CENTRE FOR DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

CDS

HOUSING

Occasional Papers 2

UNIVERSITY OF THE WESTERN CAPE

CDS

INTRODUCTION

These papers were prepared for an international workshop on Local Government and Planning held in Harare from 1-4 November 1989 under the auspices of the Centre for Development Studies (CDS) and the South African Studies Project (SASPRO), in collaboration with the University of Zimbabwe and the Ministry of Local Government of Zimbabwe.

Since the beginning of the 1980s the question of government and planning at local level has rapidly assumed national proportions. In part, this was due to the development of the state's so-called "total strategy", i.e. reform and repression - or "crush and create" - against the background of a "total onslaught". Its main allies in this strategy were the military and big capital. Its agenda, was to re-design and reform apartheid while at the same time adopting a more stringent approach to security matters.

By 1986 however, total stategy was rendered unworkable. In fact, the state's efforts at local level restructuring collapsed almost completely as a result of the rebellion which followed in its wake:

" ... *mass township resistance was the single most important method of contesting the goals, meaning and function of the city". (M Swilling: City politics comes of age).*

Social movements, Swilling continues, emerged to contest every aspect of urban control. From land-use regulations, Groups Areas, housing policies, squatter laws, influx control, labour mobility to health care, transport systems, education and welfare measures for senior citizens, the unemployed and the disabled.

The papers which form part of this series on Local Government and Planning begin to address some of these issues which emerged out of the struggle of the people to obtain a just, democratic order for a new South Africa. The one thing they have in common is that they do so mainly from the perspective of the democratic movement in South Africa. The two papers presented here focus on the question of housing.

The question of housing in South Africa cannot be separated from state strategy. Generally speaking, state strategy has been an attempt to depoliticise housing through shifting the responsibility for the provision of housing onto the private sector. Since the early eighties, for example, no new rental schemes have been built. It is against this background that these papers should be considered.

The Planact paper, " Debating the role of housing in society" raises issues such as land availability, tenure systems, privatisation, the legacy of apartheid ghettoes and the implications of individualising ownership. Important points are raised regarding the superior experience of the state and private sector relative to the Mass Democratic Movement in the arena of housing and planning. It also suggests that the concept of "the city" be given serious attention to avoid the pitfall of continuing apartheid's inequities in planning. One shortcoming of this paper however, is that it does not address the issue of rural housing. Also, it argues that proposed solutions show "little conceptual understanding of the role of housing" (p1). The paper does not explore the proposed solutions in any detail.

The other paper, "Some preliminary thoughts on alternative housing strategies for a free and democratic South Africa" by Thozamile Botha and Simon Kaplinsky states its main objective as being to "provoke discussion on housing options for a post apartheid South Africa" (p8). It does indeed raise questions that need to be debated. They examine the issues of urban land, the role of local authorities and the need for socio-economic restructuring within a framework of centralised demands around the democratic redistribution of land. They also examine the obstacles for any future government in addressing the housing shortage. The paper, it seems, could have been more instructive had it examined possible options in more detail. For example, the issue of privatisation is raised and discussed but no proposal is made around provision of rental acommodation. Interesting proposals such as the idea of management of housing stock by co-operatives and non-profit housing associations are however, put forward on the paper.

Useful points are also made regarding state strategy. The authors argue that there is a joint economic strategy being pursued by the state and capital on the eve of South African independence. Part of this strategy is to provide housing for the black middle class through various subsidy schemes, while ignoring the very poor. The subsidy in itself becomes a poverty trap while it creates divisions along class lines.

Neither of the papers provide definitive answers on the restructuring of housing policy and related areas of local government, neither were they intended to. Some may argue the relevance of these papers in the light of developments post- 2nd February. These are that the state gave R2- billion for the establishment of the Independent Development Trust, under the chairpersonship of Jan Steyn (ex- Urban Foundation Executive Director), where housing would be one of the major focusses. The Thornhill Report, issued by the Minister of Constitutional Development and Planning, Hernus Kriel, furthermore, acknowledges the failure of Black Local Authorities and suggests some alternatives to restructuring local government. Far from being new initiatives, these represent a continuation of state strategy of privatisation and the decentralisation and depoliticisation of local government. The state, it thus appears, is still ignoring its own responsibity for housing and related social services. □

DEBATING THE ROLE OF HOUSING IN SOCIETY
PLANACT

The issue of the housing crisis in South Africa has now assumed the status of a national debate. The size of the overall housing shortage has been well-documented, the problems associated with finance for housing are apparent, the problems of land speculation are increasingly evident. In the current situation, where the state and private sector have charged themselves with taking the lead in tackling housing as an issue, there are many statements, papers and conferences in which general agreement emerges that "something must be done".

There is little doubt that the combination of the state and the private sector are well-advanced in dealing with housing, relative to the abilities of the mass-democratic movement. While community organisations are now re-emerging, after more than three years of emergency, the state and the private sector have made good use of the period of repression in which to gain a significant hold in the townships.

The object of this briefing is to raise some of the larger questions about housing which, if ignored, may cause lasting damage to the interests of the members of the Mass-Democratic Movement. Rather than look at the financial and technical aspects of the housing crisis - which has been a primary focus of the state and private sector, we will argue that the "solutions" that are currently being offered are fundamentally flawed.

Any "solutions" that are proposed now must meet the challenge of being consistent with long-term planning that anticipates a post-apartheid future. If we take the "solutions" that are currently being offered, then it is arguable that this short-term approach is bound to create long-term problems. The challenge then becomes how to ensure that post-apartheid solutions are being created under apartheid.

Current solutions on offer either have very limited conceptual understanding about the role of housing in society or, more likely (and threatening), they are based on a conception of housing that is directly opposed to the interests of the working class as a whole. In short, we are raising the general warning that the housing that is being provided for the people in the townships may ultimately serve to undermine both the individual residents in the short term, and their organisations in the longer-term.

Of course there will exist a tension between the immediate acute and pressing housing needs of the people, and a process of education and debate which seeks to understand, critique and challenge the current initiatives that are underway. However, in order to secure housing appropriate to the longer term interests of the people and the country as a whole, it is argued that the first battle to be fought relates to the social conception of housing. This may be understood in seeking to answer the question: What is the role of housing in our society? This can be understood both in terms of the existing and dominant ideology, and in terms of the goal or ideal.

Historically, it can be demonstrated that the state's conception of housing for the oppressed in South Africa served two main functions:

i)   control of the urban community and workforce, and
ii)   as an important component of maintaining a system

of cheapened labour power.

In the decades of "high apartheid", for example, housing was used as an important part of the system of influx control, linked to the application of the pass laws. Access to housing was directly linked to access to legal employment, thus tying the person to the dual control of workplace and household. The continuation of either legal employment or legal accommodation was part and parcel of the same system of control of the urban African.

The state also made use of housing to order society beyond the urban sphere. Indeed, the provision and access to housing was used by the state in a concerted effort to spatially order the population in the image of Grand Apartheid. This was attempted through the decision in the late sixties to freeze existing townships and direct finance for the provision of housing for Africans to the bantustans. It is this sort of racist decision that directly caused the extensive housing crisis that is now faced.

Recently, however, there has been a decisive shift in the approach of the state in reconceptualising provision of housing for the majority. Whereas previously the state used housing as a means for securing the undifferentiated exclusion of the oppressed from civil and political society, it is now being understood as an important and significant mechanism for regulating and differentiating access to aspects of South African society.

There can be little doubt that the dominant ideology underpinning housing in South Africa today is that proffered by the government and the private sector. Indeed, the ideological dominance is such that their views and understanding of housing have assumed the status of near-truths in our society - theirs is seen as the "common-sense" approach.

Two examples will suffice to underline this assertion. The state has, with the assistance of sections of the private sector, been quite successful in gaining wide support for the notion that the provision of housing is both the responsibility and the right of the individual. This latter point is significant in that the debate has managed to suggest that the individual has been granted the "freedom" to seek private solutions to a wholly negative situation created by previous state policy. In other words, the state has managed to present its withdrawal from its responsibilities as an advance of individual rights.

Second, and equally significant, an even more substantial ideological victory has been won by the proponent of individual homeownership within the dictates of the "free market" as the most logical, rational and fairest manner of gaining access to housing. This is a particularly important ideological dominance and one that needs urgently to be fully understood, debated and, in our view, rigorously challenged.

Current state strategy is to move towards the privatisation of the existing state-owned housing stock. This is for a number of reasons. First, while noting that housing had previously been used as a form of direct control over people's lives, mass struggles over housing have exposed the contradiction and space created by the existence of a single, massive landlord. Popular collective actions such as the rent protests and boycotts have put the

state in direct confrontation with the people. This is one of the more important reasons why the state hopes to "depoliticise" housing through privatisation.

The second reason relates, again, to a form of control that is less direct. The government hopes to encourage differentiation and division within black communities by leaving the provision of housing to the "market". In essence, the question of affordability will provide the most important test as to whether people are able to have access to housing or not. A likely scenario that will emerge if this is not challenged is that townships will start to be divided on economic criteria. This will happen both within the township and, more importantly, between the township and those that are excluded from formal housing.

Finally, this will have important effects on organisation. Homeowners may start to reflect a different material interest to those denied access to formal housing, leading to potential divisions within the community. Equally important homeowners will have many different "landlords" to deal with, in the form of individual contracts with banks and building societies. In this way, the possibilities for widespread, collective action over housing will be sharply decreased.

In this scenario, then, housing has the potential to become an important issue of division within communities. This may also occur within trade unions, where only limited sections of the workforce may be able to afford any housing options that are on offer. Equally significantly, regional differences are likely to emerge, as areas of higher unemployment and low economic growth are unlikely to be able to cater for the housing needs of their urban poor.

All of the above possibilities are arguably as a result of a conception in which housing is regarded as:
(i)   a privilege, determined by economic status,
(ii)   a commodity, to be bought, sold and speculated and
(iii)   a matter for the individual household to resolve.

We would argue that housing should be regarded as:
(i)   a human right, not a privilege,
(ii)   as the basic physical cornerstone of decent family life, and
(iii)   as the basic unit of successful social relations in the community.

Therefore, it is argued, the most appropriate manner in which to address the issues is to understand the issue of the housing crisis in South Africa today as a social issue, that needs to be resolved in a way that places emphasis on finding an acceptable balance between the respective non-conflicting needs of the individual and the community.

The most telling manner in which this can be achieved is for the planning aspect related to housing, townships and urban development in general to become a long-term, inclusive and democratic process. This is to challenge directly the state and all of the non-state bodies involved: representative structures of the people should have the central role in planning solutions to the current housing crisis.

In South Africa today this may sound like an unrealistic demand. It is, however, going to become an increasingly powerful and tangible demand, and will become a reality with or without the conscious involvement and support of other interested parties. What is being demanded is the meaningful involvement of the very people whose lives are being affected and planned - currently, this is happening without their involvement or approval. This also serves to underline our contention that housing (and associated planning) must be seen as a process and not as a product designed for immediate gratification. A democratic planning process would have to tackle the following priority issues:

*The quantity and manner of the release of land for purposes of settlement. The release of land has been identified by the state as a primary control in the post-influx control era. This has translated into insufficient land being released; land being released in the wrong places - distant from the existing urban form; land being released in such a manner as to positively invite speculation, with attendant cost implications and so on. One alternative that should be seriously contemplated is the release of land to representative community control. The mere additional release of more land for development is but a part of the solution.

*The need for mixed development. Current urbanisation is guided by the state's notion of developing "an urban hierarchy with due consideration of market forces". Crudely, this approach leads to the creation of new ghettos - be it the squatter ghetto of Orange Farm, or wealthy ghettoes being undertaken on the Extended East Bank in Alexandra.

*The increasing belief that housing is an individual responsibility and an individual right - determined by a combination of the labour market on the one hand, and the primary and secondary housing markets on the other must be challenged. Housing must rather be viewed as a social good that confers benefits to society over and above the individual's access to secure housing. This is possibly the fundamental tension in the question of housing provision in South Africa today - seeking solutions that stress either the community and society, or the individual.

* The reconceptualisation of "The City" in South Africa. This will serve to underline the point that the housing crisis is part of the much larger, comprehensive problems currently facing the apartheid cities and towns of South Africa. Without such an approach, the current planning, financing and building of housing stock is likely to be operating within (and reinforcing) existing paradigms. By the way of an example, the demands for a single city put forward by the Soweto People's Delegation have begun this process. Solutions to the housing problems of Soweto would clearly have a different starting point - leading to different solutions - if viewed from this innovative standpoint. Equally importantly, we need to critically examine the housing stock and urban environments already in existence to ascertain how they might need to be transformed.

*It must be accepted that, even when all apartheid legislation has been removed, the legacy of decades of apartheid policy and practice will remain. Orange Farm, KwaMashu, Botshabelo, Crossroads, Soweto, Alexandra, Houghton, Sandton and Constantia will all be there. This will be a fundamental problem for any post-apartheid state, irrespective of such a state's ideological and economic outlook. That is precisely the reason why we have a duty to decrease the potential size of such problems now. An inclusive, democratic approach to urban development would be a major step forward in this regard.

*Even without the coercive, racist controls of influx control, the current approach to urbanisation still creates racial and class ghettos. The solution does not lie in

3

half-baked ideas such as the so-called "Free Settlement Areas". The answer lies, rather, in removing the expectation of planning for the future from the state - it has no track record to speak of - and placing it with representative structures of the people actually facing the harsh daily reality of the housing crisis.

The solutions to the problems of housing and urban development must start from the needs of the people currently affected by the crisis. At the moment, however, the current programmes on offer in the townships start from the motives of profit, the market, the individual - housing as a commodity.

There is a unique opportunity, in tackling this, in seeing housing as an exciting possibility for beginning to build new communities, democratic process in South Africa's cities - the embryo of a new South Africa. Innovative possibilities exist which are completely excluded from the current approaches - social options such as the communal control of land, housing co-operatives, banking land for the future needs of communities and so on.

Finally, it must be restated that the political and developmental problems of the black townships cannot be resolved by those communities alone. Instead, the resolution of these issues must be seen as a national political issue, in which the state must be forced to address its responsibilities at a local and national level. This is the challenge that the Mass Democratic Movement faces. However, decisive action will be necessary, before the cities of South Africa are planned and ordered by the current strategies of the state and the private sector. □

SOME PRELIMINARY THOUGHTS ON ALTERNATIVE HOUSING STRATEGIES FOR A FREE AND DEMOCRATIC SOUTH AFRICA

Thozamile Botha and Simon Kaplinsky

The Nationalist Party Government has been operating a racist housing policy in South Africa for over forty years. The state applied the Influx Control Act to limit "the migration of Africans to urban areas" it restricted land allocation for the building of African housing in the cities and; it created buffer zones between white and black residential areas; from the early 1970s up to the 1980s, it almost stopped building new housing stock for the low income groups. Whilst low cost housing stock was going down, the state continued to subsidise high cost housing in line with its policy of creating a black middle class. The building of high cost housing only creates distortions in the market, it raises the prices of building land, contracting prices and houses.

With more blacks migrating into the cities the demand for housing was ever increasing. Lack of housing gave rise to an increase in squatter camps. This trend still continues unabated, especially in the Eastern Cape which has been hit hard by the economic decline.

In the council houses, rents kept rising as more authority for the administration of the townships was delegated to the Community Councils (black local authorities). And with the advent of strong community organisations which emerged in the late 1970s and early 1980s, the Black communities were able to organise sustained rent boycotts over a long stretch of time, in some areas it covered two to three years. Consequently, many Community Councils collapsed as this was their main source of revenue.

In an attempt to curb the rent boycott, the state encouraged people to buy the township houses. But this was a two edged strategy: Firstly, with the demise of the influx control legislation the apartheid state had to institute new measures of social control in order to regulate urban African communities. Secondly, part of this urban "permanent yet controlled" urban settlement strategy was to allow African communities to own houses in the townships in order to promote a black petit-bourgeoisie. This meant a shift from the unpopular role of pass laws as the main vehicle of regulating urbanisation to a "hidden" form of regulation, that is, via the policies of home ownership.

A number of housing schemes including granting loans to state employees and the high stratum of private sector employees were subsequently introduced and, others such as the Urban Foundation projects were strengthened. This made it possible for many people to purchase houses under 99 year leasehold scheme, a programme which was introduced in the late 1970s. The imperative for involving the private sector whilst reducing the role of the state in the provision of housing for blacks had political, economic and an ideological rationale.

However, whilst some people were keen to buy, the reality was that many township houses lacked many of the basic facilities such as electricity, proper sewerage system and, in some areas water is still being drawn from the streets. Should the tenants purchase these houses in their current state the cost of installing these facilities will be borne by each individual. This has already been proved true with the ESKOM electrification scheme as a result

many families may not afford to install electricity without subsidy from the state. But in this case each tenant will enter into a contract, directly or indirectly, with ESKOM. Therefore the state is systematically shifting the responsibility for the provision of these facilities from its own terrain to the private sector. And it is throwing the poor people at the mercy of the private sector.

Meanwhile whites have always had free-hold title deeds. Because of their artificially high incomes even the white working class enjoys quite a high standard of living. And, in spite of their inflated wages the apartheid state's social policies still operate in their favour. Their electricity and water rates are heavily subsidised by taxes from the industrial and the commercial sector. Their supply of these facilities is delivered directly from the white city or town council to their homes. Meanwhile Blacks have to purchase these facilities through the Black Local Authorities which in turn have to purchase the supply from the white city or town council. By the time electricity and water is delivered to the township the rates have gone up. In other words, the cost of maintaining apartheid segregated communities is borne by the very victims of these policies. Therefore it should be expected that in a post-apartheid South Africa, it will not be enough for the state to just repeal the apartheid laws, deliberate and systematic positive measures will have to be adopted to redress the class, race and gender imbalances in society.

Housing is a basic necessity and a human right to which every family unit is entitled. Therefore in many countries it is often the responsibility of the state to ensure the provision of housing. Housing allocation is often administered by a local government guided by certain legal instruments. There are a number of broad issues which may not be directly relevant to housing and yet affect housing policy such as industry, roads, transport, schools, health facilities and so forth.

The main object of this paper is to provoke discussion on possible housing policy options for a post apartheid South Africa. The paper raises issues more than providing answers. Whatever we suggest in this paper is not a prescription for South Africa, but an attempt to raise some of the contentious issues that much of the housing debate has neglected. But before putting forward any concrete proposals we examine the reasons behind housing shortages in South Africa. The paper also examines the role of local government in the provision and administration of housing; the distinction between a "home" and "house" and, how different housing tenures affect different social groups differently.

Housing shortages in South Africa

The shortage of houses for Africans in white designated areas, at the end of 1986, was approximately 342 000 units (Race Relations Survey 1987/88 p.198). These figures included housing for an estimated 1 780 000 Africans who lived in single sex hostels or as tenants of other families. The total shortage of housing in the independent and non-independent bantustans is estimated at 161 344 and 125 - 150 000 respectively (ibid).

5

According to 1987 estimates, coloureds in South Africa had a housing shortage of between 90 000 - 100 000, Indians 44315 whilst whites had a surplus of up to 37 000 housing units (ibid). It is however, ironical that during 1987 there were 24 941 whites who needed accommodation of whom 74% were over 60 years of age (ibid). The Minister of Local Government, Housing and Works, Amie Venter described the surplus stock as luxury housing. That is, they were not affordable by or were inaccessible to old age and the unemployed people.

The Executive Director of the Urban Foundation, Michael Ridley, estimated that more than 2 million new houses needed to be built by the year 2000 in order to eliminate the back log and to meet the demand for new housing (ibid p.198 - 199). Some 150 000 units per year were needed just to keep pace with population growth and urbanisation. However, in 1986 only 25 000 houses had been built by the government and the private sector.

Economic perspectives, the land tenure and the racial question

During the early part of 1986, the government published a White paper on Urbanisation, giving notice that influx control would be abolished. Not long thereafter, the Abolition of Influx Control Act, No.68 of 1986 was passed by parliament. It repealed all the laws which traditionally constituted the body of the pass law system (Geoff Budlender, 18 April, 1989 p.6). Following this development, the government announced that it would follow a policy of "orderly urbanisation" also referred to as "positive" and "planned" urbanisation. The Minister of Constitutional Development and Planning stated that "urbanisation must be regulated in terms of ordinary and universal laws on housing, squatting, health, slums, township establishment and so forth". (House of Assembly Debates 9 June 1986 col.7662).

This immediately raised the question of allocation of urban land for African housing. It could arguably be said that the Influx Control Act was going to be replaced by restrictions on land allocation and the provision of housing as has been the case for over two decades. However as Budlender (1989 p.13) suggests the least for this government policy was the extent to which the state did allocate further land for housing in urban areas. He concludes that substantial amounts of additional land for housing has been allotted to Africans in the urban areas ever since the removal of influx control measures. However, there are no figures available as to the quantity of land released to Blacks so far. But many of these land areas are further away from the city centres, for example, Motherwell near Port Elizabeth and Khayelitsha near Cape Town.

In his speech [delivered at a meeting of the Cape Town Chamber of Commerce, 21 August 1986, pp.3-4], H.P. Fourie, The Deputy Director General of the Department of Constitutional Development and Planning stated that four solutions would be applied in dealing with what he referred to as the "main problem" of the acquisition of more land:
1. Unoccupied land within existing townships would be identified and made available for housing;
2. "buffer strips" would be looked at and, where appropriate, used for residential areas;
3. new land adjacent to existing towns would be identified;
4. and new towns away from existing towns would be identified;

It should, however be noted that decision to allocate land in terms of the above so-called solutions still rests with the government. For instance, in the case of Weiler's Farm, in the South of Johannesburg, the government vetoed the recommendation of both the body of planners appointed by the Minister of Constitutional Development and Planning, the Transvaal Provincial Administration and the community itself that the area be developed into a permanent residential area. The major reason, according to Budlender (1989), seemed to have been a high degree of sensitivity to the views of white voters in the area.

The significance of the scrapping of the influx control measures lies in the fact that the state can no longer completely ignore the problem of shortage of housing in the urban areas. If they did, it could result in more unplanned "squatter camps" which will alter the shape of the cities. Previously, many of the homeless people in the urban areas were treated as "illegal", therefore, as far as planners were concerned they did not exist.

It is clear from the evidence produced above that land is central to the question of housing in the urban areas. Furthermore, the expansion of the existing cities and the creation of new towns has to be linked to economic development programmes. Hence it becomes important at this stage to briefly examine what economic policies a post-apartheid government might pursue and how they might affect housing development strategies. It might be useful at this stage to turn to the possible economic perspectives of the African National Congress and how they might impact on housing. The ANC is committed to a "mixed economy".

The existing system is a "mixed economy" oriented toward capitalism and it could be argued that the ANC's strategy is to build a "mixed economy oriented toward socialism". But the existing mixed economy is not simply oriented toward capitalism. It is oriented toward the special South African form of capitalism which is based on apartheid, and the ANC's aim is to construct a mixed economy which overturns the economic basis and effects of apartheid". (Lauremce Harris, paper presented at the Lausanne Colloquium of the Institute for Social Development, 8 - 13 July 1989, p.2).

Independence is often accompanied by varied forms of socio-economic restructuring for better or for worse. The specific form structural adjustment takes at any given moment, in any country, is contingent upon a variety of factors - internal and external. However, faced with an institutionalised form of racism and sharp class contradictions combined with the fact that there are limited policy options for economic stabilisation, the choice is between a gradual and through restructuring, on the one hand, and the treatment of the symptoms of the economic ills, on the other. The latter option, of course, will be at the risk of losing control of the situation. As Obert Nyawata puts it, (article 1988 p.92, Zimbabwe's Prospects ed. Colin Stoneman) with respect to Zimbabwe, "what choice there is concerns the issue of containing the process, making it more orderly and less costly than would be the case if it has to occur involuntarily (i.e. through market forces)".

A prerequisite for the restructuring of the housing policy in a post-apartheid South Africa is a democratic redistribution of the land and a repeal of all existing

apartheid laws which limit the access of blacks to building land. The state will have to satisfy the demand for more land to the poor as this is at the centre of the liberation struggle. But, the extent to which it will be satisfied will depend a lot on how power is transferred to the democratic majority and on the land policies of a post-apartheid government.

However, the problem in South Africa is that the state and capital are attempting to restructure the economy rapidly on the eve of independence in such a way that capitalist ways of operating and the interests of the major capitalist enterprises would be safeguarded even if a future ANC led administration was committed to building a socialist oriented mixed economy. (Laurence Harris, EROSA paper, September 1988 p.1). The current economic restructuring will no doubt make it difficult for a post apartheid government to strike a balance between satisfaction of needs, especially of the deprived sections of the community and democratisation of the economy including land.

This will give rise to two problems: first, in order for the new state to legitimise itself beyond the post-independence euphoria, it will have to ensure, among other things, that everybody has decent housing (as the Freedom Charter states that "There shall be houses, and security and comfort"), to root out illiteracy and to provide adequate health facilities. Many newly independent countries have promised to satisfy these needs but there is always the problem of resource constraints. The state might have to begin by evolving strategies which will strive to close the huge economic gap between the black and white communities as well as ensuring equal access to both agricultural and building land.

In class and racially divided communities housing and education are used for screening people into different social classes. In many countries housing is associated with status. Education and housing, among others, can help create a climate of existence of social class inequalities. Hence housing policies may contribute to the polarisation of communities into distinct middle strata enclaves, and squalid dwellings for the low-income groups (euphemistically called inner-cities in Britain). But it is also possible to limit this phenomenon through the use of physical planning which should involve the affected communities.

However, the use of certain financial schemes such as building society loans, company loans to employees for house building coupled with the acute shortage of rented accommodation, if handled inappropriately, may not always be the answer for the housing problem. They can artificially elevate the status of a person by making him or her purchase a house which will be repossessed within a short space of time.

The schemes can be used against workers. Firstly, employers can take advantage of the poor financial position of the worker and the fact that he/she has mortgaged a house by continuing to pay low wages, knowing that workers would be reluctant to use the strike weapon for fear that they might lose a job and a house at the same time. Therefore the low income group can be caught in a poverty trap.

The second problem relates to the nature and content of affordability. These schemes can affect family relations because the higher the cost of living the more difficult it may

be to look after other people outside the immediate family members. Old age people and extended family members who are dependants of this group are often victims of these sudden forward leaps. Once the sons and daughters or cousins move to more expensive houses, they often can no longer afford to look after a bigger family, especially relatives. Such a development also increases the demand for housing as those people who are thrown into the street will have to be sheltered. It is therefore possible that adopting a policy option with a view to solving a problem could in fact lead to the deepening of the crisis rather than being in solution.

The failure of the state to provide good quality housing and its inability to constantly add new housing stock indexed to population increases can only help to exacerbate the housing problem. In class and racially divided societies those shortages severely affect the low income groups. The situation gets even worse when the private sector becomes the main provider of housing stock. In many developing countries house prices and rents are not controlled and high mortgage rates are a deterrent to new buyers and can result in homelessness even for those who had had the opportunity to purchase their own homes. It is common in Britain to find people who have purchased houses on mortgage letting them out as they cannot afford interest rates and they in turn would join the queue for rented accommodation. Lack of resources and insecurity makes it extremely difficult for the poor to either own or enter into tenancy arrangements. This could lead to an absurd situation where there can be surplus housing stock and yet have in existence a high rate of homelessness.

This is not to suggest that the private sector should not contribute substantially to the building of housing stock, on the contrary it should play a major role, but their role has to be regulated by the state. Once the provision of housing stock depends on unregulated private sector arrangements, it can give rise to uncertainties in the supply of housing and allocation strategies. These uncertainties often affect the poor most because the so-called market forces do not have much regard for inability to pay. Therefore better houses become available to those who can afford to pay and the rest of the community gets condemned to shanty areas. This is as true of the industrialised countries as it is of developing societies. But, in the case of South Africa, in addition to class divisions, there exist racial discrimination in the housing allocation policy where certain areas are reserved for whites only, even if affordable rented accommodation is available, which could be used by Blacks.

Housing does not merely refer to a neutral physical structure constructed merely to provide shelter to the homeless. As stated above, it can be used to determine a person's racial or social class position. The lay-out of the area, the architecture, the tenure all have a bearing on the socio-economic and cultural values of a given social formation. Hence the specific nature of housing policies for a post-apartheid South Africa will have to be determined with the full participation of the recipients of those policies.

Towards a democratic local government and alternative housing strategies

After the 1976 students uprisings, the regime dissolved the Bantu Advisory Boards and replaced them with the Community Councils; it devised ways of involving the private sector in the development of middle class housing

schemes, it destroyed many squatter camps without replacing them with better housing stock. These Community Councils had very limited powers, they were given responsibilities such as rent collection and housing allocation.

In 1982, Piet Koornhof reformed the Community Councils when he introduced the Black Local Authorities Act. The local authorities were given certain powers to make by-laws, responsible for maintenance of law and order, levy taxes from local business, responsible for refuse collection, rent collection etc. But as Mark Swilling puts it referring to the regional services councils and their relations with local authorities the system will, "In reality,...centralise power to higher levels of government and decentralise administration to constrained, limited and tightly controlled local governments". (paper by Mark Swilling, June 1988, Centre for Policy Studies Wits).

In terms of section 29 (1) (a) of the Local Authorities Act, 1982, "If the Minister is of the opinion that any object of this Act is frustrated by a local authority's failure to exercise or perform a power, function or duty assigned to it..." he may direct such local authority after he has given it an opportunity to submit representation to him, to take such resolution or to make such by-law or to take such action within such period as the Minister may consider necessary" (Star, Johannesburg, 23/11/1983). Koornhof argued that if black townships wanted self-government, they must also be self-financing and he then recommended the withdrawal of certain state subsidies from the townships.

In order to survive the Councils had to increase rents to levels beyond the reach of the ordinary people. This put them on a collision course with the communities. The civic associations which proliferated in the late 1970s and early 1980s became the main opposition force to the Community Councils on any matters affecting the people. In short the civic associations increasingly became an alternative power in the townships.

Since the early 1980s, different parts of the country have been involved in rent and consumer boycotts organised by the civic associations. Revenue from the bottle stores and rents were the main source of income for the councils. Many councillors were forced to resign and the local authorities collapsed in certain parts of the country. It was clear that the regime's strategy had backfired.

The regime had encouraged "free association" among blacks in so far as it legitimised the strategy of "own affairs" at a local level. To ensure the success of the strategy it combined both military and political forms of controlling revolutionary activities. The National Security Management System was overseeing these activities at grassroot level. At the economic level the state devised a number of control measures.

The creation of the community councils was a two pronged state strategy: Firstly, it formed part of the "own affairs" policy, seeking to given autonomy to urban Blacks. This was meant to remove pressure from the state for power sharing in a non-racial democratic unitary South Africa. Secondly, it was an attempt to direct pressure for equitable redistribution of resources away from the central organs of state power to local authorities. In order to legitimise the Councils the state had to devise means by which the community would be forced to deal with them directly instead of going through the white dominated

Administration Boards. Basically, the regime was trying to delegate authority without necessarily empowering the people. But the regime's strategy failed as the local authorities still remain discredited.

The devolution strategy also cannot be separated from the state's privatisation drive. Privatisation of local services such as housing, electricity, water, refuse collection and so forth might change the character of the local authority from that of delivering of services to management. This might remove the link between grassroot non-formal structures and the state organs at local level. People are being forced to deal directly with the private sector with the hope that this will shift the centre of conflict away from the state terrain. This is likely to have negative consequences for a post apartheid state unless it intervenes to reverse some of these policies.

If people demand better facilities they will be required to pay more for extra services, as the administration will be run according to the logic of the market forces. But the apartheid state is unlikely to succeed to sell all the existing housing stock because the poor cannot afford to buy. However, where it manages to make a breakthrough, the burden of collecting rents and service charges will be shifted from the council to the private sector. Albeit, the state is not likely to lease out the authority to make by-laws and to maintain law and order. Therefore the Councils are likely to continue being responsible for public policy-making areas such as policing the townships, maintenance of roads, traffic control etc. And they might even be able to levy taxes from local business and from the residents. Therefore the state has no way of completely avoiding to ensure the delivery of basic services to the people including housing.

It is important to note that people have been boycotting rents, resisting removals from squatter settlements, demanding better or decent homes. Above all, people have been campaigning for "open cities" or "one city, one municipality". In other areas such as Soweto people have been demanding a single tax base for the people of Soweto and Johannesburg. The implications of these demands are both political and economic.

Politically, a single municipality, before power is completely transferred to the democratic majority, might still mean that electoral procedures will be based on the existing racially segregated residential patterns. But economically, it could allow for sharing of resources, a common tax structure, non-racial housing allocation policies based on ability to pay, re-allocation of residential land, and doing away with buffer zones. It might entail restructuring the existing apartheid local government structure and replacing it with a more democratic structure based on the principle of non-racialism. This could help to release certain funds which have been misdeployed to develop the process of empowering the masses. The black community might be able to benefit from tax levied from industry and the commercial sector by the white municipalities.

But a "one city one municipality" should not be seen as an answer to all racial and class inequalities. In fact, racial inequalities can be replaced by class inequalities with housing acting as a mechanism to reproduce patterns of these inequalities. If redistribution of resources is determined by market mechanisms, then the poor may not be able to have access to decent housing and certain facilities that go with them. For equitable distribution to

take place it is essential to find a mechanism for a degree of state intervention in the economy. In this case the central government does not delegate the responsibility for the provision of housing, it should instead evolve different strategies which will tap community as well as the private sector initiatives. The actual delivery of housing should be guided by local authorities and local non-formal community structures.

On day one of independence, people might expect the new government to deliver housing policy in accordance with its election manifesto. It is unlikely that by this time the new government will be ready to produce well informed medium and long term housing policies. For this reason, we think it might help to declare what we call, a "settling-in period", within which ad-hoc arrangements could be made.

This proposition has two advantages:

1. The ad hoc housing arrangements over a specified period of time could help to inform policy makers about how to deal with the main problematic areas such as racial integration; development of new towns and all the necessary support infra-structure; alternative workable housing schemes suitable for South Africa whilst, at the same time providing space to evaluate the extent to which the economy could cope with housing demand.

2. The involvement of the community in the planning and design of houses is essential. The people are not only there to rubber stamp, they need to have their own technician advisers in order to avoid an unbalanced debate between professionals and the community. Therefore the "settling-in period" would provide time for the community structures to produce quickly activists who can be drawn into the planning process at different levels. This would help prevent architects being judgmental and instances where sometimes it is forgotten who the clients for housing are. Such attitudes can only perpetuate the housing problem.

In the case of new towns, central government might have to set up a special department to implement its policy. Alternatively, special organisations could be established such as "new town authorities" which will dissolve] once their task is accomplished.

Lastly, a local authority could set itself up as a "new town authority". A delegation of authority to local government should make it easy for the system to be responsive to local needs. With the delegation of authority a system of auditing would have to evolve to ensure that certain defined minimum standards are maintained and that the interests of the disadvantaged sections of the society are taken into account. This auditing structure becomes more necessary where the private sector and non-governmental bodies are involved in the provision of housing as might be the case in a post apartheid South Africa.

Schemes such as those run by the Urban Foundation (UF) could be transformed and democratised by re-articulating their policies in order to make them guided in their activities by the needs of the people rather than by profit motives. For instance, the UF can be transformed into a project run jointly by the state, private sector and the community. It could be possible to attach community activists to a transformed UF and other similar bodies for periods of six to twelve months on research training in local government issues.

It is important to note that any local housing policy has to be constructed within a framework of national budgetary plans which take many factors into account. First, housing policies have to take into account externalities such as roads, power supply, water, transport, leisure facilities, schools and creches, clinics and hospitals. Secondly, a sudden inflow of people to the urban centres could lead to the overstretching of the local budget. This coupled with the need to either upgrade existing squatter camps or develop new towns might require proper planning which will involve the affected communities at every level. Therefore housing policies in the urban and peri-urban centres should be linked to planning in the rural areas. The point we are making here is that, all housing initiatives including the private sector, have to fall in place with state housing plans in order to avoid uneven development, without it over-determining individual or group initiatives. But it should be noted that long delays between planning and implementation can be costly and could lead to poor results.

It might be useful to draw lessons from other countries. In Britain, Denmark and Holland to cite only a few, in addition to state initiatives, the construction and management of housing is undertaken by independent bodies such as co-ops and housing associations. These bodies are non-profit organisations and are subsidised by the state. Their membership can include tenants, local professionals and a limited number of politicians. They are single task organisations, most of their time is dedicated to housing issues. These organisations are accountable to the community through their committee system. We should however, warn that these bodies are run on a professional basis by skilled personnel and such skills may not be readily available in South Africa, especially among Blacks.

Generally, local authorities supervise the work of these bodies and control the subsidies made to the housing associations and co-ops. Above all, their rent levels and other policies are largely influenced by local government. In the United Kingdom, special co-ops have been set up for people to build their own houses. The Government provides materials and specialist work whilst the co-operaters provide labour. Eventually, the co-op owns the houses and rents them out to its members.

However, housing remains a site of ideological, political and economic struggles. Therefore the goodwill of these associations cannot be taken for granted. The success or failure of these schemes will depend on what the people, the state and the private sector make of them.

Nevertheless, these bodies are not the answer to the acute shortage of housing in these countries nor will they be in South Africa. They can only contribute to the alleviation of the housing problem by way of tapping local initiative, but should not be seen as an alternative or a substitute for state housing. Rather they should be regarded as complementing the mainstream housing programmes. If housing is a human right and a basic necessity, the state has to take the responsibility to ensure that even the poor sections of the society are provided with decent accommodation which can qualify as a home.

Obstacles to the elimination of housing shortages

Many housing policy analysis have identified the shortage of land in black designated areas as the main

constraint in eliminating housing shortages for Africans, Coloureds and Indians. This shortage of land result from government policy prior to 1986 which limited African settlement in the cities by freezing or restricting the provision of housing (Social and Economic Update No.1 published in 1987).

In the post - 1986 period, the regime has used different housing strategies many of which were designed to shift the responsibility of housing provision from the government to private developers and the local authorities. The responsibility of searching for suitable building land was shifted from the government to the latter groups. So far indications are that private developers and the local councils do not have the capacity to satisfy the black housing demand without state subsidy. Even the limited stock which the private sector is able to create is only available on sale. Worse still, the private sector, increasingly seeks to provide houses at market prices which means that their strategy is only targeted at the emerging black petit bourgeoisie leaving out the low income groups. The black local authorities too, are unable to provide adequate housing stock because of their limited sources of revenue.

Furthermore, the Black Local Authorities are often accused of corrupt practices in their allocation of land to developers. It is alleged that some local authorities insist on bribes of up to R1000 or more from developers before allocating land to them. In addition, some developers claim that local authorities require "unacceptable" minimum levels of service and infra-structure which result in the slow down of the building of new housing stock. It is the case that any added costs to the developer, whether bribe or infra-structural, will eventually be incurred by the buyer.

Another obstacle related to land allocation for housing is racial land zoning in terms of the Group Areas Act of 1966, and the Black Communities Development Act of 1986. The Group Areas Act, does not only reserve existing areas for whites, development of land cannot begin until the relevant authorities have allocated the area in question to a particular racial group. This policy has also meant that zoning which is based on apartheid laws has inhibited and has contributed to the Black housing shortage. As a result of these policies, Blacks are driven away from the center of town and from their work places to the periphery. The cost of transport to and from work is paid by the worker which raises his/her cost of living.

A further consequence of racial zoning has been the existence of "buffer zones" between African townships and other racial groups which were not used for housing. According to the Government official statements, some 100 000 African housing units can be built in these vacant land areas. So far, white authorities are still resisting to allow such land to be used to build African houses.

But, it should be expected that both the Group Areas Act and the 1913 Land Act will be repealed either by a new and democratic government or through the process of negotiation. Therefore in a post-apartheid South Africa, the new government can use this open space to build houses to meet the housing backlog and, to integrate the different racial groups as far as it can be achieved guided by the principle of non-racialism.

It has however, to be noted that should the current socio-economic relations remain unaltered, even if the land constraints were removed, inaccessibility would still be a major obstacle to solving the housing problem. According to the National Research Institute (NBRI) 84% of Africans, 50% Coloured people, 34% Indians and 9% whites, could not afford housing without subsidy. Private developers, on the other hand, are reluctant to build houses for the low income group who have no subsidy.

This is a clear indication that if the state should transfer the responsibility for the construction of new housing stock to the private sector, the situation will increasingly develop into commodification of housing which will further push house prices up. In the case of Britain where capital gains on housing were not taxed, it has been common practice for people to purchase houses and resell them a few years later at exorbitant prices. However, the system of owner occupation is not wrong per se, especially if people can afford it. But, if the state manages it inappropriately, it can lead to massive distortions in the housing market. For example, in Britain owner occupiers have been able to make massive profits from housing because of tax concessions as a consequence of which there has been a continuing increase in house and land prices.

This kind of policy means that existing owner-occupiers continue to benefit from the system whilst it becomes increasingly difficult for the state to provide low cost houses. The low income groups will find it very difficult to become owner-occupiers under such housing policies. This will obviously lead to frustration as this group begins to develop a perception that the state is not caring as it is not responding to need. Therefore any owner occupier housing policy may have to encourage people to purchase without creating the distortion.

Homes not houses

The Freedom Charter says there shall be housing and security. This statement implies that an ANC government will ensure that not only are people properly accommodated but that they have security of tenure. At the moment, the majority of blacks live in houses which fall below the standard of what can be described as decent homes. To redress the situation, the state will have to invest heavily in housing and in addition devise alternative housing strategies to complement its efforts without delegating the responsibility for the provision.

Many of the township houses lack certain basic facilities such as: electricity, water inside the house, proper sewerage system. The situation is worse in the squatter camps or settlement areas which are characterised by high population densities, poor sewerage/drainage system, poor lighting, health hazards. This situation is further exacerbated by the continuing influx of people from the rural to the metropolitan centres. People are hoping to find employment but they remain unemployed indefinitely which means even if houses are available they have no access to them.

If the state cannot come to the rescue of these people the only option they have is to build squatter camps. This, of course, gives an impression of a hopeless situation. As a result some people argue that the working class communities can only choose between living in shacks of whatever quality and overcrowded houses. But such a suggestion negates the whole notion of placing housing in the category of basic needs or human right. Housing as a basic human right has to satisfy certain internationally recognised standards. In an attempt to conceptualise the

difference between a shelter which has reached the required standards and something below that level, we draw a distinction between a "house" and a "home".

We define a house as simply any form of shelter which may or may not have some of the basic necessities such as water, electricity, sewerage system etc. It is an individual physical artifact. A house may cut one off from the immediate environment and members of his/her extended family. It could mean a shack, a hostel, unsanitated and unelectrified dwelling place and so forth. Such a shelter is always treated as a transit or something temporary precisely because it lacks certain facilities. But at the same time a house is a basic and an essential unit of a home.

A home can be defined as an expression of the political, economic and cultural values of society. It is concerned about its social, physical and economic environment as well as its contribution in the reproduction of the entire society. In other words a home performs two sets of functions: The primary functions which are internal to itself and necessary to shape its own social identity include physical protection, health care, reproductivity of the family and the comfort of the family, relations within the family, education of the children etc. Therefore a home takes into considerations spatial standards, the size of a family, the quality of the physical structure, durability, accessibility, drainage/sewerage system, proper streets, distance from work, transport, schools, clinics and hospitals.

The secondary functions of a home involve its contribution as a social unit to the cultural, economic, social and ideological development of the entire society. These functions and meanings can be framed in relation to the ideological objectives of a new South Africa - the Freedom Charter can provide us with such a horizon of meanings. The notion of democracy, class and gender equality, non-racialism, can inform the meaning of what can be described as a home in a post-apartheid South Africa. These functions go beyond just the physical structure which is an essential but an inadequate element and, the social identity of a home and, they locate the home within the framework of the broader society. Its ability to contribute to society at large depends on the extent to which the above requirements have been satisfied.

From the above definition, it can be deduced that a home is an abstract concept because it cannot be concretely touched. Its existence has to be empirically analysed by examining specific situations at any particular conjuncture. Society may be transformed such that what qualifies as a house at one historic moment may only constitute a home at a different conjuncture. As a concept it helps us to draw a distinction between a form of dwelling which is socially acceptable and a sub-standard shelter. It is the case that squatter areas should not be merely judged from a distance whether they need to be destroyed or upgraded, a concrete investigation has to be conducted and the expert views of the affected people be sought on what can be done.

The essence of a home is that the occupants feel that they are in control of their own lives. The occupant *does not have to own* a house to make it a home. But a share in the house can create a sense of belonging which places part of the responsibility to look after the property on the occupant. Cost-in-use can be largely reduced by the provider of housing ensuring that a house is durable and will protect the occupants against poverty related diseases. There could be a danger of the state providing poor quality housing stock because the cost of maintenance will be

shared with or will be shouldered by the tenant.

We are suggesting that when building houses the state should take quality seriously otherwise the cost of maintenance might soon be a heavy burden on both the tenant and the local government. A developing economy cannot afford to build houses and demolish them 20 or 30 years later as has been the case in Britain. Which could mean that if they are not good quality houses, people could live in derelict and health hazard accommodation, for instance, the red location in New Brighton, Port Elizabeth or the shacks at Soweto-on-Sea.

In South Africa, many black people expect liberation to bring with it decent and secure homes. Even those who live in the matchbox houses in the township expect that one day they will be given better homes. Two major questions however, remain problematic, will the state have enough resources to provide all the back log of housing stock? What would a post-apartheid government do with the township houses? The state may not be able to satisfy all the housing needs on day one of independence, it might however have to devise different workable strategies in an attempt to redress the housing problem.

Within the housing debate in South Africa there is an argument existing shacks should be upgraded on the spot, the so-called "in-situ" upgrading. It is argued that this could reduce the cost of installing the absent facilities in already existing squatters. The reason people should not be moved, it is argued, is that there already exists a support system and people have established a network of relations and friends. These are all valid arguments but treated simply as they seem to be presented can pose some problems.

First, this line of thinking is predicated on the assumption that people have accepted and that they are satisfied with the conditions under which they live. But what this assumption overlooks is the fact that most squatter camps are symbols of mass protest against influx control measures. People's refusal to move away from these squatter areas should not be mistaken for acceptance of the situation. But even if "in-situ" upgrading were to be carried out, it has to be based on certain basic minimum standards.

Secondly, when addressing the question of housing and land scarcity, people tend to be caught in the apartheid land zoning. Their strategies do not take on board the possibility of racial integration, blacks seem to be moved from one racially designated area to the other (we have already discussed this above.)

Although many scenarios can be constructed around the future of the townships, it is unlikely that they will be demolished. A more plausible scenario might be a transformation of these houses into homes through upgrading schemes. The upgrading schemes can be organised through individual and collective initiatives in a given locality and should be subsidised by the state and the private sector to enable the poor sections of the community to join in.

With respect to integration of the different racial groups and the use of available housing stock in "former white only" areas, it is unlikely that many whites will run away from South Africa at independence as they did in Mozambique and Zimbabwe. Therefore it should not be expected that there will be a lot of this stock on the housing market. Even if some of this stock did, the form of tenure

11

might decide accessibility to them and whether they are homes or houses. However, the question of occupying available housing in the "former whites only" areas is not just an economic issue, it is a political and cultural question as well, which might require political decisions by the relevant organs of state. Hence the process of integration might have to be monitored by structures and institutions representative of the different racial communities guided by the principle of non-racialism. As part of the process of integration, it might be necessary for the state to use both private and public funds to purchase houses in the "former white only" areas for conversion to accommodate low income people from all racial groups. This policy might be cost effective in that it creates the possibility for the state to purchase certain homes in white residential areas and knock some of them down to increase the population density within acceptable spatial standards. Given the fact that some of the plots are quite big, the state could buy a plot at the cost of one house and develop many low income houses.

Racial integration, social class and gender inequalities cannot be redressed unless the state takes deliberate measures to intervene in the economy on behalf of the poor. It has to adopt poverty focussed housing policies across the colour line. But it is inconceivable that these inequalities can be redressed without impacting on the high income bracket and the business sector. It might be useful to illustrate this point by way of example. If among the survivors of an air craft which has crashed in a jungle one of them had a loaf of bread, there are only two options he/she has, either to eat it alone and let others die of hunger or share it with others so as to sustain everybody until the rescuers arrive.   □

REFERENCES

Alan Mabin (16th April 1988), **Struggle for the city: Urbanisation and political strategies of the South African state**, paper for discussion at the spring workshop Southern Research program Yale University, New Haven/Wesleyan University, Middletown.

Budlender, G. 18 April 1989, Paper entitled **Urban Land Issues in the 1980s: The view from Weiler's Farm.**

Colin, D. Kemp, P. and Smith S.J. (1990), **Housing and Social Policy**, MacMillan: London.

Fourie H.P., Deputy Director General of the Department of Constitutional Development and Planning, speech delivered to the Cape Town Chamber of Commerce 21 August 1986.

Harris, L. Paper presented at the Lausanne Colloquim of the Institute for Social Development, University of the Western Cape, under the Auspices of the Institute de Hautes en Administration Publique, University de Lausanne, Switzerland, 8-13 July 1989 p.2.

Government White Paper on Urbanisation.

Social and Economic Update, No.1, 1987.

Sutcliffe, M. Todes, A. and Walker, N. (16-18 April 1989), Managing the Cities: **An Examination of State Urban Policies since 1986**, paper presented at the conference: Forced Removals and the Law in South Africa, Kramer Law School University of Cape Town.

Swilling, M. (Paper dated June 1988), City Politics Comes of Age: **Strategic Responses to Local Government Restructuring**, Centre for Policy Studies, Wits.

Race Relations Survey, 1987/88.

Roger Matlock (18th June 1988), Talk delivered at the Homelessness Focus organised by the Black Sash and PARC.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ANC	African National Congress
AZAPO	Azanian Peoples Organisation
BAAB	Bantu Administration Advisory Board
BAD	Bantu Affairs Department
BESG	Build Environment Support Group
BLA	Black Local Authority
CBM	Consultative Business Movement
CDS	Centre for Development Studies
COSATU	Congress of South African Trade Unions
CPA	Cape Provincial Administration
DAG	Development Action Group
DDA	Department of Development Aid
DOW	Department of Works
DSB	Development and Services Board
ESCOM/ESKOM	Electricity Supply Commission
IDT	Independent Development Trust
ISCOR	Iron and Steel Corporation
JMC	Joint Management Centre
KZ	Kwazulu
MDM	Mass Democratic Movement
NPA	Natal Provincial Administration
NSMS	National Security Management System
PAC	Pan Africanist Congress
PWV	Pretoria/Witwatersrand/Vereeniging
RDA	Rural Development Agency
RKDP	Repulic of South Africa/Kwazulu Development Project
RSC	Regional Sevices Council
SACP	South African Communist Party
SADT	South African Development Trust
SAHT	South African Housing Trust
SASPRO	South African Studies Project
SPD	Soweto Peoples Delegation
TA	Tribal Authority
TPA	Transvaal Provincial Administration
UDF	United Democratic Front
UF	Urban Foundation
ZIPAM	Zimbabwe Institute of Public Administration and Management

Note: Since the abbreviation is generally clear from the text, the acronym of individual civic associations have not been listed.

CENTRE FOR DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
CDS

The Centre for Development Studies (CDS) is a major new research initiative which will be closely linked to the Mass Democratic Movement. The main aim of the CDS is to research the existing social, political and economic conditions in the country with a specific view to planning for a future South Africa.

The struggle has reached a stage where we must move from a position of talking about a post apartheid South Africa to actively preparing ourselves for it. The CDS can play a coordinating role for such research, but will be different from other research bodies, because the research that will be done will empower the people. The process will be participatory and will express the goals of and be accountable to the Mass Democratic Movement. Further, the research will enable us to initiate campaigns and plans of action which will strengthen our struggle for a non racial democratic South Africa

Activities

CDS is promoting its objectives through:
- funding and commissioning research
- holding workshops and conferences
- producing publications
- providing a forum for discussion of progressive research
- making its finding accessible and understandable