

TITLE: Majority of people living in hijacked buildings are not South Africans, says Ntshavheni

AUTHOR: Amanda Khoza

PUBLISHED DATE: 31 August 2023 - 12:59

SOURCE Sowetan Live

URL: <https://www.sowetanlive.co.za/news/south-africa/2023-08-31-majority-of-people-living-in-hijacked-buildings-are-not-south-africans-says-ntshavheni/>

Article Summary

A fire broke out in a hijacked building in Johannesburg, South Africa, resulting in the deaths of at least 73 people. Minister in the Presidency Khumbudzo Ntshavheni stated that it is not the responsibility of the South African government to provide housing for illegal immigrants living in hijacked buildings. Ntshavheni emphasized that the majority of those living in hijacked buildings are not South Africans and are not in the country legally.

The national government is ready to assist the Gauteng province in dealing with the situation. The government has identified three buildings to house affected families. The cause of the fire is still under investigation. Ntshavheni and Gauteng human settlement MEC Lebogang Maile both stressed the importance of holding accountable any individuals or entities found responsible for wrongdoing.

Article Analysis

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

No, the article does not provide a political economy contextual analysis of the event.

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

The article does not explicitly state the root cause of the event.

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 evidence of complicity between Johannesburg councillor representatives and organised criminal syndicates that took over the control of the building.

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 engaging with organised criminal syndicates that took over the control of the building

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 for addressing the occupation of hijacked buildings.

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 or other NGOs regarding different interpretations of the rights of tenants.

Critical Analysis

Overall, the article appears to be written in a relatively objective manner, presenting statements from multiple sources without overt bias. However, there are a few instances of subjective language and potential biases in the article:

1. The headline itself may be seen as biased or provocative. The use of the term "hijacked buildings" suggests criminal activity and may influence readers' perceptions before they even start reading the article.
2. The use of the term "illegal immigrants" to describe the people living in the hijacked buildings may be seen as subjective. The article does not provide any evidence or data to support this claim, and it could potentially perpetuate stereotypes or biases against immigrants.
3. The article quotes Minister Ntshavheni as stating that the government cannot provide housing for "illegal immigrants". This statement may be seen as perpetuating a biased narrative that portrays immigrants as a burden or a problem for the government.
4. When discussing the police operation in the city center, the article quotes Ntshavheni as saying that the "majority of the people in the CBD are illegal in the country". Again, there is no evidence provided to support this claim, and it could potentially reinforce negative stereotypes about immigrants.
5. The article mentions that the government has identified three buildings to house displaced families, but it does not provide any further information about the government's response or actions.

Overall, while the article strives to present multiple perspectives on the issue, it does contain some potential biases and subjective language that could influence readers' opinions.

Contradiction Analysis

One potential contradiction in the news article is the statement made by Minister Khumbudzo Ntshavheni regarding the responsibility of the South African government to provide housing for illegal immigrants living in hijacked buildings. In one part of the article, Ntshavheni states, "The government cannot provide housing to illegal immigrants". However, later in the article, Gauteng human settlement MEC Lebogang Maile mentions that the government has identified three buildings to house displaced families, referring to those affected by the fire in the hijacked building. This suggests that the government is indeed providing housing for individuals affected by the incident, regardless of their immigration status.