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Abstract

This thesis investigated how public spheres are spatialised in public space. The public sphere is commonly understood as the public deliberation between people to establish their common interests and the bearing this has on state authority. While it is acknowledged that public space is essential for public sphere development, this link between public space and the public sphere has not been extensively researched. There is also a lack of literature examining people’s experiences of public space in the global south, especially anthropological studies that focus on people’s experiences of and in urban parks. This thesis seek to answer how public spheres are spatialised in an urban park, Joubert Park, in Johannesburg, by asking what the context of the creation for the park is, what rules of access and use exist, and how the management model adopted by the City of Johannesburg and the managing agent, City Parks, affect what happens in the park.

South Africa had, and still has, very specific patterns of spatial development and use, shaped through its colonial history, and apartheid. Post-apartheid South Africa holds the possibility of changing the way that space is used, and regulated, from being exclusionary based on race to being inclusionary. Joubert Park is situated in the inner city of Johannesburg, and is the oldest park in the city. At its establishment in 1891 it was situated in a relatively well-off area of Johannesburg. In the 1930s single houses in the area were replaced with art-deco apartment buildings, and served as a first receiving point for European and migrants from other parts of South African. The 1990s ushered in an era of white flight and decline within the inner-city, affecting the buildings around the park. Today the surrounding area is generally seen as decayed and is the focus of inner-city regeneration efforts aiming to build an “African World Class” city.

The park is well used by a variety of urban dwellers and is considered by City Parks as a flagship within the city. It has an art gallery, various non-governmental organisations and is patronised by a variety of users, traders, chess-players and photographers.

This thesis utilised standard ethnographic practices. Fieldwork consisted of ‘hanging out’ and participating within the park, formal interviews, directed
questioning, and archival research. Data analysis proceeded from a combination of framework analysis, arising from theory, and grounded, from within the data.

Findings were that although park users say that the park is freely available for all to use, it is in fact constrained by identity markers such as race, class, gender, sexuality and nationality. These factors articulate to produce certain experiences of the park. At the same time that people are excluded from the park, people also exclude themselves. These mechanisms of exclusions broadly reflect South African society, which has been described as socially conservative despite a liberal constitution that was implemented in 1996.

The City of Johannesburg has rules and regulations that aim to exclude certain users, mostly poor and homeless people, from the park. Park users resist these rules but their small acts of resistance do not change how the rules are applied. At the same time as enforcing rules, both written and unwritten, on park users, the City ignored its own responsibilities as laid out in by-laws concerning the park. The City’s ideal users are different from actual park users and this causes contestations around space use.

Lastly, findings were that there were wisps of public sphere activity taking place within the park, but that this is not sustained in any meaningful manner. Outside the park there are many more recognisable and sustained public sphere activities through protest marches. Park users do not participate in these protest marches despite the fact that the marches are similar to their own concerns. This thesis argues that more loosely regulated public space is necessary for public spheres to develop.

This thesis addresses literature in urban anthropology, public space, and public sphere. It contributed to urban anthropology by showing how a small urban park can reveal patterns in the city as well as applying a unified framework developed by Setha Low. It contributed to public space literature by contributing to knowledge of public spaces in the global South. Lastly, it contributed to public sphere literature by showing that the type of regulations in public spaces can inhibit the formation of effective public spheres.
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Joubert Park

once silent in green at morn
relaxed with lilies at dusk
peaceful with the doves
and strollers of moon face

Alsatians and poodles
Wiggling their thighs
Promenading side by side
With strollers of moon face

bulldog sentinels
howling from the greens
black passers-by faceless
at the peripherals…

Now JOUBERT PARK
You cuddle dirty plastic bags
and empty cans of beer

you mix all the colour bars,
nursing snores from dreamers
of past nanny days and prams

you kindly shelter
the sadness of the homeless
the madness of the jobless

you are full of hobo life
but the grass is still green
you are still a park!

(Chipeya 2000)
Picture 1: Joubert Park circa 1913 scanned postcard copyright William Judnick

Picture 2: Joubert Park 1 September 2011
Chapter 1: Introduction

I want to introduce you to Joubert Park, Johannesburg. This is the oldest, and probably the most vibrant park in the city. Walk with me around the park.

Joubert Park is a rich, dynamic place. The park, bound by three streets and a railway track, house a host of relationships, signs and symbols to help understand the city. Walking through Joubert Park was never a pleasant experience for me. Noise, smells, people, poverty and visuality attack your senses – at times I hated the park, at times I loved it. I never thought it was nice, because that is simply too neutral an expression, too washed out to capture the vitality. Going to Joubert Park always exhausted me with its vitality.

This ethnography is an attempt to understand the park, to locate it in the anthropological literature and position it in Johannesburg. What follows is a description of Joubert Park and some of the early experiences I had in the park.

I am driving to Joubert Park. Turning into King George Street (A), a cacophony of sounds assails me: cars hooting, a taxi rank¹ caller shouting out destinations, people buzzing. I wait two turns at the traffic lights (B) before getting a green light and cross over Wolmarans Street. Driving is slow due to the taxis going to the Noord Street Taxi rank. It is the biggest taxi rank in Johannesburg and is a block from the park. After Wolmarans Street the formal market stalls (C) start. They are protected by plastic sheeting, some flapping lazily in the breeze, many torn and decayed.

¹ A taxi in South Africa refers to a mini-bus that provides transport for the majority of people in South Africa. They are privately owned and operated vehicles that have seating for 13 passengers. Despite providing transport for so many people some taxis have bad reputations for the state of the vehicles, the recklessness of the drivers and their often rude attitudes.
There are Johannesburg Metro Police (JMPD) officers blocking a lane of traffic. They are placing people into the back of a South African Police Service (SAPS) van. I see a few khaki clad army service personnel. The sheer number of guns and rifles make me nervous. One of the dilapidated buildings on King George Street is the target (D).

I stop at the next traffic lights (E); to my left is the main park entrance (F). Only one small side gate, of the ornate gate set, is open. There are makeshift tables, people selling avocados, sweets, crisps, a hairdresser, and an old woman roasting mealies (corn). It smells of smoke and food. The sidewalk is thronged with people hurrying about their business. Street cleaners sweeping slowly. A few trolley pushers stand around, chatting with one another. One is pushing his customer's goods in an old shopping cart to Park Station.

The light changes and I cross over. There is a big speed hump, then the entrance to the Johannesburg Art Gallery (JAG) (G). I stop, wind down my window, and fill in a logbook with the guard. The gallery grounds are enclosed with tall palisade fencing (H). A small sculpture garden has human forms arranged in neat rows. A gardener is busy tending the grass. To the left is the fence dividing the park and the gallery. I see groups of people resting and sleeping on the grass (Lawn 1). Others are chatting animatedly. There are clothes drying on the fence, their owners keeping a watch.

I turn right, driving slowly along tall palm trees and cut-in train tracks (I). It is littered with rubbish, plastic bags swirling around. The rubbish is from the market on the opposite side of the tracks and Noord Street taxi rank. On my left is the gallery, an impressive sandstone building. There are ten cars parked in front, belonging to gallery employees. Steps lead to a grand entrance with a sign “Staff Only, Visitors Go To Main Entrance” (J).

I drive to an empty parking lot (K), where a few plastic bags are lying around. A mangy black cat walks past. I continue along the side of the gallery. In front of me is the park. After parking (L), I lock the gears and steering wheel, hoping that my car won’t become a statistic for the Hillbrow police station. Johannesburg is not an easy city without a car. Public transport is inadequate and often unreliable. I hide my wallet and phone, taking a small bottle of pepper spray, a notebook and camera.
I enter the park through the gate (M) that divides the park and JAG. The pavement is depressed in some places and filled with stagnant water. On my left is piece of a lawn (Lawn 3) with a group of people sitting, listening to a woman preacher. Some are paying attention intently, others appear bored. The woman is preaching about the need to take responsibility and accept God’s grace. Three large pots of steaming food wait. They pray and then around 60 people line up. Most are young men; there is a single woman with a young child. Some of the people are dressed in rags, looking in need of a wash and medical attention. Others are better dressed. The food is served on plastic plates, a generous helping of rice with gravy and meat and potatoes. People sit somewhere on the lawn, eating with their hands. Afterwards they go and wash with bottled water, rinsing their plate as well. A church representative is writing down names and places of birth in a black book. They encourage people to come and attend their church in town.

On the right-hand side there is a lawn with a small brick building (N). Closer inspection reveals bathrooms. The toilets are clean but there is no toilet paper. A few young men sleep on the grass surrounding the building.

Back on the path I see that one of the small fountains (O) is not working. It is enclosed with waist-high palisade fencing. A few plastic bottles float around in the water. To the right, the photographers guard their spots (P), cameras around their necks, photo frames displaying their work. One hurries with a customer to the gallery to take pictures in front of one of the statues in the gallery.

Just beyond this entrance are the palisades that enclose the clinic (Q); there is a corrugated awning that shades two cars. People with Community Public Works (CPW) bibs are tending a vegetable garden, unenthusiastic about gardening in the heat. The mealies are tall, the spinach has deep green leaves. Underneath another carport women with young babies are lined up on chairs, patiently waiting their turn. On the benches just outside the clinic a young woman and man sit holding hands, chatting quietly.

Further along the path, just behind the clinic is Lapeng (a crèche) (R), enclosed with waist high wrought iron fencing. The gate is open, and you can hear
children playing just out of sight on large wooden play equipment. At the entrance of an octagonal building the kids line up for lunch. The old bandstand is now the classroom. Lunch is pap (maize porridge) and saucy vegetables, mostly spinach from the crèche's own garden. Afterwards the children wash their hands and get their sleeping mats out and line up for a nap. The heat is oppressive in the building; there are no big windows to open and no air-conditioning. A small fan tries its best, moving the stale air around. Most kids quickly nod off, I also feel sleepy.

I leave Lapeng and go to the outdoor chess sets (S). It is in the blazing sunlight with no shade nearby. Both boards are in use. There are about 15 men watching the game at the main set. A few doze, indifferent to the game, while others follow intently. The pieces on the one set are worn down, but are all there. A group of five men have a serious discussion about the game. One player made a mistake and moved a piece in an incorrect formation. The game is stopped, and people instruct the two players on where to return the pieces. They quietly discuss the strategy, occasionally making a comment to the players. Most of the spectators are young, perhaps in their twenties. They are here to learn to play, against other players also struggling to get to know the game.

The second set has men in their late teens around. The pieces of this board are in very bad shape, worn down to small bits, some are missing and makeshift pieces have taken their place. Rules are scratched out on a dirty yellow wall. Some men use the corner as a place to relieve themselves and there is the faint smell of ammonia in the air.

There are five tables scattered alongside the big sets. Here people play serious games. Men intently watch, not commenting on the players. The players move quickly, accurately, each move timed against a clock that is slammed down. The games are quick, two or three minutes each. Rumour has it big money is gambled at these tables.

A trader has a small makeshift stand next to the chess tables, selling loose draws (single cigarettes) throat lozenges, sweets and packets of crisps and cookies. He has his own chess sets and people practice against him. His price
per play is a small bet. He jokes around with the one young man playing against him.

Just behind the chess area is the wall (T) that separates the Greenhouse Project (U) and the park. It is a corrugated sink wall. Over it you can see the remnants of a building project, an unfinished badly weathered double-storey mud house (V). If you walk alongside the wall you glimpse a dilapidated cast-iron structure (W). This is the Victorian glasshouse. It is missing glass, rusted, and through small gaps in the wall you can see weeds growing waist high. Time has not been kind to it.

Inside the park a few informal traders walk around, displaying crisps, oranges, boiled eggs, ice cream or frozen ice-lollies, entreating people to buy from them.

On the far side of the park there is a brand new kids’ playground (X), made from bright plastic. A sign announces its Simba sponsorship. There are no kids playing on it since school is still in session. The signage board warns that kids need to be accompanied by an adult, but this rarely happens. After school the kids will come play; around twenty kids, two-thirds boys.

Just beyond this playground there are more photographers (Y), some sitting on a low wall, some standing around, some with umbrellas shading them from the summer heat. A few have betting sheets, and they discuss the chances of Arsenal beating Man United, commiserating with the person who underestimated Sundowns in their match against Supersport United.

Opposite is a lawn (Lawn 1), busy compared with the rest of the park. There are between thirty and fifty young men, sitting, sleeping, and resting. Some are on their own, most are in groups. Two or three have trolleys with them. This lawn feels more ominous than elsewhere in the park and I give it a wide berth.

I walk out the main entrance of the park on King George Street (F). About eight informal traders are set up with cardboard boxes displaying a few goods, mostly crisps, seasonal fruit or sweets. The informal traders also keep a cautious eye out for Johannesburg Metropolitan Police Department (JMPD) officers. It is a lucrative spot, with people passing in and out of the park.
On both sides of the entrance there are formalised traders (C). You can find a wide variety of goods: shoes, clothes, kitchen towels, socks, jewellery, scarves in winter or sunglasses and hats in summer. Fresh fruit and vegetables are sold by the plate; R8\(^2\) for a plate of potatoes, R6 for four tomatoes. There is also cooked foods for sale, meat or chicken stew with pap or rice, a small salad with chillies.

The pavement is busy, with people hurrying past the stalls to their destinations – coming from work, home or simply having gone to ‘town’. Loud music blares from a small television set, run by a noisy generator. Traders appeal to slow walkers to have a look and buy.

At the top of the street I turn right (B), and walk towards the Greenhouse Project (W, U, V, T). The wall is littered with pasted signs and advertisements: some advertising for roommates, a prophet offering healing and salvation, cheap (and illegal) abortions, loans. The prefabricated wall is topped with razor wire. A handwritten sign says that bottles and cardboard boxes are now accepted for recycling. The gate to the Greenhouse Project is locked. There are no people or cars in sight.

I enter the park again through the Wolmarans Street gate (Z). It is brightly decorated with a yellow MTN signage: “MTN The better connection”. Here, too, a few traders have set up shop. One trader has a young child of maybe one, with her. The child sits and plays quietly beside her mother. Her mother stares into the distance.

The fountain (AA) is on, its mist cool. There are photographers on the benches all around. Township TV (AB) blares music. People ignore it unless there is a game of soccer on. I leave the park through the same gate through which I entered (M), and walk to the gallery (AC).

In the gallery the quiet mustiness envelopes you, a sharp contrast after the vibrant park. There is no one around. Somewhere in the cavernous building I hear voices. I go down the stairs to my favourite piece, a tall ballerina with her

\[2 \text{ } \$1 = R8.2 \text{ } £1 = R13.3\]
arms curved above her head delicately posed, her belly gently rising above the outline of her pants.

I head back upstairs, turning left at the top of the staircase. Two young school children come racing past; they use the gallery as a playground now that school is out. One of the guides wags her finger at them; they slow down but take off as soon as they are out of her sight. I go through the room holding the Jackson Hlongwane sculptures, into the small anteroom with only a few pieces from the permanent exhibition. A Degas, Picasso and Monet share the space with Pemba and Sekoto. The rest of the treasures are hidden in the basement, less than 10% of the gallery’s works are displayed.

The next exhibition room has the Tracey Rose exhibition. It is a huge showcase, taking up five rooms. I walk through, smiling at the yellow star that someone placed strategically on the naked-posed photograph of the artist. I wonder if the artist would approve?

After the Tracey Rose exhibition there is African art and craft: masks, headrests, jewellery, pottery and spears. A staircase to its left takes you to the lecture theatre. A valuable bronze statue was stolen from here a few weeks ago. Security in the gallery is inadequate and theft has long been a problem. The gallery director speculated that this one was stolen on consignment. I leave the gallery, and eventually also the park, the way that I came in (G).

The above description is meant to evoke a feeling of the park as you walk through it, setting the stage for the ethnography to come. It follows Stoller’s (1989) call for ethnography that engages the senses beyond the textual. This is similar to what Favero (2003) does in the opening paragraphs of his article on a Delhi market. It attempts to create a picture of the market beyond the linearity of words, conjuring the sense of chaos and vibrancy that exists. Both are found in the park.

Space is not a neutral container of action, but rather reflects social and power relations, interactions, historical processes and subjective experience (Hart 2002; Low 2000; Low 1996a; Massey 1993; Harvey 1990). Spaces such as
parks can be places of social cohesion (L'Aoustet & Griffet 2004: 175), social exclusion (Weszkalnys 2010; Weszkalnys 2008; Weszkalnys 2007), and places where ideologies of ‘the community’ are mapped (Rotenberg 2005: 139).

As much as public space has the possibility of social cohesion and transformation, it also shows ruptures and tensions within communities. Both Weszkalnys (2010; 2008; 2007) and Staiger (2009) illustrate how in post-unification Berlin public spaces are recreated to exclude certain users, for example poor and homeless people, a pattern which Smithsimon (2008) also found in New York City. Other tensions found in public space are around religion (Watson 2006), age (Watson 2006), class (Charlesworth 2009), gender (Newcomb 2006) and sexuality (Gruszczynska 2009).

Public space is ‘a range of social locations’ which can be as concrete as streets, parks and buildings and as abstract as cyberspace (Smith & Low 2006: 3). In this study I will use Kohn’s (2008: 481-482) three-part definition of public space. Public space is 1) accessible to everyone, 2) owned by government, and 3) intersubjective, meaning that different people should be able to interact there. This definition of public space is flexible and can be applied to a variety of urban and rural spaces. Moreover, it can include space that was appropriated by people for their own ends.

In the South African context, the importance of urban space has been explored by Popke and Ballard (2004: 100) who argue that “the subjective experiences of urban space provide one of the principal mediums through which ideas of identity, difference, democracy and citizenship are being reworked in post-apartheid South Africa”. The importance of urban space is underlined by the fact that the South African society is fractured along a number of fault lines. These include race (Czegledy 2003), class (Beall, Crankshaw & Parnell 2002), trade formalisation (Popke & Ballard 2004), nationality (Morris 1999b; Murray 2008b) and housing options (Margaretten 2009).
A limitation of public space literature is authors’ inability to view space as constituted by sets of relationships and to theorise space meaningfully (Smith & Low 2006: 6). Much of the work produced is descriptive and lacking a theoretical focus. For Smith and Low (2006), a possible solution to this is to use the idea of the public sphere to address the limitations of this literature.

According to Harvey (2006: 17), public sphere is an arena of political deliberation at the heart of democracy. Typically, the idea of public sphere is used in political philosophy and media studies and has only recently been applied in Anthropology (Margaretten 2009; Freeman 2008; Freeman 2002).

Through my research in Joubert Park I wanted to bring together the concepts of public space and public sphere. How, if at all, are public spheres spatialised in the park? What inhibits or enhances the public sphere, if it exists? What are the relationships between people within the park? What is the relationship between people and the various agencies of the City of Johannesburg? I answered these questions through an ethnographic study of the park.

For Holston (2009) and Freeman (2002; 2008), public spheres are found in everyday interactions between people in public space. This interaction in public space is a place where dominant fault lines can be engage both violently and peacefully, politically but more importantly, in the mundane everyday interactions of people using space. This broader interpretation moves the concept away from a narrow political focus into anthropological territory where you can also look at the every-day. Anthropology’s contribution to spatialising the public sphere is to look at ordinary moments of interaction, feeling and talk.

One way to investigate the public sphere in South Africa, especially with a focus on everyday interactions, is by focusing on a specific and contained space such as a public park. The space identified for the study is Joubert Park. It is one of the earliest open spaces in Johannesburg, proclaimed in 1903 (Davie 2001). Today the park is a space where the residents of the
many surrounding flats (apartments) come to relax, have religious meetings, play chess, do laundry and take photos. The park also houses an art gallery, Johannesburg Art Gallery. Its formal suburban visitors contrast starkly with the lively park. The park also includes a crèche, a clinic, a vegetable garden and an environmental project, which are all fenced off from the green space of the park. The park is used by a variety of stakeholders – chess players, traders, homeless people, photographers, children, gallery visitors, City Parks workers and church groups as well as Johannesburg Metro Police Department (JMPD) officers and City of Johannesburg officials. In terms of offering a space to study the everyday-ness of the public sphere, and its spatialisation, this is an ideal place due to its diversity of uses and users.

The next section situates this study within the field of urban anthropology. It argues that it is important to make the distinction between research in the city as opposed to research of the city. This thesis will make a contribution to research of the city.

1. Urban anthropology

Although the city has been present in anthropological studies, anthropology has under-theorised urban matters (Low 1999: 1; Low 1996b: 383). Exotic early images of anthropologists were of the lone ethnographer struggling to understand the life ways of an exotic group of people on a small island such as Malinowski or Mead. But this caricature of anthropology is no longer valid, if it ever was. Instead, anthropologists live in and study cities on a regular basis. But how did anthropology of the city develop and change over the years, what is its research scope and what unique methods does it offer? In this chapter I consider these issues, as well as how urban anthropology developed in South Africa.

a. Anthropology in/of the city

The development of urban anthropology was influenced by the Chicago School sociological studies of the 1920s and 1930s, and the community
studies by the Institute of Community Studies on slum clearance in the 1950s (Low 1999: 2; Sanjek 1990: 151).

The work emerging from urban anthropology between 1950-1970 can be grouped as focusing on work on urban poverty, migration, the urban village (or neighbourhood life), structure and function of voluntary associations, kinship relations and their persistence in urban areas, role differentiation and network analysis and ethnicity. This left the field with shortcomings: only focusing on the poor and migrants ignores the roles of elites in shaping the city, a lack of world system approach, women/gender/sexuality was missing, no focus on the lifecycle or grassroots political action, no urban religion or health care focus, and work sites were not represented. Research in the field focused mostly on residential areas, and finally findings stressed order and connectivity rather than the ephemeral nature of relationships (Sanjek 1990: 152).

Early urban anthropology was especially interested in following migrants from their rural homes to the city. Examples of this work are Oscar Lewis’ focus on migrants in the city (Lewis 1979; Lewis 1975; Lewis 1968). These studies treated migrants as discreet groups, paying very little attention to the context of the city (Weszkalnys 2010: 18).

In the 1980s a Balkanisation of Cultural Anthropology occur with urban anthropology as the narrowest and the least influential field (Sanjek 1990). While Sanjek identifies several strands of anthropological work that continued to emerge after the 1970s, he claims that urban anthropology as it was in the 1950-1970s (with a specific focus on trying to discover the meaning of the city and the urban of urban anthropology) was dead because of the recognition in the 1960s that cities were nodes within a society. These nodes are

---

3 This Balkanisation of the field could be a direct result of the crisis of representation and the advent of postmodern anthropology. That is, the radical self-assessment of the field, the rejection of scientific authority and an emphasis on greater co-authorship between communities and anthropologists.
contextualised by the state and its functions, and with this there is recognition
that it was not necessary to have a separate field because it just became
spread within the rest of sociocultural anthropology (Sanjek 1990: 154).

Also in the 1980s, anthropologists overcame the shortcomings of the field by
focusing on all urban classes, political economy, urban anthropology of work,
gender, and sexuality became visible, a focus was directed at all life cycles,
grass roots organisations, religion, and transitory relationships (Sanjek 1990:
154-155). This led to certain anthropologists, such as Whiteford (1994), to no
longer identifying themselves as urban anthropologists although he still
continued work within the city. Instead, Whiteford (1994) argued that people
who study similar things or use similar theoretical lenses will find one another,
whether they are labelled urban anthropologists or not (Whiteford 1994: 17).

In contrast to Whiteford’s dismissive attitude towards urban anthropology,
Kemper (1991) argued that urban anthropology had changed the entire field
of sociocultural anthropology. For Kemper (1991) and Fox (1977) the
distinction between people who do research in cities versus those that do
urban anthropology, that is, trying to understand the structure and context of
cities (Kemper 1991: 374) is vitally important. Breitborde (1994: 4) argued that
urban anthropology as a discipline may struggle to exist because as the world
urbanises, all “sociocultural anthropology will become urban anthropology”.
While this is a reflection of the rapidly urbanising world that we are in,
studying something within the city is not the same as urban anthropology,
because there is a danger of “passing over relational construction of the idea
of the city itself” and failing to interrogate the very thing that we are studying
(Weszkalnys 2010: 19).

One of the early proponents of studying the city holistically, rather than a mere
backdrop, was the eminent urban anthropologist Richard Fox (1977)
(Breitborde 1994: 4). Holism however, raised a methodological difficulty.
Studying something in the city, a bounded phenomenon, makes participant
observation easy but does not enhance our understanding of cities as a
whole. On the other hand, looking at the city holistically makes participant
observation difficult (Smart 1999: 62). This methodological realisation still remains with us today.

The 1980s saw an interest in the political economy in (of) cities as well as an interest in understanding cities by ‘reading’ the representations that it upholds as you would read a text (Low 1996b: 386). After the 1980s\(^4\), what has occurred in cities are best understood as metaphors and images such as social relations\(^5\), economics\(^6\), urban planning and architecture\(^7\) and religion and culture\(^8\) (Low 1996b: 387-399). An example of the city as a text is Holston’s (1989) work on the lay-out of Brasilia. In Safa’s (1982) edited volume *Towards a Political Economy of Urbanisation in Third World Countries*, the contributors investigate the urbanisation trajectory of Third World Countries using a framework of dependency theory, the historical process of the different modes of production, the class structure of cities and the state’s role in shaping urbanisation processes (Safa 1982: 4).

Low (1996b: 400) argues that the ethnographers of this time period, the 1980s and 1990s attempt to understand the ‘theoretical revitalisation’ of urban anthropology that “articulates understandings of particular cities”. Further they sought to investigate residents’ understanding of cities as shaped through “experiencing the city through the social relations, political economics, and planning processes” (Low 1996b: 400). An example of this new paradigm of work she mentions is Rotenberg’s (1995) work on gardens and their significances in Vienna, as well as Low’s (1996a) investigation of the cultural meaning of the Latin American plaza (Low 2000; Low 1996b). Dominant research trends in urban anthropology are “post-structural studies of race, class and gender in the urban context, political economic studies in global

\(^4\) Low’s review picks up from the 1990s when Kemper and Sanjek’s reviews end.

\(^5\) Ethnic cities – focusing on migrants, divided cities – looking at barriers of race and class, the
gendered city, and the contested city

\(^6\) The deindustrialised city, the global city, the informational city

\(^7\) The modernist city, postmodern city, the fortress city

\(^8\) Sacred city, traditional city
cities, and symbolic and social production studies of urban space and planning” (Low 1996b: 402).

More research on parks and plazas also started to be conducted, for example a compendium of park studies in North America (Low, Taplin & Scheld 2005), and other American parks (Low, Taplin & Lamb 2005), and Alexander Platz in Berlin (Weszkalnys 2010; Weszkalnys 2008; Weszkalnys 2007). The direction to parks is a newer focus area, while others comprise a continuation of previous patterns such as focusing on migration.

b. Anthropology in/of the city

Although the choice to study in, and write about the urban within anthropology is no longer uncommon (Weszkalnys 2010: 18), the challenge that Low set (1999: 2), as first proposed by Fox (1977) of studying the anthropology of, rather than merely in, the city remains. Low argued that rather than just studying something that happens to occur in the city, anthropology of the city’s focus is understanding how the city works at large, in other words, how an object of study can illuminate, and help theorise the city. Anthropology of the city is a holistic endeavour, while anthropology in the city is a fieldwork intensive understanding of discreet phenomenon that do not aim to theorise the city per se (Smart 1999: 73). The distinction between in/of the city has however never become a coherent project, as there has never been agreement among anthropologists that this is a useful distinction, and that the shift of focus to working within the city is enough.

The distinction between in/of offered by Fox was criticised by Lynch (1994). He argued that urban anthropology in the 1970s and 1980s essentialised and romanticised “the city”, leaving it at sea with nothing to study after the crisis of representation. The crisis of representation, which questioned the very validity of anthropology and the overarching knowledge that it produced, led to anthropologists focusing on telling small stories – leaving behind the quest for big stories (Astuti, Parry & Stafford 2007). Understanding the big question of what the city is like, is one such question.
Like McDonough (2000) and Low (1996b: 384), I however believe that the distinction between in/of the city is useful. Anthropology of the city can exactly challenge essentialist notions by focusing on the city as a process, rather than as a category. Through this anthropology can hopefully address some of the big and pressing issues that South Africa is confronted with.

While recognising the urban as an extremely important space for research because of the numbers of people now living in cities, the centralising of power in cities and the cultural differences between rural and urban, Lynch (1994: 36) rejects the call for anthropology of the city and argues that anthropologists should look at the “localisations, fragmentations of identity” in the city and contextualise people in larger worlds. Studying people within cities is uncontroversial, and for some researchers this may be all that they are interested in. The debate of what the proper focus of urban anthropology is seems to have remained unresolved since the 1970s, as Weszkalnys (2010: 18) highlights.

Overall, Low (1996b: 384) argues that urban anthropology has had a very low impact on anthropology itself, but also that urban anthropologists rarely take part in urban studies discourses or are involved in urban planning and policy, leaving out a very important anthropological voice. Low’s body of work in and on cities is the most visible, with books and articles spanning a range of subjects, including plazas and parks (Low, Taplin & Scheld 2005; Low, Taplin & Lamb 2005; Low 2000; Low 1996a), urban fear and safety (Low 2009; Low 2006; Low 2004; Low 2001; Low 1997), the spatialisation of the public sphere (Smith & Low 2006) and the politics and experiences of gated urban communities (Low 2003a; Low 2001).

In order to gain a full understanding of what happens within cities, urban anthropology is interdisciplinary. Our understanding of cities draws from architecture, urban planning, sociology and urban history to mention a few (Low & McDonogh 2001: 5; Low 1999: 21; Low 1996b: 401). While this interdisciplinary nature could signal the complete collapse of the anthropology in urban anthropology, anthropologists still offer valuable insights. This is due
to “[t]he contributions of anthropological fieldwork [that] still retain the power to demonstrate the how, why, and when of urban processes”, especially when paired effectively with theory (Low 1999: 21). We can offer “experience-near accounts of everyday life” (Low & McDonough 2001: 5). This methodological contribution of urban anthropology is illustrated by the ethnographies of Holston (2008), Low (2000), and Rotenberg (1996). It is a unique contribution because it combines a micro lens, people’s stories and experiences, with macro stories or theories. While all three authors offer theoretical insight into the cities that they studied (anthropology of the city), their intense engagement with fieldwork complements their understandings of cities which a focus on macro theories often misses.

The above focused almost exclusively on the North American context. How has urban anthropology developed within South Africa, and what was its contribution? The next section situates this ethnography within urban anthropology in South Africa.

c. Urban anthropology in South Africa
What is the state of urban anthropology in South Africa? Some of the early well known ethnographers in South Africa did extensive work in cities (Bank 2011). But the extent and influence of urban anthropology in South Africa are disputed as I will show.

Ellen Hellman conducted research in a Johannesburg slum. Her short ethnography *Rooiyard A Sociological Survey of an Urban Native Slum Yard* (Hellman 1948), is a description of the yard9 (and the rooms in the yard), its inhabitants, people’s reasons for living there, their economic life, the life cycle in Rooiyard, religious beliefs and practices, and the process of “detribalisation and westernisation” (Hellman 1948). She also focuses on westernisation of the Rooiyard residents. Her experience of the poverty and inequality of black

9 In colloquial South African English a yard is the piece of land surrounding a property, or an erven or a plot.
urban resident in Rooiyard led her to become involved in the South African Institute of Race Relations and to become an advocate for better conditions for black urban residents (SAHO n.d).

Excellent coverage of the small city of East London (through the Xhosa in Town trilogy) exists, compiled through research conducted in the 1950s and 1960s. The trilogy consists of *The Black Man’s Portion* (Reader 1961), *Townsmen or Tribesmen* by Philip and Iona Mayer (1971), and *The Second Generation* by BA Pauw (1973). *The Black Man’s Portion* (Reader 1961) was a survey of the black residents of East London, focusing on all aspects of life, how people earn a living, how they spend money and leisure time, and their household composition. The next book, *Townsmen and Tribesmen* (Mayer & Mayer 1971) investigated urban migration and the process of urbanisation amongst Xhosa people in East London. It argued that there is a distinction between “townsmen”, who actively seek to become urban residents, converted to Christianity and emphasised the importance of town relationships, and “tribesmen”, who remained tied to rural tradition and saw themselves as temporary sojourners in the city. The tribesmen emphasised the importance of tribal or rural relationships, and generally rejected Christianity.

In *The Second Generation* Pauw (1973) looked at the next generation of Xhosas in East London. These were the children of migrants who had permanently settled in town and who had no land outside of East London, and the effect of their landlessness on their lives.

---

10 The SAIRR was established in 1929 as the first multiracial institute in South Africa to conduct research with regard to race relations in the country. It was established to ascertain facts about living conditions of disadvantaged people (SAIRR n.d.).

11 Technically only the township areas of East London.

12 Duncan Village, where the ethnographies were conducted, was significant because the anthropologist Monica Wilson first did fieldwork on urbanisation there for her book *Reaction to Conquest* (1936). The trilogy was inspired by work on urbanisation in the Zambian Copperbelt from the Rhodes Livingstone Institute that inspired the Mayers and colleagues to work on processes of urbanisation by migrants in the East London (Banks 2002)
While the trilogy is acknowledged as seminal works in South African anthropology it was also criticised at the time for ignoring structural issues that affected the lives of the people they studied, as well as representing the Xhosa as timeless and primitive (Magubane 1973). Magubane’s (1973) critique of the trilogy is as much of a critique against the trajectory and development of anthropology in South Africa and its colonial and apartheid collaborations, as against the work itself.

A review of South African anthropology by Gordon and Spiegel (1993: 94-95) argued that few urban anthropology studies had been conducted previously and were only starting to emerge at that stage. They mention the Xhosa trilogy, Van der Vliet’s work on gender relationships between urban wives and rural husbands, and Cole’s work in Crossroads in Cape Town (Gordon & Spiegel 1993).

Another strand of urban work that Gordon and Spiegel (1993) identify is work dealing with children in urban environments. Examples of this work are by Jill Swart-Kruger (1990), which focused on street children and their lives on the streets of Hillbrow, as well as Reynolds (1983) who carried out an ethnography focusing on children’s lives in the informal settlement of Crossroads in Cape Town. Jones (1993) focused on how children experienced migrancy and hostel life.

Some selected works that have emerged since Gordon and Spiegel’s (1993) review are Mamphela Ramphele’s (1993) A bed called home that investigates life in a migrant hostel. This work situated bedholders in a larger understanding of migrant workers in Cape Town with attention to issues of

---

13 Forthcoming work by Andrew Bank, a professor of history at the University of the Western Cape, identifies a Johannesburg school of female anthropologists that worked on urban issues. His work could contradict Gordon & Spiegel’s (1993) account of the paucity of urban anthropology in South Africa (as presented at the Anthropology Southern Africa conference 30 August-3 September 2012 at the University of Cape Town).


15 A migrant worker that had a bed in the hostel.

Other anthropologists focusing on cities in South Africa in the past years have been Czegledy and Robins. Czegledy focused on the build environment, analysing Johannesburg’s Northern Suburbs (Czegledy 2003) and its architecture. The implications of the build environment on transportation use, especially car use, were another focus point (Czegledy 2004). Robins’ work largely focused on social movements active in Cape Town as well as urban forms within that city (Robins 2010; Robins 2009; Robins & von Lieres 2009; Robins 2002).

Two more recent ethnographies that have been published are works by Ross (2010) and Bank (2011). Fiona Ross’ (2010) ethnography on Die Bos, an informal settlement of Cape Town, describes life in this place as “raw”. Raw life is the basic survival of bodies exposed to constant unpredictability and ugliness. She investigates how “in contexts of extreme impoverishment and marginalisation, people make meaning, make do and get by” (Ross 2010: 7). Bank’s (2011) book, Home spaces, street styles is a follow-up on the Xhosa trilogy, focusing on the town of East London. He highlights issues of identity and power in his book and how people adapt to the poverty of living in a South African township.

A brief survey on theses done at South African universities from 2000-2011 indicates that the trend in South African universities is for many studies in urban areas, but few works on understanding the city (anthropology of the city). Examples of work in the city are Maganga (2009) on exchange students, Barbali (2009) on Senegalese male migrants and Ojong (2005) on Ghanaian women migrants. Marais’ (2008) research looks at teacher experiences of
transformation in Johannesburg. While the research of these projects was interesting in itself, they did not claim to make a contribution to our understanding of South African cities.

Three projects explicitly made a contribution to debates around the anthropology of cities in South Africa. Stevens (2006) turned her attention to urban regeneration and the imagineering of Johannesburg as an African World Class City through a case study regeneration in the Newtown precinct and the Nelson Mandela Bridge specifically. Packery (2009) investigated the implications of newly built social housing estates in East London and how that shaped social relationships and urbanism in this city. Krige’s (2011) thesis investigates the popular economies in Soweto, Johannesburg and uses this as a lens to further our understanding of this part of Johannesburg. He argues that these practices shape social relations in Soweto but also the rest of the city.

What the above has shown is the limited number of academic work that attempt to understand South African cities at large, despite Bank’s (2011) optimism about South African anthropology’s early urban focus. Most research used cities as backdrops. I am not dismissing the value that research inside the city holds, merely pointing to the fact that very little of this work set out to understand cities in South Africa.

2. What is a park?

“If the pleasure ground had been a pious patriarch, the reform park a social worker, and the recreation facility a waitress or car mechanic, the new park was something of a performance artist” (Cranz 1982: 138).

I situate this thesis within the realm of urban anthropology. Through focusing on a park in Johannesburg as a representation of the city, I aim to broaden the academic understanding of Johannesburg. I wish to understand the relationship between people, as well as the relationship between people and various local government agencies. I argue that Joubert Park can is a space
through which we can understand some social relations in Johannesburg. This is because parks have been shown to reveal ideologies of time periods, social relations and government systems as the following section shows. A city’s aims and politics are observable in public parks because parks are “filled with ideological messages” (Rotenberg 1996: 97). In this section I consider some of the ideologies revealed in parks in various parts of the world.

What are parks? In parks we can ‘read’ the ideologies of people, especially powerful citizens and governments. The ways that parks and other public spaces are established, maintained and ordered reveal for whom the park is established, and for what purposes.

Parks are public spaces of a special type. Public spaces are “all areas that are open and accessible to all members of the public in a society, in principle though not necessarily in practice” (Neal 2010: 1). Public space is any accessible space that people can and do use for extraordinary and everyday purposes. This can include spaces that are government owned and maintained like public parks, streets, libraries and administrative government buildings. Public spaces can also refer to empty spaces that are privately owned but used by the public in everyday life, for example, bonus plazas. Bonus plazas are open areas around buildings that were built by the owner in exchange for easements of building regulations. It is an example of privately managed public space (Smithsimon 2008). In theory public spaces are open to everyone but various ideologies and practicalities prevent everyone from using them. Public spaces can be in the form of streets, the Commons, plazas or parks.

One type of public space is the Commons. That is – commonly used, if not always commonly owned land. The Commons could be agricultural land and lakes, but also market places in towns (Neal 2010: 6). In Europe and the

16 The Internet is now also understood to be a type of public space (Taipale 2006), although this is contested (Dean 2003).
United States, some Commons slowly evolved into parks. For example the Boston Common where people grazed cattle in 1634, was gradually changed into a park (Neal 2010: 6-7).

In southern Africa such commonly used land also existed, and still exists (Boonzaier, Hofmeyer, Archer & Smith 1990). One example of the Commons in South Africa is commonage. Commonage in South Africa is municipally owned land, that was acquired through state grants or from churches. People have grazing rights to this land (Department of Land Affairs 1997). It is specifically for the benefit of poor people. In 1994 Commonage was identified as a key platform for land reform where people could use the land for subsistence activities while awaiting the land reform process (Davenport & Gambiza 2009). Commonage in the Eastern Cape specifically has shown to add between 14-20% extra income for poor residents, often keeping families from food insecurity (Davenport 2009). De Jongh’s (2012) ethnography on the Karretjie 17 people of the Great Karoo also highlighted the ways that commonage is used for survival by these nomadic people. Understanding the different ways that the Commons has been used for trade, in politics and in everyday life, would fill what seems to be a missing understanding of spatial use in Africa and elsewhere. Hilda Kuper (1972) started such a project when she contrasted the different spaces of colonial administration and its colonial buildings, with traditional administration and meetings in cattle byres in Swaziland.

Another type of public space is plazas, or alternately, squares, piazzas or platz. This is “a large, open and paved space, anchored at the centre by a monument, fountain, or other architectural significance like a courthouse” (Neal 2010: 7). Usually the Latin American plaza is traced to European urban planning (Neal 2010: 7). However, Setha Low (2000: 120) shows that Meso-American urban forms also included plazas, and that there was in fact

17 The Karretjie people (Donkey Cart People) are descendants from the /Xam (San/Bushman) who today live as itinerant sheep-shearers in the Karoo (De Jongh 2012)
syncretism between the Spanish and indigenous forms. Studies in plazas have focused on what people perceive as the correct behaviour in plazas (Richardson 2001), and how power is inscribed in plazas (Crossa 2009). Weszkalnys (2008) focused on different ideas of ‘the social’ by planners and youth workers in planning a vision for Alexanderplatz, a plaza in the former East Berlin. An emerging theme in literature is a focus on corporate plazas, such as Sony Plaza in Berlin (Allen 2006). Plazas provided a place to hold markets, to show the power of the administration, and to provide a place for people to gather.

In South Africa elders have often met under trees, or as mentioned above, cattle byres. These trees and cattle byres have served the same function as plazas. In Sophiatown in Johannesburg such a tree is the oak tree in Maude Street where anti-apartheid activists and clergy met to discuss issues regarding apartheid, and the destruction of Sophiatown (Davie 2004b). Also associated with, and in some ways very similar to plazas, was an open piece of land in Sophiatown, Freedom Square. This land was used by political notaries such as Nelson Mandela, to make speeches and for political meetings (Davie 2004a). In small towns in South Africa, church property often served a similar function to plazas, as a centre of community life.

Another type of public space, and the one that this thesis is specifically concerned with, is public parks. As I stated earlier, the way that parks are established and managed reflects the ideology of the managers, establishers and governments. I will look at European, English, Indian and American parks to see what ideologies were behind the establishment and management of their parks.

---

18 Sophiatown is a suburb of Johannesburg. During the 1950s it gained fame as a mixed neighbourhood where many famous black photographers, writers and musicians originated. It was demolished by the municipality due to its mixed nature and renamed Triomf (Triumph). After apartheid ended it was renamed Sophiatown.

19 Today Freedom Square is the playing field of a primary school. The Freedom Charter was meant to be signed here but because the ANC had been warned that police would be there, the meeting was moved to Freedom Square in Kliptown, Soweto.
a. Sweden
European parks were often first established as hunting grounds or gardens for royals but common citizens often had public access and use (Nolin 2004: 200; Isling 2004: 248-252; Taylor 1995: 201). Spaces that were used for military purposes – training and defence – were also later turned into parks (Isling 2004: 254). Isling (2004: 256) found in a study tracing the development of parks in Stockholm, that parks were established as places for “promenades for the bourgeoisie, with winding paths and floral displays”. In Sweden, Nolin’s (2004) study revealed that parks established under King Gustav II Adolf (in 1620) were places for bourgeoisie enjoyment, by in the 1800s the focus was on offering places for working class men and craftsmen to relax and enjoy activities away from gambling and drinking establishments. To this end public parks were closely regulated, and all political activity was forbidden (Nolin 2004: 202).

b. England
English parks have a similar history. King Henry VIII already established St James Park in 1532 (Taylor 1995: 202). In 1830 a review20 of public parks made people aware of the need for more public parks in rapidly urbanising industrial towns, in order to provide public space to alleviate “social ills” such as overcrowding (MacGill 2007: 146). Although the Commons were well established and used, the idea of providing parks in towns that would be open for everybody, was foreign and initially resisted (Taylor 1995: 202). This resistance was in general due to sweeping changes and uncertainties brought about by industrialisation and urbanisation, which lead to some people “trying to establish a demarcation between their own interests and those of others deemed further down the social ladder” (Taylor 1995: 202). However, the need to provide green lungs to towns was one of the main reasons for park development (Conway 2000: 118; Taylor 1995: 202; Clark 1973: 34). This combined with a genuine fear of revolution and riots from lower classes meant

20 The report was done through the Select Committee on Public Walks in 1833
that upper class decision makers went ahead with forming parks as a preventative measure against these fears (Taylor 1995: 202).

Soon parks were viewed as a status symbol for towns to have. Upper class citizens and burgeoning industrialists donated land for parks in order to cement their own status (MacGill 2007: 158; Taylor 1995: 203). Similar to Sweden, parks were closely regulated and focused on “improvement in manners and the social and moral behaviour of the lower classes” (MacGill 2007: 155; Taylor 1995: 203-204; Jordan 1994).

During World War Two, English parks became a centre for the war effort as a place to grow food and provide entertainment, since people were discouraged from travelling (Conway 2000: 123-129). Post-war park managers focused on providing play and creative activity for children in parks (Conway 2000: 129-130). In the 1960s and 1970s and even into the 2000s, parks became part of the regeneration efforts of cities. In Sheffield, for example, £41 million was meant to establish several gardens and squares. (Conway 2000: 130-132).

Reflecting the financial troubles that the global economic crisis brought to some London borough councils, some of the local councils are considering introducing user fees for certain parks and park users. In Hurlingham Park fitness instructors using the park as a place to exercise with their clients now have to pay licence fees (Randhawa 2011). In a similar scheme, a Battersea adventure play park was intending to levy a £2.50 charge for children to play (BBC News 2011c; The Telegraph 2011).

c. India
In India, at the same time that the parks movement took hold in Britain, the lack of green spaces in Indian cities was recognised by administrators (Sharma 2007). Similar to England, there was a push for creating urban parks in cities such as Delhi. This was done by taking existing royal gardens and funeral shrines and remodelling them as parks (Sharma 2007: 213). But where in England parks were opened to civilise lower classes and provide recreation space, in India the public parks were for the European residents
only. Many parks were created from these royal gardens after the failed Indian Mutiny of 1857. The public parks not only became a place for elite entertainment, but also an embodiment of British superiority and invincibility (Sharma 2007: 213-214).

d. United States (US)
The functions and ideologies of American parks can similarly be read. Early parks (between 1850-1900) in America were established because it was thought that nature would have a civilising effect on urban inhabitants, especially working class men. A deep anti-urban bias existed and people such as Frederick Law Olmsted\(^{21}\) thought that parks would alleviate the evils of city life (Cranz 1982: 3-4). “Conceptually, the pleasure ground was meant to transcend... the evils of urban life, of which division was a prominent symptom” (Cranz 1982: 23). To this end politics and commercialism were to be kept out of parks. People could come to the park to relax outdoors, walk around, and take part in unplanned, spontaneous activities.

The period thereafter, between 1900-1930, was focused on organising activities in parks (Cranz 1982: 61). Most users were children and adult working class men, who were seen as being incapable of organising their own leisure and recreation. “Generally, for its advocates the reform park was a moral defence against the potential for chaos that they perceived in this new abundance of free time [a shorter working week, holidays, etc.]....Spare time was a threat to society” (Cranz 1982: 62). Like its predecessor, political and commercial activities were excluded from the park (Cranz 1982: 78).

With the leisure park (1930-1965) the idea of parks as a place for social reform was abandoned, since it was no longer necessary to justify parks as they had become part of the urban fabric (Cranz 1982: 101-103). There was a focus on expanding recreational activities. Leisure activities were expanded to

\(^{21}\) Olmsted is considered to be the architect of landscape design. He co-designed many famous American parks such as Central Park in New York.
include people of all ages and sexes. There was an increase in unemployment that created more time that needed to be filled (Cranz 1982: 103-105). Parks, or rather their managers, strove for political neutrality. The idea of the leisure class was meant to illustrate that class combat had been beaten and that instead of class conflict, the only conflict in society was fighting boredom (Cranz 1982: 106). Money was being diverted towards the war effort, so park managers had to justify the existence of parks by organising activities that would boost morale and the war effort (Cranz 1982: 110).

The last type that Cranz (1982) identified is the open space system (1965 onwards). The open space system focused on providing more open spaces (Cranz 1982: 135). Middle class people started to use parks less because they were seen as unsafe in the context of riots, demonstrations and strikes. Parks had to reorient to put the perceived broken urban system back together again through “imagery and inspiration” (Cranz 1982: 137). Parks had to be brought back to life and this was done through Happenings - festivals, concerts, beer gardens, and cultural events. The focus was on participatory events, but was also meant to give people something to reflect on (Cranz 1982: 138-142). Parks started to be used for political activities such as demonstrations against Vietnam, although park services tried to stop this (Cranz 1982: 142-143).

Despite extensive searching, literature focusing on the establishment of parks in South Africa and histories and analysis on this subject is scarce. Specific parks may be mentioned in passing, for example the establishment of the Kompanje Gardens in Cape Town in Giliomee and Mbenga (2007). Grey literature on the history of the creation of parks in Johannesburg exists, especially on the City of Johannesburg website. This I consider in Chapter Four with regards to Joubert Park.

Based on the above information, we can postulate how parks have changed in meaning and function spatially and temporally. There are common themes, of wanting to provide a health benefit, civilising mission and entertainment.
The Commons provided a way for people to earn a living and survival. Plazas were central to social engagement and trade. Parks themselves had a variety of uses through time: to display status and power, to alleviate social ills, to defend against chaos, to provide leisure, and as a place for political gatherings.

Some authors argue that parks have declined, both through a lack of funding but also because public space has become privatised in various ways, as Banerjee (2001) argues for America and Allen (2006) discusses for Berlin. Central Park in New York is now managed through the Central Park Conservancy, a not-for-profit agency that manages the park on behalf of the local government (Cooke 2007). This privatisation takes a once public good and places it in different social relations to users (Madden 2010; Cooke 2007: 117). An alternative view is that parks are undermanaged with ‘undersirables’ taking over, which has lead to the emptying of public space (Carmona & De Magalhaes 2006).

Although privatisation of public space for political and economic gain is not new, this recent privatisation, which has occurred in the UK as well as US, is an expression of neo-liberal economic doctrine that seeks to limit state involvement, and involve the use of capital from business to maintain parks (Cooke 2007). The “relationship of space to social class, symbolic meaning and everyday practices existed long before the neoliberal transformations” (Grimson 2008: 506), as I showed above. However, the neo-liberal turn exacerbated these patterns at a variety of scales (Hubbard 2004: 665). Public space is privatised (Grimson 2008: 506), either outright, i.e. sold, or through giving unelected people complete control over the space (such as the Central Park Conservancy or Business Improvement Districts), or through the introduction of rules that make it more attractive for wealthier class use (Madden 2010; Cook 2009: 934; Massey 2005: 152). In this context, space is designed or redesigned to increase consumption and decrease ‘idle’ activity. It is redesigned to make it unattractive for homeless or poor people by making benches unsittable, or ‘move-along’ laws (Madden 2010; Massey 2005: 152; Schaller & Modan 2005: 394; Atkinson 2003: 1834). These changes alter the
status of space away from use value to exchange value, making space a commodity similar to private property (Cooke 2007). This transformation of space is one of the ways by which neo-liberalism increases existing, and creates new forms, of urban inequality (Gough 2002: 407).

The historical accounts of parks in Europe, England, India and US do not consider how people used and experienced these spaces themselves. Instead, it gives the official view of the functions of parks. Also, it is a very Eurocentric focus, but there are very few studies focusing on urban space outside of Western countries, especially in Africa (Brown 2006a). As posited in this section, we can use parks to understand the ideologies of municipalities and elites who were often responsible for establishing parks. But we can also use parks as a way to understand public sphere manifestation.

3. Parks as places to understand democracy

Research on parks has focused on a variety of aspects, such as, the health benefits that they may provide (Lachowycz & Jones 2011), their role as a place where migrants can meet (Armenta 2009; Noussia & Lyons 2009; Dines 2002; Law 2002), to understand urban development, as well as regeneration (Rabare, Okech & Onyango 2009; Atkinson 2003), and as a place for youths to socialise and ‘learn’ what acceptable public behaviour is (Abbott-Chapman & Robertson 2009; De Visscher & Bouverne-de Bie 2008; Germann-Chiari & Seeland 2004; L’Aoustet & Griffet 2004; Malone 2002).

A central focus of research in parks has been the power relations that are inherent in, and reflected through, parks (Allen 2007; Allen 2006; Amster 2003; Batumen 2003; Dines 2002). This in turn has given rise to theorising the role of public space, and often specifically parks, in understanding democracy or more specifically people’s interaction with one another about state authority. Public space, such as plazas and parks are recognised as being special places that are needed for democracy to form and flourish. Space is crucial to democracy (Kohn 2003: 3) as it is a “repository of historical
meanings that reproduce social relations”. It has physical, symbolic or cognitive dimensions. “Space affects how individuals and groups perceive their place in the order of things” (Kohn 2003: 3). In Ancient Greece the relationships between state and citizens were mediated by specific sites such as city walls, markets, forums and temples (Kohn 2003: 13; Arendt 1958: 41). Some of the spaces fostered democracy while others reinforced hierarchy (Kohn 2003: 14). History is marked spatially through landmarks like the Berlin Wall and Tiananmen Square which attained symbolic significance (Kohn 2003: 15). One way to understand democracy in public space is through the idea of public spheres.

The public sphere is “the public of private individuals who join in debate of issues bearing on state authority” (Calhoun 1996: 7) or slightly differently, it is the establishment of norms through discourse (Benhabib 1996: 85; Fraser 1996: 110). It is an arena of political deliberation in order for people to decide in consultation with one another what the shortcomings of their democratic society are (Harvey 2006: 17; Sinekopova 2006: 505). Simply, the idea of public sphere encapsulates citizens, not governments or business, coming together to talk about what their common interests are. The most common conception of the public sphere is through the work of Jürgen Habermas. However, Hannah Arendt’s ideas on the public realm, and Richard Sennett’s idea of publicity is also of relevance.

Hannah Arendt, in The Human Condition (1958), argues that our essential public natures make us human (Arendt 1958: 3-4). We only become fully human through speech, in the company of others who acknowledge our experiences (Arendt 1958: 23). Therefore, it is essential that we act and speak in public, because freedom is found there, in agonistic speech, instead of mute acceptance of rules (Arendt 1958: 31). When we are not in public, when we only live private lives, it is as if we do not exist (Arendt 1958: 38). This togetherness with others is very powerful because in this you can challenge authority.
People come together in space, and in this take responsibility for public functions such as the judiciary, and defence (Arendt 1958: 41). This power that establishes and exists when people are together and engaging with one another, can only be broken by force. The power of the people is threatened when people do not engage with passion and individuality (Arendt 1958: 57).

When people start to focus on sociability, and when private property interests take over the vigorous debates in the public realm, it narrows and loses its power (Arendt 1958: 68-70, 160). “What first undermines and then kills political communities is loss of power and final impotence; power cannot be stored up and kept in reserve for emergencies...but exists only in its actualisation. Where power is not actualised, it passes away....” (Arendt 1958: 200). And this actualisation is from agonistic speech in public spaces, with other people, arguing about principles and against mute power (Batumen 2003: 266; Benhabib 1996; Arendt 1958: 20). In Arendt’s view then, public space, where people come together and debate, creates one of the most important activities within societies.

Habermas is perhaps the best known theorist of the public sphere.

The bourgeois public sphere may be conceived above all as the sphere of private people come together as a public; they soon claimed the public sphere regulated from above against the public authorities themselves, to engage them in debate over the general rules governing relations in the basically privatised but publically relevant sphere of commodity exchange and social labour (Habermas 2008/1962: 27).

Writing after Arendt, Habermas (2008[1962]) investigated the formation of the bourgeois public sphere in 18th and 19th century France and England. He argued that in the 18th century conditions arose from which an independent public sphere came into existence. The bourgeois public sphere developed in the context of the emergence of finance and trade capitalism (Habermas 2008: 14). This resulted in independence from the state, and the propertied class was interested in promoting self-regulation and free competition (Habermas 2008: 79).
The bourgeois public sphere developed as a result of people using reason as a base for deciding common interests, not just griping or malcontent (Habermas 2008: 27). This emerging public sphere developed in salons and coffee shops. People were supposed to a) disregard status, b) question areas of life that had not been questioned previously, such as the supremacy of church and king (Habermas 2008: 36) and c) be inclusive. Even if people could not come and participate, the participants acted with the knowledge that they were arguing on behalf of those people as being “conscious of being part of a larger public” (Habermas 2008: 37). But this “public” was only propertied and educated.

While the public sphere of 18th Century France transcended class between the bourgeoisie and nobles, it excluded women and dependents (servants) (Habermas 2008: 35). Humanity was conceived as property owners only. Private individuals came together because they combined the identity of property ownership and education. This public sphere was interested in preserving private property (Habermas 2008: 56).

Property preconditions to participate in public sphere excluded working classes. “The bourgeoisie could conceive of his interests as universalisable because they were already reflected in the structure of the economic system.” Therefore alternative visions had to be excluded from the public sphere, the Bourgeois public sphere disguised their own property interests as if it were general, and through that strengthened elites (Kohn 2003: 35). Habermas in his work said that participation by workers destroyed the public sphere (Kohn 2003: 36). But Kohn (2003) argues that there was a public sphere amongst workers but it expressed itself differently, through for example mob violence not because of political immaturity, but rather out of necessity (Kohn 2003: 37). The reasonableness that the bourgeois public sphere demanded became a reason for excluding people who challenged the status quo (Kohn 2003: 44).

But according to Habermas, the public sphere broke down. The relationships between property owners were thought to be equal, but “under conditions of
imperfect competition and dependent prices social power came to be concentrated in private22 hands” (Habermas 2008: 144). From this unequal relationship, the public sphere couldn’t exist anymore because it became only interested in business matters (Habermas 2008: 145). Private enterprise became public comprising interests that were the first priority, instead of the genuine public interest, even if narrowly defined as the interests of private property owners (Habermas 2008: 152).

The public sphere became a place of consumption (Habermas 2008: 160-161), which was further hollowed-out by mass media. Rational critical debate was further weakened (Habermas 2008: 162). Instead of reading, people came to be entertained by mass produced entertainment magazines, in which people no longer took part in literary and political debates (Habermas 2008: 163). Debates were administrated from podiums, round tables and shows, and it became a production instead of being a true place where people could debate amongst themselves (Habermas 2008: 164).

Consumption became the most important thing after the breakdown of the bourgeois public sphere. There was no longer public use of reason, instead those who could reason removed themselves from the public domain and what remained was uncritically accepted by consumers (Habermas 2008: 175). Culture became consumption, and the public sphere became a sphere for advertising with political and economic propaganda that was seen as unpolitical (Habermas 2008: 175). Even voting becomes just an act of advertising, not debate (Habermas 2008: 176). Instead it was a publicity exercise (Habermas 2008: 213).

While Habermas only investigated the Bourgeois public sphere, leaving the impression that perhaps it can only develop under certain class conditions, Margaret Kohn (2003) found a plebeian public sphere amongst Italian

22 Private in this case referred to business interests while intimate referred to the sphere of the family.
workers. This public sphere flourished in the *casa del popolo*, houses of the people. Her work broadens our understanding of public spheres. Kohn’s work advances Habermas ideas. He was criticised for only recognising one public sphere and ignoring, for example, women’s contributions to it, as well as women’s own public spheres (Couldry & Dreher 2007; Eder 2006; Drummond 2000; Calhoun 1996; Fraser 1996). Today theorists recognise the multiplicity of public spheres, mini-publics and diasporic public spheres (Hartley & Green 2007; Johnson 2006; Joss 2002; Law 2002; Benhabib 1996; Fraser 1996).

But the proletarian public sphere exists and is also important as “a place where the subaltern classes can determine their own experience, thereby learning to formulate an autonomous political agenda” (Kohn 2003: 40). According to Habermas, only people who had critical rational argumentative skills, that developed in their private homes, could become part of the public sphere, but for working classes their homes were places of “interiority and not critical consciousness” because they were crowded (Kohn 2003: 41). Instead “[t]he capacity for political judgement was nurtured instead in places such as union halls and cooperatives” (Kohn 2003: 41). Only in communicating with others could workers develop their shared interests, including class interests (Kohn 2003: 41). Workers only had strength in numbers and therefore “physical places that bring people together to experience, celebrate and reinforce their unity are of utmost political importance” (Kohn 2003: 43).

Similarly to Arendt (1958), Richard Sennett (1977) also saw that publicity was threatened when social relations changed from being distant to intimate. Sennett (1977) argues in *The fall of public man* that social relations have changed and that instead of people engaging in public from a distant place, as polite strangers engaging about communal matters, there is more and more pressure to engage with everyone that you meet in an intimate manner, revealing all manner of psychological and private worlds in public. This places too big a burden on people because of the number of people that you meet in public, so that people start to withdraw themselves from public life. This in turns makes public life poor. This devaluation of the public also leads to dead space – “isolation in the midst of visibility” (Sennett 1977: 13), public space
becomes dead because people move through it rather than engaging with people in it.

The public sphere is important as a place where debate about common interests can take place. It shows that humanity only develops when we are in public engaging with one another, and that all classes can have public sphere debates. There are dangers if people do not engage and engage robustly, not merely as a show, and there is a threat if people become intimate with, instead of distant from one another.

Each one of these authors emphasised how important openly available space is. Habermas’ public sphere developed in the coffee houses of the 17th century, which were open and available for use by all, or perhaps, more accurately, freely available to people who could afford to go. Khon’s public spheres developed in the People’s Houses in Italy; these were public worker spaces, created by the workers themselves. Arendt emphasised the importance of having public space available that can span generations in which the public realm can develop. She uses the example of the agora in Greek society, and the important role that it played in the vibrant public realm that developed there. Sennett warned of space becoming dead where people merely move through instead of engaging with strangers.

Open urban spaces have the potential for democracy but when they become too closely regulated, too built-up, this disappears. Sennett (2007: 295) argues that we need incompleteness so people can engage themselves. “When the city operates as an open system – incorporating porosity of territory, narrative indeterminacy and incomplete form – it becomes democratic not in a legal sense, but as a physical experience. In the past, thinking about democracy focused on issues of formal governance; today it focuses on citizenship and issues of participation which have nothing to do with the physical city and its design” (Sennett 2007: 296). People feel disconnected from one another and there is no open space like the polis in Athens where people came together and talked. “Democratic space means creating a forum for these strangers to interact” (Sennett 2007: 297).
Speaking of the public sphere as a singular entity is misleading. It is multiple – and sometimes competing – public spheres, counter publics, mini-publics and diasporic public spheres (Hassim 2009; Law 2002; Fraser 1996). Through understanding public spheres we can understand who has a voice, what these voices are, and how these voices interact with government at different levels and different places (Law 2002).

What all these theorists have in common is the recognition that an important part of life plays itself out amongst and between people. You become and are recognised because some part of your life, your political and public persona, is constituted with and through other people. There is a closeness that this brings, but if it becomes too intimate, the power that the public sphere has will be destroyed. The public sphere or realm is important because this is one way that people can come to some kind of common agreement on their own interests away from state power. These can be smaller groups such as women or migrants engaging with one another away from a bigger public sphere, or it can be on the scale that Habermas envisioned, where people decide on their interests together. What they also recognised was that there are threats to the development of public spheres. Violence can be used against people, or it can be people themselves and social relationships that focus on exclusivity rather than publicity. This also occurs where business or private property changes the content of the public sphere from common interests to shielding business, at the cost of the greater public; it can either destroy the public sphere or threaten it. It can lead to tensions in the public sphere and is also played out as tensions in public space. Social fault lines and endemic inequalities in South Africa lead Dawson (2006) to argue that public space in South Africa will never have a public sphere while Hassim (2009) believes that there is a multiplicity of public spheres in South Africa that are hierarchical and separate from one another.

While there has been a multitude of work on public spheres as well as on public spaces, the intersections between the two are not altogether clear. According to Smith and Low (2006), scholars have either focused on public
space or on public spheres. They argue that the two should be studied together and that public space must become “the geography of the public sphere” (Smith & Low 2006: 3). Public spheres must become spatialised, that is, *located in space*, in order to understand the role that public space plays in its formation and maintenance, if indeed it plays any role. The weakness of literature on public space is that the translation to theoretical frameworks is missing while public sphere literature is disconnected from public space (Joseph 2006: 246; Smith & Low 2006: 6). Staeheli & Mitchell (2008: 146) argue, “property is the synecdoche for the relations that constitute publicity”. In other words, public space is a representation of publicity (public spheres) as discussed above. Parks then have a special quality through which we can understand the inclusions and exclusions of wider society, but also more narrowly, public spheres.

When I started this study it was with the idea of finding out how public spheres work in a public space such as Joubert Park. This led to the main question for this research: **How are public spheres spatialised in Joubert Park?** Before fieldwork commenced, I thought it would be necessary to also find out what *the contexts for the creation of the park is and how that has changed*. With these questions in mind I started my research. As I progressed with the fieldwork, I discovered that I could find little clear evidence inside the park amongst regular users. I asked myself whether it was hidden, or not. I did however find some evidence of activity outside, and alongside the park. This intrigued me further. I felt it necessary to answer two more questions to explain this: *what rules of access and use exist for the park? How do the City of Johannesburg and its agencies interact with park users?*

---

23 While such openness of research is perhaps foreign in other fields, it is often seen as more acceptable in Anthropology. The eminent English anthropologist, Judith Okely, at a conference in 2010, in fact railed against what she perceived as an emerging trend in Anthropology to shoehorn students into narrow questions and foci at the beginning of fieldwork. Instead, she advocated for students to go into the field and to find what they find.
4. Conclusion

In this introductory chapter I argued why this ethnography is situated within urban anthropology. The trajectories of urban anthropology were considered, as well as the strengths that are offered in terms of advancing towards understanding the nature and character of cities.

Urban parks provide one way to focus research within a city because issues occurring within cities are often reflected in parks. This chapter considered the different uses that parks have had through time and the ideologies they reflected. The public sphere and its importance as theorised by Arendt (1958), Habermas (2008), Kohn (2003) and Sennett (1977) were then investigated. It showed that being human is constituted in relation with other people, and that power must be contested through engagement with people. I will use Joubert Park as a mirror for Johannesburg in an attempt to understand issues of public spheres within the city.

The thesis consists of nine chapters.

In Chapter Two, the methods of this study are discussed in detail. It justifies why this is an ethnography. It presents and explains the data collection methods and data analysis, the ethics of the research, and concludes by looking at my positionality for this research and the weaknesses of the study.

Chapter Three positions space within the anthropological realm, showing that despite space being more commonly associated with geography, the anthropological lens can bring a different understanding. It then offers a theoretical framework with which to understand and analyse parks. This is an expansion of the framework offered by Setha Low in her work.

Chapter Four contextualises this study within South Africa and Johannesburg and shows how the historical developments of the country have shaped the way that spaces are constituted. Today these historical forces still deeply
affect South African society. The chapter ends with the current sociopolitical picture of South Africa and Johannesburg.

Chapter Five sets the scene for Joubert Park specifically. It describes the history of the park, as well as introducing the various, government agencies, projects and players who are involved or use the park. This chapter ends by identifying historical public sphere activity in the park.

Chapters Six, Seven and Eight are data chapters. Chapter Six considers the way that park users exclude people from using the park. People are theoretically free to use the park, and people recognise it as a great resource, yet at the same time identity markers such as race, class, gender, sexuality, and nationality restrain how individuals experience the park. It concludes by showing specifically how young black males’ use of the park is constrained.

In Chapter Seven the city rules for the park are explored. While the park is officially open for anyone to use, the city’s management practices actively seek to exclude especially poor park users. The management of the park is not just passively accepted by park users, instead park users subvert the rules of the park in small and unofficial ways, which in the end is not very effective in bringing a larger change about in the park.

Chapter Eight looks at the ways in which the park has been used as a site of public engagement and resistance, or how politics are played out in the park. While individuals talk about politics and the greater good, and while the projects in the park engage in public sphere activity, there is no greater public sphere visible in the park. While the area around the park has had active protests, and while the protests reflect the concerns of park users, no park user ever took part in these protests, nor did they ever occur inside the park. The inchoate moments of public engagement never translate into something more permanent or active. While formal democracy also takes place in the park through elections, park users are not interested in it, and political parties are not actively engaging park users.
Chapter Nine concludes this study. It shows that the park is an intensely contested space between different sets of park users, but also between people and the management of the park (CoJ/City Parks). I argue that due to the way that the park is managed, the park users become passive instead of actively engaging around what their own common interests are. While public space is important, it is not a sufficient condition for the development of public spheres.
Chapter 2: Methods for studying a park

1. Introduction
This chapter explains and justifies the methods that I used for this thesis. It explores methodological issues with regard to ethnography, as well as explains why it is appropriate to use this approach in a park. Following that, I describe the actual methods used for data collection and analysis. The ethics of my ethnography is explained and motivates the approach that I used. It then considers the weaknesses of this study. Finally, this chapter concludes with my positionality in the field and how that affected my fieldwork.

2. Ethnography
A family of methods involving direct and sustained social contact with agents and of richly writing up the encounter, respecting, recording, representing at least partly in its own terms the irreducibility of human experience. Ethnography is the disciplined and deliberate witness-cum-recording of human events. (Willis & Trondman 2002: 394)

Anthropology has for a long time embraced ethnography as its distinctive method and product. Early pioneers such as Malinowski, Mead and Bateson became famous for their long-term fieldwork that was associated with anthropology almost exclusively. While Ingold (2008) disputed the fact that anthropology is only ethnography24, he recognised the importance of fieldwork and engagement ‘out there’ for anthropologist. “We do our philosophy out of doors. And in this, the world and its inhabitants, human and non-human, are our teachers, mentors and interlocutors” (Ingold 2008: 83).

Ethnography is more than a method, or set of methods (Ingold 2008: 88), it is also a process of understanding and writing. It is a “theory of description” (Nader 2011: 211), which comes to life in the writing process (Nader 2011: 213). This has led anthropologists to be very self-reflexive when it comes to

24 He argues that anthropology is the broad or general view while ethnography is the specific narrow focus.
the writing of ethnographies (Marcus 1998; Clifford & Marcus 1986\(^{25}\)). What ethnography excels at is the ability to write their (our participants\(^{26}\)) stories (Marcus & Fischer 1999) in academic terms. It also brings to the forefront the ‘lived spaces’ (Hastrup 1995: 17) of the communities or cultures with which we engage. The storm about the future and direction in/of ethnography has been weathered, and as a method of investigation ethnography has gone from strength to strength. At the same time, within anthropology, the need for more than studying people has been raised, with ethnographers urged to take a moral stance and to practise ethnography that matters, such as critical or feminist ethnography (Risjord 2007; Hart 2006; Scheper-Hughes 2004; Enslin 1994).

According to Wolcott (1994: 43), the idea of ethnography is “being there in person, relying on oneself as the primary research instrument” (Nader 2011; Wolcott 1999: 44; Bernard 1998; Hastrup 1995: 163). Ethnography and observational research include seeing life as your participants see it, describing such a life with attention to detail in context. It includes paying attention to the process of social life, having a flexible research design and using grounded theoretical categories (Silverman 2004: 46). According to Hammersley and Atkinson (2007), the four features of ethnographic research are:

- exploring naturally occurring relationships and phenomena rather than hypothesis testing,
- not using closed analytical categories,
- looking at a small number of cases in detail,
- data analysis that focuses on interpretations of meaning and action.

Ethnography is “a process that requires patience and detail, creativity and exploration” (Fortun 2009: 167).

---

\(^{25}\) Clifford and Marcus’ contribution is to alert the ethnographer to the power dynamic in the field and to take that power dynamic seriously in their writing. They believe that through reflexivity we can make explicit how our presence in the field and our view have impacted our studies.

\(^{26}\) Participants can be collaborators or co-writers in the research depending on the role that they are given or take in the research.
Ethnography as method uses a variety of different data gathering techniques. There are three broad areas that constitute the ethnographic technique: experiencing, enquiring and examining (Wolcott 1999: 50-55). When Wolcott refers to these, he speaks of participant observation, interviewing, and examining historical documents or relevant written texts. The use of multiple techniques when conducting studies in public spaces has also been recognised by Low, Taplin, and Scheld (2005: 175) who warned scholars to be open and creative in their approaches and to spontaneously adapt their ‘toolkit’ of methods as the situation arises.

In my data gathering I used participant observation, interviews, field notes, photographs and historical data.

a. Participant observation

Participant observation is not a particular research technique but a mode of being-in-the-world characteristic of researchers (Atkinson & Hammersley 1994: 249)

Long-term participant observation and the embrace of multiple methods have been a hallmark of ethnography (Bernard 1998; Dewalt, Dewalt & Wayland 1998: 259). Yet there is no agreement on what participant observation is. For some it is everything ‘done’ during fieldwork, while others argue for a narrower view. Dewalt et al. (1998: 259) call for this distinction between all fieldwork activity and participant observation, because “the method of participant observation includes the explicit behavioural analysis and recording of the information gained from participating and observation.”

Fieldwork fills the gap between words and social processes and provides context for words, both our own and our participants’ (Hastrup 1995: 44-45). It would be impossible and untrue to claim that through participant observation and with ethnography we understand the total life-world and interlinked systems that make up societies (Comarof & Comarof 2003: 154). Rather it is one strategy amongst many to achieve understanding, and is never done in isolation. Participant observation is not a substitution for interviewing but a
practice that runs along interviews, providing depth. Through participant observation we become aware of avenues for analysis and sensible questions to ask in interviews, as well as being able to see contradictions between what people say and what people do.

There are several important preconditions for ethnographers to do effective and worthwhile participant observation – a non-judgmental attitude, genuine interest in learning from people, an ability to deal with the anxiety of not knowing something, a willingness to overcome your mistakes, the importance of observing carefully, being a good listener, and finally, to be open to surprise and the unexpected (Dewalt et al. 1998: 266). What Dewalt et al. (1998) advocate is being radically open to the experience of being in the field, having a true engagement with your research community and actively learning, not just passively seeing, from these experiences.

Participant observation is the everyday involvement in the day-to-day lives of the community you research. It is seeing and experiencing the mundane as well as the extraordinary (Dewalt et al. 1998: 260-261; Agar 1996). Participant observation as a method is built on the assumption that we can learn from what we see, that we can understand, to at least some degree, our participants' lives by becoming close to them and experiencing their point of view, and that this closeness and seeing can bring us understanding (Dewalt et al. 1998: 261; Agar 1996). To Wolcott (1999) participant observation closely resembles how we learn in our everyday lives.

Participant observation brings two advantages to ethnography – it brings quality data as well as quality interpretation of data (Dewalt et al. 1998: 264; Agar 1996). Since ethnographers stay in the field for substantial periods of time, we automatically engage in testing and retesting theories over time, instead of having set views and experiences that may be distorted because we were only in the field for a short while and see only a partial picture. We however still see only partially, even if we stay in the field for long periods of time.
Despite the ideal of complete immersion in daily activities, both Dewalt et al. and Wolcott realise that this is not necessarily attainable. These authors recognise that there is a continuum between pure observation and full participation (Wolcott 1999: 47; Dewalt et al. 1998: 262; Agar 1996). Various factors will influence where on the continuum you are – these can include your own personality, your gender and age, as well as the situation. Although ideally we should immerse ourselves completely, this may not be possible due to the field, our own characteristics or the situation.

I moved along this continuum of participant-observer. Participating fully in park life, becoming a trader, or photographer was impossible. Even when I was playing chess, it was as an outsider. At best I became a familiar presence, at worst an imposer. I spent much more time on the observation side of the continuum because that is what fieldwork lends itself to in an urban park. But my continued presence itself allowed me to become a part of park life, albeit as a researcher as opposed to a native. Low (2000) describes her fieldwork in the Costa Rican plaza where she had several strategies while doing participant observation. Through her long-term presence in the park, regular users became familiar with her and engaged her. Through this she found users to interview. This is similar to what I experienced in the park; my long-term presence led to familiarity and was followed by a willingness to chat.

Apart from the continuum of participant observation, there are several other issues that you need to be aware of before entering the field. These include gaining access to the field, establishing rapport, defining your identity in the field, defining your field of inquiry, ‘seeing’ rather than only conducting interviews, doing data recording and applying data analysis strategies (Silverman 2004: 57-69; Dewalt et al. 1998: 268). The issues that Dewalt et al. and Silverman raise are not only issues that graduate students grapple with but rather what every engaged ethnographer faces each time she enters the field (Holmes & Marcus 2008: 523).

In the anthropological tradition of doing fieldwork in ‘closed’ communities, gaining access was often negotiated through colonial officials and the ‘big
men’ of the community. In urban fieldwork, where the people you are researching may not form a particularly cohesive community, gaining access can often be more difficult. For Abolafia (2001) gaining access to his research community meant gaining access to ‘the floor’ and an office in Wall Street, which had to be formally negotiated through the Security Exchange Commission. For Bestor (2010), gaining access to his Tokyo community meant moving into the right neighbourhood and engaging in community activities. In the case of the park, which has multiple communities I gained access in a variety of ways.

While the idea of gatekeepers make sense in closed communities, it makes less sense in open spaces that are used by a range of people. I established good relationships with people in a range of positions in the park, but there was never one single gatekeeper. I gained access formally at some places through establishing e-mail and phone contact to the various ‘heads’ of organisations. Inside the park a variety of people engaged me and introduced me to others.

I did ethnographic fieldwork in the park for nine months\(^{27}\) (May 2010 to March 2011). Fieldwork consisted of going to the park for three to four hours\(^{28}\) at a time, between two and six days a week. In the park I sat on benches and lawns, observing people, counting, or engaging in conversations. I played chess, visited the gallery, chatted with traders, ate with people, sewed with women at the neighbourhood centre, and swept the Greenhouse grounds. Just ‘hanging out’ in the park gave rise to countless opportunities to chat with people in the park. Sometimes this would involve my approaching a person and striking up a conversation, but often it would involve people approaching me and asking about my presence. I was visible in the park due to my class, gender and race.

\(^{27}\) After the formal fieldwork stopped I continued to go to the park at least every two weeks for a few hours to keep in touch with people. This stopped when I left for the final stages of my writing-up in London.

\(^{28}\) Sometimes I spent more time in the park (6 or 7 hours), and sometimes less, (an hour).
With all the groupings in the park there were always some people willing to chat, whilst others would not be. Approaching people sitting on the grass especially was difficult because they were wary and suspicious. The grass population of the park is much more shifting than say the chess players. The large number of marginal people could also account for their unwillingness to engage, as well as possible language barriers. Having notepaper and a pen in my hand was a guaranteed way to ensure people would not talk to me. Although I introduced myself to people as a researcher, I did not flash notepaper and pen around. This could perhaps be an ethical failure, in that I did not remind people enough that I was a researcher. However, had I flashed notepaper around regularly, I do not believe that I would have been able to conduct this study.

Another important issue in the field is the act of establishing rapport (Springwood & King 2001; Agar 1996). This happens when “each [researcher
and participant] is committed to help the other achieve his or her goal” and the lines of communication is set (Dewalt et al. 1998: 268). Springwood and King (2001: 403) state that “ethnographers are instructed to, and rewarded when, they sympathetically engage with strangers, listen to their stories, observe their actions and otherwise try to grasp reality through them”. Rapport is the feeling of comfort and accord between the researcher and the researched (Soyini Madison 2005: 31). In order to establish rapport, the researcher must be a good listener. In this view, understanding of others through intersubjectivity can only happen when rapport is established (Venkataswar 2001: 448). Establishing rapport is seen as a way to (co)produce knowledge, and establishing a special relationship that gives insight (Springwood & King 2001: 403). Although some theorists question whether rapport is so straightforward and easy recognisable as described (Agar 1996: 137-138). Our own personalities and cultural biases influence the relationships that we form in the field (Sherif 2001; Agar 1996).

But while rapport is a “powerful trope” in ethnography that appears “strange and innocent” (Marcus 2001: 519-520), it is also a one-sided trust in an instrumental relationship that precludes questioning the power relations inherent in fieldwork (Marcus 2001). While I acknowledge the unequal powerful relationships that exist in the field, I still established some rapport-relationships.

With regard to rapport, there were definitely some relationships that I established. There were some people who were always welcoming and kind and who would engage me in conversation every time that I visited. While I felt an affinity with them, my relationships with them were instrumental because although I enjoyed my time in the field, I was there for a specific goal and would not have been there outside of my research. I’m not sure that establishing rapport and instrumentality is mutually exclusive. Also, some people with whom I engaged in the field also asked for help from me, which I happily obliged when I could. Others I think saw me as a way to tell their stories. Not necessarily with the end product of a thesis in mind, which seemed to bemuse them, rather the act of telling their story gave them
strength, and perhaps the hope that I would tell their story to people like me, middle class, white and clueless about living a life while surviving on very little.

During fieldwork I had two different fieldwork assistants. The first was Maboaleng, a young woman. She accompanied me to the field for the first month until I felt comfortable enough to be in the field alone. My second fieldwork assistant was Zwelaki, a young man. I asked him to do interviews with the young men whom I had difficulty in accessing. Their presence at different times within the field added greatly to this ethnography. Maboaleng’s presence comforted me when I felt strange and unwelcome in the park. She was not instrumental in gathering data, but in establishing my presence in the field. Zwelaki helped me gather data from a group of people that I could not access and helped tremendously with data collection.

Apart from the presence of Maboaleng and Zwelaki at different times during fieldwork, the rapport that I established (or not) and the gatekeepers who helped me in the field, two other events were critical during my fieldwork. These were the closures of the park. In Chapter Seven I analyse these closures but here I want to consider the impact of it on my fieldwork.

In December 2010 the park was suddenly closed until January 2011. No-one was given any notice of this closure. During this period manure was placed on the lawns of the park. All the gates were closed except the vehicle gate between the gallery, the park and the JAG. Gate 3, the gate closest to the clinic was partially opened, with a guard standing there, regulating who came in with only clinic visitors being allowed. What made this particularly frustrating was that no-one could indicate for how long the park would be closed. Both the photographers and I made concerted efforts to find out when the park would reopen. Answers ranged from the following Monday to the end of February. The period of closure fell over Christmas, which meant that City Parks itself was closed and many of the City Parks workers were away for the period. A further effect of this was that even though schools were closed from
the 10\textsuperscript{th} of December, no children could play in the park. The photographers, who had indicated to me in the preceding months that they would make the most money over Christmas were left out in the cold due to this closure. Although they put up printed screens\textsuperscript{29} against which they could take photos, their business suffered.

![Picture 4: Photographers locked out the park December 2010](image)

The park reopened in January 2011, but in March 2011 was suddenly closed once again, without any warning. This time half of the brick paths within the park were replaced. Upon inquiry the workers said that the park would be closed for six weeks. Once again the closure fell over a major holiday with schools being closed over Easter Weekend and Freedom Day (27 April). The photographers again set themselves up outside the gates with printed screens. But this closure was again financially devastating for the photographers. The irony is that the trucks and workers destroyed the grass that had been manured and tended to during the first closure. The park opened mid-July.

\textsuperscript{29} They were noticeably from China with bamboo scenes, pandas and pagodas printed on them.
The closure of the park impacted when and where I could speak to park users. During the times that the park was closed I concentrated on the traders, and when it reopened on people inside the park. The park closures disrupted when and how people used the park.

Apart from participant observation I also conducted interviews, wrote field notes, took and searched for photos and did archival research to gather data. I discuss each in turn and reflect on these methods.

b. Interviews
The next method that I used in this ethnography, is interviewing. This is the second of Wolcott's (1999: 50-55) three E-s (experiencing, enquiring, and examining) for ethnographic fieldwork. “Much fieldwork is organised talk, and the ethnographic text is the more or less creative imposition of order on the many conversations that lie at the heart of fieldwork” (Appadurai 1988: 16). Interviewing, both informal and formal, compromises different types of talk we as anthropologist have with people in the field.

Through participant observation people came to know and see me, and in this context I asked people for interviews. While people were willing to chat, formal interviewing in the park setting was difficult. This was because many people seemed uncomfortable with the formal-ness of it all. My interview with Ma Mary from the Neighbourhood Centre, is a very good example of this. When we did needlework or when we just sat and talked, she was a fountain of information. The moment we had a formal interview she hardly spoke. Whether it was the recorder or the formality of ‘an interview’ which affected her spontaneous response, I do not know. I decided rather than put us both through the trauma of a formal interview, I would end it and rather have informal chats or directed talk instead.
I also used ‘guerrilla interviewing’. Since people were suspicious if I approached with a notebook and recorder in hand, I found it were more effective to informally initiate chats with regards to weather. During that conversation I would introduce myself as a researcher, or they would ask why I was there and I would explain. Usually, I would then ask a few questions from my interview schedule and depending on their receptiveness, I would continue asking or stop. After these chats I would leave and make quick notes in a small notebook about our conversation. When I arrived home I would then describe the conversation in as much detail as possible. Since many of the people were present only fleetingly in the park, with our paths not necessarily crossing again, this was a good strategy to speak to an array of people. But it does raise ethical considerations that I discuss later in this chapter.

I also formally interviewed city officials, representatives from the South African Police Services (SAPS) and Johannesburg Metropolitan Police Department (JMPD), gallery staff and people outside, but somehow involved in the park. One important stakeholder in the park is missing from my research and that is City Parks, the managing agent of the park (I discuss this structure at length in Chapter Four). I conducted only one full-length interview with a person from City Parks who is the unofficial organisational historian. While he was extremely helpful with regard to the general history of parks in Johannesburg, he was not involved with the operational management of the park. I had one brief conversation with the person in charge of the operational management in the park. He promised to answer questions in written format, but apart from that short meeting where he would not answer many questions or consent to a formal interview, I didn’t obtain much information. He didn’t answer the questions sent via e-mail. I contacted several people within City Parks, who referred me to the media spokesperson, who referred me to the person I had

---

30 When I think of guerrilla interviewing, I imagine guerrilla gardening. This is where people walk around in urban areas and ‘plant’ seeds by throwing them into fertile but unused spaces such as traffic circles (with grass or soil), unused lots and other unkept space. There may be a political dimension to guerrilla gardening or not. It is an apt metaphor for asking questions quickly, informally.
originally interviewed. Thus City Parks, the organisation central to understanding the park, is absent.

During participant observation and with interviews I kept field notes. In the next section I reflect on how I used these.

c. Field notes
I kept field notes in two ways. Firstly, I had a scratch pad with me when I was in the field in order to make quick notes to serve as reminders of conversations or observations. Usually I found that people clammed up if I made notes in front of them, so I would do so only when I had finished a conversation and walked away. When I returned home I would then type up my observations. All my field notes were typed up on the day of observation.

During interviews, which were recorded in most instances, I also made notes in case the voice recorder malfunctioned, which happened twice. In the data analysis section I will explain how I analysed the field notes. The next section deals with the visual data collection methods.

d. Photos and CCTV
The park is well represented in photos, through the photographers who work in the park, but also through professional photographers using it as a subject space. The most recent photos are by Terry Kurgan who photographed and mapped all of the photographers in the park, along with a short biography of each. This work was the focus of an exhibition in JAG in 2005, as part of a book *Johannesburg Circa Now* (Kurgan & Ratcliffe 2005), an academic article (Bethlehem & Kurgan 2009) and as part of an exhibition at the Victoria & Albert Museum in 2011. Eminent South African photographers David Goldblat and Ernest Cole also have series of photographs in the park. There were also postcards that I bought through postcard collectors in the United States and Germany. While I tried my best to source the photographs, this was not the focus of my research. There is a visual anthropology project waiting for someone else to do on the photographs of the park.
My ambition was more modest than that. I took photos in the field as well as finding photos in archives, and through the web. These photos provide an extra layer of insight into the activities in the park. I could have, and was tempted, to focus more on photographs. There is still large scope to concentrate on photos within, and of the park, however the need to focus my research meant that I did not concentrate more on this medium. Future research combining photos with interviews of photographers, both park and otherwise, would be interesting to explore.

The inner city is well covered with CCTV cameras, including the streets bordering the park. I went to the control room twice to observe the streets surrounding the park. I observed two different times, once at night, when I felt it would not have been safe to go to the streets, and once during an ordinary mid-afternoon. I wanted to observe the entrances to the park in order to see
whether people jumped the fence to sleep in the park, and whether that was something that I would have to take into account during my study. I also wanted to see the park from a different vantage point and thought that it would give me more insight into the park.

Observing the park and surroundings through CCTV cameras is problematic though. This is because the presence of cameras erodes people’s feelings of safety in space, as well as being an invasion of privacy (Low 2006). In attempting to deal with the ethics of this, I told the traders that they could be closely observed with the CCTV cameras. The traders knew that there were cameras but none of the ones that I spoke to knew that you could see into their stalls. Although surprised, they did not seem bothered. However, I decided upon further reflection and advice to not use CCTV footage and observations in this study.

The last of Wolcott’s E-s for ethnography is examining of historical records. This is the last of the data collection methods that I used.

e. Historical documents

I looked for historical documents related to the park and the projects in the park – such as documents related to the establishment of the park, the JAG, the Greenhouse Project and the clinic, as well as at the park in broader context in South African literature. These all set the context of the park and provided a point of comparison over time. The JAG library was a rich source of data. It has a large collection of books about art and artists from their collection, but also other South African artists. The most valuable resource that they had was the A-books. These are clippings that mentioned the gallery and exhibitions, and less frequently, the park. The librarians have kept the A-books since the early 1950s. The A-books provided some information that I use in this thesis.

I also went to the CoJ local government library to access any historical data that they had. They had a small collection of minutes of council meetings dating back from the beginning of the establishment of the first town council of
Johannesburg. Unfortunately, the main library that keeps records, the Harold Strange library \(^{31}\) (in the main Johannesburg city library) was closed for the duration of my research.

I contacted The National English Literary Museum at Rhodes University to ask whether they had poetry or work related to the park in their collection. They searched and found some poetry referring to the park, which they posted to me. They also have photographs of various authors in the park but it would have been necessary to travel to Grahamstown to explore those. Perhaps a follow-up project can explore this avenue for further insights into the park.

While I contemplated the various strategies for data collection, I realised that data is never complete, because nothing can ever capture the whole picture. Data compromises selections of what is available. Your focus as a researcher determines what you see, or don’t see in the field (Berger 1990). Thus, another researcher would probably have had a different focus and collected slightly different material. “This does not invalidate the effort to produce data. It does, however, remind us that there is a human component to science just as there is in art, government, or commerce” (Bernard & Ryan 2010: 6). All data will have data distance. Some data is lost in the process of data recording, whether this is done by camera, by hand or by audio recording (Bernard & Ryan 2010: 46). These are inevitable limitations to research and explain why another researcher would have slightly different results from my own.

Data collection is one part of the ethnographic process, the other is data analysis. In the next section I describe how I conducted data analysis. In ethnography the anthropologist is both data collector and data analyst, and becomes a walking archive for her own data (Okely 1994: 20).

---

\(^{31}\) The library received funding from the Carnegie Mellon Foundation as well as using CoJ money for refurbishments. The library closed in May 2009 and only opened in February 2012 again. The Strange library also used the opportunity to convert all records to electronic format (CoJ 2010). A later study could usefully look at documents held there to provide more depth and historical nuances surrounding the park.
3. Analysis

One way of describing data analysis in ethnography is through the funnel concept (Silverman 2004: 70-71; Agar 1996). That is, starting out with general phenomena and becoming more focused in your research and answering your question. Wolcott (1994: 28) recommends that data analysis proceeds from description to analysis and interpretation. Themes can come from both data and theory (Bernard & Ryan 2010: 55) and emerges during fieldwork (Okely 1994: 20). Data analysis does however not draw only from the written texts (field notes, interview transcripts). Because the ethnographer is the main instrument for data collection, she “draws also on the totality of the experience, parts of which may not, cannot be cerebrally written down… it is recorded in memory, body and all the senses” (Okely 1994: 21). While I followed the funnel concept and used categories emerging from data and fieldwork to code my field notes, ideas would often come at unexpected times. A few words in the field would trigger something and make me return to my data to look for other themes, that I had missed previously.

I coded my data in several ways. As a first, run I printed out the notes and interviews and read through them with a pen, marking interesting passages. I did this while I was busy with fieldwork and this helped me focus my attention in the field. I also coded my fieldwork notes and transcripts using open-source coding software designed by an anthropologist. The programme called Weft-QDA is a simple programme where you import the data and then mark it according to categories that you define. This makes searching for related data easy. In many ways it is similar to the snip-and-categorise method that Okely (1994: 24) describes for her analysis process. After the initial pen and paper exercise, I defined categories in the program me, which I then applied to the data. Finally, I also imported my field notes and interviews into Wordle to see a visualisation of the data in a word cloud. This also helped me further identify themes to explore. This was more useful with some interviews than with others because in some you could really see the most important topics of the interview while in others the words used were too generic to make a big
impression. With some interviews their main focus was immediately clear while in others I had to struggle much more in meaning making.

I grouped themes that were alike together, and wrote memos explaining and expanding them, and later chapters based on these groupings. These chapters changed, were rewritten and changed again until the final structure of this PhD emerged.

I kept in mind Hastrup’s caution that we can only evoke other cultures, not represent them. “Life is no text, and is not reducible to one” (Hastrup 1990: 53). My evokings of the park are represented here through analysis and writing up, but are necessarily incomplete.

As I have mentioned throughout, the ethics of anthropology is often fraught. In the next section I consider ethnographic ethics and how I applied it in my fieldwork.
4. Ethics

Ethnographers must consider two issues before starting research – 1) through our research we have intimate contact with people in their private and public arenas, and 2) sometimes this contact opens up new and exciting research areas that were not foreseen initially. In order to deal with these two issues, ethnographers need to engage with three questions before starting research:

- What is the purpose of your research?
- Who will be affected by the research?
- What is the implication of the way that you have asked your research questions?

One orientation for doing this is through critical ethnography, doing research that promotes an egalitarian society (Foley & Valenzuela 2008: 288), speaking ‘truth to power’ (Holmes & Marcus 2008: 521), and focusing research on real world problems and social issues (Low 2011: 389).

Ethics in ethnography is not the same as it would be in medical research; we work intimately with people, and build relationships of trust and friendship (Fluehr-Lobban 1998: 173; Hopper 1996). In this process we gain data. We can ask once for a signed informed consent form, and be seen as acting ethically without truly acting in the best interest of our research community. We can deceive people, and still be acting ethically, as Scheper-Hughes (2004) demonstrates through her research and advocacy with regard to illicit organ trading.

The idea of informed consent is taken from the biomedical research field, and often the idea of applying it as a once-off form is seen as being ethical. But within ethnography the contours look different from the biomedical field. In the biomedical field the doctor has the power and knowledge, and the formal consent process is a way to seek the redress of the power balance between researcher and subject. In ethnography the contours look different. The anthropologist must inform the person about her research, and the subject becomes an agent with a choice (to participate or not). “But on the other hand, the anthropologist needs to gather knowledge about the subject’s
sociocultural position. The subject is, therefore, also already in the position of the expert. He, and not the anthropologist, is the gatekeeper of information” (Kelly 2008: 189). Refusing information is a way to assert hierarchy in the research relationship (Briggs 1996: 10). In other words, it is not a one-way process, it is a dialogical or heteroglossic process (Kelly 2008: 190). Informed consent is problematic because an anthropologist can’t control the outcome of the exchanges or interactions (Kelly 2008: 190). Or when viewed differently informed consent, especially in public spaces, is a working fiction that we ethnographers tell ourselves (Gounis 1996; Nelson 1996a).

“Does ‘public space’ mean ‘public knowledge’?” (Nelson 1996a: 102). Asking for consent before an interview is an easy enough process. What does informed consent look like in public space (Hopper 1996: 160; Nelson 1996b: 123)? Do you ask people to sign a consent form when you observe their actions? When you map their movement? When you take a wide format photograph? When you take a close-up photograph? When you overhear conversations? When they casually approach you and chat with you? When you have an informal chat? When you have a formal interview? Where does one draw the line in asking for informed consent? For some people public space is private space, such as for homeless people or traders (Nelson 1996b). These are all questions that I struggled with during fieldwork and in writing up. I do not end this thesis with complete answers to this. Instead, I did the best that I could do, behaving in what I believed to be an ethical way during research.

With participant observation, our long-term involvement and the intimate nature of our involvement mean that ideally we want people to forget that we are researchers. The very strength of our method is also our greatest ethical challenge, because as our participants forget we are researchers, we gain our clearest and best data. Hastrup (1990: 50; 1992: 123; 1995: 20) points out that ethnography is always violent, “it implies intrusion and possible pain” both for the researcher and the participants. Hastrup doesn’t advocate abandoning ethnography; rather she believes we should be aware of it during our research and writing.
I provided the relevant information with regard to my research to all participants so that they could make an informed decision about their participation. I further made sure they understood what the research goals were and that they participated voluntarily (Silverman 2004: 271). Of course within ethnography the goals of your research change, so there is some indeterminacy to research. Although the goals of my research did not dramatically change, I still faced the problem of how exactly to explain to people what I was doing. The concept of public sphere was too abstract to explain in the park itself, so I explained that I was trying to understand what people do there. To people involved in the park but not park users, I gave a similar description and if they asked for more details I would engage them with the details of the project.

In practice this meant that if I started conversations with people I would introduce myself as a researcher and asked whether they wanted to keep on speaking. When people approached me I made sure to mention that I was there doing research. But in some cases there was no consent. I relate experiences of harassment, but the men never gave informed consent to me for using these stories, they are my experiences. When I took wide-angled or general photographs I didn’t ask for informed consent, only when I took close-up photographs on which you could identify people. As time went by I reminded people that I was there to do research, which I doubt people forgot. Because I was so different to the average user, I am sure that people didn’t forget. When I arranged formal interviews I requested verbal informed consent. I also asked for consent to record interviews and make notes.

For Fluehr-Lobban (1998: 173), ethical ethnography is one where both the researcher and the research community respect and trust one another. For her ethics should not only compromise extraordinary events and singular consent forms, it is rather a general orientation to the research, the design, the fieldwork and the writing up of research and how it can be used (Dewalt et al. 1998: 273; Fluehr-Lobban 1998: 180-188; Gounis 1996). I tried to follow an ethical approach throughout my fieldwork and the writing of this ethnography.
I followed the American Anthropology Association’s ethics guidelines and especially adhered to their dictum of not doing any harm to the communities that I became involved in. I kept in mind that “in the final analysis, anthropological research is a human undertaking, dependent upon choices for which the individual bears ethical as well as scientific responsibility. That responsibility is a human, not superhuman, responsibility” (AAA 1998).

Whilst in the field, I negotiated my role amongst my participants and asked whether they had any requests for me. The photographer asked me to contact City Parks to ask for information for the chess player who was trying to organise money for new chess pieces. I responded by applying for money via the university (UJ) from the National Lottery Fund, and for the traders it implied writing a memo to the Metro Trading Company (MTC). Although none of these were ultimately successful, the fact that I willingly did what was asked, signalled me as an acceptable person. Another ethically related consideration is my positionality in the field as a researcher.

5. My positionality and the effects on the research

In anthropology, because we work so closely with and become intimately involved with people in our field of focus, acknowledging your positionality is often a key exercise in the conducting and writing-up of such research. In this section I try to work through some of the issues that arose while doing research. I will consider two things: street harassment that I experienced during research, and my response that revealed something about my positionality.

My positionality in the field is that of a white, Afrikaans middle-class woman. I worked in an area that very few white females visit; I was obviously out of place. This out-of-place-ness has led me to be a target for men to approach
me. Having previously worked\(^{32}\) in areas where women dominated (Marais 2008; Marais 2005) this was unexpected and I was unprepared for it. Gender in research has been addressed especially in the last 20 years or so (Callaway 1992). What is less often spoken about is the level of harassment, and danger women ethnographers face in the field (Perrone 2010; Okely 2009; Young 1985). A friend and I once had a discussion at an anthropology conference about this issue. While we were talking and sharing stories, a senior professor dismissed our experience saying that we must have misunderstood the situations. We both felt silenced by this reaction. This message clearly conveyed that it was not acceptable to discuss this. I strongly disagree, as it is an important dimension of fieldwork that constrained my own behaviour, but also how people responded. Pollard (2009) reports that women student anthropologists report facing sexual harassment and stalking within the field. Their training does not prepare them for this experience, speaking to their (often) male supervisors left them with feelings of inadequacy and they felt that there is a pervasive tendency towards silence of difficulties experienced during fieldwork\(^{33}\). Okely (2009) remarks that she has also noticed this tendency during her years of practice.

Venables (2009) reflects that during her fieldwork with ‘beach boys’ (young male tourist guides) in Senegal she had a difficult relationship with her participants. She often held her natural behaviour in check, not talking animatedly, not touching people as she would normally, because she sensed ulterior motives behind their willingness to engage with her and did not want to create a situation that may become difficult. I am a very tactile person and, I often touch people while talking to them, especially if I am relaxed. In my daily life this has at times been interpreted as flirtatious. Because I did not want to

\(^{32}\) For my Honours (4\(^{th}\) year) studies with urban shamans, and for my masters degree research with teachers.

\(^{33}\) Delamont’s (2009) reply to Pollard is perhaps one of the reasons why students would be reluctant to raise issues of problems during fieldwork. Her attacking tone in the reply places blame on the students experiences saying that perhaps they were just not familiar with the \textit{habitus} of anthropological research i.e. if you complain about negative experiences you are just not cut out for fieldwork. This response is neither illuminating nor helpful.
give misleading impressions, I kept this tendency in check during fieldwork so that my own behaviour could not be misconstrued.

When I went to the field I made sure that I was dressed appropriately in denims and loosely fitting clothes. The two times that I wore dresses, I was hit on more regularly and persistently. Men on a regular basis hit on me in the park. The ways differed; some were very crude, asking me to go to a flat or room to become a secret lover. Others were much sweeter, like the young construction worker who asked me for my phone number. Some people were very tenacious. One man asked me for my hand in marriage each time he saw me.

I was only scared once and that was when a very drunk man moved closer and closer into my personal space and wanted to touch my leg and hand. Although I tried to move away, he came even closer and became more agitated. Considering his state of drunkenness, I felt that talking to him was placing myself in danger and I left the park quickly.

It is reasonable to assume that my ‘desirability’ in the context of the park is not as much about my physical appearance or my personality, but rather the presumed access that I have to resources. The ability to achieve higher status through a connection with me, is similar to the way that Gambian beach boys have dalliances with Western women on the beach because they represent wealth and access to resources (Nyanzi, Rosenberg-Jalow, Bah & Nyanzi 2005: 564). In the park my whiteness made me desirable. Dickson did not want me for his girlfriend only but for me to be his white girlfriend. Steve, a friend of Dickson, asked me to have his white baby. Being white in South Africa still means to a large extent that you have access to resources, you are more likely to be educated, employed and live in formal housing, even when taking into account intraracial inequality (see Chapter Four).


34 I will never win beauty contests or personality awards.
My own reaction to the propositions has been a mixture of defensiveness and bemusement. Although I want to have good relationships with people in the field, I am not willing to parade my personal life to the field. When Dickson started to press me to be his girlfriend, my defence mechanism was to say that I was sorry but I was married and therefore not able to become involved in a relationship. This was a half-lie. I am in a relationship, but not married. My claiming of marital status is not unusual for anthropologists in the field and several female anthropologists have claimed this status as a way to gain stature in the field, especially when dealing with older men unwilling to speak to unmarried women (Pollard 2009).

However, the response to my marital status was not for the men to back off in their approaches. Dickson, the most persistent of my ‘suitors’ saw my marital status as something that was merely an annoyance, rather than an obstacle. The same situation occurred with Nicholas asked whether I would join his family. When I raised my marital status he asked whether I had children. When I said I did not have any, my supposed marital status became irrelevant. My claiming of marital status was then actually irrelevant in the field. Pollard (2009) reports that other female anthropologists claiming boyfriends in the field also had the experience that it was an inadequate incentive to stop harassment. Until my very last visit in the field I had men approaching me to have a relationship with them, or to go off to a room or flat with them for a dalliance.

6. Weaknesses of research
The above discussion with regard to my own positionality could be interpreted as weaknesses of my research. Another weakness of the study is the fact that I did not speak Zulu, Shona, Ndebele, Sepedi, Tsonga, Venda or Portuguese. Although some of my study participants tried to teach me isiZulu, my efforts were usually met with much hilarity. The people of Joubert Park are polyglot,

35 The problem with this is that this makes part of my research relationship based on a lie. This in itself has ethical difficulties, especially since I ask people to share their time and knowledge with me.
although most seem to speak Zulu and English as a common language. My fieldwork assistants were able to help, but even though between them they spoke about six languages, at times they were also not able to communicate with everyone in the park. The people they were speaking to at times told them that they would rather speak English than Zulu. A few preferred to speak to me in Afrikaans. Urban research in an open diverse community brings with it the difficulty of which language to speak to whom under what circumstances and raises issues of comparability and translation of concepts. Although English was adequate for the most part, I did rely on people interpreting for me when something occurred in a different language. People seem to also use a lot of words in English, and combined with my very small vocabulary for Zulu, it was at times enough to understand the gist of a conversation, and I could ask questions to see whether my presumption was indeed correct.

Another weakness of the research is the relatively short period of time that I spent in the field. Nine months for an ethnography is short. While I did get adequate data, a longer time in the field might have also revealed new data, and new insights although I reached data saturation point for the research question I posed. However, my PhD funding did not allow for further research time. I remain committed to a continued engagement with Joubert Park, and more research in and around the park.

7. Conclusion
In this chapter I argued that approaching my study as an ethnographer was the best way to conduct this research. This is because of the ability to form long-term relationships in order to reveal the background and social relations of the practices that I observed. I elaborated on my actual data collection methods and data analysis. I then considered the ethics of the research, including informed consent within public spaces. My positionality and the weaknesses of the research conclude this chapter. Holston (2009) and Freeman (2002; 2008) argued that the public sphere can be seen in everyday interactions between people, and ethnography excels at studying the everyday behaviour of people.
Chapter Three now returns to the literature in order to sketch a theoretical framework for understanding and analysing what occurs in the park, and how it can be analysed. This framework is an expanded version of work done by Setha Low.
Chapter 3: A framework for analysing space

1. Introduction

“Conceptualising space as open, multiple and relational, unfinished and always becoming, is a prerequisite for history to be open and thus a prerequisite, too, for the possibilities of politics” (Massey 2005: 59).

Chapter One introduced the idea that public parks reveal ideologies of establishment, management and ideal use. I argued that through public parks and other types of public spaces we could understand social relationships within society. Chapter Three takes the idea further and proposes a framework through which we can look at, and analyse public spaces. In order to understand how public spheres are spatialised, we need to understand the everyday social relations of the park. This theoretical framework will help focus understanding in later chapters.

Before proposing the theoretical framework however, and although this study has been situated within the field of urban anthropology, it is necessary to justify why an anthropological study can look at a park. Space may seem to be the exclusive domain of geographers, but more and more other social sciences are also looking at space. This spatial turn outside of geography has been criticised by some geographers (Soja 2010). Yet within the social sciences, including anthropology, people are focusing more often on space as a unit of study. This spatial focus though is not directed to understand the physical make-up of space, but rather to understand the social aspects and power relations of space (Herbert & Brown 2006: 765; Hook & Vrdoljak 2002: 217; Zukin 1995: 279).

Henri Lefebvre (1996) argued that space is made up of a triad of concrete, perceived and lived spaces. Concrete space, is physical and objective, perceived space, is the mental construction of space, and lived space, is a complex combination of the two (Lefebvre 1996). This leads to understanding social relations and lived space as “inescapably hinged together in everyday life” (Purcell 2002: 102). Similar to Lefebvre, Massey (2005: 9) argues for
space “as the product of interrelations; as constituted through interactions…space as the sphere of the possibility of the existence of multiplicity…as the sphere of coexisting heterogeneity…space as always under construction”. This insight, that space is not merely physical, opened it up to social scientists like anthropologists to also investigate space.

Anthropologists and geographers have different interests in space, although there are times that these overlap. Physical geographers are interested in the layout, and measurements: the geomorphology of space. Human geographers, such as David Harvey and Edward Soja, are also interested in space, but their interests seem to be at the larger scale. For example, Soja (2010) looks at the whole of Los Angeles, while Harvey (2012) looks at concepts such as the Right to the City.

Anthropologists, however, seem to use space as a way to delimitate a study. Where previously a clan, village, or neighbourhood would have delineated a study, a park becomes a way to limit and study a phenomenon. While anthropologists may measure and map inside this space, they are interested in who comes across this space, and the social and power relationships that play out in this space.

One possible way to approach the study of space then is to use a framework for understanding and analysis, or lenses, that anthropologists can use to understand the interactions that occur in space. Setha Low offers a distinction between the social production and social construction of space (Low 2011: 392; Low 1996a: 861-862). The first compromises all the aspects that lead to the physical making of the space; these can be “social processes such as exchange, conflict and control…[it] is the actual transformation of space – through people’s social exchanges, memories, images and daily use of the material setting – into scenes and actions that convey symbolic meaning” (Low 1996a: 861-862). There is a dialogical process between the two that can help us understand both local and larger issues around space (Low 1996a). In later work, Low (2011) recognises that this dialogical process does not go far enough, and incorporates two further understandings: “how language and
discourse influence the meaning and politics of the built environment” and embodied space (Low 2011: 393). Embodied space combines insights of the body with space (Low 2003b). The body has been theorised within anthropology as a locus of power. In similar ways that space is constructed/produced, bodies are constructed and produced. Language and discourse can come from a number of sources, such as the way that professional dialogues by architects shape our understandings or how media represents our studies.

In the following sections I expand on these themes, offering examples of how each can be applied. Although I write as if each of the issues were discreet, some can belong in more than one at a time. I have classified them according to what seem to me to be the most logical place for them to belong to. After offering the framework, I further argue that an additional lens to add going forward, is the idea of the contested city.

2. Social production

The social production of space compromises all the aspects that physically constitute the space. This is not limited to the architecture, but also the social processes that symbolically create the space. This section considers neo-liberalism and space, the Right to the City, and designing for exclusion in space.

a. Neo-liberalism and space

Neo-liberalism and space intersect, since a neo-liberal economic doctrine changes the relationship between people, the state and how space is structured and used. In this section I define neo-liberalism and then specifically investigate how it affects the social production of space. I argue that increasingly, a neo-liberal doctrine is used to change the way that space is created and managed, as well as who is seen as belonging in space, in other words who is the ideal user. A neo-liberal doctrine is used to exclude undesirable people from using the space of the city. Then I look at urban
gentrification, and the ways that this ideological project removes poor people from the city through making housing unaffordable.

Neo-liberalism is a varied and changeable phenomenon that is difficult to define (Peck, Theodore & Brenner. 2010) and differs geographically (Castree 2008a: 134; Castree 2008b: 156). It is “simultaneously a social, environment and global project” (Castree 2008a: 143). In general it refers “to a macro-economic doctrine” that favours private enterprise above state involvement and larger enterprises over small ones (Ferguson 2010: 170; Wilshusen 2010: 769). Brenner and Theodore (2002: 350) define neo-liberalism as

- the deregulation of state control over major industries, assaults on organised labour,
- the reduction of corporate taxes, the shrinking and/or privatisation of public services,
- the dismantling of welfare programs, the enchantment of international capital mobility,
- the intensification of inter-local competition, and the criminalisation of the urban poor.

This is one way to understand the link between broad economic changes from globalisation and the actual practices that have come from this idea (Kingfisher & Maskovsky 2008: 116). Neo-liberalism has made the rich richer, while simultaneously leading to a “general deterioration of quality of life for the poor and working classes” (Ferguson 2010: 171; Bourgois 2011; Hart 2008;). It will inevitably lead to polarisation between people based on class subjugation (Peck & Tickell 2002: 389).

Neo-liberalism and the free market economy are advocated as the only option to economic woes (Smith 2010: 52; Kingfisher & Maskovsky 2008: 116). It is seen as the “optimal mechanism for economic development” (Brenner & Theodore 2002: 350). South Africa embraced neo-liberalism post-apartheid (Chapter Four) had a very specific path. It is an “institutionally polycentric and multiple embedded form of market rule” (Peck et al. 2010: 107). This leads Peck and Tickell (2002: 381) to argue that rather than speaking of neo-liberalism, writers should speak about neo-liberalisation. The first implies stasis, while the second implies an adaptive and continuous changing process.
Homeless people and traders are seen as objects, dirt, that needs removal under neo-liberal doctrines and city building (Popke & Ballard 2004; Katz 1998: 39). Constructing civility and safety by excluding homeless people, reinforces the idea that poor people and homeless people are not part of the community (Amster 2003: 206). They can therefore be excluded when thinking about community uses of space. Although the “relationship of space to social class, symbolic meaning and everyday practices existed long before the neoliberal transformations” (Grimson 2008: 506 cf Crossa 2009: 3), the neo-liberal turn exacerbated these patterns at a variety of scales (Hubbard 2004: 665).

Neo-liberalism changes space from an emphasis on everyday use, use-value, towards a profit orientation, exchange value (Brenner, Marcuse & Mayer 2009: 178). In this process the rules that govern space change. This change may be in terms of relationships or a legal alteration in terms of municipal by-laws that “target the urban poor and informal economy” and its aggressive enforcement (Samara 2009: 199; cf Herbert & Brown 2006; Brenner & Theodore 2002: 352; Marais 2001: 153).

Public space is privatised (Grimson 2008: 506), either outright or through the introduction of rules that make it more attractive for middle and upper class use through a wide range of instruments, for example, through the designation of Business Improvement Districts (BIDs), or Town Centre Management36 (TCM) contracts (Cook 2009: 934) or as mentioned above through repressive by-laws. Under BIDs the idea of proper use of public space encompasses consumption and the decrease of ‘idle’ activity and homeless or poor people (Massey 2005: 152; Schaller & Modan 2005: 394; Atkinson 2003: 1834). This produces different social relations and different outcomes and increases competition (Cooke 2007). This creates new forms of urban inequality (Massey 2005: 152; Gough 2002: 407).

36 TCMs are voluntary schemes for business in a certain area to manage their spaces. BIDs are funded through a mandatory tax on business in the area (Cook 2009: 932).
Gentrification is one way through which space in the city comes under neo-liberal auspice (Eisenschitz 2010: 81; Visser & Kotze 2008; Smith 2002: 438). Gentrification can take place slowly, through individual upgrading of houses (Musterd & Andersson 2005; van Weesep & Musterd 1991), or as perceptions of risk decrease, developer-led gentrification become a common mechanism. Development corporations and businesses buy space in poor areas - sometimes with large government subsidies - and redevelop this as middle and upper class enclaves (Eisenschitz 2010: 81). The boosterist place-making agenda makes the presence of ‘undesirables’ untenable (Peck & Tickell 2002: 394-395). Gentrification advocates assume that there would be a trickle-down effect that would ultimately benefit the working class, leading to greater social mixing and a larger tax base (Hubbard 2004: 666). Poor people owned homes which suddenly gained market value, as has sometimes been the case (Lyons & Simister 2000; Lyons 1999). In some cases, too, protected tenants have benefitted from improvements in services and infrastructure. However, this is not generally the case.

Neo-liberalism has dominated for many years but might be on the wane due to the global financial crash in 2008 (Kingfisher & Maskovsky 2008: 123; Lees 2008: 2449). Smith (2010: 54) argues that “neoliberalism is badly wounded today, dominant but dead”. People need to seize the moment and governments have to start thinking differently. The results of neo-liberalism may however be felt for a while still to come (Keil 2009). While the financial crisis created a crisis of capitalism, it has been a reaction against unconstrained capitalism rather than capitalism per se. Most developing countries however feel that they regulate capitalism, as well as having established social security networks and strengthening state bureaucracies (Birdsall & Fukuyama 2011). This means that they have not retreated from capitalism. This waning of capitalism will have an impact on how space is

37 Neo-liberalism’s ideational project, according to Peck et al. (2010: 96) dates back to the 1920s while it gained traction from the 1970s forward. The term has gained widespread recognition since the 2000s.
seen, managed and whom it is designed for. In these perhaps dying moments of neo-liberalism, city governments and police departments are defending space vigorously from protestors, and their creative use of space as I discuss in a following section.

One early form of neo-liberalisation of space is the revanchist city (Smith 1996). The revanchist city is a strategy to reclaim the city, through regeneration, gentrification and redevelopment, for capital and in favour of the middle class (Peck et al. 2010: 105). The revanchist city plays on the idea of *revanche* (revenge), “the right wing movement built on a populist nationalism and devoted to a vengeful and reactionary retaking of the country” (Smith 1996: 6, 27, 45, 51). This revanchist concern allows the city governments to try and ‘take back’ the city, while taking revenge on those occupants who do not fit the cultural mould that they prefer. It is seen as a roll-back against welfare social policies that were implemented in the 1960s in the context of cities in the United States, at least (Atkinson 2003: 1830; Smith 1996). On the one hand revanchist city strategies remove entitlement rights and social programmes, while simultaneously assaulting rights of ‘others’, immigrants, gays and people of colour (Smith 1998: 1). It is a “sadistic criminalisation of urban poverty” that aims to remove all poor and diverse people to create sanitised spaces (Smith 1996: 99) to appease the terror felt by “middle and ruling class whites” (Smith 1996: 211). Although in North America the dominant expression of revanchism has been along racial lines, its class dimensions can be clearly seen in its diverse applications elsewhere. Mbaye (2011) in a comparative study of Benin, Burkina Faso and Senegal found that all three governments reacted with vengeance against informality in their cities.

The revanchist city is driven by the desire of city administrators to increase their marketability to become and be desirable locations for investment (Atkinson 2003: 1831; MacLeod 2002: 608). For Atkinson (2003: 1833), “revanchism in its purest form...is predicated on a belief system that naturalises as universal the interests and cultural codes of the white middle class while at the same time it essentialises marginalised individuals into
subjects who cannot be reformed”. This is undoubtedly true in the US from examples that Smith (1996) uses. Elsewhere it may take different forms (Aalbers 2010: 3; Uitermark & Duyvendak 2008: 1486). Revanchist policies target undesirable groups such as Muslim residents in Rotterdam (Uitermark & Duyvendak 2008: 1485) and drug users and the street homeless in Amsterdam (Aalbers 2010). Revanchism leads to “social segregation, social polarisation and displacement” of especially poor and low-income residents because they are priced out or removed from neighbourhoods (Aalbers 2010: 4). A direct outcome of urban regeneration projects has been to “sanitise the streets of urban undesirables” by removing youths, street sellers the homeless and poor from the streets (Lees 2008: 2457). With programmes focusing on urban regeneration, poor people become excluded from the street, this can be because there are specific laws introduced that would exclude users, or because poorer people cannot afford to live in gentrified areas and therefore move elsewhere. Poverty and exclusion are never solved, they are merely moved around in space.

The neo-liberalisation of space and the revanchist city contains a subset of the idea, advocating that the city and its spaces should be made attractive to investors and business. This can be done through regeneration, mega-projects, or with by-laws that shape spaces in such a way that they become hostile to poor users. This neo-liberalisation of space is a process of the social production of space, that is, the physical and economic forces that shape space. Apart from the economic policies and beliefs that have an influence on how a space is made and managed, physical design also produces space. In the next section I look at exclusion through design of space.

b. Exclusion through design
Design, both the physical act but also imagineering, plays an important role in excluding people from a space. Probably the most famous example is Haussmann’s redesign of Paris to become a modern city replacing winding and lively streets with wide, open lanes. These open roads were to emphasise the power of the state and to order Parisian life (Lefebvre 1996: 76). Similarly, in Brasilia the streets were designed so that street corners were eliminated
and a modern city created without people on the street. This modernist design project was, according to Holston (2005: 245; Holston 1989), because the street was seen as diseased and declining, which was what the government endeavoured to eliminate in the building of the new capital city. “It also embodies a principle of architectural order through which the public sphere of civic life is represented and constituted” (Holston 2005: 249; Holston 1989).

The design of a specific place, be it a park, streets or a city, can then tell us about the relationships that the designers (or government) have towards the people in their society. Bad design lead people to abandon places (Jacobs 1974). Looking at the design of a space can also tell us who the designers are trying to exclude, presumably not only from usage, but also from urban citizenship (Weszkalnys 2007: 209). Design encodes ideas of belonging, history, politics and identity in places as Staiger (2009) showed with the debates around the future of the Palace of the Republic after unification. Whose history is remembered, forgotten or celebrated? In what way are buildings changed or left unchanged and what does this show with regard to who belong in the city? The demolition of the Palace of the Republic erased a part of East-Berlin history and identity from the landscape.

In the same way that big building projects and mega projects can be seen as ways to include and exclude people, it can also be noticed in small details. These include whether the benches have been built in such a way that they can be used for sitting only (as opposed to sleeping on) or whether they are there at all. Smithsimon’s (2008) discussion of ‘bonus plazas’ shows how these spaces were deliberately designed to be unwelcoming to the general public through having bare, paved courtyards, no seating space and spikes on

---

38 The seat of parliament for the German Democratic Republic. It was built in 1970 on the site of a Prussian palace that was demolished in 1950 after war damage. It was demolished again in 2008.

39 Bonus plazas are public space that was built by private companies in exchange for certain concessions to the developers, these included allowing bigger and taller buildings. The bubble spaces are then supposed to have been signposted as being public space and are supposed to be welcoming to all public users (Smithsimon 2008).
low walls. These were all deliberate exclusions to communicate their corporate owners’ desire not to have certain types of people in ‘their’ spaces.

Designers, on behest and behalf of their clients, can either develop spaces that are exclusionary to people, or they can design spaces that are inclusionary. If designers see space without seeing its social dimensions, they will design according to such beliefs, designing for economic development rather than social justice (Van Deusen Jr. 2002: 149). The physical design of space is part of the social production of space. It has a direct and immediate influence on who uses it and in what way. In Chapter One I highlighted the various functions that parks were designed for through the ages. The functions were all designed into the landscape, whether it was designing open spaces for sport, or having paving to keep people off the grass.

An approach that challenges the exclusion of people from space, whether it is done on behalf of economic policies or through design is the Right to the City approach. The Right to the City contests the idea that the city should be attractive to middle class users only.

c. The Right to the City

The previous sections highlighted how poor people, including the homeless, youths, drug users and other ‘undesirable’ people, are excluded from space through the application of neo-liberal doctrines and gentrification. One way that this has been challenged is through the Right to the City movement (Harvey 2012; Harvey 2003; Purcell 2002; Lefebvre 1996) and its successor the spatial justice approach (Soja 2010). The Right to the City is the right for people to be publically present in the city and its spaces. It is the right to become involved in the project (œuvre) of the city.

People go to public spaces in order to be seen, to be made visible and assert their right to being publicly present. These include the homeless, poor but housed people, protestors, the young and migrants. While urban residents are asserting their right to being in public space, governments control space more and more tightly in the name of security and discipline (Mitchell 2003: 14).
New forms of exclusions combine with uneven geographic development of space such as apartheid in South Africa and segregation in the United States (Soja 2010).

The Right to the City is not only the right to be in space, and to be seen in space, it is also the right to participate in building the project (*oeuvre*) of the city. The right to participation is the right to influence what happens in the city (Soja 2010; Sanvig Knudsen 2007: 8; Lefebvre 1996: 149). It is a right of participation, but also a right of appropriation.

One key idea of the Right to the City agenda has been the democratisation of decision-making and the development of more participatory decision-making mechanisms. The Right to the City in the Lefebverian sense is “a call for a radical restructuring of social, political, and economic relations” in cities (Purcell 2002: 101; Lefebvre 1996: 63-184). It is a call to change how decisions are made in the city, moving it from the hands of an elite few, heavily influenced by the interests of capital, towards all urban residents (Purcell 2002: 102). The Right to the City is conceptualised as the right to be involved and influential in urban life. This is radical because it moves beyond mere voting rights, also implicating that urban residents can influence how business works in the city because businesses also create the city (Lefebvre 1996: 158). It can also however degenerate into a consumerist vision of the city (Keil 2009: 237).

This right to appropriate space is the right to full and complete usage and the design of space to make this possible (Purcell 2002: 103). The Right to the City is the right to “places of social interaction and exchange with people who are necessarily different” (Mitchell 2003: 18). Difference according to Lefebvre, lives in cities, but the bourgeois city has no interest in difference and rather seeks to create sanitised spaces for the inhabitants as opposed to spaces being created by the people themselves (Mitchell 2003: 18). However, there can be conflict about space by people who use the space themselves. Often such conflict leads to powerful citizens’ vision for the space triumphing (Freeman 2008).
Furthermore, this right is not a citizenship right based on the narrow version of nationality but rather the right of every person living in the city (McCann, 2002; Mitchell 2003; Purcell 2002: 102; Lefebvre 1996). It is insurgent citizenship as Friedmann (2002) defines it:

> insurgent citizenship as a form of citizenship is a form of active participation in social movements or, as we may call them, communities of political discourse and practice, that aim at either, or both, the defence of existing democratic principles and rights, and the claiming of new rights that, if enacted, would lead to an expansion of the spaces of democracy, regardless of where these take place...it is these non-territorial movements of resistance and claiming that represent the dialectical other to the formal citizenship “from above”.

The idea of insurgent citizenship can include those people who are excluded from formal citizenship such as migrants and youths, but also those that can claim national citizenship but may be barred in practice, such as homeless people. But to truly implement the Right to the City is also complex due to issues such as boundaries around citizen participation. Is a trans-urban Right to the City possible (Purcell 2002: 105)? Can you belong to more than one city simultaneously? For example, if you live in one city but work in another, which one entitles you to the Right to the City, where and how do you practically practise it?

Criticism of the Right to the City includes that it could negatively impact the city because it is indeterminate in nature (Purcell 2002: 103). It is not a set of formal rights or rules that is written down, but rather an evolving relationship between people and their city. It offers an exciting alternative to capitalism as a social system and current thinking around citizenship. We are uncertain about what kind of city such a new politics would produce (Purcell 2002: 100). What would the city look like if we assert our Right to the City? Harvey (2003) asks this question, affirming that for him the Right to the City is not just the right to be in the city’s spaces, but the right to change it. Since the Right to the City is a right to be intimately involved in decisions that would affect urban space, it means that scales of government would need to change in radical ways and would ultimately lead to the demise of the nation-state.
Would we be able to live with the city that we create? The city, Harvey (2003) argues, is continually being made and remade, but very little thought has gone into how this happens. We make the city through our everyday actions and interactions but the city also makes us. He urges people to dream and create utopic cities based on social justice, even if this is frustrating because there are different ideals of social justice (Harvey 2003: 940). These can only be obtained if we mobilise politically or organise in the street. The Right to the City is a new way to begin to conceptualise the city rather, than a final solution to what currently plagues it (Purcell 2002: 100).

The Right to the City is a way to resist the dominance of the government and capital on the spaces of the city and historically uneven geographic development. It is both a critique of practices that exclude all people from using space, and a way to formulate an alternative vision of the city and space use. As such it is a social construction of space, it is an idea that can change not only the way relationships are lived in space, but also the physical design of space, and the economic and social relationships that shape these spaces. The Right to the City approach, and evolving from it the spatial justice theory, have been used to challenge governments into providing services where there were no services or rectifying unequal services (Soja 2010 Prologue). Another example is the fight that Inglewood (a poor area in Los Angeles) residents had against Wal-Mart opening a store in that neighbourhood (Soja 2010) and the Occupy Movement (Harvey 2012: 159-164). These are typical examples of people exercising their right to restructure the city and space in ways that better suit them, instead of it suiting capital only. It can change the physical way that space is managed or constituted, as well as relational aspects of space.

The above example of the social production of space explored three elements – neo-liberalism and space, exclusion through design, and the Right to the City. Each of these elements contributes to the social production of space that compromises all the political, physical and ideological aspects that influence
the physical construction of space. The next section is about the social construction of space.

3. Social construction
The social construction of space is the social processes that shape space. It compromises the relationships that establish space, people’s actual use of the space and the symbolic meanings that this creates about the space. In this section I will look at protests, how individuals appropriate space, space as a place for livelihoods, and as a place for migrants.

a. Protest
There are two types of protests, those sanctioned through a permitting system where governments control who is in space and in what way they protest, and secondly, through groups protesting without sanction from governments. Protests seem to be one of the most common ways that people conceptualise as having their voice heard in public space as being part of the/a public sphere. Protests aim to make issues public through becoming visible in the streets.

Protests are controlled through permitting systems and the right to protest is not necessarily a free and unlimited right (Staeheli & Mitchell 2008). The right to protest is threatened by government control of space that makes it more bureaucratic and difficult to show dissent (Staeheli & Mitchell 2008; Mitchell 2003). Mudu (2002) relates how the World Gay Pride 2000 celebrations in Rome were strongly opposed by the Catholic Church and conservative elements in Italian society. They called for the march to be scrapped and although their call ultimately failed, the Roman city government threatened not to issue a permit, demanding a less visible route. Through the permit system governments decide what a legitimate protest is, and isn’t. While there were some contestation around the route and suitability of having the protest, the legitimacy of having a gay pride march is now well established in most Western countries. In the 1960s, homosexuality was still very much seen as taboo, with gay hangouts often the target for police raids. One such club was
Stonewall in New York, where in 1969, a police raid led to patrons and sympathisers rioting in the streets in protest against police violence and harassment (Poindexter 1997). Here was a case of people taking the streets, protesting and reacting, and being reacted against, violently. Today gay rights movements, and their identity-based consumerism (Richardson 2005), have become well established, and in most contexts, have become acceptable enough for protests to be allowed and regulated. This however excludes most of Africa and some East European countries (Gruszczynska 2009).

As shown above, protest marches occur as regulated but sanctioned occurrences. They can also take place through people seizing space for protest. This can happen in both truly public space but also in privatised public space. The year 2011 has shown the world the importance of public space as a locus for movements aiming to force regime changes. The revolution in Egypt through the January 25 occupation of Tahrir Square in Cairo, the revolution in Tunisia, the *los indignados* of Spain and the Occupy Movement that started in Wall Street and spread were examples of such movements. Each of these movements occupied space, parks, plazas, pavements and squares to protest, to be seen to protest. They kept on occupying public space until they were heard (Egypt, Tunisia), violently cleared out (New York, Oakland), or legally required to leave (London). But even with this, protestors keep on returning to state their causes (Harvey 2012; Mitchell 2011).

The Egyptian movement is a very important one because it is a great example of how public space and public spheres interact, how people appropriate space for protest and why it is so important to have public spaces available. The movement however did not start in the square; people did not spontaneously occupy it. Behind the January 25 protest is a history of organising, using social media. A group of young bloggers started an organisation, Kefaya (Enough), in 2005, to oppose government corruption and citizen repression. Due to a lack of popular support and numerous arrests the movement did not achieve much in terms of immediate change. In 2008, the same people however started the April 6 movement in support of a nationwide strike. They set up a Facebook group for people to communicate. Although
nothing happened during the strike, except in one area where police cracked down on protesters, it did initiate the use of social media to organise and communicate amongst youths. Following the collapse of the Tunisian government after a popular revolt on January 14, the April 6 movement organised the January 25 protests using social media to mobilise people into attending a protest in Tahrir Square, Cairo. Between 30,000 and 300,000 (the numbers are disputed) people came to occupy Tahrir, facing violent crackdowns from the police. They demanded that Hosni Mubarak step down as president and that democratic elections be held. Police opened fire at various stages on the protesters and an estimated 1000 people died during the protests. On 12 February 2011 Mubarak resigned, and the military took control, promising elections soon. Only then did people leave the square (Kirkpatrick & Sanger 2011). A year after the protests ended people returned to the square in anger over continued military rule, and again they faced violent crackdowns, this time from the military (Associated Press 2012).

In Western countries anger at the economic chaos that bankers have left through their avaricious actions and the squeeze that that has placed on ordinary people, has led to the Occupy Movement where people are protesting by living in tent cities in public spaces close to major financial epicentres. The Occupy Wall Street Movement is much more amorphous in their demands than the Arab Spring protests, but employs a similar tactic of occupying space. Although it is not yet clear how and where the Occupy Movement will end, it has spread to a number of American cities (Boston, San Francisco, Seattle) and other places such as London and Melbourne (G. Mitchell 2011).

What is important about these movements is the occupation of public space in order to raise awareness and bring about change. In Egypt there was a movement under way before space was occupied, but it was the occupation of space that attracted a broader range of people, highlighted the violence of the regime and led to Mubarak’s resignation. In the Egyptian and Tunisian cases, the Right to the City became literal in much the way that Lefebvre might have seen it, by not only claiming a right to be in the city, but claiming a
right to have a say in the running of their country against repressive regimes. However, in Egypt Mubarak was deposed, his place taken by a military council that is now jailing the same blogger that Mubarak previously jailed (BBC News 2011b). In 2012 a successful election led to the victory in Egypt of, Mohammed Morsi, the first non-military president since 1952. While Egypt’s future remains unclear, protesters have vowed to return to Tahrir Square if he does not respect the reforms for which they protested (Hill 2012).

The Occupy Movement challenges the way that states and governments act as well as challenging established avenues of influence into government with what Graeber (2012) calls a radical re-imagining of society. Many of the Occupy encampments have been forcibly and violently evicted such as at Zuccoti Park on 15 November 2011 at 1am, as well as Oakland and Portland. Craig Calhoun (2011) describes these early morning, violent clearances not only as a contraction of first amendment rights, but also as removing public officials from oversight of the public and ultimately a narrowing of public spheres. The City of London Corporation applied for, and was granted permission, based on planning laws, to remove the Occupy London encampment (BBC News 2012a), which occurred in the early morning of 28 February 2012 (BBC News 2012b). Occupy London was also placed on the domestic terror list by the London Metropolitan Police (Malik 2011). The idea of people using the spaces of the city and claiming the right to a different society seems to be a terrifying prospect for established patterns of influence in politics. Occupy treaded a line between making the occupations local, and focusing on physical needs to make it workable, and articulating new ideas at a larger, global, scale (Glück 2012). Perhaps in the same way that Occupy worked on a local level physically, but at a global level politically, the Corporation of London used planning laws on a local level to clear the space but their reaction was a rejection of the bigger ideology that the Occupy movement stood for.

Opposition to the Occupy Movement, and their occupation of space, sees the physical occupation of public space as being inappropriate, contravening planning laws, being a threat to health and safety and making the space
unpleasant for other users. “The [City of London] Corporation says it wants the camp removed for safety and hygiene reasons and planning control and because it interferes with a public right of way and the rights of those who wished to worship in the Cathedral” (Ormsby 2012). In this view public space is a place for *niceness*, not politics. Niceness is a value judgement through which middleclass values, are controlled and enforced as being the norm. It is a process of social control, “niceness is about keeping things clean, orderly, homogenous, and controlled” (Low 2009: 87). But occupying space, and demanding to be heard and seen, are the antithesis of niceness, and seemingly threatening for local governments.

Protests are a way to alter the processes that govern public space, especially when they take place against government wishes, such as in Tahrir Square and the Occupy Movement. This is because they change the way that people interact with and interpret the meaning of space. Protests, especially those that fall outside government control, those that circumvent the permitting process and take space in their Right to the City, challenge statist dominance. It is a fundamentally different way to think of space. It captures space as a vehicle to bring their beliefs to the attention of everyone. It is violently opposed by state regimes, being they Hosni Mubarak or Michael Bloomberg. Such protests adjust the social processes that shape space.

While protests commonly use streets, parks and plazas to draw attention to particular causes, proclaiming Rights to the City, people also use space as individuals and in ways that space “owners” or managers did not necessarily envision. In some spaces, repressive and democratic governments do not allow for protests. In this context individual use and users become a way of challenging the state (Thomas 2002: 1621).

b. Individual appropriation

Appropriation of space can either be as part of a group or as an individual. It can be as an isolated event, or a more widespread phenomenon. The appropriation may start out to be non-political, but it can become political, although the nature of the politics is often indeterminate at the start. That is to
say nature of the political demands are not at the forefront of the event or appropriation, and only at a later stage may there be clarity on the political nature of the individual appropriation.

One example of such an appropriation is illustrated by the community gardens in New York. In the 1970s there was an economic crisis that led to a large-scale abandonment of buildings by landlords. These buildings were left to decline and the City of New York took possession of many of them. They also left them to decay. Many of these locations were in economical marginal areas lacking green space. Community members started gardens and gardening projects in them, often with the support of a city-sponsored Green Thumb programme. Gardens were different at each site, some were divided into plots where community members could plant vegetables, some were more formal landscaped gardens, while others were more haphazardly tended (Staeheli & Mitchell 2008; Staeheli et al. 2002; Schmelzkopf 1995).

In the 1990s New York City began to sell the gardens to developers for housing projects, arguing that as landowners the city had the legal right (property rights) to do so. The city of New York also argued that this was a way to alleviate the desperate pressure for housing. The gardeners argued that the city wanted to clear the spaces not to provide affordable housing, since only 20% would be affordable, but to clear the gardeners away because they were forming communities of actions, or counter-publics (Staeheli & Mitchell 2008; Staeheli, Mitchell & Gibson 2002).

These gardeners claimed Rights to the City by claiming spaces where they had laboured for 20 years and formed places of mobilisation. In the end, some 500 of these gardens were bought at minimal costs and kept in land trusts. Up until the time the gardens became threatened by the city’s actions, the gardeners were not an organised group, operating only at a very local (garden) level. When the gardens were threatened, it lead to various gardening groups forming coalitions of action where they joined in public protests in order to stop the demolition of their gardens. (Staeheli & Mitchell 2008; Staeheli et al. 2002; Schmelzkopf 1995).
What is important to note about this, was that the initial use of the land as gardens took place with the New York City’s blessing. The opportunity that creating and maintaining the gardens provided was used for a naturally occurring community to form around the spaces. When the gardens were threatened, it became a political contestation. Although there wasn’t talk to establish their common interests to begin with, once the gardens were threatened, people recognised their communalities and banded together. Political messages or communities do not have to be self-consciously established from the beginning, but sharing space can and often does lead to its establishment at some stage. The act of being in public is enough. It is also important to remember that the availability of shared spaces gives rise to opportunity for political development. The gardens were one way of being public; another way is the need for youths to be publicly visible.

Skateboarders and other youths also use space in ways not appreciated by city governments (Chiu 2009; Howell 2008; van Lieshout & Aarts 2008). Skateboarding youths are considered a risk and are therefore in need of extra rules and controls (Chiu 2009: 37; Howell 2008). Skateboarders resist the passivity that the planners are trying to instil through rules. They are actively creating mental, social and body space through skating (Chiu 2009: 34). Skateboarders and other youths inscribe themselves into space by using it in novel ways and appropriating it as a bodily space in ways that other users do not. This is perceived as risky, and therefore evokes intense regulation in order to protect government from legal actions if people are hurt (Watson 2006: 62-79).

Youths in space are often seen as a menace because they do not use space in regulated ways. However, L’Aoustet and Griffet (2004) contest this idea that youths in public are a threat. Instead they argue that youths in public spaces learn about living together and to negotiate space use. The curtailment of youth also follows on the absence of children in cities, because parents are excluding children due to fear, especially in Western contexts and class dynamics (De Visscher & Bouveme-de Bie 2008; Watson 2006). This
sometimes has a class dimension. More well off children are kept at home, and closely monitored by parents or caretakers, they do not actively take over space. The next generation of users are then inculcated from early to avoid public space, or forbidden from using it, surely leaving adults incapable of claiming space and using it as place of mingling. In contexts of poverty, children often can’t retreat to home because it is small or overcrowded or there isn’t a home to retreat to at all.

Private uses of space also challenge the conception of what should be part of the public sphere. Public space can also be used for private purposes such as living and cooking (Watson 2006; Drummond 2000). This can lead to conflict around what the nature of public space is or should be. Drummond (2000) shows how ordinary Vietnamese, despite state control, turn public space such as sidewalks into private space, using the space for commerce, eating, cooking and bathing. Although there are occasional attempts at clearing the streets in order to emulate a modern Western city, these efforts are short-lived and people return to the streets to live and trade. In the US homeless and precariously housed people also use public spaces for the ‘private’ function of living (Reitzes, Crimmins, Yarbrough & Parker 2011), although they may be designed out and chased out, depending on the context (Madden 2010; Wakin 2008). People’s private lives in Western contexts are also spilling into public through, for example, the use of mobile technologies and fast food restaurants (Kumar & Makarova 2008). Public space then becomes part of our imageries of our private spaces, leading to changed social relations in space. In Brazil the privatisation of public land, through squatter settlements, have resulted in the recognition of the social value of land, which was addressed through legalising illegal settlements to ensure that people can live within the city (Budds, Texeira & SEHAB 2005) and the importance of the Landless People’s Movement that emphasise land as a social practice and not merely a resource in Brazil (Navarro 2009).

In this section I argued that individuals use, and appropriate space for private purposes. These purposes can include gardening, youth appropriation and appropriation for private living such as done by homeless people. These
appropriation changes space in physical and symbolic ways. Physically by changing the way the landscape look but also symbolically by changing the way that it is viewed, and as a consequence of that, the types of relationships that are formed within that space. Such a symbolic restructuring could also lead to different relationships between users and government agencies. Government agencies can react negatively by banning such individual use, or positively by widening their own idea of what space can be used for. The appropriation of space can also lead to conflict and contestations within space. Another appropriation that individuals make is to take space as a place to earn livelihoods.

c. Street trading

When public space is used as a place for livelihoods it changes the meaning of the space, as well as how people perceive it. It is a process of social construction when people use space in a different way from what it was intended or imagined. It changes the way that people relate to and think about the space.

Streets are a good example of how public spaces are used for business and small-scale trading, as Drummond (2000) showed in Vietnam. Ignoring laws against street trading is a form of protest and appropriation of space, but it is mostly at the individual level (Thomas 2002: 1616). In Vietnam where spatial control by the government has been tight, it is only recently that people have started to protest this, not as mass movements but individually. “The ‘illegal’ use of public space by individuals wishing to earn an income forms the necessary kernel for the use of public space by crowds for non-state reasons” (Thomas 2002: 1616). People use the space for survival, but it changes the way that people interact with the government and the way that they imagine the possibilities of space. Having also witnessed this, Bayat (2000) feels that rather than direct engagement with the state, marginalised people engage in ‘quiet encroachment’ that is “non-collective but prolonged direct action by individuals and families to acquire the basic necessities of their lives…in a quiet and unassuming illegal fashion” (Bayat 2000: 536) He recognises that although poor people may in some cases be spatially bound, this does not
necessarily mean that solidarity exists between them, they will not necessarily take collective action. Inevitably, conflict will develop between the state and people practising quiet encroachment, which will periodically erupt. Through their recognition on the street or as outsiders at gatherings, marginalised people form passive networks and these networks may at times become active in resisting state pressure. However, there is no guarantee that this will happen (Bayat 2000: 552). In cases where passive networks remain passive, opportunities for solidarity are lost.

Social capital, or market friendships, constitute an important part of traders’ survival strategy and these links are forged in space between traders who share space (Lyons & Snoxell 2005b: 1318; Lyons & Snoxell 2005a). Although both formal and informal groups exist into which traders can tap, these groups are not necessarily long-lasting and are often more interested in self-help (Brown, Lyons & Dankoco 2010: 670). There is also an element of spatiality to those relationships as they are formed in space.

Street traders have become almost ubiquitous in African cities where informal trade is often the only way to survive. However, there hasn’t been a change in their status politically, except at election times when they represent a powerful voting bloc (Brown et al. 2010: 667). The street economy relies on public space (Brown et al. 2010: 667), yet traders are often denied urban citizenship because if they are ignored, their voices remain unheard and they can be violently expelled from space (Brown et al. 2010: 668). During election times however politicians make promises to traders to stop evictions in order to gain the votes of traders.

Rapid urbanisation has lead to increasing numbers of informal traders in the developing world (Lyons & Snoxell 2005a: 1077; Lyons & Snoxell 2005b). Street trading is seen as leading to a decline in the urban fabric and its space (Lyons & Snoxell 2005a: 1078; Popke & Ballard 2004). Street traders also have problems due to increased competition, decreased disposable income from customers, higher taxation, and exploitation (Lyons & Snoxell 2005a: 1078).
Despite the extent to which there is informal trade in Africa, it is seen as an issue of poverty and shame, something that keeps countries from being Western or labelled as developed (Lyons & Snoxell 2005b: 1302). Street traders are “Othered”, associated with dirt and grime, viewed as an annoyance and wished away (Brown et al. 2010: 669). They often have no formal voice because they are not only traders, they are at times recent migrants or precluded because they are not residents (Brown et al. 2010: 670).

Traders need publically accessible and available space to earn their livelihoods. Traders often act individually, but may at times act as a political group who fight for their rights within the city. Their market friendships are an important part of their survival strategy, even if this does not always last for long. Their presence within public space changes the way that others perceive the city and its spaces. Often their very presence is interpreted as a sign of decline and leads to some people avoiding public spaces. Traders shape the perceptions and symbolic understandings of space, in other words, they contribute to the social construction of space. Another group of people who contribute to the social construction of space are migrants.

d. Migrants
Migrants use public space as a place to gather in the new cities where they have settled. These meeting spaces become a place where they can discuss the politics of home, but also where they can support each other in their new ‘home’. Dines (2002), Noussia and Lyons (2009), van Lieshout and Aarts (2008), Law (2002) and Elsheshtawy (2008) all pay attention to migrants in public spaces in some way.

Migrants go to public spaces in the host cities to find community and shared culture in countries that often are unwelcome to them. Public space becomes space of exchange, of information and shared resources. This helps people cope in the host country while creating linkages to home (Elsheshtawy 2008; Law 2002: 1637). Migrants often share space with one another, carving a
single space into multiple territories for use by each group (Noussia & Lyons 2009; Dines 2002). However, Noussia and Lyons (2009: 603) point out there has not been much research on the spatial dynamics of how different migrant groups use public space and interact with one another.

There can also be tension between these different groups (Noussia & Lyons 2009). Noussia and Lyons (2009) investigated the use of space by different migrant groups in Omonia Square in Athens. The square was carved up into areas for each group to use. There was distrust between these different groups, but a common experience of liminality brought migrants together in this public space (Noussia & Lyons 2009: 619). Karrholm (2007: 488) calls this territoriality “an intentional power strategy and a way of exerting administrative and spatial influence in society” leading to territorial complexity. These different territorial productions are layered in time and space, leading to heteronymous relationships.

While there may be tension between migrants when sharing space, a far larger conflict exists between migrants and hosts with regard to how public spaces are seen. Dines (2002) looks at how public space is used by migrants and at the same time how citizens in Naples decry this. There is a mismatch between the experience of the migrants and the representation by politicians and shopkeepers that reveals the “contradictions underlying the politics of public space and local conceptualisations of citizenship” (Dines 2002: 178). The negative representations are used as a reason for creeping privatisation and clean-up campaigns of space.

Contested citizenship claims between migrants and hosts are similar to disputes created by, for example the Business Improvement District where the well-to-do are seen as having more right than poor people (Schaller & Modan 2005: 394). There are numerous examples of how migrants and other excluded groups use space and are then consequently harassed for it.
Lowriders\textsuperscript{40} in Austin, Texas, many of them working class Mexican Americans are harassed by police officers and subject to heightened surveillance when they leave the barrio\textsuperscript{41} communities to cruise in their cars (Chappell 2010). The message of this harassment is that they don’t belong, neither in the space, nor in the city.

Migrants use public space because it is often all that is available to them in order to live their lives. Space becomes a way to network amongst fellow migrants, keep connections with home and exchange information about their new homes. Yet at times their use is contested by their hosts, as well as other migrants. This is part of the social construction of space. Their use of space also seems to point to their rights to belong to the public sphere and their right to participate in the democratic project of a place.

Another dimension of understanding space is through the lens of embodied space. This lens combines understandings of the anthropology of the body and spatial awareness.

4. Embodied space

Although the body has been present in all research it is only in the last thirty years that that the body has become explicitly theorised. The linkage between space and the body is an even more recent theoretical turn. This section looks at how the body has been theorised and then how it has been linked to space.

The body is experienced on three levels, the lived body, the social body and the body politic (Scheper-Hughes & Lock 1987). The lived body is the “lived experiences of the body-self” or the individual body. This includes conceptions of the self through, body image. The next is the social body. This is the exchange between the natural world and the social one. An example of this is

\textsuperscript{40} Lowriders are car enthusiasts that modify cars and then go cruising to show off these modifications.

\textsuperscript{41} A barrio is a neighbourhood, often a name given to slums or lower to middle class neighbourhoods. In America a large number of Mexican immigrants and Mexican-Americans reside here.
handed-ness, illness or women’s bodies (Scheper-Hughes & Lock 1987: 201-21). The social body comes to stand as a symbol for the social worlds and the social world as a symbol for the body. The last is the body politic. The body politic refers “to the regulation, surveillance, and control of bodies (individual and collective) in reproduction and sexuality, in work and in leisure, in sickness and other forms of deviance and human difference” (Scheper-Hughes & Lock 1987: 7-8 emphasis added). This means that the body is not only natural, its meanings are also proscribed and controlled by others.

A concept that usefully links with the body social and body politic is Marcel Mauss’ idea of body techniques. Mauss described body techniques as ways “from society to society, men [sic] know how to use their bodies” (Mauss 1973: 70; see also Ryan 2011). The idea of body techniques and the social and body politic is important because it shows the essentially communal nature in which authority figures try to have power and control over our bodies. What such an understanding of the body further opens up to, is a discussion of ways that bodies can become the locus of ideologies. These body techniques are taught and not naturally given. For Tolen (1991) the works of Mauss is helpful in understanding how social order is impressed on the body. Mauss (1973) focused on issues such as digging a trench, swimming, or hand-to-hand combat and how these differed in time (era) and space (countries or regions). He elaborated that we know the appropriate way to act because we have been socialised in certain ways. We are taught what is suitable, as children, as young adults, or when joining the army. Body techniques are “assembled by and for social authority” (Mauss 1973: 85). He elaborates:

It consists especially of education in composure. And the latter is above all a retarding mechanism, a mechanism inhibiting disorderly movements; this retardation subsequently allows a coordinated response of coordinated movements setting off in the direction of a chosen goal” (Mauss 1973: 86 emphasis added).

Two understandings of how ideologies have previously asserted their power over bodies can be seen in colonial practices and missionary work. Colonised
bodies were subjected to discipline and handling in order to make them fit subjects for the colonial regime (Pierce & Rao 2006). These authors argue that the bodies of the colonised became the focus on which the ideologies of the colonisers were enacted. Bodily violence was used “to mark and constitute boundaries of alterity” and reinforced the idea that there is a hierarchy of people, some worth more than others (Pierce & Rao 2006: 5, 7). Through violence, state authority is maintained, which makes it a powerful tool, albeit a problematic, contaminating one (Pierce & Rao 2006: 7). “[T]he history of colonial corporeality thus encompasses a particular kind of modernising project caught up in the rise of global capitalism, which comprised a distinctive relationship between the organisation and exercise of political power and which enabled changing conceptions of personhood” (Pierce & Rao 2006: 8 emphasis added; cf. Tolen 1991). A similar experience was the way that missionaries wanted to shape the bodily praxis of people they missionised (Harkin 1994).

“Embodied space is the location where human experiences and consciousness take on material and spatial form” (Low 2003b: 10). In embodied spaces the experiences of the social body collided with space. Two examples also suggest that economic ideologies may be enacted on the body, making certain bodies fit for a new position in society. The first is an example from Barbados where their restructured neo-liberal economy led to a change in bodily praxis, and secondly where surveillance and control of Chinese textile workers lead to embodied spatial understandings.

In Barbados the changing economy has altered the way that citizens and government interact both spatially and bodily (Harewood 2008). The government wants to create a certain type of citizen, suited to the post-independence neo-liberal country. Harewood (2008) cites the example of a bus terminal in Bridgetown constructed in 1985, where orderly waiting in the air-conditioned terminal replaced the organised chaos of the preceding era. Now posted rules and security guards have changed the culture of waiting for the bus. Thus “the [bus] terminal can be understood…as enacting specific notions of disciplined citizenship on the national body” (Harewood 2008: 469).
Her argument is thus that posted rules are meant to change the way that people move their bodies through space. This is an example of embodied space.

But embodied space can also be open to “spatial subversion” (Rofel 1992: 103). Rofel (1992: 98) describes the spatial disciplining that takes place in Chinese silk weaving factories, these include allocating every worker to a specific place on the shop floor and tying production to these spaces, so that workers cannot leave the space. This is not only a “spatial disciplining of bodies but a spatial disciplining of consciousness as well” (Rofel 1992: 98). In other words, by controlling how and where bodies were placed, and moved in space, the aim of the factory management was to shape their minds as self-disciplined and effective workers. This spatial disciplining of bodies and minds is in order to create a modern nation-state far removed from the Cultural Revolution. But at the same time that managers aim to enforce spatial discipline, workers engage in spatial subversions. This happens in different ways, for example hiding between the huge machines where they (the workers) cannot be seen, resort to talking or through deliberate imperfection in their work (Rofel 1992: 102-103).

Another way to understand embodied space is through performative appropriations. Artists, whether professional or amateurs, use their bodies and the space available to show public space as “physically transformable, unstable, and shared” (Joseph 2006: 250).

The Clandestine Insurgent Rebel Clown Army (CIRCA) uses carneveleseque performance in public space to “assert movement identity [anti-corporate and anti-authoritarian]…and disrupt state or corporate events/daily business” (Bogad 2010: 542). CIRCA is part of the global justice movement and their tactic of confrontational performance has spread from the UK to India and South America. Their tactical carnival strategy, is performed unauthorised in public spaces. Dressed up as clowns and performing through “flamboyant costumes, dance, puppets, tricksterism, samba bands” (Bogad 2010: 542) the perform, and protest, in order to disrupt power hierarchies. It shows a friendly
face of anarchy as opposed to the perceived nihilistic and violent confrontations, to bring attention to alternatives to corporate globalisation and to give people a celebratory outlet to their everyday experiences (Bogad 2010: 542-543). Through taking the route of carnivelesque confrontations, potentially tense stand-offs between members of CIRCA and policing bodies are likely neutralised, although violent confrontations are also incorporated in their performances. They would be running and hiding behind very small objects when police charge at them, or running away and engaging bystanders with a grin saying ‘I must be very dangerous’, all while dressed up as clowns (Bogad 2010).

This carnevelesque tactic is very similar to the tactics that the anti-tax avoidance group UK Uncut use in their protests when they shut down tax dodgers such as Vodacom or Topshop or banks. They use drama, irony, and peaceful protests to make the point that tax dodgers are at least partially responsible for the cuts, all the while raising public awareness (UK Uncut 2012).

The Nottinghill Carnival, the largest West-Indian Carnival in the UK is also a performative appropriation of space that is simultaneously contested. It started in 1958 “in response to the racist intimidation and violence from white youths against West Indians” (Ferris 2010: 519). It is a way to claim space and to assert geographic freedom (Ferris 2010: 521). The carnival was seen as chaotic because the police thought, and media portrayed it, that black youths were being disorderly, as opposed to being artistic (Ferris 2010: 522; Jackson 1988).

A similar engagement and tension exist in India with Dalit (Untouchables) festivals. Here Dalits take to the street and through theatre protest their oppressed status in their societies (Beth 2005). The Dalit festival has moved away from the rural streets and exclusively Dalit neighbourhoods, to main city centres. Through this they are engaging a wider public, staking a claim to their rights as equal citizens (Beth 2005). They are actively engaging in public spheres, both as a separate cultural group (a counter public), but also as
members of a broader public sphere. A documentary film by Talukdar and Friedman (2011) *Please don't beat me sir*, shows how ‘criminal casts’, through street performance, challenge their marginality as well as the police corruption of which they are the focus. Through this they claim their rights as citizens in modern India.

Using street performance and carnivalesque elements to challenge politics and power is an embodied form of protest. This is because people use their bodies in unsanctioned ways to challenge the authorities that try and control people’s bodies and movements. It is also a form of social constructions because when these groups challenge authorities in such a spatially embodied way, it changes the relationship that government has with space. This is either through a violent reaction or allowing citizens to claim space for themselves.

Embodied space is rooted in an understanding of bodies as socially and politically constituted. This coalescence is between the body social and body politic with the social production and construction of space. Understanding the ways that bodies are seen, handled, and managed in space can reveal ideologies of belonging, economics and of beliefs. Therefore I will focus on embodied spaces to add a layer of understanding to what happens in Joubert Park. The last element of Setha Low’s framework is that of the role of discourse and language.

5. Discourse and language

Discourse and language shape the way that a space is perceived. This can be positive or negative. In some ways the media often fills this role through the way it reports on specific spaces, but it is also shaped by the more esoteric debates within for example architecture that sees spaces in different ways. One element of the idea of discourse and language is what is normal versus what is not normal. In Section 3d mentioned the example of Dines’ (2002) investigation into Italian spaces. The discourse of failure of the public spaces was seen in newspaper reports. Similarly, Popke and Ballard (2004) showed
how in Durban the middle class discourse that labels traders’ spaces as failures takes place in media reports. In many ways this is shaped by the state, but it is also enforced through media accounts of spaces. Perhaps these reinforce one another? Other agents can however also label the space as a failure; governments, architects, designers and planners all play a role in how spaces are understood. One way to understand the discourse is through the process of normalisation.

“By normalisation Foucault means the establishment of measurements, hierarchy, and regulations around the idea of a distributionary statistical norm within a given population – the idea that judgement is based on what is normal and thus what is abnormal” (Ball 1990: 2).

Normalisation is the process through which something becomes mundane, everyday, and normative (Linke 1999). Anything can be normalised, it is in the subtle, or not so subtle, messages that is given out in order for things to be accepted as everyday, as right. It is a form of “observation, ordering, intervention, hierarchy, exclusion, and control that simultaneously homogenises and individualises its target population by taking charge of individual behaviour through forms of subtle authority” (Koro-Ljungberg, Gemignani, Brodeur & Kmiec 2007: 1077-1078).

Normalisation occurs in a variety of ways. It can be through language and symbols as Green (1994) shows in Guatemala where military toys and clothes are ever present, making the state of militarisation normal. It can be through larger projects by government such as what Ortner calls the middle-classing of America through GI Bills and McCarthyism, that simultaneously enforced patriarchy and middle class norms (Ortner 2001). It can occur through institutions and individuals not challenging and remaining silent, for example not challenging conceptions of gender relations and domestic violence, as Hall (2000) showed with regard to young working class boys. Normalisation can either be enacted violently in totalitarian states, or can take subtle forms of persuasion in democratic states (Koro-Ljungberg et al. 2007). Usually it
operates at multiple levels simultaneously, as understanding whiteness shows us (Linke 1999).

Normalisation is part of the “disciplinary society” that uses three methods of control: “hierarchical observation, normalising judgement, and examination” (Gutting 2011). Discipline above all else is the desire to correct behaviour that is perceived by power holders as improper. Discipline can either be imposed by a judge imposing the law without necessarily exercising a value judgement (although the law is, of course, normative). A different way of organising society is through “imposing precise norms” such as standardised tests. This method of discipline implies a judgement of what is acceptably normal or not. The last nexus is examination (school exams or medical examination), which combines hierarchical observation and normalisation. It is a power/knowledge junction that produces truth (answers to a test) and at the same time forces action (studying) (Gutting 2011).

Normalisation by the state is one strategy used to control space and regularise it to make it controlled and marketable (Amouroux 2009: 117). “Normalisation is a coercive, spatial and rhetorical strategy of neo-liberal-conservative state interventions” (Amouroux 2009: 110). It aims to impose neo-liberal order onto spaces and people who have fallen outside government norms of acceptability and control. Amouroux (2009) uses the example of an area in Copenhagen called Christiania to illustrate how neo-liberal normalisation works. People looking for an alternative lifestyle congregated and settled here. They had communal houses and businesses on public land, didn’t pay property tax and some sustained themselves by selling hash. The normalisation of Christiania was achieved by labelling the space a failure, arresting pushers, establishing a discourse of good and bad Christianitter - citizens and criminal - a continual police presence on the street, and demolition of buildings. This process made Christiania ‘normal’, because it could then become part of a place-making strategy known as Creative Copenhagen that privatised space for renewal projects that would make Copenhagen compete with other European cities. The residents of Christiania closed the space in April 2011 to contemplate what to do. The government
gave them two options – they could buy the land for 150 million kroner (roughly £18m) or transfer the area into a public housing association. However Christianitter regarded both options as problematic, the first because the residents were against owning property, so buying it would transgress their principles, and the second would place them under greater government control (Erikson 2011). In the end they reached a compromise where residents could buy the land cheaply from the state with the rest being placed up for rent. This turned Christiania into a separate local council within Copenhagen (Hollingan 2011).

The process of normalisation is one way in which the discourse around a place is enacted. The language of what makes something normal or abnormal enforces ideas of what should be done or not done with or in a place to bring it under the control of government, and that changes the social relations within a space. It is important to see how places become normalised, or not, through the labels that are ascribed to it.

These four parts of the framework, social production, social construction, embodied space and discourse will all be seen in space, and can be used at all times. They are not necessarily all equally represented in every study, or every space. The orientation of the anthropologist analysing space may lead her to place more emphasis on the one rather than the other. Some may be more obviously seen in space than others. It is flexible enough to adapt as and how needed. The subcategories that I included are also not the only or final ones. They constitute merely one way of understanding and applying the framework.

The framework is one way to usefully analyse parks. However, one more concept needs to be added to the mix, and that is the idea of the contested city. South African society is highly unequal, and through this inequality conflicts arise (as discussed in Chapter Four). It is useful to keep the idea of the contested city in mind for this reason. In the next section I discuss the concept of contested cities/spaces and why I think is it a valuable way to understand cities as well as space.
6. Contested cities

Several times in this chapter I mentioned that there is some form of contestation. But what does the *contested city* mean? Bollens (2007: 2) argues that we should use the term ‘contested city’ with great care and clarity. He argues that contested or divided cities must refer to cities that are ethnically divided, where people of different ethnicities in that city each demand a share of power. Hepburn (2004: 2) defines contested cities in a similar manner, adding that the desire for supremacy is the crux for contestation. For Bollens, and Hepburn presumably, contested space is an issue in multicultural cities. Bollens (2007: 3) states that “the political control of multinational cities can become contested as nationalists push to create a political system that expresses and protects their distinctive group characteristics”. Contradicting himself a few passages later, he says that cities that are contested have experienced conflicts either around ethnic groups of political differences. Conflating ethnicity and political difference is incorrect as De Soto (1996) and Tucker (1998) postulate of conflict in Berlin and Warsaw over contestations with regards to symbolic representations within these cities. In these cases the ethnicities of the people between which the contestations occurred were the same, but their political ideologies differed, and thus gave rise to conflict.

What is important is the focus on contested cities as being a way to gain power. But their focus is too narrow. David Harvey argues that there are two ways to see the city. First, it can be seen as a *container* for social action, i.e. the city is passive, action simply happens in it. If you take this view of the city then contested cities “focus on contestations occurring *within* cities – the city happens to be a mere *site* of a process of contestation” (Harvey 1997: 20, emphasis in original). A second way to see the city is as something that is *constructed*. This view of contested space leads to analysis where you “see the city not so much as a site of contestation but as something to be constructed and in which the contestation is over the construction, or *framing*, of the city itself” (Harvey 1997: 20, emphasis in original). This does not deny
that contestations happen inside cities, but rather that we should understand how these shape cities. Harvey calls for researchers to look at what make cities, and at the dialectical relationship between the process and the city. Hepburn and Bollens differ from Harvey in that they see the city merely as a backdrop against which to discuss ethnic conflicts. Ethnic conflicts are not necessarily city-based, although they can also occur in cities. Focusing on ethnicity exclusively, can lead to a narrow analysis.

Harvey’s idea of the city as constructed is similar to the idea of the city as processes. It links with Low’s (1999) call for anthropology of, and not merely in, the city. I made an argument in Chapter One explaining why I see this focus as productive, and reiterate it here. Understanding conflict of the city, rather than just in the city, allows me to say something wider about the city, rather than a narrow focus on only a space and time in the city.

Using the ideas of Harvey of the city as a process, I want to use the definition by Low and Lawrence-Zúñiga (2003: 18) who argue that contested cities are geographic locations where conflicts in the form of opposition, confrontation, subversion, and/or resistance engage actors whose social positions are defined by differential control of resources and access to power. Contested space is a useful way to frame our understandings of the “social struggles” as they play out in space.

Using this image of the contested city, and contested space, does not preclude that contestations are the only things that happening. At the same time as cities and spaces are contested, they are also gendered, divided and transnational, to mention just a few of the other categories that Low and Lawrence-Zúñiga (2003) identified. But I will show in the park that the most prominent image is that of the contested city, the contested park. It is a useful way to understand what is happening in the park because it “concretises the fundamental and recurring, but otherwise unexamined, ideological, and social frameworks that structure practice” (Low & Lawrence-Zúñiga 2003: 18).
Macro level analyses of contested space are, for example, urban regeneration. “[T]hese analyses of class-based struggles in response to state-imposed spatial regimes emphasise how space is constitutive of power, and how resistance takes the form of social movements and local activism.” (Low & Lawrence-Zúñiga 2003: 20). Social production and social construction serve to understand power relations and contestations played out in space. There may be contestations between planners who plan spaces, on behest of owners, who exclude poorer users, but often there are also contestations by richer more well-off people who want to exclude poorer or more diverse users from space or who appropriate it for consumptive facilities that exclude poor users. Permitting and policing also limit how people can use space (Staeheli & Mitchell 2008; Low & Lawrence-Zúñiga 2003: 19-22).

Another space that can be contested are memorial sites: whose memory is celebrated, to what end, is it a memorialisation for tourists or for local people (Low & Lawrence-Zúñiga 2003: 22-24)? These contestations are often not just about who has the right to use space, but seem to indicate a larger issue of belonging within societies. Thus Newcomb (2006) shows that conflict in Morocco is not only whether women can use the street, but rather what their role is in society.

Street trading is often a site of contestation itself. This has been amply illustrated by the work of Alison Brown and colleagues (Brown, Lyons & Dankoco 2011; Brown 2006a) with regard to street trading in developing cities. Brown (2006b: 7) argues that the visibility of street trading gives rise to its controversial nature. Different levels of visibility by street traders give rise to different levels of harassment by officials (Pratt 2006: 40).

Another form of contested space within cities is contestations that exist around urban housing, especially the right of housing for slum dwellers. This exists in a wide variety of situations and countries. Evictions are often motivated and characterised as being for the public good (du Plessis 2005: 123). Evictions are present in all countries and entrench patterns of social exclusion of the urban poor who are the target in their informal tenured
communities (du Plessis 2005: 123). In Zimbabwe large squatter settlements were established on the peripheries of cities as most migrants to the city could not enter the formal housing market (Chitekwe-Biti 2009: 348). While the housing that people erected were not legal according to by-laws, they were semi-legalised by local authorities through turning a blind-eye, charging a levy or giving people lodgers’ cards (Chitekwe-Biti 2009: 348). But in 2005, Operation Murambatsvina (Operation Drive Out Rubbish) evicted people from these informal settlements, leaving 700 000 people homeless and affecting up to two million people’s livelihoods (Chitekwe-Biti 2009: 349).

In India a similar history of eviction and demolition of slum housing exists. In Delhi 96 000 houses were demolished with more clearances scheduled after 2007 (Bhan 2009: 128). These demolitions were not the result of local government planning, but rather as the result of “non-poor resident welfare and trade associations” that approached the Delhi High Court through public interest litigation and demanded the clearance of the slums (Bhan 2009: 128). The slum dwellers and the middle class residents had a contestation over who had the right to be in the city and what it should look like.

In Nigeria in 1990, 60 000 people were evicted from Maroko settlement in Lagos, according to the government due to blight, disease, and flooding and the illegality of tenure. Implicated as factors for removal were its closeness to high-income neighbourhoods, affecting property values and making it impossible for these well-off neighbourhoods to expand further (Agbola & Jinadu 1997: 279). While some of the people from Maroko were relocated, it was into inferior accommodation, with similar waste and water problems that Maroko had, but at much inflated rents (Agbola & Jinadu 1997: 284).

The desire to preserve buildings can also lead to contestation around space use. In Puebla, Mexico, the desire to conserve the buildings in the historic centre has lead to the exclusion of traders within the centre (Jones & Varley 1994: 28). They were evicted during the upgrading of the centre from their market stalls into decentralised markets, threatening their livelihoods and identity as traders of the historic centre (Jones & Varley 1994: 31).
This section showed a number of contestations around space. These contestations can be between state, groups, and individuals. It can centre on race, class, gender and ethnicity. What is interesting is how these conflicts play out, what they say about power relations, and what the processes is that create these conflicts. I will argue that Joubert Park is in essence a space of conflict. The ultimate question then becomes: whose city is it?

7. Conclusion
The choice to study a park within the broader context of urban anthropology is still relatively unusual, especially in the context of South Africa. Early research focusing on parks was by Robert Rotenberg (1995) who studied gardens and power relationships in Vienna. His excellent work though is not focused on any park or garden per se, but rather on Vienna at large. Low’s (2000) seminal study of a Costa Rican plaza is the first example of ethnography and ethnographic methods being used to study a bounded space in depth. The possibility of focusing on parks was further demonstrated by Low, Taplin and Scheld (2005) and Low, Taplin and Lamb (2005) in studies on numerous parks in the United States and Weszkalnys (2010) in Germany. There is an emerging focus on the ethnography of parks and plazas, but it remains unusual. Ethnography is suitable for parks because it has the ability to “integrate the localised discourse with larger political and economic processes” (Low 1996b: 863). Although the understanding starts at a small scale, it becomes a vehicle through which you can comment on a larger scale.

This chapter set and expanded a framework with which to analyse space. The first part of the framework, social production of space, looked at neo-liberal practices, designing for exclusion and the Right to the City. It argued that neo-liberal practices have shaped spaces to become attractive to well-to-do and middle class consumers, with by-laws written and enforced to exclude poor users from the spaces of the city. This is reinforced through regeneration practices that target the spaces and buildings in cities that are run-down but is identified as valuable. One dominant expression of the neo-liberalisation of
space is the revanchist policies that target undesirable groups in spaces such as homeless people and traders. This is contested however through the Right to the City approach that argues that all people should be involved in the **ouvre** of the city, to decide how the city should look. While this could radically reshape the city to become fairer, it could also translate into the city being reinforced as a consumerist space. The spaces of the city can be designed to be inclusive, if you follow a Right to the City approach, or exclusive, if you follow a neo-liberal approach. This chapter argued that we can see for whom the city is designed in the streets and avenues, but also the benches. Design carries messages that are conveyed, can be read and analysed.

In the social construction section I looked at some processes that can shape the relationships in space. Protests are one of the most often used ways to understand how people assert their publicity in space. Protests are however controlled by governments through permitting systems, which implies that only causes that the particular sphere of government sees as legitimate will be given the chance to protest. People have taken upon themselves the right to protest in space such as the January 25 protests in Egypt. The right to protest in space does not only change the way that people see issues, but also changes relationships in space, and beyond. People also individually appropriate space to garden or skate, or just be. This individual use can lead to groups forming that can challenge state control. Simultaneously people are socialised into society through sharing space. People also use public space as a place to earn livelihoods. Traders in the informal economy are particularly dependent on public space, yet local government often reviles them. Traders are seen as polluting space, and they become the focus of clean-up campaigns. Migrants are another often-vulnerable group that uses space to come together with other migrants. The use of space in such ways changes the way that people perceive space, it changes the relationships that people have with the space, but also who perceive themselves as welcome or unwelcome.

The next aspect of the framework that the chapter investigated was the embodiment of space. I highlighted examples of how bodies are shaped in
space, but also how they resist the shaping by powerful agents. Bodies are seen as needing control in order to fit into the economy, to be ‘proper’. One way where the embodiment of space can be seen is through performance, like carnivals, that challenge the ways that bodies are supposed to act in space. Through these embodied practices, people challenge politics and power.

The last aspect of the framework is the role that discourse and language play in shaping space and how people think about it. Normalisation is the practice of something becoming common and acceptable. It can be violently enacted or become enshrined in peoples’ consciousness through subtle forms such as media reporting and labelling. It changes the ways that people think about space, who belong there, and in what ways acting in space can take place.

Finally, I argued that all of the issues that the chapter focused on are contested, not merely accepted. Contestation in space is about who has power, who doesn’t, and how this is challenged or enforced. Contested space is an important concept in understanding what happens in space because space never just is. It is an important device to frame our understanding of what happens in cities.

How do these understandings provided by this framework link with the idea of public spheres? The way that space is shaped can make us see who is included and excluded in the space. By applying the framework, we can understand who is seen as being rightfully in the space, and who not, and who can then rightfully be seen as making a contribution to the public sphere. It can show who may have legitimate concerns with regard to the way the park is managed.

We no turn to Chapter Four, which provides a spatial and historic background to South Africa and Johannesburg that will frame our understanding of Joubert Park.
Chapter 4: Post-apartheid South Africa

1. Introduction

Chapter Three outlined and expanded a theoretical framework that enabled the better understanding of parks, and concluded with the idea of the contested city and its usefulness. This chapter shows the fault lines that exist in South Africa and specifically within Johannesburg. I explore the spatial history, and current context of South Africa and Johannesburg in order to contextualise what happens in the park. Current space-use patterns are intimately linked with South Africa’s and Johannesburg’s spatial history. This context will also allow for an understanding with regard to how the park was started and the context in which it is currently managed.

The Johannesburg inner city developed specific patterns of use due to its establishment as a mining town and colonial settlement. Towards the end of apartheid, its spatial use patterns changed again. This change has had implications for the way that the inner city looks, and is managed. It is necessary to understand the deep inequalities that exist currently in the country and the city, as this has implications for park use and management. Chapter Four sketches a background that focuses on the understandings of conflicts and inequalities as a context for understanding the park. It first explores the spatial history of South Africa, then it investigates the post apartheid realities in South Africa focusing on post-apartheid transitions, and then on the current statistical picture in South Africa. It then focuses on South Africa and how its spaces were created. This is followed by trends in city management and the idea of the World Class African city.

1. Understanding South Africa, spatially

With the arrival of Dutch Settlers in 1652 in the Cape, the spatial history of South Africa changed course. While the Dutch settlers initially only occupied a
small part of the Cape, the need for farming land eventually grew and pushed people further inland, coming into conflict with the local /Xam\(^{42}\) population (first from 1659 but especially from 1680) (Ross 1999). The discovery of precious minerals led to the establishment of mining compounds, first in the diamond region (1870s) but later also in the newly established gold mining town of Johannesburg (established 1886). Workers at the newly established mines were housed in communal compounds. This compound system established the basis for a separate housing system for black migrant labourers that could only temporarily sojourn in the city. When the National Party came into power (1948) segregation were further codified in law in order in order to secure the future of white South Africans. These movements within the city led to South Africa’s urban landscape. (Pooley 2009; Giliomtee & Mbenga 2007; Giliomtee 2003; Lester 1998; Crais 1992; Armstrong & Worden 1990; Elphick & Malherbe 1990; Guelke 1990; Callinicos 1987; Kallaway & Pearson 1986; Guelke 1976; Leggasick 1974).

South Africa was seen, under apartheid, as belonging solely to whites, except for the designated Bantustans\(^ {43}\). While cheap black labour was desperately needed in the cities, black South Africans were supposed to return to the Bantustans unless they had explicit permission to remain (Smith 1992: 2). Urbanisation policies were shaped to “control the movement and settlements of black people” (Todes, Kok, Wenzel, van Zyl & Cross 2010: 332). The ethnically segregated Bantustans were overcrowded compromising only 13% of South Africa’s landmass, yet they served as home to more than 70% of the population. At the same time black South Africans were “forfeiting any civil rights and welfare privileges in ‘white’ South Africa” (Terreblanche 2002: 71). The spatial legacy of the past has been difficult to correct, and by 2001 less

\(^{42}\) De Jongh (2012) argues for the use of /Xam as opposed to Khoi, Khoisan or Bushmen due to the linguistic differences and hunter consciousness that this group had that differentiated them from other groups.

\(^{43}\) Transkei, Bophutatswana, Venda, Ciskei, Gazankulu, KwaNgewane, KwaNdebele, KwaZulu Lebowa, Qwa-Qwa.
than 1%\textsuperscript{44} of white owned land (i.e. outside of former Bantustans) had been transferred to black ownership (Mather 2002).

Urban living spaces were also segregated according to race and ethnicity (Terreblanche 2002: 334). Urban slums however had some intermingling across race lines for example District 6 that was established in 1867 in Cape Town and Sophiatown in Johannesburg established in 1903. These urban slums were perceived as lacking civility and uncontrollable (Popke 2001), and therefore had to be destroyed. People were forcibly removed to new townships on the edges of cities and the areas razed (Mather 2002; Hallett 1984; Lodge 1981). People were removed from the mixed urban slums using the Group Areas Act of 1950 (Act 41 of 1950), Sophiatown on 9 February 1955 and District 6 from 1968 onward. Both black and white residential segregation was the result of urban planning practices and state interferences often in the name of ridding slums of disease (Parnell 1993b: 17).

The processes of segregation in South Africa had some similarities to processes instituted in many other parts of the world in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century (Popke 2001). Modern planning aimed to remove chaos and the attempts to draw boundaries in cities were an effort to organise and classify the ‘other’, to make ‘them’ manageable and knowable. Spatial segregation was used to entrench white privilege, while at the same time securing labour to further industrial goals (Parnell 2002). Yet complete segregation was never manifested in any city, and people actively resisted in small and everyday ways (Czegledy 2003; Popke 2001).

Petty apartheid, the differential public facilities reserved for separate race groups, was also a way to enact micro control of space (Terreblanche 2002: 335). All aspects of life were segregated: beaches, benches, buses, and

\textsuperscript{44} The amount of land currently owned by black people is unclear. A land survey is supposed to take place in July 2012 to establish who owns what land. The amount of land owned is deemed as important in order to know how successesfull post-apartheid land transfers have been so as to correct the imblances created by South Africa’s colonial and apartheid history.
parks. Boards stating ‘European’ or ‘non-European’ indicated who could use the facilities, with facilities for black South Africans limited and inferior\textsuperscript{45}. This was a costly system to maintain and while ideologically motivated, it was also an accumulation strategy for capital\textsuperscript{46} (Marais 2001: 19).

From the late 1970s and 1980s areas once designated for whites, such as inner city Johannesburg, started desegregating or greying (Morris 1999a; 1999b; Saff 1994; Saff 1990: 7). The Free Settlement Act of 1988 was introduced to allow black people in certain areas\textsuperscript{47} “in response to the de facto ‘greying’ of the apartheid city” (Saff 1990: 7). After the end of apartheid space

\textsuperscript{45} The above photo, although unclear, indicates European only on the board.  
\textsuperscript{46} For small white merchants it was undoubtedly advantageous to keep competition at a minimum. This was a similar process to what occurred in the US (Marais 2001 endnote 29).  
\textsuperscript{47} The areas in Johannesburg included Brixton, Berea, Mayfair but not Hillbrow. The Member of Parliament for the area had to apply for it to become a Free Settlement area.
was desegregated in the sense that anyone had the right to enter, use and live in any space. However, segregated spaces have not disappeared from the South African landscape, with towns and townships remaining highly segregated (Christopher 2005).

While pre-1994 the urban policy wanted to segregate space as required by the 1950 Group Areas Act, post-apartheid urban planning has not been able to solve the problem of the diffuse nature of South African towns and cities (Pillay 2008: 113). Planning processes for post-apartheid have been restructured, aiming to demarcate municipalities in order to form integrated local governments, to plan “developmental local governments”, to widen participation in the planning process, and lastly to design and deliver housing and services to poor South Africans (Pillay 2008: 114). Williams (2000) argues that socio-spatial change in South Africa is linked with socio-spatial change in South African cities, thus while cities are segregated, the rest of South Africa also remains so. Since cities were planned and enforced with segregated areas, it has been a visible legacy of the segregationist history of city building and its underlying ideologies. As so many people find themselves inhabiting South African cities, and living in deeply unequal situations, cities need to visibly change to become less unequal and divided. Williams (2000) argues that there must be a specific transformationary urban process in order to densify and diversify South African cities, in order for the cities to become more integrated.

The National Planning Commission 48 (NPC) released the National Development Plan 2030 for the President’s consideration in 2011. The plan addressed aspects to get South Africa on track for growth and lower unemployment rates. It identifies substandard education for the black majority, crumbling infrastructure, uneven public services, corruption, unemployment, a failing health system, a divided society and spatial patterns of exclusion as the

48 A high level government planning commission that strategised the direction of government policy for South Africa. It was lead by Trevor Manual, the former minister of finance and included policy makers, academics and public consultation.
major challenges that threaten growth in South Africa (National Planning Commission 2011: 3). This last idea is important for understanding the spatial patterns in South Africa. It acknowledge that low-income housing\textsuperscript{49} has exacerbated the existing social exclusions experienced by poor people because of houses built on peripheries away from economic opportunities (National Planning Commission 2011: 16). The remedies for the lack of jobs then are to “increase urban population density, \textit{while improving the liveability of cities by providing parks and other open spaces, and ensuring safety…} reliable and affordable public transport…moving jobs…towards dense townships” (National Planning Commission 2011: 16 italics own). On national level, the importance of usable public space is acknowledged. The NPC recognised that a consequence of South Africa’s segregationist past was the differential development of public space. Historically, very few parks were developed in black townships with this trend continuing in the new reconstruction and development suburbs (McConnachie & Shackleton 2010).

South Africa, like other highly unequal societies such as Brazil, has more and more privatised space through gated communities as well as public spaces such as roads that are retrofitted with gates to keep non-residents out (Spocter 2007; Landman 2006). Dawson (2006: 132) believes that in the case of South African cities, people are privatising space due to an increasing fear of violence, brought about by high crime rates. The privatisation of space is not only racial in character, but class-based segregation as the black-owned gated community of Dainfern demonstrates (Dirsuweit 2002; Hook & Vrdoljak 2002).

South Africa’s colonial past entrenched certain spatial practices. This was exacerbated with apartheid. Since post-apartheid it has been difficult to move beyond this and spatial segregation has remained. South Africa specifically

\textsuperscript{49} This refers to the Reconstruction and Development Houses (RDP houses), which comprise a programme under which low-income earners can qualify for a government subsidy with which to buy a house. These houses are often built sub standardly, and are on the outskirts of towns and cities, and often built without planning for green open spaces, quality services and access to transportation.
excluded people from its public spaces and in this process it constricted any possibility of a wider public sphere. While there were certainly public spheres, they were of a very fragmented nature, much like the public spaces. People were excluded from space and thus excluded from participation that being together in public spaces could bring about. The following section looks at the process of transition from apartheid, and what the current context is in South Africa.

2. Post-apartheid realities in South Africa
   a. Post-apartheid transitions
Apartheid was ended through a negotiated settlement between the National Party and the African National Congress (ANC) in the period between 1990 and 1993 (Marais 2011; Marais 2001: 2). The ANC-led government inherited a vastly unequal economy, based on the mineral-energy complex, where the top 5% of the population consumed more than 85% of resources. They also inherited an underdeveloped basic needs industry (Bond 2000: 12). The result of this was dire poverty, racially skewed income distribution and inadequate basic services (Bond 2000: 13).

The ANC, since its inception, was focused on obtaining liberation and democracy as political and social ideals. They did not have a clear economic plan post-liberation (Marais 2011; Marais 2001: 85, 124, 135;) and instead opted for what Bond (2000) calls elite transition. Business in general was worried about the direction that the ANC would take economically, and wanted a policy that would restore their profit-making ability (Marais 2001: 84). The economic strategy that the ANC started to follow, on the advice of business, was aimed at “the appeasement of domestic and crucially, international capital” (Marais 2011; Marais 2001: 95; Habib & Padayachee 2000). This removed all mention of nationalisation, private property was entrenched into the constitution, and economic redistribution was hardly mentioned. The ANC feared that following a different economic path would place the economy at the risk of markets and international investment and thus endanger the democratic transition (Marais 2011; Marais 2001: 134;
Habib & Padayachee 2000). Instead, the ANC willingly adopted a structural adjustment programme, far stricter than the International Monetary Fund (IMF) proposed, and supported by business and foreign experts (Marais 2011; Marais 2001: 122-137; Bond 2000; Habib & Padayachee 2000). It followed an orthodox neo-liberal path with trade liberalisation, privatisation programmes, and a regressive tax system friendly to business (Marais 2011; Marais 2001: 136; Habib & Padayachee 2000). It intensified a “neoliberal accumulation strategy” started in the late 1980s by the National Party government50 (Marais 2011; Mayher & McDonald 2007: 443; Marais 2001: 104; Bond 2000). Perhaps the ANC believed, in the words of Margaret Thatcher, that there were no alternatives to address the massive structurally unequal, and inadequate, economy that they had inherited.

The ANC also represented the black bourgeoisie and the rising black elite’s economic interest through such programmes as Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) (Marais 2011; Marais 2001: 136) although Bond (2000: 29) argued that there are in fact only a few black elites, and that those that are, are co-opted by white business. Government policies gave rise to jobless growth, where the economy expanded but jobs were lost (Marais 2011; Ferguson 2010: 172; Marais 2001: 175). Those who were employed also suffered due to casualisation and real wage decreases51. “This economic liberalisation has benefited the upper classes of all racial groups” but poor people have become even poorer (Habib 2003: 682).

There has been little outright privatisation of public services in South Africa, instead neo-liberalism has taken the form of public-private partnerships52 (PPP) and business units, where entities are run at arms-length from government, such as Joburg Water (Smith 2006). Some of the neo-liberal strategies implemented broadly are prepaid water and electricity meters, the

50 These were to restrict state involvement in the economy, privatisation programmes and deregulation.
51 Wage increases that did not keep up with the inflation rate.
52 Such as the Gautrain and the new toll roads in Gauteng.
emphasis on cost-recovery for services, and a new audit culture for education and health care (Mayher & McDonald 2007; McDonald & Smith 2004).

South Africa’s historical patterns and the post-apartheid path that the government chose have led to new patterns of inequality developing, and existing one continuing. The next section looks at these patterns.

b. South Africa statistically speaking
South Africa has a population of 50.59 million people, of whom 52% are female (StatsSA 2011a: 2). There are 40.2 million black\(^{53}\) South Africans, 4.5 million coloureds, 1.3 million Indians and 4.6 million whites (StatsSA 2011a: 3). South Africa had a GDP of $92,7 billion\(^{54}\) (£59,01 billion) in the 4\(^{th}\) quarter in 2011 (StatsSA 2012: 4) and is the 28\(^{th}\) largest income in the world (Dimant & Roodt 2009: 1). Landman (2003) uses the poverty line as being $179.29\(^{55}\) (£114,11) for 4.7 people per household, which means that 46% of South Africans are living in poverty. Van der Berg, Louw and Yu (2007) argue that poverty has decreased, but that it is difficult to see because the data that most analysts use, is old. They analyse the All Media and Product Survey data to find that there has been a decrease in people living in poverty, which they defined as $30,10\(^{56}\) (£19,16) per month. This they argue is due to an increased uptake of social grants\(^{57}\).

\(^{53}\) It is with some reservation that I give the racial breakdown of South African society. Although race as biologically discreet categories do not exist, it is a standard question on census and population breakdowns. Since South Africa is also a society that was officially divided along racial categories, many inequalities persist along those lines. However, other divisions are becoming more prominent in South Africa. While we cannot ignore race as a category, we can also not make it the only category along which we focus our analysis.

\(^{54}\) R 770 billion, converted with an exchange rate of R1 = 0.12US$.

\(^{55}\) R1489.

\(^{56}\) R250 at 2000 purchasing parity.

\(^{57}\) A government pension is R 1200 ($142.50 /£91.24) and the child support grant is R280 ($33.25/£21.29).
Post-apartheid South Africa is still a highly unequal society with a Gini co-efficient of 0.77. In terms of income this meant that the poorest 70% of the population receive only 21% of the total income (Marais 2011: 208).

Whilst inequality is still observed along racial lines, increasing intraracial inequality is becoming evident starting to show class rather than race disparities (Marais 2011: 210; Pieterse 2009; HSRC 2004: 2; Dirsuweit 2002: 9; Beall et al. 2002). Beall et al. (2002) contend that intraracial inequality rather than interracial inequality is growing, arguing, in other words, that segregation is becoming more class, rather than only race-based. “The black share of the richest quintile of the population rose substantially, from 22% in 1993 to 42% in 2008 (though this remains far below their population share)” (van der Berg 2010: 11). But poverty has remained disproportionally black with the accumulation of wealth by the new black elite leading to the widening gap in intraracial inequality. The Thiel index which measures inequality between and within groups, shows that inequality between groups still exists but that it is growing rapidly within groups. In 1993, 61% of inequality between groups could be ascribed to race, but now it is 35% (van der Berg 2010: 14).

South Africa’s human development index (HDI) is 0.619 and it is ranked as a medium developed country (Eddy 2009: 72), at 123 of 187 countries (UNDP 2011). The official unemployment rate of 25.7% for the third quarter of 2011 (StatsSA 2011b: vi). Of the pool of people between the ages of 15-64 that could be employed, an estimated 32.4 million people, only 17.6 million people are employed (StatsSA 2011b: vi). The StatsSA definition of unemployment is those people who had actively looked for work in the four weeks before the survey. People then who “are too demoralised, penniless or marginalised to line up at factory gates at dawn or tread the suburbs for piecemeal work” are excluded from the official unemployment statistics (Marais 2011: 176). People

---

58 The Gini coefficient measures inequality in a society and is a number between 0 and 1. The closer to 0 a society is, the more equal it is.
59 The human development index is a composite statistic that the United Nations uses to rank nations in terms of their development. It uses measures for – life expectancy, literacy and standard of living, as well as the GDP to measure the statistic (Eddy 2009: 71).
making a living through begging, hunting or subsistence farming are counted as employed. The expanded unemployment level is 38.8% (Marais 2011: 177). In 2003 there were two million working poor, half of these were self-employed\textsuperscript{60} (Marais 2011: 181).

Informal employment has absorbed a large number of the unemployed, especially post-1994. But this has slowed since 2000 because of a contracting informal sector (Willis 2009: 9). The percentage that informal trade make up of GDP is calculated differently by different statisticians using varying data sources and is thus not clear. Estimates range from 6.9% to 28.4% (Willis 2009: 15) depending on the method and data source used.

South Africa shed 1.5 million jobs in the period between 1970 and 1995 (Bhorat 2000: 438). South Africa dropped import regulations quickly after apartheid ended (Barnes & Kaplinsky 2000), and its manufacturing sector suffered, as they could not compete with cheap imports from China (Kaplinsky, McCormick & Morris 2006). While skilled workers gained with trade liberalisation, unskilled workers were especially negatively affected\textsuperscript{61} (Bhorat 2000) with for example massive reductions in the clothing manufacturing industry\textsuperscript{62} prevalent (Roberts & Thoburn 2003). South Africa and Chinese trade relations were affected by the removal of barriers to importing goods into South Africa. China buys a small amount of goods from sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), but exports to SSA of completed consumer goods are high (Kaplinsky et al. 2006).

South Africa is becoming highly urbanised with 69% of its people living in cities (Todes et al. 2010: 333). Poor people live in cities because of economic opportunities, whether they are formal or informal (Centre for Housing Rights and Evictions (COHRE) 2005: 6). However, looking at historical patterns

\textsuperscript{60} This would be as traders or subsistence farmers.
\textsuperscript{61} Although Bhorat (2000) argues that you cannot draw a correlation, just a co-occurrence.
\textsuperscript{62} Between 1996 and 1997 there was a 40% reduction in staff at clothing manufacturers (Roberts & Thoburn 2003).
post-apartheid, urbanisation has been slower than previously (Todes et al. 2010: 333-334). The exception to this is Johannesburg, which has had rapid growth (Todes et al 2010: 334). Kok and Colinson (2006: 24) argue that there will be a steady increase in migration to cities that will continue with a de facto rural depopulation, but this is mostly temporary or circular migration. There are large numbers of migrants arriving in cities; there are also large numbers of migrants leaving for other destinations, either to larger towns and small cities, or to other metropolitan cities (Todes et al. 2010: 335). Some of the reasons for the migration are that 2.4 million people moved, left, or were evicted from farms, and went to urban areas. 7.5 million South Africans lack adequate housing, most of these live in the cities, in informal settlements, in so-called bad buildings in inner cities, and on the streets. In Sub-Saharan Africa 62% of people live in slums in urbanised areas (Pieterse 2009: 10).
Migration has a long history in South Africa as discussed earlier, but a lot of it has been temporary migration to look for employment or join a partner who had moved for employment reasons (Kok & Collinson 2006: 10). Along with migration within South Africa, South Africa is a popular destination for international migrants. This is due to bad economic situations in their home countries, as well as political persecution and fear (Todes et al. 2010: 341). Despite high levels of inequality and violence and a shrinking economy, for many people South Africa still remains a desirable location for a better life (Vearey 2010). South Africa’s perceived role as an economic powerhouse within Africa and the global economy, and the attractiveness of its democracy, make it an appealing destination. South Africa’s migration figure is estimated at 2.7% (National Planning Commission 2011: 82).

Although South Africa is a popular destination for migrants, there is hardly a flood of migrants who have come into South Africa. Between 1996 and 2004 there were 160 000 refugee seekers recognised in South Africa (Crush 2008). The numbers of Zimbabwean migrants are unknown. A government estimate places it at 3 million, a South African Migration Project (SAMP) places it at 500 000 (Crush 2008). The World Bank places immigration to South Africa as 1.8 million or less than 4% of South Africa’s population (Ratha & Zhimei 2008). Despite these relatively low numbers, migrants are often portrayed as flooding South Africa, and blamed for lack of service delivery and crime.

International migrants however, are not universally welcomed in South Africa. In May 2008, a series of countrywide xenophobic attacks rocked the country.

---

63 Although South Africa is a popular destination for migrants, there is hardly a flood of migrants who have come into South Africa. The 2001 census, placed it at 687,687 from SADC countries (Crush 2008). Between 1996 and 2004 there were 160 000 refugee seekers recognised in South Africa (Crush 2008). The numbers of Zimbabwean migrants are unknown. A government estimate places it at 3 million, a South African Migration Project (SAMP) places it at 500 000 (Crush 2008). The World Bank places immigration to South Africa as 1.8 million or less than 4% of South Africa’s population (Ratha & Zhimei 2008). Despite these relatively low numbers, migrants are often portrayed as flooding South Africa, and blamed for lack of service delivery and crime.
Sixty-seven\textsuperscript{64} people were killed, at least 670 injured, 10 000 displaced, and dozens of women raped and thousands of rands worth of property looted (Misago, Landau & Monson 2009: 2). The targets of these attacks were ‘makwerekwere’\textsuperscript{65} – African migrants, mainly from Mozambique, Somalia and Zimbabwe (Burns 2008: 120).

This section focused on the continued inequalities that exist in South Africa. It showed that while there is some intra-racial inequality arising, which is still largely a race-based inequality. This inequality may have effects on who will be able to participate in the public sphere. Habermas’ work already showed that although the public sphere was supposed to be inclusive, he only focused on a certain class perspective. The inequalities within South Africa may make some people more acceptable as participants in public sphere activities. The next section looks specifically at the formation of Johannesburg, its present realities, as well as its spatial formation.

3. Johannesburg

Johannesburg is the capital of Gauteng, the smallest province in South Africa, but with the largest economy (Allan, Gotz & Joseph 2001: 5). It provides 34\% of the Gross Value Added nationally, the largest single contributor (Mushongera 2011). Within Gauteng, the City of Johannesburg (CoJ) is the smallest municipality in terms of square kilometres, but has the largest population (3 888 182) (Eddy 2009: 29; StatsSA 2009: 7).

\textsuperscript{64} Twenty-one South Africans were killed during the violence (Misago et al 2009: 2).

\textsuperscript{65} A derogatory term used by South Africans to describe migrants of African descents. “Makwerekwere…as used in South Africa it means not only a black person who cannot demonstrate mastery of local languages, but one who also assumed to be economically and culturally backward in relation to South Africa…In terms of skin pigmentation, the racial hierarchy…is usually believed to be the darkest of the dark-skinned, and even to be less enlightened” (Nyamnjoh 2006, quoted in Desai 2010).
Broadly reflecting the demographics of South Africa, there are 75% blacks, 5.9% coloureds, 4.3% Indians and 15% whites living in the city. The sex split is roughly equal. The population is young, with more than 80% under the age of 39 (Eddy 2009: 33). Seventy seven percent (77%) of the residents of Johannesburg live in formal dwellings (StatsSA 2009: 9), 50% of people own or are paying-off their houses, 31% rent, and 18% live rent-free in their various places of accommodation (StatsSA 2009: 10).
In general, the living conditions of people within the municipality are relatively better than the rest of the country, with 98% having access to piped water, only 2.7% have no access to toilet facilities, and 79% have access to electricity (Lebone 2009: 83). These general statistics however mask the gross disparities that exist among households within Johannesburg. While 23% of people in Johannesburg live in informal settlements like Alexandra, the highest recorded house prices in the country are merely a few kilometres away.

a. The spaces of Johannesburg

Johannesburg is the product of a set of circumstances that are highly specific to Africa. It was born out of the conflict between Afrikanerdom and a British empire engaged in the last thrashings of its final bout of expansionism. It was shaped by the cruel restrictions of the apartheid regime, as well as by the dreams of modernity of the post-war years, that brought about some distinctive inversions of urban norms. But it is also a kind of laboratory for projecting urban phenomena to their extremes (Sudjic 2007: 200).

Johannesburg started life as a dusty mine camp in the South African Highveld in 1886 “with a collection of tents, covered wagons, wattle and daub shacks and corrugated-iron buildings” (Beavon 2004: xvi; Kallaway & Pearson 1986: 2). Johannesburg was established on a triangular piece of **uitva”** land between eight farms. The land was owned by the state, at that stage by the Zuid Afrikaansche Republiek (ZAR), one of the two Boer republics (Beavon 2004: 22). The ZAR thought that the mining camp would be temporary and wanted to make as much money out of it as possible. When they laid out the town they demarcated small stands with many corner

---

66 This is not necessarily piped into houses but may be access to a yard or street tap. The same is true for toilet facilities, where having access to toilet facilities may mean a VIP, or portaloos within walking distance. Van Rooyen, de Wet, Marais & Korth (2009) give a detailed breakdown of how the poorest areas in Johannesburg are affected by the privatisation of Johannesburg Water.

67 This section focuses on the history of inner city Johannesburg and not areas such as Soweto or Lenasia.

68 The best translation would be wasted space, land that was not incorporated into any of the farms.
stands\textsuperscript{69}, which were leased at a higher rate (Beavon 2004 23-24). Early Johannesburg grew quickly and by 1895 “it was reputed as the largest urban place in Africa” with almost 102 000 residents (Beavon 2004: 6). The reason for this rapid growth was the rich gold veins. With them came the expansion of Johannesburg, with banks, brothels, shops and hotels.

South African cities were established as colonial entities with ambitions of western modernity and the spatial planning of the cities reflected this (Bremner 2007: 203). “The classically divided colonial city was premised on high standard, intensely regulated space for the colonial population, and low quality, poorly regulated space for the indigenous population” (Parnell 2002: 259).

Since Johannesburg’s establishment in 1886 segregation occurred between races. “Black life in Johannesburg was directly related to this industrial utility [mining activities]. It was both indispensible and expendable. Its experience of the modern was one of precariousness, exploitation and humiliation. It was organised, through the biopolitics of race, to facilitate and legitimise its usage, to allow it to be lavishly spent” (Bremner 2007: 206).

Johannesburg was extended so that people could live in town. A pattern developed where north of the reef rich white people lived while poorer (white) workers lived in the south of the reef (Callinicos 1987: 66). Initially, the poor white farm workers who came to the city appealed to Pretoria for cheap homes in Vrededorp and Brickfield (Callinicos 1987: 66). Black migrant workers lived in mine compounds, or on the properties where they worked as domestic workers (Callinicos 1987: 68). Places nearer to the inner city were for the working class, and poor, black and white non-skilled worker areas spilled into one another such as Vrededorp and the Coolie Location\textsuperscript{70} (Callinicos 1987: 68-70). The early government policy was to separate

\textsuperscript{69} These small corner stands is part of the reason why Johannesburg inner-city traffic is so problematic today.

\textsuperscript{70} Coolie is the colloquial, and offensive, naming for people of Indian descent.
according to race with Indian, African, white areas, as well as according to class for white people (Maylam 1995: 23; Callinicos 1987: 70). Vrededorp, that was incepted as housing for poor white Afrikaners, quickly became mixed with both African and coloured residents moving in. The Malay camp was started in 1894 for Indians and quickly grew into an overcrowded slum with many people moving there, especially after Brickfields was demolished in 1904 after a plague outbreak (Callinicos 1987: 76-77). The mixed nature of these poor areas led to a “moral panic and racial hysteria, as whites increasingly came to associate black urban presence with squalor, disease and crime” (Maylam 1995: 24). The clearing of the Coolie Location led to the establishment of Klipspruit, 10 km outside of town (Tomlinson, Beauregard, Bremner & Mangcu 2003: 5; Maylam 1995: 25; Kallaway & Pearson 1986: 32). This further entrenched the idea of separate areas for different race groups.

Map 4: Johannesburg 1910 (Callinicos 1987: 69)
Sandton’s stupendously rich suburbs are within a few kilometres of one of the densest populated and poorest areas in Johannesburg, Alexandra. Alexandra was a freehold township that was established in 1912 outside the borders of Johannesburg. This meant that black people could live there and own houses (Kallaway & Pearson 1986: 35; Callinicos 1987: 186-187). As Johannesburg grew towards the north, more and more women took on washing and domestic work (Callinicos 1987: 187). Because Alexandra was located so far from the city centre people were reliant on transport, which made up a large part of their expenditure. Bus boycotts became a regular feature of life in Alexandra (Callinicos 1993: 42-43).

Urban clearances occurred even before apartheid was codified, fears of the Plague and influenza in 1904 and 1918 in Johannesburg led to early clearances (Parnell 1993a; Parnell 1988: 308). It was not however exclusively racial in character (Parnell 1993b: 8); early urban segregation was driven by
profit rather than ideology (Parnell 1993a: 472; Parnell 1993b: 17). Inner city Johannesburg, which was the domain of the working classes, was racially mixed until the 1920s when the City Council started to enforce segregation (Parnell 2003: 617).

After World War I, the Natives (Urban Areas) Act 1923 recognised that workers needed places to stay. The act was an entrenchment of existing practice (Parnell 2002). The Natives Urban Areas act was to address this need with the cost of housing to be carried by the municipality (Callinicos 1987: 170-171). The living areas established outside of Johannesburg were a way to control workers in the same way that the mining compounds were a way to control workers, because they all lived in one place (Callinicos 1987: 171). The application of the act was however slow, because it was costly since the courts had ruled that the municipality had to provide alternative accommodation if they wanted to clear slums. Vested interests such as slum owners also bribed officials not to clear their slums (Callinicos 1987: 172). There was also resistance from blacks themselves who appealed to keep certain areas as non-segregated, and where they could own their freeholds and rent out part of their properties (Callinicos 1987: 172-173).

Johannesburg had from the very beginning a lively informal market culture where many black people made a living as traders (Kallaway & Pearson 1986: 65). Because wages were so inadequate for black workers, many supplemented their incomes through the informal economy, especially women (Callinicos 1987: 195). People had a variety of activities – sewing, beer brewing, and prostitution (Callinicos 1987: 196). While both black and white unemployment was rife, only white unemployment was addressed by means of skills training, charity and subsidised employment (Kallaway & Pearson 1986: 82; Callinicos 1987: 44).

With apartheid, the theme of central urban control also emerged. The National Party government intervened directly in urban planning in cities, setting more rigid policies for urban areas (Maylam 1995: 35). After 1948 vast expansive suburbs for black people developed south of Johannesburg without a
sustainable commercial base or prospect of it developing (Tomlinson et al. 2003: 6).

Despite the apartheid government’s best efforts, the contrived separation of people was never entirely successful, and could not continue indefinitely. One example of the failure to enforce the Group Areas Act can be seen in the inner city of Johannesburg. Hillbrow was designated as a white area, but from the 1970s71 a growing number of black, coloured and Indian people had started to make it their home. Forced removals, which were required by the Group Areas Act, never took place; instead landlords used the opportunity to exploit the situation (Morris 1999a). In an area that was already experiencing disinvestment in the housing stock, this accelerated the decline of the area through asking higher rents of non-whites, which lead to multiple occupation in single-couple occupancy flats, not maintaining or upgrading buildings and later abandoning buildings (Czegledy 2003; Morris 1999a: 97; Morris 1999b). The situation in the rest of the inner city72 was much the same. The same areas that served to welcome European immigrants in the 1950s, now welcomed Africans. “These parts of Johannesburg are characterised not only by ruination, but also by what A.M. Simone has called ‘highly urbanised social infrastructures’ – mechanisms through which people cobble together provisional, often illicit livelihoods, through cooperation, flexibility and evasion” (Bremner 2007: 210; Simone 2006; Simone 2003).

By the late 1990s most of the flats were inhabited by black renters. Due to the disinvestment by landlords, a number of the blocks were in a severely run-down state and in serious debt to the municipality. Only 5% white residents remained by 1996, the rest having fled to more suburban areas (Tomlinson et al. 2003: 13). Despite the overcrowded living spaces, people moved here because of ease of access to transport and job opportunities. As the inner city was abandoned by its white inhabitants, businesses followed, moving to the

71 Interesting to note is the fact that Johannesburg post WW2 was more diverse than Johannesburg post-1970 (Beall et al. 2002).

72 Which includes Joubert Park.
edge cities of Sandton and Midrand (Rasmussen, 2007: 177). Many of the buildings of the inner city today are dilapidated and run-down. This situation has left the area ripe for regeneration efforts (Lipietz 2008b: 272; Lipietz 2008b).

Johannesburg consists of both incredibly poor areas and fabulously rich areas within a few kilometres of one another (Murray 2008a: 17). Whereas formalised racial segregation is no longer enforced through such odious instruments as the pass laws, forced removals and the Groups Areas Act, a new kind of ‘separate development’ have come into existence in the post-urban environment sprawl’ (Murray 2004: 23). Johannesburg’s spaces are fractured with the pre and post-apartheid city areas still resembling one another (Sudjic 2007: 201) and have remained fragmented (Murray 2008a; Murray 2008b).

More and more people in Johannesburg, and in the rest of South Africa, move into gated or enclosed communities (Durington 2006; Dirsuweit 2002; Hook & Vrdoljak 2002). This affects the spatiality of the city. According to Murray (2008a: 39), “the retreat of well-to-do urban residents into protected pockets of privilege not only contributes to the spatial fragmentation of the urban landscape, but also delegitimises open, accessible public space as an ideal of city social life”. Public parks become devalued and value rather becomes attached to privatised spaces such as Sandton Square or Nelson Mandela Square. But as Staeheli and Mitchell (2006) show in the US, entrance to these spaces is restricted to those that can afford to shop.

While Johannesburg is a rich city, it still bears the scars of its colonial and apartheid past. It has deeply divided areas, although some of the division has become class instead of purely race based. After the end of apartheid there was also a radical change in the ways that Johannesburg was managed. These divided areas imply that certain people remove themselves from public

73 Two shopping malls in the affluent suburb of Sandton.
space, which means that only some people will have access to being part of the public sphere and that only some people will be seen as legitimate. The next section looks at the changes within the city context.

4. The city context
   a. Trends in city management

The mining camp that became Johannesburg was supposed to be temporary, so establishing a governing structure came slowly. A mining commissioner based in the Zuid Afrikaansce Republiek (ZAR) controlled city of Pretoria was responsible for the early administration of Johannesburg. In 1886 licenced diggers elected a nine-member Diggers’ Committee. Their main responsibility was public health. The Diggers’ Committee could not cope with the size of Johannesburg even at its inception, but since the ZAR saw it as a temporary camp they did not want to grant Johannesburg municipal status. In 1887 Paul Kruger, the president of the ZAR, allowed elections for a Sanitary Board, an early forerunner for incorporation as a municipality. Kruger allowed for some form of early municipal government in 1897. However, it was only with British occupation of the ZAR in 1900 that there was formalisation of the municipality of Johannesburg (Beavon, 2004: 40-41).

Separate development meant separate cities and separate management structures. What is now Johannesburg was made up of various smaller municipalities, like Randburg, Sandton and Roodepoort. The black townships like Soweto were managed first under the Bantu Affairs Administration Boards, and from 1983 the Black Local Authorities (Lipietz 2008b: 118; Beavon, 2004). One anti-apartheid slogan was ‘one city, one tax-base’ (Lipietz 2008a; Beall et al. 2002). A post-apartheid priority was the amalgamation of all these separate areas into one (Lipietz 2008b: 119).

In 1993 the Local Government Transition Act introduced a two-tier governance system, with separate municipalities within an overarching metro. The Greater Johannesburg Metropolitan Council (GJMPC) was formed to establish a better management system for the different areas that were
amalgamated (Lipietz 2008b: 122; Parnell & Robinson 2006: 341; Beall, Crankshaw & Parnell 2000: 379). The first local government democratic elections were held in November 1995 (Lipietz 2008b: 122). In 2000 the GJMC was replaced with the consolidated City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Council, with an executive mayor. The city was divided into eleven administrative regions, which were then reduced to seven.

The consolidation of the different structures into a single city came with enormous debts (Barchiesi 2006: 103-104; Tomlinson et al. 2003: 9-10;). The GJMPC was technically bankrupt in 1997, when the Gauteng Provincial Government had to intervene because the GJMPC had a huge shortfall at the end of that financial year (Tomlinson et al. 2003: 10). The provincial government interceded by placing a moratorium on all capital expenditure projects (Barchiesi 2006: 104) and the municipality accepted a PriceWaterhouseCooper (PWC) recommended plan to restructure city governance, called iGoli 2002 (van Rooyen et al. 2009: 11).

The plan was accepted in March 1999 and pushed through in order to minimise opposition to it (van Rooyen et al. 2009: 11; Barchiesi 2006: 105;). iGoli 2002 separated various services into agencies and utilities while privatising non-core business (Reddy 2003: 1). The utilities – water and sanitation, electricity and waste, compromised the income-generating leg of the plan. Parks and cemeteries, roads and storm-water were established as managing agencies, which were subsidised. The zoo, produce market, property company and buses were turned into corporate companies. Metro Gas and Rand Airport were fully privatised, while fleet management was contracted out to a private company (Barchiesi 2006: 105). iGoli 2002 aimed to run these utilities and agencies according to “sound management practices” that would stabilise and ensure the economic viability of the CoJ (Reddy 2003: 10). This restructuring process has been described as neo-liberal (McDonald & Smith 2004).

While there was cross-subsidisation of services under apartheid, this ended when the national government placed caps on what local government (LG)
could charge for services. A cut in intergovernmental transfers to especially 
local government meant that in order for it to survive, they had very little 
option but to follow a cost-recovery paradigm (Smith 2006; Smith 2004). At 
the local government level it “is not privatisation in the sense of a change in 
ownership, but rather a form of governance whereby new techniques, 
marginal cost accounting in particular, are implemented mimicking the private 
sector” (Narsiah 2010: 376). The neo-liberal turn that Johannesburg took with 
the iGoli 2002 reflected the post-apartheid agenda in that business desires 
were emphasised above an agenda of equity or redistribution.

After iGoli 2002 was implemented, the Jo’burg 2030 vision was drawn up 
aiming to turn Johannesburg into a world-class African city (Harrison 2006: 
329). A Spatial Development Framework was set up in order to support this 
goal (Harrison 2006: 329). The perceived decline of the inner city led to the 
revisioning and repositioning of Johannesburg as an African World Class City. 
According to Lipietz (2008b: 184), the world-class city vision was a political 
decision that CoJ management and the mayoral committee took, without 
much research as to what it meant or how it could be attained (see also 
Stevens 2006). The concept was meant to be inspirational and aspirational; to 
differentiate between Africa as a failure and Africa as success, by linking it to 
the flows of other globalised cities (see Seedat & Gotz 2006; Stevens 2006). 
Part of the creation of this African World Class City was the regeneration of 
the inner city.

In a bid to upgrade the city-centre, several City Improvement Districts (CID) 
were established in association with private business. These were retail, 
jewellery and fashion districts (Fraser 2008: 183). Public-private partnerships 
lead to the upgrade of certain spaces in the inner-city, for example Ghandi 
Square and Braamfontein. In Ghandi Square money was invested by property 
owners and provincial government to upgrade the square in exchange for 
business use in the square (such as outdoor seating for cafes). The result of 
this was an increased occupancy rate of the properties and increased income 
for the owners. (Fraser 2008: 185-187). These areas are patrolled by private 
security companies and as shown elsewhere in the world, this leads to
exclusion (Staeheli & Mitchell 2008). Miraftab (2007: 603) argues that these CIDs are used to “restructure urban space to serve the ideal of a world class city integrated into the global economy, at the cost of the city’s social and spatial integration” and perpetuates apartheid’s planning policies, but instead of race-based exclusion, class becomes the criteria for exclusion. This is reflected in the map for the different regeneration zones. The idea of regeneration districts in the city was suggested as a way to address the crumble and ‘save’ the city (Sandercock 2005).

I. Urban regeneration and the African World Class City

The deterioration of the inner city has been an on-going worry for business for at least twenty years. In the mid-1990s the first makeover of the inner city was proposed but never implemented. The Central Johannesburg Partnership was established in 1993 between the community, the local government and business (Lipietz 2008b: 260). When the ANC took power in 1996, they inherited a seriously decaying inner city. In their view the inner city posed a health risk for the residents, a security risk to the rest of the city, as well as being a threat to democracy (Rasmussen, 2007: 177).

The Inner City Position Paper (2001) is the framework from which the Johannesburg Development Agency launched the inner city as a major development point. Based on a vision for the inner city launched by then Deputy President Mbeki in 1997, it envisioned the inner city as being a “liveable…. city for residents, workers, tourists, entrepreneurs and learners” (Inner City Position Paper 2001). In its goals it focused on promoting “investment opportunities in the inner city”, an increase in rates, and then only a liveable city for “residents, workers, business and visitors” (Inner City Position Paper 2001). In the following section of the paper the focus is on getting the basics right in order to promote “investor confidence and economic growth” (Inner City Position Paper 2001). Their first goals for 2001 were the
installation of a CCTV system\textsuperscript{74} in the inner-city, controlling informal trade, taxi management, and effective service delivery (Inner City Position Paper 2001: 5-8). Then the issue of housing was addressed by making as a goal the improvement of housing stock in the inner city and attracting middle class residents to the inner city. Part of the plan formulated by the Inner City Position Paper was to place 1 000 (out of an identified 35 000) units as social housing for people earning between R1 500-R3 000\textsuperscript{75} p/month (Inner City Position Paper 2001: 9). The Metro Trading Company (MTC) and Johannesburg Development Agency (JDA) were formed as entities to deal with trade and regeneration in the inner city (Inner City Position Paper 2001: 15).

An example of the purely business focus of inner city regeneration is the inner city performance indicators that serve as measures for JDA success. The stakeholders identified are solely business and business owners (Martin 2006). This is clearly within the order of the neo-liberal city where decision-making and dominant interests are moved away from urban citizens to the corporate sector (Routledge 2010: 1166). A survey was conducted asking business respondents about informal traders whom the business owners view as responsible for grime and crime (Martin 2006: 41). It identifies removing/moving/formalisation of informal traders as top priority for JDA (Martin, 2006: 50).

With the implementation of iGoli 2002 the city officials planned three programmes for the inner city: Bad Buildings, Better Buildings and Unsafe Buildings programmes (Rasmussen 2007: 178). The Better Buildings programme “is an attempt to secure control and promote habitability in more than 230 so-called bad buildings in the inner city that are characterised by breakdown in service provision, control by crime syndicates, health hazards and other dangerous conditions, and non-payment of services to landlords

\textsuperscript{74} 216 cameras cover every inch of the inner city (Madumo 2008) Johannesburg inner city has become intensely surveilled on an everyday basis.

\textsuperscript{75} $180-360 or £114-228
and the city council” (Harrison 2006: 330). These programmes want to transfer buildings to business to invest in maintenance and upgrading or demolish the buildings and sell the land. Twenty five thousand very poor residents were affected by these evictions and inadequate alternative housing was made available. “There is now evidence that many of the programmes implemented by the city authorities to promote its global city vision have disrupted networks of survival and dependence” (Harrison 2006: 330). Simply put, people have nowhere else to go, they don’t live in bad buildings because it is a lifestyle choice, but as it is the only affordable place to rent close to work opportunities, and with low or no transport costs involved.

The city council established a multi-agency task force to lead the programmes, and several buildings have been emptied through evictions (COHRE 2005: 61; Rasmussen 2007: 179). The buildings were cleared on the grounds of municipal by-law contraventions, but the groups targeted were supposed drug-dealers and prostitutes living in the buildings (Rasmussen 2007: 179; COHRE 2005: 46). The multi-party task force links crime fighting with regeneration and see it as the only solution to ‘saving’ the city from criminality. This cleaning-up of the inner city in effect means a crackdown on the homeless and ‘cleaning up’ the neighbourhood to make it attractive to business (Sandercock 2005: 219). A technocratic planning discourse that links certain areas with the need to be ‘cleaned-up’ or regenerated implies fear, fear of people who are different, the agents of “disorder or dis/ease – women, the working class, immigrants, gays, youth…” (Sandercock 2005: 219). Bremner (2000: 191 italics added) argues that the CoJ sees the inner city as black, threatening and barbaric, and through urban regeneration it wants “its conquest and re-incorporation into the civilised white world of corporate respectability.” In this effort of regeneration the CoJ has often ignored its responsibility, both according to its own housing policy and its
constitutional obligation, to provide alternative housing for poor residents occupying the bad buildings.\footnote{The Constitutional Court in 2011 again found that the CoJ does not provide alternative housing and has ordered them to rectify this (Sapa 2011a).}

The path that Johannesburg followed is different from the one that Smith (1996) identified for New York. There was never a period that there had been any major concessions to the poor in Johannesburg. But the revanchist city, upheld by boosterist city builders and the neo-liberal policies that the CoJ implemented, are still evident in its actions of evictions of buildings and the arrests and harassment of informal traders. Lipietz (2008a) however argues that using the idea of revanchist city builders is not appropriate, because she believes that the CoJ policymakers were not revenge driven. Rather, the complexity of the inner city overwhelms them. She argues that there are not sustained grass roots organisations in the inner city with which they can work, while business presents itself as both sustained and coordinated. These circumstances give rise to the CoJ taking orthodox, unimaginative, pro-business paths, without being vengeful in their intent (Lipietz 2008a; 2008b).

While I agree that the CoJ has shown themselves to be particularly unimaginative in dealing with the inner city, I disagree with her assertion that they are not vengeful. The gradual greying of the inner-city, seen from the 1980s onward can be interpreted as the period of major concessions. But these concessions have lead to inner-city abandonment by business, who while they may not physically be in the inner-city anymore, still owns a lot of buildings. Thus the vengefulness comes into play with trying to make the inner city a place where business can become comfortable, and in this process exclude the poor inner-city residents who use the city to survive and live. In implementing regeneration policies, people are denied the Right to the City. The only legitimate people are seen as tax payers. This then affects who is seen as belonging rightfully in the inner-city, and how they can legitimately link in with public spheres.
5. Conclusion
This chapter discussed the spatial segregation of South Africa from the Dutch arrival in the Cape. Patterns of spatial segregation were enshrined almost from the beginning and were a result of conflict between the settlers and the /Xam. As the European community and farming activities increased, there was a gradual expansion into the rest of the country. This gave rise to more conflict between the Bantu-speaking people and the European settlers over land and livestock. The discovery of diamonds and gold lead to permanent non-farming settlements inland, and the entrenchment of South Africa’s mineral energy complex.

The demand for labour in these areas gave rise to the migrant labour system. It also gave rise to entrenched forms of segregation within cities with the compound system. The Bantustans and the Group Areas Act codified into law existing systems of segregation. Forced removals from inner cities to areas outside of cities followed.

Due to the negotiated settlement in South Africa and the influence of business on the ANC, South Africa willingly adopted a neo-liberal path, after apartheid. This has meant that inequalities in South Africa continued with high levels of unemployment and poverty. In order to survive, people are largely involved in the informal economy as the formal economy has not created enough employment. While the transition from apartheid ensured that socially and lawfully all people of this country would be protected by one of the most advanced constitutions in the world, the economical reality for the majority of South Africans has remained bleak.

Fragile stability implies South Africa is in a tenuous equilibrium, one that is low-level and temporary. It is low-level in that average individual income and welfare are low, in that people are pessimistic and risk-averse in their decision-making for the future and in that ‘society’s’ collective power to pursue its national goals is low. Nonetheless, it is equilibrium because there are no social forces likely to move it away from its current position, at least in the short-term. (Beall, Gelb & Hassim 2005: 698).
Despite the spatial and economic inequalities that exist, there seems to be no indication that anything will change. The forces that led to social production of certain types of spaces and economies remain intact, despite the vast inequalities of the system.

I also looked at the settlement of Johannesburg, which started its life as a dusty mining camp. While it started small, Johannesburg quickly grew into the economic powerhouse of South Africa. From Johannesburg’s foundation, spatial segregation was the norm. Black people lived in mine compounds or in urban slums. These were the targets of removal and evictions. Through this Johannesburg’s fractured and sprawling nature was enshrined. Today, Johannesburg remains fractured with racially identifiable areas.

Johannesburg is managed as a mega-city with a variety of management agencies. It embraced a neo-liberal city-management model with a focus on business management and cost recovery rather than redistribution. Inner-city Johannesburg is seen as decaying and in urgent need of upgrading, which is being done through an urban regeneration programme. This focus meant that people have been evicted from perceived bad buildings so that these can be regenerated. But this in effect means that the problem of poverty is moved around rather than solved.

The spatial history of Johannesburg produced a certain type of city. The social production of the city created spaces that were segregated. At the same time the social construction, the social relationships that were created between the city government and its management structure, led to relationships of inequality remaining. In these unequal relationships some people were seen as more legitimate in the city, while others were and still are the target of removal. They are seen as illegitimate citizens. This combination of the social production of and the social construction of space has meant that for some people participating in a (the) public sphere is easier, and more legitimate, than for others.
This chapter showed some of the broader context of the creation and change of South Africa and Johannesburg. Chapter Five investigates the creation of Joubert Park, the agencies involved in its management and the users of the park.
Chapter 5: Joubert Park

1. Introduction
The previous chapter sketched the forces driving South Africa’s spatial divisions and changes over time. Then it specifically explored the creation of space in Johannesburg. Chapter Four created the social, political and economic context in which Joubert Park is situated.

This chapter will first trace the history of Joubert Park, then it will introduce the projects and people using the park, as well as the agencies of the City of Johannesburg. It concludes with a discussion of Joubert Park as a public sphere.

There is a lack of green open spaces in what is today inner city Johannesburg. This is due to the intense densification of the city that was only meant to be a temporary miners-camp. According to City Parks policy, there should be four hectares of open space per 1 000 people. In the inner city though there is no open space left to introduce more parks. Although City Parks have investigated establishing parks on top of buildings or creating open space through multi-level, multi-use buildings, nothing has yet come of these plans. This leaves Joubert Park as one of the few green spaces in the inner city.

Joubert Park is in the heart of the inner city and well used. This is both in terms of the number of people passing through and active users. Since Joubert Park is right in the middle of several taxi ranks and the new bus rapid transit route, as well as being only a block away from Park Station it is a busy thoroughfare. The park is used by people on a daily basis. The Johannesburg City Parks (n.d.) estimated the number at 20 000 users per month.

77 This is according to a City Parks manager
While the history of Johannesburg is relatively well covered by the literature, Joubert Park itself is not. The best-known work is focussed on Johannesburg Art Gallery’s establishment and development (Carman 2006). As an offshoot of a gallery exhibition based on the photographers in Joubert Park, a book and article was published (Bethlehem & Kurgan 2009; Kurgan & Ratcliffe 2005).

A few of the works that does focus on the park is by Ndaba (2010), Farouk (2010; 2006) and Swart-Kruger and Chalwa (2002). The first is an honours report on expressions of citizenship in the park (Ndaba, 2010). Ndaba (2010) found that park users expressed a sense of ownership in the park, and while they said that all people were welcome in the park, the park users complained about the presence of homeless people. The traders inside the park also felt that they had less ownership of the park because the JMPD and City Parks removed them from the park.

JAG commissioned research on park users and their use of the gallery (Farouk 2006). This report found that park users in general had a limited interest in the gallery, and many thought that gallery was some type of government office, especially in the context of a large police presence. The report then turned its focus specifically to the young men who make their living pushing luggage between destinations, trolley pushers, and their movement throughout the inner-city (Farouk 2010; Farouk 2006).

The last study that mentions Joubert Park is a study of children living in the vicinity of the park and their patterns and reasons of use of the park (Swart-Kruger & Chawla 2002). They found that children were fearful of the park, that

78 In the South African system honours is the first year of postgraduate studies after a three-year degree course. As part of the degree students usually have to submit a short research report of limited scope, usually between 30-60 pages.
79 The JMPD and SAPS used the gallery parking as a place to park and launch policing excursions into the park. Farouk (2006) documents abuses by the SAPS against migrants. Farouk only describes a large presence and does not quantify what he means by large.
80 The study focused on four sites in Johannesburg: Western Joubert Park, Riverlea, Malvern and Pimville.
girls were in general prohibited from using the park by their caretakers, and that contrasting with this, boys’ use of the park was less constrained.

There is thus a lot of scope left from which to continue exploring the park. While the studies discussed have started to illuminate what may be happening in Joubert Park, they do not paint a conclusive picture of the park.

2. Joubert Park history

Joubert Park is the oldest park established in Johannesburg in 1887. The Mining Commissioner, Jan Eloff, felt that a park was needed in the newly proclaimed mining camp. The ZAR accepted the proposal on 15 November 1887 and set aside 6.5 hectares of land. Until 1891 nothing happened to this land until two proposals were placed before the Sanitary Board\(^81\) to lease the land to either the Horticultural Society or the Pirates Sporting Club. The Sanitary Board decided to rather develop the park themselves and a competition for the design was announced. The winning design was by GS Andrews, who later became the Town Engineer for Johannesburg. The land was ploughed in October of 1891 and planted with seeds and seedlings, some of which had been gifted to the council by the Royal Botanical Gardens of Kew. (Chris van Vuuren Publication 1986: 177).

The layout of Joubert Park “echoed the 18\(^{th}\) century landscape garden with its isolated and artificially natural forms, regarded as a symbol of ‘paradise’” (Chris van Vuuren Publication 1986: 46). The layout was the circle and cross, an archetypical design form. The design was a harkening back to the perfect English garden, a symbol that pleased the newly arrived Randlords\(^82\).

\(^{81}\) The Sanitary Board was a five-member elected board that dealt with issues of health in the mining town before Johannesburg was declared officially as a town. At that stage they could not raise taxes.

\(^{82}\) The Randlords were mostly English mining magnates who controlled the mines in Johannesburg, many having made their fortunes in the diamond trade. Famous names include Cecil John Rhodes, Barney Barnato, Abe Bailey and Lionel Phillips.
The park had a full-time gardener who took care of the many exotic plants, the fountain, pond and greenhouse. There were regular music performances in the park at the band stand, including the police band, Cape Town orchestra, and the Australian Commonwealth band. Band contests were also held. (Johannesburg Municipality 1926). The police band performed at the park each Wednesday (Chris van Vuuren Publication 1986: 46).

In the early years of the park’s development a gardener’s cottage, glasshouse and kiosk were erected (Johannesburg Municipality 1923; 1917; 1907; Town engineer 1904). In 1924 the park was fenced and gated, research in the
archives did not reveal the reason for the fencing (Johannesburg Municipality 1924b).

The kiosk was rented out through a tendering process that was run every year (Johannesburg Municipality 1924a; 1919; 1918). Band performances, usually free, were charged for when the municipality did not have the money to pay for them. The park closed after sunset, but on certain evenings when there was a band performance it would stay open. Electric lights were installed in 1914 for this purpose (Johannesburg Municipality 1914).

Racial discrimination was established in the park from an early stage with a ‘native latrine’ installed in 1919 for black gallery staff to use (Johannesburg Municipality 1919). ‘Conveniences’ for white park users were already erected in 1911. While black people could use the park, it was not clear from the archives where people would relieve themselves. This was similar to discriminatory practices that were occurring elsewhere in the city long before official apartheid. Recall from Chapter Four that black people in Johannesburg were seen as being temporary sojourners, working as either miners or as domestic workers. The city was built to the best colonial practices and having shared facilities would not have fallen into this paradigm.

Since the 1950s and 1960s the park has been a place which homeless and unemployed, both black and white people have used. “It is also the unofficial ‘home’ of Johannesburg’s tramp community – the ‘brethren of the road’ who migrate to Durban towards the middle of the year to escape the rigours of the Highveld winter – only to return when the swallows fly back from northern climes to build their nests in Joubert Park” (Chris van Vuuren Publication 1986: 177). These homeless men were both black and white as is still the case today. The role of the park as a haven for people with nowhere to go still applies today. While park managers deplore the ‘lizards in the sun’, homeless people still come here to relax, wash clothes and sleep during the day. This is also true for the people staying in the mostly dilapidated and overcrowded flats around the park.
Picture 9: Homeless person in Joubert Park (Goldblatt 1975a)

Picture 10: Homeless person circa 1986 (JAG A Book)
Through time the people living around the park have changed. In the early days of the park, people who lived around the park were well off (the late 1890s). Later the Randlords moved out towards the northern ridge and built extravagant mansions around the 1910s. The houses around the park changed from being single house dwellings to being torn down for art deco apartment buildings (1950s and 1960s) (Beavon 1998). The area became a place for the initial settlement of European migrants. People living in the surrounding flats, office workers and nannies with their young charges used the park. There were art sales on Sundays in the park, and over Christmas there was a light display in the park. This all led to a cosmopolitan space developing in Joubert Park. This diversity still exist in Joubert Park, but has changed in its display.

This section looked at the social production of space. I argued that from its establishment, the developers pursued a racially divided park. However, this merely reflected the context of the city. It was never completely segregated, however there were different conditions of use for people. Today the park’s users look completely different. The park is used by a majority of black users with very few women using it, and only a small number of children. Traders and various other interest groups extensively use it. In addition, there is a variety of projects within the park. The next section traces some of the history of the projects and their current status.

3. Projects in the park
   a. Greenhouse Project

The Greenhouse Project (GHP) is located in the northwest corner of the park. The area is fenced off from the park with a makeshift corrugated iron fence; a prefabricated wall separates it from King George Street. Entrance to the project is through a large locked gate that is opened by a security guard. From the outside the project seems abandoned.

The GHP was first conceptualised in 1998 by architect Vanessa Beck of Earthlife Africa, who was interested in environmental sustainability. Earthlife
Africa wanted to highlight to people issues around environmental government policy and demonstrate green technology. Earthlife Africa wanted the project to be accessible to ordinary people, and not in the northern, rich suburbs. In 2002 the CoJ and Earthlife Africa agreed to the site in Joubert Park. For the CoJ the project was a way to regenerate that part of the inner city, as well as a way to transfer responsibility of the maintenance of the park to others.

Before the project started, City Parks used the area as a plant depot, but this was impractical due to inner city traffic. The Victorian greenhouse was in a dilapidated state and dangerous with glass panels falling in, and needed urgent repairs. An agreement was reached between the GHP and CoJ, where the GHP would have a 30 years minimal lease. Part of the lease agreement was the conservancy. The GHP representative submitted in their proposals plans to upgrade the conservancy, using part of it as a conservancy and part as a restaurant and demonstration space.

Funding for the GHP came from various sources.\textsuperscript{83} The main funding for the project came from the Danish Cooperation for Environment and Development (DANCED) and the South African National Lottery. But DANCED cancelled the funding for the GHP when a payment of R 360 000 was due, leaving the GHP unable to continue with the building and restoration work. The reasons for the cancellation are vague, but a new manager at DANCED seems to have been the reason.\textsuperscript{84} This change resulted in tension between GHP and DANCED. The Lottery payment was also delayed, and was only paid out to GHP in 2011.

The effect of these budget constraints has been that all building works have stopped for the past three or four years. While the earth building demonstration office was completed, the Victorian glasshouse restoration and double-storey earth building offices have stalled. The glass of the

\textsuperscript{83} Information for this section comes from a GHP board member.
\textsuperscript{84} The new manager at DANCED wanted to prove his control at DANCED and at the GHP and thus cancelled the payment.
conservatory was removed and the site enclosed with corrugated iron sheeting. Some of the iron of the conservatory has been stolen and the building has severely degraded. The half-built earth building has been constructed up to the second floor, and has no roof. This has deteriorated to such an extent that the costs have more than doubled to save it.

Apart from the restoration of the buildings and the demonstration buildings, the GHP holds monthly meetings for community-based organisation (CBO) from different parts of Gauteng. This is their main focus at this stage. The recycling centre has since January 2011 also begun acting as a buy/recycle centre.

The case of the glasshouse is an illustration of neo-liberalisation at the local level. The CoJ shifted its responsibility for the glasshouse to an NGO. The NGO privatised the space and plans to commercialise it for end-users. Thus a previously common good has changed from use value to exchange value (see Chapter Three Section 2a for a reminder). Park users think that the GHP is no longer operational, and regrets the loss of the conservancy itself.

The project is inward focusing, struggling for survival and does not seem interested in forming bonds with other groups in the park. The only relationship that they seem to maintain is with the crèche, Lapeng. Lapeng arranges for children to visit the project to learn about gardening, and has visited some of the projects that meet in the GHP.

b. Lapeng

Lapeng (at home in Tswana) is a crèche that operates from the north-east corner of the park. The crèche compound consists of two buildings, an octagonal building which used to operate as a restaurant, but that was originally constructed as an open-air theatre and band stand. The second

85 They buy recyclable products from street collectors and sell it on to big recycling companies.
building is a rectangular building that is divided into offices and a hall. There are two sets of wooden play equipment in the compound, as well as a vegetable garden.

Lapeng started as an idea by Carol Liknitzky after talks with the photographers in late 1996. The photographers identified that a crèche was needed in the area. In 1997 a pamphlet was printed and distributed in Joubert Park and surrounds. It called for interested parties to attend a meeting about the establishment of a child and family centre in Joubert Park for October 1997 (undated and untitled brochure from A-books in JAG archives). A subsequent flyer was issued in 1998, offering day care for 3-6 year olds at the newly established Lapeng. It received initial funding from The Gauteng Department of Education (GDE), the Curriculum Development Project and Open Society Foundation (undated and untitled brochure from A-books in JAG archives).

Lapeng started out as three related projects, but only one is currently operational. Their main project is an early childhood development (ECD) centre. This project provides day care along the lines of a Montessori model.
for 3-6 year olds (Lemma 2008). They have between 60 and 70 children attending the crèche. Parents pay according to what they can afford or volunteer time instead. The second project was a drop-in art centre. Here older children could drop in on certain Saturdays to do art under the tutelage of young volunteer artists. This is now defunct, although Lapeng itself is still a resource centre for the teachers at many of the crèches in the high-rise buildings around the park. Teachers bring their kids to play in the open area, as well as getting ideas for cheap and easy art projects from centre staff. The third programme is the Ziyabide children and youth festival. This quarterly festival is focused on running child-friendly entertainment in the park itself, but has not been presented for a couple of years. These two programmes ended because of the funding crisis and the lack of organisational capacity.

Lapeng receives funding from various sources: UNICEF, Department of Health, and a United States based NGO, called the Global Children’s Fund. Recently their funding has slowed down. One way that Lapeng is generating money is through renting out their grounds for church services. Every Saturday and Sunday an African Apostolic Church meets for its services there. They pay Lapeng a small fee.

Lapeng prides itself on being a part of the park. This is because the need for the crèche was established in consultation with park users. While Lapeng does struggle, it seem to have widespread support amongst park users, some park users children attend or did attend the crèche, or if they didn’t have children, park users knew about Lapeng, and said that it was a good project. People could consistently identify what the function of Lapeng was and described it as a good place. Its financial future may be bleak, but based on the goodwill that people have towards it, it could remain in the park. It also has strong connections with all the other projects in the park and the manager prides herself on maintaining those. Right next to the Lapeng is the clinic.

c. Clinic

Next to Lapeng is a public health clinic in the park staffed by four nurses. The clinic is funded through the Gauteng Department of Health and the City of
Johannesburg. It provides a variety of services including immunisation, HIV/AIDS testing, a tuberculosis clinic and antenatal care. Most of the people visiting the clinic are from the area, although some people come from further afield in Johannesburg. According to the head clinic sister, most of the clients are Zimbabwean because so many of the people around the area are from Zimbabwe.

Apart from health services, the clinic also has a community garden on its grounds although they have very little to do with it. It is organised through a Community Public Works Programme (CPWP). This is run through an independent business that bids for contracts from national government. People taking part in the CPWP come from the community and receive a small stipend for working a few hours a week. The vegetables from the garden are then distributed to participants. The same CPWP is also responsible for some clean-up work at GHP and gardening at Lapeng. The last project in Joubert Park is the Neighbourhood Centre.
d. Joubert Park Neighbourhood Centre

The Joubert Park Neighbourhood Centre is situated at the King George entrance of the park in the old groundskeeper’s house. The house was first used as an advice centre by the City of Johannesburg in early 1999. It was started as a joint initiative between the Interfaith Community Development Association (ICDA) and the City of Johannesburg and was part of a wider effort to regenerate the inner city. They provided a mediation, advice and referral service for housing-related queries, accessing municipal services, grants and identity documents. The house was given to the community by the mayor to be run as a community centre. Joubert Park was seen as an excellent location for this purpose as it is central in the city. Other projects eventually started sharing the space: Joubert Park Project\(^{86}\), Creative Inner City Initiative\(^{87}\) (CICI) and the Youth Empowerment Network (YEN).

The Neighbourhood Centre started to operate in 1999 but ceased operation in 2002. There seems to have been a variety of reasons for this. The CoJ stopped funding for the centre since they had started an alternate advice centre dealing directly with municipal bills and social assistance programmes. According to the then administrator, Martha, the decision also had to do with a funding crisis in the CoJ, although the major funding crisis for the CoJ was in 1999. It may rather have had to do with the restructuring, i.e. iGoli 2002, brought on by the funding crisis. Also, according to Martha, there may have been financial irregularities because regular financial reports were not submitted to the CoJ\(^{88}\).

---

86 This project started from the gallery and actively sought to engage the park through performances. It later moved away from the park to the Drill Hall, and is no longer involved with projects in the park, but focuses exclusively on projects at the Drill Hall. The Drill Hall was constructed in Johannesburg after the second South African War as a military base. It is also associated with the start of the Treason Trial where 156 people were charged with high treason including Nelson Mandela. The military abandoned it in 1992, where after squatters occupied it. It was refurbished in 2004.

87 Started as an offshoot of the Joubert Park Project to train unemployed people in art skills. They moved to a location outside the park and the project was then terminated.

88 The administrator, Martha explained it as a fact that the then director lost the financial reports after his briefcase was stolen. He apparently had no back-up for the paper copies of the reports.
When the advice centre ceased to operate in 2002, YEN took over the neighbourhood centre. Martha, who worked at the advice centre, started working at YEN. David Liknaitzky started the YEN in 1998 in Tembisa. It focuses on training youth to overcome the “inner psychological oppression” left by apartheid. This oppression is overcome through training in life skills, such as taking responsibility and building relationships (YEN n.d.).

At the moment the YEN has significant sustainability issues. They have not run any programmes since July 2009 and there are no immediate plans, or money, to have any in the near future. The project is dependent on external funding, mostly from the Swiss South African Co-operation Initiative. This funding has stopped and the project has not been able to secure any significant funding. YEN staff believes that this is because of the financial crisis, as well as government corruption. Also, Liknaitzky has immigrated to Australia and it seems that without his presence and involvement the programme has suffered.

People within the Neighbourhood Centre have a variety of relationships with other people and projects in the park. They have connections with Lapeng, where they borrow things if needed, and the JAG, which is a sales point for their products. Previously, the GHP and the CICI trained unemployed people in creative and gardening skills. The previously close relationship, however, seems to have fragmented somewhat because of the treatment that one of the women who is part of the sewing project received from them.

4. The troubling case of the projects’ tenancy
As part of my research I tried to find out what the legal status of the various projects were that operated in the park in CoJ properties. I became interested in this because of two stories.

89 The programme also runs in Brazil and Australia.
Martha, in our interview, indicated that the community centre was a gift from the mayor of Johannesburg to the people of Johannesburg. By the time the advice centre became defunct, YEN had settled into the premises and stayed there. YEN pays no rent to the city for the property, which Martha said, was due to the fact that the house was a gift from the city to the advice centre. While this is not impossible, it does seem implausible.

Ken Swart, the manager of the inner-city office, told me that all projects were under the umbrella of City Parks. But in a conversation with Jerome Francke, of City Parks, he claimed that the projects were the responsibility of the CoJ. The status of the neighbourhood centre at least, if not all the other projects, thus became interesting and I decided to investigate by contacting the Johannesburg Property Company (JPC). Property management is the responsibility of the JPC. I contacted JPC and described the three projects and where they were situated. After searching their records they indicated that none of the properties had a lease agreement with the city.

It is difficult to ascertain whether this is indeed correct or not. A board member of GHP claimed that extensive agreements existed between the project and the CoJ, and since a senior city official had served on its board for a long time, this seems credible. What the positions with the other projects were is less clear. It could be that no agreements existed and they are now exploiting a gap that has been created through the management model of the CoJ.

There seem to be very little communication between the various agencies that the CoJ has created. This leaves a gap for people to creatively appropriate space for their own ends. However, it also leaves projects vulnerable for evictions from three sides: City Parks, CoJ and JPC because there is no clarity on their legal positions.

90 Lapeng, Neighbourhood Centre and GHP.
91 Parks Tau, who is now mayor, but was then a senior manager in CoJ.
One entity within the park that has clarity of belonging, is the Johannesburg Art Gallery, the oldest and most permanent of the presences within the park.

5. Johannesburg Art Gallery
The wife of one of the Randlords, Lady Florence Phillips, established the Johannesburg Art Gallery in 1910. She wanted to establish a premier art collection that showcased the British mining magnates' ambitions, cementing their place as contenders in the world financial system and at the same time 'educating the colonial philistines' (Carman 2006: 198, 201).

The collection was established through her persistent efforts in persuading the Randlords to donate money and paintings. These paintings were first exhibited at the School of Mines in Eloff Street on 29 November 1910. In 1910 the city council agreed to provide a site for the gallery within Joubert Park. There were lengthy negotiations between the Phillips' and the city council, because the city council was reluctant to spend any money on housing the gallery (Carman 2006: 156). In the end money from the Union Government was used to construct the gallery (Seedat & Gotz, 2006; Chris van Vuuren Publication 1986: 203).

Once Lady Phillips secured the land and some money to start building the gallery, she chose Edward Lutyens as the architect. The choice of Lutyens as architect made people in Johannesburg unhappy because usually, for an important public building, a committee selected the architect on the basis of a competition. Lady Phillips appointed Lutyens unilaterally, which upset local architects, although nothing came from their protests (Carman 2006: 234- 235).

---

92 The 'philistines' who needed educating in good taste referred to the miners and other workers who arrived in Johannesburg, not the black residents of the city (Carman 2006: 198-201).
93 In a typical patriarchal fashion, the Randlords and Sir Hugh Lane are often praised as the founders of the JAG. This was because the South African-born Lady Phillips, as both a woman and as a South African, could not be credited with such a feat. Instead, the British born Sir Hugh Lane, a 'civilised' person, being male and British born, was credited (Carman 2006: 202).
94 Lutyens was a British architect, known for his designs in England and India.
243). Because she was such a driving force for the establishment of the
gallery, she had the power to do this.

The first stone was laid in 1910 and the building eventually finished in 1915.
Due to cost concerns only the main building was constructed. In 1940 two
more wings were completed. (Chris van Vuuren Publication 1986: 203). In
1986 the last extensions to the building were completed. For the
Johannesburg centenary celebration the gallery was significantly extended,
funded in part by the Johannesburg Municipality as well as by a generous
grant from the Anglo American Fund. Half of the money was used for the
building, and half was placed in trust for buying art works.

The gallery entrance is south facing. The planned main entrance faces the
railway line, but the visitor entrance now faces north onto the park. The visitor
entrance is a ‘hole in the wall’ and is quite difficult to find on a first visit.
Gallery lore has it that the gallery was built the wrong way because Lutyens
was a British architect and wasn’t aware that the building had to be north
facing. There is a more believable explanation. When the gallery was planned
there was another park, Jack Mincer, on the other side of the railway. The
plan was that the railway would be covered and these two parks linked. That
would have left the gallery as a dramatic focal point in the middle of large
parklands. These plans never came to fruition. Instead, in early 2000 Jack
Mincer Park was paved over and became a taxi rank.
JAG also has a small gallery shop as you enter the museum. The gallery store is the domain of the Friends of JAG. The two gallery guides, employed through the Friends rather than CoJ, run the shop. It stocks catalogues from current and past exhibitions, books, and crafts from locally based crafts people. One of the people using the gallery shop is Ma Mary, who works from the community house. She makes soft toy animals from felt in bright colours. Other stock includes beads, glasswork and ceramic pieces. All the stock in the shop is on consignment and manufacturers pay a 10% commission to the gallery.

On the top floor overlooking the park there is also a small café selling tea, coffee, and a variety of fast-food, although it seems to have closed down by the end of 2011. The café has large glass windows as well as a balcony where patrons overlook the park. For most patrons and staff that is the closest they come to the park, since most of them never go into the park because there seems to be some fear of the park.
The JAG is managed by the municipality although it has a large degree of independence from the CoJ. There are other municipal entities involved in the park, which I discuss next.

6. Municipal entities involved in the park

Apart from park users the park also has involvement from a variety of city agencies. This is a brief discussion of the various agencies that are involved and that you will encounter throughout this thesis.

a. City Parks

Johannesburg City Parks is responsible for all public parks and cemeteries in Johannesburg. City Parks is the agency that was created specifically to take care of parks, cemeteries and environmental conservation in the CoJ. It was incorporated as a Section 21\textsuperscript{95} company on 15 November 2000 (Nel 2008: 5). The idea behind the agency is to deliver a management service to the CoJ in a way that is efficient and ‘business like’ (Nel 2008: 7).

City Parks however faces serious challenges. Nel (2008: 8-9) analyses the staff turnover at City Parks and finds that there is a steady attrition of staff, at 1% per year, due to deaths and retirements, which is not replaced by new hires. If this continues, as Nel (2008: 9) expects it will, then City Parks will have a serious problem in delivering the service as envisioned by the CoJ. At the same time the number of parks and open spaces that City Parks must care for has increased by close to 19% (Nel 2008: 18). One reason for the increase is a concerted effort by City Parks to create parks in areas that did not have parks previously, such as Soweto and Diepsloot (Occupational Risk Management 2009). City Parks also takes part in the Extended Public Works Programme (EPWP) a short/medium-term job creation plan by central government. Job creation is achieved through labour intensive programmes by outside contractors (Nel 2008: 14-16).

\textsuperscript{95}A Section 21 company is a company that is not intended to make profit and generally provide services.
Allegations of corruption surfaced against the Managing Director of City Parks in February 2010. These included that tenders were illegally awarded to close friends of his. One such allegation was the buying of their headquarters, where his close associate bought a building for R2.24m and sold it shortly thereafter to City Parks for R12.8m (SAPA 2010b). Further allegations against the MD included that whistle-blowers were fired, that the audit committee that raised questions was fired and replaced, and that whistle-blowers who worked for the union South African Municipal Workers Union (SAMWU) were harassed (SAPA 2010a). In February 2010 City Parks denied the allegations, stating that the law firm that published the allegations did so prematurely and without base. Yet at the same time, the managing director went on indefinite sick leave (Lekotjolo 2010). In July 2010 Williamson resigned as MD, even though he was cleared of corruption with mayor Amos Masondo stating that “no admissible evidence of corruption at City Parks had been found” (Mungoshi 2010). The effect of these allegations in terms of research has resulted in staff being weary of journalists. When I went to interview the manager of the broader park area, he kept on questioning whether I was a journalist rather than a student.

Inside the park there are workers responsible for everyday gardening and maintenance. There are also EPWP workers responsible for picking up trash within the park and a Community Public Works (CWP) programme that employs park wardens. At City Parks headquarters there are two people directly involved in the management in the park (i.e. budgets, strategic planning and vision).

b. Metro Trading Company

Metro Trading Company (MTC) is responsible for the management of the traders within the inner city. MTC is a municipal owned entity that was established as part of iGoli 2002. They’re remit is to formalise the informal traders by moving traders from the street to markets or into fixed stalls on pavements. They are also supposed to provide training and support for
informal traders and intercede on their behalf with the JMPD. These latter functions however does not seem to be a priority to them\textsuperscript{96}.

c. JMPD
The Johannesburg Metro Police Department is tasked with enforcing CoJ by-laws and traffic enforcement. They are generally seen as incompetent, corrupt, and harassing traders, according to the traders specifically but also in general by park users and gallery staff.

Although there are more agencies involved in the running or maintenance of Joubert Park in the inner city, they do not play as big a role in the everyday life of the park. These include the Johannesburg Property Company, Pikitup, and the Inner City Office.

Apart from the projects and agencies that are in, or involved in the park, there are also recognisable groups in the park.

7. Groups
These groups make up major parts of the park users. These include the chess players, photographers and the traders.

a. Chess players
There is a fairly large number of people coming to play chess in the park, although providing an exact number is difficult. There is a core group of around ten men who play and are in the park daily for the entire day. Then there are up to 50 men who drop by periodically during the day or late afternoons. There are two large-scale chessboards with well-worn pieces. During my research they also renovated and rebuilt two older chessboards. City Parks however did not supply any chess pieces and people do not use those boards. In addition to these chessboards, there are also five tables with

\textsuperscript{96} As perceived by informal traders, as well as admitted to by a person at MTC.
built in chessboards where you can bring your own chess pieces to play. In practice however people bring their own complete chess sets and play.

Some of the chess players use chess as a way to earn money. There are two ways of doing this. First, through serious gambling, about which I only heard rumours. No one whom I spoke to ever admitted to being involved in this, but they all said that they know of people doing it. A second way was through teaching chess, renting out their boards, and making small bets. This is all combined and the chess players don’t distinguish between these activities. So Thata, a chess player and trader, would teach people to play for R2 or R5 per game. If they won the game, they would keep the money, if he won, he kept the money. If you already know how to play but don’t have a board or wanted to improve your game, the same arrangement would be made.

b. Photographers

The photographers are a much more formal group within the park. There are currently 42-47 photographers, all male. Each photographer has his own spot where he stands and no one else is allowed to occupy that. They are organised in an association that has a bank account. The association organises the photographers, interacts with City Parks, CoJ and JMPD, sets prices for services and approves new photographers in the park. Together with the Joubert Park Project, the association has arranged photography and film courses at the Market Theatre Photography lab, as well as organised business training.

At one stage they had formed a cooperative where everyone would pay an amount into the bank account and then that joint money would be redistributed as a bonus in January, when the photographers are usually less busy. A smaller group had formed a business that worked together and shared events, but this has petered out. Today their main business is just to organise the photographers inside the park. Their two most important tasks are to set prices and to keep other photographers out of the park. New photographers are only allowed in if they are apprenticed to an old one, and can only have a spot when someone leaves the park.
The photographers work long hours, the first arrive as soon as the park opens at sunrise, and some only leave as the sun sets, seven days a week. Photographers also work at private parties and weddings. Some photographers have also learnt how to do videography, and use that as part of their side businesses. The better-established, and more successful photographers have branched out to this venture because you need relatively expensive equipment. Photos in the park remain their bread and butter.

Customers are often very loyal to a specific photographer, returning year after year to the same person. Through this return support relationships are established, and park users trust the photographers due to their permanence in the park. Some photographers have been there for 25 years or longer. David, one such photographer has been there since the early 1980s.

Today the photographers’ livelihoods are threatened by cheap mobile technologies. Where previously access to cameras and photo technology was expensive, it has become much cheaper. Migrants, for example, instead of having photos taken by a photographer and then mailing them home, now have friends taking photos with mobile phones and sending them as a mobile message. This is one of the reasons why more photographers have moved into taking ‘same-time’ (instant) photos that are used for passports and identity documents. While the photographers recognise the threat of cheap digital and mobile technology to their livelihoods, they tend to react with stoic resignation to the fact.

c. Traders

There are just under a 100 formal traders on King George Avenue. They rent their stalls from Metro Trading Company\(^\text{97}\) (MTC) for a small amount each month. The CoJ, on a permit system, also directly manages a small number of stalls. The traders are in no way organised and each merely looks after his or

\(^\text{97}\) The Metro Trading Company is a fully municipal-owned entity that is responsible for the management of the markets and formalised street traders within the city (MTC 2012).
her own interest while lending a helping hand to their immediate neighbour. There is an equal number of male and female traders. There is a variety of services and goods on sale: clothes, cooked food, hairdressing, medicines, kitchen towels, vegetables, Christian books, DVDs, phone services, roasted nuts and jewellery.

Traders work even longer hours than the photographers. The first will set up just after 5 am, and the last leaves at 9:30 pm. Some traders are there seven days a week, while others work elsewhere a few days a week – usually women, and usually as domestic workers, elsewhere.

There are also informal traders working illegally inside the park, as well as at the entrances to the park, selling goods. These traders are at risk of having their goods impounded by the JMPD at any given moment. They have very limited goods for sale, a few packets of chips or sweets or some avocados in season at most. These goods are displayed on boxes that measure less than 40 cm by 60 cm. The total value of the goods is usually less than a R100. Traders keep a weary look-out and grab their goods if it appears a raid will take place. Ma Judy, a trader who made the step from completely informal trading to a stall, told me how if her goods were raided, she struggled to get anything together for selling the next day. Each raid left her more vulnerable to deepening poverty. Nkosi, the cobbler, remembered how if his goods were confiscated, he would have to lie to his clients until he had money to release his goods. For the formalised traders, this is sufficient reason to pay MTC, despite the stalls being in less desirable positions.

One common problem that traders have is that they struggle with storage for their goods. The more permanent traders hire storage space in nearby buildings. Stanley leaves his things in a hair salon across the road, Nkosi and Ma Judy leave their goods at the GHP and the community house. Godfrey, Selinah and Sindiswe rent space in various garages from buildings across the street. The garages themselves are not safe, and they have to usually pay a bribe to the guards to allow them access, above their monthly payment.
The projects and groups each has different concerns about using the park and the challenges that they face. The following chapters explore some of these themes.

d. Church feeding scheme

One regular group of park users was the church-feeding scheme. The church, an African Apostolic church started by a Kenyan migrant, had premises in the inner city. As part of their outreach they had a feeding scheme three times a week in the park. They brought warm food, handed out clothes and preached. They faced harassment from JMPD as well as difficulty convincing city officials that they should be allowed to work in the park. For unknown reasons, they stopped coming to the park at the end of 2010.

These groups of park users are each informally part of the park. Each group has in them the possibility of being a political unit of some sort (a public sphere). Apart from the groups, people as individuals also use the park. People use it to relax, to meet friends, and to sleep. The park is well used and well loved by people. If there would ever be a public space that could foster mingling and public spheres, this would be it.

8. The park as public sphere

Was the park ever a place for public sphere activity? While public space is seen as a necessary precondition for the public sphere, it is not sufficient on its own. During apartheid public space was tightly controlled, especially in areas designated for whites only. I could not find evidence of the park as a place where public sphere activity had taken place historically. This was either through ‘talk’ or through protests. The only two incidents that I can describe as the public sphere making itself known in the park, took place at the gallery during apartheid in the 1980s

Protests were happening in public spaces in other areas of South Africa, it was often violently repressed. The Sharpeville massacre, in 1960, for example, was a protest march to a police station against passbooks that
ended in tragedy when the police opened fire against protestors. Similarly, the Soweto uprising of 1976 during which school children protested against the use of Afrikaans in schools, ended in bloodshed when the police opened up fire on the children. Public space was closely regulated and ‘white’ space, even more so. While the area around Joubert Park had started to ‘grey’ around that time, it was still considered to be white, and controlled as such. The incidents that I encountered here were related to the struggle against apartheid and were both focused around the JAG.

The African National Congress was banned from 1960 until 1990. Members faced arrest, detention, and at times torture. The apartheid security apparatus were intent on ferreting out what they saw as communists and subversives who threatened the stability of their constructed house of cards. In this context Carl Niehaus, a then student at the Randse Afrikaanse Universiteit⁹⁸ had joined the ANC.

Niehaus was tasked with forming a unit of cadres amongst Afrikaner intellectuals. He was also scouting for possible places to bomb in Johannesburg⁹⁹ (South African Democracy Education Trust 2004: 418). Since the ANC was officially a banned organisation, people who joined were doing so illegally and faced the possibility of arrest and prosecution. That is indeed what happened to Niehaus in 1983.

After his arrest he showed security police a ‘dead letter drop’ at the entrance to JAG behind a flower box (Rand Daily Mail 1983). This dead letter drop was a place where he would leave and receive messages from other members of the ANC. While the JAG was not welcoming towards black people, it did not forbid them from entering the gallery either. This created a space then where

---

⁹⁸ The Randse Afrikaanse Universiteit was a white Afrikaans university established in 1968. It was merged in 2004 with the Technicon Witwatersrand and Vista University to become a comprehensive institution called the University of Johannesburg. Today most of its courses are offered in English.

⁹⁹ At this stage the ANC and PAC had started the armed struggle against apartheid since it was thought that non-violent protests were not bringing about change. The gasworks and a South African National Defence Force recruitment office were two possible targets.
people of all colours could pass through relatively simply. In the light of the fact that the ANC was banned, it was a relatively easy way to communicate with people, irrespective of their colour. The JAG and the park were used as an instrument rather than a focal point for an illicit public sphere activity.

In 1988 the gallery again became the focal point for the illicit public sphere. Instead of being a place to meet it became the target for a bomb. A young ANC cadre was killed by a limpet mine on his way to the park and the JAG. The limpet was strapped to his body but exploded before he could get to his target, killing him in the process. The target for the bombing was JAG (New Nation 1988). He was given a hero’s funeral for this ultimately futile act. The bombing was part of the armed struggle carried out by the Pan African Congress (PAC) and ANC in urban areas against apartheid. The bombings were instrumental to place pressure on the government to negotiate an end to apartheid.

The incidents differed from one another. This exemplifies two ways to think of the gallery as well as the park. The first, using the park as a dead letter drop, shows that the gallery and the park were accessible enough so that black people could go there relatively unobtrusively. According to gallery staff and confirmed by the research of Jillian Carman, the gallery was always open to black people to visit although it may not necessarily have been a particularly welcoming space (email found in A-books). It was however perceived as a racist colonial space, by some at least (Mlothswa 2001).

Similarly, the park was a space where both black and white people could go. However, the status of black visitors was beneath that of white visitors. The park enforced petty apartheid with segregated benches and facilities. The park then seemed to have been an ambivalent place, even as the area was

---

100 Illicit only in the view of the dominant but exclusionary public sphere, perhaps better described as a counter public sphere.

101 These include the Magoo’s bar bombing, the Church Street bomb and bombings at the Wimpy fastfood restaurants.
greying (Morris 1999a; Morris 1999b; Woodgate 1987). Ambivalent, not because of the greying but because it was an open space, yet at the same time a space that was still officially regulated on the basis of race.

Although these are only two examples of political action in the park it does demonstrate that the park was a place where political activity could take place. It indicates that there have historically been politics in the park, that it was never neutral, even when many people may have experienced it as such. It shows that we can read histories of cities and countries in places that may at first glance appear neutral.

9. Conclusion

In this chapter I described the park and the parts of the park. I started to link the park and the projects to neo-liberalism. I will explore this more in the following chapters. I showed that confusion exists in the park with regard to the responsibility of people and projects. I also highlighted the significant threats that the various projects face financially.

I linked the park to an overtly political moment in South Africa’s history. This is one way of understanding public spheres inside the park. Although it is not straightforward talk, it remains engagements into what the protagonists saw as a better future.

However, I also highlighted how the park is seen in its decay and decline. I situated the park specifically in a racist discourse that sees the end of apartheid as a travesty. In this discourse the park, like the city, has become a place of disorder. In the next two chapters I will argue specifically against this, showing how the park is ordered in two different ways.

This chapter situated the park in a historical context. The park was a reflection of colonial practice in similar ways that the city reflected its colonial nature.
Presently, the park is home to several projects, some which tie in with the neo-liberal project that the CoJ embraces. The park is also used by various groups of relatively organised people, some of managed by the city in one way or another. I concluded this chapter by showing that while the park was strongly controlled during apartheid, there were some form of insurgent public sphere trying to insert itself there. While these actions were ultimately unsuccessful, they indicate that there could have been moments of such public sphere activity.

This chapter also answered the question of the context of creation of the park, as well as starting to answer how the CoJ and its agencies interact with the park and park users. This chapter addressed the social production of the park, but also indicated how the social production started to change.
Chapter 6: Mechanisms of exclusion in the park

1. Introduction

This chapter investigates the mechanisms of exclusion that exist in the park. These mechanisms are in two categories; those that are recognisable in wider South African society and represent practical knowledge; and the boundaries of interactions between groups of people specific to the park. There are many groups that have competing claims on park space. Chapter Five highlighted some of the groups in the park. This chapter tries to understand how groups and individuals are excluded from park use. Massey (2005: 153) urges scholars to address the social relations that structure open space, including those that lead to exclusions. The lens that this chapter primarily employs is that of embodied space as discussed in Chapter Three Section Four. I argue in this chapter that embodied practices based on beliefs and prejudices about bodies and their proper place in society lead to inclusions and exclusions within the park. These exclusions fracture any potential public sphere that could form in the park, and in the park reflect exclusions that exist in South African society at large.

When I asked park users who is allowed to use the park, they invariably answered that anyone could. This was also what Ndaba (2010) found when he asked park users a similar question. People identified the park as a place to meet friends, to relax, to hold religious services or to sleep. When people speak of the park they think of it as if there were no barriers to use, as a radically open space, in other words unconstrained use. Yet that openness is more perception than reality. There are clear boundaries to who can use the park, and in what ways. People are not chased away when breaking the

102 This also of course represent a sampling bias, I asked people using the park who were excluded but excluded users weren't in the park to ask.
barriers of exclusion, but there is distinct disapproval that often stops use even before it occurs.

While the park may appear disorderly from the outside, there are in fact fixed patterns of use. There is order in terms of who uses the park, when, which areas they use and how they interact with others. This confirms Massey’s (2005: 112) observation that what may appear chaotic from a distance, does in fact have order when you look closely enough.

While there can be multiple public spheres because people have competing interests, I wonder whether the physical exclusion from space means that a coherent public sphere (or project) cannot develop if people are physically unable to be in the same physical space. If, as Richard Sennett (2007) believes, that open and loosely regulated, urban space is important for democratic development, then the way that people exclude one another based on identity markers is a serious threat to democracy. The mechanisms of exclusion that I discuss here are reflected broadly in South African society.

2. Identity markers as mechanisms of exclusions
The mechanisms of exclusion that I highlight are seen as ordinary. They are unwritten, and often unspoken, dimensions of practices that exist in the park. They reflect fault lines that exist in South African society itself. They are not without prejudice and mirror issues with which South African society struggles. While the South Africa Constitution is acknowledged as being progressive, South African society tends to be socially conservative (De Vos 2012; McKinley 2010; Cock 2003). This section traces exclusions based on race, class, gender, sexuality, and nationality.

a. Race
There are two issues with regard to race in the park. The surrounding area of Joubert Park has an overwhelmingly black population. The gallery visitors
seem to be, from my own observations and from discussion with gallery staff, white\textsuperscript{103}. This leads to a situation where white people are coming into the inner city who would not perhaps go there otherwise. Yet these visitors in general do not visit the park, neither do the staff members, whether white or black go to the park. There is a small but consistent group of black art lovers who visit the gallery, attend the openings as well as talks by artists. The photographers also take their customers to the gallery for photos. Ordinary park however users do not go into the gallery\textsuperscript{104}. The question that this raises is whether a practice exists in the park that implicitly or explicitly excludes white (or for that matter Indian and coloured) people, and whether that same practice includes or excludes black visitors from the gallery.

As I indicated in Chapter Five, Joubert Park has had segregated facilities since early on in its establishment. This was a reflection of course of national and citywide trends and were not exceptional to the park. This segregation was encoded through petty apartheid, notably the development of separate bathroom facilities for whites and blacks, as well as separate benches and drinking fountains.

Nel Erasmus\textsuperscript{105} related the story of a black custodial worker in the gallery, who had gone to the park during his lunch one day. He had sat on a bench, when a policeman walked past. The policeman challenged him for sitting on the bench that was designated whites only. The custodial worker said that he always sat there and ate his lunch, but that he was leaving to go back to his job at the gallery. The policeman threatened him, upon which the custodial worker ran to the gallery to hide. When the policeman came to the gallery, the director barred him from entering. The next day the police came back with a

\textsuperscript{103} This is true of the adult visitors. Schools that visit, both public and private, were more diverse.

\textsuperscript{104} Research commissioned by the gallery showed that some park users think the gallery is government offices or a police station. This research was conducted in 2006. When I spoke to regular park users people knew it was a gallery, but no-one had been to visit except if it were to have photos taken.

\textsuperscript{105} She was director of the JAG between 1966 to 1977, so although she could not remember the exact date of the incident, it would have been between those dates.
large contingent of members, and took the custodial worker away. The
director did not know what had happened to him after that, but he never
returned to his job at the gallery. While she only related this single incident, it
is emblematic of race relations in the park at that stage. Petty humiliations
were encoded in the landscape through signs and practices.

Today the situation has changed; there are no longer formal segregation. With
the ‘greying’ (Morris 1999a) of the area and the end of apartheid, legally,
anyone can come to Joubert Park. Most of the users are black. There are
some whites using the park, most notably three white homeless men. During
most visits I would be the only white person in the park. This however does
not mean that anyone is welcome to use the park.

I record an occasion in my fieldwork notes (11/10/2010) that describes an
incident in the park, involving me:

At that stage a man selling ice-cream came past. He stopped to chat with
Steward [a chess player] and then said. “Ice-cream Rossinah, mhulungu”
(Muhlungu: white) I said I was Ingrid and no thanks. Then he said “Rossinah,
jackalas” (jackal) and walked away. I said to Steward that I think that guy,
doesn’t like me much. Steward said that some people only saw colour and

Picture 14: ‘Europeans only’ bench. Photo not explicitly labelled in Joubert Park but with a
series of photos from the park. (Cole 1968).
nothing else. He said that his dad taught him to see beyond that, but also not to become negative in the way other people are because then you just bring yourself down. I had the feeling that Steward was really trying to make sure that I was not upset.

Although for the ice-cream seller my colour was important, the chess-player endeavoured to assure me that to him, my colour did not matter. People note your phenotype, it is possibly ingrained in SA after so many years of privilege around race, and while some people may interpret it negatively, it is not universally so, as the next incident illustrates.

Another incident on the park (1/2/2011) is also based around race:

When I got into the park there was a disturbance. One of the older City Parks workers was chasing after a guy and shouting at him. The guy had a rock in his hands that he directed at the man who was running towards the gate. The worker was shouting to the man and shouting for people to stop the man. I asked people what was happening, and they said that the man running had just smacked a guy for no reason. Two cops caught the man and brought him to the worker. They walked with him to the middle part of the park to an old white man looking quite threadbare. He was clearly very upset. The worker told the police that the guy that was running away had just walked past this old man and hit/pushed him. The guy who did it was making remarks to the police in Zulu that I did not understand. Then the police told him something and he tried to apologise. He grabbed the man’s hand, who pulled back and said “I don’t want his apology I don’t want anything from him. I don’t want to make a case.” The police officer asked whether he was sure he didn’t want to make a case, and he confirmed and walked away. The police held on to the guy for a few more minutes but he was scornful. The police officer cuffed him and then let him go. The worker who had chased him in the first place said to me, “We don’t want that here, we don’t want apartheid here again.”

The worker was quite upset that this incident of racial violence or tension had taken place in ‘his’ park. He saw the park as a place that had moved away from the racial segregation of the past.

Both these experiences are focused on race. Yet in each of these cases, there were park users who assured me that race is not important to them or something that hinders anyone from coming into the park. The two stories above stand out because they are unusual. Although my race was noted, it did not bar me from the park. When there were incidents, there were people who rushed to make their disapproval known. When someone transgressed the rule of ignoring race, someone else would make this transgression known.
From my own data no pattern emerged as to who played the race card at which moment and why. While the ‘making it known’ is a sanction, it is a moral judgement.

White people may think that the park is a ‘black’ space and therefore avoid it. After interviewing Antoinette, the current gallery director, we talked about the park.

She also wanted to know whether I ever went to the park alone and I said that I did. After first going with an assistant, I went alone. She said that she always went with someone, and the staff calls it her “black-up”. (Field notes 16/2/2011).

It’s not only that she needed someone to go with her because there was safety in numbers; it was that the person who went with her had to be black in order to make her acceptable. This was in many ways similar to what I did when I initially started to go to the park. I did it because I was unsure how people would react to me, and how safe I would be. Because there are predominantly black bodies in the space it is seen as a ‘black’ space, where white bodies must have someone accompanying them to be welcome in the space. Space may seem empty of people, when there are no users like yourself in it (Milun 2006).

White South Africans have censored themselves out of the space of the park. While part of this self-censorship is just a reflection of different areas where people live or work, some white South Africans see the park as a dangerous place.

Some people see the park as a place of unruliness and danger. It seems chaotic and dangerous. It contrasts with their memories of the park as a haven of beauty and restfulness. When I told acquaintances about my research in the park, many of them would recall some memory of the park106; trips to see the Christmas lights, eating candyfloss and ice cream and living in

---

106 My first early memory of the park is from when I must have been around six or seven. We lived in a town near Johannesburg. I remember one Christmas my parents loading us into the car and wanting to take us to see the famed Christmas lights in the park. I cannot recall seeing the lights or the park but I do recall the excitement of going.
the area, and going to the park in the evenings because it was so vibrant. But at the same time they would mention a feeling of loss because the park has changed.

The feelings of loss that these acquaintances mention is similar to what Dixon (2004) found in his study of beaches in the Natal region where people experienced place dislocation after desegregation. Even though desegregation itself was a good thing, it fundamentally changed how white South Africans imagined their place identity. While some people may feel place dislocation, there are some people who feel that the loss of the park is indicative of something more sinister.

A blogger with the pseudonym ‘Real Realist’ blogs about the decay of the Johannesburg inner city in a series he calls The death of Johannesburg. In a specific blog titled ‘Joubert Park: Then and now’ he takes an old picture of the park (undated and unaccredited) and juxtaposes that against new shots of the park (Real Realist 2006).
For the Real Realist the destruction and decay of the park, and the inner city, and the country is directly linked to the demise of apartheid and the advent of a democratic citizenry. When Anonymous at 6:36PM challenged him on the circumstances of the decay, he answered, “the 'circumstances' are White Flight and their replacement with New South Africans” (Real Realist, 2006 comment at 8:04PM). The comments on the blog, apart from Anonymous at 6:36PM, follow the same tone of Real Realist, blaming urban decay on the demise of apartheid and the ‘unchecked’ movement of black South Africans (Real Realist 2006).

The Real Realist seems to want a return to apartheid, where whites dominated over blacks. Apart from the sense of place dislocation that white people feel about Joubert Park, there is also an active self-exclusion from space because of the very presence of black people.

South Africa’s history of racial segregation clearly influences what happens here, but there are other factors as well. Black spaces, like townships at the edges of white areas, were no-go areas, and while black people could and did always go into white areas as servants, gardeners and in other menial
capacities, the inverse wasn’t true. White people generally did not go into black spaces like townships. In effect, the inner city has for many white people become a township where they do not go.

The park has been labelled a township in a very literal way through Township TV. This is an initiative to bring large outdoor televisions to parks in deprived areas. Township TV broadcasts sporting events and children’s television programmes. Other Township TVs are located in townships, such as, Diepsloot, Ivory Park, KwatHEMA, and Kathlehong. One of its objectives\textsuperscript{107} is “to install big screen TVs in strategic locations within the Township communities of South Africa” (Township TV, n.d). Township TV declares Joubert Park a township, deprived, and in the eyes of many white South Africans, not safe.

Perceptions of feeling unwelcome in space may be another reason why people could avoid it. People may perceive space as empty, not because there is no one there but rather because there is no one there like them (Milun 2006; Madge 1997). Watt and Stenson (1998) show that young white suburbanites in the South-East England avoid certain parts of towns because they fear the predominantly South Asian and Afro-Caribbean youths. However, when the white suburbanites knew some of these ‘Others’ they did not fear the space, and would use it comfortably. Before I started fieldwork I felt uncertain about the park, whether I would be safe and welcomed. My fieldwork assistant came with me until I perceived the space differently. The park hadn’t changed, but my perception of the park had. I felt connected to people, I felt safe and I started to go alone.

Visitors to the JAG also don’t go into the park. Up until early 2000 there were sculptures displayed in the park. This was very popular with photographers

\textsuperscript{107} Other objectives are to give “sponsors and advertisers an incredible opportunity to reach their target market”, to give a forum for local government to showcase their social activities (Township TV n.d.).
but also drew visitors into the park. Dennis Beckett\(^{108}\) (1994) writes that he sat in the gallery restaurant and observed an elderly white couple going into the park to look at the sculptures. Although he worried about them, especially when they gave their camera to a young black man to take a photo, nothing happened to the old couple and they quietly left the park. Then in 2000 the gallery removed the statues from the park into the gallery grounds itself. This was due to the theft of one statue and the systematic breaking of others for their bronze\(^{109}\). This removed an attraction for gallery visitors to go into the park. When there are art events\(^{110}\) scheduled in the park, white visitors do go to the park. If the park placed sculptures in the park, not made from bronze, would this draw gallery visitors into the park again?

Few people who visit the gallery also visit the park. I record on 29 June 2010 when the gallery was hosting a ‘walk-about’ with the artist of an exhibition that of the 40\(^{111}\) people attending the event, none went into the park except to go to the Rea Vaya bus stop. The rest of the patrons left the gallery, hurried to their cars and drove away. Similarly, there were never any JAG visitors who would enter the park at other times. During the period of fieldwork I only encountered a group of three people who entered both the park and the gallery. Part of the reason that visitors would not enter the park, was that gallery staff would warn (especially) international visitors to avoid the park due to safety concerns.

Visitors to the gallery are now both black and white, although there seem to be slightly more white visitors. According to gallery sources, the focus on the

---

\(^{108}\) Beckett is a South African journalist, writer and television commentator. Most famous for *Beckett’s Trek*, where he travelled over South Africa and explored various issues facing the country.

\(^{109}\) The gallery has had problems with theft almost from its establishment. In 2011 there were several thefts, one a small bronze statue which seemed to have been stolen on demand and the theft of three bronze statues from storage, which was an opportunistic theft by a retrenched gardener.

\(^{110}\) The Giant Match: *Meet my in-laws* a street art performance in 2010 in the park with giant puppeteers, telling the story of Romeo and Juliet with a South African twist. This was a joint venture between South African artists and the French collective Les Grandes Personnes (Zvomuya 2010).

\(^{111}\) 16 people were black, Indian or coloured, 24 were white.
exhibition influences whether there are more of the one or the other. But very few park users visit the gallery. The most prolific visitors are the photographers, who photograph people at the statues. The gallery commissioned a study that showed that park users thought the gallery was a police station or other government office. My own experience was that new park users did not know what the gallery was, while more regular users knew but had never visited. Dickson, for example, knew it was a gallery but thought that you had to pay to go in. And although he wanted to go, he never had money to pay. Others knew it was a gallery but just shrugged when I asked whether they wanted to go or had ever been. Thus people exclude themselves from the gallery in similar ways that gallery visitors exclude themselves from the park, although the reasons may be different.

This can partially be ascribed to perceptions of safety. And the inner city has a reputation for violence and chaos. I highlighted the Real Realist blog and although he is an extreme case, he does echo a lot of white South Africans’ perceptions of lawlessness in the inner city. Dirruweit (2002: 13) argues that Johannesburg residents have ritualised patterns of movements. They avoid certain routes and roads based on a “particular imagery of the city” (Dirruweit 2002: 13). This imagery is not necessarily based on a statistical reality of crime figures112.

There are no officially named exclusions from the park based on race. Rather, it seems that white people are wary of the space perhaps because of a history of avoiding spaces that appear ‘black’. They exclude themselves. The concept of boundary work is important here. Boundary work can be defined as “the strategies, principles, and practices we use to create, maintain and modify cultural categories” (Nippert-Eng 1995: 7). Boundaries are maintained by different social groups who “do not always undermine, but often enhance, the

112 Crime statistics for the park are impossible to get from the SAPS. In the past there seems to have been some violent crime, including at least one murder, although it may be more than that. The history of muggings in the park is legendary, but these have also all but disappeared, at least that is what the SAPS (not reliably) and the photographers (very reliably) tell me.
boundaries that divide them” (Lan 2003: 526). People have active strategies to maintain the boundaries that separate them, with strategies from both sides, as in the case that Lan discusses between the Fillipina maids and the Taiwanese house owners. Although the possibility exists to challenge and change the way things are, all groups involved may actually choose actions that do not do so in the end, and rather choose actions that enforce the status quo. The boundaries that South Africans hold are often related to race, although in the following section I argue that class is becoming an even more important boundary.

b. Class
A greater barrier than race in entering the park, is class. In the same way that you do not see white South Africans in cars visiting the park, you do not see black South Africans in cars visiting the park. The white people who are generally in the park, are homeless men.

Some park users expressed a desire that people from different classes should not be there. Most frequently this would be applied to the young homeless men who sleep and spend time in the park. A conversation as recorded by my field assistant, Zwelaki, illustrates the class dimension in the park:

Thabo mentioned that if the park was well maintained, all the dodgy looking people would not enter into it as they would realise that they do not fit in. Both Thabo and his friend John agreed with the idea that people should be checked when they enter the park, in order to check whether their clothes are ‘on par’ with the standards of the park. If not, then the people should not be allowed in the park. If this is done, then other people would not feel insecure to enter in to the park (as done in night clubs). (Zwelaki field notes 30/11/2010).

The wishes of the two men related above clearly show that for some at least the park should become a privatised space such as a nightclub. Privatised not in the sense of being owned by a private owner, but privatised in the sense of being exclusionary and not an open public good. Their intuitive observations of keeping people out of the park if they did not fit the profile of a consumer,

113 I mention race first because given South Africa’s history, the obvious assumption would be that race is more important.
are illustrated in studies where public parks have turned into such spaces. Usually those who do not fit are removed, moved along and otherwise made to feel unwelcome (Staeheli & Mitchell 2008; Atkinson 2003). Liechty (2002) showed a similar desire amongst the emerging middle class and consumption-orientated society for space to become exclusive and excluding.

The irony of the vision of the two park users is found in the original Olmstedian vision of parks in the US context. Olmsted saw parks as a place where different classes could mix in order for working classes to take up Bourgeois values. But Davis (1992) has shown how in the American context, vision of mixing classes is dead, and that space has now come to resemble Victorian England through malling, privatisation of space and bunker architecture. While in SA space was never thought of as open due to the colonial and apartheid history, the Olmstedian vision of class may have been in the back of the city fathers’ minds when establishing the park. Carman (2006) shows that the establishment of JAG was meant to uplift the colonial philistine\(^\text{114}\).

In the same way that people exclude themselves on the basis of race in the park, people exclude themselves based on their class. While race and class are still closely matched in South Africa, there is a growing black upper class. These upper classes are not visible in the park. In both of the above examples I showed how people exclude themselves from space. Self-exclusion is a bigger problem than exclusion by others in this case.

c. Gender

Gender is one common site on which rules of practical knowledge are inscribed. The park is a predominately male space with males outnumbering women 2:1 or more. A study of homeless women in the inner city showed that women feel unsafe in certain public spaces in Johannesburg. One area that they identified was the area between Noord taxi rank and Park Station, where

\(^{114}\) And remember that the philistines were white people from different classes.
the park is situated. One reason that they mentioned for feeling unsafe was due to the fact that there were large crowds in that area, which they associated with the possibilities of muggings (Dladla, Hargreaves, Greenberg & Vetten 2004: point 5.2.3).

The above explanations are two reasons why there are fewer women using the park than men. There seems to be fewer outright homeless women in the park115, if I compare the number of men and women who are fed through the church-feeding scheme. There would be between 50 and 70 people coming for food of who three might be women, if there were any women at all. There was only one young woman who was associated with Lawn 1, and she was always with the same group. It seems that she acted very much as the matriarch of this group, reprimanding the younger boys if they did not behave.

In the green space of the park, I would often find men by themselves. There were mixed groups, as well as male only groups, but men were frequently alone in the park. When I asked why they were there they would say that they were relaxing, resting, sleeping, or enjoying being outdoors. Women on the other hand, were mostly in small groups, either of two or three women, as part of couples or as part of larger groups. The few occasions that there were single women, and I asked why they were there, they always answered that they were waiting for someone else to arrive.

The traders are equally split between men and women stallholders. And the thoroughfare past them comprises equally men and women. It doesn’t seem to me that the inner city access per se, is gendered. However, a much closer study containing a census of use at varying times of the day and various places in the inner city would be needed to confirm this. Impressionistically, I think the observation for the foot traffic around the park holds true.

115 This may however not be true for the inner city, Dladla et al. argue that women in Johannesburg are much more likely to become homeless due to gender-based violence.
As I already mentioned, men dominate in the park. There are no female photographers\textsuperscript{116}, and no female chess players. This is also true of the chess area. I was most often the lone female watching the game. When there were other females present, they were attached to a male interested in the game. I was the only woman who ever played chess.

I asked Dennis, a chess player, why there weren’t women playing.

He said another difference between white and black women is that black women wouldn’t go where there is a group of men only. That is why black women don’t play chess here, not because they can’t, but because there are no other women here. “But white women, (pointing to me), are different because they will go to a place, even if there are no other women around.” (Field notes 11/10/2010)

To him, the reason why women don’t come to play, is the profile of the other players. If there were women players, then more women would come to play. But since there were none, no woman would come to play on her own. Another observer piped up at that stage and said women couldn’t play because they have to go home to cook. Paul, a chess player, later told me that there used to be a woman who played there, but that she hasn’t been there for a long time.

All the chess players were extremely kind to me when I played and had no issue with me playing, except for the fact that I am a really bad player. One incident did indicate though that perhaps my presence was more unusual than I had realised.

Paul [a chess player] played with me. We played three games and although I won, it was with tutoring where he and Thata would tell me to go back, make another move, try again and redo. So I won those games as well but not really. While we were busy playing a man walked behind Paul and saw him play. He called out to him that "what are you such a sore loser after losing so much against me that you now have to slaughter a woman". Everyone around the table thought it was hilarious. (Field notes 1/2/2011).

So although the person could not know whether I was a good or bad player, the automatic assumption was that I must be bad because I am a woman.

\textsuperscript{116} Although the work of Terry Kurgan on the park photographers documented a single female photographer, sharing a spot and camera with a few men. One of the photographer’s sister have helped him out in the park when he had an appointment elsewhere.
Had the person looked at the board, he would have seen that it was favourable towards me. Again, while there is no stated rule that women shouldn’t play, there is exclusion based on subtle hints.

Paul was also seen as breaking another rule, and that is that he was being too aggressive against a weaker player. Amongst the chess players there are rules that must also be followed. One of these is not to demolish a weaker player completely. Weaker players are not supposed to play against the very best players, the best players play later in the day, while the new and emerging players do so early in the day. Weak players will be defeated very quickly in the afternoon and then discouraged from playing. Strong players can play in the morning, but must then play a more gentle game. Otherwise, the watchers will admonish him to do so.

![Image of the rules of the game](image17)

**Picture 17: The rules of the game (It says: The mind game 1. Touch is a move, 2. Do not disturb, 3. Do it just).**

There are however some spaces that are recognisably female. The clinic is an example of this. The services that they offer focus on both men and women. Yet the majority of the visitors to the clinic are women. Although the head nurse at the clinic told me that they have some men coming for HIV and STD testing as well as primary care, the patients sitting and waiting, both inside
and outside the clinic are female\textsuperscript{117}. Just as with the chess area, men are welcome, but seldom use the area. Even someone like Scott who knows the park well, sees the clinic as being a female space, as this quote illustrates:

And that side it’s the clinic, it’s for ladies and babies, ja, the clinic is for ladies and kids for polio for ladies tablets what do you call it, tablets and there are some another specialist volunteers.

The same observation can be made for the children’s play area. Although children are supposed to be accompanied by an adult, this rarely happens. There is a security guard standing watch and he is supposed ask people who are there without children to leave. However, I sat at the children’s playground and took pictures around it a few times, and was never chased away. Zwelaki, my male fieldwork assistant, was asked to do so when he stayed in the area for longer than a few minutes. When an adult accompanied a child it was mostly a woman, or a family member. This is also a female space in the same way that the clinic is a female space.

Some spaces in the park is more neutral. Men and women mingle in the open spaces, although there are more men. Couples sit and cuddle on the benches and walk around holding hands. Women generally tend to be in groups if they use the park, or are waiting to be joined by someone else. Men are much more likely to be on their own.

The exception to this is two distinct spaces in the park, that is Lawn 1 (by the community house) and Lawn 3 (by the gallery). In Lawn 1 there are only ever young men. This lawn is a slightly scary place. On Lawn 3 the majority of users are male, usually young homeless men sleeping. When there are women, they are with a male. The two central lawns, between the clinic and the children’s playground and the lawn closest to the crèche, are more likely to have single women waiting or women with children.

\textsuperscript{117}I cannot recall a single visit where I have seen a man waiting to go into the clinic.
I related in Chapter Two Section Five, experiences of being approached as a woman in the streets. Although I understand that my positionality as a white middle class woman has a lot to do with these experiences, it is also a form of street harassment. “Street harassment occurs when one or more strange men accost one or more women whom they perceive as heterosexual in a public space...[t]hrough looks, words, or gestures the man asserts his right to intrude on the woman’s attention, defining her as a sexual object, and forcing her to interact with him” (di Leonardo 1981: 51-52). The distinction between badinage (flirting/witting exchanges) and street harassment is women having the choice between engaging in banter and friendliness, and being forced to interact. Street harassment can be on a continuum of catcalling to pinching and slapping, stalking or murder (Gardner 1995: 4). Street harassment creates a feeling of sexual terrorism that is meant to curb the ways that women, in all shapes, colours and sexualities, move in and around space (Stop Street Harrasment 2012; Gardner 1995; Arveda Kissling 1991).

Street harassment has increased because women are venturing increasingly more in public space without accompanying males or children (di Leonardo 1981). Di Leonardo argues that men are lashing back at women because of their perceived loss of patriarchal power much in the same way that revanchist cities are a middle class backlash. The discussion of where women belong, or how they behave, in public space, is often a discussion of where women belong in society (Andrews 2009; Newcomb 2006). Being out in the street for a woman means that she is not at home, and she loses her honour (Teppo 2009: 224). Women are from a young age taught to avoid public spaces because they are seen as dangerous.

The exclusion of women in public spaces is similar to the exclusion of women in public spheres, or the ignorance of their own public spheres. While women form separate public spheres, and while it is not bad per se that they have these public spheres, the complete ignorance of women in space, and the lack of acknowledgement of their public spheres, means that women’s concern and voices remain unheard.
If gender is a theme of how people are treated and an imperative for people to behave in certain manners, how does sexuality play out as an exclusionary element?

d. Sexuality

“Hetero-normativity is the institutionalisation of exclusive heterosexuality in society. Based on the assumption that there are only two sexes and that each has predetermined gender roles, it pervades all social attitudes” (Steyn & van Zyl 2009: 3). It is the accepted and dominant mode of acting in most public spaces and normalises heterosexuality (Brickell 2000). Any practices falling outside this strict hetero-normative mode are seen as deviant (Gruszczyńska 2009: 315-316).

This normality is enacted through heterosexual couples kissing and walking hand in hand in public space. Where homosexual couples exhibiting the same behaviour, it is seen as ‘odd’, deviant or provocative. This dominant hetero-normativity that Gruszczyńska (2009) sees in Poland is also on display in Joubert Park. In the year that I did fieldwork, there were never any other displays except for heterosexuality in the park. Considering some of the negative and derogatory sentiments expressed by people within the park, a homosexual couple walking or sitting in the park, walking hand in hand or cuddling, would not have been welcome.

The very idea of a same-sex couple seemed to be distasteful to park users. A conversation that I had with Nicholas, an MBA student who frequented the neighbourhood centre, points to this

While I was busy chewing my way through a liver sandwich, Nicholas asked me how I felt about polygamy. He said that in the world there is a shortage of men and more women. This leads to a situation that if a woman wants to be married she must consent to be part of a polygamous marriage, have an affair, or stay single. I pointed out that there was another option and that was for women to have relationships with women. He said of course lesbianism is an option, but pulled a disapproving face indicating his distaste for that idea. (26 August 2010)
We continued the discussion by speaking of polygamy and even the possibility of polyandry. But it was clear from his body cues that to him the idea of women having relationship with women is unnatural.

I had a similar conversation with a group of young men in the park, this time concerning male sexuality. The young men in the group were talking about relationships.

One of the young men was teasing his friend and said that he was married to another young man in the group. I accepted this at face value, which caused much hilarity in the group. When I asked how I would know whether this was true or not, the group burst out in laughter. The group shook their head and one of the guys said ‘no that is wrong’. (Field notes 4 March 2011).

This is opposed to the accepted practice of heterosexual couples kissing and cuddling in the park. Many park users indicated that this is acceptable to them, even though a few people indicated discomfort with the extent of the petting activities. The clinic sister, Vicky, thought that sometimes couples went too far, and that it has become a place where people come for sex, away from their crowded flats. While I never saw anyone having sex in the park, there were always couples in the park, holding hands, kissing and cuddling. Being in the park as a heterosexual couple is ‘normal’.

The feelings that these young men and Nicholas displayed are very similar to those shown in everyday South African society, from distaste to open violence. The epidemic of corrective rape, where lesbian women are raped, and often murdered, in order to ‘cure’ them of their feelings for women by showing them what sex with a real man is like, has become a scourge of townships in SA (Fihlani 2011). Ordinary discrimination however also persists, verbal abuse, ridicule, harassment and intimidation is part of everyday life (Human Rights Watch 2011). While Vetten and Dladla (2000: 71) found that lesbian women feel safer in the inner city than in the townships, this has not translated to these women acting freely in general inner city spaces, at least not in the park. Black lesbians and transgender black men learn that verbal and physical abuse and violence is normal against them and expect to be raped and often stay indoors or close to home to avoid exposing themselves. This happens in the context of violence from friends, family and
acquaintances (Human Rights Watch 2011: 45) and discrimination in the school and workplace (Human Rights Watch 2011: 57, 60-62).

Although there may be a specifically angry reaction towards different sexualities, especially of women in South Africa, it is not unique to this country. With homosexual populations becoming more visible in some countries, little attention has been paid to inclusive planning except in creating and managing ‘gay areas’ and in urban regeneration (Forsyth 2001: 344-347). The focus in the planning literature is around pride parades that are often tolerated and encouraged by city governments (Forsyth 2001: 353). Perhaps this encouragement is a form of carnival, where social norms can be challenged and critiqued for a day, but does not lead to widespread change, much like the carnivals. Scant attention has been paid to creating tolerant public spaces for public displays of affection between same sex couples. This is despite research showing on almost all continents that same sex couples experience harassment for such behaviour (Forsyth 2001: 357).

In South Africa the claim against homosexuality is justified on the basis that it is unAfrican. However “[c]urrent histiography of sexual practices in Africa…indicates that homophobia - as discrimination and Othering- not homosexuality - as same sex practice - was a colonial import” (Steyn & van Zyl 2009: 6). Niehaus (2009) shows how migrant miners often had male sexual partners in the mining compounds, while having wives or girlfriends at home. But far from being only a reaction to the male migrant system, it was “presented a unique opportunity for intimacy and romance” (Niehaus 2009: 87).

One way to understand violence against women is to see it as a way to control their sexuality (Artz 2009: 173). Being lesbian places you outside the direct control of men who must react against it violently as “terror is used as a means of settling masculinist boundaries” (Artz 2009: 174). This link between violence against women and violence against homosexual women is all part of trying to control women. No wonder then that women are rarely in the park
alone, or that homosexual couples do not display affection publicly. Another
dimension of exclusion in parks is around nationality.

e. Nationality
Another mechanism of exclusion is around nationality. These are much harder
to discern. Noussia and Lyons (2009) observed that different nationalities in
Omonia Square used different paths and avoided contact in the square. The
different nationalities that they observed were easily identifiable: young South
East Asian men contrast radically with middle-aged Eastern European women
(personal communication Lyons 2011). Within Joubert Park the distinction is
not clear between nationalities. Often the only thing that would indicate
nationality is the context of the conversation, an accent, or if the person
admitted to me to being of a certain nationality.

The photographers are a mixture of nationalities: South African, Zimbabwean,
Swazi and Mozambican. This does not seem to cause any tensions among
the photographers. Rather, the length of time that you have been a
photographer in the park is a better indication of acceptance. Thus a
Zimbabwean photographer, Scott, who has been in the park for 15 years, was
chairperson and later vice-chairperson of the photographers’ association.

With the chess players the same seems to be true. There were people playing
from Zimbabwe, Swaziland, Lesotho and elsewhere, with no sign of tension
between players from different regions. The only time that a chess player
mentioned nationality to me was when he remarked on the difference
between South African and Zimbabwean chess players.

He said the problem with the chess here is that people only learnt it later while
the Zimbabwean guys learnt it at school. This means that they are very difficult
to beat, especially since they make their living from playing tournaments and
living off the prize money. (Field notes 13/1/2011)

While no-one has told me of tensions around these, it could be possible that
some could develop around it, especially since people play chess for a scarce
resource, money.
On the open lawns, I have met groups of people who are mixed in terms of nationalities. There are South Africans, Zimbabweans, Botswanans, sitting and talking without any seeming tension between the various people. One obviously missing group was Nigerians.

Hillbrow is an area perceived by some to be a Nigerian hub. Simone (2003) for example writes about the extensive participation of Nigerians in public life on the streets of Hillbrow, where people are out on the streets, mingling with one another in an attempt to participate and be seen. Yet in the park I never met a single Nigerian person, although Hillbrow borders the park. People in the park, both South Africans and others, expressed xenophobic attitudes towards Nigerians as the following excerpt from my field diary relates.

What would you do with a drug user anyway, because they just stay there and smoke. The real problem is the dealers. The dealers are all Nigerians. I asked how he knew they were Nigerians and he said “Have you ever heard of a Zimbabwean drug dealer?” The Nigerians (according to him) are corrupt in their country and are spreading their corruption through the rest of Africa. The reason however that the Nigerians come to South Africa is because they are wanted [for crime] in their countries. (Field notes 19/10/2010)

**(Botswanan speaking)** Also he asked the one guy, a Zulu friend of his, why do South Africans not want to share with their neighbouring countries like Zimbabwe and Botswana rather he says, that they trust Nigerians. And Nigerians are loud and they cheat and they are in your space. Why he asks would you rather have them than us. The Zulu guy said that just wait soon the Nigerians will be kicked out. (Field notes 16/2/2011)

What is interesting of course is that all comments from both of the above quotes come from non-South Africans. Perhaps these men could have been a target of xenophobic attacks in 2008 and wanted to create another group that could be demonised. The author, Bessie Head (1995) in *Maru* tackles this, where each oppressed group, oppresses someone else.

This of course is speculation on my part as there could be other reasons apart from xenophobic fears for Nigerian people to stay away from the park. There might be a different space that they prefer, they could prefer to be in the

---

118 As the excellent movie District 9 showed, even a movie that offers a critique of how foreigners are seen in SA, uses Nigerians as the ‘really’ bad guys.
streets rather than the parks or that they are simply too busy to come to the park. They, like others, could perceive the park to be an unfriendly space and this could keep them away. Apart from these xenophobic attitudes expressed towards Nigerians, South Africans also expressed these towards other African nationals.

South Africans also expressed xenophobic sentiments to me.

We were sitting there when two women walked past the window, chatting to one another. Pinky said that “the minister has spoken. Their time is up.” She said that they [the women] were speaking like ducks, kwah, kwah kwah and then they [she] didn’t understand what these women said. But now the government has made new rules, where foreigners must register and then go. (6/10/2010)

Ma Mary was also sitting there and nodding her head in agreement. Both these women have sophisticated understandings of politics and support ideas of fair redistribution of resources. But Pinky, with Ma Mary offering no resistance, fell into a discourse that sees foreign migrants as undesirable. A gallery employee expressed similar sentiments of resentment towards Zimbabwean migrants. She acknowledged that the xenophobic attacks were wrong, but felt that especially the Zimbabwean migrants had brought crime and corruption into the inner city. She cheered the removal of Zimbabweans from the street by the police even when she acknowledged that the SAPS and JMPD are corrupt in their dealings with them. Farouk (2006) in his research found that African migrants were often arrested by the SAPS in the park, held in police vans for the entire day, and only allowed to go when bribes were paid. During my research period the SAPS had stopped the practice of parking at JAG and keeping people in police vans for the day, but perhaps people remember that the practice existed and therefore avoided the park.

Another place where you can see xenophobia is the exploitation of foreign traders by South Africans. It is especially in two areas that this can be seen. According to MTC rules only South Africans can access the stalls to rent. There was a process of allocation where people trading outside the park were placed on a list and then stalls built and rented to them. At least some of these stalls are now sublet by the owners to foreign migrants at highly inflated prices. If subletting to South Africans the rent is doubled (so a R50 stall would
be R100), the price for non-South African traders increases to triple or even more. The top price was rumoured to be a R1 000 for a stall. This runs in conjunction with the exploitation by the JMPD and SAPS who ask bribes from foreigners, alongside the bribes that they extract from traders in any case.

It is difficult to say whether these feelings of xenophobia influence the ways in which migrants act. There is definitely an awareness of xenophobia. Dickson would not admit to being Zimbabwean for a long time. He said to me that the South Africans who held xenophobic attitudes were simply stupid and lazy. Another young Zimbabwean, Jonathan, thought South Africans stupid for their xenophobic beliefs and claimed that he attacked South Africans in revenge.

The reasons that Misago et al. (2009) give for the xenophobic violence show that access to resources (job stealing, business competition, RDP houses) motivates attacks. Although Misago et al. explain the violence, as being instigated by local leaders vying for political positions, South Africans give access to resources as the main reason. Accessing leadership positions gives people access to resources so these reasons are not mutually exclusive. The ANC also calls on imagery of nationalism to articulate freedom (Hart 2007: 94), which then creates an atmosphere of xenophobia. A lack of service delivery is blamed on foreign nationals instead of government failure (Office of the Chief Whip ANC 2011). This could imply that as long as economic freedom remains deferred, other nationals will get the blame.

The markers of exclusions that I discussed shape access to and the use of space. These themes of exclusion can be understood as part of two axes of the theoretical framework; the social construction of space and embodied space. The ways that people interpret bodies, whether they are white or female or gay bodies, lead to the connections that they form within the park. In other words, this influences the social construction of space. Although all the exclusions I spoke about work independently from one another, they also come together in unique and different ways depending on the contexts. This coming together is best understood through the idea of articulations.
3. Articulations

As I started to show, some of these expressions of exclusions are linked. Thus being a woman, being of a certain class, and being a foreign migrant, all articulate in different ways.

I use the concept of articulation, as theorised by Stuart Hall (1996) and Gillian Hart (2002; 2007) to understand how these modes of exclusions are linked. To understand something as articulated, is to see it as sets of relations (Hall 1996: 33).

Articulation is a complex concept without a clear definition.

By the term ‘articulation’, I mean a connection or link which…requires particular conditions of existence to appear at all, which has to be positively sustained by specific processes, which is not ‘eternal’ but has constantly to be renewed, which can under some circumstance be overthrown, leading to the old linkages being dissolved and new connections – re-articulations-being forged (Hall 1985: 113-114 in Hall 1996: 37)

Articulation is the process whereby ‘things’, whether they are social relations or modes of production, come together to form new ‘things’. This new ‘thing’ that is created is not static, but can change again, or can rearticulate in a new form. With articulation “they [the various social identities] are mutually articulated, but remain specified by their difference” (Samson 2010: 407). Articulations try to go beyond intersectionality to form a non-reductionist understanding of related phenomena (Hart 2007: 90). Articulation does not reflect, instead it makes a new unity from the axis of difference (Hart 2002: 28).

Two images for understanding articulation are useful, one of a leg and one of a transformer toy. The leg is composed of different parts joined together to make something different and new. Another way to see articulation is as a transformer toy, where each thing when put together becomes something new. Together the different constituted parts make up something new and unique.
Articulation was first used in the South African context by Harold Wolpe who argued that apartheid was a new type of exploitation, based on two different modes of production\textsuperscript{119} (Hart 2007; Hall 1996). In the South Africa context articulations usually only included race and class. But gender, sexuality and nationalism, are missing and must be accounted for when speaking about articulation (Hart 2007: 89; Hart 2008; Glassman 2009). This is because discrimination also manifests through these or along these lines.

Each of the modes of exclusions is articulated with others. Young black women will have a different, although related experience, to middle-aged women, or white homeless men. Older women, older men, professionals, and homeless, will all have related experiences, but each will be articulated differently because of their identity markers, and the ways that are evaluated and give access to the park. Each combination acts as a new form, such as the young black male park users.

4. Young black male-ness
One group that I want to consider is the groups of young black men who use the park. Although from the previous discussion it would be reasonable to assume that as men they would have more privileged access to space, I however want to argue that they have less.

As previously mentioned, the young black men generally congregate on two lawns: Lawn 1 and Lawn 3. They often appear quite dangerous, and are rumoured to sell and use drugs. When I spoke to them it wasn’t on these lawns but in other places in the park. This fits with Day’s (2006) argument that for young black men being feared in public space is normal, everyday, and that this fear is used to normalise class interests.

\textsuperscript{119} Wolpe argued that apartheid was not only an extension of segregation, but that it was an articulation between two different modes of production, a capitalist one that exploited cheap black labour, and a pre-capitalist one that relied on subsistence agriculture on the reserves (later homelands).
These young men come from various places. Some are migrants who came from nearby countries because they thought they would be able to make money and send it home. Others are South Africans who have run away from their families. Their ages range from perhaps mid-teens to mid-twenties. Some of the young men make their living from collecting recyclables or helping people with their luggage (trolley pushers). Some live on the streets, sleeping near Park Station, while others make enough money to share rooms in flats.

The young men here have nowhere else to go. In order to sleep in a shelter in Johannesburg you need to be South African and have R8 to pay. For many this was just impossible to obtain. Finding a place to sleep that was safe was also very difficult. The safest place to sleep was considered to be close to Joubert Park, where many people apparently spend the night. You can’t sleep alone or in places too far away, because then you will get “beaten even for R5 or you shoes” as Gladwell explained. You must also learn to sleep with one eye open, so that you can defend yourself. That is why the young men come and sleep in the park during the day so that they can get some rest before the night starts.

Where does this place them in the order of the park? For some of the young men, being migrants is one reason why they are looked down upon. For others, the reason seems less clear. As men they would in general rank much higher in the hierarchy of the park. They are not denied space in the park, in fact they take up one sizeable patch exclusively. The attitude that is displayed towards them is what is interesting in the context of access to and use of the park.

120 The exception may be the Central Methodist Church in Hillbrow, where Bishop Verryn provides shelter to homeless people, especially after the xenophobic attacks in 2008. Especially Zimbabwean people use it. It is not clear from my interaction with him why this was not an option, and I did not ask during fieldwork.
The young men are looked down upon in the park. In the following chapter I will demonstrate how officials in the park view them, but here I just want to understand how other park users see them. The young men know that they are looked down upon and commented on this.

The trolley pushers feel that they are not wanted inside the park.

He said that they do not rob anyone or bother anyone. He dislikes the way other park users look at him and his friends. He says that the park should be enjoyed by everyone and that they should not be chased away from the park until 8 at least because that’s when the trains finish. He likes the park because there are many people who use it and that they are able to watch TV. (Zwelaki field notes 6 December 2010).

The young man expressed his desire to be treated better when they are in the park. He and others expressed a feeling of alienation by other users. Other users indeed distrust them and are equally fearful and derisive of these men.

I was told in no uncertain terms that the young men were dangerous, sold and smoked drugs, and caused havoc in the park. Scott for example would regularly warn me that Lawn 3 was so dangerous that even the police avoided it. Ma Mary also warned me of the dangers that lurk on their front yard, so to speak. The drugs seem to be true to an extent. I asked why if the young men were dangerous, the SAPS or JMPD did nothing, to which I received a variety of responses: shrugs, head shakes, mutterings about bribes and from Scott, that the police were afraid themselves. What of course makes this a complicated situation is that they, the young men, might very well be dangerous, or at least some of them could be. Ironically although I have to admit a certain wariness to these young men, if I think back at my fieldwork, it is not the young men who propositioned me. Whenever they approached me it was to ask for a job, or just to chat. It was older men (30s onwards), mostly middle-aged men who approached me.
When the park was closed I went to parks around the area to try and find some park users. We found a few places where people were now hanging out, the one a park with extensive sporting facilities. Here we spoke to a group of young men who were usually on Lawn 1. One was casually packing dagga into smaller bags inside a sports bag and was quite indifferent about us seeing it. They were unhappy about the park being closed because that was their usual spot to frequent.

The young men also claim at least one sizeable portion of the park for themselves, and use another regularly. But they are not the only group that claims space. The photographers each has a very specific space that he claims as his own, and the chess players have claimed an area as their own. There is no problem per se with claiming space in the park and longevity, such as the chess players and photographers’ exhibit make such a claim staking more acceptable.

But, as Korth (2008) showed in his study of young men engaging in crime in Zola, Soweto, that does not necessarily lead to community condemnation. If the community perceives the young men as taking care of their families, then there is a tacit agreement that criminality is a legitimate way to make a living. He argues that ‘the boys’, young men who spend their proceeds on fast living, are derided while the men who take care of their families are admired.

There are other users in the park who also smoke dagga. Some of the chess players also smoke dagga, yet other park users see them as respectable. So the presence of crime and drugs per se would not alone explain why these young guys are looked down upon.

I posit that they are disliked not because of their criminal capacity per se, but because of “their indolence, their absence from markets and their relative deprivation” (Ruggiero 2010: 164). Perhaps the young men are not dangerous
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because they are possible drug dealers or users but because they are poor, because they do not work and because they hold the potential for violence, as opposed to actually being violent.

“A society’s response to “deviant” elements is rarely linked in a direct way to any actual or credible threat. The threat is more one of perception than reality, more of a societal pre-emptive strike against an as-yet-unborn threat that often originates within the dominant culture itself, but finds concrete expression in some abject, powerless element of society.” (Amster 2003: 196). In South Africa, as in many places elsewhere, people fear young black men (Schutte 2012). This fear is reflected in the way that the young black park users are conceived.

5. Conclusion

Why would people who are in many cases themselves at the lower scale of the hierarchy, so to speak, in Johannesburg, replicate such discrimination at a very local level? One explanation that many people would give is simply that it is cultural. So, homophobia, and gender discrimination are often justified by people saying ‘but it’s our culture’. This is reflected in the recent attempts by Controlesa 122 that called for the constitutional protection against homosexuality to be removed, as well as their backward stance on women’s roles in South Africa (de Vos 2012; Hlongwane 2012).

This does however not explain why the unemployed young men are looked down upon. Although I have explored the idea around indolence as one reason why this occurs, it does not explain why other identity markers are seen in a certain way.

122 Controlesa is the Congress of Traditional Leaders of South Africa “the sole and authentic representative of the progressive traditional leadership of South Africa”. It was formed in 1987 and concerns itself with issues around traditional leadership in South Africa (Contralesa n.d.).
Perhaps one answer would be to argue that in a neo-liberal economy where access to resources is constrained, racism and sexism, and all the other isms, provide a sorting system that ultimately places people in a certain position to access these (Michaels 2009a; Michaels 2009b; Michaels 2008). While all the –isms existed before neo-liberalisation came to be dominant, neo-liberalism gives it a new coat to wear. There are all sorts of social controls in society. The “social ordering also creates stratifications along racial, gender, social and economic lines and produces specific social placements in society, which result in social hierarchies” (Artz 2009: 173). What threatens the social order, is punished. Patriarchy is a social system that ensures that men get access to resources, while neo-liberalism is a social system that ensures that upper classes get their hand on resources.

We can understand these issues of access as a form of embodied spatial practices. It is the understanding of bodies and how they relate to space. Thus the female body, the black body, the homosexual body, the young black male body, are all seen to either belong or not to belong in certain spaces. With the young black males, their blackness, their maleness endangers space with their mere presence, whether they ever actually do anything criminal. That is why the chess players, who also break the law through gambling, who also smoke dagga, are evaluated as better than their younger counterparts. Their bodies are less threatening.

Finally, these mechanisms of exclusion are important because they give us an indication of who can be in public space, and what they can do there. This has a direct effect then on who can be involved in the broader public sphere of the park. The fact that women and differently sexualised people are constrained in their park use, means that their concerns will not be heard or seen. While the young men are not per se welcomed, their very presence means that they can form their own public sphere or participate in the larger public sphere of the park. The fact that people sensor themself from public space means that they can never participate in that particular public sphere. This in itself is not necessarily negative because they may very well be part of other public spheres. What it does indicate, is the reality that there seems to be very little
common places, whether actual or ephemeral, where people of different races and classes can be together and create a larger shared narrative.

At this point I start showing some fault lines along which Joubert Park is contested. Recall Low and Lawrence-Zúñiga’s (2003) definition of contested space as: “geographic locations where conflicts in the form of opposition, confrontation, subversion, and/or resistance engage actors whose social positions are defined by differential control of resources and access to power”. In this chapter, instead of indicating the resistances, I showed the social positions, along which resistance can develop, under the right circumstances.

Under neo-liberalism public space has changed because

“[it] involves the vesting of control over spaces in the hands of non-democratically-elected owners; they may involve the exclusion from many such spaces of groups whom we might have expected (for instance had the space been publically owned) to have been allowed there (the exclusion of unemployed ‘loiterers’ – deemed not to have been prospective shoppers – from shopping malls has probably emerged as the most-cited examples)” (Massey 2005: 152).

But such a view sees parks or public space as having previously been open, which has never been the case. There have always been power relations that lead to exclusions because space is always relational. Public spaces left as unregulated will have people working out for themselves who belong and who do not belong because all public spaces are regulated through social relations. (Massey 2005: 152). It is because of these limitations, even when public spheres are elusive, that the very idea of public sphere needs to remain and be strived for because in this ideal we can negotiate a better public or democracy (Massey 2005: 153).

The mechanisms of exclusions are similar to what is found more broadly within South African society and the public sphere(s) that is created there. The voice of women is excluded, the legitimacy of homosexuality is questioned, and foreign migrants are reviled. The park reflects South African
society, and the conservative social norms that it embraces. The exclusionary nature of Joubert Park reflects the exclusionary nature of public life in South Africa. Recent examples of this are an ANC provincial policy proposal suggesting that foreign-owned spaza shops should be regulated in favour of South Africans (Hartley 2012). The leader of the opposition, Helen Zille, regularly face slurs because of her female-ness and her race, instead of her bad arguments (Mposo 2012). The parliamentary leader of the same party was called a tea lady by the then ANC Youth leader, who refused to debate her on national television (du Plessis 2011). This all means that the public sphere in South Africa is already shredded and sharpened.

This chapter partially answered the question of the rules of access and use that exist Joubert Park by looking at mechanisms of exclusions imposed and articulated, for park use. This chapter also showed the ways that the park is contested between park users.

In the next chapter I am going to argue that apart from these informal access rules that are at play in the park, the formal CoJ regulations have also shaped what happens in the park. I will argue that in these rules we can see the neo-liberal intent of the local government.
Chapter 7: City rules

1. Introduction
The previous chapter highlighted the mechanisms of exclusion within the park. These mechanisms have implications in terms of who can access the park and how they can use the park. Ultimately, it also excludes people from participating in the public sphere. I started to show how there are judgements on the basis of bodies within the space (female, homosexual, bodies of colour) and how that influences the way in which people can use the park. In the same way that the park is embodied space, it is also relational. The previous chapter focused on the social production of the park – the relationships that affect people’s experience of space. The park is a highly contested space, which was clear from the ways in which people were tacitly included and excluded from the park.

Chapter Four sketched the neo-liberal context within which the city finds itself, and which it embraced with iGoli2002. This chapter shows how the rules of the city affect the relationships within the park (social production), but also
how the CoJ aims to normalise the park into acceptable capitalist and middle class norms (the discourse of the park). Chapter One examined the motives for establishing parks in different countries and time periods. While I could not establish the reasons why Joubert Park was established, the by-laws and the way that they are implemented in the park give a clear indication of who the CoJ think legitimate park users are. This chapter will explore these themes further.

This chapter starts by looking at the by-laws that the City of Johannesburg has for parks in general and for Joubert Park specifically. It considers how these rules are enforced in the park, and who is seen as having the moral authority to drive such enforcement. While there are many avenues of enforcement of order within the park, order is kept through informal rather than formal means.

2. City by-laws

This section looks at the formal rules and regulations that are in place in the park. The regulations that I discuss here are valid for all parks and open spaces within the city. Valverde (2009) criticises anthropologists, and other spatially focused researchers, for not considering the effects of laws and regulations on behaviour in space. She argues that laws constrain how people act in space, and when people act contrary to the laws, it also reveals implications.

In South Africa’s apartheid past the legal framework for park use did not forbid black people from being present in certain spaces. It legislated against black people using facilities that were reserved for white people. These laws were part of the petty apartheid laws (Marais 2001). Understanding the context of these petty-apartheid laws would then explain how people behaved in space as I showed in the previous chapter, with regard to the gallery worker who was arrested in the gallery for sitting on a bench in the park.
The context for the by-laws from the city is the desire to be an African World Class City (as discussed on Chapter Four Section Three B.i.). This desire is communicated and enforced through regeneration efforts that exclude poor people from inner-city housing, forums that give business more voice than city dwellers, and the by-laws that endeavour to normalise a specific type of user in the park as opposed to the user who currently use the park. While there are programmes that the city has that are socially responsive, such as the Expanded Social Package\(^{123}\) (Masondo 2009), the overwhelming focus seems to be to create a city that is focused on becoming connected to the ‘outside’, rather than having care and concern for its poorer residents.

The by-laws that apply to the park are the public open spaces by-laws (May 2004 notice 831) from the CoJ (CoJ 2004). The by-laws are applicable to all parks in the city. Consider some of these laws and their implications for the management of Joubert Park specifically. I want to show how these laws are applied or ignored, including how CoJ/City Parks themselves ignore rules that are applicable to them. Finally, I want to demonstrate how these laws are another illustration of the neo-liberal nature that Johannesburg has embraced. I will not provide an illustration of each of the by-laws separately, but will refer to them in my discussion.

When the CoJ/City Parks refers to by-laws being broken it is usually in the context of park users. But CoJ/City Parks is also guilty of breaking them. They seemingly have no mechanism to police themselves. As I showed in Chapter Five Section Five, this seems to be because there is confusion as to who is responsible between CoJ and City Parks for various projects in the park.

---

\(^{123}\) The Extended Social Package, Siyasizana, is available to all indigent households in the city, irrespective of whether they are account holders. Depending on your level of deprivation, measured by a formula, you qualify for extra free water, above and beyond the nationally prescribed Free Basic Water allotment, electricity and rebates on sanitation services (Masondo 2009).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council rule</th>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>Sub-clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Restricting access | 8  |      | a) Protect environment  
|              |    |      | b) Reduce vandalism  
|              |    |      | c) Improve administration  
|              |    |      | d) Development  
|              |    |      | e) Special events  
|              |    |      | f) Other activity to achieve by-laws |
| Power of officials – authorised person may | 9  |      | a) Implement and enforce by-laws  
|              |    |      | b) Issue a section 20 notice  
|              |    |      | c) Ask people to leave if they are contravening by-laws  
|              |    |      | d) Act as a peace officer under the Criminal Procedure Act (Act 51 of 1977) |
| Obligations of council | 10 |      | 1. Display notice as per by-laws  
|              |    |      | 2. For recreational open space  
|              |    |      | a) must be open between sunrise/sunset unless specified with a notice  
|              |    |      | b) must display a notice  
|              |    |      | i. showing open and closing times  
|              |    |      | ii. showing rules that apply to the park |
| Prohibited activities | 11 |      | 1. It’s an offence to do something prohibited by the by-laws unless:  
|              |    |      | a. there is special designation to allow for it  
|              |    |      | b. you got special permission from council (in terms of 21, 22, 23)  
|              |    |      | c. it was authorised by council according to the following)  
|              |    |      | 2. You are not in contravention if you are  
|              |    |      | a) performing your duty as an employee/contractor to do your job  
|              |    |      | b) if you are doing a job for another organ of State  
|              |    |      | c) as an authorised official  
|              |    |      | d) as a peace officer  
|              |    |      | 3. but (2) above is not an exception if it is an expressly forbidden activity for 12(a) & (e) |
| General prohibition | 12 |      | 12.a. R1 500  
|              |    |      | 12.b. R500  
|              |    |      | 12.c. R1 500  
|              |    |      | 12.d. R500  
|              |    |      | 12.e. R500  
|              |    |      | 12.f. R500  
|              |    |      | 12.g. R1 500  
|              |    |      | No person may  
|              |    |      | a. act in a way that is dangerous to life or property  
|              |    |      | b. contravene posted notices  
|              |    |      | c. enter restricted space as per 8  
|              |    |      | d. cause a nuisance  
|              |    |      | e. behave indecently or offensively |
| Prohibited use | 13 |      | 13.a. R500  
|              |    |      | 13.b. R500  
|              |    |      | 13.c. R500  
|              |    |      | 13.d. R500  
|              |    |      | 13.e. R500  
|              |    |      | 13.f. R500  
|              |    |      | 13.g. R1 500  
|              |    |      | No person may  
|              |    |      | a. bathe/swim/wash self, animal, object, clothes  
|              |    |      | b. start a fire unless facilities are provided  
|              |    |      | c. camp or stay  
|              |    |      | d. consume/brew/sell alcohol  
|              |    |      | e. use radio, hi-fi, car stereo  
|              |    |      | f. play an active game unless in designated area  
|              |    |      | g. shoot anything |
| Waste | 14 |      | 14.a. R1 500  
|              |    |      | 14.b. R1 500  
|              |    |      | No person may  
|              |    |      | a. dump waste except in provided containers  
|              |    |      | b. pollute a water source |
| Vehicles | 15 |      | 15.a. R500  
|              |    |      | 15.b. R500  
|              |    |      | 15.c. R500  
|              |    |      | No person may  
|              |    |      | a. use any vehicle except for a bicycle unless specifically provided for  
|              |    |      | b. go faster than 5km/h  
<p>|              |    |      | c. park unless specifically provided for |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Rules</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Vegetation and animals | 16 | 1. No person may  
a. damage trees  
b. place printed matter on trees  
c. plant vegetation  
d. alter the course of water  
e. capture or molest any animal  
f. damage bird nests or eggs  
g. ride a horse unless  
i. if designated for it by council  
ii. if performing official duties  
h. bring any other animal in except a dog  
i. walk a dog unless  
ii. its in an area where it is designated to run free. Dog waste must be picked up  
2. (a) and (c) do not apply if you have a urban agricultural permit |
| Municipal property and erections of structures | 17 | 1. No person may  
a. damage municipal property  
b. dig or disturb the surface  
c. erect structures including hut, tent, screen, bulletin, pole, stand, stage  
d. affix printed matter to any municipal property or distribute printed matter  
e. tamper with electrical or other fixtures  
2. is excluded from people holding agricultural permits |
| Selling and special events | 18 | 1. No person may  
a. use the property in such a way that it restrict other users enjoyment  
b. unless in an area that is let from council for the purpose of selling, sell, hawk, display goods for sale  
2. Unless you have obtained a permit under section 22 |
| Community service | 19 | R500  
No person may undertake community or public service except under section 24 |
| Restoration and removal notices | 20 | 1. Unless a permit under 21, 22, 23 has been obtained, then an authorised official may issue a removal or restoration notice to anyone who has  
a. damaged etc. vegetation or a municipal structure  
b. built a structure  
c. dumped waste  
2. The notice can direct a person to within a reasonable time  
a. restore the area to reasonable satisfaction  
b. remove the structure and restore the area |
| Application for permission | 21 | 1. Apply in writing to do the prohibited activity, with a prescribed fee  
2. Council may request additional information to make a decision |
### Application for a special event permit

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Applications must be made 21 days in advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Council can reduce that period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Must contain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Name &amp; contact details of applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Nature of special event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Intended use of area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Any permission required for exemption from prohibited activities as described by 11-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The holder of the permit can use the area to the exclusion of any other persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Application for permission to farm in an urban agricultural public open space

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>An application must contain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Name and contact details of applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. The nature of the activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Size and location of proposed area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Permit holders may be required to pay a user fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The person may use the area to the exclusion of any other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Entering into agreements

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Council may enter into a written agreement with any organ of state, local community or organisation to provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. the co-operative development of any public open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. the co-operative management of any public space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. the regulation of human activities within space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The Council may not enter into an agreement with regards to 1b above if the agreement does not promote the purposes of the by-laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The Council must monitor the effectiveness of any agreement in terms of 1 to see whether the goals are being achieved and the agreement is effective or is inhibiting the purposes of these by-laws</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tree preservations

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-26</td>
<td>Deals with the preservations of trees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Offences and penalties

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Any person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. who fails to comply with the by-laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. fails to comply with notices displayed or issued in terms of these by-laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. obstructs or hinders an official in the execution of the by-laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is subject to a fine or imprisonment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Municipal by-laws pertaining to all parks in Johannesburg
The first lapse of the bylaws by the CoJ/City Parks is of section 10 that deals with the obligations of the council. It states that a recreational park must be open between sunrise and sunset, with a notice displaying this, and if it is not open there must be a notice displaying that. In Chapter Two I wrote about the two closures of the park, both for substantial periods of time. At no time were notices displayed at any of the gates to indicate when the park would open again. City Parks workers on site did not know when the park would re-open, nor did the builders during the second closure. The photographers tried to approach City Parks to find out when the park would re-open but received no answer. With the first closure I e-mailed Jerome Francke to hear when the park would open, although he replied that he would let me know, I never received an answer nor did he answer subsequent e-mails.

The park is closed today, only maintenance workers are inside. It never opened today whatsoever, I arrived here at 9am today. There is deep-cleaning occurring today, and a strong odour of manure can be smelled from outside the demarcations of the park. The photographers are standing outside the gate, advertising their work to people who thought the park was open.

At the gate that leads to park station, there are about 15 people standing. Initially they were all intending to go the park, some are furious at the fact that they were never told that the park will be closed. The north gate is open (the one near the chess place), however it is the only gate open. The reason why it is open is so that people who are going to the clinic and the crèche can be able to enter through that gate. Those are the only two exceptions. (Zwelaki field notes 9 December 2010)

These closures affected park users negatively, not only did the photographers suffer financially, but children could not play on the playground, people who relied on the church feeding scheme for food were left devastated, and ordinary users were upset because their space was closed without warning.
Another place where the CoJ fails is with regard to Section 24. Section 24 of the by-laws makes provision for CoJ to enter into agreements to develop, manage and regulate space in cooperation with other state organs, local community and organisations. Section 24.3 places the onus on the CoJ to monitor these contracts and to see whether their goals are achieved. It is in section 24 that the CoJ/City Parks fails completely. I have described in a previous chapter the confusion that exists around the legality of occupation of the various projects in the park. It does seem rather unlikely that all of the projects would be illegally occupying space at the same time, so more likely it seems that the JPC, the property managing leg of the CoJ, is just uniformed or incompetent.

Beyond the confusion, there also seems to be plain failure to adhere to these specific by-laws as well as larger fiduciary failure. I wanted to investigate the case of the GHP. In Chapter Five I described the project and its aims. One
aim is the restoration and redevelopment of the Victorian glasshouse. This conservatory was built in 1908 and should be listed as a Grade 3 heritage site\textsuperscript{124}. However, no such listing exists currently, or seems to be planned. Instead, what the CoJ did was to hand over their responsibility of the restoration to the GHP in an apparent attempt to regenerate the inner city. I suggest they also externalised the costs, since one of neo-liberalism characteristics is the shifting of welfare costs to NGOs (Wilshusen 2010; Castree 2008a).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{greenhouse_circa_1908.png}
\caption{The greenhouse circa 1908 (SAHO n.d.)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{124} Grade 3 buildings are buildings that are older than 60 years and are of local importance. The JAG is a listed building. The park would qualify as a listed site. On the CoJ website that lists the listed buildings and sites, neither appears (Davie 2011a, 2011b)
While debating who is responsible for the lack of progress in restoring the glasshouse would not bring the project much further, the GHP has clearly showed that it does not have the capacity to restore it\textsuperscript{125}. It is a failure by the CoJ/City Parks not to take overall responsibility for that part of the project at least. In their bid to externalise their responsibilities to civil society, they have failed to uphold their own by-laws. While the project has been standing dormant for the past nine years, park users have been denied access to about a fifth of the park. GHP has walled the Victorian glasshouse with corrugated iron plates because it is simply too dangerous to keep it open. Again, there is no information notices posted as required by section 10 of the Public Open Space by-laws. As Scott says of the greenhouse, “that place is just fucked up”. And no one is doing anything about it.

The above discussion related to the public open space by-laws, indicates that the CoJ themselves are breaking. CoJ and City Parks both have expressed concerns on how the park is used and how park users break the by-laws. I will highlight some of the ways that this happen.

\textsuperscript{125} This restoration is a huge project and as a small NGO it simply does not have the capacity.
Sections 12(d) and 12(e) are very subjective, because what causes nuisance and offence is personal. Some gallery visitors and personnel have said that that people sleeping in the park are a nuisance. For some park users this does not cause concern. Nuisance and offence can really be anything. To me, smoking causes an affront much more than sleeping. For some it is kissing, for others the very presence of black bodies being in the park causes affront.

More concrete is section 13(a), referring to washing self or clothes in the park. A group of homeless men, sleeping at Park Station at night and spending considerable time in the park during the day, related how they pay a homed friend to keep clothes in his flat\textsuperscript{126}. They then find sources of water in the city where they can wash themselves and their clothes. Keeping clean is a constant battle. But it is also one that the CoJ sees as inappropriate in the park, perhaps because it does not fit with the place making, where the city is a world-class city where middle class and business interests rule (Hook & Vrdoljak 2002). Also if poor people are merely objects or dirt (Katz 1998), matter out of place, then washing is an action out of place that destroys the image of the global city.

I want to draw attention to two other prohibitions in the park, drinking alcohol (section 13.c) and playing active games (section 13.f). Although there is some alcohol use in the park, few people seem to drink seriously. I saw people drinking alcohol a few times but apart from the very drunk man described in Chapter Two Section Five, there were never disruptions caused.

\textsuperscript{126} In this case the friend stayed in a flat with 20 or more people each paying a few hundred Rands for a small space. Most people whom I met in the park who were homed had similar arrangements with the amount of money that they paid, depending on the size of the flat and the number of people that stay in it.
The prohibition of active games is interesting in light of the lack of green space in the inner city. Of the four other parks in the surrounding area two have eight-a-side soccer pitches. These are very well used but it also means that the park users for those parks are uniformly young men, or so it seemed when I visited them. But the ban on active games also includes children running around in the park, kicking balls or just chasing one another. The few times that I observed children doing so, it was stopped quickly by City Parks workers.

Yet, City Parks believe that they are providing a space for children to play on the play equipment. While this is true, it seems to be as much an issue of control. Children running around is presumable uncontrollable, while those playing on the equipment are controlled and contained. The effect of the ban on active games is that children go and play in the nearby Drill Hall, which has staff who are much more child friendly, but this has led to the games taking their toll on a historic building. Alan Bluff thinks that Township TV is good because it gives children who have no access to TV a place to watch. Watching TV is a passive activity where it is easy to control people. He also
ignores the negative association regarding young children and television viewing.

Section 19 prohibits community service in the park, unless a specific written agreement has been entered into with the CoJ/City Parks (Section 24). This is quite out of step with what is happening in Joubert Park, which seems to be a hub for community service outreach. The clinic runs HIV/Aids awareness tables, eschatological May 21 preachers went to sermonise in the park, and a shelter offers peer sex education. Some of these activities are short-term and fleeting. Others have a more sustained presence. The most sustained was a church-based ‘soup kitchen’ that came on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursday to preach, hand out food, clothes and blankets. Although Bishop John had asked permission at CoJ to do this, the CoJ itself would not enter into a formal agreement.

We don’t have security, we even don’t have good future in this place because it is not allowed to do this in the park. We, my wife went up to the City of Johannesburg because the metro police used to come and harass us, so when she went she said we may allow you, but under some strict conditions. Those strict conditions are they are not favourable for me, for a man of God. So number one security, we don’t have security, I am talking about the future. We don’t know whether tomorrow… and also they didn’t give us a time, they just said for now, you can continue. Even like during the World Cup [SWC] they were threatening us to leave. Every day we were coming ready to be asked to leave. Every day it was very traumatising.

Ja, in fact, on several occasions the metro was coming. There was one who came, in fact the same day that you came, another one came and he stood there, he looked at what we are doing and he said I am supposed to tell you to go, but I can’t because what you are doing is very good. You are helping our people but it is not the right way, it is not allowed in the park. So we started telling them we went we spoke to this person at the City of Johannesburg. He said he was supposed to give you a letter so that when we come, you show us. Then we say no, he can’t give us a letter because he is not allowed. He said that if anyone asks, just say Daniel said that we can use.

The CoJ seems to be resistant to community outreach from more informal sectors. So although they have agreements with Lapeng and GHP, this was one agreement they wouldn’t agree to. A reason for this could be that what the church wanted to do, was work with homeless and hungry people, not exactly in line with the idea of a regenerated inner-city. As Ken Swart pointed out, perhaps one of the reasons that the park attracted so many homeless
people is that there are these services in the park for them. Something which for the CoJ is unacceptable.

Section 18 prohibits selling and hawking in the park unless you have special permission or are in a special designated area. The CoJ/City Parks is perfectly comfortable with commercial activities happening in the park when it is a large company doing so. During the research, several companies used the park: ice cream sellers, a skin-care company, an advertising company and a soccer club. During the 2010 Soccer World Cup (SWC) provision was made for food vendors in the park. In interviews, city officials however said that trading per se in the park is bad. To quote Alan Bluff of City Parks “No, you can’t have a spaza\textsuperscript{127} shop, that kind of thing. We say right, what is it you require for leisure?” It is not that they are per se against commercial activity, it is just that they want to control and benefit from it, through the prescribed

\textsuperscript{127} An informal convenience shop selling small household items, usually run from someone’s house. The goods are usually quite expensive.
application fees (Section 18, 21, and 22). Also in line with neo-liberal city building, authorities are comfortable with formalised business using the park commercially, rather than small informal, survivalist traders.

Another set of laws that is used to regulate people in the park is the Informal Trading Policy and by-laws of the COJ (CoJ 2000). Flowing from the growth and development strategy (GDS) of the CoJ, an informal trading policy was drawn up to regulate the behaviour and location of informal traders in the city. The city’s vision for informal trade is “to create a well managed informal trading sector which talks to the needs of its stakeholders and is effectively integrated into the economic, spatial and social development goals of the City” (CoJ 2000: 4). The CoJ has multiple missions with regard to the informal trading sector; creating the possibilities of sharing in economic growth, integrating informal economies into the formal economy, and creating a predictable regulatory framework in order for formal and informal economies to exist alongside each other (CoJ 2000: 4).

Bremner (2000: 190) argues that the city took a progressive approach to traders by focusing on legalising informal trade in the inner city. The inner city changed to accommodate,

micro-enterprise, survivalist trade, illicit activity…migratory economic activity, cross-border trade, and the presence of immigrant entrepreneurs are becoming significant and possibly structural features of the inner city economy…these presences however are largely absent from official policy making (Bremner 2000: 191).

However, if compared to the JDA document, this may be overly optimistic that they or the CoJ will have integrated informal trade in such a manner.

This policy focuses specifically on fixing traders in space and ignores the traders walking around selling goods. Section 9.2. is about MTC designating fixed stalls for traders (CoJ 2000: 13). Apart from needing to comply with the street trading by-laws, traders also need to comply with a variety of other laws depending on their specific trade, such as food safety laws or health by-laws in terms of hairdressing and piercings (CoJ 2000: Section 9.12, 13).
Furthermore, according to the policy, informal traders must pay a rental amount as decided by MTC (CoJ 2000: Section 11, 15).

The policy document also makes provision for periodic markets to take place (CoJ 2000: Section 12, 16). These could be flea markets, markets associated with sport events such as the SWC, or other sporting events. Permission for these can be obtained from the CoJ, City Parks, Johannesburg Road Agency (JRA) or JMPD.

Flowing from this policy, informal traders are under the injunction of the Street Trading by-laws (CoJ 2000). According to these by-laws, any person may engage in informal trading if they follow the rules as set out by the CoJ (Section 4). In order to work as an informal trader, you have to apply to the council for a stand and enter into a lease agreement with them (Section 6). Informal traders must keep the area clean and litter-free (Section 7). Council has the sole right to indicate which areas are suitable for informal trade and to restrict it where they feel it is not suitable (Section 8). In terms of the park, King George Street, between Wolmarans Street and the JAG vehicle gate is a designated trading area with fixed stalls. Informal traders pay either R50 or R100, depending on the size of the stall. Stalls may not be sublet according to MTC policy. The reality of it is that the stalls are sublet, often at three or four times the price that the original lessee pays to MTC, as I discussed in the previous chapter. Due to unhappiness with MTC, and what the traders see as the broken promises by MTC, the traders renting directly from MTC have stopped paying their rent three or four years ago. These broken promises include the nature of the stalls, continual harassment by JMPD, and alleged corruption at MTC.

The by-laws also expressly prohibit trading inside parks and public gardens (CoJ 2000: section 9.1b). This means that both the photographers and the informal traders selling goods in the park are doing so in contravention of the by-laws. The following excerpt from my field notes shows their vulnerability

8 September 2010
I walked to the community project. Walking towards the King George gate of the park I saw that there were very few photographers there. Normally there would be around 20-25 photographers lining either side of the path, but today there were only 5 or 6. I saw that but did not take much notice of it...

Ma Mary and Carol spoke to one another again. I heard the words, police and photographers and asked Carol what happened. She said that this morning the metro police came and arrested the photographers because they were contravening the no-trading by-laws. She said that JMPD had been there the previous day to talk to the photographers and told them they should go to Zoo Lake and trade there...

I was shocked to the extreme. Some of the photographers have been there for many, many years. Carol said that she also didn’t understand it because she said that she had been there since 1999 and then the park was a no-go area. The photographers then looked after the park and would make noise if something happened there. Back then Michelle from City Parks came to the park and wanted to kick the photographers out. But, they all got together, the gallery, Lapeng, the greenhouse, the community centre and the photographers. Michelle told the photographers that what they did was illegal, but if they were going to be there then they had to work in the park and help keep the place clean...

I left shortly after this to go and speak to the photographers. I went to Stanley and greeted him. There were more photographers but still not close to the number that was usually there. There were 13 photographers there now. I sat next to Stanley and said that I heard that there had been trouble in the park. He said that the JMPD had been there today to talk to all the photographers because they felt that the photographers were taking up too much space on the sidewalk. He said that they were told that they weren’t allowed to have umbrellas and that they were only allowed to have one small A4 picture frame to advertise their services.

The next day all the photographers were back to their usual spots. For the rest of the year the photographers weren’t bothered. Then in the beginning of 2011 when the park re-opened and the monitors started, there was again a stand-off; this time between the monitors and the photographers. My field notes from 10 January 2011:

I greeted Scott and his brother. Trust told me about the cleaners who told them on Friday to show them their permits and to leave because they didn’t have permits. They [the monitors] said “Our boss told us”. Scott said it wasn’t the cleaners that were chasing people away, but new security guards who were wearing purple bibs. There were 2 men and 2 ladies working security now. I asked if they would show them to me but they said that they weren’t there. They started fighting with the security and JMPD had to come and separate them. JMPD told them to go to City Parks offices to speak to people there. Scott said that he went this morning but the person wasn’t there and they were told to try again on Wednesday.
Ever since that day, the photographers were trying to get in contact with City Parks in order to get permits. The person who works at City Parks remained elusive. In March 2011 the photographers received registration papers from the monitors. They however have little hope that this will give them greater security in the park, since they had previously gone through a process of submitting applications for permits – then nothing happened. However, while the photographers were at times threatened they were for the most part accepted in the park. The traders did not have this leeway and were often chased out of the park and their goods confiscated. This led to tensions in the park between photographers and traders (Ndaba 2010).

It is clear from the above experiences and regulations that the CoJ has specific idea of how people in general should behave in parks. Many of the rules discussed seem to aim to keep a sense of order within parks. However, at the same time, it appears that Joubert Park is seen as special, needing special rules to ‘tame’ it.

I want to illustrate this assertion by way of three different people, Jeremy Francke of City Parks, Ken Swart from the CoJ and Clr Mashao, the local ANC ward councillor. Francke described the park as a haven for the unemployed where they are like “lizards in the sun”. He further believed that all the buildings around the park have been hijacked, and these unlawful people spill out into the park. Francke is ultimately responsible for the management of the park at City Parks. It seems that for him, the park is a dark place, a place beyond redemption. He sees the users as being illegitimate. This illegitimacy implies that extra regulations are needed, beyond the normal.

Ken Swart of the CoJ saw somewhat similar problems with park use. His was focused on the number of people using the park, because high numbers created opportunities for crime. He acknowledged though that many people came to the park during the day because they live in crowded flats and have
nowhere else to go. The presence of traders inside the park is a problem because that was not what the park was designed for. For him, the presence of wardens would ensure that people used the park for what he saw as its purpose.

Clr Mashao expresses the most telling of the general feeling from CoJ officials

IEM: Oright [pause] uhm if you would say what is a well-managed park? How would we know if we go to a park that this is a well-managed park?
CM: Okay I believe that a well-managed park is a park where the crowd inside is being controlled and maybe we also have park rangers inside the park, if the park is that we say is a well-managed park. People can't just sit and sleep wherever they like, you know. There are furnishers inside the park, where people can maybe [share] a seat for two people where you can sit maybe for 30 minutes and have a chat to your friend, and then you separate, you move, others come and have their chat and then they continue with their journey, that is a well managed park. Ja, when you enter inside the park you can identify the corners of the park, that that is the left and right, centre. But not what is happening with Joubert Park at the moment.

I quote her at length because we can see a couple of important ideas here. To her, control is the hallmark of a well-managed park, and the ideal user is someone who has somewhere to go, not someone who will stay and sleep in the park all day. The park is not a space for just being, and will not adapt to the needs of a majority of users. Clr Mashao gives no consideration to people who have nowhere else to go. Her answer seems to indicate that a legitimate user is if not a consumer, then someone who has something concrete to do, that is, being on the streets only for a short while.

Francke’s lizards in the sun evoke an image of laziness, of indolence. Instead of acknowledging that people are there because it is their only place to be, and to rest. He chooses to imagine them as good-for-nothings. Perhaps this is then motivation as to why City Parks felt the need to employ extra ‘special’ security in the park. According to the last part of the framework, labelling something as a failure is the first step into normalising it into something more desirables, something that you can control. This discourse is exactly what is

---

128 This acknowledgement that flats are overcrowded does not extend to a further acknowledgement that urban regeneration, of which he is in favour, leading to people being displaced.
happening here with City Parks and the CoJ. The park is labelled a failure because of the poor people using it, and it can then be brought under control so that it fits the image of the African World Class City.

3. Special park rules

In the previous section I discussed what rules and regulations are enforced in all parks in Johannesburg. Irrespective of where you live in Johannesburg, if you use a park these regulations apply to you. In this section I specifically want to look at the rules that are enforced only in Joubert Park. I argue that the rules enforced here are the result of a bias against a certain type of park user that is seen as needing extra discipline in order to fit into the neo-liberal regenerated world city that the CoJ wants.

Rules in the park are enforced by the JMPD, City Parks workers and since January 2011, by park monitors in certain parks on an extended public works programme (EPWP). Under Section 9 of the open space by-laws, any person who City Parks/CoJ authorises may enforce the bylaws. There are also private security guards who specifically monitor the children’s play area. In general though there isn’t enforcement of any of the by-laws by the JMPD or City Parks workers. JMPD and SAPS make sporadic patrols in the park, with an increasing number during special events like the SWC. When the park monitors started in the park the situation changed somewhat.

When the monitors were employed they had a new set of rules that differs slightly from the CoJ by-laws. Other rules seem to stem from their own interpretation of who should be allowed in the park and what ‘good’ park behaviour is. Busi, who acted as head monitor, explained the rules that they must enforce:

- No sitting on the grass or walking over the grass
- No vandalism (Section 17.1. Open Space By-laws)

129 Simba [a crisp/chips manufacturing company] sponsors the play equipment and the security guard. This programme is present in several parks in Johannesburg.
• No drinking (Open Space By-laws Section 13.d.)
• No washing clothes (Open Space By-laws Section 13.a.)
• No bathing in toilet (Open Space By-laws Section 13.a.)
• No sleeping on the grass or chairs
• No hawkers (Trading By-laws Section 9.1b)
• Photographers must have permits (Open Space By-laws Section 21.1.)
• Park open 6am-6pm (Open Space By-laws Section 10)

All of the rules except or two are found in either the Open Space By-laws or the Trading By-laws. The rules of no sleeping on the grass or chairs and no sleeping on the grass or chairs, are entirely new and seeming without precedent in other parks. This makes no sense and is an ‘old style’ of management according to Adam Botha: “and also those were the days where you had the notices up, whites only on the benches, no walking on the grass, etc. etc.”

Busi explained that:
these were good rules because there is so much crime in Joubert Park, and there are lots of drugs both being dealt and used in the park. Also people are being scammed about jobs in the park. They would come here and pay someone R200 to get a job but that person would then disappear. She said when they explain to people that they must get off the grass people understand because “people come from Kwazulu looking for a job but they don’t find one. And we tell them, sitting here in the park, they won’t help themselves. They must go out and move around, then they will help themselves. (13 January 2011)

We can gather several things from her explanation. The first is that the rules as she explained them to me, will not stop the job scams that she speaks about. None of the rules specifically address the use of drugs in the park. Perhaps she and City Parks, believe chasing the young men away from the grass will disrupt their drug use. I am not sure what their evidence is for this belief. And of course, the chess players who also smoke dagga are not disrupted at all because they keep off the grass, and are considered good park users.

For Busi, there seems to be a connection between being a park user, criminality and unemployment. The fact that there are unemployed people in
the park is because they are simply not trying hard enough to find employment, instead of the structural high unemployment rate in South Africa. Of course, the irony of this is that Busi herself is only employed through an EPWP programme. As she admitted, she is an ex MK cadre who was sitting at home “waiting for the government” and was asked to be a monitor in the park, as were her fellow monitors. Also note the subtle neo-liberal turn of phrase that Busi employs; that of the people in the park helping themselves without acknowledgement that there are very few jobs available out there. It is not as if people were sitting around and doing nothing while there are a thousands of jobs available. The framing then of the rules, from City Parks and from reframing by the monitors, is the subtle neo-liberal discourse that blames the poor’s indolence for their misery. It is also revanchist in the sense that it does not want people to be there, to be around. It is vengeful in denying people one of the few ‘free’ spaces to relax.

As I said with regard to the rule of not sleeping on the grass. It isn’t a city-wide\textsuperscript{130} rule, but seems designed to only punish poor park users in Joubert Park. Further observations confirmed the punitive nature of the monitors. An excerpt from my field notes (22/1/2011) reads:

I saw that the monitors were chasing people away from the grass, including kids running around. There were 2 trolley pushers who were resting under the big tree on the pavement. They were standing, and sitting, chatting with a group of four friends. We approached them to talk to them about being in the park. As we started chatting to them two monitors came to chase them away. It is the woman with the curly hair who seemed to be in charge (Busi) as well as the older man with the glasses who is frequently rude to people. The woman said as she was chasing us away “I don’t want your trolleys in my park”.

In terms of Open Space By-laws, the trolley pushers were not doing anything wrong, nor were they contravening monitor rules. The six people, young black men, were sitting on their trolleys underneath a tree on the paving. Yet, they were chased away for no apparent reason beside their low status, a matter that I also addressed in Chapter Six Section Four.

\textsuperscript{130}My local park does not have monitors nor any rules forbidding people to walk or sleep on the grass.
Their positionality as young black men led them to be seen as ‘different’ from the norm in an inferior position. As the above anecdote showed, when the monitors chased them it was with aggressive intent. Busi above was shaking her stick at the young men and walking towards them aggressively. I observed a similar incident between one of the male monitors towards another park user, also a young black male, although not a trolley pusher.

But out of my eye I saw a fight breaking out between the monitors and a guy. There were four monitors and this guy. The one monitor, a guy with a grey beard and a young guy were shouting at each other. The other monitors were holding them apart. The monitors walked away except for one who was talking to the guy and trying to calm him down. I walked over and started talking to the guy.

He said his name was Alfred and he was from Soweto. He came to the park to have a rest because he had been to the tavern close by. He was sitting on a chair having a nap when someone told him that the place to have a nap was on the grass so he moved to the grass under a tree. Then he said that this monitor came and started shouting at him to move from the grass. He said how dare this guy shout at him like he wasn’t human. He said when the other monitor came to explain why he shouldn’t be on the grass he accepted the explanation but he was still upset at the first guy because he was so rude and spoke to him as if he wasn’t human. (Fieldwork diary 13 January 2011)

The monitor in this case was very aggressive in his approach to this man, and often in his approaches to other people using the park too. In the same way that the trolley pusher was made to feel he wasn’t a human being, this young man was treated in a similar manner. When he challenged the monitor, a physical fight nearly broke out and only the interventions of the other monitors stopped it. It wasn’t that the young man was unwilling to move; it was that he objected to the way that he was spoken to. The young man in this story was not a trolley pusher, he was employed as a taxi driver and had a day off. This might explain why he was able to ‘push back’ in this context where the trolley pusher could not.

To further illustrate that it is a person’s positionality that matters in how the monitors approach you, I want to offer two further illustrations. The first involves a group of ten older (middle aged and over) men who were sitting on the grass having a meeting. I approached them to ask what the meeting was about and what they were doing. They told me that it was a meeting related to business of their church. At that stage I left to speak to the chess players but
saw from the corner of my eye the same two monitors, Busi and the old man, approached the group, chatting to them a minute or two, and then moved off again. About 30 minutes later I went to the group again and asked what was said. They said that the monitor asked them to move from the grass, they explained they were discussing church business and asked whether they could finish their meeting and then move. The monitors said that it was fine and left them to their business. In this whole interaction the monitors did not display the aggression that they displayed to the young trolley pushers.

The next incident has to do with myself and my supervisor, Prof Lyons. We were sitting on the grass in the park when one of the monitors, a younger woman, came to ask us to leave the grass. We said that we were just sitting there and resting our feet and would move soon. She left us still sitting there. Only a few minutes later did we move. Now, with other people what would have happened if we hadn't moved immediately, was that either the old man or Busi would have come over to move us along. In this case we were left there and could probably have remained seated there for longer without getting into 'trouble'.

This indicates to me that our bodies, and the bodies of the group of church men above had sufficient status for us to stay there without trouble. The young black men however did not have that status and their bodies seemed to be interpreted as needing more discipline to fit into what I would interpret as the body social or politic of the park.

Homeless people and people without a place to be are not welcome in city parks as I have shown here. City Parks itself boasts when it says, “[i]n a bid to ensure safety in public parks ahead of the festive season, Johannesburg City Parks is ridding parks in Hillbrow and Berea of loiterers and suspected drug dealers through a series of raids” (Johannesburg City Parks 2011). This conflates loitering with drugs, and makes clear that a certain type of user is not welcome. The discourse that City Parks foregrounds for the park is to normalise a certain user while it demonises another. Again it labels some of the park users as failures or dangerous, in opposition to an implied ideal user.
With this normalising discourse it takes actions to rid the parks of these users, despite there being no legal or moral reason for doing this. This is similar to the example of normalisation in Christiana that I discussed in Chapter Three Section Five.

The zero tolerance stance as championed by Guilliani in New York between 1996 and 2001 tackled visible poverty, making pan-handling, petty drug dealing, public drinking, urinating, and loitering into crimes (K. Mitchell 2011: 295). The broken windows theory of policing suggested that any disorder that is unaddressed, leads to disorder and a breakdown of law. The “‘solution’ to problems of crime and criminality, is to broaden the sphere of what can be constituted as criminal behaviour, and then to quickly and harshly stamp it out, sometimes before it has even occurred” (K. Mitchell 2011: 296). These led to high rates of arrests and stop-and-search on the streets aimed especially at African Americans and other minorities. The broken-window approach leads to neighbourhoods being stigmatised because poor people live there. This led to a place/race intersection that defined a place as dangerous (K. Mitchell 2011: 297). But, such broken window policing is not effective despite its long history. For me, the way that City Parks is handling the security within the park is similar to such broken-window policing that criminalises poverty. Apart from the fact that people are stigmatised, it also conveys the message that certain people are not citizens, do not belong and have no rights. To my mind, this is a worrying trend with regards to people’s legitimacy as park users and members of possible public spheres.

Despite evidence that contradicts the ineffectiveness of such a manner of law enforcement, it is one that the CoJ embraces. However, park users do not just accept this enforcement unproblematically, there are people who can legitimately enforce rules in the park, and park users resist park rules that they perceive as unnecessary.
4. Rule enforcement

The above informal rules are supposed to be enforced by the monitors. But as I have indicated there is conflict around this. The monitors have come into the park as unknowns, and they have been told to disrupt the very nature and population of the park. Their first target was the photographers who are well loved in the park.

At a stage when crime was seen as very high in the park the photographers were seen as acting to bring it down. Again and again I have heard the story of the photographers carrying whistles and blowing them when a mugging occurred. They would then close the gates of the park, and catch the person. When they caught him, they would rough him up and throw him in the pond before calling the police. Today, the same people tell me that there are no longer any muggings in the park and they largely credit the photographers. They have gravitas in the park, as people who have been there for many years and as people who are seen to take care of the park.

The monitors do not contribute in a similar manner, thus their attitude have not endeared them to park users. On my last visit to the park, Scott told me how the monitors now call them to confirm to park users that the rules that they (the monitors) are enforcing are legitimate. Only when the photographers intervene, will park users listen and do what they are told to. Scott related to me how when there was conflict between people using the park and the monitors, they were approached to solve the conflict. As a group they had more legitimacy with park users than the unknown monitors. As Scott said, “we are on the same side now, same same”. This informal rule enforcement is very important because it shows who has legitimacy in the park. These are clearly not the more formal arrangements. Of course the photographers themselves did not want the poor young black men using the park there, and would often tell me that they would prefer them not to be in the park because they scared the customers away.
The photographers had their own agenda in enforcing the rules. While there was conflict between the photographers and the monitors in the beginning when the monitors were trying to chase the photographers away, when their agendas started to align, that conflict disappeared. They discovered that they had a common ‘enemy’ in the young black men whom they all disliked. Although the photographers have legitimacy, they also act with a very specific utilitarian view of the park.

Two other agencies that are supposed to enforce rules are the JMPD and SAPS. SAPS comes into the park at times, especially when there are mega events such as the SWC. JMPD is much more involved in rule enforcement and especially the traders that are their target. Because people dislike them so much, they have no legitimacy. They are accused of taking bribes and generally being corrupt. Traders will run away from the JMPD or submit, seeming to feel in general helpless against them. This is also because the JMPD is official and while there are often protests against them, people do not seem to think that they have the power to openly resist the JMPD. People in small ways however do resist the monitors.

5. Fighting back
On the one hand we have the CoJ, City Parks and the monitors trying to enforce rules in the park, trying to create in their view, good citizens. Yet people do not meekly accept this, they employ tactics of resistance. These tactics may sometimes be futile, temporary and fleeting, but they do exist. I want to focus on a few examples here. The first is what I call the dance of the grass.

When the monitors started chasing people away when sitting on the grass, I noticed that people would get up and promptly move to another lawn. Then the monitors would follow them to that lawn and chase them away. This process would continue over and over again. In the beginning the pace of the monitors chasing people was quite fast, but later it slowed down to resemble a slow waltz. I met an artist in JAG, who was having a cup of coffee and noticed
the same pattern, the dance. When there were too many people in the park in the afternoons, then the monitors ‘gave up’ their chase and people just sat on the grass and relaxed. This usually happened when the TV was switched on. There seems to be a tipping point at which the monitors just cannot cope anymore with the sheer number of people using the park.

The ‘dance’ is the most obvious response to the monitors, it is non-confrontational and an easy way to deal with the discipline that the monitors would like to impart. There are occasionally more aggressive responses such as the one that I related above by Alfred. The photographers as a group have had conflict with the monitors when the monitors first asked them to leave as I also related in Section Three.

The ‘illegal’ traders in and around the park constitute another form of resistance, as well as being simply a way to try and earn a living. Some traders would set up a box with the goods: crisps, sweets, cigarettes, and sometimes fruit and vegetables in season. They would then trade there. According to Ma Judy those were the best places to trade because of the people walking through the park. These traders keep an eye out for the metro police, and would pack away their goods quickly and run off when the JMPD were close. A few minutes later, if the JMPD had left, they would return. At times their goods would be impounded by the JMPD, and since it would cost R1 500 to release goods from the pound, they would abandon it there.

Something similar would happen in the park. Here people more often walk around with the goods that they are selling, such as ice-cream and fruit-flavoured ice sachets in summer, in winter oranges, as well as eggs, seasonal fruit, biscuits or sweets would be sold. These walk-around traders simply leave the park when the JMPD or the monitors focus on them. It is then a very passive resistance that they offer, but I wanted to show that their very being in space, using space in ways that the city disapproves of, is a way of resisting the rules and regulations of the CoJ, City Parks and the monitors. It is in all a very passive resistance that the park users reveal. Because they rarely actively challenge the oppressive rules, nothing changes.
6. Conclusion

In this chapter I wanted to show the different rules that constrain people’s actions in the park. In the context of Johannesburg, a ‘desired’ urban resident in the eyes of the authorities would be employed within the formal economy, able to enter the formal rental market, or purchase a property through formal structures. Informality is frowned upon within the city, and considered as undesirable (Vearey 2010: 42). The rules are then set in such a way as to discourage any informality and undesired citizens.

The rules of both formal and informal intended use, seem to be a manageable space. However, these rules are used to deny poor and vulnerable people the right to the park, the Right to the City. I highlighted the different rules that are applicable in the park, and how they are contravened by both the CoJ and park users, despite the CoJ/City Parks constructing a discourse that makes park users the only ones that break rules. I further argued that only some people have the legitimacy to implement rules, like the photographers, while the monitors are not seen as legitimate.

This is of course contested. This chapter was a very good example of how the park and the city are a contested terrain. You can see the contestation between people with formal power, and users who try and subvert that power through their very presence and the challenge of powerholders. The irony, of course, would be that in other circumstances, the monitors themselves are powerless in general South African society because they do not generally have access to resources.

Foucault (1979) argued that there are two ways to organise society. The one is by trying to create the perfect society through banishment, and the other through minute control. This meant that there were two ways that discipline could be enforced. The one was demonstrated with the plague where people were banished so that those who remained could stay disease-free and perfect. In Chapter Six I illustrated this with the mechanism of exclusion at
work in the park. The other way was illustrated with the plague where authorities enforced discipline through control. Instead of people being sent away, they had to come to the window and show themselves to the townspeople. Where the first is an issue of exclusion, the next is an issue of minute control over movement (stay in the house, show yourself in the window and be counted). The spread of disease was addressed through controlling people’s movement. This idea of minute control by someone with power later led to Bentham’s idea of the panoptic. While City Parks would like to exclude users completely, and although they at times try their best to do so, they also attempt to control the minute movements of people inside the park; i.e. sit here not there, stay that long but no longer, get permits and other restrictions.

The corporatisation of the agencies has created a vacuum of responsibilities for projects in the park, leading the CoJ/City Parks to fail in their duty as described within the by-laws. The desire to be a African World Class City has set the agenda as one where the inner city is seen not only as problematic but filled with people who need control to the smallest detail. The African World Class City illustrate Rasmussen’s (2007: 176) idea of the distinction between People and people, where People are the tax-paying, decent and legitimate citizens of the city, and people the urban poor, illegal and criminal. The people in this discourse have no legitimacy, their inhabiting of the decayed inner city is problematic and stands in the way of progress. The people do not have the Right to the City. This has implications for public sphere formation because the government labels the space a failure, and it can take all sort of controls that would not necessarily be accepted elsewhere. Only the People can legitimately belong to the public sphere, while the people cannot.

In the next chapter I address the issue of the public sphere in the park, and whether it indeed exists, and what form it takes on.
Chapter 8: Engaged resistance

1. Introduction
The previous chapter was about the rules, both formal and informal, that the CoJ applies and enforces in the park. I argued that the rules and discourse around the park seek to label the park users as indolent drug users who don’t fit in an African World Class City, and the park users must be controlled through minute rules and regulations. Through this labelling they can then legitimise the rules to regulate who they see as valid citizens or the People vs. the people.

This chapter focuses on how the public sphere is enacted in and around the park. I argue that public spheres operate on two levels, a smaller scale within the park, but at a more recognisable scale outside the park. While there are glimmers of individual participation in public sphere activities within the park, they are not more widely spread.

In Chapter Six Section Two A I highlighted the Real Realist’s dire ‘warnings’ of the park. Despite the assumption that the park is a place of lawlessness and chaos, I have shown that it is in fact strictly regulated. In the previous two chapters I discussed the mechanism of exclusion that acts as ‘rules’ for using the park. The informal rules are never explicitly enforced, but are communicated in subtle messages of belonging or not belonging. Then I discussed the formal rules as written and enforced by City Parks and the CoJ. I have argued that there is a variety of legitimate park users, while other park users are seen as illegitimate. I also argued that the monitors poorly enforce rules but that the photographers effectively enforce the rules that they regard as important. This is because they are seen as having legitimacy in the park, while the monitors do not have.

I argue that there are some individual public sphere activities in the park, in that people speak of politics and what they consider to be a better society. However, there are no protests in the park. There have been several protests
around the park and people use the park as a place to meet to go to other protests. These protests often reflect issues that park users themselves struggle with, or are concerned about. Park users never join in these protests. You are then left with a situation where users talk about issues, but never join protests. At the same time you have formal democratic procedures (a local government election) taking place. While voting takes place in the park there are never attempts by political parties to engage people with regard to their policies. This culminates in the fact that the park has a paucity of public sphere activity, despite having great potential for it to occur.

2. Talking about politics
Park users talk about politics on a regular basis. People speak about politics and their view of the common good in almost every conversation. If public spheres are about discussions that people have in order to decide their common good, then the park is a hotbed of public sphere discussions. In Chapter One Section Three I discussed what the public sphere was. The public sphere is the act of coming together to discuss common interests outside of government. Theoretically, it should be open to everyone, independent of status. Public space is seen as playing a vital role in the establishment of public sphere activities.

I will show in this chapter that there is a difference between the formalised organisations that have public sphere engagements and the talk that exists in the park. The difference between the formal organisations, and people just talking in the park, is invited and invented spaces of citizenship.

“Invited” spaces are defined as ones occupied by those grassroots and their allied non-governmental organisations that are legitimised by donor and government interventions. “Invented” spaces are those, also occupied by the grassroots and claimed by their collective action, but directly confronting the authorities and the status quo. While the former grassroots actions are geared mostly toward providing the poor with coping mechanisms and propositions to support survival of their informal membership, the grassroots activity of the latter challenges the status quo in the hope of larger societal change and resistance to the dominant power relations (Miraftab 2004: 1).
The CoJ sees the park organisations as more legitimate than the people using the park. This is despite the contradiction of the lack of clarity of who needs to accept responsibility for the various projects. But as I showed in the previous chapter, people themselves are de-legitimated through CoJ/City Parks practices.

I will relate only a few discussions here with regard to conversations that I heard or participated in that I consider being the public sphere. The discussions I highlight aren’t what took place during interviews, but rather during participant observation. Discussions easily identifiable as public sphere were most likely to take place at the Neighbourhood Centre and GHP.

Matron was speaking of the water cannons that were used at the Helen Joseph Hospital [19 August 2010] on the public service sector strikers [a four-week strike in August 2010]. She said that they were powerful and indicated with her body how they pushed you back. Then Jane said that the government should just pay and why do the workers have to go on strike every two years.

Ma Mary then said that it is true there are many people with skills in the park and that those skills are not used because people do not know how to use them once they have lost their jobs. Spoong then said that many people in the park are migrants from Mozambique and Zimbabwe. He asked me what I thought of that situation. I said that it is difficult because people are blaming migrants for all sorts of things for which they should not be blamed. Spoong asked me whether it is central or local government that should change things in the park, and what central government policy was towards the park (Field notes 26 August 2010)

I said that I was well and asked how she was. She said that at the moment it is really difficult financially for NGOs as all the donors had made agreements with government to divert funding there. Government is then supposed to distribute the funding to NGOs but because government is corrupt, the funding never reaches the NGOs. She said that at the moment they were waiting for funding from the National Youth Development Agency (NYDA) from funding that comes from the EU. However, the person at NYDA who was supposed to dispense the money to them has been suspended and the funds that he was administrating were frozen. This has left them in a pickle as they were supposed to be dispensing money to the youths that they were working with. The person who was suspended was using the money to fund his own political campaigns. (Field notes 2 September 2010)

These conversations took place at the neighbourhood house and touched on a variety of subjects. How government should treat public sector workers, what the role of national and local government is, and corruption and political capture of organisations. Elsewhere in this chapter and thesis I relate
conversations with regard to housing, to the place of migrants and of women in society. The topics were wide ranging but always focused on what a better society would be. Although I would say that the mood in general was supportive of the ANC, it was against the government, recognising its failures and wanting to change it.

The next example is the GHP. Here was also regular discussion around what constitutes a good society. Their focus was mostly on the green economy. These discussions took place during the monthly meetings of the GHP.

Nomande reported back that the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) service providers came and she was very happy since this was the first time that a government institution actually pitched up when they said they would. However, an older lady, who came late and whose name I did not catch, said that the DTI service provider did not come to her. She said she had arranged everything and they just did not pitch up. She was visibly upset because she felt that she was being disrespected and that it was her own people, two young black men, who disrespected her by not showing up. Mabule tried to calm her down and said that she must just keep on trying to get them there because it was the right thing to do. She said that she can continue to do what she does without the DTI, that she has been doing it for a very long time. (field notes 6 August 2010)

After this Tsatsidiso reported that he had been asked by the organisation Terra Madre in Italy to come and speak to them about their various projects as well as setting up organic gardening projects among the youth. Mabule said Tsatsidiso is a shining example of Greenhouse success because he came from the Greenhouse and he came to ask for help, and now he is organising many youths in the Vaal area and in Soweto to have their own organic gardens. (field notes 6 August 2010)

He then said that he doesn’t like the march and that education in SA is bad already, and now we will have even worse results because of the strike. Instead, he said that the strikers should find different ways to engage the government and get what they want. He said we already had OBE to cope with and that students already can’t read or write properly. Now we will have another bunch of matric who cannot perform properly and who will become unemployed. I said that the problem is government is not listening, and while we have so many overpaid ministers and corrupt politicians people will strike for what they want. He said that it is true but rather than waiting for government, people should be doing things for themselves like he is doing. (Field notes 25 August 2010)

Matthews, Soweto/Naledi, from the Tebogo trust, started a greenhouse, organic farming project. He is busy with a mini-MBA and gave a small speech about people needing to step-up and do it for themselves and not wait for someone else to do it and take charge of things for themselves. (Field notes 3 September 2010)
On the pamphlet container there were two sets of pamphlets – Ceasefire (StopWar) and a pamphlet against the use of nuclear reactors. The Ceasefire pamphlet is dated June 2010 while the nuclear pamphlet is dated September 2010. (Field notes 8 October 2010)

The above quotes illustrate the wide range of topics that were covered in discussions, and shows that public sphere engagement takes place. The engagements were around how people should be treated by government (DTI), the rights of striking teachers, self-sufficiency vs. the role of government, and through pamphlets giving information on the role of nuclear power and war.

In the park itself people also engaged in discussion around what can be termed public spheres. Some of these I caught as snippets. Some of them were more elaborate conversations. These snippets captured some of the topics that were discussed in and around the park. At the same time they captured some of the concerns that I heard in discussions concerning the state of South Africa.

He [Dickson] said that the Zulus who were doing the attacks were very ignorant, “Because they say that we are stealing their jobs, and they can kill us but that doesn’t mean that that person becomes a doctor or an electrician, they cannot take the qualification”. He further said South Africa may one day find itself in the situation of Zimbabwe and then we will need to go there, he has this idea that the wheel turns or, as he expressed it, that God is watching. (Field notes 1 July 2010)

His concerns reflected a general discussion with regard to xenophobia in South Africa. Following the attack on African migrants in 2009, the state of migration, and the blame for government failures to protect migrants became an important point of discussion. Migration and the effects that it has on South Africa, both for migrants and South African citizens, remain a pertinent debate in the country.

The following snippet relates an occurrence just as the Soccer World Cup (SWC) was about to start. As with all countries that host a mega-event, a lot of money was spent to beautify the city. In Johannesburg’s case, the desire to be a African World Class City played into this already existing phenomenon.
Overheard while walking, the following was said between two teenage girls. “How come South Africa is only beautiful when there is something happening?” (Field notes 8 June 2010)

While many South Africans were very excited about hosting the SWC, there were also a fair amount of discussion as to whether we can afford to host it, whether we would be able to host it (Afro-pessimism) and the costs involved. These snippets link with the idea of what we want South Africa to be like for its citizens all the time not just for special events and occasions.

The last snippet that I want to mention is related to the xenophobic condition as discussed earlier. It goes further than that, it also mentions what type of society we want with regard to freedom of thought, as well as engaging in a transnational public sphere discussion.

Here in SA you can say bad things about Zuma, but in Zimbabwe if you say anything bad about Mugabe you will be arrested. He [a South African trader] said that he heard Zimbabweans are highly educated but now the young boys come here and do nothing. Even if Zimbabwe becomes good again, these boys will have no education, and will go back to Zim[babwe] and not be able to do anything, even sell something. Here they just sit around, and play cards and gamble. He doesn’t believe that Zimbabwe will come right again. [Discussion with a South African trader] (Field notes 8 July 2010)

This was a claim about South African society. We have freedom, contrary to the Zimbabwean society, they don’t have freedom. It engages with local politics, what is the state of South African society and free debate, the state of Zimbabwean democracy and freedom, but also at local level, what people will do for a living.

I have related some of the conversations that people had. A claim to be part of a broader public sphere as a migrant, an indictment against a government that ignores places unless it will be showcased through mega-events, and a discussion of Zimbabwean politics and how it affects South Africa. These may all be very brief or narrow ‘beginning’ conversations, but they are there. People aren’t discussing the reality television or mindless entertainment, a reason for the breakdown of the public sphere that Habermas (2008: 162) identified. There is a common concern about what makes a good society, even if it just comes through as snippets of conversation.
Two other places that we can see public spheres existence are in the JAG and the church soup kitchen. I want to argue that both in more nebulous ways engage in public sphere activity and have ideas of what a more ideal society would look like.

The very fact that the church comes to the park to preach and give out food is a way of saying that this is what society should look like. The act of preaching Christianity is an insertion in the public sphere that calls for it to be more religious, and religious reflecting a specific nature.

Our message is a message that tries to raise up their hopes. They are not as poor as they think and those people who are successful are no different from them. It is just that they act on the ideas that they have. We try and make them see that what pulls them down is not what they think, it is not the government, it is not their circumstances, it is their minds. If you believe that you are poor you will always be poor. Ja, our message is basically that, because that is what the Bible teaches. Ja, it is basically that. And we also show them how to clear your mind... (Bishop John).

They are not preaching liberation theology. It is rather a conservative theology that says that people are poor because they think that they are. They convey ideas of what the country and its people should look like.

The gallery is involved in creating public spheres in a different way, through the art that it exhibits. The gallery changes its exhibitions regularly and I argue that although the gallery may not necessarily agree with the message (or they might) the fact that it exists and chooses to display certain things is an important act of public sphere engagement. I am not an expert in analysing art and these are preliminary thoughts. I want to only touch on this subject by pointing towards two shows.

The first is the retrospective exhibition by the photographer Ernest Cole. Cole was a black South African photographer who chronicled the abuses of apartheid between the 1950s and 60s with a book *House of Bondage*. His work was banned from South Africa, and he died in New York in 1990. The Ernest Cole retrospective exhibition was the first exhibition of his work in South Africa (JAG press release 9 September 2010). The work on exhibit was the major work that compromised the book. The second is the Tracey Rose
exhibition, *Waiting for God*, using multiple and different medias and mediums “deal in poignant ways with explicit racial, sexual and gender political issues” (Sey 2011).

The importance of art in the public sphere was recently illustrated by the protests that occurred around an exhibition at the Goodman gallery, in Johannesburg. The exhibition by the artist Brett Murray contained work criticising the ANC’s failure to govern without corruption during post-apartheid. It also contained a painting, *The Spear*, that featured President Jacob Zuma in a Lenin stance with his genitals exposed. The painting caused a huge uproar with Zuma and the ANC appealing to court that the painting be removed (Boshomane 2012; Hlongwane 2012; Nkomo 2012). At the time of
the court challenge two people independently vandalised the painting\textsuperscript{131}. The ANC organised a march to the gallery, demanding that the painting be destroyed. This case engaged the South African public sphere around art, freedom of speech, and the right to dignity.

The JAG has also reached into the park to become involved in public sphere activities. Through the Joubert Park Project the park sought to engage park users. One significant contribution that they made was a visiting artist who organised a protest chess match against the erection of the fence between the park and the gallery. The fence cut the chessboard in half and chess players played over the fence, to protest the separation between the fence and the park (JAG A-books). While this highlighted a serious problem, namely the fence, it was an externally organised protest or public sphere engagement.

In this section I established that public sphere engagements do take place in and around the park. They may be incomplete and not fully formed ideas that individuals engage, but they are there. In the next section I show how a more recognisable form of public sphere occurs around the park, but does not occur inside the park itself.

3. Protests outside the park
Often when people speak of public sphere engagement in public space it seems to refer to protest marches (Staeheli & Mitchell 2008). The Occupy Movement has highlighted the importance of being in space in order to bring attention to problems that are ignored in mainstream politics. In this section I want to discuss the marches that have taken place around the park. The concerns that these marches raised are important in understanding problems within Johannesburg. They reflected concerns that people themselves raised

\textsuperscript{131} One was a young black man who felt that Zuma’s dignity was attacked and the second a middle class white male who felt that the painting threatened reconciliation in the country (Boshomane 2012).
in the park, yet park users were not part of these protests themselves. The protests that I address is the miniskirt march, a housing march, traders march and a trade union march.

a. Mini skirt march

On 4 March 2008 a march started from the Johannesburg Art Gallery to the Noord Street Taxi rank. This march was organised by 702 DJ, Redi Direko and the organisation Women and Men against Child Abuse (Independent Online (IOL News) 2008). About 300 men and women attended, many wearing miniskirts (Agence France-Presse (AFP) 2008; IOL News 2008). The march was organised after a young woman, wearing a miniskirt, was assaulted by taxi drivers and hawkers, because she was according to them, showing too much skin (AFP 2008; Mail and Guardian 2008). They tore her clothes off her, touched her and threw alcohol over her head (AFP 2008; Mail and Guardian 2008).

The march wanted to highlight and protest the every-day experience of harassment that women, using taxis and the street experience (AFP 2008; IOL 2008). Furthermore, it wanted to draw attention to the high number of assaults that take place on women daily, and wanted to shift the ‘blame-the-victim’ mentality (AFP 2008).

The march wanted to engage more than taxi drivers on this single assault. Rather as the head of the organisation Women and men against child abuse pointed out, “we are protected by a liberal constitution. Women should be able to wear what they want without fear of verbal or physical abuse” (quoted in IOL News 2008). Taxi drivers said that women had too many rights and if they walked around ‘indecently’ dressed, then they were looking for it (AFP 2008) and that short skirts are against African tradition (BBC 2008).

132 This is a Gauteng-based talk radio station, often covering political and current issues.
If it is true, as Arthur (1997: 11) argues, that “clothing provides a frame of reference for interpreting the abstract process of social control”, then the miniskirt march is not only asserting the right of women to wear short skirts. Instead it stands for something else. I suggest that this ‘something else’ is the control of women and the continued patriarchal system. I argued in Chapter Six that women are kept out of the park because of an unwritten assumption about women’s place in society and the attack on women wearing certain clothes is within this trend.

These rights for gender equality are undermined by calls for a patriarchal system. This can be seen in the attack on the woman for wearing a miniskirt, thus violating her autonomy of body and freedom to choose what she wears. Bystanders to the protest said that women had too many rights in South Africa and that wearing short skirts is against tradition (BBC 2008). The National House of Traditional Leaders directly contradicted that short skirts were against tradition, because women wore short skirts during traditional and special ceremonies. In conjunction then, with the bystanders saying that women had too many rights, the attack on the woman can only be interpreted as a call for patriarchal values, and the oppression of women. A similar observation can be made about ‘corrective rape’ where township lesbians are raped in order to ‘turn them’ straight by having a ‘real’ man (Middleton 2011). Meth (2009: 857) identifies the feeling as expressed above and in her study area as feelings of masculine dispossession, where the states intervention in what her participants see as domestic affairs, makes them less of men and challenges their right as patriarchal heads.
Picture 25: Women at the miniskirt march (Zetu 2008)

The women jumped up and down

Picture 26: Men’s reactions to the miniskirt march (Zetu 2008)

Yeah, we can safely say the Taxi drivers had a “crack” at it
In the Menonite community this is starkly illustrated. Women wear strictly prescribed clothes that signal their submission under men in general, and her husband particularly. Wearing inappropriate clothes signals that you are neither a good Christian nor a good woman and will lead to censure by the church fathers. Attempting to alter the way that the clothes are made is seen as challenging the “gendered power relations between Holderman men and women” and is forbidden (Arthur 1997: 24). Amir-Ebrahimi (2006) uses the example of how women in Islamic countries are at times encouraged to unveil, and at other times encouraged to veil in order to gain acceptance and traction in their countries. The clothes then are an important symbol of patriarchal social control.

In 2011 widespread slutwalks also protested against the idea that wearing certain types of clothing signifies a desire to be raped. In Canada in 2011 a police officer speaking to college-age women about rape said that in order for women not to become victims of rape, they should not dress as sluts. This blames the victims of rape, instead of the rapist. The Canadian experience led to an international movement of people against the victimisation and subsequent blaming of women (BBC News 2011a). Slutwalks have spread to all continents including Africa, India, South America and Europe. South Africa has had two slutwalks. But before the global movement, South Africa had the miniskirt march, objecting on exactly the same grounds, and calling attention to the fact that women can, and should be entitled to wear whatever they want to wear.

In sharp contrast to the attack on the South African woman wearing a miniskirt, are the attacks that veiled women in Java experience and the anti-veiling laws in France. In Java a small minority of the Muslim women started wearing the Middle Eastern style veil. This was met with derision and resistance from fellow Javanese Muslims who saw the women as

133 For example substituting buttons for zippers or making a ready-made cap instead of an elaborately folded ones. The improvements made for easier functionality rather than changing the look of the clothes, but the elders objected.
endangering existing social ties. Wearing the veil in public could and did lead to physical attack (Brenner 1996). But the veiling women revealed that for them veiling was an act of autonomy, to regulate their own behaviour instead of being regulated by others and society (Brenner 1996: 688). In France in 2010 the wearing of the veil was banned (BBC 2010). President Sarkozy claims that he wanted the veil banned for human rights reasons. Commentators such as Moran (2011) disputes this, rather he posits that banning the veil is due to religious intolerance and the politics of immigration. Women’s clothes become a vehicle and message for politics at large. The assault of and the debate around the issues of miniskirts then stand for something bigger than merely a small piece of cloth. Instead it becomes a debate on the place of women in the South African society.

This seems to be clearly what happened to the young woman wearing a miniskirt. It had less to do with her wearing a skirt and more with wanting to assert control over her. The remark of the taxi driver that women have too many rights highlights that the miniskirt was but a convenient outlet for the loss of patriarchal power that men feel and want to express.

During apartheid the liberation struggle subsumed a feminist struggle to a national liberation struggle. This was often achieved through calling on imagery of traditional gender roles that reinforces patriarchy (Hassim 1991, Hassim 2005a). The transition period (between the unbanning of the ANC, the end of apartheid and democracy) opened up a space for contesting these images and struggling against patriarchy (Hassim 1991). Women were marginalised in the formal negotiations since no political party included women. Only with pressure from the Women’s National Coalition were women included in the second round of negotiations, although they were still marginalised (Hassim 2005a).

---

134 These negotiations called CODESA (Congress for a democratic South Africa) were held in 1991 and in 1992 to discuss how a new democratic South Africa would be formed. Issues that were discussed were the new constitution, elections and an interim government.
Again, with pressure from the WNC there were gender specific provisions made in post-apartheid legislation (Hassim 1999) without which gender equality may have been left even more unfulfilled. This could perhaps be because there is a very weak feminist movement in South Africa (Hassim 2005a). While women are relatively well represented in formal institutions of government this doesn't translate into economic and social parity (Hassim 2005b: 622).

Post-apartheid women are much worse off in indicators relating to poverty, unemployment and HIV/AIDS, as well as being vulnerable to high levels of domestic violence and sexual crimes (Beall et al. 2005: 683). There has been very little substantive social and economic change for women, indeed, in some cases, the elaborate ‘gender machinery’ has actually hindered transformation (Beall et al. 2005: 696-697). Thus, although South Africa has a constitution that stands for gender equality, the reality is that women still find themselves at the ‘bottom rung’ in many aspects. This is also compounded by articulations around race and class, thus black working class women tend to have to deal with much more oppression than white women.

Formal citizenship, or narrow participation as enacted through the right to vote, which South African women have, does not mean that citizenship as defined in the broader sense of economic and social equality, has been achieved (Hassim 1999). Hassim argues, “it has proved that formal equality can co-exist quite comfortably with systematic inequality” (Hassim 1999: 11). Even with active civil society organisations there is deep-seated patriarchy prevailing and visible (Hassim 2005a). I think that her argument can be extended to include issues addressed by the miniskirt march. This implies women staking a claim for their social equality through action outside the narrow political realm of representative politics. The miniskirt march then in one interpretation, reflects women asserting their right to gender equality in the social and political sphere.

The call then that the miniskirt march stands for reform so that women’s rights against patriarchal norms are protected and accepted. This equality is
enshrined in the constitution, but these rights are not always translated into actuality. The march wanted to call attention to this. These are women fighting for their bodily autonomy and their right to the city. It is a good example of contested cities and spaces as defined by Low and Lawrence-Zúñiga (2003). That is the contest between how women want to use space, versus the resistance that they receive when doing so.

In the next section I look at housing marches that have taken place from or at Joubert Park. Whenever I asked people in the park or at the various projects whether there were ever any marches in or from the park, the only thing that was ever mentioned, was housing marches. I look at these marches as an expression of frustration over the lack of and slow service delivery that has taken place in South Africa.

b. Housing marchers

“Housing is a major issue in contemporary Johannesburg” (Bénit 2002: 47), and thus a major focal point of unhappiness in the park. When I asked people whether there were any protest actions in the park they would mention having heard of housing marches, although no-one I ever spoke to participated in them. Details around when and where housing marches took place in the park, were scarce in terms of specific dates and times, yet it was often the first and only thing that was mentioned when I asked whether there had been marches in the park. I never saw any marches personally or any documentary evidence or news report of the marches, but people in the park always insisted that housing marches were taking place from the park. This in itself is important since it reflects a major concern of park users.

Since SA has a high level of urbanisation with 69% of people living in cities, half of housing needs to be developed in urban areas (Huchzermeier 2003b: 83). Yet the "land-related discourse [has been]… preoccupied with the slow
pace of rural land reform” even though when land was invaded in Bredell\(^\text{135}\), it was for urban housing purposes (Huchzermeyer 2003b: 83). Housing and housing delivery remain an urgent priority for the SA government. Currently, around 70% of people stay in informal housing in sub-Saharan Africa, these include shacks, unmanaged hostels, sub-let flats and illegally occupied abandoned buildings (Vearey 2010: 39). The density of informal residential occupation within the inner city is continually expanding (CoJ 2005 quoted in Vearey 2010). Rental accommodation in the city takes a variety of forms, from rooms, to backyard shacks and converted warehouses. It is now beyond the control of government and services (Charlton 2010: 14).

A number of people offered their concerns about housing. The two that I relate are emblematic of the trope. The first was a conversation with a young Zimbabwean man called Thukura:

We were chatting about the people in the park and he said that he recognised a lot of people because he used to sleep at Park Station and a lot of people sleeping there in the park also sleep at Park Station. I asked why Park Station, he said because a lot of people sleep there, it is safe. If you sleep in

\(^{135}\) Bredell is an area adjacent to Johannesburg, formally in the megacity Erkhuleni. In 2001 the Pan African Congress (PAC), or people claiming to be PAC officials illegally sold plots of land for R25. The land belonged to farmers and parastatals.
isolated places you will get robbed even if you only had R5. If you had no money then you would get beaten. After sleeping at night he would then come to the park to sleep. He said that there was a church that came there and gave people food. But he said now he is in a shelter. Two months ago he met someone from the New Life Centre who told them they had a shelter. He went to tell his story to someone in Randburg and then they gave him a place to stay. But he is only allowed to stay for 2 months and in 5 days those two months will be over. He said that if he has a job he knows places where he can go and sleep for R10 or R20. But if he doesn’t find a job, he will have to go to the streets again.

(Fieldwork diary 18 October 2010)

Thukura’s biggest problem was that he had no money and would soon have no place to stay. Although there are other shelters in town they are not free. For a Metropolitan Evangelical Services (MES)\textsuperscript{136} shelter you have to pay R8 per night, and he could simply not afford it. Also, since he was Zimbabwean and an illegal immigrant, many of the shelters would not take him\textsuperscript{137}. A week later I met him in the park again, by then he had been kicked out from the shelter and was living at Park station again. He was also stuck, he had no money to go to a shelter or pay for shared accommodation somewhere, and he had no money to return to Zimbabwe.

The trolley pusher, Vincent, had a very similar story. When he arrived in Johannesburg from Mozambique he could not afford a place to stay, nor did he know anyone to stay with. He ended up sleeping at Park Station until he began earning money as a trolley pusher and could afford to pay R700 for a shared room in a flat where three of them stayed (in the room not the flat). Crusher, the chess player from Hyenas Chess Club, had a similar story of coming to Johannesburg to try and find work, ending up in the street and then struggling to afford a place in shared accommodation.

It is not only young migrants though who find themselves struggling to afford city accommodation. Of the three women whom I most regularly had contact

\textsuperscript{136} An inner city Christian outreach organisation that has been active in Johannesburg for around 25 years.

\textsuperscript{137} I found this out via a friend who approached shelters to urgently look for accommodation for an acquaintance. Although she phoned shelters willing to take the woman, when they heard that she was not South African they would not provide shelter. I confirmed this with a worker at MES.
with at the neighbourhood centre, Martha, Ma Mary and Jane, all three of
them have had issues with housing. I recall two of these. First Jane’s story:

She and Ma Mary were speaking to one another. Ma Mary at a stage said to
me they are speaking about Jane (the bead woman) and how she got kicked
out of the place where she was staying. She was kicked out because she had
a problem with the owner of the house not fixing something. She then
stopped paying rent in order for him to fix it. But he took her to court and she
was kicked out two weeks ago. They said that she had known for a long time
that she might be kicked out but did not prepare for it. Martha said that it was
always a bad idea to move out of the city because in the city it is easy to find
another place to rent if you are renting, but if you move into a house, it is
always more expensive and then it is difficult to get back into the housing
market. (Fieldwork diary 8 Sept 2010)

Ma Mary said that she lived in a place on Quartz and Leeds Street. She
shares with someone. She pays R1 000 per month for this place. The place
where they are living had been sold the previous month. It was owned by a
man and woman from Lesotho. The man died last year and then they were
just renting from the woman and her daughter. The woman died and they
were renting from the daughter. Then last month they got a phone call from
someone who said they were the new owner. She phoned the daughter and
the daughter said that she had sold the place. So they paid the new owner.
Anyway, then this month she got a phone call from the daughter asking why
she had not paid the rent. She said to the daughter she did pay to the new
owner. She said to the daughter she did pay to the new owner. Then the daughter said that she will phone the lawyer and get back to
them.

I asked how long she had lived there and she said for the past 2 years.
Previously she was living somewhere else. The red ants came and removed
them. She said that the red ants come and remove the big things, but the
small things they leave there. Also because they just dump everything outside
with no care what belongs to whom, things get lost. The red ants either then
steal or sell the small things. (Fieldwork dairy 6 October 2010)

Both these stories show the vulnerability that these women have experienced
in terms of housing. These are not young migrants, struggling for the first time
in the city. They prefer living in the city because it is closer to an offset place
for their goods, they have little travelling costs and there are other amenities,
such as chances for job training and health clinics. Ma Mary has been living in
the city since 2001. She had already been evicted from a place previously
because they wanted to refurbish the places. Although she had paid her rent,
she was also removed from the building. When they did refurbish the
apartments, it became too expensive for people like Ma Mary, Martha and
Jane.
What I want to show with the above excerpts, are the problems that park users have in terms of accommodation within the city. Flats are mostly too expensive to occupy by yourself, getting a landlord to fix anything is difficult, you are uncertain about how long you will be able to stay within the flats before eviction shadows you. All but one park user and trader shared the same story, and the one person who had a different experience did not stay in the inner city but rather a suburb where he bought a house before he became a trader. A gallery worker stays as a backyarder, where the rent is cheap, and there is space for her children to play. She however has to take a train for an hour and a half each way. The trains are unreliable and often take much longer, or she has to take much more expensive taxis to reach work.

People within the inner city are also quite vulnerable when they are evicted. The week before 6 October 2010 an apartment building was cleared on Smit Street, a mere block from the park. I drove past there on Saturday evening (2/10/2010) to pick up friends at Park Station and saw that during the day, people had been evicted from the building. The Friday there was no-one on the street, the Saturday what seemed like a mass of humanity, people were dumped like rotten garbage on the street corner with all their possessions.

I went to the community house and sat and chatted with Ma Mary and Pinky. I asked Ma Mary whether she knew what had happened at Smit Street. She said that she had heard that the red ants came and put people out of the building. She said “our government doesn’t care”. I asked whether the people had any recourse and Ma Mary said that people didn’t really have anywhere to go, that the government is supposed to help, but doesn’t. She said that she didn’t want to be funny but when white people lived there, there were never any red ants. The whites paid only R250-350 to live in the city. Now she pays more than a R1 000 for a shared apartment.

I asked whether there was any way that people can protest about what happens, or if there are people that they consult with their problems. She said people try and go to government but government does nothing. Pinky said “They think they are clever because of where they are. They done this because they are clever.” For her, government has lost touch with people, they live in their fancy houses and drive expensive cars and that is far away from how poor people live. The lawyers that they go to just take their money and nothing ever gets done. (fieldwork diary 6 October 2010)
Evictions such as these are not unusual. During 2011 several evictions from ‘bad buildings’ took place, on 6 July 2011 JMPD illegally evicted “hundreds of women and children, including fifty blind people” (SERI 2011). The JMPD acknowledged to the Social and Economic Rights Institute (SERI) that the evictions were illegal but continued anyway. SERI obtained an urgent interdict from the Gauteng High Court that allowed people to return to the building. Even though an organisation from government knew that these evictions were illegal, and were pointed out as illegal by bystanders from SERI, they continued blithely.

Poor inner city residents do have recourse from evictions through the law, and several institutions are available to help, such as SERI, the Wits Law Clinic, and the Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions (COHRE). There is however

138 Without a court order.

Picture 28: After an eviction in 2010, Smit Street
no guarantee that they will be helped. A conversation between Ma Mary and Matron reveals this.

Matron said to Ma Mary that Steven Khosa is her (Ma Mary’s) boyfriend. But that he is a crook. She first said this to Ma Mary and then to me. I asked who Steven Khosa was and why he was a crook. Matron said that he was someone who was supposed to help the people who had been evicted from Joubert Park, but that he just takes people’s money and leaves. Ma Mary said that she had paid him money (R200) after she was evicted and that they are still waiting for the 18 April meeting with him. He had promised her and everyone else that they would be back in the building by the end of the week. Sibongile laughed and said that he must have meant April 18 2011. (Fieldwork diary 26 August 2010)

Despite Ma Mary being astute and having good knowledge of housing issues through her connection with Martha, she was caught by a crook, who took her money and did nothing for her. As the earlier quote from my fieldwork diary shows, people are increasingly becoming frustrated because although the government is supposed to help them, they do nothing, or are the perpetrators of the evictions. One avenue that was meant to help people deal with housing issues in the inner city, the Joubert Park Neighbourhood Centre was shut down by the CoJ, leaving residents even more vulnerable to abuse and misinformation.

It is against this background then I want to discuss housing marches that park users have reported to me. As I stated earlier, these housing marches were the most frequently reported as occurring in the park. As I have indicated it is an intensely local issue but at the same time it is much larger than the park or even Johannesburg only.

Below is an excerpt from an interview with Ma Mary and Kathy at the community house.

IEM: Do you ever remember a time when there was protests in the park, did people strike in the park or went to gather in the park? Do you ever remember if there was something like that?
MG: Not, no.
KY: There was something like that here. It was 2008 there. When was the national elections.?
KY: Ja I think it was 2008 maybe 2009. There’s this forum, they call themselves friends of inner city,
IEM: Ja...
KY: They were marching, eh eviction, property issues. Ja they gath...
KY: I think they were giving them their memorandum to ANC. So I cannot remember whether it was after or before they went, but they gathered here.
IEM: And did it work? Did lots of people come?
KY: I don’t remember exactly how many people.
MG: But it was for...
KY: They were not violent. They were not violent, the people weren’t instigating, they were listening to their leaders, how they should conduct themselves. But further than that, there is no violent activity, at this park.

The organisation that Kathy refers to *Friends of the Inner City* was active in the inner city between 2008 and 2010, but seem to have now become defunct. They organised for housing rights in the city, urging good tenant/landlord relations (i.e. both paying accounts on time) and advocating against building hijackers. It is not clear exactly when they stopped being operational\(^\text{139}\), since the phone number on the website is not working. The last posting was slightly before the start of the SWC when they urged a clean-up campaign.

Martha from the community house reiterates that the nature of protests in the park is around housing delivery issues. Who organises the protests and what they achieve, is less clear.

CYEN: Most of the marches that I know start at the park, they are housing marches, they were marching to [xxx] because of the problems that they have within the city, there is high rentals that they are paying, housing, they went to tribunal for assistance they don’t get any assistance and it seems like people that are staying in the flats, government has forgotten about them, because they also need houses because they are not happy living in buildings, because of high rentals, buildings not properly maintained, you know. So those are issues that always make them to march. Sometimes, they march to the mayor, mayor’s office.

Photographers, traders and park users confirmed that the issue of housing is a major one for protests in the park and the inner city, although no-one I spoke to had participated in the march themselves. The park in this case was also only a convenient gathering place to go somewhere else.

\(^{139}\) This is in line with Lipietz (2008b) finding that organisations within the inner-city do not seem to last very long.
While accounts from park users such as Martha and Ma Mary above emphasised the local character of the housing protests, the local councillor saw it differently.

IEM: Uhm you know are you aware of any protests that started in the park or that is part of the park or that comes through the park or passed…
CM: Yes, and I can tell you, the protest it started in the park sometimes in February 2009 and the protests was made by people that was not even staying in the inner city for starters. They were from Soweto and other areas, they came by train, yes, and they gathered inside the park, the people who were leading the protest is staying around the inner city, yes but not in Ward 59 but is staying in the inner city. So they gathered inside the park itself, in the morning.
IEM: And what was the protest about?
CM: It was about housing.
IEM: What specifically about housing?
CM: That they don’t have access to housing, that they are looking for RDPs
IEM: Is it housing very broadly like we want a house anywhere, or is it specifically about we want housing in the inner city?
CM: No, no because those people they came from Soweto so they want housing from their areas.

While everyday park users like Martha see the housing crisis as an intensely local battle, for the councillor it is an outsider’s battle that happens to play out in the park. Of course both may be right. What the housing protests reflect is a larger struggle in South Africa to access affordable housing and services.

The South African constitution, through its Bill of Rights, guarantees socio-economic rights, including the right to adequate housing (section 26). This however was qualified as to being within the state’s resources (Huchzermeyer 2003b: 86). The courts have been reluctant to enforce the socio-economic rights of people (Huchzermeyer 2003b: 80, 82). Even in cases where poor people have had victories in court, this has not necessarily translated into a change in their circumstances (Sinwell 2010; Huchzermeyer 2003a)\textsuperscript{140}

\textsuperscript{140} This is specifically illustrated by the Grootboom case. Her case as ruled by the Constitutional Court, in 2004 was that the state is obliged under the Constitution section 26 to provide housing, also for the desperately poor, such as Irene Grootboom. She however died in 2008, still homeless and destitute (Sinwell 2010).
Although some strides have been made in providing housing from the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), these have “tended to perpetuate the patterns of apartheid planning” with new houses built far from any amenities (Poulsen 2010: 22). The focus of RDP has also been formal houses, neglecting the need for rental accommodation, especially rooms with shared ablutions and cooking facilities (Charlton 2010; Poulsen 2010: 22). These are especially important for migrant workers who send remittances home to rural areas, rather than bringing whole families to the city. “[M]any local people have also chosen to locate in the inner city to gain easier access to employment opportunities and benefit from amenities in the city” (Poulsen 2010: 23), yet the lack of affordable rental housing makes this difficult (Vearey 2010) as people within the park told me. For the city it is important to provide formal housing in order to enter a ‘transactional relationship’ with residents, in
other words to be able to recover costs from residents through billing and metering (Charlton 2010: 4).

There are a few social housing projects in the inner city where even though subsidised, only a few people can afford it. In these buildings only 20-30% of housing is available for social housing because of the need to recover costs (Charlton 2010: 14; Poulsen 2010: 23). In order for people to practise their Right to the City, there needs to be affordable accommodation available in the city.

Just like the miniskirt march was about protecting women’s constitutional right to freedom, so housing protests are about drawing attention to the difficulty of gaining decent housing in Johannesburg. It is however a bigger issue – it is a call for belonging to SA, a call for adherence to the letter and the spirit of the constitution.

c. Trader marchers

![Picture 30: Traders marching against JMPD abuses (SAPA 2010b)](image)

In a similar way that there are housing protests that originate in the park and then go elsewhere, there are also traders protesting. Stanley, a trader on King George, reported a protest from traders starting in the park. The destination was Mary Fitzgerald Square and from there the mayor’s office (SAPA 2010a).
None of the traders to whom I spoke participated in the protest and although I was there on the day that Stanley indicated the protest took place, I did not see anyone congregate there\textsuperscript{141}. The King George Street traders were at their stalls. The protest was organised against the brutality of the metro police and the fact that they confiscate traders’ goods. According to Stanley the march was a waste of time and a result of the traders not following by-laws. “This march story of hawkers, away!” (Stanley). He felt this way despite the fact that he and other traders felt aggravated by MTC.

Stanley was in many ways unique in his feelings that traders were not targets of JMPD harassment, and that the demands that these particular marchers made were illegitimate. Both the formal and informal traders in and around the park pointed to the JMPD as a source of harassment. The traders see the JMPD as an illegitimate organisation that only harasses them and demands bribes.

In order to understand why traders would march against harassment and confiscation of goods, it is necessary to understand the antecedents of antipathy towards the JMPD. Although it does not appear that the traders on King George and in the park took part in the march, they loathe the JMPD. This combines with pervasive ill feelings held towards MTC by the formal traders who also see them as corrupt.

Informal traders have no rights as traders, and are insecure in their position as traders in and around the park. The JMPD can at any moment arrest the traders and confiscate their goods. Thata, the chess-trader, sells small sweets, crisps and cigarettes at the chess sets in the park, often related to me the disgust that he had towards JMPD. This was also combined with the belief that the JMPD is corrupt in their dealings with traders. Thata said that when traders’ goods were seized, the JMPD would ask for a bribe in order to secure

\textsuperscript{141} It could have been that the traders from other localities congregated there much earlier during the day, before I arrived.
the release of the goods. From multiple conversations, it was not clear whether he meant the fine that was described in the by-laws for the informal traders by the CoJ, or for bribes to release their goods before it even arrived at the formal CoJ stores. He always insisted that all moneys be paid towards the JMPD were bribes. The informal traders had very specific complaints against the JMPD.

The formalised informal traders had similar complaints against the JMPD. One of the first conversations that I had with Ma Judy was about her feelings towards the JMPD. This was generally a feeling of distrust and dislike. She related that she had only formalised because she was tired of her goods being confiscated by the JMPD. Nkosi had a similar story. He decided that formalisation was a better idea than continually paying fines. For him, formalisation meant giving up an established client base elsewhere in the city and starting afresh.

Still, formalisation does not mean the end of perceived harassment from the JMPD.

As we were discussing this, she [Ma Judy] saw two JMPD officers walk past. I asked whether the JMPD was taking the illegal hawkers away. She said that they didn’t take them away, but harassed the legal traders as well. I asked how. Ellen said (indicating her stall) that they are harassed because of the plastic that they put up at the back of their stalls to stop the wind. She also hangs things from the top of the stall which they will sometime confiscate. She said that she also extends the bottom shelf of her stall so that passerbys can see the goods at the bottom of her stall. For this she is also harassed by the JMPD. (Field notes 15 September 2010)

Ma Judy complains because the JMPD will still confiscate goods even if you are trading in a stall. That is because of the way that she displays her goods on her stall, as well as the plastic sheeting that the traders use to try and insulate and waterproof the stalls. The reason though that traders modify stalls is that the stalls are unpractical for their needs. The MTC was aware of this, but did not seem to have any intention of correcting it.

The practices described by Ma Judy are contrary to the rules of the MTC for proper stall use.
Metro Police is suppose to leave them, as soon as they fall under MTC. But metro police will tell you according to by-laws. But at the same time the traders they are liars, there are ways to display in your pitch, they will overlap. When they overlap, definitely JMPD is going to interfere. When they don’t do their display neatly, JMPD is going to come. And when, JMPD will write in the ticket, that they were overlapping. And the trader when they come will say, I was in my place they just come. I always look and say no, you were in your place but you were overlapping. (Interview Thuli MTC)

This conflict between the idealised rules and the actuality of a stall comes about because stalls were not designed with the needs of traders in mind. Thus what traders need from the stalls was not delivered and they have to adapt the stalls and their displays in order for the stalls to be functional. This leads to direct conflict between the JMPD and traders.

The JMPD is also despised because they are seen as corrupt and ask traders for bribes. One day I was sitting with Ma Judy at her stall when two JMPD officers walked to a nearby table where meat and pap are sold. The men in this stall chop up meat, usually chicken but sometime other meat in front of you, and then sells it with pap. Ma Judy warned me to look out for the officers. I watched while they approached the table, stood around chatting to the men, who were trading illegally. They pocketed something and then left. Ma Judy said, look did you see that, that was a bribe. “Bah, these JMPD they always want bribes.” I could not see what they pocketed but since they took something and gave nothing it seemed suspicious.

Whether the JMPD actually takes any bribes or whether they are only adhering to the letter of the CoJ trading by-laws becomes irrelevant, because they are seen as not credible. This impression seems to be widespread in and around the park. Workers at JAG held exactly the same contemptuous views of the JMPD as a bully organisation. Jo, the librarian at JAG related a story of how the JMPD parked in the reserved bay for staff. The person whose bay it was proceeded to park them in. JMPD officers then physically bumped the car out of the way when they wanted to leave. When the person went to challenge them they threatened him with arrest saying that “we are the JMPD we can do what we want”. The continual JMPD presence in the JAG parking lot, and their continued bad behaviour have led to gallery attendees complaining to
the manager of JAG, who then banned JMPD from the JAG parking. To
gallery staff and visitors JMPD also represented untrustworthy organisation.

Once again the protest wanted to engage in the larger public sphere with
informal traders wanting to draw attention to their right to earn a livelihood free
from harassment. The park was a backdrop, one of several places that people
gathered to go to a different location. Like all the abovementioned examples,
it is not about the park, but a ‘bigger’ picture.

d. Trade union protests
On 7 April 2011 Pikitup workers from the South African Municipal Workers
Union (SAMWU) started to strike. They were demanding a wage increase,
banning of labour brokers, making temporary staff permanent, termination of
contracts with private companies, as well as the investigations into corruption
at the company (SAPA 2011b, Xaba & Ramoroka 2011). On the day that the
strike started, striking workers gathered for a mass meeting in the park for the
better part of the day and from there marched to the offices of Pikitup
(Sowetan 2011). The park provided them with a place where they could
gather and air their grievances and make plans.

While none of the park users participated in any of the protest actions
discussed above, the protests reflected their own voiced concerns. In 2004/5
alone there were 16 protests daily in South Africa of which 13 were illegal
(Bond & Chitonge: 2006: 1). Between 2004-2008 there were at least ten
protests per day that involved ‘unrest’, illegal or violent protests (Alexander
2010: 27). This has led to the situation being described as the “local protests
amounting to a rebellion of the poor” (Alexander 2010: 25).

The increase of demonstrations in the park seem to confirm Huchzermeyer’s
(2003b: 84) assertion that democracy will lead to more social movements and
protests because they are complementary. Thus, while institutionalised
political participation is infrequent (once every few years), social movement
protests can take place whenever a need arises. Social movements or protest
movements can give more nuanced choices as opposed to institutional
politics that is usually a crude choice for or against something or someone. Ideally, protests should make institutionalised politics more responsive in their actions as a response to their demands. Social movements can keep their priorities on the agenda even when their party of choice is not in, power or by reminding political parties of their election promises. They can also influence the outcome of elections through mobilising people to vote a certain way. (Goldstone 2004: 342-344). Despite the widespread protests elsewhere in South Africa, and the protests that I referred to that take place around the park, there are no protests inside the park. In terms of service delivery protests, the park is quite devoid of action.

In this context though, there were no protests taking place inside the park itself, though there were protests around and nearby the park. Is this because of the internal exclusions that happen in the park, or is it because of the way that by-laws and ad-hoc rules are enforced within the park that could result in service delivery protests? Does the pre-emptive policing stop the formation of broader public spheres? In South Africa public spheres seem to find expression through public service protests, which do not occur in the park. While broad public spheres do not seem to form in the park, formal democratic processes take place.

4. Formal democracy
The Independent Electoral Commission (IEC) is responsible for organising elections in South Africa. National and local government elections for Joubert Park (the area) take place in Joubert Park (the park). This was once again the case during the 2011 local government elections. At that stage the park was closed for renovations. The main gate opened on Election Day to allow people to vote in one of the three tents erected.

What struck me most in the run-up to the election and Election Day itself was the lack of political activity and talk around formal politics. A few posters were places on street poles around the park, but none of the political parties campaigned around the park, had rallies in, or alongside the park. There
seemed to have been very little engagement with people. I am not sure that this is unique to the park per se. In my own neighbourhood there was also no political party going out to engage people. No one knocked on our door, phoned or dropped a pamphlet.

What was also interesting was that people themselves did not engage with the local government elections. No one mentioned or commented on it. This is in the context where I would regularly be engaged in conversation about strikes, xenophobia, the green economy, on Zimbabwean politics, or on the affordability of rent in the inner city. People in and around the park engaged with what they thought of as the greater good, as a vision of what the world they want to live in, should look like. When it came to formal politics there were no interactions.

By this I’m not implying that people did not go and vote. Thirty-four percent of people voted, much less than the 58% who voted nationally. Overwhelmingly, people voted for the ANC candidate. I can only speculate why so few people
voted, it could be that people thought that the ANC would win, and could not be bothered. Or it could be that people had moved and hadn’t been removed from the voters roll. However, it does seemed indicative that people were less engaged with the process. On the surface, there seem to have been a much shallower engagement with this formal political moment, than what there is in everyday engagements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voters eligible (registered)</th>
<th>11454</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaner Christian Alliance</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Christian Democratic Party</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African National Congress</td>
<td>2954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African People's Convention</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African People's Organisation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Democratic Party</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress of the People</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Alliance</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inkatha Freedom Party</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Freedom Party</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan African Congress of Azania</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African Progressive Civic Organisation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Democratic Movement</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Front Plus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoilt</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes casts</td>
<td>3838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% voted</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: How people voted (data from IEC 2011)

I can assume what Pahad (2005) does, and remark that the tendency of low voter turnout exists in South Africa as in other countries. I also wonder whether the nature of party politics and formal elections have something to do with this. One thing that was noticeable to me, was the centralised campaigns that parties ran for the local elections. Of the two big parties in Gauteng, the African National Congress and the Democratic Alliance, both ran centralised campaigns around their national leaders as opposed to local issues.
Habermas (2008: 176), in theorising why the public sphere had deteriorated, pointed to the fact that voting stopped being a space of engagement, but had instead become an act of advertising and marketing. Instead of engagement between party and people, there is just a message that is broadcast to people. People become passive rather than being actively engaged. He regarded this as one of the reasons why the public sphere degenerated.

So we have this situation of electable parties running national campaigns and smaller parties not having any sort of presence in the ward and making no impact. Local issues seem to be effectively cut out of the democratic process, and it becomes merely a rubber stamp for national politics. Perhaps this is why at an intensely local level, people ignore local political elections because it is such a disengaged forum.

5. Conclusion

While I see wisps of public sphere engagement in the park, it does not occur on a large scale. People talk and are interested in the world around them; people have definite ideas of what a better society would look like. Yet very few people engage beyond this. Although there were protests that reflected the concerns of park users, no park user participated in the protests.

Even when there was a chance to formally participate in the elections park users were uninterested, they did not speak about it, nor did many people go and vote in the elections. Similarly, political parties were seemingly not interested in engaging park users.

In the concluding chapter I consider the implication of this lack of public sphere, as well as the possible reasons why this is the case.
Chapter 9: Conclusion

1. Introduction
This study set out to explore how a public park is used as a place for public sphere interactions. Public space is replete with messages, ideologies and relationships from which we can understand societies (Hart 2002; Low 2000; Massey 1993; Harvey 1990). Popke and Ballard (2004) argue that in the South African context it is a powerful way to understand identity, democracy and difference. The histories of public parks reveal the ideologies of their establishment and management, who was thought to belong, what societies’ faultlines were, and what the ideal society was in the minds of planners, as well as revealing power relations within communities (Cooke 2007; Sharma 2007; Isling 2004; Cranz 1995; Taylor 1995).

Public space is seen as a necessary good where democracy can deepen when people mingle (Sennett 2007; Kohn 2003). Public sphere theorists have acknowledged that public space is important in the establishment of public spheres (Habermas 2008; Kohn 2003; Arendt 1958), but they have not set out to systematically link how this ought to take place. At the same time, while there are emerging studies of public space, they have not been sufficiently theoretically grounded (Smith & Low 2006). This thesis set out to address this gap in the literature.

I conducted an ethnography in order to understand how public spheres play out in public spaces such as Joubert Park. As indicated in Chapter One, I started out with the main question of, How are public spheres spatialised in Joubert Park? Before fieldwork I thought it would be necessary to also find out what the contexts for the creation of the park were and how that has changed. I progressed in the fieldwork I could find little clear evidence of a public sphere inside the park amongst regular users. I asked myself whether it was hidden, or just did not exist at all. I did however find some evidence of public sphere activity outside, and alongside, the park. This intrigued me. I felt it necessary to answer two more questions to explain this: what rules of
What occurs in the park is influenced by the context of the country as well as the city in which it is situated. South Africa’s colonial and apartheid history has led to space being segregated and closely regulated. It also gave rise to a highly unequal society. While the end of apartheid perhaps presented an opportunity to address the socioeconomic inequalities, the ANC took a neo-liberal economic path that has deepened existing inequalities (Marais 2011; Bond 2000). Although these inequalities are still mostly seen along racial lines, during post-apartheid there has been an increase in intra-racial inequalities (Beall et al. 2002).

2. Summary of findings

The main findings were discussed in Chapter Five, Joubert Park, Chapter Six, Mechanisms of Exclusion, Chapter Seven, City Rules, and Chapter Eight, Public Spheres in the Park. Based on these chapters, this section will synthesise the findings of the research questions. I will focus on the four questions as highlighted in Chapter One, although in a slightly different order. The questions are: What is the context for the creation of the park and how has this changed? What rules of access and use exist? How do the CoJ and its agencies interact with the park? How are public spheres spatialised in Joubert Park?

South Africa’s spatial history, its segregationists and apartheid past and the direction it took post-apartheid, as discussed above, have influenced the contexts for the creation and continued existence of the park. Joubert Park was established in early Johannesburg. Early Johannesburg had an unequal spatial history, with closely regulated white spaces and loosely regulated black spaces. From the beginning white people were seen as belonging in the city, while black workers were seen as mere sojourners. Johannesburg itself was a product of colonial and apartheid South Africa, with the mining wealth and the migratory process shaping the city. The park itself was established in
1891 with the citywide practices of segregation already entrenched. The park was created to reflect British dominance with the design reminiscent of British practices. The Johannesburg Art Gallery (JAG), built in 1910, was also meant to show the superiority of the British culture and art, and was for use by white people.

As South Africa moved from segregationist practices to encode apartheid into law, the park reflected this as well. In its early history segregationists practices such as separated bathrooms were established, which was later entrenched through petty apartheid with benches and drinking fountains marked as being for ‘Europeans only’. People of all races have always been in the park, albeit with separate conditions of use. At times though, this co-use was disrupted through police arresting black people for transgressing petty-apartheid laws. As the city progressively ‘greyed’ and white people abandoned the inner city, there was a change of park users.

After the end of apartheid the inner city became the terrain of black people, almost solely. The context of city management changed in that it became a megacity that was corporatised. The city started to strive to be an African World Class City that would show Africa not as a failure, but as connected with other world cities, a place where business could invest. The inner city presented a threat to this vision, so the CoJ placed an emphasis on the regeneration of the inner city in ways that often implicitly and explicitly excluded poor (mostly black) people.

This gives the context in which the CoJ and its agencies manage the park, and interact with its users, as well as reflect the rules of access and use. The CoJ does not seem to see poor park users as legitimate and tries in both explicit and implicit ways to remove them from the park. The by-laws ignore the realities of the way that people use the park, and instead a vision is conceptualised of the park as a purely recreational space. The type of recreation though is based on middle class ideas of what a park should be like. The applications of the by-laws in the context of Joubert Park lead to serious impediments of the Right to the City of poor residents.
There are special rules that are applied in the park, which in their application remove the poorest of park users, those that were unemployed, appear suspicious, and do not use the park in its narrowly prescribed way. These are referred to as the “lizards in the sun” who do not fit in with the idea of the African World Class City. Ironically, while the CoJ and City Parks make a huge fuss about by-law contravention, they themselves are often acting against the spirit and the letter of the by-laws as shown in Chapter Seven with regard to closures of the park. This also extends to the management and responsibilities for projects within the park.

In terms of the projects in the park, there is confusion amongst the CoJ and its agencies about who is ultimately responsible for their overall management. This has created a situation where there is a gap for some projects to take over space in the park for different uses than may have originally been intended. However, the lack of oversight that the CoJ and its agencies have shown has meant that the Green House Project (GHP), which has failed in its bid to restore the conservancy, and which should have been assisted in re-opening a key part of the park, was simply ignored. This neglect has led to the exclusion of the majority of the park users from a large part of the park.

The CoJ and its agencies have very little regard for park users. This is seen through their lack of oversight as mentioned above, but also in the way that they closed the park without consulting with, or even properly informing, park users. The message that the CoJ sent through such actions is one that says that the needs and rights of current park users are unimportant. Further, the perceived corruption of both the Johannesburg Metro Police Department (JMPD) and the Metro Trading Company (MTC) by park users and traders is also indicative of a lack of care that the CoJ shows towards the park users.

While the CoJ’s rules constrain people in their use of the park, users themselves also exclude people from fully utilising the park, on the basis of race, class, gender, sexuality and nationality. People are constrained in their park use by mechanism of exclusion that exist in the park. Although these
restrictions are unwritten and unspoken, they seem to be powerful enough for people to stay away from the park. Sometimes this is due to people excluding themselves, rather than anyone actively excluding them, as is the case with regard to race and class. The extremely pejorative sentiments towards foreigners and homosexuality also mean that park users are given messages of exclusion by other park users. People are also excluded on multiple levels, for example, based on their sexuality as well as their sex. These multiple exclusions are articulated in new ways, and do not remain static. These exclusionary zones are reflections of a socially conservative South African society despite a progressive Constitution. In public life politicians make statements that reflect their distaste for people based on gender, sexuality, nationality, class and race. It is therefore not surprising that these prejudices would also be reflected in the micro practices in the park.

These exclusions lead to park use being contested at a very ordinary everyday level. The park is contested in how people think about and use the park, but also in terms of what they believe is acceptable behaviour in the park.

There are also formal rules that are enforced in the park. While some of the rules are similar for all the parks in the CoJ there are also rules that are specifically formulated and enforced in Joubert Park. These rules are designed and implemented to exclude poor people from using the park because officials do not see them as proper or desired users. The CoJ desires park users who will fit with the image of the African World Class City, presumably people who are productive consumers instead of the oftentimes-poor users whom they have. They thus actively work to deny poor people the right to be in space, but they also deny poor people the right to use space in the ways that would be conducive in their livelihoods. This is because the CoJ does not see poor park users as legitimate users compared to business owners and property owners.

What are the implications of this on how public spheres are spatialised in the park? In the various projects, the GHP, JAG and the community house, there
are active public sphere activities taking place. People talk about their common interests on a regular basis, and there are clear ideas about what the common good is. Although there is individual chatter in the park that can be regarded as public sphere activity, it never seems to go beyond that. There is a strong protest culture in South Africa, and while there were many protests that took place around the park, which reflected park users’ stated concerns, no park user I interacted with ever took part in these. Similarly, while the park was seen as a place for formal democratic processes to take place through voting, there was no great engagement between park users with regard to the elections and no political party came to campaign there. This leads me to conclude that although there is the possibility of people engaging in public sphere activity, this has not translated into an active public sphere. This begs the question as to why this is the case.

Perhaps there needs to be some sort of organisation around which public sphere activity can takes place, which would explain why such activity is relatively successful in the GHP and the gallery. On the other hand, the local government elections created an organised opportunity that was to a large extent ignored by park users. Perhaps the answer to this lack of public sphere engagement lies in the way that the park is managed by the CoJ and City Parks, the rules of access, as well as their impunity in closing the park, and the mechanism of exclusion that park users themselves implemented and follow in the park. People are not allowed to just be in the park; there is tight control on what activities can take place in the park, and even who can be in the park. These controls have lead to disruptions in the forming of larger cooperative engagements between people, in feelings of belonging, stability and ownership of the park. They also exclude people as legitimate citizens. Possible networks of social relations are disrupted even before they have a chance to form. Considering the way that the CoJ and its agents already police the park, the chances of them reacting positively to park users engaging in any substantive way with one another seem remote. A truly political engagement would be contrary to their idea of the park as a place of recreation that is tightly controlled.
Why do South Africans, who had to fight to be allowed to become part of a larger public sphere and to be allowed in certain spaces relatively unconstrained, not revolt against or simply ignore the rules? Why do they allow themselves to be so constrained in their use of the park? I do not have a certain answer for this. Is there something cultural about it, is it extreme levels of poverty, is it because people using the park do not necessarily live around the park, or is it that people simply don’t care, or don’t understand their rights? The bottom-line is that the park users have been defeated and let down by the uncaring bureaucracy, by the messages of not belonging, by the physical and verbal violence that they face from the JMPD and SAPS when they do something against the by-laws. The park users know from experience, that you cannot fight against the CoJ, that no-one cares and no-one listens.

While the Occupy Movement and the Egyptian Movement have shown that public space is important for the enactment of public sphere ideals, my research shows that public space is not enough for everyday public spheres to develop. Compared to these movements, it seems necessary that there be ideas first that are then popular enough to lead to a movement. These movements may appropriate space in ways that defy governments (whether national or local), but their ideas are not primarily fermented in public space. It is only when a critical mass is reached that public space becomes the focus of public sphere enactment.

3. Contribution to theory
The contribution that this thesis endeavours to make is towards understanding the ways that public spheres are actually acted out (or not) in a specific public space. I showed that while there is an embryonic public sphere possible in a public space, it will not mature in spaces where there are too many government rules prescribing how people use space. The enforcement of rules must also be evenly applied regardless of income.

This thesis contributes to various bodies of knowledge; these bodies are the relationality of space, urban anthropology and public sphere literature. This
ethnography is the first of its kind in South Africa, focusing on the spatialisation of public spheres in a specific park. Work on public spaces within South Africa and Africa is scarce and this thesis contributes to our knowledge of how such a space functions and is organised within sets of social relationships. It adds to the growing body of literature on parks and public spaces elsewhere in the world (Costa Rica, USA and Europe). I show that using a public sphere lens for our analysis of parks, can be a useful avenue of research.

This thesis confirms our understandings of public space as relational, reflecting social and power relations, historical processes and subjective experiences (Allen 2007; Allen 2006; Amster 2003; Batuman 2003; Dines 2002; Hart 2002; Low 2000, Low 1996a; Massey 1993; Harvey 1990). While the park served as the locality, it also illuminated wider social relations within the city. It affirmed Popke and Ballard’s (2004) assertion that in South Africa urban space is one of the principal mediums through which social relations is being reworked in post-apartheid South Africa; I will return to this in a following paragraph. Further, Setha Low (2011; 2003b; 1996a) has proposed four legs to understand public space: social production, social construction, embodiment and discourse. This thesis aimed to integrate these four points towards understanding what happens in public space. I have shown throughout this thesis that integrating all four of these areas into an extended argument brings valuable insight.

As a contribution to urban anthropology this thesis makes an input on three levels. Locally, I am one of very few people doing anthropological research in parks and compared to work emerging, as I discussed in Chapter One, I am one of the few people in South Africa focusing on anthropology of (not only in) the city. Through this study of Joubert Park, we gain insight into Johannesburg as a city. I have shown the tensions between the city’s poor residents, and the governing agencies of the CoJ. Furthermore, I have shown how fault lines in South Africa are reflected within the park. The tendency of the CoJ to ignore many of its residents and make decisions that negatively effect people is also clearly visible in park interactions. While Joubert Park
reflects a vibrant South African society, in interactions with and speaking about the park, the CoJ and its agencies see a threatening and menacing mass of poor people, instead of a vibrant citizenry. This is reflected in the way that park is managed, but also reflected in programmes that the city run; for example, the inner city regeneration programmes. Through studying the park we understand what the relationship is between the city, its citizens, and its government.

This thesis was conceptualised as a way to answer the call by Smith and Low (2006) to theorise space meaningfully using a public sphere lens. I have done this through using the insights of Freeman (2002; 2008) and Holston (2009) who argue that the public sphere can be seen in everyday interactions between people in public space. Through focusing on the everyday interactions between people using Joubert Park, I have shown how the public sphere in the park was fragmented, and in danger. Arendt (1958) argued that power is threatened when people do not engage with one another. The case of Joubert Park illustrated this; since people weakly engage one another in the park it has created a space for the CoJ and JMPD to establish relationships in the park that threaten people’s ability to further engage. Or perhaps the type of relationship the state established in park has led to weak engagements between people. Kohn (2003) has argued that plebeian public spheres can and do exist, and often find their expression through mob violence; my own research has not confirmed this. Rather, the park had very weak public sphere activity in its green spaces but stronger public sphere activities in the JAG and GHP. While there could have been a reasonable expectation that there would be plebeian public spheres, there was very little evidence of this. I would argue again that public space and similar people using that space is not enough; the way that the space is regulated is important for the formation of public spheres.

The Habermassian public sphere (Habermas 2008) as a space of rational critical debate that disregards status, questions the state, and is inclusive, is also not present in the park. I showed how the park is rife with exclusions, both between people but also enforced by the CoJ and its agencies. While the
exclusions could lead to a multiplicity of public spheres developing (Hartley & Green 2007; Johnson 2006; Joss 2002; Law 2002; Benhabib 1996; Fraser 1996), this does not seem to have been the case. My contribution to the public sphere literature is to argue that there needs to be space that is sufficiently open, unregulated and free from arbitrary state involvement through excessive regulations. The availability of public space does not automatically lead to public sphere activity. It also requires a state that allows opportunities for interactions between citizens. What my research shows is that public space is needed but is not sufficient. Instead the management of the space is important for the free formations of public spheres. While democratic governments are not responsible for creating public spheres, they should also not create circumstances that limit the formation of public spheres in public space. If a country strives towards an ideal of representative democracy, then the regulation of space must allow for the formation of public spheres.

In order for the park to realise its potential as a place where democracy can become actualised, it needs to provide a safe but sufficiently open forum. Richard Sennett (2007: 296) argued that “when the city operates as an open system – incorporating porosity of territory, narrative indeterminacy and incomplete form – it becomes democratic not in a legal sense, but as a physical experience”. In Joubert Park this open system is not yet present, but people do seem to want to engage with one another. For a good public sphere to develop we must change the way that the CoJ sees, and manages, the park, in order for it to reach its potential as a place where democracy, not as a formal election process, but as messy interactions between different people, can develop.

A further insight that this thesis generates is that while the idea of neo-liberalisation is important to understand what occurs in the park, it is not enough on its own. The neo-liberalisation that the CoJ embraced is similar in nature to that in cities elsewhere. While neoliberalism sketches a useful background, it is important to understand the park, and subsequently Johannesburg, through the lens of post-apartheid developments. In
Johannesburg the idea of the African World Class City in many ways shapes the way that the city chooses to manage the park. The CoJ’s idea of the African World Class City seems to be one that rejects Africa in its execution and instead only focuses on the world class. That is, they reject informality in all forms, which seems to be an important part of life in inner city Johannesburg. In turn this management of the park has an impact on the development of the public sphere. Scholars studying the public sphere, or spheres, must ground their work in understandings of the ways that the economic and existing political atmospheres shape the way that public spheres are allowed to take place. This study also contributes to understanding how the African World Class City is made visible through the management techniques of the CoJ and its agencies. While this has been amply illustrated on a citywide scale, this work shows that the same understandings could be gained from a very narrowly focused space.

This thesis contributes to the understanding of actually existing public spheres. The work of Habermas (2008), Arendt (1956), Sennett (1977) and Kohn (2003) is based on historical analyses. My contribution to the public sphere literature is to add an anthropological voice and lens to the study of public spheres. I have shown the messy realities that inhibit the formations of public spheres, both from the CoJ’s side and also among park users. As presented above, this understanding can inform the ways in which cities manage their public spaces in order to strive towards greater democracy.

4. Questions raised and further research
While my research shows that there is a co-occurrence between the management techniques of the CoJ and the lack of a visible public sphere inside the park, it cannot exclude other explanations for the lack of a well-defined public spheres. Further research is needed in order to understand whether and how public spheres are spatialised in other parks and public spaces, if this occurs at all. Is it solely the management practices that make a difference or are there perhaps other factors that I have not taken into account?
This insight, that the management of a public space can impact on the formation of public spheres, has implications for public spheres in different contexts as well, for example, the media, and the Internet. A question that needs to be answered is how closely regulated public space must be for effective public spheres to form. In South Africa recent efforts introduced to regulate the media through the Protection of State Information Bill, send worrying signals about the possibility of restricting media reporting, and the formations and continuations of public spheres.

However, the knowledge that public sphere activity seems to be constrained in a public park through the management of the park, and that local exclusionary practices add to this, is an important insight. It has implications for good management practices in the park to enable people to have the Right to the City. In order for the park to become a space where all people of the city can be welcome, the CoJ needs to change the way that it thinks about, and manages the park. This could include stopping the use of monitors and the implementation of extraordinary rules that are aimed solely at excluding poor people from park use. Levels of safety can be ensured through working closely with existing user groups such as the photographers and chess players. The CoJ should consider opening an in-situ office to offer social assistance to people in the park; the Neighbourhood Centre could perhaps serve this function again. The gallery could investigate ways to place art into the park again so that the gallery extends into the park, and so that gallery users are drawn into the park and vice versa. This would diversify the use of the park and could perhaps also lead to more diverse gallery visitors.

Under what conditions then will public spheres develop in public space? I think there are two important understandings that will contribute to public spheres arising in public spaces. The first is that there must be some sort of social crisis or tipping point around which people can gather. In Egypt the continued corruption of Mubarak and his cronies led to a large number of people occupying Tahrir Square despite the closely regulated nature of public space up until that point. This formed a critical mass, the number of people
involved were large enough that the idea started to sustain itself, and could no longer be ignored or suppressed. This is the path, I think, for public spheres occurring in tightly regulated spaces.

In places where space is less tightly regulated there must be a community that somehow pulls together around public space. In contrast to Joubert Park, my local park, Kingston Frost, is very much ignored by the CoJ. It is not as strict regulated by the CoJ, with very little, if any, JMPD or SAPS presence. The community surrounding the park has organised itself to take care of the park, but also deliberately seeks integration within the very diverse neighbourhood where there is a much more easily recognisable public sphere operating. This is what Joubert Park is missing: in Joubert Park there is no obvious integration amongst the variety of people living in the area, and no history of people pulling together to claim the park as their own.
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