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This paper is based in part on research undertaken in Windhoek, Namibia during the period 19<sup>th</sup> June - 9<sup>th</sup> July, 1999. The research entailed the gathering of primary and secondary source materials in Windhoek’s National Library, the Namibian National Archives, the University of Namibia’s Multi-Disciplinary Research Centre, the Namibian Economic Policy Research Unit, the Windhoek Municipality, and the Windhoek Surveyor General’s Office. Furthermore, I conducted approximately 30 interviews with urban practitioners working in the public, private and non-profit sector, as well as with individuals residing in various parts of the city.

Throughout the paper, views and perceptions of Windhoek residents are interspersed to strengthen or contradict certain arguments. The interviews were qualitative in nature, with emphasis having been placed on open ended questions. Note should be taken, however, that not enough interviews were conducted to formulate or justify a representative picture of resident opinions. Nevertheless, the individual views presented here are valid contributions to the aims of this paper. The data generated from the interviews should, therefore, be seen as an indication of how some Windhoek residents perceive their urban environment.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the support given to me by the staff of the above institutions, as well as thank those various people who shared their time, opinions and knowledge with me.
1 INTRODUCTION

Apartheid still exists and will continue to exist for a long time. Katutura [a former township] will stay black and east Windhoek white. There is a spatial dividing line in the brains of most people, even if unconscious (Namibian social scientist, personal interview, 8.7.99).

The north-western areas [Windhoek’s former townships] are just normal suburbs. When you need something you drive into town with your car or a taxi. That’s normal. Nothing needs to be integrated (municipal town planner, personal interview, 24.6.99).

As Sibley has remarked, “the built environment [is] an integral element in the production of social life, conditioning activities and creating opportunities according to the distribution of power in the socio-spatial system” (1997: 76). In Namibia’s capital city Windhoek, a century of colonial rule has left a durable imprint on the structure and spatial nature of its urban environment. Today, almost a decade since the country achieved its independence from South Africa, the majority of the city’s black population remains excluded from the benefits of urban life.

During Namibia’s apartheid rule, policies and laws based on ‘racial’ distinctions served to entrench economic and political inequality and helped guarantee ‘black’ people’s economic and social marginalisation. Spatial segregation further consolidated this domination, as township locations and layouts ensured the exclusion of its residents from urban life. Over time, economic, racial and spatial groupings have become interchangeable. To say that someone lives in Katutura, Windhoek’s former black township, is nearly synonymous with saying that the person has black skin and is economically impoverished.

The city of Windhoek was developed along British and US-American suburban ideals which led to cellular, monofunctional, low-density developments. Such suburban layouts represent ideal urban forms for the segregation of population groups. In this case, the monofunctional city layout helped exclude black township residents from urban opportunities. The townships’ location on the city fringe, approximately five kilometres from the then ‘white’ areas of the city, fragmented the urban environment even further. As a result of these unique circumstances, Windhoek’s townships, although fashioned along suburban models, developed characteristics different from their counterparts in the city’s former white areas.

Today, Windhoek’s urban planning legacy is most visible with regard to two particular aspects of its urban morphology. First, one notices the continued segregation of the city’s population along racial lines. Second, as evidenced by the physical separation of the former township areas from ‘the city’, monofunctional suburban layouts continue to fragment Windhoek’s urban fabric. As a result, Windhoek’s unique morphology directly impacts the access of township residents to opportunities such as employment, services, and amenities.

Windhoek’s urban planners continue to follow a suburbanisation strategy, viewing their role as providers of equal technical services to all areas of the city. These ‘equal technical services’, though, are offered with the middle-class resident in mind, and, as has just been noted above, the suburban planning model inadvertently promotes continued exclusion of township residents. Such an approach reveals how urban planners neglect history and the variations in urban morphology which resulted out of apartheid urban planning policies. Residents of the former township areas face very different urban planning issues and possess unique needs in comparison to those living in the city’s former white neighbourhoods.

If we take into consideration the historical circumstances of township development, as well as the expressed needs of its residents, then we might be directed toward the necessity for urban planning policies which promote spatial and social integration. ‘Integration’ opposes segregation and could help reverse the ill-effects of apartheid urban planning while meeting the particular circumstances and needs of township residents. Integration, hence, possesses both a spatial and a social component by bringing people together in space, and by conferring marginalised people equal opportunities in the urban setting. By integrating Windhoek, town planners could promote common and equal membership in society. However, contemporary cities rarely, if ever, offer all residents equal access to urban opportunities. Instead, segregation and marginalisation form a common feature in our present-day urban environments everywhere. One may even argue that the truly integrated city simply does not exist, at least within a capitalist society. For the sake of Windhoek, we must therefore treat ‘integration’ as a process, rather than an end-point. The term is thus utilised in this paper to describe a movement toward greater integration in respect to both the city’s spatial and social developments.

This paper will argue that racial segregation, though without legal basis, still exists in Windhoek. However, the central problem with
regard to integrating the city is not segregation *per se*. Rather, from an urban planning perspective, integrating the city requires not necessarily the eradication of racial separation, but the eradication of the spatial circumstances of that separation. Urban residents, in general, are not only affected by the physical location of their residence in relation to the city, but also by the physical structure of their immediate environment itself. It is, therefore, important to examine not only the relationship of the segregated areas to the city as a whole, but also the spatial nature of the segregated areas themselves. In doing so, the paper will point toward the need for a more spatially (and consequently, socially) integrated Windhoek by focusing on two primary objectives. First, it will highlight some of the current spatial, economic, social, and cultural urban realities experienced by Windhoek residents. Second, the paper will investigate segregation and suburbanisation in their spatial and social components in order to explore township residents’ marginalisation from the urban environment.

The second section of the paper will present a brief overview of Windhoek’s historical development, tracing its origins in the 1890s through German colonialism and the South African apartheid regime. This overview is followed by a narration of social, economic, and cultural conditions in present-day Windhoek. The description will provide the background for subsequent sections. In section three, a closer look at Windhoek’s spatial layout, as it relates to racial segregation, reveals that the old apartheid form has not been fundamentally altered. More importantly for the sake of the paper’s argument, interviews with township residents indicate that racial segregation as such does not lie at heart of their marginalisation. Rather, as an investigation of the suburban spatial and structural arrangements in section four reveals, continued marginalisation of the majority of the black population can be attributed to the fact that monofunctional, fragmented urban environments are unable to meet the requirements of these same residents. In conclusion, it is argued that little has changed in terms of the spatial living conditions for the majority of Windhoek’s residents. Spatial exclusion of Katutura residents from urban opportunities and amenities remains a problem which will exacerbate township marginalisation unless the city shifts its town planning strategies in favour of greater urban integration.

2 WINDHOEK CONTEXTUALISED

In order to better understand contemporary Windhoek and its issues of segregation and suburbanisation, it is necessary to contextualise the city historically. In fact, it is impossible to comprehend Windhoek’s city structure without reference to its colonial and apartheid past. The following section details the impact of colonial and apartheid rule on Windhoek’s urban development, and concludes with a portrayal of the city in its contemporary setting.

As is the case in many colonial settlements, colonial rule in Namibia was preceded by missionary activity, beginning in 1842 (see figure 1). The country received its present boundaries in 1884/1885 when, at the Berlin Conference, European rulers divided the African continent between them. South West

![Figure 1 Namibia (Source: Hishongwa 1992)](image)
Africa, as the territory was then called, became a German protectorate. In 1919, however, the League of Nations placed Namibia under South African mandate. Having the greatest impact on Windhoek’s urban form, the period of apartheid rule began in 1948 after the National Party came to power in South Africa.

Apartheid was distinguished from its colonial predecessor in the degree to which it restructured an entire society. All political and economic power was assembled in the hands of the white minority. Entire population groups were removed and relocated in the interests of this all-powerful minority to create an essentially dual society. Namibia and South Africa were divided into industrialised white areas with an essentially western life style, and rural black areas with subsistence agriculture and ‘tradition’ as its mainstay. The spatial separation between race groups was the physical expression of the social, economic and political division within Namibian and South African society. Due to its limited population, however, spatial separation was enforced more rigidly in Namibia than in South Africa. According to Pendleton, “[t]he small population and long distances between places made police control much more efficient than would ever have been possible in South Africa” (1994: 23).

One of the key instruments in implementing apartheid policies on a spatial level was the forced homogenisation of ethnically and culturally distinct groups, based on the policy of ‘separate development’. Separate development was justified on the grounds that indigenous traditions had to be preserved. The ideology was fostered by the view that African peoples had ‘traditionally’ lived in isolated and bounded communities. The colonialists argued that black people would feel most comfortable, and be most able to develop according to their ‘nature’, among their own ethnic group. Under the policy, all Namibian black and coloured people, classified into ten subdivisions based on race and ethnicity, were forced into ‘homelands’. These homelands were marginal with regard to size and any natural resources base, and hence unable to sustain its populations (Hishongwa 1992: 12). They did, however, ensure a steady supply of cheap labour to the cities as a way to meet the economic needs of the white minority (ibid.: 55-56). This technique of ‘re-tribalisation’, served as a means to divide and rule, and was successful in helping to create barriers and antagonisms between the different ethnic groups. As Mphalele points out, such policy made black people believe that “fragmented tribal cultures are the ultimate in [their] black consciousness. The whites know very well that they are safe as long as our cultural development is fragmented into tribal compartments” (Mphalele, quoted in Western 1984: 218).

Separate development, however, was not limited to the rural areas alone, as it also extended into the urban realm. Namibian cities were understood as a white domain. Black people were tolerated in the city in order to sell their cheap labour only (Lemon 1976: 70). As a result, black people were denied the right to own city property. They were treated as temporary urban residents, as the homeland was regarded as their place of official domicile. Furthermore, the allocation of housing, all of which was owned and operated by the state, was linked to the allocation of employment permits. Without a work permit, black people were not allowed legal residence in the city. “This meant, on the one hand, the forced removal of those marked unproductive so they may be pushed out of white areas back into native homelands and, on the other, the forced straddling of those deemed productive between workplace and homeland through an ongoing cycle of annual migrations” (Mamdani 1996: 7).

Many of the above mentioned laws were revoked in the late 1970s when it became increasingly clear, through internal and external pressures, that the apartheid regime was unable to sustain itself in its original form. However, it was not until Namibia’s independence in 1990 that the apartheid system was finally abolished. In Windhoek and other towns, apartheid planning has left an enduring imprint on urban spatial organisation and form. This particular component of the colonial legacy is less easily transcended, as apartheid urban form proves more resilient and less amenable to change than do former apartheid laws and policies.

### 2.1 Colonising the City

The early missionary activity that took place around the Windhoek area in the mid-1800s was short-lived and failed to establish a permanent settlement. Windhoek became a formal settlement only in 1890 with the arrival of the German Schutztruppe. Gross Windhoek was established as a garrison settlement devoted to military and public functions, while Klein-Windhoek housed the city’s residential quarters (von Schumann 1989: 156-157) (see figure 2).

In 1893, Windhoek possessed a population of 600 people, which increased to 2,700 inhabitants in 1909, and to approximately 10,000 in 1936 (Pendleton 1994: 146). With increased South African investment and an
expanding commercial agricultural sector, Windhoek experienced accelerated growth rates following the Second World War. The city housed a population of 15,000 in 1946, reached 74,500 in 1975, and today counts 200,000 inhabitants (Simon 1991: 176).

Figure 2 Gross-Windhoek and Klein-Windhoek, 1892 (Source: Windhoek Municipality).

Spatial segregation between the indigenous and the European settler community was not invented by apartheid rulers, for it was first implemented during the early years of the Windhoek settlement. In 1912, town planners established two ‘locations’ in order to house the city’s black inhabitants, one in Gross Windhoek and the other in Klein-Windhoek. Residents constructed and owned their houses, though they were required to pay monthly rent to the municipality for use of the plot (Pendleton 1994: 12-13). Conradie (1960), in the South West African Annual, describes the Old Location as “little more than a collection of miserable shacks and shanties, which, however, are now being replaced by a well-built and modern township to the north-west of the town” (1960: 15). Collins noted that “these locations had little of the picturesque attraction of African villages” (1970: 98) (see figure 3).
However, Rosie experienced life in the Old Location differently:

Houses in the Old Location were our own, and therefore better than in Katutura. It depended on you, whether you made your house nice. I would prefer Katutura to be like the Old Location (personal interview, 27.6.99).

During the 1960s, Windhoek’s black and coloured populations were removed from their previous locations in the city centre, as the land became a target of the growing white population (see figure 4).
This place-consciousness manifested itself through suburb and neighbourhood planning ideas which dominated the apartheid urban planning project. The Windhoek townships, as in South Africa, were established as urban landscapes of cellular, monofunctional and topographically separate 'neighbourhoods'. In addition, designers constructed roads primarily on the basis of vehicle use hierarchies, in the image of the American suburban streets. Houses, conceived as finite boxes in the middle of their sites, were rigorously standardised (see figure 5). In the words of the municipal town planner at that time:

Katutura has been creatively planned. Each group of four or six houses have been painted differently externally and where possible siting has been so arranged in order to break an otherwise monotonous symmetrical pattern (Brand 1961: 129).
In addition to their cellular fragmentation, Katutura and Khomasdal were (and remain) effectively disconnected from the city proper by buffer strips of undeveloped land, a highway and an industrial zone. As one Katutura resident remarked:

In the Old Location it was easy to walk to toto town, as town was near, you could just go. In Katutura, we had to go long distances, use buses and taxis, and pay to go in and out of town. It used to be funny [i.e. strange] - the distance between Katutura and town, but now I am used to it (personal interview, 27.6.99).

The creation of landscapes of control served as another important component to the townships' monofunctional layout and isolation. The spatial organisation of townships was beneficial for surveillance purposes (Robinson 1996: 69), and is reminiscent of Foucault's description of the exercise of power through a panoptic architectural arrangement14 (see figure 6). Eixab, a Katutura resident, supports Robinson's claim in his description of township surveillance and control:

There exists but one road on which to enter and leave Katutura. When there are times of unrest, this road is immediately blocked by tanks. The road layout within Katutura is linear and there are main roads located around the perimeter of the settlement. For this reason, the military is able to encircle the settlement.... Now they have installed these huge lights in every part of Katutura, like flood lights in a football stadium. These lights are so strong that there is no night in Katutura (Eixab 1981: 89).15
Apartheid spatial planning was extremely effective in achieving its aims, as virtually all black and coloured people were forced to live in the townships. Domestic workers, however, were the only exception to this rule. They were required to live alone in servant quarters, located behind the suburban homes of their white employers. With the abolition of the Native (Urban Areas) Proclamation in the 1970s, coloured and black people began moving into Windhoek’s white residential areas, but in low numbers only. According to Pickard-Cambridge, township residents were still effectively barred from the white areas of town because of generally low income levels, the continued racial segregation of educational institutions (black students could only attend school in Katutura), and the development of higher-income housing within the townships (1988: 24).

2.2 The Apartheid Legacy in an Independent Windhoek

Today, Windhoek is the largest urban centre in Namibia, home to approximately 10% of the country’s population (Windhoek Municipality 1996b: 1) (see figure 7). In comparison, Namibia’s second largest urban settlement possesses only a fifth of Windhoek’s population. Likewise, most of the country’s industrial, commercial, administrative and social service activities take place in the capital. Windhoek is thus a classic example of the primate city - in political, economic and socio-cultural terms (Pomuti and Tvedten 1998: 112). The over-
predominance of Windhoek within Namibia as a whole, however, is but only one urban legacy from the colonial era. In examining the post-apartheid city, we must look not only between, but also within. In doing so, we find a city fractured along both socio-economic and 'cultural' lines.

2.2.1 “People There Don’t Even Know What Poverty Is”

Namibia’s socio-economic indicators reveal gross inequality within the country as a whole. For example, the richest five percent of the population controls 70% of Namibia’s gross domestic product, while the poorest 55% of the population controls only 3% of GDP. Furthermore, one finds that this economic division follows racial lines. The country’s wealth resides disproportionately in the hands of white Namibians, while 75% of all black people live in absolute poverty (Namoya and Hokans 1994: 2). As the majority of white Namibians reside in Windhoek, such socio-economic conditions become most pronounced in the primate city.

Currently, those living in Windhoek’s former white areas comprise 27% of the city’s total population. These neighbourhoods display extremely low unemployment rates (below 4%), high income levels18, and high standards of housing and public services. In Katutura and its outlying informal residential areas, home to more than 60% of city residents, unemployment rates reach 30% or higher. Seventy-one percent of the population in Katutura’s informal areas live below the subsistence level19, while 32% do so in its formal areas (Windhoek Municipality 1996b: 47,65). As Windhoek’s population continues to grow fastest in its informal areas - currently an estimated 15% of the city’s total population (Pomuti and Tvedten 1998: 119) - it is expected that the proportion of middle-class residents within Windhoek as a whole will diminish, and unemployment and poverty levels rise (Windhoek Municipality 1996b: 49).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantifying the Socio-Economic Division (1996)</th>
<th>In Windhoek’s Former White Areas:</th>
<th>In Katutura, the Former Black Township:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 27% of the city’s total population</td>
<td>• 60% of the city’s total population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• unemployment &lt; 4%</td>
<td>• unemployment &gt; 30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• average household income = N$7,000 per month</td>
<td>• 71% of households in informal areas and 32% of households in formal areas earn &lt; N$860 per month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contrary to the former white suburbs which experience relative homogeneity in socio-economic terms, income stratification within Katutura varies considerably (see figures 8a and 8b). Some residential areas within the former township, such as Luxury Hill, provide housing for the middle-classes. But even within any of Katutura's residential areas, drastic variations in economic standing emerge. For example, one often finds ‘shanty’ dwellers living beside middle-class households.

In terms of occupation levels, most inhabitants in the former white areas find employment as qualified staff in the administrative, commercial, and industrial sectors. Professional and managerial occupations form the second largest group. The former townships, in contrast, are characterised by a high percentage of unskilled workers. A relatively large number of Katutura residents also work in the informal sector. Professional and managerial occupations are conspicuously absent among those living in this area of Windhoek (Windhoek Municipality 1996b: 49).

The socio-economic fracture between the former white areas and Katutura is also apparent in the respective residents' ability to navigate urban space. While the majority of those in the former white areas have access to private vehicles, the majority of Katutura residents are forced to utilise taxis and a restricted bus service in order to negotiate the city. A relatively high proportion of township dwellers walk to and from their places of employment (20%), often consuming up to
four hours of a working person’s day (Windhoek Municipality 1996b: 53). The lack of private transport, accompanied by an inadequate and expensive public transport system, severely impacts the mobility of a majority of Windhoek’s population.

In theory, every person in Windhoek has access to education, health care, and recreational facilities. However, in practice, the statement must be qualified. The finest educational facilities (including the University of Namibia) and health care providers are not only located in the city’s former white areas, but also remain beyond the economic reach of most Katutura residents. The same applies to recreational and social facilities. The municipal swimming pool, health clubs, the city’s only movie theatre, cafes, restaurants, pubs, parks, private hospitals, hotels, guest houses, the national theatre, and the national library are all located either in the city centre or in close proximity to the former white residential areas. Most commercial facilities, including malls, supermarkets and department stores, are also located in and around central Windhoek.

Katutura does, however, possess a growing number of businesses catering predominantly to daily supply needs. In addition, Katutura exhibits high levels of informal sector activities, a feature which is virtually absent in the former white areas. Informal businesses operate as clusters of stalls along main paths of movement, or from individual homes scattered throughout any particular neighbourhood. The latter are often unobtrusive and prove difficult to recognise for the casual observer. Such informal businesses may sell food, snacks, alcohol and clothes, or services such as car cleaning and hair cutting and braiding. A large number of shebeens - informal pubs operated from private residences - substitute for the bars, cafes and restaurants found in the former white areas of the city.

2.2.2 “They Have a Different Culture and Lifestyle”

Apart from the socio-economic division between the former white suburbs and Katutura, the two areas are also distinct with regard to culture and life style. Within the former white areas, one finds predominantly German-, English- and Afrikaans-speaking suburbs. Residential areas consist of one or two storey detached buildings which each house a single nuclear family. Individual plots are most often separated from the street by high fences or walls, while houses are secured with window bars, burglar alarms and guard dogs. Activities taking place in the yard remain invisible from the street, or are at least clearly demarcated from it. This disjunction between public and private space results from residents’ high valuation of privacy. Public activities in these residential areas are thus virtually eliminated (see figure 9).

In Windhoek’s former white neighbourhoods, life centres around the family and activities remain situated in the interior of the dwelling. Household privacy is further enhanced by a rear stoep, that is, an over-roofed veranda located in the back garden. In addition, children play only within the boundaries of each individual property. As a result, streets are usually quiet, serving vehicular functions only. The braai, one popular form of private social gathering in these neighbourhoods, entails barbecuing during weekends with family and friends. However, most gatherings take place in recreational, social and cultural establishments located outside the residential areas. The restaurants, cafes, bars, sports clubs, cinema, theatre, and other social facilities found throughout the city are disproportionately frequented by white suburbanites.

Within Katutura - on the other side of town - an eclectic mix of peoples and traditions coexist, as residents originate from different parts of Namibia and Southern Africa. Due to the high rate of in-migration, many residents identify strongly with their rural places of origin and the local customs by which they were raised. Building design, however, is dominated by western ideas regarding family structure, social relations, and public and domestic space use. Individual houses were planned by the South African Administration with the nuclear family in mind. As a result, most houses are overcrowded, as they provide shelter to an entire extended family and those recent migrants from the rural areas who hope to make a better life in the city. Since inside space is limited, much of the daily life takes place out-of-doors. People sit on the front porch of their houses to relax, cool themselves or socialise with others. Entrance doors to the individual houses are often left wide open, encouraging mutual contact and allowing for an amalgamation of domestic and public life.
For the most part, in Katutura an extended family structure prevails over that of the nuclear family. Additionally, most people retain close ties with their relatives who have remained behind in the rural areas. Katutura households are fluid social entities, as its members regularly move to and from the other parts of the country in search of employment, or merely for long-term visits (Tvedten and Mupotola 1995: 15). If one were to reduce this urban environment to a few generalised social characteristics, one might note that all of Katutura’s representative cultures are community oriented. Neighbourhoods are knitted tightly, as people know one another well, communicate regularly, and help neighbours during times of crisis. Few people can afford to own a car, and as a consequence, the streets are a place where children safely play and adults meet and socialise. Social activities take place within the neighbourhood or at home. Churches also play an important social role in the community.

As we have seen in this section, owing to Windhoek’s colonial and apartheid history, strong differences in socio-economic standing and in life-styles and social customs exist between Windhoek’s former white areas and Katutura. These differences find their spatial expression in the continued physical separation of the former township from the urban centre. Keeping in mind the background information just provided, the subsequent sections will investigate and evaluate Windhoek’s contemporary urban planning strategies. How does the municipality attempt to address the ill-effects of the apartheid urban planning legacy? What kind of changes have taken place to counter the city’s social and spatial fragmentation? And can the city of Windhoek move toward greater urban integration?

3 ON SEGREGATION AND EXCLUSION: A WINDHOEK PROBLEMATIC

Let us first consider the actual meaning of segregation before proceeding into the section. Segregation can be defined as the ordering of people based on common attributes which set a particular group apart from other members of a given society. Such attributes may include socio-economic standing, ethnicity/race, or demographic aspects (such as age). The term’s literal meaning, as in ‘to set apart’, also implies the existence of an agent, someone who actively sets apart. Segregation may be voluntary, in which case the agent resides within the segregated group itself, or forced, whereby the agent is to be found outside the particular group. Lichtenberger called segregation “the most important principle of societal order in the urban realm” (quoted in Beeker 1995: 25). However, one could easily argue that the city’s original raison d’être was one of segregation, or rather one of exclusion and inclusion. In medieval cities, for instance, city residents where distinguished from the inhabitants of the surrounding countryside by different methods of production, unique political and legal structures, and distinctive lifestyles. At the time, the city stood in sharp contrast to feudal serfdom and represented a
symbol of freedom to which many aspired. Furthermore, early European city residents constructed protective perimeter walls as a way to segregate themselves from outsiders and also labelled themselves ‘bourgeois’. In its original meaning, the term ‘bourgeois’ denoted a person living within the city walls, i.e. within the ‘bourg’. A bourgeois person was thus distinguished from a serf based on the distinctive set of rights and privileges which accompanied residence within the city confines (Pirenne 1956). Within capitalist societies, however, “the distribution of residential locations follows the general laws of the distribution of products and, consequently, brings about regroupings according to the social capacities of the subjects” (Castells 1979: 169). In other words, in industrial capitalist societies the urban realm is dominated by socio-economic segregation.

Engels, in his *The Condition of the Working-Class in England* (1968 [1892]), noted in the mid-nineteenth century that segregation within urban settlements was a typical feature of capitalist cities. His description of Manchester rings familiar to present-day city residents all around the world:

The town itself is peculiarly built, so that a person may live in it for years, and go in and out daily without coming into contact with a working-people’s quarter or even with workers.... This arises chiefly from the fact, that by unconscious tacit agreement, as well as with outspoken conscious determination, the working-people’s quarters are sharply separated from the sections of the city reserved for the middle class.... (ibid.: 49).

The origins of urban ethnic segregation on a grand scale may be located in the development of industrial capitalism in the 19th century, a historical development that brought about increased geographical mobility (Carter 1983). In Germany, for example, railway development led to the mass immigration of Polish workers into industrial centres. Ethnically segregated residential areas followed.

Ethnic segregation, though, is perhaps best explained by defining what it is not. According to Boal, a particular ethnic or other group is not segregated when “its members are distributed uniformly, relative to the remainder of the population. Any deviation from such uniformity represents a situation characterised by segregation, the greater the deviation the greater the degree of segregation” (1978: 67). Socio-economic stratification plays a further role in the relationship between a particular ethnic group and society as a whole. Boal thus distinguishes between a social class model of segregation and an ethnic model of segregation. In the former case, segregation is based predominantly on class factors (i.e. a particular ethnic group represents one income group), while the latter type of segregation is due to ethnic differentiation alone (i.e. a particular group is segregated from other groups due to their ethnic identification) (Boal 1978: 71-72).

Segregation according to race groups, as defined by apartheid urban planners, formed the basis of the apartheid city. Racial segregation was forced upon the majority of city residents by white planners serving the interests of a white minority. These segregation policies required the poorest and most marginalised city residents to live in locations that were of little interest to white residents. The segregated townships were placed far away from the city centre and its urban opportunities, including services and amenities. Racial segregation thus served to further entrench the marginalised status of the black population by imprinting the societal order onto the urban form.

Racial segregation under apartheid represented such an extreme form of segregation that its terminology is often applied in other urban contexts. Davis, for example, detects an “increasing South Africanisation” (1990: 227) of spatial relations within Los Angeles, a city in which an affluent middle- and upper-class protects itself in “Oz-like archipelagos” (ibid.: 223) from those living in the “carceral inner cities” and “urban bantustans” (ibid.: 227). Likewise, Abu-Lughod (1980) describes colonial urban development in Rabat, Morocco as imbued with the “ideology of apartheid”. There, the urban fabric was reorganised into a dual city layout, as one part of the city was designated for the indigenous population and the other for French colonial settlers. Finally, Hamzeh-Muhasilen (1999) likens the Palestinian territories in the West Bank to “isolated bantustans”.

### 3.1 Re-Segregating Windhoek

In the Namibian context, racial segregation is inextricably interwoven with socio-economic segregation. Windhoek’s black population was, and still is, largely congruent with the city’s low-income group. However, in the
literature surrounding post-apartheid segregation and desegregation, writers often assume racial segregation, having lost its legal basis, has been replaced by segregation along economic lines (see Simon 1988; Frayne 1992; Saff 1994; Seckelmann 1998). For example, Simon predicted in the late 1980s that Namibia’s independence would lead to class segregation instead of racial segregation, “as has happened in many other colonial cities” (1988: 59). Saff asserts that in the post-apartheid city “access to urban space [is] based on wealth rather than racial criteria” (1994: 377), while Seckelmann argues that racial segregation in contemporary Windhoek exists only in the lower income strata (1998: 227). Finally, Frayne denies all aspects of Namibia’s racial history, referring instead to “the poorer sections of society” (1992: 132), a newly created code name for ‘black people’.

The Windhoek Municipality adopts a similar perspective. They fail to acknowledge the city’s racial groupings and, instead, substitute such categories with income indicators. The Municipality’s de-racialised discourse is exemplified in the 1995 Windhoek Resident Survey (1996b) and the Windhoek Structure Plan (1996a). Both municipal documents, forming the basis of Windhoek’s future urban development strategy, fail to ever discuss, or even acknowledge, the city’s apartheid past. The Municipality views history as that which commenced with Namibia’s independence in 1990, a date which marked “changing times and circumstances” (1996a: n.p.).

All of the above perspectives, those of both theory and practice, are not only ahistorical but also potentially dangerous. They create the illusion that Namibia’s independence marked a new beginning for the city, and one with a ‘clean slate’. Those who adopt such a view are therefore passively positioned. They can easily shun the responsibility of having to tackle the perpetuation of Windhoek’s social and spatial inequalities along racial lines. This is not to say, though, that Namibia’s independence did not constitute a radical break from South African apartheid rule, but only that the majority of Windhoek’s black population continues to carry the burden of its legacy.

As I have illustrated, Windhoek’s municipal bureaucrats, aided by academic writers, refute the idea of continued racial segregation and, in some instances, discard the use of racial terminology altogether. In recalling Namibia’s history, such a decision may be understandable. During apartheid rule, for example, virtually every aspect of political, economic and social life was racialised. Naturally, government institutions in the new Namibia attempt to avoid public policies based on race and/or racial classifications in general. However, the new discourse which re-segregates Windhoek along economic lines de-politicises segregation by denying continued disparities along racial lines. Though material circumstances have changed little, Windhoek has miraculously dispelled racial segregation in favour of socio-economic segregation. Furthermore, the new segregation is deemed acceptable, even ‘normal’, as it is found everywhere in the world. Seckelmann, for instance, maintains that the restrictive apartheid state has been replaced by a “democratic system which gives all Namibian citizens the opportunity to freely participate in the economy and social sphere” (1998: 224). According to her, democratisation has led to an “increase in social differentiation and segregation” along social lines (ibid.).

Capitalist societies are often characterised by socio-economic segregation in urban residential areas, and, for a variety of reasons, such segregation often coincides with ethnic or racial affiliation. However, Windhoek’s situation is unique. In contrast to ethnically/racially segregated minorities in western societies, the city’s black and coloured populations constitute the majority (approximately 80%) of city residents. This demographic circumstance illustrates the importance of recognising continued racial segregation in Windhoek, as the overwhelming majority of the city’s population suffers from its ill-effects.

3.2 Race vs. Socio-Economics: Two Sides of the Segregation Coin

As was illustrated in the previous section, Windhoek is characterised by economic dualism, social inequalities and heterogeneous cultural groupings. All of these characteristics find their spatial expression in a particular urban reality: Windhoek’s black population is concentrated around the former township of Katutura in the north-western portion of the city. A closer look at Windhoek’s current spatial layout will support my claim that despite attempts to redefine it away, racial segregation remains a stark feature of Windhoek’s cityscape. Within the past two decades, migration rates to Windhoek have steadily increased, as a
greater number of rural people move to the city. In the period from 1985 to 1995, for example, the population of Windhoek doubled from 90,000 to 180,000 inhabitants. The overwhelming majority of these rural migrants take up residence in the ever-increasing informal settlements, situated on the northern fringes of Katutura. The wealthy former white areas, located to the east and south of the Central Business District, are still largely inhabited by white residents. The former white areas to the west and north of the Central Business District (i.e. those areas closest to Katutura and Khomasdal) show the city's highest degree of racial mixing (see figure 10).

The Western Bypass, a highway constructed in the 1970s as a spatial barrier between the then townships and city, still demarcates a major dividing line between poor black and wealthy, predominantly white areas of the city. The barrier effect of the Western Bypass is further accentuated with the addition of several hundred metres of undeveloped land to each of its sides. During the apartheid era, this 'buffer zone' helped restrict black and coloured township residents' access to the city (see figure 11). Today, the highway continues to serve as a boundary between low-income, high-density development to its west (including the former townships and adjacent informal developments), and high-income, low-density development to its east (including the city's former white areas). Katutura, for example, experiences densities of over 80 persons per hectare, while Klein-Windhoek, an affluent white suburb, maintains densities of approximately 10 persons per hectare (Municipality of Windhoek 1996b: 12).

In an attempt to establish the geographical locations of black households in Windhoek, Beeker (1995) utilised the telephone directory to spatially situate a representative sample of black African names. He estimates that of all black Windhoek households, 76.7% reside in Katutura, 6% in Khomasdal, and 17.3% in Windhoek's former white areas (ibid.: 101). Many poor black households in Katutura, most especially in the informal areas, however, do not possess a telephone connection. The percentage of black households living in Katutura is therefore much higher than Beeker’s figures indicate, perhaps lying nearer to 90%. Of those black households that are located outside of Katutura, a clear 'western bias' can be distinguished, as most are found in the western portions of the city (ibid.: 106).
The above figures reveal that a strong division along racial lines still exists between the black and coloured populations residing in the north-western parts of Windhoek, and the predominantly white populations living in the east and south of the city. This division is upheld by two major development trends: movement of poor, black rural migrants into the rapidly expanding informal areas on the fringes of Katutura, and movement of upwardly mobile black and coloured residents into Khomasdal and the adjacent residential areas to its west and south. The former trend is by far the most prominent, as it is estimated that 600 migrants arrive in the city each month (Windhoek Municipality 1996b: 15). Recent growth has thus occurred predominantly along the racial-spatial divisions introduced during the apartheid era (see figure 12).
However, it must be stated that this division is being partially dissolved in the newly established middle-class areas to the west and north of the city centre, where a high degree of racial mixing has occurred. Windhoek North and, to a lesser extent, Windhoek West were the first two former white suburbs to racially integrate, beginning in the 1980s. One of Namibia’s leading social scientists, suggested that these two middle-class suburbs were “sacrificed” by town planners after the petty apartheid laws were revoked in 1978 (personal interview, 8.7.99). Additionally, a small percentage of black and coloured residents have moved into upper middle-class suburbs situated to the east of the city centre.

Despite the claims of many Windhoek town planners and certain academics, the situation on the ground reveals that racial segregation continues to be a central feature of the city’s morphology. This tendency to deny racial segregation in favour of socio-economic segregation in contemporary Windhoek is problematic for three main reasons. First, racial segregation under the apartheid regime aimed to economically and politically marginalise the black majority. As a result, racial segregation in Windhoek has always been congruent with class-based segregation. In the last instance, apartheid was a form of capitalism. Socio-economic segregation is, therefore, not a newly emerged feature of the post-apartheid society, but something already long in existence. Racial segregation persists via the ‘free market’ (which is still overwhelmingly controlled by white-owned businesses) because few black people can afford to live outside the former township areas.

Second, such assertions ignore that 73% of the city’s total population, all of whom are black and coloured, still reside in and around the former townships. In addition, the city’s white population, comprising an estimated 18% of the total population, live exclusively within the city’s former white areas. Clearly, most of Windhoek’s residents (91%), their socio-economic status not withstanding, live according to the racial divisions which were instituted under the apartheid system.

Finally, as has been stated earlier, the new discourse reflects a redefinition of the status quo, rather than any substantive material change in Windhoek’s spatial structures. The view effectively conceals and denies continued racial separation. From the point of view of a poor Katutura resident, it may appear strange indeed to learn that the reason for her residence in the former township is no longer found in her blackness, but rather in her poverty.

3.3 Problematising De/Segregation

The preceding description of Windhoek’s current spatial layout provides the necessary input for a subsequent examination of racial segregation, desegregation, and spatial exclusion. One can inspect the dynamics of segregation from two points of views, either from that of the excluder or the excluded. In problematising segregation and desegregation, it is helpful to scrutinise some of the mechanisms which create and uphold segregation in the first place. Hence, we will first look at segregation from the excluders’ perspective before shifting our attention to Windhoek’s excluded township inhabitants themselves.

3.3.1 Segregation and the Excluders

Weber’s theory of community locates the formation of exclusionary communities in the competition for economic, social and political power. A particular community’s “awareness of the characteristics which differentiate them from the excluded individuals strengthens the basis of their solidarity and binds them together as members of a community” (quoted in Neuwirth 1969: 148-149). According to Weber, members of a dominant group interpret certain criteria such as language, religion, life style and customs as symbolic of racial or ethnic differences, and subsequently use such symbols as exclusionary pretexts (ibid.: 150). Sibley views exclusion from a slightly different angle, maintaining that feelings of insecurity about territory, status and power encourage boundary erection and the rejection of threatening differences (1997: 69). Drawing on the work of Mary Douglas, he identifies spatial purification as a key feature in the organisation of social space (ibid.: 77). Sibley draws on object relations theory to explain the cultural construction of ‘the threatening other’. Based on the work of Freud, object relations theory “assumes that from birth, the infant engages in formative relations with objects - entities perceived as separate from the self, either whole persons or parts of the body, either existing in the external world or internalised as mental representations” (Kahane, quoted in Sibley 1997: 5). In different words, the self is defined in relation to stereotypical representations of that which
lies outside the self, the ‘other’. This social positioning is accompanied by the drawing of borders between self and ‘other’. Purity of self is thus maintained by defending its boundaries, that is, by expelling that which is foreign to it.

In the context of racial segregation, the desire to expel the ‘other’ is, as Sibley recognises, restricted to the relatively affluent, those with something at stake and with a degree of power to implement their purification drives. Purification, as a measure of control in the built environment, should thus be understood as a mechanism which reinforces a particular group’s social, political, or economic dominance. If viewed differently, psychological explanations of exclusionary behaviour may easily end up justifying and excusing the excludes actions as ‘natural’. It is thus important to view exclusionary behaviour not as something which takes its beginning in the individual, but as a process that is inherently social in nature.

In Windhoek, some white residents label Katutura a “dirty” and “polluted” place. Likewise, they took these external characteristics as a sign of Katutura’s inhabitants’ “laziness”. On the other hand, not a single Katutura resident described any residential area (including their own) in terms of its cleanliness. The use of such terminology seems to follow an ingrained, decidedly western preoccupation with order. It may be viewed as both an expression of power over the ‘other’, and, at the same time, a fear of losing that power. An example will help support my claim. After the opening of residential areas to all race groups in the late 1970s, the then all-white South West African Municipal Association held a special congress on issues relating to desegregation. Most of the delegates vehemently opposed desegregation and justified their claims with “perceived threats of ‘lowered standards’ and hygiene, suburban ‘overpopulation’, and discrimination against whites” (Simon 1986: 296). The example highlights how arguments related to order and cleanliness, that is “lowered standards and hygiene”, are interwoven with the threat of losing power and control.

Rapoport, however, might support the municipal delegates’ fears. He contends that the exclusion of social and/or cultural groups through the erection of boundaries is a natural human disposition. Not only, in his opinion, it is a positive disposition, as it leads to a stronger social identity for each distinct group living within an urban setting (Rapoport 1977: 250). Rapoport draws his ideas from behaviourist studies which argue that humans possess an aggressive territorial instinct, not unlike other animals (cf. Sack 1986). He asserts that people need a sense of control and mastery over their environment: “The need for this sense of control is so basic that even animals show it” (Rapoport 1977: 368). Accordingly, “exposure to different people - changes in different types of people encountered, their noises, smells, gestures, clothing and environmental symbols - can be highly stressful and threatening” (ibid.: 81). Rapoport, however, would be unable to explain why black residents now living in Windhoek’s former white areas do not feel threatened by their predominantly white neighbours. Clearly, the supposedly “basic need” is not that universal. In contrast, Sack and Soja point us in the right direction. Territoriality must be seen as a socially and geographically rooted phenomenon that hints at notions of power (Soja 1990: 150). “Its use depends on who is influencing and controlling whom and on the geographical contexts of place, space, and time” (Sack 1986: 2).

3.3.2 Segregation and the Excluded: Beyond Desegregation

As we have seen, exclusion in urban environments takes root in the quest for societal control by certain groups of people. Up until now we have assumed, like most others writing on the topic, that racial segregation is experienced as inherently negative by the segregated population (cf. Jackson and Smith 1981). For this reason, desegregation along racial lines, especially through the impetus of upward mobility, is often presented as the ultimate urban development solution. As Baar has suggested, the abolition of racial residential quarters in favour of socio-economic segregation represents a goal that Windhoek should strive to achieve (1990: 103). Upward mobility, as a necessary precondition for racial desegregation, however, will always be limited to a fortunate few. Furthermore, although it is true that social mobility may lead to geographic mobility, and thus to the dispersal of racially segregated areas, this is by no means an automatism. Rosenthal, for example, has pointed out that high-income Jewish residents in Chicago preferred to live voluntarily segregated from non-Jewish city residents (cited in Boal 1978: 82). Desegregation, therefore, was not deemed desirable by these residents.
In Windhoek, two major assumptions are inherent in discussions surrounding desegregation. First, those promoting desegregation assume that black residents aspire to live in the former white areas. Such a view may originate in white residents’ construction of the township areas as dangerous, crime infested, dirty, and shabby. People in Katutura are quick to recognise this white construct. Several Katutura residents, for instance, similarly believe that:

White people would say that Katutura is violent, wild and dangerous, and that people are rude to each other. They get these informations [sic] from the news (personal interview, 26.6.99).

Another township resident maintained:

My girlfriend’s [white] employer said to her that it is dangerous where she stays [in Okuryangava]. She should stay elsewhere. The employer thought that she lived between shacks. But they would not even come for a day to see what it’s like because they’re not interested (personal interview, 26.6.99).

In contrast to the white construct, Katutura residents express a deep fondness for their area of residence. In fact, none of the interviewees want to live elsewhere. As Nick asserted:

My heart is in Katutura. One day, I would like to have a house right behind my grandmother’s place (personal interview, 26.6.99).

Similarly, Hester “would never want to live in town, it’s too quiet. You come home and lock yourself in your house and don’t know your neighbours” (personal interview, 30.6.99).

Second, many assume desegregation to be a one-way process, that is, black and coloured people are expected to integrate into the white middle-class mainstream environment, and not vice versa. Alterations to the white mainstream environment are never considered an option. Hence, the assurances of one white resident: “I don’t mind black people moving in here if they can afford it” (personal interview, 4.7.99).

Most black residents, however, will never be able to afford to live in low-density, middle-class areas. Given that the majority of black residents are poor, desegregation under these terms and conditions remains limited. Moreover, if desegregation is not undertaken in a reciprocal way, for example, by creating residential areas which respond to the needs and aspirations of these marginalised residents, Windhoek cannot develop into a truly integrated city.

As can be gleaned from the above interviews, Katutura residents value certain aspects of the former township, despite it being a segregated environment. This is not to say, however, that Katutura residents welcome their segregated status. People recognise Katutura’s unique attributes, ones that cannot be found elsewhere in the city. For example, segregation has led to the establishment of greater social networks in Katutura. These networks prove essential for the survival of low-income groups, as well as the maintenance of cultural values, norms and customs within alien cultural environments. Black rural migrants to the city, for instance, move to Katutura for the same reasons. The argument that Katutura represents an environment that is esteemed by its inhabitants can be further supported by the fact that not a single interviewee from Katutura expressed a desire to live in the former white areas of the city. The white suburban areas are often portrayed as “dead”, whereas people living in the former township value its neighbourliness and social interaction:

People always say town is boring, everyone is just on their own behind high fences. People are much more friendly here [in Katutura] than in town. People in town just live indoors, they are not outside.... They want to be on their own, they don’t know what to do outside. They have DSTV and video machines. Everyone has money, therefore they don’t need each other as much (personal interview, 26.6.99).

Other residents also associate living in Katutura with “freedom”, and value the former township for its socio-economic variety.

Simply because many people value Katutura does not imply a voluntary segregation. Katutura was established to exclude black people from city life. Based on such contradictions, some writers (Boal 1978; Deakin and Ungerson 1973) attempt to distinguish between voluntary and forced segregation. This distinction, though, is not without its ambiguities either. Socio-economic segregation is not determined legally, and therefore does not appear to be
forced. On the other hand, free choice as to one’s place of abode is available only to those who can afford it. Most residents in contemporary Katutura, for instance, have little choice in deciding to live elsewhere. In the Jewish ghetto case stated above, segregation appears voluntary, but it may nevertheless be the expression of the Jewish diaspora and/or centuries of persecution and oppression. Rapoport maintains that “clustering may be voluntary even if it appears to be forced” (Rapoport 1977: 249). However, the exact opposite holds true: clustering may be forced even if it appears voluntary. Despite the fact that Katutura residents value many aspects of township life - including its liveliness, community spirit, sense of unity, and socio-economic diversity - one cannot equate these sentiments with voluntary segregation. Likewise, one must not overlook or deny the problems individuals associate with their segregated status.

Katutura residents are acutely aware of their exclusion from urban opportunities. Many people maintain that there is a gap between Katutura and “town”:

I miss a lot staying in Katutura as most things are held in Windhoek. There is nothing here. If you came on the weekend, I couldn’t take you out here, there are no movie houses or pubs. Also, big shops are needed. The [new] Shoprite [supermarket] centre is good, but too far away for many. The cost of the taxi is the same as going to town. I would prefer to work in Katutura if there were jobs (personal interview, 26.6.99).

Nick added:

Most people here don’t have cars. They have to take busses or walk. This friend of mine used to work in Olympia. He took three hours to walk there (personal interview, 26.6.99).

He also felt that “[t]he reason they built Shoprite and the Soweto Market [in Katutura] is to keep black people out of town” (ibid.). As these interviews illustrate, township inhabitants clearly express a sense of exclusion from urban life. They experience employment opportunities and commercial centres as being located too far away; they find transport to and from the city centre too expensive; and they long for recreational and entertainment facilities within Katutura itself. If Windhoek’s town planners are to address the needs of the city’s marginalised, that is, those who live segregated in Katutura, then perhaps a shift in urban planning strategy is required. By shifting their focus toward spatial integration, the city of Windhoek could help level the playing field of urban opportunities for all of Windhoek’s residents.

As this section has illustrated, a deciding question in determining Windhoek’s move toward integration is not whether or not people live de facto racially segregated, nor whether segregation is economically or otherwise determined. Rather, it is important to examine whether segregation contributes to the marginalisation of people. While Katutura residents value certain aspects of the former township, they sorely feel the distance to places of employment, services and amenities. Such feelings of exclusion are created and perpetuated through the fragmentation of the city fabric and the implementation of monofunctional urban concepts. For the purposes of moving toward greater spatial integration, it may be useful to distinguish between residential areas which allow its inhabitants equal access to urban opportunities, and those which do not. The subsequent section, therefore, investigates the structural layout of the residential areas themselves in order to determine whether they meet residents’ urban requirements, and/or help to overcome Windhoek’s structural inequalities.

4 SUBURBANISING WINDHOEK: TOWARDS GREATER INTEGRATION?

Suburban developments in former apartheid cities are founded on British and US-American planning ideas. Windhoek’s morphological structure, therefore, cannot be attributed solely to its colonial and apartheid planning legacies, but has to be placed within the wider historical context of western urban planning models. As Parnell and Mabin (1995) point out, apartheid urban design, far from being unique, drew on modernist planning principles at that time, including those devised by the Congrès Internationaux d’Architecture Moderne (CIAM). Modernist planning envisaged large-scale urban interventions in order to fundamentally reshape city environments. Mixed-use urban environments were divided into functionally discrete areas, separating residential from other urban functions. In addition, modernist town planning principles moved away from an emphasis on streets and axes toward a greater focus on population groupings (Parnell and Mabin 1995: 55). For example,
Le Corbusier’s plan for Chandigarh (India) displayed socially regressive traits. “Especially symptomatic is Le Corbusier’s cynically resigned acceptance of the caste system as a ‘useful means of classification’, the inhumanity of which he attempts to make more bearable by high architectural quality” (Lampugnani, quoted in Parnell and Mabin 1995: 55). These segregation and monofunctional planning principles bear a close resemblance to apartheid planning strategies. Neither the reshaping of urban environments on a grand scale nor the segregation of population groups were therefore the invention of apartheid planners.35 Rather, these urban planning ideas were adopted and modified by South African planners to match their political agenda.

Le Corbusier’s urban creations, which segregated city inhabitants on vertical rather than horizontal levels, were based essentially on Howard’s Garden City ideas.36 Similarly, current town planning practices in Windhoek are closely modelled on the British Town and Country Planning Act of 1932 (Frayne 1992: 40). This piece of legislation instituted zoning as a common system of land use planning. As a result, Windhoek’s urban fabric developed in cellular fashion with a focus on monofunctional uses.

In the 1960s and 1970s, Windhoek began developing in accordance with the American city model, that is, as a space extensive development designed for private vehicular traffic (Frayne 1997: 7). Underused four and six lane highways in and around the city centre, and open undeveloped spaces within the city, bear witness to this urban planning approach. The ensuing fragmentation of the city has led to extremely low urban densities (see figure 13). Such an approach to urban planning is, however, an exclusionary one, as the majority of the population does not have access to private transport. Likewise, the low urban densities prove prohibitive for a viable public transport system.

Figure 13 The former buffer zone between Katutura (left) and ‘town’ still remains undeveloped. Independence Avenue (foreground) connects these two parts of the city (Source: F. Friedman).

4.1 The Municipality’s Urban Development Approach

Urban settlements, according to the Windhoek Municipality’s structure plan, are characterised by a variety of positive economic, environmental, and demographic features. In particular, the Municipality stresses urbanisation’s contribution toward saving fragile ecological environments in rural areas, providing cost-effective services, creating economic opportunities, and suppressing population growth (Windhoek Municipality 1996a: n.p.).37 From a social point of view, however, the Municipality views cities as invariably negative. In their view, cities increase crime rates and the “visibility” of poverty, as well as undermine social conditions and family networks. These factors require the “stringent control” of health, safety and living conditions (ibid.: n.p.). As a direct result, “new street layouts may have to concentrate on designs which improve local surveillance or which can be privatised” (ibid.: n.p.).

One could not state more clearly whose interests the new structure plan is supposed
to serve. Such planning represents, as Dubresson and Jaglin (1999) have noted, a common trend in southern African cities. We find these cities characterised, on the one hand, by the withdrawal of the rich through personalised security services, the appropriation of public roads and squares, and autonomous servicing, and on the other hand, by the territorial isolation of the poor (Dubresson and Jaglin 1999). A development which the authors define as the creation of “archipelagos”.

Generally, the Windhoek Structure Plan is demonstratively apolitical. Similar to their discourse on segregation, the Municipality’s suburbanisation policies take no account of either the city’s spatial apartheid legacy or existing wealth disparities among residents. As will be shown, the Municipality’s apolitical approach invariably favours the needs of the middle-class population, while neglecting those of the poorer black residents.

Similar to American city layouts, Windhoek’s city centre is envisaged for business and office space use only. Pedestrian traffic in the centre is encouraged within privately developed shopping malls and along the few roads frequented by pedestrians (Windhoek Municipality 1996a: n.p.). Windhoek also borrows from another classic Anglo-American city development, that is, the planned decentralisation of city centre functions and its subsequent decrease in importance.

The Municipality claims a commitment to higher urban densities and employment creation nearer to people’s homes, and reducing vehicular traffic by promoting both walking and the development of a public transport system. Upon close reading, however, fundamental contradictions to these statements emerge. With regard to the promotion of higher-density residential development, much leeway is given to the wishes of private investors. For example, higher densities may or may not be implemented depending on prevailing market trends. Moreover, residential densities are envisaged at approximately ten dwellings per hectare, a figure that is far too low for the development of a viable public transport system.

Furthermore, while Windhoekers are encouraged to work from home, it is explicitly stated that “shops and supply points should not be allowed to open up in homes since this generates traffic” (Windhoek Municipality 1996a: n.p.). According to the Municipality, home businesses should be small and not “unsightly” or noisy, and they should provide parking on the premises (ibid.). Working from home, as envisaged by the municipality, obviously excludes those “unsightly” informal businesses, shops and shebeens typical in Katutura.

The Windhoek Municipality is thus committed to a continued suburban development strategy and allows little room for alternative ideas. A recent resident survey conducted by the Municipality in the city’s informal areas reveals such an inclination. In it, residents were asked to identify their choice of residential area if land were to be made available. However, respondents were allowed to choose from only four options: Okuryangava, the current informal settlement area on the northern fringes of Katutura; Otjomuise, a recent development on the western fringe of Khomasdal; Rocky Crest, located to the south of Khomasdal; and Cimbebasia, situated on the southern fringes of the city. The first three choices are all situated west of the Western Bypass divide, while the fourth option, Cimbebasia, is stereotyped as a conservative Afrikaner suburb. Not surprisingly, the majority of informants (74.4%) chose to remain in their current location (Windhoek Municipality 1996c: 26). Most importantly, the survey approach reveals how town planners refuse to consider the development of open areas nearer the city centre. A decision to do so would help alter the city’s current fragmented, monofunctional layout.

All indications regarding the future of Windhoek urban development point toward a continuation of policies which support monofunctional, urban layouts with the exception of interspersed shops for daily supply needs. The city centre will continue to decrease in importance, as new employment opportunities are created along a 15 km axis to its north and south. The proposed axis, however, does not extend into the residential ‘suburbs’. Owing to low densities and monofunctionalism, places of employment will still be located far from people’s place of residence. The decentralisation of urban functions is, in this case, incompatible with the creation of walking distances.

Hence, Windhoek’s urban development strategies favour the needs of the already affluent residents (the minority) who possess material security and the necessary means to take part in formal urban life. Poor city residents (the majority), however, will
continue to spend disproportionate amounts of time and money in order to reach their places of work. In addition, by discouraging informal businesses within residential areas, the Municipality will eliminate their locational advantage and, hence, their viability. Municipal strategies ignore the qualitative structural differences between the former townships and affluent middle- and upper-income suburbs. Neither spatial integration of the city’s urban fabric, for example through in-fill of centrally located undeveloped land, nor the diverging needs of poor city residents seem to be serious urban planning goals.

4.2 ‘North-Western Suburbs’: The Creation of a Post-Apartheid Discourse

Since the Windhoek Municipality insists that its work is inherently technical and apolitical in nature, the fundamental differences regarding resident needs between the few wealthy residents and the poor black majority go unrecognised. This failure in recognition is in line with the Municipality’s categorisation of all residential areas as “suburbs”. The former township Katutura and its adjacent informal areas are now officially labelled “north-western suburbs” by municipal officials and many academic writers (Windhoek Municipality 1996a; Frayne 1992; Seckelmann 1998). Such labelling, however, fails to acknowledge that the structure of the settlement has changed insignificantly since independence. There are no grounds to justify Katutura’s new suburban label. Therefore, we are dealing with a redefinition only, rather than any actual qualitative change in Katutura or its relationship to the city. In other words, we witness the creation of a new discourse, a reshaped object of knowledge in the Foucaultian sense.

In interviews, Katutura residents responded to the term ‘north western suburbs’ in similar ways. The label is seen as “fancy words” that “will confuse people”, as “even someone living in Greenwell Matongo [an informal settlement on the outskirts of Katutura] will tell you, ’I live in Katutura’”. One respondent suggested that “they have changed the term because of colonialism”, while another admitted that “I don’t like the term; I am proud to live in Katutura”. White residents, on the other hand, were more ambivalent about the term. One person believed that “the term is harmless”, while another remarked that “it is silly to call them suburbs, because they aren’t”. Assuming the Municipality’s goal to be the creation of a viable city for the future, what is so wrong with the new discourse? The Municipality’s amnesia with regard to Windhoek’s political history accounts, in part, for its tendency to homogenise the city’s different areas and the needs of its residents. The Municipality’s oversight may lead to the development of a city environment that is unable to respond to deviations from a middle-class existence. As a result, urban planning policies may inadvertently perpetuate social inequalities and jeopardise the city’s spatial integration. A closer look at the Municipality’s general approach to urban planning as a discipline will shed some light on the origins of their oversights.

As the Windhoek Structure Plan illustrates, the Municipality operates under the belief that urban planning should be led by ‘the forces of the market’. Windhoek is thus implicitly defined as a ‘normal’ capitalist city. At the same time, the city’s apartheid urban planning legacy is believed to be automatically reversed through a new socio-economic order. Hence, the Municipality sees itself as a provider of technical guidance to market-led developments. Integration of a fragmented post-apartheid society is not valued as an urban goal worthy of pursuit.

The following discussion leads us beyond the urban planning discourse by taking a closer look at the ideas underlying suburban forms. In general, how are suburbs structured, what motivates their planners, and what values do their residents possess? As we shall see, suburban models are geared toward western middle-class ideals. Suburban forms, hence, leave little room for meeting the very different needs of low-income groups of people, such as Katutura’s inhabitants, whose lives are not oriented toward a nuclear family and an individualised, consumerist existence.

4.3 Theorising Suburbia

The street is bad as an environment for humans; houses should be turned away from it and faced inward toward sheltered greens. Frequent streets are wasteful, of advantage only to real estate speculators who measure value by the block and more particularly the super-block. Commerce should be segregated from residences and greens. A neighbourhood’s demand for goods should be calculated ‘scientifically’, and this much and no more commercial space allocated. The presence of many other people is, at best, a necessary evil, and good planning must aim for at least an illusion of isolation and suburban privacy.
Jacobs's description of orthodox planners' views represents a useful summary of suburban physical forms. There are, according to Hillier and Hanson (1993), two principles underlying the suburban layout: “the concept of the small community; and the concept of dispersion” (1993: 267). The implementation of these two principles will result in few, non-random and strongly controlled encounters within the streets, and strong conformity to an externally imposed socio-spatial behaviour. Such conformity may include “the maintenance of a certain type of order in the front garden, and a certain standard symbolic configuration within the household” (ibid.). On a similar note, Hillier and Hanson have also pointed to the fact that open space within suburban areas, “by flowing all round the buildings rather than being constituted by them”, may serve as a segregating medium within the suburban realm (ibid.: 263).

Many writers have pointed out that suburban layouts serve to acquiesce and control residents, as they foster individual isolation from one another. Additionally, activities within suburbia’s public spaces become more visible, and therefore more controllable (Sennett 1996; Slowe 1990; Holston 1989). Harvey concurs, noting that revolutionary working-class movements in Europe and the United States, such as the revolutions of 1848 and the Paris Commune of 1871, demonstrated the dangers in high concentrations of the working-classes. “The bourgeois response was in part characterised by a policy of dispersal so that the poor and the working-class could be subjected to what nineteenth-century reformers on both sides of the Atlantic called the ‘moral influence’ of the suburb” (Harvey 1978: 127).

From the point of view of its residents, suburbs, such as the ones described by Sennett (1996), are places of social simplicity, as increasingly fewer interactions between people take place and upward mobility is congruent with social withdrawal. Sennett equates the capitalist suburb with a “destructive gemeinschaft’, wherein families are excessively [sic] inward-looking” (quoted in Sibley 1988: 415). Chaney augments the picture by formulating “the core values of the ‘suburban way of life’ in Britain” (1997: 142). According to him, social relationships in the suburb are inward-focused on “family and particularly child-centred relationships” (ibid.), while on a community and societal level, relationships are undercut by a “privatisation of public space” (ibid.: 143). He argues that the car exemplifies the private use of public space, as individuals navigate through public space while being wholly separated and isolated from fellow travellers. In addition, the suburban home itself is a status symbol and a sign of upward mobility. As a result, the home is linked to consumerism, as “suburban culture and its activities endlessly generate new demands for objects, machines and decorations to display an appropriate commitment to the sphere that encapsulates these values” (ibid.: 142).

Suburban community values provide the "main bulwark of defence" against "class war" (Harvey 1978: 128) and are sustained through a powerful image of the ‘other’. Davis, for instance, describes these enclosed suburban communities as “socially purified and defended fortress-like, against the supposed threat posed by the poor” (cited in Sibley 1997: 38). In addition, defence mechanisms are also observable within the suburb, as the house becomes the locus of the confinement of women and the street a “milieu of quiet, discrete, respectful surveillance” (King 1996: 39). Hence, the neighbourhood is transformed into a “new panopticon” (ibid.).

Thus far, suburbs have been described as both exclusive spaces of control, where deviation from the norm is more visible than in areas of mixed land use, and as spaces of social withdrawal, where few interactions occur between its residents. Both of these dynamics are observable in Windhoek’s former white suburbs. As was mentioned earlier in this paper, the city’s former white areas have started showing a slight degree of racial mixing. This is not to say, however, that intense social mixing has occurred. Rather to the contrary, Windhoek’s white suburban environments, as mentioned above, allow people to live in close proximity without interacting socially. Simon, for instance, reports that relatively little social friction has occurred through the in-migration of black residents to formerly white suburbs (1995: 140). While this absence of hostilities can be partly attributed to the relatively low numbers of in-migrants, it may also be partly due to the fact that Windhoek’s suburban residents often maintain little or no social relationships with their immediate neighbours. In addition, Windhoek’s white suburbs also function as spaces of social control, as deviations from the norm are rejected as inappropriate behaviour. Some white
residents report being estranged and affronted by the different habits of their new black neighbours. One interviewee, for instance, told the story of a black neighbour who had slaughtered a goat in his backyard in order to celebrate a festive occasion. The agonised cries of the animal created dismay among surrounding residents. The slaughtering of goats in a suburban environment, an environment defined by the neighbourhood’s white majority, was experienced as clearly out of place (personal interview, 29.6.99).

The preceding example offers us some insight into the dynamics which occur when ‘outsiders’ move into communities with pre-established rules of conduct. In the example, contact between Windhoek’s different racial groups do not occur on equal footing. In this case, the success of interracial relations depends on black people (the outsider group) succumbing to white people’s (the insider group’s) norms and values. We may suspect that these unequal interracial relations are based on historic inequalities between black and white residents. Such conjecture, however, requires a closer inspection of interracial contact.

Dixon and Reicher (1997), for example, analyse interracial contact in South Africa via reference to the ‘contact hypothesis’. The ‘contact hypothesis’ originated in the United States of the 1940s as a call for racial desegregation (1997: 361). It is based in the belief that “regular interaction between members of different ethnic or racial groups promotes intergroup harmony and must therefore be facilitated” (ibid.). The authors, in their research on intergroup contact and desegregation in South Africa, assert that such a view is simplistic and faulty. Dixon and Reicher’s chief concern rests in their investigation into what actually transpires when the excluder’s boundaries are penetrated by the excluded. For example, in Hout Bay (South Africa) a squatter community established itself within a predominantly white, upper middle-class suburb. In this case, contact was perceived as ‘invasive’ by white residents and failed to create an increase in mutual understanding (ibid.: 376).

Although Dixon and Reicher acknowledge that intergroup prejudices are based on structural inequalities, they conceal that hostilities between groups are usually not mutual, but are due rather to structurally advantaged groups rejecting contact with disadvantaged groups. In fact, the views of squatters themselves remain curiously absent from their account. Such hostilities, therefore, will not subside through mere contact alone, but only through the elimination of the structural inequalities on which the hostilities are initially based. This recognition leads us back, once again, to Weber. As he argued, we should view racial stereotyping as both an expression of power and a quest for power maintenance (cited in Neuwirth 1969: 150).

We have seen how different economic conditions and cultural norms and values of varying groups of people lead to different needs with regard to form and function within the urban environment. This statement holds especially true for cities with extreme socio-economic and cultural disparities, such as Windhoek. Based on this insight, I now turn again to Katutura. As mentioned previously, town planners and academics construct Katutura as a suburb. In comparing Katutura to the forms, functions, and values usually equated with the suburban model, one soon realises that the former township is qualitative different from other suburbs.

4.4 Katutura: Deconstruction of a ‘Suburb’

Although Katutura’s spatial layout is distinctly suburban, at least in its origins, space use in practice has altered this prescribed form of usage. This is evidenced, for instance, by the frequent construction of rental accommodation in the backyards of township houses. Also, shanties in the informal areas differ very much indeed from suburban homes in the city’s former white suburbs. In addition, on economic, social, and cultural levels, Katutura’s inhabitants do not conform to the typical suburban resident. Several marked differences between the former township areas and suburban developments elsewhere in the city are distinguishable.

First, Katutura originated as a political tool of control and oppression, as a way to consciously exclude its population from the benefits of urban life. Its residents were relocated to these areas without their consent. As mentioned previously, suburban living represents the fulfilment of a dream, an aspiration. Neglecting the origins of the township omits the fact that Katutura still fulfils the role that it was built to perform: it excludes its inhabitants from taking part in city life.

Second, suburbia results from upward mobility, instilling in its residents a sense of
life-achievement. Middle-class city residents move out of the city in search of quiet, clean and ordered environments. Neither Katutura residents nor the residents of the informal areas flock to the urban fringe because they are upwardly mobile. To the contrary, township residents who can afford to live elsewhere may relocate to other areas. However, many of those who leave Katutura prefer to live in the former coloured township of Khomasdal, rather than in the ‘white suburbs’. Two interviewees who could have afforded to live in the former white areas support this assertion:

We moved to Khomasdal because I want to live in a neighbourhood environment. My children should be able to play with the neighbours (personal interview, 1.7.99).

The other former Katutura resident moved to Khomasdal from Dorado Park. In Dorado Park “it was too quiet, you didn’t even know your neighbours”. In addition, most newly arrived migrants move to Katutura because they have family and friends there who not only provide shelter, but also a social network on which to fall back on in times of need.

Third, Katutura residents simply do not aspire to a suburban life-style. To the contrary, people perceive monofunctional layouts as a limiting factor. One respondent maintained:

I would prefer town to come to Katutura rather than having to drive to town. Even if I had a car it would be nicer to be able to walk because town is in Katutura (personal interview, 26.6.99).

One person mused that “Katutura would be a nice business centre”, and another “would like to work in Katutura”. Katutura residents, hence, would prefer if their environment were to display heterofunctional urban, rather than monofunctional suburban, qualities.

Fourth, following from the above, the distance of Katutura residences to urban opportunities is, above all else, perceived as a locational disadvantage. Maria, a Katutura resident, expresses the point clearly:

The distance of people from town creates isolation. The buffer zone was built as a way to indicate to people that they were going to town. It was a marker - a border. They could have built Katutura closer to town, then it wouldn’t have been so isolated (personal interview, 26.6.99).

Attempts by some black rural migrants to set up residence in undeveloped open areas closer to the city centre provides additional support to the argument. These undertakings, however, have been thwarted by the Municipality (urban planner, personal interview, 25.6.99; municipal town planner, personal interview, 30.6.99). Squatter invasions of this sort could be interpreted as an effort to develop residential areas that deviate from the usual monofunctional, suburban layout.

Additionally, Katutura differs from the typical suburb in that suburban living is characterised by a focus on privacy. In typical suburbia, life centres around individual properties, and buildings are consequently inward oriented away from the street. In Katutura, due to overcrowding in houses and cultural differences regarding the use of public space, much of the daily life takes place out of doors. In contrast to the suburban ideal, in Katutura contact with neighbours is seen as desirable, even indispensable.

Lastly, suburban environments are characterised by a particular relationship to the city centre, namely a spatial division of daily life functions. Suburban residents usually own vehicles to overcome distances to places of employment, education, commercial, recreational and social facilities located outside the residential areas. Relatively high income levels enable suburbanites to sustain a particular life-style, maintaining a specific relationship to the city that is simply lacking among those who reside in Katutura. For example, an average of 30% of the potential working population in greater Katutura is without employment. These people do not commute to places of work during the day, and thus remain within the former township areas (Windhoek Municipality 1996b: 47). One should also add that few Katutura residents can afford to use the recreational and social facilities offered elsewhere in the city. As one youth voiced:

Going to town depends on whether you have the taxi money. We don’t go to town very often, only those that have a car or money do (personal interview, 26.6.99).

Given all of the above, Katutura differs from the images and functions associated with the suburban model. However, Windhoek urban planners envisage future city development in a way that postulates all residential areas as
suburbs regardless of their different historical origins and/or the disparate needs and aspirations of their inhabitants. It is, therefore, not only wrong to define the former township as a suburb like any other, but such a construction leads to urban planning strategies which neglect the disparaging needs and aspirations of Katutura residents. The fragmentation of the urban fabric, resulting from the suburban planning approach, renders access to the city, and urban opportunities in general, most difficult for those who live in marginalised Katutura. From their point of view, the former township requires integration rather than suburbanisation. Hence, future urban planning strategies should strive to spatially integrate the former townships into the city and provide urban opportunities within the townships themselves.

5 CONCLUSION

The city of Windhoek has been shaped by more than a century of colonial rule. The segregation of different race groups into distinct localities, implemented most vehemently by the South African apartheid regime, has left a durable imprint on the city’s urban morphology. As this paper elucidates, after nearly a decade of Namibian independence racial segregation in Windhoek still persists, despite efforts by the Municipality and some geographers and urban planners to show otherwise. Despite these misconceptions, we have seen that racial segregation per se does not constitute the root cause of marginalisation among Windhoek’s black majority. Rather, the more important apartheid legacy remains how these people live segregated. Most black residents live in and around the former townships. As Katutura and its informal settlements are located far away from central Windhoek and face particular structural constraints, its inhabitants remain excluded from urban life.

In the literature surrounding post-apartheid segregation, racial desegregation through upward mobility is often presented as the ultimate solution to many urban problems. Two assumptions underlie this approach to desegregation. First, it is presupposed that black people aspire to live in the former white areas. Second, desegregation is understood as a one-way process by which black people are to integrate into the white mainstream environment, and not vice versa. The majority of Katutura’s inhabitants are (and will remain) poor, a circumstance which will ultimately limit the impact of desegregation through the promotion of upward mobility. More importantly, most residents have not expressed a wish to move away from Katutura. However, this is not to say that these residents are content with their urban environment. Many people express feelings of exclusion from Windhoek’s urban opportunities, as the city’s urban life focuses around a part of the city which is nearly inaccessible for many of Katutura’s inhabitants. Future urban planning policies should, therefore, prioritise integration over desegregation. Such a strategy will better afford Katutura residents the opportunity to participate in Windhoek’s urban life on equal footing with those living in the former white areas of the city.

In direct contradiction to the above stated goal, the Windhoek Municipality - supported by some academic writers - has redefined Katutura as a suburb. The discursive manipulation indicates the future direction of the city’s urban planning approach, a path which will continue along monofunctional, cellular development lines. Such a policy approach ignores the qualitative structural differences between the former township and Windhoek’s affluent middle-class suburbs. Attempts by Katutura residents to create heterofunctional urban environments, as exemplified through the many informal businesses that exist throughout Katutura, have also been undermined through suburban development planning. In addition, fragmented suburban layouts are dependent on vehicular traffic. In the case of Katutura, however, inhabitants cannot afford personal transport and, as a result, people who reside there face even greater spatial exclusion. These urban planning oversights may be explained by the Municipality’s insistence that they provide but a guidance to an essentially market-led urban development. In rejecting an active political role for themselves, the Municipality will be unable to address the urban legacies created during the apartheid era. However, true integration of the fragmented post-apartheid society requires the active involvement and support of the Municipality on a political level.

As regards the content of such active involvement, and given that our goal should be integration, two major questions demand our attention. First, how should the issue of segregation be dealt with in the future? Second, how can structural inequalities be overcome? With respect to the former, Sibley
(1997) and Wolch and Dear (1987) note that heterogeneous inner city neighbourhoods may display more tolerance than homogenous suburban areas. The writers identify a relationship between clustering and segregation, that is, the greater the degree of group clustering, the greater the resulting segregation from other groups. However, in promoting greater urban integration in Windhoek, space syntax research may point us in a more fruitful direction. It suggests that a large degree of group clustering does not necessarily lead to segregation from other groups (Vaughan 1998: n.p.). Their research of a Jewish settlement in 19th century inner city London indicates that although its residents were highly segregated, occupying up to 95% of the houses, the settlement was located on highly integrated streets. The settlement’s Jewish population was thus able to live in cultural seclusion, while at the same time maintaining integrated relationships with other city residents (ibid.). Such “locally segregated but globally integrated” urban environments may represent a model for the successful integration of a racially mixed city such as Windhoek.

Returning to Windhoek’s spatial fragmentation, and the latter point in question, Sibley has remarked that “spatial structures can strengthen or weaken social boundaries, thus accentuating social division, or conversely, rendering the excluded group less visible” (Sibley 1992: 113). In the Windhoek context, both outcomes can be observed. First, social division has become more accentuated, for example, as a result of the continuing east/west division along the Western Bypass. A growing number of people remain excluded from urban opportunities, as they live increasingly further and further away from the actual city. Second, the excluded group has become less visible, as the expanding informal areas on the northern fringes of Katutura illustrate. In an attempt to address these ill-effects, urban planning for the future should seek to reverse both accentuated social divisions and spatial marginalisation. The aim of ‘integration’, as set out in the beginning of the paper, should be to strive toward a spatially integrated city structure which provides equal urban opportunities for all. A necessary precondition for achieving both goals is to address the unique needs of the marginalised Katutura residents, and to make provision for compact, heterogeneous environments that can meet these needs. Future town planning should therefore seek to spatially integrate the former townships into the city, and to provide urban opportunities within the townships themselves. Spatial integration of the formerly excluded townships and heterofunctional planning approaches, though not currently prioritised by city officials, remain important goals yet to be accomplished.
Racial concepts are contested social constructs, especially with respect to apartheid policies in South Africa and Namibia. As Rose et al. assert, “[h]uman ‘racial’ differentiation is, indeed, only skin deep. Any use of racial categories must take its justification from some other source than biology. The remarkable feature of human evolution and history has been the very small degree of divergence between geographical populations as compared with the genetic variations among individuals” (1990: 127). In this paper, I place all such racial terms in quotation marks at first-use only. I have done this in order to alert the reader of a contested construct and then, subsequently, to avoid cumbersome reading thereafter.

Throughout the history of Namibia, colonial and apartheid officials have used a truly mind-boggling range of vocabulary to denote Namibian peoples. This lexicon has spanned from ‘Natives’, ‘Kaffirs’, and ‘Bantus’ to ‘Blacks’, ‘Africans’ and ‘Coloureds’. Apartheid administrators utilised these classifications when applying its racial policies, and for that reason are most relevant with respect to this paper. These supposed racial categories are, of course, awkward and unscientific at best. But given the topic of my paper and the history of the region, I cannot avoid making such distinctions. Throughout this paper, therefore, I am forced to adopt the term ‘black’ as an identifier for people of African descent, and the term ‘coloured’ as a label for those of mixed (African and European) ancestry.

During apartheid rule in Namibia, the South African government constructed townships as purpose-built, racially restricted, residential localities situated on city fringes.

The former townships, of course, form part of the city of Windhoek. Placing the townships in opposition to ‘the city’ is, therefore, somewhat inaccurate. I have chosen this dichotomy to emphasise the marginalised status of township residents in comparison to those living elsewhere in Windhoek.

The same holds true for many of Windhoek’s ‘coloured’ residents. However, given their much smaller numbers, this paper will concentrate mainly on the city’s black inhabitants.

Mamdani, however, maintains that “apartheid, usually considered unique to South Africa, is actually the generic form of the colonial state in Africa” (1996: 8). Mamdani terms this form of rule “decentralised despotism”, though the South Africans labelled it ‘institutional segregation’, the British referred to it as ‘indirect rule’, and the French named it ‘association’ (ibid.).

This view was also widely held and perpetuated by functionalist anthropologists who were interested in ahistorical ‘traditional’ systems and emphasised the unifying function of common religious values, symbols, and customs among each ‘tribe’ (Asad 1973).

‘Homelands’ were remote rural areas (similar to ‘reservations’ in the USA) created by the South African government as part of its apartheid policy of separate development. The term denoted the former ‘tribal’ reserves which were, under apartheid, set aside for the black population as so-called independent areas within the states of South Africa and Namibia.

Coloured people, in a classic ‘divide and rule’ fashion, occupied a somewhat higher status than black people in the racial hierarchy and were, for example, allowed to own city property. Also, they did not require employment permits in order to remain legal urban residents. This differential treatment was attributed to their partly European ancestry, as they were “broadly viewed as being ‘in the middle’, between the whites and black Africans” (Western 1984: 227).

Revoked were the so-called petty apartheid laws which regulated social interactions between people on an individual level.

During colonial (pre-apartheid) times, segregated residential areas were called ‘locations’. Most of Windhoek’s black and coloured population lived in the so-called ‘Main Location’ near the city centre. The term ‘township’ was introduced by the South African government in the early 1950s, after the implementation of apartheid rule. Windhoek’s Main Location is today referred to as the ‘Old Location’.

Collins’s remark is in line with the former South African government’s assertion that the “Bantu” was not truly fitted for town life, would culturally disintegrate in the city, and was therefore better-off living in the “traditional” and picturesque countryside (Western 1984: 210).
14 The Panopticon, devised by Jeremy Bentham in the 19th century, consists of an annular building divided into cells. A central tower affords the opportunity to survey any of the cells at any particular moment in time (Foucault 1979: 200). This type of arrangement reduces the number of those who exercise power, while increasing the number of those on whom it is exercised. Also, an intervention can take place at any moment, placing constant pressure on those under surveillance to survey themselves (ibid.: 201).


16 According to the Namibian Economic Policy Research Unit, 51% of manufacturing activities, 96% of utilities, 56% of construction and trade, 94% of transport and communications, 82% of finance and business services, and 68% of community and social services are located in Windhoek (cited in Pomuli and Tvedten 1998: 115).

17 ‘Primacy’ refers to a condition in which one city dominates over all others within a given country, not only in demographic terms, but also with regard to political, economic and cultural considerations (Merrington 1986: 12). Primacy and resulting hyper-urbanisation are often viewed as the result of colonial urban policies. “Colonies were often the sources of raw materials and markets for finished products whilst having little part in the productive systems. Urbanisation was said to be directly related to this pattern of development” (ibid.).

18 In 1995, the average household income in the former white areas in the south-eastern parts of Windhoek was estimated at N$ 7,000 per month (Beeker 1999). As of July 1999, £1 = N$9.2.


20 Translated from the German, F. Friedman: “…das wichtigste Ordnungsprinzip der Gesellschaft im Wohnraum der Stadt.”

21 Hence, the medieval expression ‘Stadtluft macht frei’, that is, ‘city air makes one free’.

22 What is termed ‘racial segregation’ in a southern African context is referred to as ‘ethnic segregation’ in the general literature.

23 Earlier examples of urban ethnic segregation are also found in 16th century mercantile capitalist Venice. The term ‘ghetto’, for instance, originates from the name of its walled Jewish community. For a discussion on the origin and meaning of the word ghetto, see Ravid (1992: 373-383).

24 Indeed, there exist some striking parallels between apartheid and Israeli urban planning as exemplified in Jerusalem and the surrounding Palestinian Territories. Palestinians residing in Jerusalem, for example, find it extremely difficult to acquire (and increasingly difficult to retain) residency permits. Palestinians are required to carry identification papers at all times, and those without a Jerusalem residence or work permit are forbidden entrance to the city. The West Bank, hence, serves as a cheap labour reserve for Israeli cities. Furthermore, in an attempt to outnumber the Palestinian population within Jerusalem, the Israelis have utilised restrictive zoning laws to keep urban densities in certain areas to a minimum. In addition, through the erection of Jewish settlements and the construction of restricted access roads within the West Bank, the movement of the Palestinian population is severely restricted even within their own territory (Hass 1999).

25 Translation from the German, F. Friedman: “…wie es auch in vielen anderen ehemals kolonialen Städten geschehen ist.”

26 As Foucault argued, knowledge is neither politically neutral nor objective. Knowledge (and the discourse that emerges with it) exerts power not only over people, but also over the subject it intends to study. In other words, discourse shapes the object of knowledge itself (see Rabinow 1991). In this way, the denial of continued racial segregation is highly political, for it forces people to define the problem in specific terms. Windhoek’s urban realities are reshaped through the use of altered terminology, rather than by changing reality itself.

27 Translation from the German, F. Friedman: “...ein demokratisches System, das allen Bürgern Namibias die Möglichkeiten zu freiem Wirtschaften und Sozialverhalten einräumt.”

28 Translation from the German, F. Friedman: “Zunahme sozialer Differenzierung und Segregation.”

29 This figure represents a rough estimate only, as no official figures could be obtained. However, given that 73% of the population can be identified as black or coloured based on their location of residence in Katutura
and Khomasdal (Windhoek Municipality 1996b: 4), and given that some mixing has occurred in the city’s former white areas and recently developed new residential neighbourhoods, the estimate is a conservative one.

Additionally, in terms of real numbers, one should bear in mind that average household sizes in Katutura are larger than those in the affluent former white areas.

However, no figures as to the area’s actual racial composition could be obtained.

This figure is based on data provided by Graefe (1993), Beeker (1995) and the Windhoek Municipality (1996).

Sibley, for instance, believes that exclusionary tendencies first develop in the individual, and then feed into exclusionary practices on a state level (1997: 87). Examples in the literature, however, disprove this perspective. Rhue, in his classic book *The Wave* (1991), shows how exclusionary tendencies may develop through the introduction of purification measures which are imposed from the top-down. His book, based on a true incident in a California high school history class, details the results of an apparently innocent learning exercise, a game which meant to explicate the exclusionary dynamics of the Third Reich. However, once begun, most of the pupils failed to recognise the game’s connection to the history lesson. Group dynamics developed a life of its own, as the pupils fell prey to the exclusionary rhetoric of the teacher (ibid.: 121).

34 The concept of freedom of choice is rejected by the French structuralist Althusser who asserts that the idea is an ideological construct of capitalist society. According to him, people are always constrained in their acting and thinking by economic, political and ideological determinants (cited in Jackson and Smith 1981: 10-11).

Brasilia, Brazil represents another example of grand-scale modernist planning, particularly with regard to planned segregation and the exclusion of poor city residents. In an attempt to avoid urban sprawl and spoil the city’s layout, low-income residents were settled in distant satellite towns which were separated from the city by so-called green belts (Madaleno 1997: 174-177). Further insight into the making and workings of Brasilia can be gained from Holston’s anthropological account of the city (Holston 1989).

Le Corbusier himself described his Ville Radieuse as a “vertical garden city” (Le Corbusier, quoted in Jacobs 1961: 22).

It is ironic that the municipality is more interested in saving the environment “for future generations and for sustained tourist attraction” (Windhoek Municipality 1996a: n.p.) by halting environmental degradation and suppressing population growth, than in ameliorating the living conditions of those people whose poverty is expressed in these terms. Likewise, the Municipality’s positive evaluation of cities is grounded in the urbanising process as a remedy to other unrelated problems (by deflecting them onto the city), rather than in any attribute intrinsic to urbanism itself.

In comparison, urban densities in Europe and the United States may reach several hundred dwellings per hectare. San Francisco’s Telegraph Hill district, for example, a centrally located mixed use area, maintains residential densities of more than 200 dwellings per hectare (Jacobs 1961: 211).

Indeed, it appears that the in-fill of undeveloped land close to the city centre could result in meeting many of the Municipality’s stated goals. Higher densities would be created, leading to walking distances to and from the centres of employment; places of work would move closer to peoples’ homes; and a public transport system would become more viable.

The Municipality’s apolitical stance is exemplified by a town planner’s comment during a public hearing on the city’s Structure Plan. During the gathering, the municipal representative counters a question regarding the fairness of cross-subsidisation with the remark that “this issue is now becoming political and not technical”. His response suggests that the Municipality does not wish to address such an issue, that is, an issue which is political (Windhoek Municipality 1996a: Appendix 2).

Chaney also implies that the use of cars in suburban environments will destroy public space altogether, as space is considered solely in terms of any particular journey’s start- and end-points. The space in between is perceived as distance, but not as potential social space.

Contact hypothesis is based on the work of Allport, Kramer, MacKenzie, and Williams. Formulated after the Second World War, the hypothesis developed as an endeavour of societal democratisation. Many contact researchers, for example, supported racially integrated housing and schooling in the United States (Dixon and Reich 1997: 361).

Another difference between Katutura and the residential suburbs is evidenced by the fact that only 13.3% of Katutura’s population work in the Central Business District, compared to 30% of the residents in the former white areas. Furthermore, although a high percentage of Katutura residents (46%) work within the former white
suburbs, usually as general and domestic workers, virtually no suburbanites actually commute to work in Katutura (Windhoek Municipality 1996b: 52).


