

SIT Graduate Institute/SIT Study Abroad

SIT Digital Collections

Capstone Collection

SIT Graduate Institute

August 2022

Neocolonialism in Cape Town: The Municipal Spatial Development Framework (MSDF) through Critical Theory

Emily Dionne

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/capstones>



Part of the [Political Theory Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dionne, Emily, "Neocolonialism in Cape Town: The Municipal Spatial Development Framework (MSDF) through Critical Theory" (2022). *Capstone Collection*. 3268.

<https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/capstones/3268>

This Thesis (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by the SIT Graduate Institute at SIT Digital Collections. It has been accepted for inclusion in Capstone Collection by an authorized administrator of SIT Digital Collections. For more information, please contact digitalcollections@sit.edu.

**Neocolonialism in Cape Town:
The Municipal Spatial Development Framework (MSDF) through Critical Theory**

Emily Rose Dionne

Global MA Diplomacy & International Relations

Bruce Dayton, PhD

August 1, 2022

I hereby grant permission for World Learning to publish my Capstone on its websites and in any of its digital/electronic collections, and to reproduce and transmit my CAPSTONE ELECTRONICALLY. I understand that World Learning's websites and digital collections are publicly available via the Internet. I agree that World Learning is NOT responsible for any unauthorized use of my Capstone by any third party who might access it on the internet or otherwise.

Emily Rose Dionne 8/20/2022

Contents

Abstract.....	3
Acknowledgements.....	4
Introduction	5
Chapter 1: Theoretical Framework.....	8
Critical Theory.....	8
Researcher Positionality.....	13
Neocolonialism & Urban Planning.....	14
Chapter 2: A Brief Spatial History of Cape Town.....	18
First People of South Africa: Pre-1488.....	19
European Encounters & Early Dutch Colonization: 1488 – 1795.....	23
Dutch & British Colonization: 1795 – 1948.....	27
Apartheid: 1948 – 1994	34
Chapter 3: A Critical Analysis of Cape Town’s MSDF.....	40
Data Collection & Analysis Methodology.....	40
A Top-Down Approach: The “Blueprint” Model & the TOD Model.....	41
Suppression of Localized Knowledges: Public Participation.....	47
Exchange-Value Over Use-Value: Investment Over Expropriation	51
Disproportionate Effects: The Persistence of Spatial Inequalities.....	56
Study Limitations.....	58
Conclusion	60
Bibliography.....	66

Abstract

Once the apartheid system in South Africa ended in the early 1990s, spatial planning in Cape Town needed to be reassessed to address its historically-racialized use. Led by city planners, this assessment resulted in the 1996 Municipal Spatial Development Framework (MSDF) Technical Report. Yet, there ended up being a disconnect between planning and implementation, and by the late 2000s, economic growth and development had largely remained in the historically-white areas of the city. Meanwhile, historically-Black neighborhoods and communities of color remained systemically neglected. In 2012, a new MSDF was approved to address the shortcomings of these efforts. While some integration has occurred, Cape Town remains a severely spatially and economically unequal city almost ten years later. Therefore, through a critical theory approach, this study seeks to interrogate the disconnect between practice and implementation in the 2012 MSDF, and asks the following question: Despite efforts to reduce spatial inequalities in the city post-apartheid through the MSDF, does the institutional state of urban planning in Cape Town today harbor neocolonial qualities? Through historical analysis and interviews with urban policy researchers and city officials, this study connects practice to theory to understand how urban planning functions through the MSDF in Cape Town today.

Keywords: Urban planning, critical theory, neocolonialism, Cape Town

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank my advisor, Bruce Dayton, PhD. Thank you for providing counsel in this research and reading my hurried drafts. I would also like to thank Joe Lanning, PhD, for his comments and guidance throughout the capstone proposal process. To the people that I interviewed, who shall remain anonymous, thank you for taking the time to speak with me, forward me resources and provide such a strong basis for this paper. To Prentiss, thank you for being an amazing roommate, friend and confidant throughout this experience in Cape Town. Finally, I would like to thank my family and partner, Will. This project would not have been possible without your support in pursuing this opportunity to live in Cape Town.

Introduction

By the time the apartheid regime ended in the early 1990s (Piotrowski, 2019, p. 62), government officials from that era had significantly damaged the South African socio-political space. The democratic election of the ANC in 1994 marked the end of almost fifty years of forcible removals, political suppression, and segregation in almost every aspect of South African life. Nevertheless, this legacy was merely another chapter in South Africa's long colonial history of dispossession, indigenous genocide and the slave trade. These historical scars had shaped the urban space. As a result, municipalities had to seriously reassess the way that they were constructed. Cape Town specifically served as the birth place to this long and bloody history in South Africa, since it was the first location where Western colonizers established a settlement in the nation (Oliver & Oliver, 2017). Urban planning in Cape Town had been used to destabilize, destroy and displace Black neighborhoods and communities of color since the Dutch ships built the first settlement on its shores. Therefore, reassessment on how to create a more equitable city was necessary. These efforts culminated into Cape Town's Municipal Spatial Development Framework (MSDF) which sought to foster an integrated, compact city (Watson, 2002, p. 62). This document was preceded by the MSDF Technical Report in 1996, but was officially approved by the Cape Town City Council in 2012 (City of Cape Town, 2012a).

Despite efforts to spatially transform the city for almost two decades, there ended up being a disconnect between planning and implementation. Development and investment remains mainly concentrated in historically "white only" areas, while predominantly Black neighborhoods and communities of color remained systemically neglected (Turok, 2001). With mandatory five-year reviews, the last version of the MSDF that was approved by the Cape Town City Council was in 2018 (City of Cape Town, 2017 – 2022). Yet, community members and

activists are doubtful that this plan will ever come into fruition. As Axolile Notywala of the Social Justice Coalition states, “There is no political will to reintegrate people into the city” (Mafolo, 2019).

Through historical analysis and interviews with urban policy researchers, planners and politicians, this capstone project explores the disconnect between practice and implementation in Cape Town city planning, specifically pertaining to the Municipal Spatial Development Framework (MSDF). Through analyzing the historical methods to urban planning and current approaches to Cape Town’s MSDF, this project asks the following research question: *Despite efforts to reduce spatial inequalities in the city post-apartheid through the MSDF, does the institutional state of urban planning in Cape Town today harbor neocolonial qualities?* Rather than give direct solutions, the goal of this research is to connect the reality of urban planning in Cape Town to political theory to reveal how underlying neocolonial characteristics have prevented the city from implementing lasting spatial change. As a result of local activism and organizing, there is already a mass of literature and work that has been done on-the-ground to give solutions to these spatial issues. As a person who is not native to Cape Town, I do not seek to insert proposed solutions since that work is already being done. Instead, I hope that this research can add to a current international and cross-cultural study of the neocolonial nature of top-down, exchange-value-centered urban planning practices. Furthermore, this capstone aims to be an extension of thesis research that I completed in May of 2021, studying the planning practices of the Department of City Planning in New York City (Dionne, 2021). Therefore, the current capstone is a continued theoretical study of the nature of urban planning systems in post-colonial cities, using the MSDF implementation in post-apartheid Cape Town as a specific case study.

This capstone is structured as follows: Chapter 1 frames the theoretical basis for this research in exploring the Frankfurt School's literature on critical theory. After explaining this foundation in critical theory, the study discusses the relevance of Kwame Nkrumah's (1966) concept of neocolonialism, as an offshoot of critical analysis, and explores how neocolonialism manifests itself in urban planning. These identified characteristics serve as the analysis methodology in Chapter 3. Chapter 2 delves into an abbreviated spatial history of Cape Town from the first peoples to the end of apartheid. After this background, Chapter 3 reports on the qualitative data gathered through interviews with planning officials, political actors, and urban policy researchers. This chapter reflects on these perspectives through the context of the neocolonial characteristics identified in Chapter 1. The conclusion integrates this analysis with the theoretical and historical understandings from Chapter 1 and Chapter 2. In doing so, this study aims to present the reality of how the MSDf functions in Cape Town urban space today.

Chapter 1: Theoretical Framework

Critical Theory

In order to analyze the city of Cape Town's implementation of the MSDF, this study uses a critical theory framework as defined by the Frankfurt School. Famously developed by philosopher Max Horkheimer in the 1930s, critical theory was created to directly critique the widely-accepted method of traditional theory (Berendzen, 2017). Horkheimer describes traditional theory as the empirical method of knowledge-production commonly used in the natural sciences. Horkheimer (1972) describes philosophers that use this approach in the social science sphere as the Positivists and the Pragmatists (p. 196). These theorists approach understanding society, the "animate" (p. 189), the same way that one would approach understanding nature, the "inanimate" (p.189). Thus, the role of the knowledge-producer is to observe the given reality, establish the facts about the world, and create a universal theory until it is disproven by another empirical process.

Two central issues that Horkheimer finds with this method of knowledge-production lie in the role of the theorist and the underlying motivations of the approach. Since traditional theory relies on creating universal theories from factual evidence, the researcher is assumed to be a detached observer of the reality (Nagel, 1986, p. 14). Since their observations and scientific data-gathering of the given world are taken as fact, the social scientist must be positivistically-objective. Their values, interests, biases and beliefs cannot play a role in the empirical knowledge-production process. Like the experiments that are conducted to understand nature, these observations of society are deemed "objective" because they are tested by assumedly unbiased procedures. Thus, the theorist does not believe that they play a role in constructing the observed reality and their theory must be universal fact. Thomas Nagel (1986) describes this as

the “view from nowhere” (p. 14), since the theorist believes that even if they weren’t observing this reality, it would continue to exist in its given state.

Yet, this belief is ignorant of the fact that the researcher does play a role in knowledge-production through their underlying motivation to observe reality. As a result, this impacts the mode in which one views that reality, collects data and observations on that reality, interprets these observations and develops theory. This underlying motivation can be referred to as a cognitive interest (Habermas, 1971, p. 301-317). Outlined by Jürgen Habermas (1971) of the Frankfurt School, all knowledge is motivated by a cognitive interest. This interest refers to the connections between how knowledge comes to be observed, how it is applied and how it is considered valid (Scott, 1978, p. 2). When one interrogates those connections in developing theory, they are able to understand their interest for knowledge and how it could possibly put the validity of their research into question. Thus, the researcher understands how their role in knowledge-production can shape what they observe and identify as factual or universal. Nevertheless, since the traditional theorist does not believe that they impact the reality in which they observe, this ignorantly conceals their cognitive interest and thus the conditions of how their theory was formed. Therefore, the assumption that a researcher is detached and objective becomes particularly dangerous in social science research. When a social scientist believes that they are impartial from the reality they are studying, they fail to acknowledge their role in affecting that reality and their motivations in pursuing that research. This can result in serious human costs, and lead the researcher to create or lend to a theory that is sociopolitically dangerous— thus, contributing to the creation of unjust conditions.

Habermas (1971) identified three central cognitive interests: technical, hermeneutical, and emancipatory. Technical cognitive interests is what often motivates the empirical sciences.

By attempting to explain and understand society or the natural world, technical cognitive interests seeks to anticipate patterns and behavior in order to influence, dominate or control the given reality. Habermas (1971) states:

Empiricism attempts to ground the objectivist illusion in observations expressed in basic statements. These observations are supposed to be reliable in providing immediate evidence without the admixture of subjectivity... This is cognitive interest in technical control over the objectified processes (p. 308-309).

In some instances, research motivated by a technical cognitive interest can be helpful. For example, if a farmer wants to grow a flourishing crop, they must observe and understand the land and weather in order to use the farmland to its fullest capacity. Nevertheless, when applied to political or socio-economic contexts, this motivation can be particularly harmful. It can create a system of universal theories and truth-claims that shape human reality in ways that are unjust.

An example of this harmful reality is detailed in Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno's *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1972). In the *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1972), Adorno and Horkheimer describe how traditional theory was rooted in the rise of instrumental reason and modernity during the Enlightenment of the Western world. In opposition to the oppressive, monarchical systems of divine right at the time, intellectuals claimed that the modern world could instead be understood through scientifically-proven and universal truth-claims. While instrumental reason and modernity invalidated the oppressive regimes of the time, it simultaneously claimed the whole reason. Since discovered truth-claims were based on facts and universally-applicable, this constructed a singular way to understand the world, forcing knowledge-production into a teleological process— "progress." Thus, the ascendancy of traditional theory through the domination of modern and rational thinking led to a form of "creative destruction." As D. V. Kumar (2008) describes:

To be modern is to find ourselves in an environment that promises us adventure, power, joy, growth, transformation of ourselves and the world-and at the same time, that threatens to destroy everything we have, everything we know and everything we are.

By removing subjectivity in knowledge-production, traditional theorists not only provided liberation from suppressive systems, but became a suppressive force themselves by negating all subjectivity in creating knowledge (Kumar, 2008, p. 247).

Western colonization is the most prominent, historical manifestation of this harmful reality. By applying instrumental rationality and positivist thinking to the social sciences, theorists who supported colonization legitimized harmful institutions through biased “scientific” findings on human society. For example, some scholars during the Enlightenment period were proponents of “polygenism,” a theory that believed people of different races had separate evolutions (Caspari, 2018). Through using pseudo-scientific procedures like craniometry, which measured peoples’ skulls, these polygenists sought to prove that white people were superior to Black people (Cohen, 2016). This theory was influential in discourse that encouraged racial inequality during colonization and was one of the foundations of scientific racism (Caspari, 2018). Thus, thinkers like polygenists used the universality of their truth-claims to justify their inhumane actions, while simultaneously attempting to conceal their technical cognitive interest of domination, suppression and control with political defeatism.

By accepting the world as a reality to be manipulated, traditional theory’s domination attempts to suffocate two important forms of knowledge-production based on hermeneutic and emancipatory cognitive interests: (1) subjective, localized knowledges and (2) critical theories that seek to change the given reality to be more just. Hermeneutic cognitive interest is based on a yearn to understand and create a mutual agreement on existing social constructions. As opposed to technical interest, it does not seek to produce knowledge to manipulate the given reality, but

rather to enable all forms of interpersonal communication and cultural understanding (Habermas, 1971, p. 309). Critical theory falls under emancipatory cognitive interest. This cognitive interest is inspired to produce knowledge in order to criticize unjust social constructions. Emancipatory cognitive interests differs from technical in that it seeks to change the given reality through self-reflection and democratically-accountable processes (Habermas, 1971, p. 310). Rather than seeking to gain the whole power, it seeks to justly redistribute power.

Therefore, the use of critical theory in this analysis is substantiated by three reasons. First, I would like to recognize that the state of reality should not be taken as a given (Adorno, 1976, p. 112). Although this study is largely descriptive and does not seek to provide direct solutions to MSDF implementation issues, the act of acknowledging oppressive elements within the institutionalized state of urban planning challenges the current condition in order to change it, rather than accept that it is simply reality. Second, I recognize as a researcher that I maintain a bias that the spatial reality of Cape Town does not reflect a just distribution of resources, economic or land. While integration has occurred since the fall of the apartheid regime, Cape Town remains a highly segregated city (Parry, 2014). In a 2011 census, it was calculated that the Theil's entropy index for segregation in Cape Town was 0.67 (Republic of South Africa, 2011). For context, the most racially segregated city in the United States, Detroit, only has an index of 0.48 (Republic of South Africa, 2016). Finally, the intent behind using this framework is to acknowledge the role that I play as a researcher in this project. Since housing, space and its connections to an apartheid-colonial past is a sensitive issue, I need to analyze that my position in this research is not further perpetuating a subjugation of perspectives. This requires a recognition of my positionality and motivations in this study.

Researcher Positionality

As someone who is a U.S. citizen, I am not native to Cape Town. I am also going to be conducting research as a white person in an urban space that has been historically racially-segregated, and is still experiencing those effects. Therefore, it is critical to always check my assumptions and the space I am occupying in doing this research. My motivations must be to truly listen and seek to hermeneutically understand the current state of affairs. If I do not check underlying biases and motives, then this study risks further subjugating local perspectives. I need to constantly be wary that even though I am motivated by an emancipatory cognitive interest, my role is not to provide direct solutions these issues, since these problems are already being addressed and advocated by the people who are experiencing them. As a result of my positionality, I do not claim to have more expertise than local communities in the act of creating concrete solutions for these spatial issues.

Therefore, this study focuses on connecting my studies of international theory to interrogate the reality of urban planning in Cape Town through the MSDF. My background as an international relations major with a concentration in international urban development has prepared me for this task. For the past three years, I have studied the interactions between politics and space in New York City, São Paulo, Paris, Barcelona, and Cape Town. My studies have often been under a politically left-leaning lens, so I tend to focus on bottom-up approaches and community critiques surrounding affordable housing, displacement, and gentrification. In that sense, I do have a bias towards community-informed perspectives in this capstone, considering that they are the people on-the-ground experiencing the direct effects of these spatial inequalities. Thus, when gathering data and interpreting research, I often adopt a critical view towards those who hold the power in decision-making processes. Since I am pursuing a critical

theory approach, this bias plays a role in my research, as my analysis will prioritize interrogating dominant narratives.

Neocolonialism & Urban Planning: Analysis Methodology

This study draws upon the critical theory of neocolonialism for the analysis. In order to understand neocolonialism, one must first define colonialism. While there are many examples throughout history of violent expansion, occupation and subjugation of people, colonialism in this theoretical framework is defined as the Western imperialism of the early sixteenth century that resulted in mass land dispossession, violent occupation and global economic exploitation through racialized capitalism (Kohn & Reddy, 2017). Although this era of direct colonial governance was brought to an end by several liberation movements after World War II, the effects of its legacy still persist today.

As defined by Kwame Nkrumah (1966), these lasting impacts are described as neocolonial. Neocolonialism on the international stage is when a state is theoretically independent and sovereign, but its political and socio-economic system are still directed by colonial, external influences. Thus, capital is used to further exploit rather than equitably develop, increasing the economic gap. A factor that differentiates neocolonialism from colonialism is that there is no imperial power that has to justify their actions. As Nkrumah states, “For those who practice it [neocolonialism], it means power without responsibility and for those who suffer from it, it means exploitation without redress” (Nkrumah, 1966). In the urban space, neocolonialism remains an influence through the ideological underpinnings of dominant institutions (Moassab, 2013). These ideological underpinnings, largely based in modern-positivist assumptions, further implicitly and explicitly exploit and perpetuate the economic gap

in the urban space. As an expansion of my past research in New York City (Dionne, 2021), this research aims to study the neocolonial effects of fostering these approaches in constructing urban spaces. Thus, this study is a part of a larger cross-cultural study of urban planning practices in post-colonial and global cities.

My past research in New York City (Dionne, 2021) identified neocolonialism in urban planning through four characteristics: (1) a top-down approach, (2) a prioritization of the exchange-value of developments over the use-value, (3) a suppression of localized knowledges, and (4) disproportionate impacts on systemically-marginalized communities. These characteristics are described as neocolonial because they are the presence of colonial influences without a direct imperial power administering them. These influences include the empirical application of the social sciences, epistemicide and cultural subjugation, capitalist exploitation and intentional discriminatory practices. Thus, this study explains how each of these influences can manifest through these characteristics in the field of urban planning.

When planning a city, the top-down approach operates on the modern-positivist assumption that experts are more equipped than local communities to construct the urban space and address structural issues. This approach is described as neocolonial because it historically parallels the subjugation of localized knowledges and perspectives in Western colonization. As mentioned previously, in Western colonization, positivist knowledge-production conjoined by instrumental reason were used to become the “whole” reason in constructing institutions (Horkheimer and Adorno, 1972). In turn, this suppressed localized knowledges and subjectivity. Thus we are faced with Horkheimer & Adorno’s (1972) *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, where instrumental reason and its universal use have become so incorporated in our systems that they emerge practically in the social sphere. Urban planning’s top-down approach is a consequence of

this dialectic. Through implementing projects informed by their expertise, urban planners create a set of “best practices” (Bulkeley, 2004) that they can apply to revitalize or construct a space. These “best practices” achieve certain objectives and are seen as universally-applicable.

Thus, we are brought to the second characteristic which is the prioritization of the “exchange-value” of projects over their “use-value” (Marx, 1867: 2015 p. 27). When plans are shaped by “best practices,” (Bulkeley, 2004) there is an assumption that these practices have been tested methods that deliver certain results. Since the “use-value” of developments can be incredibly subjective, it is easier to measure the “exchange-value” in order to create more concrete methods. Thus, developments and city plans are usually pigeonholed to deliver quantifiable outcomes, which can lead to an unbalanced focus on profits, economic stability, job creation and measurable environmental impacts as opposed to human and cultural costs. This can lead to a prioritization of the “exchange-value” of developments and plans over the “use-value.” Thus, this approach is not only positivist, but neoliberal, since it is heavily market-oriented. The focus on easily-quantifiable outcomes often cloud the real human costs in pursuing these objectives like displacement, gentrification and the depletion of small businesses.

By focusing on these quantifiable results and best practices, we are led to the third neocolonial characteristic that can be found in urban planning: the suppression of localized knowledges. By using a top-down approach that does not justly balance power between experts and communities, the local knowledge of the people that live there in how to construct the space is suppressed. If there is no real binding role from the community or power redistribution in the planning process, a development can go forward or plan can be legally approved even if the people living there are against it. Finally, these new developments— and subsequent consequences like displacement, gentrification and the closure of small businesses— can have

disproportionate impacts on certain communities that are still experiencing impacts from historically-racist, classist and discriminatory systems. In Cape Town's case, these communities would be largely Black people and people of color¹ that suffered under the apartheid regime.

While these characteristics of a neocolonial urban planning system were ascertained during my research in New York City (Dionne, 2021), attention will be paid to identifying the existence or lack thereof these characteristics in Cape Town to draw parallels. This is not to say that all these characteristics will be present in the Cape Town context, and particular sensitivity will need to be paid to cultural, historical and geographical differences. Nevertheless, both spaces are global cities that have been historically impacted by Western colonization, so it is important to draw parallels to further our understanding of how to tackle widespread systemic spatial issues that resulted from this violent period of time. In order to understand how Western colonization and its underlying ideologies impacted the field of urban planning in Cape Town, the next chapter delves into an in-depth analysis of the city's spatial history tracked from the first people on the land to the end of apartheid. With this historical understanding, the third chapter analyzes the MSDF through various interviews with relevant actors to ascertain the plan's disconnect in implementation and the role of planning in Cape Town today.

1. It is important to recognize that the legal and commonly-used term for certain communities of mixed-race in South Africa is "Coloured" (Christopher, 1994). This term was introduced in 1911 by colonial authorities in order to assimilate several different African indigenous and biracial identities. The word later became a legal definition to identify people who didn't physically appear to be only "White," "Asian," or "Black" (Christopher, 1994). While the term is technically not derogatory in the South African context, there are growing concerns from people in these communities that the classification should be challenged (du Plooy, 2018). However, there is no general consensus on an appropriate term. Since the word is also derogatory in the United States context (where this capstone is being submitted), this study will instead refer to people who were historically classified as "Coloured" as people of color.

Chapter 2: A Brief Spatial History of Cape Town

To situate the reader to the geography, Cape Town is a coastal and mountainous city situated at the southwest tip of South Africa near the Cape of Good Hope. The city lies in the Western Cape region bordered by the Eastern Cape, which extends to the Indian Ocean, and the Northern Cape, which extends to Botswana and Namibia. The area is also home to Table Mountain, also known as Hoerikwaggo. The phrase Hoerikwaggo means “mountain in the sea,” but early Dutch colonizers called it Tafelberg due to its flat top (Voster, 2021). In order to understand how this space has developed and changed, this chapter delves into four different time periods. The first time period explores the history of indigenous people in South Africa’s southern region and their relationship with the land. The second time period delves into these peoples’ first encounters with European navigators and early Dutch colonization of the Cape. The third time period outlines the transition from Dutch to British colonization, leading up to the election of the National Party. Finally, the fourth time period explores the spatial impacts of apartheid, South Africa’s transition to a Republic, and the fall of the apartheid regime.

It is important to mention that tracing urban history in South Africa is a relatively recent academic project. As Maylam (1995) states, “[Before 1975] few scholars had engaged in any critical historical analysis of urbanisation, urban policy or the urban experience” (p. 19). While extensive scholarship has emerged in the past fifty years, the history of urban spaces in South Africa is extremely interdisciplinary. This interdisciplinary nature stems from the fact that South African urban spaces most visibly reflect the nation's economic and spatial inequalities, and have also served as sites of cultural and political resistance. This is acutely summarized by King (1977), who argues that urban planning should be understood as “environmental decision-making” (p. 13):

The history of urban planning in any society demonstrates a long continuity— in terms of emerging ideas of social policy, social and cultural values, the distribution of power and the development of political institutions— between an age when there was no governmental responsibility for ‘Town Planning’ described as such and a period (in Britain, from 1909) when there was. This continuity is especially evident in the colonial territories (p. 13).

Therefore, while this chapter outlines the history of space in Cape Town through three different periods, it also focuses on relevant cultural, political and economic histories of the time. By focusing on these other histories, this chapter hopes to give a holistic narrative of how space has been occupied, used and constructed in Cape Town.

First People of South Africa: Pre-1488

Before colonization, the city of Cape Town was referred to as //Hui !Gaeb or //Hui! Gais by the indigenous people (van Sitters, 2012): the Khoikhoi and the San. Some scholars identify the Khoikhoi and San as a singular grouping called the Khoisan, which was coined by German zoologist Leonhard Schultze in 1928 (Chebanne, 2012, p. 81). In 2003, San communities at the African Human Genome Initiative conference requested that this term no longer be used for two reasons. First, historically, there was never a singular Khoisan people. Even though there are ethnic connections between the two communities, they were two separate cultural groups (Chebanne, 2012, p. 82). Secondly, the term was created for racialized physical anthropology studies done by Schultze and fellow anthropologist Wilhelm Waldeyer (Snyman, 2021, p. 59). Therefore, this paper refers to the two indigenous groups separately.

The history of the Khoikhoi and San people is difficult to characterize, since much of their indigenous history is based on archeological evidence and oral tradition (Chebanne, 2012, p. 85). Even more so, anthropological research of “Khoisan” history during the colonial period held racial bias and depended upon written travel narratives of European “explorers” (Kohler,

1981). Therefore, the succeeding history has been compiled through the best of the researcher's abilities and prefaces that discrepancies in various reports are recognized.

It is generally agreed that the San people were the original inhabitants of South Africa, with their native lands even harboring the remains of the some of the oldest discovered Homo sapiens in the world (Lee, Hitchcock & Biesele, 2002). Based on radiocarbon data, it is estimated that the Khoikhoi people migrated down to Southern Africa from Botswana around 100 BCE. The Khoikhoi people largely occupied the coast of the Western Cape and major rivers, while the San people withdrew more to the mountains and deserts (South African San Institute, 2022). Unlike the San communities who were hunter-gatherers, the Khoikhoi people were herders or pastoralists (Nisbet, 1985, p. 114). Some reports state that the Khoikhoi and San people were historically rivals (Oakes, 1988, p. 22). Along with cattle and sheep herding, the Khoikhoi people also hunted, thus diminishing the San population's food source through direct competition and their pastures. As a result, some San people would kill or steal herd from Khoikhoi communities to make up for lost game. Other reports state that conflict between the San and Khoikhoi did not begin until after European occupation of the Cape, when the San were pushed further away from water sources (South African San Institute, 2022).

It is important to note that although the term San is widely used, it was originally created by the Khoikhoi people. Khoikhoi means "men of men" while San means "those without cattle" (South African San Institute, 2022). Therefore, some groups prefer to be called by the name of their language, rather than San. As the Indigenous Peoples of Africa Co-ordinating Committee (2022) reports, "The San peoples include a range of language communities such as the Jul'hoansi, !Kung, !Xun, Khwe, ǀAnikhwe, Naro, !Xõó, ǀKhomani and Tyhua." Despite cultural differences and historical memory of conflict, many amicable relationships between the

Khoikhoi and San were forged. Some even define the relationship between hunter-gatherers and herders as symbiotic (Jolly, 1996).

Both the Khoikhoi and San people were nomadic. Since the Khoikhoi were herding cattle and sheep, they moved every couple of weeks in accordance with the seasons in order to make sure there was enough land for livestock to graze. In a similar fashion, the San moved frequently in order to not exhaust the land with their hunting and gathering (Cezula & Modise, 2020). Therefore, both groups did not have permanent dwellings or developments. For the Khoikhoi, their homes were made from poles and reed mats (SAHO, 2021a). For the San, they often used branches and grass. As a result of their nomadic lifestyle that was dependent upon a relationship with the land, these indigenous people did not believe in ownership of the land which they regarded as sacred (SAHO, 2021b).

Between 900 CE and 1290 CE, the descendant groups of the Nguni from East Africa migrated into South Africa (Giliomee & Mbenga, 2007, p. 29). The Xhosa people, in particular, were agriculturalists and largely settled in the Eastern Cape region. As pastoralists, they used the land in a similar migratory fashion as the Khoikhoi. Some scholars state that these migrating communities, particularly the Xhosa people, intermarried with the Khoikhoi and San (IPACC, 2022) and were heavily influenced by Khoikhoi and San culture and language (Chebanne, 2012, p. 86). Meanwhile, other reports claim that this westward migration was a form of violent subjugation, with farming societies incorporating, displacing and destroying hunter-gatherer communities (Adhikari, 2010, p. 20).

While many groups were nomadic and migratory, some oral histories claim that certain groups did create kingdoms and claim land (Oliver & Oliver, 2017). Nevertheless, WJ du Plessis (2011) urges that these claims to land should not be confused with the idea of “ownership.” In

Western colonial terms, ownership as a universal principle has an air of absolutism: if a person or people own the land then they are the sole persons entitled to it. African indigenous land tenure was different in that there could be various interests in the land from different groups of people. Claims to the area were flexible and changing. As Ben Cousins (2008) describes, “[Pre-colonial African indigenous]land tenure was both ‘communal’ and ‘individual’, and can be seen as ‘a system of complementary interests held simultaneously’” (p. 111). In this sense, people were obligated to each other in respect to land, rather than owning any right to the land. Therefore, people were embedded with the land through social relationships and did not view it as private property (du Plessis, 2011).

There is no perfect legal term to describe the way that indigenous people dealt with the land. It was not “communal” because the land was not cultivated or used collectively and then shared equally. It was also not a “trust” because rights were not granted to individuals (du Plessis 2011). A word that some use to describe this way of interacting with the land was the spirit of “ubuntu” or “umunthu,” a Xhosa word that is based in other South African languages as well. In Onyebuchi Eze’s (2008) interpretation, “ubuntu” means the following: “the individual and the community are not radically opposed in the sense of priority but engaged in contemporaneous formation” (p. 106). “Ubuntu” is individual in the sense that each person has a responsibility to use the land for their own survival, but “communal” in the sense that the land must be respected by all in order for it to be used. Rather than individual rights constructing the land, the land instead informs social relations (Okoth, 2008).

It is important to understand indigenous land use in urban planning history because people had been living in the southwest region of South Africa for a millennia before Western colonization. When European colonizers first occupied the Western Cape of South Africa,

succeeding generations continued to claim right to South African land through the Empty or Vacant Land Theory. The theory was formally published as an explanation for European colonization of South Africa by W.C. Holden (1866), but had been a popular theory for many years prior. This theory rested on the falsehood that there were no people living on the land when the Europeans arrived, and that the only people the Europeans encountered in their occupation were the Xhosa migrating westward. Since both groups were migratory and there was no original “right” to the land, the Europeans justified their claim to it. The myth rested on blatant, arguably willful, misunderstandings of indigenous land use. The first misunderstanding was that since many of the indigenous people were migratory, there were large parts of land that were seemingly “unoccupied” due to the land being used in rotation for grazing and gathering (SAHO, 2022). A second misunderstanding was that Western colonizers harmfully assumed that their language of “ownership” was universally applicable and that they could appropriate “unowned” land (du Plessis, 2011). Therefore, the Empty Land Myth completely erased the history of the Khoikhoi and San people and had no supporting historical or archeological evidence (Cezula & Modise, 2020).

European Encounters & Early Dutch Colonization: 1488 – 1795

In search of sea routes to Asia, Portuguese navigators came across the Western Cape when Batholemeu Dias successfully navigated around the Cape Peninsula in 1488. By 1497, the Khoikhoi people encountered the Portuguese for the first time on their land. By 1510, the Khoikhoi and the Portuguese had a trading relationship (SAHO, 2019). This relationship quickly ended when the crew of Francisco de Almeida attempted to steal Khoikhoi cattle during a trade. After being chased back to their ship, the crew tried to attack the Khoikhoi with 150 men, taking

children and cattle. The Khoikhoi defeated the crew, killing Almeida (Johnson, 2013). For the next several decades, the Portuguese no longer stopped at the shores, but rather, on Robben Island about four miles from the coast. By the 1590s, the British and Dutch re-established a trading relationship with the Khoikhoi. Nevertheless, in the early 1600s, the British attempted to take over “the Cape” twice with criminals, but the Khoikhoi successfully defended their land (SAHO, 2019).

By the mid-1600s, the Dutch East Indian Company (VOC, Vereenigde Landsche Ge-Oktroyeerde Oostindische Compagnie) was the world’s largest trading enterprise (Giliomee & Mbenga, 2007, p. 40) with more operations in Asia than all competing European countries combined. Their main trading partners were India, Malaysia and Indonesia in which they traded by long sea voyages (Lucassen, 2004, p. 12), passing the Cape of Good Hope. Due to a lack of fresh food, many sailors developed scurvy and there was a need for a halfway station (Oliver & Oliver, 2017). After a company ship stranded at the Cape in 1644, the Dutch found that it was a viable location for a trading post and refreshment station. The VOC appointed Jan van Riebeeck to build the station. Ignorant of indigenous land tenure, the Dutch East India Company built the first permanent European settlement in South Africa in 1652. As Cezula and Modise (2020) state:

It is co-incidental that Jan Van Riebeeck arrived at the Cape of Good Hope during winter, on 6 April 1652, while transhumance had taken place for that season. They then assumed that the land was empty while the land was in fact seasonally resting. A nomadic lifestyle creates seasonal empty lands.

Even if the Khoikhoi had been grazing on the land at that time, the Dutch’s approach to land registration and planning legally would have made the Khoikhoi’s occupancy *res nullius*, meaning there was no formal ownership (Strauss, 2019). Therefore, in building the first refreshment station at the Cape of Good Hope in 1652, the Dutch also introduced a Western

system of ownership that valued private property rights over respect of the land and indigenous peoples.

Thus, the Empty Land Myth can be interpreted in two ways. First, the Dutch justified their permanent occupation of the land because it was physically empty. Second, and much more sinister, the Dutch did not view the Khoikhoi as human beings who could claim ownership of land, and through their legalese, it was acceptable to see the land as empty (Cezula & Modise, 2020). This second point is justified by numerous recorded diary entries from Jan van Riebeeck in which he racially demeans the Khoikhoi and San people (Magubane, 2007).

When the VOC built the first outpost in Cape Town, Dutch law forbid enslavement of the Khoikhoi or San people because they were dependent upon them for cattle supply. Along with that, the Dutch did not think it would be easy to coerce the Khoikhoi into taking up agriculture since they were purely pastoral. For this reason, among others, the VOC decided to release some Dutch “company servants,” also known as “free burghers,” to farm the land and raise their own herds (Marks, 1972, p. 63-64). In 1657, these people were granted land on what is known as present-day Rondebosch in Cape Town (Kuhn, 2021). The VOC quickly appropriated much of the surrounding land on the eastern side of Table Mountain for farm use (Oliver & Oliver, 2017), which ushered in the first form of urban management in the Cape: corporate management. As Kuhn (2021) describes, the VOC was in charge of settlement growth: allocating land, commissioning construction projects and employing people. Marks (1972) states:

The refreshment station began to change into a colony of settlement, though one governed by, and in every way subordinated to, the interests of a commercial company anxious to maintain its trading monopolies and maximize profits (p. 63).

The VOC was heavily involved in the Indian Ocean slave trade, and this settlement expansion led to the request for more “labour supply” (Marks, 1972, p. 64). Between the years 1658 and

1834, about 60,000 enslaved people were imported or born in Cape Town (Shell, 1997, p. 155). These people were forcibly brought from India, East Africa, Madagascar, Mozambique and other nations in the Indian Ocean Basin (Iziko, 2022), making up one of the most “diasporically diverse slave societies on earth” (Joffe & Shepherd, 2021). As Vink (2015) describes:

[The Cape Colony was a] true slave society, in which slaves played an important part in both luxury and productive capacities, empowering particular groups of elites, deeply influenced cultural developments, and formed a high proportion (over 20–40%) of the total population.

This brutal entanglement with the slave trade spatially manifested itself through the infamous colonial structure of the Slave Lodge, which housed enslaved people who worked for the VOC. By 1770, 1,000 people were living in the lodge (Shell, 1997, p. xxxi).

When the Dutch took up agriculture and began to import enslaved labor, it created tension with Khoikhoi communities. Not only were the Khoikhoi accused of harboring those who escaped, but increased labor of the land meant their pastures were depleting. As van Riebeeck (1660) wrote in his journal:

[The Dutch were taking every day] land which had belonged to them from all ages and on which they accustomed to depasture their cattle. They [the Khoikhoi] also asked whether if they were to come into Holland they would be permitted to act in the same manner (p. 205).

This led to two wars between the Dutch and the Khoikhoi in the late 1600s (Marks, 1972, p. 64) in which the Khoikhoi land on the peninsula was dispossessed.

As McCusker, Moseley & Ramutsindela (2016) state, “Land policies in the early period of state formation in the Cape reflected the context of a frontier society” (p. 42). Colonizers— known as Boers or later, Afrikaners— were continually expanding on indigenous lands. Marks (1972) states that, for the Khoikhoi and the San, this was “the destruction of their social system and independent existence” (p. 68). By the 1690s, there was increased violence on the

peripheries of the Cape colony and trading with the Khoikhoi would often lead to the Dutch raiding cattle stock (p. 69-70). As the Boers trekked further eastward into the mountains, they progressively came into conflict with the San who, as Adhikari (2010) describes, were “almost completely annihilated” due to disease, genocide and subjugation.

Boer land seizure was incredibly racialized. Accounts of white colonist invasion further into the Cape Peninsula were describe as “monstrous” (Bank, 1997, p. 264). Throughout the eighteenth century, indigenous people were forced into indentured servitude which was very similar to slavery but treated as a separate institution by the Dutch (Brenner, 2009). As Bank (1997) states, “Unable to check ‘the fierce spirit of the frontier Boers’, the Dutch government allowed the independence of the Khoisan to be shattered and turned a blind eye to ‘the most cruel and revolting punishments’” (p. 264). From the settlement of 1652 where indigenous land tenure was not recognized, European settlers shaped colonial land policy through racism, demand for labor and land dispossession. This inhumane form of land seizure through Khoikhoi and San genocide and subjugation set the foundation for the future of land distribution in not just Cape Town, but all of South Africa. As Piotrowski (2019) states, “This would later feed into racial policies that were written into legislation regarding land ownership, distribution of land, and white minority rule” (p. 58).

Dutch & British Colonization: 1795 – 1948

By the late 1700s, the VOC was on the decline (Oliver & Oliver, 2017). The Cape Colony had grown to a population of over 16,000 and was fairly independent of the VOC. Urban management had transitioned from being corporate-led to a form of “policed self-help” (Kuhn, 2021). Warders would enforce various town rules to ensure that households were managing their

own waste, following housing regulations and maintaining their property. During this time, the city was not considered segregated, but rather was dependent upon class exclusion. As Bickford-Smith (1995) states:

The biting concern of Cape Town's dominant class of merchants and businessmen remained the maintenance of their own elite position. This concern prompted occasions of social exclusion. On the other hand integration amongst the lower classes was ignored at this stage.

In terms of the actual built environment, Malan (1988) notes, "There is no evidence for slaves and servants being provided with separate accommodation. There does not appear to be evidence for neighborhood specialisation nor significant stratification" (p. 105). Nevertheless, it is worth inserting that the settlement clearly segregated itself from the Khoi Khoi and San people with the outer edges clearly defined (Todeschini, 2013). While explicit segregation may not have occurred within the Cape Colony during this time, segregated development between the indigenous and immigrant populations was certainly a keystone of colonial practice (Horn, 2019).

At the Cape Colony, the Dutch settlers pursued the European approach of gridded streets with squares (Stanley, 2012, p. 68). While urban history has long utilized the grid pattern, the grid city was particularly popular during colonization because it promoted centralized control (Boeing, 2019). As Stanislawski (1946) describes, "A distinct advantage for the grid-plan town under certain political conditions is that of military control... a torturous street facilitates defense by individuals and a straight street lends itself to control from without" (p. 106-107). This form of planning constitutes the first phase of what King describes as "export planning" (p. 14) in which settlements were organized to maximize military-political dominance (Lewock, 1963). For reference, export planning means the colonial practice of implementing Western urban planning measures in "non-Western" societies. This spatial control was an essential facet of colonization in that it fostered a "dependent urbanization" (Castells, 1971) where urban systems and planning

were organized by “the internal and (especially) the external distribution of power” (Friedmann and Wulff, 1976).

As the VOC weakened, Britain decided to conquer the settlement, and by 1806, the Cape Colony was controlled by the British (Oliver & Oliver, 2017). Beyond the desire to accumulate capital through the station, this seizure of land was also intended to serve as a naval base during the Napoleonic Wars (Muffet, 2022). The British maintained the Dutch legal system of owning land, but did not see an immediate need to start formally planning the city (Strauss, 2019). They continued to expand in a similar, grid-like style to the Dutch, catering to a substantial increase in population. In 1820, large groups of poor English settlers migrated to the Cape colony (Jackson, 2005). Housing was needed, but precincts were growing without sewers or adequate water supply. During this period, the city was lacking municipal direction and this marked the start of severe sanitation issues (Kuhn, 2021).

Although the slave trade was abolished by Britain in 1808, it was not abolished in the Cape Colony until 1838. The abolition of slavery brought a wave of urban restructuring. Britain paid large sums to slave owners in the transition, and these cash flows contributed to the city’s real estate investment. Upscale buildings were built in the city center, now known as Cape Town’s historic core, and the remainder was used to build tenements for the lower class, including people who were recently emancipated (Miraftab, 2012, p. 285). The dismantling of Roman-Dutch law also signaled the shift to industrialization and the transition from slave labor to wage labor (Jackson, 2005).

Despite this investment in real estate, the growing population and urban conditions were becoming increasingly unsanitary to the point where Cape Town was blamed for the small pox outbreak in 1839 (Miraftab, 2012, p. 286). The late 1800s marked a period of class, racial and

ethnic conflicts surrounding sanitation infrastructure and the unjust distribution of public works. These issues gave way to “sanitation syndrome” (Strauss, 2019) which Miraftab (2012) describes as the “bedrock for race-based segregated South Africa” (p. 291). As Strauss (2019) states:

The "sanitation syndrome" explains spatial control and exclusionary urban development in terms of the "moral panic and racial hysteria" of white residents who increasingly equated the presence of black persons in urban areas with poverty, disease and crime. As a result, a causal connection developed between perceived threats to the white population's health and safety, and the imperative to achieve racially motivated spatial quarantines through the forced removal of black communities from urban areas.

By 1901, the Bubonic Plague had hit the city which resulted in over 6,000 Black people being temporarily relocated to the periphery. These people were displaced to Ndabeni which was defined legally as a “location” (Coetzer, 2009, p. 2). By passing legislation, Ndabeni became the only area where Black people could live, unless they were residing in their space of employment or were property owners. Ndabeni is considered Cape Town’s first government-led housing program, since those displaced were not able to build their own houses unless approved by the Cape administrator (Coetzer, 2009, p. 2-3).

Some scholars argue that these attempts at segregation were not an end for urban administrators, but rather a means to an end, however “ill-conceived” (Parnell & Mabin, 1995, p. 48). I would like to disagree with this point. Before this period of sanitation crisis, enacting spatial segregation within the colony was difficult, due to the emerging Black middle class and various administrative inconsistencies (Swanson, 1977). Public health discourse removed these barriers, with municipal authorities using “scientific” medical reasoning to conceal racialized motivations. It can be argued that racialized medical conclusions were not “ill-concieved,” but rather were an opportune way for municipal authorities to institutionalize racism spatially under the guise of public health. The location of Ndabeni had been planned as a form of labor control years before the rise of the Bubonic Plague (Coetzer, 2009, p. 2). Even as early as 1879, George

Henry Stevens who served as the government's labor contractor was proposing segregation to not only attempt at decreasing the spread of disease, but to teach Black people about "the superiority of the European Race" (Bickford-Smith, 1995, p. 81-83). This method of "stereotype, sanitation and segregation" (Miraftab, 2012, p. 291) was not a means, but rather an end—justified by Christianity through the gospel phrase "Sanitas, Sanitas, Omnia Sanitas" and enabled through the vehicle of public health policy (p. 291). Public health legislation was developed in conjunction with unjust spatial measures (Strauss, 2019) which were accomplished by the government through a series of political distortions (Miraftab, 2012, p. 293). The racialized public health discourse was a facet of these distortions, along with discriminatory voting and land laws. An example is the Glen Grey Act of 1894 which was a complex bill that ended black communal land rights and segregated local government (Beinart, 2022). Thus, urban management had transitioned from "policed self-help" to a public-works centered force (Kuhn, 2021), planting the seeds of apartheid in its wake.

At the turn of the century, the city had an overcrowding issue. Population growth associated with the close of the Boer War (Van Heyningen, 1984, p. 64) contributed, but the inability of the municipality to serve Black, Indian and other populations of color was a prominent reason as well. European planning practices did not adequately address the cultural needs of these populations, leading to unsafe housing and overcrowding. For example, Strauss (2019) states:

Settlement plans applicable to black residential areas were not, for instance, sensitive towards the particularly complex domestic and economic responsibilities of women. The uncritical implementation of European planning norms also incorrectly assumed that black people would have nuclear families and that they preferred to keep their places of residence and employment separate. Moreover, local planning practices failed to accommodate the religious or culturally specific needs of black, Indian, and so-called coloured families and communities living in urban areas.

This overcrowding came in concert with the Influenza Epidemic of 1918 (Coetzer, 2009, p. 5). Ndabeni was at its fullest capacity and living conditions were “appalling” (Strauss, 2019). Notable legislation such as the Public Health Act 36 of 1919 and the Housing Act 35 of 1920 further displaced Black people from the city guised as public health care measures (Strauss, 2019). Laws like the Black (Urban Areas) Act 21 of 1923 gave the government further control over Black resident settlement patterns, resulting in mass displacement without alternative housing opportunities (Harrison, Todes & Watson, 2007, p. 24). Legislations like the aforementioned perpetuated the institutionalization of homelessness, physical exclusion and economic marginalization of Black people in the city (Strauss, 2019).

During the early 1900s, housing was also pushed onto the private sector. To encourage home ownership, as opposed to tenement living, there was a mass commercial operation of land subdividing. By commodifying land in a grid-like fashion, Cape Town started its first phase of suburbanization and had tripled its urban footprint by 1925. However, since land subdivision was led by the private sector, expansion was not being centrally controlled. This led to issues with public transportation connections and property tax collection (Kuhn, 2021). By this point, many were calling for urban management to transition into formal town planning (Kuhn, 2021). This marked King’s (1977) second phase of the colonial “export planning” where town planning practice and ideas from Britain were implemented in the Cape colony (p. 13).

Town planning during the first half of the 1900s was heavily influenced by the Garden City Movement. As Coetzer (2009) states, “The wistful ambitions at the heart of the Garden City [was] to use the romanticised image of the English village to ‘uplift’ social ‘others’” (p. 1). This Garden City model informed the first and oldest formally-designed Black township in South Africa, Langa, which was funded by the Native Urban Areas Act of 1923 (Kuhn, 2021). The

development of the township was significant in that it displaced Black residents and communities of color from the urban core and stripped them of tenure security, but maintained a source of labor for the city (Strauss, 2019). As Coetzer (2009) states:

Despite its failings as an architecturally convincing Garden Suburb, Langa nevertheless achieved what the stewards of the city intended it to achieve; it deployed the Romanticism of the Garden City Movement to symbolically and literally maintain the city as a white space bereft of signs of otherness, and thereby, temporarily erasing the contradictions of colonialism intent on preserving tribalism whilst simultaneously crafting ‘natives’ into socialised and ordered labourer-visitors (p. 17).

In the 1930s, the national government granted provincial governments the ability to manage townships which started a new chapter in Cape Town’s lengthy history of racialized development (Kuhn 2021). Along with this legislation, the Slums Act 53 of 1934 gave municipalities the ability to demolish neighborhoods. Although Britain required new homes to be rebuilt in the original location, communities were frequently displaced to the outskirts of the city (Strauss, 2019).

While scholars such as King (1977) argue that the modern history of planning began with the colonial settlements (p. 13), other scholars argue that the architectural community did not begin to explicitly use modernism as a design tactic until the 1920s (Tomer, 2012, p. 4). As Tomer (2012) states, “The ‘inhumanity’ of early Cape Town modernism is, however, perhaps even more sharply rendered in the realm of town planning” (p. 8). Transportation infrastructure, a tenant of the modern city, was used to segregate racial groups. The establishment of townships and “reclaimed” land reform displaced Black communities and people of color to the edge of town. Tomer (2012) calls this the “Surgical Method” (p. 9), stating that architects envisioned a spatial, economic and racial clearing of the city. While native people and communities of color were being displaced to the periphery of Cape Town, communities were also being displaced

from rural lands as well. The Native Lands Act of 1913 allocated 87% of total South African land to white settlers, leaving only 13% to native people. As Cousins & Walker (2015) state:

[The Natives Land Act of 1913 was] the fundamental cause of land dispossession in South Africa.... At the stroke of a pen, the majority of the population were cruelly robbed of their land, the source of their food and the site of their families' homes for generations. Thousands were evicted and many died (p. 24).

As a result, South Africa was quickly urbanizing with many Black Africans coming to the cities.

In 1948, the national government released a report from the Native Law Commission that argued land segregation was “impractical” (Piotroski, 2019, p. 60) from a socioeconomic standpoint. With national general elections approaching, South Africa’s United Party ran on platform that total segregation was not feasible (Byrnes, 1996). The Afrikaner National Party (Hestigte National Party, HNP) ran on the opposing platform, believing that if complete segregation did not occur, Black populations would overwhelm “white society” (Byrnes, 1996). The National Party also supported other racist policies including forcing Black Africans to be temporary dwellers (migrating between urban and farm labor), banning interracial marriages and prohibiting Black trade unions (Byrnes, 1996). In 1948, the Afrikaner National Party won the electorate and solidified the implementation of apartheid policies. As McCusker, Moseley & Ramutsindela (2016) state, “After the 1948 electoral victory, Afrikaner nationalists were able to build on a solid foundation of segregationist land policy and begin to both erase any inconsistencies in policy and propel their vision of complete segregation to the fore” (p. 57).

Apartheid: 1948 – 1994

After the elections, the Afrikaner Nationalist Party passed two particularly harmful policies within the first few years of their tenure: the Population Registration Act of 1950 and the Group Areas Act of 1950. The Population Registration Act required that every person in South

Africa register under a specific racial group: “Black”, “Asian,” “White”, or “Coloured” (Christopher, 1994). A person was categorized according to their physical appearance, language abilities, and various other social qualifications. The Group Areas Act of 1950 was the spatial enactment of this policy which mandated cities to zone according to race. The goal of these frameworks were to limit contact between races. With the rise of the automobile in the mid-1900s (Kuhn, 2021), this was accomplished through transportation routes, like freeways, and industry buffer zones (Turok, 1994, p. 244). These policies resulted in mass forced removals.

In Cape Town, District Six was one of the most notable forced removals in the late 1900s. During the 1950s, predominantly Black people lived in the area, but by 1966, it was zoned as “whites only” (Layne, 2008, p. 55). Over the course of fourteen years, 60,000 people were forcibly removed and the entire neighborhood was bulldozed by 1982. (Layne, 2008, p. 55). People were displaced to peripheral townships that were owned by the state. The aim was to socioeconomically marginalize Black people by limiting their ability to own property and start businesses. State-supplied housing was makeshift, and essential services like education and infrastructure were intentionally underinvested (Turok, 1994, p. 245-246). Pass laws, which had been used during slavery to authorize travel from the city to rural areas (Savage, 1986, p. 182), were now implemented to treat Black people as temporary laborers in the city (Turok, 1994, p. 246). As a result, urban protest was rising across the country. In Langa specifically, over 30,000 Black Africans marched into Cape Town led by the Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC) to specifically protest pass laws (Lodge, 1978, p. 216).

By the time South Africa gained independence in 1961, racial divisions had only deepened (Piotrowski, 2019, p. 60). As Oliver & Oliver (2017) state:

The Republic of South Africa from 1961 onwards was just a continuation of the rule of the National Party, which had already started in 1948. This white Afrikaner rule without any black or mixed race representation - this time independent of the supervision of Britain - was nothing else but a next phase of colonisation of this country, and this was maybe the harshest of them all.

The governing bodies of the independent South Africa merely adopted the racial policies of the British, continuing segregation in the social, economic and spatial sphere (Piotrowski, 2019, p. 61). Thus, Cape Town transitioned to the third phase of King's (1977) export planning: neocolonial or post-colonial development. Despite the lack of a formal imperial power, globalized connections cemented during colonization ensured that subjugation would continue through a "cultural colonialism" (p. 13) where underlying ideologies and planning practices continue to be exported from the former core.

Town planning during apartheid was incredibly procedural, to ensure that segregation was being implemented consistently across the country. Local spatial development had to be approved by provincial authorities, and there was little public participation in the planning process. Turok (1994) describes this period of planning as the "blueprint approach" (p. 249). There was no need for variety in development, because complete racial segregation was the only option for the apartheid government. As Turok (1994) states, "Planners showed little apparent recognition or understanding of the economic and social implications of physical controls and segregation" (p. 249).

Kuhn (2021) describes this period of urban management as upscaling. During the 1960s, a combination of factors including cheap electricity and an increased access to natural resources led to an economic boom. The annual growth rate of the decade was at a high of 6%. This resulted in a massive expansion of the city, with several multi-year housing programs resulting in an "urban building event" (Kuhn, 2021). Construction was largely managed by the public sector

through the Retreat Master Plan, which attempted to provide comprehensive solutions to housing shortages and public health issues through complete control of population and development (Kuhn, 2021). These ambitions resulted in completely new towns, characterized by forced removals and further segregation.

Forced displacements not only led to the creation of formal townships, but also the rise of informal settlements. During the late 1970s, the Crossroads was one of Cape Town's most vibrant settlements with locally-led schools, places of worship, a local government and an emerging community culture. Black women were prominent leaders in the Crossroads community and led the "Save the Crossroads Campaign" to protest the apartheid government's attempts to demolish the area. As Cole (2013) describes, "Crossroads became a national and international symbol of resistance to forced removals, supported by a diverse range of local, national, international organisations, faith-based and anti-apartheid groups" (p. 11). In September of 1978, the apartheid government in Cape Town raided the Crossroads, resulting in death and mass arrests (p. 12). Many settlers of the Crossroads were displaced to the township of Khayelitsha which was established in 1983 (Kuhn, 2021). Today, Khayelitsha is Cape Town's largest Black African township with over 391,000 people (Cole, 2013, p. 4). By the 1980s, informal settlements were increasing and economic growth was low. Urban planning driven by the public sector was very politicized. Political unrest and resistance to apartheid was mainly led by Black liberation groups like the African National Congress (ANC), led by Nelson Mandela, and the Pan African Congress (PAC) (Piotrowski, 2019, p. 61). These organized protests and action eventually led to the resignation of the Nationalist Party Prime Minister P. W. Botha in 1989. By 1994, the apartheid regime was done (p. 62).

Apartheid urban planning had cultivated four major issues for South African cities. First, by fragmenting the city, the government severely increased the costs needed for commuter transportation infrastructure and public services. Second, by spatially segregating people, inequalities increased disproportionately according to race. Lack of public services and transportation led to high costs, which further economically marginalized communities of color. Third, segregating local authorities had led to an uneven distribution of resources and general municipal inefficiency. In terms of urban planning, this contributed to a lack of political coordination on development. Due to segregated tax systems, areas tended to compete for development rather than cooperate. Finally, apartheid zoning led to a distortion in land-use markets, increasing urban sprawl and the inequality gap. This led to overcrowding and housing shortages in predominantly Black areas, while predominantly white areas maintained low density development and extra land (Turok, 1994, p. 250-254).

Apartheid, and nationalism fueled by the Afrikaners, brought to the fore fundamental issues in implementing absolute modern, or “essentialist” (Calhoun, 2019, p. 21), urban planning. When enforced spatially, modernism and apartheid both attempt to bring “order” (Tomer, 2012, p. 11) to the socio-cultural sphere. When developed in concert with nationalism, modern social theory incorporates the idea that societies must be bounded. This rests on the assumption that linear progression of human life would be easier if people existed in one social or cultural categorization (Calhoun, 2019, p. 24). As Calhoun (2019) states:

It has been the tacit assumption of modern social and cultural thought that people are normally members of one and only one nation, that they are members of one and only one race, one gender, and one sexual orientation, and that each of these memberships describes neatly and concretely some aspect of their being. It has been assumed that people naturally live in one world at a time, that they inhabit one way of life, that they speak one language, and that they themselves, as individuals, are singular, integral beings (p. 22).

While modernity propagates the value of freedom (p. 23), when combined with nationalism, modern theory assumes that this value will be unachievable without bounded society. This fact encapsulates the contradiction of modern design under apartheid. As Jackson (2005) states:

The apartheid regime was further aided by the confidence that came from the technical and bureaucratic innovations of modernism (Scott 1998). Apartheid can therefore be defined, in part, as a spatial model that was successful in modernist terms, but it required a level of coercion that brought the contradictions of modernism dangerously close to the surface (p. 51).

Thus, urban planning throughout the colonization of Cape Town and subsequently greater South Africa, cemented this conception of modernity through the logic of order (Jackson, 2005, p. 51). This desire for order can be tracked through the history of King's (1977) export planning, beginning with the grid city and then eventually evolving into the spatial implementation of apartheid. This begs to question— how were these institutionalized assumptions challenged after the upending of the apartheid regime in Cape Town? Chapter 3 explores this point by delving into a critical analysis of the construction and implementation of Cape Town's Municipal Spatial Development Framework.

Chapter 3: Data Collection and Analysis

Data Collection & Analysis Methodology

In order to understand the impacts of an apartheid and colonial history on Cape Town's MSDF, this study conducted five interviews gained through the purposive and convenience methods from June 2022 to July 2022. Two of these interviews were conducted with persons who have been involved with Ndifuna Ukwazi, an activist organization in Cape Town that challenges spatial apartheid through community organizing and land justice advocacy. Due to the anonymity of these interviews, these participants are referred to as Researcher A and Researcher B. The intent of these interviews were to understand the on-the-ground perspectives of the current reality of Cape Town space and the MSDF. The next two interviews were conducted with urban planners who have been engaged with spatial transformation efforts in Cape Town. These participants are referred to as Planner A and Planner B. Finally, the last interview was conducted with a politician involved with the MSDF, who is referred to as Politician A. The intent of these final three interviews were to understand the thought process behind the framework's approach. From these various perspectives, this study aims to achieve a holistic understanding of the MSDF from a planning standpoint, supplemented by historical data gathering. Historical data has been gathered from primary sources (government documents, oral histories, interviews and articles) and secondary sources (scholarly publications, books and reports).

This chapter reflects on these perspectives through a critical analysis, focusing on the four key neocolonial characteristics outline previously. As mentioned in Chapter 1, these characteristics include (1) a top-down approach, (2) a suppression of localized knowledges, (3) a prioritization of exchange-value over use-value and (4) a presence of disproportionate spatial and economic impacts on systemically-marginalized communities (Dionne, 2021). By transcribing

and categorizing quotes from these interviews and historical data under the neocolonial lens of these four characteristics, this study seeks to illustrate the city government's inability to implement the MSDF and meaningfully address the urban inequalities created during the colonial and apartheid eras. In analyzing these characteristics through the Cape Town context, this analysis identifies how neocolonialism persists in the urban space today.

A Top-Down Approach: The "Blueprint" Model & the TOD Model

Although the apartheid regime ended in 1994, scholars (Odendaal & McCann, 2016; Watson, 2002) trace metropolitan planning back to 1989. As mentioned in Chapter 2, urban planning during the apartheid era often followed "blueprints" (Turok, 1994, p. 249) called Guide Plans. Since racialized segregation was the only option for the apartheid government, there was no need for localized variance in designing these plans. Nevertheless, this changed in 1989 when local planners in Cape Town met to discuss the potential for a metropolitan spatial plan. This meeting was held by the Regional Services Council, a municipal authority controlled by the Nationalist Party. The motivations behind vesting power in the municipality was to build legitimacy in the racially-segregated local government system that was quickly deteriorating (Watson, 2002, p. 16). Nevertheless, transitioning this responsibility to the municipalities created an opportunity for these Guide Plans to be challenged (p. 20).

While plans of the past had focused on separate development in different "nodes" (p. 40), there was a rising discourse that the urban space should be integrated and densified. These two discourses had some key differences. The emerging calls for integrative planning focused on inward and compact development, while the existing frameworks focused on an outward expansion— continually building new cities on the periphery to enforce segregation. Despite

these differences, Watson (2002) notes that this new planning perspective was still modernist, believing that a future could be created through land manipulation by urban professionals (p. 41). Beyond that, these calls for integration were not necessarily a moral choice for planners in the Regional Services Council. At this time, there was clearly strong opposition rising against apartheid, and this new discourse offered a political advantage to these planners. As Watson (2022) states:

For the planners of the Regional Services Council, adoption of the new planning discourse potentially allowed them a better chance of continuing to exercise power over the process of metropolitan planning, and the productive value of this strategy became clear in subsequent years (p. 41).

Therefore, while these emerging metropolitan planning decisions were contrary to apartheid practices from a design standpoint, this does not necessarily mean that all of the planners from the Regional Services Council were entirely opposed to the problematic foundations of the regime. However, Planner B states:

The planners of the apartheid era were very good at what they did in perverting and distorting racial patterns, and segregating land use and segregating racial groups. They were the architects of apartheid in spatial terms, so a lot of the people who were in that space, many would leave the new government dispensation...

Even though some planners changed their position on segregation to successfully adapt to the incoming power structure, many people involved with the apartheid design did in fact leave during the turn of administration.

The plan set forth by the Regional Services Council and their consultants was described as still following the “blueprint” (Watson, 2002, p. 62) model— although, not in terms of a segregated city, but a compact city. Therefore, the blueprint nature did not come from the actual spatial goals, but the presentation of those goals: perpetuating planning as a grand vision, rather than a series of implementable strategies. Planners from the Cape Town City Council pushed for

a more “strategic” (p. 62) plan that showed action beyond merely an illustration. As the facilitator of the planning process, David Shandler (1999), stated, “The [Regional Services Council’s] plan was operating at a level which seemed to fly above the world and never engage with it... It didn’t bear any relationship to it, but the logic was perfect.” Despite conflict with the Cape Town City Council behind the scenes, the Regional Services Council’s blueprint to the compact city was the plan chosen to be published in the 1996 MSDF Technical Report.

Thus, echoes of the apartheid era persisted through the blueprint application. While no longer founded in the concept of bounded progress championed by nationalist modernism, this choice enforced modernist idea nonetheless by applying the logic of order without subjectivity to the urban space. As Odendaal & McCann (2016) describe, “the encoded structuring logic still assumed an essentially Cartesian experience of space, with its simple treatment of space and place” (p. 412). This visionary approach proved to be of detriment to its success. The blueprint rested on the assumption that, by limiting the urban edge and allocating certain nodes for investment, the private sector would follow by building capital in these underserved areas designated for growth. In turn, increased opportunity would promote integration. However, the MSDF did not have the expected influence on the market. As Watson (2002) states, “More public and private investment had taken place outside of demarcated corridors and nodes than inside them” (p. 91). By the late 2000s, development and growth were still mainly concentrated in former “white only” areas of the city, while historically-Black neighborhoods remained economically neglected (Turok, 2001).

In 2006, a new process was initiated to replace the 1996 MSDF Technical Report. This resulted in the MSDF that was approved in 2012. The MSDF rested on three strategies: (1) to better plan and improve access to employment and economic opportunities; (2) to more

effectively manage environmental protection with urban growth; and (3) to create a more inclusive and integrated urban space (City of Cape Town, Overview, 2012, p. 4-5). With goals such as developing a good transport system, fostering more fair access to public spaces and decreasing the city's overall carbon footprint, the MSDF declared that "public good should prevail over private interest" (City of Cape Town, Statutory Report, 2012, p. 9).

In order to accomplish these goals spatially, the 2012 MSDF defined the urban edge and focused on growth specifically in two northern corridors. As the CTSDf Statutory Report (2012b) states:

The identification of the north-eastern and north-western city growth directions is informed by the scale of land suitable for urban development within the municipal boundary, based on topography, biodiversity and natural resources, valuable agricultural areas, heritage sites, cultural features and significant landscapes (p. 35).

Although, by the time the MSDF's five-year review period came along in 2017, growth along these two particular corridors had been largely unsuccessful. As Researcher B (2022) states:

One of the corridors in Cape Town, the Belville corridor, is along the Vortrekker road which is basically the economic engine of the city. It drives about 85 to 70% of the city's economy. Even though the city offered extensive development rights on those parcels of land, very few private developers used those parcels because the market has its own way of functioning.

Thus, planners identified a need to shift to instead propose growth in the urban inner core (City of Cape Town, 2017, p. 4). This was to be accomplished through a transit-oriented development (TOD) model, which was approved as the comprehensive land use model by the City in 2016 (City of Cape Town, 2017, p. i).

Researcher B (2022) notes that this shift in 2016 signaled "a much more stronger evidence based approach" and was "slightly more progressive." This was described by the city government, as the "Blue Turtle," because the chosen growth nodes were connected in such a way on the map that it looked like a turtle. As Planner B (2022) states, "[The purpose of the Blue

Turtle was] framing the nodes and the corridors we were trying to link. That was a really important part of the messaging, known across the city as the urban inner core— the area that is linked by public transport.” Nevertheless, this shift did not result in significant results between 2017 and 2022. Researcher A (2022) states:

We had some very progressive provisions in [the 2017-2022 draft of the MSDF], lots of pull for building more well-located affordable housing, similarly in the integrated development plan, similarly in the more local spatial development frameworks, but that didn’t actually translate into any affordable homes being built in former “whites only” areas.

Researcher B (2022) agrees, stating that while these progressive decisions were synthesized in the plan, they never materialized into concrete actions, especially in regards to affordable housing in the urban inner core and land redistribution.

In order to understand why this occurred, it is important to reflect on the history of the TOD model. The term “transit-oriented development” was defined by American architect, Peter Calthorpe (1993), in his book *The Next American Metropolis*. The concept encouraged increased integration, mixed-use land, and densification along transit routes. As Planner B (2022) states, TOD attempted to use public transportation as the lever for integration, densification and diversification of the city. Both Planner A (2022) & Planner B (2022) impress that TOD was pushed very hard at the political level. Planner A (2022) traces this political drive back to the 2010 World Cup, “There was realization that they needed to figure out how to move people... [There is] money available, let’s start projects. TOD is going to be the driving principle. Insanity prevailed.” Planner A (2022) calls TOD as a “buzzword.” As Planner B (2022) describes, “It became a panacea, a silver bullet, like TOD will solve all your problems.”

While many planners in South Africa attributed their knowledge of the TOD to Curitiba, Brazil, the design and underlying assumptions behind it are heavily based in the “North

American experience” (Wood, 2021, p. 5). As Researcher B (2022) describes, “[The TOD model] wasn’t a viable model to begin with fundamentally, because it was based on a very Western notion that transit-oriented development means large private developers come in and develop large pieces of housing, commercial development, office development...” The TOD model that was approved in 2016 was not effective in Cape Town for two major reasons. First, Cape Town does not have a reliable transport system. As Politician A (2022) states:

When we look at bringing economic opportunities close to residential opportunity, or residential opportunities close to economic opportunity, we also dawn the assumption that there’s a healthy functional public transport system and at times... in Cape Town, that’s not the case.

While the city did attempt to implement a bus rapid transit system to remedy this, it never gained traction. Researcher B (2022) notes, “It was good at getting people into the city, but [got] stuck in traffic going back.” This issue returns to Turok’s (1994) point, detailed in Chapter 2, the issue of the fragmented city: As a result of intense spatial segregation contributing to urban sprawl, apartheid made transportation routes costly and difficult.

Second, Researcher B notes that the city had a “myopic” attitude toward private developers. The city believed that simply because TOD was going to be implemented, that property prices were going to rise, leading to a sudden increase in private investment in previously lower-income areas. This was not the case, as Researcher B (2022) states, “Private developers only play in markets which are much more robust and generally catering to the middle and upper income.” Planner B (2022) made a similar comment, saying that the private market was not adaptable enough and did not understand how to effectively use the proposed mixed-use development model. This assumption and reliance on the private sector to deliver growth has been a continual pattern in the MSDF process, and city government is repeatedly faced with misplaced expectations of the private sector.

Even more so, if the TOD model had been successfully implemented, this increase in growth along transit nodes would not necessarily make the city more equitable. As Wood (2021) states, “Around the world TOD has fueled gentrification and displacement by increasing land values... And over the past 25 years, only 12% of references recognise an association between community development and TOD” (p. 5). One example that Planner B (2022) uses to illustrate TOD is New York City. They note that you can’t even see Grand Central Station because the land around rail infrastructure is so utilized and highly-valued. The use of New York City as an example of a successful TOD model is very telling of the naivety in this top-down approach, since communities in New York City are increasingly being priced out by high-densification projects (Dionne, 2021). Therefore, the MSDF and its spatial planning methods since its fruition have harbored a top-down approach, beginning with the “blueprint” plan of a compact city in the 1990s and extending to the TOD. By seeing the city as a space to manipulate and shape, city planners and politicians who push for these plans often fail to preemptively recognize that Cape Town does not have the infrastructural or private sector requisites to accomplish their envisions.

Suppression of Localized Knowledges: Public Participation

In 1993, before the creation of the 1996 Technical Report, the City Council and the Regional Services Council produced a document called “The Way Forward, Interim MDF Draft Report No. 1” (Watson, 2002, p. 61). This document was to inform the new spatial planning approach of Cape Town, and intended to have a rigorous public participation process with key stakeholders (p. 64). Aware that the Nationalist Party was leading these workshops, representatives from “non-statutory” (p. 64) organizations were present to ensure that public services were being allocated to long-term restructuring and redistribution (Turok, 1994). After

significant workshopping led by the Regional Services Council, it was concluded that the non-statutory organizations had no significant qualms with the plan or any proposed alternatives. Although, it is recognized that Kim Van Deventer, the head of the Economic and Social Development directorate at the time, did comment, “Proposals to build low-income housing to much higher densities (in the form of low-rise walk-ups) would price housing out of the reach of the lower-income groups.” Therefore, reliance on increased densification to bring about economic redistribution was being questioned at an early stage (Development Action Group, 1993).

While the forum seemed like a thorough participation process on paper, the plan was still essentially “expert-led” (Odendaal & McCann, 2016, p. 412). First of all, the presence of non-statutory groups was limited, and they really had no direct impact on key debates. Only 21 out of the 134 people who attended the multiple workshops in 1993 were from these organizations (Watson, 2022, p. 65). Distributed reports were also written in highly-technical language. While the issues were clearly defined, the spatial solutions to address these issues were not. As a result, there was an evident power imbalance between the Regional Services Council and consultants leading the plan versus the non-statutory actors attempting to hold them accountable. Due to the technicality of these workshops, the knowledges that could attest and account for the potential human costs of the plan were marginalized in these participation processes.

In acknowledging this history, each of the interviewees were asked how they think communities have been engaged with the MSDF as it exists today. Planner A (2022) states that it is a very “legislative process” and at a basic level, the city does fulfill the requirements. Nevertheless, when these public engagements are scrutinized, the nature of these participation processes are very “exclusionary” (Planner A, 2022). Meetings are usually held either in the

morning, when people are at work, or late at night, when people are trying to navigate traffic and the unreliable public transport to get home. If the meeting occurs at City Hall, people without cars really do not have the option to catch a late train or afford an Uber, since many people in the working class live over 20 kilometers away from the Central Business District (CBD). While the city does release planning documents in Cape Town's three official languages of English, Afrikaans, and asa-Xhosa, those who do not have online access can only pick these documents up at a library or a municipal office which both have limited hours. Even if a person is able to overcome these constraints and obtain a planning document, they are usually very long and highly technical. As a result, Planner A (2022) states:

You'll find that it is really the middle to upper class, the much wealthier folks who have the time and financial means to actually sit, look at the documents, analyze and say, "Ok so this is how this impacts me," and then actually have the time as well to write down their comments and make the submissions... Community engagement leaves a lot to be desired.

On the other hand, Planner A (2022) recognizes that it takes budget and resources to properly engage with communities on these large spatial plans, and that legislation can often leave the hands of the Urban Planning and Design Department tied.

Planner B (2022) responds that it is often difficult to effectively communicate these plans to communities, as a result of language barriers and highly technical concepts:

There's never enough too can do... You're dealing with concepts, you're dealing with nodal framework... what does that mean for someone who's struggling to get to school in the morning because of congestion? You need to bring it down to something that's tangible and often that is contrary to what the plan is potentially saying.

The Blue Turtle was part of an effort to address those obstacles, and T-shirts were even created to show which areas were being addressed and how. With colors, the shirt attempted to show that the Urban Planning and Design Department seeks to enhance green areas (critical natural assets), avoid growth in gray areas (discouraged growth areas to the north of the city), fix and maintain

orange areas (incremental growth and consolidation areas) and upscale the Blue Turtle (the urban inner core) (City of Cape Town, 2022).

Nevertheless, despite these efforts to relay these ideas to the general public, community participation in the MSDF is very limited. If someone does decide to participate and make a submission, this action is non-binding. The power dynamic between urban planning experts and the community still remains. Researcher B (2022) elaborates on this point, stating that the city has a very “inward” way of developing plans:

The city develops the plans, develops the documents and then releases them out to the public and basically gives you a period to comment on [them]. And then you make a formal submission, and then it goes down into a deep, dark hole, and you don't know if it materializes into any kind of substantial shift in what the city does.

It also depends on the people that are in the municipality. As Researcher A (2022) states, “It depends on who's running the process and a whole range of factors.” Researcher A (2022) equates public participation for the MSDF as a “tick box exercise,” following legislation rather than focusing on meaningful engagement.

Politician A (2022) recognizes that the community is not as participatory in the MSDF process as they should be, due to strict legislation and technical language. In addition, they state:

You as a person staying in a particular area have the best knowledge in terms of impact of what is happening and what's not happening in your community... More should be done to create an awareness of those processes so those persons can participate in a meaningful manner.

Politician A (2022) mentions that they have seen public engagements as useful and have taken up some suggestions that the department has actually pursued. However, the city does not engage with just affected residents. A whole range of external actors play roles— including investors. As Politician A (2022) says, “The affected stakeholders should inform the MSDF because if they don't inform it, then it's a document that won't offer the necessary certainty to an investor.” This

comment was interesting, because from a political standpoint, it makes transparent that public participation is not just a means to creating a more equitable plan, but also as a means to gain investors.

While public participation mandates and initiatives like the Blue Turtle are a step forward, comments submitted during these periods do not have any real power in the decision-making processes of planning in Cape Town. Even more so, a person's ability to even submit a comment is incredibly influenced by their class, location and income, which in the South African context, is very racialized. As a result, from a political standpoint, participation from impacted residents could be used as a way to make the plan attractive for investment, rather than actually implement community-led change. Therefore, with no real binding role from impacted community members, obstacles to public participation in planning processes are very similar to that of the first forum run by the Regional Services Council. Although, rather than being a result of intentional suppression like in the 1990s, these restrictions to local knowledges are more informed by an institutionalized lack of resources to envelop meaningful community input.

Exchange-Value Over Use-Value: Investment Over Expropriation

When the democratically-elected ANC government, led by Nelson Mandela, took office in 1994, the Reconstruction and Development Program (RDP) was implemented nationally. The spatial components of the program called for a deconstruction of the "apartheid geography" (RDP, 1994, p. 83) through densification and improved public transportation (Watson, 2002, p. 45). There was also a national effort to mend the fragmentation of the government which "reflected minority interests" (National Development and Planning Commission, 1999, iv, 4). As a result, several legislations were introduced, including the

Development Facilitation Act of 1995 and the Local Government Transition Amendment Act of 1996 (Watson, 2002, p. 81). These policies introduced Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) in which the objectives of all administrative directorates had to be integrated, along with the budget. It offered an opportunity for governments to address inefficiencies between local departments in order to foster collaborate implementation (p. 84). The implementation of IDPs sought to apply private sector management methods to government inefficiency. As the Department of Constitutional Development's Deputy Director-General stated in 1997, "The IDP is a process, not a product. They are not physical plans, but business plans." By mandating this policy, the government attempted to tackle local administrative collaboration, but also introduced a "neoliberal philosophy of development" (Watson, 2022, p. 87). This legislation placed equal importance on both entrepreneurial and development needs.

From a city planning standpoint, Planner B (2022) recognizes that Cape Town's revenue is an important part of the MSDF and is necessary to create infrastructure and welfare programs. Through Planner B's (2022) perspective, it seems that the developmental and entrepreneurial needs are in an equal relationship, informing one another. However, from a political standpoint, the entrepreneurial needs may be more prioritized. As Politician A (2022) states, "[As a politician] for this directorate, you have to look at things that are macro level and what informs the economic imperative and ultimately that's what [the MSDF is] about... but also looking at spatial transformation." While the MSDF does have goals to accomplish spatial transformation, it is also a guiding document to understand the economic growth nodes, and in this sense, the document's target audience is largely investors. Politician A (2022) states, "Cape Town ultimately would desire to position itself as a place to live, to work, to play, but also invest... so we try to offer that certainty with this document." This thinking around the MSDF from

Politician A (2022) reveals how the neoliberal aims to develop can quickly overcome the need to actually deconstruct the persisting apartheid geography. This assumption that the private sector will deliver spatial equitability shadows the urgency to address these disparities, replacing it with an urgency to garner investment. Therefore, through this perspective, economic growth is prioritized over spatial transformation because it is believed that growth will enable integration which will create equity. This is even in the Executive Summary of MSDF (City of Cape Town, 2017-2022) which states:

The implication of Cape Town’s spatial, social and economic challenges is that it must place sustained job-generating economic growth at the heart of its spatial priorities. This means supporting investment in well-located growth nodes, reinforcing transit-oriented corridors and linking growing nodes with lagging nodes through connective infrastructure.

Therefore, the city government does not see itself as the actual driver of these infrastructure developments in under-serviced areas, but rather, facilitating the private sector to deliver these results through zoning. As Politician A states, “The activity in [designated growth] nodes, in those infrastructure developments, is not something that we would be driving but we would be enabling with our zoning scheme.” As mentioned earlier in the chapter, this assumption that the private sector will deliver equitable development has been repeatedly made since the 1996 MSDF Technical Report. Throughout the evolution of the MSDF, the centering of this densification and investment approach has not been questioned, but rather the identification of areas of growth— and subsequent development incentives offered— has been what has changed.

By relying on the private sector, city politicians have shown an inability to pursue direct action to accomplish spatial transformation. This comes to the fore particularly in the use of public land. In 2019, Ndifuna Ukwazi released a report on the city’s misuse of public land called, “City Leases: Cape Town’s Failure to Redistribute Land.” With many people struggling to find

well-located housing near access to services, Ndifuna Ukwazi used this study to reveal different pieces of public land with real transformational power that the city is leasing to private sporting associations for cheap. Often these public land lease agreements could be traced back to the apartheid era, contracted to be used as physical buffer zones for segregation. One of the investigations explores the Rondebosch Golf Club which the city is only leasing out for R1000 a year— less than the price of a tiny apartment (Researcher A, 2022). During apartheid, this property specifically was used as a buffer zone between the “white only” neighborhood of Rondebosch and communities of color in Athlone. Researcher A (2022) calls this an “illogical” use of land, stating:

[The Rondebosch Golf Club] really showed how misplaced the priorities of the municipality really were that they were willing to rent out a piece of land that had real transformative potential and that could benefit hundreds of families, thousands of people, and help to kind of heal the divisions of the past. Instead of using this land for this progressive, more transformative potential— it aligned with the type of provisions in our constitution and in a whole bunch of spatial planning and policy legislation— they chose to rent it out for a very exclusive use that doesn’t offer any wider public benefit.

Researcher B (2022) comments that this inability to spatially transform is rooted in the city’s legislation to fulfill both entrepreneurial and development needs:

There is still conflicting legislation that speaks to how land should be used. One from a much more social and redistributive perspective; the other, in terms of municipalities and particularly the city of Cape Town, managing its assets in its best economic way.

This legislative conflict results in a failure to actually achieve the goals outlined in the MSDF to fulfill the strategy to create more inclusive city. These goals include encouraging the effective use of public land and making sure that all communities have access to similar public services (City of Cape Town, Overview, 2012, p. 5).

In speaking about public land, Researcher A (2022) mentioned that the priorities of the municipality were “displaced.” When asked to elaborate, Researcher A (2022) expressed that this

comes down to many political and legislative factors, but they believe that the most prominent is that city politicians are not recognizing the gravity of change needed. By leaving spatial change up to the market, Researcher A (2022) does not believe that this will effectively address the legacy of apartheid:

Ultimately, there isn't really enough a reckoning with the fact that in South Africa, we had half a century of apartheid and before that, we had several hundred years of colonialism and throughout those very dark times in our history, planning and housing and cities were so intently shaped by really direct state intervention to create the apartheid city. We saw massive forced removals and evictions taking place... we had cities being laid out with different areas for different racial groups, complete separation of land uses and a whole bunch of really inefficient urban design and urban planning that was put in place to control the movement of Black and Coloured people... the people—the politicians in charge of the city of Cape Town— have to understand that that legacy and that intense history of really direct state intervention to produce a racially unequal city requires interventions of a similar magnitude to reverse. It can't be left up to the market or to making small little interventions here or there, you have to really radically change the approach or you're never going to address that legacy... Fundamentally there's a failure to recognize that... To address the legacy, we need action that matches the kind of scale and intensity of our crisis and the history that created it.

In order to address the growing inequalities in the urban space, Researcher A (2022) believes bolder action is needed which could come in the form of expropriation. Planner B (2022) notes that expropriation measures and policy provisions are “rarely used” for housing purposes. Researcher A (2022) believes that this comes from a general lack of political will, stating, “There's this big fear that if we expropriate land that it can scare off investor... but actually cities all around the world do the type of expropriation that I'm speaking about.” Planner A (2022) thinks that this lack of political will is also the underlying factor preventing the implementation of key spatial development strategies in the MSDF. While the political side of city government does recognize that spatial change is needed, the prevailing rhetoric is that it will be accomplished through investment, without recognizing further need for racial reparations and public intervention to accomplish spatial equity. Therefore, through this assumption, city

politicians believe that by promoting the exchange-value of developments to spur investment, this will in turn spur the use-value of these developments for communities. Nevertheless, this prioritization of the exchange-value has resulted in little spatial change.

Disproportionate Effects: The Persistence of Spatial Inequalities

When apartheid ended, instead of eradicating these systems of carefully planned racial segregation, Planner A (2022) notes that it was really just replaced with income segregation that had a strong correlation between income and race. Planner A (2022) states a huge design concern of the current MSDF is addressing inequality in the city and transforming the spatial legacy of apartheid. As the Executive Summary of MSDF (City of Cape Town, 2017-2022) states:

The City is intent on building – in partnership with the private and public sector – a more inclusive, integrated and vibrant city that addresses the legacies of apartheid, rectifies existing imbalances in the distribution of different types of residential development, and avoids the creation of new structural imbalances in the delivery of services.

Nevertheless, the legacy of this planning is still clearly visible in the city, even though the MSDF has been approved for a decade. Planner B (2022) notes that it is unacceptable that two generations post-apartheid, people still do not have access to land, employment, or reliable affordable transport. Researcher A (2022) describes this acutely, stating, “In Cape Town, the physical manifestations of what is wrong with our city is so clear to see. You can feel it when you drive through different areas, the contours of apartheid and colonialism are still so much intact... you’re physically and materially confronted with that inequality.” These inequalities are a result of two major issues: (1) a direct result of a lack of desegregation since the end of apartheid and (2) an inverse densification crisis where the most populated areas have the least access to employment opportunities and economic mobility (Researcher A, 2022).

Researcher A (2022) urges that the political side of the city cannot continue on the path that it has been on because it simply cannot be sustained: “Homelessness has increased, people are struggling more than ever before. We have not only our difficult and damaging legacy of apartheid and colonialism, but then you have poor economic performance after that.” Disparities have only been exacerbated by Cape Town’s water crisis in 2018 (Researcher B, 2022) and the COVID-19 pandemic which started in 2020 (Researcher A, 2022). In order to address these inequalities, Researcher A (2022) believes that action must be twofold: the MSDF should be implemented, but in tandem with bolder, long-term action. As Researcher B (2022) states, “The MSDF approach is the right approach to take. It has to be the right approach to take because the apartheid spatial planning has to be disrupted from a spatial planning perspective.” Researcher A (2022) agrees with this point:

[The MSDF] wanted to encourage investment in certain areas and discourage it in certain areas, and encourage affordable housing in well-located areas. They had a really clear spatial vision, and if they were able to follow through, I do think that would have lent to material benefit.

Nevertheless, investments and relying on the market cannot remain the top priority. A more long-term social vision is required that effectively coordinates land reform (Researcher A, 2022).

Rather than consistently focusing on the exchange-value and making investments more attractive, “people’s rights” (Researcher A, 2022) or the use-value must be prioritized.

While the failure to address persistent disproportionate impacts can be contributed to a lack of political will that was mentioned previously, it also comes down to a lack of governmental coordination as well. While Planner A (2022) argues that the city is fulfilling their role in a planning capacity, all of the government departments are not coming together to properly implement this vision. Planner A (2022) states that specific strategies in the MSDF have not been accomplished because actions are made out of sequence or the budget is not aligned.

Planner B (2022) expresses frustration around the plan being pushed back to 2026 due to the budget being needed for waste water treatment support. As Politician A (2022) states, “I’m not necessarily satisfied with the implementation of the MSDF yet, purely because you’re always responding to other needs as a municipality.” Research A (2022) remarks that Cape Town has never been very good at the “multisectoral, multidisciplinary approach.” This can certainly be connected back to Turok’s (1994) assessment of the post-apartheid city, stemming from the segregation of administrative systems in Cape Town: “Fragmentation has undermined coordinated planning and efforts to prioritise development in areas of need. Councils’ dependence on local taxes means there is competition for development rather than cooperation.” Thus, this governmental inefficiency also encourages the political will to focus on competition for investment in development, rather than coordination. All of these factors contribute to an urban space where the majority of people who are predominantly Black and people of color earn little money and live in poorly-located neighborhoods with high densification. Meanwhile, the minority of people who are mostly white live in “leafy” (Planner A, 2022) areas and make up the upper class (Researcher A, 2022). This societal makeup is eerily similar to that of the original “slave society” (Vink, 2015) in the Cape Colony, in which communities of color who were enslaved made up a majority of the population but did not own a proportionate amount of wealth. Researcher A (2022) warns, “[This] really visible kind of inequality is a recipe for conflict and disaster.”

Study Limitations

Since interviews were conducted within a short period of time over the summer of 2022, this study faced several limitations in its findings. First, only five interviews were able to be

conducted. If this study could be done again, more time would be set aside to gain at least ten interviews. Second, more attention would have been paid to interview impacted community residents from different neighborhoods to understand how perceptions of the MSDF and its implementation may have varied across the city. Third, while effort was made to interview someone from the private sector, this was unfortunately not accomplished. This study would have been more comprehensive if it included the perspective of an investor from Cape Town. Nevertheless, in interviewing a range of actors from activism to politics to planning, the research does represent a very holistic understanding of the MSDF. Thus, in identifying these limitations, this study turns to the conclusion to contextualize these findings within the historical and theoretical frameworks, and hopes to answer the overarching research question: Despite efforts to reduce spatial-economic inequalities in the city post-apartheid through the MSDF, does the institutional framework of urban planning in Cape Town today harbor neocolonial qualities?

Conclusion

As outlined by Nkrumah (1966), neocolonialism refers to the continued influence of Western modern ideologies that impact a post-colonial space after the fall of formal imperial rule. These underlying concepts continue to impact political and socio-economic systems, further entrenching the inequalities that were cemented during this era. In the context of urban planning, these assumptions about the urban space prevent just spatial transformation and perpetuate disparities on both racial and class lines. As an offshoot of critical theory, the concept of neocolonialism challenges the idea that these underlying assumptions are the “objective truth,” in an effort to recognize the injustice of the current reality and change it. Thus, through critical analysis, this study served as a continuation of past research (Dionne, 2021) to explore how neocolonialism impacts the urban space in post-colonial, global cities today. This research project started in New York City where, through interviews with on-the-ground organizers, it was determined that neocolonialism manifests itself in four prominent characteristics (Dionne, 2021). As a cross-cultural exercise, this research applied these four characteristics to the Cape Town urban space to identify if neocolonialism manifested itself in a similar way.

The first characteristic is a top-down approach. When the Dutch colonizers first started building on Khoikhoi and San native lands, they did not see the land as a place to live with and respect, but rather as a slate to export ideas and constructions. The first of these constructions was the Western idea of ownership, the concept that land could be commodified and belong to a single person or entity (du Plessis, 2011). From there, Dutch and British colonizers exported more planning instruments from the colonial core like the grid city (Boeing, 2019) and the Garden city (Coetzer, 2009), eventually completely dispossessing the original inhabitants from their land. Once colonialism ended, apartheid continued this legacy (Oliver & Oliver, 2017),

implementing the segregated city. Nevertheless, these constructions based on uneven development were not sustainable. They were founded through exploitation and displacement, resulting in severe sanitation issues, economic degradation, social inequalities and political unrest. While the MSDF and the Cape Town city government today attempt to redress this dark history, their spatial techniques are still functioning from a top-down perspective. From the creation of the MSDF in the 1996 Technical Report, planners viewed the urban space as one to manipulate and shape, rather than learn from. This was evident in the failure of the blueprint method, but also the unsuccessful implementation of transit-oriented development. This modern approach to space is continually unable to provide spatial transformation, because it is not entirely applicable to the Cape Town urban context. As Researcher A (2022) states:

[We need to accept that] this is what a South African city looks like. It's never going to look like Barcelona or New York or London or wherever. We need to work with what we have and... place people's rights in the center and require some type of more fundamental redistribution of land and housing and access to urban space and opportunity.

The second characteristic is the suppression of localized knowledges. When the Khoikhoi and the San lived on the land, they understood the need to respect it for the sake of its use for all (Okoth, 2008). This sentiment was defined in asa-Xhosa by the word "ubuntu" (Eze, 2008). When the Dutch and British colonized the land, this practice was suffocated, along with the suppression of knowledges from a migrant population of enslaved people. Throughout colonialism and apartheid, this removal of the democratic process in planning was deliberate to prevent the majority from threatening the interests of the minority. Even when the development of a metropolitan plan was underway in the 1990s, the Regional Services Council intentionally institutionalized power imbalances to retain the political advantage in leading the new spatial approach (Watson, 2002). This power imbalance remains today with the MSDF still being

largely expert-led, despite mandated public participation processes. Even though effort is made by the Urban Planning and Design Department to deconstruct highly-technical language and make the process accessible, legislation around budgeting and available resources still binds them from making these engagements with the public meaningful. As Researcher B states, “It’s quite piecemeal, the participatory planning [in Cape Town], which in some ways defeats the purpose of trying to change the way spatial planning in the city works.” Furthermore, engagement sessions are often inaccessible to people who are in the working class, which is largely Black communities and people of color in Cape Town due to the economic disparities fostered during apartheid. Even if people are able to submit comments and suggestions for the plan, there is no legislative avenue to hold departments accountable to enveloping these ideas.

The third characteristic is the prioritization of the exchange-value over the use-value. The state of planning Cape Town is currently heavily market-oriented. Planner B (2022) acutely explains this conflict, using the example of a coin to describe the duality of the Cape Town space. On one side of the coin is “formal” space: the planned city that informs the property market and investments. Meanwhile, on the other side is the “informal” space that does not wait for regulation and shapes the urban space creatively and organically. This space is driven by people’s needs and community circumstances. Planner B (2022) states:

One [side of the coin] plays by a set of rules and can be frustrated by those rules, but ultimately gives a sense of security and has the ability to generate huge... assets which can be used collateral for further investments. The other side is informal space where you are able to survive, you’re able to find a place in a community... that will allow you to try and better your circumstances... I still think that the [MSDF] is primarily a document that works for the formal environment and not for the informal.

By focusing on these quantifiable, investment-targeted steps and outcomes, the MSDF and city politicians rest on the assumption that if the private sector develops in certain growth nodes, equitable land development will follow. This assumption prioritizes the exchange-value over the

use-value, believing that by increasing economic investment and urban growth, this will translate to actual spatial transformation. However, this belief clouds the need for more bold interventions, like expropriations, and continues to be unable to provide services for these informal spaces.

The fourth characteristic is disproportionate impacts on systemically-marginalized communities. In Cape Town, people are still experiencing the racialized inequalities from the apartheid legacy. As Planner A (2022) states in Chapter 2, income segregation simply replaced racial segregation after apartheid ended, and Black people and communities of color were disproportionately impacted by this. As Planner B (2022) states, “I do think we’ve been extremely poor on integrated neighborhoods, making sure that there’s a mix of land use and income groups.” The MSDF’s inability to effectively implement meaningful spatial change as a result of the reasons listed above have contributed to these existing spatial disparities. To reflect on these four characteristics: Despite efforts from planners to spatially transform the city through the MSDF, it can be concluded that the state of urban planning and the plan itself harbor neocolonial qualities.

Space has always been a contentious issue in Cape Town, and greater South Africa. This study aimed to understand the impacts that colonialism and apartheid had on the urban space, and see how that translated with the MSDF today. As a result, the research focused on gathering a holistic understanding of planning by interviewing urban policy researchers, politicians, and planners themselves. While this study focused primarily on the MSDF’s creation and lack of implementation, areas for future research could certainly look at Cape Town’s specific land use approval procedures and how they impact trends of gentrification and displacement today. This approach would be similar to that of my research in New York City (Dionne, 2021), which focused on Foucault’s (1980: 1972-1977) “insurrection of subjugated voices,” interviewing

primarily community organizers and residents. Rather than building a lengthy historical analysis, this research would instead analyze these four characteristics through the land-use procedures of the current day, and specific on-the-ground case studies of current developments.

Another area for future research could be a cross-cultural comparative analysis between Cape Town and other cities, specifically interrogating the neocoloniality in the exportation of the TOD model. This research could question how densification and economic growth impact communities in various urban contexts, exploring which cities have responded well to this model and which ones have not. A final avenue for future research would be to continue this project of studying neocoloniality in other global cities through these four characteristics. Scopes could include the impacts of global tourism on the housing market in Barcelona, Spain, or the economic disparities in housing in São Paulo, Brazil. These studies could explore concepts such as internal colonialism (Scott, 2009) or decolonialism (Freire, 1968).

While it is not disputed that a spatial vision is needed for Cape Town in order to combat the legacies of apartheid and colonialism, it is clear that the underlying assumptions and processes informing the MSDF must be interrogated. Furthermore, if implemented, the MSDF should be used in concert with other interventionist policies to ensure that the development and spatial transformation needs of communities are prioritized just as much as the city's entrepreneurial desires. In order to deconstruct the modern idea of the urban space, city planners and politicians should continually be guided by communities and on-the-ground groups that have lived experience with the subjectivity and contours of Cape Town communities. This may even require the city to understand that everything cannot be regulated and planned. As Planner B (2022) states, "People will continue to self provide for development, and government will need to provide basic infrastructure so there's minimal incidents... and dignity [is preserved]."

Apartheid and colonialism took away communities' choice to not only claim the land, but even occupy it. Dispossession was a hallmark of this period with the aim to strip people of their dignity. For the future, Researcher B (2022) urges that development should be focused on this ability to choose, stating:

Relevant to the South African context, [development is] the ability to create people's choice, the ability to live in a certain neighborhood, to find affordability, to be able to move around freely and feel the same degree of citizenship that any of us would feel. That's really the role of the state is to enable choice— the ability to choose how they live and where they live.

If the city government truly wants to achieve this transformational change that is so often spoken of, this choice must be centered.

Bibliography

Adhikari, M. (2010). "A total extinction confidently hoped for: The destruction of Cape San society under Dutch colonial rule, 1700-1795'." *Journal of Genocide Research* 12(1&2), 19-44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623528.2010.508274>

Adorno, Theodor W. "On the Logic of the Social Sciences." In *The Positivist Dispute in German Sociology*. Translated by Glyn Adey and David Frisby. London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1976.

Bank, A. (1997). "The Great Debate and the Origins of South African Historiography." *The Journal of African History*, Vol. 38, No. 2, pp. 261-281. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/182824>.

Beinart, W. (2022, May 9). "Cecil Rhodes: Racial Segregation in the Cape Colony and Violence in Zimbabwe." *Journal of Southern African Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057070.2022.2058771>.

Berendzen, J.C. (2017). "Max Horkheimer." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/horkheimer/>.

Bickford-Smith, V. (2009). "Creating a City of the Tourist Imagination: The Case of Cape Town, 'The Fairest Cape of Them All.'" *Urban Studies*, 46(9), 1763–1785. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43201436>.

Bickford-Smith, V. (1995). *Ethnic Pride and Racial Prejudice in Victorian Cape Town*. London: Cambridge University Press, 81-83.

Bickford-Smith, V. (1995, March). "South African Urban History, Racial Segregation and the Unique Case of Cape Town?." *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 63-78, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2637331>.

Bickford-Smith, V. (2008, August). "Urban history in the new South Africa: continuity and innovation since the end of apartheid." *Urban History*, Vol. 35, No. 2, pp. 288-315. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44613765>.

Boeing, G. (2019, August). *Urban Spatial Order: Street Network Orientation, Configuration, and Entropy*. University of Southern California. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1808.00600.pdf>.

Brenner, A. T. (2009). *The "Dutch have made slaves of them all, and... they are called Free": Slavery and Khoisan Indentured Servitude in the Eighteenth-century Dutch Cape Colony*. Emory University. <https://etd.library.emory.edu/concern/etds/st74cq93z?locale=en>.

Bulkeley, H. (2004, August 29). "Urban sustainability: learning from best practice?" *Environment and Planning A* 2006, Vol. 38, p. 1029-1044. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1068/a37300>.

Byrnes, R. M. (1996). *South Africa: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress.

Calhoun, C. "Nationalism and the Contradictions of Modernity." *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 42, pp. 1-30. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41035527>.

Calvert, P. (2001). "Internal colonisation, development and environment." *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. 1, 51-63. <https://library.fes.de/libalt/journals/swetsfulltext/11375740.pdf>.

Caspari, R. (2018, October 4). "Polygenism." *The International Encyclopedia of Biological Anthropology*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118584538.ieba0579>.

Castells, M. (1972). *La question urbaine*. Paris: Francois Maspero.

Cezula, S. & Modise, L. (2020). "The 'Empty Land' Myth: A Biblical and Socio-historical Exploration." *Studia Historiae Esslesiasticae*, Vol. 46, No. 2. <http://dx.doi.org/10.25159/2412-4265/6827>.

Chebanne, A. (2012). "Where Are the 'Skeletons' of Dead Khoisan Languages?." *Botswana Notes and Records*, Vol. 44, pp. 81-92. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43855562>.

Christopher, A. J. (1994) "Segregation levels in the late apartheid city." *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 85, pp. 15– 24.

Christopher, A. J. (2001, March 1). "Urban Segregation in Post-apartheid South Africa." *Urban Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 449-466. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980120080031>.

City of Cape Town. (2012a). Cape Town Spatial Development Framework: Overview. https://resource.capetown.gov.za/documentcentre/Documents/City%20strategies,%20plans%20and%20frameworks/SDF_Technical_Report_2012_Quick_Read_Web.pdf.

City of Cape Town. (2012b). Cape Town Spatial Development Framework: Statutory Report. https://resource.capetown.gov.za/documentcentre/Documents/City%20strategies,%20plans%20and%20frameworks/Cape%20Town%20Municipal%20Spatial%20Development%20Framework_2012.pdf.

City of Cape Town. (2022). MSDF and 8 x DSDFs-EMFs Technical Review 2021/2022: What has changed?. https://resource.capetown.gov.za/documentcentre/Documents/Graphics%20and%20educational%20material/MSDF_DSDF_Presentation_PublMtg_or_SC_ActDays.pdf.

City of Cape Town. (2017). MSDF Review 2017 Draft. http://futurecapetown.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/HYS_Draft_Municipal_Spatial_Development_Framework-2017-2022.pdf.

City of Cape Town. (2018). Municipal Spatial Development Framework. <https://resource.capetown.gov.za/documentcentre/Documents/>

City%20strategies%2C%20plans%20and%20frameworks/
CT_Metropolitan_Spatial_Development_Framework.pdf.

City of Cape Town. (2017-2022). Municipal Spatial Development Framework 2017 – 2022: Executive Summary. https://resource.capetown.gov.za/documentcentre/Documents/City%20strategies,%20plans%20and%20frameworks/MSDF_Executive_Summary_ENG_16-05-2018.pdf.

Coetzer, N. (2009). “Langa Township in the 1920s — and (extra)ordinary Garden suburb.” *SAJAH*, ISSN 0258-3542, Vo. 24, No. 1, pp. 1-19.

Cohen, A. S. (2016, February 19). “Harvard’s Eugenics Era.” *Harvard Magazine*. <https://www.harvardmagazine.com/2016/03/harvards-eugenics-era>.

Cole, J. (2013, January). The Making and Re-imagining of Khayelitsha: Report for the Commission of Inquiry into Allegations of Police Inefficiency in Khayelitsha and a Breakdown in Relations between the Community and the Police in Khayelitsha. <https://s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/s3.sourceafrica.net/documents/14375/5-b-j-cole-affidavit.pdf>.

Cousins, B. “Characterizing ‘Communal’ Tenure: Nested Systems and Flexible Boundaries.” In *Land, Power and Custom*. UCT Press Cape Town. https://www.academia.edu/12724916/CharacterisingCommunalTenure_Nested_Systems_and_Flexible_Boundaries.

Cousins, B. & Walker, C. (2015). *Land Divided, Land Restored: Land Reform in South Africa For the 21st Century*. Auckland Park, South Africa: Jacana.

Development Action Group. (1993). *Well-located affordable housing: A feasible alternative?* Cape Town.

Dionne, E. (2021). *Neocolonialism in New York City: Urban Planning through Critical Theory*. Honors Thesis, Wheaton College (MA).

Du Plessis, W.J. (2011, January). “African indigenous land rights in a private ownership paradigm.” *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal*, Vol. 14, No. 7. http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1727-37812011000700003#65b.

Du Plooy, E. “The unsettling meanings of coloured identity and why it should be challenged.” *News24*. <https://www.news24.com/news24/Columnists/EleanorduPlooy/the-unsettling-meanings-of-coloured-identity-and-why-it-should-be-challenged-20180618>.

Eze, M.O. (2008). “What is African Communitarianism? Against Consensus as a regulative ideal.” *South African Journal of Philosophy*. 27 (4), pp. 106-119. <https://iep.utm.edu/hunhu/>.

Foucault, Michel. “Two Lectures.” In *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Edited by Colin Gordon. Translated by Colin Gordon et al. New York: Vintage, 1980.

- Freire, P. (1968). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Friedmann, J. & Wulff, R. (1976). *The Urban Transition: Comparative Studies of Newly Industrialising Societies*. London: Arnold.
- Giliomee, H. & Mbenga, B. (2007). *New history of South Africa*. Tafelberg, Cape Town.
- Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and Human Interests: A General Perspective*. Translated by Jeremy J. Shapiro. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Harrison, P., Todes, A. & Watson, V. (2007). *Planning and Transformation: Learning from the Post-Apartheid Experience*. Routledge.
- Holden, W.C. (1866). *The Past and Future of the Kaffir Races*. <https://ia600302.us.archive.org/29/items/pastfutureofkaff00hold/pastfutureofkaff00hold.pdf>.
- Horkheimer, Max and Adorno, Theodor W. (1972). *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Translated by John Cumming. New York: Seabury Press. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02665433.2018.1503089>
- Horn, A. (2018, July 30). “The history of urban growth management in South Africa: tracking the origin and current status of urban edge policies in three metropolitan municipalities.” *Planning Perspectives*, Vol. 34, Issue 6, pp. 959-977. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02665433.2018.1503089>.
- IPACC (Indigenous Peoples of Africa Co-ordinating Committee). (2022). “Who are the indigenous peoples of Southern Africa?” *Southern Africa*. <https://www.ipacc.org.za/southern-africa/>.
- Iziko Museum of South Africa. (2022). “Slave Routes to the Cape.” <https://slavery.iziko.org.za/slaveroutestothecape>.
- Jackson, S. M. (2005). “Cape Colonial Architecture, Town Planning, and the Crafting of Modern Space in South Africa.” *Africa Today*, 51(4), 33–54. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4187686>
- Joffe, D. F. & Shepherd, N. “Specters of Cape Town: Heritage, Memory, and Restitution in Contemporary South African Art, Architecture, and Museum Practice.” *Heritage & Society*, Vol. 13, Issue 1-2, pp. 75-97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159032X.2021.1888400>.
- Johnson, D. (2013). *Imagining the Cape Colony: History, Literature, and the South African nation*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Jolly, P. (1996, April). “Symbiotic Interaction between Black Farmers and South-Eastern San.” *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 37, No. 2. <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/204492>.

- King, A. D. (1977). "Exporting 'Planning': The Colonial and Neo-Colonial Experience." *Urbanism Past & Present*, 5, 12–22. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44403550>.
- Kohler, ORA. (1981). "Les langues Khoisan." *Les langues dans le monde ancien et moderne. Vol 1: Les langues de l'Afrique subsaharienne— Pidgins et créoles*. Hamburg: Jelmüt Buske Verlag, pp. 445-615.
- Kohn, M. and Reddy, K. (2017). "Colonialism." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, (Fall 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.). <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/colonialism/>.
- Kuhn, J. (2021). "Changing urban management doctrines in Cape Town, South Africa." *Town and Regional Planning*, Vol. 78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18820/2415-0495/trp78i1.5>.
- Kumar, D.V. "Engaging with Modernity: Need for Critical Negotiation." In *Sociological Bulletin* vol. 57, issue no. 2 (2008): 240-254. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23620789>.
- Layne, V. (2008). "The District Six Museum: An Ordinary People's Place." *Public Historian*, 30(1): 53-62. <https://doi.org/10.1525/tph.2008.30.1.53>.
- Lee, R. B., Hitchcock, R. K., & Biesele, M. (2002, January). "Foragers to first peoples." *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, 26(1): 18-20. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309076714_Foragers_to_first_peoples.
- Lewcock, R. (1963). *Early 19th Century Architecture in South Africa*. Cape Town: Hobbema.
- Lodge, T. (1978, April). "The Cape Town Troubles, March— April 1960." *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 216-239. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2636358>.
- Lucassen, J. (2004). "A Multinational and Its Labor Force: The Dutch East India Company, 1595-1795." *International Labor and Working-Class History*, No. 66, pp. 12-39. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27672956>.
- Mafolo, K. (2019). "Residents asked to comment on plans to address apartheid planning in Cape Town districts." *Daily Maverick*. <https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2019-04-24-residents-asked-to-comment-on-plans-to-address-apartheid-planning-in-cape-town-districts/>.
- Magubane, B. (2007). *Race and the construction of the dispensable other*. Pretoria, South Africa: Unisa Press.
- Marks, S. (1972). "Khoisan Resistance to the Dutch in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries." *The Journal of African History*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 55-80. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/180967>.
- Malan, A. (1993). *Households of the Cape, 1750 to 1850: Inventories of the Archaeological Record*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cape Town.

- Marx, K. (1867). *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Progress Publishers: Moscow, proofed Dave Allinson, 2015. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Capital-Volume-I.pdf>.
- Maylam, P. (1995, March). "Explaining the Apartheid City: 20 Years of South African Urban Historiography." *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 19-38. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2637329>.
- McCusker, B., Moseley, W. G., Ramutsindela, M. (2015). *Land Reform in South Africa: An Uneven Transformation*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Miraftab, F. (2012). "Colonial Present: Legacies of the Past in Contemporary Urban Practices in Cape Town, South Africa." *Journal of Planning History*, 11 (4), pp. 283-307.
- Moassab, A. (2013). "Globalization, Neo-colonization and Urbanization in Africa." *Teoria e Debate*, 111. <https://www.buala.org/en/city/globalization-neo-colonization-and-urbanization-in-africa>.
- Muffet, L. (2022, July 14). "The Cape of Good Hope Colony and the British World Turned Upside-down, 1806–1836." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03086534.2022.2086205>.
- Nagel, T. (1986). *The View From Nowhere*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- National Development and Planning Commission. (1999). *Green paper on development planning*. Pretoria: Department of Land Affairs.
- Ndifuna Ukwazi. (2019, March). *City Leases: Cape Town's Failure to Redistribute Land*. Cape Town. <https://nicspauull.files.wordpress.com/2020/01/ndifuna-ukwazi-nu-city-leases-cape-towns-failure-to-redistribute-land.pdf>.
- Nisbet, J., Smith, I., Maggs, T., Singh, V. & Laband, J. (1985). *History alive Standard 6*. Pietermaritzburg: Shuter & Shooter.
- Nkrumah, K. (1966). *Neo-Colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism*. New York: International Publishers.
- Oakes, D. (1988). *Reader's Digest: Illustrated History of South Africa*. Cape Town: The Reader's Digest Association South Africa Ltd.
- Odendaal, N. & McCann, A. (2016). "Spatial planning in the global South: reflections on the Cape Town Spatial Development Framework." *IDPR*, 38 (4). doi: 10.3828/idpr.2016.23.
- Oliver, E. & Oliver, W. H. (2017). "The Colonization of South Africa: A unique case." *HTS Theological Studies*, Vol. 73, No. 3. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v73i3.4498>.

Okoth, O. H. W. (2008). *The Nature of Land Rights Under Indigenous Law in Africa*. UCT Press Cape Town. <http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke:8080/xmlui/handle/123456789/46508>.

Parnell, S. & Mabin, A. "Rethinking Urban South Africa." *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 39-61. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2637330>.

Parry, K. & van Eeden, A. (2014, July 18). "Measuring racial residential segregation at different geographic scales in Cape Town and Johannesburg." *South African Geographical Journal*, Vo. 97, Issue 1, pp. 31- 49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03736245.2014.924868>.

Piotrowski, A. (2019). "Colonialism, Apartheid, and Democracy: South Africa's Historical Implications on the Land Reform Debate." *Journal of Interdisciplinary Undergraduate Research*, Vol. 11, Article 4, pp. 53-71. <https://knowledge.e.southern.edu/jiur/vol11/iss1/4>.

Planner A. (2022, June). Interview with the author. Recording.

Planner B. (2022, June). Interview with the author. Recording.

Politician A. (2022, June). Interview with the author. Recording.

RDP. (1994). *The Reconstruction and Development Programme: A policy framework*. African National Congress.

Republic of South Africa. (2011). "Mapping diversity: an exploration of our social tapestry." Department of Statistics South Africa. <https://www.statssa.gov.za/?p=7678>.

Researcher A. (2022, July). Interview with the author. Recording.

Researcher B. (2022, July). Interview with the author. Recording.

SAHO (South African History Online). (2021a). "Khoisan herder society in the Later Stone Age." *South African history Online: Towards a People's History*. <https://www.sahistory.org.za/article/khoisan-herder-society-later-stone-age>.

SAHO (South African History Online). (2021b). "San hunter-gatherer society in the Later Stone Age." *South African history Online: Towards a People's History*. <https://www.sahistory.org.za/article/san-hunter-gatherer-society-later-stone-age>.

SAHO (South African History Online). (2022, April 6). "The Empty Land Myth." *South African history Online: Towards a People's History*. <https://www.sahistory.org.za/article/empty-land-myth>.

SAHO (South African History Online). (2019, August 27). "Cape Town Timeline 1300-1997." *South African history Online: Towards a People's History*. <https://www.sahistory.org.za/article/cape-town-timeline-1300-1997>.

- SASI (South African San Institute). (2022). "History: A history of San Peoples of South Africa." *Written In the Sand*. <http://www.san.org.za/history.php>.
- Savage, M. (1986, April). "The Imposition of Pass Laws on the African Population in South Africa 1916–1984." *African Affairs*, Vol. 85, No. 339, pp. 181-205.
- Scott, J. (1978). "Critical social theory: an introduction and critique." *British Journal of Sociology* vol. 29, No. 1: 1-21. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/589216>.
- Scott, J. C. (2009). *The Art of Not Being Governed: An Anarchist History of Upland Southeast Asia*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Shandler, D. (1999). Interview with facilitator, Zille Shandler Associates. Now partner in Common Ground Consulting, Cape Town.
- Shell, R. (1997). *Children of Bondage: A Social History of the Slave Society at the Cape of Good Hope, 1652–1838*. Johannesburg, p. 155.
- Snyman, G. (2021, October, 14). "Petition to the Parliament of South Africa: Cape Town." https://static.pmg.org.za/PETITION_-_bundle_of_documents_S_1.pdf.
- Stanislawski, D. (1946, January). "The Origin and Spread of the Grid-Pattern Town." *Geographical Review*, Vol. 36, No. 1, pp. 105-120. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/211076>.
- Stanley, B. W. (2012, March). "An Historical Perspective on the Viability of Urban Diversity: Lessons from Socio-Spatial Identity Construction in Nineteenth Century Algiers and Cape Town." *Journal of Urbanism International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability*, 5(1): 67-86. DOI:10.1080/17549175.2012.661639.
- Strauss, M. (2019). "A historical exposition of spatial injustice and segregated urban settlement in South Africa." *Fundamina (Pretoria)*, Vol. 25, No. 2, <http://dx.doi.org/10.17159/2411-7870/2019/v25n2a6>.
- Swanson, M. W. (1977). "The Sanitation Syndrome: Bubonic Plague and Urban Native Policy in the Cape Colony, 1900–1909," *Journal of African History* 18, no. 3: 387–410.
- Todeschini, F. (2013). "Reflections on Some Aspects of Town-Building at the Cape of Good Hope, South Africa, During the 1800s of Relevance to Today," Conference: "Colonial and Postcolonial Urban Planning in Africa", Lisbon.
- Tomer, S. (2012, January). "A 'Democratic Modernism': Naturalizing and Neutralizing Architectural Traditions in Cape Town." *Traditional Dwellings and Settlements Review*.
- Turok, I. (2001). "Persistent Polarisation Post-Apartheid? Progress towards Urban Integration in Cape Town." *Urban Studies*, 38(13), 2349–2377. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43196660>

Turok, I. (1994). "Urban Planning in the Transition from Apartheid: Part 1: The Legacy of Social Control." *The Town Planning Review*, Vol. 65, No. 3, pp. 243-259. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40113645>.

Van Heyningen, E. (1984). "Refugees and relief in Cape Town – 1899 to 1902." *Studies in the History of Cape Town*, vol. 1, pp. 64-113.

Van Riebeeck, J. (1660, April 4). Personal Journal Entry. *The Record*, p. 205.

Van Sitters, B. (2012, August 2). *Place Names of Pre-colonial origin and their Use Today*. Archive and Public Culture: Research Initiative. <http://www.apc.uct.ac.za/apc/projects/ancestral-stories/place-names-pre-colonial-origin-and-their-use-today>.

Vink, M. P. M. (2015). *Encounters on the Opposite Coast: The Dutch East India Company and the Nayaka State of Madurai in the Seventeenth Century*. Brill: Boston.

Voster, R. (2021). "Who Gave Table Mountain its Name?." *Hike Table Mountain*. <https://hiketablemountain.co.za/table-mountain-hiking-name/>.

Watson, V. (2002). *Change and Continuity in Spatial Planning: metropolitan planning in Cape Town under political transformation*. Routledge: London and New York.

Wood, A. (2021). "Problematizing concepts of transit-oriented development in South African cities." *Urban Studies Journal Limited*, pp. 1017. DOI: 10.1177/00420980211033725.

Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa and the South African San Institute. (2003). African Human Genome Initiative Conference. <https://www.nature.com/articles/464487a>.