

TITLE: Marshalltown building was a ticking time bomb
AUTHOR: Hasina Gori
PUBLISHED DATE: 26 October 2023, 18:26 [SAST]
SOURCE: SABC News
URL: <https://www.sabcnews.com/sabcnews/888268-2/>

Article Summary

During the first day of the Marshalltown Fire Inquiry, Acting Johannesburg Emergency Services Chief Rapulane Monageng testified that the Usindiso building, where a fire killed 77 people, was a ticking time bomb.

He presented a document filled with pictures showcasing fire hazards identified by emergency services, including poor fire prevention measures and highly flammable materials used for construction. Monageng also mentioned that emergency routes were blocked during the fire, hindering access to stairwells.

The independent commission, headed by retired Constitutional Court Judge Sisi Khampepe, has been given six months to investigate the causes of the blaze and determine who should be held accountable. Monageng also discussed the emergency services' response on the morning of the fire.

Article Analysis

1. Does the article give a political economy contextual analysis of the event?

Based on the information given in the article, it does not provide a political economy contextual analysis of the event. The focus of the article is on the poor fire prevention measures in the building and the response of emergency services.

2. What according to the article, is/are the root cause/s of the event?

According to the article, the root cause of the event is the poor fire prevention measures in the Usindiso building. The building was described as a maze of highly flammable materials and had blocked emergency routes, making it difficult for people to escape during the fire.

3. Does the article present evidence of complicity between Johannesburg councillor representatives and organised criminal syndicates that took over the control of the building?

The article does not present direct evidence of complicity between Johannesburg councillor representatives and organised criminal syndicates that took over the control of the building. The focus of the article is on the fire hazards and emergency response.

4. Does the article present evidence of NGOs (like SERI) engaging with organised criminal syndicates that took over the control of the building, on behalf of and in the interests of their clients (i.e. the tenants)?

The article does not present evidence of NGOs like SERI engaging with organised criminal syndicates that took over the control of the building. The focus of the article is on the fire hazards and emergency response.

5. Does the article present potential solutions to the occupation by tenants of a hijacked building that has degenerated into a slum?

The article does not present potential solutions to the occupation by tenants of a hijacked building that has degenerated into a slum. The focus of the article is on the fire hazards and emergency response.

6. Does the article emphasise the conflictual relationship between city officials and the NGO SERI (and other NGOs) regarding different interpretations of the rights of tenants in terms of the law and specifically in terms of the PIE Act?

The article does not emphasize the conflictual relationship between city officials and the NGO SERI in terms of different interpretations of the rights of tenants. The focus of the article is on the fire hazards and emergency response.

Critical Analysis

Overall, the article appears to be written in a factual and unbiased manner. The author primarily reports on the witness testimony given at the Marshalltown Fire Inquiry and provides information on the conditions of the building and the emergency services response to the fire.

However, there may be a slight potential bias in the choice of words used by the author. The phrase "tragic Marshalltown Fire Inquiry" could be seen as subjective language, as it implies a negative connotation towards the inquiry. Additionally, the author describes the building as a "ticking time bomb," which is a subjective phrase that suggests a high level of danger and potentially biases the reader's perception.

It is important to note that this analysis is based solely on the given excerpt and that the full article may provide a more comprehensive view of any potential biases.

Contradiction Analysis

1. The article begins by stating that the first witness in the Marshalltown Fire Inquiry claims that the building was a ticking time bomb. This implies that the witness believes the building was dangerously unsafe and prone to a disaster. However, later in the article, it is mentioned that the witness described the conditions inside the

building as a maze of living spaces constructed of highly flammable materials. This suggests that the witness may be referring more to the fire hazards within the building rather than implying that the building itself was inherently dangerous.

2. The article states that Acting Johannesburg Emergency Services Chief Rapulane Monageng provided a 77-page document containing pictures detailing the fire hazards identified by emergency services. However, it does not mention what specific fire hazards were identified or provide any details about them. This lack of information makes it difficult to assess the severity or presence of any contradicting elements in the article.

3. The article quotes Monageng as saying, "That emergency route commissioner was blocked off with boxes, it was blocked off with plywood. But this door when its locked, you can't even access the stairwells on the other side". This statement suggests that there were obstructions preventing access to emergency routes and stairwells, which could have hindered evacuation efforts during the fire. However, the article does not provide any further context or information about this issue, leaving the reader with unanswered questions about the extent of the obstructions and their impact on the tragedy.

Overall, while there are some potential contradictions or areas where more information is needed, the article primarily focuses on the testimony of the first witness in the Marshalltown Fire Inquiry and does not provide a comprehensive analysis of the situation or mention any contradictory viewpoints.