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ABSTRACT

We live in a world characterized with enormous urbanization. Globally, half of the population lives in cities and this number will increase exponentially. South Africa as a young democracy is still faced with fragmented cities, caused by the Apartheid regime. The combination of these two developments creates the condition you see city people live in urban peripheries in conditions of illegal and irregular residences. With the shift towards People-Centred Development (PCD) participation became a central concept. Instead of a standardised, top-down paradigm of things PCD embraces a diversified, bottom-up paradigm of people. There is a transfer from power towards people on all scales of government. All over the world citizen engagement and participation is given priority in policy documents. New policy frameworks and programmes for promoting this are institutionalised, these are what Cornwall (2004) calls the ‘invited spaces’. As we can see in various policy documents in South Africa inclusive participation of all citizens is encouraged. The reality however makes clear that this new legal frameworks not always result in greater inclusion of marginalised groups. Not all residents are treated with the equal access to civil, political and socio-economical rights, not all have admission to this democratic citizenship. Marginalized groups are looking for other channels than the formal structures which are provided for them. These excluded groups address more to informal forms of participation and popular politics, the ‘invented space’. They organize different forms of popular politics to get access to citizenship. In this paper I explore cases in the Houtbay area, in the townships Isiqalo and Imizamo Yethu in the Western Cape, South Africa. What forms of popular politics are used and what does this mean for citizenship and democracy and how do these groups relate to the state?
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1 INTRODUCTION

We live in a world characterized with enormous urbanization. Globally, half of the population lives in cities and this number will increase exponentially. Governments are challenging this explosive growth by creating job opportunities, houses, infrastructure and services. Because they don’t always have the capacities to provide this, informal settlements arise. The Challenge of Slums, published by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT) says that in 2001 31.6 % of the world population lived in informal settlements. In more developed countries this is 6 % of the population but this percentage can be as high as 43 % of the urban citizens who live in informal settlements in the developing countries (The Challenge of Slums. Global Report on human settlements, 2003).

South Africa as a young democracy is still faced with fragmented cities, caused by the Apartheid regime. Informal settlements, called ‘townships’, were created with the purpose to keep coloured and black people out the cities. They were removed to nearby areas where there was lack of services and infrastructure. “The ending of apartheid rule in South Africa in 1994 brought with it the hope that not only would civil rights be restored to the majority of the population, but that the advent of democracy would bring with it significant gains to the welfare of those people hitherto disadvantaged by apartheid.” (Tapscott, 2005) But until today, South Africa is challenged to reverse this structural separation. The town centre is equipped with public services, wealthy neighbourhoods, private school and work facilities. The economic productivity in the townships is lower than in the cities and they also do not have the infrastructure that could lead to economic growth and employment (Tapscott, 2005).

The combination of the previous two conditions is the occasion that people live in urban peripheries in conditions of illegal and irregular residences. As we can see in various policy documents in South Africa inclusive participation of all citizens is encouraged. But not all residents are treated with the equal access
to civil, political and socio-economical rights, not all have admission to this
democratic citizenship. To create meaningful citizen engagement in local
governance there is not only a need for government created opportunities –
what Cornwall (2004) calls ‘invited spaces’, but also driven by citizens and civil
society organisations, called by Gaventa ‘invented spaces’. Marginalized
groups are looking for other channels than the formal structures which are
provided for them. They organize different forms of popular politics to get
access to citizenship.

This research is looking at the reality, participation seen from standpoint of the
governed, what Chatterjee (2004) calls participation as a practice of
democracy. In the two selected cases I’m first investing the different forms of
popular politics and how the groups relate to the state. Is this in a space shaped
by the government, or by another power. And on which manner is it? Is it in a
sphere of resistance, avoidance, clientelism? This gives us the insight how the
heterogeneous ‘invented space’ looks like in the two cases. Furthermore I will
look at what this means for their citizenship and how the residents see their
citizenships’ rights and the consequences for democracy.

What forms of popular politics are used in the cases of Imizamo Yethu and Isiqalo,
how do these residents relate to the state and what does this mean for citizenship
and democracy?

1.1 Structure paper
Firstly I will focus at the history of the People Centred Development (PCD)
approach, namely the shift from the traditional, economical focused theories
towards the PCD in the 1990s. The PCD concepts such as ‘participation’,
‘democracy’ and ‘inclusion’ became buzz terms. I will explain the PCD theory
and briefly overlook the most important and focus in depth at how
participation is institutionalized. I have investigated the literature about
participatory spaces from mainly the scholars Cornwall and Gaventa and will
focus on how participation is institutionalised in South Africa. This paper will
explain, first of all, why PCD and the participatory spaces are useful theories.
Secondly I investigated if the Cape Town citizens are equally involved in the ‘invited space’ and thus is the formal participation inclusive. In the cases is focused at the ‘invented space’, the forms of popular politics and what the excluded groups understand as citizenship. In this research I set out three cases within the area Houtbay, in the Western Cape, South Africa and the case of service delivery protests in the township Isiqlalo. In each case I will investigate what forms of popular politics the residents are using to demand their claims in the ‘invented space’. I will examine the concept of citizenship and apply this in each case. In the paper I’m using Mashalls’ definition of democratic citizenship to see what rights of the citizens are violated. Thereafter I’m going to look how the citizens in each case relate to the state. Finally, I’ll look at the implications for democracy before I get to our conclusion.

1.2 Methodology
My first intention was to write a policy evaluation. The theoretical insights of the research would provide the necessarily knowledge to the Cape Town government to overcome the gap between the ‘invited’ and ‘invented space’ and to provide more inclusive forms of participation. However my original plan changed along the research process due to some reasons and difficulties I encountered to start and write a policy report. When I was on the fieldwork I noticed how difficult it is to get support of local political leaders for interviews. The interviews I took were only possible via the network of professor Piper from the University of the Western Cape.

For these reasons I decided to focus more on a selection of the numerous democracy and citizenship literature in the Global South to give an adequate reproduction of the different forms of popular politics, what this means for citizenship and how they relate to the state in two cases in South Africa.

In my first case I used mostly information from local media, journals and social media were you could follow the event. Caution is necessary since some sources who report the event may be colored and the neutrality is not
guaranteed. By looking to participation from another viewpoint, from the grassroots perspective, attention is paid at the ‘invented space’.

In my second case of Imizamo Yethu I choose to do qualitative research and explorative interviews to find answers on my research questions. The data here is collected in interviews and by mapping the different forms of activism. I spoke with three groups, a group with local residents, a group with foreigners and a civil society organisation. To get access to the local residents I got help from my professor at the University of Cape Town, Laurence Piper. He has a lot of experience with fieldwork in Imizamo Yethu. He took me to the township and introduced me to local ANC leaders and the spokesperson of the Thrive, Bronwen Lankers-Byrne. Through this network it made me possible to take interviews and collect my data. The interviews were rather informal and took place in Imizamo Yethu itself. I didn’t make appointments with foreigner residents in advance, I went to Imizamo Yethu with professor Piper to do observations and had small and informal chats with foreigners living in the township. My interview with Bronwen was more structured. In preparation I made a topic list with questions, but this was more for support and was used dynamic during the interview. I did fieldwork in Imizamo Yethu the 8th of May 2015 and I spoke with the spokesperson of the Thrive the 13th of May 2015.
In 1990 there came an end at apartheid rule since 1948. The democrtatisation process that followed mid 1990s changed the nature of the government on all levels. New forms of decentralisation, state-society relations and public participation occurred. Local government did not exist before 1994 (Piper, 2011). The institutionalisation of public participation in local government will be explained in chapter five, how it has been applied. But to speak about citizen engagement it is not enough to speak of the ‘invited space’ of participation, but also take the ‘invented space’ into account which is driven by citizens, this is looked at in chapter six.

Remarkable in Cape Town is the geographical scatter in income classes. The closer to the Table Mountain the more expensive the houses are and the more high income families are living. Wealth is not geographical equal divided. At the left-side of the railways, close to the Table Mountain are mostly expensive properties in rich areas as Constantia and Green Point. At the right-side of the railway are middle-class suburbs such Pinelands, Mowbray and Rondebosch. The further you go from the Table and the railway you’ll find the ‘Cape Flats’. This area is distinctive by the many townships and informal settlements wherefrom the most famous is Khayelitsha. It is in this low-income area where the township Isiqalo is situated.
2.1 ISIQALO CASE

Socio-economic issues dominate the local state-society relations, mostly issues around delivery of services such as water, rubbish collection, electricity. The first Isiqalo case is a typical example of the so-called ‘service delivery’ protests. These protests are a popular mobilisation in protest against local government failures and have become a common phenomenon in urban life (Piper, 2011). This case will give us insight in the state-society relations wherein the state is seen as a provider of services. The main question in the Imizamo Yethu case starts out another point of view: Do all sections of society in Imizamo Yethu use the same forms of popular politics to relate to the state?

The Isiqalo settlement is located off Vanguard Drive, opposite the old Crowie homestead and Vangate Villa security complex and borders the Philippi farming area. Residents were demanding that people living in the illegal informal settlement be employed to collect the rubbish. This by a three monthly rotating system. "We want the jobs to rotate, so that everyone has an opportunity. It was suggested that people work for Chippa for a maximum of three months. Then it is time for someone else to get the job," says Ngcwangu (2015), the residents committee secretary. The residents claim to have this contracted and were angry about the selection of the people working on the cleaning project in the area did not merit their demands. The removal contractor Chippa choose at the end of last year for one year contracts to eleven people instead locals for three months, the cleaning project started in November 2014.

The workers felt threatened by the intimidation of the residents and the rubbish collection was being halted. Residents feared the rubbish piling up in Isiqalo posed a health risk that endangers the lives of the residents. The occasion for the recent protest in Isiqalo was displeasure due to the rubbish in the area not being collected. Isiqalo informal settlement handed over a letter on 20 January 2015, requesting a meeting with Cape Town’s mayor, Patricia de Lille and officials from the Solid Waste Department to discuss the lack of rubbish collection in Isiqalo.
This letter is ignored, weeks later the community started with the protest. Committee secretary Mandisi Ngcwanu: "First we try with a letter. We ask nicely for a meeting. But, when we are ignored, we come out and take action." (Ngcwanu, 2015) From 9 till 18 February 2015 days of protest follow, residents burn tires and rubbish, they blocked the Jakes Gerwel Drive which causes a traffic standstill. There are even clashes with the police. After this period of action from below the mayor, Patricia de Lille planned a meeting with the residents on 18 February. The nearby settlement Rondevleli was upset by the protests and even threatened with counter-protests.

2.2 Imizamo Yethu

The Imizamo Yethu informal settlement is situated in the high-income area Hout Bay. According to the Census 2011 there live 15,538 people, mostly black Africans and is mainly Xhosa-speaking. Imizamo Yethu was established in 1990 by black residents of Hout Bay who were not allowed by law to buy property in Hout Bay and built their houses on the vacant land here. The Imizamo Yethu township has grown significantly after 1994. Imizamo Yethu exists for a part out of formal housing. Several houses were built by the Irish non-profit organization Niall Mellon Township Trust in 2002. But Imizamo Yethu also has an informal part, with illegal housings. In Imizamo Yethu there is a lack of infrastructure, such as sanitation and housing and Imizamo Yethu is vulnerable for environmental hazards, such as fires. A huge fire in 2004 caused damage to housing and infrastructure.

As Lemanski (2012) highlights in her research, “Much of the existing literature on urban governance in the global South polarises urban citizens and their mobilisation strategies into the elite, typically understood as guilty of ‘capturing’ participatory structures; and the poor, largely conceptualised as excluded
The reality of participatory practices is more complex and nuanced than the ‘invited’ and ‘invented’ binary, although I choose in this paper to use this format because it provides a useful shorthand to distinguish different forms of participation and helps me to understand the role of the state. By focusing on an area case wherein I spoke with three groups of citizens, this paper aims to proof the complexity of citizenship and how these engage in participatory governance than the classic conceptual binary. The participatory space is a heterogeneous field.

The Hout Bay area can be distinguished in three racial groups who live in racially segregated communities. In the valley, close to the seaside, live mostly wealthy white people. The ‘black African’ people live in Imizamo Yethu and further up the mountain live a diverse foreign African population. Besides the racial fragmentation we can see a hierarchy of socio-economic development, from the luxury of the valley to the poverty of Imizamo Yethu. Much of the issues of Imizamo Yethu and Hout Bay are centred on issues of race and socio-economic development (Piper, L.; Von Lieres, B., 2014).

First I spoke with local South Africans living in the township Imizamo Yethu. Secondly I spoke with foreigners in Imizamo Yethu. These group of people live here in illegality, they don’t have the formal status as citizen. Most of them are people from Angola, Namibia, Malawi, Zimbabwe and the Democratic Republic of the Congo and other neighbouring countries, who moved here with the hope to improve their lives. But since they are illegal, they cannot practice legal jobs. I compare their status as citizen with the local Imizamo Yethu residents.

At last I spoke with Bronwen Lankers-Byrne from Thrive, Thrive Hout Bay is a non-profit environmental organization with the mission: “Thrive Hout Bay is an organization that unites Hout Bay through environmental awareness events and action projects. We encourage every individual to make a difference that
will benefit the environment and the community residing in it.” (Welcome to Thrive, 2015) It is an organised civil society organization. They aim to operate for the whole Hout Bay area including Imizamo Yethu.
3 PEOPLE-CENTRED DEVELOPMENT APPROACH

The South-African Constitution is written only two decades ago in 1994 and is committed to a people-centred development approach. This is stated literally in the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) White Paper. The RDP White Paper “is a policy framework for integrated and coherent socio-economic progress. It seeks to mobilise all our people and our country’s resources toward the final eradication of the results of apartheid. Its goal is to build a democratic, non-racial and non-sexist future and it represents a vision for the fundamental transformation of South Africa.” (White Paper on Reconstruction and Development, 1994, p. 7) I will quote a few examples from the RDP White Paper that reflects the commitment to a people-centred development approach: “Government’s commitment to create a people-centred society …” (White Paper on Reconstruction and Development, 1994, p. 6) This principle is also stated in second of the six basic principles of the RDP:

“1.3.3 People-Driven

Second, this programme must become a people-driven process. Our people, with their aspirations and collective determination, are our most important resource. The RDP is focused on people’s immediate as well as long-term needs and it relies, in turn, on their energies. Irrespective of race or sex or age, or whether they are rural or urban, rich or poor, the people of South Africa must together shape their own future. Development is not about the delivery of goods to a passive citizenry. It is about involvement and growing empowerment. In taking this approach the Government will build on the many forums, peace structures and negotiations that our people are involved in through the land. The Government therefore commits itself to a maximum transparency and inclusivity.” (White Paper on Reconstruction and Development, 1994, p. 8)

The intentions of the government are clearly expressed in the RDP White Paper and says that “development is not about the delivery of goods to a passive
“citizenry” but about active involvement, participation and empowerment (de Beer, 2009).

### 3.1 History and Origins of the Theory

Disillusionment with the traditional, mainly Western dominated, development approaches in their failure to contest poverty in the developing world led to the search for an alternative. Traditional approaches claim that development primarily has an economic origin and will result out of the capital flow from wealthy to poor countries. We have for example the modernization theory, which states that development countries will follow a linear path of the Western industrialized countries. Rostow (1960) formulates five stages which primitive countries have to pass in order to become an advanced developed country. This theory was followed up by the dependency theory with Wallerstein as the most famous theorist. This theory didn’t believe in progress as ‘stages’ but was mainly economic focused. This theory states that there is a structural relation between countries, countries are integrated in the world system in a core-periphery relation. Developing countries are underdeveloped because they are in the world system structural dependent from the core and resources flow from the periphery to the developed core.

Years of practises demonstrates the failure of the traditional, Western orientated development theories. The traditional approaches, reflected in neo-liberal development programmes failed for several reasons described by Max-Neef (1991). Firstly, because it could encourage economic growth, but did not generate development. Second, the economic assumptions are mechanistic and cannot be adapted to the context of developing countries. The poor don’t benefit from the liberalization of the market from which they are excluded. In these traditional development theories growth is an end on itself. In the new People Centred Development approaches growth is seen as an economic condition that will bring development (Max-Neef, 1991, p. 6).

The People Centred Development Theory arises as an alternative approach for the traditional development approaches (Kapoor, 2002). International capital
transfer doesn’t automatically achieve sustainable development, on the contrary it can even work counterproductive. The chief beneficiaries of these foreign development assistance are often the military political powers. The development assistance first served the local political elites by corruption and patronage and never reached the poor (Korten, 1987).

This reality shows that development goals should cover more than primarily transferring financial capital. They should include the human will and capacity to invest this resources on a productive and sustainable way. Numerous theories and approaches have formed around the methods for participatory development. These are adopted by NGOs and international institutions and reflect the widespread shift in methods (Chambers, 1994). In 1984 David Korten formulates the concept People Centred Development (PCD), working as Asia’s regional adviser on development management for the United States Agency for International Development.

3.2 ‘NUTS AND BOLTS’ OF THE THEORY

Two decades ago PCD and participation became a core concept in development policies. Next we will briefly explain the theory.

In the 1950s and 1960s the paradigm of ‘things’ was dominant in development. This paradigm was determined by an economical approach, industrialisation and top-down approach. Although economic analysis continues to be dominant in the 1990s the paradigm of ‘people’ became more influential. NGOs, aid agencies and development policies favours putting people first. Top-down becomes bottom-up, and with this shift from power to those who are local and poor the development process can be described as an empowering process (Chambers, 1994). The new focus on participation find its origins in the realization of many development projects failures, top-down programmes where the projects don’t fit the needs and the insight that projects are more effective and sustainable if it is supported and empowered by local people (Chambers, 1994, p. 2). Gaventa (2013) argues to re-think the concept development and pleas instead to use ‘transformation’. But what are the
drivers of this transformation? In an economist's perspective, it is probably the market, for the political scientist, it might be the state. Gaventa (2013) identifies popular participation and civic engagement as the drivers for personal and social transformation in a society. Citizens can create rights through citizen engagement and citizen struggles. They become the “makers and shapers” of their transformation process. (Gaventa, June 2013) Like the name says, PCD emphasizes inclusiveness, local people and communities should take control over their own development process. Chambers pays particular attention in his work to marginalised and disadvantaged groups (Kapoor, 2002, p. 103).

Power relations on all scales are in this approach hierarchical relationships, described as ‘North’ and ‘South’, ‘Donors’ and ‘Recipients’, or to use Chambers’s words ‘Uppers’ and ‘Lowers’. ‘Lowers’ participate in activities set by ‘uppers’. This hierarchical relationship has to change, ‘uppers’ should become facilitators of the learning process instead of being the teachers (Chambers, 1994).

Dialogue is crucial in participation processes. William (2006) formulates three reasons why dialogue between state and citizen is so important. Firstly, dialogue creates empathy and a better understanding of the others standpoint. Secondly, dialogue creates trust between the participants and equality. Everybody has different information and experiences about a problem, but dialogue can cause an equal base. Finally concludes William (2006) dialogue encourage participants to listen without presumptions (Williams, 2006).

We have to be careful with romanticizing concepts as civic participation and ‘invented space’. Participation is too often seen as an utopia were poor, excluded citizens are empowered to transform relationships. The democratic potential of participation is often overrated. It is difficult to make a quantitative evaluation of the impact of participation and citizen engagement outcomes, because they do not explain different contexts or strategies. These insights are
better gained from comparative case studies, but these are limited due their small size and it’s difficult to make systematic reviews (Barrett, G. Gaventa, J., 2012). Gaventa points out that in a study of hundred cases 75 % of the outcomes were positive and 25 % were negative. These negative outcomes means a rising sense of disempowerment, manipulated participation, use of new skills for corrupt ends and the elites capture of the participatory process (Gaventa, June 2013). This study shows that participation is not an utopia. There is need for a more nuanced understanding that lead to failure or success (Gaventa, 2013, p. 72).

3.3 INSTITUTIONALIZING PARTICIPATION

To include the local people in the development processes there need to be created space for them in the decision-making process. Thinking about citizenship and participation raises the question to create these new mechanism of spaces for citizen participation. We can see that governments all over the world are challenged to build democratic policy where all the legal citizens can claim their rights as a citizen. Reforms in constitution provide spaces for citizens to negotiate, intermediate and exchange information. It is the nature of these new institutional arrangements that emerges, these spaces, that will define the level of inclusiveness and participatory democracy (Kapoor, 2002). Chatterjee points out that there are two ways to look at participation. Participation has a different meaning seen from standpoint of those who govern, participation as a category of governance. The second standpoint is of those who are governed, participation as a practice of democracy (Chatterjee, 2004, p. 60).

Participation cannot be seen without the aspect of power. Creating spaces of participation is making opportunities for civil participation in the domain of policy. To borrow Penderis explanation of spaces, “participation takes place in a variety of spaces created for different reasons, by different stakeholders, with different terms of engagement and different sets of dynamics” (Penderis, 2010). Gaventa (2006) makes the distinction between three types of spaces. Firstly he
identifies ‘closed spaces’, this space is exclusively for policymakers and everybody else is denied access to this process (Gaventa, Finding the Spaces for Change: A Power Analysis, 2006).

Secondly, if this space is created by the government authorities to create a forum for citizen to participate we can speak of ‘invited space’, according to Cornwall (2004). The policymaker is the person in power with the expertise to facilitate participation processes with the citizens who are approached by the government as population. The targets of participation policies is a homogenous construct of the nation (Chatterjee, Population and Political Society, 2004, p. 36). Although this can offer a meaningful forum for citizen to participate and collaborate, citizens have a limited responsibility and are able to participate as formally provided in the institution. The relation between state-citizen is hierarchical and can undermine the meaningful participation. A second risk is that the institutional spaces will reflect the previous social relations and interplay of relations of power in earlier times (Penderis, 2010).

In contrast there is a ‘participatory sphere’ outside the legal institutions and formal bureaucracy through which citizens claim their demands such as lobbying, protesting, direct action, insurgency and other forms of popular politics. This last space is the participation from those who are governed, this is participation as a practice of democracy. This space challenge the ‘invited space’ which treats the citizens as a homogenous population. This is a space of resistance were people voluntarily participate to make entitlement of the citizens right they’re denied. Heterogeneous participants give diverse interpretations of participation with the target to influence the decision-making process. This new space opened by this last group is called the ‘popular space’, ‘claimed space’ or the ‘invented space’ (Cornwall, A. Coelho, V.).

The continuum of these three spaces are constantly in dynamic interaction with each other as Penderis highlights these spaces are “constantly opening and closing through struggles for legitimacy and resistance, co-optation and
confrontation” (Penderis, 2010). Foucault draws attention to the heterogeneous nature of space, they are a complex cluster of social relations.

“The space in which we live, which draws us out of ourselves, in which the erosion of our lives, our time and our history occurs, the space that claws and gnaws at us, is also, in itself, a heterogeneous space … We do not live inside a void that could be colored with diverse shades of light, we live inside a set of relations that delineates sites which are irreducible to one another and absolutely not super imposable on one another.” (Foucault 1967 cited by Penderis, 2010, p. 13)

3.4 WHY PCD IS A GOOD THEORY

Globally there is a shift in attitude visible towards informal settlements. While the policy used to approach these negatively nowadays there is a more positive policy according to the United Nations Human Settlements Programme, 2003. “National approaches to slums, and to informal settlements in particular, have generally shifted from negative policies such as forced eviction, benign neglect and involuntary resettlement, to more positive policies such as self-help and in situ upgrading, enabling and rights-based policies.” (United Nations Human Settlements Programme, 2003) The policy will be more effective if this is inclusive and if all the citizen are involved. “It has long been recognized that the poor play a key role in the improvement of their own living conditions and that their participation in decision-making is not only a right, thus an end in itself, but is also instrumental in achieving greater effectiveness in the implementation of public policies.” (United Nations Human Settlements Programme, 2003) PCD sees the whole population, as well as slum dwellers, as rights-bearing citizens who are the drivers for their transformation-process. This is in contrast with the traditional and neo-liberal approaches who focus on market mechanisms with citizens as consumers (Gaventa, June 2013).

Gaventa (2013) coded the outcomes from participation programmes from a hundred case studies from twenty countries to understand the outcomes of
citizen engagement. In 75% these outcomes were positive and contributed to the development goals, in 25% these had a negative outcome. The first conclusion Gaventa (2013) made in this research is “engagement is important because it helps form better citizens: citizens who are aware of their rights to participate in the first place, and are more confident of their ability to do so.” (Gaventa, June 2013, p. 9) It is not evident that people are aware of their citizenship, through citizen engagement they gain more civic and political knowledge and awareness of their rights as citizen. Citizen learn the capabilities needed for participation. This is Gaventa’s second conclusion, “citizen engagement builds more effective participation practices.” (Gaventa, June 2013, p. 10) The third conclusion of this study was “citizen engagement contribution to development results, for example in improved health, water, sanitation or education.” (Gaventa, June 2013, p. 11) This points out that citizen engagement contributes to strengthening governance. The final conclusion is that “participation is important at this higher level not just for policy change or service delivery: it can also contribute to more pluralistic societies, bringing new voices and issues into the public arena, providing a sense of recognition, social identity and dignity which are important for a sense of inclusion.” (Gaventa, June 2013, p. 11) Gaventa underlines that participation does not always work, 25% of the outcomes were negative as in creating a sense of disempowerment, use of new skills for corrupt ends and the elites capture of the participatory process. Gaventa remarks it is significant that most of the negative examples of participation were not the result of failures of people to effectively participate, but rather failures of governments to respond (Gaventa, June 2013).

Democracy as defined by Diamond (2008) includes the active participation of citizens in governance. Elections is one element, but those who are elected on behalf of the citizens are required to consult and involve citizens in the decision making process. This inclusive participation is set central in the South African Constitution, but the participation in South Africa has been unequal for historical reasons. These imbalances are a jeopardy for the democracy. It is the
challenge to avoid patterns of marginalisation and exclusion by creating spaces through the majority of the citizens can participate. The theory of participatory spaces helps to understand the shortcomings of the ‘invited space’ and can help to facilitate ways to overcome the gap with the ‘invented space’ (Ginwala, 2001).

The shift from ‘things’ and the donor logic to ‘people’ in development policy can only be encouraged. Citizen participation contributes to governance and democratic outcomes. As Menocal and Sharma (as cited by Barrett and Gaventa, 2012) outline “increasing citizens’ voice will make public institutions more responsive to citizens’ needs and demands and therefore more accountable for their actions” (Barrett, G. Gaventa, J., 2012, p. 3). This theory is useful to give decision-makers a good understanding what difference citizen participation can make to development. Barrett and Gaventa (2012) made the remark that although citizen engagement contributes to good governance and improve development outcomes, yet there are negative outcomes as well. Outcomes vary according the type of citizen engagement and the political context. These conditions have implications for the institutionalised participation and have to be taken into account (Barrett, G. Gaventa, J., 2012). For this reason and because the participatory spaces are a dialectical process it is important to have a good understanding of the dynamics of both the legal framework and the ‘invented space’ and the interaction between the two.

3.5 CONCEPTS

3.5.1 Citizenship
The common sense understanding of citizenship as described by Faulks (2000) is “Citizens formally enjoy legitimate and equal membership of a society”. As a citizen this means membership of a nation state with the accompanying rights and obligations. The definition implies the legal status as a citizen. Heather makes this strong connection between nation-state and citizenship. Heather (2004 p.2) defines citizenship as “This defines the relationship of the individual
not to another individual (…) or a group (…), but essentially to the idea of the
state." Without a nation-state there is no citizenship. This is a hierarchical
relationship, the state provides as a patron services and protection. Citizenship
evolves as political identity together with the state.

By looking at the evolution of rights in England acquired via citizenship, Marshall
distinguishes citizenship in three parts civil, social and political rights. The first
element is the civil freedoms, such as liberty of the person, freedom of speech,
the right to own property and the right to justice. Secondly we have the political
rights. This is what Marshall (2009, p. 149) describes as “the right to participate
in the exercise of political power”. The last element is the social rights, “the
whole range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to
the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilised
being according to the standards prevailing in the society.” (Marshall T., 2009,
p. 149) For example education and social services. The substance of citizenship
is broader than just membership to the state. It also means that you as an
autonomous and independent individual can access your rights and that you
have the possibility to participate in the affairs of politics (Marshall, 2009). The
‘Invited space’ is a state-centric vision of citizen participation. The formal space
of participation is provided for the citizens, but who lacks the substance of
citizenship is access to this ‘invited space’ denied. These groups excluded from
full citizenship rights have to participate in alternative ways in the affairs of
politics. This doesn’t mean that everyone who’s operating in the ‘invented
space’ is excluded from citizenship and all the citizens’ rights.

However, this is an ideal image and is in contrast to the reality of citizenship. As
Isin and Turner states in their Handbook of Citizenship Studies (2002):

“Rather than merely focusing on citizenship as legal rights (…) a social
process through which individuals and social groups engage in claiming,
expanding, or losing rights (…) a sociologically informed definition of
citizenship in which the emphasis is less on legal rules and more on norms,
practices, meanings, and identities” (Isin, 2002)
There is an inherent tension between the ideal and the reality. Citizenship is a process of inclusion and exclusion where the excluded struggle for their substantive citizenship. This citizenship here conceptualized is the ideality. In this paper we’re taking a look at the reality, what kind of citizen rights do the residents have in the cases? Do they have the substance of citizenship needed to participate in urban governance?

3.5.2 Participation

“By participation, I do not mean simple consultation: I mean the right to participate in decisions that affect our lives, the ability of people to act upon and to change the world, to shape their own futures. Ideally, such engagement is not only about participation in the development project, it is to help define and to shape the meaning and quality of development itself” (Participation as defined by John Gaventa, From Development to Transformation: Citizen Engagement for Social and Cignitive Justice, June 2013)

The concept participation is not new. Before the rise of the PCD participation was a core element in government. But we can see that the concept of participation is experiencing a renaissance since the 1990s, the meaning of participation changed (Chambers, 1994, p. 1). Participation was restricted through voting and lobbying. Citizens couldn’t get their full citizenship rights as distinguished by the typology of Marshall. It is only recently that ‘community participation’ and citizen engagement in policy formation is institutionalised. These shifts changed the discussion of participation as social and political right (Cornwall, A. Gaventa, J., 1999).

In the 1970s citizens demanded involvement in decision-making processes all over the world. The forms of participation that emerged were largely consultative mechanisms. People got involved in different types of councils, social services and committees. People became motivated to articulate broader demands and there was a growing frustration over the limitations of this narrow type of user involvement type of participation. Participation became more active as people also wanted to be involved in the policy
formulation. The concept of participation moved from users of services provided by the state towards one in which citizens became agents in the process of governance. Participation made a shift from the focus on users to a direct concern with the three types rights of citizens (Cornwall, A. Gaventa, J., 1999).

Participation is a much discussed concept in the work of scholars. Arnstein (1969) made a typology of eight levels of participations, represented as a ‘ladder of participation’. The ladder range from non-participation as the weakest form of involvement of citizens towards citizen power at the top (Arsntein, 1969). Verba (1995) made the classic typology voting, campaign-activities, informal contacts and involvement in community-activities. Patterson (2000) completes this typology by drawing attention to, that not participating at the formal structures is a way to make your displeasure clear and thus a form of activism. Bayat (2002) pursues and points out that activism is every form of human activity that has the ends to make changes in citizens lives: “As a generic term, "activism" refers to any kind of human activity-individual or collective, institutional or informal-that aims to engender change in people's lives. As an antithesis of passivity, "activism" includes many types of activities, ranging from survival strategies and resistance to more sustained forms of collective action and social movements.” (Bayat, 2002)

### 3.6 Conclude
This research looks at participation from different viewpoints. The ‘invited space’ or formal participation processes and the ‘invented space’, the informal grassroots forms of participation. Participation in the formal, democratic structures doesn’t automatically evolve in democratic outcomes. The South African government fails to include the marginalized population groups. The limitations of the ‘invited space’ will help shape the dynamics of the ‘invented space’. These groups are more focused on the alternative sphere of participation and various innovative forms of participation. These groups are participating in the ‘invented space’ but this doesn’t mean that they gain more citizens’ rights or that their demands are met. The interaction between state
and civil society is complex. They are not separate levels who can insure inclusivity. Actors on both levels engage and are in interaction, so are the spaces (Coelho, 2011).
4 Invited Space in the South African Context

As we can see after the democratic transition in South Africa the government engages to put participation of all citizens as a focal point and this on all levels of governance especially in local government. In article 152 of the Constitution this goal is written:

**(1)** The objects of local government are - (a) to provide democratic and accountable government for local communities; (b) to ensure the provision of services to communities in a sustainable manner; (c) to promote social and economic development; (d) to promote a safe and healthy environment; and (e) to encourage the involvement of communities and community organizations in the matters of local government.

**(2)** A municipality must strive, within its financial and administrative capacity, to achieve the objects set out in subsection (1) (Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, December 1996)

In South Africa numerous White Papers are written. These White Papers have a commitment to people-centered development and takes the constitutional goals for equality and inclusion as a starting point. The White Paper on Local Government and the White Paper on Urban Development Strategy of 1998 focuses on the development of local governance. The White papers committed the government to actively promote public participation and are dedicated specifically to involve excluded and marginalized groups in policy (Van Donk, 2007). This is further concretized at local level in the Local Government Municipal Systems Act of 2001. This Act encourages local authorities to draw up a Integrated Development Plan. We can see that the policy documents have tried to ensure the participation of residents in local policy but a formal guaranteed frame for citizen participation is not a guarantee that citizens will make use of this opportunity.
In the South African context the grassroots level is supposed to participate in the ward committees. The ward committee is the lowest formal system of local governance in South Africa. It is here that the notion of participation is institutionalized in the democratic state. This is full of implementation problems. Williams (2007) emphasize that participation doesn’t necessarily conduct to visible results and sometimes is reduced to a more ceremonially representation of citizens in local institutions. South Africa is challenged to build more effective channels of participation between state and citizen (Williams, 2007). Tapscott (2007) gives an example of this in his research. South African cities are assumed to make use of an active process of public consultation in drafting the Integrated Development Plan to engage the citizens and to discover the local priorities. Tapscott points out that it is common for cities to not get their information through public consultation, but get their information from secondary sources or use a template. This causes a lack of local relevance where participation is seen more as a mandatory task rather than as a necessary task of the local government (Tapscott, 2007).

In South Africa it is the challenge to make this ‘invited space’ more inclusive. As Van Bouchaute (2012) says the homogenization of these democratic participation processes disregards the inequality in participation. Socio-economical stronger elites will make more use of this participation processes than socio-economic weaker groups, like the Isiqalo residents in my case. The formally and theoretically guaranteed equality is not realized because the policy disregard the socio-economic inequality (Van Bouchaute, 2012). Because the government fails in reaching the excluded groups they make alternative spaces, the residents will focus more on the ‘invented space’ (Cornwall, 2004).

Furthermore this research wants to highlight two important remarks according the participatory spaces.

1. **Dichotomy between ‘invented’ and ‘invited space’ works polarizing**
We have to be careful with the dichotomy between ‘invented’ and ‘invited space’, because this can be polarizing. The deputy minister of Cooperative Governance, Yunus Carrim gave a speech on 11 April 2011 as a response on the publication of “Recognising Community Voice and Dissatisfaction”. This publication polarize the ‘invented space’ and ‘inviting space’. The institutional framework for public participation is limited and not inclusive. For this reason citizens are creating their own spaces because they are dissatisfied. Carrim (2011) formulates the counter critique in his speech. The two spaces can be complementary. The ‘invited spaces’ are not only created by the government, but they are also the result of mass struggles by the ordinary people. The ‘invented spaces’ created by civic movements in the eighties and nineties are constitutionalised in laws, the Municipal Systems Act is an example of legislation. ‘Invited spaces’ can be the outcomes of the ‘invented spaces’ and ‘invented spaces’ can contribute to broaden ‘invited spaces’. The conception in the publication of ‘invented’ and ‘invited spaces’ makes an abstraction of the state above the people. But it pays no attention that the state is also shaped by the people and by their needs, struggles and interests. Both are important and should not be seen separately. There is a dialectical relationship between the ‘invented’ and ‘invited space’.

2. ‘Invited space’ has to be inclusive in order to overcome further marginalisation

The theory of participatory spaces has the underlying normative assumption that citizens are ready to participate in the opportunities they are offered, that they have the knowledge and capacities and that bureaucrats are willing to listen. However multiple conditions prevent people from engaging in this participatory process such as poverty, lack of resources and education. This causes a distinction between those who are able to use these opportunities and those who are unaware that these opportunities exist. In a research of the Parliamentary Support Programme (2001) is suggested that the new ‘invited space’ widen the gap between the two groups by benefiting those citizens who were already privileged and have the capacities and knowledge to find
their way to the ‘invited spaces’ by giving them a disproportionate say in national affairs. The challenge therein is to ensure that the opportunities are exploited by the whole population and overcomes barriers such as poor transport and infrastructure, language difficulties, illiteracy, inequality and other factors which harm equal participation (Villiers, 2001). Governments are best to figure out how citizens do participate in the given context and their own spaces and build support for these, instead of simply creating new participatory spaces and inviting citizens in. The risk is here that the new space will be filled with the same elite voices. In order to create active citizens governments need to build awareness and networks that enables inclusive forms of participation (Gaventa, 2013, p. 72).

Citizen participation is a complex process and can have negative effects such as conflict and social fragmentation if it’s weakly organized. Mafukidze decides that for this reason it is necessarily for the decision-makers behind the ‘invited space’ to have a good socio-cultural knowledge of the aimed population to avoid this negative effects (Mafukidze, 2009).
5 CASES INVENTED SPACE

5.1 ISIQALO CASE

5.1.1 Citizenship

It’s important to understand the notion of citizenship in the case to contain what the people see as their rights and which components they don’t have access to. The idea of civil citizenship of Marshall involved fundamental legal changes, as well as changes in cultural attitude. For example this was an incentive for new understandings of the individual’s right to work. The residents talk about their rights to work and the monthly rotating system to maximize work opportunities for local people within the settlement fits in this logic. Citizens expect that it is their right to work and that city should organize work opportunities (Barnett, C. Low, M., 2004, p. 96).

The service delivery protest are an outing of the people claiming their citizenship and the accompanying rights, in suggestion that citizenship is a claim rather than a status. Social rights are demanded as fundamental rights belonging to their citizenship. The state should guarantee a minimum supply of services such as collecting rubbish. “These rights included, most prominently, minimum governmental provisions in the areas of health, education and housing, but extended to encompass a more general egalitarian claim to a level of social reproduction of all individuals above poverty level, and even toward a level of material satisfaction and enjoyment.” (Barnett, C. Low, M., 2004, p. 97)

By not performing the rubbish collection and not hearing the residents’ complaints the government denied their social rights. Cape Town rubbish collection plan was not shaped by political rights in the space of democracy, no formal participation and involvement of the citizens in the political sphere was allowed. Instead it was associated with clientelism. The government aims to provide welfare for their citizens in terms of the obligation to provide services, such as water, sanitation, rubbish collection, housing … to ‘the poor’.
The emergence of new citizenship formations is not always improving upon or expanding the possibilities for greater equality and justice for all. In the nearby settlements Rondevlei there were frustrations about the Isiqalo protests and on 16 February 2015 there was a meeting where residents gathered and formulated their complaints. They said they felt hostage in their community and weren’t able to go to their work because of the blocked Jakes Gerwel Drive. By the inconvenience the Isiqalo protest caused, they harm the access to the public spaces and the rights of the Rondevlei residents. These form of protests infringe the citizens’ rights of the nearby residents and causes no equal justice for all. Natalie Bent, the councillor for the Ward of the Rondevlei settlement called the Isiqalo protests ‘lawlessness’.

The remark has to be made here that the Isiqalo residents only started using forms of popular politics with an illegal connotation after their political citizens’ rights were violated and their demands towards the mayor were ignored. The Isiqalo protests called ‘lawlessness’ by councillor Bent are making the violating by the state and the law public.

5.1.2 Relation with the state

It is in the constitution were citizens inhabit the domain of theory. In the ‘invited space’ the relation with the Cape Town government and Isiqalo residents can be described as population. The state secures legitimacy not by participation of citizens but by claiming to provide for the wellbeing of the population. Cape Town hired eleven workers to collect the rubbish, without hearing the needs of the informal settlements. The relation between the state and the Isiqalo residents is signified as population. The implemented rubbish collection policy doesn’t take the needs and claims of the residents in account, it want to reach one standard general level. The residents don’t have full citizenship because the political rights are denied since the residents are not allowed to participate in the exercise of political power. The language of bureaucratic governance is more important in the case. And afterwards the residents were excluded from the domain of policy, they didn’t get access to the mayor and
their letters were ignored. We can see that governance is less a matter of politics, more of administrative policy (Chatterjee, 2004).

According to Marshall (2009) there is no democratic citizenship because their rights are formally recognized, but not practiced. The Isiqalo residents are treated as population and their relation with the state is a patron-client relation. The bureaucratic state takes the first standpoint of participation as a category of governance, rather than as a practice of democracy (Chatterjee, 2004). The residents don’t engage the state as provided but they find alternatives to engage the state, that’s what Chatterjee called the political society. This has emptied of all bureaucratic engagement of citizens with politics. In next chapter we’re looking which actions and forms of popular politics the residents are using to reclaim the spaces.

5.1.3 Popular Politics

5.1.3.1 What are they claiming?
The residents were asking two important claims. First the people were dissatisfied about the selection of people working on the cleaning project in Isiqalo. Instead to select locals for three months the rubbish removal contractor Chippa hired eleven people for one year. The citizens don’t want contractors from outside the settlement to clean the settlement, when people living in the settlement itself who are in need of work can do it. Second there was unhappiness over services in the area, complaints that rubbish had not been collected were falling in deaf ears.

5.1.3.2 What are the actions?
Let us now look at the actions of the residents. What are the forms of popular politics used to break through their status as population and to gain the full status as citizen. How are the residents reclaiming the democratic spaces.

We can distinguish different channels of mediation used by the residents. First of all the residents utilise legal forms of democratic authorisation to make their demands known to the state, they wanted to mediate about the employment
project. When the state ignored this, they used the direct channels and wrote a letter to the mayor and only after this was ignored they started to protest and occupy public spaces. Even this protesting can be seen as democratic citizenship. These are the resources poor people have. The weapons of the weak might have undemocratic means but they’re used for a democratic outcome (Robins, 2014). This notion of rights through protest we will find back in Holston’s (2009) conception of ‘insurgent citizenship’. The protest in the Isiqalo case looks to disrupt the state’s policy order and demand a rights-based alternative. The residents demand their substance of citizenship, the right to participate in policy-making around development (Piper, 2015).

Unruly politics are only used as a tool when the formal access to the space of politics was denied. It is only after the formal ways were denied that people go and create spaces that are occupied illegally. The residents were not involved in the policymaking processes of the rubbish collection project and their complaints were not heard. It is only when they start to use protests and other forms of insurgency that they become visible in the city. This is very contradictory. The policy doesn’t recognize the existence of the residents and they’re eradicated in the policy making process. So the residents are forced to become encroachers. And because they encroach, this gives the city an incentive to exclude them from the formal processes in the city and citizenship rights (Sanvig, 2007).

The actions of the citizens show some similarities and some differences with the insurgent citizenship of Holston. The style is the same as Holston describes in the Brazilian society. The forms of popular politics the citizens are forced into are not necessarily violent, but it has a violent connotation. The forms of insurgence used are more than protesting and burning tires. It’s not only destroying and rebelling, it’s also reclaiming the city. The residents don’t have easy access to political institutions, but they want to engage in the state properly. By acting disruptive the residents try to open the space from below and influence and get access to the political institutions. The actions of the residents confronted the state with its absence as a provider of essential services but the residents
don’t give an alternative order, the actions are ad hoc, not organised and there is not a common sense of justice, solidarity (Holston, 2008).

5.1.4 Conclusion
The PCD principles are reflected in the South African Constitution, but are not practiced in this case. The contradiction between the statement that “development is not about delivering the goods to a passive citizenry” (White Paper on Reconstruction and Development, 1994, p. 8) and the reality becomes visible in the Isiqalo case. In this case we see that the state relates to the residents as population who has to be governed with bureaucratic rule rather than democratic citizens who have rights. The state is challenged in the ‘invented space’ by the Isiqalo residents demonstrating where they are excluded from possessing the rights of full citizenship.

Citizenship is a product of the interaction of civil society and the state. It is a actively created and negotiate status that is shifted by processes and movements. For example how citizenship formation changed in this case, by protesting and forms of popular politics the residents get access to the state, therefor this was not the case. They tried formal ways as handing letters, but they were not heard. By protests they struggled for their rights as citizen and were successfully able to influence the shape and direction of state practices and created new spaces for themselves.

The bureaucratic government operates on a heterogeneous social field. It guarantees no equality/uniform exercise of the rights of citizenship. Success of the residents claims depends on their ability to mobilize support in the ‘invented space’ and influence the implementation of governmental policy in their favour. The residents employ whatever strategy that will achieve their demands, but also the state responds in multiple ways, from rejecting to recognising their citizenship rights. But this success is temporary and contextual; It doesn’t give a new conceptualizing of democracy and citizenship. The used forms of popular politics didn’t changed the ‘invited space’. It made the violation of their citizens’ rights public and the limitations of the ‘invited space’ visible.
In the next cases we will focus on the different forms of citizenship and the different ways to engage the state within one area, Hout Bay.

5.2 Imizamo Yethu
We will focus on the township Imizamo Yethu in Hout Bay. What different forms of citizenship are there, what kinds of popular politics do they use and how do they relate to the state? We spoke to three different groups of citizens. Firstly we look at a group of local South Africans and how they engage the state. Secondly we focus on a group of South African foreigners, these are mostly Zimbabweans who came to South Africa to work here. And finally we will look at a civil society organisation, The Thrive and how they engage the state. In conclusion we will compare how these three cases relate to each other.

5.2.1 Local South Africans
Several families were homeless as a result of the fire in 2004. When they wanted to rebuild the housings, the state claimed the ground to be his and forbade the Imizamo Yethu citizens to squat on this ground, so now the families live there in illegality. Thus while many of the residents live here for decades their land title is illegal seen from the governments perspective. What we can see here is that their right to property and to ownership is denied and that the citizens are forced into illegal squatting. Consequently these groups are excluded from basic urban services. Electricity is accessed illegally, people make difficult constructions with wires to get their own electricity connection. The practice of the Imizamo Yethu citizens to connect electricity wires is an example of Holston’s (2007) ‘insurgent citizenship’. The everyday practices of the citizens is disrupting the entrenched. It is a form of ‘invented space’ at its most active. Cape Town City Council is responsible to provide services and infrastructure but is shortcoming (Harte, W. Childs, I. Hastings, P., 2008). The social rights of the residents here are denied as well, since basic services as sanitation and electricity are lacking. In the Thrive case I discussed that the local community leaders are corrupt, so this is no positive news for the political rights. According to Marshall (2009) we can see that the Imizamo Yethu residents have formal
rights as stated in the constitution, but these are not practiced. Their substance of citizenship is denied (Marshall T., 2009).

In the developmental state only the culturally equipped elite can exercise their rights, the rest of the society is doomed to be treated as population of political society. Local citizens use different forms of popular politics and mediation to transform themselves from subjects into citizens (Shankar, 2014). These group lives in illegal squats and make illegal use of electricity, this is what Chatterjee recognizes in the Indian context as well “populations whose very livelihood involve violation of the law” (Chatterjee, 2004, p. 40), but the governmental institutions cannot ignore them either. The citizens know that they are tapping electricity illegal or dumping there faeces in the river or squatting illegally, but they have no alternative since the government lack in delivering these services to the entire population. The residents are claiming for improvement of their livelihood circumstances. We see that the successes of popular politics depends on the ability of the population to influence the implementation of governmental policy in their favour (Chatterjee, 2004).

When walking down the street with the local SANCO leader it is outstanding to see he greets everybody. The street is being used as a passive network were informal contacts among the residents are developed. The street is a public space, a sphere were marginalized groups gather. According to Bayat (1997) a common threat can activate a passive network. The common threat of eviction can turn this passive network into an active network of collective action (Bayat, 1997, p. 64)

5.2.2 Foreigner residents
Foreigner residents migrated to Imizamo Yethu with the hope to improve their lives, they settled in Imizamo Yethu on illegally established plots. Most of them are illegal and cannot practice legal jobs. This trend is parallel with Bayats analyse of popular activities in Iran’s cities in 1950s (Bayat, 1997, p. 53). Urbanisation let citizens move in illegality to the cities to survive or improve their life. But because they cannot afford housing, they build illegal settlements.
This group of foreigners does not have the legal status of a citizen as described by Faulks (2000) as “Citizens formally enjoy legitimate and equal membership of a society” and can for this reason not appeal to the accompanying rights and obligations of their membership of a society. “Citizenship is a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community” (Marshall T., 2009, p. 149) This has implications for our case of the foreigners in Imizamo Yethu, since they are not a full member of society that cannot claim the status as citizen and the belonging rights and duties. But the substance of citizenship is broader than just membership to the state. Marshall (2009) distinguishes citizenship in three parts. The group of foreigners is also excluded from citizenship in Marshalls opinion. The first element is the civil rights, but their status as illegal resident alienated them from gaining access to these rights. Second are the political rights, but foreigners are not allowed to vote. The last one are the social rights. In an interview with one of the Zimbabweans said that he was afraid to go to the police after a robbery in his shop, this indicates that this group is also excluded from social rights (Marshall T., 2009). This group is excluded from citizenship in legal and in substantive means and are forced to act in a sphere of illegality.

Because they are illegal they organise themselves autonomously and try to acquire demands illegally by tapping electricity, they settle quietly, organise their own jobs. The foreigners who are legally marginalised from citizenship start claiming all these domains besides the authorities (Bayat, 1997). This form of popular politics is what Bayat calls ‘the quiet encroachment of the ordinary’: “a silent, patient, protracted, and pervasive advancement of ordinary people on the propertied and powerful in order to survive hardships and better their lives.” (Bayat, 1997, p. 57) The foreigners live in illegality and try to avoid the state. They organise a life outside the bureaucratic state (Bayat, 1997).

We can see that these foreigners are not only marginalised from the state, but also in their own community Imizamo Yethu. Within the community we identify what Holston calls ‘differentiated citizenship’. This is based on unequalitarian rights (Holston, 2008). This paradox is a process parallel with the Brazilian society
Holston describes: “The paradigm of citizenship this man describes produces the paradox he denounces: Brazilians can consider some Brazilians as “citizens” who have rights and other Brazilians as “marginal” who lack rights – a distinction that only makes sense from within the system of differentiated citizenship that treats some Brazilians as if they were not citizens because, for reasons that have nothing to do with their national membership, they are denied rights.” (Holston, 2008, p. 255) The difference with Holston is here the last part of the quote “for reasons that have nothing to do with their national membership”. With the foreigners in Imizamo Yethu the reasons of their exclusion is related to their nationality and race. Social qualifications are used here to organize the political, civil and social rights and are responsible for the distribution of inequalities.

In Imizamo Yethu there is a gradation in rights, citizens can exercise them as the privilege of certain social categories. Under the marginalised group of township residents, the foreigners are even more marginalised within the community. A local isiXhosa speaking South African has more access to rights than the foreigner Zimbabwean. Piper (2015) gives an example for this; The SANCO meetings in Imizamo Yethu are held in isiXhosa, so non-isiXhosa speaking South Africans and foreigners are excluded from the political citizenship. Although if you ask who SANCO represent the answer is ‘the community’. The foreigners in Imizamo Yethu are not seen as part of the community (Piper, 2015). If we reflect back to Chatterjee we can see that it is not property that divides the Imizamo Yethu community, but race (Chatterjee, 2004). We spoke to foreign South Africans who lived in Imizamo Yethu they indicated that they are ‘tolerated in the community’. But when people burgle and steal no one helped because they are foreigners and they don’t have the same access to citizenship within the community. They couldn’t go to the police either, because of their illegality the formal institutions don’t help them. They rely on a highly autonomous space instead of the formal institutions.

Thus to conclude the foreigners don’t interact with the state. They avoid it and live in illegality. They organise a life outside the ‘invited space’. The space in
which the residents participate is one without and in absence of the state. (Cornwall, 2004).

5.2.3 Civil society organisation Thrive
Finally we spoke with Bronwen Lankers-Byrne (Lankers-Byrne, 2015) of civil society organisation Thrive. It is an environmental organisation. In the interviews Bronwen stated that Thrive doesn’t work with local community leaders in Imizamo Yethu after they received death threats and Bronwen accuses them of corruption. Instead Thrive focuses on the schools. By doing this, Thrive actually builds a culture of active citizenship as described by Fleish and Robins: “knowledge about the Constitution, efficient organisational skills, coupled with savvy tactics of social mobilisation in poor neighbourhoods, can contribute towards substantive social transformation.” (Fleish, B. Robins, S., 2014, p. 130) Also parallel with the case Fleish and Robins describes is the focus on the younger citizens in Imizamo Yethu and the schools. With giving priority to education the Thrive embraces a nonviolent organisational culture and believes in long term capacity building, this is parallel with the pedagogies of active citizenship. Thrive does rights based public education to create active citizenship concerned around environmental issues (Fleish, B. Robins, S., 2014).

Thrive uses both the direct, formal and the informal ways of mediation with the state. They use rights talk, go to meetings, they network, lobby, they write articles and petitions, they give workshops in schools … As stated above the local community leaders and ward committee in Hout Bay are not used, since they are corrupt. In Chatterjee’s opinion this organisation is situated in the civil society. Thrive represents the organised elite, these are the practices of the ‘bourgeois civil society’, although it the organisation states to be there for the whole of Hout Bay, and Imizamo Yethu as well. Chatterjee describes this: “Civil society as an ideal continues to energize an interventionist political project, but as an actually existing form it is demographically limited.” In reality the civil society is demographically limited till the mountain, there where Imizamo Yethu starts.
The community in Hout Bay is divided by property. The Thrive and the wealthy white community agreed that everyone has the right for a good environment and their children have the right to play in a clean river, the Disa River. They blame the faeces of the illegal slums in Imizamo Yethu for the pollution of the river, without taking into account that these people don’t have good access to sanitation and that they have the rights to good sanitation and a healthy environment as well. We can see that in this community due property equal citizen rights are undermined (Chatterjee, 2004). Lack of property of poverty is for Arendt (as cited by Das, V, 2015) not to the realm of politics but to the household. When this enters the realm of politics it endangers equal citizenship (Das, 2015).

Bronwen highlighted a curiously phenomenon. The Hout Bay community is highly concerned with the environment and they claim to have the right for a clean river. The community blames the informal settlement for polluting the river, but Bronwen points us at the construction of the housings. These are thusly built that the wastewater of the swimming pools is dumped straight in the river. How can they claim to have the right for a clean river if they help polluting the river themselves by dumping their wastewater – full of chlorine en chemicals- in the river? Holston (2008) helps us explaining this, the Hout Bay community legitimates their claims on the basis of their contributions to the city itself. “Thus although the identity of stakeholder is without doubt the strongest among owners of real property, residents very generally view home ownership, taxpaying, and consumption as evidence of their stakes in the city. This conviction not only legitimizes their demands for rights to the city. It also gives residents the sense that they are citizens of the city.” (Holston, 2008, p. 262) The citizens claim these ‘contributor rights’ because they belong with their identity of property owner. If the identity of property owner is crucial to legitimate claims, squatters and the people in the informal settlement Imizamo Yethu are excluded from these rights. This division of owners and squatters is antagonistic and the distinction between owners and others is crucial for the moral of the Hout Bay citizens. Their status as owner gives them the sense that they are
citizens, the squatters are marginal in their opinion (Holston, 2008). The argument they make is that who owns property and pay taxes has the rights to make use of the river. It is the faeces of the illegal squatters on the mountain, the squatters who don’t contribute to the city, which pollute the river.

5.3 IMPLICATIONS FOR DEMOCRACY
South Africa made a democratic transition, but as we can see the quality of the democracy and the quality of the citizenship developed uneven. In the words of Holston and Caldeira (as cited by Barnett and Low in Spaces of Democracy) we can see South Africa as an “‘uncivil democracy’ caused by a ‘disjunction’ between the successful democratization of political institutions and the limited changes to the civil components of citizenship” (Barnett, C. Low, M., 2004, p. 163). In the case we see that the citizen rights of the residents, according to Marshall, are violated. If we use citizen rights as a measurement for democracy we can conclude that the theoretic democratic institutions are not democratic in practice. South Africa is in this regard an uncivil democracy. But we don’t need a democratic state to have democratic citizens. The forms of insurgence of the citizens makes the violation of the citizen rights public and helps to extent democracy even though the citizens use forms of popular politics which don’t look democratic at first sight such as burning tires, blocking the road, protesting ...

In this sight the forms of popular politics in this case are democracy enhancing. As in the Isiqalo case, the residents who were not heard by the state before make this violation by the state public and gave new understanding of their rights and access to citizenship. I have to remark that this is only temporary and in this case. It doesn’t create a new conceptualization of citizenship.

Chantal Mouffe (2005) states that the recognition of social division and the legitimation of conflict is central in a democratic society:

“It brings to the fore the existence in a democratic society of a plurality of interests and demands which, although they conflict and can never be finally reconciled, should nevertheless be considered as legitimate.
The very content of left and right will vary, but the dividing line should remain because its disappearance would indicate that social division is denied an that an ensemble of voices has been silenced. This is why democratic politics is by nature necessarily adversarial." (Mouffe, 2005, p. 120)

In the cases we see a clear division between the government and the Isiqalo residents and a division in how the citizens relate to the state in the Houtbay area. Citizens are not given the equal possibility to decide in the policy that applies to them. Social division cannot be expressed and conflict is not seen as legitimate, this endangers the democratic society. Chantal Mouffe recalls that not all the demands formulated in a democratic society has to be seen as pluralistic legitimate. Discriminating is required between demands in the agonistic debate. But these exclusion is in political and not in moral terms. A shared symbolic space is necessary for the agonistic debate to take place to find a ‘conflictual consensus’, defined by Mouffe as the “consensus on the ethico-political values of liberty and equality for all; dissent about their interpretation” (Mouffe, 2005, p. 121). The democratic society requires a space wherein all the citizens can equally participate in the antagonistic debate (Mouffe, 2005).

Mouffe pleads to come towards a public space as a place where different actors can engage in political activities. This is not one space created by one power, but mane spaces where power struggles occur in varied combinations. In this public space is pluralistic and antagonistic debate possible for all equal citizens, which is necessary for a democratic society (Mouffe, 2005).

5.3.1 Conclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do they engage the state</th>
<th>Locals</th>
<th>Foreigners</th>
<th>Thrive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>everyday existence is one of unruly politics</td>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>Formal – informal Direct - indirect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What forms of popular politics do they use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Popular protests</th>
<th>Quiet Encroachment</th>
<th>Pedagogies of Active Citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political society</td>
<td>Outside</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are they active in the Chatterjees

The first and most important remark I want to make is that existing theories of citizenship and participatory governance in the Global South polarise citizens into the elite, who are ‘capturing’ participatory structures and the poor, who are excluded from formal participatory mechanisms and are active in other popular forms of mobilisation. These generalisation is incomplete and the reality is not as polarized as described here. In one community we identify different forms of citizenship and different forms to engage the state. The four cases have all another way to react, other demands and other ways to engage the state and within each case we have to be careful to generalize our conclusions to the whole population in the case. The ‘invented space’ is heterogeneous and diversified.

**Different forms of popular politics?**

The governmental practices reflect the conviction that not everyone can govern. People in Isiqalo, Imizamo Yethu and in most of the Global South are opening up new ways in the political society in which they can choose how they should be governed. Citizens who were not heard by the state before make this violation by the state public and give new understanding of their rights and access to citizenship. This is democracy enhancing, even if not all the used means are democratic. If citizens lack the access to the ‘invited space’ this is in no way democratic and it is a violation of the residents citizenship. Their search to find new ways to get heard is a democratic process. The ‘invented space’ is in this insight a conjunction of the ‘invited space’.

**What does this mean for citizenship?**
We can recognize the different types of rights of Holstons typology in the cases. The case of the foreigners in Imizamo Yethu prevails the same paradox Holston describes in the Brazilian society. The foreigners are seen as ‘marginals’ who lack rights. This distinction is a characteristic of the system of differentiated citizenship wherein rights are seen as privilege. The other example is one of the contributor rights. The Hout Bay community claims to have the rights to use the river as deriving from their stakes in the city, owning property and excludes with this the squatters of Imizamo Yethu. We can see that Holstons ‘anonymous citizen’ doesn’t exist in South Africa. An anonymous citizen is defined as “these rights proposes that citizens have an unconditional worth in rights, not dependent on their personal, social or moral statuses. It therefor creates conditions for the realization of a more equalitarian citizenship.” (Holston, 2008)

Citizenship is in Hout Bay divided by property ownership and race. In this insight the South African case differs from for example the Brazilian or the Indian context where the society is divided over different classes.

**How do they relate to the state?**

In each case we will invest in which respect the used forms of citizenship differs from Chatterjee’s interpretation of ‘civil’ and ‘political society’. The civil society is the arena which serves the elite of the state. It does not serve popular interests as it is middleclass focused. In the formal structure of the state, the ‘invited space’ (Cornwall, 2004), all the citizens are seen as equal and part of the civil society. Everyone is a citizen with equal rights and therefor a member of civil society. The political process is one where the members of civil society interact with the organs of the state. This story doesn’t strike with reality. Citizens are rather excluded from the domain of politics, they are treated as categories of populations who have to be looked after and controlled by the government. Opposite the civil society we find the political society. Members of popular classes are not active in the civil society, they don’t act as citizens but are instead treated as subjects of the state. They live in an illegal subaltern space, the political society. We can see a split in the domain of politics between the organised elite and the unorganised subaltern domain. The popular classes
turn in target populations of state programmes. They become subjects of governmentality in the developmental state. The implementing policy of the developmental state doesn’t take your status in account, but wants to reach one standard general level of education (Chatterjee, 2004).
6 Conclude

The South-African post-apartheid constitution made numerous laws since 1994 to make it possible for all citizens to participate in the affairs of local authorities. Local government sets inclusion central in the Integrated Development Planning for the whole population to act as right-bearing citizens. This in accordance to Chatterjee’s notion of civil society that rests on the conception of equal citizens who interact with the State as right-bearing citizens. Enhancing citizenship participation requires more than inviting people to participate (Cornwall, 2004). But the case studies learn us that this is not how the residents engage the state. The South African government treats people as populations to be managed, rather than as right-bearing citizens entitled to participate in the policy decisions over their own life (Piper, L. Von Lieres, B., 2014). The politics used by what Chatterjee calls “the governed” are complex, contextual and sporadic. In the Isiqalo case we’ve shown that new, but contextual and temporary, forms of citizenship are crafted not through the ‘invited space’ or the legal procedures, but through the ‘invented space’. The forms of politics used here make the absence of real citizen involvement in the decision of public services visible. We can see in the Imizamo Yethu case that even in the same township the forms of politics are differentiated between local South Africans and foreigners.

Participation became a buzz concept since the 1990s, yet we have to be careful with romanticizing the concept. The critique that the ‘invented’ and ‘invited space’ is polarizing is not necessarily the case. The two spaces can work complementary. The ‘invented space’ makes the limitations of the ‘invited space’ visible. It is the challenge for policymakers to have a good contextual knowledge about the forms of popular politics to improve the legal frameworks. For this governments has to invest in communication and have a broad understanding of the conditions. Citizen engagement improves dialogue and a good understanding between state and society.
The ‘invited space’ has its limitations. The relationship between the spaces is not a dichotomy, but the consequence of the limitations of the institutionalised participatory framework. For this reasons it is important to understand the limitations of the Constitution of 1994. Forms of popular politics which look undemocratic at first sight such as violence demonstrates the limitations of the ‘invited space’ and is thus a continuation of democracy. According to Mouffe there is democracy as long as there is contestation. Forms of popular politics who question the status quo and the ‘invited space’ make visible what the consensus hides, the denial of citizens’ rights par example or real citizen participation as in the Isiqalo case. A lack of the ‘invented space’ and of confrontation would be a threat to democracy.

The outcomes of the cases should be used for a better understanding of the dialectic between the ‘invented’ and ‘invited space’, the types of citizen engagement and the political context. Policy makers should take the conditions into account when institutionalizing participation.
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