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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

There are a number of reasons why social cohesion has become a concern of national importance. In the post-1994 era, the main challenge to the Government is to resolve the race and class polarizations within the population and to form and build a united nation within a unitary state in which justice and equity are leading values. At the same time, diversity in cultural terms is regarded as an asset that should be preserved. Social inclusion is seen as a necessary condition for achieving a high level of cohesion and, therefore, all members of society, regardless their race, sex, belief, or class are to participate within public affairs and processes. This includes sharing in the resources and assets of society, that is, providing the opportunity for poor and vulnerable people to increase their livelihood and quality of life.

Social cohesion, or solidarity, refers to positive social relationships, at all levels, and results in social capital, the bond or “glue” that binds people together. It is regarded as a positive value and worth striving for. At the local municipal level, it is regarded as an outcome of the Integrated Development Planning process. The paper focuses on this level of social engagement.

The paper defines social cohesion by scoping conventional and conceptual sources in academic and applied documents. With the focus on the local community level, the paper identifies the four key elements of positive relationships, equal life chances, civic engagement and participation, and a common vision and values. Five dimensions are recognized, namely belonging to a group having an overarching identity within an environment of co-existing identities, inclusion as a structural aspect, participation on an interactive level, recognition and respect of differences, and legitimacy of the representative bodies of the citizenship. Cohesive groups are well connected with networks and have social capital. Social capital bond people to each other, bridge them across divides, and link them to significant institutions that have important effects on their lives. The social assets gained through building social capital include connectivity or networks, trust, reciprocity, mutuality and collectivity.

As mentioned, social inclusion is a necessary condition for building social cohesion, but active participation is an additional needed ingredient. Participation by community members should be on equal footing with authorities, preferably in a partnership format. Social cohesion, in its turn, is contributory to enhance forms of quality of life. Local communities can transform toward achieving these desirables by cumulatively building “capitals” upon each other, and so interactively strengthen their power. This is known as the spiraling-up effect and it is most strategically affected by starting with building social capital.

Learning from social cohesion experiences elsewhere in the world, practical approaches are to be found in the UK which were designed to resolve and overcome racial tensions and conflicts at the city and community level. Commitment from leadership and developing common vision and
values, hands-on managerial approaches and space for participation by all are some of the ingredients of the operational approaches. Special challenging areas and groups include different, and especially foreign / immigrant, groupings occupying neighbourhood spaces in long standing internal communities. Integration needs to be managed carefully taking into account lessons learnt from past and comparative experiences.

The post-1994 experiences in South Africa provide some insights and lessons. Reconciliation and peace making between conflicting groups have effected by the TRC process and post-TRC initiatives. The South African Government institutionalized policy and legal frameworks, including the Constitution down to IDP Credibility Frameworks that prioritized social inclusion, non-discrimination, and social justice and equity measures. Social cohesion, as a separate category, is not defined or attended to in an explicit way. It remains an assumed or implicit conceptual phenomenon. It is therefore a need that IDPs consider this matter explicitly and consciously.

The measurement of social cohesion has been implemented in a haphazard and ad hoc manner up until now. There is a specific need to develop appropriate social cohesion indicators that could be used in local communities to serve IDPs in their monitoring function. The paper’s unpacking of the concept, with emphasis among other, on diversity, reconciliation, racism, minority relations, poverty, migration and foreigners, gender, youth, HIV and similar stigmatized groups, may be of assistance in this respect.

It remains a question how social cohesion should be promoted within the South African environment. It is clear what the content should be of what needs to be promoted. Social cohesion is a normative idea and there seems to be a general acceptance that it is a good, desirable value to pursue. Particular conditions of what a united nation means, and how diversity should be acknowledged and minorities be empowered, remain questions to be thrashed out still.

The programmatic blocks in building social cohesion require a change in thinking about the other and a review of the structural divisions within society. It is suggested that specific activities and campaigns be conducted with respect to themes, areas and sectors in societal and communal life. Some models on provincial level may be suggestive of ways to go about.

The paper finally put for consideration a way for dealing with social cohesion at the local municipal level. The community development approach is proposed as a good model. The model promotes partnerships between authorities and communities in building social cohesion and capacity to take control of communities own destiny within the common vision. Finally, social cohesion is depicted as a project to be managed and assessed according to key performance criteria and indicators within the IDP framework.
INTRODUCTION

It was the nineteenth century French sociologist, Emile Durkheim (1858-1918), that introduced solidarity, or social cohesion, the ties that bind people to one another, as a conscious conceptual category in the study of human society. He demonstrated effectively the importance of this social force in his analysis of suicide – a seemingly highly individualistic act - when he indicated that people may kill themselves because of a lack of social cohesion (‘egoistic suicide’), or because of an overabundance thereof (‘altruistic suicide’).\(^1\) Following his analysis, social cohesion since has been recognised globally as an essential ingredient of the social fabric of society, community and group life.

The idea of togetherness and mutual care is strong in African thought and social practice, as two Time journalists observed in their anti-African pessimism article of 1998, Africa Rising. They provided case studies of African countries rising out of the ashes of internal conflict and their intercountry and inter-ethnic warfare and demonstrated how small and limited yet imaginative successes based on a reliance of local people, resources and indigenous knowledge, were building new nations.\(^2\) Reflecting upon their journey through a number of countries they commented:

"There is a word we heard over and over in Africa: ubuntu. It’s different in every dialect, but the meaning is always roughly the same: a complex, highly nuanced precept governing the way individuals relate to the community. Ubuntu is the organizing principle of the African mind, defining the pre-eminence of the interests of the community over the individual, the duties and responsibilities the individual owes the community, the obligation of the individual to share what he has with the community."

In its struggle against colonial oppression, African oppressed people and their national movements grapple with the question of how to restore the erstwhile dignity of the people and community spirit characteristic of African society. In the case of the African National Congress of South Africa, this concern was “the national question” – the issue of nation-formation and nation building - as a continued and unresolved challenge in what it called the National Democratic Revolution. In a document dated for 1997\(^3\), this question was posed as a twofold challenge: How to transform the South African society and into what? The document offered a diagnostic analysis of the problem according to ten “theses” or statements.\(^4\)

In a follow-up document, published at the beginning of the Second Decade of Freedom, as a discussion document at the 52\(^{nd}\) National Conference of the ANC (the Polokwane Conference), this

---

\(^4\) We will not elaborate on these statements.
theme was addressed again, with explicit reference to the important consideration of social cohesion in society. This document acknowledges that although the political struggle has been successfully completed, there is still a long journey for achieving “a truly united, democratic and prosperous South Africa in which the value of all citizens is measured by their humanity, without regard to race, gender and social status.” In broad strokes, “a national democratic society” is the vision, including:

- A united state based on the will of all the people, without regard for race, sex, belief, or geographic location;
- A dignified and improving quality of life among all the people by providing equal rights and opportunities to all citizens; and
- The restoration of the birthright of all South Africans regarding access to land and other resources.

In chapter 3 of this 2007 document, social cohesion is seen as a collective term for addressing the hurdles, stumbling blocks and structural strains in achieving the desired quality of nationhood in our country. It is also regarded as the outcome of nation building processes.

Social cohesion has received considerable attention by many countries and has become a major issue in government policies and programmes. The reasons for the South African concern relates to deterioration of a sense of nationhood at many levels, including historical conditions and legacies of the past, as indicated in this paper. But some of the more general reasons are that:

- Societies have become more diverse
- The process of economic globalization introduce new social pressures and inequalities
- Social and economic exclusion
- Discrimination and inequality
- Lack of access to public services
- Racism and discrimination
- Marginalization and exclusion on the grounds of culture
- Migration and globalization
- The question “what keeps society” together becomes all the more salient.

Social cohesion in culturally diverse societies binds people across the boundaries of diverse identities into an overarching bond as a nation. This makes social cohesion an ideal and a sought

---

after quality, but also an obvious choice, such as in the South African case where divisions of the past need to be transcended. But, in the light of past history and present divisions and inequalities it remains a challenge. The state and other societal institutions play a crucial role in providing a macro framework or organized space for its individuals, groups and communities to function as social beings and as such it provides an environment that may be conducive for or detrimental to social cohesion. The lack of cohesion and how to heal the rift should therefore also be examined in a position paper such as this.

The paper unpacks the conventional understanding of the concept, examines selected perspectives on the phenomenon, and locates it within the discourse on social capital and racism. The way a few other countries deal with social cohesion is examined for wider perspective. The question is explored by examining local and international studies/programmes addressing concerns around social cohesion, participation and nation-building. In this respect, frameworks and programmes are explored with a focus on models for implementation.

In order to identify and formulate local models for promoting social cohesion, best practice models are reviewed for their appropriateness for the South African context to promote social cohesion and address issues such as xenophobia. The paper therefore explores what kinds of programmes are possible and can be implemented in the South African context.

The paper finally provides criteria on how social cohesion can be addressed and promoted, assessed and measured within the context of the Municipal Systems Act and the IDPs of local authorities and Credible IDP Evaluation Framework.
1 UNPACKING AND CONTEXTUALISING THE CONCEPT

1.1 Common understanding of social cohesion

The term “social cohesion” in its conventional or common usage signifies the bonding between people and groups, or in a metaphorical sense the bonding substance, or “glue”, that binds people in positive relationships. It is normally seen as a desirable quality in social relations or a state that should be pursued in situations where individuals, groups or larger aggregates share a living space and interact.

It is also perceived as synonymous to solidarity and linked to community, social capital and nation building. In official documentation and studies it is interpreted as the result of inclusion and participation. As normative concept, it suggests the promotion of positive intergroup relations, inclusion and participation as both the desired inputs and outputs and addressing the non-desirables of prejudice, social exclusion and discrimination. It is further popularly understood as that quality that binds a nation together across the lines of division like race and class and makes them proud of their national identity.

As Integrated Development Planning targets populations living within demarcated municipal boundaries, the focus of the paper is also on clarifying what social cohesion means and how it can be promoted at local level.

This paper deviates from the evasive trend in definition of social cohesion by also examining definitions and meaning. This may produce focus, conceptual clarity and provide a framework for the ordering of the abundance of ideas offered in a range of sources cited.

Social cohesion is a teleological (normative) concept in the sense that it suggests action towards a goal, informing us how to achieve it. Its normative nature connects it to a number of contributing factors and consequences. At its essence it refers to a desired quality in social relations that bind people together.

As a quality of social relations, social cohesion is manifested in meaningful social interaction, social structures and processes (the organized patterns of social life and how these patterns come about) and culture (including belief systems and ideology). Like social relationships, social cohesion may manifest both positive and negative qualities: it may unite or divide, include and exclude.

The meaning of social cohesion could be explored at all levels of social relationships, ranging from inter-personal, intergroup to social relationships at macro level, such as national and international levels. The two levels identified in this paper are inter-group as applicable to local populations residing within neighbourhoods of cities and towns (local authority level) and the entire country (national) level.
1.2 Social cohesion in communities

A British study titled What Works in Community Cohesion was conducted for Communities and Local Government and the Commission on Integration and Cohesion in 2007. It explores the problem of definition by researching stakeholder perceptions of cohesion. The study is a qualitative investigation of what works, based largely on accounts, commentaries and experiences of local stakeholders. The outcome is a description of how stakeholders define cohesion resulting in a range of understandings. Despite the problems of generalization the authors condensed the observations to key elements that may have wider and even generic application.

The four key elements in the understandings identified in the study are positive relationships, equal life chances, civic engagement and participation, and common vision and values.

- **Positive relationships:**

  Community cohesion is perhaps most widely regarded as the process of different communities ‘getting along’, working together and understanding each other. This aspect – i.e. the quality of relationships between different groups in a place – is the area of greatest consensus regarding the definition of community cohesion.

- **Equal life chances:**

  The importance of equality in service provision was a common theme across the study areas. However, in some areas stakeholders go further in emphasizing the role of social and economic empowerment and social inclusion in a wider sense. They stress the importance of tackling the disadvantages and barriers that certain groups face in trying to participate in and benefit from society – through targeted projects for example, as well as general policies of encouraging equal opportunities and access to and treatment by services.

- **Civic engagement and participation:**

  Reflecting the strong emphasis on this in current cohesion policy and research literature, most stakeholders see a strong relationship between the ideas of community cohesion and civic engagement – for example, this encompasses neighbourhood forums, decision-making bodies etc.

- **Common vision and values:**

---


7. What Works in Community Cohesion. p 24
But, in the main, local stakeholders – and practitioners in particular – place most emphasis on developing a sense of commonality through focus on tangible aspects, rather than abstract values or a conceptual vision for a community or area. For example, this was discussed in the context of neighbourhood forums which provided a community focus on improvements to services and area regeneration.

Emerging from the same British initiative a Practitioner’s Toolkit deals with the definition as follows:  

Community cohesion describes the ability of communities to function and grow in harmony together rather than in conflict. It has strong links to concepts of equality and diversity given that community cohesion can only grow when society as a whole recognizes that individuals have the right to equality (of treatment, access to services etc) and respects and appreciates the diverse nature of our communities. The Local Government Association defined a cohesive community as one where:

- there is a common vision and a sense of belonging for all communities;
- the diversity of people’s backgrounds and circumstances is appreciated and positively valued;
- those from different backgrounds have similar life opportunities; and
- strong and positive relationships are being developed between people from different backgrounds and circumstances in the workplace, in schools and in neighbourhoods.

1.3 Different dimensions of social cohesion

Anton de Wit agrees that social cohesion are the bonds or ‘glue’ that unite people (bring people together). These bonds of social cohesion are shared values, shared challenges and equal opportunities and are detectable in five dimensions. The dimensions he identifies are belonging, inclusion, participation, recognition and legitimacy. He suggests that social cohesion could best be pursued through enacting these dimensions. We add our own interpretations below.

- Belonging:

  In a diverse society belonging means adopting an overarching identity as a society, feeling of belonging to the nation and reconciling it with specific (sub)group identities. This requires consensus on inclusive symbols, values, policies and programmes binding people together across other co-existing identities.

---

8 Chris Browne, Clare Codling, Leo Musyoki, Richard Page and Craig Russell. SEVEN STEPS A Practitioner’s Toolkit. Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council Cohesion and Faiths Unit, March 2005

• Inclusion:

Inclusion is based on the principles of equality of access for all and equal opportunities; it thus forms the structural dimension of social cohesion.

• Participation:

Participation is the interactive part of social cohesion and means active involvement. It is the consequence of the former two - belonging and inclusion. Participation could be complicated by logistically unworkable conditions (like distance, cost, physical isolation, etc.), communication and language barriers.

• Recognition:

Recognition refers to the management of differences in a sustainable way, promoting pluralism. “In cohesive societies public and private institutions should contribute to practices of recognition of differences”.

• Legitimacy:

“Social cohesion is also about the legitimacy of the intermediary bodies representing the citizens. As mediators, these bodies need to be truly representative and allow enough space to allow mediation to occur”.

De Wit concludes that shared values, shared challenges and equal opportunities bind people together and thus produce social cohesion. Conversely it could be argued that absence of the stated requisites will result in alienation, division and parochialism.

1.4 Cohesion as social capital and assets

Social cohesion is secondly understood as social capital and assets, referring to the value of being connected to others. Social capital suggests that positive relationships can be compared with financial and fixed assets in the sense of social wealth and forms the basis for many other desirables pursued in a situation of societal transformation.

Networks as social capital

Networks has according to David Chidester, Phillip Dexter and Wilmot James emerged as a new language of value -
In simple terms, social capital can be defined as social networks, informed by trust, that enable people to participate in reciprocal exchanges, mutual support and collective action to achieve shared goals.\(^{10}\)

Networks and social capital, like social cohesion, also refer to the connectedness of people. At a strategic level De Wit refers to bonding, bridging and linking social capital.\(^{11}\)

- Bonding capital refers to cohesive relationships and cooperation within a single social group,
- Bridging capital refers to cohesive relationships and cooperation between social groups and communities, and
- Linking capital refers to relationships emerging from interaction within and between internal and external participants and between state and civil society in pursuit of local and societal objectives.

John L. McKnight and John P. Kretzmann describe assets at a community level as that which even the poor have, contrast it with the normal emphasis on needs (that which people don’t have) and include the skills of local residents, the power of local associations, the resources of public, private and non-profit institutions and the physical and economic resources of local places as examples.\(^{12}\)

Caroline O.N. Moser views the poor as managers of complex asset portfolios. The management of these assets affects household poverty and vulnerability.\(^{13}\) She defines social assets as the value that people get from their social structure. It consists of two aspects.

- The first is informal/horizontal social networks, such as family structures and community/ neighbourhood relationships. This includes bonding and binding social capital.
- The second is institutional or hierarchical relationships, such as relationships with government institutions, development organisations and employers. Linking capital is built this way.

The various forms of social capital seem to be mutually reinforcing. External funders and investors are more inclined to support communities that have demonstrated their ability to bridge internal rifts and divisions towards becoming a truly bonding community. In other words, linking capital

---


\(^{11}\) Chidester, et al.


follows more easily in cases where bridging capital has been created. In the absence of bridging capital, external links are severed and support is not forthcoming. Parochial and exclusivist in-group bonding may be the obstacle. What is needed, is the building of positive interpersonal relationships across dividing lines of race, ethnicity, class, space, etc (the we - them distances).

This approach is known as the Whole Community Organizing, which proceeds according to the following principles:14

- At the community level, everybody is included, “not just the local leaders or the elites who normally ‘take charge’ and initiate planning efforts to develop the community or the economy. Everyone has a stake in the community.”

- As relationships between community organizers (the planners) and the “other” (the “target” for development) are formed, empathy develops, meaning that people who have been adversaries begin to realise that they share mutual fate and that, with facilitation, old cleavages and violations of trust can be repaired. This requires commitment and respect for the “other’s” humanity. Human dignity is an essential value.

- When various segments of the community form new relationships to overcome old disagreements, hurts and slights, a community builds ties that are more horizontal and open more networks that may lead to securing access to resources outside of the locality.

The role of the IDP should be to facilitate participation of all in the social networks and institutional or hierarchical relationships both horizontally and vertically. There should be a networking relationship with local communities in the sense of feed-back loops in a reciprocal relationship.

1.5 Cohesion as quality of life

Quality of Life is at the heart of social cohesion as it provides the “better life for all” content. In the South African context positive relationships are connected to well-being as captured in quality of life. There is no universally agreed on definition, but quality of life at least include the

dimensions of economic wellbeing, health, education, freedom, social participation and self perceived wellbeing or satisfaction.\textsuperscript{15}

A community approach to quality of life identifies three major areas:\textsuperscript{16}

- “being,” which reflects “who the individual is” and has physical, psychological and spiritual components;
- “belonging,” which involves people’s relationship with their physical, social and community environments; and
- “becoming”, which involves individual activities to achieve individual goals, hopes and aspirations.

Quality of life in social terms means establishing the outlook that individuals regard each other as equals in accessing and applying the means for self-sufficiency (ability to influence their future, employment, education, etc.). In civic, community and social terms it refers to helping and encouraging others, household participation in local and governmental affairs.

When considering the need for social cohesion it may be useful to consider these dimensions that measure quality of life.

Social cohesion and quality of life is interdependent. The role of the IDP should be to take note of the multi-faceted nature of social cohesion and its linkages to the past and current situations of people and what they aspire to.

1.6 Forces in social cohesion – the community transformation model

At the local level approaches have been introduced to enlighten us about what are the critical forces in building communities. To achieve community and economic development as a transformative process in communities, a systems approach is needed. The so-called Community Capitals Framework (CCF) applies a systems perspective by identifying the assets in each capital (stock), the types of capital invested (flow), the interaction among the capitals, and the resulting impacts across capitals. Seven different components of community capital are identified: natural,

1. Natural capital refers to assets unique to a particular location such as weather, natural resources, geographic location, natural beauty, amenities, etc. Natural capital shapes the cultural capital connected to place.

2. Cultural capital reflects the way people “know the world” and how they act within it, as well as their traditions and language. It influences what voices are heard and listened to, which voices have influences in what areas, and how creativity, innovation, and influence emerge and are nurtured. Hegemony privileges the cultural capital of the dominant groups.

3. Human capital includes the skills and abilities of people to develop and enhance their resources and to access outside resources and bodies of knowledge in order to increase their understanding, identify promising practices, and to access data for community-building. It addresses the leadership’s ability to “lead across differences,” to focus on assets, to be inclusive and participatory, and to act proactively in shaping the future of the community.

4. Social capital reflects the connections among people and organizations or the social “glue” to make things, positive or negative, happen. Bonding social capital refers to those close redundant ties that build community cohesion. Bridging social capital involves loose ties that bridge among organizations and communities. A specific configuration of social capital – entrepreneurial social capital (ESI) – is related to community economic development. ESI includes internal and external networks, local mobilization of resources, and willingness to consider alternative ways of reaching goals.

5. Political capital reflects access to power, organizations, connection to resources and power brokers. It also refers to the ability of people to find their own voice and to engage in actions that contribute to the well being of their community.

6. Financial capital refers to the financial resources available to invest in community capacity-building, to underwrite the development of businesses, to support civic and social entrepreneurship, and to accumulate wealth for future community development.

7. Built capital includes the infrastructure supporting these activities.
Investment of assets forms vital areas, such as human, social and financial capital. It tends to result in increased assets among those capitals as well as others. This may lead to an ongoing process of assets building on assets, and actually leading to the effect of an upward spiral. Similarly, in a spiral-down period, the community declined in all capitals, resulting in a loss of hope and direction. The logic of the spiralling effect (either up or down) follows the path of cumulative causation: the place that loses assets, for whatever reason, will continue to lose them through system effects.

Growth and decline are therefore explained according to the same set of factors and according to the same cumulative causation logic. This bears the question what, then, is the critical entry factor for the starting of the spiralling process? The authors, Emery and Flora, suggest the following insight:\textsuperscript{18}

\textit{In our model, using community capitals, as one capital is increased, it is easier for increases, instead of declines, in the other community capitals to occur. However, the usual rural development strategy of beginning with infusions of financial capital or built capital is often not cumulative. Spiralling-up reverses declines in assets through a similar cumulative causation process in which asset growth becomes a self-reinforcing cycle of increasing opportunity and community well being. ... Our contention is that the best entry point to spiralling-up is social capital.} (Our emphasis).

\textsuperscript{18} Emery & Flora: Spiralling-Up
2 LEARNING FROM EXPERIENCE: PROGRAMMES OF SOCIAL COHESION IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

2.1 Race and social cohesion

The United Kingdom (UK) provides a varied experience regarding policy, programmes and plans for dealing with social exclusion and promoting social cohesion. For example, in January 2005, the UK launched the ‘Improving Opportunity, Strengthening Society Strategy’ with the purpose to “create strong, cohesive communities through equal opportunities, rights and responsibilities among different races, and through the development of a better sense of community cohesion by helping people from different backgrounds to have a stronger sense of ‘togetherness’”. More specifically, the aims were twofold, first, to increase race equality, and second, to build community cohesion by helping people from different backgrounds get along well together in their local area. The programme terminated in February 2009.

Before this initiative, the country was experiencing racial disturbances in 2001 in the cities of Oldham, Bradford and Burnley. The House of Commons set up a commission to conduct an inquiry into the causes of the uprising. A report was published in 2004 that revealed the following:

- Social cohesion should not be seen as a law and order issue, but as a matter of quality of life. The causes of the disturbances should therefore be addressed through long-term integrated programmes with strong leadership at a local and national level to ensure all departments give priority to achieving social cohesion.
- The Commission concluded that local authorities need greater incentives to break down barriers between different communities and promote social cohesion. At the level of local authorities the Commission suggested rewards for council officers for their effort to promote social cohesion.
- Political parties and the wider public need to share a multicultural vision for their towns.
- Services should be based where they will serve all communities to avoid duplication and promote cohesion.

2.2 Seven Steps Toolkit

In order to advance social cohesion and inclusion The Home Office formulated seven steps to this effect. These steps include:

19 Improving Opportunity, Strengthening Society Strategy, UK.
1) Leadership and commitment

A strong point is made that someone needs to take responsibility for managing and driving through the changes required to build a more cohesive community. What is clear is that someone needs to exercise leadership and demonstrate a commitment. This may be the local authority, the police, a councillor or a religious or community leader. Elected members and councillors have a particular role to play in this respect by taking the lead and act as role models. Sometimes it may also be necessary to involve high profile leaders.

2) Developing a vision and values for cohesion

According to the UK guide, developing a common vision is an essential first step in working towards a cohesive society. A vision is important to create a written or a visual image that people can identify with. The vision should articulate and focus on the challenges faced and opportunities available. It is important to be upfront about what your community will and will not tolerate and this should be carried out by the community leaders.

It is stated that ideally the vision should be clear and succinct and make a challenging and bold statement about your aspirations for the community. The vision should desirably be focused on outcomes and be in line with your own corporate agendas. Building a partnership around the vision is essential as promoting community cohesion is a shared responsibility. The vision should therefore be developed in consultation with key stakeholders to ensure ownership of the vision. It should not only be discussed on a regular basis but also communicated to the community.

3) Programme planning and management

Programme planning and management refers to planning of your programme of activities, milestones, management and decision-making. It further refers to establishing a baseline and determining relevant indicators, and establishing mechanisms for monitoring and reviewing success.
Having established your vision and values, approaches and potential partners, focus of consideration will be around the following aspects:

- A clear understanding of what your programme will look like and will achieve.
- Who will play what role in driving through the community cohesion agenda?
- Where will the responsibility for driving the community cohesion programme rest within the local authority structure.
- Developing working relationships and building networks in the community.
- Ensuring the sustainability of the programme or project.

It may be useful to develop an implementation plan that covers:

- A list of actions and targets for each project.
- A list of targets for each project overall.
- Individual responsibilities for actions or projects.
- Research allocation per partner or project.
- Key milestones and a timeline for completion.
- How each action/target/project relates to the vision and objectives to be accomplished?

It will be important for building and understanding a picture of cohesion, establishing a baseline from which to measure success and monitoring progress.

(4) Engaging communities

Reaching out to different groups and communities, and bringing them closer is what social cohesion is all about. Engaging and involving communities may be very difficult, but this is critical for promoting community cohesion. Which groups and communities you engage with will depend on the composition of your own area and priority within these areas. In some areas the priority may be to bring people from different religions or ethnic backgrounds together, for others it may be about enabling people from different areas to unite, whilst for others, it may be about young people or old people to get to know and understand each other. The point is made that the focus should be more on projects and programmes where groups can interact, than on race. Positive interaction should be encouraged between groups to build communities where people feel confident they belong and are comfortable mixing and interacting with others.

Within the context of engaging communities the following approaches may be considered:

- Engaging young people from different backgrounds in inter-territorial football matches, art and drama programmes, music, hiking/sailing adventures, school twinning, etc. In this regard the schools can play a major part in developing cohesive communities.
• Bringing the generations together by working together on certain projects to foster greater respect and understanding.
• Bringing communities together to bridge the gulf between communities from different cultures, faiths or ethnic groups. These may include festivals, sport, crafts and arts programmes, etc.
• Bringing faith groups together. Faith groups and churches play a vital role to bring people together on projects and to arrange programmes.

(5) **Challenging and changing perceptions**

Behaviour is often based on perceptions of what people heard and believe of others. This becomes a reality and basis for beliefs and becomes a threat to cohesion. It is then fundamentally important to find ways to define, test and then change perceptions of individuals and groups where these perceptions are employed or misunderstood. Engagement and contact between individuals, groups and communities can break down perceptions working with the press and media, encouraging debates and conversations in the community.

(6) **Community cohesion and specialist areas**

The point is made that clear links exist between community cohesion and other services/areas such as the local economy, health and housing. In this respect local employers should recruit and appoint people from the local area. Access to health services and good quality housing and a degree of financial security within their families are important for community cohesion.

(7) **Ensuring sustainability of programmes**

To ensure sustainability, a strong point is made for social or community cohesion to be linked to mainstream delivery of services and ensuring that the vision is pursued. Mainstream delivery is then defined as the process of moving from time bound, area based on ad-hoc programmes to universal services which are available to everyone and become part of long-term landscape of services provision.

Mainstreaming involves more than plans and policies, it also involves changing hearts and minds.

2.3 **Research on immigration and social cohesion in the UK**

More recent research (July 2008) conducted by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation concluded that to ensure social cohesion, the impact of social and economic changes needs to be addressed as well as how people relate to each other. The limited opportunities and multiple deprivations of the long-term settled population in parts of UK towns and cities undermine social cohesion. These

fundamental issues of deprivation, disadvantage and discrimination impact on both majority and minority ethnic settled residents.

This research draws on original material gathered from six UK sites with different experiences of migration and post-industrial transformations, and comprising different populations of long-term residents and new immigrants. Between them, they illustrate various contexts of social cohesion in England, Northern Ireland and Scotland.

Key points of the findings were the following:

- Most people felt that social cohesion was about negotiating the right balance in expressing difference and unity in local areas, rather than expecting complete consensus on values and priorities.
- Some majority ethnic long-term residents experienced government concerns with immigration as prioritising the interests of private business, while neglecting their specific needs.
- The arrival of new immigrants could highlight the resilience of some communities, or the profound disconnections between people, groups and institutions in others.
- Many long-term residents and new arrivals valued the UK for being multi-ethnic and multicultural.
- Communities which thought of a locality as belonging to them in particular were more likely to blame new arrivals for problems that often already existed.
- Communities which thought of a locality as belonging to everyone tended to be more open to new arrivals.
- When the arrival of new immigrants brought about improvements in infrastructure, support and opportunities for new arrivals and long-term residents, these shared circumstances were welcomed and valued by all.
- The researchers concluded that the limited opportunities and multiple deprivations of the long-term settled population in parts of UK towns and cities undermine social cohesion. To ensure cohesion, the impact of social and economic changes needs to be addressed as well as how people relate to each other.
2.4 What Works in Community Cohesion

This research study was conducted in 2007 on community cohesion. It provides a good reference point and in particular arrives at conclusions that may provide hypotheses for similar studies in SA. Two such findings are:

- Reducing residential segregation not necessarily encouraging interaction and cohesion. This was not a common view among stakeholders interviewed, partly because there is recognition that mixed housing does not necessarily result in the development of friendships or meaningful social interactions between groups. Policies to promote meaningful interaction are often a key part of local cohesion strategies. This is an aim in itself and not linked to the extent of residential segregation.
- Recognition that educational segregation presents a significant, though difficult to address, barrier to cohesion.
- The importance of recognising the structural factors that affect individual choice as well as the need for equality policies in relation to employment and service access.
- There is a clear emphasis on the role of participation and engagement.
- Promotion of common civic values.
- Building a sense of commonality around real life issues.

The study also includes a section on what works in organising and leading Community Cohesion locally. These include for example:

- Supporting socio-economic well-being of individuals and communities
- Attending to language communication problems
- Generating a sense of commonality and positive relationships
- Engagement and involvement projects
- Myth-busting communications
- Responding to major events that present risks to cohesion. Disturbances within a community require a rapid response to prevent tensions escalating within an area.

---
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3 THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT

This section will review various contextual applications or meanings of social cohesion. It will cover the roles of the following in promoting social cohesion:

3.1 State and government promoting social cohesion

The first question regarding government’s role in social cohesion is captured by what David Chidester, et al say about government and social capital: 25

_In the sphere of government, social capital is first and foremost a resource of public trust. Social capital is an index of popular participation, commitment and trust in the institutions of governance. The lack or absence of social capital, in this regard, is a measure of people’s mistrust in government. Social capital is built up when people trust government and government trusts people._

**Role of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC)**

The new government after the 1994 elections had to deal with the scars of the past dispensation and set up the TRC to bear witness to, record and in some cases grant amnesty to the perpetrators of crimes relating to human rights violations, reparation and rehabilitation. This was one of the first steps of government to address the need for reconciliation.

Right from the start there were misgivings, particularly regarding the question of how to deal with offenders even from within the Commission. 26 “There were negative perceptions about that part of the Committee’s work that related to indemnifying offenders. The resultant view that the Committee was ‘perpetrator friendly’ was thus to an extent understandable and even unavoidable.”

Many other actions of government followed to address past injustices in labour, education, business and elsewhere and dismantling the structures of the past.

**Legal and policy framework**

The role of government in promotion and monitoring of social cohesion can be examined in how it emerged in the legal and policy framework that developed since 1994.

Social cohesion as a broad objective is being dealt with by the democratic government since 1994. For a brief review the following documents were cited and provided with some comment:

---
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• the RDP White Paper, Discussion Document, September 1994

• the South African Constitution

• the Local Government/Municipal Systems Act (Act 32 of 2000),

• the Integrated Development Plan Format Guide of the Department Provincial and Local Government and two IDPs (as examples),

• the Credible IDP Evaluation Framework,

• Synthesis Report on Implementation of Government Programmes. Discussion Document,

The White Paper on Reconstruction and Development (RDP) September, 1994, outlines the new government's strategy for fundamental transformation. The document repeatedly refers to the need for national consensus and consequently buy-in of formerly divided groups of the nation. One of the principles, and also outcomes, of the RDP is nation building. This White Paper on the RDP provides a framework for the renewal of society through the Government's own RDP-related reforms. It explains not only how the Government is beginning to implement the RDP, but how in so doing it will expand the process of consultation and participation.

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act 108 of 1996) without directly using the concept social cohesion, entrenches the principles of non-racialism and non-discrimination and confirms a quest for reconciliation and nation building. The Preamble confirms "that South Africa belongs to all who live in it" and that the Constitution aims to "improve the quality of life of all citizens and free the potential of each person." Section 1 confirms the values of non-racialism and non-sexism; Section 9 (1) that "Everyone is equal before the law and has the right to equal protection and benefit of the law."; Section 9 (3) that "The state may not unfairly discriminate directly or indirectly against anyone on one or more grounds, including race"; and Section 10 that "Everyone has inherent dignity and the right to have their dignity respected and protected."

Both the White Paper on Local Government, and the Constitution, state that local government should be transformed to perform a developmental function and that it should be committed to work with citizens and groups within the community to find sustainable ways to meet their social,
economic and material needs and improve the quality of their lives. One of the salient assumptions – not necessarily valid - is that nation building, improved relationships and social cohesion should develop as an outcome of social, economic and material improvements that addresses needs and aspirations.

The Local Government/Municipal Systems Act (Act 32 of 2000) also identifies active engagement with communities as a fundamental aspect of the new government system and devotes Chapter 4 of the Act to spelling it out. Chapter 4 of the Act provides for community participation and the development of a culture of community participation, mechanisms, processes and procedures for community participation. But there is no specific attention to cohesion and building relationships in the Act.

**Integrated development planning**

After 1994 local government was made the custodian of the newly designed concept of integrated development planning. Provision was made for the process of integrated development planning (IDP), and to produce development plans for the short, medium and long term for the communities within the boundaries of local authorities. The White Paper on Local Government does acknowledge the need for inclusion and participation and spells out the steps in producing an IDP, implementation of projects and programmes and monitoring tools to measure impact and performance.

The Format Guide for IDPs emphasizes the requirement of community participation throughout: “A good, realistic IDP is therefore one that is guided by community participation throughout its design and review processes, is resourced by a realistic budget and an adequately skilled workforce and can be implemented and monitored.”

Good Governance and Public Participation (combined) form one Key Focal or Performance Areas (KPAs) and it further states that “Good governance is about governing the area, municipality and its citizens in accordance with the Spirit of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. It includes community consultations, participation and empowerment as a central feature.”

As a method of participation “Focus should be directed toward strengthening wards, ward-based plans and the institution, in order to design mechanisms to improve community participation and the governance of the Municipality. Consideration must be given to the quality and extent of community participation in municipal affairs.”

---
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As Outcomes of IDPs it states “Social Inclusion, social cohesion and Nation Building – Non-racism, Non-sexism, Democratic and accountable practices, equity, etc.”\textsuperscript{39}

Although “social cohesion” is mentioned as desirable in the Format Guide, the emphasis is on participation in municipal affairs. No specific provision is made for specific programmes to promote community relations or nation building. It is consequently neither provided for in the 

President Mandela in The Urban Development Strategy of the Government of National Unity\textsuperscript{41} said that urban development strategies should be informed by the collective wisdom of our people and unite their efforts for development. But urban planning models are often superimposed models from above onto communities and the end-user not consulted and did not participate in their own planning. Some of the most serious challenges also complicating nation building are the backlog in housing provision, informal settlements in unsuitable locations, gentrification, and densification of human settlements.


The report\textsuperscript{42} (2003) provides an internal assessment (self-assessment) of government of the progress achieved in the first decade of the new dispensation. As such it reflects on cohesion with an emphasis of addressing exclusion of the previous political dispensation. The achievements cited in this regard include a number of policies, legislation and programmes implemented since 1994 include inter alia:

- Tenure and Land Reform process addressing social exclusion and land issues.
- Promotion of gender equality
- Labour protection for domestic and farm workers
- Employment protection through the Basic Conditions of Employment Act, the Employment Equity Act, Wage Act and the Labour Relations Act
- Citizenship protection through the Refugee Act and the Citizens Act
- Protection of special groups such as the elderly, the disabled, and vulnerable children through specially targeted policies and programmes
- Reduction of discrimination against poor learners, female learners, pregnant learners, vulnerable learners and learners from certain language, religious or cultural groups.

\textsuperscript{39} Local Government/ Municipal Systems Act
\textsuperscript{40} Local Government/ Municipal Systems Act
\textsuperscript{41} Urban Development Strategy of the Government of National Unity, 1996
The Report concludes that “In the face of these social transformations, social cohesion and community life are adversely affected, undermining the development potential of some areas and giving rise to increased criminality in others.” The reasoning seems to be that social cohesion could be positively and negatively affected by policies and programmes addressing the remnants of the previous political dispensation. Social cohesion is mainly interpreted as an outcome of policies and programmes addressing exclusion or other remnants of the past dispensation.

**Assessment of progress with cohesion as reflected in Development Indicators 2008**

The key official document cited is the progress reported in the 2008 edition of Development Indicators published by the Policy Coordination and Advisory Services (PCAS) in The Presidency.43

In the Foreword it is stated that ...

> The indicators provide the framework to present aggregate data on human development and provide evidence-based pointers to the evolution of our society. They are markers that help define the milestones in our journey of social change. The 2008 edition of Development Indicators summarises data on trends mainly for the period up to the end of April 2008. Like the previous edition, this year’s publication contains information sourced from official statistics, government databases and research by local and international institutions, which has been clustered into ten broad themes.

The broad themes are economic growth and transformation, employment, poverty and inequality, household and community assets, health, education, social cohesion, safety and security, international relations and good governance.

Social cohesion is one of the themes. Two aspects of cohesion is dealt with, i.e. Voice and Accountability and Social Capital. The indicators of social cohesion used in the Development Indicators document are:

---

The two aspects Voice and accountability and Social capital limits the concept. The wide range of aspects, ideas on how cohesion could be promoted reflected elsewhere in this paper are “missing”. Although some of the related prerequisites and outcomes are accommodated elsewhere (such as on employment, poverty and inequality, household and community assets, health, education and safety and security), it remains problematic to simply use it as indicators of cohesion. Unlike many of the studies and perspectives cited, the definition, description and operationalisation of the concept is nowhere found. This leaves the reader with the impression that cohesion is what is being measured, and that is rather evasive.

The indicators used do cater for relevant aspects, but fail to provide evidence of progress (or regress) on certain aspects of social cohesion. It does partially include civic engagement and participation (by measuring participation in democratic electoral process) but does not measure the state (health) of relationships (positive / negative). It offers “racial incidents that occurred during the survey period” as reason for sharp downward trends in confidence in a happy future for all races, public opinion on race relations, and pride in being South African. There may, however, be other reasons that are not monitored in the present indicators, like perceived exclusion and the loss of legitimacy at perceptual level and the experience of deprivation and the poor being unable to sustain their livelihoods.

The detail of findings regarding social cohesion indicators are extracted from Development Indicators – see Annexure 1.
Macro-social trends in South Africa, 2006

The Presidency published in 2006 a discussion document portraying the social trends in the country with some indications of the state of social cohesion. The report states “cohesion in a society such as ours is determined by the social structure in terms of such categories as class, race, language and nationality. Social networks extend beyond these socio-economic issues, and are impacted on by factors that can define a trajectory of their own.” Trends in Social Networks and Social Capital and Identity and Self Worth are of direct importance for this paper.

These concepts are not defined or served with composite indexes in terms of definitions, as is the case with the Development Indicators as indicated above. For instance, in the section Social Networks and Social Capital, the first concept is measured, correctly but partially, only according to “the number of friends individuals had in their communities of neighbourhoods” while Social Capital is measured according to “the composite social capital score (of) a person’s living standard level (in terms of LSM).” In terms of this paper’s unpacking of the concept of social capital, living standard is only remotely connected to the concept. LSM is exactly what it says: a living standard measure.

However, interesting and noteworthy trends are mentioned. But from the report and the trends described it is not possible to get a sense of the intensity of social cohesion, nor whether it is increasing or decreasing. There is room for more work to be done on this score.

3.2 Promoting social cohesion in contexts of diversity

South Africa is an extremely diverse society, still divided along historical racial lines but with increasing cross-cutting affiliations in terms of class and access to privileged positions. Finding a position of commonality among these various and diverse racial and culture groups, therefore, poses an enormous challenge particularly to make true the values and principles entrenched in the Constitution. Transforming the nation toward “a united state based on the will of all the people, without regard for race, sex, belief, or geographic location” creates conditions conducive to strain and conflict that need to be managed into constructive actions and positive outcomes. It is therefore important to do a brief overview of the impact of the divisive forces on social cohesion.

3.2.1 Reconciliation and social cohesion

The Institute for Justice and Reconciliation was launched in May 2000 as an extension of the initiative to achieve justice and reconciliation and self-consciously located itself in post-TRC (Truth

---
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and Reconciliation Commission) South Africa to contribute towards nation building. The Institute is committed to using the insights generated through its work in South Africa to engage in dialogue with other African countries.

It seeks to look forward, rather than backward, asking the question: where do we go from here? It is founded on the assumption that there are two inseparable and equally important challenges facing this nation, namely justice and reconciliation. Justice without reconciliation and reconciliation without justice are both doomed to fail. Our constitution speaks of a "need for understanding but not for vengeance, a need for reparation but not retaliation, a need for ubuntu but not for victimisation... The Institute focuses on the promotion of nation-building within a constitutional democracy.

It positions itself as an agent in bringing about a more socially cohesive nation:

The past is remembered and reflected upon as a basis for understanding the present and building a better future. Strategies are developed for co-operation between individuals and groups who had hitherto lived in isolation from one another. The Institute at the same time, addresses the legal, social and historical dimensions of peace-making. It seeks to keep open a space for people to learn to live together in the wake of social upheaval and conflict, without resorting to recrimination and revenge.

The challenge in this endeavour is to continuously and persistently embark on the long journey for achieving "a truly united, democratic and prosperous South Africa in which the value of all citizens is measured by their humanity, without regard to race, gender and social status", addressing continued and currently felt injustices and inequities.

### 3.2.2 Social cohesion, race and racialism/racism

Racism or racialism indicates a lack of cohesion and social capital. It affects all in society in the sense of the significance attached to assumed racial identities, particularly coming from an era where race has been imposed sign or marker of identities.

The definition of racial discrimination proposed here is the one developed by the United Nations. It is laid out in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, adopted in 1966:

---
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48 Race is used here not as an objective category; we use it as a self- or imposed defined construction of identity.
any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, color, descent, or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life.

The practice of racial discrimination, and its corollary – racism, essentially is an extreme form of social exclusion.

Afrikaner Nationalism, a response to British Imperialism in southern Africa, and Apartheid, like its precursor – colonialism, maintained their position of political rule on the strength of racism. These systems created exclusivist racial domains that proved to be unsustainable as they produced conflict more than “peaceful co-existence” within a “separate development” model. On the question, why do we need the RDP? (as the policy framework for attaining “integrated and coherent socio-economic progress” in the post 1994 era), a strong reason offered was: “Our history has been a bitter one dominated by colonialism, racism, apartheid, sexism and repressive labour practices.”

Race, as a socially constructed category, however, has a universal appeal. In his analysis of thinking and visions that evolved within the notion of The African Renaissance, political scientist Willem van Vuuren, in 2000, distinguishes three positions: the Africanists, Charterists, and Black Consciousness Movement (BCM). According to his analysis, the Charterists advocate “a racially inclusive nationalism aimed at the creation of a non-discriminatory multi-racial/multi-cultural society that demanded mutual respect for the heterogeneous cultural identities of all national groups. This included protection and equal rights for minority groups/cultures.” The other positions foresee, in the case of the Africanists, a “racially exclusive struggle for national liberation”, and according to the BCM, a more intellectually refined strategy for national liberation that required a restricted (‘black’) inclusiveness amidst a racially inclusive vision of a liberated South African society which is culturally accommodative.” Like with the historical situations before 1994, and dependent on the leading position in the post-1994 era, one may expect different outcomes regarding social cohesion.

To what extent after a decade under a post-apartheid government, have South Africans overcome the socio-racial polarization? According to Francis Kornegay, who based his observations on a 2005 Race and Ethnic Relations Barometer survey, the following may be said:

---
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• While South Africa remains deeply divided along socio-racial lines, these divisions do not result in a paralysing political polarisation and are offset by all four socio-racial groups sharing a commitment to a common national identity.

• All four socio-racial groups appear to reflect a consensus on the need for “educating people about different cultures” and “improving race relations” as the best means of building South Africa.

• All groups feel that government is primarily responsible for eradicating racism. Though, when it comes to combating racism, while blacks overwhelmingly favour government assuming responsibility, substantial percentages of whites and coloureds placed this responsibility on the individual.

Racial divisions and thinking harms inter-group relationships and work against cohesion in the following ways:\(^{53}\)

• It is rationalised and justified by ideology, developing and offering “explanations” of the thinking, attitudes, actions, unequal treatment, prejudice, discrimination, or institutionalised arrangements that:
  o Generalises about those affected and the beneficiaries in categorical terms.
  o Apportions blame categorically on the affected groups.
  o Obscures (hides) the interests of those categories receiving preferential treatment.
  o Defends itself as needed to resolve societal problems.

• It generates feelings / emotions like rejection, blame and/or guilt, and anger because those affected can’t escape the categorical blame. It therefore works against common loyalties across lines of social division and impacts negatively on nation building and unity. It creates a vested interest in continuation or restructuring of unequal opportunity based on race.

There seems to be a perception among some minority groups that a revival of racial classification in post-apartheid South Africa is occurring. Kallie Kriel from AfriForum expresses a concern about the “renewed institutionalization of race by means of legislation (that) will lead to a greater awareness of race among South Africans” and “an obsessive awareness of race (that) holds enormous potential for conflict in South Africa.”\(^{54}\) The position of minorities within South African society needs to be examined briefly.

---


3.2.3 Social cohesion promoted in minority relations

A classic definition of minorities emphasised five characteristics: they are subordinated within society; they are held in low esteem by dominant groups because of their special physical or cultural traits; they form self-conscious units bound by these traits and the disabilities which these bring; membership is transmitted by a rule of descent that facilitates group bonding over several generations; they tend to marry within the group, by choice or necessity.\(^{55}\) Later descriptions emphasise more the power relations between minorities and majorities, making the point that minorities are not necessarily numeric minorities but often large groups with little power in society.\(^{56}\) South African examples from apartheid are often quoted in this regard.

Globally, attention to the position of minorities has grown. According to a UN declaration on minorities their rights should be to:\(^{57}\)

- Enjoy their own culture, profess and practice their own religion, and use their own language freely in public and private;
- Participate effectively in cultural, religious, social, economic and public life;
- Participate effectively in decisions on the national and, where appropriate, regional level concerning their minority group or region;
- Establish and maintain their own associations, and
- Establish and maintain free and peaceful contacts with other domestic minorities and with citizens of other states to whom they are related by national or ethnic, religious or linguistic ties.

Based on these rights, minorities may play a positive role in especially diverse societies by exhibiting positively their “special traits” as contributing to the mosaic of diversity as a national asset. This requires, of course, recognition of the rights of minorities, their participation in public events and affairs, and in the polity and economy as mainstream arenas of public life. The challenge for social cohesion is this area is how to ensure the “broadening of the circle” as Chirevo

---


V Kwenda, Head of the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Cape Town has put it. He proposes the following in developing difference as an asset:

- Firstly, there can be no doubt regarding the importance of awareness-raising. ... This knowledge should form a critical element of the socialisation process. This means that school curricula, public policy, corporate mission statements and staff policies, and many others, should serve as vehicles for this enterprise.

- Secondly, it should be made a requirement that every South African be proficient in at least one European-based official language and at least one African based official language. It will be up to government policy, at various levels of society, to inculcate this value and provide a means of recognising and rewarding satisfactory and above-average commitment, effort and achievement in sharing the cultural burden of the social intercourse of a diverse and changing society.

- Thirdly, the discovery and expected change of heart: Sensitivity to the values, hopes, fears and anxieties, as well as aspirations, of the other person or group is created, sharpened or heightened. In this way, the gap that divides society is progressively shrunk, if not altogether closed.

Due to the very nature of the status of minorities - a status “gained” primarily as a result of intentional or unintentional discrimination and subordination, these challenges and possible actions do not easily materialise, and often self-exclusion (or withdrawal) is observed on their part.

An expression of such perception of exclusion is the following statement by a minority rights activist group, AfriForum, who states:

*People who are not black, but whose ancestors have lived in South Africa for centuries and who know no other homeland, are no longer regarded as part of Africa. These people are reduced, on the basis of their race, to mere settlers in the country of their birth. By implication they cannot even call themselves Africans, however much they feel part of the continent where they were born.*

The response to exclusion is often apathetic withdrawal: “Civil societies in general, and communities in particular, have fallen into a spiral of withdrawal that holds negative consequences for themselves, for democratic principles and for the country as a whole.” AfriForum proposes a cycle of inward withdrawal to be replaced with one of activism:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Withdrawal cycle</th>
<th>Activism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Inward withdrawal or emigration</td>
<td>• Campaigns for the protection and consolidation of civil rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Withdrawal gives free reign to powers that be</td>
<td>• Promoting co-operation between civil institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Powers that be co-opt constitutional institutions</td>
<td>• Establishing functional forums in various spheres of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Powers that be interpret constitution selectively</td>
<td>• Creating a future vision for communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Democracy degenerates into domination</td>
<td>• Promoting co-operation between civil institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rules only serve the majority</td>
<td>• Liaising with the rest of the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minorities are ignored</td>
<td>• Liaising with the authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minorities have no say</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feelings of impotence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deficient future vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social cohesion is supposed to develop a strong common identity inclusive of all South Africans. The question remains if minority activism will work as an approach to address structural issues and if common identity as South Africans will supersede parochialism. This is, therefore, a challenging area on promoting social cohesion and nation building.

### 3.3 Social cohesion, social exclusion and poverty

Poverty can be conceptualized in a number of ways but within the context of social cohesion, that is, from a societal perspective, it should be regarded as a structural issue of social exclusion. This means that poverty is a consequence of the way society operates. If we prefer, and maintain, a society that reproduces wealth to the benefit of the wealthy, this society by implication reproduces poverty to its own benefit but at the expense of the poor. This "structural" definition of poverty does not refer to general, abstract social structures only, but point to the environments of our daily existence – schools, neighbourhoods, churches, sports clubs, shops, malls, work organizations, etc. In all these social situations we would observe and encounter social relationships of inclusion and exclusion that picture the distribution of wealth (and therefore poverty) in our communities and society. This position is extensively argued and researched in the
seminal work of the scientists belonging to the Research Group on Poverty, Social Exclusion and Minorities. They define poverty (freely translated) as:

*Poverty is a network of social exclusion that covers multiple areas in the existence of individuals and collectivities. It divides the poor from the main patterns of living in society. The poor on their own cannot overcome this rift.*

South Africa inherits from apartheid such a system of poverty. In its attempts to resolve the situation, Government as well as Business have to ask themselves whether they are subtly continuing the exclusivist forces of the past, not necessarily in racial terms, as we witness significant groups of white people falling into abysmal poverty as well, but in the manifold ways of exploitation and self-enrichment, the latter often at the expense of the already poor.

Valerie Hindson articulates a broad consensus of opinion that despite its relative wealth and a well-developed, modern economy, the new South Africa remains plagued with widespread poverty and high levels of inequality. Hindson’s informative paper points at the following:

- The benefits of economic growth have not led yet to the economic and social upliftment of the majority of the South Africans and South Africa remains one of the most socially unequal countries in the world.
- Over the last ten years, economic growth has been associated with growing income poverty and increasing exclusion of the poor from the mainstream market economy.

However, she points out that since 1994,

- The South African government has been ceaselessly striving to address the injustices of the past and to meet the basic needs of all South Africans.
- Most of its efforts were focussed on reducing the physical infrastructure backlogs and establishing a social security system and other safety nets, taking up thereby the idea of a 'caring society'.
- It also tried to implement poverty alleviation measures directly in a way that did not place too great a burden on the national fiscus while ensuring that the economy was following a growth path.
- Although an increasing number of black people are joining the middle class, the situation of most African households, both in rural and urban areas, is in many ways worse than fifteen

---

59 This Group, from Flemish origin, publishes a regular Yearbook *Armoede en Sociale Uitsluiting* under the editorship of Jan Vranken, and others. We consulted the 1997 volume: Jan Vranken, Dirk Geldof and Gerard Van Menxel, *Armoede en Sociale Uitsluiting*, Jaarboek 1997, Leuven/Amersfoort, Acco.


years ago, with the poorest third of black households falling into long term destitution, even in urban centres.

- The major causes of poverty include the legacy of the apartheid, the increasing level of unemployment, globalisation and the HIV/AIDS epidemic as an ally of poverty.

Ordinary citizens measure government by the criteria of legitimacy and effectiveness. Seymour M. Lipset, an internationally acclaimed political scientist, describes the legitimacy of a political system as its capacity to generate and maintain the belief that the existing political institutions are the most appropriate for the society and effectiveness as the extent to which the system satisfies the basic functions of government (i.e. in terms of actual performance). In situations of continued perceived ineffectiveness, the legitimacy may be at risk as well. Such situations are conducive to change but that does not necessarily bode well for relationships and cohesion and strong insistence to preserve policies like affirmative action may be the outcome. Polokwane in this sense may be regarded as a response to a growing sense of social exclusion of the poor.

3.4 How social cohesion relates to migration into South Africa and the situation of foreigners

Jo Beall and Sean Fox in an Oxfam Research Report remark that “While cities were once seen as ‘islands of privilege’, it is increasingly clear that they are becoming centres that also embrace poverty and despair. According to UN-Habitat, ‘the absolute number of poor and undernourished in urban areas is increasing, as is the share of urban areas in overall poverty and malnutrition.’”

In-migrants are seen as competitors for work and resources in such situations and this has consequences for inclusion and social cohesion.

Social inclusion and social cohesion are therefore viewed from two dimensions: an internal dimension to integrate the local/internal population/inhabitants and an external dimension to integrate foreigners into the local population. In South Africa this poses a particular challenge given the country’s history and complexities.

The outbreak of xenophobic violence in 2008 requires attending to the position of foreigners. For foreigners as well as SA citizens, social capital entails successful integration of foreigners in a way that strengthens social cohesion. It also means

---

62 Pieter Cloete. Class notes Cornerstone Christian College.
64 First edition of *Migration & Social Cohesion*, a publication – produced by democracy institute Idasa – that focuses on migration and social cohesion, particularly, but not exclusively, in South Africa.
"a politically and socially supportive environment in which migrants not only feel welcome and safe, but also have opportunities to contribute to the economic, social, cultural and political development of the host society."

The project on Migration and Social Cohesion by Idasa

The opening paragraph of this publication refers to the attacks on foreigners in South Africa, which presented significant challenges regarding the relationship between issues of citizenship, identity, inclusion and exclusion, migration, social cohesion and democracy. It points out that:

- failure to successfully integrate immigrants into society can in the longer term, lead to tension and conflict that have a significant impact on stability at local community level, and at a broad societal level and that it can ultimately undermine social cohesion and the ideals of, and the ability to achieve and maintain, an inclusive democracy.

- Immigration could be seen as a threat to national identity and social cohesion, and create a divide between those who “belong” and those who “do not belong”, and between the “insiders” and the ‘outsiders’.

The publication contextualizes cohesion as the victim of incidents like the xenophobic attack on outsiders. It also suggests preventative measures and that emphasis should be placed on the benefits to both migrants and citizens, not only economically, but also socially and culturally since economic interaction and integration also promote social and cultural interaction and integration.

HSRC Xenophobia study, 2008

In a study undertaken by the HSRC in 2008 after the recent xenophobic attacks perpetrated mainly against foreign nationals, it was found that these attacks happened mainly in informal settlements and against migrants from other African countries. The study explored popular conceptions behind the attacks such as a third force, crime, migration, corruption, gender issues, jobs, housing and small business competition. From this rapid social appraisal, discussion groups highlighted five themes as the main causes for the attacks:

- The role of government.
- The scale of influx of migrants.
- The impact of migrants of gender dynamics.
- The pace and administration of housing.
- The politics of economic livelihood and the competition for resources.

With reference to the role of government, responses generally consisted of three sub-themes:

65 Migration & Social Cohesion. Idasa.
66 Citizenship, Violence and Xenophobia in South Africa. HSRC Xenophobia study, June 2008
• The ineffective communication and/or engagement with local citizenry around the violence and its underlying causes.

• The insufficient pace and processing of service delivery contributes to the already existing tension.

• Perceived corruption and impropriety of government officials, especially in the police service, in their dealings with foreign nationals.

A second concern expressed by residents about the role of government pointed to the increased pressure that foreign nationals were creating on government ability to render much needed social and economic services to the local population.

3.5 Social cohesion and gender

For women, social capital means acquired improved positions in terms of access to resources, social roles and position, and opportunities in general. Although South Africa prides itself for having many women in parliament, the position of women in general is still a matter of concern. The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach linked to a Gender Analysis for Sustainable Livelihoods Framework addresses the question of inequalities affecting women (compared to men) in their access to resources, participation in decision-making processes and exercising of rights. The Framework provides for changes / improvements.67

• Of structural nature, by attending to productive roles (paid work, self-employment, and subsistence production), reproductive roles (domestic work, child care and care of the sick and elderly), community participation/self-help (voluntary work for the benefit of the community as a whole) and community politics (decision-making/representation on behalf of the community as a whole).

• Of attending to livelihood assets/opportunities that men and women have access to and the constraints they face. Aspects and issues dealt with include human assets (e.g. health services, education), social assets (e.g. social networks), physical assets (e.g. information, infrastructural access) and financial assets (e.g. capital/income, credit).

• In power and decision-making including what decision-making men and/or women participate in, what decision-making men and/or women usually control and what constraints they face. It further includes the household level (e.g. decisions over household expenditure) and community level (e.g. decisions on community issues).

• Of attending to needs, priorities and how women’s and men’s needs and priorities differ and what perspectives they have on appropriate and sustainable ways of addressing their needs.

Conditional Cash Transfer programs (CCT’s) have demonstrated their strength in improving health, nutrition and education and that empowerment and social cohesion are implicit objectives. Michelle Adato68 argues that the conditional cash transfers also indicated that such programs can contribute to women’s empowerment by:

• Increased participation in formal institutions
• Participation in meetings, collective activities such as health and nutrition workshops, mothers/parents organisations, quality improvement teams, promoter committees, health and nutrition committees.
• Increased control over income and expenditure decisions.
• New attention given to the importance of the role of women in the household and to girls’ education.
• Reduced social strain due to new household resources.
• For elected beneficiary-programme liaisons, new leadership and capacities.

3.6 Social cohesion promoted among youth

For youth, social capital means being included and participating in programmes addressing their needs.

The Youth Development for Local Government Strategic Framework69 provides for “professional and technical support to local government on youth development by: “Developing, adopting and facilitating the implementation of an integrated national youth development framework, providing support and partnership to enable young people to participate meaningfully in governance, economic development and social cohesion.”

---


69 Perused documentation:

Youth Development for Local Government Strategic Framework Draft 1,
Report on the National Workshop in Preparation to the National Youth Summit, 2007
The National Youth Policy 2009–2014
Youth Development Guidelines for Local Government in South Africa and
It also suggests that youth structures should conduct youth needs assessments, advocate for youth volunteerism and programmes that enhance social cohesion at local level, and to highlight social cohesion through youth service.

The concept of cohesion in the perused documentation is defined as an outcome of participation and being promoted through volunteerism.

3.7 Promoting social cohesion with special groups

A very similar situation exists regarding groups like people with disabilities and HIV infected and affected people. For all such groups addressing of stigma and catering for their needs becomes the mechanism to deal with social exclusion. This emphasizes that it is of importance to enhance policies, programmes, departments and civil society organizations as social capital at national, provincial and local levels.

The Report of the UNAIDS Technical Consultation on Social Change Communication\textsuperscript{70} summarizes the response:

\textit{There was a good level of agreement on the fact that fighting stigma can produce successful results. Stigma interventions can reduce the social exclusion associated with HIV and AIDS, and bring more people to services. ... Another lesson learnt for guidance notes is that social change communication efforts against stigma and discrimination can benefit from working with coalitions, including the voices of those affected. Spokespersons are needed from all classes and sectors. Within this strategic approach, it is necessary to identify the entry points to key institutions and groups.}

\textsuperscript{70} UNAIDS Report of the \textit{UNAIDS Technical Consultation on Social Change Communication}, September 2007, p 19
4 PROMOTING SOCIAL COHESION IN SOUTH AFRICA

4.1 The key question

In our introduction to this paper, we draw attention to “the national question” – how do we succeed in nation-formation and nation building? In a recent book on social cohesion published by the HSRC the authors ask a similar question: what holds us together? If we can answer that question, we have the key to nation building. But the counter side of the question is equally important: what drives us apart? And how would we be able to overcome the centrifugal forces working in society? The desire to form and build a united nation in a unitary state, but still valuing diversity as a national asset, is a formidable challenge in the project of promoting social cohesion and building social capital in South Africa. Both centripetal and centrifugal forces have to be managed.

One thing has become clear in our analysis: when people and groups are excluded from the mainstream of society, the project of social cohesion will fail. When they are included, it stands a chance to be successful. However, social inclusion is only a necessary but not a sufficient condition for attaining social cohesion. Something more is needed. We will be looking into these conditions.

4.2 What should be promoted?

Social cohesion is a normative concept in the sense that it suggests action towards a goal, informing us how to achieve it. Its normative nature connects it to a number of contributing factors and consequences. Promoting social cohesion in general terms means achieving changes towards the positives as described in the various understandings of the term, through promoting a conducive environment for, or implementing certain actions towards the goal. We summarise below the insights and perspectives identified in the paper.

Social cohesion refers to a desired quality in social relations that bind people together, at all levels ranging from inter-personal, intergroup to social relationships at macro level, such as national and international levels. It is synonymous to solidarity and linked to community cohesion, social capital and nation building. It assumes a common vision and values and equal life chances/equity for all. It therefore is based on social inclusion. However, and importantly, social inclusion does not guarantee the outcome of cohesion; civic engagement and participation are additional ingredients for the process of social capital formation. People need to regard the social system (in its governance function) as legitimate, to be recognised as human beings, to have a feeling of belonging, to be included in all mainstream processes, and to actively participate in

---

decision-making, planning and implementation of social programmes affecting them. Social capital may be seen as the outcome these processes and linked to improved quality of life.

4.3 Programmatic building blocks in social cohesion

If social cohesion becomes a priority, it can’t be "business as usual". Concerted effort is needed to change direction. The following three actions need to be performed.

(1) Change of thinking

A new way of thinking about the “other” is needed. Stereotyping of the “out-group” (often depicted as a minority) and the consequent process of “othering” needs to be attended to in a conscious manner. Civic practices need to be devised that will “contradict othering, generate authentic relationships, and build community-wide awareness and a shared understanding of a common future.” These practices should lead to the internalization of positive values that may serve as a motivational force in nation formation and building. Ubuntu, universal or general human values and a sense of communality comes to mind.

(2) A review of divisive structures

Divisive structures refer to policies, legislation and systems of administration that divide people and groups and frustrate attempts to addressing the needs and aspirations of the people. These structures defeat their own purposes and create side-effects and unintended consequences that turn and divide people into winners and losers.

To promote social cohesion, this means upgrading, revising and/or scrapping policies and administrative systems that are exclusivist in their effect and/or in their application in practice. Policies that affirm people according to their class, sex, race, age, beliefs, etc. are divisive in their consequences. Perceived or real ineffective service delivery (for example, municipal services to the poor) may have similar divisive consequences.

In this regard, two questions need to be considered by all spheres of Government with respect to the current policy and legislative framework driving social cohesion in South Africa:

- Does the policy and legislative framework provide adequately for promoting social cohesion, social capital and sustainable livelihoods for sustaining a satisfactory quality of life for all?

---

72 S.M. Aigner, V.J. Raymond & L.J. Smidt, Whole Community Organizing for the 21st Century, 96. “The dominant racial or classist groups weaken the solidarity of subordinate groups that oppose them and perpetuate poverty with four generic, face-to-face processes: othering, subordinate adaptation, boundary maintenance, and emotional management.” pp. 95-96.

73 We reviewed the RDP, the South African Constitution, the Local Government Systems Act, the Integrated Development Plan Format Guide of the Department Provincial and Local Government, the Credible IDP Evaluation Framework
Does it address adequately bridging deep divisions and social distances between groups and individuals and provide for healing and reconciling in broken relationships and dignifying of all people according to a norm of human worth?

As we have learned from the Synthesis Report on Implementation of Government Programmes (2003), programmes such as land reform, affirmative action, and BEE that are aimed at addressing injustices of apartheid, are currently creating certain inconsistencies that may be depicted as divisive by nature and separating citizens categorically based on race. This observation makes the two questions above all the more relevant in a project of social cohesion.

(3) Activities and campaigns promoting social cohesion

A change in thinking and a review of policy provisions and measures are necessary but not sufficient to drive the project. Concrete and specific actions are also needed to provide a full package of national impact. The project should be perceived as of national importance; therefore leadership (at all levels) should sanction it, backed-up by policy and legislative provision.

We now list specific areas and programmes that may be useful in promoting social cohesion and nation building. The focus is on local communities.

- **Programmes on national and local dialogue**
  
  A suggestion from the UK experience was that an open discussion about race issues needs to be encouraged and people should not feel threatened, discouraged or socially excluded if they talk about them. This requires a conducive environment for dialogue encouraged by appropriate structures, facilitation of processes, etc.

- **The contribution of arts and culture to social cohesion**
  
  Arts constitute a medium, space and field for creativity, diversity and dialogue between groups. It creates space for communication and a better understanding of people not part of your own group.

- **Promotion of a culture of inclusion and tolerance**
  
  The promotion of a community spirit, where commonality in place of a notion of “us” and “them” is accepted. The interest of the broader community should be promoted above sectional interests but according to values of justice and equity.

- **Community educational programmes and public awareness campaigns**
  
  To address negative perceptions, stereotyping and “othering”.

- **Promotion of non-racialism**
The role of community institutions such as schools, churches, sport bodies, etc. are critical here. The media and leadership can also play an important role in this respect.

- **Use of the media and dissemination of information**

Besides efforts by local authorities to distribute information on social cohesion, the role of the media is of critical importance. In this respect close relations with the local media would be a good idea. Local newspapers, radio and television are influential tools in affecting relations between communities or fermenting divisions. Local newspapers can exacerbate tensions in communities. They can also help to alleviate tension and promote cohesion.

Local authorities need to take their relationship with the local media more serious. They should be encouraged to develop a communications group among officers working on social cohesion to ensure that the benefits of their projects are maximised in the media and that any misinformation can be quickly countered. The media also need to recognise their responsibilities and the benefits of promoting social cohesion. The local media should take the initiative in establishing contact with faith and ethnic minorities on a regular basis and ensure that ethnic minority groups are represented in their workforce so that they have a more detailed understanding of community issues.

- **The role of schools and education**

Schools provide an opportunity for different cultural groups to mix or at least for young people to gain an awareness and understanding of different communities. Sometimes schools cater only for specific cultural or language groups or certain faiths and so do not help to promote social cohesion. Parental choice on the basis of the quality of some schools, also play a role which may increase segregation. Linking schools may help to break down barriers between different ethnic groups. Social cohesion may also be promoted through the school curriculum making provision for concepts and ideas intended to promote greater understanding and tolerance of other cultures.

- **Pro-active programmes and strategies in which the local leadership plays an active role**

Forums for awareness and education in which all participate could be a good idea. The role of councillors should be clearly stated in this regard.

- **Special projects to promote opportunities to specified groups**

Projects with children, youth, women, disabled and vulnerable groups could promote community bonding. Such projects may be initiated and implemented by churches, schools, community organizations, the community policing forum, etc.

- **Community based organizations, NGOs, churches and other role players**
Social cohesion cannot be promoted by local authorities alone. They need to work in cooperation with organizations rooted in the community and who can help to provide services and empower communities. Local authorities however could have a key role in providing leadership and to facilitating cross cultural activity.

4.4 Partnerships

Programmes for promoting social cohesion require an inter-disciplinary and inter-sectoral approach between different social partners working together. Co-operation between government, business, labour and NGOs as partners is necessary to achieve the objectives of social cohesion. Partnership networks can create a system of dialogue concerning cross-cutting issues in society.74

NGOs are of special importance in the partnership network. Stephen Heinz, President of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, highlights three primary roles of NGOs modern societies.75

- NGOs provide opportunities for the self-organization of society. Citizens can work together voluntarily to promote social values and civic goals which are important to them. NGOs promote local initiatives and problem-solving. They are involved in a broad array of fields such as environment, health, poverty alleviation, culture and the arts, education and so forth and consequently reflect the diversity of society in terms of projects and composition of membership. NGOs empower citizens and promote change at the grass roots level, they both represent and advance pluralism and diversity.

- NGOs preserve a unique and essential space between the for-profit sector and government. The niche for private enterprise is to produce goods and private wealth; for government it is to provide and manage public goods; the non-profit non-governmental sector helps to fulfil the common good and consequently provides a fulcrum for balancing the state and the free market.

- NGOs enable experimentation and social change by taking on challenges that the public and private sectors cannot take on. Due to their experimental approaches, NGOs have pioneered innovations that have been adopted as government policy.

Heinz concludes:

"As modernizing economies increasingly shift to free markets and private enterprise, they often experience a decline in social cohesion and an increase in economic and social inequality. In these circumstances the non-governmental sector has proven to be an

75 Stephen Heinz, President of Rockeller Brothers Foundation, http://www.ifce.org/pages/envirolink_Articles/5m06/Role.htm
essential mitigation force that helps create a healthier balance between the potential excesses of capitalism and the inefficiencies and limited resources of the state.”

4.5 Examples of social cohesion at the provincial level

Ichiro Kawachi and Lisa Berkman argue in their paper, Social Cohesion, Social Capital and Health, that we have a far better understanding of the forces that tend to destroy social capital than notions of what kinds of interventions help to build it. It is however clear that social capital requires stability of social structure. Disruptions of social organisations or social relations can be highly destructive for social capital. Sustained social networks are required.

Within this framework of partnering and networking, it is possible to identify an array of top-down and bottom-up approaches to build/rebuild social capital. From a top-down perspective, state and the different spheres of government, as well as private sector, could do much to foster social capital in the form of neighbourhood organizations, women’s organizations, youth organisations, etc. From a bottom-up perspective, existing community based institutions such as churches/faith communities, trade unions and NGO’s could invest in the infrastructure of poor neighbourhoods and institute programmes to promote social capital.

As examples of how social cohesion is promoted within the provincial sphere of government we look briefly at Western Cape and Gauteng. In his State of the Province Address on 16 December 2004, erstwhile Western Cape Premier Ebrahim Rasool says the following:

I believe that the single vision that we pursue in the next five years must be to make the Western Cape a Home for All. This is in line for the President’s call for social cohesion. This will transcend our Provincial fault lines of racism, sexism, classism and urban bias. A Home for All implies many things. Shelter, security, safety, comfort, warmth, welcome, justice, belonging, community and peace. To work for a home for all implies that currently we do not provide these qualities to every member of our Provincial family.

Backed by the South African Constitution, which aims to build a humane, stable and just society, to harmonise social policies with measures to promote economic development, the Western Cape gives substance to this vision in its Growth and Development Strategy. Social Capital Formation is one of the lead strategies and informs all the work of the Provincial Government. The strategy was launched in October 2005 and includes guidelines for operation in various Provincial Departments. The WC Department of Social Development crafted the strategy with a focus on

76 Stephen http://courses.ats.rochester.edu/fox/WST206F04/kawasoci.pdf
77 http://courses.ats.rochester.edu/fox/WST206F04/kawasoci.pdf
families and children, specifically early childhood development and children headed households; youth development and substance abuse; older persons; disabled persons; and HIV.

Implementation of the programmes according to the strategy is done through partnerships with organisations and programmes such as Artscape Resource Centre, Community Healing Network, Ethical Leadership, Justice and Peace Commission, Cape Nature, EFSA, Certificate of Youth Trainer, Brawam Siswam, Jikeleza, Gun Free Society, and Children Resource Centre. The department claims to have achieved measures of poverty reduction, civic responsibility, community driven development, solidarity, racial integration, and delivery of social safety nets. In the financial year of 2006-2007, the department has committed R9.87 million of finding to Social Capital Projects.80

Gauteng Province has similar thinking and proposes an integrated social cohesion model in which the implementation agencies are the various Provincial Government Departments (Social Development, Arts, Culture and Sport, Justice, Education, Provincial and Local Government), who conduct various types of programmes in order to target factors acting as hindrances to social cohesion, and to attain desired outcomes regarding social cohesion. This model is graphically presented in Appendix 2.

---

80 Social Capital in Department of Social Development. Comparable programmes and projects are also to be observed in other Provincial Departments. See www.capecateway.gov.za.
5 LOCAL SOCIAL COHESION PLANNING

This concluding part of the paper:

- Addresses the question on how to incorporate and advance social cohesion/inclusion in integrated development plans, and
- Provide ideas on how to assess/evaluate social cohesion in municipal plans within the current Credible IDP Evaluation Framework.

5.1 Addressing social cohesion at governmental level

The previous section alludes to "inconsistencies" due to certain policy and legislative applications with respect to social cohesion. The question therefore needs to be raised how to incorporate and advance social cohesion/inclusion in integrated development plans, an important application in enhancing the quality of life of South Africans.

As stated, central leadership is required to ensure that all government departments and spheres of government, national, provincial and local, in partnership with business, the non-profit sector and community-based organisations, promote social cohesion. Social cohesion as a priority should therefore be mandated at the level of the presidency and from there be delegated through the structures of state to include local government and its leadership, in the person of the ward councillor.

The very nature of social cohesion requires buy-in at all levels. Unlike the tax system where one does not have an option, the very characteristics of social cohesion are such that people must grow into it – from below and from the inside. The state at all its levels and in all its spheres however should provide a conducive environment for this to happen. A conducive environment, practically, refers to systems, human resources, facilities and finance to drive the process and assist with its planning, facilitation and monitoring. Government should provide also optimal scope to role players and local leadership in communities for their input and initiative, i.e. to participate fully in the programme.

In essence, this is what a community development approach is about.81 There are two essential elements needed, in balance, to ensure that social cohesion is guaranteed as an outcome of the local level IDP. The first is the initiative of the local people and their own participation, and the second, the role of government in the provision of technical and other services in ways that encourage initiative, self-help and mutual help and make these more effective. Community participants are therefore responsible for their own development, including

---

social cohesion, whilst government acts as a facilitation agent and technical provider in the process.

Community development, by its very nature, is the appropriate approach for attaining social cohesion. The sociologist, Jnanabrata Bhattacharyya, explains the nature of community development as the process of creating and enhancing solidarity and agency.82

- Solidarity is the building of a deeply shared identity, a code of behavior, and of social capital, within community
- Agency is achieved when people gained the capacity to organize their world, to understand that world, to recreate it, and to project themselves and to reflect; in brief, it is the result of a process of capacity building to become human agents in community.

Therefore, when building social cohesion as a country programme, it needs to be an initiative by the people for the people, supported by mainstream institutions, such as government, in order to achieve solidarity in society, a shared national identity, and a significant level of social capital for all. Promoting and sustaining the process would require continuous capacity building to enable people to conduct themselves in constructive interrelationships and supportive networks.

**LEVELS OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ACCORDING TO PROJECT STAGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Community Involvement</th>
<th>Project Stages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-help Community control</td>
<td>Community initiates action alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Shared working and decision-making</td>
<td>Authorities and community jointly initiate action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Authorities ask communities for opinion</td>
<td>Authorities initiate action after consulting community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Public relations</td>
<td>Authorities initiate action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Community Planning Handbook

---

The key to these processes is participation. Community (individually and collectively through its institutions) needs to become involved in projects concerning social cohesion. Participation, or involvement, does have different levels of community-authority relationships, as can be seen from the table above. In the community development approach, the ideal relationship may be pitched at the Partnership level, not excluding the need to start off (Initiate) processes on the Information or Consultation levels. No community development process can be sustained only on the Information or Consultation level; therefore, Planning, Implementation and Maintenance need to shift to Partnership, and eventually Self-help, levels.

5.2 A programme to build social cohesion

A programme of social cohesion should function at national, provincial and local levels and in all spheres of government:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
<th>Social cohesion /nation building to be made a national priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formulation of policy and policy guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be located in an appropriate national department such as Social Development or in the Presidency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>The programme should be implemented at provincial level by a provincial department or the Premier’s office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symbolic support of programme and major events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget for programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitation to local authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Implementation at local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identified as KPA in the local IDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depending on the category of the municipality provision for a social cohesion portfolio, office or staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local programme

The following may be considered:

- Acceptance and endorsement by the Executive Mayor.
- The creation of a position of Social Cohesion Coordinator employed by the local authority with an office tasked with the facilitation of a local programme involving and bringing together local leadership in all sectors for the promotion of nation building. These sectors should include business, NGOs, faith-based organizations, education, government departments, and individuals dedicated to nation building. The incumbents of such positions should have a background in social sciences and relevant experience.
Activities should be directed at building social capital according to the dimensions of bonding, bridging and linking, with special emphasis to building a common vision and identity towards nation formation and building. Programmes promoting social cohesion should attend to eradicating racism and sexism, promoting equity, and be supported and resourced by local authorities.

The level of community involvement must be truly participative and not imposed from above.

The capacity of the municipality (according to category and location, rural, urban or metropolitan) will have to be taken into account in

- working out the details and scale, and
- the extent to which the plan must be decentralised within the municipality, such as for different areas within a metropolitan region.

5.3 How to incorporate and advance social cohesion/inclusion in integrated development plans

According to the Integrated Development Plan (IDP) Format Guide all Integrated Development Plans should have the following impacts, among others, in the medium to long term:

- Integrated sustainable human settlement
- Stimulating growth of robust local economy
- Social inclusion, social cohesion and nation building – non-racism, non-sexism, democratic and accountable practices, equity, etc
- Environment sustainability.

A Realistic or Credible Integrated Development Plan must comply with relevant legislation and convey, among other, a responsive and sincere government that cares about its people, the environment and strives to build social cohesion.

Currently, social cohesion is specified as an outcome in the implementation of IDPs. It is not specified according to Key Focal or Performance Areas and no proper measurable indicators are available. The existing KPAs include the following:

- Spatial analysis and rationale
- Basic service delivery
- Local economic development

---

83 Department of Provincial and Local Government. Integrated Development Plan (IDP) Format Guide.
- Municipal transformation and organizational development
- Municipal financial viability and management
- Good governance and public participation.

Social cohesion may be seen as a by-product of these KPAs but that is certainly not a guarantee that social cohesion will be enhanced through the IDP process. Social cohesion needs to be specified in a conscious manner as a KPA together with appropriate Performance Indicators. It should be noted, however, that social inclusion (which we indicated as a necessary condition in social cohesion) must be a universal feature in all other KPAs and processes of IDP.

The following project management framework may be considered:

**KPA: SOCIAL COHESION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPIs</th>
<th>Improvement Measure</th>
<th>Who will assist the Municipality?</th>
<th>By when?</th>
<th>Responsible Agents (Names of officials)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Cohesion Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When was it adopted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When was it reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is it aligned with other development frameworks and principles, etc?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.4 Concerns about participation in IDPs**

The Gauteng Provincial Department of Local Government launched a study in 2007 on the depth and quality of public participation in the Integrated Development Planning process in Gauteng\(^\text{84}\) that contain lessons to take note of. The study covered the field well and attended to aspects that are relevant in this paper. The study report dealt with the measurement of “good” participation and identified issues and remedies under two headings:

- *“Room for improvement”*. The study pointed to practical and logistic issues including contextual and performance matters like poor publicity for meetings, people not understanding the process or IDP documents, language as barrier, inconvenient meeting

times, difficulty and cost of travelling to meeting venues, meetings poorly run and facilitated, and inadequate report-backs.

- **“Dealing with stickier problems”**. Issues of attitude, perception, trust and relationships were discussed. These are matters that impact on cohesion. It includes issues such as people not trusting government, perceptions of incompetence or indifference, low participation among “privileged” residents, participation fatigue, the “pay-off” or outcome of participation not clear, etc.

This study should be noted for its practical approach and findings that also may impact negatively on promoting cohesion elsewhere. The study does not reflect directly and consciously on social cohesion as it is an assessment of participation and inclusion. Above we have shown, however, that these matters are of particular importance to social cohesion.

### 5.5 Continued monitoring, evaluation and research is needed on social cohesion

Programmes for integration and social cohesion require integrated, multi-disciplinary, comparative research programmes with South Africa as its central focus. Research should inter alia focus on issues identified in this paper:

- Development of proper indicators of social cohesion and associated concepts (like inclusion and participation) that can be applied at local municipal and community levels to monitor, assess and evaluate that state of social cohesion and progress of social cohesion programmes
- The reasons for the downward trends in confidence in a happy future for all races, public opinion on race relations, and pride in being South African
- The state of our relationships, equal life chances, civic engagement and participation, and common vision and values, and cohesion in community relations
- How we are doing as far as belonging, inclusion, participation, recognition and legitimacy are concerned
- If, and the extent to which, bonding capital, bridging capital and linking capital develop emerging from interaction within and between internal and external participants and between state and civil society in pursuit of local and societal objectives
- Exploration of how to create social capital in various contexts like government, labour, business, community, culture, gender, youth, minorities, foreigners, and HIV and AIDS
- If, and the extent to which, we have overcome the socio-racial polarization
- Study racialism at all levels: interpersonal, group, national, interactional, ideological, cultural and institutional
- Socio-economic, environmental and demographic research needed to understand its impacts on social cohesion. Some of the examples from this paper are:
  - Migration patterns of persons across the border and into certain areas. We need to know how and where migrants settle, their integration into society and the impact of their migration for receiving communities.
  - At the local level, compiling of community profiles may be used to collect data and to determine community dynamics.
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APPENDIX 1

Development Indicators 2008

Policy Coordination and Advisory Services (PCAS) in The Presidency published in their Development Indicators 2008 findings regarding social cohesion according to indicators applied. The following information was extracted from this document:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Trend analysis</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Voice and accountability:**    | To promote high levels of participation of citizens in the democratic electoral process | • Voter participation in national and provincial elections has been very high in the past three elections.  
• There has, however, been a slight decline in participation in each subsequent election. This slight decline should also be measured against the increase of about five million voters between 1999 and 2004.  
• The experience of other democracies shows that voter participation in local government elections tends to be much lower than the average 48% registered in SA’s local government elections. | State of the Nation, South Africa 2007. Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) 2007 www.elections.org.za |
| Voter participation              |                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                              |
| **Voice and accountability:**    | To promote equal participation of all citizens in the democratic electoral process across all provinces | • The turnout of registered voters in the 1999 and 2004 national and provincial elections was quite high across all the provinces.  
• The table shows that while the average voter turnout was 87.5% in the 1999 elections, there was a decline to 76.7% in the 2004 elections.  
• All provinces experienced a decline. Even so, South Africa still compares quite favourably with other democracies.  
| Voters per province              |                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                              |

| Voice and accountability: Percentage of women who are members of legislative bodies | To increase the participation and representation of women in legislative bodies. | • The representation of women in Parliament and all provincial legislatures has increased from an average of 25.4% in 1994 to an average of 32.5% in 2004.  
• This puts South Africa in a league of only a few countries that have passed the 30% mark in this regard.  
• Women’s representation at local government level increased markedly from 29% after 2000 elections to about 40% after the 2006 elections. | Independent Electoral Commission (IEC) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Voice and accountability: Confident in a happy future for all races | To promote social cohesion and eliminate racism while building the nation. | • During periods of national elections, surveys show greater levels of public confidence in general, including confidence in a happy future for all races.  
• The percentage of people optimistic about a happy future for all races dropped from 82% in 2006 to 38% in May 2008.  
• The decline in optimism may be attributed in part to several racial incidents that occurred during the survey period. | Markinor’s regular surveys, based on a national sample of 3,300, conducted twice a year in two parts namely the Government Performance Barometer (GPB) and Socio Political Trends (SPT). In questions using a Likert (five point) scale, the two positive answers are combined (“very/fairly well” or “very/fairly confident”). |
| Social cohesion and social capital Public opinion on race relations | To promote social cohesion and eliminate racism while building the nation. | • During periods of national elections, surveys show greater levels of public confidence in general, including opinions on race relations.  
• The decline in opinion about race relations may have been influenced by specific incidents during the survey period. | Markinor’s regular surveys, based on a national sample of 3,300, conducted twice a year in two parts namely the Government Performance Barometer (GPB) and Socio Political Trends (SPT). In questions using a Likert (five point) scale, the two positive answers are combined (“very/fairly well” or “very/fairly confident”). |
| Social cohesion and social capital | To promote social cohesion while building the nation. | • Survey results demonstrate that in the periods of intense interaction and discourse around public policy issues, such as occurs during election periods, there is a stronger sense of the country going in the right direction.  
• The trend in the current cycle (2004 - 2009) depicts a similar trend as in the two previous cycles, with perceptions in beginning of the current cycle at a slightly higher level compared to the previous electoral cycles. | Markinor's regular surveys, based on a national sample of 3,300, conducted twice a year in two parts namely the Government Performance Barometer (GPB) and Socio Political Trends (SPT). The indicator reflects only "right direction". Markinor's regular surveys, based on a national sample of 3,300, conducted twice a year in two parts namely the Government Performance Barometer (GPB) and Socio Political Trends (SPT). The indicator reflects only "right direction" |
| Country going in the right direction | | | |
| | | | |
| Social cohesion and social capital | To promote social cohesion and national identity. | • Survey results indicate that 52.8% of respondents identify themselves as South Africans, indicating that South Africans are evincing a strong sense of national identity, at least in terms of association with the geographic and state entity.  
• While race is receding as a primary form of self-definition - having dropped from 9.9% in 2004 to 4.1% in 2007 - language has increased by 11 percentage points since 2004. | FutureFact Mindset surveys |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social cohesion and social capital</th>
<th>To promote social cohesion and national identity</th>
<th>Government Communications’ (GCIS) National Tracker survey which has a cumulative sample of 3 800 respondents per year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pride in being South African      | • Surveys on pride in being South African have depicted a generally high level of pride that has increased from 84% in 2003 to 90% maintained during the period 2004 to 2006.  
• Good performance in the economy and the role of the country in global endeavours, including the hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup may have partly contributed to instilling this sense of pride among South Africans.  
• The higher trajectory of the past four years seems to have faltered, as the percentage dropped by 12 percentage points to reach 78% in 2007.  
• This may have to do with specific incidents during the survey period, as with “happy future for all races”, as well as the tone of public discourse. |
APPENDIX 2

Gauteng: Framework on the Integrated Social Cohesion model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementing agency</th>
<th>Type of programme</th>
<th>Target factors critical to cohesion</th>
<th>Desired outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Department of Social Development | • Moral regeneration programmes using older person’s luncheon clubs.  
• Poverty relief programme  
• School uniform project  
• Victim empowerment programme  
• Prevention and treatment of drug dependency  
• Family preservation services | • Crime  
• Poverty  
• Unemployment and high dependency ratios  
• Lack of national identity  
• Xenophobia  
• Racism and tribalism  
• Drug and alcohol abuse  
• Women and child abuse  
• Elderly abuse  
• Moral decay | Self reliant communities that are characterized by:  
• Low crime levels  
• Low alcohol and drug abuse  
• Improved sense of nationality  
• No incidents of women and child abuse  
• Low unemployment levels |
| Department of Arts, Culture and Sport | Crime prevention programme aimed at transfer of indigenous knowledge and systems through sport and cultural activities | | |
| Department of Justice | Rehabilitation of identified victims of violence and crimes. Drive the process of reconciliation and deterrence | | |
| Department of Education | Education programmes instilling elements of national identity | | |
| Department of Provincial and Local Government | Re-designation of national symbols and monuments, to reflect transformation | | |

Source: Kindly provided by Mr. Mosimanegape Manoto, Gauteng Population Unit, Gauteng Province, 23 June 2009.