

Chapter 2

The Powers of Private Cities: Zoning Technologies, Neoliberal Governmentality and Citizenship in Johannesburg

Yohei MIYAUCHI

Center for Asian Area Studies, Rikkyo University

Abstract: The aspiration of post-apartheid Johannesburg to become a “world-class city” has been intensified by global city competition and urban entrepreneurialism promoting neoliberal urban projects, which are reshaping the more commercial urban spaces. We can safely say that private cities are being created using “zoning technologies,” i.e. innovative uses of zoning, such as city improvement districts and gated communities. Private cities are usually managed by private agencies, resident associations and private-public partnerships, who take responsibility for their own spaces outside the realm of city government. Such urban governance can be an example of neoliberal governmentality, which requests people inside private cities to manage and control their lives and to pursue services such as healthcare, safety and social security on their own. However, this brings concerns such as spatial segregation and social discrimination due to neoliberal governmentality, which exclude “non-citizens” such as the poor and minorities, including immigrants, refugees and street traders. Given the South African history of apartheid, we should not ignore these concerns. In this paper, I will encourage positive reconsideration of the concept of “escape” to give some hope of a possible viable alternative and that we can resist neoliberal governmentality.

Keywords: Neoliberalism, Governmentality, Zone, City Improvement Districts, Gated Communities

1. Introduction: Zoning Technologies in a Privatized World

This paper examines the current forms of urban rejuvenation and urban governance in Johannesburg under a neoliberal way of life. Since the end of apartheid, the promotion of the City of Johannesburg to become a “world-class city” intensified by global city competition and “urban entrepreneurialism” (Harvey 1989). This campaign has produced commercial urban spaces that are neoliberal

projects (Bremner 2010; Tomlinson et al. 2003).

The most significant aspects of neoliberalization of urban spaces are characterized by the privatization of urban spaces along with the creation of “private cities” (Glasze et al. 2006) or special zones. Aihwa Ong points out that “zoning technologies,” which create exceptional or special zones where the system of neoliberalism is exceptionally applied inside sovereign states, have been occurring all over the world. The zones are employed as “the instrumentalization of a form of market-driven rationality that demarcates spaces, usually nonadjacent to each other, in order to capitalize on specific locational advantages of economic flows, activities and linkages” (Ong 2006: 103). Indeed, the zones create significant boundaries to divide the inside from the outside of such areas and to restrict people’s movement based on whether someone has legitimate rights to enter. Moreover, such zoning strategies are ultimate responses to disastrous crises of mankind. For example, the Andrei Tarkovsky film, *Stalker* (1979), describes “the zone” established after a meteorite strike or a man-made disaster (imagine nuclear-related accidents), where entry is strictly prohibited because many lost their lives inside the zone, which is watched over by military guards. In the film, the stalker, or hunter, acts as a guide for someone who is eager to cross the border into the forbidden zone to seek “the room” that can make a person’s wishes come true. In the real world, such a zone has existed in Chernobyl since 1986. Twenty-five years later, we now witness the zone in Fukushima, known as No Man’s Zone (directed by Toshifumi Fujiwara, 2012)¹.

Meanwhile, private cities created by zoning technology generally take responsibility for their own space in the broader sense of governance such as security, sanitation, tax collection, marketing and branding. Such services are basically not provided by sources outside their own boundaries. Since the late 1990s, a form of private urban governance has received public attention and discussion in the media, urban social sciences, as well as politics and urban planning all over the world. These debates deal with fundamental social questions on private versus public organization of civic goods and services, the right to a secure environment versus the right to access, communal versus individual consumption, inclusion versus exclusion, heterogeneity versus homogeneity and efficiency versus equity (Glasze et al. 2006). These debates remind us that issues around private cities have close links to notions of space, knowledge and power (Foucault 1982). In particular, we should be concerned that the emergence of private cities and the restructuring of urban spaces are outcomes of neoliberal projects based on the power of capital in the last three decades. Thus, we should consider private cities in the context of issues on

power.

Lavasa City in India is a newly developed private city. It has no democratic electoral process at the city level and is governed by a private enterprise, Lavasa Corporation Limited. This type of governance exemplifies some concerns about citizenship.

In this approach to citizenship, market rationalism dictates and structures governmental processes and the equality of outcome for the citizens is not ensured. Individuals are viewed as active participants in the market, capable of promoting their own interests and thus the outputs and lives of these citizens would be a reflection of their individual skills and resources. This free market approach to citizenship does not guarantee that all people will be able to participate in citizenship because the criterion for participation is based on access to capital. In this formulation, citizenship is neither a universal right nor a moral prerogative.

(Taraporevala 2013)

Lavasa City is an ultimate case of a privatized city². However, in China, there are privatized specific zones coexisting with socialist state controls. In fact, privatization refers to not only issues of open market policy but also lifestyle issues. According to Ong and Zhang, “we view privatization as a set of techniques that optimize economic gains by priming the powers of the private self”, in other words, ‘this subjectivizing aspect of privatization as a mode of thinking, managing and actualizing the self is a central element of neoliberal doctrine’ (Ong & Zhang 2008: 3). Thus, it can be said that the world under a neoliberal philosophy promotes the privatization of our lives through zoning technology. I would like to offer a brief explanation on five types of special zones created by zoning technology before moving on to a more detailed examination of the private cities of Johannesburg.

1. City improvement districts (CIDs) or business improvement districts (BIDs): These represent models whereby a certain geographical area is defined, managed, protected and controlled by a private firm and/ or a representative business/ resident group. This model is very popular in the United States, where it has been implemented to rejuvenate many downtown areas (Zukin 2010). It has also recently been implemented in Johannesburg, Cape Town and Pretoria.

2. Gated communities: These are residential developments surrounded by walls, fences, or earth banks with a secured entrance. Houses, streets, sidewalks and other amenities are physically enclosed by these barriers, and entrance gates are operated by a guard or opened with a key or electronic card. Gated communities restrict access not just to resident homes but also to the use of

public spaces and services within the community boundary, i.e. roads, parks, facilities and open space. Since the early 1980s, the number of gated communities is expanding and currently, millions of people in the United States live in such communities. Recently, gated communities have become quite a popular residential style in large cities of South Africa (Blakely & Snyder 1997; Caldeira 2000; Landman 2000; 2004a; 2004b; Low 2003).

3. Private enclaves: An “enclave” originally referred to a territory located within a state, but outside its political jurisdiction, such as the Vatican City in Italy. In contemporary Africa, such as Angola’s offshore oil extracting enclaves, private companies are developing private enclaves where there is no direct intervention by the states and no state responsibility to societies within the enclaves, which are usually protected by private security companies. Ferguson labels this type of private governance as the “Angola model” prevailing in the African continent. “[N]ot nation-states developing national resources, but enclaved mineral-rich patches efficiently exploited by flexible private firms, with security provided on an ‘as needed’ basis by specialized corporations while the elite cliques who are nominal holders of sovereignty certify the industry’s legality and international legitimacy in exchange for a piece of the action” (Ferguson 2006: 204).

4. Special economic zones (SEZs): As in China, SEZs have autonomy in all economic and administrative matters, they are exempted from socialist central planning and regulation of investment and labour issues, and their market conditions determine wages and work conditions. Zoning becomes increasingly popular in Africa for adapting the SEZ model from China to Africa.

5. Private states: In weak African states, even the states are being privatized (Hibou 2004). In these countries, non-state actors have a strong presence. An example is the private military company, which usually assumes the role of maintaining security for the state rather than the national army.

These five types of private governances use different methodologies. However, their basic philosophies resonate with each another. Two fundamental objectives for creating these zones are the maximization of capital and the control of daily life in order to enhance health, safety and security. In this paper, I will mainly focus and discuss gated communities and CIDs in Johannesburg, which represent new urban governances in a post-apartheid metropolis. I will analyse the process of privatization through zoning in Johannesburg and describe it with reference to the concept of neoliberal governmentality.

2. Becoming the Global City of the South

Johannesburg is the most populous city in South Africa, with 4.43 million people (Black 76%, Coloured 6%, Indian/ Asian 5%, White 13%; Statistics South Africa, 2011); in 2008, the GDP was 110 billion US dollars³. Thus, it can be said that Johannesburg is one of the global cities of the world and plays an important role as a financial centre as well as attracts huge numbers of skilled and unskilled immigrants (Sassen 2001). However, Johannesburg is not a perfect global city; in fact, it is “not-quite” a global city (Robinson 2003). Therefore, Johannesburg may be recognized as a global city of South. The aspiration of the City of Johannesburg to become a “world-class African city” has been intensified by global city competition and “urban entrepreneurialism” (Harvey 1989). Thus, the process of urban policy making in Johannesburg is noticed for its aspirational pro-growth discourse (Cornellissen 2009). Simultaneously, Johannesburg is required to improve the living conditions of the poor in one of the most polarized cities in the world. Therefore, urban policy is often a contradiction between global success-oriented policies and development approaches (Cornellissen 2009; Robinson 2003); this is found in Goli 2002, the urban policy paper by the City of Johannesburg, which generally promoted aspects of neoliberalism.

The creation of public–private partnerships has become the most recent magic elixir for fixing cities: promoting economic growth, providing jobs, expanding tax revenues and creating a dynamic new image of a vibrant urban landscape (Murray 2011). We can find many outcomes of public–private partnership projects, particularly around the 2010 Soccer World Cup. It is not surprising that “more than ever before in its history, urban spaces of Johannesburg have become a product that is marked, measured, marketed and transacted” (Mbembe 2008: 54). The city has been restructured by a vast but uneven wave of property speculation (Bond 2007: 116). In post-apartheid Johannesburg, which embodies “liquid modernity” (Bauman 2001), the mobility of people, capital and power produces both anxiety and possibilities in the ‘elusive Afropolis’ (Mbembe & Nuttall 2008). To examine the current urban situations of Johannesburg, it is useful to divide the urban spaces of Johannesburg into three areas: the inner city, the outer city/ northern suburbs and the Township.

1. The inner city contains the central business district (CBD) of Johannesburg, once recognized as the commercial hub of the African continent. Since the second half of the 1980s, offices of multinational companies and headquarters of South African companies have shifted from the inner city to

outer cities such as Sandton and Rosebank (both CIDs). This shift has created a huge decline in land prices, deterioration in the condition of property and increased crime in the inner city, all of which has been accompanied by a rapid influx of poorer, non-white residents and immigrants from neighbouring countries. In the 1990s and early 2000s, most people living outside the inner city considered the inner city as a virtual “no-go” zone. Thus, in practical terms Johannesburg’s city centre is no longer its commercial centre (Czeglédy 2003). In the last ten years, things have begun to change as investment has gradually returned to the inner city. Later, I will discuss the rejuvenation of the inner city using zoning for CIDs.

2. The outer city/ northern suburbs have been allocated as white residential areas since the 1960s and development of shopping malls started in the 1970s (Beavon 2000). Since the 1980s, offices from the inner city have moved into the areas mentioned earlier. Sandton, one of the largest CIDs in Johannesburg, has attracted the Johannesburg Stock Exchange, offices of multinational companies, five-star hotels and international conference centres. Sandton is now the commercial hub of the African continent. The outer city/ northern suburbs are also the core of construction of gated communities for wealthy and middle-class people.

3. The Township comprises former forced settlements for the black population under the apartheid legislation (The Group Areas Act, 1950); blacks still mainly reside in these settlements. I will not discuss the Township in this paper. However, I would like to emphasize that even inside the Township, where most of the houses consist of minimum standard housing provided by the government, informal settlements, or shacks, the developments of gated communities as well as commercial and residential zones using the CID model have recently become quite popular for targeting the newly rising wealthy and middle-class black population, commonly known as “black diamonds.”

Indeed, all three sections of Johannesburg are currently attracting huge capital investments using zoning technology to maximize financial benefits and protect a selected population. Now we will closely examine gated communities in the outer city/ northern suburbs of Johannesburg.

3. Gated Communities in Liquid Johannesburg

It is no exaggeration to say that we live in an era of community. “Community is nowadays another name for paradise lost, but one to which we dearly hope to return, and so we feverishly seek the roads that may bring us there” (Bauman 2001). We are eager to belong to communities because in liquid modernity, there

is a feeling of uncertainty due to the severe conditions of our lives. “Globalization, neoliberalism and information and communication technology, have not led to greater inclusion; the opposite has been the case, with social exclusion, insecurity and exploitation rising” (Delanty 2009: 156). Thus, people look to their communities for identity, a sense of belonging, solidarity and routes for fragmented individuals. However, the reality is that community can only stand “for the kind of world which is not, regrettably, available to us, but which we dearly wish to inhabit and which we hope to repossess” (Bauman 2001). In fact, Rose (1999) insists that in the British society, people’s sense of belonging has shifted from society to communities such as neighbourhoods, workplaces, religions and lifestyles for a sense of values and philosophies. However, as Richard Sennett criticizes, “[C]ommunity has become both emotional withdrawal from society and a territorial barricade within the city” (Sennett 1991: 300-301); more than that, communities sometimes breed violent confrontations or exclude others. In addition, as Rose points out, governments often mobilize communities as devices of self-management.

Community is actually instituted in its contemporary forms as a sector for government [and] in the institution of community, a sector is brought into existence whose vectors and forces can be mobilized, enrolled and deployed in novel programs and techniques, which encourage and harness active practices of self-management and identity construction of personal ethics and collective allegiances [and this is labelled] government through community.

(Rose 1999: 176)

That is to say, community is a tool of “biopolitics” (Foucault 2008) to govern and control the population.

In post-apartheid South African society, people seek to create communities to ensure a lifestyle and living environment that is threatened by the deteriorating conditions of public safety and social security. The income gap has become wider than that during the apartheid regime as the GINI coefficient was raised from 0.60 in 1996 to 0.67 in 2008 (Van Aardt & Coetzee 2008) and the official unemployment rate has remained around 25%. The poor and minorities complain of unequal government services delivery such as that of safe water, electricity, health service, education and social housing (McLennan & Munslow 2001). Fifteen years since 1994, official statistics recorded over 328,000 murders, over 750,000 incidents of rape, close to 1.6 million incidents of aggravated robbery and 3.6 million incident of assault with the intent to inflict grievous bodily harm (Bruce 2010: 389). Since 2004, approximately 10,000 protests have

occurred per year and 10% of them were near-riot situations (Alexander 2012). One becomes used to witnessing brutal police actions against ordinary people; still, we were deeply shocked by the incident on 16 August 2008, where the South African police massacred 34 strikers participating in a peaceful gathering at the Marikana mine (Alexander et al. 2012). Thus, confidence in and reliance on the police and the government has been lost in the last decade. The situations mentioned above motivate people to take responsibility to protect their own lives. A response by the middle to upper classes has been to create gated communities protected by private security companies. However, the poor are left to protect their communities through resident community policing.

Normally, a gated community is a residential enclave surrounded by walls and fences with a secured entrance. Recently, this type of residential community has been increasing all over the world. Furthermore, fortification is being applied to office complexes, shopping malls and casinos, among others. Teresa Caldeira, who has researched the fortress city of São Paulo, has concerns about the generation of new forms of spatial segregation and social discrimination through the fortification of urban spaces.

In the last two decades, in cities as distinct as São Paulo, Los Angeles, Johannesburg, Buenos Aires, Budapest, Mexico City and Miami, different social groups, especially from the upper class, have used the fear of violence and crime to justify new techniques of exclusion and their withdrawal from traditional quarters of the cities. Groups that feel threatened by the social order taking shape in these cities commonly build exclusive, fortified enclaves for their residence, work, leisure and consumption.

(Caldeira 2000: 1)

Caldeira states that, “[T]he discourses of fear incorporate racial and ethnic anxieties, class prejudices and references to poor and marginalized groups,” and she points out that, “[T]hese discourses of fear intertwine with other process of social transformation: transitions to democracy in Latin America, the end of apartheid in South Africa and of socialism in Eastern Europe, and immigration in South California” (Caldeira 2000: 1).

David Harvey worries about the uneven urban development and privatization of cities in the developing world.

We increasingly live in divided and conflict-prone urban areas. In the past three decades, the neoliberal turn has restored class power to elites. [...] The results are indelibly etched on the spatial forms of our cities, which increasingly consist of

fortified fragments, gated communities and privatized public spaces kept under constant surveillance. In the developing world in particular, the city is splitting into different separated parts, with the apparent formation of many ‘microstates.’

(Harvey 2008: 32)

We will now closely examine gated communities in South Africa based on Karina Landman’s studies (Landman 2000; 2004a; 2004b) and my personal views and experiences⁴. In South Africa, gated communities have been developed since the early 1990s due to an increase in the fear of crime and unreliable government services. Landman classifies gated communities in South Africa into two types: “enclosed neighbourhoods” and “security villages.”

Enclosed neighbourhoods refer to existing neighbourhoods that have controlled access through gates or booms across existing roads. Many are fenced or walled off as well, with a limited number of controlled entrances/ exits and in some cases, security guards at these points. The roads within these neighbourhoods were previously or still are public property, and in many cases, the local council is still responsible for public services such as garbage collection to the community within. It is estimated that more than 300 enclosed neighbourhoods exist in Johannesburg. The number of houses in each enclosed neighbourhood varies from 10 to 4,000. Normally, homeowner associations of the neighbourhoods apply to local government for road closures. In Gauteng province, where Johannesburg is located, the local government examines the applications based on the Rationalization of Local Government Affairs Act (1998) of Gauteng. However, there are many illegal road closures and enclosed neighbourhoods in Johannesburg.

On the other hand, Security villages refer to private residential developments that include secure estates, office parks, shopping mall complexes, as well as casinos, where a private developer is responsible for developing and maintaining the entire land areas ranging from 10 to 50 ha⁵. The villages are physically walled or fenced off and usually have security gates or controlled access points with private security guards. The roads inside the village are privately owned, and in most cases, a private management body manages and maintains the infrastructure, landscape, security and safety. The government usually provides only electricity and water. Therefore, it is quite a welcome development for governments because despite providing only limited services, they gain huge benefits in increased municipal property taxes. Some security estates have golf courses, sporting facilities, restaurants, private schools, hiking courses and even organic farms inside their walls. In these communities,

homeowner associations are responsible for the governance of the community including strict rules for residents and visitors. The racial demographics of the estates depend on each estate. For example, in the Forestdale estate, 85.6% are white and 14.4% are non-white (5.5% are black) residents, and in the Santa Cruz estate, 19.2% are white and 80.2% are non-white (67.9% are black) residents (Jürgens et al. 2003: 65). Regardless of the strategies, the gated communities in Johannesburg represent the ultimate in self-responsibility and self-governance.

4. City Improvement Districts in Neoliberal Johannesburg

I will now closely examine CIDs as another type of private city in Johannesburg. CIDs are privately run urban regeneration projects that have been promoted in many cities worldwide in the context of growing scarcity of public funds, increasing devolution of responsibilities and functions at the local level, and rising public private partnerships in local economic development (Peyroux 2006: 9). This newly developed style of urban governance is a significant example of private cities, where private agencies, owners/residents and citizens take responsibility for their own spaces and intend to manage public spaces. Private capitals together with city governments, pushing to cultivate new markets within urban spaces, usually promote such intentions.

CIDs are derived from the BID model in the United States. Although there are no fixed definitions of BIDs, they are projects for revitalizing downtown districts by business-led schemes for business and commerce rather than residential use. They seek to create clean, safe and friendly spaces as well as secure and privatize public spaces (Murray 2011). Union Square in New York is an example of a BID. The square was a typical public space in a city centre. In the 1980s, a private association of local businesses and rich patrons with a vested interest in renovating the square and restoring it to civil use took charge of managing the square (Zukin 2010: 126). Disney World's strategies are used for the management of BIDs.

Their first goal is to clean up an area, keeping it free of litter that the city's sanitation services cannot control. They also secure space by erecting barriers or otherwise limiting public access and by making rules about appropriate behaviour on their grounds. Private security guards help enforce their strategies. They control the public's mobility by keeping people moving through public spaces and organizing where and how they sit and also determining who may sit.

(Zukin 1995: 65)

This sanitizing of urban spaces is promoted by consumer-driven culture and

BID associations that often have the power to exclude others and privatize control of urban public spheres.

These associations work to raise property values in and around public spaces, which cannot be done if homeless men and women sleep on park benches, muggers threaten shoppers, walls and lampposts are covered with graffiti, and cities fail to provide the basic services of street cleaning, trash collecting and policing on which the urban public relies.

(Zukin 2010: 126)

In a brief review of the history of the development of CIDs in Johannesburg, they were originally initiatives of the Central Johannesburg Partnership (CJP), a private non-profit company, established in 1992, which began creating CIDs in the inner city of Johannesburg in 1993. The CJP has supported activities by the Johannesburg Inner City Business Coalition, a lobbyist group consisting of business enterprises such as organized study tours to the United States and the United Kingdom for city officials and business people of Johannesburg to learn about overseas BID models. In 1997, the CJP established Partnerships for Urban Renewal to expand the model of CIDs into the outer city/ northern suburbs of Johannesburg in districts such as Sandton, Rosebank, Randburg and Illovo. In 1997, Gauteng Provincial Legislature announced the City Improvement District Act No. 12, which legislates that CIDs are required to secure financial commitment from at least 51% of the property owners in the district and to establish a management body, with property owners in the majority. In Johannesburg, there were approximately ten legislated CIDs, six 'informal' voluntary improvement districts and four precinct projects falling under the category in 2006. In 2003, the CJP and Kagiso Property Holdings formed Kagiso Urban Management (KUM), a for-profit enterprise, which undertakes planning, consulting, development and management of CIDs, and KUM took over Partnerships for Urban Renewal. Thus, KUM, renamed Urban Genesis in 2010, has become the single provider of CIDs outside the inner city. In fact, they have become a near monopoly in the design and management of CIDs in Johannesburg. They are mainly concerned with the security of their environments as well as promote cleaning and maintaining of public spaces, marketing, physical improvements and special programs to address aspects such as transportation, access and parking. Some CIDs have social programs such as the creation of homeless associations as well as organizations to support informal traders by providing them with formal shaded

markets as in the case of Rosebank (Didier et al. 2013; Murray 2011; Peyroux 2006; 2008).

Behind the CJP and Urban Genesis, there are other key facilitators such as the Johannesburg Development Agency under the City of Johannesburg, which has officially promoted the rejuvenation of the inner city through refurbishment of the infrastructure; private property developers, who mainly create CID-like complexes with a combination of offices, residences and leisure facilities; as well as public developers such as the Housing Development Agency, which is responsible for creating social housing.

Based on their function and status with reference to earlier studies, I would categorize CIDs into five types (e.g. Didier et al. 2012; Peyroux 2008): (1) Legislated CIDs: The City Improvement District Act No. 12 of 1997 legalizes this type of CID mainly planned and managed by Urban Genesis, (2) Voluntary informal CIDs: Found around Wits University, Newtown, and Constitutional Court in the inner city, where the goal is to set up their projects quickly without waiting for the formal process, (3) Special projects: These include Ellis Park—location of the 2010 World Cup soccer stadium, the fashion district and Gandhi Square, (4) Residential CIDs (RCIDs): The renovation projects for deteriorated inner city flats, such as eKhaya Neighborhood Program in Hillbrow and Legae La Rona in Berea, (5) CID-like developer projects: Reflecting the philosophy of CIDs, private property companies not only create commercial and residential complexes in the outer city/ northern suburbs such as Melrose Arch but also in Maboneng Precinct in the inner city.

The functions and characteristics of CIDs differ according to the location. CIDs in the inner city are more confined to high crime and grime areas. Therefore, the main roles of CIDs in the inner city are security, controlling informal trading and improving sanitary. They are upgrading existing public open spaces and interconnecting them with pedestrian walkways to improve walkability. On the other hand, CIDs in the outer city/ northern suburbs are less affected by serious crime and urban degradation. Therefore, branding, landscaping and promoting cultural entertainment are among their main services (Peyroux 2006; 2008).

In the inner city of Johannesburg, there are several accomplished and ongoing projects. The two types of CIDs in the inner city are CIDs and RCIDs. CIDs are usually located in revitalized areas for commercial, business and recreational purposes to bring business people, wealthy and middle-class Johannesburgers and tourists back to the inner city. Newtown is a leading CID in the inner city; Blaamfontein is also a main CID where we can find huge

landscape changes over the past few years. On the other hand, RCIDs are also found in renovated residential areas, particularly in Berea, Hillbrow and Yeoville. In 2005, the Property Owners' and Managers' Association (POMA) announced its intention to establish five separate residential improvement districts in the inner city. Cobbling together a strategic alliance of key stakeholders (which included property owners and landlords, municipal officials, city utility departments and law enforcement agencies), POMA set out with ambitious plans to transform ideas into concrete reality. The prototype for this new strategic initiative was the creation of a large-scale housing redevelopment project called Legae La Rona. Many private property companies participate in the development of RCIDs to reshape commercially oriented urban spaces (Murray 2011). At the same time, the Johannesburg Housing Company (JHC), a social housing company that develops rental housing units for low to middle income households in the inner city, set up the eKhaya Neighbourhood Program in the densely populated neighbourhood of Hillbrow, on an informal basis in 2004. This was interpreted as subjects promoting "a local form of a Third Way" but still improving the sustainability of business-friendly urban gentrifications (Didier et al. 2013: 13).

On the other hand, CIDs in the outer city/northern suburbs of Johannesburg generate islands of wealthy private cities floating over desolate old mine dumps. These CIDs represent the creation of special zones for the consumption of wealthy and middle-class suburbia in post-apartheid South Africa. Sandton is the most elaborate CID in South Africa. Moreover, the district is the commercial hub of the African continent and is known as "an African Manhattan." Currently, it continues to attract huge investments for luxury housing⁶. In the early 20th century, Sandton was the site of country estates and recreational activities for wealthy Johannesburgers. Since the early 1970s, there have been developments of shopping malls. Since the 1980s, offices from the CBD in the inner city have moved into the area. Currently, there are multinational companies, world-class hotels, mega shopping malls, luxury apartment houses, private hospitals, the Johannesburg Stock Exchange (moved from Johannesburg CBD in 2000), International Conference Centres and a station for the airport express train, Gautrain, among others. In the advance of the 2010 Soccer World Cup, Sandton attracted huge investments in travel-related business and infrastructure. Using Chinese capital investments, continued renovation of the Sandton City mall and new developments of ten skyscrapers including Sandton International Financial Centre are planned for the future⁷.

In November 2013, Shanghai Zendai Property Group announced that it

would pay over R1 billion to the explosives and specialized chemicals company, AECL, for a 1,600 ha site in Modderfontein in East Rand, 15 km east of Sandton on the Gautrain route to OR Tambo International Airport, with the intention of transforming it into a “mini city.” Shanghai Zendai plans to transform the site, originally opened in 1896 to support the gold mining industry, into a “New York of Africa” with investments of R80 billion over the next 15 years, according to chairman Dai Zhikang. The company will build a financial hub, 35,000 houses, an educational centre and a sports stadium. They boast landmark developments across 12 cities in China and one project under way in Auckland, New Zealand⁸. Using “authentic” Chinese zoning technology, such private cities will provide increasingly more exceptional urban life in the hub of Sub-Saharan Africa.

5. Governmentality in Private Cities

Governmentality is a concept coined by Michel Foucault. Foucault (1991) uses this term to examine the exercise of power to shape one’s own conduct or the conduct of others, i.e. the “conduct of conduct.” The term could be modified as to lead, to direct, or to guide. We can find a clear instance in schools. School strives to mould the students’ ideals of conduct toward individuals and groups. In other words, governmentality is about how we govern ourselves. Another important point is that governmentality always presumes the existence of a degree of freedom, however minor. Thus, it can be said that governmentality is the conduct of a liberal approach to governance (Walters 2012). The concept has been discussed across academic fields such as sociology, anthropology and geography to interpret current neoliberal governances (Dean 2010; Ferguson & Gupta 2005; Huxley 2007; Ong 2006; Rose 1999).

Foucault (2008) illuminates an important shift from classical liberalism to neoliberalism in the role of *homo economicus*: “[T]his difference has to do with the different ways in which they each focus on economic activity,” “classical liberalism focused on exchange... It naturalized the market as a system with its own rationality... Classical liberalism exchanges the general matrix of society” on one hand and on the other hand, “neoliberalism extends the process of making economic activity a general matrix of social and political relations, but it takes as its focus not exchange but competition” (Read 2009: 27). Thus, as Read (2009: 28) emphasized, this shift was recognized as an important transformation of “*homo economicus* as an exchanging creature to a competitive creature, or rather as a creature whose tendency to compete must be fostered, includes a general shift in the way in which human beings make themselves and are made subjects.” Foucault claimed that economics was therefore no longer the analysis of

economic processes but the analysis of the strategic programming of an individual's activity. In other words, *homo economicus*, who was a man of exchange, a partner in the process of exchange in the classical liberal conception, had changed to an entrepreneur of himself in neoliberal terms (Oksala 2013: 69-70). Oksala (2013: 70) concludes that, "neoliberalism advocates competition as the dominant principle for guiding human behaviour in society. Competitiveness at all levels and at various scales of human activity is paramount. It constructs a social order that safeguards competition in free markets in the knowledge that such an order is superior, not only economically but also morally and politically."

These studies warn that in neoliberal societies, all citizens are required to become "entrepreneurs" in line with competitive principles based on market mechanisms. In addition, they must be self-disciplined citizens that are governed at a distance (Rose, 1999) or through subjects (Dean 2010). Consequently, neoliberal governance excludes or sometimes punishes "non-citizens" who reject becoming or who cannot become self-disciplined subjects (Wacquant 2009; Young 2007). Indeed, we have been witness to forced removals of street traders and squatters in the inner city of Johannesburg in the process of rejuvenation that demonstrate that the city's regeneration plans have no regard for immigrants and informal traders, who are not considered part of the desired future in the re-imagined city⁹. This tendency may be attributed to the fact that social ills have been shifted to the personal realm in the process of neoliberalization. "Poverty, environmental degradation, unemployment, homelessness, racism, sexism and heterosexism: all have been reinterpreted as primarily private matters to be dealt with through voluntary charity, the invisible hand of the market, by cultivating personal sensitivity toward others, or by improving one's own self-esteem" (Hamann 2009: 40).

It would be fair to say that private cities, both gated communities and CIDs, are responses to a neoliberalizing world and realizations of neoliberal governmentality, because as I have mentioned, in the process of creating private cities, people are required to become self-disciplined citizens and are often excluded for being non-self-disciplined subjects.

Indeed, private cities are required to produce exceptionally high quality life, cut off from the chaos of the outside world. For example, the management of Melrose Arch, a CID-like private developer's complex in a northern suburb of Johannesburg, guarantees exceptional life in Johannesburg. "Live, work, play, or simply love hanging out here and you'll discover hints of London, Paris, New York and Milan. Wrapped up, for you to enjoy—an unforgettable experience we call the Melrose Arch way of life."¹⁰ Thus, private cities often provide

exceptional lifestyles including special security services such as 24-h security guards, surveillance cameras and biometrics, as well as emergency medical services. This type of living is critically described as “semigration,” which can be used to understand withdrawal from democratic South Africa, i.e. to achieve some of the effects of emigration without actually leaving the borders of the country. This way, one can opt out of uncontrolled mixing and the increasingly “African” and “Third World” character of the city (Ballard 2005). Such attempts by private city residents are understood as a strategy to sequester themselves from the greater political agendas and imperatives of the new South Africa and as representative of social reality (Hook & Vrdojlik 2002).

However, the private cites provide not only a model lifestyle for wealthy and middle-class citizens but also for the working class. RCIDs in the inner city of Johannesburg especially demonstrate this characteristic (Housing Development Agency 2012). The eKhaya (“home”) Neighbourhood Program was started in a rundown part of Hillbrow in 2004 as a result of the merger of two landlords in the area, the JHC (a not-for-profit social housing institution) and Trafalgar Properties (a for-profit landlord and management agent) and later, followed by the cooperation of the City of Johannesburg. The creation of community is the main task of the program. “The considerable success of the project aims at regenerating the physical quality of the neighbourhood, increasing the sense of security and wellbeing of its residents, generating increased private and public investment in the area, stimulating social cohesion and positive community involvement and making the eKhaya neighbourhood a place of active choice as a positive place for tenants to live” (Housing Development Agency 2012: 3). The residents of eKhaya are assessed a monthly levy of R27.50 per unit, which residents understand pays for self-management. The levy is used for security and cleaning of the area. Community social activities such as public space cleaning, sports events, kids’ events and health promotion projects also have important roles in creating neoliberal subjects in a community. Indeed, these activities are normally organized by volunteer organizations consisting of residents in cooperation with an NGO/ NPO. The Housing Development Agency (2012: 13) unquestionably evaluates eKhaya’s strategy as “compared to existing CIDs, eKhaya uses a more bottom-up approach.”

Legae La Rona (“our place”) is another inner city RCID in a high security residential zone in the heart of Berea; it comprises seven contiguous blocks. Legae La Rona also operates under some mechanisms of neoliberal governmentality. Murray (2011) clearly demonstrates many strategies of self-governances in Legae La Rona. He insists, because the focus on security is

an integral part of the overall design and management strategy of Legae La Rona, that the spatial layout of this residential precinct resembles that of a penitentiary. It is multilayered and has overlapping monitoring systems that include 12-foot-high sentry posts strategically located around the perimeter, installations of street lighting that enhance night-time visibility, placement of 16 armed guards at street corners, active foot patrols working in tandem with mobile armed-response teams and CCTV surveillance cameras linked to a central command post. In addition, only authorized tenants and visitors enter the premises using biometric access-control systems and the residents are controlled by strict rules, such as the ban on parties and alcohol consumption in the buildings, as well as a R50 fine for tenants hanging laundry off their balconies. Murray warns that the use of barriers, gates and walls is an architectural filtration system that not only controls building residents but also imposes new types of social discipline on them.

The new style of urban governances mentioned above obviously will eventually force people to become neoliberal subjects with self-improvement skills and self-reliance to maintain their lives. These cases show that neoliberal governmentality is prevalent from commercial/ business-oriented projects to social development projects interacting with one another in the inner city of Johannesburg. This governance also causes increasing concerns about generating more spatial segregation and social discrimination against the poor and minorities. We are still not fully aware of the consequences of living under neoliberal urban governance. All that is really certain is that we are now in a new stage of biopolitics.

6. Concluding Remarks: Escape Routes from Neoliberal Governmentality
In February 2013, a symposium, “New Imaginaries/ New Publics,” was convened by the African Centre for Cities of the University of Cape Town and hosted by the Goethe-Institute in Johannesburg. Artists, musicians, creators, architects, journalists, urban specialists, sociologists and NGO researchers gathered at the symposium and critically discussed current directions of urban rejuvenation in Johannesburg. At the symposium, artist Marcus Neustetter, introduced his work entitled ‘Borderless’, an installation of collaborative work with ten other artists from Alexandra Township in Johannesburg and six partner artists from Zimbabwe and Mozambique. They brought goats from Alexandra Township into Sandton and set the goats at the entrance of the Michelangelo, a five-star hotel. Surprisingly, a doorman at the Michelangelo hotel instructed them in how to quieten the goats. At that moment, I saw a break with zoning

technology when the goats crossed the border playing a similar role to the “stalker” of Tarkovsky’s film. I was also inspired and empowered by the film titled *New Imaginaries*, directed by Nadine Hutton and screened at the symposium. In the film, an artist mentions, “Johannesburg has flexibility and plenty of space still remains where we can do what we want to do!” This powerful statement gives us some hope. Although neoliberal urban governance in Johannesburg is deeply embedded in the society as a mechanism of strengthening segregation through the efforts to become neoliberal subjects and monitoring others based on “freedom.” Still, we allow finding an alternative way forward.

To conclude this paper, I want to mention some possibilities of non-citizens or non-disciplined subjects who are excluded from new urban spaces and struggle against the severe conditions of informal lifestyles in the inner city of Johannesburg. Despite their disastrous conditions, I would like to give a positive description of becoming non-disciplined subjects or “stalkers.” Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of “becoming” (Deleuze & Guattari 1987) is “a political practice through which social actors escape normalizing representations and reconstitute themselves in the course of participating and changing the conditions of their material corporeal existence. Every becoming is a transformation of multiplicity into another. Every becoming intensifies and radicalizes desire, creating new modes of individuation and new affection” (Papadopoulos et al. 2008: 81).

Based on Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of becoming, Papadopoulos et al. illuminate a possibility of escape that brings social transformation as “escape routes are transformative because they confront control with something which cannot be ignored” (Papadopoulos et al. 2008: xiii). Escape is also “a mode of social change that is simultaneously elusive and forceful enough to challenge the present configuration of control” (Papadopoulos et al. 2008: xiv). That is to say, escape works as a response to regulation. “People are often moving, creating, connecting, escaping the immediate moments and given conditions of their lives, and it is only after the imposition of control that some of these actions come to be seen as responses to regulation” (Papadopoulos et al. 2008: xv). Above all, “escape is joyful” (Papadopoulos et al. 2008: xx).

As we have seen above, escape does not always have a negative connotation but can have a positive one. I want to see some hope within “non-citizens,” who reject becoming self-disciplined subjects and quest to become “stalkers,” who try to escape from neoliberal governmentality and cross the borders. I hope the concept of “escape routes” recaptures urban space configurations and builds momentum for the transformation of urban spaces into more inclusive places

for all.

Notes

1. The idea of conceptualizing “the zone” from Tarkovsky to Fukushima as mentioned here was suggested by Japanese artist, Mikio Kawasaki in conversation.
2. Lavasa City Guide is available from their website (www.lavasa.com). Accessed on December 31, 2013.
3. In 2008, Bangkok’s GDP was 119 billion US\$, Brasilia’s GDP was 110 billion US\$ and Fukuoka’s GDP was 88 billion US\$. See PriceWaterCoopers UK Economic Outlook November 2009, p. 32.
4. I lived in a gated-community-like residence in Pretoria between 2008 and 2011.
5. Dainfern estate of 350 ha is one of the largest security estates in Johannesburg.
6. “Johannesburg’s Upscale Housing Boom” *The Wall Street Journal* (November 21, 2013) (<http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702304243904579198320612216500>) Accessed on December 31, 2013.
7. See Galetti’s blog (24 April 2012)(<http://blog.galetti.co.za/2012/04/top-five-planned-buildings/>). Accessed on December 31, 2013.
8. “Dai’s vision for a Modderfontein metropolis” *Main & Guardian* (8 November 2013), and “‘New York of Africa’ coming soon” *IOL News* (6 November 2013) (<http://www.iol.co.za/business/news/new-york-of-africa-coming-soon-1.1602659#.UsALjfaJOjF>) Accessed on December 29, 2013.
9. Most recent forced removal of informal traders in inner city of Johannesburg by the city authority occurred in November 2013: “Armed JMPD officers ‘harassing’ evicted informal traders” *Mail & Guardian* (19 November 2013).
10. See the welcome page of Melrose Arch’s website (<http://www.melrosearch.co.za/home.htm>). Accessed on 29 December 2013.

References

- Alexander, P. 2012. “Police Statistics: Some Commentary” Online. <http://www.amandla.org.za/general-downloads/protests-and-police-statistics>. Accessed 5 January 2014.
- Alexander, P., T. Lekgowa, B. Mmope, L. Sinwell & B. Xezwi 2012. *Marikana: A View from the Mountain and a Case to Answer*. Auckland Park: Jacana Media (Pty) Ltd.
- Ballard, R. 2005. *Bunkers for the Psyche: How Gated Communities have allowed the Privatisation of Apartheid in Democratic South Africa* (Dark Roast Occasional Paper Series No. 24). Cape Town: Isandla Institute.
- Bauman, Z. 2001. *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beavon, K. S. O. 2000. “Northern Johannesburg: Part of the ‘Rainbow’ or Neo-Apartheid City in the Making?” *Mots Pluriels* 13. Online.

- <http://motspluriels.arts.uwa.edu.au/MP1300kb.html>. Accessed 31 December 2013.
- Blakely, E. J. & M. G. Snyder 1997. *Fortress America: Gated Communities in the United States*. Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution.
- Bond, P. 2007. "Johannesburg: Of Gold and Gangsters." In M. Davis & D. B. Monk eds. *Evil Paradises: Dreamworlds of Neoliberalism*, pp. 114-126. New York: The New Press.
- Bremner, L. 2010. *Writing the City into Being: Essays on Johannesburg 1998-2008*. Johannesburg: Fourthwall Books.
- Bruce, D. 2010. "Our Burden of Pain: Murder and the Major Forms of Violence in South Africa." In J. Daniel, P. Naidoo, D. Pillay & R. Southall eds. *New South African Review 1: 2010: Development or Decline?*, pp. 389-409. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.
- Caldeira, T. P. R. 2000. *City of Walls: Crime, Segregation, and Citizenship in São Paulo*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Cornelissen, S. 2009. "Internationalisation and Competitiveness in South African Urban Governance: On the Contradictions of Aspirationist Urban Policy-making." In P. Kagwanja & K. Kondlo eds. *State of Nation South Africa 2008*, pp. 226-250. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Czeglédy, A. P. 2003. "Villas of the Highveld: A Cultural Perspective on Johannesburg and Its 'Northern Suburbs'." In R. Tomlinson, R. A. Beauregard, L. Bremner & X. Mangcu eds. *Emerging Johannesburg: Perspectives on the Postapartheid City*, pp. 21-42. New York & London: Routledge.
- Delanty, G. 2009. *Community: Second edition (Key Ideas)*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Dean, M. 2010. *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society (Second Edition)*. London: Sage.
- Deleuze, G. & F. Guattari (tr. by B. Massumi) 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Didier, S., E. Peyroux & M. Morange 2012. "The Spreading of the City Improvement District Model in Johannesburg and Cape Town: Urban Regeneration and the Neoliberal Agenda in South Africa" *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 36(5): 915-935.
- Didier, S., M. Morange & E. Peyroux 2013. "The Adaptative Nature of Neoliberalism at the Local Scale: Fifteen Years of City Improvement Districts in Cape Town and Johannesburg." *Antipode* 45(1): 121-139.
- Ferguson, J. 2006 *Global Shadows: Africa in the Neoliberal World Order*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Ferguson, J. & A. Gupta 2005. "Spatializing States: Toward an Ethnography of Neoliberal Governmentality." In J. X. Inda ed. *Anthropologies of Modernity: Foucault, Governmentality, and Life Politics*, pp. 105-131. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Foucault, M. 1982. "Space, Knowledge and Power" (Interview with Paul Rabinow), *Skyline* (March).
- Foucault, M. 1991. "Governmentality." In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller eds. *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, pp. 87-104. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

- Foucault, M. (tr. by Graham Burchell) 2008. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France 1978-79*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Glasze, G., C. Webster & K. Frantz 2006. "Introduction: Global and Local Perspectives of Rise of Private Neighbourhoods." In G. Glasze, C. Webster & K. Frantz eds. *Private Cities: Global and Local Perspectives*, pp. 1-8. London & New York: Routledge.
- Hamann, T. H. 2009. "Neoliberalism, Governmentality, and Ethics" *Foucault Studies* 6: 37-59.
- Harvey, D. 1989. "From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism: The Transformation in Urban Governance in Late Capitalism," *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography* 71 (1): 3-17.
- Harvey, D. 2008 "Right to the city" *New Left Review* 53: 23-40.
- Hibou, B. 2004 *Privatizing the State*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hook, D. & M. Vrdoljak 2002. *Gated Communities, Heterotopia and 'Rights' of Privilege: a 'Heterotopology' of the South African Security Park* [online]. London: LSE Research Online (<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/archive/952>).
- Housing Development Agency. 2012. *Regenerating a Neighbourhood Useful Lessons from eKhaya*. Johannesburg: The Housing Development Agency.
- Huxley, M. 2007. "Geographies of Governmentality." In J. W. Crampton & S. Elden eds. *Space, Knowledge, Power: Foucault and Geography*, pp. 185-204. London: Ashgate, London.
- Jürgens, U., M. Gnad & J. Bähr 2003. "New Forms of Class and Racial Segregation: Ghettos or Ethnic Enclaves?" In R. Tomlinson, R. A. Beauregard, L. Bremner & X. Mangcu eds. *Emerging Johannesburg: Perspective on the Postapartheid City*, pp. 56-70. New York & London: Routledge.
- Landman, K. 2000. *An Overview of Enclosed Neighbourhoods in South Africa*. Pretoria: CSIR.
- Landman, K. 2004a. *Gated Communities in South Africa: A Review of the Relevant Policies and their Implications*. Pretoria: CSIR.
- Landman, K. 2004b. *Gated Communities in South Africa: Comparison of Four Case Studies in Gauteng*. Pretoria: CSIR.
- Low, S. 2003. *Behind the Gates: Life, Security, and the Pursuit of Happiness in Fortress America*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Mbembe, A. 2008 "Aesthetics of Superfluity." In S. Nuttall & A. Mbembe, eds. *Johannesburg: The Elusive Metropolis*, pp. 37-67. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.
- Mbembe, A. & S. Nuttall 2008. "Introduction: Afropolis." In S. Nuttall & A. Mbembe eds. *Johannesburg: The Elusive Metropolis*, pp. 1-33. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.
- McLennan, A. & B. Munslow 2001. *The Politics of Service Delivery*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.
- Murray, M. J. 2011. *City of Extremes: The Spatial Politics of Johannesburg*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Oksala, J. 2013. "Feminism and Neoliberal Governmentality" *Foucault Studies* 16: 32-53.
- Ong, A. 2006. *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Ong, A. & L. Zhang 2008. "Introduction: Privatizing China." In L. Zhang & A. Ong eds.

- Privatizing China: Socialism from Afar. pp. 1-20. Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.
- Papadopoulos, D., N. Stephenson & V. Tsianos 2008. *Escape Routes: Control and Subversion in the Twenty-first Century*. London & Ann Arbor: Pluto Press.
- Peyroux, E. 2006. "City Improvement Districts (CIDs) in Johannesburg: Assessing the Political and Socio-spatial Implications of Private-led Urban Regeneration" *Trailog* 89: 9-14.
- Peyroux, E. 2008. "City Improvement Districts in Johannesburg: An Examination of the Local Variations of the BID Model" In R. Pütz ed. *Business Improvement Districts* 14, pp. 139-162, Passau: L.I.S. Verlag.
- Read, J. 2009. "Neoliberalism and the Production of Subjectivity" *Foucault Studies* 6: 25-36.
- Robinson, J. 2003. "Johannesburg's Futures: Beyond Developmentalism and Global Success." In R. Tomlinson, R. A. Beauregard, L. Bremner & X. Mangcu eds. *Emerging Johannesburg: Perspectives on the Postapartheid City*, pp. 259-280. New York & London: Routledge.
- Rose, N. 1999. *The Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sassen, S. 2001. *Global City: London, New York, Tokyo*. Princeton University Press.
- Sennett, R. 2002. *The Fall of Public Man*. London: Penguin Books.
- Taraporevala, P. 2013. "Creating Subjects in Lavasa: the Private City" (16 April 2013). Online.
<http://www.opendemocracy.net/opensecurity/persis-taraporevala/creating-subjects-in-lavasa-private-city>. Accessed 31 December 2013
- Tomlinson, R. & P. Larsen 2003. "The Race, Class and Space of Shopping." In Richard Tomlinson, Robert A. Beauregard, Lindsay Bremner & Xolela Mangcu eds. *Emerging Johannesburg: Perspectives on the Postapartheid City*, pp. 43-55. New York & London: Routledge.
- Van Aardt, C. & M. Coetzee 2008. *The BMR Income and Expenditure Model (2008 update)*. Pretoria: Bureau of Market Research, University of South Africa.
- Wacquant, L. 2009. *Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Walters, W. 2012. *Governmentality: Critical Encounters*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Young, J. 2007. *The Vertigo of Late Modernity*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Zukin, S. 1995. *The Cultures of Cities*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Zukin, S. 2010. *Naked City: The Death and Life of Authentic Urban Places*. New York: Oxford University Press.