

*development  
dialogues*



\* monograph 14



isandla  
institute



OPEN SOCIETY FOUNDATION FOR SOUTH AFRICA

**'THE WAR AGAINST POVERTY':  
CHANGING TACTICS OR BUSINESS AS USUAL?**

**\*monograph 14**

ISANDLA INSTITUTE / OPEN SOCIETY FOUNDATION

**About Development Dialogues**

*Development Dialogues* is a joint initiative of Isandla Institute and the Open Society Foundation for South Africa. The aim of the public dialogue series is to create a space for critical reflection and dialogue among key development stakeholders in South Africa. In doing so, the organisers seek to make a (rather modest) contribution to enhancing the quality of debate in the development sector. Through *Development Dialogues*, Isandla Institute and the Open Society Foundation intend to bring about creative and constructive multi-stakeholder meeting opportunities that push stakeholders to think beyond the confines of their immediate interests and theoretical paradigms.

This monograph captures the speakers' inputs and discussions at the *Development Dialogue* on 'The War against Poverty: Changing tactics or business as usual?', which took place on 17 April 2008 at the Centre for the Book in Cape Town.

Published in 2008



Isandla Institute  
PO Box 12263  
Mill Street, Gardens 8010  
South Africa  
Email: [admin@isandla.org.za](mailto:admin@isandla.org.za)  
Website: [www.isandla.org.za](http://www.isandla.org.za)



OPEN SOCIETY FOUNDATION FOR SOUTH AFRICA

Open Society Foundation for South Africa  
PO Box 23161  
Claremont 7735  
South Africa  
Email: [admin@ct.osf.org.za](mailto:admin@ct.osf.org.za)  
Website: [www.osf.org.za](http://www.osf.org.za)



In his 2008 State of the Nation Address, characterised by the phrase 'Business Unusual: All hands on deck to speed up change', President Thabo Mbeki emphasised the need to intensify efforts to reduce poverty. He said: 'At the centre of our economic programmes is, and should always be, the consideration whether their success is helping to improve the quality of life of all South Africans, acting as an important weapon in our War on Poverty and accelerating our advance towards the attainment of such objectives as the reduction of unemployment and advancing the goal of health for all.'

The War Against Poverty is, in fact number 8 of the government's 24 Apex priorities, which are seen as catalysts to accelerate development. Apex priorities preceding the 'War against Poverty' are: 1) developing an industrial policy action plan; 2) setting up an investment call centre; 3) speeding up ICT interventions; 4) implementing a campaign on energy security; 5) deal with organisational issues on skills development (SETAs, universities); 6) resource poor schools and monitor learning outcomes; and, 7) speed up land and agrarian reform.

Perhaps it is unfair or unnecessary to read anything into the ranking of these priorities, with the 'War against poverty' on eighth place.

The President specifically highlighted the importance of scaling up existing anti-poverty initiatives and integrating these into a coherent and comprehensive anti-poverty strategy that is well-targeted to those most directly affected, i.e. children, women, youth, people living in rural areas and in urban informal settlements, people with disabilities or chronic illnesses and the

## Perhaps it is unfair or unnecessary to read anything into the ranking of these priorities, with the 'War against poverty' on eighth place.

elderly. He added that most of the interventions are things that government is already doing though not sufficiently integrated.

Thus, as an immediate campaign in the 'War Against Poverty', Community Development Workers, social workers, community and home-based care workers, constituency offices, councillors and NGOs are expected to identify households and individuals in dire poverty and connect them with appropriate government support programmes (grants, food parcels, school feeding, micro-finance, etc).

To achieve the bigger objective of producing an integrated and comprehensive anti-poverty strategy and implementation plan, the President announced a 'National War Room for a War Against Poverty', bringing together departments such as Social Development, Provincial and Local Government, Trade and Industry, Agriculture and Land Affairs, Public Works and Health and provincial and local governments. This National War Room (War Cabinet?) is expected to work with and consult other stakeholders, such as non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and business.

Putting aside the usefulness of using military language for promoting human rights and people-centred development, given the mixed



success of anti-poverty interventions to date, does government have the capacity to scale up these interventions sufficiently and speedily to address the scourge of poverty? Does the proposed 'War Against Poverty' target all dimensions and manifestations of poverty, or are there particular blind spots that need to be brought to the fore? What about inequality, for example? And is government able to overcome the institutional challenges of an integrated, cross-sectoral and intergovernmental approach to poverty?

Today's dialogue will seek to unpack and explore these issues. Before introducing the speakers, let me conclude with a few final words from President Mbeki's State of the Nation Address, which may or may not be relevant to us here: '...we will all agree that our society, and the poor specifically, cannot wait for strategies and dialogues and workshops – important as these may be.' ■



Let me start by saying I do not know what the 'war on poverty is', but I suspect it is just another name for something that I know does exist, the 'comprehensive anti-poverty strategy'. I would like to discuss the evolution of this strategy over about the last two years, and then say what this reflects about the nature of this strategy and, by extension, the war on poverty.

About two years ago government announced that it was developing a comprehensive anti-poverty strategy. I was happy because quite a number of us had been urging for such a strategy for years, because while there was quite a lot going on by way of poverty reduction, there was an incoherent piecemeal approach.

The development of the comprehensive anti-poverty strategy started at the Department of Social Development and was identified as part of the government's Programme of Action. The Department of Social Development was responsible for it by way of convening an inter-departmental task team that would figure out how all the pieces fit together. Then not much was heard about it. The strategy was supposed to be completed and presented to Cabinet around July last year. Not much was heard, but then it showed up as the responsibility of an advisor to the deputy

**It is the first time in years**  
that there is a new energy  
evident in trying to figure out  
what to do about poverty in  
a comprehensive manner.

president. The word on the grapevine was that whatever the Department of Social Development came up with was 'too social' and did not have much of the hard economic stuff. So they handed it over to an economist who added the economic stuff to the detriment, some would say, of the social stuff. I cannot say I have seen any of these drafts, so this is all second and third hand.

A draft was put together and discussed in some circles towards the end of 2007. Then at the beginning of this year, the responsibility shifted again to somebody still within the President's Office but a different part of this office, namely the Policy Coordination and Advisory Services. The work still carries on. I do not know what the reason was for the shift in responsibility.

Let me start with the positives. Not having seen it, but having a vague idea through people I have spoken to, it sounds good. Not surprisingly, it addresses three things that had been foretold a few years earlier in a State of the Nation Address. President Mbeki identified three main areas contributing to the overall fight against poverty. One is boosting efforts to absorb more people into the formal labour market - as I understand it, that is very much part of this new comprehensive anti-poverty strategy. The second is maintaining the social safety net in its various forms, with the social security grants and so forth. The third is addressing the 'second economy', by trying to create or support income-earning opportunities in the informal economy.

It is possibly in respect of the second economy interventions that there is most reason for excitement, because there is actually quite a lot of work going on in that respect with innovative ways



## There is a large amount of ventriloquism to make up for the lack of articulate contributions from departments, with the President's Office doing it on their behalf.

of trying to support small, micro and medium enterprises, and so forth. And, as I perceive it, the nonsense has been dropped that was prevalent two years ago that we are going to 'eliminate the second economy', as if the informal sector is bad and that what we have to do is migrate all these people into the formal sector. Happily, that has fallen away.

To sum up, it is the first time in years that there is a new energy evident in trying to figure out what to do about poverty in a comprehensive manner.

So what is not so positive? First, I do not have concerns particularly with the fact that the responsibility for the development of the anti-poverty strategy went from one department to another. I presume there were good reasons for that. But one thing that is conspicuous is that the process has been an exclusively governmental affair, notwithstanding the lip service in the State of the Nation Address about this being a social issue around which all the stakeholders are going to come together and make a contribution. As I perceive it, it is just a very small group of government officials who are actually doing the work of designing the strategy. I am not aware of any major consultation.

Second, it involves a very small group. As I understand it, one of the problems that the Department of Social Development had was that as one particular government department, it did not have the prestige or the wherewithal to induce officials from other departments to really participate in a meaningful way. It turned out that the President's Office was a better place to make sure the people showed up at meetings. But there is not really much by way of interdepartmental work. In fact, I can say that 90% of the development of the anti-poverty strategy resides with one single individual, and this is not the only task for which she is responsible.

That is not the way in which one would expect to approach the development of a major new approach to poverty. It is not just something one bureaucrat does when he or she has time. You would expect something more serious, more august. Why did it end up with the Policy Coordination and Advisory Services in the President's Office? As far as I can make out, it is because of a perception that the capacity did not exist in other government departments to really get something like this together or even to contribute meaningfully to it. My impression is that there is a large amount of ventriloquism happening to make up for the lack of articulate contributions from Land Affairs and Agriculture and other departments, with the President's Office actually doing it on their behalf. This is not a collation of contributions from different government departments; it is actually a rewriting of strategies on their behalf, even though it builds on initiatives that already exist.

The downside of this, however, is that while analytical capacity does exist in the President's







Office, it has no power to induce government departments to do anything. Just because you say 'from now on, small-scale farmer development is going to do this and look like that', there is no guarantee that that is going to happen.

As for this 'war room' mentioned in the State of the Nation address, I know very little about it except that they are in the process of hiring somebody who will head it - presumably somebody with a loud voice and who can hang up the phone with panache. But what is the guarantee that this war room will have any real standing?

Let me take the example of agriculture, agrarian reform and land reform. I do not presume to be an expert on this, but I know a little bit more about it than I know about other things. I think it is common knowledge that land reform is not proceeding very well. Basically there are two elements to this. One is that the rate of delivery is unimpressive and the second issue is that once people access land through the land reform programme, they frequently do not benefit to any large degree. So on the one hand there are calls to accelerate the pace of delivery, while on the other hand there are people who question what we are doing to iron out all these other problems.

There are two main strategies about to be launched by the Department of Land Affairs. The first is the Land and Agrarian Reform Project (LARP), which consists of redistributing about five million hectares to 10 000 beneficiaries. It works out to 500 hectares per beneficiary, which to my knowledge is not about small-scale farming or food security. The other strategy is just a new way of acquiring land, so instead of one grant system it is another grant system. I have not seen the details

of either of these, but I am fairly certain that neither of these is going to contribute in any great measure to speeding up land reform or making sure that it has a more positive impact on people's lives. In fact, I think both of them are probably steps in the wrong direction.

**We have departments that really do not know how to perform their function and we have a centre that is very intelligent but that has no power to assist those departments to move in a better direction.**

Why is this happening? Why are we still fumbling around trying to figure out how to deal with what should not be so difficult? Let me mention a few reasons. One is the lack of leadership. Within the land sector, nobody in power has a clear vision of what we should be doing or has the means of organising the bureaucracy to produce according to that vision. There is a severe lack of analytical capacity in the departments like the Department of Land Affairs. I am not suggesting that this is typical of government departments, but I do not think it is atypical either. There is a lack of consultation. In recent years, the manner in which policy is developed within Land Affairs is secretive. Nobody really knows what is going on except once in a while somebody will oblige by giving a hint of a clue of an idea of what might be happening.

What I take away from this is that the Department of Land Affairs is doing its own thing,



notwithstanding the fact that President Mbeki gets on stage and says, 'We are going to reinvigorate land reform', and notwithstanding the fact that the forthcoming comprehensive anti-poverty strategy pledges that land reform is going to make a greater or more significant contribution to poverty reduction. It cannot, for the simple reason that analysts within the President's Office have no power to make Land Affairs do anything better than what they are doing now, or perhaps they choose not to exert such power. So we have this fundamental problem. We have departments that really do not know how to perform their function and we have a centre that is very intelligent but that has no power to assist those departments to move in a better direction.

**The State of the Nation**  
Address assumes that the building blocks are already in place and that it is just a question of scaling them up and integrating them better. This is a misdiagnosis of the problem.

I could be wrong. It may be that land reform is not a good example. But let us suppose it is typical for a moment and that what I said about it is vaguely true. If we look at the statements in the State of the Nation Address, one of them is that the building blocks are already in place and that it is just a question of scaling them up and integrating them better. But I think that is a misdiagnosis of

the problem. I do not think the building blocks are in place. They are certainly not in place as far as land reform goes. There is nothing there worth scaling up at present. In fact, it could very well be detrimental to the broader public if land reform is scaled up in its current form. Obviously there are political concerns about just calling a halt to it. But to scale it up without addressing its fundamental flaws is not wise.

As for integration, I am in favour of something like a comprehensive anti-poverty strategy. I think it should be comprehensive so that we can pinpoint areas where we should be more active and target groups of people who need assistance. But I do not particularly believe in integration. I do not think integrating bad programmes makes them better programmes. I think it just means that the good programmes get brought down by the bad ones that are linked to them. I do not think integration is some kind of magic word that is going to sort out our problems. There is a misdiagnosis of the problem. It is not about integration, but rather about the effectiveness of many of these programmes, which are not properly designed. The impetus to carry on with them in the face of knowledge that they are not performing well is either political or because they look good from a distance.

Because of the misdiagnosis of the problem, there is a misidentification of the solution. Part of the solution indicated in the State of the Nation Address is, firstly, integration and, secondly, better targeting of the specific households that need help - all six million of them. I cannot say much about this approach. My impression is that the Deputy President became acquainted with it on one of







her trips abroad and thought it was a good idea and now nobody wants to offend her and thus it has become part of government policy. I cannot see the logic of going out and identifying all six or eight million households and trying to see exactly what they need when we do not actually have the tools to benefit them (apart from linking them to social grants, which obviously we are doing anyway).

So coming back to the President's Office and the role of the Policy Coordination and Advisory Services, obviously it has a role to play. But one cannot expect it to coordinate large government departments that do not have the capacity to make policy in their own right. Something has to change. Either those departments have to be capacitated

## Because of the misdiagnosis of the problem, there is a misidentification of the solution.

so that they make more effective policy and programmes, or more power has to be accorded to the centre, which is not something we are generally in favour of. There is literally one person in the president's office working feverishly in this fashion on something as significant an effort as an anti-poverty strategy. But, to stay with the metaphor, the real problem is at the level of the generals in the departments. The generals really are not there or they are not up to scratch and have not earned their stripes. ■



**T**he Black Sash has been around for more than five decades and during its extraordinary period in our country's history it has witnessed the many faces of injustice, poverty and inequality. The meticulous records of the Black Sash provide data that emphasise and underline the multi-dimensional nature of poverty in South Africa. All of this is very carefully recorded on a database that is updated daily as part of its advice work. What I would like to do today is look at some of the insights we may glean from the statistics in this database. It may not be a statistically significant sample, but at least it demonstrates the effort of thousands of poor people seeking help from the seven regional offices of the Black Sash.

**The failure of corporations to act fairly towards citizens has an impact, because eventually the problems of the poor become the state's problem.**

Once we understand the multi-dimensional nature of poverty, we can look at gaps in comprehensive social security and better understand the nature of the battle in the war against poverty. However, is government's response to this challenge about changing tactics or business as usual?

I also want to underscore the impact that the persistence of apartheid spatial geography has had on the gains made by government, especially for the poor. Often, help is too far away. Many of us who have lived in cities all over the world know that the poor tend to cluster around the downtown area, close to the central business district, whilst in South Africa it remains almost exclusively the other way around.

It would also be valuable to look at poverty and inequality and how it is exacerbated by

exploitative commercial practices. It is not something we talk about. The failure of corporations to act fairly towards citizens has an impact, because eventually the problems of the poor become the state's problem. In other words, exploitative practices towards customers by some corporations often impoverish people, and eventually they become dependant on the State.

And then there is the impact of government's approach within the framework of what I would call a first-second economy perspective. This also impacts on participation. Is participation merely just an imbizo? Often we feel that government is saying, 'this is the plan, please rubberstamp it.' Can we even call this consultation? What then is really meant by participation?

For many of us, our hearts skipped a beat when we heard about the 'War Room on Poverty'. But what concerns us is that to date there have not been formal invitations by government to civil society organisations. Ultimately, the question is what is it that the state and we should do to heighten or accelerate the war against poverty?

Since 2003 the Black Sash has collected information from regional offices in Cape Town, Knysna, Grahamstown, Port Elizabeth, Pietermaritzburg, Durban and Johannesburg. The data is analysed every quarter. One of the trends we notice is the increasing backlogs, particularly in Grahamstown and in Pietermaritzburg, of unclaimed benefits linked to pensions, with people coming to find out when their policy is going to pay out. The shocking part of this is that these are not state pensions, but private pensions. The persistence and growing number of what we call 'open cases' has been around for more than a year, two years, three years, some even 10 years, when it comes to areas like the rural Eastern Cape.

We get referrals of people, many of whom are males who have paid twice for apartheid. These are the workers who have been forcibly removed

# development dialogues



from their families during the apartheid era to go and work in mines. They gave 40, 50 years of their lives, relocated back to their home – a place from where they were wrenched from their families – and then they cannot access that insurance policy for their retirement that is due to them, simply because of the conservative narrow-based application of the letter of the law regarding one's last known address. It is all about them currently not residing where they were before, and very little principled effort is made by companies managing retirement funds to locate beneficiaries. As a result, this backlog is increasing.

On this critical issue, there may be a lack of leadership and government has not necessarily done as much as it could. For the record, however, it should be noted that no previous government has ever done as much as the democratic government. Despite these accomplishments, the President acknowledged in the ten-year review that if we do not address the things that remain to be addressed, these will catch up with us, despite the gains made.

Let us take a step back and look at the economic profile of South Africa. It is classified as a middle-income country. If you list countries by GDP, South Africa falls in the same GDP bracket as Brazil. Brazil defines its unemployment rate, currently around 9.9% on a narrow-based definition, as a crisis. Now take the South African context, with unemployment by a narrow-based definition is 29% and by an expanded definition 39 or 40%. In some parts of the country the unemployed rate is 80%, where the state is basically keeping people alive. In towns in the Karoo, a loaf of bread for cash will cost you R8, but if you buy it on the book it will cost you R35.

By quoting these figures, I am trying to contextualise the challenges and multi-dimensional nature of poverty. It is within this context that the Black Sash tries to make a difference. In the work that we do, we have three strategies that cut across the programmes. Our strategies are rights

education, advocacy and giving advice through our regional advice offices. We have three programmes. The first one is comprehensive social protection, which involves campaigning to close the policy gaps and working for the realisation of rights. The second is consumer protection (where increasingly, we are seeing the interrelationship of unfair and immoral business practices and how these force people to turn to the state). The third and newest programme is called 'Making human rights real', which is concerned with establishing accountable local government for effective social protection, particularly in marginalised communities.

For example, in Philippi, we are working with pro bono lawyers defending 42 respondents in a Cape High Court case, where a farmer who owned various pieces of land moved people with a promise that they would get houses. We are of the view that the Extension of Security of Tenure Act applied, because they were there for more than 10 years and they had lived there all their lives. He moved them to another piece of his property. If you go down Lower Ottery Road you will see the R50 million Spar food storage facility where these families once lived. You will also see these people living across the road on what used to be a farm called Stukkende Plaas (Afrikaans for 'broken farm', which I think is an apt name). By the end of the weekend these people would have been intimidated into moving to another piece of property bought cheaply by this farmer. But let me tell you what this businessman did to 160 people, namely the 42 respondents with their children and family. During winter last year his manager took a grader and made a circle of a mound of earth around the houses so that when it rained, the water did not drain. Some of our clients lost babies, suffered from TB and had huge health problems. This person cut off their electricity to force them to move. He took the ID number of one of the tenants that had worked for him for 40 years and gave it to the



City of Cape Town and now this poor man owes the City R36 000 for services.

What I am saying through this example is that if large corporations are not held accountable, then the people in the room, or the people that should be in the room in the War Against Poverty, are facing an uphill battle.

You may have heard the term 'amount recovered' in vote 16 of the estimate of expenditure for the Department for Social Development. Government uses this term to refer to those prosecuted, held accountable for fraudulently acquired grants and the amounts recovered, which is money that goes back to the fiscus. The Black Sash, on the other hand, uses the term slightly differently, namely as money appropriated by the client which was his or her due and which was often received after dealing with a series of problems including bureaucratic wrangling, absence of a form and not knowing what to do. Ordinary people face a range of serious challenges in acquiring the grants that they are due for. Although our regional offices report that the South African Social Security Agency (SASSA), which is now the institutional agency delivering grants, has done remarkably well in terms of the rollout of grants.

Recent research shows that the ability of people to seek jobs is directly linked to the distance from the service point, and that transport costs are disproportionately higher for poor people. The cost of transport is increasing, so are interest rates and food prices, with the increase in the cost of the basket of common goods consumed by the poor being disproportionately higher compared to people in other income categories.

Let me come back to what the Black Sash views as a source of great concern in terms of this war room and the government's approach to graduating people out of poverty. I quote here from the Programme of Action (POA) 'The operationalisation of war against poverty', which notes June and December 2008 as deadlines. There certainly

has not been the space to participate. And I use that word in a very different way to "consultation" or "imbizos" or "road shows". There seems to be, in many of our leaders' heads, an entrenched mindset of economic growth above all else and this notion of a trickledown theory. The Apex Priorities mentioned in the POA are very infrastructure-oriented and we believe that the real interventions necessary for social security are currently insufficient and inadequate.

Recently, the Economic Policy Research Institute published the means test review. They recommended, amongst others, in some cases an almost doubling of the value of the grant (suggesting something like R1 900 instead of the R900-odd for the State Old Age Pension), the elimination of a means test for people over the age of 60 and the equalisation of state old age pensions for men who qualify to 60. There has been a very conservative approach by the National Treasury to roll this out on a year-by-year basis. From our initial estimates it should be entirely affordable because our nation is getting younger, not older – hence the population in the upper age-cohorts is not increasing. If you quantify the number of persons that need immediate relief, it would be far cheaper to give the State Old Age Pensions to men between the ages of 60 and 65, as opposed to child support grants jumping from 15 to 18. But we still believe that they are equally important and, especially with the budget surplus, that the extension of the child support grant can become a reality immediately. We believe that if we fail to make these interventions and invest in the quality of the lives of children, they will not be able to participate in the skills-driven economy.

In conclusion, the important thing to note in terms of the sub-theme of this debate, 'business unusual or changing tactics', is that government appears to be talking internally and to itself. To fight the war on poverty, we need real partnerships between the state and civil society and we need them now. ■



### AFTER THE INPUTS THE FLOOR WAS OPEN FOR QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS. ISSUES THAT WERE RAISED INCLUDED:

- This government has done more to address poverty than any previous government, even if its programmes can be improved upon.
- What percentage of the population receives social grants?
- It is important not to underestimate the effects of apartheid on people's mindsets, more especially the prevalent culture of waiting passively to be assisted by the state, rather than being entrepreneurial. How does one engage and counter such a culture?
- Should we not consider more effective measures to mitigate migration to urban areas and to promote effective rural development?
- We need to acknowledge the effect of HIV/AIDS on deepening poverty.
- Do African migrants qualify for any of the state-sponsored anti-poverty programmes and does that lead to tensions with the local population?

### IN RESPONSE THE SPEAKERS MADE SOME CONCLUDING COMMENTS:

#### Michael Aliber

I feel I owe an apology for making sweeping statements about government failing. I think there are enormous accomplishments. I suppose I feel disappointed because there is enormous potential that is not realised. And it is not realised for what I think are inexcusable reasons.

This notion of a culture of passivity is manifest in government thinking, for example in the concern that boosting social grants by either

extending eligibility or making them larger or both, will deepen the so-called culture of dependency. I think the jury is still out on whether grants induce dependency, but the question remains why South Africa has a relatively small number of people self-employed in the informal sector. My own perception from work I have done in different sectors is that government policy tends to aim too high. When we look at government efforts to capacitate farmers or SMMEs, it does not think in terms of the very small scale that is the reality of most people. It thinks in terms of how we create a ladder so that people already relatively far up can get higher, e.g. can become large-scale commercial farmers, or enter the formal sector and become suppliers to Mercedes. That is all fine and well, but it only goes so far when it comes to large-scale interventions that actually reduce poverty meaningfully.

On the issue of curbing migration, I do not think migration will stop. There is a good reason why we have to accept migration and it is that the cities have much more to offer economically. The reality is apartheid has destroyed the African peasantry and we cannot turn back that clock.

#### Elroy Paulus

It is difficult to quantify the percentage of poor people who benefit from grants because there is no agreement as to who is poor. By certain definitions of poverty, more than half of South African households live in poverty. Then there are various dimensions of poverty, asset poverty and time poverty, such as when a rural girl child has to spend 70 minutes a day collecting firewood. Also, defining indigence and poverty measures is very complicated as the current debate in government is showing. The Minister of Finance intended to release a poverty line index earlier this year, but



the process has been halted at NEDLAC, because community and labour felt that it cannot just be a line. It has to be a measure that takes into consideration a series of factors, unique to the South African context.

All over South Africa you have an increase in social tension about people from other parts, especially of Africa. Our constitution is unique in that it provides a gamut of socio-economic rights to people who are non South Africans and vulnerable and poor. About 30% of all cases of Black Sash in Braamfontein involves helping migrants, asylum seeker and refugees seek access to justice.

I share the frustration about people's sense of entitlement and dependency. I can still see the image of one of the ladies who was affected by the tornado that hit Manenberg and Gugulethu. She stood with her hands on her hip and said 'Where is Mbeki now?' This culture of dependency is something that is serious. Having said that and having acknowledged this problem of people empowering themselves and seeing people from other parts of the world start small businesses and succeed, this should not be the excuse for some elements in the state to demonise the poor. There has been an increasing and worrisome trend that we should only help the deserving poor.

Someone commented on human geography, poverty and crime. For me, one of the biggest crimes against humanity in South Africa is the persistence of structural poverty against the majority of its people.

On the issue of curbing urbanisation, there is the absence or the poor implementation of an integrated sustainable rural development programme. There have been some initiatives to help people in extreme poverty in some poor areas, but in my view very little has been done to stave off urbanisation. Many people, previously from rural areas, sit at the edge of the metropole, where the quality of life is sometimes worse from places where they came from because at least they could previously sustain themselves on the land. But to ask whether we should be discouraging people from moving from the North West and Limpopo to Gauteng is a very different question to asking whether the people from the Eastern Cape and the Free State should be discouraged to move to the Western Cape, because of the dynamics between the so-called Coloured communities and black African people. I am opposed to any measures that discourage the free movement of people. ■







## 'THE WAR AGAINST POVERTY': CHANGING TACTICS OR BUSINESS AS USUAL?

17 APRIL 2008

CENTRE FOR THE BOOK, CAPE TOWN

### ABOUT THE PANEL:

**Michael Aliber** is a senior researcher at the Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape, which he joined in January this year. Prior to that, Michael was with the HSRC for a number of years, and before that with the Department of Land Affairs. Michael's main areas of focus are land reform, small-scale agriculture and poverty reduction.

**Elroy Paulus** is an Advocacy Programme Manager for the Black Sash, an independent human rights organisation, committed to promoting and defending the socio-economic rights of all people who live in South Africa. He has been a community activist and public policy analyst in this arena of work for more than a decade.

**Mirjam van Donk** is the Director of Isandla Institute.



**'THE WAR AGAINST POVERTY':  
CHANGING TACTICS OR BUSINESS AS USUAL?**



[www.isandla.org.za](http://www.isandla.org.za)



**OPEN SOCIETY FOUNDATION FOR SOUTH AFRICA**

[www.osf.org.za](http://www.osf.org.za)