June 2022).
- Roy, A. & Rosenstock, C. (2021) *We Do Not Forget: Stolen Lives of LA's Unhoused During the COVID-19 Pandemic*. UCLA Luskin Institute on Inequality & Democracy. Available at: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9104j943> (Accessed 22 June 2022).

- Scott, A. (2021) High cost of Los Angeles homeless camp raises eyebrows and questions, *NPR*. May 25, 2021. <https://www.npr.org/2021/05/25/999969718/high-cost-of-los-angeles-homeless-camp-raises-eyebrows-and-questions> (Accessed 22 June 2022).
- Singh, N. P. (2014) The whiteness of police. *American Quarterly* 66(4), pp. 1091–1099.
- Smith, M. & Sjostedt, D. (2022) Shooting of Tenderloin ‘ambassador’ raises questions about security practices at fast-growing Urban Alchemy, *The San Francisco Standard*, 28 February, 2022.
- Smith, N. (2002) New globalism, new urbanism: gentrification as global urban strategy, *Antipode* 34(3), pp. 427–450.
- Speer, J. (2016) The right to infrastructure: A struggle for sanitation in Fresno, California homeless encampments, *Urban Geography*, 7, pp. 1049–1069.
- Speer, J. (2018) The rise of the tent ward: Homeless camps in the era of mass incarceration, *Political Geography*, 62, pp. 160–169.
- Steinberg, D. (2019) Building more permanent housing alone won’t solve homelessness in California, *Los Angeles Times*, May 17, 2019. Available at <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2019-07-16/op-ed-building-more-permanent-housing-alone-wont-solve-homelessness-in-california> (Accessed 22 June 2022).
- Street Watch LA ‘Echo Park Lake’ Instagram. April 22, 2020. Available at: https://www.instagram.com/p/B_TZCSRAk7I/ (Accessed 22 June 2022).
- Stuart, F. (2016) *Down, out and under arrest: policing and everyday life in Skid Row*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- UTACH (Unhoused Tenants Against Carceral Housing). Website: <https://www.utach.org/>.
- Villanueva, J. (2018) Pathways of confinement: the legal constitution of carceral spaces in France’s social housing estates, *Social & Cultural Geography*, 19(8), pp. 963–983.
- Wells, K.J. (2020) Policy-failing: a repealed right to shelter, *Urban Geography*, 41(9), pp. 1139–1157.
- White, P. (2016) Black banishment and real community at Skid Row, interview by Kenton Card. Available at: <https://challengeinequality.luskin.ucla.edu/2016/03/02/luskin-school-students-interview-urban-color-lines-activists/> (Accessed 22 June 2022).
- Woods, C. (1998) *Development arrested: the blues and plantation power in the Mississippi Delta*. (New York: Verso Press).
- Yiftachel, O. (2020) From displacement to displaceability: a southeastern perspective on the new metropolis, *City*, 24(1-2): pp.151-165.