

**THE ECONOMIC ASPECTS
OF NATIVE SEGREGATION
IN SOUTH AFRICA**

THE ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF
NATIVE SEGREGATION IN
SOUTH AFRICA

BY
JOHN KIRK, B.COM.

WITH A FOREWORD BY
DR. C. T. LORAM, M.A., LL.B., PH.D.
MEMBER OF SOUTH AFRICAN NATIVE AFFAIRS COMMISSION

LONDON
P. S. KING & SON, LTD.
ORCHARD HOUSE, WESTMINSTER
1929

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
RICHARD CLAY & SONS, LTD.,
Bungay, Suffolk

FOREWORD

It is the firm belief of many that the solution of the so-called Native Problem of South Africa will in the long run be determined by economic conditions. Religious, humanitarian and social factors will certainly function, but the deciding influence will be economic. Does it pay to educate the Native? Is it economically sound to allow "squattling"? What is the financial aspect of a White Labour policy? Complete, accurate, unemotional answers to these and similar questions will, it is held, ultimately determine the attitude of white South Africa to the Native population.

If this view is correct, then the economic aspect of the Native Problem must receive in the future much greater consideration than it has received in the past. One of the greatest students of the Native Question, the late Mr. Maurice Evans, once expressed to me the view that the time had come for what he called the monographic treatment of the subject. The field of study is so vast that even the economic aspect deserves to be subdivided for detailed study and exposition. The author of this study has therefore been wise in restricting himself to the economic aspect of one proposed "solution" of the question, namely, segregation.

Mr. Kirk is one of the growing band of young South Africans who are bringing their trained and disciplined minds to bear upon South Africa's greatest problem. His essay was easily the best submitted for the Chalmers Memorial Prize of the University of Capetown in 1926, and I had no hesitation in urging its publication, although I did not agree with several of his conclusions. Probably every reader of this book will disagree with some of its conclusions and recommendations, but few will read it without being stimulated to cogitate again and anew on matters which have tended to become postulates if not axioms in our thinking on Native matters.

Since it is true, as Professor Richards of Dartmouth College has said, that it is an asset to a community if a considerable element in it is in the habit of making up its mind upon controverted questions on a surer basis than personal prejudice, snap judgment, or supine yielding to a well-organized propaganda, then Mr. Kirk and the Natal University College have deserved well of South Africa in putting before it this stimulating essay at a season when the country is, or should be, thinking of the Native Problem as it has never thought before.

C. T. LORAM.

Rondebosch, C.P.

PREFACE

FOR a physician there are three distinct steps to take in attempting to cure any complaint—diagnosis, prognosis and treatment. The corresponding steps for a politician are, first, an investigation of the present situation; next, a prophecy of future developments; then—and only then—the formulation of a constructive policy. It is the inversion of this logical order which has caused countless errors of statesmanship.

In South Africa, for instance, we have begun to administer a Native policy without clearly diagnosing our present problem. Nor have we attempted carefully enough to deduce the probable form that this problem will take in the future, left to itself, or modified by definite action. This book seeks to fill, however inadequately, the former want, and is therefore a work of economic diagnosis. Admittedly, though, the argument spills over in places into prognosis and suggestions for treatment.

Nevertheless, on its merits as a work of diagnosis it is my hope that this monograph will be received. It is written primarily for South African readers by a South African, but it should not be devoid of interest to very many English-speaking circles.

I would like here to acknowledge, with sincerest thanks, the kind advice of Dr. C. T. Loram; Mrs. M. Palmer, M.A.; Mr. J. S. Marwick, M.L.A., and Mr. A. V. Schwikkard; the assistance of the Council of the Natal Technical College, and the generosity of Lady Campbell, which has made this publication possible.

J. K.

*Natal University College,
Durban,
1929.*

CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
I. THE TREND OF RECENT POLICY . . .	I
II. RACE COMPETITION IN THE LABOUR MARKET	16
III. THE CIVILIZED LABOUR POLICY . . .	31
IV. FURTHER ASPECTS OF NATIVE LABOUR . . .	43
V. THE CASE FOR COMPLETE SEGREGATION . . .	56
VI. EXAMINATION OF "POSSESSORY" SEGREGA- TION	72
VII. EXAMINATION OF "POSSESSORY" SEGREGA- TION (CONTINUED)	84
VIII. FURTHER EXAMINATION OF "POSSESSORY" SEGREGATION	101
IX. IS THE NATIVE LOSING GROUND? . . .	116
X. COMPARATIVE SURVEY	129
INDEX	145

THE ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF NATIVE SEGREGATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

CHAPTER I

THE TREND OF RECENT POLICY

NOWADAYS the words "Native Problem" seem continually to be forming on all South Africa's lips. The expression is not kind to our Native co-citizens of the Union, but as a collective term to describe the task of reconciling two outlooks upon life in the sub-continent, perhaps it may be allowed to stand. Most branches of the problem require some technical equipment in the student, and particularly so the legal, administrative and economic branches.

The economic problem is on the whole the most widely discussed, and the most urgent. It is the problem which is most susceptible to coloration by self-interest and racial vanity on the part of Europeans, and exaggerated complaint on the part of Natives. Generally, there seems to be some disdain of the accumulation of historical and statistical evidence, and a tendency to proceed at once to

2 NATIVE SEGREGATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

the utterance of conclusions predetermined by the circumstances of the observer. So far as space permits, an effort will be made to marshal evidence on all the principal subdivisions of the question—however irreconcilable the evidence may be—and only then does it become possible to approach segregation proper with any confidence.

First comes the reiteration of a few obvious facts. At any given moment one-quarter of Native male adults are to be found in towns. The occupations to which they proceed form the source of most of their monetary wealth and the chief outlet to their increasing numbers. Yet the average yearly percentage rate of this Native increase has declined from 3·16 in the period 1891-1901 to 2·84 in 1901-11; then to 1·55 in 1911-21, but has finally improved to 1·67 in 1921-27. It reached its maximum towards the end of the last century and has dwindled appreciably from the date of Union onwards. This is probably due to the greater migration of the Native to work away from his home and family; to the inroads of European diseases, and, to some minor extent, the land shortage. Moreover, the Native marries at a later age nowadays, as the cattle he buys as a bride-price for his wife have increased in cost, and his new standard of comfort very often requires savings in advance of marriage.

It has been frequently declared that to extend the location or purely Native areas will prove only a temporary palliative to an inevitable overcrowding. It is widely claimed that a generation will witness the recurrence of an economic saturation. Yet,

broadly, the Native areas are not so much over-populated as over-stocked and under-cultivated. One school of thought indeed holds that the locations are, in fact, under-populated. Statistics of Native rural areas would be our best guide here.

In 1921 the following densities of population (in persons to the square mile) were discovered by census :

Transkei proper. Maximum 94.05 in Kentani :
minimum 68.21 in Tsomo.

Tembuland. Maximum 102.91 in Elliotdale :
minimum 41.37 in Xalanga.

Pondoland. Maximum 91.18 in Ngqueleni : minimum
54.35 in Libode. Average of *Transkeian
Territories*, 57.99.

Zululand. Maximum 60.78 at Eshowe : minimum
12.59 at Nongoma. Average in *Zululand*,
24.40.

There is no adequate comparison with European areas of equivalent fertility. To calculate densities for Transvaal and Natal Magisterial Districts is of no special interest, since they are mainly mixed areas. But a comparison with Basutoland—42.44—is useful.

The pressure of humanity on natural resources is, of course, apparent not only in Native areas. If we accept the theories of Malthus, and economic thought is now rehabilitating them, the limit to most populations is constantly being set by the rate at which natural resources can be developed. In agriculture and mining, except after an initial stage of increasing

4 NATIVE SEGREGATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

returns, it is usual for the rate of production to decline for each subsequent application of a measured proportion of capital and labour. In South Africa, the gold-mining industry appears to be faced by diminishing returns. Pastoral farming generally is in the same position—that each increase in the number of stock carried yields a consecutively lower return. Agriculture is probably on increasing returns, and certainly so where the use of artificial fertilizer pays for itself and then yields a surplus. Other improvements such as the introduction of mechanical apparatus seem to do the same. Diamond mining on developed fields is definitely subject to diminishing returns, but manufacturing industry to increasing yield for consecutive doses of capital and labour.

It is not very profitable to generalize on these lines, but some comparison should be made between progressive rates of productive yield in location and non-location areas. The actual yield per acre is, of course, definitely lower in the locations than in equivalent tracts of European-occupied land, on account of inferior management and inadequate capitalization. But the progressive rate of yield is also lower on account of the continued ill-treatment and impoverishment which the soil has sustained for many years in most locations—a rate of yield which we may imagine to be calculated with the factors of bad management and undercapitalization eliminated. It is for this reason that the pressure of wants on subsistence is harder in Native areas than European areas. Realization of

the difference between white and black margins of profit per unit of effort and expenditure in agriculture is responsible for much of the existing determination that Natives shall not acquire just as much land as their means will permit. We must not, however, relate the problem of Native population increase too closely to productive yield on farms or peasant holdings, since Natives share in the happy consequences of increasing returns on European farms and in European trade and industry, where such returns are present. Further, there remain many ways of improving Native agricultural yield—education, less density of stock, more railways, individual tenure, to mention a few.

The gradual filling up of Native lands, though by no means everywhere complete, has added some measure of compulsion to the Natives' increasing readiness to emerge from locations to work for Europeans. Yet this egress did not cause the first contact of the races, nor did it at first provide the main supply of Native labour.

The first economic contact of European and Bantu¹ in South Africa occurred when the Bantu from the middle of the eighteenth century began to work as servants for farmers who had appropriated their lands (the Bantu had appropriated in the same fashion the lands of earlier proprietors—Hottentots and Bushmen). This service was usually rendered in return for the right of living on the now European land, and the system extended rapidly

¹ Bantu—a linguistic and racial term covering South and East African Native tribes.

6 NATIVE SEGREGATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

through the nineteenth century. Then, too, farmers have persuaded Natives not resident on their lands to work for them at a money or cattle wage, and towns and villages have drawn in supplies of Native labour for domestic service, stores, minor industries and Government and other public works. The process has been hastened by the imposition of taxes on Natives. Nor need we forget the voluntary desire of many Natives to earn wages wherewith to purchase European-made goods. In the latter half of the last century diamond and gold mining increased the demand for Native labour, and by stimulating agriculture, trade and minor manufacturing industry caused a further demand for Natives for employment in these directions. The demand was only for low-paid black labour, partly on account of its cheapness, and partly in the absence of a sufficient supply of suitable white labour. This absence was mainly the result of the cheapness of land and consequent exaggerated size of farms.

Where contact between black and white is confined to trade between the two, the effect on black civilization is sufficiently transformative. But where the Native works for a white man, and particularly at the white man's farm, home or town the effect on the Native is revolutionary in its social, economic and moral aspects. An important change in pure economic habitude is that the Native acquires the conception of private profit and private ownership. In a sense he already possessed it, for communism obtained in regard to land only in the way of ownership, not usage, and in regard to movable possessions

only where a member of the same tribe was in want, and it became the duty of the whole tribe, but relatives first, to assist the poor and unfortunate. But the idea of private property borrowed from European civilization is more absolute—gifts to the unfortunate tend to become less of duties and more of acts of grace.

Again, the Native now has a different conception of exchange. Cattle were, and still are very frequently, regarded as possessing absolute value. But when the Native became acquainted with money, it had to him little intrinsic value, and was regarded only as a title to the purchase of real goods. He did not and does not object to parting with money by way of purchase, and the use of this medium has opened up to the Native vast uncharted regions where the acquisition and satisfaction of wants freely occur.

For better or worse, we are substituting a complex civilization for a primitive, and transforming a more or less communal economy into one that becomes more and more individualistic and less collective and tribal. There are relatively few records of the retrogression of complex communities to primitive forms, and with the continued presence of Europeans in South Africa, we must agree that the Native cannot retrace his economic history of the last two centuries.

The contact of two races may prove an annoyance to one of them and a tragedy to the other, as with the clash between Europeans and Red Indians in America. Or it may mean gain for both, as in

8 NATIVE SEGREGATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

Uganda, Burmah, Malaya. In South Africa we are entitled to assume that the presence of the Bantu in the sub-continent has proved of great advantage to European civilization. Notwithstanding the expense of Kaffir wars and of Native administration, white settlement of South Africa would have proceeded slowly without Native labour, true as it may be that much of the demand for this labour arose from an exaggerated cheapness of land, and from the discouragement to the immigration of European labour which the existence of Native labour itself caused.

The advantages to the Native have been the enforcement of law and order, the eradication of debasing customs, the improvement of Native farming methods (principally the introduction of maize and ploughs), and the opportunities of gaining access to cheap and useful European-made goods. This list is by no means exhaustive. But more significant than the benefits of racial contact is its inevitability. Most people agree that Natives could have no just claim to hold South Africa as their own against the world—to deny to Europeans the right of developing the country on lines of intensive production impossible to Natives. The test of a right of occupation of a country is not solely the test of beneficial occupation, but this is an important requirement. Even were European penetration to be condemned, one must recognize the impossibility of having prevented it, and for South Africa the accomplished facts of European conquest, dominance and expansion must be faced.

We have to assume that the white man in South Africa will for many years control the destinies of the black, whatever our hopes that the Native may be admitted to citizenship on an equality basis. Even with this accomplished, it is highly probable that European influence, precept and example would continue to guide South Africa's progress along lines satisfactory to the white, despite a preponderance of Native voters. Then, too, we must at least assume that the Native cannot be cut off from European civilization and its demands upon him, even if we desire to debar him from yet greater participation in the civilized system. It is enough to point out the vast dependence of European enterprise on Native labour, and the insuperable difficulties of replacing it by labour of another colour.

Granted the participation of the Native in the labour market, it follows naturally that the imitative Bantu will continue to use his encounter with Europeans to acquire many of the characteristics of the white man, even if these acquired characteristics be often superficial. This subject must be discussed in greater detail when we consider the rival policies of accelerating or slowing down the civilizing process. But an appreciation of the inevitability of some degree of civilization being acquired is necessary to follow the subsequent discussions of the position of the Native in industry, and, at least, the accomplished penetration of civilized habits among the Bantu must be recognized.

This penetration, and its effects, have raised a crop of problems that now await solution. The

economic question provides, of course, our main task. It is interesting to notice the transformation of the administrative problems of Grey and Shepstone into the economic problems of present-day South Africa. When land was plentiful, when the Native was a docile worker who did not compete with European farmer, artisan or labourer, it was mainly necessary to preserve order and reconcile Natives to European rule. The principal economic interest lay in assisting the farming expansion of Europeans by removing surplus Natives in certain parts, and by attempts to ensure a steady and sufficient supply of Native labour in others. This process intensified greatly such economic problems as then existed, and, with the development of mining and capitalistic enterprise generally, and the other occurrences and developments which we have noticed, led to the Native economic problem as we now know it.

We have mainly to deal with the land shortage alleged by both Europeans and Natives, race competition in employment, inefficient Native agriculture, Native squatting on European farms,¹ land tenure in location areas, Native wage standards, and farm-labour supply.

The Report of the South African (Inter-Colonial) Native Affairs Commission of 1903-5 formed a milestone of some economic importance, apart from the bare significance of an attempt to devise a

¹ Squatting is a system by which a Native rents a few acres from a European landlord without fixed tenure, and as a rule finds his rent from other sources than the careful cultivation of his tenancy.

uniform South African Native policy. The Report deplored the unchecked freedom of Natives to purchase any land open to their means, and recommended a limitation to certain areas—defined by the legislatures and chosen to discourage tribal possession. The custom of Native squatting on European farms was strongly criticized. Though no action was taken for many years on the recommendations of this Commission, its Report yet formed the basis of the celebrated (or notorious) Land Act of 1913, which is summarized below without further comment.

The Act provides: Except with the approval of the Governor-General no Native may purchase or hire land outside Native reserves except from one of his own race.

These reserves were specified in a schedule to the Act, and total 9,959,000 morgen¹ (6,044,000 in the Cape Province, 2,775,000 in Natal, 1,065,700 in the Transvaal, and 74,300 in the Orange Free State). The approval of the Governor-General for Native purchase outside the scheduled areas cannot be granted in the Free State, but elsewhere three thousand permits have been given, mainly within Local Committee areas, as described below. Furthermore, except by special permission, no non-Native may purchase or hire land in a scheduled area, or from a Native anywhere.

Urban and missionary areas, however, fall outside the scope of the Act, while for the Cape Province the Appellate Division, in *Thompson and Stilwell v. Kama*, declared inoperative Sections 1 and 5 of

¹ One morgen equals 2½ acres.

the Act (dealing with the purchase and hire of land). These sections restricted the right of Cape Natives to qualify for the parliamentary franchise which Section 8 (2) of the Act specially reserved.

Another clause required that labour tenants on European farms should work for the landlord at least ninety days per annum, or be classed as squatters. The contract of squatting was now illegal, since it was a contract of lease of land by a Native from a European. But in the Transvaal and Natal Natives registered as resident on European farms might remain thereon at the landlord's pleasure, and in the Free State existing squatting contracts were allowed to run out. In the Cape, the provisions against squatting had no effect after *Thompson and Stilwell v. Kama*. Agreements for "ploughing on halves" were subject to the same modified prohibition as squatting contracts. Ploughing on halves is an arrangement by which a farmer assigns land to a Native to plough, the two parties sharing the produce. A labour tenant is a Native resident on a European farm who pays his rent in the form of service, though a wage is almost invariably given him in addition.

The main effect of the Act, embodying as it does the principle of territorial segregation, is to confine Native land-holding as nearly as possible to the scheduled areas. The Act was passed on the tacit understanding that further land was subsequently to be delimited for Native holding, but so far the promise has been implemented only to the extent of the three thousand permits already mentioned.

A second chapter of the 1913 Act provided that a Commission should report as to the provision of further Native areas, and this Commission, known as the Beaumont Commission, suggested the following extensions:—Cape Province 1,313,000 morgen, Natal 1,861,700 morgen, Transvaal 5,042,700 morgen, Orange Free State 148,300 morgen—total 8,365,700. The area was so large, and was chosen in districts so likely to dislocate the Union's property market, that Parliament sent the Beaumont Report for revision by five local Committees. In 1918 these Committees submitted proposals for the following extensions of Native areas:—Cape 1,608,500 morgen, Natal 430,600 morgen, Transvaal 4,687,300 morgen, Free State, nil—total 6,726,400 morgen. Most of the objections urged against the Beaumont Report were then repeated, and the Local Committees' Reports were shelved. The next attempt at legislation on the Native Land question is to be found in the Native Land Act 1913 Amendment Bill, now before the country.

The Bill provides that the restrictions imposed by the 1913 Act on Natives purchasing outside the scheduled areas be abrogated in respect of certain released areas, seven and a quarter million morgen in extent. Principally, these areas will be Local Committee areas, and to a minor extent, probably, land adjoining present Native holdings which the Governor-General may declare to be released. The principal released areas will be divided among the provinces approximately as follows:—Cape 1,400,000 morgen, Natal 900,000,

Transvaal 5,000,000, and the Free State less than 100,000 morgen.

Within these areas the Native may buy or hire, and, in addition, the Governor-General may expropriate land from non-Native owners for Native settlement. He *must* expropriate non-Native land which can clearly be proved to have become depreciated by being wholly surrounded by Native land. With minor exceptions, the considerable area of Crown land in released areas will become destined for sale or lease to Natives only. Though as a rule the Native will have to buy all land, and will not obtain it free (except that tribes may obtain Crown land free in exchange for other tribal land), he may obtain loans to aid purchase, fencing and improvement, from a Purchases and Advances Fund which will be established under the prospective Act—a Fund to be built up of various local receipts, and any Parliamentary Grants which may be authorized.

It is clear that no European would be able to purchase from a Native in the released areas, or indeed anywhere, either immediately or in the future. The intention seems clear that seven and a quarter million morgen are gradually, and eventually completely, to pass into Native possession.

It may be noticed, however, that Natives will be restricted in the released areas from buying land wholly surrounded by Europeans, land of which still much exists at present. Yet if any land should become wholly surrounded by Natives, it could be sold only to Natives.

In general the effect of the Bill will be to give

Natives the right to purchase where they now cannot. Such opportunity will be conferred within the limits of a policy of modified segregation—in fact that policy expressed in the 1913 Act. Still will Natives be debarred from a full and free right to purchase any land open to their means; still is Native land ownership confined to districts separated as far as possible from districts of European ownership. The justification for such a policy will be examined in succeeding chapters. This task will involve consideration of the Native's participation in the sphere of labour. It is useful for this purpose to keep the land question temporarily out of mind.

CHAPTER II

RACE COMPETITION IN THE LABOUR MARKET

FROM a purely economic standpoint, colour is an accident. Economic science pays no regard to skin pigmentation, but to productive capacity, standards of living and like characteristics. The material welfare of the European is (within limits) of no greater importance to the State than that of the Native, since the races are complementary, and together with the Indian and coloured man form a whole. Yet to reflect faithfully an existing division of opinion, the opposite hypothesis must temporarily be assumed, though it be without prejudice.

The problem of the Asiatic (taken thus separately) must be borne in mind when estimating the economic relations of black and white. By virtue of the 1927 Capetown "Gentleman's" Agreement, the Asiatic is to be placed under no economic disabilities recognized by the State. The existing competition between European and Asiatic in trade and semi-skilled occupation is to continue, as also competition in unskilled employment between Asiatic and Native. Then, too, the secondary and technical education of the Indian may mean further competition in professional and skilled occupations. While it is true

that the Asiatic as part of the Union's permanent population is entitled to treatment on the basis contained in the Capetown Agreement, his spread and rise in Natal and the Transvaal will not ease the problem of race competition in employment between European and Native. Nor will the advancement of the coloured man in the Cape Province and Free State. Asiatic and coloured man each occupy a niche in between European and Native and compete in the labour market with both.

In the absence of express economic legislation, we may assume that natural economic forces will relegate all races to the positions they best can fill. Harm is felt by the race that must adjust itself to the earning of a smaller proportion of the National Dividend, and incurred by the race which fails to make any adjustments at all. An example of the first—the European will not relish any descent from his political and social dominance and economic superiority. Then the Native's inability to adapt himself freely to altered economic conditions may place him in a less advantageous situation. He may, for instance, continue to expand in numbers far beyond the warrant of available employment or equivalent outlet.

“Economic forces” may seem a loose term. For the purpose of this chapter, however, the following forces may be recognized. First, that in the labour market, under conditions of ordinary demand and supply, the class of labour chosen will be that possessing greatest utility to the employer, relative to wage rates but irrespective of colour. Secondly,

that labour, capital and organizing power will flow to occupations in which the greatest return is available. As a corollary, these returns will tend to equalize if the flow of the agents of production is free and easy. Applied to our problem, the European, or any other race, will succeed just so far as its natural capabilities entitle it, and to this degree of success in the labour market or other sphere it must gradually adapt itself.

Such adaptations will usually include : a response of the birth rate in civilized communities to the proportion of National Dividend available; a suitable choice of fields of employment; a suitable direction to education; a suitable field for the investment of capital, or the undertaking of commercial or similar ventures; an alteration of industrial and commercial methods, and an habituation to the standard of living set by economic law.

While it is impossible for any race to make all these adjustments successfully, the European and Native races in South Africa seem specially handicapped. The European is mindful of an assumed position of superiority and of an accustomed standard of living. He has an aristocratic tradition, and a fairly general prejudice against unskilled manual labour. As a rule he demands as a right what economic law yields only as a reward. The Native, on the other hand, trusts to European protection, and responds with difficulty to forces which he cannot understand, as witness the comparative immobility of his labour, the persistence of overstocking, and a fairly general indifference to pro-

duction for the market. In many instances the present position has already been dictated by economic law, and no adjustment is necessary. In other cases economic forces conflict with social customs and mental attitudes, and symptoms of the conflict usually include unemployment and demoralization, the case of the "poor white" forming an example.

But economic law can, within limits, and if required, be overcome by political enactment. Yet there is always this price to pay—policies designed to favour one race must react to the detriment of another. Likewise, policies to favour one section of any particular race react to the disadvantage of another section. Since the races, or sections of races, maintain economic relationships with one another—trade and employment mainly—and loss to one community spreads to others, this loss must be subtracted from the advantage gained by any race or section as a result of the legislation concerned. Protective fiscal policies are offered as an example by some, wage legislation by others, and colour bars by a third group. In some cases there may be political or social justification, as there may be of the white man's traditional demand for preferential treatment. It has now to be seen whether the problem of the competition for employment of the races comes within the orbit of economic law as described above, and whether there may be good reasons for modifying the force of such law.

Consider first the conditions under which the Native enters the labour market. Usually he seeks

wage-earning occupations in the towns to supplement returns from his holdings in the reserves, or earnings on European farms. In the broadest of senses, large locations mean little labour, for with the exception of the permanently urban type of Native, the Bantu prefer, generally speaking, to remain wedded to the soil, rather than to alternate town work with periodical lotus-eating respites at the kraal.

Yet taxation, a certain amount of location overcrowding, and the fact that the luxury of yesterday tends to become the necessity of to-morrow, have rendered wage-earning in towns an essential means of securing livelihood. Concretely, the ex-Secretary of the Transkeian Territories stated :

“ It may be taken as a fact that at any given moment nearly half the able-bodied men whose permanent home is in these territories are earning money for the support of their families in areas outside these territories.”

Again,

“ The country under existing conditions cannot, from its own resources, support all its inhabitants, the greater bulk of whom are peasants with small holdings.”

From this area at least 60,000 men out of a total population of a million are at all times absent. The Native law of succession by primogeniture, by which younger sons are turned adrift, encourages this migration. It would seem a substitute for the kraal-subdivision of more spacious days. On European farms, where the average wage to labour tenants is 10s. to £2 a month, Natives usually spend in urban areas the nine or six months when they

have not to work for the landlord by law or condition of tenancy. In the towns they earn, at semi-skilled or unskilled work, wages ranging from £2 to £6 per month in most districts.

But usually, and especially in Natal locations, wage-earning to the Native is a means of supplementing rather than securing subsistence, since pastoral and agricultural pursuits provide no inconsiderable proportion of his income. The Native "frequently postpones going out to work until the last possible moment, and the possession of additional funds enables him to remain in idleness a further period." The Native Labour Recruiting Corporation states, "The social and economic position of the Native is such that he is able to supply his needs by only intermittent periods of service." It must be remembered though that "additional funds" are rarely obtainable, and that there is no valid reproach for any man who engages in even "intermittent periods of service" if he can secure sufficient income by working on his own account. The sufficiency of income is usually determined by the Native's standard of material well-being. The difference between this standard and the European's standard has been succinctly put.

"In the case of the one (European), it is essential that his feet should be shod, while the other regards boots as a luxury; one regards meat as an indispensable part of his diet, to the other it is desirable but dispensable; the white man cannot sleep unless he lies soft, the black man is comfortable on the bare ground when the weather is warm, and one blanket suffices him when he is cold. These are inherited class wants."

However, many thousand Natives have acquired civilized tastes, and are able to gratify them.

With the advantage in economic status by which he requires wages only to supplement the produce of his peasant holding—an advantage emphasized by his low standard of living—the Native is able to afford the staple supply of cheap mass labour, succeeding in competition with the unskilled white man and the coloured man, who are not able to maintain a preferential efficiency on the same earning.

So great has become the demand for cheap Native labour that there seems little limit to the number that could be employed at the existing rate. If it be suggested that industry employ Europeans instead, the reply comes that it cannot afford white wages. In 1925, industry, excluding the Mines, employed between 100,000 and 116,000 Natives, and trade a proportionate number.

The competition has become so acute that the question has arisen of legislative enactment to modify it. Natives have largely succeeded—starting by being merely cheap and docile, and entrenching their position by growing knowledge and efficiency—in ousting the whites from many semi-skilled occupations—packers, messengers, porters, grooms, gardeners, caretakers and domestic servants. They have a virtual monopoly of the unskilled labour supply, and have vigorously attacked most of the skilled openings, proving successful in particular as painters, farriers, cobblers, carpenters, harness-makers and chauffeurs. The restriction of classes

of openings for white youths leaving school is a problem the gravity of which calls for no new comment.

But little value lies in the repetition of obvious facts. Reverting to principles, the current view of the race competition problems flows in two divergent streams.

First we take the view of the orthodox economist, as represented in many respects by the First Report of the Economic and Wage Commission of 1925, signed by Messrs. Mills and Martin, and Professor Clay. In essence, the opinion is held that the cheap black labour policy means in the long run, by reducing productive costs and increasing output, an eventual prosperity that would make it possible to employ both white and coloured labour on an increasing scale.

The substitution of whites for blacks in the cheap labour market would, it is stated, tend to impoverish the Natives, whose ability to purchase the products of South African industry would be impaired. The whites who would be substituted would refuse, and their refusal would be supported by public opinion, to accept wages only a quarter or a half above those at present paid to Natives. Wages generally would rise, and with them the cost of living. In other words, the substitution would be entirely at the expense of the consumer. Were the rise in prices considerable, lessening consumption would affect the volume of manufacture. This reduction of output would reduce all employment and defeat the policy's own ends.

Lest it be thought that undue prominence is given to industry, which has not made particularly striking headway, it is added that the burden would fall heavily on the farmer, who produces largely for export and cannot pass costs on to the consumer.

Strong attention is drawn in this Report of the Commission to what is described as the fallacy of thought which holds that the number of jobs in a community is a fixed one, and that the filling of posts by Natives means that precise amount of work the less for Europeans. That this view is incorrect is argued from among a number of instances, by the fact that in the Gold-mining Industry, the employment of more Natives (as after the 1922 strike) to lessen productive costs resulted in the creation (through increased output) of an additional number of supervisory posts. Briefly, a policy that aims at increasing the scope of employment for both races by increasing the funds available for employment as a whole is claimed to provide more permanent relief than a policy which seeks to widen the scope of employment for the white man by restricting the black man.

The Relief and Grants-in-Aid Commission (1916) had reported that the only way in which the white man could gain a footing in the unskilled labour market was by showing that he could successfully compete with the Native on an economic basis. Artificial aiding of the white man to exist as an unskilled labourer was not deemed a true solution. Room could only be secured by the European were he prepared actively to compete with the Native,

being satisfied with the market value of his services, measured by the standard of the black man. It would be useless for him to demand a higher wage on the ground that his white skin entitled him to preferential treatment, since only Government or Municipal authorities could afford such artificial and uneconomic conditions. The only way out would be the cultivation of a higher standard of efficiency. In short, the poor white should be reformed, not subsidized.

These conclusions were to some extent suggested by the Report of the Transvaal Indigency Commission of 1908, which held that to protect the white man from Native competition was simply to bolster up the aristocratic tradition without doing anything to qualify the white man for the ultimate and inevitable struggle for superiority.

Said the Mining Industry Commission in 1908 :

“Whatever the respective merits of the coloured labour policy and of the white labour policy, the adoption of either necessitates legislation and administration inimical to the success of the other. . . . Such laws (to secure the reservation of special occupations to the European) may for a time be effective. . . . But no such measure could by itself be permanently effective so long as conditions are permitted to exist which cause natural laws and economic forces to be operating in the opposite direction.”

So far the exponents of cheap black labour. Turning over the picture, the reverse side is painted in totally clashing colours. While certain writers of repute have been content to slide over the race competition problem with the pious hope that

eventually the European will replace the Native, it cannot be too strongly stressed that on this aspect of the Native problem most of Native policy must be judged. The labour question is essentially the question of segregation, and in discussing the competition between black and white we are in a large measure determining the extent to which segregation may be justified. Presenting, as the labour question does, a sharp line of cleavage between the interests of employers and employees, it is inevitable perhaps that pure politics should have seized on this question and treated it as a quarrel between "left" and "right."

Again, the Report of the Economic and Wage Commission provides the sharpest line of division. On this rock, in fact, the Report splits. It was argued by the opponents of black labour that its cheapness made it impossible for the European to compete. Hence the poor white problem, the defeat of a higher standard of living, and a running sore of poverty, enforced idleness, degradation and relapsing morals.

The origin of the poor white class is to be found largely in the subdivision of farms into uneconomic units, and in the succession of disasters—flood, drought, disease, rebellion and war—that have fallen on the South African countryside and detached small farmers. Then we have the erection of jackal-proof fencing, the paddocking of sheep, and a host of minor causes reducing the demand for white farm hands. Again, the large landlord has refused to continue the tenancies of his hangers-on, as he

has needed more land to utilize himself, or bequeath to his sons. The Union Year Book estimates the number of poor whites at 120,000, and the best employment statistics give evidence for the supposition that from 20,000 to 24,000 are now out of more or less permanent employment or gainful occupation. The class may be subdivided into four—men impoverished by ill fortune, willing and anxious to work, but lacking skill; those born of indigent parents and reared in slums; those who have lost all desire to rise; and those who are unable to work through illness or feeble-mindedness.

Since they and their families cannot be suffered to starve, public relief becomes necessary, whether by private charity or subsidized labour colonies, or uneconomic employment on railways and public works. Were no opportunity open for their employment under public enterprise, the drain on charity must increase. The more so perhaps considering the usual blind disproportionate propagation of this class. Even to those to whom human pity makes no appeal, it must be apparent that the existence of a vagrant, landless, beggar type, 120,000 in number—only four-fifths in employment worth the name—is an economic evil of the first water. This is the attitude of the white labour supporters, and their facts cannot be denied.

Nevertheless, neither industry, trade nor agriculture can support, under existing conditions, all South Africa's population on a civilized standard of living. Without the hypothetical expansion of industry postulated in the First Report of the

Economic and Wage Commission, it is a fact that, over a short period of time at least, one job the more for the black man means one less for the white, and *vice versa*. Moreover, the benefits foretold by this Report are contingent on the employment of a much larger proportion of Native labour than at present. Recently calculated ratios are :

Mining: 20,000 Europeans, 200,000 non-Europeans. Percentage of Native employment—approximately 75.

Farming: 55,000 whites, 24,000 Asiatics, 51,000 coloured and 359,000 Natives. Percentage of Native employment—73.5.

Manufacturing and workshops: 56,000 whites, 117,000 non-Europeans. Percentage of Native employment—57 approximately.

We may notice that the helpless European exists on the charity of those who can afford to give, and on railway users and tax-payers eligible for income tax—the blacks at the expense of compatriots who cannot afford charity. Since the white community will not suffer the extinction of the poorer classes, and cannot check their rate of increase, the growth of a permanently indigent community will be inevitable if the State or other public bodies fail to step in. With Natives, displacement from industry must aggravate the poverty and hardship in location areas which we will later examine.

But none of these unpleasant consequences would ensue if the expansion of industry in South Africa in advance of population increase could become an accomplished fact. Such an expansion would be

dependent on more economic, political and international trade factors than can be here enumerated, and, in addition, the Economic and Wage Commission considers it dependent on South Africa's preferential position in having at its command an unlimited supply of cheap labour to reduce productive costs. But this, as we have seen, means for the present a very real hardship for the poorer sections of the white community. We stand at the cross-roads of a possibly greater wealth for the future, and, for the moment, of a moderate competence, rather less associated with this particular hardship. Just now, policy leans towards the latter alternative, for as the burden of choice becomes more embarrassing each year, the Nationalist Government has decided in favour of the policy of the moment—to "take the cash and let the credit go."

It makes out a case for a modification of economic laws in order artificially to aid the European. The free operation of economic forces cannot do otherwise than expose the European to the penalties of his inefficiency (relative to wage cost)—an inefficiency partly due to his retention of a higher standard of living. But even if it is justifiable to seek to perpetuate such a higher standard of living by aiding the European, the penalty must always be paid—a drain on the tax-payer, some reduction in productive output, and an intensification of Native poverty in the overcrowded areas.

Fortunately there are ways in which these penalties may be minimized. Two are particularly important—the regeneration of the poor white, and the

30 NATIVE SEGREGATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

improvement of Native agricultural output. The former indeed moves towards a restoration of natural conditions, by reducing the disadvantage at which the unskilled European finds himself in competition with the Native, and so diminishing the need for artificial aid.

CHAPTER III

THE CIVILIZED LABOUR POLICY

A FEW of the many methods urged of artificially aiding the unskilled and semi-skilled European may be examined in turn.

First, the proposal for raising Native wages by prohibiting the import of black labour from outside the Union (Shangaan and other labour from Portuguese East Africa). It has been suggested that this will meet the need of the poorer white labourer by equalizing the Native's wage to that which he demands, thus assisting his effective competition.

The Gold Mines Committee in 1925 took alarm at such a proposal, saying :

" Even if the Mines could afford to increase (Native) wages . . . the result of any such increase would be to still further decrease the supply, as the Native, generally speaking, remains in idleness in his kraal so long as he has food and drink. The more money he receives in wages the less would he work, and if the restrictions in the Portuguese supply caused an increase in Native wage rates it would result in an additional and increasing reduction in the number of British South African Natives offering themselves for work."

A statement of the Crown Mines Conciliation Board, 1923, might serve as a rider :

" Not only so, but the cost of living will increase, since more Union Natives will be drawn from other

employment and higher wages will have to be paid all round for Native labour in every industry—including farming and domestic service.”

The Chairman of the Crown Mines made the accustomed complaint :

“ Immediately we have the usual shortage of Natives a considerable number of Mines may have to close down, unless we can reduce wages.”

Of course, the conclusion that an increase of Native wages paid by Mining Companies consequent on the withdrawal of Portuguese labour would mean a decreased supply of Union Natives also is correct only on the assumption that the Native has no use for money except to add to the returns from his own holding for the purpose of securing a fixed bare subsistence. It is more probable that wages would rise mainly because of the decrease in labour supply from Portuguese territory, and not in addition because of the Native's utilization of higher wages to support more idleness—this in the majority of cases at least. The tendency is now for Natives to look to wage-earning as a regular mode of life and leave agriculture to their women and children and aged dependents. The Mining Companies must also remember that a rise in Native wages will mean that many persons and firms who use Natives only because they are cheap will dispense with them, this with a tendency to lower wages again. It is not certain that wages generally would rise because the Mines increased their rates. Natives would not necessarily be attracted to the Mines, because so

many dislike underground work and avoid employment of a nature not customary with the tribe or district.

It is quite likely that any possible general rise in Native wages would ease the position of the European in the labour market. Not so much the confirmed poor white, perhaps, as women and juveniles. But there may be ways of raising Native wages, or semi-skilled and unskilled wages generally, without depleting the Mines' labour supply. A reduction of this supply the Mines will, however, need to expect as a consequence of the revision in 1928 of the Mozambique Convention. From 1932, only 80,000 Natives per annum will be recruited in Portuguese territory, which is somewhat below the present number, and considerably below requirements.

A rise in Native wages would tend to raise the cost of living a little perhaps, particularly as regards commodities of regular demand, in which case producers could pass on the extra productive cost fairly easily to the consumer. So that even if more employment were made available to the poor white, an increased cost of living would put him at a disadvantage again. Except to a limited degree, such disadvantage would not be sufficiently felt by the Native to induce him to work longer periods and thus restore his wage to the normal level.

The main advantage of higher Native wages would be a stimulus to the use of more machinery, the elimination of waste, and the use of more efficient methods generally. It is possible that such methods would swell the National Dividend sufficiently to

enable the payment of higher wages to unskilled workers without diminishing profits or increasing prices. According to the Chairman of the Wage Board, the low Native wage also means a difficulty in apprenticing European youths. An employer might start the youth at the wage level customary for Natives, but periodically thereafter improvements in pay would be demanded. This would not suit the employer if the apprentice was not worth considerably more than the Native as a worker. Hence employers would decline to take on apprentices. Then, again, the gap between the high wage (say £1 per day) paid to the skilled worker and that of the unskilled man (£1 per week) often means the handing over of semi-skilled work to Natives at the unskilled rate, with the result that the higher-paid man has no employment of an intermediate character to fall back upon when out of skilled employment. In many industries the skilled man has become a supervisor only.

After discussing the ramifications of a restriction on Portuguese Native importation, we may examine the use of minimum wages in the various grades of industry as a colour bar—general minimum wages, with the object of displacing from employment all Natives not worth the minima. First, we may take it as being unjust to use wage regulation to squeeze Natives out of industry, whether it be justifiable or not to use a minimum wage to protect civilized standards of life. There can be only a condemnation from any ethical point of view for a proposal to discriminate against

any section of South Africa's population on the grounds of inferiority due only to race or colour. We must accept the position that the European has, in fact, conquered the Native and taken the best of South Africa to himself. But we would be less than human to use the fact of conquest as an excuse for oppression. The legitimacy of wage-earning by Natives is so well established by custom that it cannot now be invalidated. While it remains legitimate, attempts to prevent it are oppressive, and an accomplished displacement of the Native from industry, because he is a Native, is an act of oppression.

The discriminatory minimum wages would avowedly increase the total of wage payments. In the absence of greater efficiency in management, such an increase would discourage production for export, mining or agricultural. With an unaltered customs tariff it would injure manufacturing industries producing for home consumption in competition with foreign products. If the tariff were raised to a corresponding extent, these industries could pass on the extra cost to the consumer in many cases and possibly gain as well from the establishment of a higher wage level, as increasing home demand. This benefit would in any case be felt by industries producing for the home market without foreign competition, especially to the extent that their products were necessities.

Next we come to the Legislative Colour Bar. The Government to-day has committed itself in favour of white labour, though only in the case of

Gold Mines does it consider making its choice compulsory on private enterprise. The Mines may be assumed to be the immediate object of the Colour Bar Act, however wide its nominal scope—all mines, works and machinery. This Colour Bar Act—more properly the Mines and Works Amendment Act, 1926—empowers the Government by regulation to compel a differentiation in the class of work done by labour of different colours whenever machinery is operated and certificates of competence required. Although it has been the practice of the Mines to reserve most skilled occupations for Europeans, so far as business interests allow, a different complexion is placed on the situation when the Government forbids a non-European to occupy a skilled position. This presumably will be the case if and when proclamation is issued under the Act.

The object of this policy has been described by members of the Government as an attempt to protect the white man in an unequal fight. In opposition, it is declared that race distinction is not necessary to protect white civilization and no danger need be apprehended of its swamping by the economic inroads of the black man. Natives are proportionately declining in number. The following Church resolution of disapproval of the Colour Bar may also be cited :

“ It is wrong that any man should be debarred by law from doing any kind of work for which he is qualified, so long as that work be legitimate. It is certainly wrong that any man should be legally prohibited from doing such work merely on the grounds of colour.”

This Colour Bar if brought into operation would hardly affect wages, for it applies only to skilled posts where an adequate wage obtains, except in the instances where Natives are doing skilled work on the Mines at unskilled rates. It would, however, readjust the opportunities for skilled employment on the Mines as between the races. The readjustment would be on a colour basis, not a basis of efficiency relative to a wage. Saner would be an effort to increase the efficiency of the European rather than suppress Native advancement.

Next we examine the ingenious scheme of Professor Brookes. He proposes the assignment of a certain branch of the Gold-mining Industry, embracing all grades of work from skilled downwards, to the exclusive privilege of Natives. While this picked section of the industry would not form a large proportion of the whole, it would form an outlet to Native ambition and desire for responsibility. But this policy would arouse the high disgust of white Trades Unions. White workers would demand (and be supported by public opinion) a preferential wage rate over Natives doing the same class of work, whatever it be. This could only stultify the principle of the policy.

Before leaving the problem of the Mines, we may note the following views on Mine Labour :

The Transvaal Chamber of Mines.

“ Without the Natives, the growth of the Mining Industry would not have been nearly so rapid as it has been, and it would not have reached its present dimen-

sions, nor have proved such an enormous asset to the Country."

The Unemployment Commission, 1922.

"In regard to the Mining Industry, and more particularly deep level mining, it is questionable whether this, after all, in view of South African conditions, is a white man's job, having regard to his . . . greater liability to contract phthisis than the intermittent service of the Native renders him liable to . . ."

The Mining Industry Board, 1922.

"If, by a reduction in costs, low-grade mines are able to continue working; if low-grade ore in rich and poor mines alike is brought within the sphere of profitable exploitation; if mines which are standing idle to-day because their ore is poor are reopened, and if new mines are started on hitherto unprofitable areas, more work will be provided for Europeans than any artificial expedients which might be adopted for that purpose."

The feeling here is of exasperation at proposals to strangle the goose which lays the golden eggs. Moreover, to denounce black labour on the Mines solely on the ground that it breeds undesirable social problems is on a par with Lamb's fable in which the whole house was burnt down to roast one pig. Rand slumdom, too, forms the basis of a favourite criticism of black mine labour. Yet slum conditions in Johannesburg cannot be blamed on the Mining Companies to the extent to which they provide adequate compounds for their recruited Natives.

What are the possibilities of civilized labour on farms? They now provide work for at least 308,000 Natives out of a total of 489,000 persons engaged in

farming. Farming, like mining, is an extractive industry, and to a large extent produces for export. The Mines demur at a high wage cost. So do the farmers, whose outgoings for labour are a fair proportion of total productive costs. The parallel is by no means complete, however. Mining is a concentrated industry, with a large element of European supervision of Native labour. Farming as an industry is diffuse, and supervision of the Native usually vests in one man, the farmer himself.

Against the attitude of the farmer on Native labour must be balanced the official opinion, as represented by the complaints of the late Secretary for Agriculture, who stated in 1925 :

“ I regard the Native, contrary to the generally current view, as an expensive labourer; he is not intelligent, he requires constant supervision; his wants being few, he does not realize any necessity for exerting himself. The loss from inefficiency of hundreds and thousands of Native labourers—in the indirect loss of diminished production and of inferior production—must be enormous. Close supervision of Native labour is a necessity; and there is a drain on the time of the European, perpetual and serious, lessening his usefulness and restricting his activities: it is an addition—a heavy addition—to the cost of Native labour. The monthly bill is not paid at twenty or thirty shillings in cash and mealies and milk and tobacco and an occasional sheep. It includes also what the former ought to have obtained from the soil, but did not get, the intelligent aid which he was entitled to, but did not receive, the time which he bestowed on supervision, but could have employed to better advantage; and above all, the slow poisoning effect of inefficiency on those whose misfortune it is to have to correct it.”

The accuracy of this view will be examined in a subsequent chapter.

The absorption of poor whites on railways and public works means the shifting of the high wage burden on to the general public, to whom the extra cost is transmitted in taxes and railway rates. The policy is probably bad for the employment of poor whites but recently detached from the land, and it were best that Government unskilled employ were considered as only a second string, failing agricultural rehabilitation. But we must discuss the existing situation, which gives some compensatory advantages worth mentioning.

Since the Government is stepping in and maintaining these people at a respectable though un-economic standard of wages, it is quite possible that a sense of well-being and security may sow the seeds of some future efficiency and stamina—not only physical stamina—that will render possible success in competition with the black man, even unaided eventually by State nursery-maiding.

From figures supplied by the Postmaster-General in 1925, the average cost of white unskilled labour on telegraph construction work was £12 18s. per man per mile for extension lines, as against £9 5s. for black labour, a difference of nearly 40 per cent. extra. In building work, the Secretary for Public Works estimated a 10 per cent. increase. But there is often some measure of return for the extra cost. The Irrigation Department stated that the able-bodied European performs a fifth more work with pick and shovel. But this superior output is not a

constant feature of white labour relief work. Under experiment in Natal, according to the Provincial Secretary, the European output was only half that of the Native. In Durban, however, white relief workers got down to within 2s. 6d. per day of the Native wage, working on piece-work of a high standard right through three summers. On this wage they prospered, and gained also from the effort and patience they were forced to bring to the work.

With white labour relief works and Government unskilled employment may be associated the assistance given to European labourers on the occasions where the Government inserts a minimum wage clause of one shilling an hour in contracts given out for the construction of public utilities. Furthermore, the forestry and agricultural rehabilitation colonies, as at Losperfontein, Zanddrift, Geluk, Bergplaats, Otterford and Weza, are mostly showing good results. Some of the heavy initial outlay is being recovered, and perhaps these institutions may become self-supporting.

Although white labour can never entirely supplant the black—a sufficiency of it belongs to some remote future age—the extension of European labour in all forms of public employment may be sound socially. Such an extension in public employment is in the discretion of the Government, and must be contrasted with a compulsory increase in white labour in private employment, enforced by legislation on private employers. The Government is entitled to employ whom it pleases, if its choice is

governed by business principles or genuine social expediency. If these conditions are adhered to, and only Europeans are engaged for certain classes of work, no other race can complain. Moreover, under Government employ, a chance exists of bringing the poor whites under reforming influences, as more or less successfully accomplished in the labour colonies mentioned. But to dictate to private enterprise as to labour of what colour it may employ, or legislatively to discriminate against a race, falls under a different category. Such a colour bar would seek to improve the white man's position, not by improving the white man, but by suppressing the black.

CHAPTER IV

FURTHER ASPECTS OF NATIVE LABOUR

BROADLY speaking, the Native has to realize his destiny as an agriculturist in his own right, in trade, or in wage-earning on farms, in industry, or in domestic service. Widespread though the last form of service is, particularly in Natal, it cannot supply more than a small proportion of Native wages, say 10 per cent. in Natal. As the Juvenile Advisory Boards testify, the European girl has a strong aversion to domestic service. In the Western Province, coloured people are largely used. The Native woman is preferred in the Eastern Province of the Cape, and on farms in most parts of the Union.

To trade on his own account, the Native has shown himself unadaptable. Examples of success in this field are found rarely, and then mainly amongst Natives disciplined and trained under Mission influence. The Native lacks the capital to start in a big way, in a small way he cannot compete with the coloured man, the Indian, and small Jewish shop-keeper. To most South African Indians, trading is not merely a talent but an instinct. But the Bantu's "ubuntu," in the form of a recognition of communal tribal title to all goods when members of the tribe are in want, hinders development of a busi-

ness sense. On the whole, it would be a pity to find the Native adding to the list of South Africa's small traders, since the Union's prime need is for more production.

The phenomenon of a Native working for another Native is still rare enough to provoke comment. Even less than in trade has the Native an aptitude for industry on his own account, except cobbling. The handicrafts taught in the Mission and other schools may provide a useful and in some cases remunerative occupation for the Bantu artisan who can acquire a reputation among his own people, but in competition with the European machine-made article, the market for Native goods is as a rule very restricted. Yet the tendency is sound—in basket and mat weaving, pottery, broom-making, chairs, rope, crockery and vases, the schools are successful in obtaining a high standard of work. But only to a very limited extent can we foresee from this source an addition to Native income.

In general industry, as an employee working for the European, the Native can never be displaced. There is not only to be taken into account his cheapness, but his physical strength and endurance. As a dock-labourer (though this comes more properly under the head of Public Services) the European is incapable of competition in the raising of heavy loads and pushing of trucks. The same applies to the sugar and flour trades, quarrying, building and constructional work, involving the handling of heavy girders and other weights. The machine handling of heavy articles will no doubt be universal eventually,

but meanwhile the muscular machine, or brawny Native, will reign supreme. The Chairman of the National Council of the Building Industry admitted that it is cheaper for a contractor to employ three Natives throwing up bricks than to install plant operated by one European only.

Turning to mining industry, the facts just related in regard to physical endurance apply also to labour in the hot bowels of the earth. In the coal-mines it is difficult to obtain Europeans for pick-axe work on the score of heat and ventilation alone. Europeans in South Africa disdain hot and toilsome occupations which must perforce be undertaken by white men in other temperate countries.

In European agriculture we meet the Native in one of three rôles—squatter, servant or labour tenant. As squatter, he may merely reside on the farm for a few months in the year, though he leaves his family behind when away earning wages in towns. Or he may be a full-time independent agriculturist. In return for his rent, he has not only the right of occupation, but, except in the case of absentee ownership of the European, the advantage of observing the usually superior methods adopted by his white landlord, if he is not too conservative to imitate. But then the insecurity of his tenure, depending on the pleasure of the landlord, discourages efficient cultivation. The landlord may care to continue the tenancy for the sake of the rent or for the labour of the squatter's dependents, but lately a number of evictions have been proceeding, especially in Natal.

Efficient cultivation is also discouraged in the many

instances where rent is paid out of earnings derived from work in the towns, or on other farms as servant, or from dependents, and not from the produce of the tenancy. In these cases the land, usually unimproved, is used for residence only.

As already mentioned, no new squatting tenancies may be entered into except in the Cape Province: in the Free State existing contracts are allowed to terminate; in Natal and the Transvaal they may be renewed in respect of squatters registered before the 1913 Land Act came into operation. But the number of squatting tenancies has decreased since 1913. Undesirable tenants have been evicted, desirable tenants have made way for the introduction of more sheep or cattle, or the extension of ground under European systems of tillage, while lately certain Natives closely associated with the I.C.U. political trade-union movement have been ejected from farms.

The official objection to the squatter is, that since the squatting tenancy persists only during the pleasure of either party (except where the tenancy has a longer currency by special contract), it tends neither to the effective use of the land nor to the uplift of the squatter.

The squatter hesitates to make any improvements, however slight, or to apply any methods of cultivation learnt from Europeans which involve any expense. A non-official objection is that the squatting system allows the "hoarding" of Natives by certain farmers, while others are short of labour. Then there is a general objection to the practice of

speculative Land Companies in buying up huge tracts for sale at an enhanced price in the future, but meanwhile letting the land out to Natives at a small rent. This practice delays the spread of farm settlement and is claimed to cause a shortage of Native labour. A Native squatter on a fairly large piece of fertile land, or land fairly near the railroad leading to a big town, does not require to take service with a European farmer.

The number of squatters (with dependents) is now thought to be half a million. Dr. Loram, in evidence before the Native Bills Select Committee, 1928, thought that the number of squatters is too large for general dispossession, immediately or gradually; that it is to the interest of Native agriculturists to reside in European areas and learn improved methods; that it is to the interest of European farmers to use the available labour of the squatter's dependents; and that therefore squatting tenancies should be replaced by fairly long tenancies under definite contract, and the status of Native tenant on European farms be legally recognized.

Associated with the squatting system discussed above is the system of "ploughing on halves." Here the rent of the squatter is paid in produce, usually half the fruits of the plot squatted upon. All valid objections urged against the ordinary squatting system hold in the cases of "ploughing on halves," and the same remedies also apply. On the whole the latter system is the worse. The rent is not a fixed quantity. With a careless landlord and a shiftless Native it will be very small. Hence the

land will be most ineffectively utilized. The landlord's carelessness will be frequent where he has a low standard of living or considerable surplus land.

As labour tenant, the Native agrees to provide his services in lieu of cash rent. The 1913 Land Act provides for a minimum of ninety days' service, but the common practice is for the Native to work for six months in the year, or, over a period of years, to work half that time for the landlord. Labour tenancy is the most common status of Natives on European farms, and is felt by both parties to the tenancy to be a satisfactory arrangement. In addition to the foregoing of a cash rent, the Native usually receives a small wage, from 10s. to £2 monthly, with milk, sugar, tobacco, mealies, etc., from time to time, except with hard employers. The landlord will usually plough the land subject to the tenancy on behalf of the Native, or allow him time off to plough himself. He will often lend oxen to the Native, and sometimes allow a regular ration of maize-meal, continuing this to the family while the wage-earner is away. The continual loan of cash and food-stuffs may, however, lead to instances of debt-slavery. But generally the farmer will feel responsible for the feeding and maintenance of the Native and his family so long as the Native himself is a satisfactory and honest worker.

Since services are demanded for use by a farmer working under modern methods, labour tenancy does not usually mean a very wasteful use of labour. The only chance for the continuance of grossly wasteful cultivation occurs when the Native's land is not

ploughed by the farmer and thereafter worked under his supervision, but is cultivated by the labour tenant himself in his "six months off," instead of his proceeding to a town to earn higher wages.

The system of labour tenancy provides Natives with a residence on the land of their occupation for many generations on terms which are not as a rule onerous, and which usually include patriarchal care by the farmer. The general demand for labour tenants of an industrious and honest nature gives the Native a safeguard against ill-usage, for he can give notice under his Masters' and Servants' Contract, and take up residence on another farm under a more generous owner. But so strong is the Native's attachment to the land he has customarily occupied that he removes only under strong pressure. The number of labour tenants on any farm is usually determined by the number of kraals (or family systems of huts) existing on the farm when acquired by the European farmer. The distribution of these kraals is very irregular as between farm and farm, and this accounts for a considerable diversity of treatment of labour-tenants on farms of any given district. The same diversity also results from the difference of European standards of living in the district. The progressive and fully civilized farmer will desire to work his Natives fairly hard. The backward farmer will allow his Natives to idle, and thus there will be a tendency for the drift of Natives from progressive to slovenly farms. Where indifferent farming methods coincide with large acres the reverse drift, to progressive farms of smaller acreage,

worked intensively, will be very difficult to obtain, despite the inducement of higher wages. It is usual, too, for large farms, holding many Native families, to require less labour, owing to cultivation and utilization being on extensive lines. In many cases it would be desirable in the interests of efficient cultivation for Natives to render continuous service on the farm (at a higher wage than under the "six months on, six months off" system). This in particular is the demand of progressive smaller farmers, who are liable to feel a labour shortage under the present system. But the diversity of bargaining power from farm to farm, and the Native's desire for interludes of town service, make it difficult to obtain this continuity of service, no matter how just the farmer's claim to it, nor how great in reason the wage inducement.

As a "servant" a farm Native has no residential status. He is a surplus tenant from another farm, a dependent of a Native squatter, labour tenant or servant, or a recruited Native, contracted from a distance. He receives a wage, housing and rations usually, on a scale more generous than that given to the labour tenant to the extent equivalent (on an assumed cash basis) to the latter's rent.

On the whole, the scale of wages and supplements to wages paid on farms is lower than that paid in towns. In the Newcastle district, for instance, average wages to a labour tenant working a full year amount to £24 per annum, foregone rent and value of ploughing performed to £14, and rations and gifts £7, total £45. The earnings of dependents will prob-

ably amount to £2 per annum, and £2 worth of Native goods are sold or bartered. An approximate grand total of £49 per annum is obtained. In a town like Durban the average location Natives working in a store for nine months will obtain £2 per month, in a house £3, or on "togt" (day labour) from £1 10s. to £2 per month. To this they add the same sum as farm Natives for dependents' earnings and sale of hides, skins, mats, baskets and so on, and perhaps £15 as the value of crops and so on raised at home. The total here is from £40 to £64 per annum, and generally a substantial advance on earnings obtained wholly from farm sources.

Apart from the higher scale of remuneration in towns, the urban centres have a strong attraction for Natives, and neither the pecuniary nor other inducement is to them offset by the higher cost of living in towns. Frequently only the farmer's threat to turn the squatter or tenant off the land altogether can retain him the whole year round on farm work, with its inferior remuneration. But in other cases, where a farmer has a surplus of Native labour resident, he may be pleased to encourage some of his "boys" to proceed to town so that their earnings may assure his rent receivable. Apart from absentee ownership on the part of Land Companies, there is the system of "Kaffir farming" in operation in many parts, encouraged by the ability of Natives to earn wages in towns. The farmer may own land which is uncultivable or too distant for his adequate supervision, which he rents to Natives whose services

he periodically demands for his cultivable lands. In other instances the farmer may hardly leave the stoep, and almost his entire profit is earned by Natives paid at an unskilled rate. At this they do not complain. They still have access to the venerated land of their forefathers. That access compensates for the necessary evils of monotonous labour and low wages.

On the whole, a shortage of farm labour is the usual experience of the European pastoralist or agriculturist. The supplementary or alternative system of white labour on farms offers some of the attractive possibilities mentioned by the late Secretary of Agriculture (p. 39), so far as his view is accurate—and the few inaccuracies are all exaggerations. The Native is not always unintelligent. Where unintelligence is the case it is often offset by dependability in the performance of routine duties. His wants are not usually few. What passes for a paucity of wants is usually laziness in acquiring the means to satisfy them. Close supervision of the Native is an exaggerated requirement usually—we may substitute "periodical" for "frequent" supervision. The drain on the time of the farmer is frequently an illusion. Not many farmers are so constantly pressed for time that supervision of the Native means loss. Most of the criticisms of the Native would apply also to the "bywoner," if not so forcibly. The implication that the European farmhand is always immeasurably superior to the Native must be resisted. A good bywoner is usually superior to a Native worker; a bad one may well be worse.

The difference in the utility of the two rarely covers the extra wage cost. But we must not overlook the possibilities of improving the standard of the poor white labourer, nor the possibility that Native farm wages are so inadequate as to constitute injustice to Native and poor white alike, the former receiving the inadequate wage, the latter being displaced from farms by cheap Native labour.

The difference in utility to the farmer between bywoner and Native labour tenant is accentuated by the frequent shiftlessness of the former compared with the usual docility and obedience of the Native. A solution might be found in State-regulated conditions of agricultural employment—hours, wages, contracts of service—with possibly a more extensive scheme of agricultural apprenticeships, which now are still rare. With a staple supply of white agricultural labour resident on farms (to such extent as it is available and either needful or useful), the seasonal demands of planting, reaping, hay-making and so on could be met by temporary Native labour drawn from locations, squatting tenancies, and the dependents of the residuary labour tenants.

But even the bywoner must maintain a standard of living superior to the Native's, to ensure which he requires a considerably higher wage. This extra cost, coupled with his smaller stock of physical endurance in the sun, gives rise to the supposition that the Native supplies labour far and away cheaper. Such a supposition ignores much of the undoubted truth of the late Secretary for Agriculture's contentions.

Enthusiast for European employment on farms as this authority was, he had to admit :

“ He (the Native) will . . . continue to be the main supply of farm labour because he is supposed to be cheap ; because he is available in large numbers and furnishes a plentiful supply ; and because he is docile ; prepared to work from sunrise to sunset, and later, and has no organization which comes into conflict with employers.”

This opinion was, of course, uttered before the meteoric rise of the I.C.U. It is not altogether improbable that the demands of this Native Trade Union for higher payment on farms might yet encourage a movement towards the employment of Europeans instead. Already it undermines the docility of the Native farm-hand, and draws attention to those of his grievances which are legitimate (and many which are imaginary). A public ventilation of the farm-hand's complaints—of either kind—has obvious advantages.

From farming we turn to the Native's future as a worker on railways and public works, and other fields falling under the influence of the civilized labour policy. The extent to which European labourers have been placed in Government employ since December 1924 is probably 14,000. This is not all a deliberate replacement of coloured workers (all races), but is partly due to retirement of previous coloured employees, and to expansion of public services. The actual replacements (they cannot be enumerated) are certainly negligible beside the figure of 27,000 Natives employed on public works in 1921, 37,253 on railways, 100,000 in industry, and roughly

170,000 (Union) Natives employed in mining. The civilized labour policy has hardly affected the Native. Removed from Government unskilled employ, the Native has turned to other employment with ease. Yet to press the full quota of 40,000 (employable) poor whites into the Public Services is a different matter. A tendency to proceed in this direction, and make the Government Service a white preserve, needs to be carefully watched. If actuated by legitimate non-discriminatory motives, it cannot be impugned. It is only necessary to see that the motives are in fact efficiency, economy, or the public interest. But any plan for the compulsory employment of Europeans under private enterprise must be resisted at once, especially where it means extensive displacement of Natives. There is ground for suspicion that proposals to ease congestion in Native areas and encourage full-time agriculture for Natives would form part of a policy designed to march arm-in-arm with the civilized labour policy in the towns. The new Native Land Bill will be examined in such a light.

CHAPTER V

THE CASE FOR COMPLETE SEGREGATION

At the outset of this chapter "segregation" must be particularly defined. The word is loosely used in some quarters to mean merely differential treatment or recognition of racial differences, or even the restriction of opportunities for Natives. More definitely, the dictionary gives "separation" or "isolation." Two species of such separation may be discussed—what Professor Brookes terms "possessory" and "complete."

What does complete segregation imply? Nothing less than the confinement of the Native to areas in which he shall develop and be dependent on his own resources. He may have no liberty to leave these areas except by special permit, and any employment in urban centres, or on European farms, is a direct violation of the principle at stake.

Complete segregation is not generally recommended as practical politics. But it is sometimes advocated on one or more of the following grounds:—preference for a policy of "white South Africa," as opposed to participation by both races in our economic life; apprehension of undue penetration of Natives into industry, and ultimate dominance; fear of the Native population expanding so rapidly

as to force Europeans out of South Africa; apprehension of a Native general strike or rebellion; fears of spreading miscegenation; as a solution of the poor white problem; in suspicion that the availability of cheap black labour enervates the energy of Europeans; dislike of contact with Natives, and in some cases out of general antipathy to Natives.

Taking these apprehensions or hopes one by one: the policy of "white South Africa" must be related to the present economic situation. It cannot be approved for the Union merely on the ground of success in Australia. Australia's aboriginal black population has declined rapidly in the face of white immigration. Her policy really makes a virtue of necessity as regards the use of pre-resident black labour. It is an effective policy only as regards the prohibition of Chinese, Japanese, Indians and Kanakas. This policy of exclusion can be sustained when white immigration can successfully be undertaken, when wages are kept high and when natural resources are large and easy of development. In South Africa the immigration of efficient white labour is hindered by the pre-existing use of cheap black labour, and by the unattractive possibilities of farming in South Africa (as compared with Australia), due to animal and plant diseases, unreliability of rainfall, inferior soil, and political instability.

Then one will suggest the injustice to South Africa's existing Native population contained in proposals to exclude it from participation in the economic life of the country. Any denial of equality of opportunity to all human beings, so far as that

opportunity can be utilized, betrays the principles of civilization.

Fears of the Native's ultimate dominance in the labour market are groundless. The participation of the Native is limited by his utility to employers, relative to wage rates. He may successfully oust the European from unskilled labour; he cannot do so in the cases of skilled labour or the functions of supervision and management. The only rational fear is for the depression of wage standards in general by the excessive use of cheap black labour. Wage legislation can protect the higher standard of living. Complete segregation is too drastic a remedy.

The fear of undue expansion of Native population relative to European increase has been intensified by an alarmist Census report, predicting the ousting of the European from the economic life of the nation by a rising tide of colour. This Census report has since been considerably qualified by the Census Director responsible. Since 1911 the Native rate of increase has continued to fall till it is now lower than that of Europeans. The contact of Native with European seems to set up reactions in the Native community leading to a decline latterly in the birth-rate, and to the encroachment of infectious diseases, and particularly venereal diseases. These tendencies are not fully balanced by the extension of civilized medical methods among the Native population, or its growing appreciation of hospital treatment.

Apprehensions of a Native general strike or rebellion are vastly exaggerated. Natives and Euro-

peans are as amicably related as one would have any right to expect. This friendly regard can be fostered by the treatment of Natives by Europeans on more generous lines and the spread of methods founded on sympathy, co-operation, mutual respect. The Native's exasperation at complete segregation is more likely to lead to conflict than the continuance of such less unfair treatment as he now obtains. Economic ties tend to bind the Native closer to the European every year, and the strength of these ties to be more and more realized. Their rupture promises no good to either race. On a lower plane is the argument that the Native has no general organization for extensive strikes and revolts.

One has sympathy for the fear that miscegenation may result from the free intermixture of Natives and Europeans. It actually does occur at an undesirable rate, especially in slum areas. The undesirability of miscegenation does not require to be proved to any South African of pure race. The problem is to prevent or discourage it. It would seem that the principal conditions which favour it are: a temperament conducing to recklessness and immorality; lack of sufficient moral training; low wages leading to delayed marriage; female poverty resulting in a resort to prostitution; overcrowding and congested housing conditions.

Some of these conditions can be eliminated by the improvement of the economic conditions of Native and poorer European by social legislation and by mission work. Generally, the principle must be recognized that the improvement of social and

economic conditions disfavours the occurrence of illicit unions. They usually occur to-day among the lower or poorer strata of populations. If complete segregation, by causing the dislocation of industrial enterprise, results in unemployment and lower incomes, illicit unions will be encouraged. It is true, however, that they will be prevented as between race and race. This result must, however, be counterbalanced by the overwhelming disadvantages of complete segregation elsewhere indicated.

Complete segregation is likewise too drastic a remedy for the poor white problem. Even assuming the complete use of poor whites as labourers in place of the segregated Natives, the fact of complete segregation, by robbing productive and distributive agents of the economic capacity of over a million employees, would so reduce output as to throw the poor whites, with thousands of more efficient workers, out of employment in the cases where the business survives only by the payment of low wages, be they fair wages or not. An alternative solution of the poor white problem is suggested in the final chapter. The folly of assisting the poor white without reforming him may be noticed again; and likewise the injustice of sacrificing the Native to the poor white, except in the genuine interests of national well-being.

It is probably true that the presence of thousands of Natives in European centres, engaged on laborious or menial tasks, leads to a European prejudice against any manual labour which has the character of drudgery. The white man does become enervated

and lazy in South Africa, compared with Australia and New Zealand. But we cannot accurately apportion the blame between cheap labour and climate, and should consequently refrain from sweeping proposals for complete segregation on this ground alone.

The dislike of Europeans for contact with Natives in any sphere cannot be regarded as a serious argument. It is usually the result of prejudice and bias of an irrational nature. The better type of European mixes amicably with the Native on due occasion, and respects the many high qualities in the Native character. Nor, on grounds already indicated, can we sympathize with plans for complete segregation designed to harass, irritate, suppress or restrict the black man.

Yet the principal objections to complete segregation will be economic where the tie between white man and black man is mainly economic. The preceding chapter examined the demand for Native labour in some detail. We may assume that no proposal which would have the effect of removing over a million Natives from employment by Europeans will commend itself to any legislature.

But equally we must consider the effect of complete segregation on the position of the black man. Can Natives exist on none but Native resources without dying like flies or resorting to wholesale robbery or rebellion? Not without a huge extension of Native areas. Common humanity would demand almost the doubling of Native reserves—the reversion of more or less economically developed land to subsistence

agriculture. Perhaps there are possibilities of improving Native methods of peasant cultivation which would avoid that necessity.

At present we find that Native lands are inadequate for the support of the Native population without the supplementary support of wage-earning. Many would assert that they are inadequate even with the subsidy of wages earned away from the reserves. Professor Macmillan gives a detailed account of conditions in the Herschel district of the Transkeian territories. This we may summarize with comments, remembering nevertheless that Herschel is a backward district and not fully representative of the Transkei.

This Herschel district is congested, and the normal result of congestion is a loss of productive capacity. Erosion (the result of over-stocking and multiplication of footpaths and so on) robs the inhabitants of valuable soil. The increase of cattle, which the Native refuses to sell, besides contributing to erosion by reducing the density of surface vegetation, invites the spread of noxious weeds. The stock crops avidly at the grass and destroys much of it, whereat weeds usurp its place. Sheep, by cropping the grass deeper, help this spread. Even with their quick return in wool, the possibilities of extension of sheep are limited by inadequate pasturage and heavy capital outlay. Often Natives graze both sheep and cattle on the same land, and the sheep starve out the cattle. The multiplication of cattle (there is an average of one head per man) leads to deterioration of quality. A shortage of pasturage tells heaviest

on the best milkers, whose strength goes to milk production, leaving less for the maintenance of animal vitality than with inferior breeds. This, with inbreeding and tick infestation, leads to a low productivity in milk and poorness for draft.

Irrigation is exceedingly rudimentary, even in the few cases where it is practised. Ploughing is very little more than the scratching of the earth with broken and obsolete implements. Seed is carelessly chosen, and the use of dung for fuel in the bush-denuded areas prevents the use of natural manures. Artificial fertilizer is too expensive for the Native. The staple Native diet consists of mealies, Kaffir corn, pumpkins, sour milk and a few sundries, so that there is little opportunity for crop rotation, even if its value were fully realized. There is practically no digging in of decayed matter, and the increasingly impoverished soil gets no rest, except in seasons of drought or crop disease.

The Native's inability to make good use of his land means a continual dependence on wage-earning, even to the extent of buying grain from outside. This dependency is accentuated by the usual improvidence of the uneducated Native. A good crop merely means the paying off of old debts, and rarely an opportunity to save. The value of imports into the Herschel district is estimated at £3 per head per annum. Taxation averages 10s. per head, and exports £1 10s. per head. The balance of £2 is made up by wages. Assuming that the Native family consists of six persons, there can be no surplus.

Since the Crown dependencies (Swaziland and

Basutoland) are overcrowded, and most of Bechuana-land and the Karroo are unsuitable for Natives, the Native would require to look principally to the Transkei and Zululand in the case of complete segregation. In the Transkei, with the Glen Grey district as an example, five hundred Natives will live on the 1500 morgen which would provide a very moderate return for a European farmer. In Zululand, however, the pressure is not so great. In the early days of Natal, adequate reserves were provided for Natives, of which Zululand is the chief. The position of other Natal locations and of the Transvaal reserves is intermediate between those of Zululand and the Transkei. Generally, the Native population could not survive the addition of a hundred per cent. to its numbers (under complete segregation), willing as Natives might be to cater for indigent hangers-on. Nor could they survive such a burden even with a radical improvement in farming methods. Apart from the requirements of complete segregation, the possibilities of obtaining this improvement may be examined.

First, agricultural education should achieve much. Native demonstrators should be trained to urge among their people the practice of deeper ploughing, manuring, crop rotation, harrowing, water conservation, the planting of more white man's crops (legumes especially), the introduction of more pigs, goats, sheep, fowls, and the better breeding of cattle, not as under the requirements of "lobola," the hoarding of animals till they drop of old age.

The practice of lobola is a prime cause of location

over-stocking. It is not the sole cause, for cattle to Natives embody absolute wealth, and a Native's herds are his bank. It is the custom with most Bantu people south of the Equator for a bridegroom on marriage to hand over ten or more cattle to the bride's father. This is not purchase price, as the father-in-law cannot sell, for some time at least. Rather it is a gift, in return for the father-in-law's gift of his daughter. The transaction is part of the marriage ritual, expressed by the transfer of cattle as the ritual animal of the Bantu. The cattle may usually be reclaimed by the husband if the wife deserts or misconducts herself, or even in certain cases if she is barren. The fact of their being part of a gift and being sacred does not prevent their subsequent use for the lobola of a bride's younger brother. For this purpose they are stored. Generally, the sale or slaughter of lobola cattle would correspond to the alienation of a European bride's marriage settlement, for they provide support for a deserted or ill-used wife.

Despite the evil of over-stocking, the custom has many advantages. It makes for self-respect among Native girls, as each hopes to command the largest lobola of her family. It leads to a better treatment of female children by parents, since they represent potential cattle. It ensures the proper conduct of wives to husbands, under pressure by the father-in-law if necessary, who fears having to refund the lobola. It leads to proper treatment of wives by husbands, for, as the equivalent of at least ten cattle, wives acquire an aspect of value.

On the other hand, the course of true love is frequently interrupted by a suitor's lack of the requisite cattle, and a girl may be married off to the highest bidder if she is not already mortgaged, perhaps from birth, to a wealthy old man, possibly polygamous.

Whether we like it or not, to suppress lobola would be as drastic as to suppress Christian Church marriages. Even Christian Natives often pass lobola on marriage. Even when East Coast fever decimated Native herds, money was passed as a temporary substitute for cattle. While it is too much to hope that the custom will disappear in our lifetime, and so free over-stocked land for the plough or rational cattle breeding, a century may easily witness the decay of the lobola custom. It already becomes undermined where in a few instances money passes in lieu of cattle—a gross disrespect for sacred traditions.

There is considerable belief that Native farming methods might be improved by the imparting of a more individualistic element into peasant agriculture. Some writers go so far as to say that production is directly proportionate to security of tenure. Before the advent of the European all Native ownership was communal—the chief's *dominium* being essentially a trust. This communal system may lead to the arbitrary allocation of land by chiefs, the victimization of the chief's enemies, removals of families from site to site at short notice, and sometimes the suppression of activities of a progressive nature as supposed indication of an individual claim to land.

The 1903-5 Commission stated :

“ The Native population as a whole instinctively clings to and cherishes the communal system. But there is an increasing number who fret alike for the opportunity to gain independence and assert individualism. Education and contact with civilization seem to augment the number. There is apparent a yearning among many who have progressed which requires satisfaction—the aspiration is healthy and tends in the right direction.”

Individual tenure is recommended, subject to the following :

(1) Liability to forfeiture on conviction for rebellion, treason or sedition; failure to occupy beneficially; failure to pay punctually all dues attaching to the land; a second conviction for stock theft.

(2) Right of resumption for public purposes in whole or part, subject to compensation in land or otherwise.

(3) Payment of an annual rent.

The Glen Grey Act of 1894 gives in a number of Transkeian districts individual holding on quit-rent (15s. per morgen per annum). Title may be forfeited on failure to occupy beneficially. (This for some reason has not, in fact, been the actual policy of the Native Affairs Department.) As early as 1882 Captain Blyth mentioned the advantages of individual tenure among the Fingoes—the erection of proper dwellings, tree planting, fencing, personal interest, individual responsibility, and the principle of “ If a man does not work, neither shall he eat.”

In other parts the Act has had but a moderate success. Yet it has proved worthy enough to be scheduled for extension to the Ifafa and Amanzimtoti locations, and thence very probably to Mission

reserves and locations administered by the Natal and Zululand Native Trust as rural survey is extended. Given more time, it seems likely that the encouragement of Native individualism will improve agriculture in the same way—if not to the same extent—that the decay of the manor and enclosure of the commons in England led the way to a more scientific cultivation. Natal and Transvaal Native chiefs need not feel that this growth of individualism menaces their authority, since the Native Administration Act of 1927 recognizes most of their privileges and extends not a few. This should reconcile them to individualism. Perhaps they will welcome it on more emphatic demonstration to them of its virtues.

Next we may take the complaint that wage-earning by Natives acts as a subsidy in aid of peasant farming. This is claimed to cause neglect of cultivation, since the Native looks to his wages as the principal form of support. Or at all events he can dispense with efficient methods since wages make up the difference. Yet there is no evidence for belief that peasant methods have degenerated since wage-earning began among Natives. In some cases they were too bad to deteriorate further. Or custom or force of habit kept up the existing standard. So, too, did the expansion of the Native population and the acquisition of new wants. Perhaps it would be a blessing if Natives cultivated less energetically, so as to rest the soil. Where more active cultivation impoverishes the land the sooner, it is fortunate that wage-earning subsidizes peasantry. The subsidy will be only a disadvantage when Native agriculture

sheds its crudity. Then a subsidy would hinder the full use of the improved methods. But the effect of a subsidy must not be over-emphasized. The further increase in Native wants will assist a development of scientific methods even as subsidized. There is, however, the disturbing possibility that employers of labour will intercept the benefits of these improved methods by reducing wages, or resisting otherwise effective demands for their increase.

Cultivation, of course, proceeds season by season in Native areas during the year. It is carried on by the wife, children and aged dependents of a married adult while he is away in town, as is very often the case. This contingent is reinforced when he himself arrives on holiday for usually three months in the year. But it is true to say that the bulk of a Native's earnings in locations near to railways is due to the work of women and children. In all locations a considerable amount of woman's field labour, mainly on the agricultural side, is traditional. This work subsidizes the wage of the adult married Native, and represents gain to the employer. Apart from this objection, it is not wholly wrong that Native women should work in the fields. They have very few household and social duties to perform; it were better to work than lounge about. In the absence of the husband's supervision they do not overwork; they merely preserve a very fine health. Unfortunately, the Native woman is usually less intelligent and enterprising than the man. Hence the spread of efficient systems of cultivation will be hindered.

It is disturbing to find that wage increases among

Natives are likely to provide still another source of delay, if the subsidy theory is correct. And correct it would seem, with the qualifications mentioned. The solution would lie in a policy of educating the Native with a view to increasing his standard of living. If Native wages are based to-day on the Native's customary standard of living, then an improvement in this will cause an effective demand for higher wages, or better cultivation—perhaps both. It would seem impossible to divorce wage-earning entirely from peasantry. The Native generally clings to his land, and it would be inadvisable to dispossess him. We cannot face the vast discontent of landless Natives nor the moral deterioration which the landless state is prone to encourage among them. Nor can we abolish the system of wage-earning in towns without ruining the nation. The evils of the wage subsidy are evils felt primarily by the Native. We may assume he prefers these evils to a revolutionary separation of wage-earning and subsistence cultivation.

A further group of possibilities of improving Native farming methods remains to be noticed. Most of them are suggested by Professor Brookes. This study does not purport to explain agricultural policy, and the bare mention of the possibilities will suffice; the establishment of experimental farms in Native areas; the use of Native demonstrators; the presentation of prizes for best cultivated plots by Native Councils or the Government; the holding of Government-aided shows, and the opening up of Native markets, by railway construction, road building, bus

services, and the use of Council-appointed market agents.

The Council system of the Transkeian territories makes an attempt to supply some of these needs. Between 1903 and 1924 there were spent on public works £386,000; and on agricultural development, £417,000. These funds were raised by local Native taxation. In no other part of the Union is this admirable system in operation. Its merits might well be emphasized to the Zulu and other chiefs.

Returning to a final demolition of the case for complete segregation: complete segregation could only emphasize the present poverty of Natives and lead to a regime of degradation. To provide relief would cost millions—at present the Native is made to pay for himself throughout. The remission of taxation would barely help—it amounts only to a general tax of £1 per annum per head, and a hut tax (except where rent is paid on Crown land) of 10s. per hut per annum. To make any success of complete segregation, the uprooting of whole tribes from congested areas would be required. Changes of this description do not commend themselves to the Native mind—they have met with armed resistance. Nor are Natives acquiring European property disposed to pay for expensive improvements—such as farm-houses. The cost would fall on the Government. The difficulties that have been encountered in delimiting the present location areas warn us against the evils of complete segregation. It is with relief that we turn to the possibilities of segregation of a less ambitious but more practical kind.

CHAPTER VI

EXAMINATION OF " POSSESSORY " SEGREGATION

THIS species of segregation means, in short, the setting aside of certain areas for the Native to own, but on which he need not permanently reside. It endeavours to segregate the Native in respect of land, but not in respect of labour. This is the segregation contemplated by the 1913 Land Act and the present Land Act Amendment Bill.

There are varying motives adduced for policies of possessory segregation :

- (1) To check and discourage undue social intermixture;
- (2) To facilitate the task of Native administration;
- (3) To encourage Native agriculture;
- (4) To protect Native health and morals;
- (5) To preserve a minimum acreage of land for Natives;
- (6) To prevent an undue acquisition of land by Natives;
- (7) To encourage a white labour policy;
- (8) To check a too sudden civilization of the Native.

The 1913 Act, in laying down a policy of segregation for the whole Union, was conceived in terms of most of these suggested advantages. But mainly it was passed in the fear that Native land purchases from Europeans were increasing too rapidly. There was a certain amount of European purchase from Natives to offset them, but this could not be great, since Native reserves were already protected from alienation. The Amendment Bill now pending upholds the policy of possessory segregation, though it probably recognizes an additional motive for this segregation, namely, the furtherance of an urban white labour policy. This is on the principle that large locations mean little labour. Hence to increase Native areas will decrease Native egress to towns (or so it is thought). There is also, however, a genuine recognition of present-day overcrowding in black areas.

Apart from public and parliamentary opinion, is possessory segregation expedient? Is it feasible? Are alternative policies more advantageous? Is it compatible with fair play to Europeans and Natives alike?

First, is it desirable to check social intermixture of the races? Is it possible for two cultures to react on each other without disadvantage? Most South Africans would answer that a too sudden and complete contact with the European demoralizes the Bantu and antagonizes the white man. The Native is apt to acquire many of the evils of white civilization rather than the benefits. He has, in fact, absorbed to a certain extent the evil ~~part~~ ^{portion} of

prostitution, theft and dishonesty; he has acquired habits of indiscriminate insolence, disobedience of parents and employers, restlessness, unreliability. The European fears miscegenation and claims by Natives to complete social equality. Both races are inclined to feel embarrassment, if not distaste, at too complete a contact with the other. From bodily habits to mental processes a gulf yawns between the two.

But is segregation necessary to prevent undue social intermixture? Perhaps it is possible for the races to meet on due occasion in the social sphere without a clash. Events have, in fact, proved that the respectable Native does not desire to insinuate himself into European society. Nor does the European desire to live with Natives except in an official capacity of some kind. Exceptions do exist, however, where household Native servants attempt to regard themselves as members of the family, or where Natives imitate European manners with the intention of being insolent. But generally the races desire to keep apart in their leisure hours.

Possessory segregation will not, of course, completely keep the two races apart socially, for it permits Natives to resort to European centres. Yet it prevents Natives and Europeans living side by side all over the country and developing further antagonisms. It does not, however, hinder the meeting of Natives and Europeans on essential occasions—conferences, administration, hospital work and education, as instances.

It is that the work of Native administration is

facilitated by the grouping of Natives into separate territories. The success of the Transkeian Council system is claimed as an example. It is true that in the Transkei the officials obtain more co-operation from the Native inhabitants than in other locations, and that the existence of such a large block of Native territory has furthered the progress of Native self-government. When Natives live in large communities together they are apt to realize an identity of interest. Then, too, the larger the Native area, the easier to introduce hospitals, schools, churches; the easier to build bridges, roads and dams. It may be profitable to build a trunk road to serve a Native area of ten thousand inhabitants, but unprofitable for two thousand. It is true, however, that with black and white spread indiscriminately over the Union, public utilities would be provided for both and shared. Equally it is true that the advance of the Transkei has largely depended on the relatively progressive habits of the Transkeian tribes. But there is no reason to doubt that segregation facilitates administration, especially the local government of Natives by themselves. It would seem obvious that if black and white were mingled over the Union on a chess-board principle, attempts to govern Natives on differential lines would meet with great difficulty. That such attempts are necessary is agreed by Europeans and tribal Natives. Different customs prevail—marriage, succession, relations of child to parent, work, play, courtships, funerals; different taxes are levied; different types of judicial process appeal to the races. Native opinion would

warmly object to prosecutions for drunkenness with incapability on Native property; European opinion, for white public premises, would acquiesce. Natives would be indignant at an enforcement of civilized sanitary standards, or at a proclamation of the Union fencing law in the locations. The existence of the Natal Code illustrates the divergence of European and Native law in one province at least.

With the task of administration may be associated the task of improving Native farming. There is no need to elaborate the advantages of compact Native areas in this regard. But against this must be set the fact that a Native is likely to learn from a European neighbour by imitation. To the extent that segregation means a limitation to Native land-holding, a spur to improvement exists. The expansion of population requires a more effective cultivation if the expansion is not wholly absorbed by migration to towns. For the present a danger exists that more strenuous cultivation will take the place of more effective cultivation. To seed more heavily, to plant closer, to raise heavier crops, without manuring, fertilizing or rotation means a quicker exhaustion of the soil. But over a longer period it will be found that the limitation of Native areas is essential. If the Native has ready access to an almost unlimited extent of land he has no inducement to make an efficient use of it, except he be educated or progressive.

The protection of Native health and morals next engages our attention. We have already indicated some of the vices which the Native has acquired from

the European, and some of his own which inter-racial contact has intensified. The acquisition of immoral habits, or at the least unnatural habits, is perhaps inevitable upon any contact of the races, even if it be for employment only. But undoubtedly the demoralization would proceed faster without the existence of tribal reserves, that prime feature of the segregation policy.

Said the Economic and Wage Commission :

" Reserves safeguard the morality of the Native population. . . . To preserve the traditional morality, it is necessary to preserve the traditional economic and social system—which can be done only in purely Native communities in reserves. The transition from primitive to civilized economic conditions will be a trying and hazardous experience for the Native population under the most favourable circumstances. It will be eased, and its tendency to demoralization will be checked, if it is made gradual by limiting the contact as much as possible to intermittent periods of employment under sheltered conditions, while the greater part of the Native's life is still passed in the nursery of his own tribal community.

" The efforts of the white employers to secure Native labour, and the efforts of white traders to induce the Native to buy the products of European industry, offer sufficient assurance that the Europeanization of the Native in his superficial economic habits will not be unduly retarded. Moreover, with every decade he will require the support of his tribal community less; and his community will become less unlike the European communities in which in the end it is likely to merge. The function of the reserve is to ease the transition—a temporary function for perhaps a majority of the Native population—and to provide a shelter for that slowly diminishing minority who cannot, or will not, be assimilated to the economic system of Western civilization."

To break up a nation's social scheme is to destroy that nation's soul. The Native race is undoubtedly losing its soul, as in broad terms Native society disintegrates under modern economic pressure. Be this loss inevitable or not, its happening is a grave misfortune. It is possible to appeal to the best in a Native in the measure of that Native's personal pride. And with the Native population, personal pride is a reflection of social order and unity. Today the Native personal morality depends on inheritance of tribal morality, as a cut flower lives on sap derived from the main stalk before severance. Severance from the old means in either case decay. With the Native population, however, a new morality may be fashioned from imitation of the European, or in natural response to the Native's new place in the national scheme. This always remains a possibility, part of which has already been realized. And, in any case, moral decay is an infinitely slow process as it affects the mainsprings of human conduct. Careless sexual conduct and children's disrespect for parents are alarming, but not yet universal. With dishonesty, these aspects of moral retrogression are at present the most noteworthy among Natives. But it is only fair to remember that a Native's lapse from his traditional morality does not necessarily set him on a lower plane than a European who has not lapsed. In many ways the Native tribal system was stricter than any corresponding European effective obligation to morality.

It is highly probable that the Native's health is being undermined by contact with the European.

Vital statistics are no complete guide, even where such statistics themselves are complete and accessible. One gathers that tuberculosis is rapidly spreading, though some believe that exposure to tubercular infection in time sets up a natural immunity. Diseases of the alimentary tract seem also to be spreading. Typhus is now endemic among most Native communities, while epidemics, spreading from European centres, such as the influenza of 1918, take a heavy toll of life. More especially should venereal diseases be noticed—diseases which are for all practical purposes hereditary, and which react directly on the birth-rate and infant and maternal mortality rates. The spread of syphilis, for instance, is of grave extent. It was contracted by Natives in towns originally, and Native habits of pre-marital cohabitation, polygamy, etc. have spread it widely. In one district known to the writer, over half the Natives are estimated to be infected: on one farm, over a period of four months, one child was reared out of six births. It is obvious that segregation of a possessory nature is not drastic enough to prevent the spread of European diseases. Such is the actual history of European settlement, if segregation has been the policy of South Africa since the earliest contact of the races. Segregation, however, protects Native health by reducing the number of Natives likely to frequent European centres; by reducing exposure to infection in point of time by at least a quarter, since the Native returns to his reserve for three months' rest; lastly, this holiday allows a chance for recuperation if not for total cure.

On the other hand, a small school of thought holds that segregation undermines the Native's health and morals by maintaining his home on the land, while his labour is commonly used in the towns. For it is correctly held that this state of affairs is virtually inseparable from the usual conditions under which Natives migrate from the reserves—in unorganized groups of males of all ages. Most of the adult males become separated from their wives. To a regrettable, though exaggerated extent, these migratory Natives respond in the towns in a perverted fashion to the promptings of nature by resort to homosexual practices among themselves. Where administration is slack they frequently make use of prostitution. The extent to which these practices, forced on Natives as it were by the circumstances of their migratory life, cause moral degeneration is conjectural. But beyond all doubt their occurrence is unpleasant and somewhat disconcerting, and opportunities are thereby given for the spread of venereal disease. It is to be noticed, however, that compound Natives are usually subject to a control which eliminates chances of homosexual indulgence.

Certain further remedies suggest themselves. First, the inculcation of Christian precepts among Natives, and of personal hygiene. Secondly, the detection and suppression of Native brothels. Thirdly, an improvement in Native accommodation on private premises, to avoid the herding together of Natives in an indiscriminate fashion. But more important is the withdrawal of most town-dwelling Natives from casual outhouses to supervised town

locations and villages established by the Municipalities. Very few complaints are heard of the occurrence of sodomy and self-abuse in such establishments.

But it is suggested by opponents of possessory segregation that these remedies touch merely the fringe of the problem. They demand that the organized recruitment of married male Natives be discontinued, unless they are accompanied by their wives. They desire, moreover, to discourage the unorganized migration of male Natives only, unless these males are unmarried or widowers.

The implications of this demand are grave. It might require a vast withdrawal of Native labour from all the Union's industry and trade. Or it might mean a virtual desertion of the reserves, through permanent emigration to the towns of the families of all Natives who now engage more or less regularly in town employment. If accommodation were obtainable in or near the towns for these families, it is probable that a large proportion of the Native population would forthwith relinquish all beneficial ties to the land, and ultimately become town dwellers, working for unskilled or semi-skilled wages, with no supplementary income. This would be a likely outcome.

The suggestion is now strong that such a divorce from the land, in the case of a fundamentally primitive people, of pastoralist origin, would set up moral problems of even greater gravity than the abuses considered above. The complete separation—enforced—from tribal authority, from tribal

morality and custom, from ritual observances based on pastoralism, from the space and freedom of the country, from its tranquillity and health-giving freshness, must turn the Bantu into a dispirited, shiftless people, not too moral, respectful to authority, healthy or joyous. There is no definiteness about the suitability of the land as the natural habitat of the Bantu, to compare with the definiteness of sexual perversion, but nevertheless there is a great weight to set in the balance against the restriction of purely male migration—indeed an overwhelming weight. And if this migration were stopped altogether by such a restriction, accompanied by a refusal to permit Native families to accompany their breadwinners, the consequent unemployment and distress among Natives would set up moral problems graver than any yet mentioned.

Of course, segregation is quite consistent with the establishment of Native villages on the outskirts of towns to accommodate Natives who have become or desire to become urbanized, together with their families. If these villages can be erected cheaply enough to suit the Native's purse and yet not degenerate into Native slums, their extension will be desirable indeed. But for the bulk of the Bantu let us keep the land and its associations. This bulk will desire to avoid urbanization for many years. Individual tenure, primogeniture and the natural increase of Native population will inevitably swell the ranks of permanent town dwellers residing with their families. But for the next few decades we have still the opportunity of preserving regular and periodical

access to the land for employed Natives, and virtually permanent residence thereon for wives and dependents. Undesirable as may be the conditions obtaining in many towns, it is now too late to effect a drastic rectification without precipitating the disasters of a wholesale detachment of Natives from the soil. Let us not hesitate to employ all the other remedies available. But this too drastic cure we must reserve for a graver contingency.

CHAPTER VII

EXAMINATION OF "POSSESSORY" SEGREGATION (CONTINUED)

Two further motives for possessory segregation may be discussed together, and in relation to pending legislation—the protection of Native land and the restrictions on further ownership.

Locations were delimited and set apart for Natives in all four provinces before Union, and protected from alienation except for special purposes. The 1913 Act confirmed these reservations when it forbade the European to buy or lease land in scheduled areas except under permit. A large portion of the reserves—Transkei, Pondoland, Tembuland, Natal locations and Zululand uplands—comprises the better-watered land in the Union, and land with great potentialities of being raised to higher fertility. It seems very probable that without such reservations, much of this land would have passed into white ownership. The European could have taken advantage of Native poverty after drought or stock disease to buy this land at an uneconomic figure. It is only too likely that the Native would have been tempted by cash offers to part with considerable land whose full value he did not realize. In due course European ownership would have embraced all the fertile and

climatically desirable land of the Union. The Native would have retained only land of an inferior character. The penetration of European sugar and cotton planters into Zululand illustrates this process, though it be legal, and possibly justifiable, in view of the Native's inferior use of this plantation land, and the relative under-population of Zululand. The fate of the Griquas of Griqualand East affords another example of the dispossession of Natives by the European's length of purse.

It is highly important for the Native that these reserves be secured to him. As a landed proprietor he retains his capital resources. As part of an urban proletariat he squanders them. On the land he remains happy, moral, law-abiding. In the towns he encounters unnatural conditions, to which he cannot easily adapt himself. There are temptations he cannot resist; diseases he cannot withstand; overcrowded conditions he dislikes; a multiplicity of urban regulations he cannot remember to obey; a lack of facilities for recreation and exercise which makes him prone to discontent and crime. Segregation, in the aspect of preserving a minimum acreage of Native land, checks the attraction of the towns and reduces the pressure to resort to them.

The Economic and Wage Commission drew attention to an apparent economic advantage of reserves in affording at least a minimum income.

“ In the interests of the Native the reserve is a powerful asset. . . . Reserves, if adequate, serve two purposes: they provide the most apt safeguard against unjust economic exploitation, and they provide the best

means of maintaining his morale in the difficult transition from primitive simplicity to the complexity of modern economic civilization. Adequate reserves protect the Native against exploitation because they give him an alternative to accepting employment on unjust terms. While it is untrue to say that the Native who leaves, for example, the Transkei to work on the Mines seeks employment there as a subsidiary source of income merely, it is the case that the rights he possesses in the land of his tribe enable him to resist an unjust contract, and to exact something like the full economic value of his services. The reserve thus meets the same need in the life of the Native as the strong trade union meets in the life of the European wage-earner, and it meets it in a way which is consonant with his traditions and is, in a way, automatic. In addition, it fulfils the purposes which a reserve of capital fills in the European's life, helping him to tide over interruptions in employment, whether due to trade depression, sickness or other cause, and providing a support in infancy and old age."

It would seem correct that the location provides a reserve of capital. We actually do find the reserves supporting Natives in infancy, old age, sickness and unemployment. But it is only half true that reserves enable Natives to resist an unjust contract. It is more likely that the reserves act as a subsidy in aid of wages, keeping wages lower than they would otherwise be, to the disadvantage of the urbanized Native and the coloured man.

To the extent that town employment and peasant cultivation are alternative rather than supplementary, the safeguard theory holds. The Native cannot be occupied in a location and a town simultaneously, and chooses the more advantageous opening. But resort to the towns he must, to obtain cash for

taxation, clothes, blankets, implements and utensils. This he does for six or nine months in the year, and hence carries on both the pursuits of wage-earning and peasantry. If for three months in the year by his own exertions, and for the whole year by those of his family remaining at home, sufficient can be produced to make it possible to accept lower wages without hardship, then obviously Native wages tend to remain low.

Although both sets of factors are in operation simultaneously, the second is clearly dominant. We therefore conclude that the reserve makes it possible for Native wages to remain low. The reserve is hence of greater advantage to the employer of Native labour than to the Native himself.

It is not the size of the reserve, nevertheless, to which Native wages tend to adjust themselves so much as the Native minimum standard of living. While the subsidy provides conditions for low Native wages, so does the comparative paucity of Native wants in a greater degree. This for the reason that the amount of the subsidy, so far as it is measurable, is less variable or less liable to variation than the number and intensity of Native wants. And so, for this and other reasons, we cannot at once assume that to enlarge reserves, and apparently increase the total subsidy, will act to depress wages.

Before we can completely estimate a desirable minimum of Native land-holding and arrive at the other reasons for caution in our deductions of the effect of enlarged reserves on wages, it is necessary to propound a theory of Native wages in general. The

problem is complex, owing to the existence of four important variables: (*a*) wage rates, varying with standard of living, agricultural advancement, and possibly size of reserves; (*b*) standard of living, varying with wage rates, agricultural methods, and possibly size of reserves—to say nothing of education, contact with civilization, etc.; (*c*) agricultural methods, varying with wage rates and standard of living, and (*d*) size of reserves, with which may be associated climatic conditions, increasing or reducing the normal crop. To be more precise, one would also consider strength of Native bargaining power on the basis of racial status; capacity of industry to pay; rates of child and woman labour; character of employment, and readiness of response to the inducements of higher wages. Four variables would be sufficient to consider together, nevertheless.

Let us eliminate a different three in turn. Assume, first, that the size of reserves is fixed, that seasons are normal, that standards of living and peasant methods are constant. Then the Native wage must approximate to the difference between the average customary cost of living and the produce raised in the reserves. The amount of produce raised depends on the size of the plot and the methods pursued in utilizing it. Hence Native wages would tend to rise if reserves were contracted or the season were bad. The tendency might not, however, be fulfilled in the absence of strong Native bargaining power; in the possibility that many Native servants would be dismissed if wages rose, and in the event of a higher wage attracting from the reserves many Natives who

would otherwise remain idle or cultivate intermittently. If the standard of living rose (*pari passu* with a development of effective Native trade unionism), wages would rise to the same extent, less the effect of more efficient cultivation. If methods of cultivation improved, but other factors were unchanged, wages would fall.

If reserves were expanded, but no other changes occurred, wages probably would fall at first. Later they might rise with a migration homewards of Natives dissatisfied with the lower wage. This, however, would be offset by the need of other Natives to work longer to obtain the same amount. Moreover, if reserves were expanded, but gradually, an increase in population would restore the previous degree of saturation and leave wages stationary. Broadly, we would find it true that to increase reserves would not affect wages, but to decrease reserves would raise them slightly. Wages are likely to remain extremely rigid, since the normal effect of saturation in reserves (a lower wage on account of more emigration) would be offset by a tendency to the higher wage consequent on more subdivision and closer stocking, with graver soil exhaustion. It is not necessary to examine all the repercussions of wages on standards of living, and *vice versa*, even on the broad bases of averages in character of employment, in size of wages, in Native customs, in responses to wage fluctuations. It is sufficient to conclude that while the size of the Native reserves helps to determine Native wage rates, not too drastic changes in such size will leave the wage rates unaffected. Hence our Native land

policy can safely disregard any question of Native wages being reduced, increased, or kept stationary. It will need only to regard the social conditions of the Native; the securing of minimum acreage to Natives in fulfilment of past promises; the securing of a minimum quantity of Native labour to employers; and the task of obtaining the most effective use of all South Africa's land.

The availability of a sufficient amount of labour to employers does depend, of course, on the size of the reserves. The relation is not direct, however. The expansion or contraction of Native areas will hardly cause a proportionate fall or increase in emigration from such areas. Counter-tendencies will be set up by the effect of the size of reserves on the possibilities of Native peasantry. Assume, for example, that the scheduled areas were doubled as a gift to Natives. This would at first sight seem likely to halve the exodus from them. Yet a consequent increase in Native wages would draw back to employment again thousands who are now idle. Others would stay longer in towns to grow wealthy. Others, again, would remain in employment a shorter period, which would sufficiently satisfy their cash needs. Then the consequent probability that Native crops would be increased with a doubling of the scheduled areas would tend to reduce again the wages of those Natives who continued in employment. Reverse processes would be set up. In total, such a doubling of Native areas would in fact reduce Native labour supply, but not nearly to an equivalent extent. If Natives had to purchase land in this supplementary

area instead of being given it, the extent of the consequent labour shortage would be less and its occurrence slower. This is actually the proposal of the Land Act Amendment Bill, except that Native areas would be liable to increase by a half, not by doubling. Those who hold that all the proposed released areas should be expropriated at once for Native occupation must expect a Native labour shortage of fair gravity. Those who propose released areas without general expropriation need expect only a very minor labour shortage, which population increase is likely to satisfy in large measure.

It can be taken for granted that any policy which will cause a pronounced labour shortage should be viewed with suspicion. Already the demand for Native labour exceeds supply. The greater the shortage, the greater the hindrance to the nation's economic progress. A high wage policy may or may not be evil. But a policy which renders unavailable a sufficiency of labour at any reasonable wage is definitely wrong. The misfortunes of early Australia—too many landowners, too few labourers—illustrate this point. The Union need not be ashamed of policies designed to lever the Native into employment, if such employment be on just terms, and if the leverage does not amount to direct pressure that cannot be escaped by Natives who could succeed independently. Nor should any such inducement of the Native to work be in excess of the European's customary obligations in the same direction. Broadly, it is to the Native's interest to work harder. South Africa's spacious days are passing, and the Native

must learn to survive conditions more strenuous than those which now obtain.

How should our Native land policy be designed to secure effective use of the land? Shall we approve possessory segregation because it restricts Native land acquisition? Is restriction a necessary part of the segregation policy? We have seen that the Native is apt to misuse the land he owns, by ignorance, by custom, or by force of circumstances. No one would claim that the European in South Africa is an ideal farmer. In many parts he is admittedly backward, and cherishes his unprogressiveness. Cases exist where white farming methods are more primitive than Native. But, broadly, the European will extract from a given area of land six times the return that the Native will.

As already noticed, the Land Act Amendment Bill proposes to release seven and a half million morgen for Native purchase. Natives already own just over a million morgen of the specifically released areas, and the Crown nearly a million and a half. In the Cape Province, where the vital clauses of the 1913 Act do not apply, the release of these areas is superfluous, except that the Representation of Natives in Parliament Bill, which is interlocked with the Land Bill, may seek to remove from Cape Natives the historical privileges of franchise which barred the operation of those vital clauses.

The release of five million morgen of privately owned European land is proposed in recognition of Native land shortage now existing. It is probable that the Government's proposals are also in fulfilment

of the implied promise that after Commissions had reported, further areas would be provided for Natives over and above the scheduled areas. The Land Bill may perhaps also be conceived in terms of the white labour policy, but this remains to be seen.

Since five million morgen (or more if the Crown will sell) are to be released for potential Native ownership, and the embargo on a European purchasing land from a Native is not removed, then the creation of released areas will not allow free competition between the races. In purchase the Native is at an advantage—he may buy from the white man; the European may not even buy back what he himself has sold. A tendency will exist for the released areas to become in time exclusively Native. Such a tendency is, however, held in check at several points. First, the weakness of Native purchasing power. Secondly, the provision that no Native may buy land wholly surrounded by Europeans.

Native purchasing power will, of course, gradually grow. It will be assisted by the Purchases and Advances Fund to a limited extent, but in itself is bound to accumulate. Natives willingly syndicate, tribally, for land purchases, and are bound to acquire portions of the released areas at a steady if not rapid rate. The valuations of farms in the released areas are likely to fall after the passing of the Land Bill, and accelerate the process of Native purchase, since the Government must expropriate for this purpose under the Land Bill those which have become wholly surrounded by Natives. No Europeans will wish to buy farms in a district liable inevitably to fall to

complete Native occupation. Natives will probably be the sole purchasers in the released areas, except for speculators. Besides the inevitable depreciation of released land, and consequent expropriation of much of it, the Government will have power to establish Native land-settlement schemes by expropriation on its own initiative. Moreover, it can dispose of Crown lands to Natives only. The second bar to Native acquisition—the prohibition of purchase in land surrounded wholly by Europeans—will tend to lose effect gradually as the released areas become more and more Native. Nor will the fall in value of farms in released areas assist Native settlement merely by causing a certain amount of Government expropriation. Very obviously it will reduce the price payable by Natives who purchase privately and not through the Government at all.

We have agreed that generally speaking the reserves, in the absence of efficient utilization, are overcrowded. To a moderate extent we can therefore agree to proposals for the extension of Native areas. What should be the amount of the extension, and in what districts is it required? In Natal there would seem no great requirement for released areas. The same applies to certain portions of the Transvaal. In the southern Transkei and in the Ciskei, on the other hand, mere release of land does not go far enough. It will be necessary to expropriate land outright for Natives and throw open any Crown land still available.

As a whole, location overcrowding can also be remedied by intensive measures—by the encourage-

ment of Native agricultural improvement. This would mean expenditure from current revenues. The alternative of releasing land is cheaper, but it has dangers. Except from an individual standpoint, purchase price never represents the full value of land, since no funds received in the present can be commensurate to the loss of a constantly reproductive asset in perpetuity. Most land sold to Natives represents a loss to the interests of commercial as opposed to subsistence agriculture.

Said Sir William Beaumont :

" The ownership of the land by a Native does not tend to the elevation of the owner nor to the general progress and prosperity of the country. It is for this reason that one consistently hears that it is a waste of good land to allow it to come into the possession of a Native.

" While, therefore, it is quite true that most of the reserves are overcrowded, this is only so because of the uneconomical manner in which the land is occupied and cultivated, and the overstocking which goes on without let or hindrance, save for losses through drought or disease."

It is obviously best that extension of Native areas move step by step with intensive development. Though the ideal is not always the practical, it is always wise to keep the ideal in sight. While it is impossible to postpone an extension of Native land-holding until the state of Bantu cultivation improves, it is possible to make such an improvement stand in lieu of some small proportion of the extensions now proposed. And as the released areas gradually fall into Native ownership, it may become advisable to rescind the embargo on European purchase or re-

purchase from a Native, and thus make the areas genuinely subject to supply and demand.

In essence, however, we may support proposals to extend Native land-holding generally by releasing certain areas and assisting Native purchase therein, rather than by making over large tracts at once. This would dislocate the property market of the Union, seriously curtail Native labour supplies, and require the flotation of a loan bearing perhaps an annual charge of a million pounds in interest until the land was all re-sold by the Crown to Natives. It were better to devote that sum to the spreading of agricultural education among the Natives. If common humanity demands some extension of Native areas now, the extension would be less undesirable if it did not necessarily mean a perpetuation of existing slack cultivation. We must beware of a reversion of huge tracts to a state of subsistence agriculture comparable with that from which England freed herself as early as the reign of the third Edward.

It has already been said that the released areas are not likely to fall completely into Native ownership for many generations. But this does not mean that the Native's capacity to purchase all sorts of land is equally low. A large part of the released areas comprises fairly high-priced land, somewhat improved by European owners, and carrying buildings of various kinds. The Native would far more rapidly be able to buy unimproved land enjoying a smaller rainfall and somewhat remote from railways. In this he would be assisted, but for the 1913 Act, by speculators, who would buy large farms and sub-

divide. Or Natives would syndicate, tribally or otherwise.

In total, an abolition of land purchase restriction for both races would lead to a situation in which, sooner or later, the Europeans had acquired that smaller proportion of South African land which can be described as good. Natives, on the other hand, in large numbers, all endowed with an urgent lust for land, would have obtained the whole residuum of less suitable land—land less fertile, less well watered, or more remote. Natives would then own the bulk of South African land, but, by exchanging better land for worse, be hardly better off. This short-sighted process would follow from the Native's difficulty in distinguishing qualities of land, and from his habit of regarding land less as a commercial proposition than as a traditional, almost a spiritual, requirement.

The Native's poorer land would, of course, be land demanding the greatest care and the most scientific cultivation. Even so, most of it would be difficult beyond the average to raise to a profit-earning capacity. In all probability it would deteriorate, even more readily than the Native's present land of better quality is apt to deteriorate.

Then, again, the removal of all restrictions on Native land purchase would reduce the pressure to use land more economically. There would be less hope than ever of Natives coming to improve the land in their charge, because population increase would merely take up fresh areas to be used as wastefully as before—the whole process being financially

supported by moneys earned in the towns. Needless to say, good land and poor land are not divided from each other by broad geographical divisions. They abut on one another all over South Africa, and inevitably, therefore, Native land and European land would become hopelessly intermingled. And as Native occupation penetrated into areas presently owned by Europeans, European farms would depreciate in value. For, as Lord Olivier somewhat dramatically puts it :

“ White men do not want Kaffir families about their house-places, Kaffir kraals on their farms, or Kaffir locations against their boundaries. They do not want the Natives' untidiness, their noises, their odours. There is much in their habits repulsive to Europeans, with which white people hate their children to become familiarized. They do not want to be plagued by their thieving : they do not want their piratical dog, their meagre ravenous goats, their scabby sheep, their ploughshare-headed pigs, their ungelded runts, their tick-infested cattle, about their farms.”

He might have added the Native's disrespect for fences, and his aptitude for stock-theft and petty larceny. On the whole, the European farmers' objections seem valid. They may be associated with racial bias, but are quite separable from it. Beyond all doubt, farming all over the Union by Natives under no supervision and in continual dispute with European neighbours would add to racial antagonism.

Eventually, no doubt, when the Native has developed into an able agriculturist or stock-farmer, and requires no longer any measure of segregation for the protection of his traditional modes of life,

there may be a good case for abolishing discriminatory land legislation, or at least for the abolition of restrictions on the amount of land he may buy, if not for permission to buy anywhere. The distinction could be put into practice by using the method of releasing specified areas, area after area, in such a way that fresh Native holdings adjoin as far as possible land already Native, the present reserves acting as nuclei.

But for the present, the disproportion between European and Native populations, and the Native's excessive desire for land, to the satisfaction of which he would devote most of his monetary means, present and, through instalment buying, prospective as well, makes necessary a restriction in the interests of conserving and utilizing to greatest advantage South Africa's greatest asset, the land.

True, no doubt, is it that the Native continually complains of land shortage. But where, outside the Transkei, do Natives show any general realization that they must make better use of what they already have? Where do they realize that their standard of civilization must approach nearer the European's before the latter can be expected to surrender area after area? Surrender will be the practical effect of releasing land where release is for the specific purpose of settling Natives on it.

We have agreed that Native demands are reasonable to a certain extent. But, after all, land restriction cuts both ways, and the white man begins to feel a shortage even now of land that is commercially usable. Before long he will make the same demand

as the Native now makes. To be firm with Native desires now will set a suitable precedent for dealing with an inevitably similar situation in the future, whether arising from Native complaints or European.

The inelasticity of the supply of land in the face of expanding populations cannot be overcome by the removal year by year of racial barriers. The ultimate solution can only come from a determined effort to raise the standard of cultivation all over South Africa. The premature removal of the restrictions will merely postpone further an effort already overdue.

CHAPTER VIII

FURTHER EXAMINATION OF " POSSESSORY " SEGREGATION

POSSESSORY segregation next needs to be examined in relation to the white labour policy. The possibilities of extending white labour by any just or reasonable parliamentary measure are slight. The Native is with us for good in a hundred different occupations. But he need not remain so in others where cost is supposed to be the sole objection to more European employment.

If the indigent European can increase efficiency by being less afraid of hard work, by realizing more the dignity of labour, and by straining every nerve in his employer's interests, there is no reason why he should not become cheaper in the long run, though paid double the black man's rate. The white labour supporters of the Economic and Wage Commission stressed this point, and quoted a number of hopeful tendencies.

It is probable that attempts to raise wages in industries producing for export, with the aim of encouraging European employment, would be highly unwise. Not many disinterested observers would willingly acquiesce in a policy of low wages in preference to high wages. They might feel that wages

rarely represented the value of the services required in return; that high wage standards are essential to improvement in social conditions; or that high wages pay for themselves through the creation of a larger home demand.

In the case of farming and mining, South Africa's main exporting industries, high wages would impose a clogging restriction. Any rise in productive or extractive costs would draw inwards the margin of profitable exploitation, reduce the number of units of industry, reduce the size of those units, and swell unemployment. The higher wage cost could not be passed off to the consumer to the extent that prices are fixed in the world market. The increased purchasing power consequent on the higher wage would benefit the industries paying it only to the limited extent that the earners of that wage spent it on the purchase of products of the industries concerned. In South Africa this is limited to meat, vegetables, meal and dairy produce. The only other compensation is the tendency of higher wages to encourage the use of superior methods, more machinery and systems of waste elimination, and to increase the scale of productive operations. From all account there is little room for such improvements on the mines. Agriculture is not, however, so highly organized nor so scientific.

On the whole it would seem that the application of Wage Board determinations to exporting industries should be either withheld or postponed. It may be generally true that industries should not be suffered to survive which cannot pay a "decent"

wage. It is equally true, however, that numerous additions to the unemployed population would be more resented by the employees affected. We would remember, too, that the wages customarily paid on mines and farms are low only from the viewpoint of the European. They are quite adequate, generally speaking, in relation to Native wants *and capacity*.

In the two main exporting industries, Europeans requiring a fully civilized wage should devote their expectations of employment to skilled and supervisory jobs—stoping, machine-tending, timekeeping, building, harness-making, acting as farm foreman. Black labour, *per se*, is not necessarily to be preferred to white, nevertheless. Where the European is more efficient than the Native, he can justify a higher wage to that extent.

Manufacturing industry is now complaining of Wage Board determinations which, generally speaking, discourage the employment of Natives at wages lower than £8 per month. Under the heading of "manufacturing industry," Government departments are apt to include workshops of the boot-repairing and sawmill type, and firms like breweries and bakeries. Common to most of them is an absence of production for export. The special objections urged in the case of farming and mining do not apply. The objections now put forward, that higher wages raise cost of the the finished product and reduce the demand for it, are true only because the work of the Wage Board is incomplete. If sweet factories are surcharged with the higher wage, but not the pre-

served fruit factories, it is natural that sweet-makers will complain that trade goes to their rivals. But if the same wage is enforced in both industries, then the *status quo* is regained as to the distribution of consumers' demand.

South African manufacturing industries mainly supply the local market with necessities and comforts. That demand could not be turned to the consumption of goods produced by firms not paying the minimum wage, except as regards farm produce. There is, however, the question of exposing South African industries to more effective overseas competition. It turns on the manufacturer's need to pass on the increased cost of production to consumers. Assuming stability of the general level of prices, manufacturers producing conveniences and luxuries, like sweets and biscuits, must bear most of the extra cost themselves, or consumers would divert part of their demand to similar imported products or to goods of a different class, like butter and meat. This second form of diversion would be inevitable. The first form, if it were serious, which is unlikely, could be remedied in part by increasing the customs tariff on appropriate commodities. This would be undesirable. The onus should be on the manufacturer, not the consumer, to pay for decent wages.

In the case of necessities, manufacturers could with fair ease pass on costs to the consumer, if an increase in customs tariff were allowed, though in the case of this class of goods the tariff is small. Here, too, an increase in the tariff is undesirable. If prices of manufactured necessities were permitted to rise, we

would find wages gaining slightly at the expense of salaries, pensions, rents, dividends and profits. We would probably also find a slight fall in prices of other commodities.

This last-mentioned result could be prevented or modified by the policy of the Central Reserve Bank. The Quantity Theory of Money—roughly that the general price level varies directly with changes in the volume of currency and credit instruments in circulation—explains how the Bank could allow a rise in general prices by increasing the note issue and/or discount rate. Though very probably, if wage determinations increased the prices of manufactured goods, the extra currency would be used to sustain a greater turnover, measured in money, of these particular goods, and not all goods and services, however produced.

In Australia the minimum wage policy was put through at a time of generally rising prices. It therefore hurt nobody. But when prices slumped in 1920-2 by the withdrawal of currency notes and raising of the discount rate, workmen secured a real gain at the expense of manufacturers or consumers or both. It has been suggested in South Africa that a slight inflation accompany the extension of wage minima, and so prevent a too sudden contraction of employment, and then over a longer period, deflation generally, so as to enhance real wages.

It is part of South Africa's present policy to increase by law in numerous industries wages which do not reach a civilized standard. Wage determinations are made after examination by the Wage Board

of industries suspected of under-payment. The result of wage minima of over £8 per month is generally the elimination of the Native and the substitution of the semi-skilled European or Indian. It is not usual, however, to apply such minima to unskilled workers, who will usually be excluded from a wage determination. Hence there is likely to remain in manufacturing industry a large substratum of Natives paid at an unskilled rate, while Natives become displaced from positions bearing higher wage rates which they are not worth. Industrial Conciliation Agreements fixing sufficient minima would have the same effect as Wage Board determinations, assuming they embraced all classes of employee equally, regardless of race.

Commercial firms are somewhat in the same category as manufacturing firms with relation to employment. Here Natives are used for packing, handling, street delivery, sweeping and cleaning. It is probable that low rates of pay will remain legal for occupations which are declared unskilled. For semi-skilled work the European will be substituted under wage determination. It is probable that more Natives are employed by commercial firms than efficiency would justify. Employment on the distributive side is not usually so stereotyped as with machine-tending and so on on the productive side. Intelligence, initiative and application are needed, but not sufficiently supplied by Native workers. The measure of wages is efficiency, and work indifferently performed can never be really cheap. Such is the experience of a Durban merchant who substituted white youths for Natives in his packing department.

On the Railways and Government Construction Works the current policy of engaging young Europeans rather than Natives or Indians is the best way out of a bad difficulty. The replacement of the Native can only be a drop in the ocean beside his total employment, but it provides welcome relief to European families struggling with coloured competition. The principal taxpayer is studying the advantage of his own race by shouldering the burden, which is, however, relieved by savings on disbursements for relief works and charity. The principle of preference to Europeans in Government employ holds good for European youths in urban centres primarily, and only secondarily for rural adult indigents. It can only be justified for the latter class so far as the progress of agricultural rehabilitation is slow. "Back to the land" is the wiser policy for most of the rural unemployed.

In farming, intelligence and application are always needed. In farming, South Africa should find her future destiny when the mining era is over. A sharp rise in the price of food-stuffs and animal products seems likely before the end of the century, and in these circumstances the Union would seem to have a future as a greater food-supplier than heretofore. Hence its agriculture, in which the human and individual element is highly important, should be built up on a scientific European basis. At present the efficiency of many poor whites compares unfavourably with that displayed by the bulk of Natives. But an increasing sense of discipline is being noted yearly, and success is the rule rather

than failure in instilling the elements of efficiency and good citizenship into the succeeding generation of impoverished rural whites. To the scientific development of farming it is likely that the educated next generation of Europeans will contribute more readily than the Native. Under suitable supervision this class seems to be making fair headway. The Department of Labour has always deplored the migration of poor whites from the country to the towns, and seems satisfied with the success of its forestry, tobacco, wheat and maize growing colonies, and of its tenant-farmer extension schemes. The observation that poor whites acquire better discipline in towns must be viewed with suspicion. The conditions of immorality and dishonour to be found on the outskirts of the larger centres are largely due to the rural influx. Agricultural rehabilitation would seem the wisest policy for all rural unemployed who have not forgotten the instincts and traditions associated with the soil.

England experienced an agrarian problem in the eighteenth century, when peasants were displaced through the enclosure of the remaining commons and the transition to large-scale agriculture. A solution was found in the absorption of these people into the rapidly expanding manufactures. More suitable for the solution of South Africa's problem are the methods adopted in Ireland, where the rural displacement was checked by improving the peasant's tenure and establishing more favourable conditions on the land. In South Africa these improved conditions might be obtained by encouraging a substitution of contract-

regulated service, in place of the present elastic relations of farmer and bywoner. Then, again, progressive bywoners might be assisted to obtain freehold instead of indefinite lease, and their sons secured to the land under apprenticeships. The root cause of rural indigency was found by the Transvaal Indigency Commission to be the backward methods of farming of these people, an expression of their character and habits. These habits are not improved by intermittent employment in the towns or on diamond diggings.

The labour provisions of the Native Land Bill now pending may be mentioned in connection with farm labour. In the majority of European farming areas, including farms in the released areas if the Government desires, the registration of labour tenants and squatters may be made compulsory. Labour Tenants Control Boards will be given power, on application of the Minister of Native Affairs, the local magistrate, or six European landowners of the district, to refuse to register squatters not lawfully resident on any land at the date of the Act and any labour tenants deemed to be surplus on any farm. In deciding how many are surplus, the Boards will be required to assume that five labour tenants are justifiable and that each works for the landlord six months in the year. If registration should be refused for any labour tenant or squatter, his continued residence on land to which the Bill may apply will be illegal. For all squatters, and for labour tenants in excess of five on each farm, a licence fee will be payable, nominally by the farmer-landlord. Power is given to the Govern-

ment to declare that in any district the three months' compulsory service of labour tenants under the 1913 Act shall be raised to four months.

If the licence fees should be drastic, it is clear that not only would squatters lawfully resident on European land be evicted if they could not pay the fee (or the farmer be unwilling to pay it for them), but that the speculative Land Companies (who rent land to squatters pending a rise in market price) would be hit perhaps severely enough to cause the displacement of these squatters and their arrival in the ordinary labour market. Perhaps also it will force the sale of this hoarded speculative land—to European farmers if unreleased, to both races, maybe, if released. The system of "Kaffir farming" will also be discouraged—that is, "Kaffir farming" by practical farmers. Squatters on land held either by speculative companies or by *bona-fide* farmers will if displaced—that will probably depend on the amount of the licence fee—need to become labour tenants on farms where an increase of labour tenancies is permissible, or migrate to the towns for good, or apply for the hire of land in the released areas, with perhaps the aim of buying it by instalments later.

Surplus labour tenants who become evicted will have the same choice before them. It is not clear, however, that a farmer will dispense with a labour tenant as readily as with a squatter, on account of the licence fees—probably he will retain as many as are allowed him, despite the licences on more tenants than five. The aim of the provisions relating to labour tenants is probably to effect a redistribution

of labour on farms, and bring the supply of labour on each farm into closer correspondence to the real demand for it. The power which the Government will have to increase the labour tenant's obligation to serve a stated number of months is theoretically undesirable, as the obligation should be one assumed by free contract. But in practice the effect will be slight, since six months' service, not three nor four, is the general rule.

The unequal distribution of Native farm labour which these provisions seek to remedy undoubtedly has evil consequences. But nevertheless these labour clauses of the Land Bill are too suggestive of downright Government interference with free labour contracts, in the interests of one particular class, to commend themselves wholly to impartial thought on the subject. It is true, of course, that speculative Land Companies require control in the interests of freeing land for developed settlement; that squatters require limitation; and that a redistribution of labour tenants is likely to encourage intensive farming by progressive men, and discourage wasteful use of land and labour by old-established sluggish and ultra-conservative owners of broad acres. If it is understood that the licences be mild only, and that the refusal to register surplus labour tenants is made with the utmost caution, and gradually over, say, ten years, with the immediate displacement only of tenants who are being used wastefully and who have clearly the chance of other employment on reasonable terms in the same district—then hardship to the Native will be reduced to a minimum.

Moreover, every Native who is displaced by the Control Board or on account of the licences must have preference in the way of purchase or hire of Crown lands in the released areas, and preference in drawing on the Purchases and Advances Fund. If this is done, then under-employment will be prohibited without disastrous consequences. It is mainly squatters who would be displaced. Labour tenants are much in demand in most districts for service on the customary terms, and will not, as a rule, need to migrate from any particular farm away from the district altogether.

Squatters, and those few labour tenants who will in fact be unable to take service on other farms, will not only have the Crown lands on which to seek tenancies, but European farms in the released areas as well. In these cases the segregation principle will not be vitiated, since the released areas are destined to become entirely Native.

During the period of the tenancy the lessees can save up to buy on their own account. If the tenancies are of a fairly long currency, and on definite terms, the reproach of "squatting" cannot be uttered. A long tenancy, with compensation for improvements, and perhaps supervision, will not prevent that fairly effective use of the land so notoriously lacking under squatting tenancies. If the proposed Native tenancies prove successful in the released areas, they might be extended to approved areas now closed to the Natives. These would be areas experiencing a labour shortage, and farmers therein would employ the children and dependents of

the tenant. The whole scheme is, of course, one of free choice of lessor and tenant.

It is improbable that either Native tenancies, or Native agricultural education, or the extension of released areas, would set up serious Native competition with white farmers. The Native has fewer wants which necessitate production for sale, and usually he prefers to obtain cash by taking employment. It is likely, if unfortunate in many directions, that his rise above subsistence economy will be slow. Moreover, his plots are smaller and usually remote from the railway. Above all, the market for most agricultural products is world-wide, and local competition can be only slight.

We have given an explanation of, rather than a justification for, Native subsistence economy. It is not an elevated type of economic habit, and it carries only the slightest possibilities of economic progress on the land. If the Native produced for the market, he would feel a need to improve the quality of his crops and to increase his yield. This is a feature of Uganda, from which protectorate Natives export cotton direct to Lancashire. Even in Kenya, where white settlers employ Natives, the latter prefer in many cases to derive an income from the export of maize and coffee rather than by wage-labour.

In South Africa the immediate development of this exchange culture would reduce the labour supply. But a gradual development would probably absorb population increase without affecting the supply of Natives for employment. This increase in population, if it is certain, will intensify Native wants and

discourage mere subsistence economy. The now overdue construction of railway lines in Native territories will likewise reduce the Native's reluctance and inability to produce for the open market. This inability is by no means general, however. The Transkei often exports grain to other parts of the Cape Province. Other encouragements to exchange culture among Natives will be individual tenure and any decline of over-stocking.

South African farmers must face the fact that Natives will not continue to labour for them indefinitely at the present scale of real wages. Many black people who now emerge from reserves to work on farms are likely at some later stage to take up exchange culture or become permanent town dwellers. The present under-cultivation of the reserves is possible only with a weakness of the profit-earning motive and with a large demand for transient Native labour in the towns. The individualistic profit-seeking aim gains strength each year. The feature of transience in Native employment, the periodical migration back to the reserves, will probably not survive the emergence of more strenuous conditions and the inevitable modification or disappearance of the Native's veneration for his tribal home.

Developments of this present century are likely to be increasing urbanization on the one hand, and the emergence of exchange culture on the other. Possibly Natives now resident on European farms will either become permanent farm labourers or emigrate finally to the towns. Migration backwards and forwards between home and work is likely to disappear. At

present it is a mainstay of the segregation policy, and defensible. But segregation is obviously not to be a permanent order in South Africa's Native economy, desirable as it is as a temporary expedient for preserving Native home life, and for securing to Natives a minimum of land either for subsistence or exchange economy.

We can now sum up the possibilities of the white labour policy and the bases of black employment on farms. In the towns the Government is effecting a slight displacement of Natives from its employ. The Wage Board determinations are doing likewise, though not purposely. On the farms, the redistribution of Native labour is likely to reduce rather than expand the demand for white labour. Taking all these tendencies together, the danger to Natives is but slight. But any disadvantage that may accrue must be compensated for, so that the Native need not suffer. One would suggest the provision of areas wherein displaced Natives may settle, and this is, in fact, the proposal of the Land Act Amendment Bill. These areas are chosen to fit into the segregation policy, for as far as possible these released areas abut on the reserves.

It is because Native land and Native labour are interlocked that segregation needs to regard so carefully the extent of Natives' opportunities for employment. But there is nothing in the civilized labour policy which demands segregation in particular. Yet, civilized labour or no civilized labour, the segregation policy rests on a broad and urgent requirement—the need to protect the Native.

CHAPTER IX

IS THE NATIVE LOSING GROUND?

IT is too late now to doubt that the Native is losing ground in South Africa. Seventy years ago he typified the sub-continent. To-day the stage has become occupied by the European—the Native is his scene-shifter. If this were all, it could have been foreseen. It is inevitable for the white man to take the lead.

But worse for the Native, living in the background has altered his outlook and his nature. Not only has his position in the community been affected, but his character and individuality. In time he may become negligible—the nonentity of a dispirited and dwindling people.

The facts of Native morality and health have already been examined, and as a result we have found that contact with civilization has not improved Native morality, though education may help to regenerate it. All observers unite to agree that Natives readily acquire European vices. They also acquire habits of behaviour which, while not amounting to vices, predispose to vice. Among such we noticed restlessness, a craving for excitement, the decline of ability to amuse oneself, a disposition to quarrel, to be insolent, to despise authority. These

are diseases of an urban proletariat, or of an urbanized people generally. They are the hall-marks of the unnatural conditions of crowded town-dwelling, and represent an unconscious desire for the freedom and space to which man is on the whole still physically and psychologically adapted—life in the open air, intermittent toil, plenty of leisure, simple living. These symptoms are not peculiar to the Native who has need to frequent South African towns. But with him they are graver. His emergence from rural economy and primitive social organization is so recent that the adaptation required to fit him for town life must be more thorough. So wide is the gulf between the two systems of life that one is entitled to expect extremely marked evidences of discord among Natives in towns. The reason that the discord is not as pronounced as that obtaining in, say, London slums, is that Native traditions discourage self-assertion and the vocalization of complaint. Yet complaint now tends to become more vocal through the medium of the I.C.U. But the organizers of this body err in attributing all the grievances of their members to economic injustice. Natives themselves may associate grievance with injustice of this nature. But it is more likely in many instances that economic injustice is psychologically a mere peg on which to hang the long-accumulated discontent arising from unnatural conditions.

The extent to which the conditions of labouring for Natives, especially in towns, are unnatural has been seen to be great. It is also to be noticed that the Native has neither the aptitude nor means of

overcoming the artificiality, nor of reducing its scope. He cannot, like the European, use his resources to vary town monotony by travel, or establish conditions which imitate the country, in the shape of gardens and parks. He cannot buy houses and furniture and entertainment in which he may take a delight that will outweigh the discomfort of a cramped existence.

The facts of the penetration of European diseases into Native areas have been examined. This penetration is likely to continue. Grave as is the problem of diseases, it must be remembered that disease cannot flourish except on the basis of impaired physical vitality. The physique of the Native is obviously deteriorating. The larger number of undersized Natives which one sees in recent years is not only the result of a change from the age of the elimination of the unfit, but also to the lowering of physical vitality by cramping, overcrowding, unnatural diet and disease. Concretely, we have noticed the serious decline in the rate of Native population increase. We need not be surprised to see that rate fall to nil in the future, for it fell by half in ten years between 1911 and 1921. The Native population may well become stationary in the not too distant future.

The Native would now seem to have a definite consciousness of his inferiority. Such a consciousness would explain known facts of insolence and disobedience. The inferiority has been imposed on the Native by conquest. He has seen the European take the best of South Africa and suppress opposi-

tion. He has been taught to look up to the white man and make apologies for himself. He has been made to keep out of the European's way, or very often cringe to him. He has been set degrading tasks which make a farce of manhood. Native males of two generations' descent from savagery have admitted their abject feeling on being required to make beds and tend babies.

They have lost their pride of race, for they can no longer exult in their bravery, their wealth, the power of their chiefs. Racial pride, the great inspiration or solace of nations, has been drained out of South African Natives. Away from the fastnesses of the locations they admit to being a race of the defeated and inferior, and lose a sense of glory in belonging to the Bantu race to a wistful envy of the white man. In fact, they now depend on appeals to the European. The more complete their contact with civilization, the greater their dependence on the civilized race.

Only a few exceptions break the rule of Native disenchantment. These are the robust faith of the Christian convert, the acquired pride of the educated, the natural pride of the Native whose tribal organization still means all to him. A consciousness of inferiority does not, of course, mean to be melancholy. Natives are still superficially cheerful—lazy and laughing. But in serious moments their helplessness and bewilderment will be too clearly seen.

It is sometimes thought surprising that a beaten people should be able to alarm the conquerors. The Colour Bar Act was a reaction to such alarm at the

Natives' penetration in the industrial sphere. But this penetration is neither controlled nor organized—usually not realized by Natives themselves—it is merely their response to the forces of economic circumstance.

The arrival of still more strenuous conditions will probably depress Natives the more. The growth of populations in South Africa will intensify the struggle for employment, will demand unremitting care of the land, will require whole-time labour, will curtail leisure, and will demand the Native's keenest attention to the problems of earning his daily bread. It is a task for a virile people at the easiest—not for a bewildered people.

The spread of Christianity among Natives brings benefit in many instances. Education is a right they may fairly claim. Christianity brings moral awakening: education brings intellectual and economic power. Both represent advantages unobtainable in the primitive system. In this sense they are a real gain. But in another sense they merely patch up a crumbling structure. They seek to remedy the decay of tribal morality, the exploitation of Natives by cunning Europeans, and the degrading effects of street mis-education. But let us also contemplate preventive measures. Let us envisage a policy which seeks to reduce the Native's exposure to immoral influence, to exploitation, to conditions which sap racial pride. Let us reduce the incidence of forces which unbalance the Native mind, demand from him more response than he can make, undermine his health and give rise to just grievance. Is it inevitable

that the Native must accommodate himself to all the civilizing changes now proceeding? Must he share in the growing restlessness and speed of life, and be crammed with the thousand sensations that daily startle the senses of Europeans—with complex machinery, crowded traffic, mechanical and sensational entertainment, multiplied laws, and contact with the lowest crime? Must his fine unselfishness be corrupted, his leisurely survey of life be hastened, his customs of home and marriage be turned into pale imitations of the European's?

To a large extent these disturbing changes are inevitable. It needs no deliberate policy to transform the simple into the complex. The transformation was completed by natural processes of evolution in other civilizations. With the Bantu, imitation will perform much of this work. The Native believes most European habits to be superior to his own, and imitates them, or they are forced upon him by the exigencies of town life. He is compelled to work for gain, and acquires the motive of desiring gain at the expense of others. He envies the European his clothes, and, buying them, in the beginning develops pulmonary troubles. He becomes accustomed to spend, and squanders. He is forced to live in cramped conditions, and thereafter herds in squalor. He buys ready-made articles, and forgets the use of his own hands.

While we recognize that the complete transformation of Native simplicity is inevitable, we must recognize that too great a rapidity of change is of definite harm. Though the Native must frequent the towns

now that his labour is indispensable, his home life can be secluded. He spends from four to six months a year in the location—a system which offers the chances of physical and mental recuperation. It reduces the length of his exposure to civilized conditions. It prevents the full play of these transformative influences on the mothers of the race, and children in their plastic years. It provides a refuge to those Natives who desire to retire from the task of contending with the ordeals of civilization, and offers shelter for the remaining years of the tribal system.

In the reserves the chiefs may exercise much of the sovereignty their followers desire them to wield. Their tribesmen may retain unchanged their customary diet, their customary clothing, their customary habits of intercourse, entertainment, relaxation. They may sleep in huts of the traditional pattern, and use implements and utensils hallowed by the usage of generations. The outward substance of tribalism can be retained almost in full. Much of its essence may also persist, but here the ferment is already introduced—individualism, money, and the inferiority complex. It is but fair to afford Natives as great a chance as possible of preserving their customs. They imitate the Europeans, sometimes consciously, sometimes involuntarily, but very frequently deplore the consequences. We must give them all available opportunities of checking the evils they deplore. They have no remedies of their own. Their systems cannot stand up unaided against the Europeans'. With the help of segregation they obtain the chance of discovering and demonstrating

to another advantages in their social order which hitherto they have ignored.

We do not, of course, claim that the Native requires sheltering solely on the ground that he is biologically different from or inferior to the European. Part of the difference may be due merely to racial history, and thus be transient over a few generations. But nevertheless one is conscious of a psychological if not biological difference from the European in the educated and urbanized Native who outwardly behaves like a European. If there were not this difference, the Bantu could with fair ease turn into black Europeans. If there is a biological difference, Natives can never become more than superficial imitations of the European.

Popular opinion tends to the extreme view that the Native is a different sort of humanity. Scientific opinion of a certain type, on the other hand, puts all the emphasis on racial history and social organization. Probably the fairest view is that both biological and historical factors play a part in determining the distinction between European and Bantu mentality. For the present, we have merely to admit a difference, whatever its cause, and protect the Native from the consequences of the difference. If the difference lasts, we require permanently differential treatment, except so far as the Native's superficial appearance of civilization allows identity of treatment, as, for instance, in every-day trade transactions. But even if the Native will inevitably become fully civilized, he requires differential treatment over the period of transition.

Such instalment of possessory segregation as has already formed part of Native policy has proved to be of advantage. It has not been commonly criticized on the grounds of impracticability. No airtight barrier has been erected between white and black development. No hindrance has been put in the way of the European's ability to obtain Native labour. No ban has been placed by segregation on the Native's acquisition of monetary means. The mutual interdependence of the races has been realized—the European in respect of his knowledge and gifts of organization—the Native his strength and endurance. The Native still has opportunity to rise in the scale of civilization by contact with change and progress—if he desires. There is no hindrance to the free movement of men or commodities. The main requirement for possessory segregation is the separation of land ownership. The hardship felt by members of either race who desire to acquire land in districts not demarcated for them is the nearest approach to injustice in the segregation policy. No other complaint on the score of justice has been heard from persons who understand the real meaning of possessory segregation. A few economic objections of it, such as the Native's subsidy to employers, have already been mentioned. The main crop of evils summed up in the words "Native problem" are not the results of possessory segregation. They have arisen in spite of it. Only complete segregation could have averted race competition for employment; squatting exists as an evil because possessory segregation is not fully complete. Land shortage is

inevitable. The inefficiency of Native tillage and inadequacy of tenure can best be remedied by segregation as providing fuller opportunities for enlightened administration over large areas. Any apparent minor demerits in the segregation policy are likely to be results of a special need to protect the Native from demoralization.

Perhaps on the platforms of rival policies proposed for South Africa we can find hints of otherwise unnoticed disadvantages in possessory segregation. In studying these policies we confine attention to economic and associated aspects. First the policy of repression. The essence of this policy is to prevent any Native competition with the European and to check the Native's progress in civilization. It is not only the segregationists who consider the first object immoral, viewed as an aim not merely to protect civilized standards of life but also to bar Native advancement. But it is mainly the segregationists who sympathize with the desire to check the too sudden civilization of the Native, which they propose to achieve by methods not inconsistent with Native progress. Apart from the injustice of repressing the Native, it is to be remembered that Native advancement contributes to European well-being, and that the repressed Native is the likeliest to turn to crime and revolt.

Next the policy of identity. In many respects the Cape policy prior to Union was conceived on the basis of the Native being a potential white man. Hence he was accorded the franchise and his whole school curriculum was the same as that of the European

child. In earlier days the Roman Dutch law was applied to Natives, and in theory the Natives' own legal code ignored. Practical exigencies of administration required, however, that Native law be recognized, and that Native school curricula be differentiated. In these two respects the identity policy broke down. It does not seem feasible to treat Natives as equal in all respects to Europeans. Their psychological reactions, their mentality, their racial history, are all different. The Natives have been introduced to civilization for less than a century—to take an average over the Provinces. Natives themselves admit and often cherish their profound differences from white men. While an identity policy might appear to be working in theory, it would be found that officials and the general public all over the country were in practice finding themselves required to differentiate. The application of European laws to unsophisticated Natives would be an absurdity; the requirement of similar standards of sanitary observance, of educational training, social legislation, police regulations, fencing and dipping laws, are all known to be impracticable. Not even the thorough-going equalists demand identity so complete—they themselves have recognized the limits of their policy. The demand for identity is frequently a reaction against repressionism, and to decide against repression is to avoid many of the claims of identity. Enlightened public opinion now tends to discard hopes of turning the Native into a passable imitation of the European. It prefers a policy which aims at making the Bantu into a better Bantu.

Associated with the exponents of identity are exponents of "citizenship" for the Native. These theorists do not hope for an evolution of the Native into a black imitation of the European. They merely demand the rescision of all discriminatory legislation—whether designed to repress or protect the Native. This demand is, of course, very far-reaching—for the virtual deletion of the word "Native" whenever it appears in a statute. We have already shown that the interests of economic efficiency demand the refusal of "citizenship" rights in the uncontrolled purchase of land by Natives. The test of beneficial occupation rules out permission for Natives to acquire huge tracts anywhere. Another effect of citizenship applied to land will, of course, be the penetration of the European into reserves.

Apart from the Colour Bar Act, citizenship for Natives in the labour market already exists as far as legislation can obtain it. Only minor instances exist of Natives being excluded from industrial and labour legislation. Probably most of these exclusions are unsound—as of that of pass-bearing Natives from the Industrial Conciliation Act. But the remainder are mainly due to recognition of racial differences, with the aim of protecting the black man from exploitation, or of protecting the European from the Native's disregard for the requirements of contracts of service. The Native has the main substance of citizenship to-day; the right to own, buy and sell property, the right to earn, spend and save wages obtained from voluntary employment under masters of his own choosing; the right to trade and employ. The few

illegitimate discriminations can be removed within a policy of segregation : there is no need to formulate policies which aim at identity of treatment in the economic sphere. This identity would, in fact, expose the Native in South Africa to the consequence of his ignorance and unsophistication.

Though the Native has the main part of citizenship to-day, the most of it consists of rights which should be taken for granted. Rights more positive will include rights to education, to the development of the reserves, and the provision of Native villages on town lands. This sort of work now proceeds slowly, but its speed is not greatly out of proportion to the Native's payment of taxation. That the authorities should undertake it is an admission that these positive rights are due. But not enough of them are yet admitted. One of the most important, that of further railway construction in the reserves, is for all practical purposes denied. This is a decided shortcoming of South Africa's present policy.

CHAPTER X

COMPARATIVE SURVEY

IN other colonies and protectorates, British, French, Dutch or Belgian, further varieties of social and economic Native policy are to be found. Some of these may be very profitably studied. Java, for instance. It may be said that the Dutch policy, undertaken by the Government acting directly upon the Natives, is to make them work, willingly or not, for the prosperity of the island, and for gain to the Mother country. The principle has been established that Java exists for the benefit of the Dutch, rather than of the Javanese in particular. The idea that black and white are equal, or that they should be treated as equals, is repudiated. The islanders are treated socially as children, economically as servants of Holland. It is fair to add that this policy, within its own scope, has proved considerably successful. Java is now an exporting country, although, despite being hardly larger than Natal, it carries a population of thirty millions or more, mostly agriculturists.

The pre-war German system in Tanganyika, though built on the model of Java, outdid the original. Natives were conscripted for forced labour on public works and private estates, very frequently by threats of floggings. Territory was expropriated for

German planters and Natives forcibly dispossessed, without the Administration waiting for the pretexts that served to explain or excuse expropriation in South Africa. The Germans, moreover, sought to wreck the tribal system of Tanganyika. They found it a hindrance to the satisfaction of labour demands, and thus refractory chiefs were deposed and Government nominees substituted to serve German ends. In short, the system was one of military despotism, and Native rights were almost wholly ignored. There was no attempt to shelter the tribes from the impact of civilization, if German colonization deserved that name.

Since the administration of Tanganyika has vested in Great Britain under mandate a revolution has occurred in the recognition of Native rights. The present policy is to emphasize Native interests and consider them predominant, without, however, excluding European settlement altogether. Certain tracts have been given to Europeans on ninety-nine years' lease, but not more than 5000 acres to any single concessionaire. These concessions are located in the highlands on lands unclaimed by Natives, and more or less separated from definite Native reserves. A large amount of land vesting in the Government is still unoccupied, and no doubt it will be allocated as the populations increase among Europeans and Natives according to its respective suitabilities.

The European settlers are not being encouraged to believe that they have any prescriptive right to a Native labour supply. On the contrary, a policy of

Native agricultural development is being pursued which may yet transform the present subsistence economy into production for the world market. This process is well under way. Yet, no doubt, tribesmen living in the vicinity of European plantations will supply a certain amount of labour to them, and there will be some migration of younger sons to these plantations, with perhaps a tendency for them to settle down and form a class of permanent agricultural labourers.

The present policy, moreover, seeks to reinstate and reinforce the tribal system, by gathering together scattered tribesmen, and regrouping them under their natural leaders. These chiefs have considerable administrative and judicial powers. They can levy taxes and expend revenues on roads, hospitals and schools. Already a class of Native Civil servants has been formed, and Natives are being trained technically for work among their own people.

In short, the policy of Tanganyika is to rebuild a new tribalism, played upon by civilized influences and requirements, but preserving its character of a Native institution—rule by the Natives for the Natives, with transformation proceeding at a rate of their own choice. This is a form of segregation adjusted to the requirements of Tanganyika, and in many respects a model for South African imitation.

The situation in Kenya has been obscured for many years by the fact that no Native tribe has had any legal right to the land it occupied. All land vested in the Crown on annexation, and while lands were disposed of to Europeans in freehold, the tenure

of the Native tribes was of an exceedingly nebulous kind. Of late, definite reserves have been allocated—on the principle of segregation—and these reserves will, no doubt, be secured to Native tribes on trust.

Further areas, unallocated to any race at present, remain with the Crown, about 4500 square miles being deemed suitable for alienation to Europeans, if desired. It is proposed by the "Hilton Young" Commission (1929) that these areas remain as unoccupied Crown lands until population expansion requires that they be disposed of, either to blacks or whites, as the future situation may require.

Kenya further supplies a disturbing labour problem. At present it may roughly be said that Native reserves are so extensive and fertile that comparatively few Natives, from the settlers' point of view, have sufficient inducement to migrate to the European estates. Actually the percentage compares with that of the Transkei—40 per cent. males absent from the reserves at any time. To obtain a larger percentage (though not all Kenya Natives go to the estates), Natives must be tempted by more attractive conditions and a higher wage. It is questionable whether an industry not yet adult can as a whole yet afford to pay more than five to ten shillings a month.

Generally, at the level of inducement offered, there is a shortage of Native labour, which is, of course, gravest on the least well-managed estates. Moreover, the labour supply varies from season to season, and as the demand for labourers increases at ploughing and reaping times, supply fails, for Natives have

their own similar work to do in the reserves. It may be noticed that coffee, sisal, maize and dairying are branches of farming which call for considerable labour in proportion to the value of the realized crop or product.

Farmers cannot afford to import white labour, and many of them came to Kenya on the implied understanding that sufficient coloured labour would be available. The shortage of labour due to the extent of Native reserves is being aggravated, and will probably be further intensified, by the Natives taking up cultivation for sale of maize, coffee and other crops. In the recent past, various systems of forced labour for public works have been in vogue, together with high taxation, and persuasion of Natives by officials to work on private estates. But now, the direct official encouragement of Natives to grow their own crops—cotton, for instance—will prevent for many years a sufficiency of Native labour supply. Yet it will accustom the Natives to work, and encourage individualism. As Native numbers increase, there will be a surplus of younger sons to reside in European areas at unsubsidized rates of pay, or at least the migration of Natives from reserves at wages subsidized by their own production.

Until Natives increase, the settlers can merely raise wage offers and economize in labour. Kenya in respect of labour is in the situation of Natal sixty years ago—that white settlement without Native dispossession was possible because of the sparseness of Native population. That implied a shortage of Native labour. In Natal the shortage is not yet

wholly overcome, despite the presence of 150,000 Indians. Kenya also has imported Indians as substitutes for Native labour, but the Indians are not frequently available as farm labourers. It seems, however, that Kenya planters do not desire further Indian immigration.

The inter-racial policy of the British Government for Kenya is generally summed up in the principle of trusteeship—that the rights of the immigrant communities shall be subordinate to Native rights, when and where immigrant and Native rights shall conflict. Where, however, the races may cooperate, there need be no bar to the advancement of European settlers. It is not clear that this trusteeship policy is, in fact, yet being pursued. But perhaps a certain lapse of time is necessary for the transition from the almost diametrically opposite policy at its height about five years ago.

The "Ormsby-Gore" Report of 1925 has pointed out that the Government of the East African territories should be regarded as a threefold trusteeship: first, for the advancement of Natives; secondly, for humanity as a whole, in the development of the natural resources of the region in a progressive fashion; and thirdly, for the immigrant peoples, whose "initiative, knowledge and material resources are necessary instruments in the fulfilment of the first two tasks."

To what extent can these three trusts all be discharged in Kenya? Can Native development be promoted side by side with modern commercial farming by Europeans? It is clear that the second

form of development is necessary in Kenya to provide revenues from which to finance Native development—contributed by settlers direct, or by Natives who have earned wages from them. Yet European progress must compete with Native progress in the sphere of labour in the present, and probably in that of land in the future. Clearly, in a country with more than a sufficiency of exploitable land, the employment of labour on European estates must compete for labour power with the development of Native reserves. Should European settlement become more and more widely established on a profit-earning basis, and should Native population increase also, a time must come when the two races must compete for proportions of the still unalienated lands, as in South Africa. This competition will, however, be far distant if the Government continues to develop reserves even at the expense of a labour supply to Europeans, and if reserves are presently delimited so as to provide adequate areas for all Natives even on an extensive subsistence economy basis. Yet the economic development of the reserves should further postpone the emergence of Native land hunger by economizing the use of land.

There must also be a conflict of racial interest in the fixation of railway rates on the typical products of European and Native cultivation. Likewise, conflict is inevitable in assessing taxation, and in the use of Government facilities, such as agricultural advice and assistance.

Some of these conflicts of interest now arise in South Africa, and others are on the horizon. But

the Union has not over-emphasized Native rights, and is not committed to a solution of all racial disagreements in favour of Natives. In the Union, Europeans can no longer be regarded as "immigrants." In Kenya, where they are still "immigrants," mainly of recent arrival, it will be necessary to put Native interests first, even at some sacrifice of the interests of commercial development for the sake of the world as a whole, and of the specific interests of the Europeans. It is clear, however, that whosoever's interests be paramount, Kenya is now committed to a policy of possessory segregation, with the aim mainly of conserving the Natives' tribal life, and of building up political institutions among them.

Of Northern and Southern Rhodesia and of Nyassaland, it may be said that policies of possessory segregation have been instituted in recent years and Native reserves defined. In Nyassaland, nearly all the land suitable for white habitation has already been alienated, while the Native reserves are so densely populated that "Nyassa boys" must travel immense distances to obtain work. Yet as a whole these three colonies or protectorates are somewhat akin to Kenya, Nyassaland representing, economically, if not historically, a stage of Kenya's probable future. The Belgian Congo has a new Native policy, somewhat the antithesis of the old Leopoldian one. The Belgian policy is now well known for its principle that not more than 10 per cent. of Native adult males may be drawn from a reserve as labourers, if they must work at more than two days' distance from

their home. This is a lower proportion than that now obtaining in the principal British areas.

The Belgian view is that a shortage of Native male adults in the domestic, social and tribal life of the reserve must lead to a collapse of tribalism, and eventually to a stationary population. Some parts of South Africa begin slightly to illustrate this contention. Yet it is probable that tribal life in the Transkei, for instance, has been weakened by the spread of the individualistic habit of thought rather than by the absence of 40 per cent. of males. It is not clear that the spread of individualism is caused principally by migration from the reserves, though this is a powerful agent. Mere trading, and taxation, and education are together nearly as important. The extent to which the absence of fathers of families from their homes for six or nine months in a year affects the birth-rate is not ascertained. It affects the death-rate, however, by leading to the spread among Natives of diseases.

The Belgian authorities may or may not have set too low a maximum of permissible recruitment. But some limitation, where it is still possible, seems advisable. The dependence of South African Natives on migration to centres of employment is too strong now, unfortunately, for such a limitation to become possible without economic injury severer perhaps than any injury to the tribal life. The best solution for South Africa is some increase in the extent of Native lands, together with a more rapid development of them, so as to prevent population increase swelling migration unduly.

The French, too, have some enthusiasm for Native rights. For many years their policy has been one of assimilation—the absorption of the Native into French civilization, and indeed the treatment of the Native as almost the civilized equal of the Frenchman. In Senegal, for instance, only French law is applied. Natives outnumber Europeans on the Colonial Council. In the towns the Natives perform most of their own local administration. Even in other protectorates where Natives are not made citizens, the region is managed, however, for the benefit of the indigenous population, who are encouraged to transform themselves into Frenchmen, if they can. The citizens, of course, are liable to conscription, even to fight for France in Europe. The tropical French possessions are not as a whole suitable for European settlement, and in this connection the paramountcy of Native rights and the grants of citizenship become more understandable. It remains to be seen, however, how readily the Native can become assimilated in more than any mere superficial aspect.

Uganda is a British protectorate which is also unsuitable for European settlement. Officials and missionaries are present in Uganda—the paternal element, as the “Hilton Young” Report recognizes—a few traders, the commercial and capitalist element—but very few European settlers—the permanent European element. Uganda is hot and damp and fertile. It is accordingly unsuitable climatically for white men, and is densely populated by blacks. The largest part of the protectorate is

the Kingdom of Buganda, ruled over by the Kabaka (King) and his Council, with advice and assistance from the British official staff. By an agreement of 1900, the Kabaka has full control over Baganda land, and, with the assent of the British Government, alienation to non-Natives is refused. Alienation to non-Europeans of land under British control is also refused. Uganda is clearly then a black man's country.

It is, however, a comparatively prosperous black man's country. The export of Native-grown cotton and other crops is considerable. Besides providing the main traffic for the Kenya-Uganda railway, the export trade brings considerable wealth to the Baganda landlord chiefs and their cultivator tenants, which is used for the import of manufactured goods. Uganda provides an East African example of successful production for the market by Natives working under European guidance, but under Native control. Uganda also provides the East African illustration of indirect rule by Britain through the Native tribal hierarchy and Civil service.

It may be noticed, however, that wealth shows a tendency to demoralize the Baganda. Profits are largely spent on luxuries like motor-cars, rather than on agricultural equipment. So profitable is cotton-growing that it is exceedingly difficult to obtain labour for necessary public works, or even for the ginning of the cotton. The cotton has frequently to be stored, even over a period of high prices. At present it is free from pests. Should the boll weevil

be introduced and spread, the prosperity of Uganda must temporarily collapse.

Of the nature of Uganda is the group of West African colonies and protectorates—principally Nigeria, Gold Coast, Sierra Leone and Gambia. These may be considered together. They also are hot, damp countries with a fair density of population. There is little room for European settlement, even if the climate were suitable. The principal feature of the West Coast group is Native production for export, though North Nigeria is also a pastoral area like Kenya and Zululand. Alienation of land to Europeans is virtually prohibited. The principal crop of Gambia is ground-nuts; of the Gold Coast, cocoa; and of Nigeria, vegetable oil and cotton, together with the export of hides and some cocoa. Cultivation is usually performed by Natives working under Government assistance on communal lands, but a strong tendency towards individual holdings is in progress. The success of Gold Coast cocoa has been phenomenal, for this small region, developed only in recent years, now supplies over half the world's cocoa, though mainly of inferior grade. Despite the fact that cocoa is one of the easiest crops to grow, the yield per acre is very low. Nevertheless, cocoa cultivation is so widespread on the Gold Coast that ordinary food production is languishing, and food-stuffs are now imported.

The Gold Coast still has a considerable reserve of forest land, and this is being continually cleared for cultivation. As land is still so easy to obtain, it is very simple for any man to start growing cocoa, or

rather any woman, for, as in Uganda too, most of the work is performed by women. When the vacant lands are exhausted, it will be possible to see the economic basis of the cocoa industry in a clearer light. Sierra Leone is less fertile than the Gold Coast, and cocoa does not thrive there. Native cocoa cultivation is conditioned more by the fertility of land than by the absence of competitive European plantations, as some negrophilists believe.

Nigerian production for export is not as spectacular as that of the Gold Coast, but even here the Government definitely encourages peasant cultivation, and discourages the plantation system. Sir Hugh Clifford considered the plantation system to be an artificial growth, but Native exchange production natural and likely to be more permanent. Yet the situation of the Gold Coast seems to contain elements of artificiality. It is questionable, too, whether European planters could not have increased the crop fourfold.

The West Coast system appears to have been so successful on the whole that many believe it to be the only system, or the only system just to Natives. Yet it is clear that the cultivation of cotton and cocoa on the West Coast depends on West Coast Natives having a less communal and more individual complex than East and South Coast Natives, and probably a greater degree of intelligence too. Then, too, the suitable crops of the region are comparatively easy to grow, require little capital, and in the case of cocoa little labour also, and when reaped have a high value. The crops of the South and East Coasts

make greater demands on the cultivator's skill, patience and pocket.

It is dangerous, too, for Natives to specialize on non-edible crops. A one-crop culture is especially liable to the ravages of disease, and to disasters from a slump in the market, change in fashion, exhaustion of the soil, or the opening up of new areas. It does not submit the Native to any great educative process, and he tends to depend endlessly on Government aid through all stages of production from choice of seed to marketing. It is less important, however, that the West Coast methods have certain disadvantages than that these methods should not be thoughtlessly deemed suitable for immediate adoption all over the rest of Africa. Nor can it be reasonably suggested that only the existence of white settlement in East Africa and South Africa prevents the spread of these methods in the particular forms they assume on the West Coast.

Indirect rule is also typical of this West Coast group—especially the Gold Coast and Northern Nigeria. Associated with indirect rule is a deliberate effort to conserve tribalism and hinder too complete a contact with the European if not with commercial methods.

The East and South African systems, though much criticized, have at least the advantage that they allow development by Europeans of crops and stock impossible to Natives commercially, if not as a matter of skill. Moreover, they provide the Natives with opportunities of imitating European methods, and of benefiting by opportunities of employment and by the introduction of transport and other facilities.

Yet these systems must lead at some time to a situation of land hunger for both races. And at this point it becomes more difficult to justify Native land extensions in view of superior European cultivation. Yet in South Africa we are beyond the stage of deciding whether or not to copy West Africa, even if it is still possible to encourage a certain amount of Native exchange culture. We have to make the best of the actual fact of European settlement.

Our survey of colonial policy outside the Union shows no substantial departure from the principles of segregation or the conservation of Native tribal and social life. Kenya, Tanganyika and Northern Nigeria indeed all give evidence of a strong official desire to shelter Native traditions, or to retain Native institutions, whether modified or not by slow and gradual outside influence. The process of modification can be controlled, and checked if need be, if the traditions and institutions of Native life are isolated in Native areas and protected from indiscriminate contact with European customs. So far, then, we find definite assent for segregation in the colonies named, and in other regions, for policies which aim at the same object. We are therefore encouraged, after survey of other British African possessions, to regard segregation as expedient in South Africa as in themselves.

May we, however, ask if segregation is fully just? On the surface it would seem unfair to prevent the Native buying land anywhere he pleased in South Africa. But if Natives themselves desire segregation for the temporary preservation of racial integrity, is it still unfair? Surely not, as regards separation at

all events. From the point of view of restriction the Native is not the sole sufferer. Equally is European expansion restricted. It may not penetrate into Native areas. Limitations are assigned to both races. If limitations are legitimate, boundaries may be fairly determined on the basis of maximum national development. It is fair enough to draw the boundaries of Native areas in such a way as to obtain the largest extent of beneficial occupation, if not to discriminate against the Native as a Native. Perhaps Government may desire both results. But that is the fault of the Government, not of segregation. The test of beneficial occupation is really to ensure justice to posterity—to the posterity of the Nation as a whole. If it should conflict with Native demands national interests must override racial interests.

Segregation, like all policies, requires to be carried out on equitable principles. The fact that it may in the past have been associated with repression does not condemn the policy of segregation. Only an inherent flaw in segregation itself can defeat the advocacy of it. The existence of such a flaw has yet to be proved. During the past, the policy of modified segregation, though not a perfect policy, has been evolved mainly by disinterested and competent administrators, and has received the substantial assent of the Native people. On the basis of such assent possessory segregation now obtains, and for many generations will surely continue.

THE END

INDEX

- ADMINISTRATION of Native affairs, 19, 74-6, 126;— in Senegal, 138;— in Tanganyika, 130, 131;— in West Coast territories, 142
- ASIATICS. *See* Indians
- "ASSIMILATION" Policy, 138
- BASUTOLAND, density of population in, 3
- "BEAUMONT" COMMISSION (1917), 13
- BELGIAN CONGO, Native Policy in, 136-7
- BUGANDA, Kingdom of. *See* Uganda
- BYWONERS, employment of, on farms, 52-4
- CAPE PROVINCE, under Native Land Act, 11, 92
- CHRISTIANISING of Natives, 119, 120
- CISKEI, population of, 94
- "CITIZENSHIP," policy of, 127
- COLOUR BAR ACT. *See* Mines and Works Amendment Act.
- COLOURED PERSONS, status of, 17
- CROWN lands, 14, 94, 112
- ECONOMIC AND WAGE COMMISSION (1925), 23-9, 77, 85, 101
- EDUCATION of Natives, 64, 120, 125, 126, 128, 137
- EUROPEAN, racial status of, 18; standard of living of, 18, 34, 53, 58; virility of, 60
- NATIVE SER.
- FARMS (European), Natives employed on, 38-9, 45-54, 102-3, 109-12, 114, 115; methods used on, 49, 92, 111; values of, 93-5, 96, 98
- FRANCHISE of Natives, 9, 12, 92, 125
- FRENCH Colonies, Native Policy in, 138
- GAMBIA, Native Policy in, 140-2
- GLEN GREY ACT (1894), 67
- GOLD COAST, Native crop production in, 140-2; Native policy in, 140-2
- GOLD-MINING industry, 31-3, 36-8, 102
- GRIQUALAND EAST, land transactions in, 85
- HANDICRAFTS of Natives, 44, 121
- HEALTH of Natives, 2, 58, 78-80, 85, 118, 121, 137
- HERSCHEL, Native field methods in, 62-3
- HOUSING of Natives, 38, 59, 80, 82, 85
- "IDENTITY," policy of, 125-6; — in Senegal, 138
- INDIAN affairs, Capetown Agreement, 16-17
- INDIANS in Kenya, 134
- INDIVIDUALISM among Natives, 6, 66-8, 114, 137; — in Gold Coast territory, 140, 141

- INDUSTRIAL COMMERCIAL UNION (I.C.U.), 46, 54, 117
- INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION ACT (1924), 106, 127
- INDUSTRIES of Natives, 44
- INTER-RACIAL contact, social effects of, 7-9, 73-4, 78, 120-1; relationships, 59, 61, 73-4, 98, 118, 125; — in Java, 129; — in Tanganyika, 130
- JAVA, Native Policy in, 129; prosperity of, 129
- KENYA, Indians in, 134; Native crops in, 113, 133; Native Policy in, 131-6; railway rates in, 135; segregation in, 136; taxation in, 135; "trusteeship" in, 134, 136
- LABOUR of coloured persons, 17, 86; theory of competition for employment, 17-19, 23-30, 31-42, 58, 101-6, 124; of Europeans, — apprenticeships, 34; — scope of, 22; of Indians, 16-17; duty of Native to engage in, 91
- LABOUR of Natives, availability of, 22, 47, 90-1 (in Kenya, 132-3), colour bar on, 34-7, 54-5, 57, 119; in commerce, 44, 106; displacement of, 34-7, 54-5, 60, 106, 115; distribution among farms, 10, 49, 51, 109-12; distribution among occupations, 22, 28, 54; in domestic service, 43; on farms, 38-9; 45-54, 102-3, 109-12, 114, 115; immobility of, 18, 20, 21, 32, 49; import of 31-3; in industries, 44, 106; in Kenya, 132-3, 135; migration of, 2, 20, 80-1, 114 (in Belgian Congo, 136-7), (in Kenya, 132), (in Nyassaland, 136); on mining, 31-3, 36, 37-8, 45, 103; origins of, 5-6; on public services, 44, 54-5, 107; on railways, 44, 54-5, 107; recruitment of, 10, 50, 81, 137, (in Belgian Congo, 136), (in Kenya, 132); scope of, 22; subsidies to wages in, 20, 21, 85-90, 124; labour in Tanganyika, 129-31; in towns, 51; 80-2, 86, 114, 117, 128; value of, 8, 61; wages rates of, 20, 50-1, 85-90, 101-6; wages subsidizing cultivation, 68-70
- LABOUR TENANTS, conditions of service, 48-50; requirements for, 12, 48, 109-10
- LAND, acquisition of, by Natives, 11-12, 12-15, 71, 73, 90, 92-6, 97-100, 124, 127, 137, 143; Land Act (1913), 11-13, 46, 72, 73, 96; Land Act Amendment Bill, 13-15, 72, 73, 91, 92-4, 109-12, 115; desire of Europeans for, 73, 84-5, 97, 100, 124, 143; distribution of, in Kenya, 132, 135; — in Nyassaland, 136; — in Tanganyika, 130; as habitat for Natives, 70, 81-2, 117, 122; lease of, to Natives (not squatters), 112-13; settlement schemes for Natives, 14, 94, 112; tenure of bywonders, 108-9; — of Natives in Kenya, 131; — in reserves, 66-8, 125; — of squatters, 45
- LEGAL Code for Natives, 76, 126
- LOCAL COMMITTEE Areas of 1918, 11, 13
- MANDATORY system in Tanganyika, 130

- MINES AND WORKS AMENDMENT ACT, 36, 119
- MINING INDUSTRY COMMISSION, 25
- MISCEGENATION of Europeans and Natives, 59-60, 74
- MORALS and mentality of Natives, 59, 73-4, 76-82, 85, 116-7, 120
- MOZAMBIQUE CONVENTION, 33
- NATIVE, racial status of, 18, 34-5, 57, 74, 116, 118-20; standard of living of, 20-2, 85, 87-9, 90, 113
- NIGERIA, climate of, 140; Native crop production in, 140-2; Native Policy in, 140
- NYASSALAND, Native Policy in, 136
- ORMSBY-GORE Report on East Africa, 134
- PASTORALISM of Natives, 62-3, 64-6, 95, 114
- PLANTATION System, 141
- "PLOWING on halves," 12, 47
- PONDOLAND, population of, 3
- "POOR WHITES," charity or relief work for, 27, 28, 40-2, 54-5, 107; classes of, 26-7; employment on farms, 52-4, 107-9, 115; general employment of, 60, 101, 108; moral and social status of, 26-7, 40, 42, 59; numbers of, 27; origins of, 26
- POPULATION (Native), density of, 3, 20, 73; distribution of, 2; effect of industries on, 4, 113; rate of increase of, 2, 58, 113, 137
- PORTUGUESE Natives, 31, 32
- "RELEASED" Areas, 13-14, 92-4, 96, 112, 115
- RELIEF AND GRANTS IN AID COMMISSION, 24
- REPRESSION, policy of, 125
- RESERVES (Native), character of, 84; contribution of, to Native income, 20, 21, 85-90; development and utilization of, 3, 4, 18, 62-71, 76, 88-90, 95-100, 113-14, 125, 137; delimitation in Kenya, 132; utilization in Kenya, 133, 135; protection of, 73, 84-5, 97, 127, 144; sufficiency of, 2, 3, 63-4, 73, 87, 89, 90, 92, 94-6; development of, in Tanganyika, 131; transport facilities in, 70, 114, 128
- RHODESIA, segregation in, 136
- SCHEDULED Areas of 1913, 11, 13, 90
- SEGREGATION (Complete) — definition of, 56; — argument for white South Africa, 57; (Possessory), definition of, 72; — need for, 77, 115, 120-3, 143; origins of, 12; — temporary nature of, 77, 115
- SENEGAL, Native Policy in, 138
- SIERRA LEONE, Native Policy in, 140-2
- SQUATTING of Natives, 11, 45-7, 109, 110, 124
- TANGANYIKA, Native Policy in, 129-31
- TAXATION of Natives, 6, 20, 71, 137
- TEMBULAND, population of, 3
- TRADING by Natives, 43, 44
- TRANSKEI, agricultural advancement of, 75, 99, 114; Native Council system of, 71, 75, 77; population of, 3, 64, 94
- TRANSVAAL INDIGENCY COMMISSION, 25, 109

- "TRUSTEESHIP," policy of, 134
- UGANDA, climate of, 138;
European element in, 138;
export of cotton from, 113,
139; imports into, 139;
inter-racial policy of, 138-9
- UNEMPLOYMENT COMMISSION
(1922), 38
- VILLAGES for Natives in towns,
80, 82, 128
- WAGE Regulation, 34-5, 101-6,
115
- WOMEN'S labour among
Natives, 69
- ZULULAND, European planters
in, 85; population of, 3, 64