QUESTION 1 [25]

1.1 Discuss the role of cheap labour, technology and equipment in the history of gold mining in Johannesburg. (10)

Initially low key approach to mining
Lack of appropriate infrastructure, equipment and support services
Everything from the most mundane to sophisticated needed to be imported
   Many mining resources had to be imported from other countries. These resources were transported by ship and then ox-wagon. Both of which are very slow means of transport. It could take a very long time for resources and tools to get to Joburg. The first wave of major investors came from Kimberley, with established mining companies.
   Mines could not control costs of imports or the standard trading price of gold, but could control labour.
   2 categories of labour needed
      ∘ Skilled and experienced
      ∘ Hard, manual labour
   African labourers were exploited through low wages and social control to restrict labourers freedom of movement and associations
   African labourers lived on closed compounds on mine premises
As both of these changed over time, mining improved rapidly with long standing and significant impacts/growth of the mining industry of South Africa. Also should include in the discussion how they both did change over tme.

1.2 Detail the various State responses to African urbanization including details on both the Slums Bill (1988) and the Prevention of Illegal Squatting Act (1988). (15)

Slums bill (1988)
Prevention of illegal squatting act (1988)
These are responses to try and reduce the informal settlement population in urban areas.
These aspects need to be discussed in detail, in line with the prescribed reading for this chapter. Please see the following excerpt.

Within the townships, the passing of the Black Communities Development Amendment Act in 1986 made possible full home ownership and introduced procedures through which the supply of land for African housing could be increased, thus making possible the development of an African housing market. The government made clear its intention to withdraw from the direct supply of housing (which for urban Africans it had hitherto dominated) preferring to concentrate on the supply of land and bulk infrastructure. Henceforth the private sector could apply to build in development areas (land zoned for Africans in terms of the Black Communities Development Act of 1984).

The government's continuing determination to control urban growth was demonstrated by two measures in 1988. The Slums Bill attempted to give local authorities greater power to control slums and act against property owners responsible for slum conditions, limiting the number of people on the premises and setting health standards for the buildings. The Bill also gave the government power to act if a local authority failed to do so. It was strongly criticized given the overall housing shortage and the inevitability of such conditions for most of those living in them. After reference to a parliamentary standing committee, it was tabled as a white 'own affairs' Bill in 1989.

The Prevention of Illegal Squatting Amendment Act included a series of punitive measures which were attacked in similar terms. It appears that the measures are intended largely as a deterrent, which the government hopes it will not need to employ, but the Act also confers powers on farmers and local authorities who may decide to use them. More positively, the Act includes several measures allowing the provision of more land for squatting, particularly the establishment of 'informal towns', in which regulations usually governing the establishment of towns will not apply. It appears that this is intended to be a major policy instrument of 'orderly urbanization', and several such towns had already been established at the end of 1989.

QUESTION 2 [10]

2.1 Provide a detailed comparison between Davies' (1981) two models of the city. Outline the key differences and similarities of the Segregation City and the Apartheid City. (10)

The Segregation City (Davies, 1981)
Pre-Apartheid cities were highly but not completely segregated
CBD, with a small Indian CBD on the edge
Broad differentiation of income groups
Low income Whites and Africans close to industrial areas
Barracks and compounds for Africans within industrial zone
Indian and Coloured is mainly peripheral

Model provides areas of mixing , especially between whites and coloureds

The Apartheid City (Davies, 1981)
Exclusively white CBD
Surrounded by white residential areas
Coloured, Indian and especially African townships located on periphery
Hostels within townships not place of work
Increased travel time for marginalised

- o Group areas act (1950/1966)
- o The most far reaching effect on racial segregation than previous legislation
- o Led to major reordering of South African cities
- o Was the cornerstone of Apartheid for 40 years
- o Groups area formed basis for segregated education, health and social services
- o GA exemplifies Apartheid ideology that incompatibility between ethnic groups is such that contact between the groups leads to friction, harmony is secured by minimizing contact.
- o Hindered the formation of a pluralistic society
- o Kept people from knowing or understanding each other
- o Africans entered white homes as servants, but many whites have never visited African townships and lived comfortably ignorant of conditions

QUESTION 3 [20]

3.1 Provide a historical overview on the foundation years of Johannesburg (1886-1900) and discuss how the early land use patterns shaped the future growth patterns of the city. (20)

Transvaal in the 19th Century

First urban footholds in the Transvaal region were Klerksdorp (1837), Potchefstroom (1838) and Pretoria (1855) the capital of the Boer republic (ZAR)

There were many gold seeking prospectors in the Transvaal from the 1850s onwards

White *burghers* could quite easily obtain parcels of land by simply finding a piece of unoccupied land and registered claim at local magistrate. Points of boundary were in terms of natural landmarks (rivers, ridges, etc.)

Most farms would have been selected around a source of fresh water

The absence of maps led to haphazard boundaries of farms and in-between these farms pockets of unclaimed land, called *uitvalgrond* existed.

The events of 1886 ensured that *Randjeslaagte* would be anything but a wasteland.

Discovery of Gold

Discovery of gold on the main reef was made by an Australian prospector named George Harrison on the farm Langlaagte, he stumbled across exposed conglomerate in the veld in March 1886.

News soon leaked of the discovery among the gold seeking prospectors in the Transvaal region.

By September and October of 1886 the following farms were declared public diggings; Driefontein, Elandsfontein, Doornfontein, Turffontein, Langlaagte, Paardekraal, Vogelstruisfontein & Roodepoort

Developing a Mining Town

The first mining camp was on the farm of Turffontein called Ferreira's Camp, which would later be incorporated as the Ferreira's town part of the CBD.

Acting surveyor-general (Rissik) was asked to select a suitable site for a village and must give preference to government land.

The farms were private, thus *Randjeslaagte* was the only public land available for the establishment of the town.

From Mining Town to Booming City

The scene was set for the creation of an industrial city.

Johannesburg was almost an instant city, with no previous history.

It was not located near a good source of water or on any trade routes.

All the factors for establishing the worlds great cities were missing.

Johannesburg a city whose sole *raison d'être* was the desire for material wealth.

Founding of Johannesburg

Randjeslaagte was virtually in the centre of the line of the 8 farms proclaimed as public diggings but it is important to note that is was state owned (ZAR).

State owned land = revenue

Initially assumed that Johannesburg will only be a mining camp/village not a permanent city and governments eyes were fixed on maximising revenue.

This impacted on the layout of JHB – as many stands as possible were demarcated, and short blocks were created to ensure a lot of corner stands, which could be leased at higher rental rates.

QUESTION 4 [20]

4.1 Critically discuss the impact of the forced removals on the urban landscape of South Africa, providing insights into both the site and soul of Sophiatown. (20)

- Township established in 1905 by a speculator named Tobiansky, and named it after his wife.
- Situated 4 miles (6.5km) north-west of the JHB CBD.
- 260 acres, divided into 1 694 small plots.
- Initially restricted black occupancy.
- In 1910 around 88 families (mostly white) lived in the area.
- Cause for rapid increase in population in Sophiatown:
- Effect of increased population in Sophiatown:

The Sight of Sophiatown…

➡ The council had justification for labelling Sophiatown a slum, due to its over crowdedness, its poverty and ill blighted physical appearance.
➡ It was extremely densely populated with more than 150 persons per acre.
➡ One half of all families lived in 1 room.
➡ Rack-renting was rife.
➡ Approximately 70% of all the structures were officially classified as slums by some measure.
➡ The landscape consisted of over-crowded backyards, dusty and dirty streets, sprawling, unplanned and unsanitary. Marked by uncollected garbage, absence of streetlights and inadequate filthy lavatories and stench.
➡ Sophiatown children played street games.

- Adults actions included legal and illegal ways of eking survival in a largely informal economic sector
  Legal informal economic activities
- Sophiatown was also home to well-housed, middle class professionals who chose to reside there.
- Their beautiful homes, sometimes 'double storey mansions' stood side by side with quaint cottages and rusty tin shacks.
- The township was one of the few areas in greater Johannesburg region where black were permitted to have free-hold title to property.
- Sophiatown was quite close the city, which offered convenient access to workplace and services.
- **Sophiatown incorporated enormous complexity and stark contrast**
  The Soul of Sophiatown…
- Sophiatown boasted vitality and exuberance not found in any other SA suburb.
- The bustle and variety of Sophiatown were instrumental in making it a lived in place, not just a labour *entrepôt*.
- The soul of Sophiatown was identifiable not only by its unique attributes but also in contrast with the soulless municipally controlled black urban locations.
- The new townships met sanitary standards.
  - Too clean, cleaned up of colour and spiritual values
  - Sense of placelessness and un-belonging.
  - Some locations surrounded by iron fences with white officials.
- After the 1948 election black townships that allowed ownership of land in designated white areas that were centres of black political resistance had no future.
- Removals were also linked to 'urban renewal' so that projects assumed an air of respectability
- After clearance Sophiatown was transformed into a wasteland, a blank canvas, and all that remained was its proud indestructible soul.
- Before destruction, Sophiatown symbolised the black man's capacity to endure the worst, also represented resilience and scorn for the white suburb from which he was excluded.
- Sophiatown offered sense of stature, belonging, individuality in the midst of poverty.

Total: 75 Marks