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Abstract

This paper aims to analyze street homeless of Metro Manila, a globalized city of developing country. First, it makes in order the pathways in which the poor people become homeless using the push-pull hypothesis. Many street homeless come from the squatter’s evictees. Second, it aims to analyze the spatial distribution of street homeless. In Metro Manila, squatter dwellers are suburbanized. On the contrary, street homeless are centralized to the inner city. Third, it aims to analyze the political situation of street homeless. The private occupancy of the street has been accepted conventionally in the developing country. However, the street has been gentrified and beautified and this results in strengthening of the regulation of the street. Street homeless find it more difficult to work and live on the street. With these analyses, this paper makes clear the unique conditions of street homeless of Metro Manila and their political convergence to those of Western city, westernization, through the politics around the street among street homeless and other agents.

This paper aims to analyze street homeless (taong grasa or palaboy) which have increased rapidly in Metro Manila, Philippines. The previous studies have discussed street homeless by regarding them as a part of squatter dwellers or the houseless poor forming the majority of the urban poor in Metro Manila. However, street homeless are people different from squatter dwellers. It is good that the papers focusing on street homeless are appearing recently in the developing country. Olusola Olufemi (1998) refined the concept of street homeless by contrasting them with squatter dwellers in South Africa. S. M. Schor, Rinaldo Artes and V. C. Bomfirm (2003) analyzed
the spatial distribution of street people in Sao Paulo. As for the study of street homeless in the Philippines, there are the papers written by Cirilo Edgar Eboña (2000), Rodolfo B. Alcazar (2001), Gregory Vincent Omila Ferrer (2003), Huynh Thi Ngoc Dung (2003), Hideo Aoki (2008), Emily B. Roque (2011) and Ada A. Colico, Mark M. Garcia and Nilan Yu (2011), although most of them have not yet become publicly readable papers.

These papers analyzed the pathway to the street, the spatial distribution, job, the way of life and the meaning world of street homeless in Metro Manila. They informed us not only about the details of street homeless, but also about its common characters with street homeless in other countries, even though the key concept such as homeless, job, street, network and social identity etc. is debatable until today. Some papers have a methodological difficulty because they applied directly the key concepts constructed in the Western (especially American and English) society characterized as economically developed and individualistic principle of social organization to street homeless in Asian society characterized as economically developing and collectivistic principle. 3 We never miss that those key concepts have the unique meanings in the Asian social and cultural context4 and that we need to prepare its own framework for analyzing Philippine street homeless. Based on the same theoretical interest, Lisa Drummond (2000) pointed out the more inclusive function which the street has for the urban dwellers in Vietnam than in America as mentioned in detail later.

This paper has two purposes. First, it is to analyze the pathways of the poor people on their way to becoming homeless, the streetization, to refine the sociological concept of street homeless by contrasting them with squatter dwellers and to examine the composition of street homeless. Who do go to the streets and under what backgrounds? How do street homeless differ from squatter dwellers? And what subgroups are street homeless composed of? Second, it is to analyze the spatial distribution of street homeless in Metro Manila. In what places do they work and sleep? The spaces which street homeless choose are regulated not only by their personal needs but also by the politics around the public space among three agents: government, storekeeper and street homeless. This discussion will bring an important issue around the definition of public space in the political context of Metro Manila.
Data about street homeless used in this paper came from various sources such as observation, interview, research paper, administrative document and newspaper etc. collected mostly in the last three years. The author thanks sincerely the collaborators who gave information about street homeless: homeless person, squatter dweller, social worker, administrative officer, civic and union movement activist and translator although their names are not listed up here.

1. Pathway to Street

1) Streetization of Poor People

_1’m 70 year-old and my wife is 80 year-old. I collect recyclable garbage for a living and earn 150 pesos a day. We came from a province in Visayas (islands of Central Philippines), our home in Payatas (garbage dumpsite in Quezon City) was demolished and hence we became homeless. We have nine children left behind in the province. I used to be a security guard assigned in various places. At present we clean up the streets near the venue of a popular noontime show and get money. We use toilet in the church and get water from neighbors. We use tin cans and woods for cooking. The neighbors sometimes give us food. When there is a storm, a neighbor allows us to come over (story of Jim, a street homeless living in a waiting shade along Madison Street in Quezon City on July 28th, 2011 summarized by John F. Lagman, a survey collaborator)._ 

Push-Pull Hypothesis

This is a typical story of street homeless in Metro Manila except that they are elderly. They came from a province but have not cut off the relationship with their children. They entered a squatter after arriving in Metro Manila and made living as a security guard (and maybe a scavenger). But their house was demolished by the government and they lost job at the same time. Thus, they were pushed to the street and became the street cleaner. They live by juggling life on the street and by getting help of the neighbors.
However, they seemed to be hesitant to divulge information when asked about the personal details probably because of being scared to be evicted from the street.

What about the whole picture of street homeless in Metro Manila? Street homeless have increased in Metro Manila. But we do not have data which inform their exact number. Hideo Aoki inferred that the number might reach much more than 100,000 persons, or almost one percent of the total population of Metro Manila, which was based on the indirect information about street children, their parents and the inmates of public shelter for street homeless (Aoki, 2008:160). There are many social, political and spatial factors which push the poor people to the street. In order to explain them Aoki proposed the *push-pull hypothesis* composed of three push-factors and two pull-factors (Aoki, 2008:170-172). The push-factors are 1) increase of general downward pressure of laborers’ social status caused by the casualization of employment, 2) eviction of squatter, which deprives the dwellers of the place to live and 3) deadlock of policies which aim to prevent the poor people from becoming homeless and to rescue them from the street. The pull-factors are 1) increase in the opportunity to get the life resources such as food and money on the street and 2) increase of informal jobs on the street such as vendor, scavenger and beggar etc. All of these factors are the products of the transformative labor and housing markets in Metro Manila under globalization.

**Pathway to Street**

The poor people are pushed to the streets via six pathways regulated by the push/pull factors as seen in Figure 1. This is an ordering of the *macro-structural pathways* extracted from information around street homeless in Metro Manila, although we cannot specify the exact population size of each pathway because there is no data. In the author’s interviews some street homeless, especially young homeless, told that they had come to the streets because of escaping from the abuse by their families or because of their families being broken. Other street homeless told that they had come from the prisons. In these stories family and prison functions as the *micro-structural pathways* which give the direct triggers of the poor people becoming street homeless in the macro-structural pathways. In other words,
behind the family abuse and the crime, there is poverty brought by the three structural conditions: joblessness, houselessness and family-tielessness. Well, shall we see each pathway to the street in detail?

Figure 1. Formation Process of Street Homeless

1) Many street homeless come from squatter dwellers. According to the National Housing Authority, there are 2.7 million persons (544,000 families) or 23.4 percent of the total population of Metro Manila living in the squatters in 2007 (UN-HABITAT, 2011:19). Many dwellers have been evicted from the squatters. The Urban Poor Associates, a NGO supporting squatter dwellers facing the evictions from their houses, reported that 14,744 families or 73,780 residents lost their houses in 39 squatter evictions in Metro Manila in 2011, and that 2,453 families or 16.6 percent of the evicted families received nothing from the national/local governments, not even a relocation site (Urban Poor Associates, 2012). And more than half of squatter dwellers live in the eviction priority areas such as dangerous places to live, area earmarked for the government infrastructure and area for the priority development. Evictees do not move from the original places right after the evictions, because they cannot find jobs in other areas immediately. They stay on the streets and move to other places seeking help of their relatives gradually. However, some people who have no close ties with the relatives continue to stay on the streets. On the other hand, it is almost impossible for
street homeless to enter other squatters again because there is no room to accommodate them in the squatters which are congested and guarded tightly.

2) The government promises to provide the relocation lots of evictees from the squatters located in the public lands. However, in reality it can realize the promise only to a small percentage of evictees because of its financial shortage. For example, 23.8 percent of 1,591 families evicted from the squatters in 2005-06 were provided the alternative relocation lots and 37.0 percent of those families were provided money for the relocation (Karaos and Payot, 2006: 77). Moreover, the relocation sites are in Bulacan, Cavite and Laguna, which are more than two hours away from Metro Manila by bus. Those areas sometimes lack job opportunities and access to basic services such as market, hospital and school etc. This results in many relocatees going back to Metro Manila selling the houses in the relocation sites. However, they do not have the houses in Metro Manila anymore. Thus, relocatees who cannot find any places to live become homeless.

3) The population of Metro Manila was 11.6 million in 2007, and its growth rate was 2.11 percent between 2000 and 2007 (UN-HABITAT, 2011:18). Many people move from the provinces to Metro Manila seeking jobs although the number is decreasing. Among street homeless, there are many migrants from the provinces especially in the southern part of Philippines such as Bicol, Visayas and Mindanao and who arrived at Metro Manila only one or two months ago (story of Gary, a social worker of Jose Fabella Center on Aug. 24th, 2010). They are divided into two subgroups: the permanent migrant who never go back to the province and the transient or temporary migrant who works in Metro Manila and sometimes goes back to the province. The former includes people who cannot earn livelihood in the provinces and refugees escaping from disaster or war in the provinces. The latter includes the farmers who come from the outskirts of Metro Manila during the agricultural off-season and the indigenous people who come seeking income only in Christmas and New Year Season. Most migrants go to the relatives living mostly in the squatters after arriving in Metro Manila. However, the migrants who have nowhere else to go stay on the streets, work and go back to their provinces.

4) Globalization has brought the casualization of employment and the
devaluation of laborer’s real wage in the Philippines. There have increased the laborers working under the level of minimum wage, 350 pesos (equivalent to around 8.16 US dollars in April of 2012) per day and living below the poverty line, 674 pesos (equivalent to around 15.71 US dollars) per day in Metro Manila in 2006 (Philippine Daily Inquirer, Jan. 5th, 2007). According to the Social Weather Station, a social research agency, 17.7 percent of respondents in Metro Manila answered that they had experienced hunger in three months before the survey in 2006 (The Philippine Star, Dec.20th, 2006). The economic environment produced by globalization has strengthened the downward pressure of social status among the laborers. Many laborers have slipped down in the hierarchy of social status. Some laborers became the self-employed engaged in the various miscellaneous jobs, and others could not get jobs and remained in the informal sector. Among them laborers who do not have houses to live and the ties with the relatives to depend on, that is, jobless, houseless and family-tieless are driven out to the streets (story of Lina, a researcher of squatter problem on Apr.26th, 2012).

5) The national/local governments such as Metropolitan Manila Development Authority, Local Government Units (LGUs) and Manila Police District (MPD) implement the rescue operation for street homeless and send them to the public accommodation such as the Jose Fabella Center (JFC) which provides the shelter and foods for them. The rescue operation is conducted for three purposes: the mitigation of traffic congestion, the prevention of street crime and the gentrification or beautification of urban landscape. The MMDA sends two teams of 6:00am-2:00pm and of 2:00pm-10:00pm, rescues about thirty street homeless per day and sends them to the JFC. The JFC accommodates about 300 street homeless and sends them to 13 facilities such as mental hospital, aged care center, child rearing facility, women shelter, job training center, among others, according to the need of each inmate. Its ultimate purpose is to make homeless go back to the provinces by providing them the tickets for transportation when its budget affords to do it (story of Tom, a social worker of JFC on July 19th, 2011). However, this policy is successful only partly because most inmates go back to the streets soon after being released from the JFC (Colico, Garcia & Yu, 2011: 29). Some of them, especially children, tend to become the
repeaters who go back and forth between the street and the JFC. There have increased the repeaters: 67 persons in 2007, 325 persons in 2008 and 374 persons in 2009 (Colico, Garcia & Yu, 2011:30).

There are two reasons behind this. First, the JFC being a short-term (one week to three months basically) rehabilitation center cannot provide the sufficient services to make the inmates finally escape from the street lives. Second, it is the attractiveness of the street life. The street is a place which provides not only job but also the shelter to sleep for homeless. And he/she can establish the human network and the peer supporting relationship on the street. Thus, the street becomes a convenient home in which homeless work, sleep and enjoy the friendship with the others even though the street life is full of danger. Catherine Kennedy and Suzanne Fitzpatrick claimed that there are three conditions required for street homeless to get off the life of begging on the street: to get rid of the need to beg on the street (routes in), to give the conditions for getting out of the begging on the street (routes out) and to solve the beggar’s problems by the institutional collaboration and the cooperation of various measures (policy co-ordination) (Kennedy and Fitzpatrick, 2001: 2010-2013).9

6) There are many street children in Metro Manila.10 Although a survey estimated that there are 50,000 to 75,000 street children at most in Metro Manila ((Porio, Moselina and Swift, 1994:112), we cannot specify the exact number of street children in Metro Manila because it is different greatly from paper to paper.11 Street children are classified into three subgroups (Ruiz, homepage. 12): 1) Children on the street, who work on the streets but have the regular connections with their families or live with them in the squatters or on the streets. They comprise around 70 percent of the whole street children, 2) Children of the street, who live on the streets and only sometimes go to the families, that is, who run away from the homes for a long-term. They comprise around 20 percent of the whole street children, 3) Abandoned and neglected children, who have completely turn off the ties with the families and live alone in the severest situation on the streets.12 As a whole, it is not easy for street children to get out of living on the streets after growing up because they cannot go to school, except in the case of children on the streets, and if they cannot get the educational assistance of Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) or NGO. Street
children grow up on the streets, cohabitate with the other street boy/girl-friends, make babies and form the street families. Thus, they reproduce the street families inter-generationally.

2) Squatter Dweller and Street Homeless

There are various people who work in the public spaces such as street, sidewalk, pavement and park in the city of developing country. Under such circumstances two difficulties arise in identifying street homeless operationally. The first is how to distinguish street homeless from the working people who go back to their houses mostly in the squatters after finishing work in the evening. Therefore, in order to identify street homeless among the working people on the streets, we have to specify people who sleep on the streets by watching them until late at night. Some street homeless sleep near their work places and others move to the quiet and safe places.

The second is how to distinguish street homeless from squatter dwellers. Squatter dwellers also are homeless because they do not have the legal right to live in the lots which they occupy. The National Housing Authority contrasted street homeless and squatter dwellers by three indexes: whether they have the shelters or not, whether they sleep at the fixed places or not and whether they live in group in the wide lots such as riverbed and dump site etc. or live in anywhere including streets and under the bridge. (National Housing Authority, 1993). Olufemi contrasted street homeless with squatter dwellers by twelve indexes (Olufemi, 1998: 227). Arnold J. Padila contrasted the visible and permanent street homeless with the invisible and transient squatter homeless (Padila, 2000: 5-6). These contrasts of street homeless with squatter dwellers are summarized and supplemented as Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>squatter dweller</th>
<th>street homeless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sleeping place</td>
<td>permanent shelter</td>
<td>transient materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>living space</td>
<td>fixed place</td>
<td>always moving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spatial location</td>
<td>urban periphery</td>
<td>city downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life form</td>
<td>group living</td>
<td>living apart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>network</td>
<td>tight network</td>
<td>loose network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Squatter Dweller versus Street Homeless
However, it is not easy to distinguish street homeless from squatter dwellers even with it. Street homeless are the houseless people. However, they sometimes live in the vacant hut, the abandoned car, the deserted house and the covered open space by the cloths or the blue sheet tent along the wall or the tree dodging the rain and dew. Are these shelters or not? Suzanne Speak and Graham Tipple regarded street homeless in the continuum between squatter dwellers and street homeless by examining homelessness in nine developing countries (Speak and Tipple, 2006:176). Olufemi classified street homeless of Johannesburg in South Africa into three subgroups: the pavement or street dwellers (rough sleepers), those who live in temporary shelters such as bus and railway station, open hall, taxi stand etc. and those who live in the city shelters (Olufemi, 1998:229). Kesia Reeve (2011) contrasted rough sleepers with those who squat in the empty buildings in England and Wales. “Those who live in temporary shelter” (Olufemi) and “those who squat in the empty buildings” (Reeve) are people occupying any midpoint of squatter-street continuum. However, in spite of such difficulty in distinguishing street homeless from squatter dwellers, we must not miss the uniqueness of street homeless as a social category because they are different clearly from squatter dwellers in the main group characteristics.\textsuperscript{13}

3) Composition of Street Homeless

Street homeless are classified into some subgroups through the personal attributes which they have. Each group has its own social condition and need to be solved. The MMDA rescued 2,859 adult homeless and 460 street children in Metro Manilla between January 1\textsuperscript{st} and July 18\textsuperscript{th} of 2011 and among them 2,680 persons were male, 813 persons were female (MMDA, 2011a). The JFC accommodated 56 abled, 22 disable, 35 mentally challenged, 30 elders, 36 improved mental patients, 15 indigenous people, 16 minors with family, 80 minors without families on July 13\textsuperscript{th} of 2011 (JFC, 2011a). It accommodated 400 mendicants, 3,560 vagrants and 843 transients between January and December of 2010 (JFC, 2011b). The DSWD-National Capital Region provided the services to 960 street children, 517 street families, 851
street single adults and 141 indigenous on Apr. 27th and May 10th to 11th of 2011 (DSWD-NCR, 2011). Those street families included 288 adults and 229 children. Those adult homeless included 502 vagrants, 238 mendicants and 111 mentally ills.14

These data inform us four characteristics of street homeless. First, the biggest group of street homeless is the vagrant adult single man. And there are many handicapped homeless and street children, especially those without families.15 Second, the homeless men are much more than the homeless females. Third, there are the indigenous homeless. They are Bajau and Aeta who come from the provinces and enter the downtowns by vending and begging. Fourth, street homeless are classified based on their situation on the streets: mendicant, vagrant and transient. The JFC defined the mendicants as those who beg money or foods on the streets and other public places, the vagrants as those who wander idly from place to place without lawful or visible means of support and the transients as those who need help to return to their homes (JFC, 2011c). We need three supplements about these definitions. 1) these categories are overlapped by each other. Vagrants and transients also beg money and foods to survive on the streets. 2) vagrants are not the idle people but the people being turn off to look for jobs and work because of their persistent and severest circumstances. 3) there are mentally ill and the disable among mendicant, vagrant and transient.

Street homeless are classified based on job too. There are street homeless sitting on the streets for begging, going around for vending at the corners of the streets, walking around the towns for scavenging by pushing carts and working as car watcher, luggage carrier and barker who are calling for the passengers to take the jeepney (mini bus) in the designated places. However, street homeless can be classified in any way. We have to scrutinize the composition of street homeless to grasp its whole picture. By the way, there is much discussion about the definition of street homeless in America, Europe and Japan. The result might be that it is almost impossible to define street homeless uniformly and inclusively, because they are human being who has endless existence forms to live and needs to be solved.16 We can only give street homeless the operational definition according to each analytical purpose.
2. Spatial Distribution of Street Homeless

1) Social Construction of Public Space

Street homeless work and sleep by getting in the niche of the urban space such as street, sidewalk, pavement, market, shopping mall and park etc. in Metro Manila. The place to work sometimes is different from the one to sleep. Some homeless persons work and sleep in a limited range of territory and others always move from place to place. The place and the way to live in which street homeless work and sleep are diverse being constrained not only by the personal circumstances but also by the political, social and spatial conditions around street homeless. Moreover, those conditions always change along with the transformation of the whole urban spatial structure influenced by globalization. The issues which should be highlighted here are proposed as following. What is the spatial distribution of street homeless? Why are street homeless many in some places and very few in other places? What political, social and spatial conditions influence such spatial distribution of street homeless?

Rob Kitchin and Robin Law (2001) discussed the socio-spatial construction of (in)accessibility of public space by taking the case of public toilet for the handicapped. The handicapped cannot go to the place which lacks public toilet for them. It means the exclusion of the handicapped from the public spaces. The circumstances are similar to street homeless. Space is constructed through the negotiation of the interests of various stakeholders. Karen Malone (2002) analyzed the politicized and regulated processes of the movement of people in the public spaces by contrasting the open space whose boundary is weakly defined with the closed space whose boundary is strongly defined. It is increasing the closed, purified and homogeneous public space with the clear boundary, which excludes people whose behaviors conflict with the public regulation supported by the dominant values. Mike Raco (2003) considered the process of remaking and securing the space by analyzing the strategies, tactics and practices of the spatial politics. The place is reconstructed through the national/local governmental and situational measures for the spatial securitization leading to the zero-tolerance measure
against the *broken window syndrome*. Thus, street homeless and the young people become to be regarded as the latent trouble-makers and excluded from the consumption spaces. Tom Richardson and Ole B. Jensen (2003) discussed the cultural sociology of space and claimed that the space is culturally and socially constructed. The space is constructed in a different way by the different social agent through the power struggle over the space. The space is the product of the *dialectical* relations between the socio-spatial practices and the symbolic and cultural meanings which the social agents attach to their environments. And the street becomes the place where two forces function with conflict: globalization and localization. Nicholas Blomley (2007) criticized the version that the purpose of traffic code in America is not to exclude any human being but to regulate the spatial activity. Based on such version begging and vending on the streets are regarded as the spatial activities which use the public spaces and then considered to be same to the bus stop and the post. Thus, it results in accepting the exclusion of vendor and beggar from the streets eventually as an obstacle of the traffic. In such version the political context of the problem, that is, the uneven power relationship between the poor people and the passers-by is nullified. Henrik Gutzon Larsen and Anders Lund Hansen (2008) discussed the merits and demerits of the gentrification of the urban space. The gentrification is the commodification of the space which brings the polarization of the power relationship: the creative class versus the trash and rest product. There is a big gap between the catch-phrase and its actual result of uneven regional formation. The city becomes a battlefield of the continuous *space war* and is suffered from the gentle and traumatic transformation. Jeremy Németh (2009) asked how the public space is privatized by what agent. She analyzed its political process and the various ways of management of privately owned public space such as the *bonus space* which means the public space of floor area ration (FAR) bonus for aiming the efficient market-driven production. In those spaces the human heterogeneity is filtered and the undesirable such as homeless, activist and the unconsumable people are excluded. Laura Huey (2010) analyzed the multiple meanings which the surveillance such as CCTV, the surveillance camera, has for street homeless. Street homeless sometimes are harassed physically by the citizens and other street homeless. The CCTV not only monitors the behavior of street homeless but also
protects them from the risk of harassment. The function of surveillance is multiple in the way that it marginalizes street homeless from the spaces as the eyesore and the potential criminal on the one side and includes them into the protection from danger on the other side. Laura Nichoks and Fernando Cázares (2011) analyzed the homeless’ riding bus, a public transportation. By riding bus, they can stay warm at night and escape from the stigma and label that goes with homelessness for the shelter and other public spaces. Space of the bus has become a valuable substitute for other public space for street homeless, but only at night.

In those studies the urban public space was analyzed by focusing on its function and meaning for the socially disadvantaged such as street homeless. What these studies emphasized is summarized in four points. First, the space is constructed through the conflict of interests and meanings of the various social agents in the uneven power relationship with each other. Second, the privatization of the public space is going on and the spatial management of the privately owned public space has been strengthened by the business firms and the national/local governments. Third, the disadvantage such as street homeless has been excluded from the use of the privatized public space in the process. Fourth, it is a violation of the human rights, which is a deviation from the democracy.

2) Philippine Context of Spatial Construction

The most part of this discussion on how the transformation and construction of the public space in the Western city can be applied to the Asian city. In Metro Manila too the public space has been privatized, the regulation of public space has been strengthened and the disadvantaged such as vendor and street homeless has been excluded from the public space such as street, park and square. However, we have to abstain from the direct application of the Western experience to the Asian city because the social meaning which the transformation of public space has for the people in the Asian city is different from ones in the Western city. Drummond (2000) pointed out that the street has been the pseudo-public space used privately and granted by people in Vietnam. The street has been a part of living space of people who live in the small no-room houses (inside-out). People have meals, especially
breakfast, take bath and do the informal small business activities on the streets. Such private occupancy of the public space is accepted culturally and socially. Therefore, people resist against any other agents which infringe the privately owned street spaces, even if the infringer is the State. Thus, the Western street regulation cannot be applied to the street in Vietnam directly. At the same time, along together the penetration of the market economy the public space such as the leisure space has been going on to be commercialized, managed and controlled by the companies backed by the State which wanted to evict people from the pseudo-public spaces by force. Thus, the street management of Vietnam has been converging to the Western one.

We can tell almost the same about Metro Manila. Street homeless live in the unique public spaces different from the Western city and even more different from Vietnam. Their uniqueness is characterized in six points. First, many poor people have squatted the public (mainly government-owned) spaces such as dumpsite, park, riverbed and railway threshold etc. in Metro Manila. The squatters have functioned as the pseudo-public spaces for the dwellers because they have occupied those lots for many years, sometimes as old as their grandfather. However, they are always scared of the evictions from the places to live because they have no legal right to live there. Thus, squatter dwellers have become the big source of street homeless. Second, the situation is the same on the streets. The street of Metro Manila often has functioned as the extended space of people’s houses and has the multiple roles for them. People wash faces, have meals, play, sleep, work as vendor, scavenger, street sweeper, driver, Barker, carrier and beggar and get money and life resources on the streets. They always occupy a part of public spaces privately. Third, under such circumstances the private occupancy of the public space is accepted de facto socially in the Philippines. The forced eviction of the dweller from the squatter in the government-owned land is discouraged by law (the Urban Development Housing Act) although its actual effect is limited. In the case of vendor working on the street the forced eviction from the street is often avoided too. The eviction has the implicit meaning that the vendors should be compensated the alternative places when they are evicted from the streets. It is the important fact that the private occupancy of the public space is admitted actually even if not legally.
Thus, the border of the publicness (government-owned) and the privateness (occupied privately) is blurred in the public space. However, the degree of the social admission is smaller on the street vendor than in squatter dweller. And as for street homeless, there are many street homeless living in the same streets for a long time. However, they are less admitted to occupy the streets socially and politically than the vendors because their social existence is regarded as an eyesore, they have no organization and hence they become the first target of the urban beautification measure. Fourth, because of the confusion around the land use in Metro Manila, an issue on the land ownership sometimes arises. In general, the right of residence is composed of the right of land ownership (legal right), one of land occupancy (right to use the land exclusively), one of leasehold (right to lend the land) and one of renting a house (right to rent a house). Many squatter dwellers pay for getting the right of land occupancy, of leasehold or of renting a house. Therefore, they think that they have the legal and legitimate right to live in the lands (Hosaka, 1997: 160). Almost same thing can be said in the case of street vendor. Many (if not all) vendors pay for getting the right to use the corners of streets. They also think that they can use the lands legitimately even not legally. All these circumstances around the land ownership or occupancy form the social background of the homelessness in Metro Manila. Some street homeless live in the corners of a street for a long time. They think that the spaces which they occupy are just like their home. Fifth, the social and political process around the public space in the Western city has gone on in Metro Manila, a globalized city too. The policies of the urban development and renewal by the construction of the infrastructure, the privatization of the government-owned land, the elimination of the traffic congestion and the street crime and the gentrification or beautification of the street have been implemented by the national/local government and the business community in Metro Manila. And the management and control of the public space directed by their interests have been strengthened. The MMDA regulates street homeless strictly based on Article 202 or the Anti-Vagrancy Law.

Any person found loitering about public or semi-public buildings or places or trampling or wandering about the country or the streets
without visible means of support. (omission) and any person found guilty of any of the offenses covered by this article shall be punished by arresto menor or a fine not exceeding 200 pesos, and in case of recidivism, by arresto menor in its medium period to prison correctional in its minimum period or a fine ranging from 200 to 2,000 pesos, or both, in the discretion of the court.

The Manila Police District (MPD) arrested 1,581 persons in 2008, 1,571 persons in 2009 and 1,091 persons in 2010 for vagrancy in the City of Manila (Philippine Star, Nov. 7th, 2010). The MMDA has set its mission as the following: “To clear roads and public spaces of Metro Manila of street nomads and to ensure their safety, care and protection by removing them from the streets and other public spaces (omission by the author)” (MMDA, 2011b). And the MMDA implements the Street Dweller Care Program: Rescue of mendicants, solvent people, street children and vagrant psychotics along major thoroughfares within Metro Manila and refer them to appropriate DSWD and other facilities (omission and italics by the author). On the one hand, the MMDA focuses on regulating the main streets especially in EDSA, a highway which traverses Metro Manila from north to east, and Cubao in the Quezon City. On the other hand, the Local Government Units (LGUs) focus on implementing the gentrification or beautification of downtowns and the mitigation of the traffic congestion. Thus, the social and political processes of the public space in Metro Manila are converged to the Western city. Sixth, this has resulted in the exclusion of people who work in the public space, and so many collisions between the street people and the street cleaning agents (SCAs) such as the removal crew of MMDA and the local government and the policemen to cracking down them have happened. The power of the SCAs is overwhelmingly stronger than the street people. The vendors always have been evicted their places of job. And they have gone back to the original places after the SCAs leave there, and have started again their business. On the streets such offense and defense between the vendors and the SCAs has been repeated on every day basis. The mitigation of traffic congestion and the beautification of street are the reasons which the SCAs implement the eviction policy. The more the management and control of the street is strengthened, the stronger the street people feel the
sense of crisis that the vested rights to use the streets are infringed and the more intensely they become to resist against the SCAs. Such collision between the SCAs and the street people is much bigger in size and severer than in Western city. Offense and defense often develop to violent clashes and leave many persons injured and even dead in Metro Manila.

All these circumstances become the social, political and spatial conditions of street homeless working and living on the streets. On the one hand, the ambiguity of land ownership/occupancy is influential to street homeless. The eviction from the street is strengthened on the other hand. They have no power to resist against the SCAs and can only escape from place to place. Thus, street homeless in Metro Manila live in the circumstances around the street as a public space different from one of Western city socially and politically.

3) Concrete Spatial Distribution

Street homeless work and sleep in the public space such as pavement, sidewalk, street, bus terminal, commercial district, market, sea port, park, church’s square and cemetery in Metro Manila. Why do they stay in those places? There are four fundamental factors that urge street homeless to choose the places in which they stay. 1) The place in which they can get the life resources such as money, food and others easily and constantly. It is the place in which a lot of people (passer-by, passenger, shopper, tourist and churchgoer) and things (money, goods and services) gather and flow continually and which the surplus life resources for street homeless are produced as the leftovers and alms. Street homeless get them mainly by vending, scavenging and begging. There has increased the places to provide the opportunities by which street homeless can get money and food in Metro Manila under globalization. 2) The place in which street homeless can sleep quietly and safely. Street homeless change their places to sleep on a daily basis, on a weekly basis, on a monthly basis or even on a yearly basis. Some street homeless sleep at the places to work, others sleep at the different places from ones of job. Some street homeless sleep alone, others sleep in group. For street homeless the most important thing is to sleep quietly and safely, no matter what the form of sleep is. Street homeless move only in a
range of area because it is not easy for them to find places to sleep quietly and safely. 3) The place in which the church and NGO provide foods and services such as life and medical consultation for street homeless. Street homeless gather at the square in front of church seeking foods and the services. Roque analyzed the activity and function of church feeding for street homeless such as San Sebastian Church, Ermita Church and United Central Methodist Church etc. in the City of Manila (Roque, 2011: 82-83). Some street homeless move from church to church in accordance with each Service Day. And street homeless get the alms from the churchgoers and sell them the goods such as candle and flower (*Sampaguita*). Every church has a square where street homeless can work and sleep. However, in many churches they are not allowed to enter the chapel in dirty clothes. 4) The street policy of national/local governments. Street homeless avoid the places where the city workers manage the street strictly and evict the illegal activities constantly. At the same time such places provide street homeless many life resources. They are the places where the *push-force* to the street and the *pull-force* from the street intersect each other.

By the way, in what places in Metro Manila do street homeless stay concretely and why there? The places in which street homeless stay are decided by the social, political and spatial circumstances defined by the above-mentioned four basic conditions. Then shall we see in which and why street homeless stay by using some indexes shown in Table 2 which is composed of data that I collected as possible as I could? However, it is unfortunate that we can know only the rough tendency from it. See it by referring to the map of Metro Manila.
Table 2. Indexes on Squatter, Street Children and Street Homeless by Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Squatter Household (no.)</th>
<th>B. Relocaled Household (no.)</th>
<th>C. Ratio of Reloc. HH (percent)</th>
<th>D. Project for Street Chil. (no. of area)</th>
<th>E. Rescued Homeless (person)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caloocan City</td>
<td>67,292</td>
<td>2,360</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Malabon</td>
<td>12,481</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Navotas</td>
<td>19,030</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Valenzuela</td>
<td>36,404</td>
<td>1,772</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Manila</td>
<td>99,549</td>
<td>28,545</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Mandaluyong</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Las Piñas</td>
<td>36,107</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taguig City</td>
<td>21,931</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pateros</td>
<td>3,502</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Muntinlupa</td>
<td>40,457</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quezon City</td>
<td>169,490</td>
<td>15,770</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Marikina</td>
<td>28,580</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pasig</td>
<td>27,328</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. unpublished report made by Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council, 2002 (Ragragio, 2003: 9)
C. B devided by A.
D. number of area in which project was conducted by DSWD-NCR.
E. number of rescued street homeless by DSWD-NCR.

1) Squatter
Squatter might be the biggest spatial source of street homeless. We can know some tendencies of the squatter from Column A to C of Table 2 although data are a little older. The relocation policy of the squatter has not progressed.
evenly as a whole. The regions (cities) whose number of the relocated household is big relatively are Manila, Makati, Pasay, Parañaque and Caloocan which have the Central Business District and the oldest downtowns whose land price has soared because of the active land speculation under globalization. The exception is Quezon City which is east of the City of Manila, whose percent of the relocated household was small because it has the widest land which affords to absorb the houseless people from other cities in Metro Manila. Such tendency of squatter can be characterized as the squatter’s *suburbanization* or *doughnutization* which means the transfer of the squatter from the urban center to the urban periphery whose land price is cheaper. After the eviction of the squatter, some evictees remain by making makeshift houses with the carpet or the blue-sheet right outside of the wired netting stretched around the original places. That’s because they cannot find the other places to work and sleep immediately. They are gradually scattered to other places in the cities. And some evictees could not move and resulted to become street homeless.

2) Street Children

The existence of street children has two important meanings when considering street homeless (story of Lily, a social worker at Baclaran on July 16th, 2011). First, there are many street children who grow up and become street homeless. They live with their partners at their mid-teens, give birth to babies and make families on the streets. Second, most street children live on the streets with their parents who are street homeless. DSWD-NCR implemented the activities to assist the children on the streets in thirty eight areas of seventeen cities in Metro Manila in 2011 as seen in the Column D of Table 2. It shows that there are street children with their families in all regions (cities) of Metro Manila. There are many street children especially in the downtowns along the big streets. It is inferred to exhibit the same distribution as the adult street homeless. However, the places where street children sleep are slightly different from ones of adult street homeless. Street children tend to avoid sleeping at the isolated places such as cemetery and park in order to protect themselves from danger. And street children rescued by the JFC tend to become the “repeaters” between the street and JFC (story of Rose, a social worker of JFC on Apr. 28th, 2008). The
Kanlungan sa Erma (Shelter in Ermita and Malate), a NGO supporting street children in Malate, City of Manila, is taking care of over 200 street children (story of Sally, a social worker of Kanlungan sa Erma on Apr. 29th, 2008). Its main purpose is to send back the children to their families and has initially succeeded in it almost 90 percent. However, some children go back to the street because of neglect and violence at home. Other children could not go back to their families because they were already broken and dysfunctional.

3) Street Homeless
The Column E of Table 2 shows the number of street homeless rescued from the streets by DSWD on Apr.27th and May 10th and 11th of 2011. It informs us the areas in which DSWD concentrated on the relief activities for street homeless. It suggests two things about street homeless. First, DSWD made relief activities for street homeless in all cities of Metro Manila with the exception of Makati and Navotas. It means that street homeless are scattered in the whole Metro Manila. However, there are not many street homeless in Makati and Navotas. Makati includes the biggest business district in Metro Manila and so the city government of Makati has implemented the strict clearance by the gentrification or beautification policy and evicted street homeless from the district’s landscape almost perfectly. On the other hand, Navotas is a small city whose main part is the fish and cargo port in which there are many working children but very few street children (story of Roy, a squatter activist of Navotas, on July 21st, 2011). Second, there are many rescued street homeless especially in the cities of Pasay, Manila and Quezon. The Pasay City has a big church in Baclaran, and a big street, Roxas Boulevard. The City of Manila has some big downtowns, Quiapo, Sta. Ana, Malate etc., the big parks, Luneta and Rizal Park and the big cemetery, the North Cemetery. The Quezon City has a big downtown, Cubao and a big street, EDSA. On the contrary there was no rescued street homeless in the cities of Makati and Navotas.

The number of street homeless is strongly influenced by the street policy of the city government. According to the author’s observation on the streets, there are many street homeless including the street families in Malate and Sta. Ana in the City of Manila and Bacralan in the Pasay City in the daytime.
It might be why the city governments do not implement the strict eviction measure for street homeless. On the contrary, there are very few street homeless in the business district in Makati City as above-mentioned. Even in areas where there are many street homeless, they disappear from the streets in the daytime, because they work to the main streets and transfer to another places or take refuge in the back alleys in order to escape from the eviction and arrest by the city authorities. For example, it is hard to find street homeless in the morning at Cubao in Quezon City, because the MMDA implements the strict round-up measure of street homeless before the rush hour time every day. Street homeless come back to the main streets in the afternoon or in the evening. There are many street homeless in Cubao as understood by the fact that the number of rescued street homeless in Cubao is big as seen in the Column E of Table 2.

Finally, we can infer three rough relationships between squatter dwellers and street homeless by referring to the spatial distribution of squatter (Column B of Table 2) and the rescued street homeless (Column E). First, there is a tendency that when the squatter is evicted, street homeless increase around it. Second, there is a tendency that contrary to the suburbanization of the squatter, street homeless are concentrated to the downtowns in the central regions of Metro Manila especially in the City of Manila and the Pasay City. Third, all of these things result in the increase of street homeless in the center of Metro Manila. In short, in the region in which the squatter eviction increases, street homeless increase too. The suburbanization of the squatter and the centralization of street homeless are happening together. Fourth, the number of street homeless is strongly influenced by the street policy of the national/local governments.

Conclusion

This paper analyzed the pathway and the spatial distribution of street homeless in Metro Manila. We must not miss the unique social, political and spatial conditions around street homeless in Metro Manila. On the other hand, we must not miss their commonality with ones in the Western city. The conditions around street homeless in Metro Manila are converging to it, that
is, homeless are going to be westernized.

Street homeless have increased in the city around the world. They are a product of globalization and a symbol of the transformative social structure. Therefore, we have to make clear the uniqueness of street homeless in each country and its commonality with ones of other country. In studying street homeless of the developing country such as the Philippines the following should be taken into consideration. First, street homeless are on the continuum with squatter dwellers. Second, the living conditions of street homeless are same to ones of the working street people, especially the vendors. Third, the private use of the public space such as street is accepted generously. Fourth, these circumstances regulate the relationships between street homeless and other agents such as ordinary people, administrative staff and NGO etc. Fifth, such relationships regulate the living world of street homeless. The dynamic politics around the public space between street homeless and other agents is expanded under these circumstances. This paper provided an analysis of street homeless of Metro Manila only in the macro-structural level. The study should be advanced to the next stage with more data.
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Note

1 The street is used as a symbolic word to include street, sidewalk, pavement, park and public/private vacant lot in which the street people work and sleep in this paper. The word of homelessness is used by including both of rooflessness and houselessness. And the word of street homeless is used in order to distinguish them from squatter dwellers which are homeless too.

2 The word of informal settlement is used recently as the alternative word of squatter in order to eliminate the biased connotation which the latter has. The informal settlement implies that squatting is not a criminal behaviour even though it is problematic legally. However, the informal is not a clear word because it conveys many meanings: unofficial, subterranean and illegal etc. On the other hand, the squatter has been used as a scientific word. That is why the word of squatter is used in this paper. The actual situation does not change even if we change the word to call it. Recall the discussion about the word of underclass which had meant the criminal in America. It was reconstructed as a scientific concept to specify the urban bottom people (Wilson, 1987)

3 In some papers written in the Philippines the living world of street homeless was analysed using the phenomenological and ethnographical methods. They interpreted the living world by laying it over the experience of American homeless directly. However, the interpretation is not easy because the cultural and social context in which the living world is embedded is different from one of Westerner. The living world of street homeless has the different nature in the Philippines. In those papers such methodological issue was not taken into consideration.
Although Japanese homeless sometimes is regarded as same to American and European homeless in those papers, there are many important differences between the two. In Japan, main part of homeless came from the day laborer of the constructions, most homeless are almost 60 year-old, there is no street child, very few female homeless and very few homeless who have ties with their families and there is penetrated so strong prejudice against homeless in the whole society.

All names of informant are the pseudonyms in this paper.

Ariel Geronimo, former professor of Saint Scolatica’s College classified street homeless visiting a shelter into four subgroup: 1) people who were born on the streets in Metro Manila, 2) people who were squatter dwellers, 3) people who were the returnees from the relocation sites and 4) people who came from the provinces (Sept.4th, 2010). It would be helpful here.

There arise many fires in the squatters. It is said that the fires were caused by the arsons asked by the owners of the lots (story of Bon, a squatter activist of the City of Navotas and Max Cruz, a labor movement activist of the City of Paranaque on July 21st, 2011). The dwellers often are barred from returning to the original places (story of Liza, a squatter activist of NGO on Jan. 17th, 2012). This may be another way of the eviction.

Aoki called the occupations with the poor labor conditions and the starvation wages brought by globalization the new labor and the depressed standard of living resulted from it the new poverty (Aoki, 2006, chap.1).

There are many studies about the causes which people become street homeless. Yin-Ling Irene Wong and Irving Piliavin asked which cause is more influential the individual deficit framework (ID) or the insufficiency of institutional resource framework (IR) for people to become street homeless and concluded that it is a positive correlation between ID/IR and the period during being homeless (Wong & Piliavin, 1997: 421).

The age of street children is mostly between 11 to 14 years old, and they are consisted of 70 percent for boy and 30 percent for girl (DSWD-NCR, 2011). The girl live with the partner on the street in order to get the life resources in group ant to protect herself from the danger such as the police crackdown, the violence of the adult and the turf wars with other groups of street children.

(Scerri, 2009: 21). However, we cannot know how she counted the number of street children using what materials.

12 Scerri also classified 70 percent of children as the children on street, 30 percent of children as the children of street and 25 percent of children living with the families based on the survey on 599 street children in four cities in Metro Manila (Scerri, 2009: 20).

13 Squatter dwellers recognize themselves clearly as a different existence from street homeless. “There is no homeless in our community. We always share the houses with the newcomers”. (story of Dan, a squatter dweller in the City of Taguig on Nov. 5th, 2006)

14 David Snow and Leon Anderson classified American homeless people into four categories: hobo as a migratory worker, tramp as a migratory non-worker, bum as a non-migratory non-worker and mentally ill (Snow & Anderson, 1993: 59-66). The mentally ill was understood as a person who spoke the meaning of unknown suddenly. However, such understanding of mentally ill might not be exact and there might be the mentally ills among hobo, tramp and bum too.

15 It is another characteristic of the city in developing country that there are street children without families. They came from the poorest families which neglected and abandoned them or were broken because of their parents’ separation.

16 There are various definitions of street homeless in Japan too: furōsha (vagrant), jūsyō futeisha (person of no fixed address), rojō seikatsusha (person living on the street), hōmuresu (homeless), nojuku seikatsusya (person living a homeless life) and nojuku rōdōsha (homeless laborer). Aoki adopted the word of nojukusya (rough sleeper) as the most flexible definition because it is the minimum definition for street homeless (Aoki, 2006:107-113).

17 A street homeless in Malate in the City of Manila told that he has lived at the same place in Malate with his family for 17 years (story of Bill, on Apr.22nd, 2010).

18 The National Capital Region Police wiped out 189 crime syndicates composed of 1,029 criminals in 48 districts of Metro Manila before the Christmas Day (The Philippine Star, Oct. 24th, 2006). Street homeless often commit the various kinds of crimes and at the same time become the victims
of crimes.

19 The city government of Manila stopped to issue the new permit of the car wash and of junkyard on the street in order to mitigate the traffic congestion (*The Philippine Star*, Nov. 13th, 2006). Only the new application of the shops which have the lots of 500 to 1,000 square meters was permitted. The city government of Quezon began the street regulation that the vendors could sell goods only in the permitted places of downtowns such as Commonwealth Avenue, Philcoa, Balintawak and Novaliches (*The Philippine Star*, Dec. 2nd, 2006). Vending is prohibited strictly in other places including all sidewalks, pavements and overpasses. The violator is arrested, confiscated goods and imprisoned without any exception. The Court of Quezon City dismissed the appeal of the owner of *sari-sari store* (variety store), who was demolished the store on the street and confiscated goods by the MMDA two years ago (*Philippine Daily Inquirer*, Feb. 27th, 2007). The Court confirmed the authority of MMDA to remove the obstacle in the public space.

20 A Korean Baptist church holds the prayer meeting which serves foods to street homeless in front of Manila City Hall every Sunday. About 100 street homeless took part in it (author’s observation on July 17th, 2011).

21 It is not easy to define the *squatter*. The National Census Office has defined the informal settlements (squatter) as the “households occupying a lot rent-free without the consent of the owner” on the basis of the Urban Development and Housing Act (UDHA) which regulates the fundamental policy about the squatter problem in the Philippines (Cruz, 2010: 2). Jeanette E. Cruz (2010) discussed about the operationally problematic points contained in the definition of UDHA has.

22 MMDA rescued 3,493 street homeless on the streets by the *barangay* base between January 1st and July 18th of 2011 (MMDA, 2011a).

23 There are estimated to be around 2,000 homeless in Rizal and Luneta Park and around 4,000 homeless in North Cemetery (story of Eric, an activist of squatter on Nov. 20th, 2006). Rizal and Luneta Park is the place which many migrants came from the Southern provinces of the Philippines by ship stay. North Cemetery is the place which many migrants came from the Northern provinces by bus live. And Baclaran is the bus terminal of the migrants from Southern provinces and Cubao is the bus terminal of the migrants from Northern provinces.