




Occupation dynamics and resistance of homeless people in public spaces

Gabriel Robles Gavira

Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia y Ayuntamiento de Cádiz  

Esther Hernández Fernández

Trabajadora Social de Cruz Roja Cádiz  

<https://dx.doi.org/10.5209/cuts.92229>

Enviado: 30/10/2023 • Aceptado: 20/03/2024

ENG Abstract. The aim of this article was to analyse the processes involving control, conflict and removal of homeless people from urban public spaces in the city of Cadiz. The physical and social context of the research refers to the social field, a competitive social space with different positions and hierarchies that produce power inequalities. The field work was conducted at two points of the city to compare differences and similarities in terms of the dynamics of the field of conflict. The methodology involved participant observation and informal interviews. The results reflect differences in power and resources between authorities, neighbours and other actors in disputes over space and homeless people with meagre means. The conclusion is that the field has developed into a fight to make homeless people visible and secure recognition and rights, in response to the tendency to render the problem invisible and make it disappear from public space.

Keywords: Homeless, social agents, public space, social field, conflict.

How to cite: Robles Gavira, G., & Hernández Fernández, E. (2024). Occupation dynamics and resistance of homeless people in public spaces. *Cuadernos de Trabajo Social* 37(2), 311-318. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5209/cuts.92229>

1. Introduction

According to FEANTSA (2017), homeless people are those who live on the streets and may spend the night in a shelter and the rest of the day in a public space, falling under the category of "Roofless/Homeless". This is the first section of the European Typology of Homelessness and Residential Exclusion (ETHOS). This research focuses on the most extreme situation in the classification, ETHOS+1, which includes people who live on the streets or in public spaces. The following circumstances descend in severity from the categories of Roofless, Homeless, Insecure Housing, and Inadequate Housing. There are thirteen situations in this classification based on the risk of residential exclusion, ranging from spending all their time on the streets to living in overcrowded housing (see FEANTSA, 2017; De la Fuente-Roldan, 2022).

The journey from at-risk residential areas to homelessness is the result of a multitude of interrelated factors. Individuals transition from spaces of vulnerability to homelessness. The integration-exclusion dichotomy can be visualized as a dynamic process through three spaces: integration-vulnerability/risk-exclusion (Castel, 1995). The analysis of the circumstances leading to homelessness must be interpreted from the interactions of individual spheres (illness, addiction, divorces or separations, delinquency, deaths or mental health problems), relational and social networks (family conflicts and breakups, lack of family and friendship networks, lack of social skills, uprooting, isolation, disconnection), cultural (racism, belonging to excluded minorities, immigrants, cultural and linguistic integration, illiteracy), or economic-labor (unemployment, precariousness, instability, low qualifications and training, irregular or insufficient income and losing housing) (Subirats, 2004; 2005; Tezanos, 2008). In the Cadiz city, the most common causes among the homeless people are unemployment, family problems and a combination of separations/divorces, health issues, and addictions (City of Cadiz, 2021).

This work purpose is to analyze the process and strategies in power struggles over public spaces between integrated citizens, homeless people, and other actors. That is, to describe and analyze the process of the expulsion of homeless people from public spaces until they become invisible in the city. On the other hand, to analyze what are the practices of appropriation of public space by homeless people. How this appropriation is countered by other actors (citizens-neighbors, public administrations, companies and businesses, NGOs, political parties, media) that coincide in the field of dispute to expel and restore the previous image of the place. The physical place of the dispute is a public and symbolic space of struggle between different agents and interests. The research scenario refers to the notions of field, a competitive social space structured around different positions and hierarchies of resources leading to power inequalities (Bourdieu, 2000).

A field in dispute with different resources is connected to the exercise of power, domination, and discipline. Power, as the likelihood of imposing one's will; domination, so that homeless people obey the instructions they receive, and discipline, so that attitudes are internalized, assuming quickly, obediently, simply, and automatically to the requirements of the agents (Weber, 2014). The goal of the agents (police, municipal services, neighbors, associations, etc.) is the removal of the homeless from the visible spaces of the city and achieve, through discipline, that they move to other locations.

According to Foucault (2009), it is possible to impose this discipline through various mechanisms. Firstly, with constant hierarchical inspection and control of the camping sites. Applying normalizing sanctions, such as collecting, raising, and moving regularly. Forcing the relocation of individuals from the places where they spend the night, justifying the need for cleaning and removal of belongings. They also denounce and fine the homeless, although it rarely happens. The insistence on cleaning devices and removing belongings, as well as the mobilization of the homeless by the authorities, reduces their presence and visibility in the public space of the street. These practices foster constant nomadism.

Parties prime the hypothesis that a field of conflict emerges when there is a dispute over a space. That is, homeless people find a separate and sheltered place, away from the interactions and gazes of the rest of society. Gradually, they settle in that space until they attract the attention of any of the Occupation dynamics and resistance in public spaces of homeless people. What are the phases, moments, and characteristics of space, time, and people that result in the appropriation and removal of public space.

Homelessness signifies the lack of material means, but also a limitation in the exercise of many rights that the rest of the population has internalized unconsciously due to living a normalized life. The lack of housing limits the right to vote, access to health care, education, social benefits, social assistance, and obtaining or maintaining employment. In this sense, two states of citizenship can be suggested, a formal one that provides the possibility for all individuals to have rights and a real one where some people encounter obstacles to exercise them and, therefore, are excluded.

Just as important as material and legal support is the social construction based on ideas, prejudices, and stereotypes that articulate the discourses and actions of aporophobia (Cortina, 1996). The individualistic explanation turns the homeless people into guilty and responsible for their situation. Economic marginalization drives them to invisibility, casting them to the streets. In contrast, recognition is an identification and public appreciation of value (Honneth, 2011).

These people live in public spaces like streets, squares and places where it is allowed to stand and/or pass. It is the territory of social interaction and collective disposal. As a physical space, it is of open access and travel, opposed to restricted legal norms (Varela, 1999). Although public spaces can also be considered as environments for the reproduction of inequalities and political influences. Monreal (2016) states that the economic crisis of 2007 meant the culmination of the "neoliberal city". A model that seeks segregation, stigmatization and the invisibility of poverty, accompanied by the gentrification and tourismification of historical centers, as well as the isolation of residential areas making them more secure through isolation, surveillance and control. From one end, the values of order, well-being and cleanliness to their antithesis, poverty, dirt and marginalization (Monreal, 2016). In summary, what can be shown and what should be hidden.

The commercialized public space rejects elements that go against the aesthetics of the city as objects of consumption. In this way, the exercise of "preemptive repression" against the poorest groups (Delgado, 2011:49), "homeless containment areas" (Davis, 2001:17) or "hostile architecture" to distance them from urban centers (Romero, 2019) are justified to achieve their exclusion (Bourdieu, 2007a:120). "There is no space that is not hierarchized and does not express social hierarchies and distances". The position of the homeless in urban space manifests their social space in that hierarchy, without capital and outside of social norms. Their physical and social place concentrates negative qualities. The exclusion of homeless people from social space is an attempt to maintain social distance, keeping them away from spaces that are positively valued.

In the city of Cádiz, the historic center or urban beaches attract tourist activities and visitors. It promotes an image of a clean, sterile, peaceful, and safe tourist city. However, these tourist spaces are attractive for informal activities such as begging (Rubio-Martín, 2021).

The notion of field delimits the social space where conflict with the homeless takes place. A field is the specific social space of related social positions (Bourdieu, 2000). These relationships are shaped by the power or capital of the agents involved in the dispute in that social space. Power or capital creates hierarchy and inequality between individuals, groups, and institutions.

On the other hand, the field, according to Bourdieu (1995), has three moments. Firstly, the positions in the social field, secondly, the relationships between the positions of agents or institutions, and lastly, the habitus of agents. The habitus is the product of internalized macrosocial structures during socialization through the material and emotional environment that the individual unconsciously and pre-reflexively puts into practice, but structured and structuring, which guides, conditions, and determines the practices of individuals according to that scheme in the field (Bourdieu, 2007b:86). The actors involved try to impose their worldview and, according to their place in the social space, have different resources that regulate their actions (Bourdieu, 2000: 118-119).

Homelessness, public space, and agents, along with their respective interests, shape the social field of conflicting forces in the city of Cadiz. On one side is the State's position, through local administration, which holds symbolic power, legal powers, and the "monopoly of legitimate physical force" (Weber, 2021:143). On the other hand, homeless individuals, who "have practically no social existence without a fixed address" (Bourdieu, 2007:120). There is also the citizenship, those integrated, who maintain social and symbolic resources that

can be mobilized in various ways in favor of specific interests and needs, pressuring institutions to achieve their goals. To a lesser extent, companies and businesses appear in the field, which have economic and relational resources. Lastly, the media, which use symbolic capital to mobilize public opinion.

The situation of homeless people, the use and occupation of space, the conflict fields for that space, and the legitimization of how that space should be, lead to the concept of power. Bourdieu and Foucault share an interest in the study of power. Bourdieu (2000; 2012) examines how social distinctions, not only economic ones, construct hierarchies. Foucault tries to unravel how power manages to internalize obedience and discipline through control and normalization of behaviors (Foucault, 2009).

Finally, just as there is an exercise of power, there are processes of resistance. In this case, there is an asymmetrical situation due to the resources of homeless people in the field. In their subordinate position, they must use their own means of resistance. For the dominated, openly confronting a superior enemy is counterproductive. Therefore, they resort to subtle actions or shortcuts. According to the degree of acceptance-rejection of the official discourse, they range from flattery, praise, conformity, and empathy to concealment, covert actions, and anonymity; then to masking, where rumors, gossip, lies, and distortions can be found; and finally, to explosion, challenge, revolt, starting with grumbling, criticism, protests, escalating to open confrontation (Scott, 2003). Another extreme resource is civil disobedience (Thoreau, 2015), the refusal to obey justified by an extreme situation of injustice.

2. Methodology and research techniques

The techniques used revolve around three main vertices: first, participant/non-participant observation and informal interviews; second, the analysis of legislation on the use of public space, administrative documents; and finally, news from the media. Information is obtained through various channels: municipal delegations and services for the implementation of eviction or the removal of belongings and cleaning, intervention bulletins from the local police, notices or information from neighbors or NGO's, in this case, through the local press: *Diario de Cádiz* y *La Voz de Cádiz*.

The physical locations that focus on the work are the surroundings of the Puertas de Tierra, the main entrance of the walled enclosure in the city center, and, on the other hand, the lower part of the La Caleta Spa, on the beach of the same name, also in the old part of Cadiz. The social reality from which the data emerge is the relationships between the various agents, the result of their actions, the places where they take place, and the regulations that govern the use of that space. This context has two main actors: the homeless and the public administration. Indirectly, there are other actors, the neighbors who denounce the situation, and, to a lesser extent, the media, which disseminate and amplify the problem.

The fieldwork was carried out in the months of March and April 2022. However, the documentation on the research dates back to 2016 for the Balneario de La Palma area and the summer of 2018 for the Santa Elena vaults, although, after their closure, camping moved to the other side of the wall, to the Puerta Tierra Foso Park.

In the practical fieldwork, most of the interviews are informal and brief conversations. Questions and comments are made at the time of intervention. However, during interventions, when the focus is on other municipal devices, especially cleaning, it is possible to ask questions or seek clarification from the homeless individuals. Municipal devices generate distrust among the homeless, making it difficult to arrange for them to attend or formally organize interviews. There is a manifestly evasive attitude towards recording conversations. The lack of length and depth in the interviews is compensated by the number of contacts with homeless individuals in a short period of time.

During the fieldwork, five interventions were carried out in the two settlements, interacting with nineteen homeless individuals, predominantly male, Spanish, aged between 35 and 55, and with more than three years on the street. The presence of women in the settlements is minimal. Additionally, municipal cleaning and local police personnel participated in informal conversations and provided their professional opinions on the issue. There are a few interviews that have more depth. These are individuals who are willing to spend more time and engage in a dialogue about homelessness and camping. Two homeless individuals, both men, aged 57 and 55, with two and five years on the street, respectively. An interview with the social worker from the street team, aged 32, who has been part of it since 2019. Finally, a 49-year-old woman, president of a neighborhood association for 5 years, with a focus near the settlements.

Media presence is captured through Google's advanced search tool. The filter yielded ninety-six news articles. The search keywords were "homeless individuals", "homeless", "homelessness", and "camping" combined with "Santa Elena vaults" and "La Caleta". After cleaning and filtering, sixteen positive news articles about homeless individuals were found for the research.

3. Results

3.1. Homeless Spaces: Puertas de Tierra and La Caleta Beach

The first space, the Puertas de Tierra (the Santa Elena vaults and the Puerta de Tierra Moat Park), has records of the presence of homeless individuals since 2018. Initially, the occupation is caused by situations of insecurity and vulnerability that arise in other parts of the city. It is a migration of the most excluded. Santa Elena has ideal conditions, both architectural and urban and socio-community. Being a new settlement

with new practices, they avoid the presence of drugs as it deteriorates coexistence, alarms public opinion, and authorities. It is a small delimited community of homeless individuals. However, the main obstacle to maintaining the settlement is its location in a Cultural Interest Site. On the other side of the walls is located the Puerta de Tierra Moat Park. It is a garden area with a road that connects the main avenue of the city with the train station. The place is central and visible to passersby. The campsite has tents and everyday life objects (blankets, clothes, utensils, etc.). In general, easily transportable objects. The other conflict area is the lower part of the La Palma Spa, on La Caleta Beach. Although this place is used as a place to spend the night during Carnival festivities, in recent years the homeless have been camping there permanently. It is less visible because it occupies the lower part of a building supported by columns. The downside is that the lower visibility favors the presence of drugs, conflicts and uncontrolled spread of the campsite. However, discretion ends with the beginning of the beach season, between June and September. During this period, complaints from beachgoers are common: for unhygienic conditions, decorum problems, drugs and fights. This leads to tensions, resistance and negotiations between the eviction devices and the homeless. Like Puertas de Tierra, La Palma Spa is classified as a Cultural Interest Site, which additionally is also subject to the Coastal Law, as it is located on a beach.

Finally, both share the scope of application of the Public Safety Protection Law, which considers the occupation of public spaces a minor offense. In article 17.1, it says "The Security Forces and Corps may limit or restrict the circulation or stay in public roads or places." Consequently, in article 32, point 3, it specifies that "Mayors may impose sanctions and adopt the measures provided for in this Law when the infractions are committed in municipal public spaces or affect local assets." However, in practice, it is difficult to act because it is a minor offense.

The way of life of the homeless in La Caleta and the surroundings of the "Puertas de Tierra" walls shows differences, they are two settlement models. The first, the La Caleta settlement, is more anarchic and improvised. There is a greater flow of people coming and going. Additionally, it is the place chosen by passersby in the city, hippies, street musicians, young backpackers, immigrants looking for a place, etc. On the other hand, due to less control, it is the space chosen by people with consumption behaviors and addictions. It is dirtier and more neglected. There is trash, waste, bags and papers around it. There is usually more tension with cleaning devices and the police. It is the space chosen by the excluded among the excluded. In contrast, the stay at Puertas de Tierra is more organized and orderly. It is a more visible place and a historical-touristic attraction. There are certain rules, even if tacit, that self-regulate entries and the behaviors of those who camp there. This results in a reduction of conflicts. Interactions with other agents are dialogical and negotiable. Disputes are scarce.

3.2. Start of Campsites

The first moment of conflict activation and the expulsion of the space is the appropriation of the space by homeless individuals. The process begins with the presence of a person with their few belongings taking up a small space. Exclusive use of this space doesn't attract attention initially. Normally, a single person with a few belongings is not unusual. The two main locations of this work (La Caleta beach and the surroundings of Puerta de Tierra) share features of discretion, anonymity, reservation, and concealment from others, as well as distancing from passersby.

However, it doesn't take long for a space unnoticed by the rest of society to become a desired place for the homeless. Within a few days, the settlement has multiplied, transitioning from an anonymous place to a visible one. The growth of the campsite is both quantitative and qualitative. That is, the number of people installed increases, but also the sophistication of the dwellings and the limited comforts that can be provided. The customization of the space provides characteristics of appropriation, differentiation, and identification of the place for its resident. There are usually broken frames, stuffed animals, used game boxes, some old books, beach umbrellas, in other words, debris found in the trash or abandoned that serve as decorations. In the last visit to the La Caleta campsite, the following comment arises: municipal personnel: "and this... (pointing to a broken television)?" homeless person: "what's up... we have it in the living room to watch the games (laughs)."

Regarding solitary individuals, the appropriation process is similar, however, they have more time to make the space their own. As they don't stand out, they stay longer in the place, invisible. On the other hand, if there is no report or mobilization for their expulsion, they reach an implicit agreement with the community to establish themselves in the medium or long term.

3.3. Eviction Process

Evictions have a protocolized dynamic by municipal devices. One or two days before, we inform them of the date for cleaning and removal of belongings. The day of the intervention is an "uncomfortable" moment, municipal staff see it as "a very unpleasant situation", "these people who have nothing and we are going to take away what little they have, a small space they try to make their own" (Street Team). However, in these processes, there are concessions based on empathy because the situation is emotionally valued as "unpleasant and unfair". Homeless individuals are the target of the device, but most of their biographies are known. A recurring thought in these situations is: "after all, they are not criminals, it is inevitable to empathize."

Municipal personnel: “Well, leave the things outside the beach, but quickly. When we leave, I won’t know what you do because I won’t be here... Understand?... then you decide what you want to do...”

When a homeless individual’s site and belongings are disorderly and there is trash around, the likelihood of alcohol, drug, or mental health problems is higher. Upon notice of eviction, the attitude is inquisitive and defiant, “where do we go; what do we do; where do we go; tell me where to live; when are you going to give us an alternative; etc.” The conflict is latent and can erupt at any time during the intervention.

On the other hand, the opposite style is conformity. The looks say, “okay, fine,” and they shrug because they passively accept it. They are tired of the recurring interventions that do not solve anything. Their only option is to grumble or resign. They collect their belongings, move to another place or wait a while to resettle.

The intervention is different when the homeless person is alone and in very poor condition. They occupy a central space on busy streets to beg. This individual is a homeless person who begs and remains there almost all the time, unlike beggars, who leave the site when commercial activity decreases. The physical and psychological deterioration is acute. The occupied space is small, almost no belongings and no tent. They sleep on a blanket or sleeping bag with few objects around. There are some food scraps that attract insects. The lack of hygiene and the strong odor are unbearable because, at times, they cannot hold back their needs. If we add the exposure to the sun and the rising temperature, the image is daunting. The person’s response is always the same: “leave me alone,” “I don’t want anything,” “leave me alone.” The expressed desire is to dissociate, alienate and isolate themselves from others. Here, the concept of disaffiliation takes on its full meaning of personal abandonment, disconnection, and isolation from the world.

The withdrawal and cleaning of these places is quick. The lack of hygiene allows for intervention for public health reasons and due to health risks for them. Health services are called and the patient is transferred to the hospital’s emergency department. Sometimes, there are arguments with the ambulance staff because they believe their life is not in danger and it is not an emergency. In this case, the person is abandoned and in a regrettable state, with incontinence and abdominal ascites. The ambulance service’s resistance to transporting such deteriorated homeless individuals is due to the fact that they subsequently have to disinfect the ambulance. The time they spend on transportation and disinfection immobilizes the ambulance for several hours, not attending to other emergencies.

3.4. The Meaning of Space

The situations show two ways of appropriating public space. On the one hand, homeless people at the beach and those who frequent the surroundings of the “Puertas de Tierra” walls try to turn the space into a reflection of a home, a refuge to return to and rest with a certain temporal projection, “until they kick us out.” On the other hand, there are homeless individuals who are alone or heading towards a process of disaffiliation, isolating themselves from the rest of society, the more severe the physical and mental deterioration.

The latter do not seek anything resembling a home. Taking a part of the commercial public space responds to the need for a place to stay, rest, safety and basic resources for food but with no future projection, just trying to get through one more day. The appropriated space does not grow or improve to become more habitable. On the contrary, it increases in uncleanness along with the physical and mental deterioration of the individual. In these cases, there is no conflict when faced with eviction devices because there is no fight to stay in the space.

In the campsites, the extent of the term home goes beyond having a roof; it needs to fulfill the basic functions of residence, security and intimacy to lead a dignified life. The most controversial function for the homeless and society is the concept of intimacy, the right to preserve our most intimate actions from public and general exposure. Modernity establishes a separation between behaviors confined to the private sphere (Elias, 2009). Among them, everything related to bodily practices confined to the privacy of the home: eating, grooming, dressing, resting, attending to bodily functions, having sex...

At La Caleta beach, when the summer season arrives, the most vocal in expelling those living in the lower part of the La Palma Spa are “the bathers.” A significant portion of the bathers are residents of the La Viña neighborhood, one of the most popular and depressed neighborhoods in the city. During the summer, complaints from bathers are constant and interventions are frequent. These come through the city hall’s registry, through the Local Police bulletins, in news articles, or directly ordered by the City Council. The reasons are the lack of hygiene, indecent behavior, drug and alcohol consumption, or fights among the campers. In the beach season, from May to September, this space is taken over by residents and tourists, and the tension is directed towards the excluded, who are outside socially and publicly accepted behaviors.

In the improvised dwellings of the homeless, it is challenging to replicate a bathroom, so they relieve themselves wherever possible, but space quickly becomes saturated. Then, the criticism is automatic, simplistic, and derogatory. Neighbors comment: “They’re dirty!,” “Can’t they do it somewhere else?,” “Right there, in front of everyone!” The truth is, in that environment, there are not many places to do it. The exposure of the intimate in public marks the distance between “them” and “us.” It underscores individual differences, justifies their state of poverty, but does not question the cause of this situation. It is reassuring to believe that the cause is individual and not structural; otherwise, we would all be responsible or could all end up in that situation after a stressful life event (deaths, separations, unemployment, evictions, etc.) (Cabrera, Malguesini, & López, 2002; Muñoz, Vázquez, & Vázquez, 2003).

On the other hand, most citizens who walk down the street do not see the conflict. Only a few citizens who observe the situation take the homeless individuals’ side. A woman passing by says, “He doesn’t harm

anyone, doesn't cause trouble, leave him alone." Charity or compassion are attitudes that most people can feel. However, the question is, what would this person's opinion be, if a homeless person slept in front of their house every day? Sometimes, the "*Not in my back yard*" theory comes into play and citizens are not as compassionate. This phenomenon (NIMBY) refers to organized movements by community agencies that react by rejecting and vehemently opposing the perceived risk that the establishment of groups, populations, activities or infrastructure considered uncomfortable, unpleasant, dangerous or threatening entails (Nello, 2003; Sepúlveda et al., 2008; Mardones, 2009).

This conflict is constant in commercial streets. The most heard phrase is "*do something*" In "*do something*" any measure can fit. Here, the end justifies the means. Smelling bad or lack of hygiene is not a crime, but smell isn't just a physiological phenomenon; it is a moral issue, contributing to the construction of the self, as well as the moral formation of the group. Smell is not just an individual emission and a moral declaration; it is a social attribute, real or imagined. Smells, real and imagined, can legitimize class and racial inequalities, constitute one of the criteria used to impose a negative moral identity on a particular population. In this case, the smell is associated with poverty because someone is poor. In fact, this is not a thing of the past hygiene of cities; it is present, penalizing begging and associating it with antisocial behaviors (Burgos, 2022; 20minutos, 2012). This dilemma does not have a simple solution, moving, as Honneth (2011) says, between recognition and disdain.

A campsite or a person in the street is part of a process. It is neither the beginning nor the end of the homeless problem; it is another phase. They conceive street situations as a long journey. The solution to homelessness requires deep, long-term work because one must rebuild a disrupted life, whether it be due to loss of work and housing, family problems, separations or divorces, health problems, or addictions. The causes are complex, as are the solutions. The professional's perspective must be multidimensional. Working with homeless individuals aims to rebuild, at an administrative level, personal documentation and registration to access aid and services, a health card, and medical support, and at a personal level, self-esteem, social skills, and lost support networks. The goal is to reverse the street situation and reintegrate a person into society. The journey to the street takes months or years, and their recovery will require a proportional amount of time. The following interview segment narrates a common experience that social services try to address.

Municipal Personnel: "How did you end up on the street? What caused you to be in this situation today?" Interviewee: "Well... I lived in Madrid, with my father and a younger brother. My mother abandoned us when we were little. That time was tough, our father didn't treat us well; we grew up hearing my father constantly insult my mother; we grew up full of hatred and resentment towards her. That wasn't good, it affected us. My brother ended up in drugs, and in the end, he died of an overdose at 19. I loved him a lot... My relationship with my father worsened. I've spent almost my whole life with chronic depression. Later, my father, the only family I had, died. I've been working, but now, things have turned for the worse... Covid, unemployment, you know... The truth is... I'm very lonely, I have nothing (almost crying)."

Living in a camp with other homeless people is a form of sociability, there is no disconnection from the world. However, the resources needed to exit are immense, in terms of housing, support for job insertion, and treatment of physical or psychological pathologies. In extreme cases, support, supervision, and care need to be constant because the deterioration is irreversible. Even in these cases, the goal is to seek a dignified and stable alternative.

The concept of legitimacy refers to procedures, values or ethical criteria that underpin or justify social or legal norms, their source, or their content. In this sense, legitimacy judgments are value judgments. Behind these values is the consideration and justification of what is good or bad for individuals, groups, or society.

The legitimacy that the homeless seek is based on the demand for fundamental and universal rights to housing or a roof to live under and a job to sustain themselves. Constantly, in the evictions observed and in interviews conducted for this work, they recall the rights to work and to decent housing as enshrined in the Spanish Constitution, articles 35 and 47, respectively. They feel "victims" of their own personal circumstances and of the "system" that expels them and does not help them. The historical and traditional view of the homeless places them in the realm of meanings of begging, laziness, alcoholism or petty crime. This creates mistrust. This image attributes to the homeless the responsibility for their situation, it is an individualistic explanation of the causes.

Municipal services face the problem of complying with the guidelines of political representatives and laws that affect the spaces where homeless people settle. Homeless people, like municipal services, accept this principle of functional hierarchy, they understand the hierarchical procedure they must follow. Both the homeless and municipal employees, although from different perspectives, have internalized the sense of discipline through legal authority and the consequences of not obeying it. Obedience to authority (Milgram, 1980:15) is one of the forms that retains the greatest legitimacy in history, although no scenario is exempt from complications.

Finally, the third agent in the social field, integrated citizenship. It legitimizes its position by appealing to morality, order, normalization of behaviors, and rejecting deviations in privacy, decency, and other risky behaviors (urinating, defecating, drug use, fighting, yelling, explicit sexuality, etc).

Practices and strategies of conflict and expulsion. Between semi-permanent encampment and forced mobility According to Foucault (2009; 2019), the strategy of power begins by imposing control over individuals through constant surveillance. The strategy of control and power aims to normalize behaviors through surveillance, inspections, sanctions and forced mobility without exerting violence. Subsequently, inspections and punishment will deter behaviors so that individuals obey. The goal is for individuals to normalize and internalize behaviors automatically and unconsciously through these steps.

The city functions as a panopticon where information comes from different angles to control people who use public space regularly. Constant surveillance is accompanied by recurrent inspections. These inspections

are a means of controlling encampments and against the appropriation of space. The governing principle is that repetition internalizes obedience. In the early stages, they dialogue and discuss with municipal services to find empathy. With the routine of inspections, the homeless grumble, but gather their belongings to leave. In the last interventions, many people have left after being warned the day before, and those who remain have their belongings stacked up. Even municipal resources advise them to change locations to have more time for tranquility. The goal of repeating inspections is to internalize a mechanical discipline that causes their mobility. The goal is to make the phenomenon invisible with a punishment and learning continuously reproduced until the mechanics of the forbidden places are internalized, those that are more visible because they are more populated and/or attractive for commercial or tourist activities. The normalizing sanction seeks to correct and internalize behaviors with the infinite multiplication of processes. As Foucault expresses, "to punish is to exercise" (2009:185).

Scott (2003) describes different tactics that the dominated put into operation against the dominating groups, from seeking acceptance to challenge through veiling. What strategies do the homeless adopt to confront municipal services?

Firstly, conformity, negotiation and empathy. When we arrive at the camp, they have been informed the day before and have gathered some things. The sheds are unhooked but not folded, they move them complete with the less heavy belongings inside. They do enough to show that they are willing and that they are fulfilling their part of the deal. A pact that implies: "if we pick up things and move them aside, can we return when you leave?". We must understand that "we have to live somewhere". This scene of interaction and approach manages to introduce empathy into the process.

The next strategy of the homeless is to mask or hide information as a form of resistance. In this case, the people in the camps have knowledge and receive certain information, but they hide or distort it to favor their interests. There are occasions when at the beginning of the withdrawal and cleaning of the area, nothing is collected. A discussion begins because they claim that no one informed them of the operation. However, we always communicate the date and time of the intervention one or two days in advance. The goal is to delay the service as long as possible with the intention of cancelling it.

Another example of resistance is generating distortions, gossip or rumors regarding the work of homeless services. Often, homeless people claim that they cannot leave the camps because they have nowhere to go, that there are no vacancies in shelters, and/or denounce the malpractice of professionals: "they won't let me in", "they say it's all filled up", "there are no free beds", "they don't treat me with respect", "the food is bad", etc. The reality is different, the majority of the homeless have access to shelters and other housing resources, but it implies following rules, among others: not being drunk, not consuming drugs indoors (including smoking), following closing and meal times, respecting rest and waiting their turn (food, shower, social attention,...). Compliance with these rules is perceived as a lack of freedom, which diminishes their autonomy and freedom as well.

Lastly, the homeless resort to a defiant attitude, leading to active disobedience or open confrontation. First, anger, grumbling, under-the-breath comments, or comments that are not directly addressed to anyone appear. They criticize the attitude of municipal services by resorting to the injustice of their situation. They reproach our obedience and submission to orders. When conflict arises, they accuse us of being unable to disobey in the face of injustice. As a means of defense, they understand that the imperative to fight injustice must be stronger than the legal imperative. According to one homeless person: "you know we are right, that this is not right, that it is not fair..., but you keep going until you kick us out, you have no heart. Don't let the same thing happen to you. You don't have the balls to stand up..., what they tell you".

The last strategy homeless people implement is civil disobedience (Thoreau, 2015). An intervention with so many people, so much movement, so many orders, is an intense contrast compared to any day of their life, which is highly organized and subject to the meal schedules of social resources. Faced with the stress and pressure of dismantling their temporary home, they disobey.

In rare occasions, they go to extremes and resort to using violence. This happens when a person is very nervous and irritated and the cleaning employees have taken away their belongings. They take them out of the collection truck to leave them in the sand. The Local Police negotiates and tries to impose calm. After a period of mediation, the situation returns to normal.

4. Conclusions

This work describes the process of appropriation, conflict and expulsion of the homeless from public space and explains how it seeks to make this group invisible. Theoretical framework of these strategies delves into the different dimensions involved: rights, dynamics of the neoliberal city and power strategies. Citizenship rights, which these people formally hold according to the Constitution, although excluded by other laws. The neoliberal city, commodified, turned into a showcase for touristification and gentrification that only allows what is decorative and attractive as an object of consumption. The city does not want to show its miseries; it has to hide them if it wants to provoke the desire of tourism. Lastly, the power strategies of agents to impose a hegemonic model of public space and the resistance of the homeless to their expulsion from the tourist centers.

The consequence is that the evolution of interventions and their continuous repetition leads all the agents in the field to avoid conflict knowing that no solution is possible or definitive. The negotiation between the parties generates an informal agreement, officials execute political decisions without using force or violence and on the other hand, the homeless do not adopt an attitude of active resistance. This dynamic establishes a model of appropriation of public space without many conflicts, consisting of an intermittent and mobile camp, continuously monitored and redirected. The problem is not invisible because for the agents, especially

municipal officials and the homeless, visibility has a political connotation. Keeping the problem present exerts pressure to find solutions and the flow of resources to implement them. At no point in history has any society managed or wanted to completely hide all its miseries.

5. Bibliografía

- 20minutos.es (2012). Municipios a la 'caza' de mendigos y de vecinos incívicos y molestos, *20 Minutos*, 11 de marzo de 2012. Recuperado de: <https://www.20minutos.es/noticia/1335158/0/mendicidad/prostitucion/multas/>(Consultado el 2 de junio de 2022).
- Ayuntamiento de Cádiz (2021). *Informe censo de personas sin hogar en la ciudad de Cádiz*. Cádiz: Delegación Municipal de Asuntos Sociales. No publicado.
- Bentham, J. (1979). *El panóptico*. La Piqueta.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Poder, derecho y clases sociales*. Desclée de Brouwer.
- Bourdieu, P. (2007a). Efectos de lugar. En Bourdieu, P. *La miseria del mundo*(pp. 119-124). Buenos Aires: FCE..
- Bourdieu, P. (2007b). *El sentido práctico*. Siglo XXI.
- Bourdieu, P. y Wacquant, L. (1995). *Respuestas. Por una antropología reflexiva*. México D.F: Grijalbo.
- Burgos, R. (2022). Alicante sancionará a mendigos y prostitutas con multas de hasta 3.000 euros tras aprobar una ordenanza pactada por PP y Vox, *El País*, 15 de febrero de 2022. Recuperado de: <https://elpais.com/espana/comunidad-valenciana/2022-02-15/alicante-sancionara-a-mendigos-y-prostitutas-con-multas-de-hasta-3000-euros-tras-aprobar-una-ordenanza-pactada-por-pp-y-vox.html>(Consultado el 2 de junio de 2022).
- Cabrera, P. (1998). *Huéspedes del aire. Sociología de las personas sin hogar de Madrid*. Universidad Pontificia de Comillas.
- Cabrera, P; Malguesini, G. y López, J. A. (2002). *Un techo y un futuro. Buenas prácticas de intervención social con personas sin hogar*. Barcelona: Icaria.
- Castel, R. (1995). *La metamorphoses de la questionsociale*. Gallimard.
- Cortina, A. (1996). *Ética*. Santillana.
- Davis, M. (2001). *Más allá de Blade Runner. Control urbano: la ecología del miedo*. Virus.
- De la Fuente-Roldán, I. N. (2023). La realidad conceptual del sinhogarismo. Reflexiones para un abordaje comprensivo. *Cuadernos de Trabajo Social*, 36(1), 61-71. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.5209/cuts.81320>
- Delgado, M. (2011). *El espacio público como ideología*. Los libros de la catarata.
- Elias, N. (2009). *El proceso de la civilización. Investigaciones sociogenéticas y psicogenéticas*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- FEANTSA (2017). *ETHOS – European Typology on Homelessness and housing exclusion*, Bruselas: Feantsa. Recuperado de: Tipología ETHOS sobre la falta de vivienda y la exclusión de la vivienda (feantsa.org)
- Foucault, M. (2009). *Vigilar y castigar*. Siglo XXI.
- Foucault, M. (2019). *Microfísica del poder*. Siglo XXI.
- Giner, S.; Lamo de Espinosa, E. y Torres, C. (1998). *Diccionario de sociología*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Honneth, A. (2011). *La sociedad del desprecio*. Trotta.
- Mardones, R. (2009). ¡No en mi patio trasero!: el caso de la comunidad ecológica de Peñalolén. *Íconos – Revista De Ciencias Sociales*, (34), 139-149. doi: <https://doi.org/10.17141/iconos.34.2009.331>
- Milgram, S. (1980). *Obediencia a la autoridad. Un punto de vista experimental*. Desclée De Brouwer.
- Monreal, P. (2016). Ciudades neoliberales: ¿el fin del espacio público?. Una visión desde la Antropología urbana. *Quaderns-E de l'Institut Català d'Antropologia*, 21(1), pp 98-112. Recuperado de: https://repositorio.uam.es/bitstream/handle/10486/679670/ciudades_monreal_qe_2016.pdf
- Muños, M.; Vázquez, C. y Vázquez, J. J. (2003). Los límites de la exclusión. Estudio sobre los factores económicos, psicosociales y de salud que afectan a las personas sin hogar en Madrid. Madrid: Témpora.
- Nello, O. (2003). *¡Aquí, no!: El conflicto territorial a Catalunya*. Empuries.
- Romero, L. C. (2019). Ciudades del control y la restricción: las personas sin hogar y la arquitectura hostil. *La razón histórica*, 42, pp 163-178. Recuperado de: [file:///C:/Users/u31259042/Downloads/LRH%2042.10%20\(2\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/u31259042/Downloads/LRH%2042.10%20(2).pdf)
- Rubio-Martín, M. J. (2021): Personas sin techo y espacio público. Un estudio de caso de la ciudad de Alcalá de Henares. *Acciones e Investigaciones Sociales*, 42, 241-263. https://doi.org/10.26754/ojs_ais/ais.2021426236
- Scott, J. (2003). *Los dominados y el arte de la resistencia*. Txalaparta.
- Sepúlveda, M.; Báez, F. y Montenegro, M. (2008). No en la puerta de mi casa. Implantación no conflictiva de dispositivos de drogodependencias. Barcelona: Grupo Igia.
- Subirats, J. (2004). *Pobreza y exclusión social*. La Caixa.
- Subirats, J. (2005). *Análisis de los factores de exclusión social*. BBVA.
- Tezanos, J. F. (2008): *La Sociedad Dividida. Estructura de Clases y Desigualdades en las Sociedades Tecnológicas*. Biblioteca Nueva.
- Thoreau, H. D. (2015). *Walden/Del deber de la desobediencia civil*. Ed. Juventud.
- Valera, S. (1999): Espacio privado, espacio público: dialécticas urbanas y construcción de significados. *Revista Tres por Cuatro*, 6, 22-24. Recuperado de: https://www.academia.edu/25038846/Espacio_privado_espacio_p%C3%BAblico_Dial%C3%A9cticas_urbanas_y_construcci%C3%B3n_de_significados
- Weber, M. (2014). *Economía y sociedad*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Weber, M. (2021). *El político y el científico*. Alianza.