Abstract: This paper deploys Henri Lefebvre’s concepts of the right to the city and encounters to analyse the contestation between street traders and the City of Johannesburg. This clash arose as a result of the decision by the City of Johannesburg in September 2013 to destroy and remove street trading stalls belonging to both African immigrant and South African street traders. The interviewees with both African immigrant and South African traders who were affected by the actions of the City of Johannesburg seem to suggest that the politics of encounter more than the right to the city can be used as an explanatory framework of the dynamic of the contestation. Although the right to the city, which street traders either do not fully understand or understand in a limited context, gives some insight into the conflict, interviews seem to suggest that it was too lofty a struggle, in which they do not have an active interest. This evidence seems to move beyond a casual and simplistic understanding of Henri Lefebvre’s right to the city and thus expand the application of the concept to a setting like the Johannesburg inner city
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I. CONTEXT

In September 2013, the City of Johannesburg decided to destroy and remove street trading stalls belonging to both immigrant and South African street traders. This resulted in a fierce battle to assert control over the trading space on the streets of Johannesburg inner city. The decision to clean the streets of the Johannesburg inner city of these traders seem to fall in line with the programme of the City Johannesburg to rehabilitate and revamp those parts of the city which are
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considered to be degenerating into ruin. Johannesburg inner city has since the 1990s, declined (Mapetla 2006; Winkler 2009; Olitzki & Luiz 2013), a development which has necessitated the need for gentrification and revitalisation since the year 2000 (Winkler 2009; Olitzki & Luiz 2013). The composition of the Johannesburg inner city dwellers prompted the City of Johannesburg to clean up the city of undesirable elements in line with imagined city standards of the North (Winkler 2009). To this end, the Johannesburg inner city was declared “as an Urban Development Zone through public and private sector collaboration”, which has involved among other strategies, the identification of “bad buildings” and incentivising the private sector to revamp these, a move called the Better Buildings Programme (BBP) (Winkler 2009:26). Furthermore, City Improvement Districts were established so as to achieve the regeneration of the inner city (Winkler 2009; Olitzki & Luiz 2013) and “to stimulate and support area-based economic development initiatives throughout the Johannesburg metropolitan area in support of Joburg 2030” (Luiz 2003:4).

The Joburg 2030 Vision, which was implemented in 2006, is a plan designed to make Johannesburg to be a world class city by 2030, by attracting private sector investment and increasing the price of properties. It was implemented in 2006 and further refined in 2011, in what is now called the Joburg 2040 Growth and Development Strategy. Thus, the Johannesburg inner city gentrification and rehabilitation strategies are part of Joburg 2030 Vision and its successor, the refined Joburg 2040 GDS “that sets its sights on a desired Johannesburg of the future – a Johannesburg in which all will aspire to live and work” (Joburg 2040 GDS 2011).

Notwithstanding the fact the City of Johannesburg is positive that the Joburg Vision 2030 project and its successor Joburg 2040 GDS, will yield positive results in line with transforming the city into a world class African city, some scholars believe that “the 2030 Vision and the subsequent 2003 Inner City Regeneration Strategy undoubtedly demonstrate a preference for capital accumulation with negligible attention paid to the formulation of social policies” (Winkler 2009:28). Granted that in 2007, the City of Johannesburg came up with the Inner City Regeneration Charter so as to include the needs of poor people, Winkler (2009) argues that this has not been achieved as the ideas of creating a world class African city seems to take precedence. This is because, the top down approaches adopted by the City of Johannesburg fails to consider the poor people on the ground because “Johannesburg’s policy makers and politicians continue to be inspired by international renaissance precedents where market led redevelopments, tax incentives, flagship projects”, which do not consider the urban poor (Winkler 2009:28). Hence, the City of Johannesburg decided in September 2013 to demolish the trading stalls and structures on the streets of Johannesburg
inner city in a move they explained was intended to clean up the city and make it safe and healthy (Operation Clean Up). This appears to be in line with Section 13 (a) of the Local Government, Municipal Systems Act No 32 of 2000 (Act 32 of 2000) which governs informal trade in Johannesburg. Therefore, Local Authority Notice 328 published the Informal Trading By-laws, 2009 for the City of Johannesburg on 14 March 2012. These were intended to promote: social and economic development; a safe and healthy environment; and municipal planning, trading regulations, licensing and control of undertakings that sell food to the public, markets, public places, municipal roads and street trading (Gauteng Provincial Administration, 2012:1). These Informal Trading By-Laws and the broader provisions of Act 32 of 2000 seem to inform the object of Operation Clean Up.

II. IN PURSUIT OF URBAN MODERNITY: ANNIHILATING STREET TRADERS AND SPATIALIZED DEVIANCE IN JOHANNESBURG INNER CITY

The question of why street traders and the informal economy continue to be targeted in the clean-up in the Johannesburg inner city seem to validate dualistic and structuralist perspectives of urban informality. Dualistic perspectives conceive of informality as backward and separate from the formal economy and because they are separate from the formal economy, they would soon phase and die out (Geertz 1963). Structuralist perspectives regard urban informality as a product of economic crisis or the informalisation of the formal economy (Portes et al. 1989). The two perspectives of urban informality which seem to fit in well with the objective of the City of Johannesburg to create a world class African city which conforms to the standards of the North, can be used to explain the rationale behind destroying street traders’ stalls. In this way, Kamete (2013:17) argues that many regulatory regimes in African cities regard urban informality as a problem, a “spatial disorder” or “spatialized deviance”, which explains the obsession by governments to annihilate urban informality so as to preserve urban modernity.

In Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland, South Africa, Zambia and Zimbabwe, urban informality is not regarded as an integral part of the urbanisation process, but something ugly that must be destroyed or at least made to conform to the modern Western type of city (Kamete 2013), an approach and assumption which makes formality superior than informality. This forces urban informality to operate outside the law (Lindell 2010). From this, it appears as if African cities regulatory regimes seem to be guided and influenced by both the dualist and structuralist frameworks of looking at urban informality as a phenomenon that must be eliminated than an integral part of urban economic systems.
In fact, in South Africa, urban informality is regarded as the second economy (Aliber et al 2006), which seem to suggest that urban informality is not viewed as a central part of the urbanisation process. Even though in South Africa, there are attempts to support the informal sector, it is arguable that, because it is regarded as the second economy implies a certain degree of ambivalence or equivocation. It can be posited that, just like urban informality of which they are part, which is regarded as an irritation by the regulatory regimes of many African cities including the South African ones (Kamete 2013), this paper posits that Operation Clean Up in the Johannesburg inner city and the contestations it has generated is correctly positioned within the debates around urban informality and the right to the city. If street traders and urban informality is regarded as spatialized deviance which stands in the way of urban modernity, for which reason they must be destroyed, the street traders felt they were being short changed regarding their rights to trade.

In this way, the actions of the City of Johannesburg generated resistance from the street traders, who were forcibly removed from their trading stalls. Hence, both African immigrant and South African traders asserted that the city was being converted for rich investors and tourists and in the process marginalising the poor people who depended on street trading. For these reasons, they were prepared to fight the eviction and continue operating on the streets in defiance of the municipality orders. Represented by the South African National Traders Retail Alliance (SANTRA) and the South African Informal Traders Forum, the street traders took the matter to the Constitutional Court, which ruled in their favour in December 2013, by allowing them to return to the streets to trade.

Therefore, this paper explores the nature of the contest over the right to trade on the streets of Johannesburg inner city based on the interviews with both African immigrant and South African traders. This is how Henri Lefebvre’s concepts of the right to the city and encounters are employed in this paper so as interrogate the fight between the street traders and the City of Johannesburg. In pursuit of this objective, the following questions are asked: How and to what extent does this conflict illustrate the right to the city? Do street traders understand the right to the city as espoused by Henri Lefebvre or even care about it? Addressing among others these questions should assist going beyond a simplistic understanding and application of Henri Lefebvre’s right to the city.

III. THE RIGHT TO THE CITY

“The right to the city is like a cry and a demand... a transformed and renewed right to urban life” (Lefebvre 1996: 158) and would involve the “full and complete usage” of urban space by the urban citizens (Lefebvre, 1996:179). In this
vein "Lefebvre`s work on 'the rights to the city' 'everyday life in the modern world',
the social struggles over 'the production of space' and the need for a 'specifically
urban revolution', introduced a trenchant new perspective on the politics and
ideology of city space, as well as the geohistory of modernity and capitalism" (Soja
200:100). For this reason, Purcell (2002:103) states that urban "space must be
produced in a way that makes that full and complete usage possible". Hence, the
right to the city “revolves around the production of urban space, it is those who live
in the city – who contribute to the body of urban lived experience and lived space –
who can legitimately claim the right to the city" (Purcell 2002:102). What this
suggests is that it is the inhabitants of the city, (Lefebvre 1968 refers to them as the
citadins) who must exercise "the right to participation and the right to
appropriation. The right to participation maintains that citadins should play a
central role in any decision that contributes to the production of urban space.
Appropriation includes the right of inhabitants to physically access, occupy, and
use urban space. Not only is appropriation the right to occupy already-produced
urban space, it is also the right to produce urban space so that it meets the needs of
inhabitants" (Purcell 2002:102-103).

Hence, regarding the appropriation of urban space Harvey (2008:23) adds
that, "the right to the city is far more than the individual liberty to access the urban
resources: it is the right to change ourselves by changing the city, the freedom to
make and remake our cities". This basic understanding of the right to city reduces it
to the right of participation and appropriation. However several scholars including
Purcell (2002, 2003); Plyushteva (2009); Merrifield (2011) contend that reducing
the concept of the right to the city "to a politics of turf is clearly insufficient as a
horizon for strategic goals and a general framework for thinking and action"

Arising from the fact that the urbanisation process is global, the
understanding of the right to the city as a politics of turf is open to many problems,
because "on the one hand, the city needs to be considered globally because
urbanization is global, masterminded by transnational finance capita. On the other
hand, in this global struggle the city somehow holds the key. The specificity of the
city seems to be that there is no longer any specificity; the right to the city is a
global struggle for citizenship that needs to be grounded in the city" (Merrifield
2011:471). Furthermore many urban areas have expanded such that they are multi
centred, hence, the question of the "right to what city arises" (Merrifield 2011:471).
For this reason, the right to the city “remains at a too high level of abstraction to be
anything that is existentially meaningful in everyday life. Put a little differently, the
right to the city politicizes something that is too vast and at the same time too
narrow; too restrictive and unfulfilling, too empty a signifier to inspire collection
retribution. The right to the city quite simply isn’t the right right that needs
articulating. It’s too vast because the scale of the city is out of reach for most people living at street level; and it’s too narrow because when people do protest, when they do take to the streets en masse, their existential desires frequently reach out beyond the scale of the city and revolve around a common and collective humanity, a pure democratic yearning” (Merrifield 2011:473). In addition, "capitalism and neocapitalism have produced abstract space, which includes the world of commodities, its logic and its worldwide strategies, as well as the power of money and that of the political state" (Lefebvre 1984:53). This growth of capitalism has weakened instead of strengthening the city as an autonomous institution (Castells 1977:14). The result of this is that neoliberal capitalism has taken "control over the social production of urban space and their city building prowess to a global scale, leaving the city behind as merely the container or canvas for capitalism’s inscriptions" (Soja 2000:102). These insights appear to validate the idea that the city may be something which transcend the physicality of any given urban area, hence the difficulty of perfectly applying the concept of the right to the city. Which city, if the cities are global and connected by global capital? How can people even contribute or own the production of space in such a scenario? With these questions in mind, it is relevant to focus on Johannesburg inner city contests.

Therefore, being intimately aware that the concept of the right to the city is not settled and may mean different things to different people, this paper deploys the concept in an attempt to understand why and how the street traders decided to defy the City of Johannesburg. Reducing it to mean a struggle for turf, this discussion shows that street traders held the simple belief that they had a right to earn a living on the streets of Johannesburg inner city. The street traders argued that:

"these authorities are heartless because we were told that they were cleaning the city and making it safe. What are they cleaning? Are we trash? There are no jobs and for me this is a way of supporting my family. Who are they making the city clean for? This is wrong. What is clean about not being able to support my family and pay rent? Who needs the cleanliness except the rich and powerful people and tourists?" (Interview with Karabo, South African informal trader, October 2013).

This statement from a South African suggests that they believe that the Johannesburg inner city belongs to them; they have a right to trade and earn a living. This seems to fall within what (Lefebvre, 1996:179) regarded as the right to ‘full and complete usage’ of urban space by the citadins (Lefebvre, 1996:179).

The insistence to trade on the streets of Johannesburg inner city shows a specific demand to a specific part of the city. This could be regarded as a direct claim to the city, a right to the city. What is even interesting is that the street traders are aware that urbanisation is global as measured by international investors and tourists, as can be inferred from the above interview. All that they want is a
specific part of the city. Although they may not successfully fight against the rich, powerful people and global capital, this does not diminish the fact that they understand they have a right to do businesses on the streets of Johannesburg inner city. This evidence from the street traders seems to show that, their understanding of the right to the city may not be too narrow. They are exercising the right to appropriate and participate and this conforms to Lefebvre’s right the city.

Hence a street trader declared that:

“as long as there is no immediate plan for me to continue my business, I will illegally trade on the streets. I cannot postpone my life and wait for the municipality to clean the city at their own pace. Life must go on. The buying of food for my children and the payment of their school fees and rent for where I stay is now; it cannot wait or be postponed. What this means is that I will continue to trade on the streets whether I have authority or not, they should be engaging a war against poverty and not a war against poor people who have taken matters into their own hands to provide for themselves” (Interview with Phumla, South African informal trader, November 2013).

This street trader earns a living from selling on the streets. These are the same streets they are prepared to defend, they refuse to be evicted. It is important to mention that the Operation Clean Up was intended to, among others, make the city clean and healthy and encourage private investment. As far as these street traders are concerned, they are being removed from the streets to make way for rich investors and tourists to enjoy. For them, the streets are a source of income just as they are for the rich investors. This is where the struggle is. Street traders refuse to be removed from the streets, because they assert that they have a right to the city. Even though their understanding of the right to the city is limited to their demand for trading space, it is a still a right to the city. To the extent that Lefebvre posited that in pursuit of the right to city, the citadines should participate in the decisions which lead to the production of space, should not be taken to mean that they must always sit in boardroom meetings. The fact that they defy the municipality from removing them from trading sites means they are making a statement. They are saying that they should have been considered in the first place and because they were not considered, they refuse to abide by a decision which excluded their input. This is how the street traders understand their right to the city, the streets of Johannesburg inner city.

This seems to link with the findings of a study of immigrant entrepreneurs and the right to Johannesburg inner city space (Grant & Thompson 2015). Immigrant entrepreneurs argued that they had a right to the city because they created self-employment and generated "tax revenue and job opportunities for the local population and that immigrants demonstrate to locals methods to succeed in entrepreneurship" (Grant & Thompson 2015:189). Using a human rights
perspectives and territorial ethics perspectives in a study of three immigrant populated areas at Jeppe Street and Delvers Street and the vicinity, Eight Avenue in Mayfair and Raleigh Street in Yeoville, in Johannesburg inner city, (Grant & Thompson 2015), have convincingly argued the claim of immigrant entrepreneurs to the rights of the city. They have shown that the businesses of immigrants occupy previously abandoned buildings which do not prejudice the local population, but have created a good business environment which benefits both South Africans and immigrants. In addition the study also suggests that from a human rights perspective, immigrant entrepreneurs had a right to the city. This is because they come from war torn or economically and politically destabilized countries to which they cannot return soon.

However, beyond the right to the city illustrated in this case study, which seem to link with the study by Grant & Thompson (2015), I argue that the concept of the right to the city only provides an entry point into an understanding of the struggle of the street traders against the City of Johannesburg. There are other aspects of the contest between the street traders and City of Johannesburg, which the concept of the right to the city does not fully illuminate. For example, in the case of immigrant entrepreneurs in Johannesburg inner city (Grant & Thompson 2015), business and economic factors which validate their claim to the city operate within the framework of global neo liberal capital, with network in other areas of Johannesburg, South Africa and beyond. The right to only a small section of the area where they operate, although informative, may be limited. In addition, using the human rights perspective to claim to right the city is useful, but poses potential limitations as it does not adequately illuminate the struggle. For instance, questions of how they go about actually claiming the human rights so as lay claim to rights to the city arises. Do they ever win in face of xenophobia and harassment by the police and the general citizenry? Similarly, regarding the street traders in this case study, they interpreted their right to the city to mean that they should go back and reclaim the areas from which they were forcibly evicted. But is all that there is in the right to the city as advanced by Henri Lefebvre?

Hence, this paper proposes that the politics of encounter together with the right to the city may proffer an adequate explanation relating to resistance to Operation Clean up in the Johannesburg inner city. Thus, it is important to establish the concept of encounter and how it links with the right to the city. "The notion of encounter after all is a tale of how people come together as human beings, of why collectivities are formed and how solidarity somehow takes hold, takes shape, shapes up. The politics of encounter too, is something that can mediate between the lived and historical, between and individual life and dynamic group fusion. It can overcome the inertia of powerlessness. When striving individuals encounter one another, when people express their collective power of acting, a
social movement is in the making, common notions bond people" (Merrifield 2011:473). The politics of encounter is deployed in this paper so as to explain the action of responding to Operation Clean Up by the street traders in the Johannesburg inner city. While the right to the city may generally and broadly explain why the street traders decided to resist the actions of the City of Johannesburg, the politics of encounter illuminates how they executed their defiance. This illustrates a specific struggle which achieved specific goals than a broad and general right to the city.

For example, when the African immigrant and South African traders were removed from their trading stalls; this provided a rallying point for both groups of traders. They wanted to reclaim their trading spots. This provided a bond which transcended nationality. On a day to day basis African immigrant and South African traders do not always get on well, but when they were removed from the streets, they were united by the desire to resist the City of Johannesburg (Interview with Brenda, African immigrant trader, November 2013). Thus the politics of encounter seems to explain more how the street traders resisted the City of Johannesburg. This is because, when the people took to the streets, they were not looking for rights to the city, they wanted their trading spaces. Whether they were granted the rights to the city or not, were not the objective and what united them was their eviction from the streets of Johannesburg inner city. They seized the moment to make a statement about the Operation Clean up. The interesting aspect of the politics of encounter is the idea of moments. Merrifiled (2011:274) conceives of moments as "a political opportunity to be seized and invented, something metaphorical and practical, palpable and impalpable, something intense but fleeing, too, the delirious sense of pure feeling, of pure immediacy, of being there and only there, like the moment of festival or of revolution". This is why during the process of eviction the street traders gathered on the streets of Johannesburg inner city, drew a petition and marched on the streets to demonstrate their defiance of the order to leave their trading areas on the streets.

This led to them approaching the South African National Traders Retail Alliance (SANTRA) and the South African Informal Traders Forum, to take the matter to the Constitutional Court, which ruled in their favour in December 2013. Hence one street trader declared that:

"if it was about planning, they should have implemented the new measures without destroying the stalls. Why did they not plan around the stalls, when they built the stalls in the first place and then make the transition? I sell my clothes from this bag and if the police try to catch me, I evade them. In the final analysis I am back on the streets with or without a stall, legally or illegally. I will continue what I am doing. Well if they allocate us the trading stalls, which will be great. Either
It is in this context that the politics of encounter seems to explain the dynamic of the resistance to Operation Clean Up by the street traders. The marching on streets of Johannesburg finally led to the streets traders taking action against the City of Johannesburg and today the street traders are back on the streets. Some continue to trade illegally, whereas some legal. Thus, in the politics of encounter, "one moment lead to other moments and a politics of encounter explodes when moments collide, collide on the street" Merrifiled (2011:274). It is in this way that the right to the city provides an entry point into understanding the resistance to Operation Clean Up by the street traders in Johannesburg inner city. They knew that they had a right to trade on the streets of Johannesburg, that not only big business, rich capitalist and tourists were the only ones who needed to use the streets. But the struggle assumed monumental proportions when they decided to march in protest. This led to them filing a constitutional challenge in the High Court which ruled in their favour. This is how the politics of encounter as advanced by Lefebvre can be used to explain a dynamic like the resistance to Operation Clean Up in the Johannesburg inner city.

The street traders were not strictly looking for the right to the city and for them to be included in the decision making process about the city. Although this would be impossible to achieve, that is not what they were looking for. They were looking to regain their trading spots on the streets of Johannesburg inner city. The commonality of the grievance between African immigrant and South African traders drew them together. This is how the politics of encounter seem to have controlled the nature and dynamic of the struggle between the street traders and the City of Johannesburg. In this way, I argue that the politics of encounter provides an expanded view of the contest beyond the simple right to the city.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The concept of the right to the city provides an entry point in an examination of the contestation between street traders and the City of Johannesburg. This is because the African immigrant and South African traders who fiercely resisted the Operation Clean up were neither fully conversant with what the right to the city meant nor were they prepared to pursue it. They understood the right to the city in a limited way which applied to reclaiming their trading stalls and/or going back to the areas where they used to trade before they were forcibly removed by the City of Johannesburg. They did not understand or have an interest in "participative democracy" (Lopes de Souza 2010:316) relating to the everyday life in the city. In this way, the concept of the city only offers us a
limited glimpse into how the street traders resisted their violent eviction from the streets of Johannesburg. Thus while the right to the city may include the "politics of turf", limiting it to this is "clearly insufficient as a horizon for strategic goals and a general framework for thinking and action" (Lopes de Souza 2010:317).

In addition, the right to the city is a broad concept and struggle. Cities today are not only multi centred, but also global as a result the neo liberal and capitalist forces of globalisation (Merrifiled 2011). If this is case, using the right to the city to analyse a struggle such as the street traders in the Johannesburg, may not be sufficient. The street traders were not looking at being involved in making everyday decisions affecting the running of the city or the broad range of urban citizenship rights. Without debating the feasibility of such a struggle, this paper suggests that applying the general concept of the right to the city to explain a clash between street traders and a regulatory authority may be limited.

This case study suggests that, the street traders were defying the eviction by the City of Johannesburg, but does this illustrate the right of the city as conceptualised by Henri Lefebvre? This discussion seems to suggest that the answer to this question is negative. Thus, if the right to the city is too abstract and unattainable, it appears as though the politics of encounters can be used as a theoretical framework, which adequately captures the contestation between the street traders and the City of Johannesburg. When African immigrant and South African traders were forcibly removed from their trading stalls and areas, that moment provided a bond between these groups of people. They decided to march against the City of Johannesburg; they were not fighting for the abstract and lofty ideas assumed in the right to the city. Hence "a politics of encounter is potentially more empowering because it is politically and geographically more inclusive. Let’s forget about asking for our rights, for the rights of man, the right to the city, human rights. A politics of encounter just acts, affirms, takes back. It doesn’t ask, doesn’t plead for anything abstract, it has little expectation of any rights and doesn’t want any rights granted, because it doesn’t agree upon any accepted rules, isn’t in the mood for acceptance by anyone in power. If it says anything, the politics of encounter talks a language that the group has only invented" (Merrifiled 2011:474).

Accordingly, street traders in the Johannesburg inner city marched and defied the City of Johannesburg and some went back to illegally trade on areas where they were forcibly removed. Although the street traders eventually took the City of Johannesburg to the High Court which ruled in their favour, some of the street traders had gone back to trade on the streets even before the court order. In this way, the politics of encounter seems to explain more the nature and dynamic of the resistance by street traders against the City of Johannesburg. There is no contradiction in the argument that the right to the city, provides a general understanding of the conflict, but does not illuminate the nature of the fight of the
street traders. Because the right to the city incorporates broad and lofty ideas, which go beyond one city, it fails to capture what can unfold in a setting like Johannesburg inner city. Consequently; the politics of encounter illuminate the dynamics and intricacies of the contestation. It suggests that it was not so much about the right to the city than it was a moment of rebellion in demand of a specific recognition, which maybe or maybe not essentially about a right to the city in terms of representative democracy or democratic participation in pursuit of urban citizenship.
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