Feminist Praxis, Citizenship and Informal Politics:
Reflections on South Africa's Anti-Eviction Campaign

Faranak Miraftab

Abstract

This paper focuses on the Anti-eviction Campaign (AEC) in Cape Town, South Africa, which is part of the larger Anti-privatization Movement, mobilized by disadvantaged township residents to assert their constitutional rights and resist evictions and service disconnections. It introduces the mutually constituted concepts of *invited* and *invented* spaces of citizenship and stresses the range of grassroots actions spanning those. The paper also sheds light on the gender dynamics of the Campaign and how its patriarchal order may be destabilizing. The AEC case study engages the feminist scholarship that has pioneered an inclusive conceptualization of citizenship embracing both formal and informal arenas of politics. The study points out the risk in constructing yet another binary relation within the informal arena of politics and a bifurcated civil society, by celebrating grassroots coping strategies (invited spaces) and demonizing resistance strategies (invented spaces). The paper calls for a refinement of feminists' extended notion of politics, recognizing the oppositional practices of the poor in order to construct an inclusive citizenship. It argues that doing so better reflects the practices of the grassroots and furthers a progressive feminist praxis.

****

This paper examines the struggle of the poor in South Africa with respect to basic needs such as water and shelter. It presents the specific case of the Anti-eviction Campaign (AEC) in Cape Town, a movement by the poor to protect their shelter against eviction orders by the city council and the private banks. The case example of AEC, which is part of the larger Anti-Privatization Movement, is placed within the citizenship debate. The paper calls for a careful rethinking of the critique, first put forward by feminist scholars, that urges an expanded notion of politics: namely, the rejection of binary constructs of formal/informal and attention to the informal arena of community-based activism, where women and disadvantaged groups are most effective politically and as citizens.

Introducing the concepts of *invited* and *invented* spaces of citizenship, the paper urges recognition of the range of spaces within the informal arena where citizenship is practiced. "Invited"[1] spaces are defined as occupied by those grassroots actions and their allied non-governmental organizations that are legitimized by donors and government interventions. "Invented" spaces are defined as occupied by those collective actions by the poor that directly confront the authorities and challenge the status quo. The two sorts of spaces —invited and invented— should be understood as a mutually constituted, interacting relationship, not a binary one. Their distinction lies in the fact that actions taken by the poor within the *invited* spaces of citizenship, however innovative, aim to cope with systems of hardship and are sanctioned by donors and government interventions; within the *invented* spaces, however, grassroots actions

are characterized by defiance that <u>resists</u> the status quo. In one space, strategies cope within the existing structure; in the other, resistance is mounted to change it. Grassroots activities move back and forth between those spaces. Institutions of power, such as the mainstream media, the state and international donor organizations, however, configure these spaces in a binary relation, and tend to criminalize the latter by designating only the former as the "proper" space for civil participation. In this neoliberal moment, when state-civil society relations are central to state legitimation, it is important to bring to light the significance of the invented citizenship spaces of insurgency.

The paper first briefly discusses the problem of housing in South Africa and the eviction crisis in Cape Town. Next, from interviews conducted with AEC members and activists during the summers of 2001, 2002 and 2004,[2] the Campaign's gender hierarchies and forms of collective action are explained. I discuss how the Campaign uses both formal and informal channels to acquire information, to make demands, and — most importantly — to stop evictions and service cut-offs, the assaults by neoliberal policies on residents' life spaces. The challenge by women activists to the existing gender hierarchies within the Campaign is described. I explain how that struggle for gender justice has prompted a larger organizational quest for accountability and transparency, with the potential for inclusive participatory democracy within the informal politics of community-based activism.

This discussion will be situated in the larger feminist debate over liberal formulations of citizenship and politics and will benefit from feminists' insights on South African township politics in the anti-apartheid era. It is hoped that by grounding feminists' concepts in the experience of the Campaign, the paper will improve understanding of the informal arena of township politics and of not only the external complexities faced in relation to the state and the media, but also the internal complexities amongst male and female activists. The paper concludes by a) emphasizing the significance of the practices of marginalized groups within the invented spaces of insurgency, which a limited focus on state-legitimized, informal politics inevitably obscures; and b) pointing out how the instability of the patriarchal order in community-based activism could lead to more progressive grassroots practices that treat gender justice and social justice as inseparable.

1994 and the Promises of Formal Citizenship

To understand the experience of AEC, a historicized perspective on housing and evictions is imperative. Housing has been central to the citizenship question in South Africa. Black populations dispossessed of land and resources were denied South African citizenship and under the Native Land Act of 1913 were restricted to desolated areas of unproductive land called "homelands." Their access to housing and services in cities was tied to their employment as migrant workers. For other non-white populations, treated as second class citizens, access to housing and services was tied to their residential area designations under the Group Area Act of 1950. Such exclusionary and stratified citizenship involved brutal forced removals: people were evicted and dumped in designated racialized areas, or were removed from shacks illegally set up in city outskirts and bussed back to the homelands.[3]

Against that background, the 1996 constitution, aiming to make universal citizenship meaningful, recognized the right of all South Africans to adequate housing and basic services (articles 26 and 27).[4] Those constitutional and formal rights were received with much joy and hope, in the belief that the gross inequalities and brutalities of the past had been replaced by

2

substantive citizenship for all. But the post-apartheid government's rapid shift from the redistributive agenda of the Reconstruction and Development Programs (RDP) to a market-driven growth agenda known as Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR) has brought profound disillusionment (see Bond 2000; Cheru 1997; Moore 2001). The neoliberal development framework that was adopted relies on private sector principles of cost recovery through users' fees:[5] basically, "no fee, no service." Applying that policy in a society with some of the world's largest social and economic inequalities[6] has stripped the universal aspect from substantive citizenship, i.e. has limited actual access to socio-economic rights. While the overall provision of basic services has increased substantially, the ability of vast numbers of poor residents actually to <u>afford</u> them has decreased dramatically.[7]

Today, almost a decade after the constitutional change, South African poor still suffer evictions and forced removals from their homes, albeit for different reasons than in the previous era. Data on the exact number of evictions by category or region are unavailable; however, the Municipal Services Project and the Human Science Research Council (HSRC) report that since 1994, nearly 2 million South Africans have been evicted from their homes because of service non-payments (see McDonald 2002: 22). In addition, the cost recovery strategies have led to extensive cut-offs of water to disadvantaged households. Since 1996, in Cape Town alone, the post-apartheid government has disconnected water service to an estimated 92,772 poor households, or for nearly 463,000 people (McDonald and Smith 2002: 30).

The Eviction Crisis in Cape Town and the Birth of AEC

In Cape Town, the poor face eviction threats both by the city council and by the private banks. The banks issue eviction orders against residents of state-developed, bank-bonded houses (e.g., Mandela Park)who default on their mortgage payments; council issues eviction orders for residents who have fallen behind in payments for housing or for services. Families who face eviction due to default in housing payment live in state-built rental houses (called council houses in Mitchels Plain (e.g., Tafelsig, Valhalla Park, Elsies River), in hire-purchase home ownership developments (e.g., St. Montagur Village, Lavender Hill and Lentegeur), and in informal settlements with post-apartheid subsidy houses or new land occupations (e.g., Delft South and Philippi).[8] In any of these, residents may face council eviction orders for arrears in payment for municipal services.

The eviction crisis has been most acute in Mitchels Plain and in particular Tafelsig, where in one month alone there were 1800 cut-offs among council houses, and in Mandela Park among bonded houses of the black township in Khayelitsha. Council tenants are predominantly the unemployed or welfare recipients such as the elderly and the disabled (A. Desai 2002: 17). They cannot afford to relocate and find it difficult to make payments on rental arrears with their monthly pension or grant incomes; particularly disturbing is the fact that often the arrears had accumulated during the rent boycotts of the apartheid era. In Mandela Park, poor, working-class, black families were offered the chance to own affordable homes for the first time in the late 1980s. Their payment defaults are due partly to high unemployment and poverty, but partly to protests against banks' and developers' refusal to correct serious constructional flaws in the buildings (see Desai and Pithouse 2004; Miraftab and Wills forthcoming).

The anti-eviction movement emerged in 2001 in response to the evictions and service disconnections in Cape Town's poor townships.[9] A grassroots agglomeration of groups whose members have suffered or faced the threat of evictions or service cuts, politically the Campaign

is composed of civic organizations originating in the anti-apartheid movement's organizing in townships through the United Democratic Front (UDF) and the African National Congress (ANC). From that historical perspective, the AEC activists conduct oppositional practices as discontented residents, civic organizers, retrenched workers, union activists and shop stewards and ex-members of the ruling tri-partite coalition (ANC, Communist Party and Cosatu). The Campaign also works closely with the Anti-Privatization Forum (APF), which mobilizes locally and collaborates transnationally with other movements against neoliberal privatization. APF, comprising unions, political parties, grassroots groups and NGOs, started in Johannesburg in late 1999 in response to privatization policies carried out there. Its members represent themselves as defending basic elements of their life spaces. As one of the Campaign activists put it, they try to defend their right to water and roofs above their heads ― necessities, not privileges. Their struggle is against "privatization of these basic rights, which leads to dehumanization of the poor and those who cannot afford them" (Robert Wilcox, interview 2002).

Although entrenched social divisions persist between groups racialized under apartheid as "blacks" and "coloreds," socially the Campaign has been able to bridge the color lines in the poor townships. In the beginning, evictions were the problem mostly of the "colored" population, because the eviction process targeted council tenants, who belonged to that group. The movement embraced black townships, as well, when evictions spread to bond houses occupied by black owners.[10] Since the eviction crisis now cuts across Cape Town's disadvantaged and racialized groups, the anti-eviction movement enjoys a racially diverse membership.

With respect to gender, however, the Campaign's internal dynamic is not much different from other community-based movements in comprising mostly female community activists, but being led primarily by male activists. That gender hierarchy seems, however, to have been destabilized in the last year, as the Campaign encountered organizational difficulties and women challenged its decision-making processes and degree of inclusiveness.

Since its inception, AEC has grown to incorporate close to 25 communities' civic organizations (Oldfield and Stokke 2004:11). It has had certain achievements: placing the indigents policy back on the agenda of the city government; achieving municipal rate exemption for houses worth less that R 50,000; getting moratoriums on evictions and service cut-offs in many poor townships and even stopping those aggressions all together in some areas, e.g., Valhala Park. In Mandela Park AEC has had a partial victory in banning banks' eviction of the elderly or disabled. In a landmark victory, AEC won a court case for about 90 families that had squatted in an empty lot in Valahala Park and rejected the council's eviction order. At the moment AEC's major efforts are its "ten-Rands-a-month campaign," demanding provision of basic services for the poor at a flat and affordable rate of R 10, and the campaign for scrapping the arrears accumulated during the apartheid era.

The Campaign today faces the challenge of articulating a long-term agenda and objectives, revisiting its strategies and organizational procedures and moving forward from its "guts-driven" formation. An AEC activist defines the situation thus: "[We] must bear in mind, the Campaign was not started by NGOs, wasn't started by university, it did not come out of a workshop... it came out of the struggles of the communities. So it never had the resources. So there were no structures and knowledge about how to deal with these things. People knew that they have constitutional rights to housing, and responded from their guts to the actions of the council. [Campaign] emerged out of that process and needs" (A. B. interview, 2004).

4

Several factors have prompted the AEC to revise itself. First is the national and international attention that the Campaign has gained in the course of its struggle and in the face of state repression. Although AEC, to maintain its autonomy, is financially inward-looking and hence resource strapped, the occasional material and financial resources that academics and activists have brought to the Campaign have raised new questions of distribution and accountability.[11] Second is the relative slowing of eviction rates and service disconnections in some areas as moratoriums are issued. That has relieved the Campaign of its most urgent "crisis management" in some communities, allowing it to reflect on its constitution beyond such urgency. Third is the fact that AEC brings together not diverse individuals socialized in certain racial and gender roles and hierarchies, but diverse communities with distinct histories, struggles and forms of action. That composition poses another challenge, which Oldfield and Stokke (2004) eloquently analyze as creating unity within diversity, or forming a cohesive and inclusive whole of the different entities that constitute the movement. Taken together, these conditions have led the Campaign to address thorny issues: organizational accountability, transparency, democratic decision-making and participatory democracy. Women have been the main agents of this push for change.

The Campaign's Strategies within Invited and Invented Spaces of Citizenship

The Anti-Eviction Campaign engages in a range of programs, with both short and long-term goals of securing access for the poor to shelter and basic services. Its strategies stretch from informal negotiations, capacity building and action research; to mass mobilizations and protests, sit-ins, and land invasions; to defiant collective actions such as reconnection of disconnected services by so-called "struggle plumbers and electricians" and relocation of evicted families back to their housing units. While some of their strategies echo those used in the anti-apartheid struggle, such as the rent boycotts,[12] sit-ins and mass protest demonstrations, others have emerged from the post-apartheid context — e.g., sitting in boardrooms, or using the court and judicial systems and formal politics to claim the citizenship rights granted by the new Constitution.[13] Some activists undertake the immediate task of protecting the roof above a person's head and access to basic services, by resisting poor residents' evictions and service cut-offs; others pursue a long-term goal of building capacity to challenge policies, claim citizenship rights and achieve a just city.

Three areas exemplify Campaign activities beyond immediate resistance: One area is building capacity in media and the use of video cameras for social documentation; although not actively pursued in the last year, the idea was to equip some Campaign activists with media training to counter the criminalized image of the Campaign presented by the official media. Another area is community-based research so that members of the community can document their own struggles and history, and gain knowledge about themselves. The Campaign's Community Research Group (CRG) has several goals: challenging policy, building organization, affirming their identities and experiences, substantiating their claims, and facilitating learning and sharing (Oldfield and Stokke 2004: 27). The third area of Campaign activities is legal training. The Legal Coordinating Committee (LCC) consists of community members who have gone through five weeks of legal training to represent in magistrate's court the families facing eviction or service disconnection. LCC members, by learning the language of the legal system and its procedures and loopholes, aim to use the courts to their benefit, be it by overturning and delaying eviction and disconnection orders, by frustrating the process, or simply by documenting their struggle through the formal system. They hope to "generate sufficient court records on the

arbitrary and inequitable nature of evictions in order to oppose them in the Constitutional Court" (Oldfield and Stokke 2004:23).

AEC activities engage both the formal and informal arenas of politics and aim to combine the struggles for redistribution and for recognition. While some AEC activities such as reconnections and resistance to evictions have a direct redistributive goal, its work also aims at recognition of poor residents' plight, their histories, their struggles and their plea for justice. The Campaign is conscious that the two sides of their struggle should be knit together. Echoing Nancy Fraser's theorizations, they are weary of limiting their struggle to recognition without redistribution (1997).

Undoubtedly important to the ability of excluded residents to claim substantive citizenship in South Africa is the progressive, pro-poor constitution, which recognizes and expands "human rights" to include substantive "rights to livelihood" (Beall, Crankshaw and Parnell 2002). But spaces created from above are not sufficient for achieving actual redistribution (Hassiem 2002). In contrast, spaces created from below for practicing citizenship through the agency of poor people could be more responsive to their immediate needs and realities and hence should be more effective in turning recognition of their rights into redistribution.

Campaign activities try to ground the notion of citizenship as a practice, not a given (Gaventa 2002:4), the practice that Holston and Appadurai describe as aspiring to "new kinds of citizenship, new sources of laws, and new participation in decisions that bind" (1999:20). As a Campaign activist put it: important as it is to establish relevant formal channels for making claims, for the immediacy of the poor's concerns the laws are often ineffective and fall short (Bobby Wilcox, paraphrased interview, 2002).

> "We understand the limitation of the legal system. We can't confine the struggle to the legal system . . . [and have] the courts become the site of our struggle. Using the court is one technique that we use, but it is not the most effective tactic. But we'll use it if there is space to use it in that case and at that level. But we need to also realize that law keeps changing and are more accessible to the rich than the poor because they have more resources to access and to change the law and poor people don't have those kinds of resources. We are very conscious about how we use the law and when we use the law." (A.B. interview, 2004).

Moreover, within the informal arena of politics AEC activists use both the invited and the invented spaces of citizenship — e.g., those created from above by local and international donors and governmental interventions, and others carved out from below, demanded and seized through collective action. They take part in legitimized spaces for civil society organizations by participating in government or NGO training workshops and collaborating with the universities; they use formal channels to claim citizenship rights by participating in courts and using the legal system; they negotiate with the council and if necessary sit in its boardrooms.[14] But they try not to limit their struggle to any of those sites. When formal channels fail, they innovate to create alternative channels and spaces for active citizenship to assert their rights and negotiate their wants. They use formal spaces when they are advantageous, and defy them when they prove unjust and limiting. They combine displays of force and solidarity through spontaneous, cooperative action with the power of conviction displayed in informal, persuasive negotiation.

To cite an example: A Campaign supporter who is also the president of the civic organization in her community, reports on the weekly operation of a soup kitchen that feeds more than 300 children in her community. They received the equipment from a local Mosque, but the ingredients of the soup have to come from the civic group and the members of the community. Operating in the absence of funding, they have to gather material daily from leftover vegetables of the local grocers and whatever they can scrape together themselves; she says, "every Thursday we have to get the pot going." Many studies report on how setting up soup kitchens in poor neighborhoods has been a survival strategy of women in many poor communities around the world to cope with the devastating effects of structural adjustment policies that cut food subsidies, jobs and social welfare programs. The operation of the soup kitchen is not per se a Campaign strategy; nevertheless, as Civics who join the Campaign operate in the context of the specific problems of their communities, the strategies they use are also context-specific. In this community, the civic organization joined the Campaign and managed to stop the evictions, but hunger is a serious problem. "A lot of children go hungry here and right now that is what we need to do," C.D. states. In short, Campaign members do not follow a blueprint. Their tactics rather are flexible and innovative to meet specific situations.

The Campaign's Gender Dynamics: Opening Spaces of Citizenship

The gender hierarchies within the Campaign mirror those of the patriarchal society at large. Though women make up the bulk of grassroots mobilization, the Campaign's steering committee is almost exclusively male (9 out of 10 members). This section of the paper, through extracts from an interview with a long-time female civic organizer and Campaign activist, examines how the patriarchal order is constructed and destabilized. C., who has worked since she was eleven years old and was victim of three evictions during the apartheid era, is a founding member of the civic organization in her community. The civic organization and C. joined the Campaign to fight evictions and service cut-offs in 2001, when the problem began in her community. With respect to the gender composition of the Campaign she states:

> I can really tell you, it is the ladies that are doing all the work, the men are doing all the talking and all the flying. Going with the airplane to this place, to that place, representing the Campaign, it's just men, but when it comes to the work at the grassroots level, time to mobilizing, when there is work that must be done...it is the ladies that do the work. . . we are the people doing the work, mobilizing, getting people to protesting, the marching and so on. (C.D. interview 2004).

In explaining this inequality C., who raised her children as a single mother, clearly sees the transcendental nature of gender inequalities, with domestic gender relations extending into other, public realms including community activism.

> It is always women that have to put food on the table, the children don't ask daddy give me a piece of bread, it is always the mommy that must put a piece of bread...the children come and ask mommy my teacher said I must have school fee, mommy this and mommy that. . . . We made the mistake to give the men the opportunities always because they haven't got the responsibilities [at home], . . . [but] we are busy working on this thing now. . . . We are ready now to do the flying, and do the talking, and also do the work. We are ready for that now, because times are long gone that the women must just sit at home and keep quiet while men is doing all the talking and walking and so, . . . now we

cut that out . . . because we are speaking now . . . I am talking about the Campaign, the change is happening now ! (C.D. interview 2004).

Moreover, the change that C.S. is talking about not only concerns gender, but is bringing with it a profound revisiting of the Campaign's philosophy, methodology, and forms of action. "The ladies of the Campaign," in her terminology, have accurately identified the entanglement of gender inequalities and a lack of participatory democracy. Their struggle for gender justice engages issues of inclusive decision-making, bringing to the fore the need to discuss representation, accountability, and transparency. Consequently, some Campaign activists, mostly women, have successfully pushed to postpone the election of a new steering committee until key questions have been clarified and accounted for by the outgoing committee — what one female activist called "sorting out the mess."

Meanwhile, taking the more horizontal and participative approach of rotating the chairing role among attendees, the Campaign now holds weekly meetings "to set the record straight" on the past decisions of its steering committee. It also is establishing certain structures for its future organizational accountability: how are resources, whether of information or financial and material, to be handled and distributed by the steering committee and AEC activists? When and how can the AEC activists act in the name of the Campaign, and when are they acting in the name of their civic group or as individual activists? These questions of organizational structure have generated discussions among different tendencies within the Campaign: some argue that greater structuring of the Campaign bureaucratizes it, and others reject that critique as an anarchistic view that allows the creation of an organizational elite, mostly men, who accumulate information and skills. Some have also raised questions about the worth of the direct confrontational strategies currently used, considering that their relatively small base has been vulnerable to state repression that has expanded their resources in court appearances and bail payments. Some see a gender bias in such strategies, as being less of an option for female activists, who are often the primary if not the sole care givers in their families.[15] These are important questions with which the Campaign is currently grappling.

AEC women's ability to carve out more space for their views and interests within the clarification process is no doubt enhanced by the Campaign's changing context and by organizational friction that has pushed for constitutional articulation. The situation is well defined by a woman activist describing the masculinist dynamics of the group as "men fighting amongst themselves" and women "jumping in" to rescue the organization.

Women are not alone, however, in seeing themselves as protagonists of this process. Although some men on the steering committee had not even registered its male-exclusiveness and were surprised when it was brought to their notice, and some others resist women's demand for accountability and leave the meetings in protest when pushed to give reports of workshops attended and to set records straight, other male activists recognize the gender inequalities and value women's prominence in "saving" the Campaign. "Centralized tendencies usually come from men," F.G., a male AEC activist and union organizer declares, "but if women are to play the prominent role in pushing for change, AEC may be a different kind of organization. . . . [I would say] if the Campaign manages to survive its current problems, it is because of women. Can't you see?!"

This account is not to suggest that AEC is an exception to the male-dominated dynamics of the civics organizations and movements that preceded it in South Africa and in Cape Town, for example as mobilized through UDF; nor is it to claim that the current process will dissolve the organization's gender hierarchies — for I don't believe we can essentialize women or men or the kinds of organizations they may promote. Through the current critical process, the Campaign may mature its struggle towards social justice within and without; it may, like many grassroots mobilizations, prove ephemeral and disappear having gained its most immediate demands; or it may carry on its activities with only limited change in its masculinist practices. Whatever the outcome, importance lies in the meaning of the Campaign's process for the construction of inclusive citizenship among the grassroots, and the reflections it promotes among both men and women.

Feminists' Expanded Notion of Politics

Feminists have been the most vocal critics of a liberal conceptualization of citizenship as Eurocentric: viewing citizenship rights as linear and evolutionary (i.e., assuming that political and civil citizenship brings about social and economic citizenship rights); and assuming the state to be the institution granting citizenship (e.g., Marshall 1964). Feminists have refuted liberals' claims of universalism and gender blindness by pointing out that to start with, citizenship had been about only men and their rights of citizenship. By not recognizing difference, feminist theorists have argued, the universal claims of the liberal citizenship discourse have inherently favored men and those with power (Hassiem 1998, 1999; Young 1990; Sandercock 1998). Feminist scholars have demonstrated that women's exclusion has been not an aberration, but integral to the theory and practice of citizenship and liberal theories of politics (Pateman 1988; Lister 2003:5). Demonstrating the constitutive exclusion of women in those theories and practices has been central to feminists' expanding the notion of politics. Asserting that citizenship depends on a gendered set of arrangements and practices, feminist analysis has questioned how far the formal inclusion of women can change a citizenship so structured (Durish 2002; Cornwall 2002; Kabeer 2002).

For that debate, the experience of women in post-apartheid South Africa offers particularly important insights. Gathered in a unified front — the National Women's Council (NWC), incorporating a range of women's organizations and women's arms of political organizations including the ANC's Women's League — South African feminists successfully pushed for inclusion of women and their interests in the negotiations of the early 1990s that led to the laws and formal structures of the 1994 political settlement and to the 1996 constitution (for more on this process, see Hassiem 2002 and McEwan 2000). One consequence was a dramatic increase in women's participation in formal government structures. Up until the 1994 elections, women politicians constituted less than 2 percent of parliament; after those elections, eventually one quarter of the national parliament seats were occupied by women. (The figure had risen to 30 percent by 1999.) At the local level also, women have captured a growing number of elected seats: 20 percent in 1995 and 28 percent in the 2000 local government elections.[16] ANC's policy of a gender quota that reserves at least 30 percent of its electoral list for women, and the Municipal Structures Act, which recommends gender parity on party lists for the PR seats, have made important contributions to those trends.

A decade into representative democracy, South African feminists reflect on their experience of formal inclusion in legal and political institutions, and on how far their participation in formal politics as elected officials and office holders has been able to change the

9

structure of citizenship to achieve social and substantive rights for the majority of women (see *Agenda* special issue on citizenship). The question remains unresolved. While women's groups continue to push for inclusion in formal politics and view it as a point of access for marginalized populations, they also see how this inclusion may absorb women's energies and constrain their ability to effect change (Hassiem and Gouws 1998).

From a series of interviews with women MPs and parliamentarians, Primo (1997:43) reports on how, in the absence of change in formal institutions, women's political experience may actually be a disempowering one with limited gain: "It is not enough to put a rural woman in the parliament without transforming the institution," one of the interviewees declares (in Primo 1997:43). Meaningful impact requires taking advantage of the gains women have made through legal and political institutions, recognizing the difficulties (Haysom 1999:2) and trying to overcome the many obstacles women face in parliament by transforming the formal politics (Van Donk and Maceba 1997). Strong women's groups and movements are needed to pursue their claims on government, lobby in civil society and pressure state institutions for change (Hassiem 2002, 1998, 2003). Otherwise, as has been shown for civic groups in general, the negotiations and political transition at the top can have only limited meaning for those at the grassroots (Zuern 2001).

Reflecting on the post-apartheid experience of women in South Africa, Hassiem remarks that women's rights in the constitution and legal mechanisms are significant, but limited "as guarantees for women" (2002:720). Femocrats can leverage women's movements, but cannot address inequalities. Effective change rather requires feminists' efforts both inside and outside the state and its institutions, and within both formal and informal politics (Hassiem 2003). That range of activism is necessary, she argues, because the state is not homogenous but contradictory and complex, and so feminists must use a range of strategies to deal with it (ibid:523).

By showing that formal and informal are not self-contained sites of politics but porous, each shaping the other (Hassiem 1999:12), feminist scholarship in South Africa strengthens the challenge to binary constructs: formal/ informal, public/private and active/passive. It calls into question traditional assumptions: that only formal politics dominated by men are valid political participation and citizenship —a longstanding tradition that has been able to ignore the political activities and agency of women (Tripp 1998; Yuval-Davis 1997; Lister 1997; McEwan 2000; Sandercock 1998). The feminist formulation of politics and citizenship recognizes women's political work carried out in the private sphere through informal networks of household and community that face issues of collective consumption (Miraftab forthcoming, 1998; Mc Dowell 1991; Lawson and Klak 1990). It also recognizes the unpaid caring work women perform at home as a citizenship responsibility that carries social rights[17] (Lister 2003:3; Naples 1998; Bakker 2003).

Community activism as a form of political action, undertaken in particular by women and disadvantaged populations in informal arenas, is crucial for gains of polity in the formal arena of citizenship. Whether through their symbolic protest and silent demonstrations (such as the *Plaza de Madres* in Argentina), or through civil society mobilization among grassroots and community-based groups, women's informal community activism has been effective in keeping larger social and political struggles alive (Hassiem and Gouws 1998; Kaplan 1997; M. Desai 2002; Jelin 1990; Robnett, 1997; Lister 1997; Staheli and Cope 1994; Naples and Desai 2003). This recognition, however, cannot be understood apart from the broader global trend celebrating civil society and grassroots survival strategies.

Women and Civil Society

For feminist scholars and activists, the global proliferation of community-based groups and the celebration of civil society and grassroots survival strategies have raised important questions about the relationship between gender and civil society (see, e.g., the special issue of *IFJP* 5, no.2). In the last two decades, mainstream international development institutions have acknowledged women's survival strategies and "poverty management" skills as important assets that build social capital, strengthen civil society and benefit development projects; meanwhile, however, critics have interrogated other dimensions of those relationships. Some have pointed out how women's unpaid work within home and community has enabled neoliberalism's transfer to them of public and social service responsibilities (Beneria 1992; Crewe and Harrison 1998; Miraftab 2004, 2005, forthcoming). Other critiques have addressed the limitations of civil society organizations for achieving women's interests, insofar as they perpetuate patriarchal gender relations by mirroring formal politics and structures (Hassiem 1998). Some critics also point out that the current celebration of civil society that fosters the NGO-ization of social movements, risk turning feminists into experts with policy impact rather than actors with revolutionary impact (Rios 2003; Alvarez 1998).

In South Africa, feminist scholarship has contributed to debate on citizenship and civil society by framing questions in the context of the national struggle against apartheid and triple oppression by race, class and gender (Hassiem and Guws 1998). When in the 1980s politics shifted from conventional sites (political parties and unions) to townships, which were recognized as significant informal sites of political struggle (Seeking 1991), South African feminists' scholarship reveals how there also dichotomies stubbornly persisted, within the UDF and popular organizations of anti-apartheid struggle. Pitching national liberation against women's liberation, Hassiem (1987:14) has argued that women were used in movements pushing the nationalist agenda, but were suppressed when women's liberation was set on the table.[18] In the anti-apartheid struggle the line of argument was that, "given the bleak injustices of apartheid and blacks' impoverishment, before women fight for gender equality in the kitchen and at the sink they need to have a sink and a kitchen!" In the national struggle, women's struggle for gender equity was seen as divisive and kept secondary; some argue that this context weakened the possibility of an assertive women's movement in South Africa (Charman et al 1991; Beall et al 1989; Hassim 2003b).

On the other hand, the argument is made that the South African women's movement grew through participation in civics and townships politics (Fester 1997; Primo 1997). Women activists were perhaps not always able to work simultaneously on gender justice and national liberation and had to prioritize one, but they never ignored patriarchy or 'conserved' women's subordination, argues Fester (1997:57). Despite being male dominated, according to this view, the formation of UDF (1984) galvanized organizations at the community level and in particular women's organizations that articulated the links between women's and national issues; it also gave women a profile, placed some in leadership and created a space in which to raise women's issues.[19] "Many women who now hold public office either in parliament or in government departments cut their political teeth in CBOs and trade unions" (Primo 1997:35). Fester pushes the point further by arguing that indeed the active participation of women in the anti-apartheid movement within the civil society generated a unique form of South African feminism with a heavy emphasis on motherhood, what Wells (1991) terms motherism (Fester 1997). It is important to remember that in the apartheid context, motherhood had salience as a source of

dignity for women (Salo 2000) and also as a public action: they had to use their roles as mothers and the wellbeing of their children (e.g., pregnancy or having a sick child) to negotiate with the state for staying permits (Kaplan 1997: 127-28). "Through motherhood as a political activity," argues Gouws (1999:58), "the private sphere [was] . . . inscribed into citizenship."

Once the triple dimension of women's oppression in the apartheid South Africa is understood, one can appreciate the complexity of their struggle and its relation to national liberation within civil society, which created spaces both to advance and to hinder their call for gender justice (Primo 1997:36). That understanding also casts light on the AEC's post-apartheid bearings and the challenge it faces to define and achieve social justice — including gender justice — within and without the organization.

The Anti-eviction Campaign and Feminist Praxis

Certain aspects of the debates in feminist scholarship on citizenship and informal politics that are discussed above are substantiated by practices of the AEC: 1) the flexibility of grassroots and the fluidity of their actions in spanning different political arenas and spaces of citizenship, 2) the complexity and instability of gender order within civic movements and the informal arena of politics.

1) Fluidity of Grassroots' Actions

Earlier this paper noted how flexibly Campaign activists use both informal and formal arenas of politics and move between invited and invented citizenship. With practices situated within the informal arena of politics and predominantly within the invented spaces of citizenship, the AEC nevertheless does not rule out using formal channels to claim citizenship rights or to take advantage of invited citizenship spaces when it furthers their cause. Within the arena of informal politics, sometimes they devote their energy to a survival mechanism to cope with hardship; at other times they turn to strategies of resistance to challenge the structural basis of their hardship.

That insight gained by examining AEC practices is an important one: it refutes the tendency in dominant politics to lay out a bifurcated view of civil society as constituted by an "authentic" civil society that participates in invited spaces sanctioned by the state and the international development agencies, and an "unauthentic" or "outcast" civil society whose "extremist" actions in invented spaces of citizenship are discredited and delegitimized as ultra-left. Rather as seen in the case of the AEC, grassroots collective actions move between invited and invented spaces of practicing citizenship. Those spaces are not mutually exclusive, nor are they necessarily affiliated with a fixed set of individuals or groups or with a particular kind of civil society.

I stress here the risk of the dominant politics constructing a new binary relationship, this time <u>within</u> informal politics. Invidious distinctions may be drawn between the grassroots activities that seek strategies to survive the adverse effects of social and political hierarchies and that take place within the invited spaces of citizenship, and the grassroots activities that resist the dominant systems of exploitation and oppression and that occur predominantly within the invented spaces of citizenship. Binary constructs are known to damage the constituent at the lower end of the social hierarchy; here, a bifurcated construct of civil society tends to criminalize

one informal space of citizenship practice by designating the other as the "proper" informal space for civil society participation.

In South Africa the state and the media are promoting such stratification of civil society by classifying people invidiously as "authentic" or "inauthentic" citizens. Although the same individuals who run the soup kitchen, to give an example, might also act in defiance as struggle plumbers who reconnect services, the media projections of each activity are quite distinct. The former is sanctioned and legitimized as heroic acts of the poor, e.g., running a soup kitchen from their empty pockets to feed the hungry. But (possibly the same) activists resisting service disconnections and evictions are derided as "free-riders embedded in a culture of non-payment." The former activity is celebrated as community participation conveying the authentic voice of the poor, and the latter is repressed as acts of extremism and labeled by the ANC and president Mbeki as "ultra left" (see *Mail and Guardian* 2/4/2003, 5/13/2003, 3/30/2004, 9/24/2004). Denied the celebratory status bestowed on other organizations within civil society, AEC activists have often suffered brutal repression by the state's police, facing rubber bullets, house arrests, and prison terms. (As recently as February 2005, for example, an AEC activist was shot in the leg. (See Ndenze, 2005 in *Cape Times*).

As far as the media are concerned, media coverage of the 2002 World Summit of Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg is a case in point.[20] Leading international and local newspapers touted the WSSD as setting the platform for a "resurgence of civil society." They celebrated the summit's inclusion of environmentalist and indigenous groups and complimented its emphasis on partnerships among governments, "civil society," and business. However, that coverage was selective: of civil society voices, only the march that the state had sanctioned was reported — although it was fully seven times smaller than the march by the other groups within civil society.[21]

Nor have the mainstream international development agencies and literature been innocent of formulating such bifurcated images of civil society. Development agencies have celebrated civil society selectively, with a narrow focus on grassroots' collective actions that offer coping mechanisms to the poor and are often formulated in social capital discourse (Fukuyama 1995; Putnam 1993; World Bank 1998). Development literature, too, has contributed to the misconception of civil society and the state as mutually exclusive or binary categories. Both the WSSD example described above and Mamdani's study of colonial societies (1996) reveal how the state and civil society can indeed be entangled in the colonial or neoliberal project of domination through participation. So can the politics of the formal and informal arenas.

The last point is of significance to the discussion here. We must be reminded that informal politics is a broad arena that should not be conflated into a single category. Some informal politics have been coopted or turned into criminal elements by the state or by despotic elites and have indeed acted in the interest of the status quo, though outside the formal institutions of politics and participation.[22] Grassroots mobilizations and initiatives outside the formal arena of politics, commonly referred to as community activism, should be carefully distinguished according to their historical origins, their political cultural roots and their agendas. The insurgent movements and oppositional practices referred to in this paper in the examples of the AEC and the anti-privatization movement, if historicized, reveal their political and cultural roots to be in political formations that have resisted and challenged the inequalities produced by

colonialism, apartheid — and now, neoliberalism. A contextualized understanding of such organizations is essential to avoid a naive celebration of insurgency per se.

2) Instability of Gender Orders

The second area illuminated by the examination of AEC practices is the complexity of gender relations within the informal arena of politics, exemplified by the persistence and yet the instability of the Campaign's male-dominated gender dynamics. A common feature of most grassroots mobilizations, including the AEC, is for women to constitute their bulk but not their leadership. The stability of this order, however, should not be overestimated. Transformations within and without an organization contribute to processes of change that ultimately may also challenge its gender hierarchies. The AEC experience, for example, stresses the need to re-imagine the process of community participation as open-ended. It shows that the consequence of women's participation in male-dominated groups is not pre-determined.

In the AEC, the ability of women to question the Campaign's gender order is no doubt assisted by its organizational crisis. Changes in the Campaign's social and political landscape at the state and national levels and also at the township level have opened certain cracks within the organization. Women have both furthered that and used it to destabilize patriarchal gender orders. Changes women have experienced at the intimate levels of individuals and households also should be taken into account in this analysis. Examples are the greater awareness and sense of empowerment gained through the political struggle and engagement with the state apparatus; better communicative skills and ability to maneuver socially in a larger group, gained through training and capacity building workshops; and the changing stages of women in their domestic life cycles. In the expansion phase of the domestic life cycle when women are the main, if not the sole, care givers to their young families, the extent of their political participation is constrained. With advance to a more mature stage of the domestic life cycle, the consolidated or dispersion stages, when children either are grown or have left home, women are more able to be away from home and take a greater part in community activism.[23] The composition of the household, specifically extended households, also may give women practical support, freeing their time and energy and lifting some of their household preoccupations to greater community activism. Taken all together, those changes represent a force not to be underestimated for women's ability to open certain cracks in an organization to serve their aspirations to a new way of doing things.

This analysis, stressing the simultaneous reproduction and destabilization of gender hierarchies within the Campaign, may speak to anxieties of feminist scholars and activists about the ability of the civic or grassroots movements to achieve gender justice. Note that it also parallels the contradictions in the neoliberal processes of governance in large, which erode women's livelihoods and access to the most essential services, yet also open up certain public realms of decision-making from which women have been excluded. For example, South Africa's policies of decentralization have brought significant percentages of women and disadvantaged groups into the arena of formal politics through local governments. Simultaneously, however, local policies of cost recovery and privatization have evicted a high percentage of poor women and disadvantaged households from their shelters and have disconnected their basic services.

The observation of such contradictory processes lends weight to feminists' questioning of the linear liberal assumption that political rights automatically lead to other substantive rights

and citizenship. Neoliberalism fosters "double movements" of simultaneous inclusion and exclusion. It opens up certain spaces of citizenship as it closes down others. The women's grassroots strategies that neoliberalsim relies on to stabilize processes of capital accumulation by providing free community care or "affective labor" also destabilize the gender orders on which neoliberalism relies. Women's community activism, which is often fueled by their gendered responsibilities as caregivers, often also finds the transformative power to seek gender justice within and without their organization. The everyday practices of women who engage with the state and the dominant institutions of power in distinct ways through invented and invited spaces of citizenship reveal the limitations of the status quo. Its formal structures of inclusion and participation are brought into question, and the need for greater societal transformation toward social justice, including gender equality, is brought to the fore by their actions.

Conclusion

The story of the Anti-Eviction Campaign in Cape Town and its struggle to secure a shelter for the poor resonates with and contributes to feminist critiques. It both highlights the significance of the rights inscribed in the South African constitution and reveals the inadequacy of their application by the current state. In order to make constitutional citizenship rights actual and achieve a meaningful social change, the paper argues a range of practices through both formal and informal politics is needed. Improvising new spaces and innovating strategies can "expand the public sphere" (Rose 2000) and transcend legal civil citizenship to achieve substantive citizenship — e.g., justice in housing.

The struggle of communities mobilized through the AEC reminds us that arenas in which to claim one's citizenship and practice it should be found not only beyond formal citizenship and politics, but even beyond the sanctioned, or invited, politics of the informal arena. By revealing the significance of the disruptive, oppositional practices of the poor that take place within the informal arena, the paper invites us to sharpen the feminist conceptualization of informal politics. Conservative scholarship and mainstream development agencies tend to define civil society and validate informal politics narrowly and selectively. The Campaign case study offers a deeper insight: limiting the recognition of citizen participation to only those actions within officially sanctioned channels (invited spaces) constitutes yet another state-centered perspective. For just as liberal views assigned the citizenship-granting agency to the state, the neoliberal view assigns the state the agency to grant status as civil society as well, and to define the spaces where citizenship can be practiced.

It should be noted that oppressive regimes can be quite tolerant of grassroots activism when confined to its state-recognized and invited spaces of citizen participation and refraining from confronting the oppressive structures. Within the informal arena of politics, therefore, sharper differentiation and recognition of the range of collective actions by disadvantaged groups is a useful exercise. In short, grassroots supporters should move beyond fostering only those movements sanctioned by and conforming with the state and other establishments, to consider those within the informal arena that the state and the mainstream media label as "extremists" in order to marginalize them. The Cape Town Anti-eviction Campaign illustrates how mobilization to immediately <u>protect</u> the roof over one's head may be as essential as state-legitimized groups and movements to <u>produce</u> shelter for the poor. The Campaign exemplifies the urgency of promoting participation and citizenship by marginalized populations through both formal and informal arenas; both invited and invented spaces; and both cooperating/conforming and

insurgent/disruptive practices. In that light, a more inclusive reformulation of informal politics is imperative.

The examination of AEC's gender dynamics brings to light the multiple sites of women's struggle for equality and gender justice: the realm of formal politics, the informal political realm of community activism, and the domestic realm of home and family. As the transcendental nature of women's struggle for gender justice is recognized, the inter-sectionality of those citizenship spaces also should be acknowledged. Practice of an inclusive citizenship cannot be contained within any one of these realms. Only a broad conceptualization of citizenship and the spaces of its construction, struggle, and practice can ensure a progressive feminist praxis within and without civic movements.

References:

Abdulhadi, R. 1998. 'The Palestinian Women's Autonomous Movement: Emergence, Dynamics, and Challenges.' *Gender and Society* 12(6): 649-673.

Adler, G. and J. Steinberg. 2000. 'Introduction: From Comrades to Citizens', in G. Adler and J. Steinberg (ed.) *From Comrades to Citizens: the South African Crisis Movement and Transition to Democracy*. NY: St Martin's Press.

Anti-Privatisation Monitor. 2000. 'Phantsi nge-iGoli 2002, phantsi!' *Anti-Privatisation Monitor*. 1 September.

Alvarez, S. 1998. 'Latin American feminism 'Go Global': Trends of the 1990s and Challenges for the New Millennium', in S. Alvarez, E. Dagnino and A. Escobar (eds.) *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Culture: Re-visioning Latin American Social Movements,* pp. 293-324. Bolder, CO: Westview Press.

Bakker, I. 2003. 'Neoliberal Governance and the Reprivatization of Social Reproduction: Social Provisioning and Shifting Gender Orders', in I. Bakker and S. Gill (eds.), *Power, Production and Social Reproduction*. New York: Palgrave McMillan.

Bornstein, L. 2000.

Beall, J., O. Crankshaw and S. Parnell. 2002. *Uniting a Divided City: Governance and Social Exclusion in Johannesburg*. London, Sterling: Earthscan.

Beall, J., S. Hassim and A. Todes. 1989. 'A Bit on the Side? Gender Struggles in the Politics of Transformation in South Africa.' *Feminist Review* 33.

Beneria, L. 1992. 'The Mexican Debt Crisis: Restructuring the Economy and the Household', in L. Beneria and S. Feldman (eds), *Unequal Burden: Economic Crisis, Persistent Poverty, and Women's Work.* Boulder: Westview Press.

Bond, P. 2000. *Elite Transition: From Apartheid to Neoliberalism in South Africa.* London: Pluto Press.

Castells M. 1998. *End of Millennium.* Malden, MA and Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

Charman A., C. de Swart and M. Simons. 1991. 'The Politics of Gender: Negotiating Liberation', *Transformation*, 15.

Cheru, F. 1997. 'Civil Society and Political Economy in South and Southern Africa,' in Stephen Gill (ed.) *Globalization, Democratization and Multilateralism.* New York: St. Martin's Press. Pp. 219-244.

Cornwall, A. 2002. 'Locating Citizen Participation.' *IDS Bulletin* 33(2): 49-58.

Crewe, E. and E. Harrison. 1998. *Whose Development? An Ethnography of Aid.* London: Zed Books.

Desai, A. 2002. *We are the Poors: Community Struggles in Post-apartheid South Africa*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Desai, A. and R. Pithouse 2004. 'But We Are Thousands: Dispossession, Resistance and Repression in Mandela Park.' Working paper for Center for Civil Society, University of Kwazulu Natal.

Desai, M. 2002. 'Transnational Solidarity: Women's Agency, Structural Adjustments, and Globalization', in Nancy Naples and Manisha Desai (eds.), *Women's Activism and Globalization*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 11-33.

Durish, P. 2002. 'Citizenship and Difference: Feminist Debates.' Annotated bibliographies series of the Transformative Learning Center (TLC): Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto.

Fester, G. 1997. 'Women's Organizations in the Western Cape: Vehicles for Gender Struggle or Instruments of Subordination?', *Agenda* no. 34: 45-61.

Flynn, S. 2003. 'Rights to Essential Services: a Public-Private Continuum For Essential Service Rules.' Unpublished paper. Municipal Services Project (Draft: March 31, 2003).

Fraser, N. 1997. *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections of the Post-Socialist Conditions*. New York: Routledge.

Fukuyama, Francis. 1995. 'Social Capital and the Global Economy.' *Foreign Affairs* 74(5):89-103.

GAP/FCR (Gender Advocacy Programme and the Foundation for Contemporary Research). 1998. 'Survey of Selected Municipalities in the Western Cape. Cape Town', in M. Van Donk (ed.), *Local Government and Gender: A Reality Check*. Cape Town: GAP/FCR.

Gaventa, J. 2002. 'Exploring Citizenship, Participation and Accountability', *IDS Bulletin* 33(2):1-11.

Gonzales de la Rocha, M. 1994. *The Resources of Poverty: Women and Survival in a Mexican City*. Oxford, Cambridge: Blackwell.

Gouws, A. 1999. 'Beyond Equality and Difference: the Politics of Women's Citizenship.' *Agenda* no. 40: 54-58.

Hassiem, S. 2003a. 'The Gender Pact and Democratic Consolidation: Institutionalizing Gender Equality in the South African State.' *Feminist Studies* 29 (3): 505-528.

Hassiem, S. 2003 b. 'The Limits of Popular Democracy: Women's Organisations, Feminism and the UDF.' *Transformation* 51:48-73.

Hassiem, S. 2002. 'A Conspiracy of Women: the Women's Movement in South Africa's Transition to Democracy.' *Social Research* 69(3):693-732.

Hassiem, S. 1998. 'Politicizing the Subject: Feminist Challenges to Political Science in South Africa.' *Politikon* 25(2):3-15.

Hassiem, S. 1999. 'From Presence to Power: Women's Citizenship in a New Democracy', *Agenda* no. 40: 6-17.

Hassiem, S. and A. Gouws. 1998. 'Redefining the Public Space: Women's Organisations, Gender Consciousness and Civil Society in South Africa.' *Politikon* 25(2)53-76.

Haysom, Lou. 1999. 'Citizenship.' *Agenda* no. 40:2-3. (especial issue on citizenship).

High Court of South Africa Cape of Good Hope Provincial Division. 2002. 'Application for Interdict Against Mandela Park Anti-Eviction Committee, Masixole Ntanyana, Raymond Khohlakala, Ncebe Sithole and Fonkey Goboza.' 28 June.

Holston, J. 1998. 'Spaces of Insurgent Citizenship,' in Leonie Sandercock (ed.), *Making the Invisible Visible: a Multicultural Planning History*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/New York: University of California Press.

Holston, J. and A. Appadurai. 1999. 'Cities and Citizenship,' in J. Holston (ed.), *Cities and Citizenship*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Jelin, E. 1990. 'Citizenship and Identity: Final Reflections', in E. Jelin (ed.) *Women and Social Change in Latin America*. London: Zed Books.

Kabeer, N. 2002. 'Citizenship, Affiliation and Exclusion: Perspectives from the South.' *IDS Bulletin* 33(2):12-23.

Kaplan, T. 1997. *Crazy for Democracy : Women in Grassroots Movements*. New York: Routledge.

Lawson, V. and T. Klak. 1990. 'Conceptual Linkages in the Study of Production and Reproduction in Latin America.' *Economic Geography* 66: 310-27.

Lister, R. 2003. 'Feminist Theory & Practice of Citizenship.' Paper presented at the annual conference of the DVPW (German Political Science Association). September 2003.

Lister, R. 1997. 'Citizenship: Towards a Feminist Synthesis.' *Feminist Review* Fall, no 57: 28-48.

McDonald, D. 2002. 'The Theory and Practice of Cost recovery in South Africa,' in D. McDonald and J. Pape(eds.), *Cost Recovery and the Crisis of Service Delivery in South Africa*. London: Zed Books.

McDonald, D. and L. Smith. 2002. Privatizing Cape Town: Service Delivery and Policy Reforms Since 1996. *Municipal Services Project Occasional Paper Series.* No.7. Cape Town: Municipal Services Project.

McDowell, L. 1991. Restructuring Production and Reproduction: Some Theoretical and Empirical Issues Relating to Gender, or Women in Britain,' in M. Gottdiener and Chris Pickvance (eds.), *Urban Life in Transition*. New Burry Park, London and NewDelhi: Sage Publications.

McEwan, C. 2000. 'Engendering Citizenship: Gendered Spaces of Democracy in South Africa.' *Political Geography* 19:627-651.

McEwan, C. 2001. 'Bringing Government to the People: Gender, Local Governance and Community Participation in South Africa' *Geoforum*.

Mail and Guardian. 2/4/2003. 'Socila Movements: 'Ultra left' or 'global citizens'?' (Downloaded from the Internet.)

Mail and Guardian. 5/13/2003. 'Power to the People.' (Downloaded from the Internet.)

Mail and Guardian. 3/30/2004. 'Courts to Balance Policy and Rights.' (Downloaded from the Internet.)

Mail and Guardian. 9/24/2004. 'Left vs Ultra-left.' (Downloaded from the Internet.)

Mamdani, M. 1996. *Citizens and Subjects: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Marshal, T. H.. 1964. *Class, Citizenship and Social Development*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Mayekiso, M. 1996. *Township Politics: Civic Struggles for a New South Africa*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Moore, D. 2001. 'Neoliberal Globalisation and the Triple Crisis of 'Modernisation' in Africa: Zimbabwe, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and South Africa.' *Third World Quarterly* 22(6): 909-929.

Miraftab, F. forthcoming. 'Informalizing the Means of Reproduction: The Case of Waste Collection Services in Cape Town, South Africa', in L. Beneria and N. Kudva (eds.), *Rethinking Informalization: Precarious Jobs, Poverty and Social Protection.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University e-Publishing Program. (forthcoming Winter).

Miraftab, F. 2005. 'Making Neoliberal Governance: The Disempowering Work of Empowerment.' *International Planning Studies*. 9(4):239-259.

Miraftab, F. 2004. 'Neoliberalism and Casualization of Public Sector Services: The Case of Waste Collection Services in Cape Town, South Africa.' *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 8(4). December issue.

Miraftab, F. 2003. 'The Perils of Participatory Discourse: Housing Policy in Post-apartheid South Africa', *Journal of Planning Education and Research.* 22(3):226-239.

Miraftab, F. 1998. 'Complexities of the Margin: Housing Decisions of Female Householders in Mexico.' *Society and Space: Environment and Planning D* Vol. 16: 289-310.

Miraftab F. and S. Wills. Forthcoming. 'Insurgency and Spaces of Active Citizenship: The Story of Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign in South Africa.' *Journal of Planning Education and Research*.

Naples, N. 1998. 'Women's Community Activism and Feminist Activist Research', in N. Naples (ed.) *Community Activism and Feminist Politics*. New York: Routledge. Pp.1-27.

Naples, N. and M. Desai. 2002. 'Women's Local and Translocal Responses: an Introduction to the Chapters', in N. Naples and M. Desai (eds.) *Women's Activism and Globalization*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 11-33.

Ndenze, B. 2005. 'Man Shot in Leg During Anti-eviction Protest.' February 09 *Cape Times*.

Oldfied, S. forthcoming. 'Polemical Politics and the Practice of Community Organising in Cape Town, South Africa.' *Antipode*.

Oldfield, S. and K. Stokke. 2004. 'Building Unity in Diversity: Social Movement Activism in the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign.' Report prepared for Globalisation, Marginalisation and Post-Apartheid Social Movements Project. Center for Civil Society, University of Kwazulu Natal. October.

Pardo, M. 1998. 'Creating Community: Mexican American Women in Eastside Los Angeles', in N. Naples (ed.), *Community Activism and Feminist Politics*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 275-300.

Pateman, C. 1988. *The Sexual Contract.* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Primo, N. 1997. 'Women's Emancipation: Resistance and Empowerment', *Agenda* no. 34:

Rios Tobar, M. 2003. 'Chilean Feminism(s) in the 1990s.' *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 5(2):256-280.

Robnett, B. 1997. *How Long, How Long? African American Women in the Struggle for Civil Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rose, N. 2000. 'Governing Cities, Governing Citizens', in Engin F. Isin (ed.), *Democracy, Citizenship and the Global City*. London, New York: Routledge.

Salo E. 2000. '"Ordentlike Moeders" Mothering and Gendered Identity in Manenberg Township.' Paper presented at the University of Cape Town-University of the Western Cape Anthropology Seminar Series, University of the Western Cape

Sandercock, L. 1998. 'Framing Insurgent Historiographies for Planning', in L. Sandercock (ed.) *Making the Invisible Visible: a Multicultural Planning History*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/New York: University of California Press.

Seeking, J. 2000. 'After Apartheid: Civic Organizations in the 'New' South Africa', in G. Adler and J. Steinberg (ed.), *From Comrades to Citizens: the South African Crisis Movement and Transition to Democracy*. NY: St. Martin's Press.

Seeking, J. 1991. 'Gender Ideology and Township Politics in the 1980's.' *Agenda* no. 10: 77-88.

Seidman, G. 1999. 'Gendered Citizenship: South Africa's Democratic Transition and the Construction of a Gendered State.' *Gender & Society* 13(3):287-307.

Staheli, L. and M. Cope. 1994. 'Empowering Women's Citizenship.' *Political Geography* 13(5):443-460.

Stall, S. and R. Stoecker. 1998. 'Community Organizing or Organizing Community? Gender and the Crafts of Empowerment.' *Gender and Society* 12(6):729-756.

Tripp, A. M. 1998. 'Expanding 'Civil Society': Women and Political Space in Contemporary Uganda', in N. Kasfir (ed.), *Civil Society and Democracy in Africa: Critical Perspectives.* London: Frank CASS.

Tripp, A. M. 2003. 'Women in Movement: Transformations in African Political Landscape.' *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 5(2):233-255.

True, J. 2003. 'Mainstreaming Gender in Global Public Policy.' *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 5(2):368-396.

Van Donk, M. and M. Maceba. 1999. 'Women at the Crossroads: Women in Governance.' *Agenda* no. 40:18-22 (especial issue on citizenship).

Young, I. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Yuval-Davis, N. 1997. 'Women, Citizenship and Difference', *Feminist Review* Autumn no 57:4-27.

Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign. 'Campaign Statement: What is the AEC?' Online. Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign. http://www.antieviction.org.za.) Accessed 22 Sept. 2002.

Zuern, E. 2001. 'South Africa's Civic in Transition: Agents of Change or Structures of Constraint?' *Politikon* 28(1): 5-20.

Endnotes

[1] I borrow the term "invited spaces of citizenship" from Andrea Cornwall (2002:50) and build on her articulation of citizenship practice to develop the notions of invited and invented spaces of citizenship. In a critique of a formalist formulation of citizenship, she argues that the conventional perspective on social and political participation circumscribes the possibility of public engagement within a frame defined by external agents, basically as a means of social control. Articulating a more pluralistic view that bridges social and political participation, she stresses citizenship participation and extends it from taking up invitations, to autonomous actions through which citizens create their own opportunities and terms of engagement.

[2] Fieldwork was conducted in Cape Town by the author in 2001, followed up in 2002 by Shana Wills, and updated by the author in 2004. It involved a series of open-ended and in-depth interviews with residents of communities affected by evictions and service cut-offs, members of the Anti-eviction Campaign and the Anti-privatization Forum, and other activists in these movements. Where consent has been obtained the interviewees' full identity is released, otherwise, they are referred to by an alphabetical code.

[3] These processes of spatial control also contributed to forming a large pool of black informal laborers, mostly women whose male loved ones were migrant workers in cities, so they set up illegal camps outside cities and made their labor available for use and abuse by the dominant white population and the economy.

[4] Article 26 of the 1996 constitution states: "everyone has the right to access to adequate housing … No one may be evicted from their homes, or have their homes demolished, without an order of court made after considering all the relevant circumstances. No legislation may permit arbitrary evictions." Article 27 states: "every one has the right to have access to … sufficient food and water and social security, including, if they are unable to support themselves and their dependants, appropriate social assistance."

[5] This strategy is also referred to as "cost reflective pricing' or full recovery of service costs, "wherein the entire cost of service delivery, including infrastructure maintenance and replacement, is structured into rates" (Flynn 2003:10). In this system, black areas with inferior infrastructure incur higher service delivery costs, whereas white suburbs, historically subsidized by the apartheid state for their infrastructure development, enjoy lower service delivery costs. Such "cost reflective pricing" of services does not allow for cross-subsidy between the areas; hence, residents in black townships pay more than do those in affluent white areas for identical services. (For more, see Sean Flynn 2003.) Despite the high rate of unemployment, intense poverty and greater service delivery costs among black townships, impoverished residents who cannot afford to make their service payments have increasingly had service disconnected.

[6] South Africa has the world's most unequal income distribution as measured by Gini co-efficiency. It has a Gini co-efficient of 0.65, compared with 0.61 for Brazil, 0.50 for Mexico and 0.41 or less for the advanced industrial countries (Castells 1998: 125).

[7] Statistics South Africa reports a growing income gap between 1995 and 2000. "In real terms, an average African household has seen a 19% fall in income, while the average white household has enjoyed a 15% increase. As a result, in 2000, the average white household earned six times as much as the average black household, up from four times as much in 1995 … The poorest 40% of all households saw a 16% drop in their share of total incomes. Meanwhile, the richest 20% of households get about 65% of all household income. The decline in incomes meant that the percentage of households earning less than R 670 a month grew from 20% in 1995 to 28% in 2000" (Makgetla 2002). The author interpreting these statistics links the growth of poverty "to the massive increase in joblessness which has soared from 16% in 1995 to almost 30%," and blames unemployment in large on "the public sector and the private firms shed[ding] their lower-level permanent posts on a large scale; [flagging that] job losses peaked in the late 1990s, as tariff barriers fell and government reduced spending" (ibid).

[8] See Oldfield (forthcoming) differentiating these areas and their struggle for housing and against evictions, warning against conflating the divergent experience of these families into a generic category of evicted families.

[9] Officially the Anti-Eviction Campaign (AEC, also referred to in this text as the Campaign) was formed in February of 2001 in Mitchels Plain following a brutal clash between the police and the residents who were trying to prevent a neighbor's eviction. Since arrears in payment for utility services frequently lead to an eviction, the AEC not only fights evictions, but also resists service disconnections.

[10] Residents from black townships like Khayelitsha, Guguletu and KTC joined the "colored" townships of Delft, Elsie's River and Mannenburg in the campaign's first organized mass action, a march on the mayor's office in Cape Town, establishing an instant solidarity among the AEC's racially and regionally diverse participants.

[11] For example, facing the frequent incarceration of its activists starting in 2002, to bail out their members and to bear the costs of court procedures— least of which is members' transport fees for court appearances that regularly get postponed — the Campaign had to reach out beyond its poor members for financial support. A series of fund raising efforts (e.g., the Free Max Campaign) through the national and international networks of solidarity movements then brought certain financial and material resources to the Campaign.

[12] Boycott of rent payments for housing and services was a strategy used by the anti-apartheid movements to protest the poor quality of services and the illegitimacy of an oppressive state (Adler and Steinberg 2000; Seekings 2000; Mayekiso 1996). Zuren (2001:13) reports the extensive rent boycotts that led to the collapse of the black authorities. By July 1990, 49 of the Transvaal's 82 townships were on rent boycott, up from 25 townships in April of the same year. By the end of 1990, 40 percent of the 262 Black Authorities in South Africa had collapsed.

[13] For a detailed account of the diversity in Campaign strategies, see Oldfield and Stokke 2004.

[14] See the Oldfield and Stokke interview with an Athlone Civic activist, affiliate of the Campaign, where she stresses a change from street politics to boardroom politics (2004:12).

[15] In an article on patterns of women's participation in the anti-apartheid struggle, emphasizing the ideological more than the practical dimension of women's constraint, Seeking (1991) argues that in the mid-1980s a shift to violent confrontational strategies among township youth groups contributed to a reduced participation of women in the informal politics of township. If Seeking's observation is considered viable at all, the practical and ideological dimension of such a pattern deserves a closer examination.

[16] This was almost on a par with women's representation in the provincial parliament, growing from 24 percent in the first election to 28 percent in 1999.

[17] Pardo 1998 frames the question of informal community activism and formal politics within the race and ethnicity relations in the US context. Formal politics, she argues, often engages the white working class emerging from paid work at places of employment, while informal community activism emerges from unpaid caring work performed by women around home and neighborhood.

[18] This binary construct of women's and anti-colonial, anti-imperial movements resonates with the experience of women and women's organizations in colonial contexts, or the contemporary struggle of Palestinian women and fatah, Iranian women during the anti-Shah, anti-imperialist struggles. See Abdulhadi, 1998.

[19] Tripp (2003), for example, referring to the international promotion of NGOs and the experience of women in civil society groups in the African context, argues that although these groups might not have been feminist in their agenda or objectives, women's participation in these civil society actions, by offering more opportunities to women, helped to justify and validate women's movements. Referring to what she calls the second generation of activism in the 1990s, Tripp argues that given the greater recognition and celebration of civil society discourse and NGOs, women have been successful in taking advantage of the new political openings of the last decade (True 2003; Tripp 2003).

[20] The "Civil Society Global People's Forum," a rally/march organized by the South African government and its alliance partners, at which President Mbeki addressed an estimated 3,000 representatives from trade unions, relief agencies, and various international NGOs, was consistently called the "civil society" march by newspaper correspondents. By contrast, more than 20,000 farmers, squatters, rural and urban dwellers, and international activists marching under the Social Movements Indaba, a coalition jointly organized by the APF and the Landless People's Movement, against what they called the "South African government's anti-poor policies" and the summit's "corporate-friendly" agenda, were repeatedly referred to as "radical" protestors, "renegades," and members of the "ultra left." See *London Guardian*. 11 September 2002, p.9; *The Boston Globe*, 5 September 2002, p. A10; *The Washington Post,* 18 August 2002, p. B04, and 31 August 2002, p. A18; *The Mail & Guardian*, 24 May 2002; *The Chicago Sun Times*, 1 September 2002, p. 27; *South Africa's Times Media Limited Business Day*, 23 September 2002, p.6).

[21] The media's delegitimization of certain kinds of grassroots and/or community-based groups coincides with the implicit and explicit attitudes of the state through which certain spaces of citizens' participation are criminalized. At the WSSD, despite the fact that permission had been obtained for a peaceful protest, the Social Movements Indaba's activities were implicitly criminalized by the government when it dispatched police units in armed trucks and helicopters to follow the protestors as they marched.

[22] There are also informal political practices that take place at the very center of the formal arena of politics, such as bribery and corruption. The concern of this paper, however, is with the informal arena, not the informal practices of politics.

[23] There is an extensive body of literature on how women's position in domestic life cycle influences their resources and constraints. For example, see Mercedes Gonzales de la Rocha 1994. and Miraftab 1998.