



Contesting Street Spaces in a Socialist City: Itinerant Vending-Scapes and the Everyday Politics of Mobility in Hanoi, Vietnam

Noelani Eidse, Sarah Turner & Natalie Oswin

To cite this article: Noelani Eidse, Sarah Turner & Natalie Oswin (2016) Contesting Street Spaces in a Socialist City: Itinerant Vending-Scapes and the Everyday Politics of Mobility in Hanoi, Vietnam, *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 106:2, 340-349

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00045608.2015.1117936>



Published online: 09 Feb 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 134



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Contesting Street Spaces in a Socialist City: Itinerant Vending-Scapes and the Everyday Politics of Mobility in Hanoi, Vietnam

Noelani Eidse, Sarah Turner, and Natalie Oswin

McGill University

In 2008, Hanoi's municipal government banned street vending from numerous sites, significantly delineating and redefining access to urban space. The ban privileges certain forms of movement by designating streets and sidewalks for the fluid movements of "modern" transportation, rather than the staccato "traditional" mobilities of street vendors who stop frequently to ply their trade. In this article, we explore the everyday mobilities of Hanoi's vendors in light of this ban, focusing on the careful negotiations vendors undertake to secure rights to the city's streets and highlighting how vendor mobilities are socially, politically, and culturally produced and reworked. We combine Cresswell's six facets of mobility with Kerkvliet's everyday politics to form a hybrid everyday politics of mobility. In doing so we highlight vendors' daily experiences of mobility and the politics affecting itinerant vendors compared to their stationary counterparts. Based on eight months of fieldwork in Hanoi, incorporating interviews, mobile ethnographic methods, and vendor journaling, this article contributes an in-depth examination into the politics of (im)mobility in the Global South, considering how mobility is framed and produced in a distinctly socialist context. By focusing on the everyday politics of vending in Hanoi and the tactics undertaken to carve out mobilities in the urban landscape, we illustrate these vendors' daily lived realities as well as their connections with and contestations of local, regional, and global political-economic systems. We find mobility is a mechanism of resistance, as vendors strive to maintain mobile livelihoods despite threats of state sanctions and exclusion. *Key Words: everyday politics, mobilities, politics of mobility, street vending, Vietnam.*

2008年，河内市政府禁止了多处的街头贩卖，显著地勾勒并重新定义了获得城市空间的途径。该禁令通过将街道与人行道指定作为流畅的“现代”交通移动之用，而非经常停驻与顾客进行交易的街头小贩所拥有的断断续续的“传统”能动性，以此偏好特定的移动形式。我们于本文中，探讨河内小贩面对此一禁令时的每日生活能动性，聚焦这些小贩为了确保城市街道权所进行的谨慎协商，并强调小贩的能动性如何在社会上、政治上与文化上进行生产与再製。我们结合克瑞斯威尔（Cresswell）的能动性六大面向与克弗列特（Kerkvliet）的每日生活政治，形构混杂的每日能动性政治。我们藉由这么做，凸显出相较于其定着的对照者而言，小贩每日生活中的能动性之经验，以及影响游走小贩的政治。本文根据在河内为期八个月的田野工作，包含访谈、移动式的民族志方法，以及小贩日志，对于全球南方的（不）能动性政治，做出深度检视之贡献。我们透过聚焦在河内进行贩卖的每日生活政治，以及在城市地景中开拓能动性的策略，描绘这些小贩的每日真实生活，以及他们与在地、区域和全球政治经济系统的连结及竞逐。我们发现，当小贩面对国家禁令和排除的威胁，仍力图维系其动态生计之时，能动性便是一种反抗的机制。 *关键词：每日生活政治，能动性，能动性政治，街头贩卖，越南。*

El gobierno municipal de Hanoi proscribió en 2008 las ventas callejeras en numerosos sitios, delineando y redefiniendo significativamente el acceso al espacio urbano. La prohibición privilegia ciertas formas de movimiento designando calles y calzadas para los movimientos fluidos del transporte "moderno", contra las caprichosas movibilidades "tradicionales" de los vendedores callejeros que paran aquí y allá para ejercer su oficio. En este artículo exploramos las movibilidades cotidianas de los vendedores de Hanoi a la luz de esta prohibición, concentrándonos en las cuidadosas negociaciones que ellos emprenden para asegurar derechos sobre las calles de la ciudad, y destacar cómo las movibilidades de los vendedores son producidas y reelaboradas social, política y culturalmente. Combinamos las seis facetas de movibilidades de Cresswell con las políticas cotidianas de Kerkvliet para formar una política de movilidad cotidiana híbrida. Al hacerlo resaltamos las experiencias cotidianas de movilidad de los vendedores y las políticas que afectan a los vendedores itinerantes en comparación con las de sus contrapartes estacionarios. Con base en ocho meses de trabajo de campo en Hanoi, que incorporó entrevistas, métodos etnográficos móviles y apuntes de los vendedores, este artículo contribuye un examen a profundidad de las políticas de (in)movilidad en el Sur Global, considerando el modo como la movilidad es enmarcada y producida en un contexto distintivamente

socialista. Al enfocarnos en las políticas cotidianas de ventas en Hanoi y en las tácticas emprendidas para forjar las movibilidades en el paisaje urbano, ilustramos las realidades vividas a diario por los vendedores, lo mismo que sus conexiones y retos de los sistemas político-económicos locales, regionales y globales. Hallamos que la movilidad es un mecanismo de resistencia, en tanto los vendedores se esfuerzan por mantener fuentes de subsistencia móviles a pesar de las amenazas de sanciones y exclusión del estado. *Palabras clave: políticas cotidianas, movibilidades, políticas de movilidad, ventas callejeras, Vietnam.*

Within municipalities in the Global South, modernist and revanchist policies often pit the state's vision of urban development against those of the informal economy, restricting informal vendors' livelihood security and options for a safe trading space (Bromley 2000; Brown 2006; Hansen, Little, and Milgram 2013). In 2008, in the capital city of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Hanoi's municipal government enacted a ban on street vending in sixty-two streets and forty-eight public spaces.¹ This ban effectively defined sidewalks and pavements as spaces to move through rather than move in—spaces of flow rather than spaces of place—positioning vendors as obstructions to, instead of part of the flow (Castells 1996; Blomley 2011; Graham 2014). Along with previous legislation limiting sidewalk commerce, Hanoi's 2008 ban has resulted in vendors' visions of fair and reasonable governance and control colliding with those of the municipal government. In response, vendors often develop ingenious tactics, digging in their heels in opposition to state and developers' plans, as part of an everyday politics of livelihood survival (Cross 2000).

Building on previous investigations of vendor livelihoods in Hanoi that have produced meaningful findings regarding trade practices (cf. Drummond 1993; DiGregorio 1994; Mitchell 1995; Tana 1996; Higgs 2003; Koh 2008; Jensen, Peppard, and Thang 2013), our case study focuses on street vending as an important, but until now conceptually neglected, form of mobility in a socialist context. First, we briefly review the mobilities and everyday politics literature, demonstrating how a combination of these concepts can help us to better understand vendor mobilities and actions in the Global South. Then we detail the rapidly transforming socioeconomic context in which Hanoi's vendors are operating, especially since the 2008 vending ban. We introduce the vendors at the heart of this piece and then frame our analysis according to Cresswell's six facets of mobility, highlighting the differential mobility politics between fixed and mobile traders. We reveal how itinerant vendors have complied with, negotiated, or resisted the ban and examine the everyday politics of making do in this restrictive trade environment.

To tease out the points of collision between the lived mobilities of street vendors and the imagined, ideal mobilities of Hanoi's state officials, this article draws on eight months of fieldwork involving conversational and semistructured interviews, solicited journals, mobile ethnographic methods, and participant observation. The first author carried out 265 conversational street vendor interviews (during 2010, 2012, and 2015), as well as fifteen semistructured interviews with law enforcement officers and policymakers. We also draw on semistructured interviews completed with forty additional street traders in 2009 (Turner and Schoenberger 2012). Participant journals with ten vendors contribute in-depth accounts of vendors' day-to-day mobilities, and walking-while-talking interviews with two itinerant vendors add further nuance regarding mobile patterns of trade. Of our 305 vending participants, 265 are women and 40 are men. Stationary, local vendors account for 83 of our participants, whereas 222 are itinerant, migrant vendors. All itinerant participants come from farming households and describe vending as their primary source of income, whereas the majority of fixed vendors (90 percent) work this way for pleasure or to supplement their income. Vendors sell a range of products including produce, prepared food, beverages, convenience items, and services, usually earning around US\$5.00 per day, compared to a national average income of approximately US\$5.50 per day (World Bank 2015).

Conceptualizing Mobilities and Everyday Politics for the Vietnam Case

Mobility is by no means a new phenomenon. Nonetheless, the ways in which people, ideas, and materials move have undergone increasingly intensive investigation in recent years. Because "all the world seems to be on the move," scholars across the social sciences and humanities have advanced a "new mobilities paradigm" (Sheller and Urry 2006, 207; also see Adey et al. 2014) to train analytic attention on the character and quality of movements and flows. The resulting body of work offers a particular take on the process of movement,

one that unravels the entanglements of movement with power and meaning and interrogates its social, cultural, and political production. In other words, the concept of mobility facilitates critical discussions of the politics and power dynamics that animate processes of movement, raising questions about who is or is not able to move, what forms of movement are privileged and desired over others, and how the same movement can take on drastically different meaning depending on the positionality of the mobile subject and the motive force behind their movement (Cresswell 2006, 2010; Uteng 2009; Tanzarn 2012; Oswin 2014).

McCann (2011, 121) argued that “mobility is stratified and conditioned by access to resources and by one’s identity (classed, racialized, gendered, etc.)” Elaborating on the gender dynamics at play, Hanson (2010) noted the interdependence of mobility and gender, examining the ways in which they both shape and are shaped by one another. Hanson argued that mobilities are reflective of the positionality of the mobile subject and that as unequal power relations are often drawn along lines of gender, mobilities are differentially accessed by male and female subjects. This is clear in the case of street vending in Vietnam, predominantly undertaken by female laborers. In this context, Leshkovich (2014) argued that attempts to render vending livelihoods as chaotic, disorderly, and problematic are closely linked to attempts at regulating and controlling female mobility. Leshkovich added that street vendors are targeted by state reprisals because of who vendors are, rather than how they make a living.

Within mobilities scholarship, increasing attention is being paid to the street as a space of flows and movements, barriers and moorings (Blomley 2011). Yet, as is true of the mobilities turn more broadly, there is a geographical bias within work on the politics of the street. That is, with some notable exceptions (see Gough and Franch 2005; Porter et al. 2010; van Blerk 2013), it tends to focus on the Global North. This is surprising because, as Cresswell (2006, 20) noted, “mobility is central to what it means to be modern.” Indeed, developmental imperatives put issues of modernization high on the agenda in the Global South. Narratives of progress and modernization are particularly evident in state attempts to regulate and reorder street spaces as a means of increasing global connectedness (Hutabarat 2010). As increased automobility is imagined as the foundation for the modern city, urban streets in the Global South become representational spaces linked to the assertion of national identity (Short and Pinet-Peralta 2010). What results is a contested urban

landscape, in which multiple stakeholders compete for use of the streets, often resulting in an encroachment on spaces of place that are central to the social, economic, and political livability of the streetscape (Khayesi, Monheim, and Nebe 2010). The dissonance between the imagined and lived mobilities of street spaces is imbued with inequity, as everyday users—such as vendors—are neglected by vehicle-centered planning initiatives and presented as obstructions to the flow and, by extension, inhibitors of progress toward modernity (Short and Pinet-Peralta 2010).

As we explore later, Hanoi’s municipal government exercises social control in part through the deployment of a particular and narrow notion of mobility as instrumental and productive. This mobile imaginary poses significant challenges to residents who rely on street vending as an economic survival strategy. Nonetheless, vendors do not receive these regulations passively. Although overt resistance to livelihood restrictions is fairly futile in Vietnam’s semi-authoritarian context, vendors advance under-the-radar approaches that either bring them into closer compliance with the law in a manner that suits them or allow them to work around problematic regulations and enforcement. To explore these negotiations of mobile proscriptions, in addition to the critical mobilities framework already detailed, we draw on Kerkvliet’s (2009) notion of everyday politics, which he described as “people embracing, complying with, adjusting, and contesting norms and rules regarding authority over, production of, or allocation of resources and doing so in quiet, mundane, and subtle expressions and acts that are rarely organised or direct” (232). Kerkvliet divided everyday politics into four categories; namely “support, compliance, modifications and evasions, and resistance” (233). By focusing on the everyday politics of street vending in Hanoi and the tactics undertaken to carve out mobilities in the urban landscape, we can thus illustrate these vendors’ daily lived realities as well as their connections with and contestations of local, regional, and global political–economic systems.

Hanoi: A Socialist Planned Context

In Hanoi, informal livelihoods such as street vending provide a much needed means for residents to earn a living amidst growing disparity associated with urban development, rising cost of living, and stagnant agricultural profits (Jensen, Peppard, and Thang 2013). The informal sector provides a means for survival and

entrepreneurship, as informal laborers respond to market demands, doing so in a way that is both beneficial to the provider and convenient for the consumer (Sassen 1994). Regardless of livelihoods it provides, however, state initiatives seek to dismantle Hanoi's informal sector without adequately addressing the complex factors at play in the persistence of informal livelihood activities (Jensen and Peppard 2003; Turner and Schoenberger 2012).

Hanoi's vendors have been subject to numerous regulations over the past thirty years, the enforcement of which has varied substantially. In 1984, city authorities announced that pavements were only for walking, charging a fee for other activities (Koh 2008). In 1991, a national traffic and pavement order campaign (Decree 135/CT) was applied in Hanoi's inner-city areas (Order 57/UB), with police fining street vendors who were unable to flee (Drummond 1993). This, and other decrees that followed, continued to be unevenly implemented throughout the 1990s, with vendors usually finding ways to outmaneuver the ward (neighborhood) officials in charge of implementing such laws at the local level (Koh 2008). Crackdowns were also increasingly linked to large-scale public events—including the 2003 Southeast Asia Games and 2006 Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation summit—resulting in the implementation of tough measures aimed at clearing vendors from the streets and encouraging a “civilized lifestyle.” Yet enforcement always remained uneven as ward officials were accustomed to a steady flow of payoffs (Jensen, Peppard, and Thang 2013).

More recently, in 2008, Hanoi banned street vending along sixty-two streets in the city center and in forty-eight public spaces around hospitals, schools, and bus and train stations (People's Committee of Hanoi 2008). The ban forbids vendors from “blocking transportation” on “national highways, roads, pavement in the city, road for transportation in community areas” (People's Committee of Hanoi 2008). This policy reflects the state's approach to urban development, positioning vendors as inhibitors of traffic flow, unproductive, and obstacles in the state's modernization discourse. Moreover, the state's fixation with automobility, made evident by the ban, mirrors a long-standing urban planning rationale that equates progress with fluid movement (Castells 1996). Policies like the 2008 ban that reimagine streets as channels for the efficient flow of traffic have been introduced at the cost of everyday users of street spaces such as pedestrians, cyclists, and vendors (Khayesi, Monheim, and Nebe 2010). One urban planner working in Hanoi

noted, “Street vendors who take up space in the streets or sidewalks disrupt other people from being able to use that space for transportation—to walk or drive their motorbikes. [Vending] is not the intended use, so it's not allowed.” Similarly Phi Thai Binh, Vice-Chairman of Hanoi's People's Committee, described the ban as an effort to “re-establish urban order in a civilized way” (“Hanoi's Street Vendors” 2008).

In Hanoi, the *enforcement* of the vending ban, aiming to reduce “slow mobility,” has mainly targeted itinerant traders, who overwhelmingly originate from Hanoi's periurban zones (cf. Agergaard and Thao 2011; Jensen, Peppard, and Thang 2013). These periurban zones have been subject to drastic modernization policies and plans since August 2008 when the official land area of Hanoi was expanded from 920 to 3,345 km², increasing the city's population overnight from approximately 3.5 million to 6.23 million (Prime Minister of Vietnam 2008). The merger of Hanoi with its periurban environs is part of the government's ongoing bid to create an economic superhub—more populous than Singapore or Kuala Lumpur and rivaling Ho Chi Minh City—through rapid modernization (“Supersized Hanoi” 2008). In the process, Hanoi is engulfing periurban villages and market gardens, refashioning them as private high-rise office and apartment complexes. New waves of migrants emerge from these periurban areas as residents now see street trading as one of their few livelihood means, despite having to compete with long-time Hanoi residents already using public areas for fixed vending (van den Berg, van Wijk, and Hoi 2003).² Simultaneously, authorities have tagged certain central corridors for demolition to create new transportation links. Such links—including highways, expressways, and a metropolitan railway system—privilege modern mobilities and gesture toward patterns of disparity emerging alongside increased urbanization (Smart and Smart 2003; Cresswell 2006).

Six Facets of an Everyday Politics of Vendor Mobility

Cresswell (2006) described mobilities as a conceptual triad formed from movement, representation, and practice. In Hanoi, vendor *movement* refers to their day-to-day motions through the streets, in turn encoded and *represented* by the state as an obstacle to modernity and development, resulting in an experience, or *practice*, imbued with everyday politics. Cresswell's theorization explains mobility as a highly

regulated and contested resource and offers an analytical vantage point for examining the power dynamics and inequity characterizing mobile hierarchies on Hanoi's streets. Additionally, by drawing on Kerkvliet's notion of everyday politics, we can better understand how those relegated to the bottom of the mobility hierarchy enact everyday politics in a bid to push back against the state structures and imperatives that seek to immobilize them. In this section we combine Cresswell's six facets of mobility (motive force, route, speed, rhythm, experience, and friction) with a discussion of everyday politics in order to examine vendors' daily experiences of mobility. In doing so, we highlight the mobility politics affecting itinerant vendors compared to their stationary counterparts.

Motive Force

The motives for vending differ between Hanoi's fixed and itinerant traders. Stationary vendors tend to be longtime residents of Hanoi, supplementing their household or pension income by selling from fixed stalls near their homes. Alternatively, the majority of itinerant vendors are migrants, frequently sharing rented rooms in Hanoi with other vendors from the same village and returning home to visit their families monthly. Itinerant traders lack the social and financial capital to secure a fixed trading spot. One young shoe vendor explained, "Locals have more rights to the sidewalk than we [migrant vendors] do—they wouldn't sell

itinerantly, because they are able set up stalls, and we wouldn't dare sell in one place." Itinerant vendors trade to support their households in response to changing conditions in their home villages, including decreasing land access and a growing inability to survive on farming alone. Vending also offers flexibility in contrast to the strict schedules of factory work that can conflict with familial and farming responsibilities. Nonetheless, itinerant vendors primarily undertake this trade due to lack of alternative livelihood options. Although itinerant vendor Kiêu³ faces harsh regulations because of her conical hats being so conspicuously for sale, she does not know what else to do: "Everyone from my home sells these, all these vendors you see with hats and bracelets—we are like family. This is all I know."

Route

The 2008 ban attempts to foster fluid traffic flow, channeling vendor routes away from sixty-three streets on which vending is prohibited. Signs on the sidewalks and daily announcements over loudspeakers remind vendors to stay clear of these streets. Yet these major thoroughfares are lucrative sites for trade and hubs for foot and vehicle traffic. Itinerant traders thus carefully adjust their daily routes, taking note of which streets and spaces are more frequently targeted by ward officials—including larger, artery roads and those that permit ease of access for police vehicles. In strategic acts of everyday resistance, some vendors continue to trade on



Figure 1. Balloon vendors trading in the middle of a busy and highly regulated intersection on the edge of Hanoi's Old Quarter (a location included in the 2008 ban). *Source:* Photograph by Noelani Eidse, 2015. (Color figure available online.)

highly regulated streets by noting restrictions on police mobilities; vendors identify nearby side streets too narrow for police vehicles to pass through and use them as escape routes to flee police. One young vendor, Nãm, described how she and her friends are able to sell on a bustling banned street (Figure 1), regardless of frequent raids: “We go into small streets or alleys where they cannot go in with their trucks, or we run to one-way streets where trucks cannot come in either.” Alternatively, fixed local vendors draw on social capital with ward police, who they have often known for years, and on perceived rights to the pavement as long-term residents to trade on regulated streets.

Speed

Cresswell (2010) argued that a discussion of the politics of speed must address choice, cautioning against the simplistic equation of high-speed movement with the “kinetic elite.” This is certainly the case in Hanoi, where stationary traders are able to choose fixity, and itinerant vendors must adjust their speed strategically, moment by moment, to avoid reprisals for their trade. One itinerant pomello vendor, Hãn, explained:

Locals have more rights to the sidewalk than us migrants because they are from here. They often sell in front of their homes. They are able to use the pavement without being troubled by the police—not like us.

Itinerant vendors are frequently told to keep moving by shop owners, residents, and fixed vendors, in an act of exclusion from remaining stationary (Figure 2). At the same time, their movement is considered too slow and out of place in the city. Fixed stall owner Hoai noted, “Street vendors using a bamboo carrying pole are dangerous for the traffic and they should not clog the street.” Vendor equipment and goods are often cumbersome, making sustained or rapid movement physically strenuous or impossible. For instance, Cúc, an elderly vendor selling clothing with a carrying pole, noted that her stock could weigh up to 45 kg, explaining why she is unable to walk more than a few meters at a time. Moving slowly or stopping for long periods increases itinerant vendors’ vulnerability, and during police raids they must run quickly to avoid being caught and fined. Itinerant vendors’ ability to choose their speed of movement is thus filtered through a plethora of physical, social, and political constraints.

Rhythm

Itinerant vendors’ daily rhythm is staccato, divided into intervals of rest and motion. By remaining on the move almost constantly, itinerant vendors are able to cover more ground and access a greater number of customers, but brief periods of rest are necessary to manage the physical stress of their trade. Hũnh, a DVD



Figure 2. A stationary vendor displays her cleaning products on the sidewalk in front of her house, while an itinerant guava vendor pauses momentarily on the road in front of a closed shop. *Source:* Photograph by Noelani Eidse, 2015. (Color figure available online.)

vendor, explained, “I get so tired from walking around, but the longer I sit in one place, the more sales I miss.” Because the state imagines streets as spaces of fluid movement and flow, as introduced earlier, the improvised and unpredictable rhythms of itinerant vendors are branded as antimodern, uncivilized, and a hindrance to development. Some vendors we interviewed have internalized this state narrative, reiterating that they are an obstruction to the flow of goods and people in the city, rather than being part of the flow itself. Siu, a vendor using a bicycle to ply her wares, noted:

I think I'm not allowed to sell because I take up too much space, I block traffic. . . . The cars might take up more space, but I stop more than they do. But what can I do? I do this because I don't have any other way to get by.

Siu's statement highlights the tensions between these public spaces as imagined spaces of flow and as lived spaces entwined with livelihood practice (Brown 2006; Cresswell 2010).

Harnessing the benefits of their itinerancy, vendors strategically adjust their daily rhythms to trade under the radar. They are savvy to the daily and weekly rhythms of ward officials and police and have created micromobility patterns to avoid fines and retributions. Police repeatedly patrol at fixed times and are not particularly inventive in their routines. Vendors build on these repeated customs to create their own trade mobilities. Siu noted, “When the police are out, even if I'm just walking I'll get a fine—so I don't go out then.” By resting when the police are less active and moving when the police patrol, vendors minimize the physical strain of their mobile livelihoods while reducing their interaction with police. Itinerant vendors likewise adjust their rhythms according to power dynamics between themselves and locals. One mango vendor, Linh, explained, “We sometimes rest in front of that pharmacy during lunch, but if we don't move quickly enough when they open for business again, they will curse, push our carts into the street, throw tea in our faces and kick us.” As such, vendors are compelled to stay on the move and pause cautiously, always ready to pick up their goods and become mobile again.

Experience

Itinerant vendors' experiences of mobility are characterized by a sense of being out of place. They are considered outsiders by fixed vendors, who often disparage itinerant vendors as migrants, with lower

socioeconomic status. One itinerant migrant clothing vendor explained:

We face many hardships here, just because we're from outside Hanoi and don't know the rhythm of the city. The vendors who live in Hanoi do not accept us.

Tensions rise over the favorable treatment Hanoi residents can receive from local officials. Hạng, an itinerant hawker, put it bluntly: “Street vendors with stalls are always from Hanoi; they think they're above us vendors who walk around.” Despite many itinerant interviewees having worked in Hanoi for fifteen years or more, they still feel poorly treated and excluded by native Hanoians who sometimes threaten to call the police, damage their products, or take goods on credit without repaying their debt. Even when not actively trading, itinerant vendors experience restricted mobility; their positionality as vendors affects what shops they can enter, where they can sit, and which streets they can pass through. Kiêu, an itinerant vendor in her sixties introduced earlier, noted that by simply walking through certain streets with her goods she is a possible target for police action, irrespective of whether or not she is pursuing a sale. The positionality and mobility of an itinerant vendor thus becomes paralleled with a fixed social position in the minds of local residents and officials (Cresswell 2006).

Friction

Clearly, the greatest source of friction for Hanoi's vendors is the enforcement of the 2008 ban. Due to the relationships fixed vendors forge with local city officials, however, they rarely face the same friction as migrant vendors. Stationary vendors often have an established informal relationship with local law enforcement officers—such as regular unofficial payments—and a degree of social capital from connections that enable them to maintain their trade. One stationary cigarette vendor, Thanh, noted, “It is a privilege to be able to pay the police,” explaining that engaging in bribe networks enables her to occupy street spaces with reduced fear of retribution. Without the social connections needed to negotiate the illegality of their livelihoods, migrant vendors' mobilities are disproportionately restricted by the 2008 ban. Indeed, by defining street vendors as those who use streets and pavements to undertake “buying/selling activities *without a fixed space*” (People's Committee of Hanoi 2008, italics added) police can manipulate their take on the ban, focusing on migrant

vendors who trade itinerantly and consequently experience harsher fines and restrictions.

The friction that some itinerant vendors experience in relation to the ban has led them to an everyday politics response of compliance (Kerkvliet 2009), discontinuing their trade permanently, whereas others temporarily modify their trade to minimize risks. Danh, an itinerant vendor selling lighters, noted that when the police increase their presence in the streets—for instance, during Vietnam’s Independence Day celebrations—he stops trading for a week or two, returning home to Hu’ng Yên. Like countless others, though, once the police ease their presence again, Danh resumes his trade. For Cresswell (2010), friction is about asking when and how mobilities stop, yet in the context of our study, the question becomes: To what extent does friction immobilize vendors? Itinerant vendors respond to friction with various acts of everyday politics, doing so to negotiate external sources of pressure and continue to trade in spite of friction. By adapting their route, rhythm, and speed, itinerant vendors push back against sources of friction that threaten to immobilize them.

Concluding Thoughts

We have demonstrated that in Hanoi, when delineating between acceptable and unacceptable mobilities, those in positions of power demonstrate a rationale of functionality, favoring modern, fluid mobilities over those that are both traditional and staccato. Inhabitants who do not conform to acceptable mobilities become obstructions to, rather than part of, the flow in the eyes of the state. Some vendors have internalized this state discourse, although they are also quick to note that they have few alternative livelihood options. The imagined mobilities of state planning clash with vendors’ everyday experiences of mobility, emphasizing the tensions between mobile subjects who compete for the same space (Cresswell 2010). Informal mobilities thus become entwined with processes of negotiation and resistance as vendors undertake forms of movement outside the state’s view. Indeed, it is the very fact that their mobilities are informal and exist beyond regulation that enables Hanoi’s street vendors to carve a trading space.

In sum, we have highlighted the informal power plays and processes undertaken by long-term Hanoi residents, selling from fixed street stalls, compared to

those carried out by migrant itinerant traders. To understand the underlying factors contributing to the everyday politics of disparate mobilities, one must consider positionality, addressing how mobilities are embodied and gendered. As our case demonstrates, in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam’s capital, certain forms of mobility are strongly privileged over others, and mobility hierarchies are not only drawn according to movement but fixity, boundaries, and moorings as well (Cresswell 2010). Mobility is socially produced and reworked, inherently political and differential—both produced by and reproductive of hierarchies of power and social exclusion (Uteng 2009; Tanzarn 2012). Echoing McCann’s (2011) suggestion, we argue that by applying the concept of mobility in conjunction with other concepts, we are able to more fully understand the spatial politics at play. By incorporating Kerkvliet’s everyday politics with Cresswell’s six mobility facets we have teased out the ways in which street vendors contest their (im)mobilities, enacting everyday politics to exert claims to the city’s streets. By integrating everyday politics into an examination of mobility, we contribute new understandings of how compliance, contestation, negotiation, and evasion and resistance can underscore mobility and in turn prove essential for informal economy livelihood options. We have highlighted the power dynamics that underpin hierarchies of itinerant trade in the Global South, while also uncovering the ways in which street vendors—members of the “kinetic underclass” (Cresswell 2010)—push back against the very structures that seek to immobilize them.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the participants in Hanoi who shared their stories with us. We also thank the anonymous referees, the *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* special issue editors, and Jana Eidse for their valuable suggestions.

Funding

Funding for this research was provided by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the International Development Research Centre, Canada.

Notes

1. In 2009, the vending ban was revised to include an additional street, with sixty-three streets banned in total. The updated ban can be viewed online at <http://m.thuvienphapluat.vn/archive/detail/84303>.
2. This migration raises a range of complex issues, not least that having registration papers with official residence status in the city provides access to government-funded health care, schooling, and other amenities. Few street vendor migrants receive official urban residential status (see Agergaard and Thao 2011).
3. All participants have been assigned pseudonyms.

References

- Adey, P., D. Bissell, K. Hannam, P. Merriman, and M. Sheller. 2014. Introduction. In *The Routledge handbook of mobilities*, ed. P. Adey, D. Bissell, K. Hannam, P. Merriman, and M. Sheller, 1–20. London and New York: Routledge.
- Agergaard, J., and V. T. Thao. 2011. Mobile, flexible, and adaptable: Female migrants in Hanoi's informal sector. *Population, Space and Place* 17:407–20.
- Blomley, N. 2011. *Rights of passage: Sidewalks and the regulation of public flow*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bromley, R. 2000. Street vending and public policy: A global review. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 20 (1–2): 1–28.
- Brown, A. 2006. Challenging street livelihoods. In *Contested space: Street trading, public space, and livelihoods in developing cities*, ed. A. Brown, 3–16. Warwickshire, UK: ITDG.
- Castells, M. 1996. *The rise of the network society*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Cresswell, T. 2006. *On the move: Mobility in the modern western world*. London and New York: Routledge.
- . 2010. Towards a politics of mobility. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28 (1): 17–31.
- Cross, J. C. 2000. Street vendors, modernity and postmodernity: Conflict and compromise in the global economy. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 1 (2): 30–52.
- DiGregorio, M. R. 1994. Urban harvest: Recycling as a peasant industry in northern Vietnam. East-West Center Occasional Papers, No. 17, East-West Center, Honolulu, HI.
- Drummond, L. 1993. Women, the household economy, and the informal sector in Hanoi. Unpublished master's thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
- Gough, K. V., and M. Franch. 2005. Spaces of the street: Socio-spatial mobility and exclusion of youth in Recife. *Children's Geographies* 3 (3): 149–66.
- Graham, S. 2014. Disruptions. In *The Routledge handbook of mobilities*, ed. P. Adey, D. Bissell, K. Hannam, P. Merriman, and M. Sheller, 468–71. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hanoi's street vendors given temporary reprieve. 2008. *Vietnam News* 24 January 2008. <http://vietnamnews.vn/society/173216/ha-nois-street-vendors-given-temporary-reprieve.html> (last accessed 31 May 2015).
- Hansen, K. T., W. E. Little, and B. L. Milgram, eds. 2013. *Street economies in the urban Global South*. Santa Fe, NM: School for Advanced Research Press.
- Hanson, S. 2010. Gender and mobility: New approaches for informing sustainability. *Gender, Place & Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 17 (1): 5–23.
- Higgs, P. 2003. Footpath traders in a Hanoi neighbourhood. In *Consuming urban culture in contemporary Vietnam*, ed. L. Drummond and M. Thomas, 75–88. London and New York: Routledge Curzon.
- Hutabarat Lo, R. 2010. The city as a mirror: Transport, land use and social change in Jakarta. *Urban Studies* 1 (27): 1–27.
- Jensen, R., and D. M. Peppard. 2003. Hanoi's informal sector and the Vietnamese economy: A case study of roving street vendors. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 38 (1): 71–84.
- Jensen, R., D. Peppard, and V. T. M. Thang. 2013. *Women on the move: Hanoi's migrant roving street vendors*. Hanoi, Vietnam: Women's Publishing House.
- Kerkvliet, B. J. T. 2009. Everyday politics in peasant societies (and ours). *Journal of Peasant Studies* 36 (1): 227–43.
- Khayesi, M., H. Monheim, and J. M. Nebe. 2010. Negotiating streets for all in urban transport planning: The case for pedestrians, cyclists and street vendors in Nairobi, Kenya. *Antipode* 42 (1): 103–26.
- Koh, D. 2008. The pavement as civic space: History and dynamics in the city of Hanoi. In *Globalization, the city and civil society in Pacific Asia: The social production of civic spaces*, ed. M. Douglass, K. C. Ho, and G. L. Ooi, 145–74. London and New York: Routledge.
- Leshkovich, A. M. 2014. *Essential trade: Vietnamese women in a changing marketplace*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- McCann, E. 2011. Urban policy mobilities and global circuits of knowledge: Toward a research agenda. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 101 (1): 107–30.
- Mitchell, D. 1995. The end of public space? People's park, definitions of the public, and democracy. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 85 (1): 108–33.
- Oswin, N. 2014. Queer theory. In *The Routledge handbook of mobilities*, ed. P. Adey, D. Bissell, K. Hannam, P. Merriman, and M. Sheller, 85–93. London and New York: Routledge.
- People's Committee of Hanoi. 2008. 02/2008/QĐ-UBND Quyết định. Ban hành Quy định về quản lý hoạt động bán hàng rong trên địa bàn Thành phố Hà Nội [Decision: Promulgating regulation on management of street-selling activities in Hanoi]. Revised policy No. 46/2009/QĐ-UBND, 15 January 2009, Hanoi, Vietnam.
- Porter, G., K. Hampshire, A. Abane, E. Robson, A. Muntali, M. Mashiri, and A. Tanle. 2010. Moving young lives: Mobility, immobility and inter-generational tensions in urban Africa. *Geoforum* 41:796–804.
- Prime Minister of Vietnam. 2008. *Quyết định 490/QĐ-TTg phê duyệt quy hoạch xây dựng vùng Thủ đô Hà Nội* [Decision of the Prime Minister on the approval of construction planning for Hanoi capital zone]. Hanoi, Vietnam: Prime Minister of Vietnam.
- Sassen, S. 1994. The informal economy: Between new developments and old regulations. *Yale Law Journal* 103:2289–304.

- Sheller, M., and J. Urry. 2006. The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning* 38 (2): 207–26.
- Short, J. R., and L. M. Pinet-Peralta. 2010. No accident: Traffic and pedestrians in the modern city. *Mobilities* 5 (1): 41–59.
- Smart, A., and J. Smart. 2003. Urbanization and the global perspective. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 32:263–85.
- Supersized Hanoi. 2008. *The Straits Times*. 7 June 2008. <http://www.streetnet.org.za/index.html> (last accessed 5 June 2009).
- Tana, L. 1996. *Peasants on the move: Rural–urban migration in the Hanoi region*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Tanzarn, N. 2012. Gendered mobilities in developing countries: The case of (urban) Uganda. In *Gendered mobilities*, ed. T. P. Uteng and T. Cresswell, 159–72. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Turner, S., and L. Schoenberger. 2012. Street vendor livelihoods and everyday politics in Hanoi, Vietnam: The seeds of a diverse economy? *Urban Studies* 49 (5): 1027–44.
- Uteng, T. P. 2009. Gender, ethnicity, and constrained mobility: Insights into the resultant social exclusion. *Environment and Planning A* 41 (5): 1055–71.
- van Blerk, K. 2013. New street geographies: The impact of urban governance on the mobilities of Cape Town's street youth. *Urban Studies* 50:556–73.
- van den Berg, L. M., M. S. van Wijk, and P. V. Hoi. 2003. The transformations of agriculture and rural life downstream of Hanoi. *Environment and Urbanization* 15:35–52.
- World Bank. 2015. Vietnam overview. 15 April. <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/vietnam/overview#3> (last accessed 31 May 2015).
- NOELANI EIDSE is a PhD Candidate in the Department of Geography at McGill University, Montreal, QC H3A 0B9, Canada. E-mail: noelani.eidse@mail.mcgill.ca. Her research interests include the underlying relationships between livelihoods, urbanization, and public space governance, and how these relationships are framed by everyday politics and negotiations.
- SARAH TURNER is a Professor in the Department of Geography at McGill University, Montreal, QC H3A 0B9, Canada. E-mail: sarah.turner@mcgill.ca. Her research interests include urban and rural livelihoods and strategies of those on the margins (economically, politically, and culturally) in northern Vietnam and Yunnan, China.
- NATALIE OSWIN is an Associate Professor of Geography at McGill University, Montreal, QC H3A 0B9, Canada. E-mail: natalie.oswin@mcgill.ca. Her research focuses on sexual citizenship, with a specific emphasis on how sexual politics intertwine with processes of globalization and urbanization, and on the politics of mobility.