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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Cape Town is a city steeped in a colonial past. In the project of examining the becoming of Cape Town – as a city, as a space, as a history of social practices – a boundary space is an especially illuminating vehicle. Boundaries are critical to the colonising project: they distinguish between different identities and practices, constructing distance between the coloniser and the colonised ‘Other’. This study examines one boundary space – Buitengracht Street – as a case study, indicative of Cape Town’s history of colonialism and particular productions of power. Buitengracht Street is a singular geographic space multivalent in its various boundary manifestations: it has distanced that which is ‘inside’ the colonised city from that which is ‘outside’ or ‘Other’, manifesting social practices of exclusion, particularly marking the distinction between the Bo-Kaap and remainder of Cape Town.

The thesis uses the Buitengracht boundary as the case through which is to examine how space is a manifestation of social practices. Space is read through both built form and lived reality, and is seen as a process, rather than a static artefact. The theoretical framework used to examine the Buitengracht links the spatial dialectic of built form-lived reality to practices of power and to Cape Town’s colonial history, using post-colonial theory and the work of philosophers Henri Lefebvre, Michel Foucault and Michel de Certeau.

The study examines the history of Cape Town since the first moment of permanent European colonisation, in 1652. It examines different paradigms of political practices in Cape Town’s history, from colonialism to modernism and apartheid, through to the present post-apartheid condition. For each of those different paradigms, structured as epochs, the Buitengracht has manifested ‘boundary’ in different forms. The thesis tells a story of those different forms, as a narrative, reading the space as a manifestation of the sets of social practices at play during each epoch, and recognising that the story told is only one of multiple possible stories. The story of the Buitengracht is both textual and visual: maps and visual data are examined as primary evidence, and the research is analysed and re-presented through the drawing of maps, as well as through the written narratives. The thesis attempts the project of researching through architectural method, in conjunction with traditional scientific method, exploring the contribution architectural disciplinary knowledge and methods can make towards understanding the becoming of Cape Town – as a specific case in understanding the becoming of cities in general.
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FOREWORD

NAVIGATING THE THESIS +
GLOSSARY | RESEARCH PRACTICES

This thesis emerges from a course which explores relationships between material culture and power, building upon architectural and contemporary critical theories. The prospect of the thesis is to research utilising an architectural method, examining a spatial subject as a manifestation of social practices. The manner of researching and representing the thesis has resulted in an unconventional document, thereby rendering it important to explain its reading and navigation. As may be seen from the Table of Contents, the contents of the work have been divided into three sections. The intended reading of the document is traditional: from beginning to end, methodically uncovering the theoretical and spatial story of the Buitengracht 'boundary'. However, this story is told through three themes - theoretical explorations, narratives; and mappings – and each of those could be read isolated from the others and a story of the Buitengracht will still emerge. These three themes reflect the intellectual queries explored in the thesis, and the different methods utilised for investigating the topic.

The first, theoretical explorations, refers to the broader questions that have been explored through the examination of the Buitengracht boundary as a case study. These explorations could be applied to other cases, in other spatial and temporal locations, and they reflect questions that have long interested me about architecture and social practices, particularly practices operating under colonialism or other politically dominating ideologies. These are chapters 1, 3, 4, 5, and 10, and they are identified by green font.

The second theme is the narrative: telling the history of the Buitengracht 'boundary' in a way that engages space in relation to social practices. The use of narrative as the method for representing the history of the Buitengracht is intentional and critical to the project of finding techniques appropriate for exploring space as a manifestation of social practices. These are chapters 2, 6, 7, 8, and 9, and are identified by blue font.

The third theme is the mappings: the drawings made as a method of explorations and representations of the Buitengracht boundary. The mappings are arranged chronologically and thematically and can be examined on their own as a discrete story. These are not merely illustrations, but rather means of exploring the history of a space in architecturally, both as research and as representational devices. For example, a mapping has been made of each epoch, describing the practices manifesting 'boundary' during that time period. Maps and illustrations have their own language, and therefore have been located on left-hand pages, with text on right-hand pages; thus, left hand pages are labelled 'D' (Diagram) and have separate numerations.

In conclusion, the three themes can be seen as the three legs of a triangle, and you may choose to examine each individually, or the sum object in the order I have arranged. The breaks from conventional academic practices - in the document size, organisation of table of contents, and the pagination and location of illustrations – have been intentional and are necessary to communicate the architectural nature of the research approach. They have not been made in disregard for conventions, but rather to find methods of communicating the research precisely and meaningfully.

Glossary | Research Practice
The following section sets the terminology of the research. Its use is twofold: it establishes the definitions and meanings that have been applied to key words used throughout the document, locating the terms in relation to
1. Map of the world

2. Map of South Africa

3. Map of Cape Town Region

Table Valley: Location of first permanent European settlement at the Cape.
the specificity of the inquiry; it also discusses how those words or concepts have been utilised as research devices, thereby rendering the research practice transparent.

ARCHITECTURAL METHOD- This is in contrast to traditional scientific method. The thesis attempts to make use of the tools of the architectural discipline, tools such as reading drawings (maps) in order to understand the spatial subject and drawing maps in order to present an understanding of space. Whereas traditional architectural histories examine the spatial subject as a static artefact, the method used in the thesis is non-traditional in that it rather examines space as a process. Whilst traditional scientific enquiries look for 'facts', this thesis looks for 'possibilities', and ways of becoming.

BOUNDARY- A boundary is a thick, inhabitable, space that demarcates between two adjacent spaces, thereby signifying difference and distinction. It is a device that achieves 'distancing', manifesting practices of exclusion. For the purpose of this study, 'boundary' will be used as a tool, a mechanism through which to focus the study. The study will not attempt to validate or test the degree to which the Buitengracht operates as a boundary, but rather explores how 'boundary' has been constructed.

BUITENGRACHT- 'Buitengracht' refers to Buitengracht Street: a street in Cape Town that has particular 'boundary' conditions. The term 'Buitengracht' will be used rather than 'Buitengracht Street', and in this way refers to both the street and to the zone running from Table Mountain to Table Bay along which the street is now constructed. Buitengracht is a Dutch term, composed of two words: buiten means 'out', with the implication of remoteness and 'outer'; a gracht is a water course, or canal.

CASE STUDY - A case study is an exploration in which larger theoretical propositions are explored through the examination of a 'case', or situation. The case is chosen for its quality of being symptomatic of a larger context. Therefore, the intent of the study is to examine specific theoretical propositions through the examination of the Buitengracht 'boundary' (the case):

A. Propositions regarding the relationship(s) between social practices and space generally, and specifically in regards to practices occurring under ideologies of domination, such as colonialism; and
B. Propositions regarding space and the construction of social identity; and
C. Propositions regarding conceptions of space, both material and Imaginative.

COLONIALISM- Colonial practices, those practices undertaken by an imperial power in the project of 'colonising', or 'take control over a piece for one's own use'. The colonial practices examined in this thesis concern ideologies, struggles for power, constructions of identity (of the colonised as well as coloniser), as well as the economic and pragmatic centre-periphery relationships of empire building. Empire is distinguished from colony in that 'colonies' are devices toward, or articulations of the, end goal of constructing 'empire'.

EMPTY-FULL- a binary couplet, referring the colonial conception of the colonised land. This couplet refers to the coloniser's perception of the land prior to colonisation as 'empty' because it has not been developed in the image of the coloniser, and because of its emptiness, is available to be 'filled' through colonialism.

(H)ISTORY- This term is used to simultaneously signify two concepts critical to the undertaking of the research project. The first is that history is the primary aspect of the subject investigated. The research examines the history of a space, trying to uncover its past, so to better understand the present condition. The second concept is that the device for telling the history is story. Story refers to narrative and to multiple possibilities. It is acknowledged that this 'story' (or stories), that will be told in the following narrative chapters, is only one of many possibilities. This multiplicity of possible stories refers to a postmodern, post-structural view of history as not "a past expressive of some sort of essence", but rather a linking between and selection amongst a myriad of facts, always reflective of the assumptions and subjectivity of the author of the history.

IDENTITY- Identity is considered fluid; it is constantly evolving and being constructed in relation to its context. Whilst 'identity' may refer to the identity of a place or an individual person or group of people, this paper is primarily concerned with cultural identity - the identity of people via practice.

IMAGINATIVE- a significant adjective used in the research, referring to non-physical conceptualisations, primarily of space. The phrase, particular in regards to space, is used in contrast to 'material' or physical space. A premise of the research is that space may be material, a physically construction, but also may be produced imaginatively. Imagination refers to speculation, (creative) conceptualisations, and multiple possibilities. The term is used for the power it bestows upon modes of conceptualisation that provide alternatives to the Modernism's hegemony of built form and singular conception of 'History'.

2 The concept of boundaries creating distancing was introduced by Ian Low in Course Apg 707z, University of Cape Town, 4 May, 2005.
4 The colonial conception of the colonised land. This couplet refers to the coloniser's perception of the land prior to colonisation as 'empty' because it has not been developed in the image of the coloniser, and because of its emptiness, is available to be 'filled' through colonialism.
5 Iain Borden, "Edge of Empire: Postcolonialism and the City (London: Routledge, 1996), 16.
7 This 'story' may refer to the identity of a place or an individual person or group of people, this paper is primarily concerned with cultural identity - the identity of people via practice.
8 A myriad of facts, always reflective of the assumptions and subjectivity of the author of the history.
9 Rees Jacobs, Edge of Empire: Postcolonialism and the City (London: Routledge, 1996), 16.
INSIDE-OUTSIDE- a binary couplet, I will use it to refer to the two sides of boundaries in general, and to the Buitengracht boundary in particular. The couplet refers to inside or outside of Cape Town, and speaks of the identities and practices permitted or prohibited inside the city.

'MALAY'- refers to a controversial racial category, used officially under apartheid, referring to descendants of slaves from Indonesia, usually Muslim. Although a contested term, and I am personally critical of its historic validity (in its implication of static homogeneity and privileging of Indonesian origins for a phenomenon of mixed heritage), it will be used in the thesis where social practices were referent to 'Malay' people or to the 'Malay Quarter'.

MAPPING- a research device used to examine the spatial subject (of the Buitengracht) in relation to social practices in a fluid and architectural manner. Mapping is a practice of measuring and describing the research subject, optimistically in creative ways that communicate previously unseen realities.

NARRATIVE- Narrative refers to the giving of an account, or the proposal of the links between elements of the story, such as between the spatial manifestations and the social practices which have constructed the Buitengacht boundary. It is used in this thesis because of the particular power that the genre of narrative provides or bestows. Narrative gives voice to actors in a story, to memories perhaps forgotten or repressed. The telling of a narrative has the possibility to change the perception of both the teller and the listener. Narrative, as a medium, is sympathetic to the research interest of representing space through its experience and inhabitation, as well as appropriate for the critical engagement with dominating ideologies of colonialism. The goal of utilising narrative as the written medium for representing the research is to present a space as it changes in relation to different events, different inhabitations, different representations, and shifting social practices.

'OTHER'- a term frequently used in post-colonial studies, referring to the subjugated, subaltern identity of the colonised. The colonised is distinguished from the coloniser through being 'other' to, or outside of, the colonial hegemony.

POWER- a premise of this research proposal is that power is 'produced' through practices, rather than an attribute of any object or person. Power is found in a variety of dimensions of social practices, but predominantly the political.

SOCIAL PRACTICES- a broad term for the practices that constitute human life. Consists of three dimensions: political, economic and cultural. The political dimension is practices concerning power; the economic dimension practices concerning economic exchange; and the cultural dimension includes 'lived realities' or 'the practice of everyday life' as well as the practices that produce identity and knowledge. The term social is used to refer to 'society', as it is the practices of society being investigated.

SPACE- refers to architectural space, which is defined by four dimensions: solids, which are buildings; voids, which are open spaces; events, such as functions and zoning laws which dictate the use of space; and people, or the inhabitation of space. The subject of the study is space, seen through all four dimensions.

SPATIAL MANIFESTATION- space is considered a manifestation of social practices. What will be engaged is a manifestation of practices, rather than space as a discrete entity. Manifestation differs from representation in that representation is the product through which identity is made manifest, whilst manifestation is the spatial product that emerges from social practices.

URBAN-RURAL- a binary couplet, distinguishing between those practices inside a city or settlement, and agrarian practices.

WILDERNESS-RURAL- a binary couplet. Wilderness is considered land and space unknown, uninhabited by the coloniser, and yet undeveloped. Wilderness differs from rural, in that the rural, whilst not urban, has been cultivated, and therefore claimed and controlled.

Abbreviations
CA Cape Archives
CTCC Cape Town City Council
GAA Group Areas Act
NLSA National Library of South Africa
UCT University of Cape Town
VCC Dutch East India Company

15 Jacques, Edge of Empire, 8.
17 As I am heavily relying on the theories of Henri Lefebvre and Michel Foucault, both of whom speak of 'societies', using 'social' rather than 'cultural' causes less confusion and contradictions.
INTRODUCING THE NARRATIVES

SIX EPOCHS IN THE (HI)STORY OF THE BUITENGRACHT BOUNDARY

The story this thesis intends to unfold is one of uncovering and examining spatial manifestations of the shifts in social practices at play at the Cape, from the first moments of European colonisation through to the beginning of the twenty-first century. It is a story of colonialism, of the various empires (national and corporate) whose construction relied upon controlling (thus, colonising) the land and people of the Cape. It is a story of the dominant ideologies wielded by European colonial powers, and the resistance and resultant contestations of power, knowledge and identity that occurred at the Cape. It is also the story of modernism and apartheid, as ideologies and sets of practices emerging from European colonialism. Finally, it is a story of the resistances and negotiations emerging from practices at play in a twenty-first century (post-colonial) post-apartheid condition. However, most significantly, this is a spatial story: a story of (spatial) manifestations of those practices, as particularly seen in one boundary space – Buitengracht Street. This space is singular in its geographic location, but multivalent in the various boundary conditions it has manifested over the years; as social practices shift over time, space - both material and imaginative - has been continually re-made in response to those practices.

The mechanism of boundary provides a potent focus for the story of a place formed through colonial practices. Abstractly, boundaries are the spatial manifestations critical to the colonial project: they are agents of geographic control and the mechanisms for creating distance. Distance - between places, between people, and therefore between identities - is one of the primary conditions rendered under any colonising practices; distance is necessary in order to render the colonised subject as separate, or 'Other', from the coloniser. Examining a boundary provides the opportunity to examine how a (colonial) place has been constructed, both physically and imaginatively. Particularly, the Buitengracht boundary has had a history of manifesting social practices of exclusion: practices of contesting identities, negotiating who and what were allowed 'inside' or otherwise forced 'outside'. 'Inside' has taken on different meaning at different times - inside the settlement, inside the empire, inside the municipality - and has always been subject to practices of resistance and the reactive 'outside'. This thesis will explore those social practices, and how their spatial manifestations have specifically constructed the Buitengracht boundary.

In order to examine the varied manifestations of the Buitengracht boundary, it is necessary to delve back into the (political) history of the Cape, to the first moments of European colonisation, to trace the beginning of colonial practices and boundary manifestations. Whilst passing ships, of various European nationalities, had stopped at the Cape since the beginning of the sixteenth century, this story begins with the moment of first permanent European settlement: the 8th of April, 1652. On that date a fleet of Dutch East India Company ships, under the command of Jan van Riebeeck, reached Table Bay at the Cape of Good Hope. The intention of the expedition was to establish a refreshment station at the Cape, a stopping point for ships passing to and from the East. The station was not intended as a permanent colony, but merely to supply fresh produce and medical care along the journey between Holland and the colonies in the East. Settlement, however permanent or transient, is a spatial construct; space is one of the most profoundly felt of the...
manifestations of social practices.\textsuperscript{21} The first spatial marks left by van Riebeeck and his expedition can still be seen in Cape Town today, and commenced practices of colonising the land and indigenous people of the Cape.

The Cape remained under control of the VOC\textsuperscript{22} until 1795; at that point financial difficulties and European wars took their toll on the Company and Britain seized control. Political rule was tumultuous for the next eleven years, with occupation by French troops and the independent Government of Batavia (the VOC's former colony in present-day Indonesia) briefly taking control back from the British; in 1806, when Britain definitively re-claimed the Cape.\textsuperscript{23} The nineteenth century was the period of British colonisation at the Cape, and expansion further into the African continent. Entry into the twentieth century was marked by the Anglo-Boer War and national unification with the Union of South Africa declared in 1910. The twentieth century in Cape Town saw a shift from colonial practices to modernism and power practiced through the local municipality. The hegemony of modernism was consolidated and intensified in 1948, when the Afrikaans National Party won national elections, and instituted the racial policy of apartheid. Eventually, in 1994, South Africa enjoyed its first completely free and democratic elections and the African National Congress swept the elections, bringing in a representative majority government for the first time since the beginnings of colonialism.

The political history, briefly laid out above, of South Africa sets the scene for examining the social practices at play in Cape Town and along the Buitengracht. Those practices, and their spatial manifestations, cannot be isolated from larger political events; particularly when examining a spatial manifestation such as a boundary, the political dimension of social practices is fundamental. In an attempt to structure the exploration of social practices, and the subsequent shifts in space, Cape Town history has been divided into six epochs between 1652 and 2005, each epoch representing a shift in prevailing political practices at the Cape.\textsuperscript{24} The intention of the remainder of this chapter is to introduce the prevailing social practices and spatial manifestations of the Buitengracht of each epoch. This introduction is an (perhaps simplified) overview of each of the epochs; the body of this paper will present more nuanced and detailed stories, highlighting the multiple possible stories that constitute history and space.

\textsuperscript{21} Such a premise builds upon significant twentieth century theorists from outside spatial disciplines who have recognised the importance of space in social discourses. See Foucault, "Space, Knowledge and Power;" Henri Lefebvre, The Production of Space (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1994), and Iain Low, "Space and Transformation: architecture and identity," Digest of South African Architecture (2003): 34.

\textsuperscript{22} VOC stands for Dutch East India Company. From this point forward in this paper, for the sake of brevity, VOC will be used rather than Dutch East India Company.

\textsuperscript{23} Worden et. al., Cape Town, 83-87.

\textsuperscript{24} The decision to use epochs as a means of structuring the research draws upon Foucault's work, yet does differ. A body of Foucault's work focused upon using archaeological and genealogical methods using empirical, historical evidence to excavate the 'boundaries of thought in a given period' and the reason for transition from one period to the next. My use of epochs differs from his use of epoques (or discursive formations) because the shift from one epoch to the next is not representative of the shift in knowledge systems so much as shift in political governing practices. The research is similar, however, because I am using empirical, historical evidence to uncover and demonstrate the shift from one epoch to the next, and am using that shift as a mechanism for structuring the examination of spatial manifestations. See Gary Gutting, "Michel Foucault," in The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2003 Edition), ed. Edward N. Zalta, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/foucault/#3.2 (accessed 21 January, 2006); Michel Foucault, The Archaeology of Knowledge (New York: Harper & Row, 1972); and Michel Foucault, The Order of Things (London: Tavistock, 1970).
Boundaries were constructed in order to separate land claimed by the VOC from the 'wilderness'.

The first boundary marks were the Fort and the Company Gardens. These manifested two of the primary colonising devices: military power and agricultural cultivation.

See
KCA CT (1650-1786) [NL54]
1856 Map [Warden et al., Cape Town, 12]
1660 Map [Warden et al., Cape Town, 29]
M1/14 (1656) [CA]
M0/15 (1660) [CA]
Epoch 1 - 1652 to 1699

In this period, the Cape functioned as a refreshment station for the VOC, but was not yet recognised as a permanent colony. Boundaries were constructed in order to distance (and thus control) land claimed by the VOC from that used by indigenous inhabitants\(^2\), as well as protect VOC interests from potential contestation by other European colonising powers. The boundaries made in this period primarily reflect military and agricultural interests, two of the fundamental devices of colonial control. The first structure constructed at the Cape by the VOC was the Fort (later replaced by the more robust stone Castle) - a pragmatic and symbolic manifestation of military might in the face of power contestation (from both the indigenous Khoi-San and foreign rivals)\(^2\). The next boundary marks made were the circumscription of hedges around agricultural lands: a thorn hedge to protect the Company Gardens from human and animal foraging\(^2\), and the almond hedge around the Liesbeeck River farms to prevent 'trespassing' by Khoi in practice of their transhumance routes\(^2\). Boundaries produced exclusions of Khoi practices, and therefore Khoi themselves, from the Cape.

---

\(^2\) The contemporary accepted names for the indigenous inhabitants of the Cape are 'Khoi' for those that practiced a pastoral way of life, and 'San' for hunter-gatherers. A broader, oft-used term is 'Khoi-San', which refers to any indigenous inhabitant.


\(^2\) Ibid., 77.

\(^2\) Worden et al., *Cape Town*, 24-25.
A shift occurs in recognizing the Cape as a permanent VOC colony. The boundaries to the town are constructed through the naming of streets: Buitenkant at the eastern edge, Buitensingel at the southern edge, and Buitengracht at the western edge.

The Buitengracht boundary manifestation was reinforced by the gracht (water channel) constructed down the street.

The institution of the Castle stood outside of the boundaries: standing guard over the town, indicating the power of the VOC, and removed from the town as it was increasingly populated by and identified with free-burghers.

See
1703 The lot of Good Hope, the Company Gardens and several public buildings around them [Wosten et al., Cape Town, 41]
1767 Map [Wosten et al., Cape Town, 41]
M316 (1780) [CA]
M138 (1772) [GA]
M138 (1776) [CA]
M138 (1786) [CA]
KCA CT (1789) [NLSA]
Epoch 2 - 1700 to 1794

The VOC continued to maintain political control over the Cape during this period, but in contrast to Epoch 1, began to conceive of the Cape as a permanent settlement. European colonisation at the Cape was profitable for the free-burghers (those people who are not in direct employment of the VOC) in addition to acting in support of VOC imperial interests. Boundaries signified urban productions, demarcating the space of Cape Town as an urban settlement. Buitengracht Street was constructed in this epoch as part of the practice of naming streets to indicate the boundaries of the settlement. Buitenkant Street to the east, Buitensingel Street to the south, and Buitengracht Street, the boundary to the west (The sea, Table Bay, provided the boundary to the north). The growth of the town at the Cape reflected the growing free-burgher population and the large number of persons passing through the Cape, some on VOC ships, and some on ships belonging to other national and commercial interests. Along with demographic growth came growing complexity of cultural practices and economic exchanges, heralding an intensification of ordering operations. To assert its control, particularly in relation to the growing free-burgher population, a practice of the VOC was the spatial locating of institutions in regards to the ‘Buiten’ boundaries. For example, the Company Gardens - whose produce was devoted to feeding VOC soldiers and passing VOC ships - were located inside, whilst private farms – non-VOC interests - were located outside the boundaries, thereby privileging VOC practices by locating them inside in contrast to similar burgher practices located out.

---

29 Worden et al., Cape Town, 38-39.
30 Ibid., 39-40.
31 'Buiten' means ‘out’ in Dutch, so streets names literally express their edge condition. Kant means ‘side’, so is most expressively the ‘outside’ edge. 'singel' means the crescent, and gracht means canal. Buitengracht Street did have a canal bisecting it, so was literally the canal at the ‘out’ or edge.
Social practices at the Cape shift in response to the change in political power from the VOC to Britain.

The Buitengracht boundary was a manifestation of practices concerning the British imperial project. Practices fell into two predominant categories:

1. The boundary was part of a system negotiating between the centre and periphery, in terms of labour, goods, wealth and economic practices.

2. The boundary also marked the distinction between practices that promoted and those that resisted the British cultural hegemony.

See George Thompson's Plan of Cape Town and its Environs, Travels and adventures in Southern Africa [NLSA]
Plan of Cape Town in 1840 Cape of Good Hope Directory and Almanac [UCT (HARG)]
1845 Plan of Cape Town [CTCC]
1854 Plan of Cape Town [UCT (HARG)]
William Wardlaw Snow 0.682 Survey of Cape Town [CTCC]
Richards' Map of Cape Town, 1854 [CTCC]
1895 Good Insurance Plan [NLSA]
Epoch 3 – 1795 to 1899

In 1795, the British took over control of the Cape. For the next 105 years, the Cape could be classified as a British colony - excepting a brief period, from 1803 to 1806, when the government of Batavia gained control. In this period, the social practices of the Cape increasingly reflected those of other British colonies; the Buitengracht boundary served as a device to reinforce practices of the British Empire, practices such as social classification and establishment of the centre-periphery binary. The alliance with Britain resulted in the abolition of slavery, as well as less humanitarian, Victorian cultural practices productive of class distinction and sanctifying appropriate public behaviour - which led to increased sense of racism and separation of races, both culturally and spatially. In reflection of the complex social practices of the epoch, the boundary manifestations of Buitengracht Street also took on a more ambiguous nature than indicated by its definitive Dutch naming. The slopes of Signal Hill, on the 'outside' of Buitengracht Street, became the space of liminality: home to the mosques and the freed slaves of the Cape. Yet, the boundary was not finite; crossing of practices occurred, as seen through the location of a significant mosque on Long Street and similar built fabric of small row houses on both sides of Buitengracht Street. However, devices of institutional control more explicitly manifested the street as a boundary: hospitals, churches and burial grounds were meaningfully located on one side or the other of Buitengracht to indicate inclusionary or exclusionary practices. The street also marked a thick zone of warehouses, serving the economic imperative of the British imperial project, and provided distancing between the commerce activities of the centre of town, and the excluded activities of 'ill-repute', such as alcohol storage and sale.

33 Kirsten McKenzie, "Scandal in the Colonies: Sydney and Cape Town, 1820–1850" (University of Sydney, 2005).
35 Achmat Davids, History of the Tana Bana, (Cape Town: The Committee for the Preservation of the Tana Bana, 1985), 42.
36 Ibid., 70.
Town planning and legislature are the predominant political practices manifested spatially. The Buitengracht boundary is a manifestation of political municipal practices demarcating difference and creating distance between excluded, 'slum' areas and the space of city centre.

See:
- 1926 Map (M. Bezuidenhout et al., Resilience and Memory: The Urbanism of District Six, 39)
- 1925 Goad Insurance Plan [NLSA]
- Walter Thom’s 1895 Survey of Cape Town (CTCC)
- Central Cape Town 1930’s City Survey Series (Buildings of Central Cape Town, Volumes One, Two)

**LEGEND**
- Tram Lines
- Vehicular Regional Links
- Space used for parking automobiles
- City Engineer - Construction projects
- Legislation spaces imposed under Slums Act of 1934
- Buitengracht Boundary Axis
- Boundary marks from previous epoch

---

**Table Bay**

---

**Harbour Expansions**

---

**D6**

---

**Buitengracht Retaining Wall**

---

**Schetsche Kloof Flats**
Epoch 4 – 1900 to 1947

Around 1900, a shift occurs in the practices governing Cape Town. The Anglo-Boer War and death of Queen Victoria both herald an era in which the Cape no longer operates as a British colony, but rather as a municipality.37 The epoch marks the beginnings of modernism, which (locally) evolves from colonial values and the South African mineral revolution of the late nineteenth century. The practices reflective of this shift prioritised legislation, utilising regulations as methods of social control. Space was thus increasingly subject to legislated controls. Boundaries became more definitive, through the minds and actions of planners and engineers, rather than through inhabitation. The primary example of such is the construction of the stone retaining wall that bisects Buitengracht Street. Now a clear boundary was constructed between the Bo-Kaap and the rest of the city; no longer were individual buildings responsible for negotiating the steep slope at the bottom of Signal Hill. Now the boundary was visible and legible to all inhabitants of Cape Town. This was also the era of the automobile, which impacted the Buitengracht boundary: the inhabitation of commercial buildings on Buitengracht street was part of a zone devoted to vehicle sales and repair, the open space of the street itself was appropriated for parking, and the street constructed a vehicular link up to Kloof Nek Road to pass over to Camps Bay and the Atlantic seaboard. The domination of space by the automobile indicates a planning disregard for pedestrian-scale and residential inhabitations, and reinforces the street as a zone of separation.

37 Vivian Bickford-Smith, Elizabeth van Heyningen, and Nigel Worden, Cape Town in the Twentieth Century (Cape Town: David Philip, 1999), 19.
The Group Areas Act (1951) epitomizes the practice of distancing people along racial classifications. Boundaries are used to construct and reinforce political and economic privileging for whites. Sympathetic to the apartheid project are modernist town planning practices, thus privileging the automobile over the pedestrian and reinforcing the Buitengracht as a boundary of automobiles.

See
Group Areas Act
Photograph Collection (PhL54)
'M' Maps, Designating Erfs [Surveyor General]
Orthophoto Map [Surveyor General]

LEGEND

- Venetia Regional Links

- Space used for automobiles - parking, automobile-related businesses, and land desired for freeway extension

- Group Area Act boundary

- Malay Group Area

- Buitengracht Boundary Axis

- Boundary marks from previous epoch
Epoch 5 – 1948 to 1993

In 1948, the (Afrikaaner) National Party won national elections and apartheid became the pre-eminent policy of the government, with its impact felt at all levels of social practices – political, economic and cultural. This era was not such a radical shift from the previous: the tendency towards using legislation to control practices was felt prior to 1948, and in some ways apartheid was an extreme iteration intensifying racist practices. The regulating of space through planning, the move towards producing space in the abstract, however, became even more articulated in this epoch than in the last. The Buitengracht became a boundary in the most abstract, yet powerful way imaginable: under the system of drawing lines to designate the location of each ‘racial group’ – the Group Areas Act – Buitengracht Street was the dividing line between the ‘White’ centre of Cape Town and the ‘Malay’ Bo-Kaap. The Group Areas Act removed any ambiguity regarding the spatialisation of racial classification and the identity and extent of the Bo-Kaap, and Buitengracht Street’s identity as a boundary was fixed in the shared consciousness (or imagination of the space) of Cape Town.

38 Bickford-Smith et al., Cape Town in the Twentieth Century, 141.
39 The Group Areas Act was a significant piece of apartheid legislation, dividing South African urban spaces into different ‘areas’ so that people of different races – ‘groups’ – were spatially separated across cities. For a discussion of the implementation and impact of the Group Areas Act in Cape Town, see John Western, Outcast Cape Town (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996).
Repeal of the Group Areas Act removes the legislated Buitengracht boundary, enabling greater fluidity and crossings between processes in the CBD and those in the Bo-Kaap. This can be seen in the construction boom in the Bo-Kaap and crossing of practices such as parking. However, resistance to the perceived loss of Buitengracht boundary translates to a threat to the 'homogenous' Malay identity of the Bo-Kaap. Social practices attempt to preserve the distance between the Bo-Kaap and Cape Town, through preservation of religious sites and public spatial celebration of cultural identities specific to the Bo-Kaap Muslim identities and identities related to descent from slavery.
Epoch 6 – 1994 to 2005

The elections in 1994 signalled the end of apartheid, and a shift in social practices, and thus spatial manifestation. The Group Areas Act was repealed in 1991, as part of a series of measures taken in preparation for the transition of power, and the Buitengracht no longer held its legislated role of separating Whites from ‘Malays’. Yet, whilst freedom of movement has been enjoyed by all racial groups, the homogenous identity of the Bo-Kaap which solidified (involuntarily perhaps) under apartheid is currently under threat from the newly allowed heterogeneous transformation of the Bo-Kaap. In resistance to the loss of a discrete social identity protected through spatial boundaries, practices are currently occurring which attempt to preserve that discrete identity - of both a people and a place - and thereby contest the loss of ‘boundary’.

The remainder of the thesis will elaborate upon the issues introduced here, beginning with theories regarding ‘boundary’, space, social practices, colonialism, power and identity, and how those theories have shaped a method for exploring the Buitengracht boundary. The subsequent chapters will tell a story of the Buitengracht boundary. These chapters will elaborate upon the epoch summaries described above, presenting a more detailed and nuanced story. They will utilise shifts in social practices in order to identify the shifting spatial manifestations of the Buitengracht, and tie together the shifts through a theorised narrative.

One final explanatory clause must be added to the introduction of the narratives. Because the evidence examined is formal – visual evidence rather than oral histories – the story that will be told, of the Buitengracht, of Cape Town, is one of firm boundaries, of separations and distinctions. However, mixing – of races and of identities – has been common throughout Cape Town’s history, particularly in the early years of European colonisation. Identities and practices at the Cape were often fluid; however, the story being told in this thesis is of the boundaries between practices, between spaces. Thus, the use of the pronoun ‘a’ (rather than ‘the’) to describe the Buitengracht story is significant: it refers to the belief that this story is just one of any number of possibilities, that it is imaginative and emerges from one position and reading of history and of particular forms of evidence, and does not claim to be definitive. It is intended, though, that the theoretical explorations and boundary story of the Buitengracht will illuminate a way of conceptualising space that is fluid, and temporal, and productively critical of the social practices it manifests.

---

40 Bickford-Smith et. al., Cape Town in the Twentieth Century, 219.
3 THEORY

THE BUITENGRACHT – A SPatial DIALECTIC OF SOLID-VOID : EVENT-INHABITATION

One of the principle foundations of this research is the concept of space as a dialectic of built form and lived reality. This conceptualisation of space diverges from traditional architectural histories, in order to transcend modernist conceptions of history and opening up ways of examining space in relation to social practices. The dialectic negotiates two potentially contradictory aspects, or conceptualisations, of space: built form, which consists of solid buildings and void open spaces, versus lived reality, which consists of the events governing space and the inhabitation of space. Traditionally, architectural histories only engaged built form, whilst the study of lived reality perhaps was examined in the social science disciplines. However, examining the two aspects in relation to each other provides the opportunity to see both architecture and social practices, and to read space as a manifestation of social practices. The dialectic provides an instrumentality into reading space, as a language, in multivalent and imaginative ways; it enables conceptualising space as a practice rather than merely as an artefact.

A Way of Seeing the Buitengracht

I would like to clarify how the study of the Buitengracht fits into the architectural discipline. The study seeks to use the language and disciplinary tools of architecture, but expand the traditional scope of architectural investigations through a re-conceptualisation of space and its role in understanding the history of built urban environments. Historically, space "had a strictly geometrical meaning: the idea it evoked was simply that of an empty area." Twenty-first century theorists such as Henri Lefebvre have re-asserted space into the discourse of social science and history, posing alternative conceptions of space that highlight the significance of space in social discourse and reformulate the nature of space itself. Through Lefebvre, I have come to view space as a social product, as well as also a process. This suggests also re-conceptualising architectural space and cities, in seeing them also as processes, rather than as artefacts.

Whilst spatial practice, rather than architecture, is the subject of the study, the disciplinary knowledge necessary in order to conduct the study is architectural. The examination of the spatial dialectic is a discourse; every discourse operates through language. The language of this study is architectural – the reading of space through representational drawings and the comprehension of the construction of architectural artefacts. To read the event and inhabitation aspects of space requires an understanding of space, particularly an imaginative understanding of space. Much of the primary data used in the thesis is visual representations of space, specifically maps, photographs and paintings. Knowledge of architectural language affords the ability to read evidence of social practices into those graphic representations, thereby (re)asserting the significant contribution that architectural research can provide to the field of social history.

The instrumentalisation of the spatial dialectic is particularly well suited to the examination of the boundary manifestations of Buitengracht Street. This is because typologically, a boundary, as a space manifesting...
exclusionary practices, rarely manifests such practices purely through the construction of built form\textsuperscript{47}. Rather, a boundary is often most poignantly constructed through the events and inhabitations that dictate and describe the use of space; a boundary is practiced rather than being a static object. However, the spatial examination must investigate both built form and lived reality; neither tells a sufficient story alone, for the two spatial aspects are not isolated constructs. Space is both a condition for and resultant from social practices\textsuperscript{48}; in order to probe deeply into the Buitengracht's boundary manifestation, the solid and void aspects must be seen as relational to the event and inhabitation aspects. This is a relationship dependent and influential in both directions, as built form facilitates some lived realities over others, and lived reality influences the construction of particular built forms\textsuperscript{49}. The utilisation of the spatial dialectic also relates to the historic scope of the study, for in the three hundred and fifty years of the study, built form has changed less frequently than the social practices and lived reality along the Buitengracht. I propose that this is a typical historic reality of cities; over time, meanings of buildings and neighbourhoods are reconstructed through lived reality far more often than built form is materially altered. The instances of change to built form do provide potent moments for investigation into the architectural nature of boundary; however, those moments are enriched by examining them in relation to lived reality. Utilising a spatial dialectic enables seeing the social meaning of built form; it enables reading the boundary manifestations of the Buitengracht. Thus, the spatial dialectic provides a framework for the examination, giving structure and broadening the scope of the study from a traditional architectural history.

**Instrumentalising the Spatial Dialectic**

The choice to employ the spatial dialectic in the examination of the Buitengracht stems from intellectual queries and disciplinary practices. The examination of the construction of the Buitengracht as a boundary is phenomenological, rather than typological. Seeing the space of the Buitengracht as a process structures research that endeavours to measure the plurality of the space: its fluid qualities and its temporal dimension. Supporting the conception of space reached through Lefebvre, that space is a process and social product, is the work of architectural theorists involved in the Strangely Familiar\textsuperscript{50} project. Their work supports the premise that the Buitengracht boundary has transformed each time it was re-inhabited, each time the new events governed its use, and even each time it was re-represented as a cultural artefact:

[Architecture, like all cultural objects, is not made just once, but is made and remade over and over again each time it is represented through another medium, each time its surroundings change, each time different people experience it.\textsuperscript{51}]

In order to examine space in its fluidity, two aspects of modernism must be critiqued and disarmed: the hegemony of built form in the writing of architectural history\textsuperscript{52}, and the silence of space in the writing of social history\textsuperscript{53}. Divorcing space and social practice will lead to static, mono-disciplinary constructions of history, separating architectural from social histories. In order to integrate the examinations of space and social practice, the conceptualisation of space must be questioned and re-constructed. Michel de Certeau compares two spatial extremities, illuminating a potentially integrated, dialectic approach to space. De Certeau draws an analogy between space understood as solid and void - the space traditionally seen by disciplines such as architecture and planning - and a bird's eye view of the city\textsuperscript{54}. This view is distanced; the observer is removed from the spatial subject. If viewed from above, the spatial subject is static, unchanged through time except when radical changes are made to its exterior form. De Certeau contrasts the bird's eye view with the experience of walking the city. The walker sees just the converse of the built environment professional; the walker never sees the spatial subject in its totality, never understands the relationship between forms. However, what the walker sees, and constructs, is an experience of space. The walker is never removed from

\textsuperscript{47} An example of a boundary manifested purely through built form would be a suburban fence: the division it renders is not necessarily reinforced or negotiated through social practices.

\textsuperscript{48} Lefebvre, The Production of Space, 85.

\textsuperscript{49} Foucault, "Space, Knowledge, and Power," 246; Lefebvre, The Production of Space, 85.

\textsuperscript{50} Borden et al., Strangely Familiar.

\textsuperscript{51} Forty, Strangely Familiar, 5.

\textsuperscript{52} Jacobs, Edge of Empire, 9.

\textsuperscript{53} Soja, Postmodern Geographies, 10-13.

\textsuperscript{54} De Certeau, The Practice of Everyday Life, 91-93.
space; s/he creates space through her movements through the city. The 'walker' writes a new space with each path taken: his/hers is the city experienced on the ground, a transparent reality as opposed to the abstraction experienced only in plan. Neither view of space, the planner's nor the walker's, is sufficient on its own. The dialectic attempts to reconcile the two and enjoy both perspectives, perhaps even uncovering a new view in the space between.

Examining the Buitengracht Dialectic through Lefebvre

While de Certeau's work gives clues to the data necessary to seeing the space of the walker in relation to the removed bird's eye view, Henri Lefebvre's work on the production of space provides a way in to reading that data. De Certeau's work enables conceptualising the city and its different lived realities as accessed through different representations. Lefebvre provides a structure for reading, examining, and understanding the space of the city through the way it has been produced. Affinities exist between de Certeau and Lefebvre. Both recognise space as 'lived', as other than the static, timeless entity previously engaged in architectural histories. The difference between the two theorists is the final product each attempts to realise through their engagement of space. Lefebvre attempts an examination of the production of space in order to probe into the structure and relations of capitalist society. Through those probings, Lefebvre demonstrates a structure for conceptualising space in relation to social practices, a conception useful in examining the Buitengracht.

I have found three aspects of Lefebvre's work most useful in the examination of the Buitengracht boundary. One is the premise of space as lived, as composed of textures (as opposed to the supposed neutrality of Cartesian space). The second is the spatial triad – of spatial practice, representations of space, and spaces of representation - as a means of recognizing different spatial productions. The third is the historic shift from absolute space to abstract space, and the relevance of this shift in the changing nature of the Buitengracht's boundary construction over the 350-year span of study.

I have found one of the most critical concepts put forth by Lefebvre to be that space is lived. This concept identifies that space is produced through social arrangements, affirming the significance of 'lived reality' – events and inhabitation – in space and confirming the utility of the dialectic as a mechanism for examining space:

"Behind the curtain there is nothing to see", says Hegel ironically somewhere. Unless, of course, 'we' go behind the curtain ourselves, because someone has to be there to see, and for there to be something to see.

Lefebvre probes the relations between spatial products and social practices through the concept of textures:

The subject experiences space as an obstacle... Thus the texture of space affords opportunities not only to social acts with no particular place in it and no particular link with it, but also to a spatial practice that it does indeed determine.

Space is not neutral, but integral to social acts; the Buitengracht boundary is not only a manifestation of exclusionary practices, but the space affords opportunities of exclusion, reinforcing the social system. This is not to say that space is creative, in the sense that social practices are products of their spatial location, but rather that a discourse occurs between space and social practices. The sense of boundary precedes its spatial manifestation, but also exclusionary practices are facilitated through the built form of the boundary. The two – space and the forces of production – cannot be separated from each other. Space (such as the Buitengracht) "is at once a precondition and a result of social superstructures. Space is both a product and
a means of production, of the social structures of exclusion, of negotiating the identity of the Cape through the exclusion of particular practices and identities. The boundary is neither a priori nor purely a result of practices of exclusion, but a component of the history of social practices in Cape Town.

Lefebvre establishes a conceptual triad to distinguish between the different types of spatial productions that have occurred throughout the course of history. The triad enables him to conceive of space much more as a societal product by engaging with non-physical (non-material) 'spaces' in relation to the production of physical space. More specifically, the triad consists of:

1. **Spatial practice**, which includes the production and reproduction of space, and the locations and spatial "sets" which are characteristic of each social formation (society). 'Spatial practice' is the spatial dimension that speaks of the shared language, or "competence and continuity", which constructs the "given society's" relationship with space. Spatial practice can also be conceived as the actual action of 'making' space. In relation to the definition of space I am using, spatial practice corresponds to the inhabitation of space.

2. **Representations of space** relate to the codes and knowledge that describe the order imposed by the relations of production. These are "conceptualised" spaces, those created in the minds of planners of space. For example, representations of space are the lines drawn by planners, 'imagined' space, created to represent sets of values and knowledge. Representations of space correspond to the event aspect of space- the zoning codes and legislation which dictate the use of space, constructing space mentally prior to its material manifestation.

3. **Spaces of representation** (or representational spaces) embody "complex symbolisms, sometimes coded," linked to social life. These are spaces lived through symbols and images; dominated and passively experienced spaces which overlay physical space. Spaces of representation are 'material', but loaded with meanings and symbols, spaces created to impart meaning, either in addition to or instead of simply being 'lived'. These correspond to the solid and void aspects of space; they are material spaces.

A distinction exists between the dimensions of space identified in the glossary — solid, void, events, and inhabitation — and Lefebvre's triad of space. The two concepts - space as I have defined and Lefebvre's spatial triad - emerge from a common theoretical position that space is constructed through social practices and inhabitation. However, the conceptual framing of space differs: my spatial aspects attempt to categorize the dimensions through which a particular physical space is constructed as a mechanism for architectural research, whilst Lefebvre's triad utilises non-material spaces in order to facilitate unpacking how (material) space is produced through practices. My spatial definition is a device complimentary to Lefebvre's spatial triad, developed to assist in researching material culture. Lefebvre's triad has complimented my definition, and enhanced the research by enabling drawing distinction between the practices that produce space and space itself, both material and imaginative.

The third component of Lefebvre's work that has been utilised in conceptualising the research is the historic shift from 'absolute space' to 'abstract space'. Lefebvre states that over the course of history, particularly European history, a shift has occurred from 'absolute space' to 'abstract space', a shift in the relationship between spatial productions and representations. Absolute space, space indicative of pre-Enlightenment social relations, displays an immediacy between social practices and spatial manifestations. Absolute spaces, which Lefebvre assigns to 'primitive societies' through to the European Middle Ages, are produced as confusions of the spatial triad. In absolute space,

Everything in the societies under consideration was situated, perceived and interpreted in terms of such places... It is indeed a space, at once and indistinguishable mental and social, which comprehends the entire existence of the group concerned.

---

66 Ibid.
67 Ibid., 33.
68 Ibid., 38.
69 Ibid., 33.
70 Ibid., 39.
71 "Ian Low has assisted with this clarification to the definition of space.
72 Lefebvre, The Production of Space, 240.
Absolute spaces contrast abstract spaces - spaces characterised by separation between each element of the triad, between spatial practices, representations of space, and spaces of representation. Lefebvre states that abstract spaces result from a societal rupture of capitalism. This rupture occurs in roughly the sixteenth century\(^7\); however, space has become continually more abstract since that time, and the difference between absolute and abstract space is relevant in the study of the Buitengracht. Over the course of the study period, from 1652 to 2005, I have identified that space and the forces of production have become distanced; not separated, for as Lefebvre states they can never be separated. However, the boundary manifestation of the Buitengracht increasingly became a mental production - a representation of space – prior to its production materially or through practice. I am specifically referring to the Group Areas Act, passed under apartheid, which designated Buitengracht Street as the boundary between the 'White' city centre and the 'Malay' Bo-Kaap. This was a boundary of political will; the location of the boundary line built upon previous spatial practices, but boundary was constructed as a representation initially, forcing spatial practices to follow.

The Fluidity of Identity

I have already stated that a premise of the research is that space is a process as much as a product. Viewing space as fluid, and relational to social practices, builds upon another premise: that identity is a fluid construct. Just as space is produced in relation to social practices, identity also is neither static nor isolated. Rather, it is a dynamic construct, practiced and formed in relation to contexts. I have been able to reach this premise primarily through two theorists: Stuart Hall and Arjun Appadurai.

Hall locates identity in regards to fluidity and history. He states that identity is:

> a matter of ‘becoming’ as well as of ‘being’. It belongs to the future as much as to the past. It is not something which already exists, transcending place, time, history and culture. Cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But, like everything which is historical, they undergo constant transformation. Far from being eternally fixed in some essentialised past, they are subject to the continuous ‘play’ of history, culture and power. Far from being grounded in a mere ‘recovery’ of the past, which is waiting to be found, and which, when found, will secure our sense of ourselves into eternity, identities are the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past.\(^74\)

He thus indicates that identity is historical; it is constructed within the story of the past. I have examined the Buitengracht as a historical spatial story; the conjecture I suggest is approaching identity as constructed in space. Alternately, the reading of space as a historical artefact and story begins to illuminate different identity constructions. Examining the Buitengracht historically, as a process of becoming, provides a text through which to read identity. Particularly, it provides a text for reading fluid identities, for seeing the contradictions and contestation of identities symptomatic of systems of domination, such as colonialism and apartheid. Hall indicates that identities of separation, as constructed through a boundary, are not false constructions, but rather just one choice, made available through one reading of space and practices. Other identity constructions are also possible, also simultaneously chosen, utilising different contextual engagements.

Appadurai’s writings further qualify the fluid quality of identity. He suggests that we replace the use of the term ‘identity’ with ‘identification’:

> I've come more and more to prefer the term “identification” to the term “identity.” Only because identity suggests something fairly formed, fairly fixed, fairly exclusive, fairly stable. In the classical sense of the word people have many identities, and there’s a large portfolio: some are very recessive, others very active… But if you move to identification, you move to a kind of process, where people are engaging in a menu of possibilities in the work of the imagination.\(^75\)

As a process, identity, just like space, is not fixed, but in a constant state of production. Just as history is a narrative, a chosen linking of facts and events, constructing identity also involves the choice of facts and relationship between facts. Appadurai refers to the phenomenon of people using imagination, of conceptualising the spaces that they inhabit as fields and relations and possibilities. This relates to de

\(^7\) Ibid., 268.
Certeau’s example of the ‘walker of the city’, who reconstructs the city with each different path chosen. Appadurai’s concern is not the individual reconstructing the city, but the empowerment manifested through imaginations of identity and space. Appadurai’s writings regarding identification (and imagination⁷⁶) suggest that the (hi)story of the Buitengracht, particularly as a boundary and a spatial manifestation, is imaginative, it is one reading amongst many possibilities. This does not suggest, however, that choices are made neutrally; identification, as well as the writing of spatial history, is a critical selection, based upon subjectivity and values.

**Using Narrative to Represent the Dialectic**

In order to instrumentalise the spatial dialectic fully, it is requisite to find expressive means of representing the research. In addition to making mappings and including many visual illustrations, I have chosen to tell the story of the Buitengracht boundary as a spatial narrative of social practice. I have chosen narrative method for its capacity to illustrate the spatial subject as a process, rather than a series of monuments.⁷⁷ As the intention of the research is to critique and present alternatives to static, traditional architectural histories, the telling of the (hi)story must be critically constructed. Narrative, as a medium, is a route, a journey; it is temporally expressive, subject to changes depending on the conditions of its telling (and receiving). Narrative is especially appropriate to the Buitengracht research, for it involves an imaginative and speculative combination of facts. Narrative has the power to express previously silenced voices through the telling of and relating of facts to each other. The Buitengracht narrative is not personal, to me, but endeavours to present the boundary story so that spatial ‘voices’ previously unheard and unseen may be expressed, contributing the understanding of the street, of Cape Town, and its social history.

**Conclusion: The Need for Non-traditional Theories of Space**

This research has endeavoured to explore the history of a space – the Buitengracht boundary – as a process. The critical question asked is how the spatial manifestations of social practices have constructed the Buitengracht boundary; how have the shifts in social practices shifted the boundary manifestation of Buitengracht Street? The research departs from traditional architectural histories⁷⁸, which engage the spatial subject as an artefact rather than process. In order to examine the spatial subject as a process, appropriate, ‘non-traditional’ theoretical frameworks must be utilised. Considering the political history of Cape Town - initially as a colony, then subject to the racially divisive practices of apartheid - post-colonial theory is particularly relevant to the historical practices examined, and Cape Town’s contemporary post-apartheid, post-colonial condition. The next chapter will expand upon the use of post-colonial theory, and its particular relevance in the examination of a spatial boundary.

⁷⁷ Borden et al., Strangely Familiar, 8-12.
⁷⁸ See Chapter 1, Glossary for definition of architectural methodology, and how this thesis attempts an approach alternative to traditional architectural histories and scientific method.
Chapter 3 identified the theoretical position for this discourse, locating the spatial dialectic as the approach for examining the space of the Buitengracht. This chapter will connect the choice to look at a boundary space, particularly the Buitengracht boundary, with Cape Town’s colonial history. This chapter explores post-colonial theory as a framework for examining the social practices at play over Cape Town’s history, and their spatial manifestation, particularly in the boundary space of the Buitengracht. At the end of the previous chapter, I wrote of the need for non-traditional theoretical frameworks in embarking upon non-traditional architectural histories. I have found post-colonial theory particularly appropriate: it is sympathetic to the post-structural position of the research undertaking, it is critically illuminative of colonialism and politically dominating practices, it builds upon Foucault’s premise that power is practiced, and it provides the opportunity for examining the possibilities of transformation in Cape Town’s contemporary post-apartheid condition. I will use postcolonial theory in order to uncover and examine the colonial practices manifested through the Buitengracht boundary, thereby examining how productions of power have been spatialised in Cape Town.

The Colonial Project, Spatialised, in Cape Town

The colonial project is one of constructing boundaries in order to effect limits and distancing, and thereby control the colonised subject and claim the colony as subordinate to the empire. Boundaries are spaces critical to the success of the colonial project. The history of Cape Town cannot be separated from colonialism; the marks left by its colonial history, the marks available for reading the history, are spatial marks. Iain Low states: “Space is the construct that most effectively realised and maintained apartheid’s grand plan and continues to ensure the endurance of its legacy;” I do not wish to attempt to defend a similar assertion regarding colonialism, but to observe that through space, the history of power relations in Cape Town avails itself for reading and critique. The particular boundary space chosen, the Buitengracht, is especially revealing for the case of Cape Town: it manifests distance between ‘Other’ practices and identities at the Cape – such as islam, racial mixing, and heterotopic practices – and the hegemonic practices of colonialism.

Boundary and the Colonial Binary at the Cape

When the Buitengracht emerged as a boundary in the Cape landscape, it did so as one element amongst a network of boundaries manifesting colonial binary couplets. The boundary operations at the Cape were typical of generic colonial boundaries: effecting homogeneity, acting as the spatial agents of the colonial tendency “to construct cultural binaries.” Boundaries post only binary options and relations: inside or out, here or there, coloniser or colonised. Their use privileges and constructs homogeneity in the simplicity of binary differences, in that subjects are prohibited multivalent, fluid identities. Instead, homogenous identities are constructed, as oppositional to what they are not, enabling distinguishing the coloniser from colonised.

---

79 This refers to the bodies of theoretical frameworks that fall under the ‘umbrella’ of postmodern thought: theories potentially critical of modernism and static, hegemonic conceptions.
81 A post-colonial text I have found particularly useful is Ashcroft, Post-Colonial Transformation.
82 As established in Chapter 1, at the Cape, ‘Empire’ has been governmental and corporate, British and VOC, at different times.
83 Low, “Space and Transformation,” 34.
84 Ashcroft, Post-Colonial Transformation, 141.
85 Ashcroft, Post-Colonial Transformation, 180.
Maps of Africa, demonstrating different ways the imperial has come to 'know' Africa.

Source: Above: Vergunst, Hoerikwaggo, 50; Below: Vergunst, Hoerikwaggo, 11.
Whilst the subsequent narrative chapters will tell the story of the Buitengracht boundary, and its emergence amongst the network of initial boundaries at the Cape, I will now locate the development of binary couplets practiced at the Cape in regards to post-colonial theory. The historic progression of boundaries constructed at the Cape reflected the increasing spatial and social complexity of practices over time. The first boundary construct at the Cape, the Fort, established the empty-full couplet. Colonisation assumes a blank, empty landscape; it is read as ‘blank’ because it has not yet been civilised in the terms of the coloniser. Emptyness is a prerequisite of colonisation, operating from the assumptive view that the colonised land is empty, waiting to be claimed and shaped in the image of the coloniser. The construction of the Fort established a ‘full’ space in opposition to the supposed ‘emptiness’ encountered. The next boundaries constructed - hedges and grachts - circumscribed coloniser ‘property’, distinguishing rural space from the surrounding ‘wilderness’. These boundaries spoke of the VOC colonisation through cultivation, of the colonisers’ need to claim possession of land through agrarian practices. The next significant boundary constructed at the Cape, the Castle, speaks of the beginnings of urban practices and practices of power in urban space. Boundaries began to distance the town from outlying rural areas and establish hierarchies and power relations within the colonial society, enabling asserting VOC control over human subjects. The Buitengracht boundary was constructed within that context of urban practices of demarcating the edges of the town and distancing those practices inside from those outside.

Colonialism, Distancing and the Buitengracht boundary

‘Distancing’ was one of the urban, colonial practices manifested through the construction of the Buitengracht boundary. Distance is requisite for the construction of colonial knowledge – for knowing the coloniser and colonised as different, as distinct and as separate. Distancing is linked to two other colonising practices, quantification and the reliance upon perspectival vision, both of which also enable colonialism's particular production of knowledge. This section will look at the role of knowledge in the colonial project, how knowledge was constructed through quantification and perspective – both manifested in the construction of maps – and how a material boundary such as the Buitengacht manifested those colonial practices.

Said states that knowledge is one of the fundamental underpinnings of the imperial project:

Knowledge ... means surveying a civilization from its origins to its prime to its decline – and of course, it means being able to do that. Knowledge means rising above immediacy, beyond self, in the foreign and distant. The object of such knowledge is inherently vulnerable to scrutiny; this object is a ‘fact’ which, if it develops, changes, or otherwise transforms itself in the way that civilizations frequently do, nevertheless is fundamentally, even ontologically stable. To have such knowledge over such a thing is to dominate it, to have authority over it. And authority here means for ‘us’ to deny autonomy to ‘it’ – the Oriental country – since we know it and it exists, in a sense, as we know it.

Said suggests that to have ‘knowledge’ of the colonised ‘Other’ is to have the right and the power to dominate it – to colonise it.

The colonial project, as a mode of production, developed techniques for constructing knowledge of the ‘Other’. These techniques relied upon mathematical and scientific principles, allowing the colonial project to claim a rational – and therefore universal - basis. In the construction of maps (D9), the spatial predecessor to actual geographic possession, quantification and perspectival vision are fundamental instruments. Quantification was manifested through classification practices:

Rhetorically speaking, Orientalism is absolutely anatomical and enumerative; to use its vocabulary is to engage in the particularizing and dividing of things Oriental into manageable parts.

At the Cape, ‘particularizing and dividing’ were instrumental to productions of power and identity construction: KhoiSan were classified as distinct from colonist, the wilderness from the rural, even VOC from free-burgher.
Maps of the Cape (previous possession of the land manifested through mapping)

Source: Above: Vergunst, Herkomrooij, 15; Below: Vergunst, Herkomrooij, 46.
and the rural from the urban. The Buitengracht boundary was a spatial manifestation of such practices. While Appadurai has found that the British use of the census illuminates the examination of colonial practices in India, a parallel spatial colonial device is the map and subsequent construction of boundaries.

Just as the census measured people, land was also "a quantity which can be mapped with mathematical precision". This was manifested through the construction of maps. Surveying and mapping practices were amongst the foremost tools operationalised in the imperial project: recording and producing geographical knowledge in order to claim control. The British imperial project, in particular, was manifested spatially, through maps and the construction of architectural symbols of British cultural identity. Surveying and mapping, as pointed out by Denis Cosgrove, are products of spatial imagination. Said elaborates and states that "the moment when a coincidence occurs between real control and power, the idea of what a given place was (could be, might be) and an actual place – is still the moment when the struggle for empire is launched." Mapping, as a system of quantification and productive of knowledge and the possibility of empire, is a form of surveillance. Thus, it relies upon perspectival vision. In order to construct the geographic knowledge, the observer is removed, both spatially and temporally, from the subject. Distance is thus requisite for perspectival vision:

This world must dispense with the perceiver located in the perceived world, a perceiver who, in the act of perception, compounds the spatial and the temporal. It must dispense with the concept of the perception of space altering through time. It relies on an observer positioned outside it and comprehending it in a single instant of vision.

Whilst the map is the representation of colonial knowledge, the imperial project is only complete once possession of the land is accomplished:

Underlying the construction of social boundaries, of social spaces, with their racial, class and ethnic dimensions, were the geographical domains, the 'actual geographic underpinnings of the imperial',. Possession, geographical possession, relies upon intervening devices between the coloniser and colonised: devices of distancing, both spatial and temporal. "Boundaries ... are more than simply a method of parcelling up the world, they are critical to the Western passion for seeing and the prominence of vision in the ideological control of space." Boundaries thereby enable distancing the perceiver - not just in the construction of maps but also in the lived reality of colonial space – and claiming possession. We can then see the Buitengracht as a colonial distancing device in Cape Town. During the period of VOC control, the Buitengracht distanced the rural from the urban landscapes of the Cape. It also provided distance between heterotopic practices - burial and execution - and the urbanised space of VOC ideal practices. Under British imperial rule, the Buitengracht further distanced colonised and coloniser identities: freed slaves and Islamic practices inhabited one side of the Buitengracht, whilst the institutions of colonial administration the other. Through distancing, the Buitengracht boundary constructed the identity of the colonised as the 'Other'.

Naming the Buitengracht Boundary

The 'Other' was also a production of colonial naming. Edward Said declares that 'naming' instrumentalises two of the fundamental underpinnings of colonialism: knowledge and power. To name the 'Other' is to persuade the 'Other' how to know itself, as subordinate to Europe. As a boundary, the Buitengracht becomes complicit in processes of naming colonial subjects in the Cape. The (Buitengracht) boundary, simply through naming, enables the discourse of exclusion. The boundary acts as the device through which to

91 Whilst the reading of spatial boundaries at the Cape is of firm, exclusionary devices, cultural interaction was subject to heterogeneous practices, particularly with regards to miscegenation; mixed marriages were common, especially between VOC subjects, slaves and Khoisan. See Page II.
92 Ashcroft, Post-Colonial Transformation, 162.
93 Ibid., 148.
94 Ibid., 124.
96 Ashcroft, Post-Colonial Transformation, 162.
97 Ibid., 151.
98 Ibid., 137.
100 Ibid., 148.
measure what – practices and identities - is outside and where – geographically - is outside. Identities and practices were located, with significance, on either of the Buitengracht; however, the power of location, whether inside or out, was only realised through its naming as such. Naming brought the Buitengracht into the discourse of boundaries, and therefore into the discourse of power in Cape Town.

Therefore, to return to Lefebvre’s spatial triad, the Buitengracht’s boundary manifestation was realised not only through spatial practices, that is, through the construction of the space. Through naming, of both the street and the practices on either side, as inside or outside, the Buitengracht boundary became a representation of space. The named Buitengracht boundary ‘describes the order imposed by relations of production’; it is a conceptualised space, created mentally by the planners of the space of Cape Town. A name is a representation, in this case one that claims Buitengracht Street’s identity as a boundary. “The world acquires spatial meaning only after the different regions have been ‘inscribed’ by Europeans”; similar practices occurred in Cape Town through the inscription of boundaries:

The dynamic of naming becomes a primary colonizing process because it appropriates, defines, captures the place in language.

**Productions of Power – Constructing a (Colonial) Boundary**

The examination of Buitengracht Street, as a colonial boundary, relates to the need to uncover the role of space in productions of power. If, as I have suggested, space is a manifestation of social practices, and political practices are one dimension of social practices, space can be examined to uncover productions of power. Foucault states that space is a realm through which power has been produced; in the discourse of ordering society, the realm of space is historically utilised:

One begins to see a form of political literature that addresses what the order of a society should be, what a city should be, given the requirements of the maintenance of order; given that one should avoid epidemics, avoid revolts, permit a decent and moral family life, and so on. In terms of these objectives, how is one to conceive of both the organization of a city and the construction of a collective infrastructure?

Foucault demonstrates that it is not that power becomes a production of design professionals, but rather space a realm appropriated by politics. Social operations, productions of power, are conducted through and in the realm of space. It is not that space itself has power, or even that a particular political body has power, but rather that power is practiced through spatial operations. This nuance is critical, for power itself is not an entity, but rather a production:

> Power would be a fragile thing if its only function was to repress, if it worked only through the modes of censorship, exclusion, blockage and repression [...] if, on the contrary, power is strong this is because, as we are beginning to realise, it produces effects at the level of desire — and also at the level of knowledge. Far from preventing knowledge, power produces it.

Foucault also states that:

> to decipher discourse through the use of spatial, strategic metaphors enables one to grasp precisely the points at which discourses are transformed in, through and on the basis of relations of power.

As Said, and many post-colonial theorists since, have shown, colonialism is a discourse, a particular sort of production of power. The space of a boundary, as a manifestation of colonialism, is particularly illuminating of the colonial power discourse, through practices such as distancing, naming, and construction of binaries. Solid and voids enable distance, providing forum for the communication of practices. Events, the regulations of bodies in space, govern the activities allowed and prohibited in space. This can be seen in various boundary constructs in Cape Town: the first perhaps being the Parade Grounds. The Parade constructed a void space between the Castle and remainder of urban settlement, producing distance between the VOC and

---
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all other inhabitants of the Cape. This distance enabled the practices of the VOC to be displayed or hidden, producing knowledge - of the VOC, of the relationship between VOC and other bodies at the Cape - through distance, through exclusion, and even through display. A similar reading of the discourse of power can be gained through other boundary manifestations at the Cape, such as the naming of the ‘buiten’ streets – Buitenkap, Buitensingel and Buitengracht. This naming, a spatial event, declared/communicated that the VOC ordered space was inside, therefore indicating the existence of an excluded, separate ‘outside’.

The power produced through boundaries was not only a colonial practice. Likewise, the twentieth century - a period of modernism in which Cape Town was subject to municipal productions of power and to apartheid - saw power produced spatially. Rather than concern with constructing an ‘Other’, as occurred under colonialism, power productions constructed classifications, and space manifested distinctions and racial exclusions:

Spatial practice in the city became more about boundaries, barriers and borders and about the curtailed spaces of crossings and imaginings in these spatialised terrains of apartheid.110 This shift will be seen in Narrative Three, the period from 1900 to 1993, when the Buitengracht boundary manifested categorisation and separation of races, and of slums from the clean, modern city.

To return, once again to Foucault, space – of the Buitengracht – is itself not exclusionary or prohibitory; “Nothing is fundamental... These are not fundamental phenomena. There are only reciprocal relations, and the perceptual gaps between intentions in relation to one another.”111 Space is produced as an operation of power productions. It is again necessary here to remember that space, as defined in this research, consists of more than just solids and voids. Inhabitation and events also are operative of power relations and productions. The work of Foucault and Lefebvre compliment each other, and the conceptual premise of this research: that space is a process, a production of social practices (of power), and can be read through material aspects – solid buildings and void open spaces – as well as the events and inhabitations of space.

Conclusion: The Buitengracht – a Space | a Place

This leads to the final clarification necessary regarding space, colonial practices, and the Buitengracht: the distinction between space and place. According the Bill Ashcroft, the assignment of place is one of the acts implicit in colonial practices:

Where is one’s ‘place’? This question is fundamental to the cultural impact of colonization and affects every aspect of colonized society. The issues surrounding the concept of place – how it is conceived, how it differs from ‘space’ or location’, how it enters into and produces cultural consciousness, how it becomes the horizon of identity – are some of the most difficult and debated in post-colonial experience.112

Locating one’s ‘place’ constructs where one ‘belongs’. Belonging emerges not only from spatial location, but also from the network of social connections: “family, community, in those symbolic features which constitute a shared culture, a shared ethnicity or a system of belief... It is when place is least spatial, perhaps, that it becomes most identifying.”113 Here the tension of the spatial dialectic arises – between the built form and lived reality. The Buitengracht is a spatial location – in all aspects of solid, void, event, inhabitation – and one that enables the description and realisation of social connections. One of the key problems of colonialism is that the power to determine one’s place is contested; control is wrested from the hands of the colonised subject and identity is constructed as a creation of the coloniser. If place is a conceptualisation of constructing identity, its role in colonial practices is ‘imaginative’; in contrast, space is the ‘material’ - the tool and objective of the imperial project. Place and space are both essential to colonial practices: place is the mode of constructing identity, and is the device through which colonisation occurs (and is resisted); space, in contrast, is the material object (or goal) of possession in the colonising act.

112 Ashcroft, Post-Colonial Transformation, 124.
113 Ibid., 125.
The distinction between space and place is crucial in discerning the Buitengracht as a boundary. The street itself is a space. However, as a boundary, its use is in the creation of place(s). ‘Boundary’, as a notion, actualises the possibility to describe place, particularly as a place distinguishing the colonised from the coloniser. The construction of boundary, as an agent of describing place, is a spatial practice. It is constructed through inhabitation, through the events that dictate the use of space, and through the solid-void material spatial manifestations. These spatial manifestations of the Buitengracht, as a boundary, construct places – contemporary places such as the Bo-Kaap, the centre of Cape Town, De Waterkant. Under VOC colonialism, it created places inside Kaapstad and places outside, the wilderness of the Cape. These places are not geographical, but imaginative identities; they are localities and through those, Cape Town has been constructed in the collective cultural imagination.

The efforts thus far described, of seeing the Buitengracht as a boundary, as a manifestation of social practices, particularly of productions of power in the colonial discourse of exclusion and classification, rely upon the dialectic spatial conception. The work of Lefebvre and of de Certeau, in enabling formulating the spatial dialectic, compliments that of Foucault and Said. It is only possible to read the space of the Buitengracht as a boundary, manifesting colonial notions such as distance and exclusion, if one reads the space as dialectic – as not only built form but also as lived reality. To see the space of the Buitengracht as a boundary is to see it as not a static, built artefact, but as a process. The next chapter will demonstrate how the Buitengracht as a process has been researched, before finally delving into the narratives of the Buitengracht boundary.

114 Locality is a concept developed by Arjun Appadurai that will be discussed in Chapter 5.
5 METHODOLOGY

RESEARCHING AND CONSTRUCTING
THE BUITENGRACHT NARRATIVE

The project of researching the Buitengracht, as a boundary, has required developing methods of architectural
historiography that approach:

architecture not as a series of monuments, but as a process — a process in which the monuments
themselves were just one stage.115

My desire in developing a method for researching the Buitengracht has not only been to examine the history of
the production of that space, but to conduct the research through 'architectural methods', building on the tools
used in the architectural discipline, in addition to those used in the social sciences. The approach to the
research has been to utilise a qualitative research framework for structuring the research paradigm, data
collection, and (to some extent) the presentation; this has been integrated with an application of architectural
techniques for analysing the data and presenting the research.

Methodological Approach

As stated above, the intent of the research is to uncover space as a process, finding relationships between
space and social practices and seeing how each element changes over time. The approach to the research
has been qualitative, as the research inquiries have been how questions, rather than quantifiable questions
such as what or how much.

The methodological strategy is the case study: building up a “thick description”116 of the case, which in this
instance is how Buitengracht Street has manifested 'boundary' — how it spatially manifested social practices of
exclusion, distinction and classification. Although a historical subject, the research does not aim to construct a
history of Buitengracht Street, but rather a study of the phenomena of boundary along Buitengracht Street.
The interrogation is relational — finding the relationship between social practices and spatial manifestations, or
"seek[ing] data describing diverse operations of the case."117

The collection of research material primarily utilises documentary evidence, except for the last narrative period
studied (1994-2005). As the last narrative period is the contemporary iteration of Buitengracht Street, visual
archival data — maps, photographs and images — has been neither been available nor been appropriate.
Instead, I have used direct observation of the space of the Buitengracht, and contemporary research practices
— such as discussion with other researchers and informal discussion with inhabitants. Direct observation has
not been used in an ethnographic method of observing human participants, but in an archaeological manner of
finding the practices behind the production of space.118 The evidence gathered has been read as textual
evidence: reading the evidence "as self-contained systems"119 rather than examining in order to uncover the
systems of production of evidence. Although I am working from a post-structural position, and am aware of
the concern of subjectivity in the production of documentary evidence, I have focused the research upon
uncovering the (hi)story of the Buitengracht boundary, rather than the meaning behind the evidence. As
Derrida informed us, "there is no 'original' or 'true' meaning of a text outside specific historic contexts."120

115 Forty, Strangely Familiar, 5.
117 Ibid., 440.
118 Ian Hodder, “The Interpretation of Documents and Material Culture,” in Handbook of Qualitative Research, 704-705.
120 Hodder, “Interpretation of Documents,” 704.
1 Exaggerated representation of the topography of Table Mountain and the Cape. This representation has been duplicated repeatedly in other artistic impressions of the Cape, particularly in the eighteenth century. Source: Vergunst, Horschaggo, Table of Climates.

2 By the twentieth century, representations of Table Mountain and the Cape tended to be more accurate, in regards to topographic representation. Source: Vergunst, Horschaggo, 34.
have used documentary evidence in awareness and agreement of this premise, but not engaged with examining the context of production of evidence.

It is in the analysis and re-presentation of the research that I have attempted to introduce architectural methodologies to augment those traditionally used in other disciplines (such as social science). The research utilises ‘mapping’ as a technique for drawing out the relationship between the social practices and spatial manifestations identified. Contemporary research and practices have instrumentalised mapping to "engender the re-shaping of the worlds in which people live." Although this research does not attempt to provide agency for reconstructing the built world, as creative mapping practices can, it does use mapping as an instrument for "measuring and describing" the subject, for analysing data to find relationships between spatial manifestations and social practices.

The technique for representation of the research is a combination of narrative and the presentation of mappings. The use of narrative is similar to use of montage or bricolage. Whilst those techniques illuminate the scepticism of the possibility of uncovering "objective reality" through representing multiple voices and methods, the narrative approach provides a similar perspective through rendering transparent that the story presented is one amongst alternate possibilities. It is not intended, or even desired, to suggest that the Buitengracht narratives are a singular, objective reality. This does not suggest that they are not grounded in verifiable research, but the products of research – data collection, analysis, and interpretation – are inherently reflective of some subjectivity and selectivity.

The limitation to the study has been that it has been a scoping; it has surveyed an extensive length of time and researched a geographic site – Buitengracht Street – that has not previously been discretely studied. Therefore, this has been a broad study, that once complete can be used to identify areas appropriate for further, in-depth study. Additionally, due to the lack of previous studies of Buitengracht Street, the thesis has examined the Buitengracht boundary by studying the spaces on either side of Buitengracht Street, and not focused only upon the street itself. Instead, the focus is on how Cape Town has been subjected to the divisions and distancing of 'boundary' alongside the Buitengracht; the search for evidence has looked beyond the space of Buitengracht Street itself in order to scope how boundary has been manifest along the Buitengracht.

Before continuing on to the specific methods employed in the research, and reason for choice of methods, I would like to add a note about reliability and triangulation: I have recognised the potential limits to the reliability of the data to be gathered, due to the subjectivity inherent in visual data such as maps and paintings. Often maps and paintings, when verified against other sources, are found to contain ‘inaccuracies’ (D11). I have attempted to verify any observations made from visual sources through triangulation with other visual sources and with secondary sources. There is a limit, unfortunately, to the extent that triangulation is productive when using visual representations of the Cape. It seems that many representations, particularly from the VOC period through to the mid-nineteenth century, were only slightly modified copies of earlier representations. For example, the map produced by George Thompson for *Travels in Southern Africa*, was reproduced and altered only slightly for the *1832 Almanac and Directory*. Therefore, any inaccuracies produced by Thompson were reproduced in the Street Directory, and may have continued to be for generations of maps to come. I believe this situation probably occurred numerous times, through numerous representations, and does inhibit the degree to which accuracy of representations are verifiable.
Research Question(s)

In researching the Buitengracht, the following critical question has been examined:

How did the spatial manifestations of social practices construct the Buitengracht 'boundary' in each narrative period? The research examines shifts of social practice paradigm - particularly political practices - between each period, and the resultant shift in spatial boundary manifestations from one period to the next.

In order to answer the above questions, the following issues have been examined:

- Historical context of boundaries in Cape Town, prior to the construction of the Buitengracht;
- Distinction between the Bo-Kaap and remainder of Cape Town, through both social practices and space;
- The production of locality and construction of identity in Cape Town, with an emphasis on understanding the Bo-Kaap, as the space-place distanced from the remainder of Cape Town through the construction of the Buitengracht boundary;
- Social practices productive of exclusion, distinction, and classification, undertaken by the different political authorities in Cape Town – the VOC, the British colonial administration, and the municipality;
- Social practices productive of exclusion, distinction and classification, occurring through economic practices and cultural practices, particularly religious practices;
- Spatial examination of Cape Town over the study period, looking
  1. at Buitengracht Street itself, and
  2. at the spaces on either side of Buitengracht Street.

For both spatial sets, I have examined both

a. The solid-void aspects of the space – the buildings and open space;

b. The events and inhabitation aspects of the space – building uses, uses of open and public space, leisure activities, legislation governing use of space, transportation practices, celebratory events.

Sources

The material gathered for the study has been of three primary types:

1. Visual material, representing the space of the Buitengracht and Cape Town.
   This has primarily consisted of maps, photographs, and paintings. The sources for visual material in Cape Town are collections at the Cape Archives, National Library of South Africa, Surveyor General's Office, museums in Cape Town, and in secondary sources, which range from social history books to artist monographs, such as *The Cape Sketchbooks of Sir Charles D'Oyly*.

2. Social history, of Cape Town.
   Social history has been primarily gathered through secondary sources. The possible sources are vast. I have focused upon three schools of thought:

   - Contemporary historical research, either completed in the post-apartheid era or critical of apartheid and colonising practices. This work has predominantly been undertaken by historians associated with the University of Cape Town and University of the Western Cape, such as Nigel Worden and Vivian Bickford-Smith.
   - Research concerned with the Bo-Kaap, predominantly by Achmat Davids and Lesley and Stephen Townsend.
   - Research concerned with Cape Town, often nineteenth century Cape Town, completed in the mid-twentieth century, as by Cornelius Pama and Hymen Picard. The historical subjectivity of these works may be problematic, but they provide rich descriptions of Cape Town's architectural fabric and cultural practices that have been very useful for the research.

A limitation to the research has been that primary sources have not been used in examining the related social history. The reason for this is that the data gathering focused upon primary visual material and the scope of the research effort did not render it feasible to also gather primary

128 Identity and locality will be elaborated upon, conceptually, later in this chapter.
FOCUS SITES
Wale Street
Riebeeck Square
Strand Street-Somerset Road
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social history research material. It was also not necessary or appropriate to focus the data gathering on the social history - the finding of social practices - as the study is an architectural one, and therefore the focus is upon examining primary evidence of spatial manifestations.

3. The space of Buitengracht Street and Cape Town itself.

Fortunately, I have been able to examine the space of Buitengracht Street itself during the course of the research. I observed the current (2005) manifestation of the street and adjacent areas - the solid/void aspects of the space, as well as the social practices at play in and manifested through the space. Whilst the observation of Buitengracht Street only directly relates to the fourth narrative, it brings insight relevant to earlier periods, directing the historical research. This is particularly related to the focus upon the Bo-Kaap, as the contemporary resistance to loss of legal boundary of the Bo-Kaap has inspired me to question historic iterations of boundary and historically how boundary has been constructed between the Bo-Kaap and remainder of Cape Town.

Method

The research focused upon the following topics and methods of investigation:

- The boundary precedents in Cape Town prior to the construction of the Buitengracht boundary. This was done through review of maps of Cape Town, looking for evidence of spatial constructions that demarcate a distinction between the VOC settlement and surrounding areas.
- The spatial distinction between each side of the Buitengracht during each period, and the shift from one period to the next, by looking for the urbanisation that occurred on the 'outside' of Buitengracht Street. This was done by examining maps and paintings, to see when and in what manner the area outside of Buitengracht Street was developed from farms or uncultivated land to urban blocks, or to see other types of spatial development that may have occurred.
- The spatial development of the Bo-Kaap, through examining secondary sources that describe the history of the Bo-Kaap, triangulating spatial evidence from secondary sources with visual documentary sources to ascertain when spatial productions occurred and the material form they took.
- The predominant social practices productive of exclusions, classifications and distinctions, and the shift in practices from one period to the next, through the use of secondary sources. Secondary sources have been examined for descriptions of practices, with a focus upon political practices and exclusions-distinctions-classifications along lines of race, class, and religion.
- The above findings (of social practices) were then examined in relation to visual data to look for corresponding spatial manifestations of those practices. The research method examined shifts in social practices, identified a spatial boundary manifestation of those shifts, and then developed the relationship, through the theoretical framework, between the social practice and spatial manifestation.
- The spatial development of Buitengracht Street itself has also been examined, through visual sources, looking for shifts to the space which may indicate shifts in social practices and practices of exclusion.
- A selection of representative sites have been chosen as focus spaces for the analysis of findings. These are Wale Street, Riebeeck Square and St. Stephen's Church, and the space along Buitengracht Street, from Strand Street to Somerset Road (D12). These three spaces have been the focus for mapping – measuring and presenting – findings, so to illuminate how boundary spatial manifestations change over time and along the length of Buitengracht Street. The three were chosen for their significant open space qualities, and thereby the forum they provide for public life in Cape Town.

130 Chas Goad, Insurance Plan of Cape Town (London, 1925).
Research Operations: Finding the Walker of the Buitengracht

Traditional architectural histories predominantly focus upon the solid and void aspects of space—the built fabric. The challenge for finding methodological alternatives to traditional architectural histories is seeing all four aspects—solid, void, events and people—as well as seeing them in relation to social practices. In this way, the subject of the study has been dialectic space, as opposed to architectural fabric. In working towards doing so, I have used de Certeau's proposition of 'walking the city' as a muse. The intent of the research has been to find both the bird's eye view and the walker of the Buitengracht, as the two components of the spatial dialectic.

Duality has been used as a theme in the operations of the research: duality of space and social practices, and duality in the compilation and analysis of knowledge production. I have simultaneously worked from two directions: from compiling the practices occurring in each epoch, and from drawing the space of the Buitengracht, as maps and sections. I have organised knowledge of social practices into the six epochs, and within each epoch identified significant events, then divided practices into political, economic and cultural. This enables seeing the social practices of an epoch in its entirety, including contradictory practices. From the epoch practices, I have identified spatial shifts that correspond to the social practices. The other method has been to begin with space: to construct my own maps and sections that compile the data gathered from visual and written sources in order to re-present the spatial story of the Buitengracht for each epoch or period. The two methods together construct a dialectic research methodology: writing the Buitengracht boundary history from space and from social practices.

Locating the Operations: Colonialism, Identity and the Production of Locality

The operations developed have been in response to a desire to find techniques for architectural research that address issues of identity and enable engaging the production of locality in architectural research. The operations also stem from the use of post-colonial theory and desire to find an architectural application of the theoretical position.

Post-colonial theory has been applied to the research in two ways: in the choice to examine a boundary space as the topic of study, and in the critical examination of social practices and their spatial manifestation. I have found in my examination of post-colonial theory that its application (in the context of research) as a critical mechanism is most fruitfully applied to systems of production, rather than to built artefacts. Therefore, the research method has been structured to uncover the systems of the production of the space of the Buitengracht as a boundary, and to conversely use the space as a text through which to uncover and critique the social practices manifested. A post-colonial critique will not be applied to the space, in a discrete manner, but rather to the social practices that have been spatially manifested.

Space— and thus architecture— may be used as a text through which to read identity. Space provides a measure for constructing and reading identity: I am who I am because I live here, I work there... The study of the Buitengracht attempts to enable the reading of identities in Cape Town, through examining the space of the Buitengracht as a manifestation of social practices and therefore as a process. Significantly, however, it is not static identities that the research attempts to uncover but rather identifications, or the process by which identities are constructed.

A concept introduced by Appadurai that further elucidates how identity can be seen in regards to space is locality. Locality is not a spatial entity, but rather a structure of feeling:

---

131 The term 'predominantly' is used as a qualifier; for example, the study of typology also examines the use of buildings.
132 The choice to examine a boundary, and its application to post-colonial theory, has been discussed in Chapter 4.
133 I have found, in my literature review, that often post-colonial critiques of architecture have applied to representations of architectures, rather than built artefact. I would like to reiterate that I am intentionally not engaging with examining or critiquing the representations of the Buitengracht boundary, but rather using representations to build uncover how the Buitengracht manifested 'boundary'. For related literature review, see Nathan and Wong, postcolonial spaces; Borden and Rendell, Intersections.
I view locality as primarily relational and contextual rather than as scalar or spatial. I see it as a phenomenological quality, constituted by a series of links between the sense of social immediacy, the technologies of interactivity, and the relativity of contexts.\footnote{Arjun Appadurai, Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 178.}

Locality is a fluid entity, being both context derivative - formed in relation to contexts - and context generative - forming contexts themselves. As contexts can, and always do, change, so too are localities fluid. Contexts may be ecological, social, or even cosmological. Again, though, locality is not spatial; the production of local knowledge seeks to produce human subjects, not material spaces. However, like in all social practices, space is a dimension of the production of locality. Appadurai labels the spatial dimension as the "spaciotemporal production of locality"\footnote{Ibid., 180.}. This "spaciotemporal" production includes:

- techniques for naming places, for protecting fields, animals, and other reproductive spaces and resources, for marking seasonal change and agricultural rhythms, for properly situating new houses and wells, for appropriately demarcating boundaries...\footnote{Ibid.}

This research, in looking at the processes through which the Buitengracht has been produced, is an examination of the spaciotemporal production of locality.

This suggests looking at the subject of the study as a production of localities. As stated in the introduction, the Buitengracht is singular in its geographical location, but multivalent in its boundary manifestations. The social story the research has uncovered is of the productions of localities that have occurred through the Buitengracht boundary. Because locality is fluid, because it both generates and derives from contexts, it is necessary to develop operations which identifies contexts, which recognises fluidity in space, and which sees the spatial subject as a product of generative process rather than as an artefact in and of itself.

Navigating the Narratives

Two points need to made regarding reading the subsequent narratives: one is the conflation of six epochs into four periods, and the second is the use of images in the narratives.

The six epochs have been conflated into the four periods in order to draw together similar practices, and facilitate reading the history of the Buitengracht as a continuum. I have established a nuanced distinction between an epoch and a period: an epoch represents a distinct set of practices, whilst a period is a longer set of historical time and one marked by more contradictory and nuanced sets of practices. The conflation from epoch to period has particularly affected two sets of epochs: Epochs 1 and 2 have been conflated into period 1, and epochs 4 and 5 conflated into period 3. I have come to see both Epoch 1 and Epoch 2 (both under the VOC) as operating under similar colonial systems, with similar social practices at play (although it is recognized that the shift that separated the two epochs from refreshment station to colonial settlement is distinctive). Similarly, I perceive that both Epochs 4 and 5 are actually manifestations of modernism, and although apartheid is an incredibly significant practice, the social practices and their spatial manifestations of Epoch 5 are an outgrowth and intensification of the practices of Epoch 4. Therefore, the history of the Buitengracht has been divided into four periods and will be told through four narratives:

- 1652-1794 | 'Bounding' the VOC Settlement (a conflation of Epochs 1 and 2),
- 1795-1899 | In Support of the British Empire (Epoch 3),
- 1900-1993 | Representations of Space (conflating Epochs 4 and 5), and

The second navigational explanation is the use of images. As mentioned earlier, the research has been undertaken through the act of drawing maps and sections; it is therefore follows that the presentation of the research should also be visual and graphic. Therefore, the narratives will be told through both text and images. Images are found on left-hand pages, labelled 'D' (diagram), while the written story on right-hand pages. The visual presentation of images provides a means of telling a story in another medium, one which hopefully elucidates the story further as well as allows for deeper readings. The inclusion of images documents the research process, thereby rendering the research methods more transparent in the...
communicating of the findings. The images which are included as illustrations to the argument are aligned to the lower-right hand side of the page. The mappings, which are methods of data analysis and productive of knowledge on their own, are aligned to the upper-left side of the page. It is hoped that the inclusion and integration of images with text will contribute towards the development of a non-traditional architectural historiography.
6 NARRATIVE ONE

1652-1794 | ‘BOUNDING’ THE VOC SETTLEMENT

The first period of boundary making at the Cape is characterised by the practice of
signifying the settlement as something ‘Other’ than and separate from the
wilderness from which it was surrounded. This practice was necessary in order to
manifest the VOC imperial project: in order to realise the economic goals of trade
and wealth accumulation, a colony distinct and distanced from its surroundings
would have to be constructed. Constructing such distance was both a spatial and
social project; it involved the classification of identities, realised through the location
of social practices in space. The emergence of Cape Town as a coherent
settlement relied upon boundaries manifesting the construction of coloniser versus
colonised identity. As the settlement grew into a formally recognized colony, the
boundary practices grew in scale, both spatially and in degree of social complexity.
By the time the Buitengracht boundary was constructed, in the latter half of the
eighteenth century, it operated as one boundary amongst a field of devices,
manifesting practices concerned with defining identities and the parameters of the
town.

In order to begin to examine the Buitengracht boundary, it must be seen in the larger context of boundaries at
the Cape. The primary use of boundaries in this period was the manifestation of political and cultural
practices: who and which sets of practices were excluded from the VOC settlement in order to maintain
political control and identity as a VOC domain. Boundaries were reflective of negotiations and contestations of
power, subjecting all identities - KhoiSan, slaves, free-burghers,137, as well as employees of the VOC - to
exclusionary practices.

First Colonising Practices | First Boundary Manifestations

The Cape encountered by European colonists was not an empty landscape138; it was full – of human practices,
as well as flora and fauna – and was ‘wild’. From their first moment at the Cape, the VOC expedition
attempted to distance itself from this wilderness. There was wild game – bucks, lions, elephants and much
more – roaming the land. Khoi pastoralists traversed the landscape along seasonal transhumance routes, a
practice ‘Other’ to and incompatible with the European practice of establishing permanent and urban
settlements.139 The flora of the Cape had not been subject to cultivation prior to colonial settlement, and so
was ‘unproductive’ in the sense of providing fresh food. Whilst this landscape, both environmental and social,
was ‘wild’ and foreign to the colonists, it was not empty. Politically, power struggles occurred between
different Khoi groups, such as the Gorachouqua and Goringhaiqua, over access to scarce resources, such as
transhumance routes, livestock herds - the agent and measure of Khoi wealth – and access to fresh water.140

The first marks made by the VOC expedition were to separate themselves from, and therefore provide means
of controlling, this wilderness. Van Riebeeck was directed by the Heeren XVII to construct a fort and a garden
at the Cape; both tasks were initiated within the expedition’s first month at the Cape (D14.1). Construction of
the Fort was the first task tackled. The Fort was necessary in order to assert the VOC’s claim over the land, in

137 Private citizens; those people granted freedom from service by the VOC.
139 Worden et. al., Cape Town, 12, 16.
140 Elphick, “The Khoisan to c. 1770,” 6-7.

2. Growth of the settlement: from the Fort and Gardens to the first farms along the Liesbeeck River. Source: Worden et al., Cape Town, 30.

3. Growth of the settlement into a colony: expansion into the Hottentot Mountains, construction of the town of Stellenbosch, and the eventual remainder of the colony beyond. Source: CA 44/873.
regards to both indigenous inhabitants and rival European powers. Symbolically it asserted dominance over the landscape; pragmatically it protected the vulnerable VOC from a "wild" and potentially hostile environment. The Fort communicated the dominance of the VOC to those on both land and at sea, and enabled communicating — or naming — that which was under VOC control:

At their first encounter the Cochoqua "came with thousands of cattle grazing in the vicinity of the fort, indeed almost entering the gate and being kept out of the gardens with difficulty." In February 1655, "...it happened that about 50 of these natives wanted to put up their huts close to the banks of the moat of our fortress, and when told in a friendly manner by our men to go a little further away,"

Once construction of the Fort had commenced, Van Riebeeck set out to establish a garden, thereby manifesting the role of the settlement in the VOC's larger imperial project. The Gardens changed the nature of the Cape from an unbound, undivided — in the western sense — landscape, unmarked by property divisions to a cultivated, and therefore, colonised landscape. Pragmatically, the Gardens provided fresh produce for passing ships, assisting in lowering the sickness and mortality rates amongst the long journeys from Europe to eastern colonies. This increased productivity of ships' crews and thus the profit of the commercial imperial project as a whole. The Gardens also instrumentalized the permanence of European settlement at the Cape. Particularly as the first Fort was structurally weak and subject to erosion (and later replaced by the more robust Castle), it was the agricultural cultivation that left a lasting imprint on the Cape landscape.

The Gardens, since named the Company Gardens, cemented the spatial development of the future town. Laid out in a rectangular grid, surrounded and bisected by irrigating canals, the Gardens set the model for the organisation of city streets and rainwater control, one based firmly on European practices. The Gardens also cemented the separation of the settlement from the wilderness: A thorn hedge and grachts circumscribed the Gardens, creating one of the first colonial boundaries at the Cape: the boundary of the wilderness/rural couplet. The boundaries manifested, both symbolically and pragmatically, the colonising social practices occurring at the Cape. Symbolically, they distinguished between the wilderness and the settlement, between the 'Other' and the colonised space, possessing the land through cultivation. Pragmatically, the boundaries manifested exclusion. They barred all other than Company employees from the Gardens, and even employees were only permitted entry for the purpose of labour. The intents of exclusion were primarily pragmatic — the Gardens did suffer from foraging, particularly by roaming animals and visiting soldiers. Such exclusions, though, also rendered the Gardens a (contested) space of VOC power: contested because every practice asserting power is potentially subject to reactionary assertions.

The first few years of agricultural production in the Company Gardens produced disappointing yields. In an attempt to raise productivity, Jan van Riebeeck proposed to release some of the VOC's employees and place some farming efforts in their hands, on the mineral-rich lands east of Table Mountain, along the Liesbeeck River. His hope was that personal economic motivation and the possibility for expansive (rather than intensive) farming on larger tracks of land would lead to higher productivity. The first farms along the Liesbeeck set into motion broad expansion of the settlement, expansion which locally set the limits of the future southern suburbs of Cape Town and globally would eventually become manifest in practices such as the Great Trek and colonisation of all of (future) South Africa by European powers.

141 Worden, "Space and Identity," 74.
143 The role of cultivation in the imperial project is discussed in Ashcroft, Post-Colonial Transformation, 163.
144 Noeleen Murray, "Imperial Landscape and Cape Town’s Gardens" (Master's thesis, University of Cape Town, 2001), 2-4.
145 waterways, specifically used as irrigation canals
146 Worden, "Space and Identity," 77.
147 Foucault, "Body/Power," 56-57.
148 "A freeburgher remained a subject, though not an employee, of the VOC; he acquired certain economic freedoms of which the most important was the right to own land." The first freeburghers were the precursors to private citizens of the Cape. See Leonard Guelke, "The white settlers, 1652-1790," in The Shaping of South African Socioc 1652-1820, 45.
149 Table Valley, where the VOC located the Fort and Gardens, is rather steep and small, and therefore only provided opportunity for garden plots rather than large-scale farming.
150 Worden et. al., Cape Town, 25.
The 'Buitenv' Streets, marking the edges of Kaapstad.
Source: Warden et al., Cape Town, 41.
However, the Liesbeeck River farms were located on land traversed by the Khoi on their transhumance routes. Conflict over access to resources and incompatible conceptions of land usage arose between the Dutch settlers and Khoi. In response, Van Riebeeck ordered a hedge of almonds to be constructed around the perimeter of land holdings, thereby rendering the space of the colonists symbolically and physically impenetrable.

Various proposals were made to stake out physically the mapped space of fort, gardens and farms as protection against Khoi 'intrusions'. In a striking reflection of the company's predilection for islands, far removed from threatening and untamed hinterlands, the VOC directors recommended the digging of a channel between the Salt and Liesbeeck rivers, cutting right down to False Bay – a scheme which Van Riebeeck soon declared to be impracticable. Instead, he ordered the planting of 'bitter almond trees and all sorts of fast-growing brambles and thorn bushes' along the boundaries of the farms, including the outlying land he had appropriated for his own use on the site of modern Wynberg.

The almond hedge was the first linear boundary mark made upon the landscape, a mark that deliberately excluded the Khoi from the space of the Cape through prevention of their practices of livelihood. However, it would not be the last of such boundary marks.

Creating a Town – Distancing Urban from Rural

Gradually, the settlement at the Cape grew from the origins of Fort and Gardens into a colonial town. The free-burghers developed roots at the Cape, making it their home, and eventually the VOC accepted that the Cape was to be a permanent settlement. The practices that shaped the space of the town manifested two agendas – distancing the urban from the rural, and assertion of control of the VOC over non-VOC identities. Both agendas subjected different groups of people – Khoi, slaves and free-burghers – to negotiations and potential exclusions from the space of the emerging town. Different identities experienced different types of VOC control: slaves and free-burghers were integrated into the practices of both the rural and urban, but subjected to VOC hierarchical control within those spatial realms. The practices of the Khoi, however, were declared incompatible with VOC colonisation at the Cape and were thereby completely excluded:

In 1656 the Dutch were more assertive, telling the Goringhaiqua to move their cattle 'further behind the Lion Mountain ... out of sight of the Company's settlement'. When Autshumato asked in July 1657 'where he and the Kaapmans were to live and graze their cattle now that we were ploughing the land everywhere, they were told to remain where they were now living, that is in the country towards the mountain range in the interior'. This attempt to break down the transhumance cycle would, as Autshumato pointed out, lead to disaster.

As conceptual Kaapstad ('Cape Town') emerged, its identity was reinforced as a discrete space, distinct from the rural - and wild - surrounds. Traditionally, in other European settlements, walls and moats were constructed to bound urban settlements. At the Cape, however, the bounding devices were more symbolically ambiguous and spatially permeable; streets were named to mark the perimeter of the town. The operation of naming rather than constructing physical barriers speaks of the reliance of the town upon rural practices. Whilst the town itself was a place of economic exchange rather than rural production, it relied upon those rural practices - farming, animal husbandry, and fishing - in order to support the daily practices of the town. The boundary streets signified the distinction between the 'inside' urban and 'outside' rural, yet their permeability enabled the interdependent and intimate relationship of exchange between the two places.

Three boundary streets were named to identify Kaapstad: Buitenkant Street at the eastern side of town, Buitensingel at the southern side, and Buitengracht at the western edge (the fourth edge was the sea) (D15). Buiten in Dutch, means 'out', and the three streets indicate the different spatial conditions used to designate 'out': Buitenkant means the outer edge, Buitensingel the outer crescent (Buitensingel Road curves around the

---

151 Traditionally, the European, Western conception of land is ‘property’ to be owned and controlled, whereas the Khoi (like many First Nations people) did not believe in, nor practice, individual or collective land ownership. See Worden et. al., Cape Town, 16-17.
152 Ibid., 24-25.
153 Ibid., 25.
154 In 1661, Riebeeck was rebuked by the Company directors for the tendency for establishing a town and expanding the colony. See Worden et. al., Cape Town, 27.
155 Ibid., 23.
156 Kaapstad was the named used by residents and visitors. By the mid-eighteenth century, Kaapstad replaced the more ambiguous Cabo ('the Cape'), indicating recognition of an urban settlement. Ibid., 36.
1. The Boerenplein: wagons entered Cape Town at the patrol guard house adjacent to the Castle, walked down to Strand Street, along the length of Strand Street to the Buitengracht, up Buitengracht to the Boerenplein, where the wagons and carts were 'stiffened', while goods were bought and sold in the market square. The length of Strand Street, from the Castle (Buitenkant Street) to Buitengracht Street marked the breadth of the urban settlement, as opposed to the rural areas and wilderness. Sources: Base Map: NLSA KCA 1997 Map; Wagon Image: The Cape Sketchbooks of Sir Charles D'Oyly 1832-1833, 5.

2. The Roggebaai 'breachfront', a zone 'outside' or limited to the town of fishing, fishmarket, and wagon traffic. Source: The Cape Sketchbooks of Sir Charles D'Oyly 1832-1833, 116.
southern edge of the Company Gardens), and Buitengracht refers to the outer water channel. The different names indicate the different boundary qualities and relationship with the rural wilderness on each side of the town. Buitenkant, the street adjacent to the Castle, represents the symbolic edge of the town; the name alone indicates boundary without reliance upon a spatial device. Buitensingel and Buitengracht 158, however, both utilise a spatial device; the different spatial devices communicate the nature of the town at each side. Buitensingel Street becomes a bridge between the town and suburban development at its edge, whilst the water channel of Buitengracht predicts a space of regional connections, bordered by agricultural and utilitarian development.

As the rural areas outside of the town were granted to free-burghers and not farmed directly by the VOC, those spaces increasingly became a realm outside of the direct political control of the VOC. Whilst the boundaries between the rural and urban were spatially permeable, entry to town was controlled: the rural was potentially subject to contamination by the wilderness of the pre-colonised Cape, and this contamination was to be prevented from entering the urban, VOC space. The rural also threatened VOC power through the different identities constructed outside of the town: Khoi identity was constructed through the inhabitation of the rural wilds, free-burghers asserted growing independence while outside the surveillance of the VOC, and any space not under VOC surveillance was a potential refuge for escaped slaves. Controlled access to the town, through spatial devices such as the Castle and watchtower 159, subjected those contested identities to the exclusionary practices of the VOC, thereby assisting in practices negotiating the centralising power of the VOC at the Cape.

Once goods and people from rural areas did enter the town, their access was restricted and controlled. Rural practices were limited through travel restrictions: oxen and wagons were only permitted to pass along two streets in town in order to limit the contamination of urban streets by the farm. 160 They entered into town along Strand Street - after passing the patrol guard house at the Castle - and walked the breadth of the town, then turned up Buitengracht Street and walked up until the Boerenplein 161 (known today as Riebeeck Square), where the wagons were parked. Goods for market were then carried a few blocks down Longmarket Street to the Market Square, whilst the oxen and wagons were left ‘parked’ at the Boerenplein (D16.1). The other rural productions and identities, particularly those related to fishing and seafaring, were also subject to exclusions from the town. The beachfront (fourth boundary of the town) became the ‘unsavoury’ zone of fishing activities of cleaning and selling fish (D16.2). The image of the beachfront as unsavoury - and thereby excluded – was reinforced by the density of taverns and rented rooms in the area. Strand Street constructed distance between this space and the urban, centre of the town – between the space of consumption and the space of production.

The location of productive agricultural lands in relation to the town boundaries particularly manifested the power contestations between the VOC and free-burghers. The Company Gardens, which served the VOC (both stocking passing ships with fresh produce and feeding company employees whilst in service at the Cape), were located within the limits of the town, with the upper edge of the Gardens forming one of the town’s boundaries (Buitensingel Street). Conversely, private farms and Gardens, belonging to free-burghers, were located outside – outside of the control of the VOC and outside the spatial boundaries of the town. At the larger scale of the settlement, the Liesbeeck River farms formed part of rural, ‘outside’ terrain (leading towards latter expansive development in Stellenbosch and Drakenstein) 162 (D14.2-3). At the smaller scale of the urban town, the boundaries of the town demarcated the space between the private gardens and the urban grid of the

158 This indicates that perhaps Buitengracht was not as coherent a boundary as Buitenkant, a quality that allows the opportunity for speculative and imaginative conceptions of its boundary manifestation.
159 Worden, "Space and Identity," 76.
160 This was done by edict of the Governor Simon Van Der Stel, in 1687. See Hymen Picard, Gentleman’s Walk: The romantic story of Cape Town’s oldest streets, lanes and squares (Cape Town: C. Stroika, 1968), 18.
162 Worden, 'Space and Identity', 74.
1. The Parade Grounds: a distancing space between the Castle and the town.
   Map Source: Woodin et al., Cape Town, 41.

2. Washerwomen on the slopes of Table Mountain, constructing identity 'outside' the town.
   Source: Pama, Regency Cape Town, 13.
town (D15). Buitengracht particularly manifested the boundary - between the urban grid spaces of the town and rural market gardens climbing up the slopes of Signal Hill.

Devices of Control – Boundaries within the Settlement

Boundaries were not only constructed to distinguish between the town and the surrounding wilderness and rural, but also as devices within the town manifesting practices of power and negotiations for control of the settlement. Similar to the periphery boundaries, the practices manifested through internal boundaries also concerned the contestations and negotiations of VOC power in relation ‘Other’ identities at the Cape, manifesting the larger VOC imperial project.

Discussion of internal boundaries, particularly those concerned with VOC power, must begin with the Castle. Construction was begun on the (stone) Castle in 1664 to replace vulnerable mud Fort. Not only was the new structure more robust, it was also located further east, in a location commanding attention from both land and sea.\textsuperscript{163} A watch station was located at the junction of Buitenkant and the Castle, commanding control over entry into the town from the East. A \textit{plein}, or parade ground, deliberately separated the Castle from the growing town, thereby manifesting distancing between the VOC and all other life at the Cape (D17.1). The Parade Grounds and Castle rendered the VOC as distanced from daily life at the Cape.\textsuperscript{164} The Castle provided a single defensive building within which the Company could consolidate and “huddle” official residences, employee sleeping quarters, storehouses and administrative offices.\textsuperscript{164} The Parade Grounds provided a space for military and disciplinary activities – a clear space in view of the entire settlement. The prominence of the Castle and Parade Grounds – the first spaces seen by visitors arriving from both sea and land – and their spatial distance from the town provided opportunity for exercising control through exclusion. Crossing the threshold between the Parade Grounds and the moat surrounding the Castle required permission from the VOC - both symbolically and in practice. The location of the Castle and Parade also constructed the edge of the urban settlement, dictating the development of the space of Cape Town for centuries to come.

Military control formed a strong spatial theme at the Cape. In addition to the Parade Grounds and Castle, a network of batteries reinforced the defensive strength (both symbolically and practically) of the VOC. The batteries, located along the coast and inland between the perimeter of the town and the surrounding rural areas, reinforced the Cape landscape as one of contestation for control, one where exclusions were practiced - even if the primary use of the batteries was military contestation with rival European nations.

Control - and thus, exclusion - was most significantly practiced through daily rituals at the Cape. As the town grew, formal zoning (town planning) and informal planning practices shaped where certain practices were permitted and where they were forbidden. The centre of the town was reinforced as the zone of VOC control, where institutions such as the Dutch Reformed Church, Slave Lodge and Hospital were located. This was in contrast to the liminal practices, which were kept to the periphery. Taverns and lodging houses were kept to the edge of town closest to the sea (and later the Buitengracht edge)\textsuperscript{165}. Spaces ‘outside’ of the town were claimed by practices through which subaltern identities were constructed, outside of view of the coloniser. Table Mountain became a space for both runaway slaves and washerwomen (D17.2), the latter performing a duty in employment of the colonisers, the former escaping control of the colonisers. For both groups, the Mountain was a zone through which to contest the control of the VOC and colonisation in general through the lack of supervision and visual control.

One of the least ambiguous means of controlling bodies – and thereby ordering the settlement – was through punishment.\textsuperscript{166} The Company wielded a heavy hand at the Cape, attempting to control most every aspect of society, not least of which its employees. Company soldiers lived a harsh life, enjoying few freedoms more

\textsuperscript{163} Worden et. al., Cape Town, 17.
\textsuperscript{164} Worden, “Space and Identity,” 74-76.
\textsuperscript{165} ibid, 83-85.
Buitenkant Street marked a different sort of boundary than Buitengracht Street, distancing the Castle and rural settlements from the town, while Buitengracht Street distanced the market gardens from town and provided connection to settlement of Camps Bay on the Atlantic Ocean. Source: CNM/123.
than slaves did. All residents and visitors at the Cape were subject to the harsh punishments meted out by the Company. The ultimate space of punishment, Gallow’s Hill, was located beyond the Buitengracht boundary, outside of the urban settlement, at the foot of Signal Hill (D19.2). The execution ground was positioned outside the settlement, yet its location near the water’s edge placed it in clear view of all entering the Cape from the sea, serving as a constant reminder of the repercussions for committing prohibited acts.

Emergence of the Buitengracht - Demarcating ‘Inside’ | ‘Outside’

It was within the context of practices of exclusion that the Buitengracht emerged as a boundary in Cape Town. The initial role of the Buitengracht was to mark the edge of the town, to manifest practices of demarcating the extent of the urban Kaapstad, distancing it from ‘Other’ spaces at the Cape. If this initial role was to distance the urban from the rural, it quickly came to manifest practices of exclusion within the town, as society inside Cape Town became further and further segregated and divided between different identities and sets of practices.

In comparison to Buitenkant Street, the Buitengracht has been a boundary of liminality since its conception. Buitenkant Street emerged between the Castle and the Parade Grounds (D18), marking the boundary between the town and its administration, as well as between the town and the wilderness beyond. Buitenkant was also located on the same side of the Company Gardens as most other political institutions. Conversely, Buitengracht Street marked the boundary to the side of Cape Town predominantly inhabited by free-burghers and institutions of commerce - rather than political administration. Its proximity to the sea also rendered Buitengracht less necessary than Buitenkant as a boundary between urban and rural. These comparisons do not serve to devalue Buitengracht as a boundary, but rather compel a more imaginative and speculative examination of the space, and deeper probing into the practices of exclusion of the colony.

Initially, Buitengracht’s spatial manifestation developed in relation to urban infrastructure and topography. In the latter part of the eighteenth century, a gracht was built to divert rainwater run-off from Signal Hill (then called Lion’s Rump) from flooding the streets of the town. From examination of maps, it can be deduced that the gracht was constructed at that particular location because it was the furthest edge of the developed town, the edge of the expanse of the urban grid of streets. Additionally, as one moves further northwest, the slope of the land becomes quite steep; Buitengracht marks the (somewhat ambiguous) bottom of Signal Hill.

In addition to the task of channelling rainwater, the Buitengracht provided a regional transport connection, a link between the future suburban growth along the Atlantic coast of the Cape and the urban settlement of Cape Town. This boundary manifestation relates to the conception of boundary as a "zone of negotiation"a, a connection between here and there. As urban infrastructure, the Buitengracht has acted as connector since its inception. As early as 1770, Camp’s Bay, has been an outpost along the coast; the path to Camp’s Bay over the Kloof Nek, was located in direct line with the route of the Buitengracht (D18). A breakage in the route did occur just above the top of the gracht, only to be completed in the twentieth century with the extension of New Church Street. This break did enable the entrance to the settlement – from the Atlantic - to be located in the centre rather than at the periphery. Even as Buitengracht Street linked the future iterations of inside/outside of suburbs – Camp’s Bay – to the centre - Cape Town - it remained a periphery space in the structure of the settlement.

If the Buitengracht served as a linking and negotiating device along its length, to traverse it was to cross a boundary between the urban and rural. Thereby the Buitengracht became a boundary in complimentary negotiation with other boundary operations in Cape Town. Rural spaces were only permitted on the ‘outside’ of Buitengracht; these were free burgher owned market garden spaces, producing goods for sale (to other free

---

Since Buitenkant and Buitengracht were parallel boundaries, and may have been originally symmetrically located in relation to the Company Gardens, they can be directly compared, temporarily ignoring Buitensingel in the field of boundaries.  

Borden, "Thick edge," 221.
1 Waal Street, connecting the urban 'inside' to rural 'outside', with Buitengracht as the boundary distancing the Company Gardens from private Burgher market gardens: spaces and practices that negotiate VOC assertions of power. Sources:

2 Spaces of bodily control: Burial Grounds and Gallow's Hill, both located outside the Buitengracht boundary.

3 Spaces of religion: Christian institutions - the Dutch Reformed Church and the Lutheran Church located inside the Buitengracht boundary, whilst the quarry appropriated for Islamic worship, as an open-air mosque, was located outside the Buitengracht. Map Source (for all maps): NLDA KCA 1797 Map.
burghers) at the market square (Greenmarket Square). The Wale Street mapping, D19, shows the Schotse Kloof farm climbing up Signal Hill along (the future) Wale Street, and Stadzicht along (the also future) Longmarket and Shortmarket streets. Wale Street, crossing Buitengracht Street, traversed between the Schotse Kloof farm and Company Gardens, reinforcing the distinction between cultivation by and serving the VOC, and that by private free-burgher citizens. In the future, Wale Street would continue to provide a potent view into the boundary quality of the Buitengracht through the different spaces and practices it linked on the two sides of the boundary.

Boundary was also a manifestation of those practices indicative of lived reality of settlements, practices Michel Foucault proposes manifest through ‘heterotopias’. Foucault distinguishes between utopia and heterotopia as the two ends of the spectrum of the types of contemporary (post-Medieval) spatial productions. Utopias are the arrangements without space, representing perfect, unreal conditions. At the other end of the spectrum of societal arrangements are heterotopias – those arrangements “absolutely other with respect to the arrangements that they reflect.” It is between the two extremes that society understands itself. Heterotopic spaces may be those spaces of crisis: “privileged or sacred or forbidden places that are reserved for the individual who finds himself in a state of crisis with respect to the society or the environment in which he lives”. They may also be spaces of deviance, such as prisons or place of any activity considered deviant to the societal norm. Heterotopic spaces are requisite components of societal arrangements, but also requisite spatially separate. Thus, a boundary manifests distancing heterotopias from the societal and spatial centre. The Buitengracht boundary most certainly did so: it distanced two heterotopic spaces - the burial grounds and the execution grounds – from the inside of the settlement, indicating their location outside. Foucault speaks of cemeteries as ‘other’ to ordinary cultural spaces, yet connected to all locations in the city: every citizen has relatives in cemeteries, and every citizen eventually is laid to rest in cemeteries as well. The ‘otherness’ of cemeteries relates to the ‘obsession with death as sickness’, death spreads sickness, so must be kept separate from the city of the house and the church - the city of everyday practices. Similarly, the execution ground is also a space of death. Even more intensely, it also is a space of behavioural deviance; its location at the Cape was also ‘outside’ the Buitengracht, but even further out than the burial grounds. (D19.2)

As Cape Town grew and the cultural dimension of social practices became more differentiated, religion began to play a role in distinguishing between different identities (D19.3). Since the time of its appearance, Buitengracht street, as a boundary, marked the location of religious institutions, manifesting exclusionary practices. The Lutheran Church was the first Christian denomination permitted at the Cape other than the Dutch Reformed Church. The Dutch Reform Church was located in the centre of the town, on the Heerengracht, nearly adjacent to the edge of the Company Gardens. The Lutheran Church, however, was located at the periphery of the urban settlement, on the corner of Strand and Buitengracht Streets. Its location on the periphery of the town speaks of the power of the VOC: the Dutch Reformed Church, although administratively independent from the VOC, could be considered the religious arm to the VOC’s corporate core in Dutch society. The Lutheran Church posed a potential threat to the hegemony of the Dutch Reformed Church, and subsequently to the VOC; it was therefore relegated to the periphery of the town. However, non-Christianity formed an even greater religious threat to the VOC identity of the Cape. Therefore, the location of the Lutheran church on the inside of the Buitengracht reinforces its reading as a boundary; we shall see this through the location of non-Christianity – Islam - outside the Buitengracht.

One of the significant cultural dimensions of Cape society has been the presence of Islam. Islam first arrived at the Cape through exiled political prisoners from Batavia and other eastern VOC colonies. Speculations

---

169 Lesley Townsend and Stephen Townsend, Bokkap Faces and Facades: A Record of the Passing Scene in Cape Town's Malay Quarter with a Brief Account of its Architecture and the Muslim Inhabitants (Cape Town: Howard B Timmins, 1977), 7.
171 Ibid.
172 For example, the inactivity of the elderly is considered deviant in contemporary society.
173 Foucault, "Of Other Spaces," 423.
174 Buitengracht Street first appears on maps as a discrete space, as the edge of the urban grid, around 1770.
175 Worden et. al., Cape Town, 43.
Waalendorp - the origins of the Bo-Kaap

1 Location of Waalendorp, at intersection of Wale Street and Builengraaff Street.
Source: Worden cc al., Cape Town, 41.

2-3 Typical elevation of Bo-Kaap street: drawing, above, and photograph, below.
Source: J. Townsend and Townsend, Bo-Kaap Potters and Pavers, 14, fig. 7.

4 Plans of typical houses in Bo-Kaap
Left: one-bay house
Right: double-bay house
Source: Ibid., 18.
arise as to why Islam took such a strong hold at the Cape, predominantly amongst slaves and 'free Blacks'; one theory is that Islam formed a resistance to the hegemonic Christianity of slave owners, both the VOC as an institution and individual private owners. Islamic teachings began in the Slave Lodge, and metaphorically spread from there towards Signal Hill, subversively out of sight of VOC rule. The early Islamic gatherings were one of the first significant cultural practices outside of the town: the first 'mosque' at the Cape was the disused stone quarry on the slopes of Signal Hill, just outside the Buitengracht boundary. Once more formalised, Islamic worship moved from out-of-doors to private homes and warehouses, to buildings located along the Buitengracht. As we shall see, the home of Islam at the Cape, and in South Africa, became the Bo-Kaap - a space and a place intricately linked to the Buitengracht boundary.

'Outside' the Buitengracht - Growth of the Bo-Kaap

The Bo-Kaap, a neighbourhood on the slopes of Signal Hill, was to become one of the most notable spaces in Cape Town, and its identity was consistently connected to the Buitengracht boundary. The neighbourhood grew out of the subdivision of the Schotse Kloof farm, at the corner of Buitengracht and Wale Streets. In 1760 Jan de Waal purchased the portion of the farm adjacent to the urban streets, and upon the property built huurhuisjes (houses for rent) — calling the residential development 'Waalendorp'. Constructed as rental housing for visiting French soldiers, the de Waal development initiated the development of the Bo-Kaap as a dense neighbourhood of rental row houses, inhabited by identities 'other' to the ruling colonists.

The construction of Waalendorp occurred within the context of expansive residential development in Cape Town in the latter third of the eighteenth century, as Cape Town's population swelled with visiting foreign soldiers. England and Holland were at war in Europe, and France and Spain entered into the conflict as allies of the Dutch. The colonies in the East were potential prizes to be won, and control of the Cape a key to maintaining successful trading routes; thus, a French garrison was stationed at the Cape in order to protect their Dutch ally's imperial interests. The French garrison included over 2000 soldiers, soldiers in need of shelter, food, clothing and entertainment. The potential economic profits to be made from serving the soldiers lured artisans to Cape Town. The first huurhuisjes potentially not only soldiers, but also those artisans: smiths, millers, butchers, carpenters, shoemakers, and general traders. We shall see that not only did Waalendorp set the stage for the spatial development of the Bo-Kaap, but its artisanal inhabitation was to continue for centuries to come as well.

These first houses, half the width of typical houses at the Cape, established the pattern of residential development that was to grow up the slopes of Signal Hill (D20.2-4), forming an urban 'outside' aspect to the Buitengracht boundary. This new residential area was to be quite dense, through the construction of narrow houses and the lack of formal, public outdoor space. The urban grid of the 'inside' Cape Town continued up Signal Hill, until the slope became too steep to be pragmatic. However, urban institutions were not recreated on the outside of the Buitengracht. No space was laid out for public squares. Before the nineteenth century, no churches were built. As will be seen in future centuries, as the inside of Cape Town grew and changed, the Bo-Kaap retained its original architectural quality and only tangentially gained from the commercial growth of the town. Increasingly, the Buitengracht bounded an increasingly discrete place - the Bo-Kaap - integral to, yet outside the practices of Cape Town.

177 Davids, History of the Tana Baru, 45.
178 Ibid., 42.
179 Often referred to as the Malay Quarter. The term Bo-Kaap means 'upper-Cape', referring to the Bo-Kaap's position on Signal Hill, above the centre of Cape Town.
180 Townsend and Townsend, BoKaap Faces and Facades, 3.
181 Ibid., 5.
182 Ibid., 7.
Conclusion

Through the course of this narrative, I have told the story of Cape Town from its VOC, colonial origins through to its fruition as a young town: a complex town, inhabited by varying identities, produced through practices of contestation and negotiation of power. In the time covered, the boundaries constructed at the Cape have been read as manifestations of increasingly complex practices. In Chapter 4, I identified colonial boundaries as manifestations of binary relationships – inside/outside, empty/full, rural/wilderness, and urban/rural. However, the Buitengracht narrative, in the period of VOC colonisation at the Cape, has demonstrated that boundary manifestations have potentially even greater complexity. This has been in relation to the growing complexity of social practices at the Cape: negotiations and contestations became more nuanced, and the number of people and practices – and thereby identities\textsuperscript{184} - inhabiting at the Cape grew. Boundaries - in general and specifically the Buitengracht boundary – grew in complexity as well: manifesting distance between practices, and distinction between those practices permitted inside the settlement and those prohibited. This period sets the tone for future development of the Buitengracht: the boundary shall become more nuanced and more ambiguous, as the Cape experiences demographic changes and intensification of complexity of social practices, along with changes to political paradigms.

\textsuperscript{184} European settlers came from nations other than Holland; for example exiled French Huguenots settled at the Cape, bringing wine making practices with them, and significantly impacting agrarian productions at the Cape. Also, slaves were brought from a variety of places: Indonesia, India, Madagascar, East Africa. See Shamil Jeppie, "Historical Process and the Constitution of Subjects: L.D. du Plessis and the Reinvention of the 'Malay'" (Honors thesis, University of Cape Town, 1987), 29.
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NARRATIVE TWO

1795-1899 | IN SUPPORT OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

During the later years of the previous period, the three ‘Buit’en’ Street boundaries were constructed and Cape Town began to expand, particularly beyond Buitengracht Street and up the slopes of Signal Hill. As Cape Town grew and experienced a change in political control, social practices likewise grew in complexity, and consequently the Buitengracht boundary became a somewhat ambiguous manifestation of social practices. Key events and practices in Cape Town during this period were the change in political control from the VOC to Britain, the abolition of slavery, the shift towards Victorian values and cultural practices, and the political and economic expansion resulting from the Mineral Revolution and industrialising, technological innovations. As the period unfolded, the solid-void distinction between the inside and outside of Buitengracht boundary was reinforced; cultural practices, however, crossed the Buitengracht, resulting in a more ambiguous event-inhabitation aspect of boundary than in the previous period.

The event most critical to the shift between this period and the previous was the change in political control of the Cape, from the VOC to Britain. In order to structure the narrative of the Buitengracht during this period, I have sought to identify a paradigm for its boundary manifestation; I have found the British imperial project as the most singularly influential, hegemonic practice. I have chosen to utilise this paradigm because of the significance in shift in political control to Britain, and because of the tendency of colonial practices to establish binaries, and the consequential manifestation of binaries as boundaries. Hence, I have structured the narrative of the Buitengracht boundary during this period as a story of the spatial manifestation of colonial binaries.

In contrast to the previous period, when the Buitengracht boundary manifested distance and distinction between the inside and outside of the VOC settlement at the Cape, Buitengracht Street during the nineteenth century was predominantly the city of Cape Town. As a boundary, Buitengracht Street manifested the discourse of exclusion conducted within the settlement. Exclusionary practices instrumentalized the construction of the identity of the British Empire – as dominant to the indigenous and ‘Other’ identities at the Cape. However, to reduce all boundary-manifesting practices to assertions of British hegemony would be simplistic; Cape Town in the nineteenth century was an expanding, post-Enlightenment society impacted by industrialisation, growing complexity in the demographic make-up of its residents and a gradual shift towards modernity. Exclusionary practices can be read in reference to the tendency towards classification and constructing distinction – between cultural identities, economic practices and modes of political control. The Buitengracht boundary developed over the period as a spatial palimpsest of the practices of the previous period and shifting practices of this period, manifesting the growing complexity occurring over the course of the nineteenth century.

The Bo-Kaap – ‘Periphery’ to Cape Town’s ‘Centre’

I have taken the relationship between centre – the metropole, London in the case of Britain - and the colonial periphery, a relationship key to generic imperial projects, as the metaphor for the binary relationship.
Centre-Periphery Binary Couplets

2. centre. Wale Street, looking towards the centre of town to Adderley Street. Source: CA E-1936
3. periphery. Wale Street, looking up towards the Bo-Kaap. Source: CA E-1939
manifested in Cape Town through the Buitengracht boundary (D22). In the centre-periphery binary couplet\(^{185}\) distance - yet mutual reliance - is constructed between the two spaces.\(^{186}\) As Cape Town developed over the course of the nineteenth century, social practices manifested a periphery to city centre. The periphery was spatial – in terms of solid-void and event-inhabitation aspects – and was socially practiced. Buitengracht Street manifested the boundary between one of the peripheries of Cape Town – the Bo-Kaap – and the centre of British political administration, economy and cultural hegemony. The metaphor of colonial binary couplet is not merely symbolic, however; the practices of distinguishing and distancing socio-economic classes, races, and modes of economic production also contributed towards the fulfilment of the British imperial project – politically, economically and culturally.

As a boundary, Buitengracht Street rendered the division in Cape Town between spaces of residential inhabitation and spaces of economic exchange: between the productive centre and residential periphery. The Bo-Kaap, introduced in Narrative One, began to grow up the slopes of Signal Hill at the end of the eighteenth century. In the nineteenth century, development of the area expanded, following the pattern established by the first developer of the area – Jan de Waal - and the narrow huurhuisjes he built. The Bo-Kaap continued to develop as a residential area, maintaining and reinforcing the predominant iterations of rental houses and inhabitation by artisans and labourers.\(^{187}\) The spatial manifestation of boundary along Buitengracht Street was seen through the solid-void distinction between the dense, narrow houses of the Bo-Kaap and larger buildings of the centre (D22). It was also seen through the inhabitation aspect – very few businesses existed on the Bo-Kaap side of the Buitengracht boundary, as the Bo-Kaap became known in Cape Town as residential area, particularly as it became more common for the city to become zoned through categories of inhabitation. In 1832, the census records\(^{188}\) identified nearly all of the residents along Buitengracht Street as varied sorts of artisans and labourers, such as shoemakers, bakers, and blacksmiths. This pattern intensified over the course of the nineteenth century, particularly as the maritime industry grew in Cape Town, the Bo-Kaap's residential mix additionally included those involved in the maritime industry\(^{189}\) – boatmen, carpenters, and ship's carpenters\(^{190}\) as its inhabitants.

The distinction between the Bo-Kaap, as a space of residence, and the centre, as a place of production can be read as a natural development in the growth of Cape Town (D23.1). The 'outside' of the Buitengracht comfortably served as a periphery to the centre: it was geographically adjacent to the centre, alongside the market gardens on the slopes of Signal Hill\(^{191}\), and close to the docks and future harbour. How the Buitengracht boundary manifested exclusionary practices, as a specific type of town planning practice, was through the distinction that the Buitengracht boundary provided between classes and races in Cape Town. The first residents of the Bo-Kaap were visiting soldiers and artisans. The artisans would have been of varied racial backgrounds.\(^{192}\) However, upon the abolition of slavery, the Bo-Kaap became one of the areas developed to meet the newly created demand for housing for freed slaves. It was most ironic: slave emancipation precipitated a housing shortage in Cape Town, slave owners received reparation money upon the emancipation of slaves to compensate for loss of property\(^{193}\), and this money in turn reinvested in the construction of rental housing on the slopes of Signal Hill - rental housing let out to recently freed slaves:

But even there they could not escape the grip of their ex-masters. In one of the ironies of emancipation, the compensation money provided by the British government to the slave owners was often invested in real estate. A building boom occurred in Cape Town, and the main so-called 'Coloured' quarters of later Cape Town, District Six and the Malay Quarter on Signal Hill, were built at

\(^{185}\) Jacobs, Edge of Empire, 13.
\(^{186}\) See Jacobs, Edge of Empire; Anthony King, Urbanism, Colonialism, and the World-Economy: Cultural and Spatial Foundations of the World Urban System (London: Routledge, 1996); McKenzie, "Scandal in the Colonies."
\(^{187}\) Townsend and Townsend, Bokkap Faces and Facades, 5-7.
\(^{188}\) Grieg, 1832 South Africa Almanac and Directory.
\(^{189}\) A measure of the importance of maritime practices to the sustenance of the British Empire.
\(^{189}\) C. Martin, 1865 Directory (Cape Town: Dutch Reformed Church Buildings, Adderley Street, [1865]).
\(^{190}\) The market gardens were eventually subdivided and developed into residential buildings, but the initial manifestation of the slopes of Signal Hill was a market garden area. See C. Martin, 1865 Directory (Cape Town: Dutch Reformed Church Buildings, Adderley Street, [1865]).
\(^{191}\) Townsend and Townsend, Bokkap Faces and Facades, 5, 11-12; Achmat Davids, Mosques of the Bo-Kaap (Alhme: The South African Institute of Arabic and Islamic Research, 1980), 12-14.
1. Wale Street: marking the distinction between the inside and outside of the town, as occurs at the Buitengracht boundary. Map Source: Grieg, UCT (HARG).


4. General Post Office (left) and Standard Bank (right), re-making the space of central Cape Town. Source: Warden et al., Cape Town, 215.
this time and let out to rent. The profit that the slave-owners once gained from the law of slavery was now replaced by the similarly strict laws of capital and the housing market.\textsuperscript{194}

Not only was the Bo-Kaap peripheral to the centre through racial segregation, an economic boundary was also created between those supplying income – in the form of rent paid – and those supplying housing.

Modes of economic production also differed on each side of the Buitengracht boundary. The space outside, the Bo-Kaap, provided resources, in the form of fruits and vegetables cultivated in market gardens. In the previous period\textsuperscript{195}, the Buitengracht distinguished between the VOC-controlled Company Gardens inside, and the burgher-owned market gardens outside. By the nineteenth century, the Company Gardens were no longer agriculturally productive, but rather were converted into an ornamental garden\textsuperscript{196}. Agricultural production became a practice completely excluded from the town; the Buitengracht marked the boundary between the last space of rural practices and the thoroughly urbanised centre. It also marked the relationship between the production of goods and consumption of goods, as the produce of the market gardens was brought across the Buitengracht and sold in the public squares on the inside of town (D23.2).

In contrast to the agricultural and rental productions outside the Buitengracht boundary, the inside centre of Cape Town in the nineteenth century became both generative of and a spatial product of economic prosperity. Beginning in the 1870's\textsuperscript{197}, the architecture of the centre of Cape Town changed, reflecting economic prosperity and growing investments into the institutions of the city. New building typologies appeared in Cape Town: large, institutional and commerce buildings reflecting innovations in building technology and displaying Victorian architectural styles. Introduction of the new type altered the space of Cape Town; buildings such as the Standard Bank, the General Post Office, Stuttafords Department Store, and Central Methodist Church on Greenmarket Square heralded a change of space from a city previously composed of two-storey, stylistically subdued Dutch and Regency architectural works (D23.3-4).\textsuperscript{198} Not only did the space of the centre of Cape Town change, particularly in comparison to the Bo-Kaap periphery, but the new buildings also manifested social practices that intensified the distance between the periphery and centre. These were practices of banking – now expanded to include international investment – and the growth and formalisation of commerce – as general dealers modernised marketing practices and graduated to the status of department stores. These economic practices signalled a shift in governance at the Cape, one which promoted capitalist business interests, and in parallel discoursed concerns regarding "the 'unfit' denizens of the slums"\textsuperscript{199} infecting the growing middle class.\textsuperscript{200} Cape Town became further internally distanced, spatially and through social practices.

Increasingly, over the nineteenth century, the Bo-Kaap's identity as a place, became peripheral to the centre – administratively and economically - of Cape Town. Spatially, by the end of the century, the Bo-Kaap was identified by narrow houses as a contrast to the architectural growth in the centre of town, seen above. This distinction in solid-void space, as well as the racial and class inhabitation of the Bo-Kaap, by freed slaves and the labouring-artisan class, contributed to an identity as 'Other' to the centre of Cape Town. The expansion of docks and harbour in the nineteenth century further enabled the distance between Bo-Kaap and centre, as the expansion of docks created a destination for the labourers residing on the outside of the Buitengracht, enabling the labour/labourer binary manifestation of the boundary. The growth, literally, of the town into the sea\textsuperscript{201} also took pressure off areas like the Bo-Kaap, enabling them to retain a residential inhabitation rather than be adapted to commercial uses. This enabled a very special quality of the Bo-Kaap, preventing change.

\textsuperscript{195} See Narrative One, Chapter 6.
\textsuperscript{196} Mia Karsten, The Old Company Gardens at the Cape and its Superintendents (Cape Town: Maskew Miller, 1951), 12; Murray, "The Imperial Landscape," 24.
\textsuperscript{197} Whilst income was generated for the middle and upper classes through real estate speculation in the Bo-Kaap, the economic flourishing of the late nineteenth century was produced by the construction of harbour, railways, mineral revolution, and subsequent foreign investment. See Worden et. al., Cape Town, 213.
\textsuperscript{198} Ibid., 214-215.
\textsuperscript{199} Ibid., 217.
\textsuperscript{200} Ibid., 213-217.
\textsuperscript{201} Most dock and harbour areas were built upon fill. This can be surmised from the study of maps, noting that the docks and harbour grew into Table Bay, rather than being carved out of the mainland.
to the inhabitation of the area, change which most likely would have been followed by other spatial aspects. Otherwise, it is likely that real estate pressures would have forced change to the area, in light of its proximity to the centre of town, forcing out the residential inhabitation by subaltern identities in favour of commercial interests. Already by the end of the nineteenth century, the space of the Bo-Kaap can be read as outside of the modernising, developing practices of Cape Town: a phenomenon intensified and utilised politically in the twentieth century. In the next section, the distancing between the Bo-Kaap and centre, manifested by Buitengracht Street, will be further iterated through an examination of the religious and cultural practices negotiated through the boundary.

Assertion | Resistance to British Cultural Hegemony

In examining the spatial manifestations of cultural practices, I have utilised postcolonial theory's approach to the construction of identity. Postcolonial theory declares that the identity of the colonised subject is a construct of the coloniser, that a seminal aspect of the colonial project is constructing how the colonised subject knows itself. At the Cape, the colonial project was reliant upon constructing a hegemonic British culture — a culture other than that of the Dutch (who previously controlled the Cape) and other than that of the 'Other' identities at the Cape, whether if slave, free Black, KhoiSan, other Europeans, or the emerging hybrid identities. One of the means in which the Buitengracht manifested 'boundary' was through spatialising the colonising project, by distancing cultural practices, thereby distinguishing identities at the Cape.

The spatial distancing and distinguishing between cultural practices enabled the construction of a British hegemonic identity. As colonial practices so often construct binaries, cultural identity at the Cape in the nineteenth century was also a binary couplet: either an assertion of the British hegemonic identity, or of resistive identity. A variety of practices were utilised in the struggle for cultural power at the Cape, practices concerned with racial identity and superiority, religion, leisure, celebratory practices, and even practices concerned with cleanliness and illness. The distinction between practices, in negotiating and contesting the binary, was spatialised in different ways in relation to Buitengracht Street, thus rendering the street a boundary. It must be said that this reading of boundary is speculative, and the boundary was imaginative: this narrative is positing possibilities, and the boundary was imaginary in that it constructed different places as much as different spaces.

A discourse of classification — of cultures in terms of race and religion — contributed towards the construction of a hegemonic British identity at the Cape. The relationship between British hegemony and classification was the Victorian reliance upon a racial hierarchy, constructing British superiority. The subjugation of the colonised was validated and rendered possible through claims of racial supremacy. These claims were substantiated by the Victorian scientific practices of categorisation and classification, which were outgrowths of Darwinism and distinction between species. The racial and religion discourse in Cape Town, in the nineteenth century, concerned the distinctions between Christianity and Islam, and between White and 'Coloured' races. This discourse was spatialised, in regards to the Buitengracht, by the distinction between identities residing and practicing on one side of the boundary versus the other. The subaltern classifications, Islam and Coloured, were considered inhabitants of the Bo-Kaap, whilst Christianity and White people inhabited the centre of the city. The Bo-Kaap's identity of 'Other' was reinforced through its association with Islam and density of Coloured residents.
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202 See Ashcroft et al., Post-colonial Studies Reader, 1, Said, Orientalism, 3-4.
203 This conclusion has been reached through various writings about colonial identity, particularly Mullerstein, "Scandal in the Colonies", Wordsen et al., Cape Town; Wordsen, "Space and Identity", and Vivian Blackford-Smith, "A special tradition of multi-racialism'? Segregation in Cape Town in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries," in The Angry Divide: Social and economic history of the Western Cape, ed. Willem G. James and Mary Struan (Cape Town; David Phillip, 1989).
204 See the distinction between space and place as defined by Ashcroft, Post-Colonial Transformation, discussed in Chapter 4.
206 "Coloured" became a racial classification after the abolition of slavery, and generally referred to non-White identities, whether originating from KhoiSan, Asian, or a mixture of origins. From this point hence, the term 'Coloured' will be used to identify, mixed, non-White racial identities at the Cape. 'Coloured' is a contested term, and generally, 'Mixed' may be more appropriate. 'Coloured' will be used for the currency it holds in South African racial discourse. See Western, Outcast Cape Town, 13.
2 Mosque Shaiem, in the Bo-Kaap, on Chippie Street. Source: CA E-5219


4 Entertainment in the centre: Sunday strolling in the Company Gardens. Source: Worden et al., Cape Town, 146.

5 Entertainment in the periphery: playing cricket in the street in the Bo-Kaap. Source: Worden et al., Cape Town, 356.
The Islamic identity of the Bo-Kaap can be mapped through the predominance of mosques located within the Bo-Kaap boundaries (D24.1-2). Mosques, Islamic spaces of representation, primarily occur on the ‘outside’ of the Buitengracht, creating a space that is “at once a precondition and a result of social superstructures.” Historically, the Bo-Kaap was the location of the first mosques in Cape Town; this spatial phenomenon both contributed to the attraction of Muslim residents to the area and fed the increase in number of mosques in the area over the course of the nineteenth century. The connection between Coloured — and eventually ‘Malay’ — identity and the Bo-Kaap originates in the inhabitational roots of the space to artisans, free Blacks and after emancipation, freed slaves. However, the area was not solely inhabited by non-Whites. The non-White residents did become the majority over the course of the nineteenth century, particularly as practices in Cape Town attracted White residents out of the Bo-Kaap. During the latter quarter of the nineteenth century, suburbs grew in Cape Town, attracting White, middle class residents. This ‘flight’ from the city was enabled by the transportation innovations — specifically, the construction of the Sea Point tram line and Wynberg rail line — that made daily commute into Cape Town viable. The growth of the suburbs and their inhabitation by primarily White, middle class residents contributed to the Cape Town’s increasing racial segregation over the nineteenth century. Within the phenomenon of segregation, the Bo-Kaap increasingly became a non-White area in the city, distanced from the White centre through the Buitengracht boundary.

The presence of mosques on the outside of the Buitengracht is contrasted by the existence of missionary churches just on the inside of the boundary. The missionary movement was the religious arm of the Cape liberalism that fought for abolition of slavery, seeing its divine role to educate and uplift the non-Christian (non-White) people of Cape Town. This resulted in the growth of mission churches along the Buitengracht boundary: the second Dutch Reform Church was built in 1833 between Buitengracht and Bree streets just on the ‘inside’ of the boundary. After emancipation, the African Theatre, on ‘Hottentot Square’ was converted to St Stephen’s Church, a church for Coloured people, presumably to serve the non-Islamic freed slave population living on the west side of the town. As one crossed the Buitengracht boundary and the current Bo-Kaap boundary of Strand Street, one finds St. Andrew’s Church, a Scottish missionary church, built adjacent to the burial grounds and Somerset Hospital. And although mosques do exist outside the Buitengracht boundary, there have never been any churches inside the Bo-Kaap. The space of religion along the Buitengracht can be seen as a contestation of cultural control — Islam as contesting the colonising Christian hegemony, and the missionary churches in turn contesting Islam.

Often at odds with both religions in Cape Town — Christianity and Islam — were leisure pursuits. The propensity for dancing, gambling and drinking was enjoyed by those White and non-White, and equally disdained by both religions. However, it was the spatial manifestation of alternatives to such pursuits that constructed a boundary in Cape Town. On the inside of the Buitengracht were spaces and institutions of leisure officially sanctioned by the ruling authorities: strolling through the Company Gardens or across the Parade Grounds, attending dances in the Commercial Exchange or a play at the African Theatre. On the outside were dens of ill repute — boarding houses and taverns where drink, cards and prostitutes were readily available. Specifically, entire blocks of the area west of Buitengracht and between Strand Street and Table Bay were inhabited by single liquor warehouses and stores. Even more appropriate leisure pursuits,
1 Route of the New Year's Parade, from District Six, across the city centre, across Buitengracht Street, to the Bo-Kaap, and on to Green Point for the minstrel competitions. Map Source: Richard's Map of Cape Town, C/CC.

2 Open ditch along Buitengracht Street, demonstrating lack of street improvements. Source: N.L.E.A.
such as sport, were made illicit on the outside, as they were played in the streets (D24.5) rather than on proper sport courts and fields. The space of city streets fell under municipal control in the late nineteenth century, as regulatory campaigns - and subsequent legislation - discoursed the use of streets as a mechanism to provide social order. In the 1880's, municipal regulations banned all street processions without written permission of the mayor. The inhabitation of streets - as done in the Bo-Kaap - as the spatial forum for the public realm and as sport fields was legislated an illicit inhabitation of the city. Similar to the practice of Islam, those social practices considered ‘Other’ and resistive to the hegemonic cultural identity were spatially manifested on the outside of the Buitengracht boundary, while the British hegemony was practiced inside the boundary.

The legislated celebratory practices that did engage with the outside of the Buitengracht were those of officially non-White identities. One of the most significant annual cultural events of the Coloured citizens of Cape Town was the New Year’s Parade. Celebrating freedom from slavery, the New Year’s Parade was (and still is) a colourful event of music, musical competitions between ‘minstrel groups’, and costumes and masques. Its practice appropriated and reinvented spaces of Cape Town as outside of the British hegemony. The New Year’s Parade (also called Coon Carnival) became the singular annual event in which the White, British centre of Cape Town was traversed and united with the outside areas – the Bo-Kaap and District Six (D25.1). Both were areas spatially outside of the inside centre of Cape Town, and areas of non-British, hybrid identities. Events such as the New Year’s Parade briefly erased the cultural boundaries of the town, and reinvented Cape Town as a singular space, boundary-less for a day. However, the erasure of boundaries was in turn contested by the British, as near the end of the century the New Year’s Parade was subjected to official administration; musical minstrel groups were forced to align with sports clubs and the musical competitions were moved further away from the centre of the city to the Green Point Commons.

Whilst Cape Town in the nineteenth century was subject to the Victorian concern for cleanliness, Buitengracht Street marked the distance between the clean, inside city and the diseased outside: between sickness and health and between order and disorder. The practice of separating death and sickness from the centre of the town, begun under the VOC, was reinforced in the nineteenth century. The burial grounds ‘outside’ grew, in one direction right up to the edge of the Buitengracht, then further out towards Green Point. A second Somerset Hospital was constructed, even further from the boundary, towards the new harbour. A second practice manifesting the concern for cleanliness was the ordering of the streets and grachts of the town. Stoeps were removed in order to ease pedestrian movement, sidewalks were constructed, streets were paved and grachts, described as filled with refuse and waste, were covered. Yet, these changes only occurred on one side of the Buitengracht boundary. Late nineteenth and early twentieth century photographs show a Bo-Kaap of rough streets, open ditches; the Buitengracht gracht was the last gracht to be covered in Cape Town (D25.2). As the twentieth century and modernism approached, a division was emerging between the clean, modernised inside of Cape Town and the diseased outside.

The closure of the Tana Baru, a spatial event, epitomised the conflict between cultural identities and identities of space in Cape Town. The Tana Baru was the Muslim burial ground above the Bo-Kaap, at the top of Longmarket Street. As the burial site of the some of the most important founders of Islam at the Cape, the Tana Baru is one of the most culturally valued sites in the Bo-Kaap. However, the Victorian concern with disease and the outbreak of smallpox in Cape Town heralded a call for closure of burial grounds in Cape Town.
1. Hottentot Square, connecting the imperial space of the Bo-Kaap to the British hegemonic Cape Town centre. The African Theatre (Image 2) was initially constructed as a space of leisure for Cape Town’s upper class citizens, the same citizens that frequented the Commercial Exchange (Image 1) and spent their Sundays strolling in the Company Gardens (Image 4). After the emancipation of slavery, the Theatre was converted to St. Stephen’s Church to serve freed slaves. Thus the space of Hottentot Square was shifted, across Buitengracht, to a connection with the Bo-Kaap (Image 5), in resistance of the Islamic practices of many freed slaves (see Masjied Boorhanoel Mosque - Image 3, and Image 6).

Sources: Map: Greg, UCT (KARG); Image 1: Worden et. al., Cape Town, 101; Image 2: Fransen, The Old Buildings of the Cape, 24; Image 4: Worden et. al., Cape Town, 146; Image 5: Fransen, Cape Camera, 50; Image 6: CA E-39180.

2. Long Street in the nineteenth century, demonstrating the crossing of races and practices from the Bo-Kaap to the centre of the city inside the Buitengracht "boundary". Source: Worden et. al., Cape Town, 107.
Town, to be replaced by locations further away from residential and urban inhabitation, in the Cape Flats. 228 When, in 1884, the Tana Baru was closed by the city administration, Islamic and British values publicly clashed, heralding the first widespread riots ever held by the Muslim population in Cape Town. 229 The riots signified the space of the Bo-Kaap as outside and resistive to the British cultural value system, both as a space of 'diseased' practices and resistant to the hegemonic order.

A Thick Boundary Zone – the Bo-Kaap and the Water’s Edge

In the previous sections, I have discussed how Buitengracht Street distanced and distinguished between different practices – cultural, economic and political. In those readings of the Buitengracht boundary, it was imagined as a line distinguishing one side of the street from the other. However, another reading of 'boundary' is as a zone: a space less finite and clearly divisive, an inhabited space that marks the distinction between spaces to either side of it. Iain Borden speaks of this sort of boundary as a thick edge, or zone: "boundaries are not finite, but zones of negotiation … the spatial temporal limit between here and there." 230 The concept of zone may be a more accurate reading of the nineteenth century iteration of the Buitengracht boundary, for reading the Buitengracht as a distinguishable space in the city – a space of liminality.

Two thick zones emerged along the Buitengracht – the Bo-Kaap, which negotiated and marked the separation between Islam and Christianity, and between White and non-White; and what I call the water’s edge – the zone of liminal, heterotopic practices spread up from the docks (towards the Bo-Kaap). 231 Both sets of practices were spatially manifest on Buitengracht Street itself, and to varying extents on both sides of Buitengracht Street. It was the spread of practices across the street that renders it as a zone, as a part of a space of liminality.

Imagining 'boundary' as a zone, rather than a line, is poignantly demonstrated by the Bo-Kaap, and its nineteenth century definition. Whilst the architectural quality of the Bo-Kaap - of narrow houses and streets, and lack of public squares - was contained by Buitengracht Street at its eastern edge, the social practices through which the Bo-Kaap was constructed crossed Buitengracht Street. The contrast between architectural quality and social practices demonstrates the need for examining space through its different aspects: the solid-void aspect is seen in the architectural space and the event-inhabitation aspect in the social practices. The crossing of spatial manifestations and social practices across Buitengracht Street can be seen by the location of mosques on Long and Loop Street, and the social practices portrayed in nineteenth century art (D26.2). Artistic representations and collective memories 232 suggest that the practice of Islam, and residential inhabitations by artisans and freed slaves (Coloured people) extended beyond Buitengracht into Bree Street, filtering down to Loop and Long Streets. Rather than a clear line, Buitengracht boundary provided a spatialised zone marking segregation and construction of identity in Cape Town.

The Bo-Kaap constructed an 'Other' through which British identity could construct themselves. Because practices crossed Buitengracht Street, the boundary to this 'Other', was however fluid, similar to the sometimes contradictory and fluid nature of as Victorian colonial practices. The 'Other' and the coloniser could spatially interact in the zone between Buitengracht Street and city centre. The 'Other' was spatial and social: it consisted of small houses, where washing was hung on the front stoep and games and socialising occurred on the street; its space was not subject to the municipal cleaning of the late nineteenth century, and its inhabitants walked to mosque on Fridays rather than to church on Sundays. The space of the 'Other' differed to the 'British' space of Cape Town through its inhabitation aspect. The spatial - and thus social -
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228 Ibid., 96.
229 Worden et al., Cape Town, 210-211.
230 Borden, "Thick Edge," 221.
231 This area overlaps with De Waterkant, but also crosses Buitengracht Street, thus forming a boundary zone. The present-day limits of De Waterkant are bound by Buitengracht Street to the East.
232 Immetman, "Social Scene", 23. Also interview with Tariq Telfa, a Bo-Kaap resident, 5 November, 2005.
The 'liminal zone', from Strand Street to Somerset Road: Buitengracht Street, linking the docks (Image 3) to the town, also manifested the 'liminal' practices associated with maritime trade: taverns, liquor stores and boarding houses, representing the transient, 'ill-repute' practices of sailors and similar temporary inhabitants of the Cape (Image 4 - Taverns and Boarding Houses along Dock Road). These intermingled, perhaps uncomfortably, with the moralising practices of the Lutheran Church (Image 1) and St. Andrews Church (Image 2). The presence of the burial grounds along Somerset Road since the eighteenth century perhaps reinforced the liminal nature of this zone of the Buitengracht boundary.

Sources: Map: Grieg, UCT (HARQ); Image 1: Fransen, Cape Cemeteries, 29; Image 2: Wooden et al., Cape Town, 116; Image 3: Wooden et al., Cape Town, 118; Image 4: Wooden et al., Cape Town, 147.
interaction between the 'Other' and the hegemonic culture both contaminated and clarified each identity, a relationship symptomatic of colonising operations.233

Whether Christian or Muslim, the west side of Cape Town (the side of the Buitengracht) was marked by a non-White, subaltern identity. Evidence of this can be seen in the renaming of Boerenplein to Hottentot Square (D26.1): an event aspect of space. The square is significant amongst the network of public squares in Cape Town, and its role in spatialising Cape Town's public realm has historically contributed to Buitengracht Street's boundary manifestation. Although it is not clear exactly when the square was renamed, if ever at all officially, during most the nineteenth century it was recorded as Hottentot Square. In the late twentieth century, the word Hottentot is considered a politically incorrect reference to the KhoiSan people. However, during the nineteenth century, it was often used to refer to any non-White person who was not a slave (the term Coloured did not come into use until after emancipation)234. The change in name of the square, from the square of the farmers to the square of the non-Whites, indicates a shift in the use or users of the square, confirming the nineteenth century growth in non-White population along the Buitengracht. The location of the square on the inside edge of the Buitengracht boundary speaks of the boundary as a zone rather than line, a thick edge of subaltern identities surrounding the White city centre.

The second boundary zone of the Buitengracht was the water's edge – a zone of liminal practices symptomatic of Cape Town's identity as a port city. Some practices of the zone were economic, some cultural; all were heterotopic – the practices outside of the hegemonic utopia, which allowed the centre to create a vision of itself. The docks and harbour expanded during the nineteenth century, a practice reflective of business interests wishing to protect maritime trade and the technological innovation necessary to construct a modern harbour.

The expansion of the docks manifested the maritime focus of the bottom of Buitengracht Street along with the predominance of warehouses inhabiting the area surrounding the bottom of Buitengracht Street. This spatial inhabitation intensified over the course of the nineteenth century, particularly as refrigeration technology made international produce shipping feasible. The economic practices of shipping and trade spatially cohabitated with the cultural, liminal practices often associated with transient, maritime activities. The warehouses - located along Buitengracht Street and its immediate parallel and cross streets - intermingled with liquor stores and boarding houses. In fact, at the end of the nineteenth century, a large portion of De Waterkant was inhabited by liquor stores, some occupying entire urban blocks (D27). Boarding houses, frequented by visitors and temporary residents at the Cape, were primarily located along Buitengracht and Bree Streets.235 The thickening of such liminal practices in one zone, one distanced from the remainder of the city, enabled the transience typical of sailors and those partaking in the similar economic and cultural practices in Cape Town. The intermingling of sailors, temporary boarders, prostitutes (who did much business at boarding houses), and liquor sales created an identity of 'ill-repute' along the Buitengracht. Such an identity was neither new to Cape Town nor rare for a (colonial) port city: Cape Town had already been given the name 'Tavern of the Seas' in the seventeenth century236. As the city grew, though, especially during the nineteenth century, such inhabitations of space were pushed further away from the administrative and commerce centre (around Adderley Street) towards Buitengracht Street, out of the city. The fusion of docks, burials, missions and liquor can be seen at the intersection of Buitengracht Street and Somerset Road. Here one sees the intermingling of the economic imperial project, the cultural (leisure) activities typically associated with maritime practices, and the religious resistance to those practices. Whilst the economic project was crucial to the sustenance of the British Empire, and the logic of capitalism naturally strove to meet the demands of seafarers (for drink and sexual entertainment), these practices were excluded from the centre of the city. The Buitengracht formed an
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233 Ashcroft et. al., Post-colonial Studies Reader, 1.
234 Interview with Nigel Worden, 12 December, 2005.
235 The data used to arrive at these conclusions has been gathered through studying photographs and maps. See references from Epoch 3 map.
236 This was due to the high proportion of taverns to other non-VOC institutions in Cape Town.
intense zone, heterotopic and buffering between the British centre of the town (and thus, the colony) and the growing White, middle class suburbs of Sea Point and beyond.

Conclusion
As a nineteenth century boundary, the Buitengracht enabled distinguishing the practices of the colonial centre from those of the periphery – practices such as residential versus commercial inhabitation, racial and class segregation, and modes and products of economic production. The boundary also manifested the distinction and distance between those practices that established the British cultural hegemony and those in resistance – religious practices, leisure practices, and the cultural practices of identity construction. Lastly, it was seen that the boundary was not merely a line distinguishing between inside and outside, but a thick zone of practices, ones heterotopic to the idealisation of British colonial identity. As we shall see in the next chapter, in the twentieth century, the negotiations and speculative quality of boundary manifested by the Buitengracht in the nineteenth century would become more rigid, and enforced through legislation rather than inhabitation, as modernity emerges as the next paradigm in Cape Town's history.
1900-1993 | REPRESENTATIONS OF SPACE

In the introduction, Chapter 2, the twentieth century (through 1993) is divided into two epochs: Epoch 4, where Cape Town is defined by municipal practices, and Epoch 5, under apartheid. This chapter is a conflation of the two epochs, allowing them to be examined as a continuum of similar practices. It provides the opportunity to understand apartheid as an outgrowth of the racist and modernist practices of the first half of the twentieth century, and those practices as outgrowths of colonialism. Such a perspective tells the story of the Buitengracht boundary in terms of shifting social practices and spatial manifestations; it enables seeing the boundary as contextual - historically and spatially - rather than as singular and isolated.

In the twentieth century, the Buitengracht boundary took its most definitive form in its history: it was a specific, legislated, material boundary, produced through representations of space, conceptualised before constructed, symbolic of racism and modernist ideals of order and scientific abstraction. This reading of the Buitengracht’s boundary manifestation relates to Lefebvre’s spatial triad; it has been identified through an analysis differentiating between spatial practices, representations of space and spaces of representation. The Buitengracht in the years under British control of the Cape was a negotiating device, an imaginative boundary; in the twentieth century it became dictatorial and absolute in the separations it created, both spatially and socially. The severity of the boundary reflected not so much an increase in degree of racism practiced at the Cape, but rather a shift in paradigm, from colonialism to modernism and the scientific, absolute manner in which the project of modernism was manifested. The Buitengracht was a boundary produced through legislated, technocratic spatial manifestations of bureaucratic practices of exclusion - such as the Slums Act and apartheid. It was also a boundary produced through the modernist urban project of planned privileging of vehicular over pedestrian mobility, and administrative knowledge produced through construction of (large-scale) public works projects.

Before proceeding to the boundary narration, it is necessary to present the conception of modernism utilised in this chapter. Paradigmatically, modernism began long before the twentieth century. Some theorists, Habermas in particular, trace its roots back to the eighteenth century, to the Enlightenment and French Revolution. The ideas of the Enlightenment, and thus modernity, concerned “objective science, universal morality and law, and autonomous art according to their inner logic.” The project of modernity sought universal, scientific solutions to the problems of humanity, realised through a privileging of the individual and of secular, non-historic knowledge. It will be proposed in the body of this chapter that this project was manifested in Cape Town, specifically along the Buitengracht, through reliance upon scientific, technological solutions to spatial and social concerns. Another proposition will be that the dominant instrumentalisation of apartheid - whilst initially a racist, values-based project - was bureaucratic and technocratic. Therefore, its
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237 ‘Representations of space’ refers to Lefebvre’s spatial triad, of spatial practice, representations of space and spaces of representation. See Chapter 3 for further discussion.

238 A severity in racial practices did occur under apartheid. Although this chapter labels apartheid practices as a continuum from modernism in the early twentieth century, I do recognize the significance of introduction of apartheid to social practices in South Africa and do not wish to minimize the horror of apartheid.


240 Ibid.

Prior to the construction of the Buitengracht stone retaining wall, individual buildings negotiated the slope of Signal Hill, often with storage space underneath the building. The construction of the wall shifted the slope negotiating mechanism, as well as created a division, a boundary, down Buitengracht Street.
spatial manifestation was also a technocratic one; rather than the ambiguous, negotiating boundary manifestations of the nineteenth century, those of the twentieth were precise and produced initially through the work of the planners, rather than the inhabitants, of space.

**Power practiced through the municipality - Building projects**

Before the twentieth century, Cape Town operated as a colony, first of the VOC, then of the British Empire. The turn of the century saw a shift in the social practices dominant at the Cape. The death of Queen Victoria (in 1901) and the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902) together heralded a new period in Cape, and South African, history. The war led to the move toward unification of the South African provinces into a single nation, into the eventual (1910) Union of South Africa. The death of the Queen marked an end to the hegemony of colonialism at the Cape, of the reliance upon the imperial centre for administration and cultural identity. Within Cape Town, the shift away from imperial to municipality political control had been a gradually taking place since the latter years of the nineteenth century. Political productions became increasingly dominated by the municipal administration, and the realm of space increasingly came to be controlled and constructed through laws and regulations. As space came to be a tool utilised by political administrations, its production shifted into the hands of City Engineers. As Buitengracht Street manifested boundary through projects of the City Engineer Office - projects such as the Buitengracht retaining wall, the Schotschtre Kloof Flats, and road constructions – the mechanism for constructing boundary was through 'event' regulations and solid/void constructions much more than through inhabitation. It was stated earlier, in Chapter 3, that space and the force of its production cannot be separated, but over the course of history, they have become distanced. The fact that boundary was a spatial production of the will and intent of the City Engineer’s office distances the representation of space – its conception – from spatial practices – the inhabitation.

It was at the beginning of the twentieth century that the Buitengracht took on its most material spatial manifestation of boundary. In approximately 1900, a stone retaining wall was built parallel to Buitengracht Street, bisecting the road into upper and lower Buitengracht Street. Whereas previously individual buildings negotiated the steep slope of Signal Hill, now a municipal device – a stone retaining wall – did so (D29). Storm-water drainage had consistently posed problems in the area. During this period, engineering concerns became pre-eminent in municipal practices, and large scale, public solutions became preferred over private, individual ones, thereby necessitating an engineering solution to the problem of drainage and steep roads traversing the slope. As the modernist paradigm took hold, no longer were unpaved roads, annual structural collapses (due to seasonal rains), and flooding acceptable urban occurrences. Thus, the retaining wall was a requisite pragmatic solution to engineering problems on both sides of the boundary. However, although the retaining wall was a technical solution to an engineering problem, the manifestation of wall negotiated both topographic and social divides.

The wall, bisecting a road into two, also manifested political and cultural values. Lefebvre states that space has a dual relationship with society, acting both as a manifestation of social practices and as an enabler of certain practices in favour of other’s. The construction of the Buitengracht wall did so: it manifested practices of exclusion, of setting the space of the Bo-Kaap as separate from other areas of the city. It also was productive of knowledge, inserting into the public consciousness the division and separation between the inside and outside of the Buitengracht. Through both the (sectional) spatial separation it provided and the length that it ran, the wall reinforced and manifested practices productive of exclusions. These practices were
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234 Bickford-Smith et al., Cape Town in the Twentieth Century, 12-23.
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237 This will be demonstrated through construction of built projects as boundary devices. It can also be seen in the communication of City Engineer; see CA 3/X/CT: 4/2/1/1/4: 138/1.
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239 At the time of writing, within Cape Town, the Buitengracht retaining wall still holds such a strong image in the collective conscience of the city that it is referred to simply as the Buitengracht wall.
240 Lefebvre, The Production of Space, 31-32, 37.
1 Buitengracht Stairs

2 The Buitengracht Stone Retaining Wall
Marking the boundary between the Bo-Kaap and Tamboerskloof
Map Source: Surveyor General, Orthophoto Maps.
the distance between the Bo-Kaap and adjacent ‘White’ areas of the city, such as Tamboerskloof and the city centre, and the built form preceding the eventual Group Areas Act\textsuperscript{244} line.

The wall provided a vertical separation between the Bo-Kaap, located at the top of the wall, and the remainder of Cape Town, located below. The sectional shift precipitated by the wall constructed upper Buitengracht Street as the ‘stoep\textsuperscript{250} to the Bo-Kaap, the space of distinction and negotiation between the Bo-Kaap and remainder of the city. The wall limits\textsuperscript{251} crossings into the Bo-Kaap, by both pedestrians and vehicles. The wall is only broken at two streets to allow cars to cross Buitengracht Street. Pedestrians may scale the wall only at the stairs constructed (D30.1). The limited number of stairs and increased speed of traffic along the wall discourage pedestrian crossings, thereby isolating the Bo-Kaap through inhabitation practices.

Its specific length, from Carisbrooke to Woale Street, indicated the separation between the Bo-Kaap and Tamboerskloof at its upper end, and provided a space for the ‘White’ city to colonise the Bo-Kaap at its lower end. A definitively White, middle class neighbourhood, served by the tramline running up Kloof Street, Tamboerskloof was socially separate from the Coloured, Muslim Bo-Kaap. The two neighbourhoods were also spatially distinct – the Bo-Kaap marked by dense, small, ‘decaying’ houses and Tamboerskloof much newer, less dense, and built of larger residences. The Buitengracht retaining wall assisted in declaring the distinction to the rest of Cape Town, as it stops at the boundary between the two neighbourhoods (D30.2). At its bottom end, the Buitengracht marked the space at which the Buitengracht boundary could be crossed and public interaction between the Bo-Kaap and remainder of Cape Town could occur. This space, Woale Street - unobstructed by the wall and generous in width - acted as the ‘voorkamer\textsuperscript{252} to the Bo-Kaap.\textsuperscript{253} The Buitengracht boundary manifestation differed below Woale Street: no wall existed to mark a clear separation between the Bo-Kaap and remainder of the city. The lack of wall below Woale Street manifested (and enabled) more ambiguous practices than above, leading to the eventual colonisation of the block between Rose Street and Buitengracht Street as a White area under the GAA.

The retaining wall was not the only project manifesting engineering practices, productive of the modernist tendency to utilise public works projects to construct the idealised, (socially and spatially) ordered city. The Buitengracht boundary also manifested the exiling of certain spatial and social practices to the ‘outside’. This was particularly seen through the construction of modernist housing schemes outside the Buitengracht boundary. By the beginning of the twentieth century, concerns in the city administration had been raised regarding quality and availability of housing for ‘poor married families’.\textsuperscript{254} In response to those concerns, the city began constructing two ‘inner-city’ housing projects in the 1930’s\textsuperscript{255}; both project, however, were located outside the ‘buiten’ urban boundaries. The Canterbury-Bloemhof Flats were located in District Six, outside the Buitenkant boundary, and the Schotsche Kloof Flats in the Bo-Kaap, outside the Buitengracht boundary. The significance of the housing projects and the boundary manifestation of both Buiten streets was both cultural and architectural. The projects reinforced the perceived racial majority inhabiting the areas in which they were built; specifically, the Schotsche Kloof Flats were built for ‘Malay’ residents.\textsuperscript{256} Both housing projects were typological departures from traditional or historic architectural approaches: their spatial arrangements differed from their contexts (D31). The ‘open’ spatial planning of the projects, contrasting the narrow alleys of both

\textsuperscript{294} From this point forward, the Group Areas Act will be referred to as GAA, for the sake of brevity.

\textsuperscript{250} A stoep is an uncovered front veranda, usually a step or two raised above the level of the pavement. It provides a place for the residents of the house to observe and interact with people on the street, while remaining spatially somewhat separate. Stoops are characteristic of Bo-Kaap houses and much of the inhabitation quality of the space of the Bo-Kaap is attributed to the interaction between public and private facilitated through stoops.

\textsuperscript{251} As the wall remains unaltered since the beginning of the twentieth century, I will refer to its material manifestation in the present tense.

\textsuperscript{252} A voorkamer is the front room of a house in the Bo-Kaap, where guests are formally entertained. To penetrate further into a house requires social intimacy with the residents.

\textsuperscript{253} The metaphor of stoep and voorkamer was introduced by lain Low in UCT course Apg 706z, 2004. Although used in the past tense to describe the Buitengracht boundary in the twentieth century, the metaphor of stoep and voorkamer are still relevant to the Bo-Kaap today, at the time of writing. A similar spatial metaphor is the veranda, a ‘no-man’s land’ space between the public of the street and private of the house, where strangers may meet inhabitants of a house without involving sacred, private space. See Ashcroft, Post-colonial Transformations, 183-184.

\textsuperscript{254} Mayor’s Minutes: CA 3/CT/3/7/1/3.

\textsuperscript{255} These were the only two such modernist housing schemes constructed in the city proper, not in the suburbs or Cape Flats - areas earlier declared sites of public housing, especially for ‘Natives’. See Andre van Graan, “The Influences on the two Inner City Housing Projects of the Bo Kaap and District Six in Cape Town that were built between 1934 and 1944,” (Master’s thesis, University of Cape Town, 2004).

\textsuperscript{256} Van Graan, “Influences on Two Inner City Housing Projects,” 23; Davids, Mosques of the Bo-Kaap, 14-15.

District Six and the Bo-Kaap, and reflective of European modernist housing schemes, enabled control over inhabitants through their visibility. These projects constructed ‘Other’ spaces in the city – yet outside its boundaries. These spaces were constructed as ‘Other’ through the non-White inhabitation and the architectural solutions; solutions which re-made the urban space of the city and potentially re-structured its social order.

The construction of the Schotsche Kloof Flats signifies a shift in practices indicative of the increased role of the municipality in constructing the modern city. In previous periods, the provision of housing, except for soldiers, was a private – rather than public – undertaking. The development of both the Bo-Kaap and District Six, in particular, were private, individual, capitalist investments. In the twentieth century, as provision of housing came under the heading of public infrastructure, the Buitengracht boundary signified distancing and separation as constructed by the municipality. The boundary became a manifestation of the will of the government, realised through modernist housing practices and engineering projects. As will be seen later, the construction of the Flats was one component of a programme of classification and prohibition of the specific architecture and inhabitation in the Bo-Kaap, of controlling the ‘outside’ of the city.

The twentieth century modernist paradigm dictated that the municipal administration use space, in various guises, as the medium through which to practice power. Of all arms of the Cape Town municipal administration, the City Engineer claimed a dominant role, utilising the construction of built form to manifest administrative policies. I have shown that the Buitengracht can be read as a boundary, a manifestation of exclusion distancing and distinguishing the Bo-Kaap from city centre, through the construction of the retaining wall and the Schotsche Kloof Flats. Transportation projects were also productions of the City Engineer in this period, manifesting exclusions just as the retaining wall and Flats did. Transportation was one the realms of the grand project of modernisation of South Africa (and Cape Town). The twentieth century saw the construction of long distance train lines (connecting the entire nation), highways, expansion of the harbour, and (perhaps most significantly in Cape Town) construction of the Foreshore. This was in addition to the local train and tram lines constructed in the late nineteenth century. Modernisation of transport re-constructed space through the social connections it enabled, and through the spatial divisions it created.

Buitengracht Street manifested both conditions during this period: it constructed connections across the city, linking different destinations across Cape Town, yet its width and prioritisation of the automobile also created spatial divisions and cultural isolation. Buitengracht Street provided vehicular connection between the Foreshore highways and Kloof Nek Road to Camps Bay, between Somerset and High Level Roads and the city to Green Point and Sea Point. However enabling these connections were, twentieth century transportation spaces also had a divisive potential. Spaces of transportation provide buffers, divisions between spaces. Just as the train lines and highways divided urban Cape Town from the sea, and townships from White suburbs on the Cape Flats, Buitengracht Street - a continuation of the Foreshore highways - buffered the city centre from the Bo-Kaap. Transportation creates cellular space, where the practices occurring inside vehicles (carriages, train cars, automobiles) are sealed off from the surrounding environment, where interaction between those mobile and immobile is prohibited and the impossibility of interaction creates a boundary space of isolation. Buitengracht Street, a space devoted to vehicular movement, a space where the pedestrian was isolated from the vehicular user, provided isolation. This was achieved not only through the use by automobiles, but also the width of the street: Buitengracht has always been one of the wider streets in Cape Town. This width both enabled vehicular transport and provided a chasm of space between the city
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258 Van Graan links Foucault’s theories of control and social order to the construction of modernist housing, declaring that modernist housing can be seen as a manifestation of the exercise of authoritarian control over bodies. See “Influences on Two Inner City Housing Projects,” 22-24.
261 The Foreshore is the name given to the area constructed between the dockslharbour and the original coastline of Cape Town. The Foreshore, built upon fill and inhabited by large blocks of glass curtain-wall office buildings, represents the grand and surgical approach to modernist urban planning symptomatic in Cape Town in the twentieth century. See Pinnock, “Ideology and urban planning.”
262 Ibid., 158-159.
263 See M. de Certeau, The Practice of Everyday Life, 111.
1. Group Areas Map: Bo-Kaap the only 'Malay' area in Cape Town, and the only 'non-White' area in the Cape Town CBD. Source: Western, Outside Cape Town, 107.

2. Transport infrastructure, such as railway lines, used as boundaries between different Group Areas. To the left of the railway line, a 'White' area; to the right, a 'Coloured' area. Source: Western, Outside Cape Town, 104.
centre and outside. In 1951, Cape Town's City Engineer, Solly Morris, envisioned a ring road encircling Cape Town, enabling unhampered mobility by the private automobile. One leg of the ring road was to be Buitengracht Street, an elevated highway from the Foreshore down to Riebeeck Square, at which point it would again integrate with the system of surface roads. Although this plan was never brought to fruition, Buitengracht Street was nevertheless widened in anticipation of its reconstruction; those cleared spaces have only gradually been filled, leaving behind a scar of modernism and blank space of boundary. Throughout the twentieth century, Buitengracht Street spoke of the modernist privileging of the automobile over the street inhabitant, linking yet also providing a buffer space between places of different (racial) identities—

Power practiced through the municipality—Legislation

At the beginning of the chapter, I referred to the development of the Buitengracht boundary in regards to Lefebvre's spatial triad; as the title of the chapter indicates, in the twentieth century the Buitengracht boundary was produced as a representation of space. Representations of space are the spaces that are created conceptually, in the minds of planners of space, rather than through spatial practices or inhabitations. Lefebvre distinguishes representations of space from spaces of representations by distinguishing between space that is conceived (representations of space) and space that is lived (spaces of representation). The distinction between the space of the Buitengracht boundary in the twentieth century and the prior epochs is the degree to which the boundary was produced as a representation of space—rather than spatial practice or space of representation. The Buitengracht wall was a representation of space: constructed mentally through the dreams and intentions of engineers, with spatial practices of inhabitation undertaken as consequence to its conception. The other ‘representations of space’ boundary manifestations were the legislating of space: actions taken directly by politicians and bureaucratic administrators. Lefebvre states of conceptual spaces such as representations of space: “Conceptions of space tend [...] towards a system of verbal (and therefore intellectually worked out) signs.” Legislated space, space produced in consequence of administrative, political actions, is space conceived, for it has been a product of intellectual work, rather than physical labour (of constructing material space) or of inhabitation of space. As will be shown, in the twentieth century, the Buitengracht boundary manifested legislation—political acts—that dictated the shape of space through all of its aspects—events, inhabitation, and solid and void constructs. The specific representations that constructed the Buitengracht boundary were the Native Locations discourse, the Slums Act and finally, the Group Areas Act (GAA).

The Victorian concern for cleanliness and order did not dissipate under the modernist paradigm, but grew. It grew geographically within Cape Town, up the slopes of Signal Hill into the Bo-Kaap, and out along Somerset Road through the burial grounds and blocks of liquor stores. These areas were previously considered extraneous to the effort to cleanse the city, as they were ‘outside’. However, in the twentieth century, they too were subjected to cleansing, but of a different sort. Rather than ordered through new buildings and paving of roads and sidewalks, the areas outside of the Buitengracht were subjected to removals—of people, of practices, and even of buildings, in a modernist, ‘surgical’ approach to ordering the social and built environment. The concern for health and safety took priority over property owners’ rights (in contrast to the laissez-faire practices of British liberalism and colonialism) and the City declared its right to intervene in a spatial manner to resolve public health concerns.

The twentieth century iteration of spatial legislation utilised health and safety concerns, rather than inhabitation, to effect (racial) exclusions. I have already stated that in the discussions leading to the

264 UCT Manuscripts and Archives: S.S. Morris Papers BC 672: C6.3.15.
265 Lefebvre, The Production of Space, 38-39.
1. District Six, razed.
Source: Bezzoli, et al., Texture and Memory, 54.

2. Bo-Kaap, renovated - rather than razed.
Source: Townsend and Townsend, Selected Places and Facades, 44.
construction of the Schotsche Kloof and Canterbury-Bloemhof Flats, over-crowding and inadequate housing provision were the subject of public discourse in Cape Town. The subtext to the discourse, however, was race, racial mixing, and the poor living conditions (in)voluntary inhabited:

The first article of the series had described the area in the environs of Waterkant Street, District One (otherwise known as Waterside), as one where the inhabitants were living as contentedly ‘as pigs in a styre’. The article went on to inform the reader that in this area ‘poor white and filthy blacks live side by side’. Cape Town’s dominant class was also told that here was ‘poverty to be sympathised with’. There were ‘poorer white’ families of labouring men living in Caledon Street... These were people who were ‘compelled’ rather than who chose to reside there and who (again that phrase) were ‘degenerating by reason of their surroundings’.278

The solution to overcrowding and (considered worse still) racial integration was to ‘locate’ certain races outside of the city. The outbreak of plague in 1901 precipitated the removal of Black South Africans from the community of Cape Town in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. When that solution was rejected, a ‘Native location’ was located even further outside the city, on the Cape Flats: Cape Town’s first township, Ndabeni.272 Clearly, though, outside of the Buitengracht – where the quarry was located – was also outside of the White, sanitised city.

One of the most potent of legislative acts to (spatially) manifest the Buitengracht boundary was the Slums Act of 1934. The Act opened the (legislative) space for the City Council to clear large sections of undesirable areas, enabling the reconstruction of Cape Town in a modernist image. The Bo-Kaap was particularly impacted: nearly the entire ‘Malay Quarter’ was declared a slum under the Act.273 The Act gave the Medical Officers of Health the right to expropriate property deemed to be of a health risk. Already by the beginning of the twentieth century property owners in the Bo-Kaap, often landlords residing elsewhere in the city, were warned by the City Engineer to maintain their property to acceptable standards.278 The Slums Act gave the city even greater authority in the battle against overcrowding and decay. It had a dual impact on the construction of the Buitengracht boundary, in declaring the Bo-Kaap as outside of the city. Firstly, the Act declared (or confirmed) amongst public perception that the Bo-Kaap was a slum; it was an ‘Other’ space in the city. This perception, or discourse, was secondly confirmed through spatial productions – properties declared slums were demolished or subject to forced acquisition by the City Council276, and the modernist Schotsche Kloof Flats were added to the space of the Bo-Kaap. Interestingly, however, the Bo-Kaap277 did experience little building clearance, particularly in comparison to District Six, which was (nearly) entirely razed in the 1970’s.272 Some speculate that the Bo-Kaap was spared the modernist surgical clearing because of the construction of the ‘Malay’ identity and its place in the apartheid discourse; this will be discussed further later in this chapter and the next.

The Slums Act, and the construction of the Buitengracht as a legislated boundary between clean and slum, was a build up towards the most extreme legislated manifestation of boundary in the Buitengracht’s history: the Group Areas Act (of 1951). The GAA was one of the most spatially implicative manifestations of the will of the Afrikaaner National Party and the policy of apartheid. The construction of group areas was the government’s attempt to deal with racial segregation in urban areas278, to give White residents privilege.

278 Ibid., 54.
279 Ibid., 58.
270 Ibid, 58-60.
271 Davids, Mosques of the Bo-Kaap, 12.
274 Similar to the City Engineer, the Medical Officer became a powerful administrator in this period of South African history, giving authority and weight to much of the controlling, race-related legislation of the period. Communications from the Medical Officer to Slums Clearance committee expressed particular concern regarding the ‘Rose Street’ Area, that it be better maintained, and preferably that properties were transferred to the Housing Supervisor. See JCT: 1/4/95(1)/3.47.
276 See Housing and Slum Clearance Committee Minutes, JCT:1/4/95(1)/3.34.
277 By this period in history, the Bo-Kaap was commonly referred to as the ‘Malay Quarter’. For consistency sake, and because I consider the term ‘Malay’ a mythic misnomer, I will continue to use the term ‘Bo-Kaap’ throughout this paper.
278 The creation of Bantustans, or ethnic homelands, attempted to deal with racial equality on a national and rural scale, by minimizing the number of Black South Africans permitted to enter into cities at all. The Group Areas Act dealt with the remaining racial diversity in urban areas. This was done by designating every area of urban space as racially homogenous. Homogeneity was constructed through land ownership and inhabitation. See Western, Outcast Cape Town, 69-71.
1. Buitengracht Street
The boundary of the Malay Group Area.
Map Source: Surveyor General, Orthophoto Map.

2. Former Group Areas erased from 2005 Surveyor General Map.
Source: Surveyor General, Ulf Designation Maps.
through spatial domination in South African cities. In Cape Town, this privilege took the form of the city centre being designated 'White', while distant, outlying areas lacking amenities were zoned for other racial groups. The one exception to this was the Bo-Kaap: it was the singular non-White area declared in the urban centre of Cape Town. The Bo-Kaap was not only located adjacent to, but was actually above, the White centre of Cape Town. The significance of the GAA and 'Malay' declaration of the Bo-Kaap to the Buitengracht boundary? The line of the Act, the line separating the White area from the non-White, was Buitengracht Street.

The significance of the alignment of Buitengracht Street to the Group Areas boundary cannot be undervalued in the story of the Buitengracht boundary. As will be seen in Chapter 9, even after the repeal of the GAA, Buitengracht Street has retained an identity as the boundary between the Bo-Kaap and White city centre, between identities of White, 'Malay' and Coloured, between Islam and Christianity, between homogeneity and post-apartheid diversity. It has by now been acknowledged (hopefully) that Buitengracht Street has manifested boundary practices in Cape Town since its first material (and imaginative) construction. However, in the contemporary history of Cape Town and South Africa, because the GAA was the spatial 'villain' of institutionalised racism, domination, and exclusion under apartheid, the Group Areas iteration of boundary may be the Buitengracht's most politically potent manifestation in its history thus far.

However, even this iteration is nuanced - demonstrative of the subtleties and complexities of social practices, even under a tautological regime. As hinted at earlier, the line separating the White area from 'Malay' area did not continue along Buitengracht Street for its entire length. It did follow the length of the Buitengracht wall, but at Wale Street, the line moved up one block, and then continued down Rose Street, encompassing the city blocks between Buitengracht Street and Rose Street into the White area (D34). It will be shown in the next section that the blocks encompassed into the White area were primarily inhabited by businesses - most likely businesses with White owners. As apartheid served not to divide races purely for the sake of doing so, but for the privilege and (economic) advance of Whites, it can be conjectured that the shift in the Group Areas line off of Buitengracht Street was done for the benefit of the (Afrikaaner) National Party's constituents, the White residents of Cape Town.

The impact of the Group Areas Act (along the Buitengracht) was to erase any ambiguities and prohibit any negotiations potentially conducted along the Buitengracht boundary. If the boundary under British colonialism was ambiguous, if the nineteenth century social practices that defined the Bo-Kaap crossed Buitengracht Street, the Group Areas Act redefined the spatial parameters of those practices, and therefore the space of Cape Town. The operative mechanisms of apartheid were bureaucratic and exact, constructing legal definitions for moral, interpersonal acts and values; under apartheid, it was impossible to separate cultural practices from political. Apartheid legislation attempted to render cultural practices as discrete and homogenous, both socially and spatially. The Buitengracht boundary manifested these attempts, first through the homogeneous (and possibly mythic) identity of 'Malay' assigned to the residents of the Bo-Kaap, then through the demarcation and isolation of that identity spatially within Cape Town.

The Group Area's designation cemented the Bo-Kaap's identity as the Malay Quarter in the collective Cape Town consciousness; through the designation it became known as a homogenous area of Muslim, Coloured residents. 'Malay' was a term coined and promoted by I.D. du Plessis, an Afrikaaner intellectual and Commissioner of Coloured Affairs under the first National Party administration:

279 Ibid., 59.
280 Ibid., 115.
281 Ibid., xxi.
282 Ndelo, "Truth, Memory, and Narrative," 23.
283 Peet, "Does Size Matter?" 233.
284 Ndelo, "Truth, Memory, and Narrative," 31-32.
285 The terms 'cultural' and 'political' refer to the definition of social practices given in the *Civilian*. 
286 My opinion, developed through various readings and conversations, is that the homogenous identity of 'Malay' is mythic. I am particularly suspect of the designation of any place as homogeneous, as 'knowable', and of the historical inaccuracy of assigning all Cape slaves Malaysian origins. This opinion, though contentious, has been proposed by other scholars. It was particularly reachied through discussions in the undertaking of APG 706z 2004 research project entitled "Living Heritage of the Bo-Kaap." Also, see Joppie, "Historical Process and the Constitution of Subjects."
In his influential writings Du Plessis constructed an archetypal ‘Malay’, derived partly from nineteenth century writings and partly from current theories about race types. The ‘pure Malay’, he claimed, was ‘introspective, kind towards women, children and animals; inclined to speak slowly, to be passive and indolent. When aroused he may lose all self-control and run amok.”

Du Plessis’ racial constructs were informed by cultural practices such as folksongs; in turn these constructs rendered new practices, such as the formation of the Cape Malay Choir Board and construction of the Bo-Kaap as the ‘old Malay quarter’. These were colonialist constructs, in that they claim knowledge of the ‘Other’, the ability to define the ‘Other’, and therefore power over it. Through the construction of ‘Malay’ identity, the National Party was able to declare the Bo-Kaap a homogenous, Muslim, Coloured area. Under the policies and beliefs of apartheid, homogeneity – racial purity – is desirable, whilst heterogeneity and diversity are to be dismantled. The question has arisen in Cape Town historiography why the Bo-Kaap was preserved under the Group Areas Act while District Six, a similar area of overcrowding and liminality in central Cape Town, was declared White and then razed. Perhaps it was because District Six was a heterogeneously inhabited area, and that diversity needed to be expelled in fulfillment of the apartheid project? Similarly, the Waterside (today known as De Waterkant) was also declared White, and many residents removed. The Bo-Kaap - constructed as homogenous and elite amongst Coloured people - was preserved, signalling the importance of the ‘Malay’ identity in apartheid’s homogenous, hierarchical view of race and identity. The preservation of the Bo-Kaap may also be attributable to the Buitengracht boundary, as the boundary enabled rendering its isolation, its separation, and the construction of its homogeneity. Neither District Six nor the Waterside ‘enjoyed’ similar discretionary spatial limits; the heterogeneity of those areas was not only demographic, but also spatial.

Buitengracht Street, the Group Areas boundary, manifested principles of race and identity: it established a limit to the Bo-Kaap, isolated the ‘Malay’ identity from White, and it constructed the separation between Bo-Kaap and Cape Town for all to see. Lastly, it enabled the preservation of the Bo-Kaap, preventing the destructive fate of District Six, by preventing its spread, and therefore the threat of contamination - the miscegenation of ‘Other’ with White.

**A boundary of negative space**

Thus far in this chapter, the focus has been upon the events governing the space on either side of Buitengracht Street, but rarely the street itself. This has partially been because of the potency of practices on either side in constructing the boundary; however, it has also been because during the twentieth century, Buitengracht Street became a ‘negative space’. In art and architectural design discourse, the term ‘negative space’ is given to background space: shapeless in itself, but necessary for giving shape to the foreground. Negative space co-exists with positive space to construct a composition: without it, different objects could not be given distinct and appreciable form. I would like to propose that during the twentieth century, Buitengracht Street operated as a negative space in the city, facilitating its boundary manifestation, allowing each side to claim its own (separate) identity.

Buitengracht Street can be labelled a negative space because of it lacked the qualities of a destination space. Rather, the street was a space of movement – specifically, movement by the automobile. As mentioned earlier, Buitengracht Street became part of the regional vehicular network as highway construction and domination of the automobile impacted space planning in twentieth century Cape Town. Such inhabitation of Buitengracht Street has historic roots: under the VOC wagons were required to enter the city by walking up Strand Street to Buitengracht Street, then leave wagons and oxen at Boerenplein (now Riebeeck Square). However, in the twentieth century, the regional links went further a-field and Buitengracht Street lost its destination quality, except for parking. Buitengracht Street operated as a route to elsewhere. Compounding the quality of negative space, this route was excluded from the urban amenity system of public
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287 Bickford-Smith et al., *Cape Town in the Twentieth Century*, 83.
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1 Narrative 1 Boerenplein Map
Wagons entered Cape Town at the Castle, walked along Strand Street, then up Buitengracht to park in the Boerenplein.

2 Narrative 3 Riebeeck Square Map
Cars enter Cape Town on the Foreshore highways (lower image), onto Buitengracht Street, then park on Buitengracht Street - in the parking bays in the middle of the street, see Images 2 and 3, below - and in Riebeeck Square, demonstrating a continuum in practices from the eighteenth to twentieth centuries. St. Stephen's Church, seen in Image 1, has not been started since the eighteenth century but shares the square with cars instead of wagons. Base Map Source: Surveyor General, Orthophoto Map.

Symbol of Parked Car
Symbol of Car-related Business

S-4 Parking down Buitengracht Street in the early and mid-twentieth century. Source: NLSA.
transportation. The tram lines, removed in 1939\(^{291}\), ran parallel to Buitengracht Street on Long Street and crossed Buitengracht Street en-route to Green Point and Sea Point, but were not installed along Buitengracht Street itself. That left the individual automobile as the vehicle that inhabited Buitengracht. The automobile operates as an isolating cell in the city, separating the driver and passenger from the adjacent inhabitants and architecture. The domination of Buitengracht by the automobile rendered the street as devoid of interaction, a negative space. Buitengracht Street suffered the fate of modernism through technocratic mobility planning.\(^{292}\)

Public spaces of exchange and interaction – as Riebeeck Square had been in previous centuries – were replaced by privatisation practices of parking – for profit. If there was a destination along Buitengracht Street, it was parking bays. I have shown that the GAA line diverted from Buitengracht Street at Wale Street. However, Buitengracht Street retained its boundary manifestation below Wale Street: parked cars formed a thick zone of boundary down the middle of Buitengracht from Wale Street to Strand Street. This practice, of colonising the thick width of Buitengracht Street with cars, began early in the twentieth century, after the gracht was closed (D35). Even Riebeeck Square, once the destination of rural inhabitants from the hinterland, was converted to a parking lot - the destination of suburban dwellers coming to the city for commerce and entertainment.

It is conceivable that the impetus for claiming Buitengracht Street for cars relates to the commercial inhabitation of the buildings along the street. During the nineteenth century, it was seen that the space of Buitengracht Street related to maritime practices, with warehouses, boarding houses, and residents who supported the maritime industry – an inhabitation convenient to the docks located near the bottom of Buitengracht Street. As the twentieth century progressed, larger, commerce-inhabited buildings gradually replaced the residential inhabitations of boarding houses and private homes. The businesses that inhabited the street predominantly dealt with automobiles – sales, repair, and parts of automobiles – now conveniently located above the raised Foreshore freeways that end at the bottom of Buitengracht Street. Not only was Buitengracht a space for automobiles, but it provided a buffer zone in the city, between the commerce and hegemonic culture of the city centre – banks, theatres, department stores – and the liminality of the outside – liquor stores, mission schools and churches, 'slum' dwellings; even the Immigration Department was pushed to the 'outside' in Green Point in the 1920's. The buffer zone of automobile businesses was protected under the Group Areas Act, as seen in the shift of the line from Buitengracht Street to Rose Street. The claiming of Buitengracht for the automobile and as the bounding device between the Bo-Kaap and remainder of the city will be seen in the future to be instrumental to and indicative of the negotiating practices of the post-apartheid era, as Cape Town attempts to transform itself into a democratic space – yet one deeply rooted in global, capitalistic economic practices.

Conclusion

This chapter has told the story of the Buitengracht boundary as a representation of space – a conceptualised space, reflective of urban ordering produced through legislation and municipal control. The Buitengracht during the twentieth century, prior to the end of apartheid in 1994, was a boundary manifestation of modernist practices, as seen in the construction of the retaining wall and Schotshe Kloof Flats. The potential ambiguities in boundary manifestation read in the space of the nineteenth century Buitengracht, such as crossings of the Bo-Kaap, were controlled through legislation such the Slums Act and GAA: constructing an absolute, dictatorial boundary. Modernism also brought changes to practices of mobility in Cape Town, practices that inhabited Buitengracht Street with automobiles, rendering it a boundary space of negativity, constructing distance between two destination spaces. The next period in the Buitengracht story is by far its shortest, but yet the shift in paradigms – from apartheid to democracy, from modernism to postmodernism – are significant; through those potentially radical shifts, we shall see the (potential) re-making of a boundary.

\(^{291}\) Bickford-Smith et. al., Cape Town in the Twentieth Century, 63.
The shift from the previous period to this is marked by a momentous political event: the first-ever free, democratic South African elections were held in April 1994, heralding an end to apartheid and political control by the minority White population. The shift from apartheid to democracy is especially significant for the Buitengracht, as 'boundary' has previously been defined as a manifestation of exclusionary productions, typical of practices of colonialism and political domination. The post-apartheid manifestation of the Buitengracht 'boundary' is illuminating of the social and spatial practices of the postmodern, post-apartheid city: re-writing social and spatial boundaries of race, class, and identity in the 'new dispensation', and negotiating contemporary, global practices in a city still bearing the colonising marks of its origins.

The end of apartheid brought changes significant to the Buitengracht, and its construction as a boundary. The repeal of the Group Areas Act removed the legislated boundary of the Buitengracht - the representation of space. The Bo-Kaap, which has continually functioned as the poignant context for the Buitengracht's boundary manifestations, has become a space for negotiating the struggle to find and assert identity since the end of the apartheid practices that constructed the 'homogenous', isolated home of the 'Malay' people. Spatial productions in the Cape Town CBD have particularly manifested economic practices, practices influenced by state-level economic policies and global phenomena. Since 1994, Cape Town has experienced the international trend of growing income inequalities, with swelling unemployment and economic growth limited to skilled labour force areas such as finance, trade and leisure activities. This has led to a persistence of apartheid-induced racial segregation, although currently enforced through economic inequalities rather than legal racial separations.

Whilst local, provisional and national government have focused efforts on redeveloping previously disadvantaged areas, on the Cape Flats, through programmes such as the IDP and RDP and spatial plans such as the MSDP, spatial development in the Cape Town CBD has been primarily practiced through private, speculative investment. The combination of the global trend of residential revival of central business districts, and local trend of business and retail decentralization has resulted in residential growth in the Cape Town CBD, as seen through the conversion of office buildings to apartments and lofts. The Buitengracht, as the 'boundary' of the CBD, has been particularly impacted by these spatial and economic practices, as we shall see in the remainder of this chapter. The shifts in its boundary manifestation have been indicative of the negotiations of space and identity in Cape Town and post-apartheid South Africa: between dispensation and neo-liberal economics, between transformation and preservation of cultural heritage.

294 Unless noted otherwise, 'Cape Town' in this chapter refers to the CBD - Central Business District, the current term used in reference to the city centre, or 'City Bowl'. Geographically, this area covers that of the early settlements at the Cape. It differs from Metropolitan Cape Town, which includes all settling suburbs. Although it is arguable that to examine spatial practices while disregarding broader metropolitan scale practices will present an incomplete reading, for the sake of this study, it is only feasible to examine the Cape Town CBD.
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Views (from top to bottom) of Devil's Peak, Table Mountain, and Lion's Head, from the Bo-Kaap.
practices through material artefact\textsuperscript{300}; and between the stability of isolated, homogenous spaces in the city and the diversity of the ‘rainbow nation’.

Resistance (to the Loss of Boundary)

The impetus for this thesis was a small, group research project in which I participated in 2004, examining the intersection of cultural heritage and tourism in the Bo-Kaap. A subtext emerged in that study: a perceived threat to the identity of the Bo-Kaap. The (unspoken) argument stated that without the Group Areas Act and other related articles of apartheid legislation, the Bo-Kaap is no longer protected as a homogenous, ‘Malay’ community. Heterogeneity – of race, religion, and class – now is permitted and practised in the Bo-Kaap. This practice reflects not only the loss of legal prohibitions, but also the desirability of the Bo-Kaap: its ‘empty’ quarry sites provide shelter to homeless - predominantly Black - people, people of all races and classes enjoy the proximity to the city centre and the quality of views afforded - of the city, of Table Mountain, of Lion’s Head (D37). The GAA – spatially manifested through the Buitengracht boundary - is now (unconsciously) recognised to have provided a double-edge protection: protecting the ‘White’ city from contamination by the ‘non-White’, yet also protecting the Bo-Kaap from infiltration by heterogeneous social practices. This infiltration is seen as threatening the ‘way of life’ – the identity - of the Bo-Kaap: gentrification is economically forcing out residents, the influx of squatters and diversity of residential and commercial inhabitations bring change to the cultural and spatial practices of the neighbourhood. The implication of the concern is that ‘boundary’, specifically the Buitengracht boundary, is necessary for preservation of identity and for a sense of societal stability. This concern reflects those of the postmodern condition: the grand, historical narratives - of modernism, of apartheid, of racial distinction and separation - have been rejected. Postmodernism’s multiplicity of possible truths and realities is a liberating alternative to modernity; however, it also causes unease as it brings a loss of certainties – of known, shared values and truths.\textsuperscript{301} The concern of the loss of identity of the Bo-Kaap is indicative of this postmodern condition: whilst the end of apartheid has brought liberation, it has also brought a loss to the perceived – and possibly mythic - homogeneity of the Bo-Kaap.

The concern regarding loss of Bo-Kaap identity brings challenges to an intellectual, academic inquiry. The ‘perceived’ loss of identity is an emotional concern, debated in realms such as the press and personal conversation. It raises challenges for finding ways to construct a framework for measuring diversity and how change has occurred, both socially and spatially. This section of the chapter will attempt to tell the story of how the Buitengracht boundary has been ‘lost’ since the end of apartheid, and how that loss has been resisted in the attempt to assert an identity of the Bo-Kaap – and the nature of that identity. Whilst my own subjectivity questions the ‘mythic’ homogeneity of the Bo-Kaap as an apartheid construct, the narrative will focus upon examining the practices manifested through the Buitengracht boundary rather than interrogating the Bo-Kaap ‘Malay’ identity.

The Group Areas Act prohibited anyone other than ‘Malay’ persons to inhabit the space west of Buitengracht Street, with a nuanced clause permitting Christian ‘Coloured’ in one portion of the Bo-Kaap\textsuperscript{302}. When the Act was repealed, people of any race and religion were permitted to rent and purchase property in the Bo-Kaap. The removal of the exclusionary measures has resulted in changes to the demographic make-up and space of the Bo-Kaap: changing it from a ‘homogeneous’ space to heterogeneous one. Whilst I consider the term ‘homogeneous’ to be suspect, I would like to describe how heterogeneity has impacted the Bo-Kaap since the end of apartheid. Demographic changes have occurred: wealthier, often non-Muslim people have bought homes in the Bo-Kaap, which has increased property values. The increase in property values has made it difficult for less wealthy residents to remain: those renting are subject to evictions and those who own their homes now must pay higher rates, which are based upon property values.\textsuperscript{303} A subsequent concern raised is

\textsuperscript{300} Linda Graaf, et. al., “Living Heritage of the Bo-Kaap,” (Research Project, University of Cape Town, 2004).
\textsuperscript{301} Jenkins, On ‘What is History?’, 8-9.
\textsuperscript{302} Davids, Mosques of the Bo-Kaap, 20-21.
\textsuperscript{303} Thabo Masemola, “Shaking the foundations of history,” Cape Times, 18 June, 2005.
1. Typical second-story addition in Bo-Kaap.

2. Renovations at Shortmarket Street.

3. New construction at Rose Street and Shortmarket Street.


5. Rose Café, at the corner of Rose Street and Waale Street.

6. 7-11 on the 9th side of Rutengraacht Street.
that the influx of non-Muslim residents has the potential to erode the cultural practices of the Bo-Kaap, as new residents may not practice the modesty in dress or the temperance traditionally practiced by Muslim inhabitants. Another concern is that if the predominant economic class of the Bo-Kaap changes, a more "suburban" or private lifestyle will be practiced, in contrast the intense social interaction now practiced through the inhabitation of stoeps and streets. The divergence from traditional cultural practices of the Bo-Kaap is also experienced at the other extreme of income spectrum, as the people squatting the quarries also practice lived realities 'Other' to those of the 'Malay' residents of the Bo-Kaap. The degree to which the cultural practices of the Bo-Kaap may have changed in the post-apartheid years is difficult to measure: demographic changes can be measured through studies documenting home sales and property values; however, the loss of the discreteness of the Bo-Kaap is a more nuanced and subjective concern.

Regardless of the contention of the threat to discrete identity, spatial changes have occurred in the Bo-Kaap. I noted in Chapter 7 that over the course of the nineteenth century, as the centre of Cape Town was rebuilt, reflecting economic investment and technological innovation, the spaces outside of the Buitengracht were left relatively unchanged. Although a great deal of the Bo-Kaap was declared a 'slum' under the 1934 Slums Act, and therefore subject to demolitions, relatively little spatial change did occur during the twentieth century. One potential reason for this was that the combination of the Slums Act and Group Areas Act required the Cape Town City Council to acquire ownership of properties in the Bo-Kaap, and it was not in the city's financial interest to make investments to improving those properties, especially as racial legislation severely restricted potential buyers. Another reason was that the apartheid construction of 'Malay' identity included spatial protection of the Bo-Kaap, in an effort to preserve its architectural as well as cultural heritage. Due to these intentional and unintentional efforts, the Bo-Kaap is one of the most architecturally preserved spaces remaining in Cape Town. However, now that the space is subject to economic investment, its preservation has been threatened. Since the end of apartheid, a building boom has occurred in the Bo-Kaap. Additions have been added to existing homes, properties subdivided and new structures added, and empty plots developed. Densification has occurred, and along with densification, change to the architectural character of the Bo-Kaap.

The above paragraph focused upon the built form aspects of the space of the Bo-Kaap. The concern that the discrete quality of the Bo-Kaap is being lost in post-apartheid years also refers to the lived reality of the space of the Bo-Kaap. The apartheid-constructed Buitengracht boundary restricted the crossings permitted, and possible, between the "Malay" Bo-Kaap and White city centre. Without those restrictions in place, the number and frequency of exchanges across Buitengracht Street have intensified since 1994. For example, the streets of the Bo-Kaap are used for parking by people working and shopping across Buitengracht Street, in the Cape Town CBD. This can be attributed to the lack of parking facilities in the CBD, and the fact that on most streets in the CBD, street parking is metered; conversely, no bureaucratic practices govern parking in the Bo-Kaap. As parking practices cross the Buitengracht 'boundary' to come into the Bo-Kaap, shopping practices cross the street in the opposite direction. Formerly, the economic practices of daily life in the Bo-Kaap were discrete, with residents predominantly conducting their shopping inside the Bo-Kaap. Whilst crossings most likely occurred even during apartheid years, the practice of frequenting businesses on the CBD side of Buitengracht Street by Bo-Kaap residents seems to have increased in the years since 1994. For example, residents of the Bo-Kaap seem to frequent the 7-11 store on the CBD 'inside' of Buitengracht Street as much as - or possibly more often than - local shops such as the Rose Café. The significance of the change to the boundary manifestation of Buitengracht Street is that practices freely cross in both directions: Buitengracht Street now operates in a field of economic exchanges rather than as a dividing axis. Thus,
1. New mixed-use building above the Bo-Kaap Way, inside the Bo-Kaap.

2. SAHRA Guidelines for additions in Bo-Kaap: either locate at the rear of house or at least set back from street facade to minimize appearance of addition from street. Source: Pretorius, "Guidelines for Mainstream," 30-31.
commerce exchanges occur in both directions, at a rate increased since the end of apartheid. People come from across Cape Town to buy spices at Atlas Trading Company, meat at the Rose Street Butchery and Palmo Butchery, and get take-aways from Biesmellah's. Businesses with regional-scale cultural significance — such as MonkeyBiz and Carol Boyes — have recently re-located their headquarters to Rose Street, inside the Bo-Kaap. The events aspect of space has also "erased" the Buitengracht boundary: contemporary (2005) zoning laws dictate that both sides of Buitengracht Street are zoned identically - for mid-rise, commercial uses. This has translated to the construction of new, 3-4 storey, commercial and mixed use buildings on Buitengracht Street, on the Bo-Kaap side of the street (D39.1). Commercial inhabitations of space are infiltrating the Bo-Kaap, attracting businesses and clientele not restricted to Bo-Kaap residential inhabitants.

If the end of apartheid and repeal of the Group Areas Act have contributed to the deconstruction of the Buitengracht as a boundary, practices - particularly within the Bo-Kaap - have attempted to reassert the boundary, re-claiming the discrete identity of the Bo-Kaap. Resistance to the spatial changes of various aspects have been mounted. To prevent the (potential) loss of architectural heritage, SAHRA, the South African Heritage Resource Agency, has developed guidelines limiting the visible changes allowable to 'heritage' structure within the Bo-Kaap: such as requiring a one-room deep setback to any second floor addition so that the alteration is not visible from the street (D39.2). Gentrification is fought through legal action and cultural discourse. When developers threatened to evict the long-term tenants of the Leeuwen Mansions, a block of flats located at the intersection of Leeuwen and Lion Streets, legal action was taken to prevent the evictions. Newspaper articles and editorials debate the degree to which the Bo-Kaap is subject to gentrification and change. An anti-gentrification organisation has been established, and both it — the Anti-Gentrification Front - and the Bo-Kaap Civic Association regularly speak out against changes to the social and spatial fabric of the Bo-Kaap. The result has been a discourse of contestation: contesting the loss of the boundary to the Bo-Kaap — the Buitengracht boundary.

Legal resistance to the loss of the Buitengracht boundary — and subsequent threatened loss of identity of the Bo-Kaap — has also been mounted in regards to the Tana Baru. Although closed for burials in 1884, the Tana Baru has continued to manifest a religiously significant space, both in the Bo-Kaap and for the broader Islamic identity in Cape Town. In the discourse of space and identity, the Tana Baru has continuously symbolised Islam in Cape Town, particularly as a resilient, subaltern religion. However, the Tana Baru has recently been the proposed site of speculative real estate development, by families residing in the Bo-Kaap who hold title deeds to land in or adjacent to the burial ground. In 2005, a fatwah was issued by the Muslim Judicial Council (MJC) in protest of the proposed development, banning any land sales and housing construction at the site of the Tana Baru. Although the fatwah was countered by three pro-development Islamic rulings, it was supported by the Bo-Kaap Civic Association. The fatwah points to the nature of the discourse of space and construction of identity currently undertaken in Cape Town and the Bo-Kaap. It demonstrates that the projection of identity - or at least the role of a space such as the Tana Baru in the projection of Bo-Kaap identity - is not coherently practiced within the Bo-Kaap as static and Islamic: the fatwah was issued by MJC, with support from the Bo-Kaap Civic, against Muslim Bo-Kaap residents. It also demonstrates that space is a production of events - legal action in this case — as well as construction of built form, and the significance of space in the construction of identity.

306 MonkeyBiz is an employment and empowerment project which supplies women in townships with glass bead, with which they make artwork that is predominantly marketed to tourists. Carol Boyes is a silversmith, making high-end tableware, also marketed to tourists. Both companies have developed as recognisable brands in the craft market, certainly at the scale of Cape Town if not nationally.


309 See Chapter 7 for a lengthier discussion of the Tana Baru and its significance in Cape Town.

310 Marianne Merrin, "Muslim council issues fatwah against property development," Mail & Guardian, 1 July, 2005.
Wale Street: the “voorhanger” to the Bo-Kaap

Its width and gentle slope make Wale Street the most accessible entry into the Bo-Kaap, and its link to the centre (CBD) of Cape Town (Image 1) marks Wale Street as the public entry - the “voorhanger” - to the Bo-Kaap.

Destinations such as the Bo-Kaap Museum - significant for its built form and use - (Image 2), shops such as Attie Trading and the Rose Cafe (Images 3-4), and the tourist attraction of street “colourful houses” (Image 5) bring Cape Town to Wale Street, and thus, the Bo-Kaap.

The use of (Bo-Kaap) for celebratory events, such as the Kaapvoet Klopse (Image 6), asserts an identity of Wale Street, and thus the Bo-Kaap, as historically and spatially distinct from Cape Town, thereby potentially reasserting the Ruitengracht as a boundary in the post-apartheid city. This assertion contests the “crossing” of practices, such as parking (Image 7), and new constructions (Image 8) that have begun to occur on the Bo-Kaap side of Ruitengracht Street.

1 Wale Street: The “voorhanger” to the Bo-Kaap

2 Bo-Kaap Museum, with wavy parapet, on Wale Street.

3 Cones set out to mark “private” parking space on public street, in the Bo-Kaap.
Less formal resistance also has been mounted, attempting to protect the discreteness and isolation of the Bo-Kaap within Cape Town. The appropriation of streets of the Bo-Kaap for parking is contested by the use of ‘red cones’: mosques and private homes set out coloured plastic cones and bricks in front of their buildings, preventing cars from being parked there (D40.3). Although the streets are public spaces, owned by the City of Cape Town rather than by individuals or private organisations, parking prohibitions speak of the privitisation of public space. Whilst privitisation is a global phenomena related to shopping malls and similar private/public spaces, this practice rather asserts that the infiltration of ‘outside’ practices into the Bo-Kaap is not welcome for the disturbance it creates for residents. Another practice with similar effect is the projection of call to prayers made from the mosques of the Bo-Kaap. At certain times of day, and days of the week, the call to prayers can be heard throughout the Bo-Kaap, announcing the presence of Islam in the space, and the temporal and cultural rhythms particular to the Bo-Kaap. These ‘spatial’ practices communicate the identity of the Bo-Kaap: as discrete, as isolated from the Cape Town that surrounds it.

The practices described above - legal action, parking prohibitions and projection of calls to prayer – attempt to assert the identity of the Bo-Kaap through spatial events. Perhaps the most publicly overt way that the loss of the Buitengracht boundary has been contested and resisted is through the inhabitations of Wale Street. Just as the Bo-Kaap has continually served as the context through which the Buitengracht manifested ‘boundary’, Wale Street has similarly held the continual role of marking out the space of the Bo-Kaap as distinct from the CBD. Wale Street is the voorkamer to the Bo-Kaap318, the space where the city is allowed to enter and visit the Bo-Kaap. Its role as such has not been diminished in the period since 1994; perhaps, even, the celebration of the space as such has intensified in that period. Wale Street’s special role in asserting a Bo-Kaap identity can be seen through the built form of the street: the drastic change to architectural fabric that occurs at Buitengracht Street, and the width and access of the street - in comparison to parallel streets. The change to the space of Wale Street at Buitengracht Street was reinforced in the 1970’s, when a significant portion of Wale Street demolished - under the Slums Act - was rebuilt as replicas of the nineteenth century huurhuisjes.319 Wale Street also is the widest street entering the Bo-Kaap, and of the streets perpendicular to Buitengracht, the one most accessible for automobiles, due to the low grade of the slope and the presence of a traffic signal. This has been augmented by the Bo-Kaap museum: part of Cape Town’s network of Iziko Museums, significantly located at the intersection of Rose and Wale Street, in one of the oldest buildings in the Bo-Kaap, and one recognisable for its ‘wavy parapet’320 (D40.2). The combination of recognizable architectural heritage and accessibility has constructed post-apartheid Wale Street as the public face – the voorkamer - of the Bo-Kaap: the space that publicly preserves and communicates its identity (D40.1).

Wale Street’s public role is practised on a daily basis: as inhabitants of the CBD look up Wale Street towards Signal Hill, as tourists come to visit the Bo-Kaap Museum and tour buses drive up Wale Street321, as various inhabitants of Cape Town enter and exit the Bo-Kaap through Wale Street. The significance of Wale Street, though, in relation to assertion of Bo-Kaap identity is also played out through special events, events which claim Wale Street, and thereby the Bo-Kaap, as the destination for subaltern identities in the city. Two such events are the Kaapse Klops, or New Year’s Parade, and the Bi-Centennial of Freedom of Religion. The first, the Kaapse Klops, is a New Year’s celebration - comparable to Carnival and Mardi Grad festivals around the world - traditionally held on January 2, the single day of the year that all slaves were given as a holiday.322 Just as in the nineteenth century, the parade publicly presents and celebrates Cape Town’s racial diversity, and its crossing of the city re-writes the space of Cape Town. Whilst the Kaapse Klops is an annual event, celebrating different racial identities in Cape Town, the Bi-Centennial was a single event – held in September 2004 - linked to the history of Islam at the Cape. Both events, however, share a spatial dimension: publicly claiming space in Cape Town, briefly re-writing the city through a discourse of identity and practices. The

---

318 See Chapter 8 for a discussion of voorkamer.
319 See Townsend and Townsend, Bokaap Faces and Facades; and contemporary iteration for recognition of huurhuisjes replication.
320 This building is one of two remaining in the Bo-Kaap that still have the significant, baroque parapet, and is therefore significant to architectural history in Cape Town. Terma Loew, Buildings of Cape Town: Phase Two 1983, Volume Three: Catalogue and Classification (Cape Town: Cape Provincial Institute of Architects, 1983) 336.
321 Graaf et. al., “Living Heritage of the Bo-Kaap.”
322 See Chapter 7 for a further discussion of the New Year’s Parade.
1. Marking the Buitengracht boundary - stopping the Kaapse Kloof for cars to cross Water Street.

2. Marking the Buitengracht boundary - through its measure.


The Kaapse Kloof - New Year's Parade - re-making the space of the Cape Town through its crossing, crossing from District Six into the CBD, across the Buitengracht 'boundary' into the Bo-Kaap at Water Street.

5. Heritage Square - commercial inhabituation, architectural preservation.

6. Rubbeek Square - car park.
spatial dimension of both events is defined by procession down Wale Street, and a significant crossing of Buitengracht Street before entering the Bo-Kaap (D41.1-4). Both events cross the boundary, doing so in such a public, conscious way as to bring attention to the everyday existence of the boundary - through their special rejection of it. These public, celebratory events, although occurring only annually - or even less frequently - leave behind traces of practices and identities, enabling the reading of Buitengracht Street as the boundary to the Bo-Kaap for the remainder of the year. By crossing the Buitengracht boundary, these events bring the city to the Bo-Kaap, yet through such an overt subtext of subaltern identity, they simultaneously assert the ‘Other’ identity of the Bo-Kaap.

**Buitengracht – negotiating device in the post apartheid city**

If the practices and spatial manifestations described above resist the loss the homogenous identity of the Bo-Kaap, the next set of practices and spatial manifestations of the Buitengracht are less contestational. Rather, they are involved in negotiating the practices and identity of a post-apartheid Cape Town, balancing heritage with commerce, preservation with development. These negotiations give rise to questions regarding the role of boundaries in contemporary cities, and in Cape Town particularly – a post-apartheid, post-colonial city still steeped in and deeply marked by the colonising (and apartheid) practices through which it was constructed.

One space that poignantly marks the negotiations and transformations of post-apartheid Cape Town is Riebeeck Square. The spatial narrative of the Buitengracht boundary has consistently been linked to the practices occurring in and around Riebeeck Square – initially called Boerenplein, then Hottentot Square, and in the twentieth century renamed as Riebeeck Square. At the end of the twentieth century, Riebeeck Square and its surrounds are indicative of the transforming practices of the city. The initial inhabitation of the Boerenplein in the eighteenth century was a place to park wagons coming from the rural hinterland, bringing goods to be sold at Greenmarket Square (D35). In the twentieth and twenty-first century, the square is used as a car park (D41.6). This speaks of the role of the automobile in the city: a contemporary phenomenon, but one particularly relevant to Cape Town because of its lack of public transportation infrastructure. It also speaks of the adjacency between Buitengracht Street and Riebeeck Square – that Buitengracht Street operates as a regional vehicular link, facilitating access to the car park for daily commuters. It speaks of the privileging of the automobile economically; the square has always been a space of trade and exchange, and importation of goods from rural areas; now those goods are cars and the trade is payment for a parking spot. The car park reinforces Buitengracht Street’s boundary manifestation: it fulfils the street as a distancing space, privileging vehicle rather than pedestrian inhabitation, and reiterating that the destination is inside the CBD, inside the Buitengracht boundary.

The privatisation of Riebeeck Square, through parking practices, is indicative of the contemporary, global urban practices, as public space is increasingly commodified and subject to subtle practices of privatisation. Cape Town in the post-apartheid years has followed such global trends, partially as crime and safety concerns are negotiated through controlling access to otherwise public space. Riebeeck Square and its neighbour – Heritage Square – manifest these practices, and in doing so construct Buitengracht Street as a boundary.

---

323 The last renaming presumably occurred as part of a larger revival interest in Jan van Riebeeck that developed in the first half of the twentieth century. Interview with Nigel Worden, 12 December, 2005.

324 Miriam Hansen, foreword to Oskar Negt and Alexander Kluge, *Public Sphere and Experience: Toward an Analysis of the Bourgeois and Proletarian Public Sphere* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), xxvi-xxxix.

opposite side of Buitengracht Street, where the buildings have been built in the mid-twentieth century, with little regard for constructing a pedestrian-friendly street. If Heritage Square provides a built form that can be considered beneficial for the city in comparison to the buildings on the opposite side of Buitengracht Street, it does however construct a privatised realm: one that contrasts the public inhabitation of streets, across Buitengracht, in the Bo-Kaap.

Whilst spaces such as Heritage Square continue to distinguish between inside the Buitengracht and outside, the post-apartheid boundary manifests difference much more than exclusion. Buitengracht Street, in its post-apartheid manifestation, marks the difference between built form spatial productions: between pedestrian scale storefronts and monolithic, blank-façade buildings, between preserved nineteenth century built fabric and late twentieth century modern interventions, and between density and the open space of car parks. These differences, best understood through the examination of images (D42), speak of a city of transition, of change; these differences speak of the different moments in the history of Cape Town.

The bottom of Buitengracht Street to Strand Street distinguishes between the Foreshore – a production of modernist, apartheid Cape Town – and the Waterfront and de Waterkant. The latter two spaces are post-apartheid productions. De Waterkant is a residential neighbourhood, historically similar and connected to the Bo-Kaap, but subjected to forced removals under the Group Areas Act. It has recently become an expensive residential area, associated with homosexuality through its high density of gay bars and high number of homosexual residential inhabitants. The Victoria and Alfred Waterfront is a commercial development, re-making the harbour into a space of entertainment with shopping malls, hotels and condominium developments. Just as the bottom of Buitengracht Street in the nineteenth century supported the contemporary maritime practices with warehouses, boarding houses and liquor stores, the post-apartheid space similarly supports contemporary practices: the V&A Waterfront is a tourist destination; the Foreshore’s inhabitation by the Cape Town International Convention Centre, office buildings, and its connection to the harbour speaks of globalism and international trade; and de Waterkant represents Cape Town’s identity as an African city tolerant of different cultural practices.

From Strand Street to Wale Street, the different sides of Buitengracht Street mark different moments in architectural history. The CBD side of the street is primarily made up of buildings dating to the nineteenth or early twentieth century. At street level, most buildings have large storefronts, which construct a pedestrian-friendly streetscape. Conversely, the opposite side of the street (the Bo-Kaap side) is marked by large, open spaces and buildings with few openings to the sidewalk. This side is a production of modernism: the open spaces are the clearings left as space was made for Solly Morris’ planned Ring Road326 and the few buildings built up to the edge of Buitengracht Street reflect modernist architectural language. This portion of Buitengracht Street particularly negotiates the role of the automobile in the city, through the amount of space used by parking – in the middle of Buitengracht Street as well as in Riebeek Square – and the clearances rendered to make space for vehicular traffic.

The top portion of Buitengracht Street, above Wale Street, is the space marked by the Buitengracht retaining wall. The wall persists in dividing Buitengracht Street: above it is the Bo-Kaap, the Bo-Kaap of negotiations between small, nineteenth century houses adjacent to new, three-storey mixed use buildings. Below the wall are four, fast moving lanes of traffic and large, monolithic buildings, occupying entire (or large portion of) blocks, with few or no apertures along the street at the pedestrian level. The wall has perhaps enabled the

326 See Chapter 8 for discussion of the ring road and expansion of Buitengracht Street.
protection of historic architecture of the Bo-Kaap and distinction between the Bo-Kaap and modernised CBD.

Conclusion

The Buitengracht’s manifestation of difference, whether architectural or inhabitational or cultural, demonstrates the negotiations and contestations in post-apartheid Cape Town. However, this post-apartheid Cape Town and its post-apartheid boundary are not unique; the differences marked by the Buitengracht, the differences that construct the boundary, are those of all living cities. The Buitengracht of the post-apartheid period is one reflecting space as process: new spatial inhabitations and events intermingling with traces of historic built forms and practices, creating a palimpsest of boundary manifestations. Identities are negotiated through social practices and spatial manifestations, practices and phenomena are asserted and resisted, rendering contestations and negotiations. Perhaps these practices and the reading of their spatial manifestations as boundary manifestations can re-imagine what is ‘boundary’, and what is the role of boundary in the contemporary, living city.
THE BUITENGRACHT – IMAGINATIVE PRODUCTIONS

Having concluded the narratives of the Buitengracht boundary, it is clear that a dialectical examination of space, as a manifestation of social practices, does not produce a finite reading. Rather, the construction of a story of space is on-going; the examination of space is a process, is speculative.

The intention of the thesis has been to examine space as a manifestation of social practices: to operationalise the spatial dialectic through the case study of the Buitengracht boundary. Through the dialectic, I have shifted the subject of the study from a traditional architectural history, to looking at both built form and lived reality as spatial subjects, seeing how 'boundary' has manifested, through both realms. This has been the study of a space geographically fixed, but multivalent in the boundary conditions it has manifested throughout its history.

The study has been a scoping of the Buitengracht’s various boundary manifestations over the 350 years since Cape Town’s European colonial origins. The span of the study has been structured through identifying ‘epochs’: critical paradigms in the productions of power relations in Cape Town, and the corresponding shifts in the boundary manifestation of the Buitengracht. Because a boundary is a device crucial to the colonial project, a focus of the research has been the becoming of Cape Town through its colonial history, and the role of Buitengracht Street in that history. Therefore, it has been read that the Buitengracht first emerged as a colonial boundary; it manifested the distancing of the VOC settlement from the outside, ‘Othered’ space of the Cape. When the colonial paradigm at the Cape shifted from VOC control to British control, the boundary manifestation likewise shifted. Within British colonial Cape Town [Epoch 3], the Buitengracht manifested the practices indicative of the British imperial project, practices concerning race, religion, class hierarchies, and the production of wealth. Thus the boundary negotiated the distinction between the centre and periphery of Cape Town, between the Bo-Kaap and centre of town, distancing Islam from Christianity, labourers from the space of commerce, freed slaves from former owners. In the shift from British to local municipal control [Epoch 3 to Epoch 4] at the beginning of the twentieth century, colonialism was (gradually) contested by modernism as the dominant paradigm in Cape Town. This shift was spatially manifested in the Buitengracht by productions of the local authority, most noticeably the construction of the stone retaining wall bisecting Buitengracht Street. As the first half of the twentieth century saw power produced through legislation and civic constructions, the use of bureaucracy and legislation to construct racial values was intensified under apartheid [Epoch 5]. During apartheid, the space of the Buitengracht most significantly manifested boundary through its event aspect: through the Group Areas Act, legally separating the White city centre from ‘Malay’ Bo-Kaap. Since the end of apartheid, in 1994, Cape Town has operated through post-apartheid, post-modern practices. The post-apartheid boundary [Epoch 6] has been one of crossings, of negotiations, and of resistance to the loss of the stability provided by modernist grand-narratives. Consequently, throughout its history, Buitengracht Street has manifested boundary as a practice — as a dynamic, shifting set of exclusions, classifications and negotiations, typical of the urban productions of the social and spatial ordering of cities.

Through the scoping of the Buitengracht, the project of the thesis has been to recognize non-material as well as material productions of space. Thus, I have relied upon theorists who have demonstrated the spatial

327 Scoping has been used as a research operation appropriate for 'mini-thesis', one-half of the requirement for a Master’s of Philosophy degree. The intent of the scoping has been to develop a broad understanding of the subject area, in which an area of focus could be identified for future study.
dialectic of lived reality-built form: theorists such as Lefebvre and de Certeau. Their theories have been operationalised by working dialectically: firstly, I applied a four-part definition of space: reading through solids, voids, events and inhabitation. Then, the actual examination of the Buitengracht was a dialectic operation of examining social practices and constructing mappings. The two operations brought a dynamic reading to static, archival, historic evidence, thus seeing the space as fluid. Additionally, in light of Cape Town's colonial history, a sub-intention has been to see how space can be used as a text through which to critique the practices of politically dominating ideologies. Thus, the thesis set out to uncover previously silent (or quiet) histories of liminal identities and practices. In order to do so, I utilised theories critical of productions of power, particularly under colonialism, relying upon Foucault and post-colonial theorists.

The outcome of the study, of seeing the boundary space as inconclusive, as on-going, is indicative of and appropriate to the nature of the study: to post-structuralist perspective, to the application of post-colonial theory, to the case-study nature of the research. The study has been one of claiming a spatially dialectic subject; in doing so, a limitation has been that the findings of the study have not produced architecturally dense descriptions. Instead, the study has produced descriptions of the process of the becoming of the city, with architectural space as the representation of epochal shifts. Just as post-colonial studies reject discrete, meta-narratives indicative of modernism, this thesis has rejected the goal of constructing a 'meta-narrative' of the Buitengracht boundary, preferring to see construction of the space as a process of possibilities.

The project of the thesis, rather than attempting to unearth a singular spatial manifestation, has been to illuminate a spatial history of Cape Town, to demonstrate how practices operative under political systems such as apartheid and colonialism have rendered (a) boundary space(s), manifesting the exclusions of the productions of power. More importantly, though, this thesis has sought to be operational — to explore and represent an approach towards architectural investigations, to instrumentalise the spatial dialectic, to demonstrate the need for the recognition of space as a process and as multivalent.

However, now that the Buitengracht boundary has been scoped, that a spatially dialectic research method has been operationalised, additional ways need to be found to move forward, to further the contribution architectural research can make towards understanding how cities become. Whilst the Lefebvre spatial triad enables expanding the conception of space, its application to contemporary conditions is limited. The spatial dialectic, as I utilised in the thesis, is most appropriate for dynamically examining static historical evidence. However, the contemporary condition is much more fluid and complex. Inspired by Jennifer Robinson and Arjun Appadurai, I propose that the work of the imagination perhaps suggests a way forward.

Robinson uses imagination as a means of proposing readings of cities alternate to those traditionally offered:

> Just as the spaces of the apartheid city divided, they also generated crossings and interactions: crossings as people moved and lived and worked in different places; crossings as the memories and meanings of different places were carried with them; crossings as people imagined what those other places were like.[328]  
> The city spaces imagined by Robinson offer choices, possibilities. Hers is not a city materially different to Cape Town, it is not a boundary materially different to the Buitengracht; rather, it is imagined differently. The Buitengracht imagined thus far in this thesis has been one of exclusions, of distance, of distinctions and classifications. Neither Robinson's city of crossings and intersections nor the thesis' city of exclusions is more accurate, more real: they are each products of different imaginings. To see space imaginatively is to see it in relation to social practices, as a fluid entity that alters depending on its inhabitation, its context, as well as its built — or material — manifestation.[329] This supports the postmodern notion that space is not a fundamental truth, waiting to be uncovered.

---

Imagination gives (mental) space for the complexities of contemporary conditions. For example, Robinson explores the imaginings of dwellers of the apartheid city, through Zakes Mda's novel *Ways of Dying*, and the power of their dreamings to enlighten us to the multi-dimensionality of apartheid space:

> [the novel] refuses to treat experiences of these spaces as one-dimensional. Shack settlements may be spaces of exclusion, of poverty and neglect on the part of authorities. But they are still part of the city, part of the creative potential of modern urban life. They are places where people build everyday lives, imagine and reimagine themselves, and make homes from which they set out to negotiate — and change — city spaces. 330

Appadurai develops a similar position, in his work with urban dwellers in India, furthering the relationship between imagination and space through the concept of *locality*:

> But because I do believe in the work of the imagination, I believe your engagement with this empirical world can be somewhat different depending on what translocalities you inhabit mentally, in and through the imagination. 332

Perhaps, then, a further study would examine the Buitengracht imaginatively, as a material space and as a set of localities. To shift the conception of spatial productions from material to imaginative opens up a range of possibilities — possibilities of the ways of seeing space — as inhabitant and as researcher — and possibilities of space itself. This thesis, through scoping the boundary manifestations of the Buitengracht, has provided a spatial (hi)story, one in which the language of architecture has been used to examine material and non-material manifestations of social practices. It has laid a foundation for further investigations, for re-examining — imaginatively — the Buitengracht and the city. Consequently, perhaps future work will read the Buitengracht as a space of possibilities, of 'translocalities', of crossings as well as exclusions, of intersections as well as distancings, postulating what the post-modern, post-apartheid city may be and become.

---

330 Jennifer Robinson, "(Im)mobilizing space — dreaming of change," 164.
331 Please see discussion of ‘locality’ in Chapter 5.
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