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Cape Town Freedom Song,
Covering many aspects of the Right to the City
By Luke Zandstra (12 Years old)
Mowbray Cape Town

I was walking down the road,
When I saw a big truck
It was tearing down the houses and covering me with muck
I turned around a corner and saw them cutting down the trees
And then I saw some animals whose eyes were full of tears

Chorus
They are tearing down the houses and cutting down the trees
Please look around I’m begging on my knees

Cape Town was our city but it is no more
The wealthy ones have taken it and are sending out the poor
So give us back our city and the dignity of all

Chorus
They are tearing down the houses and cutting down the trees
Please look around I’m begging on my knees

Cape Town should be all of ours
And greed should be seized
Please look around I’m begging on my knee

Source: Website of the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign
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1. Introduction

One of the things we wish to make clear during our trip [to Europe] is that the World Cup in South Africa is not benefiting the poor. The lives of small businesses and informal traders in South Africa have been destroyed by this World Cup. If we are not allowed to trade near stadiums, fan parks and other tourist areas, how can we benefit from tourism? The poor are not only evicted from their trading spaces for the World Cup, we are also being evicted from our homes. In Woodstock, Salt River and Gugulethu, massive gentrification linked to World Cup accommodation projects has affected thousands of residents. In Joe Slovo, government evicted 2,000 residents and dumped them in Tsunami and Thubelisha Temporary Relocation Areas in Delft. They tried to evict another 10,000 Joe Slovo residents and hide them from the N2 Freeway as part of a Word Cup vanity project. But luckily, residents of Joe Slovo sent thousands to the street in protest and the government eventually gave in. Just the other day in Greenpoint, near the Somerset Hospital and the new stadium, 150 poor residents were evicted without any alternative. Maybe they will end up in Blikkiesdorp [temporary relocation area in Delft, 30 kilometers from the city centre of Cape Town] where the City is trying to dump all of Cape Town’s poor. These are just some of the injustices that our communities are faced with every single day. If there is still any doubt as to whether there is or is not democracy for the poor in South Africa, hopefully our words and experiences will convince Europeans otherwise (Anti-Eviction Campaign Western Cape 2010a).

From 11 June to 11 July 2010, South Africa has hosted the second largest sporting event of the world, the FIFA Soccer World Cup. This ‘hallmark’ event was expected to provide South Africa the opportunity to signal international recognition and to promote socio-economic development (Bob & Swart 2009: 47). Most studies on sport tourism events or mega-events tend to focus on economic benefits and impacts, while many impacts and benefits might also arise in numerous other spheres, such as environmental, political, cultural and social impacts, but also impacts on the urban structure of especially host cities must not be neglected (e.g. urban renewal projects, urban regeneration, residential polarization and gentrification) (Newton 2009: 95; Pillay & Bass 2008). The discourses that emerge around these consequences of hosting an event are often framed by using the “legacy” terminology.¹ South Africa paid serious attention to the legacy the World Cup would leave behind. An all-encompassing development programme was designed, in which attention was not only given to infrastructural plans, but programmes to alleviate poverty and to undo the urban segregation of the past were also included (e.g. job creation, more adequate housing for the urban poor). In the South African bid for the World Cup, explicit focus was thus given to development issues. Critics however warn ‘to be vigilant for a possible mismatch between the governments projected image of a more inclusive and prosper society as a result of 2010 and the actual reality on the ground’ (Newton 2010: 96). In his article ‘The 2010 FIFA World Cup: critical voices from below’, Percy Ngonyama (2010) gives attention to critical voices of social movements, labour formations, NGO’s and left-leaning

¹ (…) “The idea underlying legacy creation is that it represents something of substance that will enhance the long-term well-being or lifestyle of destination residents in a very substantial manner – preferably in a way that reflects the values of the local population” (Ritchie 2000: 156 cited in Newton 2009: 95).
individuals who raise important questions regarding the economic spin-offs and the asserted ‘development’ and ‘anti-poverty’ component of 2010. According to Ngonyama (2010: 170) there is a strong sense among commentators of the left that the World Cup will ‘(...) further enrich the wealthy and that the event’s much talked about ‘resounding success’ will come at the expense of the disadvantaged who will be exploited, expected to work longer hours to meet deadlines, evicted from unsightly shack settlements; and deprived of their livelihoods’. According to Newton (2009: 98) city governments have become increasingly engaged in remodelling their places for the “visitors class”, while the needs of the residents have gone out of sight. She further argues that prestigious events are used as justifications for city redevelopment, while in fact literally pushing the poor aside (Newton 2009: 98). One example she gives, is the controversial N2 Gateway Housing project in Cape Town. This mass housing project is located on the N2 Freeway between the airport and the city of Cape Town and it is presented by the media and the government as a “flagship” project of the New Breaking New Ground strategy to fight the backlog of 400,000 houses in the city. Newton describes the fast-tracking of this project and accompanying massive slum eradication as a “beautification strategy” to prepare the city for the World Cup 2010. Clearing the city of its slums and derelict buildings and massive and forced relocations designed to make poverty less visible to international tourists and to beautify the city, are common phenomena in the run-up to international events (Davis 2006: 104; Drakakis-Smith 2000: 28; COHRE 2007: 215-217). The Olympics in Seoul and Beijing for example resulted in more than 300,000 people being evicted from their neighbourhoods and relocated to other areas (Newton 2009: 94; Davis 2006).

In South Africa, forced evictions are however not a new phenomenon, but the dimension of the World Cup gave a new boost to the urban regeneration of the host cities. As mentioned in the quote of the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign, hosting the 2010 World Cup in Cape Town has led to the eviction of many squatters from informal settlements as well as from derelict buildings. However, these squatters were not passive actors during these processes and attempts to forcefully evict and relocate them to Temporary Relocation Areas in the outskirts of the city, but they took the streets and actively claimed their right to the city. This right to the city is not simply a right to safe and stable housing, but the right to access citizenship in the city they call home. More specifically, this thesis focuses on two contested spaces in the Athlone area of Cape Town, a place where Cape Town’s practice venue for the 2010 FIFA World Cup was located, and a place from where the City wanted to evict two groups of squatters who were living for up to eleven years in empty buildings. Their collective attempts to claim the right to the city is the main focus of this thesis.

By using this abstract notion of the right to the city (Lefebvre 1996; Harvey 2003; McCann 2002) and in line with recent studies which applied this notion, this thesis hopes to contribute to the political and scientific debate whether and how this notion of Lefebvre is suitable for studying collective actions and urban social movements. This notion of the Right to the City is also internalized by the United Nations in the recently held UN-Habitat World Urban forum 5 (WUF) in Rio de
Janeiro\textsuperscript{2}, which implies the concepts’ renewed interest and relevance in policy making and urban planning. Furthermore, by focusing on the daily life experiences of squatters and their communities’ struggle against evictions, this thesis hopes to contribute to the existing knowledge on the forms, opportunities and challenges of anti-eviction struggles that are based on egalitarian principles.\textsuperscript{3}

In this thesis, attention is both given to the spatial injustices and the further marginalization of squatter communities from the places they called home and to the collective efforts of these marginalized squatters into staying put and into making social just spaces. This thesis thus aims to give voice to grassroots anti-eviction struggles for the right to the city and for democratic urban governance, and it not only focuses on massive demonstrations but also on daily forms of resistance. Furthermore, because these struggles of the Athlone squatters do not exist in a vacuum, attention is also given to city-wide struggles for the right to the city in the context of the World Cup, by focusing on the solidarity actions of two urban social movements working on housing issues in Cape Town and their allies abroad. This analysis will show how these small scale anti-eviction struggles of the Athlone families are highly embedded into larger struggles against evictions and exclusionary actions by the state. Furthermore, in order to understand why these squatters have chosen certain strategies and forms of collective actions above others, it is important to analyse the environmental, political and societal structures surrounding these actors and social movements in Cape Town. For these reasons classical theories concerning social movements will be discussed and attention in this thesis is given to external factors in society that have influenced, inspired and determined the collective actions of these squatters.

1.1 Research Questions

In order to investigate the anti-eviction struggles of squatters in the run-up to the 2010 FIFA tournament thoroughly, a specific location for research had to be selected upon arrival in Cape Town, South Africa. The information I obtained via the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign about contested spaces from where evictions took place due to World Cup regeneration projects, the access to the field and the barriers of language, made me decide to take the area surrounding the Athlone training stadium as my main focus of study. Besides these reasons, the Athlone region appeared to be an interesting location to investigate as one group of squatters managed to resist the eviction, while another group failed to do so: they were eventually relocated to the outskirts of the city. My overarching research question is therefore:

\textsuperscript{2} WUF was held from 22-26 March 2010 and the theme of the Forum was ‘The Right to the City – Bridging the Urban Divide’: www.unhabitat.org/wuf

\textsuperscript{3} Many grassroots struggles are based on a egalitarian principles, such as non-hierarchy, self-organisation, direct democracy and mutual aid.
How do squatter communities in the Athlone district of Cape Town collectively cope(d) with forced evictions from their living spaces carried out during the run-up to the 2010 FIFA World Cup? In other words, how do they collectively claim the Right to the City?

In order to assess this question, a few sub-questions have been posed which aim to give a more holistic perspective surrounding the anti-eviction struggle of the Athlone squatters in a neo-liberal Cape Town:

- What are the social and spatial impacts of 2010 on squatter communities in Cape Town and especially for the issue of forced evictions?
- Which social movements are active on the issue of forced evictions in Cape Town and how do they relate themselves to cases directly linked to the World Cup?
- How did squatters living close to the Athlone training stadium coped with the planned evictions to regenerate the area?
- Which societal and institutional opportunities and challenges structure the space for collective action in Cape Town?
- How is the concept the Right to the City used by these squatters on the ground?

1.2 Structure of the Thesis

This thesis is structured into eight chapters. After the introduction, chapter two serves to deliver a theoretical framework of the main concepts, theories and debates concerning the strategies, forms and outcomes of collective action and social movements, in order to assess the case of the anti-eviction struggles of squatters in Cape Town. Chapter three on research methodology will outline the techniques and methods used to conduct my fieldwork and will inform how I have analysed my data. Before discussing the empirical findings, a contextual chapter will first provide information about the historical background of the City of Cape Town, the implications of the apartheid system for the current social and spatial segregated outlay of the city, the political and economic situation of squatters, and the historical and current state of evictions and social resistance. In short, chapter 4 gives an overview of the societal and institutional settings in South Africa and of Cape Town in particular, which structure the anti-eviction struggle of squatters in Cape Town. Following this chapter, the analysis of the empirical material is divided into three parts (chapter 5, 6 and 7). Chapter 5 is focused on the contested spaces in Athlone and seeks to give an understanding of the dynamics of how and why these squatters stood up against evictions and which strategies and collective actions they undertook to guarantee their right to the city. Chapter 6 follows the relocation of one squatter community from Athlone to Blikkiesdorp, a Temporary Relocation Area at the edge of the city. This chapter further focuses on the effects of the relocation and on the attempts of the former squatters from
Athlone to secure their basic rights via a diverse repertoire of social resistance. In chapter 7, the city-wide and international collective actions and social movement campaigns that are directly related to the local anti-eviction struggles of (squatter) communities living close to World Cup venues in Cape Town will be analysed. This chapter further illustrates that anti-eviction struggles which take place in one space do not exist in a vacuum, but that these spaces are interlinked with city-wide, national and even international anti-eviction struggles of poor people against mega-events, oppressive states and constructors and developers. Finally, the conclusion (chapter 8) will relate all parts to each other and gives an answer to the overarching research question and sub-questions. The most important opportunities and constraints that influence and determine the space for collective action of squatters in Cape Town are discussed and it is debated whether the abstract notion of the right to the city is a useful concept to analyse social movements and collective action.
2. “Moving People from the Shacks to the Streets”: Theoretical Perspectives on the Processes Behind Collective Action

In order to investigate the dynamics that influence the social resistance of squatters against forced evictions in Cape Town, it is important to discuss the relevant theories, concepts and existing scholarly debates on social movements and collective actions. In order to do so, brief definitions of what constitutes collective action, urban social movements and forced evictions are given. Secondly, the relationship between large sport events and social movement activism will be discussed. Thirdly, an outline of the abstract notion of the Right to the City is given as this notion forms one of the major theoretical premises of this thesis. Fourthly, the classical theories of Resource Mobilisation, Political Opportunity Structures and Frame Analyses will be described and the opportunities and challenges of the theories will be discussed. At last, in the paragraph Contextual and Institutional Approaches, specific focus is given to the importance of structure above agency for studies done in developing countries. In short, this chapter specifically pays attention to the practicalities of the classical theories and debates developed in the western world for the study of social movements and activism in developing countries.

2.1 From Collective Action towards Urban Social Movements: Defining the Concepts

Collective action is the pursuit of a goal or set of goals by more than one person. Staples (2004: 6) defines social action as action that ‘(…) brings people together to convince, pressure, or coerce external decision-makers to meet collective goals either to act in a specified manner or to modify or stop certain activities’. Collective action can take many different forms. Examples of collective action are demonstrations, marches, (mass) public meetings, workshops, platforms, legal actions, etc. According to Staples, community organizing is by definition and by necessity local. Ordinary people have always been moved to political action in the local settings where they live and work. ‘It is in local settings that ordinary people form solidarities, that they discover their shared grievances and where they sometimes find sources of institutional leverage’ (Staples 2004: xii).

The issue of social movements is the issue of collectivity and social change (Castells 1983). Charles Tilly (1985) suggested that ‘the proper analogy to a social movement is neither a party nor a union but a political campaign’. Elizabeth Jelin (cited in Ballard, Habib, Valodia and Zuern 2005: 617) defines movements as ‘forms of collective action with a high degree of popular participation, which use non-institutional channels, and which formulate their demands while simultaneously finding forms of action to express them, thus establishing themselves as collective subjects, that is, as a group or social category’. Social movements can thus be describes as politically and/or socially directed
collectives, often involving multiple organisations and networks, focused on changing one or more elements of the social, political and economic system within which they are located (Ballard et al. 2005). What makes these social movements urban is that these movements are focused on social changes in the urban environment, especially changes that are directed at the distribution of resources, the destination of the urban space and the distribution of power in the city (Mamadouh 1992: 21). However, many urban struggles are apparent in South Africa, but not all of South Africa’s contemporary struggles around housing and evictions can be categorized as urban social movements.

2.2 Forced Evictions

Forced eviction is a widespread practice which affects millions of persons annually in both developed as well as in developing countries. Under international human rights law, everyone has a right to be protected against forced eviction. Over the years, several United Nations bodies, including the UN Commission on Human Rights, have developed consistent standards stating that forced evictions constitute grave violations of human rights, particularly the right to adequate housing (COHRE 1999). Throughout the General Comment No.7 of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights ratified by 138 countries, the term “forced evictions” is defined as ‘the permanent or temporary removal against their will of individuals, families and/or communities from the homes and/or land which they occupy, without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protection’ (UN Commission on Human Rights 2007). The prohibition on forced evictions does not, however, apply to evictions carried out by force in accordance with the law and in conformity with the provisions of the International Human Rights Covenants. Evictions are thus permitted only in exceptional circumstances, and then only under strict conditions. However, according to the General Comment, evictions - whether illegal or in accordance with the law - should not result in individuals being rendered homeless or vulnerable to the violation of other human rights and it makes it obligatory on governments to guarantee that people who are evicted to be ensured some form of alternative housing, resettlement or access to productive land (UN Commission on Human Rights 1997).

Attention to the human rights dimensions of the practice of forced evictions has not been isolated to the international texts examined above. National and local laws in numerous countries aim to regulate the forced evictions and are fundamental in the global struggle against displacement. In South Africa, Article 26(3) of the 1996 South African Constitution addresses evictions in the following manner: ‘no one may be evicted from their home, or have their home demolished, without

---

4 Forced evictions may also result in violations of civil and political rights, such as the right to life, the right to security of the person, the right to non-interference with privacy, family and home and the right to the peaceful enjoyment of possessions.
an order of court made after considering all the relevant circumstances. No legislation may permit arbitrary evictions’ (South African Government Information 2010b).

According to the Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions (COHRE) the term forced eviction refers to ‘the removal of people from their homes or lands against their will, directly or indirectly attributable to the State’. CORHE (1999) further argues that ‘forced evictions can always be attributed to specific decisions, legislation or policies of States, or to the failure of States to intervene to halt forced evictions by third parties’. Thus, States are always legally responsible for forced evictions occurring on territory under their jurisdiction. Besides this, governments are often actively involved in the physical removal of people from their homes. Causes for these forced evictions are diverse and some examples are development and infrastructural projects, hallmark international events (Olympic Games, World Cup, etc), housing renovation, urban redevelopment or city beautification initiatives and mass relocation or resettlement programmes (COHRE 1999; UN Commission on Human Rights 1997). According to COHRE (1999) there is a tendency to justify evictions on the basis of broad generalizations by declaring that they are “inevitable”, “unavoidable”, a “necessary price for progress”, “in the public interest” or required in order to promote “development”.

As we are now familiar with this concept of forced evictions, the next paragraph will continue with the focus on the implication of “hallmark” events on host cities and its citizens and attention will be given to the ways in which these mega-events itself have been used by activists and social movements as political platforms to voice their grievances.

2.3 Collective Actions and Social Movement Activism in the Context of Large Sporting Events

In their report ‘Fair Play for Housing Rights’, the Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions (COHRE), discusses the relation between mega-events, the Olympic Games and housing rights (COHRE 2007). Mega-events are according to Maurice Roche best understood as ‘large-scale cultural (including commercial and sporting) events, which have a dramatic character, mass popular appeal and international significance’ (Horne and Manzenreiter 2006: 2). Two central features of contemporary mega-events are firstly, that they are deemed to have significant consequences for the host city, region or nation in which they occur, and secondly, that they will attract considerable media coverage.

COHRE states in their report that the potential of mega-events such as the Olympic Games is to foster cooperation and dialogue among the world’s peoples and nations. ‘Through the bringing together of humanity in all its diversity to celebrate excellence in sport and other pursuits, such events can promote peace and global solidarity’ (COHRE 2007: 9). However, they further state that the staging of mega-events can also have the opposite effect. For example, they can result in human rights

5 See COHRE website: http://www.cohre.org/forcedevictions
violations, such as the forced eviction of many thousands of people from their homes, causing severe hardship and misery. This unfortunate, darker side of mega-events stands in stark contrast to the admirable universal ideals that are often cited at their opening ceremonies (COHRE 2007). In their report, COHRE discusses case studies of Olympic Games Host Cities (Seoul, Barcelona, Atlanta, Sydney, Athens, Beijing and London) and the implications it had for the practices of forced evictions, discrimination against racial minorities, the targeting of homeless persons, and the many other effects in order to host a beauty pageant.

Besides the many discussions in the literature about the impacts of sporting mega-events on local communities, mega-events have also been widely studied as a platform for activists to express grievances to the international world. Many human rights activists, unions and community organisations have taken the streets and protested against the thousands of evictions that make mega-events ‘successful’. In the recent Vancouver Winter Olympics, for example, nearly 15,000 protesters took part in social action before and during the Olympics (Sport for Solidarity 2010). Political activism in the culture of sports is however nothing new. Hartmann (1996) for example demonstrated in a case study of the 1968 African American Olympic Protest Movement how a cultural arena like sport can make it possible for otherwise powerless racial and ethnic minorities to draw attention to their cause, which was in this case asking for attention to black poverty in racist America and the regaining of black dignity (Hartmann 1996). This athletically based racial protest movement was organized around the idea of an Olympic Boycott. Especially the demonstration of two African American athletes, using symbols of Black unity and banners stating ‘The Olympic Project for Human Rights’ was pictured on the front page of newspapers across the United States and around the world.

Cultural arenas, like the Olympic Games thus provide one of the few public spaces in which otherwise marginalized groups can express their social grievances and begin to fashion some sort of mobilisation on their behalf.

Most of the studies about protest movements and collective actions in the context of a mega-event have been carried out in the Western world, which is in most countries characterized by a strong tradition of civil society activism. However, in a recent project called ‘Cities for All: proposals and experiences towards the Right to the City’ of the Habitat International Coalition (HIC), there is one article that focuses on the implications of and the social resistance towards a mega-event in a developing country, namely the case of the 2008 Beijing Olympics (Sugranyes & Mathivet 2010). Harris (2010) describes how the Summer Olympic Games signified great changes for the historical Qianmen district in Beijing, a commercial and residential area located in the city centre since the 1600s. The author used the concept of the right to the city through analyzing citizens’ actions in response to the many violations committed by developers, government officials and municipal authorities during the re-development of Qianmen. What happened in short was that the Beijing government began to offer residents of Qianmen’s residential neighbourhood’s compensation for houses it planned to demolish (Harris 2010). The compensation rates were however less than the real
value of the homes. If residents refused compensation, they underwent a mediation process with the government in which houses were valued individually. However, the author describes that compensation rates did increase after mediation, but they were still insufficient to provide residents the same quality of life they enjoyed in Qianmen elsewhere in the city. Furthermore, the residents faced constant harassment from developers and constructors attempting to push residents out. As a result, resistance became too much of an inconvenience for the daily life of many families and many residents eventually accepted the low rates and left the neighbourhood. Only a few residents actually stayed and did claimed their right to the city and to the urban space of Qianmen (Harris 2010).

However, those people who managed to stay were covered with a green plastic net during the Olympics in order to keep them out of sight and out of mind for the thousands of Olympic spectators that would be passing by.

Although this study interestingly shows how a mega-event has impacted residents life and how the right to the city can be conceptualized, this study did not gave a thick description and analysis of how these residents resisted these evictions, or how institutional and environmental constraints determined the process of mobilisation, the collective actions and outcomes. Furthermore, the author described this case in a vacuum, without referring to other cases or neighborhoods related to the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games or to connections of the residents with civil society movements or organisations. However, this study did contribute to the current debates on how to implement the concept of the Right to the City in empirical studies about social movements and activism. In the next paragraph more insights will be provided on the notion the right to the city.

2.4 Claiming the Right to the City

The right to the City is an emerging concept in activist discussions which questions the failing, ultra-liberal urban policies implemented throughout the world (Fumtim 2010). Many scholars and policy makers interpret the Right to the City in very different ways: as a social, political, legal or cultural tool (Brown & Kristiansen 2008; Sugranyes & Mathivet 2010). The right to the city is according to Harvey not merely a right of access to what the property speculators and state planners define, but ‘an active right to make the city different, to shape it more in accord with our heart’s desire, and to remake ourselves thereby in a different image’ (Harvey 2003: 941). The right to the city came originally from the French sociologist and philosopher, Henri Lefebvre (1901-1991). His right to the city includes the ideas that; the city is public – a place of social interaction and exchange; being public it demands heterogeneity – as the city is a place where encounters with difference thrive; difference creates struggle, as people compete over the shape of the city, terms of access to the public realm, or the right to citizenship (Mitchell 2003). The role of public space is crucial in defining the right to the city (Brown and Kristiansen 2008). ‘Where rights are defined by private property, public space – as the
space for representation – takes on exceptional importance, but is increasingly policed and controlled’ (Mitchell 2003: 34).

Lefebvre’s right to the city endows citizens to participate in the use and production of urban space (Purcell 2002). Citizenship is here defined to encompass all urban inhabitants, discussing two central rights – the right to participation and to appropriation. ‘Participation allows urban inhabitants to access decisions that produce urban space. Appropriation includes the right to access, occupy and use space, and create new space that meets people’s needs’ (Lefebvre 1996: 174). One important feature of Lefebvre’s idea was the emphasis on the right to the city as a whole, rather than to specific rights in cities (Markuse 2010: 87). Raising the issue of the right to the city also means discussing the right to life. In effect, beyond its purely speculative and regulatory aspect, the right to the city aims to ensure that every citizen is able to exercise their basic biological functions such as eating, drinking, breathing, and defecating all with the utmost dignity, and that they have the freedom to inhabit and become one with the city (Fumtim 2010: 195).

From an ethical standpoint, the right to the city is not a new right, but rather adopts rights language to describe the participation of citizens in the oeuvre of their city. It is not part of a human rights regime, but rather an approach for urban change. It further poses an exciting and direct challenge to the nature of citizenship, and places the city at a primary level of decision-making (Purcell 2002). The right to the city can therefore be seen as an ideal or a utopia fought for by social movements (Brown & Kristiansen 2008; Sugranyes & Mathivet 2010).

2.5 Resource Mobilisation Theory

Resource mobilisation is a major sociological theory in the study of social movements which emerged in the 1970s. The theory stresses the ability of social movement actors to (1) acquire resources needed for collective action and to (2) mobilize people towards accomplishing the movement’s goals (McCarthy and Zald 1987). Grievances and resources alone will not generate social change. The major issues, therefore, are the resources controlled by the group prior to mobilisation efforts, the processes by which the group pools resources and directs these towards social change, and the extent to which outsiders increase the pool of resources (Jenkins 1983).

This theory assumes that individuals act rational. Individuals thus weight the costs and benefits of movement participation and act only if the benefits outweigh the costs. When movement goals take the form of public goods, the free rider dilemma has to be taken into consideration (McCarthy and Zald 1987).6

Although Resource Mobilisation theory stressed the importance of social movements’ ability to acquire and control resources, little agreement however exists on the types of resources that are

6 “Free riders” are those who consume more than their fair share of a public resource, or shoulder less than a fair share of the costs of its production.
significant. Assets that are frequently mobilized by movements are money, facilities, labour technical expertise and legitimacy (Jenkins 1983). Freeman has offered a more useful scheme, distinguishing tangible assets, such as money, facilities, and means of communication from the intangible assets that form the central basis for movements (Jenkins 1983). Intangible assets include both specialized resources such as organizing and legal skills and the unspecialized labour of participants.

The most important contribution of resource mobilisation theory has been to emphasize the significance of external contributions and the cooptation of institutional resources by social movements. Traditionally, researchers have assumed that since movements lie outside institutionalized politics, they derive their resources from non institutional resources (e.g. from the social movement activists and participants themselves). Some researchers however have argued that the movements of the 1960s and 1970s co-opted institutional resources from private foundations, social welfare institutions, the mass media, universities, governmental agencies and even business corporations (Jenkins 1983). Social movements can thus use different ways to pool resources; this depends on the degree of ‘professionalization’ of a movement.

In short, resource mobilisation theorists have adopted an open system approach, arguing that grievances are not sufficient to explain the creation and outcomes of social movements, but that the outcomes of collective actions are critically shaped by the larger political and economical environment (Jenkins 1983; McCarthy and Zald 1987). The outcomes of challenges depend not only on strategic choices but also on the interactions and relations between social movements and other organisations, such as other social movements, businesses and governments and on the flow and access of resources to and from the movements.

From the 1980s onwards, other theories of social movements and collective actions challenged the Resource Mobilisation theory. Critics have pointed out that Resource Mobilisation theory fails to explain ‘social movement communities’, which are large networks of individuals and other groups surrounding social movement organisations, and providing them with various services (Jenkins 1983). Critics also argue that it fails to explain how groups with limited resources can succeed in bringing social change and that it does not assign sufficient weight to grievances, identity and culture as well as to macro-sociological issues (Ibid.). Furthermore, Resource Mobilisation theory was based on the American context, while some theorist pointed out that the institutional context is an important determinant of movement mobilisation that may vary. Subsequently, some RM theorists shifted their focus to environmental factors and formulated what is known as political opportunity structure (POS) theory (Shigetomi 2009).
2.6 Political Opportunity Structures

In the POS theory, social movements do not choose goals, strategies and tactics in a vacuum, but they are influenced by the political context. The political opportunities framework focuses on the political variables of the environment in which the social movement acts. Political opportunity theories focus primarily on the effects of structures on social movements and collective actions, claiming that their agency can only be understood in the political context in which they function. According to Goodwin and Jasper, the Political Opportunity Structure theory differs however from the classical theories in that it regards the environment as the facts observed by actors rather than as direct facts that determine the behavior of actors (Jenkins 1983).

Dellaporta and Diani (1998: 196) distinguish variables that can influence the strategies, opportunities, challenges and outcomes of social movement activism, namely: political institutions, political cultures, and the strategies of their opponents and allies. The degree of openness of the political system and the level of decentralisation can for example influence the outcomes of the social movement activism. Furthermore, they state that it is also important to look at the political history of the country. Besides this, Dellaporta & Diani (1998:197), describe how relational factors can also influence the political context, such as the relationships between the political elites and the movements themselves. The political opportunity structures theory takes all these factors into account.

Criticism on POS is however that it focuses solely on the political context on the one hand, whereas the environmental context is also important and it promises to explain everything on the bases of these political structures, while it is neglecting the importance of activist agency on the other hand (Meyer 2004: 126). Therefore, a combination with more agency focused theories is recommended.

2.7 Framing Collective Actions

While the political opportunity framework (discussion above) focuses primarily on the influence of political structures on the strategies and success of social movements, the frame analysis focuses more on the active agency of social movements. In collective action, frames can be viewed as: ‘action-oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimate the activities and campaigns of a social movement organisation’ (Snow & Benford 2000: 614). Frames for undertaking collective actions have a few specific characteristics. Next to the set of beliefs and meaning, collective action frames function to simplify ‘the world out there’ and gain support for intended actions. At the same time collective action frames are being used to demobilize possible opponents.

In Frame Analysis, framing consists of three core tasks. (1) The ‘diagnostic’ core task is related to the fact that an organisation has to be able to explain that there is a problem in society that needs fixing. (2) The motivational core tasks means that the organisation has to explain that there is a solution and makes use of strategies to convince people to participate. (3) At last in the prognostic core task the
organisation proposes solutions or alternatives. These core framing tasks are related to the problems of "consensus mobilisation" and "action mobilisation" which relates to getting to a general agreement and accommodate action or 'moving people from the balcony to the balustrade' (Snow and Benford 2000: 615). In case the opinions of society do not differ fundamentally from those within a social movement collective action will be easier to establish than when the views are very different from each other. Collective action frames are thus important to investigate, in order to get a better understanding of how actors are mobilized and motivated to undertake collective actions and to understand how certain actions are legitimated and placed within the broader society.

2.8 Contextual and Institutional Approaches

One frequently heard answer to better understand why local people are motivated to change their environments is that the situation itself impels the people to stand up for themselves (Shigetomi 2009: xi). However, the structure which causes grievances among the people may at the same time function as a restriction to change the situations of these people as they are.

In the above discussed mainstream theories and studies on social movements, the question of how major processes of social movements are conditioned by environmental factors has not been seriously examined. Although the POS theory examined the external political context surrounding social movements, other environmental constraints and opportunities were neglected. This can be attributed to the fact that the role of actors in the mobilizing process is decisively important in developed Western societies, where these theories have been formulated. For example, since there is a surplus of resources in the hands of individuals and institutions in Western societies, the extent to which resources can be mobilized depends quite heavily on the performance of movement actors (Jenkins 1983; McCarthy and Zald 1987). However, when we examine developing countries as the settings for social movements, we cannot take these conditions for granted. The environmental factors, such as resource limitations, oppressive political systems, and social control within the local community, may condition the processes through which the movement actors organize collective action (Shigetomi 2009). Therefore, in the developing world phenomena of social movements and collective actions cannot only be explained by the structure or by applying an actor-centred approach while neglecting the structure. Contextual factors, such as the historical, economical, political and environmental factors in a country, surrounding social movement actors need to be taken into account to understand what conditions determine the course of action and to define the space of actors for collective action (Shigetomi 2009). Thus, in developing countries, there is a need to search for an approach which takes environmental factors into account.

In the literature on developing countries a lot of emphasis is placed on the structural and environmental factors which create grievances among subordinate people and determine the scope and
possible forms of collective actions. However, the interests and discussion about environmental factors did not advance into approaches or theories. Shigetomi (2009) describes that a recent attempt of scholars has been to elaborate the environmental factors which directly affect the emergence and shape of each social movement into neo-institutionalist approaches. In a collaboration between social movement scholars and neo-institutionalists, the social movement scholars focus on how the regulatory environment molds the form of social movements, while the institutionalists borrow the concept of actors in an attempt to resolve the dilemma of the institutional approach, or in other words, to explain institutional change in an institutionalist framework (Shigetomi 2009).

2.9 Conclusion: The Importance of Structures in Developing Countries

The modern theories, which have developed in Western countries, found the right to the city, resource mobilisation, political opportunity structures, and framing to be indispensable processes for movement actors to achieve their goals. However, because they take a subjectivist approach, these theories do not pay significant attention to the environmental factors which affect these processes of mobilization and collective action. On the other hand, studies in developing countries, although they show much more interest in environmental factors, do not advance beyond references to structural problems affecting ordinary people (Shigetomi 2009).

I therefore assume that, by incorporating the contextual factors into the analytical framework of the modern theories, it becomes possible to identify the environmental variables which determine how the processes work. In brief, resource endowments may determine the possibility of resource mobilisation. The institution of ownership, and access to the resources, also define the opportunities and challenges in mobilizing resources (RM theory). Furthermore, political institutions, political cultures and the strategies of their opponents and allies, may determine the breadth and shape of political opportunities (POS theory) and the framing process may be influences by the situation and experiences of both the frame makers as well as the frame-receivers (Frame Analysis theory). At last claiming the Right to the City can be restricted or determined by diverse institutional and environmental factors, such as by resource limitations and oppressive political systems.

In short, when studying the case of squatters collectively fighting against forced evictions in Cape Town, the first step has to be an introduction of the city of Cape Town, its colonial history and the implications of the apartheid system for the current social and spatial segregated outlay of the city. Furthermore the current political system in place, the economic position of these squatters and the history and current state of evictions and social resistance need to be investigated as these environmental and institutional context influences and determine the social resistance and outcomes of collective actions of squatters in Cape Town. Before this analysis can be carried out, the following chapter gives an overview of the research methodology used to collect and process the empirical data.
3. Research Methodology, Techniques and Methods

This chapter seeks to give an insight into the research methods I employed during my field work. I will first describe the methodology, methods and techniques used for this research. Then, I will explain the unit of analysis and describe how I got access to the field, before moving on to the research limitations and constrains. Finally, I will describe the ways in which I have analysed my data.

3.1 Research Methodologies

My case study approach explored the complex ways in which squatter communities cope with forced evictions, marginalisation and exclusion of urban life due to mega-events in relation to neoliberal processes. The methodology I used while conducting my fieldwork was constructivism, believing that there is no objective truth but that meaning and reality are socially constructed through interactions of individuals with the social world around them (Bernard 2002). Constructivism fits with the assumption that social movements in developing countries differs from social movements in the Global North (Lewis 2002: 576-580; Shigetomi 2009: 2). Furthermore, the empirical research and this thesis are guided by social interactionism, as I analysed the perceptions and values of the people I studied (Bernard 2002). I tried to analyse the urban struggles and forms of social resistance of squatters by understanding the culture and beliefs of the actors involved.

3.2 Research Techniques and Methods

The research I conducted was a case study of social resistance of squatter communities that face(d) evictions due to World Cup related urban regeneration or “beautification” projects in the City of Cape Town. In general, case studies are the preferred strategy when “how” or “why” questions are being posed, when the researchers has little control over the events, and when the focus lies on a contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context (Yin 2003). Furthermore, a case study’s unique strength is its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence: documents, artifacts, interviews, and observations (Yin 2003).

With the above mentioned guidelines in mind, I used different qualitative techniques to collect my data. By using different techniques and methods I was able to find many different insights that provided a holistic perspective of my case study. Qualitative methods seemed more appropriate to this research, as it is more sensible to the social context in which the respondents operate and is better used to provide a thick description of social phenomena, events and groupings (Bryman 2004: 275-281). In
short, qualitative research method will, as Bryman (2004: 279) states, try to (...) ‘see through the eyes of people being studied.’

Throughout my whole fieldwork project I had many informal interviews with activists from the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign (AEC) to get a better understanding of the housing crises in the City of Cape Town, the impacts 2010 had on poor communities and the daily challenges the AEC faces when trying to assist communities in need or to mobilize people and resources for raising awareness or to fight evictions. These conversations gave me more insight into the situation and helped me to ask the right questions in the semi-structured interviews I conducted.

The semi-structured interviews I conducted with activists from the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign (AEC) and Abahlali baseMjondolo Western Cape (ABM), residents of Blikkiesdorp and of the Athlone changing room, government officials, academics and journalists are the main method I have used during my fieldwork. This way I had a guiding set of questions and topics to ask the different informants, but there remained space to elaborate on issues that were addressed in the interview. Semi-structured interviews are considered a good method to collect experiences of the respondents involved (Bernard 2002). However, the use of the interviews also has several limitations, as interviews are highly susceptible to contextual factors (the appearance of the interviewer and the way he/she ask questions, the characteristics of informants and the environment). Besides this, the reliability of the interview data can be negatively influenced by social desirability, deference\_, mistakes or forgetting, but also by certain expectations of the researcher, there can be a tendency to obtain results they expect (...) ‘not simply because they have correctly anticipated nature’s response but rather because they have helped to shape that response through their expectations’ (Rosenthal and Rubin cited in Bernard 2002: 234). To notice these phenomena, control questions can be added. Furthermore, the interviewer has to make sure that the interview situation is as favourable as possible, ensuring that the informant feels safe and comfortable to tell his/her story.

I conducted one focus groups discussion with five residents from the Spes Bona Hostel in Athlone to get a better understanding of their perceptions concerning the impact of the World Cup, their recent eviction and relocation to Blikkiesdorp, their perceptions of the new situation and the reasons for moving to Blikkiesdorp. This focus group further helped me to get a better understanding of how desperate many people are when it comes to promises for formal housing.

I used participant observation, when living one week in Blikkiesdorp and when I spent days hanging around with activists and affected residents, to see how they cope with challenges they are facing on a daily basis and to get a better understanding of how they interpret and give meaning to the recent relocation and how they perceive each other and outsiders (NGO’s, journalists, government officials, FIFA). In shortly, this experience of spending time together, listening and watching each other, helped me to understand their social worlds. As I gained trust of these activists and I became\footnote{When people tell you what they think you want to know, in order not to offend you, that’s called the deference effect or the acquiescence effect.}
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accepted into their lives, it was easy for me to attend – and sometimes participate in - many community meetings, AEC meetings, marches, media launches and other events during my stay. The AEC and ABM always invited me along or made sure I was invited for events they considered interesting for me.

Furthermore, I have used qualitative document analysis to analyse texts, documents and blogs from the AEC, the government and the media. This technique was used in order to obtain information on the impacts of 2010 on poor communities in Cape Town and on the goals, strategies and effects of their coping behavior to resist the evictions and marginalization. Through document analysis I could also get a better understanding of the residents’ values/meanings and which frames they used for their advocacy and to legitimate their collective action and if/how this is picked up by the government or media (Benford & Snow 2000).

I believe the different ways of collecting data – or triangulation– have helped me to be able to draw a more complete picture of the coping strategies of squatter communities in Cape Town and it helped me to cross check my findings.

3.3 Unit of Analysis

In this thesis I will focus on the social resistance of squatter communities against evictions that were carried out in the run-up to 2010 in Cape Town. Hereby squatter communities living in semi-informal settlements nearby the Athlone stadium were chosen as the main subject of study. From this unit of analysis I wanted to explore how these communities collectively coped with these evictions (purpose, forms and scales) and if they received horizontal or vertical support from other communities, organisations, etc. In order to find these specific cases I had to get into contact with the two biggest social movements working on housing issues in Cape Town, namely the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign (AEC) and Abahlali baseMjondolo (ABM). Especially the AEC was very active in these areas and on the topic of evictions, that is why I also conducted many informal and semi-structured interviews with the coordinators of this urban social movement. From this umbrella organisation I looked more specific into contested spaces of squatters mobilizing to stay put and coping with evictions on the ground and from here I worked up again to the AEC to gain a city-wide perspective of the socio-and spatial impacts of 2010 and their resisting strategies. For these reasons I conducted my research in these contested spaces next to Athlone stadium and in Blikkiesdorp TRA as this is the place where the city moved and attempted to move these communities to.

I also interviewed policy makers, academics and local and international journalist to get a better understanding of the political opportunity structures that determine the course of action and define the space for collective action for squatters and AEC activists. These different perspectives
gave me a better understanding of the motivations, opportunities and challenges squatter communities face(d) while trying to mobilize to stay put – and to claim their right to the city.

3.4 Access to the Field

In order to find the informants and communities needed to answer my research questions, I used purposive sampling. I started my research by contacting the leading activists from the two biggest social movements working on housing issues in Cape Town, namely the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign (AEC) and Abahlali baseMjondolo Western Cape (ABM). ABM was willing to have an interview with me in Khayelitsha, were their office is based. Mzonke Poni, the chairperson of this movement, informed me about interesting cases of evictions directly related to the World Cup and gave me contact details of activist working in those areas. He further mentioned that many of these communities were relocated to Blikkiesdorp, a Temporary Relocation Area (TRA) in the outskirts of the City. Via one of his contacts I was invited to spend some days in this notorious TRA. I realized that I needed to build up a trustworthy relationship with activists from the AEC in order to get inside information and to be able to attend their meetings. This was not because I looked suspicious, but merely due to the fact that these social movements are autonomous and do not want to work with NGO’s or government officials. They therefore first wanted to know if I was not affiliated with any of these institutions or with political parties.

This reason of building trust among each other in relation to safety issues, made me decide to spend a week in Blikkiesdorp to learn about the community struggles there, the reasons and perceptions of why these people were moved to this place and to build up a network and relationships with members of the AEC. My stay in Blikkiesdorp, opened many doors for me of which I had otherwise no access. Besides this, the AEC coordinators introduced me to many interesting people, relevant for my research. I further used the snow-ball method to get all the useful respondents related to my case study. This method is also interesting, because it gives implicit information about the social (horizontal and vertical) networks involved.

While I attended many meetings, marches and events like the Poor People’s World Cup, I met journalists from Cape Town, South Africa and all over the world and these contacts provided me with useful information and sometimes with contact details of city officials. Via these local journalists I received emails about media briefings of the government and this helped me to build up a network of my own.

As part of gaining access to the community, fulfilling the ethical need to benefit those from whom I gleaned information, I have chosen not to give money in return, but to use some of my time in Cape Town to support the Blikkiesdorp and Athlone residents and the AEC with several activities.

---

8 Due to a negative personal experience I had with traveling to an informal settlement in Cape Town, I thought it was better for me to stay with the community in Blikkiesdorp than to risk traveling around.
Among these activities where: helping at the day-care centre for children in Blikkiesdorp and with cooking food for these children. I further helped Johan, a Blikkiesdorp resident with his weekly preparation of a soup meal for the children in Blikkiesdorp. I assisted the Delft AEC and the Western Cape AEC with writing and publishing their press releases on their website. I also wrote a story about the launch of the Right to the City campaign for the website Abahlali baseMjondolo as these activists asked me to do this for them.⁹ I assisted them with the practical preparations of the Poor People’s World Cup, with informing the press and the residents and with the making of pictures for their website and for a future publication about the event.

3.5 Limitations

I acknowledge that there are constraints and gaps in my research. First and foremost, it is difficult to determine, whether all these evictions would have taken place even if the World Cup had never come to South Africa. Another problem is the limited time and money available to carry out the research. I stayed for a period of 10 weeks in the field and because of this I had to make decisions on which actors to interview and which cases to investigate. I spent the majority of my time with the AEC, which could have biased my visions and selection of whom to include as respondents and whom not. However, due to safety issues I was always in company of one of the coordinators (who introduced me to the residents). Because of time limitations and safety issues, I had to select from a range of relevant actors whom to interview. Due to this it is possible that I missed out on interviewing some of the relevant actors. However, as I focused on two contested spaces where squatters have faced or are facing evictions, this small case study provided me via the interviews and observations with enough material. Besides this, I spoke to at least six persons of Spes Bona Hostel and of the changing rooms, so I was able to cross check my findings. Furthermore, in order to get a more holistic perspective on this case study, I interviewed key-actors from a variety of backgrounds and from diverse communities, organizations and institutions. I also used data-analysis so that I could use data triangulation to verify my results.

3.6 Data Analysis

Upon return from my fieldwork, the data gathered through the different methods and techniques described above needed to be analysed in different ways. All the semi-structured interviews were recorded and transcribed as soon as possible during the first two weeks upon arrival in the

⁹ See ‘The Poor have the Right to be Housed in Well Located Land’ by Rosalie de Bruijn: http://www.abahlali.org/taxonomy/term/2144
During the interviews in Cape Town I made notes of significant things that were said and of notable aspects of the context of the interview. These notes and the interviews that were not recorded were transcribed directly after the meeting took place. I marked the transcriptions on topics and concepts that guide the research. This way I could easily track what was said regarding a certain topic and I could compare the opinions and insights of the different respondents more easily. The transcriptions of these interviews were my main source of information for answering my research question.

During the participant observation, I wrote down a “thick description” (Bryman 2004) of the AEC, how it is organized, how the members carry out their work, how power relations are reflected through the daily activities, how members interact and communicate amongst each other and with external actors. This method provided me with information about the way of working of the AEC and existing power relations within the AEC. I further made observations and took notes of the community meetings, AEC meetings, marches, media launches, of the Right to the City Campaign and of the Poor People’s World Cup. These observations gave me insights into horizontal forms of organizing, the ideology of the AEC and which frames the squatter communities and the AEC members use to legitimate their actions and ideas.

I collected many materials of the AEC, media and government and used document analysis to study these documents. I have read and summarized the documents and compared them with one another to see if I came across conflicting and/or coherent information relevant for my research. I studied housing policies and the legal framework around forced evictions. The large amount of materials from many different stakeholders helped me to get a better understanding of the political and environmental context in which the AEC and squatter communities of Athlone operate, the social (in)justice discourse they use, the work the AEC had done throughout the years, and about some of AEC’s accomplishments.

In the next chapter institutional, societal and historical information is given about South Africa and in particular about Cape Town in order to better understand the complex context in which the squatter communities work, how they try to fight and mobilize to stay put and which challenges they face in their anti-eviction struggles.

---

10 It would be better to transcribe the interviews directly after the interviews, but due to obligations towards the activists there was not so much time to do this.
4. Research Location and Research Background

This chapter aims to provide a context surrounding social resistance of squatters against evictions that were related to the World Cup by giving a brief overview of Cape Town’s population, its geographical and political structures and its history in regard to evictions and social resistance. It will further discuss a social movement in Cape Town that fights against evictions and the marginalization of the urban poor in Cape Town. The chapter will start with an introduction to the city.

4.1 General Introduction to Cape Town

Cape Town is the second most populated city in South Africa and the largest in land area, forming part of the City of Cape Town Metropolitan Municipality. More precisely it has a population of almost 3.5 million and covers an area of 2461 km² (Small 2008). Cape Town’s population comprises of 44.0% Coloureds, 34.9% Black Africans, 19.3% Whites and 1.8% Asians (Small 2008). The majority of the inhabitants speak Afrikaans, but English is the most commonly understood language in Cape Town. A majority of 76.6% is Christian. South Africa’s oldest city – the Mother City - is the provincial and primate city of the Western Cape, as well as the legislative capital of South Africa, where the National parliament and many government offices are located (Ibid.).

4.1.1 The Political Structure of Cape Town

Although the ANC is still the largest party that governs South Africa, the most recent elections in Cape Town, were won by the Democratic Alliance, with 90 out of the 210 seats on the council (The City of Cape Town 2010b). The African National Congress (ANC) ended second, with 81 seats. However no party was holding a majority. Therefore, after a number of party defections and by-election successes, the DA now has 97 members. The DA is currently in a coalition with the Independent Democrats and the United Democratic Movement. This multi-party government has with 114 members a majority in the council.

Cape Town is furthermore divided into 105 electoral wards; each ward directly elects one member of the council, whilst the other 105 councilors are elected by a party-list proportional representation system (The City of Cape Town 2010b). The Executive Mayor, currently Dan Plato (DA), and the Executive Deputy Mayor, currently Ian Neilson (DA) are chosen by the city council.

Besides this city council, Cape Town has decentralized governmental structures into 23 sub councils. Collectively, these sub councils exercise over 90 functions (Ibid.). By this decentralization,

---

11 In this system, parties make lists of candidates to be elected, and seats get allocated to each party in proportion to the number of votes the party receives.
the City aims to better meet the needs of Cape Town’s residents (The City of Cape Town 2010b). Subcouncils are made up of groups of neighbouring wards usually between three and seven. There are 105 electoral wards in Cape Town, with between 13 000 - 15 000 voters each. Wards are represented by a ward councilor, who is elected by the community. Each of these councilors is a member of a subcouncil. Subcouncils are comprised of these councilors and they are elected on the proportional representation list according to party strength. Subcouncils can make recommendations on any matter affecting the area they represent to the City Council (including the Mayoral Committee). Subcouncils can furthermore determine their own procedures, subject to any directions of the City Council (Ibid.).

4.1.2 Cape Town’s Turbulent History

Located on the shore bay of the Table Mountain, Cape Town was the first permanent European settlement in South Africa, developed in 1652 by the Dutch East India Company. It first served as a supply station for Dutch ships sailing to eastern Africa, India and the Far East, but Cape Town grew steady and became the economic and cultural hub of the Cape Colony (South African Government Information 2010a). In the years that followed, Cape Town was captured by Britain, returned to the Netherlands and finally forcefully occupied by Britain again (Ibid.). In 1910, Britain established the Union of South Africa, which unified the Cape Colony with the two defeated Boer Republics and the British colony of Natal. Cape Town became the legislative capital of the Union and later of the Republic of South Africa.

In the 1948 elections, the National Party was elected to power. As a result, it intensified the implementation of racial segregation under Dutch and British colonial rule and subsequent South African governments since the Union was formed (South African Government Information 2010a). The Nationalist Government systematized existing segregationist laws, classifying all people into three races (White, Coloured or Black), developing rights and limitations for each, such as pass laws and the Group Areas Act, which classified all areas according to race. In the formerly multi-racial suburbs of Cape Town, non-white residents were evicted and the neighbourhoods were demolished or ‘cleared’ for whites to inhabit. The most infamous example of these massive evictions in Cape Town was District Six. After it was declared a ‘whites-only region’ in 1965, all housing there was demolished and over 60,000 residents were forcibly removed (District Six Museum 2003). Many of these residents were relocated to the Cape Flats, a low-lying, flat area situated to the northeast of the central business district (CBD) of Cape Town. While the CBD of Cape Town lies on the shore bay of the Table Mountain, mostly displayed on pictures of the city, the Cape Flats are located at the backdrop or the shadow side of the Table Mountain (See Appendix 2, Figure 2.1 and 2.2). From the 1950s onwards the Cape Flats became home to people the apartheid government designated as non-White. This system of racial segregation became known collectively as Apartheid. Because of this system of racial segregation, the Black majority remained disadvantaged by almost every standard, including income,
education, housing, and life expectancy, while the White minority enjoyed the highest standard of living in all of Africa, which was comparable to the European living standards (South African Government Information 2010a).

As the 20th century went on, apartheid became increasingly controversial; the country was dramatically opposed to world opinion on questions of human rights (South African Government Information 2010a). Sanctions and boycotts were instituted by countries across the world and through the United Nations (UN). After years of internal protests, activism and insurgency by black South African anti-apartheid movements and their allies, in 1990 the National Party government took the finally the first steps towards dismantling discrimination; it lifted the ban on the African National Congress and on other liberation movements (South African Government Information 2010a). It released Nelson Mandela and many political prisoners who were incarcerated for years on Robben Island. In 1994, South Africa has held its first universal elections, which the African National Congress won with an overwhelming majority. It has been in power ever since.

4.1.3 Post Apartheid South Africa
The ANC-led Government embarked on a programme to promote the reconstruction and development of the country and its institutions. This called for the simultaneous pursuit of democratisation and socio-economic change, as well as reconciliation and the building of consensus founded on the commitment to improve the lives of all South Africans, in particular the poor (South African Government Information 2010a). A significant milestone in the democratisation of South Africa was the exemplary Constitution-making process, which in 1996 delivered a document that has evoked worldwide admiration (South African Government Information 2010b). So too have been the elections subsequent to 1994, all conducted peacefully, with high levels of participation compared with the norm in most democracies and accepted by all as free and fair in their conduct and results (South African Government Information 2010a).

In the First Decade of Freedom, the national government placed emphasis on meeting basic needs through programmes for socio-economic development such as the provision of housing, water, electricity, education and healthcare. These programmes are also known as the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP). South Africa’s key economic objectives included the creation of jobs, poverty eradication, reduction of inequality and overall growth (South African Government Information 2010a). By the end of 2004, growth was increasing and there were signs of the beginnings of a reduction in unemployment (Ibid.).

However, many challenges remained. Since the ANC-led government took power, the United Nations Human Development Index of South Africa has fallen, while it was steadily rising until the mid-1990s (HDR 2009). Furthermore, the life expectancy at birth for the total population in South Africa is only 49.2 years (CIA 2010). South Africa ranks currently 85th on the Human Poverty Index.
among the 135 countries for which the index has been calculated (HDR 2009). Furthermore, South Africa occupies the 129th place on the Human Development Index (HDI) of 182 countries with data (HDR 2009).\textsuperscript{12} Besides the fact that many South Africans still live underneath the poverty line, the country is also one of the most unequal societies of the world. South Africa has a GINI coefficient of 65 in 2005 (the most recent data to date) ranking only below Brazil as the most unequal country of the world (UN-HABITAT Global Urban Observatory 2008).\textsuperscript{13} This inequality is partly attributed to the legacy of the apartheid system and to the failure of the current government’s policies to bridge the growing divide between the rich and poor. This segregation of the apartheid system shifted in the post-apartheid era from racial to class segregation and this is still visible in the layout of cities like Cape Town. While in the past white residents lived in the inner cities and non-whites were forced to live in the outskirts far away from the urban centers and from the access to basic services, at the moment the inner-city is still populated by the rich, mostly whites and the outskirts by the poor, of which the majority is black or coloured. This segregation is however not only spatially visible in Cape Town, but also socially, as there is in any aspect of life still a large difference between the living conditions of the poor versus the rich.

4.2 Cape Town’s Housing Crisis and Evictions

The poverty and inequality in South Africa is a legacy of apartheid, nonetheless some of the policies which were nominally aimed at alleviating these problems have in fact aggravated them (Oldfield & Stokke 2004; Miraftab & Wills 2005). In 1996, South Africa showed its commitment to open markets and foreign investment with the introduction of Growth, Employment and Redistribution policy (GEAR). While these macro-economic policies were designed to attract private investments and thereby enhance economic competitiveness in the long run, it has perpetuated and deepened unemployment, poverty and inequality in the short run (Oldfield & Stokke 2004). The impact of this neoliberal strategy has furthermore been the wide scale privatisation of basic services such as water and electricity and housing. Whilst the intended increase in employment and greater redistribution has failed to materialise, privatisation has led to a sharp rise in electricity, water rates and rents. The net result has been a steady rise in cut offs in the poorest communities. Besides this, more families have fallen into arrears leading to an increase in evictions, in a country which already suffers from a backlog of 1.2 million homes, 400,000 of which are in the Western Cape alone (Interview with Martin Legassick, 23/06/2010). Many low-income Capetonians have preferred to risk insecure tenure and

\textsuperscript{12} 129th place is classified according to the UN as medium Human Development, while the Netherlands is for example on the 6th place with very high Human Development (HDR 2009).

\textsuperscript{13} The GINI index is an 0-100 scale. The closer the GINI coefficient is to the 100, the more unequal a country’s income distribution, whereas closer to 0 would mean a more equal country’s income distribution. Scandinavian countries with a GINI coefficient of 25 are for example the countries with the most equal income distribution in the world.
possible eviction by building shacks in informal settlements that may be closer to livelihood opportunities and may have low or no rental rates and minimal service charges. Another risky alternative for these low-income people is to occupy abandoned buildings in the inner-city, contending with overcrowded conditions, poor sanitation, and the constant threat of eviction, in order to be close to livelihood opportunities. Once removed from these spaces and left with no alternative, the City of Cape Town has to provide in some cases alternative housing. This alternative housing is provided in areas that are situated miles away from the city centre or from peripheral centres or business districts.

In theory, the South African Constitution gives people the right to access adequate housing, protects against forced evictions and requires authorities to consult with communities affected by housing developments. Nonetheless evictions are still commonplace and are frequently done without consulting affected parties (Interview with Lilian Chenwi, 27/05/2010). Besides this, although the constitution for example guarantees the right to adequate shelter for all citizens, it remains a difficult task to translate this into actual houses for marginalized groups. In this situation, where there is no translation of the extensive de jure socio-economic rights into de facto socio-economic empowerment of the poor, many civil society organisations have emerged around the issue of housing and service delivery and state- and bank- led evictions and disconnections of services (Oldfield & Stokke 2004). Since 2004, the country has had many thousands of popular protests, some violent, making it, according to one academic, the “most protest-rich country in the world” (Buccus 2007). One of these movements that emerged around these issues and that tries to utilise and transform democratic rights and institutions is the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign, based in Cape Town.

4.3 Social Resistance: The Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign

Formed in November 2000, The Western Cape Anti-Eviction campaign is an umbrella organisation for the coordination of poor people’s struggles against evictions and cut-offs in basic services like water, electricity and health care in an increasingly neoliberal South Africa. By directly responding to these threats of evictions and cut-off in basic services, the AEC has created spaces of resistance for average citizens to protect their livelihoods and claim their constitutional rights to access decent living conditions (Miraftab & Wills 2005).14

The AEC is fighting evictions and water and electricity cut-offs on many different levels. Via mass public meetings, workshops and training, the AEC seeks to make the linkages between people’s concrete experiences with evictions and cut-offs, their right to housing and basic services and government’s macro-economic policies (Anti-Eviction Campaign Western Cape 2008). By mobilizing the communities around these issues, the AEC hopes to build a mass political base from which to challenge evictions, one that the government will be forced to listen to and think about before

14 See articles 26 and 27 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996 (South African Government Information 2010b)
continuing with its eviction policies. Aside from organising demonstrations, lobbying and submitting memorandums and petitions to the government, the AEC protects families from being evicted by directly challenging evictions as they are taking place. The AEC protects families from being evicted primarily by staging sit-ins and demonstrations aimed at turning away government and privatized security forces that come to evict families. For those families who have already been evicted, the AEC often responds by moving them and their belongings back into their homes (Anti-Eviction Campaign Western Cape 2008). The AEC provides much needed free legal advice to all those affected by evictions and forced removals. Furthermore, the organisation seeks to democratise the internal governance of communities by helping them set up participatory platforms which enable residents to hold local authorities to account.

In the last ten years the AEC has grown to become an umbrella body for over 25 community organisations, crises committees and concerned residents’ movements in the Western Cape (Anti-Eviction Campaign Western Cape 2008). As such, the AEC is completely rooted in, and responds directly to the needs and concerns of the poor people’s struggle in the affected communities. However, at the moment, the AEC only consists of five coordinators, who try to cover most of the areas on the Cape Flats. \(^{15}\) These are rough neighbourhoods where Cape Town’s urban poor reside.

In their struggle to assist poor communities in Cape Town’s metropolitan area against evictions and service delivery, the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign is not alone. The AEC works together in Cape Town with the shack dwellers movement, Abahlali baseMdjondolo [Zulu for ‘people based in shacks’]. This urban social movement is located in Khayelitsha, the biggest Xhosa speaking informal settlement of Cape Town, and was formed in 2008 by the residents of QQ section in Khayelitsha. This urban social movement is currently an affiliate of more than 15 informal settlements based in Khayelitsha and Somerset West. Abahlali baseMdjondolo (ABM) is not a political party and does not affiliate or favour any political party in South Africa. The social movement is meant to articulate the conditions in which people are living in and to campaign for accessing well located land and housing for the poor, including service delivery for people living within informal settlements of Cape Town (Interview with Mzonke Poni, 22/05/2010). The AEC and ABM are both working on evictions and the privatisation of basic services, but ABM more specifically works on issues directly related to the living circumstances in informal settlements, while the AEC not limits their work to informal settlements, but also works in formal settlements where poor people reside.

Although these urban social movements work in different areas, they always support each other’s collective actions and statements. These movements might further differ internally but they are based on the same principles of non-hierarchy, self-organisation, direct democracy and mutual aid. Both urban social movements furthermore do not affiliate with political parties or with NGOs as they

\(^{15}\)The Flats are often referred to as a ‘dumping ground’ for those who were forcefully removed from more affluent areas in terms of the notorious Group Areas Act during the apartheid era. The Cape Flats have since then been home to much of the population of Greater Cape Town (mostly blacks and coloureds).
do not want to be restricted in their movement and activities (interview with Jane Roberts and Pamela Beukes). However, these two social movements do work with one NGO based in London, namely War on Want. Pamela Beukes, secretary of the AEC explained to me that this NGO is different than other NGO’s because War on Want works very close with different social movements in South Africa and in other parts of the world (Interview with Pamela Beukes, 29/06/2010). They further let the social movements themselves decide how to spend the money they receive from War on Want as long as they are transparent about their expenditures. On the Website of War on Want, the history of this NGO shows that it has been founded in 1951 by Victor Gollancz via a letter he send to the Guardian in asking people to join an international struggle against poverty (War on Want 2010a). The result was the birth of a movement that has been at the forefront of the fight against injustice. The slogan they use is: ‘Poverty is Political’. War on Want has supported the struggles of liberation movements in Eritrea, South Africa and the Western Sahara. Throughout its history War on Want has supported people who have struggled to find their own path to development. They not only supported these struggles through partnerships, but also by participating in mass demonstrations (War on Want 2010a). This thus makes clear that War on Want is indeed very close with community groups and social movements on the ground. In South Africa, War on Want not only works with the AEC and the two ABM branches in Cape Town and Durban, but also with their partners, namely the Anti-Privatisation Forum, Sikhula Sonke (women farm workers) and the Landless People’s Movement.

The AEC and ABM, together with the Landless People’s Movement and the Rural Network are part of the Poor People’s Alliance – a network of radical poor people’s movements in South Africa. Besides these partners, the AEC also works together with many affiliated movements in South Africa (e.g. Anti-Privatisation Forum) and beyond (Anti-Eviction Campaign Western Cape 2008). As Emeritus Professor Martin Legassick highlights in one of his articles (2003); ‘In the course of its existence the AEC has had solidarity from activists visiting from many countries, including Argentina, Canada, Italy, Norway, the United States, Germany, India, and Palestine – as well as from fellow-social movements in Johannesburg and Durban’.

Due to the 2010 FIFA World Cup, the AEC came even more in the (international) picture, as they published stories on their website about forced relocations of poor Capetonians who had lost their homes or trading spaces due to World Cup related regeneration projects. According to Ashraf Cassiem (Interview on 08/06/2010) chairperson of the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign, ‘in the last ten months about 800 families were driven out of their sleeping places, houses or shacks and these are only the ones we know about’, suggesting that many have not been noticed by the AEC. Besides these evictions and relocations caused by hosting the World Cup in Cape Town, the AEC made clear on their website that the 2010 FIFA World Cup is not benefitting the poor, but only causing much havoc in their communities (Anti-Eviction Campaign Western Cape 2010a). What the first socio-and spatial impacts have been since 2004 for low-income groups and especially for squatters in Cape Town, will therefore be discussed in the next paragraph.
4.4 First Tangible Implications of the 2010 FIFA World Cup for the Urban Poor in Cape Town

In 2004 South Africa won the bid of hosting the World Cup in June and July of 2010. In that same year, the national government implemented a pilot project, known as the N2 Gateway Housing Project. This project aimed at speeding up housing delivery to the poor and the N2 highway between Cape Town and the city’s international airport was chosen as the site for a pilot study. The vast conglomeration of shacks known as the Joe Slovo informal settlement in Langa, therefore was subjected to make way for more attractive housing. The project aimed at completely breaking down the shacks and to move as many as 20,000 people to a temporary relocation area in Delft, called Tubelisha (named after the company that was in charge of the project). However, the residents from Joe Slovo won a Constitutional Court ruling with the help of the AEC, that imposed such costly conditions on the eviction order that the government dropped the plan to move them, but this was only after several thousand people had already been evicted to Delft (Legassick 2008). Critics say that is was nothing more than an attempt to beautify the city for 2010 as the shacks alongside the highway were very visible and the first sites greeting incoming visitors to Cape Town (Newton 2009).

Besides the Joe Slovo case of forced evictions and relocation to TRA’s in Delft, many other cases that concern the eviction of poor blacks and coloureds from urban centers or spaces close to World Cup venues have been linked to the World Cup. The Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign and many international reporters from all over the world claimed in the pieces they wrote and published on the AEC website, that massive gentrification linked to World Cup renovation projects of buildings and accommodation facilities has affected thousands of residents who lived previously in Woodstock, Salt River and Gugulethu (Anti-Eviction Campaign Western Cape 2010a; War on Want 2010b). Furthermore they say that in Greenpoint, near the Somerset Hospital from were BBC television had its headquarters during the World Cup and in the shadow of the new stadium, 150 poor residents that were squatting the Waterfront building for years were evicted without any alternative (Maclean 2010). Although poverty campaigners from the English NGO War on Want16, claimed that the evictions were part of an effort to cleanse the image of the nine host cities South Africa will present to the world, City councilor JP Smith said to The Independent that the eviction process had taken up to two years and predated the BBC’s contract to use the top of the historical Somerset Hospital as their panoramic television studio. He added that ‘these people were land-grabbers, plain and simple. They were asked to leave and they disobeyed the court order. The regeneration of this area is something has been tabled by provincial government and is long overdue’ (Maclean 2010). The AEC was not able to keep track of these residents, but they stated on their website that ‘maybe they

---

16 This is currently the only NGO that is financially supporting The Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign and its partner Abahlali baseMjondolo Western Cape.
will end up in Blikkiesdorp where the City is trying to dump all of Cape Town’s poor’ (Anti-Eviction Campaign Western Cape 2010a).

It is however not clear how many of these recent evictions would have taken place even if the World Cup had never come to South Africa. Rhodes University professor Richard Pithouse says that there are currently 100 court cases challenging evictions in Durban, and that none of them can be connected to the World Cup, although the link has been made in the press (Werth 2010). ‘This idea that mega-events lead to evictions has become very popular’, says Pithouse. ‘This is very worrying because people were being evicted long before we got the World Cup, and they will be evicted for a long time afterward’ (Werth 2010). However, even if it is not sure which evictions were actually 100% caused by hosting the World Cup, this thesis uses the voices of the squatters and their interpretations of what happened and what made them to stand up and to fight for their houses and right to the city. It is thus not my aim to judge who is wrong or right.

On the website of the AEC and in many articles of international newspapers, such as the Guardian and the Independent, reference was further made to case of the eviction of 366 squatters from the Athlone Spes Bona Hostel and the attempt of the City to evict 6 families who are squatting the changing rooms next to the Athlone training stadium in Cape Town. In the next chapter these evictions and attempts of evictions in the Athlone area will be further discussed (see Appendix 2, figure 2.3 for a map of the contested spaces that have been briefly touched upon in this chapter and of those that will be discussed in the following chapters).
5. Contested Spaces and Social Resistance

For several years in Cape Town, the government has been overseeing construction and renewal with the explicit objective of beautifying the city and turning the city into a World Class city by improving the infrastructure, by upgrading the stadiums and its surroundings and by ‘cleaning-up’ the neighbourhoods deemed unfit to inhabit. A closer look at these projects nonetheless shows that they are denying access to the city to its poorest residents. Thus banished, these inhabitants are pushed further and further towards the margins where they survive, barely getting by, in often inhuman conditions. The City of Cape Town, however, denied this: ‘as the city of Cape Town, we do not have a program of rounding up people and move them to the outskirts of the city’ (Mohamed Mansoor\textsuperscript{17}, during the Media Meeting at the City of Cape Town about the 2010 Legacy Programme, 04/06/2010).

However, as this study focuses solely on the perceptions, ideas and beliefs of squatters and how they cope with these evictions, it is not my task to prove if FIFA and the city in fact evicted people and relocated them to the outskirts only to beautify space for 2010. Therefore, opinions of outsiders will not be my main interest but it will be of importance to provide a context to the situation squatters in Cape Town are facing.

The 2010 FIFA World Cup thus signified great changes for the city of Cape Town and its residents. The city needed to be fit to host an international-mega event, which brought on the modernization, beautification, and construction of all aspects that would make Cape Town more “attractive” to the world.

This chapter will focus on those contested spaces that are directly linked to World Cup related regeneration projects. The focus is in particular on the Athlone area in Cape Town – a residential area near the city center where Cape Town’s practice venue for the 2010 FIFA World Cup is located. The Athlone region is part of the historical Cape Flats. The construction of the Railway Station in Athlone, which forms part of the popular Cape Flats railway line, has contributed to the economic development in the area. It is complemented by a well-established bus and taxi route that links the shopping districts to each other. Although Athlone is located on the Cape Flats, it is due to the many transportation facilities not far away from the city centre of Cape Town, only a 15 minutes drive with the minibus. Athlone and its surrounding areas have grown into a melting pot of different cultures. The city of Cape Town sees this area as an example of how different cultures can join together and become one society (City of Cape Town 2010a). This area is furthermore a mixture of classes, with the majority of its residents battling poverty, unemployment and socio-economic hardships (City of Cape Town 2010a). Despite this, the community remains active and involved in civic and community based organisation (CBO’s). This chapter will not only focus on the physical aspects of these areas, but also on its

\textsuperscript{17} Mohamed Mansoor is the Executive Director of Economic, Social Development and Tourism for the City of Cape Town.
residents. The Right to the City is exemplified in these cases through citizens’ actions in response to the relocations and eviction notices carried out by city officials during the run-up to this world class event.

5.1 Fighting for a Place to Call Home: The Athlone Changing Rooms

Eleven years ago, an empty change room on the edge of the Athlone stadium area was given a new function, namely to host the offices of a youth organisation. Three residents Alwyn, Llewellyn and Shawn were supposed to run this organisation, but due to financial problems they couldn’t. After this organisation left the building, the building became empty. Shawn, the caretaker of the place was asked to stay in this city property, because the city was afraid that people would vandalize the place. However, due to personal/family circumstances at the homes of Llewellyn and Alwyn and his wife, these persons decided to occupy this place and to turn it into their homes. ‘We fixed the place up; we made it clean and habitable and sectioned it off so people with nowhere to stay could make a home for their families’ (Interview with Alwyn, 13/06/2010) (see Appendix 3, pictures 3.1 and 3.2). Families in dire need of housing from Athlone, one of Cape Town’s poorest and roughest suburbs, followed their example and they all turned this disused change room into a place to live. The 6 families, a total 24 people (of which more than half children) have divided the change room into six tiny cement-floored rooms, one for each family (see picture 3.3). They all share two toilets and two taps and they have had no electricity since the council cut off the power two years ago (picture 3.4).

The reasons of the 6 families for moving into this change room ranged from divorcement, overcrowded living conditions at their parent’s place to unemployment. The majority of the residents was and still is unemployed and had nowhere else to go. All these circumstances made them to squat the building and to turn it into their homes.

A couple of years ago, Alwyn worked as an officer for the Athlone Advice office and helped to advice the Athlone council when the upgrade of the area was first mooted a couple of years ago. The squatters were excited when they first heard that South Africa was going to host the 2010 FIFA World Cup and Llewellyn commented to the BBC News: ‘I “cried with joy” when I heard that Athlone would feature as part of it all. I thought it would bring good things for all of us in this area, which is desperately in need of development’ (Mohamed Allie 2010).

The City of Cape Town first wanted the Athlone stadium to be the main stadium for matches to be held in Cape Town. This choice would have generated a lot of development in and surrounding the Athlone area (Bob and Swart 2009). However, FIFA in cooperation with the National Government of South Africa decided that Greenpoint would be a better location to have the main stadium, because of its scenic setting with the Table Mountain in the back and the ocean in its front (see Appendix 2, picture 2.1).
Because the Athlone stadium was chosen to function as a training venue during 2010, it brought several changes to the area. The Athlone stadium had undergone a R406 million upgrade to bring it up to FIFA standards, including a brand new pitch, three new grandstands VIP suites and improved player facilities. Besides improving the stadium, the area surrounding the stadium was also upgraded. The council flats surrounding the stadium were for the first time in 30 years painted from the outside and broken plumbing and roofs were fixed, to improve the view. According to Pamela Beukes and three other women from Kewton (neighbouring area of the stadium) these projects are ‘a “smokescreen” to hide the suffering of poor communities displaced by the World Cup’. These women feel furthermore abandoned in poor living conditions, while government funds get spent on making the soccer world cup a “world class event”. Furthermore, the city wanted to create more parking space for the soccer teams and their fans. This resulted in the demolition of two historical buildings, built during the First World War for British soldiers, on the edge of the stadium area and they also planned to demolish the change room.

In December 2009 the six families were visited by their ward councilor Charlotte Tabisher. Charlotte Tabisher, was in charge of ward 49 in Cape Town, which includes sections of Athlone, Mowbray and Kewton and one of her biggest projects in the area was the project to upgrade Athlone stadium and it surroundings. On a day in December 2009, she brought a visit to the changing rooms and she held a public meeting with all the families outside the building, where she took everyone’s name and ID number. This DA ward councilor told the residents that they maybe had to move to Blikkiesdorp. Three weeks later, the families received an eviction notice from the city council to move out of the building. After the squatters ignored the eviction orders served against them, they had to appear in the Wynberg Magistrate’s Court.

The six families living close to the Athlone training stadium refused to move to Blikkiesdorp, because they wanted to belong to the re-development of Athlone and not to be pushed to the outskirts of the city (see Appendix 2, figure 2.3 for the exact location of the changing room versus the distance to Blikkiesdorp). The six families knew about the circumstances inside and outside of Blikkiesdorp and that they had to live in shacks there. Although the shacks in Blikkiesdorp have electricity they rather sacrificed life in the change room. The residents further expressed their concerns about the distance and expensive costs for traveling from Blikkiesdorp to for example Athlone. Furthermore, all these residents came from Athlone and they therefore wanted to stay in the area. As one of the residents said:

---

18 I have tried to contact Charlotte Tabisher, but she was not in her office and she did not answered her mobile phone. I found out that in April just before I started my research in Cape Town, Charlotte Tabisher was dismissed from her office and there was an investigation going on because criminal charges were laid against her. Charlotte Tabisher, DA councilor for Athlone was found guilty by the City’s Disciplinary Committee on 9 charges of misconduct, including fraud and corruption (Mjekula 2010). One of the charges was for example that she promised residents state-subsidised housing in return for payment from them.
(…) This is the only place we know. We don’t have another place. For seven years, that I am staying here, this is the only place that I can call home. Where I can come in the evening and stay here. My parents passed away a long time and my father sold the house. We have cousins but the have there own lives, and their own families and things to do. So it is actually me and my brother. So that is how we came to this place and why we stay here. It is because of destitute. We call it home and we make it as livable as we can.

After the first eviction notice the families discussed what to do. They were all very clear that they did not wanted to move to Blikkiesdorp. ‘Blikkiesdorp is way out of the city. It is behind the airport. So we said no we don’t want to go to Blikkiesdorp, because in this area they are building houses’, explained the residents. One resident suggested they must take a lawyer, while another said they should go to the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign, because the AEC can assist them without money. One resident explained this to me:

One lawyer was here one week before we went to court, but he was asking 1500 ZAR to arrange in court transport for us to Blikkiesdorp! He was not prepared to fight for us. He was there only for the money. I said no! and I took the whole scenario to the Anti-Eviction Campaign and they told us, how we must go through this process alone. So we did it without a lawyer.

One of the residents was already familiar with the work of the AEC, because he visited a few meetings of Pamela Beukes, the AEC coordinator for the Athlone area and because it was not the first time the families received an eviction notice. Alwyn said the council had served eviction notices on the squatters several times over the years, beginning in 2003, but had always failed to follow through. Their ward councilor, Charlotte Tabisher, had also told them not to worry, as she would help them find alternative accommodation. ‘She promised us that she was going to organize houses for us. I wasn’t there when she promised Alwyn that she is going to put us in the flats here. I knew for certain that she wanted to put us in the back, but a couple of weeks before the court case, she said we must get ready for Blikkiesdorp. This was a total shock for us!’ (Interview with Llewellyn, 30/06/2010).

The residents thus informed Pamela and Ashraf of the AEC about the whole scenario. The AEC took two of the residents to their attorney, Mr. Parker, and they organized a consultation session. Parker advised them what to do in court. ‘They were advised to go to court and to represent themselves without a lawyer. This would show them that we are the poorest of the poor. The court would look into our favour, because we don’t have a legal professional person with us, so the court should take our citizenship rights into consideration’ (Interview with Pamela Beukes, 29/06/2010). When the six families had to appear in court, they did it alone without a lawyer. One of the residents explained me how this works:

Everytime we went to court, we told them, listen here we don’t have a lawyer but we are entitled for legal representation. And everytime the court said ok right, you must go to that place, like a legal aid centre. We go there we get the letter and go back to court; we showed the court that they can’t defend us but referred us to another lawyer or legal aid centre. We went to
UCT and we went to the University of the Western Cape, but they couldn’t help us because they couldn’t find a merit in our case. I think that is was because we are unemployed people, we are poor people and we don’t have money, that’s why they didn’t want to help us. Anyway, we went back to court and gave them they letter to show that they can’t help us.

This technique of ordinary people representing themselves without an advocate or lawyer is how the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign works most of the times. Ashraf Cassiem (chairperson of the AEC) called this, laments representation and always tries to get the issue into court. ‘We try to do laments representation, because we think that people like us will know more of what we expect and what how we feel about things. Ordinary people have more affinity than a lawyer or an advocate that you have to pay to get affinity’ (Interview with Ashraf Cassiem, 08/06/2010). Besides this reason, Ashraf Cassiem said that:

(…) You are not allowed to represent anybody, because you don’t have a paper that qualifies you to be an attorney or an advocate so you get throw out most of the time and that buys time. That buys at least an extension of three months before you have to go back to court, or you have to look for legal representation. So it creates some sort of different style or a different way of how the court works if you attempt to do this (Interview with Ashraf Cassiem, 08/06/2010).

This is thus what also happened with the six families. They had to go for the first time to court in December 2009, but due to the fact that they did not had resources for a lawyer, the court send them to the legal aid centre with the aim of finding a lawyer that could represent them. After going to court from December 2009 until May 2010, and each time showing the letters of all the different institutions that did not wanted or could not represent them, the court listened to all the stories of the families; why they moved into the change room at the first place and why they were still living there at present. In May 2010, the court made a judgement and ruled in favour of the squatters. Llewellyn thinks the reason for this was humanitarian and that they won the case probably because of sympathy: ‘I think it was on a humanitarian ground, because we are the poorest of the poor and the city wants to cut us off, that why they want to build a wall around us. We are still playing wait and see, and hopefully they will give us something better’. The squatters thus stopped the eviction by actively claiming their right to stay put. According to the AEC the city wanted to relocate the squatters to Blikkiesdorp, but the Temporary Relocation Area (TRA) was full and in the judgement the court argued that the squatters cannot be evicted to Blikkiesdorp and that the city has to provide alternative housing in the Athlone region as this will not cause great disruption into their lives (Interview with Pamela Beukes, 29/06/2010).

Despite the resistance of these families, the city did not willingly accept their presence. According to Pamela Beukes and Llewellyn, the City said in a local newspaper, that they wanted to erect a wall around the former changing rooms to enclose it and to protect the residents from tourists. The AEC however asks themselves whom they want to protect the residents from the tourist or the other way around. The residents claim that the idea of putting a wall around them was to hide them
from the tourists. One thing is clear, the City wanted to cut-off the changing rooms so that it will no longer be part of the area surrounding the training stadium. Residents expressed their fear of being further marginalized or forgotten:

Now they say they want to put a wall around us, but if they put a wall around us they are going to forget about us. That was before the World Cup, but nothing happened. We are still where we are. At least we want the councilor and the city to have attentions for us, but nothing happened so far (Interview with Llewellyn, 30/06/2010).

The idea of building a wall around the change room a few weeks before the kick-off of the 2010 World Cup was however not implemented by the city council. This was according to Pamela Beukes the case, because several soccer teams cancelled the initial idea of practicing in the Athlone stadium, and only the Dutch team trained there for a few days (informal conversation). Therefore the change room was not a big issue anymore as not many tourists will visit the area and no extra parking space was needed.

However, according to the residents there was another article in the local newspaper of mid June, which said that the City wanted to appeal on the case and that they most likely take the squatters to court again. According to the residents, ‘the City can use other tactics, because they the City got the money so they can go to a lawyer and try to find other ways to evict us’. Llewellyn summarizes their situation by saying that:

Although the city gave us the right to stay, we are not going to sleep properly at night, because the state can come tomorrow and bulldoze our place. Our children are also staying here, how will they then get to school, they don’t care about the children. We are also human beings, although we live here, without electricity, no proper sanitation, no proper dustbin, nothing is proper (Interview with Llewellyn, 30/06/2010).

The coordinators of the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign and the residents of the changing rooms claimed 2010 to be the main reason for the City to try to evict them. Now that the World Cup is over and the tourist left South Africa, it can be questioned if the City still wants to evict the squatters in the near future. Maybe when South Africa will host the 2020 Summer Olympics, the city will attempt to evict the squatters again.19

5.2 Evictions of Squatters at Spes Bona Hostel

In the same area, about 200 yards away from the Athlone stadium, 366 people were evicted from the Spes Bona Hostel on January 4, 2010. Although Spes Bona Hostel is located further away from the Athlone training stadium, these squatters argue that their eviction is directly related to 2010 as the

19 The South African government has plans to host the 2010 Summer Olympics (Bond 2010).
building is on the main road from the city centre to the stadium and thus highly visible for the eyes of the soccer teams, their fans and international reporters and broadcasters (See Appendix 2, figure 2.3 for the specific location of the Spes Bona Hostel).

In the January 2005, there was a devastating fire that destroyed 3000 shacks in Langa, the Joe Slovo informal settlement (Xhosa speaking area), and left about 12,000 squatters homeless. The city wanted to relocate some of these fire victims temporary to the disused Spes Bona Hostel in the coloured area of Athlone. This triple-storey hostel next to Spes Bona High School used to house Spes Bona boarders from up country, but has been vacant for four years. Before the city renovated the building for the Joe Slovo fire victims, backyarders in the surrounding Bokmakierie area took notice of these relocations of Joe Slovo residents into the empty building and illegally occupied the hostel themselves. They were adamant that they would not vacate the building until the council built 100 houses for the most destitute families in the area (Gophe 2005). According to the newspaper Cape Argus (Maughan 2005), these backyarders were angry at the news that Joe Slovo fire victims were to be moved into the disused Spes Bona hostel and therefore occupied the building themselves. This article further claims that this action was racially motivated as ‘they claimed they had been waiting for housing for years, and resented the fact that Joe Slovo residents were getting priority’ (Maughan 2005). Community representative Moereeda Sawyers said to Cape Argus (Gophe 2005) that ‘they also need houses urgently and are sick and tired of the council's empty promises’. She said the people feared that if they moved out, the council would never listen to their problems. She further denied they were racists, opposing the move of the Joe Slovo residents, mostly black, to the hostel because it was in the heart of a coloured area (Ndenze 2005a). She said the reason the group had moved into the school was because they had no other options. Before moving into the Spes Bona Hostel, these squatters had been living in shacks, in backyards and on streets next to the hostel in Athlone. Some lost their homes during fires and flooding, while others were evicted from the backyards they used to squat on. They said they had waited in vain for years for the council to provide low-cost housing and had been prevented from living in the hostel in the meantime.

After these backyarders illegally occupied the building, the provincial government obtained a temporary interdict against the Bokmakierie residents, who agreed to move out of the hostel into tents in the Spes Bona school grounds while the hostel underwent a R2-million redevelopment. Many of the residents have vowed to return when the renovations were completed. Even before the refurbishment was completed, a group of people from the tent camp cut the fence between them and the hostel and moved back into the hostel. After a few days, they were evicted again by the city and moved back into the tents next to the Spes Bona High School Hostel.

---

20 In Cape Town, as well as in many other South African cities, many people live in own build small shacks or houses in the backyard of others. According to estimates of Martin Legassick, Professor Emeritus at the University of the Western Cape, there may be as many backyarders around the country as those living in informal settlements. His estimates bring the total demand for formal housing in South Africa to nearly 5 million homes (Legassick 2008: 45).
After the Bokmakierie residents lived for two months in these temporary tents they were told to move into the unoccupied hostel, because the conditions they were living in were “uninhabitable”: the tents were soaked, flooded and full of mud, and even the mattresses were wet (Ndenze 2005b). The city said from the beginning that is was going to be temporary, but did not give the residents an indication of how long they would be accommodated at the hostel. People from the informal Waterfront settlement in Athlone, were also relocated to the hostel (Ndenze 2005b). Since April 2005, these residents did not receive any notification of a relocation until the 22nd of December 2009. But they refused to move just before Christmas, and they eventually did move on the January 4, 2010.

Charlotte Tabisher, the ward councilor organized a public meeting with the residents of Spes Bona to inform them about the relocation to Blikkiesdorp. Residents of the Spes Bona hostel in Athlone said to Eyewitness News (Smith 2009) that they are willing to renovate the building they live in themselves to avoid being relocated to Blikkiesdorp in Delft. Many of the hostel’s residents have been living there for more than five years and if they are forced to go to Blikkiesdorp, many families will be uprooted, they expressed in Eyewitness News (Smith 2009). David, one of the residents said to this newspaper that ‘all the children are going to school in Athlone. How are they going to get bus fare from Blikkiesdorp to Athlone? I don’t know. There’s even, there’s no trains nearby’ (Smith 2009). The 70 families are refused to move, saying they would rather live on the streets than in Blikkiesdorp, which is a Temporary Relocation Area erected by the City of Cape Town for emergency housing. However, the families did eventually move to Blikkiesdorp. Sandy, now living in Blikkiesdorp said to the Guardian (01/04/2010) ‘we didn’t want to move because we’re used to it and it’s close to everything. But they said if we didn’t get out, they would move us out with law enforcement’.

According to one of the residents of the changing rooms, the residents from Spes Bona moved without a court case, because they bargained with the City:

They bargained with the city and that’s why they went to Blikkiesdorp. But their bargaining is going to pay off, because the City did make a promise to them and within a couple of months they are going to build houses for them. In our scenario, we don’t know where we stand. Tomorrow they can come and bulldozer us out of this place. Tomorrow they can come because they said they are going to appeal on this case. We will go back to court. It doesn’t matter how long it is going to take, but they are going to try to evict us with the law. They are going to spend a lot of money. But why do they spend the money and they already spend so much money on the stadium, but why can’t they spend it to build simple RDP houses, like they build for all the other people. Six houses doesn’t make a difference. So what is wrong with the City!

However, it is September 2010 now and the residents from Spes Bona are still living in Blikkiesdorp, without further notification about possible relocations to brick houses. Pamela Beukes, AEC coordinator of the Athlone region told me that the people from Spes Bona were under the impression that they were moving to real homes soon and not that they were moving into shacks in Delft. As the coordinator of the Athlone region, she was unaware of these relocations to Blikkiesdorp:
I just found out about the Athlone people the day they arrived in Blikkiesdorp, because they were under the wrong impression due to their ward counselor, Charlotte Tabisher. They believed her and they didn’t seek for advice. There was no paper work, nothing was done. They were just told, look you have to go and you have to move here. Here is the truck we are going to move you now to your homes. For them to arrive in Delft it was: wow are these the homes that they were talking about? They promised us brick structures and not Tin Cans. So only when they arrived there, I found out about Athlone. They didn’t ask us for advice, because they thought their demands were being met (Interview with Pamela Beukes, 29/06/2010).

When I asked her if these residents did not knew about the circumstances in Blikkiesdorp, Pamela Beukes told me:

They knew about the circumstances in Delft. Even the people in the Athlone hostel they knew about the situation in Delft, but they were unaware that they were moving into that situation. They though I am going to live in a house and not in a TRA. I am not going to live in a Tin. So it is the impression that they got by the ward counselor and also to the fact that she manipulated them into thinking something else which wasn’t actually going to materialize. Before they realized that is was a lie, they were already there (Interview with Pamela Beukes, 29/06/2010).

For the many residents that were evicted from the Spes Bona Hostel in Athlone, there was only one alternative provided by the City: relocation to the Symphony Way TRA in Delft. Because of the promises of getting brick houses, many residents thus moved to the outskirts of the city, where the informal settlement Delft and the TRA’s are located.

5.3 Conclusion

The outcomes of the eviction notices varied for the residents of Athlone. Some experienced treats, others believed the promises of the ward councilor and made compromises, and only a minority managed to resist and remain. In their struggles to stay in their place of residence, the people of Athlone who either faced, accepted, and/or resisted evictions all attempted to secure their right to the city. The right to the city is about citizens being involved in the decisions that affect where they reside and having the opportunity to participate in the transformation of the urban spaces they live in (Harris 2010; Sugranyes & Mathivet 2010).

When it came to the renewal of Athlone, the principles the City aims to secure in its vision and policies where almost entirely ignored by the local government. These principles, which value aspects of the right to the city such as improving the living conditions of local residents and enabling them to participate in the decisions affecting their neighbourhood, were disregarded and unenforced, while modernization and beautification took precedence prior to 2010. Furthermore, if the right to the city is respected, citizens should be allowed to remain in the city and not be pushed to its outskirts (Harris 2010). The Athlone evictions violated the right of citizens to remain in the city when it was not their choice to leave. The inconveniences faced by the residents now living in the Delft TRA’s are many.
Their access to work, social networks, health services, high quality education, and commercial and shopping areas has been reduced, as well as their overall quality of life since they must now invest a lot of money and time in commuting to and from work (when they still have a job, and otherwise in searching for a job) and to their families and friends still living in their former neighbourhoods. This valuable time could have otherwise been used to spend with their families or for their own personal activities. Besides this, they have to pay much higher transport costs as Delft does not have a train station.

As much as we saw the right to the city been violated by Cape Town’s city officials and developers, we also saw it represented through citizen’s struggles to remain in Athlone by claiming their right to housing and to the urban space they lived in since they were born. The six families managed to remain in Athlone and even made sure that they will be part of the development process in their neighbourhood by having granted the right to be housed in the surrounding area, instead of moving to Blikkiesdorp. The institutional and societal structures in society made them to stand up for themselves, because a relocation to Blikkiesdorp would have further marginalized the already vulnerable and poor residents by uprooting them from their livelihoods and their social networks they are currently surviving from. Furthermore, these structures in society also influenced their activism and agency. Due to the lack of financial resources they used the tactic of wait and see until the city council forced them to move out of their homes with law. They further used laments representation, a tactic often used by the Western Cape Anti-Eviction campaign. This technique made them win the case as they showed the court that they did not have money to pay for a lawyer and through the stories they told in court they showed that they did not have another place to live. They still lived in the changing rooms out of necessity and because of dire poverty. Based on humanitarian grounds they were granted the right to stay. By successfully advocating the use value of a place, instead of a market value for privatized growth, the residents of the changing rooms showed to have a voice in advocating their own vision for the future.

These collective actions to stay put and to contest marginalization, demonstrate that citizens do have the capacity to stand up for what they want and to demand that their rights be recognized. It further shows that citizens cannot be disregarded to give priority to an international mega-event like the 2010 FIFA World Cup. However, the squatters from Spes Bona, believed their ward councilor and this false impression in relation to the threats they received from the police and law enforcement, made them lost the battle to stay in the Athlone region. However, their struggle against marginality and their claims for urban citizenship and the right to the city continued after their relocation to Blikkiesdorp. These forms of social resistance to claim the right to the city will be discussed in the next chapter.
6. Blikkiesdorp: Out of Sight, Out of Mind…

This chapter will focus on the Spes Bona Relocation to the Symphony Way Temporary Relocation Area, known to many as Blikkiesdorp (Afrikaans for “Tin Can Town”), a government built shantytown. Set on the far periphery of Cape Town, in a windblown sandlot with standpipes for water and only a few working toilets, Blikkiesdorp is the literal reckoning of the adage “out of sight, out of mind”. Blikkiesdorp was built by the City of Cape Town and filled with residents evicted from all around the metropolitan area. These include squatters from Salt River, backyarders from Delft who occupied N2 Gateway houses and later Symphony Way and residents relocated from the Spes Bona Hostel TRA in Athlone. Their relocation to this sandlot behind the international airport at the outskirt of the city, made these residents feel pushed aside and forgotten. Many residents blame one thing for their recent eviction: the 2010 FIFA World Cup. According to Martin Legassick, Emeritus Professor and housing activist working together with ABM and the AEC, the World Cup is responsible for Blikkiesdorp in two ways:

First of all, the money that has been spent on the World Cup by the government which is something like 40 billion rand could have been spent on solving the housing crises which is about 1.2 million nationally. Secondly, there has been a lot of evictions due to the World Cup and to try and clean up spaces, treating people like litter and those people have been evicted to Blikkiesdorp (Interview with Martin Legassick, 23/06/2010).

This process of displacement is such that many inhabitants of South African cities live in their own cities, like passengers in transit camps or even as if in refugee camps. They are there, without being truly present, or not? Although the relocation has further marginalized the already vulnerable groups of society, this has not silenced these residents. Residents of Blikkiesdorp are still attempting to claim the right to the city through different forms of social resistance and collective action. This chapter will therefore focus on community organizing in the TRA and especially on how the squatters of Athlone cope with their recent eviction to Blikkiesdorp. Before I will discuss how these communities have mobilized themselves to raise their concerns to the City, their government and the international world, in order to demand their rights as urban citizens, I will first provide a general overview of the conditions of Blikkiesdorp.

6.1 Welcome to Blikkiesdorp

The Symphony Way Temporary Relocation Area (TRA) as it is formally known, was established in 2008 to house people evicted after illegally occupying homes in the N2 Gateway Housing Project (Legassick 2008). The residents have named the place Tin Can Town, or Blikkiesdorp [in Afrikaans]
as all the houses are made of tin. In the two years of its existence, Blikkiesdorp has become known as a dumping ground for those evicted from unsafe houses, from public spaces visible to World Cup tourists, vagrants and victims of xenophobic violence.

Behind Cape Town’s International Airport, in a fenced off barren area surrounded by the dunes of the township of Delft, 1,667 metal structures rise from the sand. Welcome to Blikkiesdorp (see Appendix 4, pictures 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3). Rows upon rows of 18m-square units with four metal walls and a roof are erected in a grid pattern on hard gravel. For every four units there is a freestanding toilet and basin, but on closer inspection it becomes clear that some are not working. Beside rows of tin structures with shared toilets and basins, there is nothing. No grass, trees, public spaces or facilities for children to play (see picture 4.4). The whole area is further enclosed by a high metal fence. Police vehicles sit at the entrance, making their presence known to all who enter and exit. It is easy to see why residents frequently refer to the shantytown as a concentration camp.

Though Blikkiesdorp was promoted as an alternative to informal settlements and backyard constructions, it takes only a short walk through the TRA to see that these accommodations are no better than the insubstantial homes its 12,000 residents came from (see picture 4.5). The thin walls of the temporary structures provide limited protection from the elements (picture 4.6). With or without insulation, the structures capture heat in the summer and release it in the winter, leaving residents to combat the outdoors even as they escape it. Flimsy construction materials, poorly fit windows and porous ceilings and walls let in the elements, flooding the dirt on cement floors. The monotonous gray houses are only distinguishable by their rapidly spray painted numbers, beginning with A1, A2, A3… until Q60. Doors that can be opened with a screwdriver and walls so thin that it can be cut using a pair of scissors, offer little to no security. The one or two windows per shack let only a small patch of light into the units. In some cases, families of six or seven people are cramped together in a living space of three by six meters.

Outside the shelters, the ground is covered with all kinds of waste that is explored by groups of dogs constantly searching the small byways between the buildings. Though the despair of the area is visible to an outsider’s untrained eye, it understood more clearly in the words of residents. Therefore residents will be speaking in the next paragraph about the conditions in the TRA.

6.2 Community Perspectives on Blikkiesdorp

For many residents, the move to Blikkiesdorp was not a choice but rather a necessity due to a lack of alternatives. During interviews, residents repeatedly spoke of eviction processes that left them with few options, and even of threats of officials to remove them from housing waiting lists if they did not comply. Other residents felt as though officials deceived them into coming to Blikkiesdorp. In the

---

21 Informal conversation with Odie, Blikkiesdorp Resident, 19/05/2010
focus group, six residents who moved from the Spes Bona Hostel remembered that government officials brought people papers of houses that were already built and people signed for those houses, they thought they were going to move there. But at the end of the day when people found out they were moving to Blikkiesdorp everyone was shocked… ‘We didn’t think we were going to move into a shack…they call this a way forward, who is moving forward?’ Reluctance to move to Blikkiesdorp is understandable. Outside of the conditions of the TRA, Delft itself leaves much to be desired. With limited services, overcrowded schools, few job opportunities and distant markets, the township greatly disrupts citizens’ livelihood strategies. Mohamed, a Blikkiesdorp resident phrases it like this:

The places where we lived before, I mean if you look at Blikkiesdorp as a whole, most of the people are deprived of their livelihood. If you talk about Salt River, Cape Town, Sea Point, Athlone, those people lived near fruit stalls if they don’t work they could go to a fruit stall and get some rotten vegetables or rotten fruit to provide their families with some food. But here in this place, you can’t go out to get a rotten apple or a rotten potato to peel off and make a pot of food for your children. You get nothing here. At nighttime children are crying for food (Interview with Mohamed, 22/06/2010).

Though quantitative studies of Blikkiesdorp and the impact on the livelihoods of its residents have not been undertaken, similar research on the impact of moving to another Delft TRA, known as Tsunami, was conducted by the Development Action Group (DAG), a South African NGO, in 2007. The DAG report found that 68 percent of the households surveyed were unhappy about their relocation to the TRA in Delft, most often citing the lack of access to a range affordable public transport options. Furthermore, the report found that 95 percent of the respondents had seen a significant change in their income and expenditure since moving to Delft and that 34 percent indicated that someone in their household had lost his/her job or was no longer able to find employment as a result of moving to Delft (DAG 2007: 16-18).

Blikkiesdorp residents reported similar patterns as those found by the DAG. At the top of their list of concerns was a lack of access to essential services including schools for their children. Shirley (Focus Group, 10/06/2010) made a comparison between Blikkiesdorp and their former lives:

Everything was much better there, we all helped each other and everything was near, we could walk to the shops and everything. When I had nothing I could walk to my mother. Also the schools were convenient for the children, they only had to walk 10 minutes to school there, but here we have to pay a taxi fare of 300 Rand per child per month. When we can’t pay this fare for the children, the children stay at home.

Although there are multiple schools in Delft and Leiden, Shirley, Peggy and Estralita (Focus Group, 10/06/2010) said that due to capacity restrictions her children needed to continue to attend school in Athlone, where they had begun the year and had attended the school for the past few years.

Furthermore, many people in Blikkiesdorp do not have an income or lost their jobs due to the relocation. Claude, one of the residents from Athlone explained the reason for this:
People are losing their jobs here, because they can’t pay for the transport. Transport costs 50 Rand per day; you have to take two taxis or the train, while we only earn about 70 to 80 Rand a day. From this money you can only buy groceries for maybe two days. From then on, you have to ask again if they can fetch you to do a job for a day. But they don’t want to come along to get the people for work, because of the distance (Claude during the Focus Group, 10/06/2010).

The people are thus willing to work, but because they lack the financial resources to cover the distance of going to work, they fall back into a vicious circle.

Safety was also a major concern for the Blikkiesdorp residents. In a report about the conditions in the TRA based on a visit in 2008, the Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions found that Blikkiesdorp had a ‘high rate of crime, particularly rape and other gender specific crimes’ (COHRE 2009: 26). Many interviewees reported feeling the anxiety of the dangerous environment acutely, especially when compared to their previous living conditions. During the focus group a former Athlone resident argued that ‘at Spes Bona we could see our children playing outside, and look after each other’s children, it was very safe there, but here we can’t see them playing between the shacks. We sometimes don’t know where they are, but they can be killed, they can be raped, they can be taken away…’ Besides the concerns of residents about safety for their children, the adults do not feel safe themselves at all times. During the evening Sandy said she felt unsafe of going to the toilet outside; ‘It is totally dark and you don’t know who might be walking there’ (Interview with Sandy during the Focus Group, 10/06/2010). Besides these concerns about safety, many residents accuse the police of brutality and fear them. Mohamed, a Blikkiesdorp resident, from Athlone described this to me:

Here around 9 you have to be back in your structure, because gangsters can rob you or you can be brutalized by the police or by the neighbourhood watch, the bambananis. From my own experience, when the police catch you around 9.30 pm outside they can smack you, hit you, arrest you or give you a fine of 150 Rand. We are being oppressed like when the Jewish were put in a concentration camp, it is basically the same here, because you can’t do what you want, you can’t go where you want after 9.30 pm because when they catch you on the road they are going to hit you (Interview with Mohamed, 22/06/2010).

These circumstances in Blikkiesdorp, made people feel both angry and sad, but also willing to stand up for themselves to change the situation they were living in.

### 6.3 Mobilisation and Resistance in Blikkiesdorp

The forced relocation of squatters from the Athlone area to Blikkiesdorp, as well as from other areas in Cape Town, caused many inconveniences, as discussed above. The former Athlone community was completely shocked when they were brought to Blikkiesdorp to live in a tin house. This made some of the residents decided to stand up for themselves and to join community based organisations (CBO’s),
the Anti-Eviction Campaign (AEC) or collective actions organized by the Delft AEC or CBO’s in the area.

However, from a planning perspective, the physical design of Blikkiesdorp, the location, layout and fences, has made it difficult for the residents to organize as this design reduced interaction amongst them. The location, far away from the City centre and cut off from the surrounding area by the busy Symphony Way and by a high fence that keeps criminals out and citizens confined inside away from the rest of society, all contribute to the increased marginalization of these poor urban dwellers. Inside Blikkiesdorp, rows of structures all face the same direction, hindering any interaction from one home to the next. Doors face the next shack’s back and windows look out to nothing. Additionally, the division of the TRA into phase one and phase two and then into alphabetical blocks seems to have intentionally created fractions within the area, using labels in much the same way as the apartheid government did to exaggerate differences between people (Wileden 2010). Furthermore, Blikkiesdorp lacks a community center or even open space for people to gather, exposing planning flaws that help deconstruct community bonds (Ibid.). Although the planning of Blikkiesdorp is not to promote social interaction, some forms of community organizing are visible. Different CBO’s are active in the TRA to help solve the problems within the TRA as well as to assist the people into getting decent housing in the near future outside of the TRA.

Some of the people from the Spes Bona Hostel in Athlone have joined the J-block committee in Blikkiesdorp, which focuses mostly on problems of people or material in J-block, while two persons have joined the Joint Committee of Blikkiesdorp which discusses issues that concerns all residents from phase 2 in Blikkiesdorp (about 800 structures/ 6,000 people).

The Joint Committee, which includes two elected representatives from each alphabet block in Phase 2, is an outgrowth of the community group that existed when Blikkiesdorp residents occupied Symphony Way. Now encompassing more residents from other areas, like Spes Bona Hostel and Salt River, the Joint Committee brings together a broad group of residents whose needs, committee members believe, it is the job of the committee to address (Interview with Jane Roberts, 18/05/2010). The committee also serves as an intermediary between residents and government and often organizes marches or mass subsidy form completion meetings. Within this Joint Committee there is a strong link with the ideology, perspectives and activities of the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign. Jane Roberts, Blikkiesdorp resident and AEC coordinator of Delft is actively involved with the Joint Committee. The Joint Committee tries to come together each Thursday in structure M49, where Jane Roberts resides. This paragraph will further discuss the different forms of mobilizing and resistance, especially related to the former Spes Bona Hostel residents.
6.3.1 Quiet Encroachments

Residents in Blikkiesdorp, not only express their grievances in mass mobilisations, but also through small forms of resistance in daily life. One example of this is the way many of the residents of the TRA furnished their structures. Some residents turned their structures into homes; they gave personal meaning to it by painting the house from the inside or outside. The act of painting the house made the structure no longer one of the so many identical structures with only a hastily spray painted number on it to distinguish it from the others, but a home for a family to turn to after a day of work or school.

Other residents, however, did not purposely make these iron congregated shacks livable and a place to call “home”. This is to show the outside world that they are not happy with the fact that they were moved to Blikkiesdorp and they therefore resist settling down in this place. Settling down and making the structures comfortable, can be seen as giving up the battle for proper brick houses and showing yourself and others that you are fine with the living conditions in the TRA and that you feel comfortable here (Interview with Johan, Blikkiesdorp resident originally from Salt River and member of the Joint Committee, 19/05/2010). Therefore some people have structures furnished with only the essential equipments to be able to live there, for example a bed and a stove to cook food. Some residents do not have carpet on the concrete floors and the tin walls are not covered to make it look nice:

The floors are lifting up and there are holes coming in, but I don’t want to repair it because I want the people to see what is really going on. When it is winter time, the water is flowing in the house. A couple of weeks ago the water was 100 mm above the ground. We had to sweep the water out. My wife is now in the hospital because of the cold and my children are sick. So this is basically where we have been dumped into (Interview with Mohamed, 22/06/2010).

Besides these forms of resistance to adapt to the current situation, I also found other forms of resistance through which these residents expressed their discontent, namely the ways of engaging with the government and state authorities responsible for Blikkiesdorp and through residents’ non-voting behavior in elections. In Blikkiesdorp, the majority of the people I spoke with abstained from voting in the last election(s). When I talked with them about politics and about which party they voted for, they laughed and said that all the parties are the same. They further expressed the feeling that the political parties are not accountable to the poor. Some people said that politicians only come to the communities during election time to obtain votes via the spreading of promises that they will eventually not fulfill. According to Richard Pithouse (2009), instead of an open system, the South African political scene resembles a ‘caste system in which the poor are simply unworthy of engaging with politicians on the basis of equality.’ It seemed to me that residents did not want to be part of the formal political process so long as the formal political process abstained from engaging with them. Many resident also repeated the phrase “No Land, No House, No Vote,” a slogan of political boycott used by the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign and its partner Abahlali baseMjondolo [shack
dwellers movement] and this political boycott was followed by many poor communities in Cape Town.

Besides these forms of resistance to the state and the situation they are facing, many residents also did not participated in meetings about a housing project in Delft, organized by the City of Cape Town. These meetings were held at the Delft South Library, but were only attended by a few Blikkiesdorp residents. The Delft AEC told me that they do not want to attend the meetings as they are organized by the government and the AEC does not work together with the government. Other residents did not seem to care at all about these meetings. They did not saw it as an opportunity to participate in the decision-making process of the local government, which is in charge of the next housing project in the area. Some residents rather explained to me that these housing projects are implemented top-down and that communities do not have a say in this process.

Although this non-engagement with formal politics on different aspects can be seen as a strong and powerful sign of discontent with the current political process and the government and thus as a form of empowerment, the risk of non-voting and withdrawing from the formal political scene is that residents perpetuate their own disenfranchisement. By not exercising their democratic right to hold politicians accountable through elections, Blikkiesdorp residents remove themselves from the equation (Wileden 2010). They cease to factor in a politician’s calculations, because they become a dead district where there is nothing to be lost or won, a voting area of no one. In a time when the community is already encountering walls at every turn, to silence themselves in the formalized political process is self-damaging (Ibid.). For them to see social change they must not only voice their opposition to the status quo, but act upon it.

Some alternatives are emerging. For instance, the organization of a new party, called the Conference of the Democratic Left, seeks to rouse the working class, the dispossessed, the unemployed, the youth and women and to gain the power and the right to shape a new agenda that would confront neo-liberalism, capital and redistribute wealth.22 These and other groups, that seek to change the existing political sphere in terms of the peoples’ struggle, provide a promise to those exasperated with the current system. If such a group were able to mobilize the support of those disengaged from politics, it is possible that alternative discourse would arise and different approaches could be sought (Wileden 2010).

This paragraph has shown that not only the mass actions or sporadic eruptions of mass protests of squatters in public spaces are of importance to study, but also the quiet encroachments or everyday forms of resistance (Scott 1985). It is however difficult to define which actions in which contexts can be defined as protests, but quiet encroachments can be seen as daily forms of protests as they are signs of discontent and thus survival and protest techniques of the poor. Desai (2003) defines quiet encroachments as:

The silent, protracted and pervasive advancement of ordinary people on those who are propertied and powerful in a quest for survival and improvement of their lives. It is characterized by quiet, largely atomized and prolonged mobilisation with episodic collective action—open and fleeting struggles without clear leadership, ideology or structured organisation.

While quiet encroachments ultimately targets state power, I want to emphasize that quiet encroachments, although it might indirectly follow generalized political implications, implies changes which the actors consider significant in themselves without intending necessarily to undermine political authority. Yet these simple and everyday practices are bound to shift into the realm of politics. These forms of behavior can thus be seen as small but pervasive forms of social resistance against the conditions that the residents of Blikkiesdorp are currently facing. Through individual and quiet struggles, they seek steady and significant changes in their own lives.

6.3.2 Voicing their Grievances, Engaging with the Media

Jane Roberts, community activist and coordinator for the AEC in Delft, opened her “hokkie” [Afrikaans for small shack] in the beginning of 2010 to the international public in order to let them experience life in Blikkiesdorp. This resulted in the comings and goings of some reporters, photographers and researchers who stayed from one or two nights up to three weeks living at Jane’s place.23

After David Smith from the Guardian published the article ‘Life in “Tin Can Town” for the South Africans evicted ahead of the World Cup’ on April 1, 2010 alongside with a photo gallery of Gareth Kingdom (who stayed three weeks living in M49), masses of international reporters and TV crews came to Blikkiesdorp for a couple of hours to write a story about the negatives impacts of 2010.

Just before the FIFA World Cup, Jane Roberts had about three to five appointments each week with local, national and international journalists, researchers or students who wanted to know about life in “Tin Can Town”, about the recent evictions that took place and about the actions the community and the AEC are planning during the World Cup. When these journalists asked about evictions related to the World Cup, Jane often referred to the 366 squatters that were evicted from Spes Bona Hostel and relocated in January to Blikkiesdorp. Sandy, the only former Athlone resident still active in the Joint Committee of the second phase of Blikkiesdorp, was often asked to inform these people about her recent relocation. She sometimes arranged interviews with more residents of the Spes Bona Hostel, to let them tell their story to the international newspapers.

The short term effect of telling these stories to these journalists was that more and more people over the world became aware of the negative side effects of hosting the World Cup for South Africa’s poor. Furthermore, these stories about the circumstances in the TRA were brought to the attention of

23 I stayed one week living in Jane’s shack for my participant observation and interviews.
NGO’s, such as Black Sash, a South African human rights organization, that monitored the area to see if it was in line with the national government guidelines for temporary emergency accommodation.

6.3.3 March for the Evicted Communities and Traders

During the World Cup, the AEC had planned to have two big collective actions. The first one, The Poor People’s World Cup, was an alternative football tournament for poor communities in Cape Town, accompanied with political speeches to discuss the impact 2010 had on low-income communities in Cape Town. This Poor People’s World Cup was for all the poor communities in Cape Town that work together under the umbrella body of the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign and will therefore be discussed in chapter 7 ‘actions of solidarity for the evicted communities and traders in Cape Town’. The second big collective action, a march, was an idea of the coordinators of the AEC, but it was organized by the Delft Anti-Eviction Campaign, located in Blikkiesdorp. The organisation of this march - applying for a legal march, mobilizing the communities in Blikkiesdorp and the surrounding areas (through the three framing techniques), arranging transport to the city and the creation of banners and slogans was discussed with the Joint Committee of the second phase in Blikkiesdorp (Joint Committee meeting, 13/05/2010). The Joint Committee decided in cooperation with the AEC to have the march on the 9th of June, just before the kick-off of the 2010 FIFA tournament.

In their press release on the AEC website about the march the community stated that ‘the idea of having this march was to tell our government and the world that this FIFA World Cup hasn’t brought us any good and that we are further being marginalized’ (Anti-Eviction Campaign Western Cape 2010b). Pamela Beukes, secretary and coordinator of the AEC, said that the main purpose of having a march was to:

(…) shows that this World Cup took place right enough but it has created so much havoc in our communities. So much communities are being displaced, so much families have been displaced, and so much humility and inhuman stuff took place because of the World Cup and because of making money. We also want to showcase that the World Cup should have brought a change of a sense of development and all that this current World Cup brought to our people is more poverty and more enslavement and it has brought also that our children think more less of themselves and it didn’t bring that thing of being proud and having more dignity, it didn’t bring along that for people. So this march takes up that for us and fights for us, and also to showcase that look here although all those injustice took place with us that we are still standing our grounds and that we are still going to be fighting for what is really ours and what we should actually get as citizens. And as citizens we got the right to a house, as a citizen we have got the right to clean water, and the right to food and to basic necessities. We have got the right to proper shelter, not a tin can but a brick structure. It is to show that we are people and we are not animals. And also to show that the government can do it if they want it. If you look at the amount of billions and millions they spend on the World Cup, why can’t they spend so much on the poor and try to alleviate poverty. They are not even attempting to do it. What we want is change (Interview with Pamela Beukes, 29/06/2010).
In short this march was to ask attention for the people that lost their houses due to 2010 and for those who were relocated to Blikkiesdorp, as well as for traders who lost their trading spaces. The communities wanted to show the world what is actually happening in South Africa and wanted the government to be accountable to the poor and especially to the residents of Blikkiesdorp. Besides this, the AEC also wanted to invite the mayor, Dan Plato, and FIFA officials to the finals of the Poor People’s World Cup. All their demands were written in the memorandum that was supposed to be handed over on the 9th of June to the mayor of Cape Town. However, due to several problems the community rescheduled the march to the 23rd of June. These challenges will be further discussed in the next paragraph.

After the Joint Committee came together on May 13, 2010, Jane Roberts, chairperson of that meeting, asked the Joint Committee members to inform the communities in their blocks about the march on the 9th of June. This was done via personal visits of the Joint Committee members or via a public meeting mostly held in front of the structure of the committee member. Jane Roberts for example called up a public meeting on an evening in front of her structure, M49. This was done through blowing on a vuvusela24 and yelling around: meeting, meeting! During this public meeting she informed her blocks about the march. Some members of the Joint Committee were also present. The people first made a circle, held each other’s hands and took 60 seconds of silence to pray. After this Jane Roberts said: Amandla! [Xhosa and Zulu for Power!] and the people in the circle replied: Awethu! [To Us!]. Together forming the rallying cry: ‘Power to the Poor People!’25 Then the meeting was opened. Jane walked to the middle and said:

We are holding this meeting to inform the people about the march. On the 9th of June we will have a march. This is not only for Blikkiesdorp, but for the whole community. We will march to Greenpoint Stadium. Greenpoint was billions of Rand, while they could have build houses for us. Nothing happened so far [in Blikkiesdorp], so we must fight again. We are so relaxed now, thinking that these are our homes now, but if you are not fighting you will stay here for years. We have to stand up for ourselves to fight for houses! (Community Meeting, 19/05/2010).

Some people asked if the march was legal, as they did not wanted to march when it was an illegal march, because of police brutality. Jane Roberts told them that they were busy to arrange a legal march, because then the children can also join. After she answered all the questions, the meeting came to an end and the people did the same ritual again (standing in a circle and holding hands). Then everyone went as soon as possible back to their structures, because of the coldness at night.

Days passed and the date of the march came closer. However, six days before the march no action was undertaken so far. The people were informed, but nobody yet applied for the march and transport to the city centre was not arranged. For a march to be legal, an application form has to be

---

24 The Blikkiesdorp residents currently use a vuvusela, introduced by the World Cup, to make noise, but before the tournament they used other instruments to call people for meetings.
25 These words were often used by the ANC and activists as a rallying cry in the struggle against apartheid. These words are still associated with the anti-apartheid struggle.
filled in and handed over to City officials two weeks before the actual date of the march. This was not done, so the march needed to be rescheduled at least two weeks. Because the Delft AEC wanted Ashraf Cassiem, the chairperson of the AEC to be there too, they choose to reschedule it on the 23rd of June. Ashraf Cassiem was one week in London, because he was invited by War on Want, the NGO the AEC is working with, to discuss the impacts 2010 had on low-income groups in the City of Cape Town.

This time, the Delft AEC applied for the march on time and after a meeting with the police forces and City officials, they were given green light to march. However, their plans to march to the Green Point Stadium was not possible as all marches and protests actions in close proximity to the FIFA venues was banned. Therefore, they could only march to the Civic Centre, where the office of the mayor is located. The Joint Committee was called together and the blocks needed to be informed. Besides this, the traders, surrounding communities and soccer teams and coaches who played in the Poor People’s World Cup needed to be updated, because the intention was that ‘in solidarity with these residents now living in this relocation area – soccer teams, coaches and communities that are involved in the Poor People’s World Cup plus the informal traders affected by the FIFA World Cup – will also support and join this march’ (Anti-Eviction Campaign Western Cape 2010c). Furthermore a press release was written to inform the media about the march.

As Pamela Beukes said about the media: ‘we don’t expect much of it [handing the memorandum over to the mayor] but we do expect the media to be there to cover it so people can know about what is happening in our country. Than they can put pressure on our bloody politicians and ministers who are not doing their work’ (Interview with Pamela Beukes, 29/06/2010).

So everything was thought of, or not? On the night before the march, the memorandum still had to be written. It was decided that Jerome a Blikkiesdorp resident with a computer in his structure could type the memorandum with the help of Jane. They made a list with four demands: (1) they wanted to invite the mayor Dan Plato and an official of FIFA to attend their Poor People’s World Cup; (2) they wanted to know when the residents of Blikkiesdorp will be getting proper houses; (3) they demanded for hawkers and traders to be moved back to their original spaces; and at last (4) they wanted the City to ‘undo all the damages caused to marginalized communities by the 2010 World Cup’ (see Appendix 5, a copy of the Memorandum).

On the morning of the march only 20 people showed up. They were gathering in front of Jane Roberts’ house and wrote slogans on pieces of cardboard, such as: “Dan Plato, ons need huise vir ons kinders” [we need houses for our children] or “Set to die in Blikkiesdorp, where are the houses?” Most of the participants were dressed in red t-shirts (red is the colour of AEC and ABM activists). Some of them had newly printed t-shirts of the AEC with the slogan “World Cup 2010 for S.A. Poverty for the Poor will be the OUTCOME!” on the front and “NO TO!! 2010 forced removals, pre-paid water devices. NO TO!! The privatization of: housing, land, education, health & jobs” on the back.
After waiting for an hour, Jane Roberts decided that they had to go to town, from where the march had to start, because maybe more people would come to gather there. Jane Roberts and some residents, including a family from the Spes Bona Hostel went with a pick up car to town, while the others walked towards the train station and took a train to the centre. At the place from where the march started, seven police cars and a dozen of journalists waited for the protesters to arrive (see Appendix 6, picture 6.1). Once arrived, the 20 residents decided to wait for others to come, as they heard that 300 traders were still on their way by train. However, because it took too much time, the police gave the residents no more time and they had to decide if they wanted to march or not. They decided not to march because they were with too few people. They postponed the march to the 2nd of July 2010 (see their press release on Anti-Eviction Campaign Western Cape 2010d).

On the 1st of July the coordinators of the AEC had send a piece with information about the march to a radio station [Voice of the Cape] to try to inform the poor communities in Cape Town about the march and to ask them to participate and support it. However, this was not fruitful as about 35 people turned up to participate in the march, while the Delft AEC expected 500 people to come. Some residents from the surrounding areas were present as well as players and coaches from soccer teams. The Athlone family or other residents from Athlone for example did not participate, due to work obligations, limited resources, lack of knowledge, or due to disappointment, because the last attempt to march was not successful at all. Besides this low turnout of protesters, only two German journalists showed up to cover the story. The participants however decided to continue with the march, in order not to lose face (see pictures 6.2, 6.3). When they arrived at the Convention Centre where the office of the mayor is located, people were singing songs, toyi toying\textsuperscript{26} and yelling that the mayor had to come and listen to their grievances (picture 6.4). The mayor however was not there to accept the memorandum and the protesters reacted furious. After a while another city official, Alida Kotzee of the City’s Housing Directorate, arrived to accept the memorandum and she promised to hand it over personally to Dan Plato (picture 6.5). The community did not had many time left, before the march would be declared illegal and decided to hand it over and return home (picture 6.6). Although this city official said that the mayor would react within two weeks, the residents have not received any response yet.

\textbf{6.3.4 Challenges to Successful Mobilisation and Resistance}

As discussed above, the march organized by the Delft Anti-Eviction Campaign, was cancelled several times and the final march had only a limited turnout of residents as well as of media. While they stated in the press release to have at least 500 participants and while the turnout rate of the public meetings

\textsuperscript{26} Toyi-toyi is the war dance of black South Africans, which dates back to the Mau Mau people in Kenya, who rose against the English colonialists (Nevitt 2010). This dance was used during the Apartheid as a powerful statement, by which the oppressed voiced their grievances to the government. Post-Apartheid, people have used toyi-toyi to express their grievances against current government policies.
held in Blikkiesdorp in front of Jane Roberts’ house were high, the actual scale of people that turned up at the location of the march was small. What were the challenges to successful mass mobilisation? Why were there so few people, while so many media was there to cover their stories during the World Cup? They could have used the World Cup as an international platform to question the circumstances they are living in and the impacts 2010 had on their lives.

One of the first challenges was to inform all the people about the march. When a date was chosen and discussed at a meeting of the coordinators of the AEC, then Jane Roberts, AEC coordinator for Delft, reported this first in the Joint Committee and then in a public meeting in front of her structure. The other members were asked to inform their communities. Although, this procedure was followed through before the supposed march on the 9th of June, after rescheduling the march to later dates, no Joint Committee meetings or public meetings with all the blocks were held to inform the residents about the march. So only a small sample of Blikkiesdorp was informed. Besides this, the soccer teams and coaches were supposed to be informed about the march on a tournament day, but this was done only on the first day of the Poor People’s World Cup. The weekend before the march of July 2, the Poor People’s World Cup was cancelled due to a lack of resources for transport. This resulted in difficulties of informing the 500 participants of this tournament. There were no other financial or material resources to inform all these communities about the march. There was a press release on the Internet, but the majority of these poor communities do not have the money or access to this form of communication. There was also a message send to a few local radio stations to inform all the Capetonians living on the Cape Flats about the march, but this message was send on the night before the march and therefore broadcasted on the actual morning before the march, and thus too late to inform the communities. Furthermore, most of the people do have mobile phones, but they do not have airtime to call each other. Besides this, the AEC has only five coordinators to cover massive areas. In order to inform all the communities it would take weeks of preparation and meetings.

The second challenge was to motivate the people into joining the march. Some people were disappointed because it took them a lot of effort to join the march on the 23rd, while it was eventually cancelled. Other persons asked if it would actually result into getting houses, if not, then they would rather use their energy, time and money for other things. Some persons said they wanted to join, but they had other obligations, like their work or school. Many people thus made personal calculations of the costs and rewards of joining this march. In the literature (see e.g. Shigetomi 2009 or Jenkins 1983), this problem is often referred to as the problem of free-riding. Some people want to benefit from the outcomes, the public good, of a collective action, but they shoulder less than a fair share of the cost to accomplish this. If only a few people free-ride, while enough people participate in the action, then the goals can still be achieved for the community, in this case it can result in better living conditions and formal houses in the near future for the Blikkiesdorp residents. However, this problem of free-riding is probably widespread and can have unexpected negative effects for the outcomes of a collective action as well.
The third challenge to successful large-scale mobilisation and resistance are financial resources. The Delft Anti-Eviction Campaign is part of the Western Cape AEC and this social movement is based on horizontal forms of organizing. In order to maintain freedom and autonomy, the AEC does not have vertical alliances with, or support from NGO’s, institutions, businesses or the government. Instead of professionalizing and institutionalizing their movement into the formal and hierarchical structures of society, they have chosen to oppose these structures and found support, solidarity and mutual aid on a horizontal base. Horizontal forms of organizing means, that neighbourhood organisations or CBO’s help other neighbourhoods or communities in need on a non-hierarchical base. While the positive sides of horizontal structures are for example that the Anti-Eviction movements remain autonomous, form social networks of reciprocity among many neighbourhoods/communities and are therefore able to organize large-scale protest campaigns, the negative effects are that they lack external financial resources. In the preparations of the march, the Delft AEC did not had money to arrange transport for the communities to the city centre, thus an extra barrier of participating was the fact that they had to provide for their own transport. Public transport from Blikkiesdorp to the city centre costs about 20 Rand (2 euro), which is a lot for most of the people, because they do not have a regular income. Participating in a march or having food on the table is then an easy choice. Another way to go to the centre is by train, but although this is much cheaper, it is very far walking from Blikkiesdorp to the nearest train station. This financial situation most residents are facing, thus asks for a lot of effort of the residents to support the public good, with the ultimate aim of getting better living conditions and formal houses in the (near) future.

Other challenges that might have influenced the low turnout of participants during the march are the fact that (1) the residents of Blikkiesdorp all came from different areas of Cape Town and the group of participants did not formed a community with strong ties amongst each other, which resulted in a low mobilisation potential as ‘the mobilisation potential of a group is largely determined by the degree of pre-existing group organisation’ (Shigetomi 2009) and (2) the role of personality characteristics, as some community representatives were no longer supported by their whole community or block in the TRA. In short, there were financial, organisational and communication problems, which resulted in a low turnout of participants for the march.

6.4 Conclusion

In this chapter we have seen how institutional and environmental constraints play a crucial role in determining the course and outcomes of collective actions. Due to the fact that these poor residents did not had the means nor the opportunity to engage meaningfully with politicians and city officials, this

---

27 An exception to this is the cooperation with the War on Want charity from the United Kingdom. As discussed in chapter 4, the AEC told me that War on Want is not like other NGO’s and that they want to work on the ground with social movements.
made them to choose for an array of different small to large actions to ask attention for their cause, which is fighting for better living conditions and for the enhancement of democratic urban citizenship, or the right to the city. Besides these institutional or political structures in society that limit the space for poor urban dwellers to negotiate about decision that affect their daily lives, such as their forced relocation to Blikkiesdorp without other alternatives and their stay in this “temporary” relocation area without knowing if or when they will be moving into formal subsidized housing, these structures also influence and determine the strategies and actions of social resistance among its residents. Because these structures had limited the possibility to engage with the City, Blikkiesdorp residents have chosen to oppose working via the formal political structures in society, and to use non-institutional forms instead. By their non-voting behavior, non-participation in meetings organized by the City and by marching they have tried to collectively resist the situation they are living in, with the ultimate goal of fostering social change. However, as discussed above, non-engagement with the formal political system both empowers as well as silences these residents (Wileden 2010). Blikkiesdorp residents have further created their own autonomous spaces, as their communities are run by local committees and community based organisations, with limited or no assistance of the government. These committees perform open and horizontal structures that provide direct democracy and opportunity for participation for everyone in the settlement. This is in reaction to the political structures in society that deny citizens participation in decisions that affect their lives (see Dellaporte and Diani 1998). The creation of a community in this TRA has a special meaning, as these communities give rise to resistance. However, the situation in Blikkiesdorp that made people willing to stand up for themselves, which is referred to in the literature as diagnostic and motivational framing (Benford and Snow 2000), functions at the same time as a restriction to change the situations of these people as they are (Shigetomi 2009). The fact that all Blikkiesdorp residents were living in extreme poverty in an area far away from schools, work, transport facilities and social networks that can support their livelihoods, made it a challenge to organize, mobilize resources and people for mass collective actions during the World Cup. This was however a time to show international visitors the other side of the medal, namely the fact that many people struggle daily to have food on their table and the fact that the World Cup has caused even more damage to the already vulnerable poor by relocating them to places far away from basic necessities. However, even if their attempt of having a mass march was not that successful, their other forms of social resistance as small as they might be, have brought the attention of the international world. Short term effects are that national human rights organisations came to the area to monitor the living circumstances, while the long-term effect might be that these organisations and the international world can put pressure on the local government of Cape Town to foster social change in the long-run.

As the anti-eviction struggles and struggles against marginality do not exist in a vacuum, the next chapter will therefore discuss the city-wide campaigns of the two urban social movements in Cape Town, that stand in forefront of the struggles of poor communities in Cape Town against evictions and displacements and for the improvements of their lives.
7. Actions of Solidarity for the Evicted Communities in Cape Town

This chapter will discuss the solidarity actions of the two urban social movements in Cape Town that are working on housing and service delivery issues for the poor and were held during the one month FIFA tournament. With the discussion of these mass collective protest actions, this chapter shows that the anti-eviction struggle of the Athlone squatters is not a case on its own. It shows how these communities are embedded in larger networks of anti-eviction struggles. The two campaigns that will be discussed in this chapter are not related to one case or to one contested space where evictions took place, but focuses on city-wide struggles of the poor against marginalization, evictions and relocation to TRA’s and their claims to the Right to the City.

These actions were organized to raise awareness among the international community about the negative impacts of 2010 for low-income communities and raised questions about the large sums of money spend on World Class facilities for the rich and the tourists, while the majority of South African’s citizens still lives in shacks or derelict buildings in the outskirts of the city. Especially the Poor People’s World Cup organized by the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign is of interest to the topic of this thesis as it concerns a solidarity action for the evicted traders and communities in the context of 2010. It asked and received attention from the international world, as many journalists attended this tournament and published stories about it in many international newspapers. It even generated solidarity actions from social movements in the United States.

The Right to the City Campaign of Abahlali baseMjondolo (ABM) of the Western Cape has however less to do with the 2010 FIFA World Cup alone, but discusses the right to the city of poor communities in Cape Town before, during and after 2010. This second campaign is thus not bounded to this once in a lifetime event, but questions the marginalization of the poor and why the poor are denied access to city life. This Campaign is therefore not totally or only related to the negative socio-spatial impacts of 2010 for the livelihood of squatters, but uses 2010 as a international political platform to discuss the poor’s right to the city. How this urban social movement uses this notion of The Right to the City and how they reflect on this notion in their daily struggles in Khayelitsha, an informal settlement in Cape Town where the urban social movement ABM is based, will be discussed and compared to Lefebvre’s original idea in more detail below.

7.1 The Right to the City Campaign

Abahlali baseMjondolo Western Cape is one of the partner organisations of the Western Cape Anti-Eviction and launched a campaign during the FIFA World Cup that directly links to Henri Lefebvre’s notion of the Right to the City. This Right to the City Campaign kicked off on the opening day of the 2010 FIFA World Cup and aimed to build shacks outside Green Point soccer stadium at Cape Town,
to occupy governmental offices, to invade open public spaces within the city and to occupy unused hotels, flats and schools within the City. The message behind this was to show the world, that the World Cup 2010 is not benefitting the poor, but is instead further marginalizing the urban poor from places they called home and from public spaces where they found their main sources of income. Furthermore, besides creating this awareness about these evictions that were carried out during the preparations for the World Cup, this Right to the City Campaign is further used to claim the right to adequate housing and especially to claim ‘that the government must build houses within the city’ (Launch of the Right to the City Campaign, 22/05/2010). Mzonke Poni, chairperson of Abahlali baseMjondolo Western Cape, said during the launch of the campaign:

(…) We are told that there is no place to build houses in the city, but they are building stadiums. They must not build houses far away from the jobs and everything, we as the poor also have a right to be housed within well located land (Launch of the Right to the City Campaign, 22/05/2010).

During the speeches that were held at the launch of the campaign in TT informal settlement, Site B, Khayelitsha, the community leaders stated that they are waiting for 16 years on adequate housing, and on the general improvement of their living conditions, but nothing happened so far (see Appendix 7, picture 7.1). In their speeches the community leaders made clear that they are tired of empty promises and that it is now time to take action themselves. Mzonke Poni (2010) further explained this by stating that:

This [restoring their dignity and improving the quality of their lives] can only be done and be achieved not by relying on government any more, as we gave them opportunity to deliver services to our communities but 16 years down the line people are still living under appalling conditions with no access to clean water, electricity, toilets and descent houses and our people still continue to die every day because of shack fires, illegal electricity connections, etc.

Besides this, the community members made clear that they want to be involved in the decision-making process and that the City officials have to come to the communities to ask what they want and to work together on an equal foot. However, space for negotiation is limited and people are tired of promises made by the local government. Mzonke Poni (2010) therefore stated in his letter on the ABM website, that:

(…) Now is the time for the poor not to listen at empty promises any more, now is the time for the poor not to be patient any more, now is the time for the poor to do away with party politics and rally behind united front, now is the time for the poor to do away with useless negotiation, time for negotiation is over, there’s no time to talk now is the time for action.

This statement shows that these activists feel that the government is not working for them and accountable to them, and that they are left with no option but to actively take responsibility to ensure that they improve the quality of their lives themselves by standing up and taking action. In this case by housing themselves forcefully in the city and by the illegal march they held as part of their Right to the City Campaign (see pictures 7.3, 7.4 and 7.5 of the campaign). This further shows again that poor
communities in Cape Town do not want to be part of the formal political process so long as the formal political process abstained from engaging with them. Besides this, it shows that trust in these formal institutions is low due to years of experiences with them and no or few positive outcomes from them. Furthermore, these political structures in Cape Town influence and determine the behavior of these squatter communities. They have chosen to stand up for themselves and to ask attention for their cause via non-formal ways, in other words via illegal marches, rioting and burning tires, because engagement within formal structures has not resulted into positive changes.

The Right to the City Campaign uses the FIFA World Cup as a platform to show the world ‘that this [South African] government is not accountable to the poor but to the rich’ (Poni 2010) and this mega-event will be used by those evicted and marginalized from their spaces and livelihoods to claim back their Right to the City:

It is time now for those who were evicted under the bridge within the city to claim back their space so that we can show the world that we are still alive, visible and refused to be dumped in the dumping sites which distract our livelihood (Poni 2010).

What does ABM actually mean with this abstract and theoretical notion of Lefebvre? Mzonke Poni (2010) asked himself the question ‘what does this notion (the right to the city) means to the poor in Cape Town?’ He answers this by saying that: (1) It means improving the quality of life; (2) It will promote social and economic development; and (3) It will respect, promote, protect and fulfill the rights in the Bill of Rights. Mzonke Poni (2010) further comments that ‘the right to the city should not be seen as just a demand to be housed within the city but it should be looked at how it will improve the quality of life for the poor’. He makes this notion of the Right to the City practical to the South African context, as he refers to sections in the South African Constitution. For example, when he lists the aspect of improving the quality of life as part of the right to the city, he refers to the South African constitution that says that the government has a duty to ‘improve the quality of life of all citizen and free the potential of each person’ (Poni 2010; see also South African Government Information 2010b). He further refers to section 152 of the constitution that says that ‘the local government must provide services to communities in a sustainable way, it must promote social and economic development, and it must encourage communities and community organisations to be involved in the matters of local government’ (Ibid.). Besides this, section 7(2) of the constitution places a duty on the state to respect, protect, promote and fulfill the Rights in the Bill of Rights (see South African Government Information 2010b). The Right to the City is here, thus not used as an abstract right with the utopian vision to ‘make the city different, to shape it more in accord with our heart’s desire, and to remake ourselves thereby in a different image’ (Harvey 2003: 941), but to put these ideas into practise by actively accessing city life and to enjoy urban citizenships in its full facets. However, Mzonke Poni (2010), makes clear in his statement about the Right to the City campaign that although the government should provide all its citizens with the above mentions rights that are part of the South
African constitution, the reality in South Africa is that the majority of South Africans still live below poverty lines, within informal settlements with no tenure security and with possible evictions on their heads. Mzonke Poni refers furthermore to section 21 (1) which says that everyone has the right to freedom of movement, but this right is only applicable to the rich but not to the poor as 40% of South Africans are still living below poverty lines and do not have the means to move wherever they want to (Poni 2010). They are stuck in their small worlds at the edge of the city. This reality is thus far from what the right to the city and its campaign strive for.

7.2 The Poor People’s World Cup

Another mass collective action during the World Cup and about its negative effects was organized by the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign, the major movement that was in the forefront of South Africa and FIFA’s World Cup displacement and exclusion of shack dwellers, low income people and street traders from the tournament.

A couple of months before the FIFA tournament, the five coordinators of the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign together with their communities came up with the idea of organizing a Poor People’s World Cup. Running parallel with the FIFA games, it aimed to highlight the province's struggle against rampant poverty and homelessness. However, although it began on the 13th of June, the same week as the FIFA tournament, it has taken not one, but two months, to complete, as the tournament depended on local donations and on some external funds of the U.K. based NGO, War on Want (Anti-Eviction Campaign Western Cape 2010e; Mudzingwa 2010).

The point of the competition, said Pamela Beukes, was to show how the World Cup was a missed opportunity to promote development to the benefit of South Africa’s poor:

We looked at it from the perspective that the tournament would bring better houses for us, we thought they would develop our areas to give a good image to foreigners, but we were relocated to tin houses hiding us away from foreigners (Interview with Pamela Beukes, 29/06/2010).

Organizers of the AEC said that the games are a way to protest what they call the exclusion of poor communities from the FIFA games and the negative impact of the World Cup on the poor and homeless (Anti-Eviction Campaign Western Cape 2010b). Most South Africans are not benefiting from the official World Cup, rather than benefitting financially from the influx of visitors, Ashraf Cassiem claims that many people have lost their livelihoods due to the World Cup (Interview with Ashraf Cassiem, 08/06/2010). He said that many informal street traders and hawkers were not allowed to trade near World Cup stadiums, in an effort to protect FIFA’s official partners, and that many street vendors have been cleared from their usual trading spaces in a bid to ‘clean up’ Cape Town. Activists further stated during their alternative World Cup that poor South Africans, especially the homeless, have been relocated to TRA’s to be hidden from visiting soccer tourists. Besides this, the AEC
activists said that people in Cape Town are really crazy about soccer, but they did not get the opportunity to participate in the real World Cup as the FIFA World Cup excludes the poor with high-priced tickets people cannot afford. The cheapest tickets cost 150 ZAR (15 euro), which is more than some people earn in a week. Thus, in contrast to the FIFA World Cup, which has further marginalized the poor, organizers of the Poor People’s World Cup said that their tournament is ‘for the poor communities by the poor communities that will not exploit or marginalize people but rather involve them and create new spaces of exposure and participation’ (Anti-Eviction Campaign Western Cape 2010c).

During the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign meetings, the coordinators made clear that they especially wanted to invite all the traders and communities who lost their livelihoods due to FIFA related urban renewal projects and the implemented nuisance and trading by-laws; ‘We want the players and traders during our tournament to be the ones who were evicted’ (Ashraf Cassiem, Meeting with the Western Cape AEC, 20/05/2010). During the Poor People’s World Cup, the Concerned Hawkers and Traders Organisation (CHATA), a partner organisation of the AEC, organized that evicted traders came to the venues to sell their goods. This showed how the AEC supports CHATA and the informal traders that were negatively affected by 2010 and how they in turn show affinity with the communities that were evicted.

Besides the evicted traders and communities, the tournament brought together 36 neighbourhood teams from 40 poor communities all over Cape Town and beyond (see Appendix 8, picture 8.1). Each team represented a World Cup nation, plus four other countries (Palestine, Haiti, Somalia and Zimbabwe) were included to highlight their struggles (picture 8.2). The AEC has recruited football teams from different townships and shack settlements like Joe Slovo, Gugulethu, Hanover Park, Khayelitsha, Athlone, Blikkiesdorp and so on. One the one hand the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign introduced football teams and youngsters to the work the AEC does. During a meeting with the soccer teams, the AEC coordinators explained that this tournament is not only for the soccer teams, but also for the whole community and for the people who struggle everyday against water and electricity cut-offs and against evictions from their homes and working places. On the other hand, this tournament gained a lot of international attention and thus gave exposure to soccer teams and their communities to tell the world about their daily struggles:

We don’t have houses, we don’t have land, we don’t have water, we don’t have food, we can’t pay for our education, our parents are struggling to get social grants, so we have a lot of social issues. There will be a lot of media here, and I want you to tell them about these things. I want you to know that the media wants to tell your story, so don’t hide it (Opening Speech of Ashraf Cassiem at the first day of the tournament, 13/06/2010: see picture 8.3).

In sum, the Poor People's World Cup was used to expose and educate youngsters and soccer teams about the work, the ideas and actions of the Anti-Eviction Campaign and as a platform created by poor
people, for poor people, to expose the international world to the evictions and displacements affecting poor people in a negative way.

This tournament not only brought exposure to local teams that have been marginalized in the coverage of the World Cup, but it also provided space for political discussions that will help to explain why 2010 is not benefitting the country’s poor and how to challenge that marginalization. At the opening day of the PPWC there were speeches of Ashraf Cassiem (chairperson of the AEC), Michael Premo (Housing is a Human Right) and of Martin Legassick (University of the Western Cape Emeritus Professor and prominent housing activist) that questioned the large sums of money spend on 2010 while South Africa’s poor still lives in shacks and the evictions carried out because of 2010.

In his speech, Michael Premo of the media organizing project, Housing is a Human Right, talked about similar issues low-income people face(d) in the United States. He further read a message of solidarity from the Take Back the Land Movement in Miami that wanted to express their solidarity with the oppression social movements currently face in South Africa and with the recent evictions that took place. In this solidarity message, the Take Back the Land Movement further said that they would do everything in their power to raise these issues to the international community and to bring awareness to their plight off to the United Nations. In this message Rob Robertson, member of the Take Back the Land Movement writes:

> The world must take its blind fold off to see what is happening to the people of South Africa. The government must live up to its obligations, to universally respect and absorb human rights accorded to all mankind. We will do everything in our power to promote a human rights agenda. I stand with you, we stand by you and your struggle is my struggle. All power to the people!
>
> Amandla! – Awetu! (Message recited by Michael Premo during the the first day of the Poor People’s World Cup, 13/06/2010).

Martin Legassick talked in his speech about this money question, the evictions carried out during the run-up to 2010 and about the attitude of the South African government towards the poor (picture 8.4). Underneath follows a piece of his speech, between the brackets are the responses of the public:

> This is the poor people’s World Cup. [Yes our world cup!] and why is it the poor people’s world cup? It is because we are not against football, we are for football, we are not against Bafana Bafana, we are for Bafana Bafana, but we are against FIFA [yes!]. FIFA is organizing this World Cup to benefit itself and the rich [yes!]. You know business day, the newspaper, on Friday it said that the total government spending on this World Cup was 20 billion dollars, that is over 140 billion rand. Just think what that money could have done if it was given to benefit the poor. We could have solved the housing problem. There is a 2,5 million homes backlog and with 140 billion rand you could have solved the housing problem, build houses for everybody who needs it. With that money the hospitals that are in crises could be renovated and make decent and accessible to everybody, so we don’t have to wait for hours at the hospital when we go. Education system which is in crises, that money could have been spend on that. Instead we have got this big stadium, you know the Greenpoint stadium, they could have renovated the

---

28 There is a long tradition of using sports to organize and politicize participants that goes back to resistance of political prisoners on Robben Island and this project follows in that tradition.
Athlone stadium, but FIFA didn’t want that because they didn’t like the TV pictures of the surroundings of the Athlone stadium. They said no, the stadium must be in Greenpoint so they had to spend 6,1 billion rand on that. (…) and as well as that, as a result of FIFA’s dictation they swiped the homeless from the streets as if they are so much litter and dumped them in Blikkiesdorp in Delft, they take people who were living around Athlone stadium and they also dumped them in Blikkiesdorp in Delft. They are not benefiting the poor, but they regard the poor as useless as marginal as without purpose. So that is why we had to organize and why we are having this Poor People’s World Cup and we will tell the world media what our conditions are, that we are poor but we have dignity and we want to be treated like citizens and not like animals. Amandla! – Awethu! (Power to the Poor People!)

Besides these political discussion about the impact of 2010 for the poor residents of Cape Town, the organizers of the Poor People’s World Cup also wanted to use the FIFA World Cup as an international platform, by attracting and exposing journalist and researchers from all over the world to the stories of evicted communities and traders, related to World Cup vanity projects and the implemented by-laws that prohibit traders from trading next to World Cup venues. The activist of the AEC therefore published press releases about their alternative tournament on their website. This attracted the attention of many international journalists. Many articles have been written about the Poor People’s World Cup and these were published in newspapers/TV- and radio programmes such as, The Guardian (UK), Huffington Post (USA), Blacklooks (Blog), People’s World / Mundo Popular (USA), Anarkismo (English and Italian), CNN (USA), The Zimbabwean (UK), Kick it Out (UK), Free Speech Radio Network (USA) and PressTV. Although there was a lot of media attention for the PPWC, no high-ranking officials from FIFA or the government deigned to visit the parallel tournament, despite invitations from the AEC. Pamela Beukes (secretary of the AEC) commented on this by saying that: ‘we invited the mayor, he did not come. They are showing disregard for the poor. All that we wanted is for them to come and support it and especially to come and see the talent on the ground’ (Interview with Pamela Beukes, 29/06/2010).

7.2.1 Solidarity Actions from Abroad

Besides the statement of the Take Back the Land Movement and the press coverage in various local and international newspapers, there were also solidarity actions from abroad. Social movement activists at the U.S. Social Forum in Detroit played soccer in solidarity with the South African Poor People's Alliance for their World Cup resistance. On June 25 in Detroit, members of the Chicago Anti-Eviction Campaign, Coalition of Immokalee Workers, Malcolm X Grassroots Movement, Picture the Homeless, Poverty Initiative, and other movement activists at the U.S. Social Forum gathered to play football — as a solidarity message to their allies in South Africa and their Poor People’s World Cup games happening at the same time (Durant and Nagaraja 2010). The message they send to the participants of the Poor People’s World Cup and to the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign activist was:
As the World Cup began in South Africa in June 2010, the social movements of the Poor People’s Alliance continue to face off against the governing elite’s escalation of harassment, repression, and displacement. At the same time, activists gathered at the second United States Social Forum — to bring together U.S.-based movements fighting poverty, racism and oppression, within the States as well as globally. Some of the poor people’s organisations that gathered in the embattled and resilient, majority-Black city of Detroit for the USSF had met with members of Abahlali baseMjondolo and the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign who visited the U.S. in 2009, finding common cause and inspiration in their creative struggles and visions for a better world. We are with you! Aluta continua! [The struggle must go on!]
Amandla Awethu! [Power to the Poor People!]

Their solidarity action, playing football at the same time as the poor communities in Cape Town, was recorded on a video and put on the website of both the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign and Abahlali baseMdjondolo (Durant and Nagaraja 2010).

As discussed in chapter 4, the two urban social movements in Cape Town do not only receive solidarity and support from U.S. based social movements, but from all over the world. It is however important to note that the AEC for example really wants to learn about community organizing in India, but that these South-South relations are difficult to develop. Ashraf Cassiem, chairperson of the AEC told me that there is a very interesting women’s organization in India working on similar issues like evictions and on the privatization of services and that he hopes to be invited by them in the near future, because he does not has the money himself to visit these activists. The difficulties in developing South-South relations are caused by the fact that both social movements work in developing countries and have in most cases limited resources to exhaust from. As a result the social movements in Cape Town are more interlinked with social movements in the North, or in the Western world, where financial assets play a lesser role.

7.3 Conclusion

Although the 2010 FIFA World Cup revealed the South African government’s currently misplaced priorities, it is important to note that many poor Capetonians have remained severely disenfranchised for decades before the FIFA World Cup came to South Africa. Many communities have been evicted and relocated to the outskirts of the city, denying their access to the right of the city. However, in the face of such marginalisation, communities of resistance have surfaced, offering hopeful and practical visions of change for South Africa. In their struggle for justice in shack settlements, TRA’s and poor neighbourhoods of Cape Town, the AEC and ABM have challenged the privatization of housing and basic services such as water and electricity, all aspects of the right to the city.

Furthermore, their solidarity actions with the evicted communities in Cape Town who had to make space for World Cup regeneration or ‘beautification’ projects, not only questioned the recent local evictions related to 2010, but discusses the right to shelter, to legal recognition by the government and to participate in decisions that concern their lives before, during and beyond 2010. In
short, their actions not only asked attention to anti-eviction struggles of local communities in Cape Town, but questioned the Right to the City for all South African inhabitants and advocated for a radically different physical and political infrastructure for all South Africans. The political and environmental structures in society thus inspired their activism and agency to challenge and to change the physical and political structures that have been significant sites of oppression in their lives.

While these mass collective actions of Abahlali baseMjondolo, the shack dwellers’ movement in Cape Town as well as the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign represent examples, their distinct embodiment of the right to the city connects their activism to movements and cities across the globe, as shown with the solidarity actions and statements from Take Back the Land Movement in Miami and from different social movement organisations in the United States that were present at the U.S. Social Forum in Detroit. Although the poorest citizens experience a diverse range of injustices in different cities across the globe, the fact is that the right to the city inserts an entirely new rhetoric into conversations on urban growth and social injustices. Rather than emphasize “growth” in future cities, the right to the city advocates the “right to return,” as with foreclosures in many cities of the United States, or “the right to stay put,” as with Cape Town’s evictions. No matter the circumstance, the right to the city articulates the right for inhabitants to inhabit – to live safely, to work stably, and participate freely in the governance of their neighborhoods, wherever they may be (Harvey 2003). Thus local small scale anti-eviction struggles, like the contested spaces of Athlone, are embedded in city-wide campaigns and networks of radical poor people’s movements and these campaigns and urban social movements are themselves related to transnational advocacy networks. In every scale, the Right to the City is represented as a theory, a movement and as a realized vision for future just cities.
8. Conclusions

This research was undertaken to investigate the anti-eviction struggles of squatters in the context of the 2010 FIFA World Cup. More specifically, the main research question in this thesis was:

*How do squatter communities in the Athlone district of Cape Town collectively cope(d) with forced evictions from their living spaces carried out during the run-up to the 2010 FIFA World Cup?*

In order to answer this question, empirical data has been gathered through a 2.5 months independent fieldwork study in the City of Cape Town, South Africa.

Via the use of diverse social science research methods and techniques, such as participant observation, semi-structured interviews, informal interviews, focus group and qualitative document analysis, a holistic perspective is given on the anti-eviction struggles of squatters, the opportunities and challenges they faced in these struggles and their claims to the Right to the City. Through using more than two research methods, the process of data triangulation could take place, which helped me to feel confident that my research findings are as accurate as possible.

8.1 Research Findings

South Africa has shown the world that it can host a world class event, namely the 2010 FIFA World Cup. For the city of Cape Town, one of the host cities of 2010 and the subject of this thesis, the legacy 2010 would leave behind is a brand new system of transport and new and upgraded stadiums. The legacy the World Cup would however leave behind for many poor squatters is the fact that they lost their houses due to World Cup vanity projects. These squatters, or families with children, not only lost their living spaces, but they lost a place they called *home* for many years. Their relocation to the outskirts of the city furthermore reduced their access to work, high quality education, social networks, health services, and to commercial and shopping areas, as well as their overall quality of life due to the money, time and effort they now have to invest in order to access full participation in society. These forced displacements to Delft have thus robbed these citizens from their urban citizenship as they were “dumped” in tin houses far away from the city centre, where they have to survive in inhuman conditions. In short, these families from Athlone, Joe Slovo and from other contested spaces have lost their Right to the City as these projects to “beautify” the area are denying access to the city to its poorest residents. In fact, it is even debatable to say that they have lost their Right to Life (Fumtini 2010) as the right to the city further aims to ensure that every citizen is able to exercise their basic biological functions such as eating, drinking breathing, and defecating all with the utmost dignity, and that they have the freedom to inhabit and become one with the city (Harvey 2003).

These forced evictions have been justified by the City as legitimate, because these squatters were seen as “land grabbers” and the buildings they had occupied for years were declared as unfit to
inhabit and needed to be demolished or renovated. However, that these evictions were decided upon just before the World Cup and the fact that these squatters were living close to World Cup venues, highly visible to the eyes of the international world, is just a coincidence as we may believe City officials.

As we have seen how the right to the city of squatters in Cape Town has been robbed by FIFA and the City of Cape Town, we also saw this represented through the anti-eviction struggles of squatters from Athlone, the ones who had been living up to 11 years in occupied derelict buildings near to Athlone stadium, Cape Town’s practice venue for the 2010 FIFA World Cup. Through their collective efforts, these residents from Athlone have not accepted this marginalization, this ‘othering’ by the government. Although the 366 families from Spes Bona were forcibly evicted to Blikkiesdorp, it did not silenced all of them. The new situation they were facing inside Blikkiesdorp motivated some of the residents to stand up for themselves and to join CBO’s or the AEC with the idea of changing their environments in the long-run. However, the structure which had caused grievances among these people functioned at the same time as a restriction to change the situations of these people as they are (Shigetomi 2009).

Although agency is important for collective actions to happen and for social movements to flourish, structural constraints such as financial resources, geographical distances and political opportunities in the South African society, like the limited space for negotiation in formal politics and the limited access to resources due to a situation of extreme poverty, all play an important role as these structures influence and determine the forms and outcomes of social resistance (Dellaporte & Diani 1998; Shigetomi 2009). Because the political opportunity structures in Cape Town have restricted the possibility to engage meaningfully with the City, Blikkiesdorp residents have chosen to oppose working via the formal institutional structures in society and to use non-institutional forms instead. By their non-voting behavior, non-participation in meetings organized by the City and by marching they have tried to collectively resist the situation they are living in, with the ultimate goal of fostering social change. Blikkiesdorp residents have further created their own autonomous spaces, as their communities are run by local committees and CBO’s, with only limited or no interference of the government. These committees perform open and horizontal structures that provide direct democracy and opportunity for participation for everyone in the settlement. This can thus be viewed as a direct reaction to the political structures in a society that deny citizens participation in decisions that affect their lives (see Dellaporte and Diani 1998). Although horizontal forms of organizing can foster large collective actions to take place, because of the mutual support of surrounding communities, the negative side is that they often lack (external) financial resources. These residents, activists and social movements in Cape Town all have the will, but not the means to organize or to participate in (mass) collective actions. As a result people often have to choose between participating in collective actions for the public good or having food on the table. Besides this, most of the people have for example some assets, like mobile phones, but they lack airtime in order to be able to call, to inform and to
mobilize each other. While Resource Mobilisation Theory stresses the importance of social movements’ ability to (2) acquire resources needed for collective action and to (2) mobilize people towards accomplishing the movement’s goals (McCarthy and Zald 1987), the case of the squatters in Cape Town shows that the ability of social movement actors does not play a crucial role here, but that the surrounding structures, such as living in extreme poverty influence the forms and outcomes of social resistance.

Although the surrounding structures made it more difficult for the former Spes Bona residents to claim basic human rights, the right to the city was still represented in their daily struggles or quiet encroachments, in their engagement with the media, by marching and through handing over a memorandum. This thus asks for an approach that takes both structure and agency into consideration. What is further interesting to note, is that the former Spes Bona resident all agreed that there was a problem in society that needed to be fixed, namely their circumstances in Blikkiesdorp (diagnostic framing); most of them were highly motivated to undertake action (motivational framing), but that this has not led to move people into action (action mobilisation) or as I called this: “moving people from the shacks to the streets”. This thus showed that the theory of Framing Analysis of Benford and Snow (2000) is too much focused on the agency of actors and social movements alone, while it neglects the structures that are highly determining the outcomes and scales of collective actions in South Africa and other developing countries. This theory thus seems more useful in Western countries, where structures play a lesser role.

The abstract notion of the Right to the City, however, has proven in this thesis to be more than only a utopian goal where social movements and actors strive for (Sugnayes & Mathivet 2010). By contesting the forced eviction of the six families in the Athlone changing rooms in a legal struggle against the City, these families were able to claim their right to housing, to participate in the redevelopment of Athlone and to access and enjoy full participation in society. In this thesis, the theory of the right to the city has offered an alternative vision of urban change, one that believes in the powerful agency of individuals and communities, the importance of the use value of land and the urgent need for an improved, more just city for all inhabitants. This thesis has not only emphasized the rights of squatters, but also their role and that of the two city-wide urban movements, Abahlali baseMjondolo (ABM) and the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign (AEC) in recreating their cities in a decidedly more egalitarian vision.

The concept of the right to the city was thus not only represented through the collective actions of these squatters on the ground, but also by the city-wide campaigns of the AEC and ABM. Abahlali baseMdjondolo Western Cape even used this notion of Lefebvre in their campaign ‘The Right to the City’. With this campaign they legitimated themselves to undertake action and to access city life in its full aspects by occupying empty buildings and empty spaces inside the city centre of Cape Town. They further legitimated their action by stating that they have been waiting on the
government to improve their lives for 16 years now, but because nothing has happened, they have to take action themselves by claiming the Right to the City via illegal actions and marches (Poni 2010).

The Poor People’s World Cup, organized by the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign can be also seen as a city-wide campaign that actively claimed the right to the city for all the poor communities who are denied access to participate in the decisions that affect their daily lives and who are denied to access, to use and to create urban space that meets people’s needs (Lefebvre 1996). This alternative tournament provided these poor communities in Cape Town with an international political platform to discuss the effects of evictions and displacements affecting poor people, and to challenge that marginalization.

This thesis has further shown that the local anti-eviction struggles of the Athlone squatters are intertwined with city-wide struggles for houses and even with international anti-eviction struggles via transnational advocacy networks.

Although the Abahlali movement and the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign are largely bound to Cape Town, their activism asserts the right to the city to an expansive audience, voicing opposition not only to the South African government but also the oppressive political and market forces operating on an international scale. As such, the movements tactfully inserted the right to the city into a broader discourse on the growing polarization of cities, the power of the urban elite and the complicity of the government in the processes of privatization that routinely deny rights to citizens most in need. As a matter of speaking, the Anti-Eviction Campaign is at the moment preparing to organize demonstrations against plans of the City of Cape Town to install pre-paid water devices in poor communities of Cape Town. As these poor communities, such as the Blikkiesdorp residents, already struggle to pay for pre-paid electricity in their structures, the privatization of water in those areas will have tremendous effects upon their lives. Although South Africa was one of the 122 countries that was in favour of the on 28 July 2010 adopted General Assembly resolution, recognizing access to clean water as a human right, this plan to privatize water in the poorest areas of Cape Town questions the Universal Human Right to water for these residents.29

Movements for the right to the city, whether born out of the shacks or out of the poor neighbourhoods in Cape Town or the foreclosed homes of the United States or other cities around the world, are stark reminders of the strength of communities, the alternative visions for the future of cities and the models of citizenship that can powerfully translate theoretical and democratic ideals into a lived reality.

Through marching, delivering memorandums and asking their politicians to listen to residents, the residents of Athlone and Blikkiesdorp and the activists from ABM and the AEC are calling for a new form of truly participatory democracy where citizens share a vital and respected role in government, no matter their race, class, gender, or religion. As Bob Catterell (2007) writes in his article Squatters and the Cities of Tomorrow, ‘when squatters fight for these things (the right to water,

electricity and land tenure) their deprivation becomes real to the rest of the city. And when they win these city services, their communities become, quite literally, a bit more powerful, a bit more estimable and a bit more legitimate.’ As residents of Athlone and Blikkiesdorp, and other semi-informal and informal settlements around the world, continue to fight for the basic right to shelter, the burden is not only on the policy makers, but also on the academics and theorists, to recognize that the demand has come from the bottom up, and now, too, must the solution.

The struggle of the Athlone and Blikkiesdorp residents is one that thousands of people all over South Africa are currently facing. This struggle is instantiated in housing evictions, land redistribution, and unemployment rates and articulated through meetings with councilors, NGO’s and mass meetings and demonstrations, but also through daily forms of resistance. It is a struggle for equality, for a re-humanization of the urban poor in the second most unequal country in the world. Ultimately, what the residents of Athlone and Blikkiesdorp were and still are requesting, and what the ‘othered’ citizens of South Africa are requesting, is what any human requests - dignity and recognition of their human rights.

8.2 Recommendations

With the inequality in housing distribution and the annually growth rate of poor families squatting empty plots of land or occupying buildings, the study of anti-eviction struggles is full of possibilities and extremely important. In the current academic arena there is a significant void in literature focusing on the autonomy of such movements, and their choice to do so. Partnering of NGO’s and academics with these struggles for housing on the ground is another highly relevant area that this project, regretfully, could not cover. Besides this, it would be interesting to investigate on a more in-depth base how these anti-eviction movements and activists engage with the government and politics as they often say they do not want to work with them in order to form an independent movement, but on the other hand they cannot create their own bounded world. They sometimes still have to participate in the formal structures laid- out by the government.

As this thesis focused only on activism in Cape Town, future research of this kind would greatly benefit from a broader scope of movements for land and housing rights. The interconnected scale of the right to the city demonstrates the prevalence of the theory in practice in countless cities. Therefore, further research with a broader perspective and greater attention to detail would only serve to strengthen the argument for more just and inclusive cities and to further elaborate the many different ways the right to the city is put into practice.

Furthermore, this thesis has shown that the most important constraint for successful mobilization and collective action are financial resources of social movements to overcome geographical distances. These social movements have shown to be able and willing to support
communities in need, but due to the simple fact that they just do not have money to pay for transport fees or to buy airtime in order to make the necessary phone calls, they are stuck with money explicitly for certain projects, without being able to pay for the basic necessities. A recommendation towards NGO’s who are willing to support social movements and their campaigns in development countries, is therefore to give more financial support for basic necessities such as transport and airtime, instead of only supporting complicated development projects.

Furthermore as I briefly discussed the solidarity actions from abroad in chapter 7, it would be interested for future research to assess the impact of international actors on the local dynamics of social resistance and on collective action. On a less academic, but on a more political and humanitarian base, and with the eyes on the 2014 FIFA World Cup, the 2016 Olympics in Brazil and maybe the 2020 Olympics in South Africa, it would be furthermore interesting to find out if and how the transnational advocacy networks of the Anti-Eviction Campaign and the efforts they took into showing and telling the world how 2010 has negatively affected many poor communities in Cape Town, can put pressure on FIFA, the Olympic Committee and governments around the world.

Mega-events can be organized without forcibly evicting residents, without criminalizing the homeless and without rendering housing unaffordable (COHRE 2007). Where it appears that displacement of people might be necessary, governments, host cities and international agencies such as the International Olympic Committee and FIFA have to approach the planning process from a human rights framework, which would include the full participation and full consent of affected communities (see also the recommendations made by COHRE 2007). Successive hosts of mega-events such as the FIFA World Cup like to improve on previous events by making them bigger, better and more spectacular. It is crucial that this spirit of improvement is translated into a growing commitment to ensure that these events not harm or even improve the human rights and well-being of the inhabitants of host cities. Past mistakes should be used to improve future conduct of host cities. For now, we can only hope that the next international sporting event, will value the local, be inclusive, and treat its residents, especially the poor, as citizens with rights, rather than solely as objects that can be mistreated, pushed away and forgotten (Harris 2010).
Bibliography


Appendices
Appendix 1. Overview of the Primary Resources

1.1 List of the Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alwyn</td>
<td>13.06.2010</td>
<td>Resident of the Athlone changing room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beukes, Pamela</td>
<td>29.06.2010</td>
<td>AEC Coordinator, Silvertown Anti-Eviction Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassiem, Ashraf</td>
<td>08.06.2010</td>
<td>Chairperson, AEC coordinator for Tafelsig and legal representative of the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chenwi, Lilian</td>
<td>27.05.2010</td>
<td>Senior Researcher in the Socio-Economic Rights Project of the Community Law Centre, University of the Western Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>09.10.2010</td>
<td>Resident of the changing room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude</td>
<td>10.06.2010</td>
<td>Blikkiesdorp resident, originally from Spes Bona Hostel, Athlone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniels, David</td>
<td>08.06.2010</td>
<td>Head of Local Government and Housing of the Provincial Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estralita</td>
<td>10.06.2010</td>
<td>Blikkiesdorp resident, originally from Spes Bona Hostel, Athlone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham, Alistair</td>
<td>14.06.2010</td>
<td>Local Governance Department of the City of Cape Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartzenberg, Gary</td>
<td>20.06.2010</td>
<td>AEC Coordinator, Newfields Village Anti-Eviction Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hweshe, Francis</td>
<td>14.06.2010</td>
<td>Freelance Journalist for Sowetan and Cape Argus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan</td>
<td>22.06.2010</td>
<td>Blikkiesdorp resident originally from Salt River and Joint Committee member (of the second phase in Blikkiesdorp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotzee, Alida</td>
<td>24.06.2010</td>
<td>Director of strategy support and coordination in the Housing Directorate of the City of Cape Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legassick, Martin</td>
<td>23.06.2010</td>
<td>University of the Western Cape (UWC) Emeritus Professor &amp; Housing activist working with ABM and the AEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llewellyn</td>
<td>30.06.2010</td>
<td>Resident of the Athlone changing room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, Trevor Dennis</td>
<td>24.06.2010</td>
<td>Policy and Research Unit of the Housing Directorate of the City of Cape Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohamed</td>
<td>22.06.2010</td>
<td>Blikkiesdorp resident, originally from Spes Bona Hostel, Athlone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy</td>
<td>10.06.2010</td>
<td>Blikkiesdorp resident, originally from Spes Bona Hostel, Athlone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poni, Mzonke</td>
<td>22.05.2010</td>
<td>Chairperson of Abahlali baseMdjondolo Western Cape and the Concerned QQ Section Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Jane</td>
<td>18.05.2010</td>
<td>AEC Coordinator for Delft, Delft Anti-Eviction Campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soraya</td>
<td>09.06.2010</td>
<td>Resident of the changing room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Besides the above mentioned interviewees, due to the method of participant observation, many more informal interviews or conversations were carried out with journalists, Blikkiesdorp residents, community activists and participants of the march, the Poor People’s World Cup and the Right to the City Campaign. All these conversations provided me with more background information to understand the context in South Africa and in particular of Cape Town.

1.2 Overview of the Attended Meetings in Cape Town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview of the Meetings, from where I took notes and recordings</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Committee Meeting</td>
<td>13.05.2010</td>
<td>Blikkiesdorp, Delft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with the Western Cape AEC</td>
<td>17.05.2010</td>
<td>Athlone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Meeting</td>
<td>19.05.2010</td>
<td>Blikkiesdorp, Delft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with the Western Cape AEC</td>
<td>20.05.2010</td>
<td>Athlone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Meeting at the City of Cape Town about the 2010 Legacy Programme</td>
<td>04.06.2010</td>
<td>Civic Centre, in the centre of Cape Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with the Western Cape AEC</td>
<td>09.06.2010</td>
<td>Athlone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Meeting</td>
<td>22.06.2010</td>
<td>Blikkiesdorp, Delft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting to connect Businesses and the City of Cape Town, with a specific focus on the World Cup 24.06.2010 Cape Town International Convention Centre, in the centre of Cape Town

1.3 Overview of the Attended Collective Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collective Actions, from where I took notes and recordings.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Launch of the Right to the City Campaign</td>
<td>22.05.2010</td>
<td>TT informal settlement, Site B, Khayelitsha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kick-off of the Right to the City Campaign (illegal march)</td>
<td>11.06.2010</td>
<td>Illegal march started from Keizersgracht in the centre of Cape Town to Wale Street in Cape Town’s CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First day of the Poor People’s World Cup</td>
<td>13.06.2010</td>
<td>Avondale sports fields, Athlone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second day of the Poor People’s World Cup</td>
<td>20.06.2010</td>
<td>Delft central sports fields, Delft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March of the Evicted Traders and Communities (eventually cancelled)</td>
<td>23.06.2010</td>
<td>Keizersgracht in the centre of Cape Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March of the Evicted Traders and Communities</td>
<td>02.07.2010</td>
<td>March started from Keizersgracht in the centre of Cape Town to the Civic Centre, where the local government is located</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2. Images of the City of Cape Town

**Figure 2.1:** Cape Town’s Image for the 2010 FIFA World Cup. This image shows Cape Town’s CBD, with the stadium in the front and the Table Mountain in the back.

![Cape Town - 2010 FIFA World Cup™ Host City](image.png)

Source: The official website of the City of Cape Town, 2010

**Figure 2.2:** Locating the Cape Flats. The areas surrounded by the dotted line are part of the Cape Flats.

![Locating the Cape Flats](image.png)

Source: 4Given Ministries International, 2010: [http://www.4givenintl.com/photo_cape_flats_map.jpg](http://www.4givenintl.com/photo_cape_flats_map.jpg)
**Figure 2.3:** Locating the Contested Spaces in Cape Town.

Below, Figure 2.3 shows the locations of the evictions and relocations that have been discussed in chapter 4 and 5. This figure furthermore gives an idea of the distance between the city centre and the places, Langa and Athlone, where the squatters used to live and it also shows the distance between their former living spaces (1, 2 and 3 on the map) and their new homes in the TRA’s in Delft (4).
Appendix 3. Pictures from Athlone

**Picture 3.1:** Two residents of the changing rooms in front of their house at the edge of the parking lot of the Athlone stadium. In the back, soccer teams are playing the Poor People’s World Cup, 13 June 2010.

[Image of two residents standing in front of a building]

**Picture 3.2:** A resident sitting outside of his house. The view from the changing rooms: Athlone stadium, 13 June 2010.

[Image of a resident sitting outside a house with a view of the stadium]
**Picture 3.3:** The inside of the changing rooms. A resident cooking a meal in her small house of 10 square metres. She lives here with her husband and two children. Picture taken on 9 June 2010.

**Picture 3.4:** Another resident trying to write during the evening with only one candle lighting his house. Picture taken on 30 June 2010.
Appendix 4. Pictures from Blikkiesdorp

**Picture 4.1:** The entrance of Symphony Way TRA, Blikkiesdorp. May 2010.

![Picture 4.1](image1.jpg)

**Picture 4.2:** An overview of the 1,667 structures in Blikkiesdorp. May 2010

![Picture 4.2](image2.jpg)
**Picture 4.3:** Blikkiesdorp, at the Shadow Side of the Table Mountain. May 2010

**Picture 4.4:** Children playing on the sand. In the back with the green door is a toilet and water standpipe shared by the four structures around it. May 2010.
**Picture 4.5:** A former Athlone resident with his child in front of his structure. June 2010.

**Picture 4.6:** A structure blown away by the wind. June 2010.
Appendix 5. Memorandum

This is the memorandum that was written by the residents of Blikkiesdorp and handed over to city official Alida Kotzee (in name of the mayor Dan Plato) during the march on July 2, 2010.

DELFT
Anti Eviction Campaign
M 49 BLIKKIESDORF DELFT
0761861408

Date: 23-06-2010

MEMORANDUM OF DEMANDS

WE THE ABOVEMENTIONED ORGANISATION WOULD LIKE TO PUT FORWARD OUR DEMANDS TO BE LOOKED AT AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. WE ARE VERY DISAPPOINTED IN THE WAY WE HAVE BEEN TREATED BY THE CITY OF CAPE TOWN AND THE GOVERNMENT BEFORE AND DURING THE WORLD CUP.

1. FIRST AND FOREMOST WE WOULD LIKE TO INVITE THE HONOURABLE MAYOR DAN PLATO AND AN OFFICIAL OF FIFA TO ATTEND OUR WORLD CUP (POOR PEOPLE’S WORLD CUP) WHICH WILL BE HELD ON THE 4TH OF JULY 2010 ON A VENUE STILL TO BE DECIDED. WE ARE NOT ABLE TO ATTEND YOUR WORLD CUP BECAUSE AS POOR WE CAN’T AFFORD TO SO IT WILL BE GOOD TO HAVE YOU ATTEND OUR WORLD CUP.

2. BLIKKIESDORP WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHEN WILL WE BE ALLOCATED WITH PROPER HOUSING AS THE TIN TOWN THAT YOU HAVE PUT US IN IS KILLING US. WE WOULD ALSO LIKE TO KNOW HOW LONG YOU PLAN TO KEEP US HERE IN BLIKKIESDORP BECAUSE WE WOULD LIKE TO BUILD OUR LIVES, WITH OUR FAMILIES, AND WE CANT STAY IN A PLACE FULL OF CRIME AND DRUGS WITHOUT PROPER HEALTH CARE, SCHOOLING, SPORTS AND RE CREATION FACILITIES.

3. HAWKERS & TRADERS WE DEMAND TO BE MOVED BACK TO OUR ORIGINAL SPACES, BECAUSE THE SPACES THAT YOU HAVE PUT US IN ARE NOT SUFFICIENT FOR US TO TRADE IN AS WE ARE LOSING OUT ON OUR LIVELIHOOD, WHICH WE DEPEND ON TO SURVIVE.

4. TO Undo ALL THE DAMAGES CAUSED TO MARGINALIZED COMMUNITIES BY THE 2010 WORLD CUP.

SECRETARY
Appendix 6. Pictures from The March of the Evicted Communities and Traders

**Picture 6.1:** The Police is ready to escort and control the protesters on 23 June 2010. However, this march was eventually cancelled and postponed.

![Picture 6.1](image)

**Picture 6.2:** The beginning of the March organized by the Delft Anti-Eviction Campaign on 2 July 2010

![Picture 6.2](image)
**Picture 6.3:** Marching to the mayor Dan Plato, towards the Civic Centre in the CBD of Cape Town, 2 July 2010.

**Picture 6.4:** Angry protesters. Where is the mayor? 2 July 2010.
**Picture 6.5:** Alida Kotzee (Director of strategy support and coordination in the Housing Directorate of the City of Cape Town) signing the memorandum and declaring to hand it over personally to Dan Plato, the mayor. 2 July 2010.

**Picture 6.6:** How to get back home? Some protesters did not have money to pay the minibus in order to get back home to Blikkiesdorp, 2 July 2010.
Appendix 7. Pictures from the Right to the City Campaign

**Picture 7.1:** Launch of the Right to the City Campaign in TT informal settlement, Section B, Khayelitsha on 22 May 2010. Slogan on the banner: “We Want City Life, Tired of Promises”.

**Picture 7.2:** Kick-off of the Right to the City Campaign on 11 June 2010, the Opening Day of the FIFA World Cup: Illegal protest in the city centre.
Picture 7.3: Singing freedom songs and toyi-toying. The toyi-toyi is quite a marvel to watch, as throngs of people charge forwards, stomping and chanting political slogans. On the t-shirts, the slogan says: ‘the poor have the right to be housed within well located land’, 11 June 2010.

Picture 7.4: Illegal march to Wale Street 27, the Provincial Government, 11 June 2010.
Appendix 8. Pictures from the Poor People’s World Cup

**Picture 8.1:** Kick-off of the Poor People’s World Cup in the backdrop of the Athlone training stadium. The soccer teams are waving the flags of the countries they represent. 13 June 2010.

**Picture 8.2:** Soccer team from Joe Slovo representing Brazil during the PPWC, 20 June 2010.
**Picture 8.3:** Ashraf Cassiem, chairperson of the AEC, holding an opening speech at the first day of the PPWC, 13 June 2010.

**Picture 8.4:** Speech from Martin Legassick, Emeritus Professor and Housing Activist, 13 June 2010.
Abstract

South Africa is after Brazil the most unequal society of the world. Despite the fact that many South Africans still life in shacks below poverty line, the South African government has spent billions of rand on hosting a world class event, namely the FIFA World Cup, which is only accessible to a small and rich segment of society. Although the 2010 FIFA World Cup was a great success according to the South African government and FIFA, it had no benefits for the majority of the country, the poor.

In this thesis, attention is given to the negative socio- and spatial impacts 2010 had on the lives of squatters in the City of Cape Town, one of South Africa’s cities that hosted the World Cup. More specifically, this thesis focuses on one of the contested spaces in Cape Town, namely the Athlone practice stadium, from where squatters have faced evictions and relocations to the Symphony Way Temporary Relocation Area, known to many as “Blikkiesdorp” (Afrikaans for “Tin Can Town”), located in the outskirts of the city.

Via the use of diverse social science research methods and techniques, such as participant observation, semi-structured interviews, informal interviews, focus group and qualitative document analysis, a holistic perspective is given on the anti-eviction struggles of squatters and their claims to the Right to the City.

This thesis explores how this notion of the Right to the City is represented through the strategies, forms and outcomes of the collective actions of these squatters from Athlone and shows how these local struggles are intertwined with city-wide struggles for houses and even with international anti-eviction struggles via transnational advocacy networks. Furthermore, this thesis not only contributes to the political and scientific debates concerning struggles for the Right to the City, but also contributes to the existing knowledge on the forms, opportunities and challenges of anti-eviction struggles of squatters that are based on principles of non-hierarchy, self-organisation, direct democracy and mutual aid. It further made clear that in South Africa, as well as in other developing countries, institutional and environmental opportunities and constraints surrounding urban social movements and squatter communities in society, such as the limited space for negotiation in the political structures for (poor) residents, oppressive governments and limited resources, are important factors that influence and determine the scope for social resistance.

Key words: Squatters, Urban Social Movements, Evictions, Social Resistance, The Right to the City and FIFA World Cup.