

Identity, conflict, and memory in Cape Town's public spaces: Unearthing the Waterfront

Lindsay Ryan

Mall developments, in the words of one critic, “represent the utopian future that we would have if we could have it now”.¹ “Made of dream and desire,” they are a projection not of who we are or were, but who we wish we were: they are our attempt to remake our own identity.² The mall is also a path, “a traditional metaphor for life...inviting journeys that evoke but do not follow tradition”.³ In a new democracy like South Africa, these twin tasks of remaking identity and beginning journeys, rooted in history, take on fresh imperatives. The relationship between a commercial development like Cape Town's Victoria and Alfred Waterfront and the young democracy in which it is situated is complex. Shopping malls tend towards “defining people as consumers, a shopping public (pseudo-public), rather than as citizens”.⁴ They are the artificial “fusion of the profit motif and the egalitarian ideal”, stand-ins for democracy that are privately controlled.⁵ Recent events at the Waterfront, including government plans to privatise its share and conflicts between local fishermen and developers over marina properties, make the Waterfront questionable as a symbol of a new democratic South Africa.⁶ The discovery of a human burial ground at Prestwich Street in the Waterfront development area also brings up issues of memory in post-apartheid South Africa – its disappearance into collective forgetting, its selective revitalisation, and the constant tug-of-war between these forces. However, the Waterfront has space for multiple interpretations and identities that form, reform, and replace each other in a process akin to creative destruction. Its democratic potential materialises not from the developers' intentions but from the conflicts and reawakenings that emerge as reactions to those intentions. These contested, evolving notions of historical and global identity communicate something much deeper than mere commercial calculations ever could.

The Waterfront is designed to project the image of a young, vibrant society gloriously reborn from the ashes of the past. Malls are conceptualised as able to “counteract the phenomenon of alienation, isolation, and loneliness and achieve a sense of identity”.⁷ In a country where so much violence has been done to identity and belonging, the language in which the Waterfront is couched rings of a retroactive attempt to rectify matters. The Waterfront rebrands Cape Town. According to a cruise company employee, “It's the Waterfront now. Before it was just a plain harbour”.⁸ If Boston has Faneuil Hall or Minneapolis has Mall of the Americas, post-apartheid Cape Town has the Waterfront. Its motto includes the phrase, “Choose a better future”. Promotional materials glorify the working harbour as Cape Town's “link to the sea”, alive with “the slap of water, the creak of rope, the groan of wood”.⁹ Books make implicit analogies between the renewal of South Africa as a whole and the revitalisation of the Waterfront, transformed from “a bleak no-man's-land of derelict warehouses and restricted areas” to “an environment of infinite potential and interest once again”.¹⁰ The shops include countless African boutiques, craft vendors, and Indian clothing and jewellery stores. As an immaculate mall whose image expressly radiates (at least superficially) pride in diversity, the Waterfront is intended to emanate an identity that should have been publicly celebrated for decades but was violently suppressed under apartheid.

Not only is this multicultural identity politically correct and progressive in conception, if not in implementation, it also sells. As Morris points out, “The display of difference will today increase a centre’s ‘tourist’ appeal”.¹¹ Worth billions of rand, the Waterfront is South Africa’s number one tourist destination with some twenty million visitors annually and part of a booming global tourist “destination industry”.¹² The Victoria and Alfred Company now offers consulting services worldwide on waterfront development.¹³ The Waterfront is one example of an explosion of the “heritage industry”, with “the sale of a modern ethnicity to foreign tourist; design gestures towards the Victorian-colonial, and deployment, in the service of consumption, of human and resource management strategies which were originally formalised in the contexts of imperial rule”.¹⁴ The Victoria and Alfred Company capitalises on its sensitivity, identity creation rhetoric, and somewhat token gestures towards historians, including thirty-two informative but inconspicuous historical storyboards.¹⁵ The Waterfront is self-consciously post-apartheid, which raises questions of the “authenticity” of its post-apartheid-ness: it markets itself as such partly because visitors demand a “post-apartheid experience”. It also provides a place for visitors to relieve themselves of their nation’s complicity in apartheid through shopping somewhere associated with a new, non-racist vision of South Africa. In the words of a gallery owner, “American money built the Waterfront...They feel when they buy a painting they are doing something. With apartheid we all feel guilty”.¹⁶ Thus, responsible consumers can buy goods for cheaper than at home and consciously assuage their guilt over apartheid without having to take real action: an easy, comfortable symbiosis in which money mediates all interactions.

Nevertheless, the Waterfront as post-apartheid utopia shatters upon closer inspection. Malls are, after all, “palaces of dreams, halls of mirrors, galleries of illusion”; their substance is never so tangible and simple as one first believes.¹⁷ Despite attempts to reimagine itself as cleanly severed from the past, the Waterfront is still a racist and classist environment. The ads and manikins are disproportionately white, perhaps to make the predominantly white, middle-aged, foreign shoppers more comfortable in a city where they are a minority. Likewise, the very idea of recreating a romanticised moment from the imperial past panders to whites and has discriminatory implications, given that “pastness will be associated in consumers’ imaginations with the repressions of colonial-apartheid social orders”.¹⁸ As an assertion of Cape Town’s liberal, British identity, supposedly repressed during apartheid by Afrikaners in Pretoria, the Waterfront becomes a rationalisation for white Capetonians.¹⁹ It assures them they were not at fault for apartheid, while it “excludes others who had no part in a predominately white bourgeois Capetonian nostalgia”.²⁰ By leaping directly from the Victorian past to the present, it also conveniently excises apartheid. Moreover, the heritage presented “lays emphasis on buildings rather than people”, and since buildings reflect the history of the wealthier classes who inhabited them, “the result was a drift on the part of the planners to preserve a heritage which reflected technological development, aesthetic appeal and success, all associated with white capitalism”.²¹ The storyboards are one attempt to re-introduce erased histories of oppression, but even they were edited to remain in line with a vision that admits past oppression but refuses any hint that it relates to the present.²²

Additionally, the Waterfront is profoundly spatially and socially segregated. People are “in their places”: shoppers are mostly white, security guards are black, dockworkers are coloured, and supervisors are white. Mall-goers see the fenced-off docks but do not go there, just as dockworkers rarely go to the malls.²³ Shoppers may read the historical placards about workers at

the Waterfront in the past, but they have no means to connect to workers now. Furthermore, security guards are not allowed to speak to shoppers, except to give directions and handle policing; even beyond being figuratively silenced by a class divide, the largest group of black South Africans at the Waterfront is literally silenced. The echoes are disturbing; an apt analogy might be to Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, where white foreigners experience Africa as a primordial jungle backdrop but Africans themselves never speak.²⁴ Thus, whites at the Waterfront are absolved from true interracial interaction; the mall is a "spectacle [that] therefore pacifies and depoliticises and takes the form of a permanent 'opium war', with commodified, segregated leisure as the narcotic."²⁵

Even when working class black South Africans do come to the Waterfront it as lookers-on, as "aspirational consumers".²⁶ Rents are astronomical to ensure only "quality" traders.²⁷ The result is uniformly high prices. As one Waterfront employee commented, "Lower income guys can walk around all day and spend no money...they come on bus on the weekends with their families. They're all coloured people".²⁸ Thus, most black or coloured South Africans at the Waterfront, a space supposed to represent a new South African identity, are sidelined; as in apartheid, they can go to the white parts of the city, but only to work, or in this case, to see the spectacle without participating. As one critic notes, "identity will 'necessarily mirror the inequalities of wealth and power that already exist: if you can't buy it, you can't have it'".²⁹

While "respectable" coloured or black people can browse at the Waterfront if they like, the mere presence of certain groups of people is unacceptable. These include street children, hawkers, car-minders, minibus and taxi drivers (except in marked, ever-diminishing areas), beggars, and "suspect' township shoppers".³⁰ During construction of the Waterfront, more than three hundred squatters, who had been there on average more than ten years, were evicted; they were in a "particularly sensitive area" and according to a nearby nightclub owner, caused "great damage to the image of Cape Town as a prime tourist destination".³¹ Conflicts continue. In the words of a young woman begging outside Victoria Wharf with her one-year-old son, "Most of my time, I'm struggling with money, so I come here. People here are friendly and give. I'm looking for twenty rand, maybe thirty, then I go home to buy food. The security guards kick us away, but...if we were bothering them [the shoppers], we'd go away'".³²

Waterfront management sees the situation differently: beggars, street children, and vendors do not belong in their vision of the new South Africa, and image control demands that these people be erased from the landscape. As the security shift manager put it, "The problem here is especially the beggars, the vagrants. We have to get them off the premises or have the police get them off the premises...Tourists usually give to them. We advise them not to, because they just go buy alcohol and drugs".³³ Security also boots performers who have not earned licensure by audition.³⁴ Below the manicured façade, a continuous turf war takes place between those entrusted with maintaining the illusion and encroaching representatives of urban poverty. Shoppers are not exposed to the details of this struggle but are comforted to know it exists. The Waterfront proudly announces 24-hour surveillance on over one hundred CCTV cameras, proclaims the Waterfront a "zero tolerance environment", and advertises its R8 million annual security budget.³⁵ As cities are increasingly perceived as dangerous places, "overt and pervasive security may itself be part of the attraction [of malls]", and the exclusion of underprivileged

subpopulations “protects patrons from the moral confusion that a confrontation with social difference might provoke”.³⁶

The natural question is who exactly these patrons are and why they must be so diligently protected from any suggestion of socioeconomic tension. Such security lengths would be unnecessary if the Waterfront were intended for a primarily South African demographic, since South Africans confront the realities of social difference in their cities every day. However, the Waterfront is not so concerned with creating a new South African identity *for South Africans* as it is about disseminating one to the world. Part of this “myth of identity” is of a racially enlightened, post-apartheid city, but part of it is also of a country open to the world. By linking city to port and port to the world, the Waterfront portrays Cape Town as an internationalised, modern metropolis.³⁷

This global element can be both defining and destructive. On the one hand, the Waterfront would not exist without tourism; it craves tourists and tourists crave it. The Waterfront is built around the possibilities of global visitors; management searches for “things that will differentiate us, not from Tyger Valley, not from Cavendish Square, but from Boston, and from Sydney”.³⁸ Nonetheless, conforming to global norms can be profoundly homogenising – hence the global is at once an impetus for and a bulldozer of local identity.

Moreover, to appeal to tourists the Waterfront represents itself in a very specific way that fortifies pre-existing stereotypes about Africa. There is a continuous, in-your-face focus on African-ness at the Waterfront, but it seems drawn not from reality but from colonial myths of a romanticised, wild Africa. Every store has elephants, from the pricey silver elephant bracelets to Harley Davidson t-shirts with elephants. In a country with a complex political and socioeconomic situation, cute megafauna are an obvious, facile solution to creating a friendly image. However, the ostrich eggs, springbok skins, and zebra-print hats sold at stores like Out of this World seem ironic. The Waterfront, as South Africa’s symbol of modernity, commercial culture, and “newness”, still depends on safari imagery that would fit better in eighteenth-century explorer accounts than in a dynamic, postcolonial society. Even the names of shops like “Out of this World” advertise South Africa as exotic, heathen, and uncivilised – but also fascinating and sensuous. That image resonates at other stores as well: Diesel Style, for example, has a poster out front with an S&M scene in the jungle.

This exoticisation, the result of demand at its most fundamental, is a window into one of the principal contradictions of the Waterfront: the uneasy compromise between practical economic benefits and less tangible issues of forging a new, non-colonial identity. The Waterfront provides thousands of jobs, supporting tens of thousands of people indirectly. The revenue it brings in feeds families, clothes children, buys medicines, and improves people’s quality of life. Academics may ignore such benefits, but to do so certainly reflects their own class-privileged ability to overlook the daily struggle for survival that many South Africans face. Yet at the same time, the Waterfront perpetuates stereotypes that do ideological violence to South Africa – and that has very concrete socioeconomic impacts in the long run, since global markets, far from being the rational mechanisms purported, are deeply influenced by ideology.

Public culture shies away from messy economics, but the Waterfront is unmistakably a cost-benefit analysis, although one involving a comparison of two very different creatures. Perhaps in continually avoiding economics – in leaving cost-benefit calculations to the economists – public culture has deprived itself of creating analytical tools to apply to these costs and benefits in order to analyse the interplay between ideological and economic impacts.

Consumption is not merely a material act. It is also “a language in which commodities are goods to think with in a semiotic system that precedes the individual”.³⁹ Marketing intends to “mask the materiality of the commodity” since circumstances of manufacture (in this case, perhaps, mass production in a factory near Durban) “threaten to invalidate the conditions required for rightful and righteous possession”.⁴⁰ Consequently, commodities at the Waterfront are not just items to be purchased but symbols of an “authentic” Africa, which the consumer deciphers through tacit cultural codes of meaning. Examination of the commodities offered is really an analysis of representations of Africa.

The goods sold at the Waterfront do have an African character, but not one that is especially South African. At one store, for example, the beaded Ndebele dolls are from Zambia, the wooden carved giraffes and spoons from Kenya, and the masks from the Ivory Coast. The only South African items in the store are figurines of the Masai, who are not from South Africa and which are made by a woman originally from Italy. Thus, the Waterfront capitulates to the European tendency to lump all of Africa together into one undiversified land mass filled with tribes and wild game. Tourists can buy a purportedly genuine curio, place it on a shelf at home, and use it as a conversation-starter or simply a symbol of how well travelled they are: “the image has more substantive effect than reality”.⁴¹ In a nation dependent on tourism, foreign consumers thus have a role in determining how that country produces (quite literally and materially) its identity.

The flip side to the Waterfront’s African flavour is its offer of an escape from Africa. The mall is “a mixture of convenience, leisure, and symbolic aspiration evocative of such values as ‘modernity’ and ‘first world progress’”.⁴² It is a foil to the grit, bustle, crime, odours, and visible class divides of the downtown.⁴³ Business at the Waterfront picks up substantially when Ratanga Junction is closed down; the Waterfront is an equivalent choice for a commodified South African entertainment experience.⁴⁴ In fact, tourists never have to leave the Waterfront: it offers attractions, shopping, hotels, tours, and conference space all in one. Visitors can buy their African souvenirs and then escape to Levi Strauss; Africa can be consumed in manageable bites, and Robben Island can even be thrown into the mix as the one-stop historical shop for the politically conscious. In the words of a British tourist staying on site, “I came to the Waterfront to take a break. I wanted to go off and explore some areas, but the concierge said not to go to the bad part of town – and why leave here when you have everything at your fingertips”?⁴⁵ As even the Waterfront company itself admits, “A strong contemporary commercial force, American entertainment, has moved into a building erected by a previous strong force, British manufacturing and engineering. It recalls Christians in Southern Europe erecting cathedrals right on the sites of city mosques...”.⁴⁶ This “Westernised” feel might not have been part of the original conception, but as Morris comments, “Shopping-centre identities aren’t fixed, consistent, or permanent”.⁴⁷ (Interestingly enough, the consumer demographics are changing: a recent internal report shows that 65 percent of buying income is from 16–25 year-olds, mostly

local.⁴⁸ This shocked storeowners, who now must completely alter their marketing.⁴⁹ If the Waterfront represents a new post-apartheid and global identity then all that is absent – poverty, integration, crime, etc. – is simply deleted from South Africa’s public conception. The Waterfront is a paradox: it claims to be both authentically South African and an escape from South Africa.

While Worden dismisses the globalised character of the Waterfront as an “internationalized, escapist image” that makes “producing a new heritage...fruitless”, this is not entirely accurate, since internationalisation is also part of Cape Town’s heritage.⁵⁰ The waterfront was always a liminal zone, where goods were exchanged, journeys began and ended, cultures met, and people immigrated and emigrated. Until World War II, it was one of South Africa’s focal points for international capital and human flows.⁵¹ However, the pier was destroyed to deepen the harbour, ugly and monolithic buildings dehumanised the landscape during apartheid, and highways severed the waterfront from the city.⁵² Meanwhile, containerisation, the reopening of the Suez, and finally international sanctions diminished the harbour’s significance.⁵³ It became an irrelevant agglomeration of “run-down yards and decaying warehouses” stranded amidst a “concrete desert”.⁵⁴ Although globalisation now has different connotations than before (for example, of homogenisation rather than diversity), it is ironically also a rediscovery of a heritage of sorts destroyed by apartheid isolationism.

The Waterfront can be conceptualised as a spatiotemporal journey. Developers clearly envisioned it this way. The visitor walks into Victoria Wharf through enormous glass revolving doors, entering a clean cocoon, the portal to a dream. The floor plan lures one deeper into a railway station, or perhaps a ship, with white masts, skylights, and lanterns shaped like sextants. The elevator, mechanical workings exposed, draws one upstairs. The nautical ambience reiterates the harbour’s history but also produces the sensation that coming to the Waterfront is like stepping onto a ship to journey into the unknown future. The Clock Tower, built in 1882, reinforces the sense of temporal voyage at the Waterfront. The clock is “a symptomatic and almost universal new feature of the postmodern retail environment...visually punning history and the way things were...[yet] not a threat to the idyll of consumption for it always stands at the threshold of the present”.⁵⁵ In essence, the Waterfront exalts Cape Town’s history only insofar as this does not threaten the eternal present of consumption.

However, authorities can never control every layer of meaning: hidden significances push up like volcanic intrusions from deeper strata. Malls are “consecrated to timelessness and stasis...yet lived...in intimately historic terms”.⁵⁶ In quantum mechanics, Heisenberg’s Uncertainty Principle states that the very act of measuring a phenomenon changes it. In the case of the Waterfront, this could be modified: the very act of telling a story changes it. The Waterfront cannot create a pure image of the revitalised past without the traumas of that past affecting it, and the story that finally emerges is still of a temporal journey but not the one envisioned by the developers.

The histories that emerge are many: the Waterfront is full of ghosts. There are the storyboards, and the story of the storyboards that Worden explains.⁵⁷ There are countless books recently published on the Waterfront due to surging interest since redevelopment. These works entail a re-evaluation and re-valuation of the totality of the Waterfront’s rich history. The stories tell of

sailors and slaves helping each other escape masters and press-gangs, of the breakwater construction that occupied thousands of convicts in the latter half of the nineteenth century, and of the 1878 riots and escapes from Breakwater Prison, where prisoners had to run on a giant treadmill for hours on end.⁵⁸ They tell of the 1884 strikes of Irish, Mozambican, West Indian, and West African labourers, of the emergence of the Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union (ICU) in 1919, and of the introduction of industrial revolution technology to deepen the harbour.⁵⁹ They tell of the pier, demolished in 1938, that served as a cultural centre to the city, with fireworks, concerts, food, and a vibrant fishing industry.⁶⁰

There is the tale of the San prisoners and the 11,000 pages of the Bleek/Lloyd notebooks, and there are sub-tales of San folklore.⁶¹ The Breakwater prison construction was linked to harbour improvements, needed during one epoch of internationalisation, just as the UCT spell out acronym or footnote business school now inhabiting the building is essential in another epoch of internationalisation, one demanding specialised financial knowledge. The San prisoners themselves moved between identities – Kabbo the shaman, the scientific specimen, the Englishman – like the Waterfront itself moves between identities – the post-apartheid, the global, the Victorian, the Western. The story of the San is one of linguistic, cultural, and physical translation, just as the Waterfront now demands translation of commodities, history, and painstakingly constructed image into individual or collective identity.

Finally, there is the story of Prestwich Street. If developers assumed they could unearth a selective piece of history without the contestations surrounding it, they were wrong. In digging up old stories, they quite literally dug up the people who inhabited them. The hundreds of bodies buried in an informal early nineteenth-century graveyard at Prestwich Street brought to the forefront debates over memory and forgetting and highlighted extant race and class divides. Prestwich Street was a microcosm of clashes at the Waterfront as a whole, but it was also different because it was concrete: there were bodies. From the perspective of Hands Off Prestwich Street, the debate centred on the need to “symbolically restore memory and dignity” to “the forgotten people who were part of the life of Cape Town...who built Cape Town”.⁶² The bodies were “an opportunity for the new South Africa to demonstrate to the international community its ability to imaginatively acknowledge its collective history,” with all its pain.⁶³ They were a test to see exactly how far the notion of heritage, and of Waterfront re-vitalisation (bringing back to life, in multiple senses), would be taken. Activists viewed the Waterfront as “a recognised centre of development skewered towards the historically advantaged...It says nothing about the Africa which is ours”.⁶⁴ The exhumation of the bodies was also explicitly linked to the forced relocations that destroyed District 6.⁶⁵ The dismemberment of the sea from the city, of vibrant communities during apartheid, and of human bodies themselves coalesced in a struggle over who defines heritage and what that definition includes. In the end, the activists' loss raised questions common to many redevelopment projects about whether the lure of heritage-based revitalisation actually weakens the power of the very people to whom that heritage belongs.⁶⁶

The story of Prestwich Street is a defeat for a notion of heritage deeper than buildings and nautical accessories. Nonetheless, to see Prestwich Street as nothing more than a defeat is to miss its significance as a contestation over identity in a place with myriad meanings. The mere fact that these struggles are taking place is a success, for they represent organic identity formation

and reformation that is truly South African, in a way that the highly controlled image envisioned by Waterfront authorities is not.

Globally, we struggle with issues of memory and forgetting. The evolution of identity is a process of selection of those elements from the past and present that we choose to define ourselves. And the creation of that identity is always a struggle – over both who has the privilege to make those choices and where on the spectrum of memory and forgetting the notion of progress lies.

Cape Town's Victoria and Alfred Waterfront is a nexus of contradictions, extremes, and syntheses. The Waterfront claims to embody “a sumptuous blend of Victorian architecture, maritime tradition, and African culture [that] ensures a shopping environment that is lively and cosmopolitan” and to be “a splendid introduction to South Africa”.⁶⁷ Whether it succeeds in that is certainly problematic on multiple cultural, historical, spatial, and social levels. However, regardless of whether the Waterfront is a “success” in its mission, it undeniably reveals a genuine struggle over notions of identity beneath the entire carefully staged spectacle. Moreover, it is in this very struggle – unplanned, unchoreographed, and unwanted by the developers – that the authentic South Africa shines through: as a place of tensions, of compromises, of contrasts, and of ongoing identity negotiations in a post-apartheid, globalising society.

¹ N. Backes, “Reading the Shopping Mall City”, *Journal of Popular Culture*, vol. 31 no. 3 (1997), p. 12.

² N. Backes, p. 1.

³ N. Backes, p. 11.

⁴ S.A. Murray, “An Academic Milling Around ‘The Mall’: (De) Constructing Cultural Knowledge”, *Critical Arts Journal*, vol. 11 (1997), p. 160.

⁵ G. H. Lewis, “Community Through Exclusion and Illusion: The Creation of Social Worlds in an American Shopping Mall”, *Journal of Popular Culture*, vol. 24 no. 2 (Fall 1990), p. 121; K. T. Jackson, “All the World's a Mall: Reflections on the Social and Economic Consequences of the American Shopping Center”, *The American Historical Review*, vol. 101 no. 4 (Oct. 1996), p. 1118.

⁶ “Waterfront put up for sale,” *Cape Times*, 18 February 2005; “Mega marina planned for V&A's Granger Bay”, *Sunday Argus*, 27 February 2005.

⁷ J. Goss, “The ‘Magic of the Mall’: An Analysis of Form, Function, and Meaning in the Contemporary Retail Built Environment”, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol. 83 no. 1 (March 1993), p. 23.

⁸ V. Cruises. Employee. personal interview, 24 February 2005.

⁹ N. Worden, “Contested Heritage at the Cape Town Waterfront”, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, vol. 2 no. 1&2, p. 61.

¹⁰ N. Veitch, *Waterfront and Harbor: Cape Town's Link with the Sea* (Cape Town: Human and Rousseau, 1994), introduction.

¹¹ M. Morris, “Things to do with Shopping Centres”, *The Cultural Studies Reader*, ed. S. During (London: Routledge, 1993), p. 398.

¹² Victoria and Alfred Waterfront website, www.waterfront.co.za; “Waterfront put up for sale”, *Cape Times*, 18 February 2005.

¹³ Victoria and Alfred Waterfront website, www.waterfront.co.za.

¹⁴ J. Goss, p. 36; S.A. Murray, p. 159.

¹⁵ N. Worden and E. van Heyningen, “Signs of the Times: Tourism and Public History at Cape Town's Victoria and Alfred Waterfront”, *Cahiers d'Etudes africaines*, no. 141-142 (1996), p. 232

¹⁶ Gallery owner. personal interview, 24 February 2005.

¹⁷ M. Morris, p. 397.

¹⁸ S.A. Murray, p. 157.

- ¹⁹ N. Worden, p. 63.
- ²⁰ N. Worden, p. 65.
- ²¹ N. Worden and E. van Heyningen, p. 221.
- ²² N. Worden, p. 71.
- ²³ Dockworkers. personal interview, 24 February 2005.
- ²⁴ C. Achebe, "An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*," *Hope and Impediments: Selected Essays* (New York: Doubleday, 1989), p. 17.
- ²⁵ D. Thorns, *The Transformation of Cities: Urban Theory and Urban Life* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), p. 145.
- ²⁶ S. A. Murray, p. 153.
- ²⁷ N. Worden and E. van Heyningen, p. 224.
- ²⁸ Gallery owner. personal interview, 24 February 2005.
- ²⁹ S. A. Murray, p. 160.
- ³⁰ N. Worden, p. 73.
- ³¹ "Waterfront Squatters Demand to Stay," *Mail and Guardian*, 24 January 1997.
- ³² Patricia. personal interview, 24 February 2005.
- ³³ Waterfront security shift manager. personal interview, 24 February 2005.
- ³⁴ Idem.
- ³⁵ R. Birk, *The Making of Cape Town's Victoria and Alfred Waterfront: The Inside Story of Its Planning, Design and Creation* (Cape Town: Victoria and Alfred Waterfront (Pty) Ltd., 1998), p. 84.
- ³⁶ J. Goss, pp. 27, 26.
- ³⁷ M. Morris, p. 393.
- ³⁸ R. Birk, p. 87; Tyger Valley and Cavendish Square are malls located in the Western Cape.
- ³⁹ N. Backes, p. 6.
- ⁴⁰ J. Goss, p. 20.
- ⁴¹ J. Goss, p. 21.
- ⁴² S.A. Murray, p. 156.
- ⁴³ P. Underhill, "Inside the Machine", *Wilson Quarterly*, vol. 28, no. 1 (Winter 2004), p. 4.
- ⁴⁴ Employee of Vicky Cruises. personal interview, 24 February 2005.
- ⁴⁵ British tourists. personal interview, 24 February 2005.
- ⁴⁶ R. Birk, p. 42.
- ⁴⁷ M. Morris, p. 393.
- ⁴⁸ Art gallery owner. personal interview, 24 February 2005.
- ⁴⁹ Idem.
- ⁵⁰ N. Worden, pp. 73, 74.
- ⁵¹ N. Worden, p. 61; V. Bickford-Smith and E. van Heyningen, *The Waterfront* (Cape Town: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 28.
- ⁵² V. Bickford-Smith and E. van Heyningen, p. 60.
- ⁵³ N. Worden, p. 60.
- ⁵⁴ N. Veitch, p. 103; V. Bickford-Smith and E. van Heyningen, p. 51.
- ⁵⁵ J. Goss, p. 37.
- ⁵⁶ M. Morris, p. 399.
- ⁵⁷ N. Worden and E. van Heyningen,
- ⁵⁸ N. Veitch, pp. 64, 68; P. Newall, *Cape Town Harbor: 1652 to the Present* (Cape Town: Portnet, 1993), p. 10.
- ⁵⁹ V. Bickford-Smith and E. van Heyningen, p. 20.
- ⁶⁰ P. Newall, p. 21; Cape Metropolitan Tourism: Cape Town 2000, "Waterfront Heritage Route" pamphlet.
- ⁶¹ N. Penn, "Fated to Perish": The Destruction of the Cape San", *Miscast: Negotiating the Presence of the Bushmen*, ed. Pippa Skotnes (Cape Town: UCT Press, 1996), 81-92; J. Deacon, "A Tale of Two Families: Wilhelm Bleek, Lucy Lloyd, and the /Xam San of the Northern Cape", *Miscast: Negotiating the Presence of the Bushmen*, ed. Pippa Skotnes (Cape Town: UCT Press, 1996), pp. 93-114.
- ⁶² Hands Off Prestwich Street internal documents.
- ⁶³ Hands Off Prestwich Street, "Substantiation of Appeal," 15 October 2004, pp. 7, 8.
- ⁶⁴ Prestwich Place Project Committee submission to the DAC Tribunal, 20 May 2004, p. 9.
- ⁶⁵ Hands Off Prestwich Street internal documents.

⁶⁶ D. Pinder, B. Hoyle, and S. Husain, "Retreat, Redundancy, and Revitalization: Forces, Trends, and a Research Agenda", *Revitalizing the Waterfront* (London: Belhaven Press, 1988), p. 257.

⁶⁷ Victoria and Alfred Waterfront website, www.waterfront.co.za; N. Worden and E. van Heyningen, p. 215.