ConclusionS

This book has examined the technologies of capitalism applied to urban development, and the ways they are informed by colonial and apartheid discourses. It has shown that it is the mergence of past and present discourses that makes the urban condition of the postcolony so special. Through disentangling the role of business sector, security sector, government, as well as media, in how displacement and criminalisation of low-income residents is being framed, this work has revealed that these practices are not accidental side-effects of urban development, but that they are a necessary part of the realisation and regulation of urban development projects that strive for a competitive, marketable, profitable and investor-attracting city. I defined and analysed the Urban Development Discourse as the corporate institution for regulating city spaces and the public that resides in the space, practices of inclusion and exclusion, and displacement of low-income residents.

The book identified the ways in which the discourse has created a body of practice in which the *People's Post* produces a specific notion of the local and criminalises or at least depicts the rest as an homogenous entity that is the Outsider; in which the security sector is established to maintain gated neighbourhoods and produce fear towards the disorderly, low-income city; in which informal traders are set as the polar opposite of the desirable milieu and become criminalised and marginalised; in which the business sector delivers discursive material through identifying their specific target groups and excluding the rest from the narration of their development and design projects; in which city officials present low-income people as lacking the right attitude for improving their lives; in which institutions as the South African Heritage Agency are forced by provincial government units to alter their reports in favour of construction companies; in which development projects of City, Province, and the private sector are almost always favoured over residents; in which no institution speaks about the enslaved peoples and forced

labour who built the city; and in which the Urban Development Discourse governs the imagination of how the city should look and imposes limits upon thought about possible inclusion and more equal urban spaces.

I argued that this body of practice continuously gives birth to and reproduces a web of classed, raced, and gendered concepts of belonging.

Each eviction case I delved into was caused by a different reason. The District Six evictions of the pensioners were profit-driven in a very immediate manner; the Joe Slovo evictions were set to make space for a development project that would bring Cape Town closer to the status of a world-class city; the Symphony Way evictions ended a two years-long occupation and with it a community struggle that taught people how to organise themselves and fight for a collective cause; and the Tafelsig evictions were to set a sign that no empty space would be allocated to the working class for free and to demonstrate the determination with which city government would address the attempt of takeover of land by people. This difference in cause and effect also meant that the motivations to struggle against the evictions differed in each community. Whereas the one community fought to maintain the houses that were home to them for decades and with them the social relations and networks they had built with each other, the other was determined to break out of the instability and humiliation of backyard dwellers' life, even if that meant taking on huge risks for their families and starting from scratch on an empty field.

The common feature at stake is that all four cases derive from a discursive condition in which the lower-class *black* subject has no negotiating power. To not be fully absorbed by this powerlessness, the people affected decide to treasure their own memory, to be able to access it even if years pass, and to present it and make it accessible for others. The concern of access to their own memory and of the possibility of presentation to others, makes them narrate their own history, create visual evidences, and store them in what I called with reference to Combé and Derrida, forbidden archives. The fact that political powers always seek to control the archive does not mean that contradicting narratives do not exist. They do exist in people's homes. I assume that the risks involved in raising one's voice depends on the way the violence inflicted on them has shattered them, as well as the realities of the ongoing afterlives of those violences and shatterings. In the cases I looked at, all people affected had organised themselves as a community and had decided to struggle against the evictions together. The collective power this releases and the dynamics it brings, assists to formulate one's own narrative to make it under-

standable for others. It also reduces the fear of vocalising what has happened and thus helps to create one's own archive against the dominant narrative of forced eviction and urban development. Most notably, it sets examples for other communities that face the same threat of being forcibly evicted and removed. With the experiences of Symphony Way, Joe Slovo, District Six, and Tafelsig in mind, other communities have the opportunity to better the formulation of their political contents, forms of organisation and legal strategies. I hope that this work can help to form this bridge between these experiences, more current ones, and those that have yet to come.

One of the most surprising features of the residents' struggle against forgetting and the systematic and discursive production of silence, distortion and falsification of their stories, was an almost absent process of mourning. Caught in the duality of discourse and anti-discourse, the people affected by eviction had no time and space to mourn their losses, or at least I could not gather from our encounters that loss and grief had turned into mourning and nostalgia. This absence of mourning, if my perception did not intrigue me, might be related to their continuous hope of finding home at the end. The loss is not an accepted loss. To create home and build a new community has remained an essential aim around which everything else becomes negotiated. This shows that the archives they compiled are as much about the recording and narration of the past, as about the creation of the future. Every document archived and the process of archiving itself stands in a direct relationship to the evicted resident's future, how they envision it and how they approach it. And again, Derrida's words ring in my ear when he says that "…the question of the archive is not, we repeat, a question of the past. It is not the question of a concept dealing with the past that might *already* be at our disposal or not at our disposal, an archivable concept of the archive. It is a question of the future, the question of the future itself, the question of a response, of a promise and of a responsibility for tomorrow."[1]

The same intention can be identified for the prevailing power that is constructed by both the political and the business sector. Controlled by political power and the rule of the market, the Urban Development Discourse ordains the archive of the postapartheid. The fact that the question of who built the city finds no public response and is entirely absent from the narrative of the city and its past, shows the degree in which the discourse aims at collective memory. Memorialising South Africa's histories of enslavement and forced

1 Derrida, Jacques: *Archive Fever*. Chicago 1996: p.39.

labour in a publicly organised way could lead many of the excluded majority to not only link this past to their present-day socio-economic condition, but also to address and articulate the manners in which inequality has been produced historically. The erasure of the history of a people helps to maintain the politico-economic status quo.

But the above-mentioned powerlessness translates not only in situations of very direct and bare exclusion like forced evictions, but also in the cityscapes both architecturally and spatially. Walking the streets of the Western Cape, social inequality is a highly visible condition one cannot shut the eyes to. The difficulty is to phrase it, to make it tangible and allegeable. This book has shown that we can speak of an institutionalised regime of inequality to which highly securitised city spaces, law and criminalisation practices are central. Urban Development and City Improvement have become dogmatic projects that facilitate the enlargement of that inequality, excluding the majority of society from the design-focused, creative, fashionable, liveable, in short, normative narrative of cities. This regime includes institutions such as the Mayoral Committee, Provincial Government, the Anti-Land Invasion Unit, the High Court, the South African Heritage Agency, the Metro Police, Law Enforcement, City Improvement Districts, other public-private security companies, as well as private security companies, the Cape Town Partnership, construction companies, developers and specific media services.

This book has illuminated their role in framing and implementing the Urban Development Discourse that uses articulations of power and a specific rhetoric of criminalisation, informed by colonial doctrines, theses, and framings of the *black* subject. The ways in which the *black* subject was produced ideologically and politically, continues to nurture present-day depictions of the lower-class *black* subject. Just as the colonial and apartheid regime and the settler society gained strength and identity through creating the imagination of the inferior other, the Urban Development Discourse gains a dispositive rationalisation model through creating the working-class *black* subject as demotivated, irresponsible, lazy, and incapable of taking life in his or her own hands. These labels I identified as direct descendants of colonial and apartheid discourse. Colonial and apartheid understandings of the human are not discursive material of the past, boxed into dusty archival places. They have been evaporated onto dominant discourses of the present, in this case, onto the Urban Development Discourse. This also speaks of the strength with which the colonial discourse of superiority and inferiority has reproduced itself from one century to the other. Linked to this discourse was the political

practice of forced removal under colonialism and especially under apartheid. But to be able to create them as an isolated social condition, forced evictions of the present become dehistoricised. On the one hand, the Urban Development Discourse maintains the political and economic conditions that enable the reproduction of apartheid technologies of power, and on the other hand, disguises the links between forced removals of the past and forced evictions of the present.

Collective memory is being driven away from establishing these links. As I have emphasised repeatedly in this work, this dehistoricisation leads to the depoliticisation of the practice of forced eviction. From the nourishment of the Urban Development Discourse by colonial and apartheid discourse and the control of archive and memory in this regard, I derived that we are facing a colonial condition of postapartheid archive and memory, a state that I marked as coloniality.

The Urban Development Discourse creates imaginaries of the city in which the social realities of the majority of people in South Africa become totally erased. One of these imaginaries is a prestigious imagery embellishing the route from the Cape Town International Airport to the city, disqualifying the Joe Slovo part of Langa township from the scenery. Within this frame, the first thing tourists, business entities, foreign investors and heads of states witness on the way from airport to city, cannot be shacks. And as a continuation of the logic these imaginaries emanate from that is the rule of the market, the new housing units in Joe Slovo cannot be accessible for the very residents of Joe Slovo, as the aim of the development project was not an improvement of the residents' living conditions, but beautification and the replacement of the residents by higher income families. City improvement is not allocated to the townships but reserved for the affluent, profitable parts of the city.

The city as an object of the capitalist desire for profit sets Temporary Relocation Areas as inhuman misconducts of the right to housing. TRAs are the only response city and provincial governments have to forced eviction. Spatially, TRAs are not located on the city margins, but are created as totally separate and insular spaces fully suspended from the city. The manner and scale at which urban development becomes imagined prevents any radical engagement with social inequality and spatial division. The modernities articulated and conceptualised, of which the TRA is but one example, are set by the capitalist elite and derive from fixed visions of how a profitable city must look like and from the modes of production that enable these visions. The

promised prosperity this brings with is inaccessible for the ones suspended and marginalised. It materialises in that parallel world that is set to be the beneficiary, the wheel that keeps this condition intact. This world is formed by the capitalist elite and the middle classes that impose themselves in this social position and its practices. At the other side of this world, the humanity of all those criminalised and excluded has been stripped down to their production value and to the degree they contribute to the profitable city – a condition that translates into perpetual displacement and segregated city spaces.

The artists, the members of the Housing Assembly, Reclaim the City activists and the shack dweller's movement have another vision for the city. It is not only the Urban Development Discourse that is interested in liveability and joy. Individuals and movements opposed to the discourse envision vibrant neighbourhood lives as well, but not within the frame the dominant discourse dictates.

We need to create our own narrative and to articulate our own imaginaries of the urban. The artists whose work I analysed, the people affected by forced evictions I encountered and Abahlali, Housing Assembly and Reclaim the City activists show that this is possible. One of the main tasks a long-term intervention into the Urban Development Discourse requires is to address people's imagination through understanding that it is a responsibility to rethink our social, political, and economic worlds. All people that have been excluded and marginalised wait for a tomorrow in which they can perform their own urban practices and create belonging to the city. If this tomorrow is what the majority of the population is waiting for, what must be done to reach it and how does it look like?