



The African Centre for Citizenship and Democracy (ACCEDE) was established at the School of Government in September 2007. The goal of establishing ACCEDE is to form a research space within which to mobilise scholars and resources towards a constructive but critical examination of the factors and policy environments which support or inhibit the development of a more inclusive citizenship in the region and continent. ACCEDE projects focus on questions of governance and development from a citizen-centred viewpoint, prioritising the role of grassroots organisations and movements in their quest for more inclusive, democratic policies.



An exploration of the concept of community

And its impact on participatory governance policy and service delivery in poor areas of Cape Town, South Africa

Working paper **15**



Lisa Thompson
Chris Tapscott
Pamela Tsolekile de Wet

An exploration of the concept of community

Lisa Thompson, Chris Tapscott and Pamela Tsolekile de Wet

Research on citizenship, development and democracy at ACCEDE

The process of democratic transition, while resulting in political liberties, has not necessarily created an inclusive citizenship for many previously disenfranchised and economically marginalised communities. While government has ensured, through the enactment of statutes and policies, the participation of local communities in decision-making affecting their day-to-day lives, participation through these state structures remains marginal. Previous research revealed the disconnect between the institutional arrangements of the state, on one hand, and the ability of the poor and marginalised to get their voices heard, on the other hand. It is therefore apparent that an enabling legislative and policy framework in and of itself is insufficient in ensuring inclusive participation.

In this context the challenge, for many, is how to find voice in meaningful and effective ways, so as to be able to access resources and opportunities which will enhance their livelihoods and thereby enable them to escape chronic poverty. At the level of policy analysis, there is a need to move beyond formalistic understandings of citizenship to examine the ways in which rights are interpreted and used. Of particular concern in this respect is the challenge to move beyond the notion of representative democracy (which typically invokes the widest national and international scrutiny and which is assessed according to the freeness and fairness of elections), to forms of participatory democracy, which have substantive meaning for the majority of citizens. How citizens' rights are understood, by both public officials and ordinary people themselves, profoundly affects understandings of their legitimate entitlements to social services, as well as their obligations as citizens.

Issues relating to constructions and reinterpretations of citizenship in southern contexts form the central focus of research at ACCEDE. The links between citizenship, democracy and development are explored through the VLIR funded project that focuses on Citizenship and Democracy, the Ford funded project on New Forms of Citizenship, and the international Citizenship Development Research Centre (CDRC) hosted by the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex.

This working paper series aims to stimulate academic and policy debates through research emanating from the research programmes, as well as by publishing the work of visiting scholars, postdoctoral and doctoral research fellows at the Centre.

Published by ACCEDE, University of the Western Cape, Private Bag X17, Bellville, 7535, South Africa.

The research for these working papers was made possible by generous research grants from VLIR and the Ford foundation to ACCEDE. The views expressed in this paper are not necessarily those held by the funders or ACCEDE and reflect the researcher's own research and viewpoints.

ISBN 978-0-86808-760-3

Production: Page Arts, Cape Town

Typeset in Garamond

Printed by Print On Demand, Cape Town

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior permission from the publishers.

An exploration of the concept of
community and its impact on
participatory governance policy
and service delivery
in poor areas of
Cape Town, South Africa

Lisa Thompson, Chris Tapscott and Pamela Tsolekile de Wet



2016

Abstract

The inclusion of citizen participation as a means to the equitable delivery of public services has distinguished South Africa's democratic development trajectory over the last 20 years. While equitable resource allocation remains a problem and a challenge for all countries, it remains high on the agenda of more recently democratised states, most of which have highly diverse and unequally resourced populations. Influencing the design of more inclusive participation as part of effective administrative systems is the notion of a universal citizenship that applies the concept of the equality of individuals to the needs, identities and sense of agency of citizens both between and within states. The liberal democratic theoretical conceptualisation of the individual centres on the notion of universal citizen, who is the recipient and embodiment of democracy through the rights bestowed through the democratic model. This conceptualisation has been criticised for its inability to deal with the imprecision of individual and collective political identities, especially as these evolve in newly democratic contexts. The analytically constructed democratic citizen has fed into an ideal type administrative policy construction of the notion of community. The construction of a single identity citizen living in communities imbued with homogenous characteristics is carried forward into the policy construction of participatory governance, which has become part of the orthodoxy of administrative thinking in many states in the global south. This article explores and challenges the notion of the single identity citizen that belongs to one homogenous community (among a similar set of identifiable homogenous communities that can be identified and drawn into formally constructed government spaces for consultation and engagement). The paper explores the construction of political and socio-economic identities, how this links to collective identities, how notions of community are constructed by citizens, on one hand, and government policies, on the other. Through an examination of different, sometimes conflicting, and/or overlapping constructions of collective identity and community, the article tackles the question of whether community engagement as a policy directive is able to translate into effective development policy implementation aimed at redressing unequal resource allocation of public and social services.

INTRODUCTION

Democratic development has become something of a clichéd phrase in terms of giving substance to the meaning of democracy and democratic rights in the global South. Many of the newly emerging democracies (as they are often called) claim to prioritise the provision of public and social services to all their citizens regardless of their socio-economic standing, ethnicity, creed or gender. Democratic development as a concept entails an implicit commitment to both equity and equality in terms of rights, particularly socio-economic rights. Embedded in the conception of democratic development is the further commitment to ensuring that those who have been discriminated against can claim rights previously denied to them. The attainment of this objective remains a challenge for all countries, irrespective of their level of economic development, but it is especially problematic in newly democratised states with highly diverse and unequal populations.

Policies aimed at service delivery that is both equitable and also cognisant of historical inequalities include two somewhat antagonistic conceptions of citizenship – both the idea of a universal citizen, essentially an ‘identity free’ conceptual prototype that allows for collective characteristics to recede in the face of individual freedoms and equality before the law, as well as the acknowledgement of the need for redress in terms of the allocation of public goods and services to those who have been denied these on the basis of their collective identities. In policy terms, international best practice in local development and service delivery policy embodies prescriptions of efficiency, equity and, a corollary of the later, citizen participation. In this formulation, community participation is included in policy design to ensure policies meet collective needs. There is, however, an implicit duality between the idea of participation based on the universal citizen, and the assumption in development

policies that communities can be identified in relation to homogenous identities and needs. Chatterjee (2004: 4) refers to this duality as an ‘inherent conflict’,

... the opposition between the universal ideal of civil nationalism, based on individual freedoms and equal rights ... and the particular demands of cultural identity, which call for differential treatment of particular groups on grounds of vulnerability or backwardness or historical injustice, or indeed for numerous other reasons.

The notion of ‘community’ is integral to official thinking about the ways that states do or should interact with their citizens. Communities are seen as central to the dynamic of participatory government and in this discourse they are the targets of development intervention and their engagement is seen as essential to its validation. The concept of community, however, is generally un-problematized and the collective to which this typically refers is seen by the state at all levels of the governing hierarchy (as well as by some donors) as largely homogenous and, to that extent, undifferentiated. Typically, as Agrawal and Gibson observe, communities are assumed to be groups of similarly endowed households (in terms of assets and income) who possess common characteristics of ethnicity, religion or language. ‘Such homogeneity’, they maintain:

is assumed to further cooperative solutions, reduce hierarchical and conflictual interactions, and promote better resource management. Outside the community conflicts prevail; within, harmony reigns (Agrawal and Gibson, 1999: 634).

The idea that communities are homogenous, moreover, can be seen in the ways that state officials interact with different segments of the population and how, regardless of this diversity, they relentlessly pursue a Weberian symmetry in their delivery of public services. This practice, as so many scholars have made explicit, has served to disadvantage the poor, minorities, the less educated and women, among other vulnerable segments of society. All too often, their views are either not heard or are not acted upon by administrators, who tend to focus on the needs of the more vocal and influential members of a locality. The a-historical approach to identifying communities in order to roll out democratic development policies becomes unstuck from the dualism between the individual and the disadvantaged collective, ‘communities’ that require identification and inclusion so as to ensure effective policy implementation occurs.

There is a broad literature on the meanings of community, noticeable among scholars from the north (Cohen, 1985; Crow and Allan, 1994; Hoggett, 1997 among others) and a lesser, but nevertheless substantial literature, on how, in their failure to appreciate the complex dynamics of local social formations, participatory development programmes have been subject to elite capture or have failed to address the real needs of the poor (Cooke and Kothari, 2001). Considerably less focus, however, has been directed to the ways in which

state understandings of the concept of ‘community’, along with the administrative practices to which they give rise, routinely fail to encompass the diverse identities, agencies and needs of all their citizens and in so doing reproduce both unequal relations of power in a society and patterns of poverty. State conceptions of community inclusion are not able to deal with the power relations already in place within the locales where socio-economic redress is to take place. By ignoring the traces of ‘existing relationships of power’ the state may unwittingly reproduce and reinforce these to the detriment of those who are the most resource deprived (Lefebvre, 1991; Robins, Cornwall and Von Lieres, 2008: 1072).

Historical analyses of the emergence and changing meaning of community emphasise the socio-economic and political construction of the sense of collective belonging inherent in the concept. This had originally to do with specific forms of livelihood inter-dependency as well as the need for the sacrifice of some individual freedom in the interests of collective security. In this regard, Bauman (2001) details the socio-economic evolution of the notion of community in the western context, and Freund (1998) alludes to a similar socio-economic trajectory of the on-going reshaping of community identities throughout the colonial and post-colonial eras in Africa. In the African context, writers such as Amin (1975) and Mamdani (1986), among others, emphasise the ways in which the overlay of colonialism and patterns of economic migration have unravelled distinct notions of community, nationally and regionally. The current global political economy places additional tension on attempts to construct community as a stable, geographically definable entity. At the local level, survey data and fieldwork undertaken in some of Cape Town’s poor urban areas shows that identities, agencies and needs are unstable, and that geographical proximity may offer a sense of community to some collectives but very little to others (Thompson, Conradie and Tsolekile de Wet, 2014). Collective identities are also multiple and shifting, and allegiances are not narrowly based on one determinant, as is often misrepresented in the popular press and lay understandings, where cultural and ethnic affiliations are somewhat simplistically understood as directly linked to political and community allegiances. Furthermore, who is identified as representing different constructions of community has often more to do with power, patronage and clientelism than it has to do with parity of rights and economic redress.

Recognising the difficulties inherent in theoretically grounding the concept, a number of writers have drawn attention to the ideological dimensions of community and community participation and argue that it is embedded in idealised notions of how society should be organised (Emmett, 2000). Lacking a sound theoretical and conceptual framing, Emmett maintains, this state of affairs has given rise to a situation where states (and, it may be added, many international donor agencies, NGOs and academics) focus on the practical dimensions (techniques and methods) of community participation (Emmett, 2000: 502). Applied in this manner at policy level, lacking conceptual rigour, the definition of community and community participation is left to the varied intuition, experience and commitment of officials at programme and project level. As a result, community involvement is largely doomed to be a messy and conflict-ridden undertaking, because balancing power relations in terms of representativeness will more

often than not continue to dominate the discourse on effective and meaningful participation through the replication of existing patterns of inclusion and exclusion.

Ideas about citizen participation and community-based development have been central to legislative and policy reform in post-Apartheid South Africa. This approach is driven principally by a commitment to promote a more egalitarian society, but also in part by a desire to develop a modern state embracing international best practice in good governance. In the discussion that follows, we examine how the notion of community is used, in legislation and policy, in processes of participation both in the delivery of services and in local level planning through the preparation of Integrated Development Plans (IDPs), and in the delivery of services and participatory social housing programmes in poor urban areas of Cape Town.¹ We argue that participatory service delivery policies are premised on the understanding that homogenous communities exist and that irrespective of their different historical trajectories, social cohesion, and socio-economic standing, they are able to mobilise and organise themselves to engage with the state to the benefit of all their members. The findings of the research point to the fact that these normative understandings of community frequently do little to promote meaningful citizen participation² and equally that they do little to promote efficiency in the delivery of services. Identification of deserving communities is deeply fraught, and frequently replicates existing patterns of inclusion and exclusion.

As a point of departure, it is necessary to provide a brief background to the factors that have influenced thinking about citizen participation and understandings of community in contemporary South Africa and of the way they have been incorporated into legislation and policy at all three levels of the governing hierarchy.

THE UNIVERSAL CITIZEN AND IMAGINED COMMUNITIES

In its efforts to overcome the racist and highly in-egalitarian legacy of Apartheid rule, the African National Congress, which assumed office in April 1994, committed to constructing a new social and political order which would assert the equality of all citizens and which would grant each a significant say in public decision making. The quest for the universal notion of citizenship is evident in the 1996 South African Constitution, which not only prescribes 'a common South African citizenship' and asserts that all citizens are 'equally entitled to the rights, privileges and benefits of citizenship', but also maintains that they are 'equally subject to the duties and responsibilities of citizenship' (Section 3). In this context, it is assumed that the majority of the country's inhabitants not only have a clear understanding of the rights, privileges and benefits to which they are entitled, but that they also have equal ability to achieve these rights. As a legacy of Apartheid rule, South Africa remains a highly unequal society. The Gini-coefficient of equality, where 0 is perfectly equal, and 1 is perfectly equal, measures South Africa as fluctuating between 0.660 and 0.696, making South Africa one of the most unequal countries in the world (Bhorat, 2015).

In the brave new world sketched by the country's first democratic government considerable emphasis was placed on the need to work with communities and to afford citizens, and particularly the poor, an opportunity to participate in decision making. This was, at least in part, an attempt to overcome the destructive impact that Apartheid rule had had on the social fabric of those oppressed by white minority rule, namely the African, Coloured and Indian populations. During the Apartheid era the concepts of 'community' and 'community development' had extremely negative connotations, in large part because they formed part of the language of ethnic and racial segregation. The then Department of Community Development, in Orwellian fashion, played a key role in destroying long existing African, Coloured and Indian communities by forcibly removing them from areas designated for White habitation. For many African people this implied resettlement in distant rural areas (the so-called homelands) where they were frequently subjected to the patrimonial and authoritarian rule of traditional leaders, many of whom derived their authority from the Apartheid government. At the same time, Apartheid policies worked to inhibit associational life within the black population, fearing in its development the basis for mobilisation against white minority rule. The divide-and-rule policies of the Apartheid regime enforced racial and ethnic separation and effectively served to break down social cohesion and family life, as those living in the rural areas were forced into migratory labour for their survival.

While the struggle against Apartheid served to unite black people in a common cause and, to that extent, acted as a form of social glue, the depth of this cohesion was shallow and the focus of collective action was on political mobilisation rather than social organisation. The collective identities thus forged tended often to be dissipated as leaders were absorbed into the new government. As residential segregation ended they also moved out of areas in which they had previously lived. The sense of collective identity was further eroded by the massive influx of rural people, previously restrained by Apartheid laws, into the urban areas. The need to mobilise the population to the task of building a new democratic state was thus a challenging one in the context of this social fragmentation and it was to the local level of government and the idea of community that the new government turned in pursuit of this goal.

Commencing with the 1996 Constitution, which stipulates that municipalities must provide 'democratic and accountable government for local communities' and must encourage 'the involvement of communities and community organisations in the matters of local government' (Section 152), a plethora of legislation has been enacted that explicitly charges different state structures with responsibility for engaging with (undefined) communities and the promotion of citizens' participation. Thus, the 1998 White Paper on Local Government committed municipalities 'to work together with local communities to find sustainable ways to meet their needs and improve the quality of their lives' (Section B). Implicit in this approach was the need for local government to actively promote the participation of their citizens, particularly those from marginalised sections of the community:

Municipalities must adopt inclusive approaches to fostering community participation, including strategies aimed at removing obstacles to, and actively encouraging, the participation of marginalised groups in the local community (DCD Section 1.3).

The idea of community participation in local systems of governance was further evident in the Local Government Municipal Services Act of 2000, which exhorted municipalities to ‘establish appropriate mechanisms, processes and procedures to enable the local community to participate in the affairs of the municipality’ (Section 17.2). According to the Act:

A municipality must develop a culture of municipal government that complies formal representative government with a system of participatory governance, and must for this purpose ... encourage and create conditions for the local community to participate in the affairs of the municipality’ (Section 16.1).

The commitment to community engagement is also to be seen at the sectoral level and in the delivery of public housing in particular. Thus the 1994 Housing White Paper committed the Government to ‘a development process driven from within communities’, which would promote ‘the participation of affected communities in the planning and implementation of new developments’ (Sections 4.4.4 and 4.5.1). This perspective was also advanced in the 1997 National Housing Act, which asserts that national, provincial and local spheres of government must ‘consult meaningfully with individual and communities affected by housing development’ (Section 2(1)). It is further evident in the 2008 Social Housing Act. The Act emphasises the need to ‘consult with interested individuals, communities and financial institutions in all phases of social housing development’ (Section 4.4.4.).

What is striking in a review of policy documents on local government is that the concept of community is used so fluidly to describe a wide array of ideas. Where legislation and policy produced in the late 1990s spoke un-problematically of ‘the community’ or the ‘local community’ (RSA, 1998), subsequent documents have broadened the usage of the term to cover a variety of categories. Thus the Local Government Municipal Systems Act of 2000, one of the very few documents to attempt a definition, refers to a ‘local community’ or ‘community’ as being:

that body of persons comprising a) the residents of the municipality; b) the ratepayers of the municipality; c) any civic organisations and non-governmental, private sector or labour organisations or bodies which are involved in local affairs within the municipality; and d) visitors and other people residing outside the municipality who, because of their presence in the municipality, make use of services or facilities provided by the municipality, and includes, more specifically, the poor and other disadvantaged sections of such body of persons ... (Section 1).

From this definition it is evident that a community may refer to a geographical agglomeration of people (the residents of a municipality), special interest groups (ratepayers, organised labour etc.), user groups (those from outside of a municipality making use of its facilities) and the poor. In other words, a community is pretty much whatever national policy makers define it to be in any given context.

This problem is compounded by the fact that the delivery of key basic services such as housing, electricity and water is a concurrent responsibility of all three tiers of government and problems of coordination between them abound (PGWC, 2011: 15). Although provincial and local government are constitutionally compelled to follow the broad directions of national government policy, the way in which they implement this is left to their own interpretation. In the case of Cape Town, which falls under the political control of the opposition Democratic Alliance at both municipal and provincial levels, problems of policy alignment are further constrained. In this context, possibilities exist for still further different conceptualisations of community. Thus, for example, in recent documents the provincial Department of Human Settlements avoids use of the term ‘community’ completely, preferring to refer to those in need of housing as ‘citizens’ or ‘stakeholders’ (PGWC, 2011). The City of Cape Town’s Five Year Integrated Housing Plan 2011/2012–2016 similarly avoids the use of community and refers to ‘households’, ‘residents’ or ‘groups of people’.

While this approach avoids the conceptual pitfalls that beset national policy, it does little to resolve the definitional challenges posed by national legislation. This is because the conceptual vagueness of ‘community’ aside, the administrative practicalities of involving citizens in participatory process have also seldom been made explicit at any level. Fieldwork for this paper suggests that the impact of this analytical vagueness becomes acute when local administrators attempt to implement policy. Here the tendency is to fall back on the idea a homogenised community projected in national legislation and policy, living in contiguous space, with a collective identity, a recognised leadership and common needs. While some social collectives fit this conceptual model, many don’t. As a legacy of Apartheid, as indicated, many social groups remain deeply fractured and could be considered communities only in name. The histories of social mobilization across society, furthermore, differ significantly from one locality to another. In some, such as those of African people who migrated in from the rural areas some 20 years ago and who now reside in the sprawling formal and informal settlements of Khayelitsha on the margins of metropolitan Cape Town, there is a strong tradition of community organization, born out of the anti-Apartheid struggle, and residents are accustomed to electing representatives to street committees, ward committees and the like. As a result of these more established patterns of social organization, local leaders are more closely linked to the areas they represent, although there are still problems associated with the legitimacy and responsiveness of political representatives, particularly ward councilors (Thompson and Nleya, 2010; Thompson, Conradie and Tsolekile de Wet, 2014). In areas where there has been little or no history of social mobilisation, conversely, there is frequently neither a sense of collective identity nor a recognized leadership with the legitimacy to speak

on behalf of the collective. The section that follows provides some evidence of the ways that the conceptual vagueness of ‘community’ in development policy discourse has rendered the process of citizen participation as fraught.

TARGETING THE ‘COMMUNITY’ IN POLICIES

Assumptions about participation in setting service delivery policy priorities

The presumption by officials that all citizens in a municipality are equally capable of organizing themselves towards a common cause around a legitimate leadership and that there is a tradition of voluntarism sufficient within them to sustain this, is illustrative of a superficial grasp of (or a disinterest in) the complex social dynamics that make up all communities, however defined and irrespective of their socio-economic character. The way in which community is officially imagined is evident in the rollout of Integrated Development Plan (IDP) participatory processes.³

The establishment of mechanisms for the promotion of citizen participation is generally set as a precondition for the receipt of central government grants. Thus, in terms of the Municipal Systems Act of 2000, each newly elected council must, within a prescribed period, prepare and adopt an inclusive plan, which aligns the projects, programmes, budgets and other council resources with the sustainable development priorities of the community. In terms of the Act, the preparation of an IDP must include an extensive process of public consultation, both to determine local priorities and to promote a sense of citizen and community involvement in the running of the municipality. In terms of the prescripts of the Act, a municipality must

allow for: i) the local community to be consulted on its development needs and priorities; (and) ii) the local community to participate in the drafting of the integrated development plan ... (Section 29.1).

The soliciting of what is known as ‘community buy-in’ is a central component of this process (Mhone, 2003).

In Cape Town, as elsewhere, IDP participatory processes are organised by councillors, in an approach intended to ensure that communities are consulted. This forms part of a structured process of calling and documenting meetings with the residents of different localities in the city (Sisiwa, Interview 2011). This process is intended to be comprehensive and yet survey data and key informant interviews in the poor and predominantly informal areas of Khayelitsha, Langa and Delft show that most residents are unaware of, or unfamiliar with, IDP processes (Thompson and Nleya, 2012; Thompson, 2014). It is also not clear who has participated in the consultation process, as focus group interviews show that few people

have attended an IDP meeting called by councillors. The sense that engagement with a broad group of the residents will result in a better flow of communication on the identification and prioritisation of needs is not evident in the actual consultation process. Between 2011 and 2016, discussions with officials in the City of Cape Town (CoCT) associated with IDP participatory processes indicate that the priority lists of local development initiatives which councillors forward to the City are mostly ‘unusable wish lists’ that reflect individual rather than community concerns. Senior officials in the CoCT are aware of the compliance-based nature of the IDP process, and that due to the IDP consultative process taking place in politically demarcated municipal wards that correspond to local election constituencies, it is virtually impossible to get ‘community’ input, because even in areas where there are more self-defined forms of collective identification like Khayelitsha, Langa and Delft, these do not correspond with ward boundaries. This expresses very clearly the duality or conflict between universal individualism and collective self-identification which occurs in policy, as mentioned by Chatterjee earlier in this paper.

Further difficulty with a homogenous policy conception of community is evidenced in the rollout of a variety of social housing schemes. In this instance, a municipality is obligated by the National Housing Code to work with the elected representatives of groups targeted for receipt of public housing through what are called beneficiary committees (2009: Part 3). In the format envisaged in the policy, the beneficiary committees (as the legitimate representatives of a community) should assist the municipality in the selection of beneficiaries for a given project. However the different types of housing projects present different challenges in both identifying the most appropriate community-based partners and in selecting eligible beneficiaries in a fair and transparent manner.

In the case of a project aimed at the in-situ upgrading of an entire informal settlement, beneficiaries are more likely to know the individuals whom they elect to a committee and, hence, are more likely to accept the decisions taken on their behalf. However, in the case of Greenfield projects which draw potential beneficiaries from an entire municipality, the process of electing a representative beneficiary committee is especially challenging. This is because beneficiaries are not known to each other, they have no history of collaboration and trust levels between them are low. Despite these obvious distinctions, the process of community consultation advocated in the housing policy remains essentially the same for all projects (Tapscott and Thompson, 2013). Here, engagement with an imagined community can actually do harm to the efficacy of the policy, as its putative leaders are expected to assist with the selection of beneficiaries, and may be asked to explain selection processes to their constituencies. However as they lack a formal mandate from those they are supposed to represent, the decisions of these beneficiary committees are distrusted and this in turn leads to distrust of the entire process of participation.

Lacking clear directives on how to identify communities and community leaders, there is a tendency on the part of officials, eager to get housing projects off the ground, to engage with anyone who purports to speak on behalf of the potential beneficiaries. Such leaders,

often elected by acclamation on the basis of a nomination at the first public meeting of beneficiaries, frequently pursue narrow and self-centred agendas. As Thornton and Mamphela point out:

(t)here is a difference ... between visibility and genuine political representation ... In what could be called take-me-to-your-leader syndrome ... well-meaning people ... end up establishing relationships with the most visible people who tend to be very articulate as spokespersons (mostly spokesmen) of 'their' people (Thornton and Mamphela, 1988: 32, emphasis in original).

Evidence of this syndrome emerged in the implementation of social housing in the Drakenstein municipality in the Western Cape, where a group of self-appointed community leaders negotiated with the local political leadership just prior to elections and were successful in ensuring that the beneficiary allocation system was altered in their favour. This self-same group of representatives excluded women leaders from their ranks, claiming they were 'noisy and troublesome, they make things more difficult'. The resultant mobilisation, politically timed just before local elections, led to a prioritisation of the more politically-aligned informal residents group. As a result, other, equally desperate households who had been on the municipal housing waiting list for longer, but who lacked visibility, had to remain waiting (ACCEDE Beneficiary Committee Housing Report, 2010). In such contexts, Bauman (2001) asserts that community 'claims' can become antithetical to the broader understandings of individual rights as these come to be competing. Kabeer (2005) and Nyamu-Musembi (2005) discuss the same dilemma in the context of the global South, where constructions of community identity can, and indeed have, become deeply polarising. Echoing Chatterjee (2004), Nyamu-Musembi highlights that the dilemma is around crafting legal (and policy) frameworks that

do not disregard the community context in which people are embedded, but at the same time do not legitimize a narrow definition of personhood based on status in hierarchical relationships (Nyamu-Musembi, 2005: 41).

For policy makers, the challenge is to get the balance right in engaging with citizens without embracing too simplistic an understanding of community, the more so in the context of a global development discourse that views participation as a key component of a modern democratic state. However it needs to be highlighted that even in communities where there is a sense of social cohesion, socio-economic tensions and the competition for scarce resources remain a feature of daily life (Thompson and Conradie, 2012). Even survey data collected over a longitudinal time frame illustrates the limited degree to which communities understood to have fairly high levels of social cohesion discuss important concerns with each other and also with their local councillor. Forms of collective representation and mobilisation have grown, as witnessed by survey data showing an increase in interaction with

councillors between 2011 and 2013 in Khayelitsha, with 38% of residents having engaged collectively. Even so, in 2013 69% of residents still felt that ‘people like me have no influence over what the government does’ (Thompson, 2014). Survey data and ongoing action research engagement with leaders of civil society organisations (CSOs) in Langa, Khayelitsha and Delft shows that, even in areas where there are higher degrees of homogeneity due to cultural and ethnic affiliation, such fixed community identities do not necessarily translate into collective political identities.

While public meetings may be regularly attended, this does not necessarily lead to the lobbying of councillors or ward committees to address community ‘needs’. As Thornton and Mamphela put it:

(c)ommunities do exist. People believe in communities, desire community, and act as if they exist even when they don’t. The word community then, refers in a self-contradictory way to a belief and practice. The problem is we cannot infer the practice from the existence of the belief; that is, while the belief may be real enough, the reality may not reflect it (Thornton and Mamphela, 1988: 38).

This leads the discussion back to the fraught question of who ultimately represents whom in the participatory spaces local government creates to ensure ‘effective consultation and collaboration’. Research undertaken with smaller CSOs and local social movements who have less political patronage and connections, but who may more authentically represent the voices of the historically excluded, show fairly low rates of inclusion into government-initiated participatory spaces and processes despite using the same repertoire of actions of larger, better connected and funded CSOs. Such repertoires of action include consultation, engagement and protest (Thompson and Nleya, 2010). Protest, we have shown, is usually the last of the range of measures used to achieve collective goals. Among communities, the dominant service delivery issue is social and low-cost housing and the allocation thereof, encapsulating other basic service issues like water, sanitation and electricity provision. This remains perhaps one of the most critical areas where grievances around fairness and socio-economic redress occur, and where the messiness around defining community emerges the most starkly (Interviews, Sivukile Sonele and Community Justice Movement 2014-2015). Protest is more likely to occur when groups feel they are being excluded from spaces, that they are not being consulted or ‘listened to’ and that the criteria for choice in regard to allocations to certain community groupings over others is not made clear. Local governments, on the other hand, within the spaces they create for engagement, often resort to consultation and information sharing rather than engagement and evaluation of contesting demands. Contested demands, especially from smaller movements, are often dismissed as ‘trouble-making’ and as illegal, and police action is frequently used to address protest that is defined as such. This cycle of government intolerance towards the frustration of residents who feel they are not being included in the narrow conceptions of community that local government

uses, cuts to the heart of the current problem of escalating protest action in South Africa.

In the case of protest action undertaken by the Langa-based local social movement, Sivukile Sonele, for example, recent housing allocation participatory forums did not include all stakeholders, and housing project allocations were explained to a selected group of residents at public meetings that were not widely advertised. Resistance to the allocations by residents who grouped to form Sivukile Sonele first took the form of requests to see the Mayor and later the Public Protector. After such efforts did not result in proper engagement on key issues around housing allocation, the movement held a public meeting where the leaders were arrested and released on condition that they would not organise such public gatherings again, pending further legal action by the CoCT. Thereafter protests ensued in Bhunga Avenue, and the resultant police action and media exposure led to a meeting between the leaders of Sivukile Sonele and the Minister for Human Settlements. While the outcome of the housing allocation still hangs in the balance, after the meeting with the minister charges against the Sivukile Sonele leader of public agitation were dropped and assurances given that the 'matter would be looked into'.

The question of inclusion and exclusion of certain groups in the allocation process was clearly at issue, with the provincial Department of Human Settlements insisting that all 'legitimate' stakeholders had been consulted. The growth of Sivukile Sonele over the same period in response to allocation grievances shows clearly that at grassroots level many did not feel this was a reflection of what had transpired in terms of public participation. The grievances arose from a collective feeling of exclusion across a fairly wide section of Langa residents. While these groupings may not have been identified by housing project developers as beneficiaries, their perceptions of lack of consultation, transparency and accountability with regards to housing allocation are an indication that all is not well in the state of participatory development. Sivukile Sonele has demanded to know the basis on which certain allocations have been made, where clientelism is perceived. As Robins, Von Lieres and Cornwall point out (2008: 1082), 'It would seem that democracy works for elites who already speak the language of bureaucratic state power, but is less efficacious for the rank-and-file of the popular classes'. Those who do not speak this language, groups such as Sivukile Sonele, are dismissed as unruly and illegitimate. It is not clear that Sivukile Sonele's interventions have made, or will make, any difference to the way in which contesting demands and understandings of fairness of allocation are to be dealt with at local level. It is clear that the contestation is not just about who gets houses, but about how this is communicated and how communities are engaged, irrespective of whether or not they will be recipients of the service in question.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this initial research have highlighted the dualities and tensions between the understandings of universal citizenry, on one hand, and the notion of a homogenous community, on the other, as a central concept in the official development discourse in South Africa. Ironically, the notion of the 'community' that was so central to Apartheid policy, and the ethnic fragmentation of the population, is still a fundamental feature of policies addressing inequalities at the local level. However as the research findings illustrate, beyond its rhetorical appeal, the ill-defined and undifferentiated term 'community' facilitates neither citizen participation nor the targeting of those most in need of state support. It also points to the fact that the needs of the poor are difficult to aggregate and the diversity and complexity of their different forms of social organisation need to be contextualised and factored into local development programmes. Finally, policies that target community participation require more specificity about what the intended outcomes of participation are. Without a clear understanding of what the policy outcomes could possibly be, there is always the possibility that stakeholders will expect to shape these in ways that might not be possible, or even desirable. Meaningful participation as both a concept and a process requires careful clarification for it to move beyond being a fuzzy feelgood phrase.

This then is the challenge of ensuring that policy design does not rest on imagined communities that replicate power relations and clientelism. If consultation and participation are to rest on superficial constructions of collective cohesion, they may run the risk of valorising the most visible. If instead they rely too heavily on the image of the individual in community in the neo-liberal sense, collective interests may be underplayed. A more detailed operational dimension to consulting with communities, and identification of community interests ought to be an initial point of redress, as well as an acknowledgement of the fact that communities are not stable entities but are constantly in flux (Thornton and Mamphela, 1988: 38). Communities are also the sites of many interests rather than one collective coherent harmonious vision, especially when it comes to the division of resources. This means that the design and roll-out of policies needs to be very much more reflexive in relation to balancing competing community interests, and much more precise about what the outcomes of participation ought to be.

Notes

- 1 The research on which this article draws spans a 10-year period. We acknowledge and thank the Ford Foundation and Vlaamse Inter-Universitaire Raad (VLIR) for funding the fieldwork and survey research.
- 2 Service delivery protest statistics to date show a rapid increase in protests, especially before elections. In 2014, there were 218 protests across the country, mostly in the five metropolitan areas (Civic Protest Barometer, 2015).
- 3 This section is based on ongoing engagement and action based capacitation fieldwork with Sivukile Sonele over the period 2014–2016. The nature of the capacitation involved information sharing and discussions on key policy and legal obligations of CoCT towards local communities, to as to provide the necessary technical policy knowledge to assist Sivukile Sonele in their engagements with the City.

References

- Agrawal, A & Gibson, C. 1999. Enchantment and disenchantment: The role of community in natural resource conservation. *World Development*, 27(4).
- Amin, S. 1976. *Unequal development*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Andersen, B. 1980. *Imagined communities*. London: Verso.
- Bauman, Z. 2001. *Community: Seeking safety in an insecure world*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bhorat, H. 2015. Is South Africa the most unequal society in the world? *Mail and Guardian*.
- Chatterjee, P. 2004. *The politics of the governed*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- City of Cape Town. 2011. Five Year Integrated Housing Plan 2011/2012-2016/17. Available at http://www.capetown.gov.za/en/Housing/Documents/Housing_Plan2011_16.pdf.
- Cohen, A. 1985. *The symbolic construction of community*. London: Tavistock.
- Community Law Centre. 2015. *Civic protest barometer*. Belville: University of the Western Cape (UWC).
- Cooke, B & Kothari, U (eds). 2001. *Participation: The new tyranny?* London: Zed Books.
- Crow, G & Allan, G. 1994. *Community life: An introduction to local social relations*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Department of Cooperative Government and Traditional Affairs (CoGTA). 2011. *Annual report 2010/2011*. CoGTA: Pretoria.
- Department of Housing. 1994. A new housing policy and strategy for South Africa. Available at <http://www.info.gov.za/whitepapers/1994/housing.htm>.
- Department of Human Settlements. 2009. National Housing Code. Available at <http://www.dhs.gov.za/Content/The%20Housing%20Code%202009/index.htm>.
- Department of Human Settlements. 2010. *Report on the evaluation of the impact of the Rural Housing Programme 2009/10*. Pretoria.

- Department of Human Settlements. 2011. *Annual Report (2010/2011)*, RP93/2011. Pretoria: Department of Human Settlements.
- Department of Provincial Affairs and Constitutional Development. March 1998. The White Paper on Local Government. Available at <http://www.thedplg.gov.za/subwebsites/wpaper/wp2.htm>.
- Emmett, T. 2000. Beyond community participation? Alternative routes to civil engagement and development in South Africa. *Development Southern Africa*, 17(4).
- Freund, B. 1998. *The making of contemporary Africa: The development of African society since 1800*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Hoggett, P (ed). 1997. *Contested communities: Experiences, struggles, policies*. Bristol: Policy Press, Bristol.
- Kabeer, N. (ed). 2005. *Inclusive citizenship: Meanings and expressions*. London: Zed Books.
- Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The production of space*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Mamdani, M. 1996. *Citizen and the subject: Contemporary Africa and the legacy of late colonialism*. Cape Town: David Phillip.
- Mhone, G. 2003. Democratisation, economic liberalisation and the quest for sustainable development in South Africa. In Mhone, G & Edigheji, O. *Governance in the new South Africa: The challenges of globalisation*. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Newell, P & Wheeler, J (eds). 2006. *Rights, resources and the politics of accountability*. London: Zed Books.
- Nyamu-Musembi, C. 2005. Towards an actor oriented perspective on human rights. In Kabeer, N (ed). *Inclusive citizenship: Meanings and expressions*. London: Zed Books.
- Provincial Government of the Western Cape. 2011. Department of Human Settlements, Annual Report 2010/2011. Available at http://www.westerncape.gov.za/Text/2012/2/annual_report_2011_part1.pdf.
- Republic of South Africa (RSA). 1996. *The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act 108 of 1996*.
- Robins, S, Cornwall, A and Von Lieres, B. 2008. Rethinking citizenship in the postcolony. *Third World Quarterly*, 29(6).
- RSA. 1997. *National Housing Act 107 of 1997*. Cape Town: Government Gazette 18521.
- RSA. 2000. *Local Government: Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000*. Pretoria: Government Gazette 21776.
- RSA. 2008. *Social Housing of Act 16 of 2008*. Cape Town: Government Gazette 25721.
- Sen, A. 1999. *Development as freedom*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Tapscott, C & Thompson, L. 2013. Between supply and demand: The limits to participatory development in South Africa. *International Review of Administrative Science*, forthcoming.
- The Presidency, RSA. 2009. Development indicators. Available at <http://www.thepresidency.gov.za/learning/me/indicators/2009/indicators.pdf>
- Thompson, L & Nleya, N. 2010. Passivity or protest? Understanding the dimensions of mobilization on rights to services in Khayelitsha, Cape Town. In Coelho, V & Von Lieres, B (eds). *Mobilising for democracy*. London: Zed Books.

- Thompson, L, Nleya, N & Africa, C. 2011. *Perceptions of service delivery*. Belville: African Centre for Citizenship and Democracy (ACCEDE), UWC.
- Thompson, L, Africa, C & Tsolekile de Wet, P. 2013. *Measuring the democratic deficit in Khayelitsha, Langa and Delft, Cape Town*. Belville: ACCEDE, UWC.
- Thompson, L. 2014. Agency and action: Perceptions of governance and service delivery in poor urban areas in Cape Town. *Politikon* 41(1).
- Thompson, L. 2014. Expressions of citizenship through participation and protest: Reflections on 20 years of South African democracy from below. *Politikon* 41(3).
- Thompson, L, Conradie, I & Tsolekile de Wet, P. 2014. Participatory politics: Understanding civil society organisations in governance networks in Khayelitsha. *Politikon* 41(3).
- Thornton, R & Ramphela, M. 1988. The quest for community. In *South African Key words: The uses and abuses of political concepts*. David Philip, Cape Town.

