

Feminist Praxis, Citizenship and Informal Politics

REFLECTIONS ON SOUTH AFRICA'S ANTI-EVICTION CAMPAIGN

FARANAK MIRAFTAB

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA

Abstract

This article 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 article also sheds light on the gender dynamics of the Campaign and how its patriarchal order is being destabilized. The AEC case study engages the pioneering feminist scholarship on citizenship that has embraced both formal and informal arenas of politics. The study points out the risk in constructing yet another binary relation between grassroots coping strategies (in invited spaces) and resistance strategies (in invented spaces). The article 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.

Keywords

citizenship, civil society, eviction, gender, grassroots, privatization, South Africa

This article 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 article

calls for a refinement of feminists' extended notion of politics by insisting on 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 article 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 should be understood as being in 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, grassroots actions are characterized by defiance that *resists* 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 article 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 article 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 among male and female activists.

The article 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 the 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, 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.

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). 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 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 Cheru 1997; Bond 2000; Moore 2001). The neoliberal development framework that was adopted relies on private-sector principles of cost recovery through users' fees:³ basically, 'no fee, no service'. Applying that policy in a society with some of the world's largest social and economic inequalities⁴ 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 *afford* them has decreased dramatically (see Makgetla 2002).

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. Since 1994, nearly 2 million South Africans have been evicted from their homes because of service non-payments

(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 THE 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 defaulting on 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 Montagu Village, Lavender Hill and Lentegeur) and in informal settlements with post-apartheid subsidy houses or new land occupations (e.g. Delft South and Philippi).⁵ 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 particularly in Tafelsig, where in one month alone there were 1,800 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 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 2005).

The anti-eviction movement emerged in 2001 as a grassroots agglomeration of groups whose members have suffered or faced the threat of evictions or service cuts in Cape Town's poor townships.⁶ In terms of its political heritage, the AEC is composed of civic groups 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, 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

based in Johannesburg, which collaborates transnationally with other movements against neoliberal privatization. The members of the AEC 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’ (Bobby Wilcox, interview 2002)⁷.

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.⁸ Since the eviction crisis now cuts across Cape Town’s disadvantaged and racialized groups, the anti-eviction movement enjoys a racially diverse membership.

Since its inception, the AEC has grown to incorporate close to twenty-five communities’ civic organizations (Oldfield and Stokke 2006). 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 than 50,000 Rands; 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, the AEC has had a partial victory in banning banks’ eviction of the elderly or disabled. In a landmark victory, the AEC won a court case for about ninety families that had squatted in an empty lot in Valahala Park and rejected the council’s eviction order. At the moment, the 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, and the campaign for scrapping the arrears accumulated during the apartheid era.

The AEC 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. [The Campaign] emerged out of that process and needs.

(Faizel Brown, interview 2004)

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 the 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. 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 the 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 (2006) 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 AEC 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,⁹ 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. 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 since 2004, the idea was to equip some activists with media training to counter the criminalized image of the Campaign presented by the official media. Another area is community-based research. The Campaign's Community Research Group has several goals: challenging policy, building organization, affirming their

identities and experiences, substantiating their claims and facilitating learning and sharing (Oldfield and Stokke 2006: 27). The third area of Campaign activities is legal training. The Legal Coordinating Committee consists of community members who have gone through five weeks of legal training to represent in the magistrate's court the families facing eviction or service disconnection. By learning the language of the legal system and its procedures and loopholes, these members 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 2006: 23).

AEC activities engage both the formal and informal arenas of politics and aim to combine what Fraser (1997) has characterized as 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.

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 *et al.* 2002). But spaces created from above are not sufficient for achieving actual redistribution (Hassim 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 (1999: 2) describe as aspiring to 'new kinds of citizenship, new sources of laws, and new participation in decisions that bind'. As a Campaign activist put it, important as it is to establish relevant formal channels for making claims, the laws are often ineffective and fall short of meeting the immediate needs of the poor (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 [that laws] 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.

(Faizel Brown, 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 (see Oldfield and Stokke 2006: 12). 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 left-over 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 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 civic groups join the Campaign 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’, (Gretrude Square, interview 2004). 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 and of other community-based movements. Though women make up the bulk of grassroots mobilization, the Campaign’s steering committee is almost exclusively male (nine out of ten members). This section of the

article, through extracts from an interview with a long-time female civic organizer and Campaign activist, examines how the patriarchal order is constructed and destabilized. Gretrude who has worked since she was 11 years old and was the victim of three evictions during the apartheid era, is a founding member of the civic organization in her community. The civic organization and Gretrude herself 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.

(Gretrude Square, interview 2004)

This statement shows that Gretrude who raised her children as a single mother, sees clearly the transcendental nature of gender inequalities, with domestic gender relations extending into 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 ... 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 ... because we are speaking now ... I am talking about the Campaign, the change is happening now!

(Gretrude Square, interview 2004)

Moreover, the change that Gretrude is talking about not only concerns gender relations, but also 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 brings to the fore issues of 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 participatory 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 and this has expended their resources in court appearances and bail payments.¹⁰ 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 (e.g. Seekings 2000). 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, other male activists recognize the gender inequalities and value women's prominence in 'saving' the Campaign. 'Centralized tendencies usually come from men', 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.'

This account is not to suggest that the 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 the UDF; nor is it to claim that the current process will entirely dissolve the organization's gender hierarchies. Through the current critical process, the Campaign may mature in its struggle for social justice within the wider society and among its own membership; 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 in terms of the future of the Campaign, it is important to reflect on the meaning of the Campaign's processes for the

construction of inclusive citizenship among the grassroots and among men and women.

FEMINISTS' EXPANDED NOTION OF POLITICS

Feminists have been the most vocal critics of a liberal conceptualization of citizenship that is Eurocentric, that views citizenship rights as linear and evolutionary (i.e. assuming that political and civil citizenship brings about social and economic citizenship rights) and that focuses on the state as 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 (Young 1990; Hassim 1998, 1999; 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 (Cornwall 2002; Durish 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, 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 McEwan 2000; Hassim 2002). 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. The 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 those seats elected through proportional representation, have made important contributions to those trends.

South African feminists have reflected over the last decade 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 structure of citizenship to achieve social and substantive rights for the majority of women (see, for example, *Agenda* 1999: 40). 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 (Hassim 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 1999). Strong women's groups and movements are needed to pursue their claims on government, lobby in civil society and pressure state institutions for change (Hassim 1998, 2002, 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, Hassim (2002: 720) remarks that women's rights in the constitution and legal mechanisms are significant, but limited 'as guarantees for women'. Femocrats can gain leverage for 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 (Hassim 2003). That range of activism is necessary because the state is not homogenous but contradictory and complex, and so feminists must use a range of strategies to deal with it.

By showing that formal and informal spaces are not self-contained sites of politics but porous, each shaping the other (Hassim 1999: 12), feminist scholarship in South Africa strengthens the more general feminist challenge to binary constructs such as public/private and active/passive, and to the traditional assumption that political participation and citizenship only takes place in the sphere of formal politics dominated by men.¹¹ 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 (Lawson and Klak 1990; McDowell 1991; Miraftab 1998, forthcoming). It also recognizes the unpaid caring work women perform at home as a citizenship responsibility that carries social rights (Naples 1998; Bakker 2003; Lister 2003: 3).

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.¹² 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, for example, Howell and Mulligan 2003). 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, in so far as they perpetuate patriarchal gender relations by mirroring formal politics and structures (Hassim 1998). Some critics also point out that the current celebration of civil society fosters the 'NGO-ization' of social movements and risks turning feminists into experts with policy impact rather than actors with revolutionary impact (Alvarez 1998; Rios Tobar 2003).

In South Africa, feminist scholarship has contributed to debates about citizenship and civil society by framing questions in the context of the national struggle against apartheid and triple oppression by race, class and gender (Hassim and Gouws 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 (Seekings 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, Hassim, Meterlerkamp and Todes (1987: 14, cited in Seekings 1991: 79) have argued that women were used in movements pushing the nationalist agenda, but were suppressed when women's liberation was set on the table. 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).

Conversely, 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 the UDF (1984) galvanized community-based organizations (CBOs) 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.¹³ '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 (1997) pushes the point further by arguing that indeed the active participation of women in the anti-apartheid movement generated a unique form of South African feminism with a heavy emphasis on motherhood. 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 well-being of their children, to negotiate with the state for staying permits (Kaplan 1997: 127–8). '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 beyond 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 earlier are substantiated by practices of the AEC: (1) the fluidity of grassroots actions in spanning different political arenas and spaces of citizenship; and (2) the complexity and instability of the gender order within civic movements and the informal arena of politics.

Fluidity of Grassroots Actions

Earlier this article noted how the Campaign is situated within the informal arena of politics and predominantly within invented spaces of citizenship,

but its activists nevertheless do 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 'authentic' civil society actors who participate in invited spaces sanctioned by the state and the international development agencies, and 'inauthentic' actors whose 'extremist' actions in invented spaces of citizenship are discredited and delegitimized. Rather, 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 *within* informal politics. Invidious distinctions may be drawn between the grassroots activities that focus on surviving the adverse effects of social and political hierarchies and that take place within invited spaces of citizenship, and the grassroots activities that resist the dominant systems of exploitation and oppression and that occur predominantly within 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' (e.g. see *Mail* and *Guardian* for Forrest 2003; Haffajee and Robinson 2003; Calland 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 (Ndenze 2005).

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. 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.

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 (e.g. Fukuyama 1995). 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 (1996) study of colonial societies 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 political actors 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.¹⁴ Grassroots mobilizations 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 referred to in this article 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.

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 the bulk of their membership but not their leadership. The stability of this order, however, should not be overestimated. Transformations within and outside 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 for their young families, the extent of their political participation is constrained. With advance to 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 (see, for example, Gonzales de la Rocha 1994; MirafTAB 1998). 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 the anxieties of feminist scholars and activists about the ability of civic or grassroots movements to achieve gender justice. Note that it also parallels the contradictions in the neoliberal processes of governance more generally, 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 neoliberalism 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 care givers, 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 meaningful social change, the article 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 and practice one's citizenship are 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 article 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 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 invited spaces of citizen participation and refraining from confronting 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 AEC illustrates how mobilization to immediately *protect* the roof over one's head may be as essential as state-legitimized groups and movements to *produce* shelter for the poor. It 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 intersectionality 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 beyond civic movements.

Faranak Miraftab
Assistant Professor
University of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign)
Dept. of Urban and Regional Planning
111 Temple Buell Hall, 611 Taft Drive
Champaign, IL 61820-6921, USA
E-mail: faranak@uiuc.edu

Notes

- 1 I borrow the term 'invited spaces of citizenship' from Andrea Cornwall (2002: 50) and build on her critique of formulations of citizenship that circumscribe the possibility of public engagement within a frame defined by external agents, basically as a means of social control.
- 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 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. 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.

- 4 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).
- 5 See Oldfield and Stokke (forthcoming 2006) on the need to differentiate between these areas and their struggle for housing and against evictions, and to guard against conflating the divergent experience of these families into a generic category of evicted families.
- 6 Officially the AEC 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.
- 7 Where interviewee's permission is obtained the real name is used in this text.
- 8 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.
- 9 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 (Mayekiso 1996; Adler and Steinberg 2000; Seekings 2000). See Zuern (2001: 13) on the extensive rent boycotts that led to the collapse of the black authorities.
- 10 Faced with the frequent incarceration of its activists starting in 2002 and accompanying costs associated with that AEC had to reach out beyond its poor members for financial support and launched a series of fund-raising efforts through the national and international networks of solidarity movements.
- 11 See, for example, Lister (1997); Yuval-Davis (1997); Sandercock (1998); Tripp (1998); McEwan (2000).
- 12 See, for example, Jelin (1990); Staheli and Cope (1994); Kaplan (1997); Lister (1997); Robnett (1997); Hassim and Gouws (1998); M. Desai (2002); Naples and Desai (2002).
- 13 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 them helped to justify and validate women's movements. Tripp asserts 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 (see also True 2003).
- 14 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 article, however, is with the informal arena, not the informal practices of politics.

Acknowledgement

I am grateful to Elain Salo for her participation and insight in the initial phase of this project. I also thank African Gender Institute and Sophie Oldfield at the University of Cape Town; Antonia Darder, Ken Salo, Manisha Desai, David Wilson, Jan Nederveen Pieterse and participants in the transnational seminar at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. I thank Shana Wills for carrying out the 2002 interviews in Cape Town and the anonymous reviewers of this article for their extremely valuable comments. Above all I am indebted to the members of the Anti Eviction Campaign for trusting me with their stories of struggle.

References

- Adler, G. and Steinberg, J. 2000. 'Introduction: From Comrades to Citizens', in Adler, G. and Steinberg, J. (eds) *From Comrades to Citizens: The South African Crisis Movement and Transition to Democracy*, pp. 1–25. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Alvarez, S. 1998. 'Latin American Feminisms "Go Global": Trends of the 1990s and Challenges for the New Millennium', in Alvarez, S., Dagnino, E. and Escobar, A. (eds) *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Culture: Re-visioning Latin American Social Movements*, pp. 293–324. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Bakker, I. 2003. 'Neoliberal Governance and the Reprivatization of Social Reproduction: Social Provisioning and Shifting Gender Orders', in Bakker, I. and Gill, S. (eds) *Power, Production and Social Reproduction*, pp. 66–82. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Beall, J., Crankshaw, O. and Parnell, S. 2002. *Uniting a Divided City: Governance and Social Exclusion in Johannesburg*. London: Earthscan.
- Beneria, L. 1992. 'The Mexican Debt Crisis: Restructuring the Economy and the Household', in Beneria, L. and Feldman, S. (eds) *Unequal Burden: Economic Crisis, Persistent Poverty, and Women's Work*, pp. 83–104. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Bond, P. 2000. *Elite Transition: From Apartheid to Neoliberalism in South Africa*. London: Pluto Press.
- Calland, R. 2004. 'Courts to Balance Policy and Rights.' *Mail and Guardian*, 30 March. Available at http://www.mg.co.za/articledirect.aspx?articleid=45638&area=%2fcolumnist_richard_calland%2f (accessed 4 January 2006).

- Castells, M. 1998. *End of Millennium*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Charman, A., de Swart, C. and Simons, M. 1991. 'The Politics of Gender: Negotiating Liberation', *Transformation* 15: 40–64. Available at <http://digital.lib.msu.edu/projects/africanjournals/pdfs/transformation/tran015/tran015004.pdf> (accessed 4 January 2006).
- Cheru, F. 1997. 'Civil Society and Political Economy in South and Southern Africa', in Gill, S. (ed.) *Globalization, Democratization and Multilateralism*, pp. 219–44. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Cornwall, A. 2002. 'Locating Citizen Participation', *IDS Bulletin* 33 (2): 49–58.
- Crewe, E. and Harrison, E. 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 Pithouse, R. 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 Naples, N. and Desai, M. (eds) *Women's Activism and Globalization: Linking Local Struggles and Transnational Politics*, pp. 11–33. New York: Routledge.
- 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* 34: 45–61.
- Flynn, S. 2003. 'Rights to Essential Services: A Public–Private Continuum for Essential Service Rules.' Unpublished paper. Municipal Services Project (Draft: 31 March).
- Forrest, D. 2003. 'Social Movements: "Ultra-Left" or "Global Citizens"?' *Mail and Guardian*, 4 February. Available at http://www.mg.co.za/articledirect.aspx?articleid=15335&area=%2finsight%2finsight_national%2f (accessed 4 January 2006).
- Fraser, N. 1997. *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections of the Post-Socialist Conditions*. New York: Routledge.
- Fukuyama, F. 1995. 'Social Capital and the Global Economy', *Foreign Affairs* 74 (5): 89–103.
- 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* 40: 54–8.
- Haffajee, F. and Robinson, V. 2003. 'Power to the People.' *Mail and Guardian*, 13 May. Available at http://www.queensu.ca/msp/pages/In_The_News/2003/May/8.htm (accessed 4 January 2006).

- Hassim, S. 1998. 'Politicizing the Subject: Feminist Challenges to Political Science in South Africa', *Politikon* 25 (2): 3–15.
- Hassim, S. 1999. 'From Presence to Power: Women's Citizenship in a New Democracy', *Agenda* 40: 6–17.
- Hassim, S. 2002. 'A Conspiracy of Women: The Women's Movement in South Africa's Transition to Democracy', *Social Research* 69 (3): 693–732.
- Hassim, S. 2003. 'The Gender Pact and Democratic Consolidation: Institutionalizing Gender Equality in the South African State', *Feminist Studies* 29 (3): 505–28.
- Hassim, S. and Gouws, A. 1998. 'Redefining the Public Space: Women's Organisations, Gender Consciousness and Civil Society in South Africa', *Politikon* 25 (2): 53–76.
- Hassim, S., Meterlerkamp, J. and Todes, A. 1987. "'A Bit on the Side"? Gender Struggles in the Politics of Transformation in South Africa', *Transformation* 5: 3–32.
- Haysom, L. 1999. 'Citizenship', *Agenda* 40: 2–3.
- Holston, J. and Appadurai, A. 1999. 'Cities and Citizenship', in Holston, J. (ed.) *Cities and Citizenship*, pp. 1–18. Durham, NC & London: Duke University Press.
- Howell, J. and Mulligan, D. (eds). 2003. Special Issue – Gender and Civil Society: Challenges for International Feminism, *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 5 (2).
- Jelin, E. 1990. 'Citizenship and Identity: Final Reflections', in Jelin, E. (ed.) *Women and Social Change in Latin America*, pp. 184–207. 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 Klak, T. 1990. 'Conceptual Linkages in the Study of Production and Reproduction in Latin America', *Economic Geography* 66 (5): 310–27.
- Lister, R. 1997. 'Citizenship: Towards a Feminist Synthesis', *Feminist Review* 57: 28–48.
- Lister, R. 2003. 'Feminist Theory and Practice of Citizenship', paper presented at the annual conference of the DVPW (German Political Science Association), Mainz, September. Available at <http://www.dvpw.de/data/doc/ad-hocCitizen.pdf> (accessed 4 January 2006).
- McDonald, D. 2002. 'The Theory and Practice of Cost Recovery in South Africa', in McDonald, D. and Pape, J. (eds) *Cost Recovery and the Crisis of Service Delivery in South Africa*, pp. 17–36. London: Zed Books.
- McDonald, D. and Smith, L. 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 Gottdiener, M. and Pickvance, C. (eds) *Urban Life in Transition*, pp. 77–105. London & New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- McEwan, C. 2000. 'Engendering Citizenship: Gendered Spaces of Democracy in South Africa', *Political Geography* 19 (5): 627–51.

- Makgetla, N. 2002. 'Stats SA Income Figures Make Gloomy Reading.' *Business Day*, 22 November. Available at <http://www.businessday.co.za/Articles/TarkArticle.aspx?ID=652190> (accessed 25 January 2006).
- Mamdani, M. 1996. *Citizens and Subjects: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Marshall, T. H. 1964. *Class, Citizenship and Social Development*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
- Mayekiso, M. 1996. *Township Politics: Civic Struggles for a New South Africa*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- MirafTAB, F. 1998. 'Complexities of the Margin: Housing Decisions of Female Householders in Mexico', *Society and Space: Environment and Planning D* 16 (3): 289–310.
- 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): 874–92.
- MirafTAB, F. 2005. 'Making Neoliberal Governance: The Disempowering Work of Empowerment', *International Planning Studies* 9 (4): 239–59.
- MirafTAB, F. Forthcoming. 'Informalizing the Means of Reproduction: The Case of Waste Collection Services in Cape Town, South Africa', in Beneria, L. and Kudva, N. (eds) *Rethinking Informalization: Precarious Jobs, Poverty and Social Protection*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University e-Publishing Program.
- MirafTAB, F. and Wills, S. 2005. 'Insurgency and Spaces of Active Citizenship: The Story of Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign in South Africa', *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 25 (2): 200–217.
- 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): 909–29.
- Naples, N. 1998. 'Women's Community Activism and Feminist Activist Research', in Naples, N. (ed.) *Community Activism and Feminist Politics*, pp. 1–27. New York: Routledge.
- Naples, N. and Desai, M. 2002. 'Women's Local and Translocal Responses: An Introduction to the Chapters', in Naples, N. and Desai, M. (eds) *Women's Activism and Globalization: Linking Local Activism and Transnational Politics*, pp. 11–33. New York: Routledge.
- Ndenze, B. 2005. 'Man Shot in Leg during Anti-Eviction Protest.' *Cape Times*, 9 February. Available at <http://www.capepress.com/ArticleId=2403460> (accessed 25 January 2006).
- Oldfield, S. and Stokke, K. 2006. 'Building Unity in Diversity: Social Movement Activism in the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign', in Habib, A., Valodia, I. and Ballard, R. (eds) *Globalisation, Marinalisation and New Social Movements*, pp. 25–49. Durban: University of KwaZulu Natal Press.
- Oldfield, S. and Stokke, K. Forthcoming 2006. 'Polemical Politics, the Local Politics of Community Organising, and Neoliberalism in South Africa', in Peck, J., Leitner, H. and Sheppard, E. (eds) *Contesting Neoliberalism: The Urban Frontier*. Connecticut: Guildford Press.

- Oldfield, S. and Stokke, K. 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.
- Pateman, C. 1988. *The Sexual Contract*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Primo, N. 1997. 'Women's Emancipation: Resistance and Empowerment', *Agenda* 34: 31–44.
- Rios Tobar, M. 2003. 'Chilean Feminism(s) in the 1990s', *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 5 (2): 256–80.
- 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. I. (ed.) *Democracy, Citizenship and the Global City*, pp. 95–109. 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 Sandercock, L. (ed.) *Making the Invisible Visible: A Multicultural Planning History*, pp. 1–33. Berkeley, Los Angeles & New York: University of California Press.
- Seekings, J. 1991. 'Gender Ideology and Township Politics in the 1980s', *Agenda* 10: 77–88.
- Seekings, J. 2000. 'After Apartheid: Civic Organizations in the "New" South Africa', in Adler, G. and Steinberg, J. (eds) *From Comrades to Citizens: The South African Crisis Movement and Transition to Democracy*, pp. 205–24. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Staheli, L. and Cope, M. 1994. 'Empowering Women's Citizenship', *Political Geography* 13 (5): 443–60.
- Tripp, A. M. 1998. 'Expanding "Civil Society": Women and Political Space in Contemporary Uganda', in Kasfir, N. (ed.) *Civil Society and Democracy in Africa: Critical Perspectives*, pp. 84–107. London: Frank Cass.
- Tripp, A. M. 2003. 'Women in Movement: Transformations in African Political Landscape', *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 5 (2): 233–55.
- True, J. 2003. 'Mainstreaming Gender in Global Public Policy', *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 5 (2): 368–96.
- Van Donk, M. and Maceba, M. 1999. 'Women at the Crossroads: Women in Governance', *Agenda* 40: 18–22.
- Young, I. M. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Yuval-Davis, N. 1997. 'Women, Citizenship and Difference', *Feminist Review* 57: 4–27.
- Zuern, E. 2001. 'South Africa's Civic in Transition: Agents of Change or Structures of Constraint?', *Politikon* 28 (1): 5–20.