

SECOND CARNEGIE INQUIRY INTO POVERTY
AND DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

Removals of a quiet kind:
Removals from Indian, Coloured
and White-owned land in Natal

by

Ian Donald

Carnegie Conference Paper No.75

Cape Town

13 - 19 April 1984

ISBN 0 7992 0861 2

REMOVALS OF A QUIET KIND: REMOVALS FROM INDIAN, COLOURED AND WHITE-OWNED
LAND IN NATAL

by

I. DONALD

In November 1983 the press gave a great deal of publicity to the impending removal of the Bakwena tribe from land which they had bought 70 years before. Because in South Africa it is not possible for a tribe with changing membership to legally have title to land, the tribe at the time of buying the land, entrusted the title to the Minister. Such confidence was discovered to be ill-founded when the people were ordered in 1983 to move from this land in terms of Section 5 of the Black Administration Act, within 10 days, to Pachsdraai.

On November 17, 1983, the Ventersdorp magistrate, Mr P. de Villiers, gave the remainder of the tribe 10 days to move from Magopa, failing which they would be loaded onto lorries and moved with force. Lorries arrived every day to move the people but they left empty in the evenings. The threatened removal received widespread publicity, the story making the front page of the Rand Daily Mail on a number of occasions.

South Africa's ambassador in the United States, Mr Brand Fourie, was summoned to the Washington State Department to receive a formal protest against the forced removal of the inhabitants of Magopa (RDM, 1/12/83). The reasons for the widespread publicity around this removal can be understood in the following terms:

1. It was the first forced removal from an area owned by African people for more than a year, and according to the state, only one black spot (freehold area) had been removed in 1982 (that being Alsatia in the Cape Province - Parliamentary question 140, 8/3/83).
2. Black Sash and SACC's more forceful role in the area of removals had allowed them to act as a link between local communities and outside pressure groups.
3. A substantial number of families (300) were involved.
4. Magopa was reasonably close to Johannesburg, heart of the South African media.
5. Although technically not (the title-deed being vested in the Minister), most importantly it was a removal from an area which people owned, and the English-language press, mouthpiece of the free-enterprise system regard this as the ultimate violation.

Alan Paton, voice of the Liberal party, voiced these sentiments when discussing removals from freehold areas at an Annual Congress of the Liberal Party of South Africa (Natal Division) in the 1960s:

'The long-allowed right which is the deed of sale is to be taken away, a right almost as old as democracy itself, a right that has become part of the very warp and woof of what is called Western Civilization, a right that accedes dignity and status to a man, a sign that he is somebody, a person not an animal or a thing to be moved about at authority's pleasure, a sign in fact that even authority shrinks from wounding him in the secret parts, that he has a privacy which is his and his alone, to which he admits as he wills, from which he excludes as he wills, a privacy which when taken from him, destroys him in his inner self so that he is no longer a man.'

At the same time that Magopa receives widespread publicity, removals from white, Indian and Coloured-owned land continue almost unnoticed.

AFRA has estimated that between 1948-84, 300 000 people have been evicted off farms while 105 000 were moved from black spots and 10 000 people have been moved from reserves.

In the 1960s and 1970s there were massive removals from non-scheduled, non-released land (land which had not been allocated for African occupation in terms of the 1913 and 1936 Acts). One of the motivations underlying these evictions was security, the Du Toit Commission of 1959 echoed this viewpoint in pointing out the danger of the platteland whites being overwhelmed by an increasing black population in 'white' platteland areas. However, the main thrust for these evictions and removals came from the economic considerations of a restructuring of labour requirements for farm labour. Thus both the South African Agricultural Union and NAU to a lesser extent supported the abolition of labour tenancy although NAU pleaded for a slower pace of implementation. Of course, there were specific groups within the farming community which opposed its abolition.

In the 1980s the emphasis on the removals from non-scheduled and non-released land (including the removal of tenants from certain non-released African freehold areas) has become that of consolidation and security. Large numbers of African people living in these areas, contradict the idea of separate areas for whites and blacks and the notion that African people should only be in 'white areas' for purposes of providing labour.

However, another important consideration is that of security. The emphasis on registration of workers and the limitation of workers to the minimum number necessary for the running of the farm, stems now no longer from maximum utilization of labour, instead it has become a security measure. This is evident, I believe, from the conflict between the Administration Boards and the white farmers over the question of registration of workers. The farmers in Natal are strongly opposed to the registration of workers and the work of the Administration Board. NAU actually called for the abolition of the administration boards in 1982 and Mr Sinclair, President of NAU, in his presidential address in 1983, maintained that,

'I regret to say that no notice whatever has been taken of our views which perturbs me considerably, since it seems that the authorities are determined to force upon us an unwanted system and to ignore the expressed wish of agriculture in Natal'.

In 1983, a farmer from the Besters area near Ladysmith appeared in court for refusal to pay registration fees for his farmworkers. An attempt was made to subpoena the Deputy Minister of Co-operation, Dr G. Morrison, by this farmer for a speech he had allegedly made in which he said the cost of administering the registration of farmworkers was greater than the revenue accruing from the registration fees.

Registration of workers and the removal of non-registered workers or those people who are rent-paying tenants on non-scheduled or non-released land is an attempt to monitor and regulate all African people in 'white' areas. This is made clear by the then Deputy Minister of Development and Land Affairs in Parliament on 6 June, 1983, who, when under attack from the CP for not moving enough people, said:

'The hon. member knows that we anticipated that the Sothos from Thaba Nchu would have to move to Onverwacht. Approximately 25 000 people were involved... The number of 25 000 is on record. We now have more than 200 000 people in Onverwacht. They came there of their own volition. This is the method we are using now. We are removing people on a voluntary basis. Does the hon. member mean to tell me that if we concentrate only on the so-called black spots or poorly situated areas, these are the only removals that should take place? There is enough evidence in this regard in our neighbouring States to the north of South Africa. It has been said that the most dangerous situation which has arisen in Zimbabwe was due to the fact that the government did not give enough attention to the Black people on the farms, in the rural areas. Before Onverwacht came into being, the White:non-White ratio on white farms in the Free State area was 1:15.

4

'As a result of the fact that people have moved voluntarily to Onverwacht - at least 150 000 souls have moved there - we are reducing the ratio. At the moment the ratio is 1:13. Is this not something which has been achieved? This kind of thing is not mentioned in reports in respect of removals because the people go there voluntarily'.
(6 June, 1983, p.8735)

Two points need to be made here. Firstly, the then Deputy Minister openly admits that part of the motivation for the removals is to prevent the existence of large numbers of African people living on any land which is not scheduled or released. This is to prevent the possibility of guerillas moving easily amongst the farm population.

The second point concerns the number of people moving off white farms into Onverwacht and the extent to which this is a voluntary move. Some background is necessary before this point is expanded upon.

Legislation

Most of these removals are implemented in terms of Section 26 of Act 18 of 1936. This section states that Africans may neither reside nor congregate on land which is non-scheduled, non-prescribed or non-trust land, unless:

1. He/she is the registered owner, or
2. is a farmworker, or
3. is a dependant of the above.

An owner who allows Africans illegally on his/her land is guilty of an offence unless it can be shown that the Africans are in a process of being ejected. This means that both owner and rent-paying tenant can be prosecuted and the owner can be forced to evict his tenants.

Experience in Natal has indicated that large numbers of people are being prosecuted in terms of this legislation, and large numbers of people are being forced to move.

In answer to a question in Parliament as to whether any persons were prosecuted in 1982 under Section 26 of the Development Trust and Land Act, No. 18 of 1936 (Question 1125, 9 September 1983), the Minister replied that the following numbers of people had been prosecuted:

Transvaal: 3100
 Cape Province: 487
 Orange Free State: 2755
 Natal: 147

These figures are extremely misleading if one is attempting to gauge the effect of this legislation. Two considerations should be borne in mind. The answer only covers those people brought to court. Thus those people who were threatened with this legislation unless they evicted their African tenants would not appear in these figures. Secondly, under this legislation, both land-owner and tenant can be prosecuted. For instance, in Inanda, the Indian land-owners were threatened with prosecution. The land-owners are then compelled to evict the tenants. Each land-owner could have any number of tenants. Thus, one prosecution could lead to 100 families being forced to move.

It is therefore interesting to note that a relatively high number of people - 2 755 - were prosecuted in the Free State in 1982, the province where the then Deputy Minister boasted of having reduced the black/white ratio on farms from 15:1 to 13:1. The Deputy Minister sees these people as moving voluntarily, 'We did not force them to get onto a truck'. However, the enforcement of legislation which results in the eviction of tenants, is as good as a forced removal. The only difference is that these people are forced to find their own new place to live.

The emphasis on security is expressed directly in a number of removals that took place last year. In Cliffdale, the removal of 200 families from Indian-owned land began in what the Drakensberg Administration Board described to the press as 'a clean up'. The increasing power of the Security Council is likely to increase this emphasis on security in the process of removals. Certainly, the proposed Orderly Movement and Settlement of Black Persons Bill expresses this emphasis on security in relation to rural people. For instance, Clause 15 states that 'no black person shall -

- a) be resident in the rural area unless he has been authorised thereto by a designated officer, or
- b) if he has been so authorised, be resident at any place or in any area in the rural area other than at such place or in such area with respect to which he was authorised.

Even the amount of labour on white farms is to be controlled to prevent large numbers of African people from living in white areas and to prevent the creation of a similar situation to that 'dangerous situation in Zimbabwe'. Thus, farm tenement boards may be established by Gazette:

Clause 24:

'If a farm tenement board has reason to believe that the number of black persons resident on any particular area of the board is unduly large, or that for any reason an investigation into the number of black persons on any particular land in its area is necessary, ...it shall call upon the owner of the land to appear before the board.'

The Board is further empowered to decide what the labour requirements of each farm are.

The vision then of the drafters of this legislation is of white rural areas with the minimum number of African people to provide the labour necessary for white farms, and the few African people there, registered and known. This would allow absolute control of these African populations and it would be clear when any new person would leave or enter the area.

Van Zyl Slabbert has described the drafting of the Orderly Movement and Settlement of Persons Bill in the following terms,

'In the case of the Orderly Movement and Settlement of Persons Bill, the representatives of the military staff of the State Security Council joined forces with civil servants from Koornhof's own department to defeat his reform endeavours in the constitutional committee. The Bill that emerged was not one that Koornhof wanted, but security considerations had prevailed'.

(30 Jan. 1984, Hansard)

At the time of writing, the redrafted Bill had not been presented. It seems unlikely however that this emphasis on security will change. The result will be further large scale evictions and removals.

The difference

How does the removal of people from non-scheduled, non-released land differ from removals from freehold areas?

Firstly, the groups of people living on the non-scheduled, non-released land like Indian-owned and white-owned land, are generally scattered,

living in small groups. At Cliffdale, 200 families were affected, at Good Hope more than a hundred people were moved but generally the people are living in pockets; isolated from each other and in an insecure position, both in regard to the land-owners and the state.

Resistance is limited because of the small numbers of people, isolation and the strategy that the state takes against these people.

At Matiwane's Kop, a freehold area north of Ladysmith, there are 12 000 people living in an established community. They have been threatened with removal since 1978 but strong organization has deterred the state.

In the case of Indian or white land, the strategy of the state leaves the threatened people in a much more vulnerable position. Administration Board officials enter these areas and serve summonses on either tenants or land-owners or both.

Generally, both land-owners and tenants receive suspended sentences. Failure to leave the area on the part of the tenants and to evict these tenants on the part of land-owners means the implementation of these suspended sentences; in other words, fines that people cannot afford or prison sentences. The land-owners under this type of pressure eventually evict the tenants, or if the tenants are being threatened with prosecution, unable to pay the threatened fines, they move themselves.

In reply to a query with regard to Cliffdale as to where the tenants who were being evicted should go, the Department of Co-operation and Development replied that the tenants had the following options open to them:

1. Find a place in the KwaZulu area;
2. live in approved housing provided by an employer;
3. register with the administration board and employment and approved housing will be provided;
4. approach a chief for a place to stay; or
5. apply to the Chief Commissioner for a place in a closer settlement.

Numbers 1 and 5 are, in fact, the same thing and the option that most people choose, to try and 'khonza', paying amounts of money to the chief for a place to stay in the already overcrowded reserves, rather than face living in a

closer settlement, miles from any employment. The fact that these people at Cliffdale were working at Hammarsdale, close by across the valley, that this is a time of high unemployment, that Cliffdale was a well-established community and that it is extremely difficult to find a place in the already overcrowded reserves, are issues which the Department chooses to ignore. Rather than be transported to a closer settlement, most likely Compensation, more than 150 km from where the people currently live, most of the people have chosen to dismantle their homes and try and find a new place near Shongweni.

Impoverishment

Impoverishment through this process occurs in three ways.

1. People are deprived of access to land when they are moved to closer settlements. If they are rent-paying tenants, labour tenants or even labourers, they have some access to land and are able to cultivate and have a few cattle. When they are moved to closer settlements they do not have access to land.
2. People are moved far from any employment. The Department makes the following distinction between full-scale replacement townships, rural townships, closer settlements and agricultural settlements. (KZ No. 2 of 1982). According to the memorandum, border townships are 'planned and developed in a sophisticated way'. The townships are so situated that black workers in the nearby white area can usually commute daily between their place of residence and place of work.

Rural townships are next on the list and are for 'inter alia, families whose breadwinners are usually employed in white areas as migrant workers or for the aged, widows, women with dependent children' (p.14). In other words, these areas are too far away for people to be employed and continue to live in these rural townships.

At the top of the list in distance away from employment possibilities are what the Department's memorandum calls 'closer settlements'. According to the memorandum, 'This type of residential area is developed for the settlement of squatters from white farms as well as from black spots and mission farms'. The Department's term 'squatters' means rent-paying tenants and labour tenants.

Thus, even within the arena of removals there is differentiation and the people

who are rent-paying or labour tenants on African freehold areas and white or Indian-owned farms are settled in areas where there are the least facilities and in places furthest away from any employment. It seems that at any time in Natal, there are one or two closer settlements available for the dumping of tenants. At the moment, these are Compensation in the Mpendle district and Frankland, on the south coast. Towards the end of 1983, some Indian land-owners in Inanda were threatened with prosecution for illegally having rent-paying tenants. They were compelled to serve eviction notices on these tenants. The Department then delivered notices to all these tenants offering them either Compensation or Frankland as places to settle. This offer was easy to refuse - Compensation being about 300 km from Durban, where most people were working.

Not only are these tenants then the people who are the most vulnerable as far as resistance is concerned, but they are the people who receive the worst services and are situated in the worst places when they are moved. Generally, they move themselves at no expense to the state and without publicity.

3. Tenants are not paid compensation when they are moved from these types of areas. People at Cliffdale, for instance, had been living there for 20 years in substantial houses. They were compelled to dismantle their houses and move. No compensation was paid.

These removals then are conducted at no expense to the state, with little resultant publicity and yet are part of a process of removals which is driving people into the homelands and leading to an increasing proportion of African people being compelled to live in the homelands, either being forced into reserves or moved into closer settlements which will be incorporated into homelands like KwaZulu.

The following examples, all of which took place in 1983 in Natal, give some sense of the process at work.

Qinisa

In 1976, the land-owners and tenants at Roosboom, a freehold area outside Ladysmith, were moved to Ezakheni. In line with its policy, the Department of Co-operation and Development only gave land compensation to those people with more than 17 ha. Mr Cornelius Ndlovu was one land-owner lucky enough to be given this land for land compensation, even his compensatory piece of land was some thornveld adjoining Ezakheni.

Mr Nklovu decided to take on as tenants a number of people who had been evicted off white farms. The Administration Board summoned him to appear in court on 7 November 1983 for having unregistered tenants on his land. However, after some negotiation, the Commissioner indicated that he had nowhere for these people to stay.

The slightly sympathetic approach in this case is probably explained by the fact that this land is to be incorporated into KwaZulu anyway, even though at the moment it falls under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner at Ladysmith.

Good Hope:

The same removal of people from Roosboom affected some of the tenants differently. The tenants were moved in 1976 to Ezakheni, a township about 23 km from Ladysmith. Roosboom had been bought by African people before the 1913 Land Act. Although many of its people worked in Ladysmith and other urban areas, Roosboom being only about 7 km from Ladysmith, a rural life was conducted here as well. People had cattle and cultivated a bit of land. This made an important contribution to their standard of living.

Secondly, rentals in Ezakheni are currently R13/month while the average rentals in the freehold areas are between R10 and R20 a year.

Thirdly, while at Roosboom people lived in a community, the removal destroyed this community and violence is endemic at Ezakheni.

A number of these original tenant families, having lived for a year at Ezakheni, attempted to recreate their rural life by moving back to an Indian-owned farm adjoining Roosboom. Here the people had cattle, although they were dependent on earnings from people working in Ladysmith.

Under Section 26 of the 1936 Land Act, they were illegally living as rent-paying tenants on non-scheduled, non-registered land. On 13 October 1983, 147 people were moved from this area to a closer settlement at Compensation in the Mpendle district. On 24 October, another 9 families were moved. People who were living here and working in Ladysmith were compelled to become lodgers in the already overcrowded townships of Steadville or Ezakheni or lose their jobs; while their families were moved to Mpendle.

In response to a query from a Natal Witness reporter, the Chief Commissioner of Natal replied,

'They were offered free transport to any place where they could obtain legal accommodation but failed to accept the offer. An offer of alternate accommodation at either Waaihoek or Compensation was made to them of which the latter was accepted after they had inspected both areas'.

It is clear that in this case, the people were unable to find any place in the reserves and were consequently moved to a closer settlement.

A report by a Natal Witness journalist gives an impression of this removal (30/11/1983):

'I asked a woman where her husband was. She said: "He's in Ladysmith. He works there, cleaning the trains". She shook her head. "He will come for three days at Xmas'.

"Did he live with you at Good Hope?" (the Indian-owned farm)
"Yes, we lived together".'

They were initially offered a place at Waaihoek (about 50 km from Ladysmith).
'The men came and counted us and put marks on our houses', the women at Compensation told me.

'Then they showed us a place at Waaihoek near the river. We wanted to build our houses on the Ladysmith side of the river so we could catch the bus. But we were told we must go to the other side. Now there was no bridge and we did not know how our men would go to work when the river was flowing. So we said we did not want to go to Waaihoek. Then our men said we must go back to Ezakheni. We agreed even though there is no place for cattle there. But then they said there were no toilets in Ezakheni, and that we must come to Compensation. We came and looked at the place and we agreed to come'.

Dorinkop

In 1976, about a hundred people were moved from a block of white farms loosely called Dorinkop and bordering on a large block of African freehold farms which have been incorporated into KwaZulu. Because these African freehold areas are reasonably close to industry at Newcastle, there has been a massive inflow of rent-paying tenants into the area.

It seems that some time in the 1970s the white farmers of Dorinkop gave up productive farming and used the farms for labour tenancy. The abolition of labour tenancy led to these farmers being compelled to evict these labour tenants. In 1976, these people were moved to Qudeni, into a closer settlement. This settlement, about three hours from Pietermaritzburg by car, had no schools or water. Erected fletcraft was all that people found. The only nearby employment were some Co-op and Development-run phormium estates which were closed in 1982.

Towards the end of 1983, AFRA discovered that the white farmers who own these farms had moved new tenants onto the farms from 1980 onwards and charged them R60 a year as well as R90 from each family for a borehole.

In June, the families were given eviction notices by the nduna. These eviction notices expired in August of that year. In the time that the people were there they had built substantial houses, had ploughed fields where they were getting good harvests of mielies and had cattle and goats.

The people, shocked by this news, first went to Ulundi where they failed to be helped and then employed a lawyer at R30 a family. The lawyer took them to the magistrate at Dannhauser and they were granted a reprieve until the end of May 1984.

The nduna who had collected their rentals disappeared and the local people suspect that he will reappear when everyone has been removed. The land-owners (white farmers) have not been prosecuted for allowing tenants onto their land and as the tenants had no receipts for the money they had paid and had entered into an illegal agreement by being rent-paying tenants on white farms, there is no recourse to the courts in attempting to recover the money.

In this case, it seems that the white farmers, because the farm is unproductive, have decided to use it to make money by renting it out (illegally) to African tenants. It is not clear in this case whether the white farmer used the existing legislation as a pretext for evicting people so that he could move new people on, or whether the Dannhauser magistrate initiated these removals.

Cliffdale

Cliffdale consists of Indian-owned land close to the National Highway running between Pietermaritzburg and Durban. From the 1860s, the Natal Land and Colonization Company owned a large portion of Cliffdale. In the 1920s, it was sold off to individuals and gradually from the 1950s onwards Indians began to buy up portions of Cliffdale. In the 1970s, there was debate as to whether or not Cliffdale should become a white group area. The Cliffdale Indians finally got the support of industries which were wanting an Indian township to be developed near Hammarsdale for workers in Hammarsdale, Cato Ridge and Camperdown. R. Cadman, then MP, also lent his support, saying that the area supplied most of Durban's vegetable needs. Cliffdale was finally gazetted an Indian area in 1978.

Over the years African tenants moved onto the land. In 1983, there were approximately 200 families living on the land as rent tenants. Some families had been living there for over 20 years. People were paying low rentals of around R10/month, living in substantial houses and were close to their work in Hammarsdale. A school owned by the Roman Catholic Church served 120 primary school children from this community.

In 1975, there were threats of removal. These were forgotten until September 1982, when tenants were given eviction notices by the Drakensberg Administration Board and later by Indian land-owners. This follows the Administration Board tactic of prosecuting both tenants and land-owners under Section 26 of Act 18 of 1936.

A number of Indian land-owners were fined R100 in the Camperdown Court for illegally having tenants on their land. Tenants were compelled to appear in the Hammarsdale Court and were fined R40 or 80 days suspended until the end of June. Indian land-owners were thus compelled to serve eviction notices on their tenants, to avoid further fines.

Until the intervention of the Drakensberg Administration, there was an amiable relationship between land-owners and tenants. However, African tenants now began to perceive Indian land-owners to be evicting them, and consequently racial tensions developed in the area. A Mr P. Singh was shot by an assailant and a number of lesser incidents of inter-racial violence took place. Indian land-owners out of fear were reluctant to meet their tenants formally, to discuss this matter and this exacerbated tensions.

The local Inkatha committee which attempted to resist the removals was hopeful that KwaZulu would intervene on their behalf to prevent the removals. However, the Secretary for the Interior of KwaZulu replied to questions about imminent removals that

'...according to the statement made by representatives of the mentioned families, the farm in question is privately owned and the KwaZulu government has no say or jurisdiction over such farm'.

Tenants are currently leaving Cliffdale, trying to find a piece of land in a reserve where they can begin again. The state is not providing an alternative place for these people to stay, is not paying compensation, does not have to pay the costs of transportation and avoided the embarrassment of being seen to move people.

Prospect Farm

This is a freehold area bought by the present land-owners' forefathers before 1913. The 1980 population was 16 land-owners and a total population of 3 005. In 1980, a small group of tenants were moved to Bulwer Farm.

The Port Natal Administration Board seems determined to rigidly control any new tenants moving into the area. In May 1983, the Port Natal Administration Board came onto this freehold area and served eviction notices on a number of tenants. One of the tenants was a woman, Doreen Gcabashe. This woman returned to the area where she was born, Prospect Farm, when she left her husband. During the visit by the Port Natal Administration Board, she was given 21 days to leave. Then on 17 May 1983, the owner of the land was summoned to appear in court, in terms of Section 26 of Act 18 of 1936, for allowing 'Africans to congregate upon or reside on her land'. She appeared in court and was fined R100, suspended until the end of June that year. This also applied to the tenants. However, because the tenant family is poor and has nowhere to go, the land-owner has not yet done this.

The statements below reveal the perceptions of the people from that freehold area. The people affected by the threatened evictions have made representation to Ulundi and although this seems to have brought about some sort of reprieve, it is unlikely that this representation will bring about a change in policy. Although differences between officials that operate in each area will determine how harshly people feel the laws, clearly the laws themselves are unbending.

Statement by Miss Doreen Gcabashe

I was born at Prospect Farm. When I got married I left my home and stayed with my husband at another area. Due to some other reasons, we were divorced and separated. I had no alternative but to go back home to my parents. The Commissioner and Port Natal refused to accept me as a Prospect Farm resident. They said I was not allowed to reside there. They wanted to arrest me for trespassing. They produced a list of names of people with permission to reside at Prospect Farm. Mine was not there. When I explained the whole issue to them, they did not want to listen. Considering that everybody rebuked me I decided to hire an attorney. When I appeared before the Commissioner, I was not allowed to plead. They could not listen to my attorney and I was charged for illegal squatting in my place of birth. I was given three months notice to vacate the said place.

I am now confused. I have been left in the lurch by my husband, Commissioner and police. What should I do and where shall I go? They allege that I have married another man from Maphumulo, so I must go to him. I wonder where did they get such unfounded lies. Moreover, there is no proof of that.

Statement by Mrs Ntombela

I am also title-holder of a certain portion of land at Prospect Farm. The Commissioner and Port Natal Administration Board have been troubling us for a long time. They come at night to raid and force our relatives and their children to vacate our own land. I have offered many homeless and wandering people accommodation in my place. Some of them were fired or removed from other places referred to by the Commissioner as 'black spots'. If I refer these people to him so that he can grant them permission to reside on my piece of land, he refuses. All that he knows is to issue the notices and summonses accusing me of accomodating people on my property without permit. Some of these people, especially my relatives, have built beautiful houses but the Commissioner and Mr Smit are threatening to destroy these if they will still be available by the end of September and no compensation will be paid. They also told me that if these people will still be on my property at the end of September, they will arrest me.

In this case, although Prospect Farm is an African freehold area, it was never scheduled or released and thus Section 26 of Act 18 still applies here.

Conclusion

The removal of tenants, rent-paying or labour, from non-scheduled and non-released land is widespread. Generally, this process goes by unnoticed, the press not regarding it as particularly newsworthy as the removed people do not themselves own the land. Yet it is as much part of the whole process by which African people are forced into the small area allocated for them and by which finally they will be deprived of South African citizenship. This process is part of a continuing process of the impoverishment of the African people, as they are deprived of access to land and employment possibilities.

These people are, in fact, the ones at the very bottom of South African society, in closer settlements far from any employment possibilities, without access to land. This process of impoverishment, however, goes by unnoticed.

These papers constitute the preliminary findings of the Second Carnegie Inquiry into Poverty and Development in Southern Africa, and were prepared for presentation at a Conference at the University of Cape Town from 13-19 April, 1984.

The Second Carnegie Inquiry into Poverty and Development in Southern Africa was launched in April 1982, and is scheduled to run until June 1985.

Quoting (in context) from these preliminary papers with due acknowledgement is of course allowed, but for permission to reprint any material, or for further information about the Inquiry, please write to:

SALDRU
School of Economics
Robert Leslie Building
University of Cape Town
Rondebosch 7700