

Violence

Commission of Inquiry
into
Oukasie Violence

LAWYERS FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO THE CAUSES OF VIOLENCE
INTO OUKASIE TOWNSHIP, BRITS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	TERMS OF REFERENCE	PAGE 1
2.	MANNER OF INVESTIGATION	1
3.	INTRODUCTION: THE HISTORY OF THE AREA AND THE ANTI-REMOVAL STRUGGLE IN CONTEXT	2
4.	THE STATE, THE LAW AND THE OUKASIE REMOVAL	6
5.	A SUMMARY OF THE VIOLENCE THAT HAS OCCURRED IN OUKASIE SINCE 1986	10
6.	CIVIL AND POLITICAL FACTORS THAT HAVE CONTRIBUTED TOWARDS THE VIOLENCE	12
6.1.	RACE CLASS, THE STATE AND THE OUKASIE REMOVAL	12
6.2.	THE SOUTH AFRICAN POLICE	13
6.3.	THE COURTS	14
6.4.	THE STATE OF EMERGENCY AND THE SAP	14
7.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC FACTORS THAT HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE VIOLENCE	17
7.1.	TRANSVAAL PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION	17
7.2.	BRITS TOWN COUNCIL	18
7.3.	INDUSTRIALISTS	19
7.5.	HOUSING, HOUSING SUBSIDIES IN LETLHABILE	19
8.	UPGRADING OF OUKASIE	21
9.	CONCLUSION	23
10.	RECOMMENDATIONS	24

LAWYERS FOR HUMAN RIGHTS
COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO THE CAUSES OF VIOLENCE
INTO OUKASIE TOWNSHIP, BRITS

1. TERMS OF REFERENCE:

In June 1990, the United Democratic Front [UDF] appointed Brian Currin, National Director of Lawyers for Human Rights as Commissioner to investigate and report on the reasons for the violence in Oukasie Township, Brits, since February 1986. Brian Currin was empowered to appoint additional Commissioners to assist him. David Bam and Mpno Molefe, both practising Attorneys in Pretoria were duly appointed as co-commissioners.

As part of their report on the reasons for the violence in Oukasie, the Commissioners have taken the liberty of making recommendations to the United Democratic Front.

2. MANNER OF INVESTIGATION:

For the purpose of the investigation the Commissioners established contact with a broad cross section of the Brits Oukasie community during which time many witnesses were interviewed and statements minuted. In addition, the Commission studied numerous reports and articles written on Oukasie. In conducting its investigations it interviewed: Reverend Louis Khompela, the co-ordinator of the Brits Council of Churches; David Mpontshi Modimoeng, the Northern Transvaal Organiser of the National Union of Metal Workers of South Africa; Leonard David Brown, acknowledged leader of the 'Comrades'; Moshe Jan Mahlaela and other members of a group known as the 'Vark Squad' including Meshack Nong, George Martin, Moses Molokwane and Samuel Mabiletsa; Geoff Budlender, Director of the Legal Resources Centre Johannesburg; Members of Oukasie Civic Association; Johannes Cornelius Kraamwinkel, Attorney, Brits; Japie Steenkamp, Nationalist Party Representative in Brits Town Council; Father Juliano Guliano, Roman Catholic Priest; G S Motlala, Personnel Administration Officer for Firestone S.A. [Pty] Limited, as well as the Managing Director of Firestone and Head of Personnel. The Commission was refused interviews with Chairperson of the Brits Industrialists Organisation and the Conservative Party member of Parliament. The South African Police at Brits were not prepared to officially assist the Commission but an informal discussion was held with the Station Commander of the Brits Police Station. The Commission also interviewed the legal representatives who acted for persons who had been charged in the Brits Magistrate's Court as a result of the violence. A list of the Reports, Judgments, articles and Court Records studied by the Commissioners is set out in Addendum 'A' to the Report.

3. INTRODUCTION; THE HISTORY OF THE AREA AND THE ANTI-REMOVAL STRUGGLE IN CONTEXT:

The Brits black township 'Oukasie' which name derives from ou lokasie [old location] is situated next to the small town of Brits in the Transvaal, approximately 70 kilometers north/west of Pretoria. It is a small township about two kilometers long and 300 meters wide. It was established by Government Notice 775 of 11 May 1928 [read with Government Notice 999 of 15 June 1928] and Government Notice 664 of 17 May 1935. It is a typical product of the separate development policies which were eventually entrenched in Statute in the 1950's under National Party rule.

The residents of Oukasie were either originally allocated sites in the township and built their own houses, or occupied houses which had been built by the Local Authority and which were leased to them. Less than one tenth of the houses are built by the Local Authority. Residents do not have free hold rights but are granted permits issued by the Authority recording their ownership of the buildings on the site and entitling them to occupy and use them. In terms of Regulation 6 of Chapter 2 of the Regulations governing the control and supervision of an urban black residential area and related matters [Government Notice R1036 of 1968] the holder of such permit is entitled to live there with family and to sell or let the premises to another qualified person.

The identity of the responsible Authority for Oukasie has changed from time to time.

- During or about 1973 the responsible authority was the Administration Board for Central Transvaal established in terms of the Black Affairs Act 45 of 1971.
- With effect from 1 April 1984, the Administration Board for Central Transvaal became the Development Board for Central Transvaal in terms of the Black Communities Development Act 4 of 1984.
- With effect from 1 July 1986 the Development Board for Central Transvaal was abolished. Its assets, liabilities, rights, duties and obligations then vested in the Administrator of the Transvaal

The de facto position provided by the Regulations dealing with the rights of the site permit holders and as recognised in practice by the Authority closely approximated that of ownership. However, according to the Transvaal Provincial Administration, a policy was adopted as far back as 1953 that Oukasie should in due course cease to be a black township and that its residents should be moved elsewhere. This policy was pursued by various means on the part of the Authorities:

- a] In 1971 for example a number of Oukasie residents were removed to another area known as Mothutlung which would form part of Bophuthatswana and has since been incorporated into that "homeland" and therefore no longer falls within the Republic of South Africa.

b] During or about 1979 the Development Board for Central Transvaal ['The Board'] obtained a piece of ground on the farm Nooitgedacht. The intention of the Board was to establish a new black township with the specific intention of moving all the residents of Oukasie to this new Township. The envisaged township was situated on the border of Bophuthatswana and the intention was that in due course it would be excised from the Republic of South Africa and incorporated into Bophuthatswana. As at date of this Report it is still possible for the South African Government to in fact by decree incorporate Letlhabile into Bophuthatswana. This strategy was a typical product of the "Verwoerdian dream" to eventually create a white South Africa.

c] Due to the official intention that Oukasie would cease to exist, the Board made little attempt to provide the township with basic facilities and services. There are no tarred roads, no electricity and no street lighting. Water is obtainable from approximately 50 communal taps placed next to the streets in the Townships. Sewerage is removed through a system of bucket latrines and night soil removal.

The township does, however, have an infrastructure. A survey conducted in early 1988 found that there was a primary school which had an enrollment of 1984 pupils and a secondary school with an enrollment of 919. There are about ten churches, nine shops, a clinic and a creche. The churches and the shops were built by the community. The community has also built three parks and has endeavoured to keep the roads in a usable state. The community has also attempted to improve the storm water drainage by laying new pipes and clearing old ones. It must, however, be emphasised that the State's contribution to the infrastructure to Oukasie has been virtually nil.

For the first forty years or so, the township grew slowly. In 1970 the Brits Industrial Area was declared a decentralisation point and as a result, several sizeable factories were established. This led to the population of Oukasie expanding significantly. By December 1985 the residents estimated that the population of Oukasie was approximately 16,000. Subsequent developments outlined below have again reduced the population to about 6,300 [excluding the so called coloured section of the population].

Besides providing virtually no facilities or services to Oukasie, the State did very little to built houses. Most of the houses, built by the people themselves, are constructed out of corrugated iron and in some instances out of packing cases from the abandoned Alpha Romeo car plant.

Multi-national companies such as Firestone, Alpha Romeo, Bosch, Ciba-Geigy were attracted to the area by State incentives and the large pool of cheap labour. Prior to unionisation in the early 70's, many factories were paying on average R20 a week.

As a result of reforms to Labour Legislation and the significant growth in Trade Union movement during the 80's, wages were increased significantly. It has been alleged that these increases contributed to the closure or relocation of a number of factories. The most notable closure was that of Alpha Romeo in 1985, which at its high point employed 1,500 workers. Other companies such as "Steelbrite" allegedly relocated to Bophuthatswana in pursuit of a non-unionised work force and cheap labour. The closures and relocations have contributed to a high rate of unemployment which is estimated to be in excess of 50%. There are workers who have been unemployed for up to seven years and have lost any hope of obtaining formal employment. There are many persons who have never been employed despite the fact that they are now in their late twenties.

Removal of the township which was first muted in the 1950's and partially implemented in 1970, gained momentum in 1977 when Dr Jan Grobler, a Nationalist was elected member of Parliament for Brits. He regarded the removal of Oukasie as a central issue and was in regular contact with the responsible Minister. Prior to his election, the issue had gained momentum and had been referred to from time to time in the Brits Town Council minutes and in the Brits Post [a local newspaper]: 'The Brits location which has been a local eye-sore and abuts on one of our smart suburbs will shortly no longer blight our town'.

The farm, Nooitgedacht was renamed Letlhabile [meaning Sunrise] and was bought by the State for the express purpose of developing it into a resettlement town for Oukasie residents. In terms of the State's grand design of separate development, the plan was to incorporate Letlhabile into Bophuthatswana.

The demand to move Oukasie intensified during the 70's with the growth in the white population of Brits and the establishment of the new white middle-class suburb, Elandsrand, next door to Oukasie. The nearest white owned home situated in Elandsrand is approximately 150 meters from the Oukasie border. It is alleged by residents of both Brits and Oukasie that potential Elandsrand residents were told that Oukasie was to be demolished.

White Brits residents are mostly politically conservative, as is indicated by the performance of the Conservative Party in the election of 1989. The Conservative Party has taken over the old policies of the National Party. In a 77.62% poll, the Conservative Party obtained a substantial majority over the Nationalist Party. The Brits Town Council has made no secret of its desire to remove Oukasie. Every year, from 1975/76 onwards and up until 1982/83 the mayoral report stated:

"The Council has, during the year, continued its efforts to have the Brits black township, which constitutes a hindrance for the development of white suburbs, removed." [Mayor's Annual Report Brits, 1981-1982; translated].

According to the Brits Post dated 4 March 1983, the National Party M P Dr Grobler, was stated as being joyful at the fruit of years of hard work when he reacted to the announcement in June 1983 that funds were definitely going to be allocated for the building of Letlhabile.

The Minister responsible for township removals, Mr Chris Heunis, insisted that the removal was an altruistic act. He argued that the area had to be moved as it was unhygienic and too expensive to upgrade [Business Day, 18 October 1986].

On 5 December 1985, the local black community council resolved that the residents of Oukasie were to be informed that they would have to move to Letlhabile situated 24 kilometers north of Oukasie. On 7 December 1985 the residents were summoned to a meeting and informed of the decision. It is worth noting that only 390 residents participated in the "election" in 1983. Generally black South Africans have boycotted local elections and regard those who participate as "sell-outs".

On 8 December 1985, the day after the Community Council announced the removal plans, a meeting was called. [It is unclear who initiated the meeting]. It was attended by approximately 800 residents. A committee was elected to represent residents in a fight against the removal. This apparently was the first time residents of Oukasie had elected an organisation to represent them on a community issue.

The Committee elected was called the Brits Action Committee [BAC]. It had 12 members. The late Marshall Buys, apparently an articulate and charismatic personality was elected Chairperson. He had, at the time of election, been unemployed for approximately four years. Previously he had worked at Firestone and had been active in the National Automobile and Allied Workers Union [NAAWU]. The BAC soon became the dominant organisation in the township. It was led by a caucus of four members who were very close friends.

The community objected to the removal for, inter alia, the following reasons:

- [a] They regarded Oukasie as their ancestral home as many residents were born there and many resident's parents were buried in Oukasie.
- [b] Letlhabile is 25 kilometres away from the Brits CBD. Oukasie is only 5 kilometres away. It was feared that -
 - transport costs would increase
 - more time would be spent on travelling
 - they would have to travel by vehicle while at Oukasie many residents walked to work.
- [c] Rent and service charges would be higher.
- [d] Residents suspected that Oukasie would be incorporated into Bophuthatswana.

[e] Generally, residents had no capital and accordingly would have to obtain a loan from a bank or building society for building or buying a home in Letlhabile. Many residents could not afford to service the loan.

The BAC had large scale support and managed to stage a high profile campaign against the removal. The strategy was to put as much pressure on the State as possible so as to persuade the Cabinet to rescind the decision to remove Oukasie. An intensive publicity campaign was launched and the press were kept informed of events in Oukasie and regularly invited to meetings and community events. In addition, the Diplomatic community was informed and strongly encouraged to intervene on two occasions; a demarche on the Oukasie removal [a very strong form of diplomatic protest] was delivered by the European Economic Community to the South African Foreign Office.

4. THE STATE, THE LAW AND THE OUKASIE REMOVAL:

During the period 1950 to approximately 1970, there was little or no attempt on the part of the State to obscure the primary reason for removal. This reason was to consolidate the Bantustans, remove all 'black spots' and ultimately to move the black population as far as possible from 'white' areas. For example, in the parliamentary debate concerning the introduction of the Group Areas Act, the then Minister of Lands in 1950 stated:

"If people were mixed up together and sit along side each other, if they live in houses alongside each other, the colour sense of the Europeans must necessarily become dulled, and if a white nation does not preserve its colour sense, nothing on earth can prevent our nation from bastardising To prevent these clashes and to prevent bastardisation in South Africa, apartheid is essential in every sphere, but particularly it is essential as regards the residential areas" [Hansard, May 1950, column 8791].

In every annual report from the Mayor of Brits, there is a section headed 'Bantus' or 'Swart Mense'. Under this section, starting in 1975/76 and ending in 1982/83 the Mayor writes:

"The Council has, during the year continued in its efforts to have the Brits black residential area, that is a stumbling block for the development of their white residential areas, removed."

Government strategy has been to try and entice residents to move. This is clearly depicted by the Minister when he stated 'it is Government policy to make the development in Lethabile as attractive as possible for the purpose of persuading the population of Oukasie to move as quickly as possible - by attractiveness of the alternative - to settle in Letlhabile [Hansard, 15 April 1988, column 5983].

During 1985 Government changed its mind about incorporation into Bophuthatswana. At the end of 1985 or the beginning of 1986, the Honourable Minister of Constitutional Development and Planning held a long meeting with President Mangope and

some of his Ministers to convince him of the necessity in light of the circumstances related to the re-settlement of the inhabitants of Oukasie, that Letlhabile should no longer become part of Bophuthatswana.

It appears that this was for strategic purposes as the State had realised that residents would be far less inclined to move to Letlhabile if the latter were destined to be part of Bophuthatswana. In addition, President Mangope quoted fundamental objections to land rights having to be granted to 'non-Tswanas in that area' [Hansard, 15 April 1988 column 5979].

The Board's policy from the end of 1985 was that in the furtherance of the goal of removing Oukasie, no vacant sites or vacant homes would be allocated to existing residents [or would-be residents] and vacant houses would be demolished as soon as they had been vacated. As a result of this policy, when holders of site permits left for Letlhabile, the sub-tenants who constituted a much larger number than holders of the site permits, were left with nowhere to live, they had no alternative but to move to Letlhabile.

On 22 January 1986, as an act of defiance, Moshe Jan Mahlaele, an Oukasie resident, applied to the Township Superintendent, M D de Beer, to have a vacant site allocated to him. The Application was summarily rejected, it being alleged that the Township Manager had, in so doing, told Mahlaele:

".....take this letter and give it back to your Attorney. Tell him to shove it up his backside and not to waste my time".

The Attorney responded with a Supreme Court Application compelling the Superintendent to allocate a vacant site or house to Mr Mahlaele. While the matter was still sub judice, the Board continued to demolish those houses which had been vacant at the time the Court proceedings were launched. On 23 April 1986, in a watershed judgement, the Transvaal Provincial Division of the Supreme Court of South Africa made an order setting aside the Superintendent's refusal to allocate a home to Mr Mahlaele and ordered the Superintendent to allocate a dwelling.

The State, in its persistent aim of achieving its single minded goal, continued through the Local Authority, to follow a policy of positive neglect. No new facilities were provided and the existing facilities were not improved in any way.

The Mahlaele judgement resulted in many residents requesting the Township superintendent to allocate them vacant sites and houses. The Superintendent was now legally obliged to consider and accede to their requests.

The State responded to the outcome of the case by disestablishing Oukasie on 17 October 1986. The Minister of Constitutional Development and Planning published a notice in the Government Gazette in which he stated that Oukasie had, in Terms of Section 37 [1] [of the Black Community Development Act] been disestablished. The residents, through the Brits Action Committee, consulted their legal representatives, who advised them that the purported disestablishment

was invalid. Despite the purported disestablishment, the remaining residents of Oukasie, which population had remained fairly stable since about mid 1986 at between 6000 and 7000, continued to pay rent in advance to the Transvaal Provincial Administration.

On 26 April 1988, the Transvaal Provincial Administration, acting in terms of Section 6 of the Prevention of Illegal Squatting Act 1951, by Notice 25 of Government Gazette 11272 of the same date, purported the establishment of an emergency camp in Oukasie. It furthermore published regulations, which, on the Transvaal Provincial Administrations own version was to ensure 'that the existing community is kept well organised.' It was contended by the residents that the purported declaration of Oukasie as an emergency camp was a further step taken by the State to achieve the eventual demise of Oukasie. The direct result of this step was to impose draconian controls, to prevent homeless people from obtaining accommodation in Oukasie and to provide a means for removing the residents of Oukasie to Letlhabile. Reference to some of these regulations illustrates the extent to which the obsession with removal resulted in Government loosing all sense of reasonableness and morality:

- a] Regulation 6 provided that no person other than a registered occupant or his family may stay overnight in Oukasie unless the said person has obtained a temporary permit from the Superintendent.
- b] Regulation 19[1] provides that no person other than the registered occupant or his family may even enter Oukasie without obtaining a permit from the Superintendent. This provision makes normal social intercourse with family and friends from outside Oukasie subject to the permission of a State official.
- c] Regulation 25, prohibits the collection of monies at Oukasie. This regulation inhibits religious, cultural and charitable activities in Oukasie.
- d] Regulation 11, provides that a permit holder shall not keep any redundant material, or scrap on his site and he shall keep it free from weeds at all times. Failure to observe this requirement is a criminal offense and can result in the withdrawal of the site or lodgers permit.
- e] Regulation 14 provides that no person shall keep a live animal at Oukasie without the approval of the Superintendent. Failure to comply with this regulation is a criminal offense and can result in the withdrawal of the site or lodgers permit.
- f] Regulation 24 increases rent and service charges for home owners by approximately 70%, and for lodgers by 85.5%. Failure to pay such charges is a criminal offense and can result in the site or lodgers permit being withdrawn.

- g] Regulation 17[2][b] provides that the Superintendent may withdraw a site or lodgers permit where the owner fails to comply with an order to effect alterations, which in the Superintendent's opinion are necessary for the maintenance of the building in order to make it fit for the purpose for which it is occupied.
- h] Regulation 17[1] provides that a site or lodger's permit shall expire when the Respondent decides to disestablish the 'emergency camp' in terms of Section 6[5] of the prevention of illegal squatting act.
- i] Regulation 17[4] provides that within 28 days after a registered occupant's permit has expired or been withdrawn, he, and all members of his family must leave Oukasie.
- j] Regulation 33 provides that failure to comply with certain provisions of the regulations constitutes a criminal offense.

In an information bulletin [when Oukasie was declared an emergency camp] issued by the Transvaal Provincial Administration and sent inter alia to employers in the Brits industrial sector, the sharp contrast between the services and charges at Oukasie and Letlhabile was apparent. According to the 'information bulletin' Letlhabile provided residents with well developed services; electricity for all buildings, running water, tarred roads, bus services to and from Brits, water-sewage, primary and secondary schools, a variety of shops and industries, a community hall, sports facilities, a well organised and thoroughly planned infrastructure with provision for expansion, and access to full property rights. By contrast, the rudimentary and neglected services in Oukasie consist of refuse removal, night soil removal on the bucket system, water from about 55 communal taps situated on the streets and the occasional upgrading of some gravel roads. There is no electricity of whatsoever nature.

The homeowner at Oukasie was now required to pay R37-50 for those services, while the Letlhabile homeowner was required to pay R3-40 per month plus 18 cents per kilo-litre of water and 10,67 cents per unit of electricity consumed. The residents submitted that the service charges at Oukasie had been increased in order to compel or at least pressurize them to leave Oukasie and move to Letlhabile.

On 2 August 1988 and at a mass meeting of the residents of Oukasie, it was decided not to pay the increased service charges stipulated in the regulations and to continue to tender service charges payable under the old Township regulations. The decision was taken on the grounds that:

1. It was believed by the residents that the declaration of Oukasie as an emergency camp and the regulations were unlawful and invalid.
2. That the service charges had been increased firstly in order to pressurize residents of Oukasie to leave and secondly to obtain funds to carry out the removal of the residents of Oukasie.

After various negotiations between lawyers representing the residents and the Transvaal Provincial Administration concerning the validity of the establishment of the emergency camp and the regulations including service charges, a deadlock was reached which resulted in a Court application launched by Joseph Makama and three others against the Administrator of the Transvaal for an order that the decision of the Administrator of the Transvaal to establish an emergency camp be reviewed and set aside and the regulations concerning the emergency camp be declared null and void and of no force and effect. The Court decided in favour of the applicants setting aside the emergency camp declaration and the regulations. The Administrator has appealed to the Appellate Division.

5. A SUMMARY OF THE VIOLENCE THAT HAS OCCURRED IN OUKASIE SINCE 1986:

The creation of Letlhabile and the announcement by the Community Counsellors of Oukasie that the Township would disappear was not sufficient to move the majority of the residents 'voluntarily'. The realisation that the goal of the total removal would not be achieved appears to have introduced a new strategy during or about February 1986. This new strategy took the form of petrol bombings, intense police surveillance on members of the Brits Action Committee, a grenade attack and a murderous bomb attack on the leaders of the Anti-Removal Struggle.

On 7 March 1986 the homes of the Brits Action Committee Chairperson, Marshall Buys and the Young Christian Workers President, Jacob Mohatshe, were petrol bombed. Nobody was hurt, but two rooms in Buys' house were damaged. Ironically Buys was later arrested and charged with arson, although the charges were subsequently withdrawn.

A public meeting to discuss the petrol bombing incident was held at the Roman Catholic Church. This meeting was interrupted by the South African Police who threw tear gas into the hall and into the home of the local priest. Many persons who tried desperately to escape from the packed hall were badly cut by glass. On 11 March 1986, the house of the Action Committee Secretary, Sello Ramakobye, who was also Chairperson of the Firestone Shop Stewards Council, was petrol bombed. Immediately afterwards, the home of the parents of the leading activist, Leonard Brown, was hand grenaded. Brown was detained on 15 April 1986, charged with attempted murder and intimidation and subsequently acquitted.

On 17 May 1986 a lethal home-made bomb was thrown into the home of Metal and Allied Workers Union organiser, David Modimoeng. His wife, Joyce was killed as the house was ripped apart. Modimoeng was not a member of the Brits Action Committee although he worked closely with the Committee in fighting the removal. Joyce's death was the first of the Oukasie struggle.

Members of the community allege that vigilante groups have at various times caused chaos in the township. They further allege that the vigilantes work hand in hand with the South African Police in an attempt to create a climate of fear and demoralisation in the township so that the people would move

'voluntarily'. During this period the Transvaal Provincial Administration Board offices in Letlhabile were burnt down and a Bophuthatswana Transport Services bus was burnt out. During 1987/88 many members of the community were detained in terms of the State of Emergency.

During or about February 1987 and at a time when many members of the Brits Action Committee were in detention under the provisions of the State's powers granted to it by the State of Emergency, rumours were spread that members of the committee had squandered money that had been donated by foreign embassies. The result of the rumours led to a decline in the support of the leadership of the BAC and towards the end of 1987 they became involved in a desperate struggle to maintain power. This struggle was lost as most of its leaders were unable to defend themselves as they were in detention or in hiding.

A new committee was elected in August 1988 known as the New Brits Action Committee. This committee, like its predecessor, was also dominated by unemployed workers. At around about this time, members of the old committee were released from detention. The township which had had a reputation for cohesive and united action was no more. A shop owned by an Oukasie resident was attacked. The persons concerned discharged the contents of a number of buckets used for sewerage disposal, in the shop. Numerous incidents of violence occurred, the reasons for which are dealt with below.

The violence erupted mainly between two groups, the "Comrades" and the "Vark Squad" [Pig Squad]. The Comrades in the Oukasie context are the group of residents who supported and followed Leonard Brown. The "Pig Squad" are those residents who did not accept Leonard Brown's leadership and who were associated with the Old Brits Action Committee. The origins of the name "Pig Squad" are not exactly clear but it was suggested by a member that the name was given to the group by the South African Police and those who actively supported the removal of the residents. It was alleged that they were pigs as they were prepared to live in the pig-sty conditions of Oukasie. The violence consisted mainly of intimidation and assault. During the period 10 November 1988 to 12 October 1989, there were a number of incidents involving alleged attacks by the "Pig Squad" on members of the "Comrades". Charges were laid and prosecutions followed in the Brits Magistrates Court. Details of these trials are dealt with below.

It is alleged that the confrontations between the two factions occurred almost on a weekly basis. In turn there were attacks by the "Comrades" on the "Pigs" which took the form of for example attempted murder, murder, assault and robbery with aggravated circumstances.

Marshall Buys who was a well known resident of Oukasie carried the support of both groups. He was regarded as a leader in the community. On the 21 May 1989, Marshall Buys, leader of the "Comrades" was stabbed to death and on the 14 June 1990, Abel Molokwane who was a member of the "Pig Squad" was shot and killed.

It is significant to note that since this Commission commenced investigations during June 1990, the violence has ceased.

6. CIVIL AND POLITICAL FACTORS THAT HAVE CONTRIBUTED TOWARDS THE VIOLENCE:

6.1. CLASS, RACE, THE STATE AND THE OUKASIE REMOVAL:

In terms of the Native Land Act of 1913 and the Land Act of 1936, South Africa was geographically divided on racial lines. Africans were not permitted to own land outside the 14% of South Africa which constitutes reserves or Bantustans. There were other Acts passed which in principle were aimed at putting into practice the Land Acts of 1913 and the Land Act of 1936. Amongst those draconian laws were the Group Areas Act, the Influx Control Act and the Prevention of Illegal Squatting Act. One of the policies of the ruling party [the National Party] is known as the policy of separate development. When the National Party was voted into power in 1948 it promised the electorate that it will create "own" areas for the various population groups. It is in keeping with this apartheid policy that Oukasie was to be relocated to Letlhabile.

The plan to remove Oukasie was mooted in the 1950's.

The official reasons for the removal were that:

1. Due to a supposed land shortage, expansion of the old location was impossible, and
2. That the old Brits location was a slum and it was not possible to upgrade the area.

As indicated Oukasie adjoins expensive farmlands and there is little doubt that if the Government were willing it could buy the land required. Furthermore there is no doubt that Oukasie can be improved at minimal costs compared with the resources presently spent on developing Letlhabile. It is clear that a central factor motivating the Government's desire to move Oukasie was the proximity of Oukasie to the white group area, especially the new white suburb of Elandsrand. There is no doubt that many white residents of Brits have placed pressure on the local MP and would be delighted to see Oukasie moved away. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that the Brits old location was established some time in or about 1925 and the white area which is just a stones throw away from Oukasie was recently established in the early 1970's. Furthermore it is also interesting to note that the plan to remove Oukasie was first mooted in the 50's, just two years after the National Party came into power on its ticket of separate development.

In his article published in "Transformation", Volume 8, [1989] Morris quotes from an interview with a white resident in the suburb of Elandsrand:

"I don't want them to live next to me. I am quite frank about it. I don't want them to live right next to me because we differ too much as well as our culture and religion etc. is concerned. Some of them even belong to the same religion. They call themselves Christians. I call myself a Christian but I think I am only being fair in saying let's keep them apart, let's keep ourselves apart to the extent that we can live in peace."

In the same article he quotes a shop steward residing in Oukasie and a member of the PAC as having said the following:

"The reasons I can come up with why the government would like to move Oukasie is that firstly, since the 1976 uprisings, whites, you know, are very reluctant, sitting next to black people and in the Oukasie context whites are actually neighbours of black people and I think we should understand it in that context, this new white suburb which is next to Oukasie started in the 70's and Oukasie has been there, you know, for more than 50 years, I would say, so they feel uncomfortable, you know, with blacks next to them and the other reason is that a lot of white people are now getting too much conservative and you know what that means. If possible they would like to have, you know, all the blacks staying alone in their own republics somewhere else even if it can be in the sea probably."

6.2. THE SOUTH AFRICAN POLICE:

The Brits Old Location does not have a police station of its own and the nearest police station is situated at City Centre in Brits. There has been a lot of interaction between the activists in Oukasie and the South African Police stationed there. There has been continued interaction between the lawyers representing the community and the South African Police in Brits.

Since the outbreak of violence in Oukasie both factions [Comrades & Pigs] have accused the South African Police of not maintaining law and order and of bias in favouring the rival group. There have also been allegations from both sides that whenever they lay charges they do not get properly assisted or their complaints are not investigated and when the other side lays charges against them they are promptly arrested and charged.

There have also been allegations by a number of residents that whenever they went to lay a charge they would be told by the South African Police that they should rather leave Oukasie and go to Letlhabile where the crime rate is very low.

The residents allege that it was a strategy on the part of the South African Police to demoralise the community and eventually force them to leave and go to Letlhabile. It is interesting to note that all the members of the South African Police who lived in Oukasie have since

moved to Letlhabile and there is not one member of the South African Police left in Oukasie. This Commission did have the opportunity of having an informal meeting with the Station Commander at Brits. At the outset of the meeting he advised us that he did not have authority to have any discussions with us and as such whatever comments were made should not be put on record.

6.3. THE COURTS:

Most of the incidence of violence were reported to the South African Police. People on both sides of the opposing camps were charged. The "Pig Squad" was in most cases represented by an Advocate and the "Comrades" were in most cases represented by attorneys. The legal representatives were requested to prepare memorandums in respect of the matters that they handled on behalf of their clients at the Brits Magistrate's Court. It is apparent from their reports that both legal representatives had a high success rate in cases where they represented clients.

The legal representative of "the pigs" normally adopted the approach that the accused were members of a rebel group. They were opposed to the "Comrades" for political reasons, and because of this they [the Comrades] fabricated false charges against the accused. From the results of all the cases brought before the Court, it is apparent that the Court was unable to address the conflict satisfactorily, the end result being a breakdown in the administration of justice.

In some instances, the complainants did not appear in Court. In most matters the accused was acquitted at the end of the State's case. This was largely due to the fact that complainants usually made contradictory statements and the Courts seem to have concluded that they were being used by both groups as a tool in their power struggle.

As a result of these factors very few members of the two opposing groups were convicted of crimes of violence. It is our considered view that this failure by the State to secure convictions created a feeling in the community that people from both sides were free to commit acts of violence for which they would never be convicted. Some of the residents who were interviewed believe that the failure to secure convictions made residents feel helpless, insecure and afraid. They therefore moved to Letlhabile where the crime rate seemed to be much lower.

6.4. THE STATE OF EMERGENCY AND THE SOUTH AFRICAN POLICE:

On June 1986 the South African Government declared a state of emergency in various parts of the country. The declaration of the state of emergency coincided with the detention without trial of key political activists in various townships. Regulation 3 of the said state of emergency made provision for the arrest of an individual by a police officer for a period of 14 days and thereafter the Minister of Law and Order could extend

the detention of that particular individual for an indefinite period. As a result many people spent periods of 2 - 3 years in detention without being charged.

Oukasie was not an exception to this repression and arbitrary detention of activists by the South African Security Police. The declaration of the state of emergency in June 1986 saw the detention of most of the Brits Action Committee. A few managed to escape into hiding. A number of leading activists closely linked to the Action Committee were also detained. As a result of the detentions there was a leadership vacuum in the township. It is submitted that the South African Security Police used the provisions of the state of emergency to weaken the resistance movement in Oukasie.

In interviews with various activists who were occupying leadership positions at that time it became apparent that quite a number of them were approached by the South African Security Police who attempted to recruit them into the security establishment. In an interview with Moshe Jan Mahlaela, the following emerged:

"Since 1987 I have not applied anywhere else for employment. I did not do so because the Security Branch told me that I would not find a job. They said I must see them if I want a job. Warrant Officer Hunter told me that if I want work I must speak to Captain Java who will buy me a house in Letlhabile and there I can work as a policeman and make a future for my children. I was told this when I was detained in terms of the state of emergency during 1986. At that time I was held at Assen Police Station.".

Apparently this attempt to recruit leading activists in the community continued for some time. In the same interview Mahlaela said:

"It happened again in 1988 when I was held in the Pretoria Central Prison. I was detained in terms of the state of emergency. Warrant Officer Hunter told me to leave the Brits Action Committee and to work with them by getting to Letlhabile and becoming a policeman. He was with Captain Java. I refused and he said if I refuse I will get killed. He said I will be killed by my own people whom I think I am representing."

Moshe Jan Mahlaela was an executive member and treasurer of the first Brits Action Committee.

It is not clear as to how successful the Security Police were in their endeavours to recruit various activists in the community. Not surprisingly nobody admitted to being successfully recruited.

Various witnesses who were interviewed at Oukasie stated that immediately after the detention of their leadership, some agent provocateurs began spreading rumours that the Brits Action Committee was corrupt and that some of their leaders are in actual fact agents of the South African Security Police. It is evident that these rumours caused a lot of tension amongst various

individuals who were occupying leadership positions at that time. This was the beginning of animosity between certain individuals who occupied leadership positions in Oukasie. This led to the birth of the two factions, namely the "Comrades" and the "Pig Squad".

It was reported that the Security Police openly associated themselves with certain individual leaders thus appearing to confirm the rumours of bias. It was alleged that members of the South African Police approached a resident in an attempt to recruit him to their ranks. He was specifically requested to attack the homes of members of the Brits Action Committee. He refused their request. However, the Commission established that he was subsequently convicted of Public Violence for stoning the properties of certain members of the Brits Action Committee.

In another affidavit a resident of Oukasie alleged that he was hired by a certain member of the community to attack houses of Brits Action Committee members and the said person assured him that they had the support of the South African Security Police. At one stage they were allegedly promised arms and manpower by the South African Security Police.

In an interview with David Modimoeng, he stated that a certain Captain Java told him that if he continued to support the resistance to the move, he would suffer the consequences. During or about this time his house was bombed resulting in the death of his wife.

There is consensus between the opposing sides in Oukasie that the Security Police had much to do with the violence in Oukasie. Both sides accuse one another of having Security Police agents in their ranks.

The use of informers was an effective strategy of the Security Police generally. Brits was no exception. The strategy sowed the seeds of suspicion everywhere and intensified demoralisation. The Commission supports the view of Morris, in an article published in the South African Sociological Review Vol.2 No.2, April 1990 at page 62 states that "the problem of informers and agent provocateurs in the urban context has to be examined against the backdrop of poverty and unemployment. There is little doubt that it is easier to place agents in the townships than it is to place them in the work place. In the urban context, it is common that some of the key leaders are unemployed and desperately short of money. At times the State will ensure this by destroying whatever informal activity the unemployed worker may be engaged in. These individuals become prime targets of the Security Forces to infiltrate leadership of township organizations."

We also heard allegations of police supporting vigilantes. In the publication Transformation 8 [1989] "The South African State and the Oukasie Removal" p.24 at 36 Alan Morris stated

"The contemporary methods of persuasion can be very rough and crude. More than thirty members of the community have been detained since the start of the state of emergency, some more than once. Furthermore vigilante groupings have at various times caused chaos in the township. Residents allege that the vigilantes were working hand in hand with the police in an attempt to create a climate of fear and demoralisation in the township so that people would move "voluntarily". An important aspect of the vigilantes' strategy is that it leaves the State untainted. Brutal methods can be used as long as they cannot be pinned on the State. The latter cannot afford to be openly involved as this would severely undermine its claim to be reformist. The smashing of the Magopa community in February 1984, the ransacking of Cross Roads in 1986, and the removal of Langa in 1987 confirm that the State makes use of methods normally associated with a reactionary despotic regime when it feels it is loosing control of the situation.

The Commission supports this view as well.

The Security Police have in the past admitted that at their headquarters in Pretoria [Compol] there is a division of the Security Police which deals specifically with so-called Black Resistance Organisations. In the State v Toka and others [Third Delmas Trial] a senior officer of the South African Police admitted that the particular section is called "Black Power Section". This unit is specifically charged with the task of infiltrating Black Resistance Organisations and forming new ones where it is necessary. The Oukasie Community is definitely not an exception to this practice.

7. SOCIO ECONOMIC FACTORS THAT HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE VIOLENCE:

7.1. TRANSVAAL PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION:

This Authority is a component of the State. As mentioned above, the one consistent component regarding State policy in regard to Oukasie has been its determination not to lose control of the relocation process and its resultant determination not to reverse its initial decision to remove Oukasie. The TPA, as an important arm of the State, has consistently assisted the State in this policy. According to an information bulletin issued by the TPA during or about October 1986 the TPA made the following statement:

"A Government decision was taken to deproclaim the black living area [Oukasie] outside Brits. This decision was implemented on 17 October 1986.

Although the responsibility for deproclamation does not lie with the TPA, the TPA is responsible for ensuring that the existing community is kept well organised. The only way to achieve this situation was to declare this area an emergency camp.

By doing this, the inhabitants are ensured of the basic community services, such as water supply and refuse removal. It must, however, be made clear that no additional residents will be allowed in the abovementioned area

The TPA, by letter dated 27 June 1988, placed on record that in Oukasie 349 permanent structures had been valued by two independent valuators and the total value of the structures amounted to R1,697,804-00 which meant an average of R4,864-77 per house. A further 250 temporary structures were assessed at R500,000-00 or R2,000-00 per structure. During May 1988, the Brits Action Committee's lawyers addressed a letter to Regional Representative Community Services TPA enquiring as to what steps the Administration intended to take in regard to restoring the roads which had deteriorated. For a considerable period no steps had been taken to keep them in proper repair. The lawyers further requested the Administration to consent to the Brits Action Committee having the roads repaired at their own expense by a professional firm.

After numerous letters had been exchanged between the parties in which inter alia the nature of the private involvement in the repair of roads was specifically dealt with, the TPA refused the request to arrange assistance from the private sector for the repair of roads and persisted with its stance that the "Brits Emergency Camp" [Oukasie] would be maintained by the Administration. The factual position, however, is that the TPA has done virtually nothing to maintain the general state of the township.

7.2. BRITS TOWN COUNCIL:

White Brits residents are generally conservative. As stated in this report they won the 1989 Parliamentary election by a large majority. The Brits Town Council is no exception and is run by Conservatives. It has made no attempt to disguise its racism or its desire to achieve the removal of Oukasie.

Despite the fact that Oukasie has always been a dormitory suburb to Brits, originally with the main purpose of supplying domestic labour to the residents of Brits and to the surrounding farmers, there does not appear to have been any consultation whatsoever between the Conservative white Brits Town Council and the residents of Oukasie over the removal issue. For all practical purposes the white run Brits Town Council has repeatedly ignored the residents of Oukasie and their civic structures.

During 1986/87 a socio economic sample survey of Oukasie was conducted. According to the survey a total of 46% of the men were out of work and 68% of the women. Those who struggled most to find employment were the men and women under 34 years of age. The report found that the rate of actual unemployment was far higher than average, which had disturbing implications for removal of the community. In Letlhabile the difficulty of job seeking

would be significantly higher due to the greater distance between Letlhabile and the employment opportunities in Brits, Pretoria and Johannesburg.

7.3. INDUSTRIALISTS:

The employer federations, the Federated Chamber of Industries [FCI] and the Steel and Engineering Industries Federation of South Africa [SEIFSA] made representations to the State to reverse its decision on the removal of Oukasie. They apparently also promised to assist in upgrading Oukasie, if given the opportunity by the State. Local capital and management did not, however, wish to become involved. According to the publication Transformation 8 [1989] "The South African State and the Oukasie Removal" p.24 at 40 the differing positions are explicable as - "firstly there is little doubt that the allegations by Union organisers and shop stewards that some local managements and industrialists have actively collaborated with the State on the removal, are correct. The removal of Oukasie is seen as a way of undermining the strong union presence in the Brits industrial area. Although workers are drawn from numerous areas, Oukasie is seen as the centre of the worker movement"..... This allegation is given further credence by the fact that many companies had, according to the then Minister of Constitutional Affairs, Mr Heunis, indicated their willingness to help provide housing for employees in Letlhabile. The employer federations were far removed from the Brits area and had nothing to loose if the removals were stopped while local capital and management was forced to face the wroth of the local authority and the conservative white component of their labour force.

The Commission unsuccessfully endeavoured to obtain an interview with the Chairman of the Brits Industrialists Association. A spokesperson for the Association said:

"The issue investigated by the Oukasie Commission of Enquiry falls outside the scope of the Brits Industrialists Association and that neither the Chairman nor the Association is authorised to make any statement in this regard."

7.4. HOUSING, HOUSING SUBSIDIES IN LETLHABILE:

According to the minutes of the "Brits swart woongebied/Lethabile vestigings vergadering" held at Brits on 18 November 1986, the following was recorded:

- Every married man living lawfully in the Brits black township will be able to buy a site at Letlhabile.
- The houses already built can be bought, at a price of R8,000 : See proclamation 2624 of 29 December 1978.
- People will be given two years to build their houses to plans which must be approved.

- Where the lodgers are not able to build their own home, they can move with the family with whom they are living.
- The bus tariff to the industrial area will be the same as it is at present from Oukasie, namely R4-50 per week.
- The compensation for houses will be calculated on the basis of a 1982 valuation plus 40% for inflation plus 10% "inconvenience allowance".
- There are currently 1,250 sites. Another 600 are being measured out and supplied with services. There remains a shortfall of 500 units to accommodate the present inhabitants of Oukasie. Once some of the people have been moved, the position of the excess will be investigated.
- There are currently 174 houses, 43 of them occupied including 18 by officials.
- Temporary fletchcraft huts will be available for a maximum of 12 months on each site. An additional tent will also be available on a loan basis.
- Once a site has been vacated at Oukasie, the Brits Town Council will knock flat structures which are still standing there.
- The Community Council will continue to exist in its present form until the Brits township [Oukasie] has been vacated or until the amended legislation for an election in Letlhabile has gone through.

On the agenda for the Community Council meeting on 25 February 1986 was the following

"As a result of the fact that all the Council members are living at Letlhabile and therefore no longer function as a community council for the black town-ship [Oukasie], it is recommended that the Council should cease to function, but this will first be discussed with all the Council members before a final decision is made."

According to Morris [Transformation], the Oukasie removal showed that black townships generally are not homogeneous entities with a uniform consciousness. There exists in their structures different classes with different levels of affluence. These different classes ensure different responses there being no exception to the responses to State removal plans. The responses of different households will be shaped by what they see as their material interests. Other variables also shape to household decision whether to move or stay. These include -

- The age of the householder;
- The possibility of obtaining compensation for demolished homes;
- Whether the household could afford to build a decent home in Letlhabile.

In general, relocation was certainly advantageous to the middle class residents. This group consisted mainly of traders, teachers, nurses, policemen and administration staff in Government offices. The movement to Letlhabile was also facilitated by the granting of subsidized home loans by some firms to their workers. Many companies 'had indicated their willingness to help provide housing for employees there [Letlhabile]' [The Citizen 17.10.86]

The compensation payout was also enticing. On average R5,000-00 was paid in compensation by the State for brick homes. This resulted in certain unemployed workers also deciding to move. Tenants were often forced to move when the standholder decided to leave for Letlhabile. This was due to the regulation that in order to obtain compensation, all the structures on the plot had to be demolished.

Most members of the middle class had left Oukasie by June 1986 and moved to Letlhabile.

Despite encouragement to industrialists to assist workers with housing projects and subsidies, the reaction from industrialists in general has been negative.

8. UPGRADING OF OUKASIE:

The State has purported to adopt an altruistic approach to the removal issue. It has never, prior to the press statement issued on 25 January 1991, insofar as can be established, produced a feasibility study on the upgrading and expansion of Oukasie itself. It has always adopted the line that the township is situated in an unsuitable area, the soil is clay and unstable and to improve the services it would be necessary to conduct blasting of certain rock formations which blasting is impossible because of the close proximity of the township to the white residential areas.

On the other hand, the residents of Oukasie maintain that the township can be upgraded. In substantiation hereof and at the request of the Brits Action Committee and the Brits branches of the Metal and Allied Workers Union and the National Automobile and Allied Workers Union, a feasibility report was commissioned to investigate the upgrading of the Brits old location. A professional team was appointed, consisting of:

M Axelrod	MSc [Civil Eng] MSAICE
P Axelrod	MSc [Civil Eng] MSAICE Pr.Eng.
G Faller	MSc [Civil Eng] MSAICE Pr.Eng.
N Legge	BSc Phd Engineering
A Morris	M.Soc.Sc [Sociology]
G Mendelowitz	BSc [Civil Eng] MSAICE
L Mostert	B.Econ. MURP.TRP[SA] MIV [SA]
L Platzsky	BA B.Soc.Sc MURP

The report produced by the team gave a social profile of the township and investigated the provision of services. It concluded that upgrading the township is advantageous and feasible with modest expenditure. The major findings of the report were as follows:

A. SOCIOLOGICAL REPORT:

The analysis by the Sociologist indicated that the remaining residents were adamant that they were not going to move. The main reasons for not moving were:

- [i] The close proximity to the Brits town centre and industrial area.
- [ii] They regarded Oukasie as their home. About 90% of the residents were born in the township, according to the surveys conducted.
- [iii] A survey indicated that a large proportion of the community could not afford to move and that moving as such would not in fact improve their standard of living.
- [iv] The general consensus in the community was that the State should rather build on the old than destroy it.

B. TECHNICAL REPORT:

[i] GEOLOGY:

The technical report confirmed that there was a highly expansive clay layer which apparently varied in degree from 0,5 meters to 1,5 meters. Underneath the clay layer was, however, stable clayey sand. The report concluded that the soil conditions did not preclude the providing of water-borne sewerage or adequate housing, contrary to what the authorities alleged.

[ii] PORTABLE WATER SUPPLY:

By building a new water main the number of taps in the township could be increased from 50 to 100. Included in the upgrading would be provision for the installation of several fire hydrants and the supply of water to communal toilets. The estimated cost at that stage was R260,000-00. To supply water to each homestead would include further upgrading at an estimated cost of R420,000-00.

[iii] STORMWATER SYSTEM:

It was found that by upgrading the existing major storm water system through the township, potential serious flooding problems would be avoided. The estimated cost was R100,000-00. It was further estimated that by constructing a secondary drainage system, linked into curbed roads, all storm water could be drained into the major system. The estimated cost was an additional R100,000-00.

[iv] SEWERAGE:

The bucket system could initially be partially replaced by the building of ten communal toilet blocks incorporating a facility with the disposal of night soil. Sewerage could be transported to

treatment works by a conventional water borne system. The estimated cost was R600,000-00. Eventually a water borne sewerage reticulation network could be made accessible to all plots. The estimated cost was a further R600,000-00.

[v] ROADS:

The upgrading and lowering of the primary and secondary road systems, where necessary, would cost an estimated sum of R100,000-00. To tar the two primary access routes through the township would cost a further R700,000-00.

Taking into account the combined total cost of initial development and final development on the above figures and on the basis of a cost per resident [10,000 residents], the total cost of R3,026,000-00 would pro rata at R303-00 per resident.

It is submitted therefore that the upgrading of Oukasie is feasible.

9. CONCLUSION:

- There are numerous factors which contributed towards inter-community violence in Oukasie. Undoubtedly the starting point was the policy decision taken by the National Party Government in 1953 to remove all residents from Oukasie and to physically destroy the township. This decision gave rise to certain facts and subsequently events which impacted negatively on the Oukasie community and which had detrimental socio-economic and political consequences.
- Specific socio-political and economic factors which had a destabilizing affect on the Oukasie community are:

- [a] Lack of free-hold rights;
- [b] Refusal by the authorities to provide any satisfactory infrastructure;
- [c] Inadequate services;
- [d] The obvious political motivation behind the forced removal;
- [e] The establishment of a middle-class white suburb literally meters away from their own life experience of political oppression and dire poverty;
- [f] The disestablishment of Oukasie on 17 October 1986;
- [g] The declaration in April 1988 of Oukasie as an emergency camp in terms of Section 6 of the Prevention of Illegal Squatting Act of 1951;
- [h] The 1985 State of Emergency and detention of community leaders.

- Informal repression was a major cause of inter-community violence. In our opinion, the most significant factors are:
 - [a] Subtle forms of blackmail by T.P.A., Local Authorities, S.A.P. and some of the local business enterprises, to force people into leaving Oukasie;
 - [b] Hit Squad and/or vigilante activities allegedly initiated by the Security Forces and aimed at local community organizations, trade unions and individual leaders;
 - [c] A subtle campaign, allegedly by the Security Forces, to drive a wedge between political organizations and community leaders. Tactics used, include the spreading of rumours regarding corruption, the alleged co-option of some local political leaders and sowing seeds of suspicion and distrust by creating the impression that numerous community leaders are police spies;
 - [d] A total breakdown in the administration of justice, caused by police neglect or refusal to properly investigate inter-community acts of violence and the ineffectiveness of the Courts. By regarding the violence as politically motivated and refusing to be drawn into the conflict, the Court in effect decriminalized the violence and at least unwittingly contributed towards a state of anarchy in Oukasie.
- The local government structure is clearly not representative of the people of Oukasie and does not enjoy either their support or trust. This local authority is totally out of touch with the wishes and aspiration of the people and is therefore a destabilizing factor.

Finally, the fact that not a single counsellor is resident in Oukasie makes a mockery of local politics.

10. RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Commission has noted that the State has announced by Press Release dated 25 January 1991, a copy of which is annexed hereunto marked "B" that Oukasie has been declared a permanent residential area and will be upgraded.

The Commissioners recommend that -

- [a] The Transvaal Provincial Administration be called upon to liaise with and consult the residents in regard to the upgrading of Oukasie, and that a joint problem solving approach be adopted.
- [b] That a working group be established consisting of the residents of Oukasie and the residents of Brits over mutual issues relating to Local Government and employment.
- [c] That a working group be established between the residents and the Industrialists of Brits in regard to employment and obtaining financial assistance in respect of the upgrading of Oukasie.

- [d] That sound interpersonal intergroup relationships be established between the South African Police and the residents to facilitate co-operation between the South African Police and the residents so as to improve the upholding of law and order.
- [e] That residents criminal complaints/charges laid with the South African Police be investigated thoroughly by them as swiftly as possible enabling the law to take its proper course.

BRIAN CURRIN
DAVID BAM
MPHO MOLEFE.

ADDENDUM "A"

Transformation 8(1989) Critical Perspectives on
Southern Africa - Alan Morris
"The South African State and
The Oukasie Removal" p 24.

South African Sociological Review Vol 2 No 2 April 1990 -
Alan Morris "The Complexities of sustained Urban Struggle :
The Case of Oukasie. p 49.

Medical Survey of Community Health in Oukasie.

Socio-Economic Sample Survey of Oukasie.

Upgrading The Brits Old Location - A feasibility Report.

South African Labour Bulletin Vol 11 No 3 Sept/Oct 1986.

Mahlaela v De Beer NO 1986 4 SA 782 T.

Joseph Makama & Others v Administrator of the Transvaal
Case No 19317/88 TPD

A 28 '91 12:07 TPA "SPEST" PTA.

012 21 20248 11:49 P.2/3

Embargo: Vir onmiddellike gebruik op 25 Januarie 1991

MEDIAVERKLARING DEUR MRS. CANIE HOUGH, ADMINISTRATIEWE VAN TRANSVAAL, OOR DIE OPGRAДЕING EN UITBREIDING VAN OUkasIE NABY ERITS

Die Kabinet het gedurende Desember 1990 besluit dat Ouksie as woongebied behou sal word.

Voortspruitend hieruit het die Kabinet vroeër die week besluit dat Ouksie opgegradeer moet word.

Die opgradering en uitbreiding sal beteken dat die huidige inwoners nou permanent daar kan woon. Tans woon sowat 7 000 mense op Ouksie.

Die finale besluit oor Ouksie is geneem nadat die Transvaalse Provinsiale Administrasie se voorstelle en uitvoeringsplanne oor die opgradering en uitbreiding van Ouksie, wat verlede jaar aan die Kabinet voorgelê is, vandag week deur die Kabinet goedgekeur is.

Rangsig die opgraderingsproses baie duur gaan voes, word groepe en instansies wat die behoud van Ouksie voorgestaan het, om finansiële hulp gevra sodat die opgradering en uitbreiding verder bespoedig kan word.

'n Onlangse dreigement deur die Civic organisasie van Ouksie het nie 'n invloed op die Kabinet se besluit gehad nie omdat die beginsalbesluit verlede jaar reeds geneem is.

Einde

Uitgereik deur die Direktoraat Skakeldienste
Transvaalse Provinsiale Administrasie
Pretoria
25 Januarie 1991