

Post-apartheid housing policies in South Africa

The discourse and implications of housing policies in post-apartheid South Africa

3-7-2014

Wageningen University and Research Centrum

Rianne Doller 921110188050

Bachelor Thesis BIN

Department: SDC

Supervisor: dr.ir. MCM Nuijten



Abstract

When the apartheid ended in South Africa and the ANC was elected post-apartheid issues became apparent. This thesis focuses on the issues around housing from the perspective of inequality, integration and location. A discourse and implication analysis is made of two policies. This gives insight in the meaning policies has for society. First an historical overview is given of spatial segregation acts based on races in the period 1910 until 1990. After that relevant post-apartheid issues regarding the housing question are laid down and post-apartheid population movements analyzed. After that the discourse of the policies 'Redistribution and Development Programme' (RDP), and the 'White Paper on housing' are analysed. The policy 'Breaking New Ground' (BNG) is shortly looked into as amendment of the RDP. This is followed by an assessment of the policies with my own and scholars interpretation. It becomes clear that inequality is the overall denominator of issues post-apartheid and also has a great influence on the proposed policies. Without more equity, the diminishing of poverty and housing schemes cannot succeed. In the equity issue the location, and especially access to employment and other facilities, plays a great role. Inequality is partly continued by the market-oriented approach of the RDP and the White Paper.

Table of contents

1: Introduction.....	4
2: The history of segregation from 1910 - 1990.....	7
2.1: 1910-1948: the beginnings of segregation policy in the union.....	8
2.2: 1948-1970: the peak of the apartheid era	9
2.3: 1970– 1990: the influx of Black movement to cities.....	10
2.4: Concluding comments.....	11
3: Assessment of the post-apartheid situation	13
3.1: Interregnum period: 1990-1994.....	13
3.2: The housing issue in the new South Africa	14
4: The policy documents analyzed	17
4.1: Redistribution and Development Program, RDP.....	17
4.2: White Paper on Housing.....	19
4.3: Breaking New Ground, BNG	21
4.4: Concluding comments.....	23
5: Assessment of the RDP and the White Paper	24
5.1: Inequality.....	24
5.2: Integration.....	25
5.3: Location housing schemes	26
5.4: Concluding discussion assessment policies.....	26
6: Discussion and conclusion.....	28
References:.....	30

1: Introduction

When you walk through the city centres of South-Africa you see good looking historical buildings, well dressed people and shops just as luxurious as in any Western city. The people you see on the street are a mix of different ethnicities, but if you walk outside the inner city some changes start to occur and stark inequalities are visible. A few kilometres outside the cities are the informal settlements with townships and the suburbs. Between those two areas is a great difference in material living conditions and there is a division in race visible. The suburban areas close to the cities are mostly populated by white people and the townships and informal settlements, which are located some distance from city centres, are mostly populated by non-White persons. When I was studying for my minor in South Africa those things came to my attention and made me wonder how that division in living place came to be.

When you actually engage with the people you also notice a social segregation. The different population groups interact little with each other. Of course there are exceptions, but the general trend is clear. During my stay I once held a party with people from different groups such as poor Blacks from townships, white Afrikaners from suburbs and exchange students from all over the world. It took some time before they were used to each other and the party really started and a relaxed atmosphere emerged. Still the separate groups did not really interact with each other. Engagement between the different groups is made difficult because off two directly apparent reasons. The first one is a centuries old history of social segregation on the base of race. This started when the first colonist arrived at the cape and more or less culminating in the apartheid era in the second halve of the 20th century. The other reason is a spatial segregation on the base of race in living places deriving for a great part from racial segregation legislation in the 20th century. In this thesis spatial segregation and its implications will be the main focus.

In my time living in Stellenbosch, the Western Cape, the dynamics between spatial and social segregation became apparent. This is a very interesting dynamic to keep in mind during the thesis, because the two mutually reinforce each other. The dynamic was visible in the way that the white population discouraged me from using the 'Black' infrastructure, such as the train, and discouraged me from visiting the township alone. They deemed it too dangerous, although many had no personal experience at all. They were probably right in some occasions, but wrong in many more. Also, they not understand why I wanted to visit the township in the first place. There seemed to be an unwritten rule between the groups of leaving each to their own place and not to interact with each other. On the other hand are the townships located some distance from city centres and suburban areas which makes it an effort for the separate groups to engage with each other. Those two factors partly explain the dynamics between spatial and social segregation in which infrastructure causes spatial segregation and the lack of the populations interactions with each other social segregation. This struck me as very remarkable, because the government directs the course of the rainbow nation, started by Archdeacon Desmond Tutu. The idea of the rainbow nation is: The population is an integrated nation through reconciliation after the apartheid. It is true that the separate groups live in general peace with each other, but they do not live in the same areas. Those aspects together with the social division made me wonder what the government has done post-apartheid to integrate the population. In that question integration is put opposite of segregation. It consists of the reconnection of racial groups specified to the South African case post-apartheid. With some research the decision to focus on urban housing policies post-apartheid was made. Most post-apartheid housing policies are aimed at urban areas, making it therefore a relevant area of study. While doing further research into the housing policies, the focus came a bit more on the issue of diminishing inequality and integration. With inequality is meant the difference in welfare, translated into living places and economic opportunities, which originated from a difference in development opportunities. In this thesis the focus will be on the spatial and housing policies implemented by the

government before and after the end of apartheid aimed at housing looked at in light of the terms inequality and integration. The aim is to investigate the discourse of housing policies and to analyse the possible effects of those policies with the help of several authors.

Little more than twenty years ago apartheid ended in South-Africa as the culmination of a long history of gradual social and spatial segregation. During the apartheid period non-Whites were forcibly evicted from their lands and kept out of cities by the pass law. Also non-Whites were forced to leave their homes often in a matter of days and were sent to homelands to live, or to government build townships on the fringe of cities. In those homelands or townships the opportunities to build a good living were slim and often the people still had jobs in the industry or in households near and in the cities. There were more non-Whites moving to the city than the amount of houses the government was able to build, which led to the forming of informal settlements on the border of cities because non-Whites created their own living places. Eventually with the 1950 group areas act the government started to significantly increase the number of houses they built. They built formal housing in the place of the informal settlements and the official term township started to emerge. These were low-cost housing initiatives without any public services themselves because the government believed the townships only to be temporal. Also the houses were rental because of that assumed temporality. Also the housing schemes were not sufficient for the inflow of people which resulted in additional informal settlements within the township. An important factor of the formal townships is a strict racial division. During apartheid the South African population became first officially divided in four categories: the Whites, Blacks, Coloureds and Asians/Indians¹. Non-White groups were forced by Whites to live in the townships and also within the township itself a spatial segregation based on race was enforced. The separate non-White groups were strictly divided from each other and prevented from interaction by the creation of different racial ‘zones’ for the race groups. Nowadays the population is still divided in those four main categories in official government discourse. Therefore those terms will also be used for the population groups in this thesis in both the history and present-day part.

After the apartheid the newly elected ANC government wanted to deal with issues that were caused by the spatial segregation legislation based on race. Those issues were among other things a social and spatial division between the four population groups. Also there was a backlog of housing and basic facilities in townships, such as access to water and the problem of mobility resulting in a great inequality between township areas and the city centres. One of the aims of the ANC and other governmental bodies was to solve the housing problem, which they hoped would also positively benefit other issues. The housing policies are analyzed in terms of their efforts towards integration and diminishing inequality, since the ANC talked about the importance of solving those two issues post-apartheid. (RDP, website, n.d) The focus will also be somewhat on the area the houses of the housing scheme are build. The discourse of policy documents is analyzed and compared with scholars’ opinion on the policies and its effects. With the 2014 re-election of the ANC it is even more relevant to analyze the policies they put forward. The ANC has been in power since the end of apartheid, which means that all the post-apartheid policy documents are implemented under their rule. Also the policies are approved or devised by the ANC. Through their 20 year rule they have influenced the housing policies and thereby the efforts of diminishing apartheid inequalities to a great extent. Therefore it can be relevant to analyze the discourse of their policies and compare it with the possible effects those policies have and can have.

The focus will be on the initial nation-wide policies implemented after apartheid regarding the building of urban housing. In 1994 the beginning was made by Nelson Mandela of the ANC with the

¹When using the terms in this thesis there is no intention to be racist. The government still uses the terms in official documents.

'Redistribution and Development Program' (now referred to as: RDP). This program was aimed at diminishing social inequality by creating a stable economic development. The RDP was followed by a White Paper on housing in 1994 communicating the RDP policies to the general population and setting forth the policy plans and implementations. The policy was re-assessed and in 2004 an update was published named 'Comprehensive Plan Sustainable Human Settlement' or 'Breaking New Ground' (now referred to as: BNG). The RDP and the White Paper's discourse will be analyzed and assessed. The BNG is used as an assessment of the RDP and the White Paper. The BNG as amendment of the two policies can shed light on the effects and viability of the RDP and the White Paper. The focus on the documents is mainly on the Black people, since they are by far the largest population group. Also they are hit hardest by historical racial segregation policies. Therefore this thesis focus is on the Black population group.

The main question of this thesis is: what is the discourse of the RDP and the White Paper policies to address the integration and inequality issues, connected to housing post-apartheid in South Africa. To answer that question first the historical context is given of spatial segregation based on race. This is done by giving an overview of government acts from 1910, the founding of the Union of South Africa until 1990, the official end of apartheid when the negotiations for dismantling the apartheid system started. After that an assessment follows of where the four population groups live nowadays and the spatial changes that occurred after apartheid without government interference. This will somewhat explain the discourse of the policies, because those are made according to the post-apartheid situation. The challenges for urban housing post-apartheid are addressed in the third chapter as well. After that the urban housing policies RDP and the White Paper on Housing are critically analyzed with help of the discourse of government policy documents in the fourth chapter. This follows with an assessment of the effects of the policies. This all concludes with a discussion and reflection about the possible effect of the post-apartheid government policies. Also some other issues which came up during the writing of the thesis, but fall outside the scope, will be named as suggestion for possible further research.

2: The history of segregation from 1910 - 1990

"The town is a European area in which there is no place for the redundant native."
(Colonel C.F. Stallard, in: Christopher, 1982)

The above statement sums up the general trend of urban spatial segregation acts implemented from the time of the union, 1910, until the abolition of apartheid in 1990. The time of the union was the unification of the separate South African colonies in the form South Africa has more or less today. The urban segregation acts came forth out of a fear from the White population to lose political and economic dominance, which is explainable because they have always been the minority. Through the act they could forcibly move natives from their original lands enabling the Whites to claim the valuable land for themselves. Whites lived predominantly in or near cities on fruitful land. From 1904 until 1980 the percentage of city dwellers of the total population doubled (Christopher, p.36, 1982). This caused an even bigger fear within the White population to lose their power, because slowly they saw themselves getting more and more outnumbered. The peak of white people living in cities was already in 1931 (Christopher, p.3, 2002) with the non-Whites consequently growing in urban numbers rapidly from the seventies onwards. Their hope was that keeping the non-Whites out of the city and forcing them to move on the urban fringe as cheap labour force for their industries would create a strong White dominated South Africa, at least in the urban areas. This, though, led mainly to the existence of townships and informal settlements on the urban fringe, as will become clear in this chapter. The houses in townships were built by the government with a rental character underestimating the envisioned temporarily nature of the townships. Townships had little development opportunities of their own and in general lacked sufficient formal housing, which led to the existence of informal settlements because non-Whites kept moving to the urban fringe despite the lack of formal housing. They built their own housing in the form of informal settlements close to or inside townships. This resulted in issues the government tries to deal with nowadays with post-apartheid policies. It is important to first give an historical context before current policies can be analysed. Often the history explains for a great part why things are the way they are and it explains actions in the present day.

Three things have to be made clear before starting this chapter.

The first point is that there is a division made in three separate time spans: 1910 until 1948, 1948 until 1970 and 1970 until 1990. This is done because all three periods mark a distinguished period in the history of segregation and have their own implications for the situation in South Africa today. 1910 until 1948 is the period before the official implementation of the apartheid ideology. This period marked the start of non-White eviction from land and restrictions on land ownership. The period 1948 until 1970 marks the highest intensity of implementation of the acts and the highest intensity of forced spatial relocation. The period 1970 until 1990 marks a time of slowly dwindling apartheid legislation enforcement and the loosening of urbanization restrictions for the Black population.

The second point is that the acts had different meanings for the four main population groups as officially implemented in the Population Registration act in 1950. Also some acts were aimed at specific groups, while others were aimed at the whole non-White population. The emphasis in this thesis is on the Black group, since they were by far the biggest group, and therefore posed the biggest threat to the White minority rule. Consequently a large part of the acts were aimed at relocating or restricting movement of the Black population.

The third point is that there is a difference in implementation of the acts in the different provinces and municipal areas. Some acts were dependent on local authorities for its enforcement, which did not implement them to the same extend in all cases. Most acts were only piecemeal enforced dependent on the willingness or possibilities of the local authorities. For example the Orange Free State did not want to allow any Indians in their territory and the Cape Town area was relatively liberal in the first years by allowing Coloureds to live in the city. This thesis looks at the

general effects the policies could have on post-apartheid issues, but it is important to be aware of the possibility of regional differences.

2.1: 1910-1948: the beginnings of segregation policy in the union

The first act implemented after the founding of the union focused on spatial segregation based on race was the 1913 Black Land act. This act prohibited Blacks from owning or renting land outside their designated areas. The 1913 act was the first one to designate specific areas to the Black population group creating a spatialized patterning of society on racial grounds (Ramutsindela, p.292, 2013). This also meant that the place where people lived started to determine their place in society. Those areas would later grow into homelands. The act also restricted Black persons from buying land outside their own areas. The White population hoped in that way to create a White South Africa. The act forced Black people to their designated areas, especially those who had lost their land or those who wanted to buy or rent land in order to provide for their livelihood.

The following relevant act is the 1920 Housing act which provisioned low cost housing for the non-White population. This increased the spatial segregation of races, although it was initially not a racist act in itself (Christopher, p.3, 2002). The act was used to provision housing for the poorest population in their designated areas and in that way forced them to live in those areas. By this act the idea of housing in separate areas divided by races was pushed through the government, which resulted in the provisioning of houses for Blacks in designated Black areas, whereas Coloured's housing provision was still pooled with White housing schemes (Christopher, p. 254, 1989). This would later be further implemented resulting in townships near cities with separate areas for every non-White population group; the city was generally speaking the living area for the White population. Townships back then were areas of formal houses build and rented out by the government on the fringe of urban areas. They were meant to provide the nearby cities or industries with a cheap labour force. The residence of Blacks in townships was only seen as temporal (Marais, Sefika, Ntema, Venter & Cloete, p. 61, 2013). This building of houses is linked with the 1923 act talked about next.

The Native Land act from 1923 enforced urban segregation and enabled local authorities to re-settle non-Whites living in cities in their designated areas. The White population saw the city as an area only suitable for White people, which is made clear with the quote in the beginning of this chapter. The act was only enforced piecemeal until about the 1940s when it was revised. There was an opposition between the government's view of total racial segregation and the industrialist's one who were dependent on the non-White labour force. That labour force would be inaccessible when the non-Whites would be forced to live in their designated areas, since those were often situated a great distance from the economic viable White areas. Also a problem with implementing the Native Land act was the fact that there were still a lot of Non-Whites living in the city as domestic workers, because the White population living in the city were dependent on those workers. Both the request for domestic workers and industrial labourers made the enforcing of the native land act difficult ('Apartheid legislation 1850-1990', n.d). This resulted more townships to arise near industries or cities. Townships were a way for the White population to still enforce spatial segregation based on race, but also to have a work force living nearby. Townships consisted of formal build housing by the government. With the building of those houses the government also implemented a racial spatial segregation by building the houses in zones per racial group; those areas of formal build houses attracted squatters who build informal settlements adjacent and inside the townships. This happened because the government could not keep up with building houses for the influx of non-Whites moving to the urban areas. Another important point is that the designated areas in the form of homelands and townships were not build to have an economy of their own keeping them

dependent on White South Africa. This disenabled them from ever being independent actors which will become a relevant issue later in this chapter. Therefore it can be said that the initial declared plan by the government of creating several spatial segregated countries based on race was dubious from the beginning and one can wonder if that ever was part of the agenda. Christopher (1982) said that the white population never even achieved the envisaged majority in the 'white' cities causes by an abundance of natives working in cities. There was a difference, though, per city and province. This can explain why townships or homelands were forced to depend on White areas for economic purposes, because that allowed the White population to execute control over the non-White population. That eventually led to a great gap in development between White areas and non-White areas. The inequality was one of the issues post-apartheid the government aims to deal with.

The 1923 native land act was followed by the 1934 Slum act further enforcing the first acts which designated areas to racial groups. The 1934 act legalized the removal of unwanted squatters from urban areas and relocating them in their designated areas (Parnell, 1988b in: Christopher, p. 255, 1989). This enabled local authorities to clean away unwanted squatter camps from the fringe of cities. This was especially done when there was already sufficient labour available for the industries near the cities.

The Native Trust and Land act in 1936 increasingly enforced the spatial segregation based on race started in the earlier acts. The 1936 act enlarged the designated areas for the non-White and gave those areas an increased legal base ('Apartheid legislation 1880-1990, n.d.). But the full scale enforcement of spatial segregation on the base of race would only start after 1948 when the apartheid ideology was adopted (Christopher, 1982). Now the designated areas, which later would be become homelands, and townships were predominantly used to house workers or to put away other 'unwanted' non-Whites. Also the act was used as a way to evict Blacks from highly wanted territories to claim them as White areas ('Apartheid legislation 1880-1990, n.d.).

2.2: 1948-1970: the peak of the apartheid era

In 1948 the National Party came in power and institutionalized the apartheid ideology. This resulted in a harsher racial segregation of the population on spatial and institutional bases. The designated areas were further developed into homelands and efforts were made towards political independence of the homelands. Also more forced resettlement of Blacks living in white areas occurred.

The most important act in the pursuit of full racial segregation in this timeframe was the Group Areas act in 1950. This act made the spatial segregation compulsory and consequently marked an influx of township formation. This act also heralded large scale forced relocation out of cities from non-Whites. ('Apartheid legislation 1880-1970s', n.d.) Before forced replacement was only done with illegal squatters. The new act also forcibly evicted long-time non-White resident in cities and demolished neighbourhoods where non-Whites were living creating wastelands. This act can be seen as the real legal start of apartheid and spatial segregation based on race. The act had two important relevant effects for this thesis. The first one is the large-scale building of housing in townships on the border of towns by the government. This was on a bigger scale than before. While building the housing different zones were created for the different non-White races. Buffer strips were built between the different zones disenabling the groups from mixing and meeting. The second result was the emerging of wastelands in city centres. Areas were a mix of the population groups used to live were demolished to prevent the people from moving back. Examples of those areas are district six in Cape Town and South End in Port Elizabeth (Christopher, 1982). Plans were made to rebuild those areas as white suburban living areas, but often little actually happened with those areas. Both the building of housing in townships with the separated zones and the wastelands in city centres had effects on the issues post-apartheid the government tried to deal with. The waste lands were an area

of informal settlement post-apartheid and the townships were a place of underdevelopment, but more about that later.

The Group Areas act can be seen together with the Population Registration act of 1950. The Population Registration act was the first one to officially classify the population in groups based on race (Ellson & Erasmus, 2008). The categories used differ slightly over time, but in general White, Coloured, Black and Indian is applied, which terms are also used in this thesis. The division was made on ‘appearance, descent and social acceptance’, with an emphasis on the social aspects according to Erasmus and Ellson. They emphasize in their article that race was above all a social construction; a practical outcome of the segregation legislation and kept in place by acceptance and reinforcement out of society. There were no hard scientific conditions appointable to divide people in races and reclassification was possible. (2008) The Population Registration act can be seen as a means to give the Group Areas act a legal basis to make enforcement of the relocations easier, since classification determined the area you were supposed to live.

Another act which helped enforcing the Group Areas act was the 1952 Pass Law. This act was especially aimed to curtail the movement of Black people towards cities and to limit the Blacks living in urban areas. This was done by forcing them to carry identification at all times. The identification held details about employment among other things. If the Blacks could not prove their reason to be in White areas, by proven employment for example, punishment would fall on them. (Apartheid legislation 1880-1990, n.d) This further employed the idea that the non-White population only had purpose as a work force for the White rulers.

Further the Group Areas act was enforced by a succession of acts making squatting near town’s illegal or curtailing the amount of non-White people allowed to work in cities. All were efforts to increase the amount of White people living or coming into town. Also a succession of acts was implementing allowing local government to remove non-Whites from their territory and to relocate them in their respective townships or homelands. This was a way for local authorities to get the best land for themselves and to remove unwanted non-Whites out off their territory.

The last relevant act at the cumulus of the National Parties’ envisioned goal towards full racial spatialized segregation was the Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act in 1959, Bantu being a different name for homelands. This act proclaimed the emerging of eight independent non-White states consisting of the already existing homelands. These states would gain political independence from White South Africa, but not economically (Christopher, p.48, 1982). When looking closer at the act it can be seen as another effort by the White government to gain back the majority in their own areas. The hope was that by relocating the Blacks to either the townships as a work force or the homelands to govern themselves, the majority would numerically be somewhat more in White hands. The efforts to relocate the non-White population in political independent areas, but not granting them economic independence, have implications for post-apartheid policies. Post-apartheid inequality in development between population groups is partly a result from the economic dependence on White areas in townships and homelands during the apartheid area. That dependence never allowed the homelands and townships to develop economic opportunities of its own, which had its effect on the inhabitant’s development. This deployed the population living in those areas from development option which created the inequality within the population nowadays.

2.3: 1970– 1990: the influx of Black movement to cities

The first act in this time period is the Bantu Homelands citizens act in 1970, which forfeited all claims to citizenship for non-Whites in South Africa’s White areas. Citizenship was to be appointed from the respective homeland designated to a Black person. The loss of South African citizenship meant that

Blacks were no longer allowed to work or reside in South Africa anymore, except with special permission from a ministry. The hope was that this would force the Black population to move to their designated homelands. This act was a further implementation of the Bantu Self-Governance act from 1959. With the new 1970 act the 1959 act was meant to get its full meaning towards spatial segregation based on race. This act was followed with declarations of independence of four of the eight homelands² (Apartheid legislation 1880-1990, n.d).

This can be seen as one of the last struggles to keep Blacks in their homelands and to enforce racial segregation, because from the mid 1970 onwards it became increasingly difficult for the White people to hold on to the spatial segregation based on race. An influx of Blacks moving to urban areas in defiance of the Pass Law juxtaposed to a movement out of towns by Whites caused an increasing minority of Whites in Urban areas. This caused a rapid growth of informal settlements near towns of non-Whites. When the Pass Law was repealed in 1986 this only increased the influx of Blacks in urban areas (Saff, 1993). Another factor adding to urban growth and therefore increased Whites' minority was the natural population growth of the Black population. Only a quarter of the urban population is White in 1980 as a result of the above mentioned movements (Christopher, p.36, 1982). With the end of the Pass Laws some private housing development happened around cities for the Black middle and upper class to negotiate the influx of non-White migrants, but this remained on a very small scale (Marais, Sefika, Ntema, Venter & Cloete, p. 61, 2013). This caused some development for the non-White population, although it only developed the already better-off. That was mainly because the White government could not keep up with the movements of the Black population because of an increasingly lack of funds for housing (Marais, Sefika, Ntema, Venter & Cloete, p.62, 2013). The last twenty years of apartheid created the greatest part of the backlog in housing struggled with nowadays. This process was even further enhanced by a court ruling in 1982 stating that non-Whites could only be forcibly evicted from White areas when an alternative living place would be made available, something the local authorities or industries were unable to provide.

Another problem deriving from that time is that housing for non-Whites has always been a state issue, but the houses they built were of a bad quality. Also the townships were not given employment opportunities or facilities for themselves, which caused underdevelopment in the townships. The townships were only meant for living and not meant to become an economic independent part of the city (Christopher, 1982). This caused townships and the informal settlements nearby to be fully dependent on the state for development, which the state increasingly failed to provide.

The court ruling together with the repeal of the pass law in 1986 is exemplary of the gradually diminishing enforcement of the segregation legislation which led eventually to the end of apartheid (Saff, 1993). More and more was the White government unable to hold their position in the flood of non-Whites towards their areas. But paradoxically the peak of spatial segregation on the basis of race was reached in 1991 according to Hamann en Horn; (2014) clearly marking the challenge after apartheid regarding integration and development. At the moment when apartheid was thought to be over, it might have been at its worst.

2.4: Concluding comments

In general it is to say that the initial plans to create a 'white South Africa' without other ethnicities did not succeed. One can even wonder if that was the purpose at all of the apartheid legislation

²Transkei in 1976, Bophutswana in 1977, Ciskei in 1978 and Venda in 1979. They were not acknowledged by any other nation except themselves and South Africa and were all again incorporated in South Africa post-apartheid.

looking at all the acts mentioned above. It is true that non-Whites were appointed homelands to become independent states, but those did not have opportunities for independent economic development, as Steven Biko also said in his 'Let's talk about Bantustans' appeal (1987). He sees the Homelands political independence as a trick of the White government to appease the Black population with promises of an own state. But the homelands were only a small proportion of the total of South African's territory and economic completely dependent. Maybe if they were given economic as well as political freedom from the start and maybe if the land was divided in an equal way would the segregation have succeeded, but that was not the case. The White population was far too dependent on Native labour to grant the homelands economic freedom, which led to the townships near cities. Those townships eventually appealed to more natives than the White could provide houses for, leading to informal settlements and thus a backlog of housing near cities. Another factor is that the townships were built as labour housing, so when building them no attention was paid to the economic viability of the townships itself or to the long-term situation. With the initial building of the townships the White population intended them to be only temporal, which is explained by the rental policy of government houses instead of private ownership. There was attention paid to racial segregation within the townships, through zoning of township areas divided per racial group.

During the whole period of 1910 till 1990 people were forcible evicted with changes in intensity over time. In 1985 ninety percent of the total population lived in their designated area (Christopher, table 2, 1989); respectively inner city, suburban area, township or homeland with a peak of spatial segregation in 1991. When the National Party came into power in 1948 and implemented the apartheid ideology this marked a more extreme and active implementation of spatial racial segregation policies. Before apartheid forced removal was mainly associated with informal settlements. During apartheid mixed living urban areas were pulled apart and all habitants sent to their own designated areas leaving wastelands in city centres.

The division between the different groups, and mainly between White and non-White, is still largely visible today among other things in the case that townships are not an integrated part of urban areas, which reinforces segregation. The most important spatial issues to be dealt with post-apartheid are the real distances between the four groups, which influences the rate of integration within the population, especially because the townships have little development opportunities of themselves. This leads to an ever increasing inequality between people living in the city and people living in the townships. Inequality within the South African population is another high profile issue post-apartheid. Both issues can be studied within the light of housing policies post-apartheid.

3: Assessment of the post-apartheid situation

When I was visiting a township in the Western Cape there was an inequality within the township visible. Inequality is not only something that is present between city centres and townships, that is to say previously White and non-White areas. Some houses are provided by government initiatives, which seemed predominantly in a good condition; but there were also tin shacks almost falling apart. This shows a clear division in wealth among townships dwellers. The division within the township makes sense because townships are not only living places for poor people. Instead they were originally a place where non-White racial groups were forced to live together separate from other non-White racial groups. That division is still somewhat visible in townships nowadays. The inequality within townships shows the possibility for vertical social mobility, although with sufficient funds. This is a relevant point to make and an important argument in the discussion how to address the inequality issue. Is it the actual place where the township is situated, and therefore access to city centres, which causes the continuing inequality or is it the opportunities townships are able to generate of their own? It is true that almost all township dwellers have their jobs in the adjacent cities, because most townships lack employment opportunities and access to other facilities of their own.

The first part of this chapter gives a short overview of two spatial effects of the breakdown of segregation legislation in the interregnum period of 1990-1994. That period marks the break-down of segregation rule before the democratic elections in 1994. This period is relevant because those four years already marked a change in the racial spatial outlay of South Africa. The post 1994 government policies are built as continuance on those movements. The second part gives an analysis of the housing situation and the issues revolving around it post-apartheid. This will give a theoretical framework for the discourse analysis of the government documents in chapter four and the assessment of the policies in chapter five. An analysis of the post-apartheid issues will reveal a dual dilemma of integration and inequality. As seen in the previous chapter the segregation acts caused both spatial segregation and social segregation. These lead to two relevant elements in the dilemma of what the housing policies need to achieve according to the government policy documents; re-integration of the population groups and more equality in wealth and living conditions. It is important to shortly analyze how these two elements are related with each other and how they influence each other, which will be done in the second part of this chapter.

3.1: Interregnum period: 1990-1994

In 1990 the national party with F.W. de Klerk as state president lost rule and Nelson Mandela was freed from prison. This marked the end of apartheid. Together de Klerk and Mandela formed an interim government and started negotiations to disband apartheid rule. In 1994 the first democratic elections found place. This created an interregnum period of four years where no new policies were implemented, because there was no official parliament. This gave the non-White population freedom of movement. Two trends characterize the movements of the non-White population in the interregnum period and their acquisition of a new place to live.

The first trend was a move of the government towards privatization of previously rental state-owned houses in townships. The houses were originally rental, because the townships were presumed to be only temporal (Marais, Sefika, Ntema, Venter, & Cloete, 2014). With the end of apartheid and thus the end of spatialized racial segregation the townships got a permanent nature, since the government did not pursue the segregation anymore. The privatization started from the mid-eighties onwards, because the financial burden of maintaining the houses had become too much to take for the government (Marais, Sefika, Ntema, Venter, & Cloete, 2013). The privatization went on for many

years after apartheid. In total 500.000 houses were privatized. Selling the houses to the renters gave the non-Whites permanent residence in urban areas for the first time for a long time in history. This permanent settlement dramatically changed the face of the city, since non-Whites could finally make a claim on the city.

The second movement was an increase of non-Whites settling into city centres and on the urban fringes in the form of informal settlements (Saff, 1993). They made use of the abolishment of movement restrictions such as the pass law. They settled in wasteland in urban centres which were empty because of the removal and demolishing of mixed living places through historical spatial segregation acts based on race. In the course of time the new settlers were able to make those initial settlements permanent (Marais, Sefika, Ntema, Venter, & Cloete, 2014). That was possible because the authorities were restricted from removing squatters unless they could make alternative land available (Saff, 1993). Also there was no government present to regulate the movements in the interregnum period. The inner city was an attractive area for settlement because it was close to inner city facilities. This process of increased informal settlement was further enhanced by the shortage of housing of over a million at the end of apartheid. This forced non-Whites to build semi-legal informal settlements to provide housing for themselves. (Saff, 1993) There were not many other alternatives for housing available. In 1990 there was a shortage of 1.3 million houses, but in 1992 only 200.000 new houses were built (RDP, n.d.).

3.2: The housing issue in the new South Africa

There are three main issues most obvious post-apartheid originating from the historical spatial segregation based on race connected to the housing issue as discussed in chapter two. The first is an inequality within the population caused by a difference in development of the separate racial groups. The non-White groups had less development opportunities through a lack of economic independence in townships and homelands, which lead to a difference in development between the groups, especially during the apartheid period. This difference has led to an inequality post-apartheid between population groups. The second issue is the backlog in housing provision leading to informal settlements adjacent to townships and in wastelands in the inner city, because there is no other alternative available for living. The third issue is the historical originated spatial segregation on the base of race. This translated in a lack of integration nowadays within the whole population. The issue of spatial distance and inequality in development leads to a discussion of reintegration versus inequality. This chapter will give some insights to the different importance various authors give to either one of those aspects. Also it is an important question how those two are related and if one can be achieved without the other. This chapter will serve as a theoretical framework to understand the housing policies discussed in the next chapter.

Finchilescu en Tredoux (2010) addresses in their article the problematic dynamics of integration versus inequality. The Black population is by far worst hit by segregation policies which caused the majority to live in poverty in townships or in adjacent informal settlements. The conditions of living and the access to good social services, such as health and education, are so poor in townships in comparison to the rest of the country that Blacks have no opportunity to rise above their status in life. Without the ability to rise from poverty, integration seems impossible. (Finchilescu & Tredoux, 2010) With integration the re-connection of the population is meant as the opposite of segregation. That can be both in a spatial and social ways. For example the poor quality of primary education in townships disenables a lot of Blacks to have sufficient knowledge and skills to apply for university, which in general is seen as a stepping stone out of poverty.

Another problem connected to the accessibility of services is the mobility within townships (Freund, 2010). Often townships are placed a long way from cities, were employment opportunities and

facilities are. Those are hard to reach without money for transportation and without employment that money is often not available. Marais and Ntema (2013) say in their article that transportation costs can be ten percent of total household expenditure. The lack of mobility stunts the development of townships areas, as also said in the paragraph above. This both does not lead to a diminishing of inequality and also does not lead to a more integrated population. The non-Whites are virtually locked into townships without being able to mingle with the rest of the country. This underlines the interconnectedness of integration and inequality reduction. Hamman and Horn (2014) also emphasize in their article the fact that integration is not possible without solving inequality and Saff (1994) states that the only way to achieve a meaningful change towards deracialization is to solve inequality and poverty. Saff (1994) also states that empowerment of the township poorest is necessary to solve the segregation. This can be done by enabling the poor access to facilities to the same amount as the richest of the population have. This can either be done by building facilities in township areas or moving the poor to more affluent areas with employment opportunities and facilities. There is no consensus among scholars which of the two options would be best.

There is a discussion going on about the importance of the place where people live for their level of development. Tom Slater (2013) argues in his article that the place where people live does not affect their chances in life, but rather the ability to accumulate capital. This means that people's opportunities in life are not determined by where they live, but the other way around. He is therefore against moving poor people out of 'lost neighbourhoods'. Bill Freund (2010) on the other hand argues that there is a remaining inequality between White and non-White population groups because non-White groups have no access to the city and thus employment. He consequently says that re-housing people closer to the city or increasing their mobility is the key to diminish inequality. Therefore it cannot be said if living in townships in itself is the cause for the post-apartheid issues. When apartheid just ended it was thought that townships could gradually become a fully integrated part of the post-apartheid city (Bähr, Donaldson, Jürgens & Rule, 2013). This would mean the building of equal facilities in townships as present in affluent parts of inner cities. Is integration by the upgrading of townships better than pulling them apart and build new integrated housing? Both options have risks. Marais & Ntema (2013) point to a problem in upgrading housing; intended beneficiary are displaced towards other informal settlements because they cannot maintain the houses. They lack finances and are therefore forced to sell their house and move back to an informal settlement. This problem also underlines the importance of the inequality issue in South Africa.

The issue of diminishing inequality is connected to housing policies as can be read in Visser (2004). He states that the delivery of huge amounts of houses and basic services do not immediately lead to a more equal and 'just' society, the distribution is also of importance. However what is just is largely determined by the opinion of the population and not from generalized aspects which can be applied to any situation or country. (2004) So it is to say that public opinion plays a big role to assess what needs to be achieved by policies, which will be a relevant topic for further research. The point regarding more equity he mentions leads him to argue the existence of a new division within the population on the base of Class (Visser, 2004), especially when the large inequality within the population keeps continuing to exist. This is a relevant point to keep in mind when analyzing the policies.

A final question that has to be asked in the integration and inequality debate is which one the population gives more importance to. Government policies follow public opinion to some extent, so it might be an important indicator. Does the population assign more importance to integration or equality? A trend study is done about the meaning people give to the rainbow nation symbolism³. According to the study the meaning given to the rainbow discourse lost power to the RDP program

³ The rainbow nation discourse was first used by archdeacon Desmond Tutu. It symbolized the differences within the South African nation and the aim towards integration of those differences in one nation.

pride a few years post-apartheid, meaning that the population puts more emphasis on the diminishing of inequality than integration (Dickow & Møller, 2012). In that conclusion does the rainbow nation symbolize integration and the RDP the diminishing of inequality. This states that the population rather has equality than integration, but to really make a statement about that dilemma an extensive research in that area is necessary.

4: The policy documents analyzed

In this chapter three government policies are analyzed. The first two are implemented directly post-apartheid. The other one is implemented ten years later. The focus will be on the first two. The third policy will only be analyzed in terms of what changed in comparison with the first two.

The first policy document is the ‘Redistribution and Development Programme’. This policy was the first one to be implemented post-apartheid in 1994. It was an all-encompassing policy to eradicate the apartheid past. Its aim was diminishing social inequality, but above all stabilizing the economy and creating economic development for South Africa (Department Human Settlements, p.45, 2010). The RDP also had the policy of mass delivery of houses and services. The RDP is a basic outline of goals and outcomes of a wide range of post-apartheid policies. The second policy is the ‘White Paper on housing’ from 1994. The White Paper is the implementation of the housing policies part of the RDP. The White Paper gives an overview of the housing issue and the proposed policy solutions to those issues. The White Paper is the practical lay-out of housing policies derived from the RDP. The third policy is the ‘Breaking New Ground’, which is devised in 2004 as an amendment on the RDP and the White Paper. The BNG has more focus on creating sustainable neighbourhoods. The switch to more sustainability in the BNG can give insight in the RDP and White Paper policies and the meaning of those policies.

The focus is on a discourse analysis of the policies; to analyse what the documents actually say and the language the documents use. Also the analysis will be about the meaning the policies could have for the population. With the analysis of the policies the emphasis is on efforts towards integration and diminishing inequality. Related issues, such as mobility, employment and the actual delivery of the houses, will also be shortly enlightened when relevant. The RDP analysis will be more about the ideas serving as background for the RDP policies. The White Paper will be a more practical analysis of the housing policy and the issues connected. Therefore the RDP analysis will be less focused on housing policies than the White Paper.

4.1: Redistribution and Development Program, RDP

The RDP is devised in 1994 by the ANC, the trade alliance COSATU and the South African Communist Party. Those bodies were powerful political bodies in 1994 when the final RDP policy was drafted. The paper was drafted in unison to make an all-encompassing policy framework to eradicate apartheid legislation (Turok, 1995). Also the RDP was meant to cancel the effects of policies made in the years 1910 – 1990. After the election the ANC underlined the importance for a new policy to change South Africa for the better post-apartheid. They said:

“The RDP is this programme, it is not full of empty promises designed to win votes at an election. It identifies the real problems we face and what we need to do to overcome these problems.”
(RDP, n.d, website ANC)

This quote shows the aim towards a practical solution to address social and economic problems originating from apartheid (RDP, n.d). Also the quote talks about making plans to address issues, not to only talk about them. This is in contradiction with the symbolism of the rainbow nation as Dickow and Møller explain in their article. They state that the first ten years post-apartheid was a time of reconciliation, not of delivery (2002). Reconciliation, and integration connected to that, has a symbolic meaning with a far less practical implementation. The practical approach is evident in the promise to build one million houses in the first five years after 1994 and to solve the housing shortage by the year 2002 (RDP, n.d). Turok (1995), though, states that the RDP is very vague about

where those houses should be built and the implications for those places when mixing different income groups. The RDP recognizes that development of the country is not possible when there is still such a great inequality in development within the population (RDP, n.d). The RDP made the following statement regarding that question:

"Some people argue that we must first strengthen our economy and only then can we provide money to develop our poorer, disadvantaged communities. The RDP says NO to this. Of course, we need our economy to grow. We need to produce more. But we also need to start now to wipe out poverty. Our people can wait no longer. Building the economy and developing the country must happen side by side. The RDP spells out how to do this."

(n.d, website ANC)

The main envisaged outcome of the practical approach is nationwide economic growth in all parts of society. Believed is that economic growth will lead to development and vice versa. The quote states that both processes enhance each other. The RDP believes development of the economy and the population is a way to pull the nation out of the apartheid legacy and also give the country a place in the world economy. One way according to the RDP to achieve the nation-wide development is by the mass delivery of houses.

"The RDP aims at decent, well-located and affordable shelter for all by the year 2003. In the short-term, the aim is to build one million new low-cost houses in five years."

(n.d, website ANC)

The provisioning of houses falls with the goal of meeting the basic needs of the population, which is paramount for economic development of the whole country and consequently the diminishing of inequality. The RDP seems to hold that housing will give economic empowerment to the whole population. The RDP states that neither economic development nor the diminishing of inequality is more important; both processes are dependent on each other, as is also made clear by the penultimate quote mentioned. Therefore the proposed development by the RDP can be translated as an effort towards diminishing inequality within the population.

Democracy in the form of participation from the beneficiaries of the policy is a very important aspect of the RDP. They want to make the building of houses labour intensive to have the extra benefit of employment opportunities (RDP, n.d). The ANC also aims to make the RDP a people-driven process and thus they expect engagement from communities and the civic sphere (Turok, 1995). This can have both positive and negative sides. A positive side is that the needs of the populations can be better taken into account when they are incorporated in the whole policy process. A negative side is that the government can pull back from responsibility because they believe that the people should organize themselves and generate their own resources. Participation of the population is partly connected to the privatization of houses.

The financing of the RDP policies are to be arranged with a combination of government funding and investments out of business and private initiatives. There is a constraint in government money, so the RDP is dependent on business and private funding (Turok, 1995). This was a possible tactic according to the RDP because the hope was that the programmes would lead to economic growth. This would enable a growing part of the population to finance parts of the housing schemes. This would diminish the government funds necessary. The plan was to privatize the houses through subsidies and loans for the poorest population. But the question of economic growth set aside; investors still need to believe that revenues can be made out of the housing schemes before they will invest (Turok, 1995). The RDP document of the ANC mentions the need to build on stronger parts of the economy to achieve economic growth:

*“Our economy also has stronger points that we will have to build on.
To rebuild our economy we need the government to play a leading role in promoting reconstruction
and development.
There also needs to be a thriving private sector and active involvement of all sectors of civil society
including trade unions.”*

(n.d, Website ANC)

This quote understates the importance the RDP policy gives to government, private and business investments to gain economic growth.

Summarizing the RDP is best seen as a policy towards economic development, both of the country as a whole and of the population. The RDP states that both economic development and the diminishing of poverty are important factors in dealing with issues originating from the historic background. This is done by efforts to stabilize the economy and to eradicate post-apartheid policies as far as possible with as end goal South Africa as a part of the world economy. This the RDP aims to achieve with a mass delivery of houses and by promoting economic development of the whole nation. In that way the RDP aims to eradicate inequality in living circumstances within the population and to give the population ownership over their own houses.

“The transfer of home ownership to long-term residents will be completed.”

(RDP, n.d, website ANC)

The RDP wants to achieve their goals through economic growth and participatory involvement of communities. That can be seen as a step towards integration of the population. But the danger of a too strong focus on participation of the population is too much emphasis on abilities of the population who might have nothing; causing failure of the policy and the poor not to get any betterment at all. Too much reliance on the capacity of the population can lead to a growth of inequality. A larger inequality will make housing delivery increasingly difficult, especially when the aim of privatizing houses stays, but the RDP policy document shows a level of awareness of that problem:

“We cannot successfully build the economy while millions do not have homes or jobs. And we cannot provide homes and jobs without rebuilding the economy. We need policies and strategies to address all of the problems together. The RDP aims to do this.”

(n.d, website ANC)

This shows a dual dilemma talked about in the RDP policy document. At the same time economic growth is pursued, while that is not possible without developing the whole population as well. The RDP tries to negotiate a solution between those two spear points.

4.2: White Paper on Housing

The white paper is implemented in December 1994. It was written as a practical translation of the RDP housing vision in the society. The practical translation came down to integrating existing communities both economy and social wise. Also the access to facilities and employment for all was an important issue in the implementation of the housing policy (Department Human Settlement, p.38, 2010). The White Paper on Housing starts with a sketch of the current housing situation. The paper estimates that approximately 1,5 million South Africans live in informal settlements. A great part of those settlements are in previously racial segregated sites designated by the previous government (White Paper, p. 9, 1994). 13,5 percent of all the households live in squatter houses, that is to say non-government build self-assembled houses. This situation came because of a slow delivery of new houses together with a high rate of natural growth of the amount of households in

urban areas (White Paper, p.9, 1994). Pillay explains the natural household growth by an ‘unbundling’ of households. In the apartheid area big families often lived together in a single household, this changed when more space was made available and more grants to achieve housing were made available. Nowadays through migration patterns and youths leaving homes earlier to live on their own, the total amount of households still grows fast, and thus also the amount of houses required and the subsidies linked to the housing provisioning. (2008) This maintains the ever-presence issue of the backlog of housing. The aim of the White paper is best summarized as follows:

In undertaking its new housing programme, the Government will strive to eliminate previous approaches which effectively separated the provision of housing stock from other services, be they physical or social. The massive damaging effects of this illogical and fragmented policy approach are physically reflected in our urban and rural areas, and socially reflected in the dislocation of our society.

A housing programme cannot be limited to housing, but needs to be promoted in such a manner as to give meaning to the goal of creating viable communities. (...) constitutes one of the primary challenges in effecting the Government's Reconstruction and Development Programme.

(White Paper, p.10, 1994)

The government strives towards an all-encompassing housing strategy to tackle all identified problems mentioned in the beginning of the White Paper. The aim is also towards rising general living standards of the population and thereby diminishing inequalities within the population. The goal of creating viable communities can be seen as a striving towards integration, but they do not specify who the communities consist of. The aim is mass delivery and stabilizing of the housing economy in the first years post-apartheid, without much thought on where to build those houses. The White Paper states that this will create security, so the poorest people can be sure of their new Houses (Department Human Settlements, p.40, 2010).

One of the key challenges the White Paper underlines is the difficulty to clear land for the housing policies (White Paper, p.13, 1994). That problem is both still a legacy of the historical racial division of land allocation and the newer land allocation according to a market principle where the more wealthier gain access to the more fruitful land. Both problems exclude the poor or marginalized population groups. Also the informal settlement in urban areas excludes those areas for housing policy use, since the areas are already habituated. (White Paper, p. 13, 1994) The government tries to speed up land freeing for housing policy, by for example relocation, to make sure there are sufficient locations to build houses on, but that is difficult because the relocated people need alternative housing. Gaining access to viable land is a vital point to reach the goals of the White Paper in the period assigned for it (Department Human Settlement, p.41, 2010).

Another problem outlined in the paper is the affordability of the housing, because both the state and the poorest of the population lack funds. The government tried to diminish the investment they need to make by negotiating the housing policies towards private ownership. In that case they only need to grant the initial money to buy the houses for the beneficiaries. The lack of government funds is enlarged by other priorities of the government, as said in the quote above. Solely solving the housing issue is not enough; basic services need to be bettered as well according to the White Paper. That means the money available needs to be divided among several priorities. (1994) Private housing schemes can be problematic for the beneficiaries when they lack the money to keep and maintain the houses.

“One of the greatest initial challenges facing all role players is the creation of a public environment conducive to attracting the necessary private investment, both of the household as well as that of the institutions.”

(White Paper, 1995)

The above quote indicates the importance of both private and government funds for success.

The White Paper aims for cooperation between government, private sector and communities for an all-encompassing durable policy (P.4, 1994). This is a clear indicator of the aim towards a participatory approach, or people-led development as the White Paper states it. The White Paper also puts emphasis on the necessity of housing for economic growth of the whole nation, also talked about in RDP part of this chapter. The White Paper's vision towards housing can be summarized in the following quote:

"Government strives for the establishment of viable, socially and economically integrated communities, situated in areas allowing convenient access to economic opportunities as well as health, educational and social amenities, within which all South Africa's people will have access on a progressive basis, (...)"
(P.10, 1994)

The goal seems to be towards integration in the form of integrated communities. At least they want to ensure equal access to facilities and housing for all South Africans. Inequality diminishing therefore seems to be a spear point of the White Paper.

Another important part of the White Paper regards the future prospects of the housing policy, since the White Paper aims for affordable and good quality houses (White Paper, p.22, 1994). This durability is enhanced with an as quickly as possible delivery of the houses with maximum mobilization of resources (White Paper, p.22, 1994):

"All functional policies and strategies should accommodate the complexities of the upgrading and redevelopment of human settlements in order to create sustainable human living conditions for residents within the context of a broader community."
(Department Human Settlements, p.43, 2010)

This piece seems to indicate that the aim of the White Paper is both integration and the diminishing of inequality. This complies with section 26 of the South African constitution that everybody has the right to adequate housing (Department Human Settlements, p.42, 2010). The White Paper aims to ensure houses for the population, for now and the future, by assigning grants and by developing the economy. Job opportunities and grants will hopefully generate enough income for the households to pay for their houses.

Summarizing the White Paper is mostly an effort towards the provision of houses as quick as possible for the whole population. This might lead to more equity and integration, but those two aspects are not explicitly named. Housing is to be achieved by a partnership between private, state and community initiatives. The overall line of thinking seems to be that sufficient houses will lead to economic development for the nation. A problem of housing provision is the accessibility of land; especially land which gives the beneficiaries access to employment and facilities. Another problem is the affordability of the houses, since both the government and the poorest people lack funds. The White Paper hopes this can be solved with economic growth. So in a way housing policies can be seen as a means to an end; the end being economic growth for South Africa. Housing policies is seen as an important factor in post-apartheid policy, but it cannot be seen apart from other post-apartheid issues.

4.3: Breaking New Ground, BNG

The Comprehensive Plan for Sustainable Development, or BNG, is an amendment of the RDP and the White Paper implemented in 2004. At the time of the implementation of the BNG in 2004 apartheid had ended for more than ten years and new socio-economic realities had started to emerge, so housing policies needed to be adjusted accordingly. This piece will not be an analysis of BNG policies and outcomes per se; it is rather used to gain more insight in the RDP and White Paper. Therefore it will only talk about the relevant change made in the BNG compared to the other two policies. This chapter analyzes two points of the BNG which are changed from the RDP and the White Paper. The overall vision of the BNG can be summarized with the quote underneath by the Department of Human Settlement stated in their document which summarized major post-apartheid housing policy schemes:

"The goal is to address the housing needs of the people, within the context of the broader socioeconomic needs, resulting in sustainable human settlements."
(Department Human Settlements, p.44, 2010)

The first point is the emphasis put on the sustainability of the location of the housing schemes which is necessary to ensure the long-term effect of the policies (Pillay, p.126, 2008). With the above mentioned quote the government seems to steer away from the ideas of economic growth for development and to put the emphasize more on the sustainable provisioning of housing. The policy puts more emphasis on the quality of living instead of only focusing on providing a large amount of houses. A better quality of living will improve the economic condition and opportunities of the poorest of the population, helping the housing projects to sustain in the future. According to Pillay that puts far more emphasis in the BNG on diminishing inequality within the population than the previous policies (2008). The new vision in the BNG on diminishing inequality is to achieve that through the sustainable provisioning of houses.

The second point where the BNG differs from the RDP and the White Paper is that regarding sustainable communities. The emphasis in the BNG seems to be more on the creation of strong communities, instead of mobilizing people to implement the policies (Department Human Settlements, p.46. 2010). The Department of Human Settlements defines sustainable communities as follows:

"Well-managed entities in which economic growth and social development are in balance with the carrying capacity of the natural systems on which they depend for their existence and result in sustainable development, wealth creation, poverty alleviation and equity."
(p.50, 2010)

Sustainable communities can thus both be seen as diminishing inequality and generating a better quality of living. The BNG is not clear if the existing communities need to be strengthened or that also new communities need to be created, which can have implications for where the housing projects are placed. The importance of sustainable communities is outlined in the quote underneath:

"The most relevant points in the revised vision on housing by the government is: an acceleration of housing provision; employment creation by that acceleration; creating economic equality and ensuring access to housing and land for the whole population. All those factors should lead to sustainable communities."
(Department Human Settlements, p.46. 2010)

In the way stated above sustainable communities can play a big role in the diminishing of inequality. Witch a sustainable community people can pull themselves out of poverty through employment

opportunities and access to facilities. So the BNG puts more emphasis on the future sustainability of the housing policies and less on economic growth or the mass delivery of houses.

4.4: Concluding comments

The RDP and White Paper aim for a mass delivery of houses to eradicate apartheid policies and to stabilize the economy as quick as possible. Their focus to achieve that is building houses. Compared to the BNG they have less attention to location and the quality of living; instead the focus lays on economic growth. The belief of the initial policies seems to be that economic growth will gradually diminish the inequality within the population. Sustainable communities are seen as a way to achieve growth and development; as a mean to an end and not as end goal. The BNG on the other hand focuses predominantly on the creation of sustainable communities both in socio-economic terms and with the location of the housing schemes. It seems to focus more on the long-term implications of the policies where communities are seen as end goal and not as a means to get there. The BNG, RDP and the White Paper have in common that they all aims for durable housing provision, although the BNG has a stronger emphasis on sustainability of the housing location and on the sustainability of the community. The difference of emphasis is a logical one. The BNG was formulated and implemented ten years after the other two policies. In those years a lot can be learned about housing policies and a lot changes in ten years. After ten years the focus was less on racial division and more on a class-based division. The effects and reviews of the RDP and the White Paper will be discussed in the next chapter.

5: Assessment of the RDP and the White Paper

This chapter will make an assessment of the RDP and the White Paper housing policies using texts by scholars and my own interpretation. This is done on the basis of the themes integration, inequality, and the location of the implementation of the housing schemes. The time span talked about is 1994 until 2004 when the new BNG policy was implemented. This will keep the review solely to the RDP and White Paper. The RDP and White Paper will be reviewed together because the White Paper is the implementation of the housing policies of the RDP and therefore the two overlap significantly and complement each other.

Much contestation comes from the idea that the RDP is a market-oriented approach. In the previous chapter it became clear that the goal of the RDP, and consequently the White Paper, is above all economic growth (Pillay, 2008). This is believed by some to have negative effects on the benefits the poorest people can get, which has effects on the inequality within the population. The market-oriented approach is connected to another case of contestations, which is the focus on input from communities and business. This is partly explained by a lack of government funding, but can also be seen as a way from the government to redraw responsibility. The market forces determine partly the location of housing schemes and the economic opportunities those areas has. The last point is the place of the houses. The three points are related to each other and will be connected in the conclusion.

5.1: Inequality

Saff (1993) believes it is more relevant to talk about South Africa as divided by class than Race. That is not to say that one struggle is replaced with the other, merely that the struggle is nowadays more translated in class-based aspect and less in racial terms. This has implications for the RDP and White Paper policies since they were aimed towards eradicating apartheid law and thus use a different discourse. The class segregation is both coming from the historic spatial segregation based on race and functional segregation nowadays (Saff, 1993). Visser (2004) among others believes that the class division comes from the capitalist nature of the 'new' South Africa, because that determines how the benefits are distributed in society. He claims that South Africa, and therefore the RDP and the White Paper, did not manage to 'bridge the gap' between groups but merely to better the living standards of the poorest. The policies need to be revised to fit in the new social situation. (2004) The BNG is indeed planning to create more viable neighbourhoods by ensuring that the beneficiaries have employment opportunities and access to facilities, giving beneficiaries of the policies employment opportunities and access to facilities.

According to Visser the post-apartheid policies fail to open up opportunities for employment and access to facilities for the previously marginalized groups (2004). This is also said by Charlton and Kihato who state that the nature of the implementation of the RDP and White Paper failed to alleviate poverty (2006). This can be explained by the market-oriented principle of the policies generating investments for the houses through private or business funding. Also they want to grant people ownership of their own houses through funds and subsidies. Pillay states that reintegration policies in a market-oriented way can lead to an increased segregation between the wealthy and the poor (2008), because in market-based schemes the rich benefit more than the absolutely poor. This causes his contestations for the market-oriented way the policies operate.

The emphasis on private and business funding in the RDP and the White Paper can also increase the inequality instead of diminishing it. With the dependence on private spending, the fact is ignored that revenues have to be made. Money is easier made with high-value housing causing a low rate of

investments in the RDP and White Paper housing schemes, which are aimed at the poorest of the population. Turok (1995) said in his article that private investment has been historically low in housing projects and he does not expect this to increase with the RDP and White Paper policies. Turok fears that keeping a dependence on investors through market-oriented means will keep the structural inequalities in South Africa in place, thus his comments on the RDP are directed at the capitalist nature of the RDP (1995). He states that only when all actors, private; business and the government, agree with each other on which actions need to be taken the RDP can succeed, but he doubts if that is happening in the current system. Slater (2013) also wonders if the focus on market-oriented growth will ever lead to a 'more just' society, because funding is an important aspect of the RDP. Corder states in his article that if the RDP and the White Paper are to succeed it is paramount to have more funding. He sees as the only way to diminish inequality a higher commitment of the state, private and business investors. The government contradictory diminished the funding of the RDP projects. (2013)

5.2: Integration

This chapter brings us back to the discussion if integration is a spear point to achieve in the post-apartheid discourse of the RDP and the White Paper. Chapter three already stated that integration is not possible without diminishing inequality as well. Scholars disagree about the necessity of implementing integration efforts in the policies. Hamann and Horn state in their article that the social attitude of the South African society might still be too much aimed at spatial segregation to be able to successfully implement integration policies. Previously White areas are more mixed now than before, but non-White areas are still predominantly non-White. There is difference, though, in integration among the four distinguished population groups, which Haman and Horn assign to the market-based approach of the RDP (2014).

There is no consensus if the place where people live also has influence on integration. Slater (2013) and Freund (2010) both have opposite opinions about the effects of the place where people live and their circumstances in live. Slater broadly speaking looks at the effect of the market and policies on where people live. Freund states that where you live determines the person's situation in live. Krige (1998, in: Marais & Krige, p.9, 1999) states that post-apartheid urban housing is shaped by economic forces and not by state policies anymore. The current focus of the RDP on businesses and private investments causes land and housing prices to be determined by the market, excluding the poor from areas with more opportunities (Marais & Krige, p.9, 1999). This leads in some cases to housing in less affluent areas because those areas are available (Marais & Krige, 1999). So although the RDP and the White Paper do not have any high-profile aims towards integration, the policies might lead to a higher rate of segregation, because the inequality is not addressed in a successful way. To fully assess this statement more research is needed.

The rainbow nation discourse was very dominant the first years after apartheid. The idea of reconciliation, and therefore integrating the whole population with each other, was carried out Dickow & Møller, 2002). It can be wondered what was meant with integration, integration in social terms or also in spatial terms. The rainbow nation discourse talks about social integration, but is that possible without addressing spatial segregation? The RDP and the White Paper's practical translation for the integration issues was among other things a mass delivery of houses in the first five years after apartheid. Less emphasis was put on location and quality of the houses, which led to houses built on the fringe of cities far from employment opportunities or other facilities. Freund wondered in his article if this can ever lead to a rise in status for the poor and consequently to more integration of the population (2010). Also the mobility issue he talks about plays a great role in integration, more talked about in chapter 5.3.

Integration in itself can be problematic. Saff talked in his article about the effects on areas when integration finds place; integration between the poor and wealthy population. There is a fear from the wealthy population that their neighbourhood will decline in value when poorer citizen live nearby; a decline because of crime and a fear for crime. This causes wealthy people to move away from mixed areas counteracting the integration process. (1993) This point further enlightens the importance of equality for integration.

5.3: Location housing schemes

Charlton and Kihato (2006) remark that the aim of the White Paper towards housing was, next to the building of houses, also the creation of affluent neighbourhoods for the beneficiaries. With that they meant sustainable neighbourhoods with sufficient access to employment and facilities. In that way the neighbourhoods will be able to sustain themselves in the future. They remark that those sustainable neighbourhoods failed to materialize. Consequently in the BNG more emphasis is put on the sustainability of the housing schemes. The BNG assigns more importance to the long-term effect of the projects by focusing more on sustainable communities and sustainable locations. They say that the initial policies were inadequate because of a lack of 'settlement integration' and a lack of opportunities in the new housing locations. This connects with Freund's (2010) thesis that building houses in itself is not the solution for integration; people need the access to employment opportunities and facilities to sustain house ownership as well. Only in that case housing schemes are able to allow for a permanent rise above status for the poorer population and consequently a diminishing of the inequality within the population. Therefore it is important that the new BNG policies gave more importance to the neighbourhood and location of housing schemes and its future prospects. A point of critique is the fact that not all the goals of the RDP are met. The proposed building of 1 million houses the first five years after 1994 was not even finished for 50% by 1998 (Marais & Krige, table 2, 1999)

The historical spatial segregation in South Africa created a great gap within the population of those who have a lot and those who have very little. This explains the inequality present in South Africa. This segregation is still for a part the legacy of apartheid legislation where non-White population groups were forcibly removed to non-affluent areas. Those that were marginalized back then still lack the opportunities to move or better their status because the neighbourhoods they live in are depleted from opportunities to do so. (Haman & Horn, 2014) Slater (2013), though, disagrees with the idea that the neighbourhood determines the status of the people living in it. He proposes instead to look at the large-scale forces that create the living places. With that he means that larger forces, such as the nation's economy, determine the opportunities neighbourhoods have. He focuses his theory on the large scale forces determining the accumulation of capital. So the neighbourhoods in itself are not the cause, the cause lies with the opportunities they have to generate capital. With that he says that the problem is not solved with moving people, but instead with adjusting the way opportunities are divided in society. According to his theory the RDP should aim towards dividing those opportunities more equal. Again it seems most important to diminish inequality within the population to successfully implement the RDP and White Paper policies.

5.4: Concluding discussion assessment policies

The focus of the RDP and the White Paper was stabilization of the economy and eradicating apartheid legislation. This they aim to do with the delivery of new houses for the poorest of the population. A large backlog in housing originates from the historical background of South Africa contributing to the large inequality today within the population. Other historical spatial segregation

policies based on race are the other cause for the inequality today. The RDP and White Paper focused on overcoming race based legislation and the inequality coming from that.

Comments in the inequality debate were aimed at the policies' failure to open up opportunities for the poorest people to develop economically. This counteracted the possible successful implementation of the policies, since beneficiaries could not maintain their houses or gain access to employment and other facilities. This is connected to the integration debate since a lack of opportunities for employment and facilities does not reconnect previously racial segregated township areas and homelands with the rest of South Africa. Also some comments are made about the relevance of looking at integration in terms of race. Scholars, among others Saff (1993), claim that now it is more relevant to look at integration in terms of class and economic opportunities than race. Class is a better explanation of the current issues revolving around integration and inequality. That is not to say that race lost its relevance; it is a matter of emphasis.

Commentary towards integration was mostly aimed at the problematic nature of integration. Integration is made difficult when the poor have no opportunity to rise above their status. This is the cause because the location of housing schemes does not give them those opportunities. Another reason is the moving away by the wealthier population from mixed neighbourhoods out of fear for crime. Scholars wondered if integration needs to be a spear point in the post-apartheid policies. Generally speaking people seemed to put more importance towards economic growth and therefore the diminishing of inequality. The policies also focused on that aspect. Integration is an aspect that grows naturally out of a more evenly divided society instead of something that needs to be actively pursued. This is somewhat explained by the proposed use of a class division discourse instead of a racial segregation discourse.

The location of the housing schemes also plays a role in the effect and implications of the policies. Commentary in this area is mainly aimed at the sustainability of the location of the housing schemes and the concerning communities. Already in the White Paper some attention was given to the sustainability of the housing schemes, but the BNG really puts emphasis on sustainability. This can be an indicator of lack in implementation of sustainability in the RDP and White Paper policies. The location of the housing schemes is connected to the access to employment and facilities. In the history of South Africa non-White groups were forcibly removed to areas depleted from opportunities to develop. The policies were partly aimed to give them opportunities to rise above their status or to move away from those opportunity-poor areas. Without those effects the poor will not be able to move away from the depleted areas. In that case the policies will have little of the proposed effects on diminishing inequality. But an important question regarding location is still what the influence of the neighbourhood is on the development opportunities for the previously marginalized on racial terms and thus the effects of location on inequality.

In general a lot of commentary seems to be aimed at the market-oriented approach of the policies, among other things including the private ownership of the houses. Many scholars such as Slater (2012) deem it impossible for a society to diminish inequality through capitalism and a market-mechanism. Without diminishing the inequality the housing schemes cannot succeed, because the poorest people will not be able to maintain their houses. Also the market-oriented approach causes housing schemes to be on areas depleted from possibilities of employment and access to facilities. This disenables the poor population to grow above their station and to maintain their houses. With a housing policies focusing at giving people ownership of their houses, this is very problematic. Those ideas are connected to the statement that first inequality needs to be diminished before the housing policies can be successfully implemented.

6: Discussion and conclusion

This thesis aimed to give an analysis of government housing policy by examining the discourse of the documents with my own and scholar's interpretation. Also the possible effects the policies could have on post-apartheid issues such as integration and inequality are examined. This was all done with a focus on post-apartheid housing policies. This can give insight in the discourse and meaning of government policy in general. It is interesting to see if there is a difference between policy discourse and the effect they are believed to have in society according to various interpretations.

This thesis started with an overview of historical acts in the period 1910 until 1990 in order to place the issues dealt with in the policies in the right context. The acts institutionalized in that timeframe had lasting effects on the post-apartheid housing situation in South Africa as discussed in chapter two and three. The discourse of the policy documents RDP, the White Paper and the BNG is analyzed in chapter four and the possible effects the policies could have on the post-apartheid situation according to several scholars are analyzed in chapter five. For the analysis the themes integration, the diminishing of inequality and the location of housing schemes are used to look at the broader housing issue, because those aspects turned out to be important aspects in the housing issue and of a great influence on the possible outcomes.

For the housing schemes to have long-term effect it is vital that the inequality within the population is diminished. The RDP tries to achieve that by economic growth. It is a question, though, if the diminishing of inequality will happen with the RDP and White Paper's market-oriented policies, especially because the difference between the rich and the poor of the population are so big. The RDP and White Paper housing policies already assume a certain level of economic powers of the poor, but after the marginalizing and spatial segregating policies during apartheid it is unlikely that the non-White population groups had much economic powers of their own immediately post-apartheid, especially because they were mostly living in economic depleted areas as stated before. Economic growth is important because it can lead to more equity, but not through market-oriented tactics if not the whole population is able to participate. The BNG puts more emphasis on the sustainability of communities, which is a vital change in the housing policies for a more successful implementation of its goals. If you built houses place them in areas with sufficient opportunities to develop for the beneficiaries to also enjoy the housing in the future. It is better to build less houses of a good quality than to build a lot of bad quality houses. Long-term effects are more important than short-term relief, especially for the future of South Africa in the long run.

Integration might be possible to achieve by integrating the living places of different groups. This is difficult through economic differences and the fact that the groups are still spatially separated post-apartheid, especially the White and the non-White population groups. To achieve integration of living places immediately post-apartheid the whole outlay of the country would have to change, which is unfeasible. It is best for South African housing policies to first focus on economic development for all and a diminishing of inequality, so there is a more equal living standard within the population. This can be done with the upgrading of current townships or informal areas and by considering the area of new housing schemes regarding future prospects. The new BNG policy towards sustainable communities and a sustainable location of the housing schemes can be useful to achieve that. It is very likely that a diminishing of inequality will eventually lead to more integration, because there are fewer differences between the separate population groups. Also a basic level of economic empowerment for the whole population decreases the differences within the population. Both aspects might lead to different population groups to slowly move away from historically determined areas and to integrate. Now the living places are still very much determined by the racial division out of the apartheid, though class has also became increasingly important in determining the living place of the people post-apartheid. Only when the whole population has more the same opportunities in

live is it possible for integration to happen. With a large inequality it is even the question if the population itself has integration closest on their mind. When engaging with especially poor persons from different backgrounds it became clear that most of them are not really occupied with the state of integration post-apartheid, they are busier with gaining a livelihood for themselves. So it is important to look at the implementation and effect of the BNG housing policy towards diminishing inequality and the possible long-term success of the BNG. Only when the BNG is able to diminish inequality by providing long-term housing for the poorest of the population can the other post-apartheid issues such as integration really be addressed.

Proposed topics further research:

- Influence of the neighbourhood on development opportunities for the inhabitants.
- assessment of the discourse and implications of the BNG policy.
- the effects of mobility and the access to employment and facilities on integration or the diminishing of inequality.
- ethnographic research into feelings of integration between the different population groups and the necessity they feel for integration.
- Ethnographic research of the meaning the population gave to the post-apartheid housing policies.
- how Integration is defined within the difference population groups and classes. Does the view on integration change with different opportunities in life?
- the effects of crime on integration of different neighbourhoods.

References:

- Apartheid legislation 1850-1990.* (n.d). Retrieved May 21, 2014, from
<http://www.sahistory.org.za/politics-and-society/apartheid-legislation-1850s-1970s>
- Bähr, J., Donaldson, R., Jürgens, U. & Rule, S. (2013) Townships in South African cities – literature review and research perspectives. *Habitat International*, 39, pp. 256-260. DOI: 10.1016/j.habitatint.2012.10.011
- Biko, S & Stubbs, A.D.R. (Ed.) (1987) Let's talk about the Bantustan, *Steve Biko 1946-77, I write what I like* (pp. 80-86). United Kingdom: Bowerdean Presss.
- Charlton, S & Kihato, C (2006) Reaching the poor? An analysis of the influences on the evolution of South Africa's housing programme. In U. Pillay, R. Tomlinson & J. du Toit (Eds.), *Democracy and delivery. Urban policy in South Africa* (pp. 252-256). Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Christopher, A.J. (1982). *South Africa, the world's landscapes*. London: Longman.
- Christopher, A. J. (1989) Spatial variations in the application of residential segregation in South African cities. *Geoforum*, 20(3), pp. 253-267. DOI: 10.1016/0016-7185(89)90001-8
- Christopher, A. J. (2002) Trends in political geography. *South African Geographical Journal*, 84(1), pp. 48-57. DOI: 10.1080/03736245.2002.9713755
- Dickow, H. & Møller, V. (2002) South Africa's 'rainbow people', national pride and optimism: a trend study. *Social indicators research*, 59(2), pp. 175-202. DOI: 10.1023/A:1016234504243
- Department Human Settlements. (2010) National housing policy and subsidy programmes. Republic of South Africa. pp. 38-59. Retrieved on June 5, 2014, from
http://www.kzndhs.gov.za/Portals/0/docs/Policy&Legislation/National_Policy_&_Legislation/National%20Housing%20Policy%20and%20Subsidy%20Programmes.pdf
- Ellson, G. T.H. & Erasmus, Y. (2008) What can we learn about the meaning of race from the classification of population groups during apartheid? *South African Journal of Science*, 104(11/12), pp. 450-452.
- Evans, M (2010) Mandela and the televised birth of the rainbow nation. *National Identities*, 12(3), pp. 309-326. DOI: 10.1080/14608944.2010.500327
- Finchilescu, G. & Tredoux, C. (2010) The changing landscape of intergroup relations in South Africa. *Journal of social issues*, 66(2), pp. 223-236. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2010.01642.x
- Freund, B. (2010) Is There Such a Thing as a Post-apartheid City? *Urban Forum*, 21(3) pp. 283-298. DOI: 10.1007/s12132-010-9087-4
- Geyer Jr. H.S. & Geyer Sr. H.S. (2014) Disaggregated Population Migration Trends in South Africa Between 1996 and 2011: a Differential Urbanization Approach. *Urban Forum, published online 21 March*. DOI: 10.1007/s12132-014-9229-1

Hamann, C. & Horn, A. C. (2014) Continuity or discontinuity? Evaluating the changing socio-spatial structure of the city of Tshwane, South Africa. *Urban Forum*, published online 5 April. DOI: 10.1007/s12132-014-9231-7

Lehohla, P (2007) Community survey 2007. The RDP commitment: what South Africans say. *Statistics South Africa*, Pretoria, South Africa.

Marais, L. & Ntema, J. (2013) The upgrading of an informal settlement in South Africa: Two decades onwards. *Habitat International*, 39, pp. 85-95. DOI: 10.1016/j.habitatint.2012.11.001

Marais, L. & Krige, S. (1999) Post-apartheid housing policy and initiatives in South Africa, reflections on the Bloemfontein-Botshabelo-ThabaNchu region. *Urban Forum*, 10(2), pp. 115-136.

Marais, L., Sefika, M., Ntema, J., Venter, A. & Cloete, J. (2013) Towards an understanding the outcomes of housing privatization in South Africa. *Urban Forum*, 25(1), pp. 57-68. DOI: 10.1007/s12132-013-9206-0

Pillay, U. (2008) Urban policy in post-apartheid South Africa: Context, evolution and future direction. *Urban Forum*, 19(2), pp. 109-132. DOI: 10.1007/s12132-008-9038-5

Ramutsindela, M. (2013) The enduring spatial legacy of the Natives Land act. *Social dynamics: a Journal of African Studies*, 39(2), pp. 290-297. DOI: 10.1080/02533952.2013.796119

RDP, A basic guide to the Reconstruction and Development programme. (n.d). Retrieved June 2, 2014, from <http://www.anc.org.za/show.php?id=234>

Saff, G (1993) The changing face of the South African city: from urban apartheid to the deracialization of space. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 18(3), pp. 377-391. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2427.1994.tb00274.x

Slater, T (2013, March) Your life changes affect where you live: a critique of the 'cottage industry' of neighbourhood effects research. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 37(2), pp. 346-387. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2427.2013.01215.x

Turok, I. (1995) Reconstruction or reconciliation? South Africa's reconstruction and development programme. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 19(2), pp. 305-318. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2427.1995.tb00506.x

Visser, G.(2004) Social justice and post-apartheid development planning, reflections on moral progress in South Africa, *International Development Planning Review*, 256(4), pp. 359-376. DOI: 10.3828/idpr.26.4.2

White Paper, a new housing policy and strategy for South Africa. (1994) Department of housing. Retrieved on June 5, 2014, from http://www.dhs.gov.za/sites/default/files/legislation/Policies_Housing_White_Paper.pdf