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Abstract—Since the 1990s, cities in the Global South have implemented revanchist neoliberal urban regeneration policies that cater to urban elites based on “recovering” public space for capital accumulation purposes. These policies often work to reify street vending as survival strategies of ‘last resort’ for marginalized people and as an unorganized, unsystematic economic activities that needs to be disciplined, incorporated and institutionalized into the formal economy. This paper suggests that, by moving away from frameworks that reify formal/informal spheres of the economy, we are able to disrupt and rethink normative understandings of economic practices categorized as ‘informal’. Through queering economies, informal workers center their own understandings of self-value and legitimacy informing their economic lives and contributions to urban life. As such, queering the economy opens up possibilities of rethinking urban redevelopment policies that incorporate rather than remove street vendors, as their economic practices are incorporated into the everyday fabric and aesthetic of urban life.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Since the 1990s in cities in the Global South, a pattern has emerged whereby local urban regimes implement aggressive neoliberal urban regeneration policies catering to urban elites based on “recovering” public space for capital accumulation purposes [1], [2]. This pattern is exemplified by the current redevelopment project of the Historic Center in Cancún, Mexico; Johannesburg’s 2013 spatial recovery program, Operation Clean Sweep; and Bogotá’s 2014 Rescate del Espacio Publico (Public Space Rescue programs) [3]. The neoliberal policies of public space adopted in these three cities have been influenced by both New York City’s former mayor Rudy Giuliani, and Bogotá’s Mayor Enrique Peñalosa. Making their models travel, both Giuliani and Peñalosa have marketed their urban policy “successes” as examples of innovative urban regeneration policies. Both mayors also understand recovering public space from marginalized, undesirable populations and economic activities in the city as a process of urban development [3].

Over his two terms from 1994 to 2001, Rudy Giuliani solidified his reputation as the architect of the revanchist city. While viewing the homeless, street vendors, sex workers, squatters, and graffiti artists, to name only a few, as the source of urban disorder and decay, Giuliani privatized and commodified public spaces such as Times Square and Bryant Park, and accelerated gentrification processes all over Manhattan. Smith [2] describes Giuliani’s administration as benefiting from hyped-up public fears of social disruption and economic insecurity in order to gain public support for aggressive urban change, arguing that: Deep-seated fears and insecurities are enlisted to conflate physical and psychic safety; the symptoms were the cause. Sanitizing the landscape would reverse the urban decline, opening up the possibility of a new city on the hill. With the advent of Giuliani time, revenge against the sources of disorder was raised to a moral obligation... toward an eradication of the signs of disorder that littered the urban landscape [2].

Since the 1990s, Giuliani’s vision has influenced the implementation of neoliberal urban redevelopment across cities of the Global South. Giuliani’s neoliberal regime policies have been marketed and disseminated in person as city governments hire the former mayor as a consultant. Recently, Luis Abidane, Colombia’s Partido Revolucionado Moderno (PRM) candidate for president in 2020, hosted Giuliani in Bogotá, and announced him as the national security consultant for his campaign [4]. In 2012, the government of Mexico City paid Giuliani’s consulting group $4 million to help securitize and lower crime in the Historic Center, resulting in the removal and attempted relocation of street vendors from the historic center and the Zocalo [7]. Since then, Giuliani’s redevelopment plan has been adopted in other cities in Mexico, such as Cancún, as an effective strategy of recovering public space.

On January 21, 2013, mayor Enrique Peñalosa presented to the United Nations headquarters the need to consider rights to public space and mobility as human rights. He argued that Bogotá’s sustainable public busses (trasmileno) and urban spatial policies have been effective in eradicating poverty in cities. Underscoring the importance of transportation systems to political life, “sidewalks are the most important element of a democratic culture. Good sidewalks are the most important thing a city needs to have, but the most [politically] difficult to make happen” [6]. The promotion of a public above-ground transportation system and infrastructure for pedestrians and bicyclists – in short, an ideology of “good sidewalks” – however, is entangled with the problematic regeneration of urban spaces for the civic elite as consumers. Transmileno was conceived to reduce congestion and crime and as an alternative to privately owned bus systems that were considered unsafe, unpredictable, and inadequate to serve the population of the city. The addition of cycling pathways and rentable bicycles along with a new public transportation system gave way to a
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neoliberal urban model, and subsequently an example for developing cities around the world [8]. Under this banner, Peñalosa, began a tour across cities in the Global South to promote his “successful” transportation system and urban vision of equitable public spaces as viable solutions towards the regeneration of developing cities.

All of these local spatial programs have called for systemic efforts to continually, and often violently, remove street vendors from public spaces in the city that have been targeted for redevelopment. As such, neoliberal redevelopment programs have attempted to “rescue” and “recover” the use of city space from marginalized populations blamed for urban social decay. Street vendors, who are categorized as unpermitted and informal workers, are portrayed as unproductive civic participants in the development of “new” imagined urban spatial aesthetics [9]-[11]. Based on social contestations over street vending in Bogotá, this paper suggests that neoliberal redevelopment policies are informed by normative frameworks of the economy that often reify informal economic practices as survival strategies of “last resort” for marginalized people, while depicting these practices as unorganized, unsystematic economic activities that need to be disciplined, institutionalized, and incorporated into the formal economy [12]-[17]. Current normative economic frameworks based on a hierarchical dichotomy of formal/informal economy do not explain the realities of non-normative and diverse economic lives, businesses, and strategies. As such, this paper challenges normative understandings of street vendor economies towards understanding street vendors and their economic practices as valuable, flexible, entangled, non-criminal, and productive.

II. QUEERING ECONOMIES

Queering (in)formal economies means rethinking the formal/informal dichotomy by understanding heterogeneous economic processes as at once queer, entangled, and relational. “Queer” is a highly contested term [8]. It is a term that challenges and redefines ontological views that frame everyday realities within normative categorizations [18]. Importantly, by queering economies, we move toward understanding the rich, complex, invisible, de-valorized, and often confusing economic systems that nevertheless result in sustainable and productive lives that are often understood as marginal, informal, unincorporated, and disfranchised with respect to normative socioeconomic and cultural systems.

Moving away from totaling binary frameworks of informal/formal economy that flatter out diverse capitals is what feminist political economists Gibson-Graham term “capitalcentrism”; all economic references to capitalism are understood as “fundamentally the same as (or modeled upon) capitalism, or as being deficient or substandard imitations; as being opposite to capitalism; as being the complement of capitalism; as existing in capitalism’s space or orbit” [16]. In the formal/informal binary, the informal economy is positioned as a “deficient” entity of capitalism that must be eradicated or disciplined into a “formal” capitalist process. We need to build and expand on Gibson-Graham’s diverse economies framework and rethink the production of “informal” street vending practices. Queering the (in)formal economy also opens possibilities for understanding the complexity of multiple, incomplete, embodied, everyday processes of subaltern populations that reconfigure, deconstruct, and challenge assumptions about what constitutes, produces, and operationalizes informal economies. To this end, we can account for temporal entanglements of material and non-material processes that inform and affect the way bodies construct, organize, and consume local informal economies. Thus, moving away from frameworks that reify formal/informal spheres of the economy, we are able to disrupt and rethink normative understandings of economic practices categorized as “informal.” This creates possibilities for reimagining “informal” workers not as criminal, devalued, stigmatized, and marginalized [21], [22]. As such, there is a need to prioritize and center informal workers’ own understandings of their self-value and the legitimacy of their economic lives. Thus, queering the economy opens up possibilities of rethinking urban redevelopment policies that incorporate rather than remove street vendors, as their economic practices are incorporated into the everyday fabric and aesthetics of urban life.

III. DIVERSE ECONOMIES FRAMEWORKS

This paper builds on Gibson-Graham’s [16] framework of diverse economies that rethinks normative frameworks of the informal economy. Gibson-Graham reconceptualizes Marxist political economy, which as a unitary all-encompassing framework, positions non-capitalist economic processes as outside of capitalism. Economic systems are far from unified, and as such, Gibson-Graham’s detail the diverse ways multiple economic processes engender sustainable ways of livelihoods across the globe that are devalued and hidden as viable mechanisms of well-being. In this framework of diverse economies, although capitalism is dominant as a hegemonic economic discourse, it is not the only economic form that comprises “the economy.” These diverse economies are exemplified in the social economy “made up of cooperatives, mutual societies, voluntary organizations, foundations, social enterprises, and many non-profits that put social objectives above business objectives [19],” which further includes care-work; consumer, producer and worker cooperatives that are organized around racial, ethnic, and other forms of solidarity, distributing their economic surplus to their membership and wider community; movements that place community food production at the center of economic activity (i.e., Community Supported Agriculture, urban farming, and food programs).

These “alternative” economies are clearly situated within a broader diverse economies framework, not excluded from a homogenous category of capitalism, which subsequently opens up opportunities for fully recognizing “the plethora of hidden and alternative economic activities that contribute to social well-being and environmental regeneration” [19]. For example, through understanding these diverse economic practices, Brown [22] disrupts narratives that situate the “theorisations of contemporary homonormativity which locate its origins solely
in relation to neoliberal socio-economic relations and subjectivities” [23]. In addition, Sweet [20] suggests that a diverse economies framework is needed to build knowledge about how migrant Latina spaces are produced, paying attention to informal economic practices in order to propose public policy suited toward the complex, dynamic, and entangled economic lives of Latina immigrants in Chicago. Perhaps most useful of the diverse economies framework is rendering visible the existence of multitude forms of “informal” economic processes on the margins.

Social difference is at the core of understanding so-called informal work. Even before they engage in informal work, informal workers are already marked as ‘other’ and located outside of normative economies. Informal workers are often stigmatized and read as disposable based on poverty, immigration, race, gender, and sexuality [22]. Utilizing Marxist economic frameworks, Gidwani’s [24] work on waste systems and waste laborers in India demonstrates how value production based on maximizing profits bestows subordinate value towards “needs-oriented” forms of production, such as the processing of waste. Market driven economic processes “continuously casts certain people, places, and conducts as wasteful, superfluous, or residual… capitalist value constantly battles to assert its normative superiority over and autonomy from other forms of value production that interweaves with it” [25]. Waste workers become entangled with meanings and values attributed to the value of waste economic systems, as devalued and marginal. Thus, the low market value placed on the waste sector confers low value on informal waste pickers. In the case of street vendors, the value of informal street-vendors partially results from the state’s devaluation of street vending as an informal economic activity. That is, the state, at multiple scales, dialectically attributes the workers’ value in relation to the legitimacy the state places on the informal economy and informal workers.

IV. MORE THAN DIVERSE ECONOMIES: QUEERING ECONOMIES

In order to reimagine street vendors as part of civic society and contributing to urban life, it is necessary to understand queer economics beyond the framework of diverse economies. Gibson-Graham’s diverse economies are based on a (re)categorization of the economy, but does not eradicate economic categories. In their schema, they categorize informal economic activities as capitalist, alternative capitalist, or non-capitalist, which continues to marginalize the informal. In this way, the creation of categories once again reifies informal practices into discrete economic spheres [19].

The categories of formal/informal do not reflect the complex reality of products acquired, sold, and distributed through both informal and formal circuits of production [26]. Building on diverse economies, Heiliger [25] rethinks the informal work of trash pickers in Los Angeles as blended economic activities that have “radical potential for transformation, extending options to survive and thrive through deliberately relational activities such as bartering, trading, care shift collectives, and trash picking” [25]. However, Heiliger suggests that economic activities do not fit neatly within the categories presented by diverse economic frameworks, rather these activities flow among and within economic categories. Economic activities of trash pickers in Los Angeles flow in and out of non-capitalist, alternative capitalist, and capitalist processes, given that some of the trash picked up may be repurposed and sold in collectives or “formal” shops in Los Angeles. Therefore, the diverse economies framework falls short when trying to understand the way goods and services cross over between capitalist and non-capitalist economic categories.

The entanglements of material and non-material social worlds of these informal workers produce possibilities for more nuanced understandings of informal labor as always, a changing and flexible process. Breaking down and reworking economic dualisms help us understand how wide-ranging economic practices are materially and fluidly intertwined. As such, the informal economy is a temporal and fluid economic process, and not a static bounded category that is separate and external from “the formal economy.” In other words, through a framework of queer economies, the “informal” economy is a part of, not separate from, formal economic processes. Informal processes are never actually performed as outside – since there is no outside – but co-constituted with the “formal.” A queer approach asks us to pay attention to diverse economic lives and allows for a rereading of these economies as part of a sociocultural system of economic production.

Furthermore, by disrupting normative understandings of economic practices categorized as “informal,” we analyze these economic processes as produced along with, not separate from, formal economic processes and state legitimizing systems that impose spatial/temporal values to informal work and workers. This provides an opportunity to shift the dominant way we understand the informal economy and its workers as unproductive, criminal, devalued, stigmatized, and marginalized [27]-[29]. Instead, we center the value and meanings that workers in non-normative economies place on their own economic lives and how they imagine different kinds of viable economic futures.

Queer economies thus open up possibilities for uncovering layers of multiple strategies, organizations, and resistances that operate through messy, complex, and fluid processes that destabilize all-encompassing categories of the economy. Thus, a queer rereading of informal work and workers as part of and contributing to the economy lends itself to opening up possibilities for understanding the complexity of multiple, everyday processes of marginalized populations that in turn challenge assumptions about what constitutes, produces, and operationalizes multiple economies.

V. STREET VENDOR POLICIES IN CANCUN, BOGOTA AND JOHANNESBURG

A. Cancún: Anti-Vending Policies and Practices

In Cancún, Mexico on July 2014, the new local government had suspended vending permits in the historic center to redevelop the city center as an “alternative tourist” destination. This move was part of the local state’s broader goal of
promoting private investment and bolstering Cancún’s new tourism redevelopment plan. That summer, the local state was actively removing vendors. Police harassed street vendors with and without permits. While not uncommon in Cancún, as vendors are seen as threats for ongoing tourism development, harassment escalated.

In an interview with city planners from Instituto Municipal de Desarrollo Urbano del Municipio de Benito Juárez (IMPLAN), they described street vending as informal work that needed to be institutionalized and absorbed by the formal economy. The planners discussed their vision towards the urban renewal of the Historic Center of Cancún as similar to the transformation in the last decade of Mexico City’s historic center. Their multi-year plan has consisted of public-private partnerships of investment of eco-friendly, cultural sensible tourism, and cost accessible strategies to attract global and domestic tourists to the historical center of Cancún. They described their vision of Cancún’s future grounded in late neoliberal ideologies of redevelopment based on recovering public space, securitizing that recovered space, maximizing profits through tourism consumption and development, and beautifying public spaces for elite and tourism capital accumulation.

Given these efforts, street vending as well as vendors are criminalized, unproductive, and undesirable, running counter to plans for large-scale tourism redevelopment. Street vending and street vendors, according to city planners, exacerbate crime, encourage public disorder, generate trash, and feed tourists’ perception of Cancún city as unsafe, crime ridden and disorderly. As such, planners described their efforts to redesign the historic center by “rescuing” the CBD and investing in an extensive alternative tourism project aimed towards tourists that seek a more “authentic” travel experience as an alternative to the gated large scale tourism development of the hotel zone. However, one of their main concerns is to address the unsafe perceptions attributed to the city of Cancún in relation to the hotel zone—a highly protected and monitored area. Their strategy was to heighten anti-vending regulations in the city center to remove vendors as possible threats to safety perceptions of the area. In spite of neoliberal revanchist anti-vending measures, unpermitted street vending has continued.

B. Bogotá: Spatial Recovery and Anti-Vending Local Policies

Since the 1990s under the new Colombian Constitution of 1991, Bogotá has implemented a massive agenda of rescate del espacio publico (recovering public space), a series of policies under the guise of constitutional rights discourses that seek to redevelop public space for the “safe” use by its citizens, and thus “rescuing” public space from illicit use and violence. Like in Cancún, local state policies aggressively target street vendors because street vending allegedly represents health risks, crime, public disorder, and unemployment. Aggressive anti-vending policies and various local state programs to eradicate crime and take back public space from street vendors, which manifested in cleaning up public spaces from both permitted and unpermitted street vendors.

On July 2018, the Mayor of Bogota, Colombia Enrique Peñalosa once again enacted a new anti-vending campaign aimed at forceful removal of street vendors from public space, tapping into reifying tropes about street vendors bringing ‘mess’, disorder, crime and shame to cities. This is not new to Peñalosa, throughout his previous administrations, and the current one, he has continuously declared war on street vendors, by sponsoring various anti-vending legislation, enforcing violent removals, and villainizing street vendors for disrupting urban mobility, creating crime and insecurity in the city. Peñalosa has clearly positioned street vending as antithetical to his vision of developing Bogota as the ‘Amsterdam’ of Latin America. His anti-vending ideologies are embedded in his globally celebrated accomplishments of urban redevelopment in Bogota; manicured public spaces, bicycle lanes, green spaces, public parks all surrounding large investment capitalist projects in the city. Absent in his plans is a vision for the over 400,000 street vendors who make their living as street entrepreneurs.

His vision of urban futures is focused on cleaning up cities via ordering public spaces to give way for new investments and opportunities for capital accumulation. Street vending and vendors are on the frontline of state violence, as their economic and social worlds are barriers to ‘progress’ and modernization. As such, the informal economy is embodied upon street vendors who are not only classed and raced as people but also embody criminality, mess and disorder that needs to be cleaned and removed. It is clear to Peñalosa and rightwing politicians in Colombia that street vendors have no place in a neoliberal vision of the future of cities. As a celebrated champion of social justice and urbanism, Peñalosa has disseminated his urban ideologies across Latin America and beyond. His TED talks, publications, radio speeches, public talks, and conferences, roll out his vision of the future or cities, and the blueprint looks like this: clean, organized, sustainable, smart, functional, walkable cities. These ideologies of urban redevelopment are connected to larger universal urbanisms discourses that are often disconnected from the way people live and produce social worlds that are quite different to what is valued by capitalists’ ideologies. Thus, street vendors are in constant conflict with neoliberal practices of the state.

One of the perceived successful public space programs that adversely affected street vendors is the nocturnal bike ride program, an effort to encourage healthy living through physical activities. During the nocturnal bike program, there are thousands of street vendors selling a myriad of perishable and non-perishable products to the public. Although the nocturnal bike program does attract serious bike riders, for the most part the avenue is filled with pedestrians leisurely purchasing goods from street vendors. The majority of the vendors and customers interviewed stated that people go to nocturnal bike rides to enjoy themselves and purchase food and goods from the
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1 Interview by Author with IMPLAN directors June, 2014.

2 The main artery of the city closes from 6:00 pm to midnight to clear the path for bicyclists, pedestrians, and skaters.
vendors. In contrast, Peñalosa has claimed that street vendors threaten the security of the citizens by selling illegally, causing congestion and trash pollution during these events [8]. Yet one street vendor stated, "if there are no vendors selling then people will not come." The program is an example of how street vendors and local spatial policies can envision possibilities of creating vibrant spaces in the city together. Yet, it requires a shift in how the local state understand that what they read as messy and disorganized, it is actually a productive way of living for many of the vendors and their customers. The event is an example of how we might think of street vendors as contributing to the life of urban spaces and part of the economy of the city, and not only part of the informal economy. In doing so, we open up possibilities of creating public spaces that are accessible to all.

**C. Johannesburg: Spatial Recovery and Anti-Vending Local Policies**

Under the guise of redevelopment and spatial recovery efforts, Johannesburg has also removed both permitted and unpermitted vendors to clean up the center city from street traders. There are approximately 12,000 street vendors in the central business district (CBD) of Johannesburg, comprised of mostly of African immigrants from Nigeria, Ethiopia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Zimbabwe, and Uganda [30]-[31]. On October 24, 2013, over 4,000 street traders marched in Johannesburg to protest Major Parks Tau’s new anti-traders campaign [30]. The “Major’s cleanup campaign” imposed new policies allowing the removal and arrest of street vendors regardless of having permits. Protesters stated that the “cleanup campaign” was a policy attack on the most vulnerable urban populations, who depend on street trading for their economic livelihood. Meanwhile, street vendors interpreted the campaign as a strategy to exclude them from public urban space by associating street trading with the undesirably dirty and poor. African immigrant street trader groups have accused local politicians from the African National Congress (ANC) of creating anti-trading policies based on xenophobic sentiments towards African immigrants [30].

The 2013 ‘Mayor’s cleanup campaign’ is built upon urban renewal ideologies and practices that have been in place since the 1990s. The city of Johannesburg adopted the North American Business Improvement District model of urban development (urban regeneration) under the City Improvement District (CID) local economic policies during the 1990s [30]. These private-public local partnerships are based on neoliberal urbanization principles of creating spaces of elite consumption and intensified surveillance of public spaces [30]. In Johannesburg, CID policies have focused on tools for urban management security policing that unavoidably have resulted in exclusionary spatial processes and the intense discipline and control of bodies in public space. The policies adopted in the 1990s were established as a result of urban decay across South Africa. Since the 1970s, city centers have suffered from continual white flight in conjunction with accelerated suburbanization projects.

Capital flight is evident in central Johannesburg with the conspicuous visibility of office vacancies, a sharp plunge in real estate values, and financial redlining. Additionally, the post-apartheid city center suffered has witnessed a housing shortage because of broader population shifts from townships as Indian, Colored, and finally Black residents poured into the previously white-only areas [27]. These changes resulted in dense, overcrowded living conditions, simultaneous with disinvestment in the built environment by property owners. Accordingly, buildings further deteriorated into slums while crime rates escalated. The perception among the mostly white members of the private sector was that they lost control over the people and spaces in central Johannesburg. To regain control, in 1992 the private sector introduced The Central Johannesburg Partnership (CJP), a partnership among businesses, local authorities and “the community” to implement strategies of safety and surveillance, and to clean-up the CBD. In 1993, the partnership was fully funded by financial institutions. Only one year later, it fully embracing neoliberal measures, it implemented the “crime and grime” project.

Although the CJP has implemented various programs over the years, it was the 2013 “Mayor’s cleanup campaign,” spearheaded by the ANC and supported by the CJP, that resulted in the violent removal of street vendors in the CBD [30]. In Johannesburg, Operation Clean-Sweep in 2013 was created as a mechanism of urban regeneration policies adopted by the local post-apartheid state to reverse the social and economic decline of the city center. Johannesburg was one of the cities that considered implementing Peñalosa’s vision as an urban regeneration model. Peñalosa’s vision prioritized reducing the dependence on cars for a more social, equitable, inclusive, and efficient modes of transport, including bike paths, bike sharing, clean sidewalks, and efficient public bus transport [31]. In 2016, Democratic Alliance mayoral candidate Herman Mashaba unveiled his platform for a simplified transport system and public space regeneration as part of his plan for a healthy, social and equitable city based on the Bogotá model. However, Peñalosa failed to mention the public outcry and resistance towards the raise in fees of public transportation, the removal of homeless population and street vendors, and the problem public transportation caused in congestion.

It is important to note that Cancún, Bogotá, and Johannesburg have implemented similar anti-vending policies for the recovery of public space. These policies have resulted in the often-violent removals of street vendors by taking away their permits, relocating them, and categorizing them as informal, subjecting them to discipline and in effect criminalizing them.

**VI. Conclusion**

This paper suggests that in order to implement urban renewal policies that create more just and equitable public spaces in the city, it is necessary to analyze how normative economic
frameworks dialectically inform urban regeneration and revanchist policies. These normative economic frameworks are based on the separation of discrete spheres of the formal or informal economy. Neoliberal local urban regimes in this study have adopted Guliáni’s and Pehalosa’s neoliberal ideologies of space and have attempted to eradicate informal vending practices and incorporate vendors into formal employment. As such, by moving away from frameworks that reify formal/informal spheres of the economy, we can disrupt and rethink normative understandings of economic practices categorized as “informal,” allowing us to reimagine understandings of “informal” workers as not criminal, devalued, stigmatized, and marginalized. Through a queer economies framework, we can further understand how street vendors contribute to the urban life of cities while promoting and producing more equitable public urban spaces.

As this paper shows, informal workers’ understandings of their self-value and the legitimacy of their economic lives and activities runs counter to and questions the meanings and values imposed by the local state that views informal workers as unproductive, backwards, criminal, stigmatized, and marginalized. Additionally, goods and services exchanged and sold through the so-called informal economy are not produced in isolation from, outside of, or in opposition to the formal economy; instead, they are folded into formal economic processes, and entangled and part of diverse economic sectors. Vendors’ products are part of larger circuits of goods that are produced and distributed through both formal and informal economic processes. Lastly, queering the economy opens up possibilities of rethinking urban redevelopment policies that incorporate rather than exclude street vendors. For instance, street vendors vitally invigorate an inclusive public life in Bogotá. Vendors’ economic practices are incorporated into the everyday fabric and aesthetic of urban life.

However, there is still much left to theorize in a queer economies framework. There needs to be further research on developing more just urban public spaces that incorporate marginalized populations into a new urban vision. Nevertheless, by rethinking normative frameworks of the economy in relation to neoliberal local urban spatial regimes through a queering economies framework, we can challenge policy makers and scholars whose work continues to reproduce the subjugation, criminalization, and marginalization of “informal” workers, and further think of possibilities to implement an inclusive and more just urban vision in cities of the Global South.
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