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PRESENT:
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Mrs. Sophia Koerkop, President, Women's League, Germiston,
Mrs. Rachel Eleanor Masale, Secretary ditto.
Mrs. Margaret Gwaze,
MRS. Maria Kondile,
Mr. Ngoyi, President,
Mr. James Zini, General Secretary,
Representing the African Residential Organization, called

and examined: (Interpreted by Mr. Faye)

CHAIRMAN: In one of the statements you have handed in, you say you represent the Temperate Domestic and Liquor Dealers Section of the Women. Are these sections separately organized?-- (Mrs. Mdaka): Together.

It is one organization?-- Yes.

But there are certain women of that organization who are the liquor dealers?-- No, sir.

You say "The Liquor Dealers' Section" in this statement; what does that mean?-- We are not liquor sellers, but we wish to speak on behalf of the women who sell liquor.

I was not accusing you of selling liquor, but I wish to know what you wish to say on behalf of the women selling liquor?-- What we wish to say, in a word, sir, is that the women who engage in this traffic are driven to it owing to
economic depression; their menfolk do not earn enough to keep their families. Men have to pay certain dues to the authorities. They have to keep their families in comfort—medical comforts, food, clothing and other needs. A feature which bulks big in this traffic, sir, is that there are certain persons, including Indians, who are authorised by the authorities to sell yeast to Natives. From that, sir, it is an easy step to grind grain and make intoxicating beverage. Of course, intoxicating beverage is not made from grain alone and when the unfortunate people who do that have done their work, they are in danger of being arrested; if the Police find them out they are arrested. We view that, sir, as a social evil in our midst.

We have been told that the women who deal in liquor are not in the first instance the wives of men who work in town and who carry on a respectable living, but women who come in from outside——unattached women——who carry on this trade. Is that the case?——We deny that, sir. The women who sell these drinks are the wives of the men. The average wage received by their menfolk is £3, and £3 is not enough to keep a Native family in Johannesburg; economic pressure bears on the people and forces them to look to other means of implementing what their menfolk earn.

Are these generally the wives of men who have been loboloed, or are they women who live with the men without lobolo?——Some people who have been here a long time have taken wives without lobolo passing, but we look on the unions as legal unions. Most of them though are people who have married and observed the custom of lobolo.

They look upon the union of a man and woman who have
lived together without lobolo or without going to church, as a legal union?—The circumstances are peculiar, sir. These people have become separated from their homes in the country. They do not look to relatives there for having anything to do with the marriage, as we call it; they live as man and wife; they have children, and their neighbours look upon them as properly married. Perhaps the law would not say they are legally married.

Now, which group is more common among the Natives living in the towns: those, on the one side, consisting of people for whom lobolo has passed, plus people married by Christian rites or married at the Civil Court; or, on the other side, people who live together in customary unions without having married in one of the three ways I have described?—They are so mixed, sir, that it is impossible for us to say; we cannot say with certainty. There are many who have married legally. As I say, sir, there are many who have been married according to law—that is, who have become united as man and wife legally; and there are many who just live together as man and wife; but I cannot say with certainty which of those two groups preponderates.

I think Mrs. Lupuzi wanted to say something about it?—(Mrs. Lupuzi): I was merely prompting the speaker, sir.

If any of you others have any information on the point, you are at liberty to give it?—(Mrs. Masole): I think those married by law are more than those married by lobolo.

Yes; but take those married by law and lobolo and civil marriages in the Magistrate's Court; on the other side, take the customary unions of those who have always
lived together but who are regarded as married; which of those two groups predominate in town? — That I could not say.

Are there many in each group? — Yes. (Mr. Ngqoyi): In this case, those who live together unlawfully are more than those who are married legally.

Those who are living in a customary union? — Yes, they are more than those who are legally married.

In legally you include lobolo, Christian marriage and civil marriage; they are all legally married? — Yes.

That group is smaller than the other group? — Most of the Natives now are even failing to pay lobolo.

But is not lobolo still used very largely by most Natives, even in towns? — It is so.

I mean, when there is a marriage — even a Christian marriage, there is always some lobolo? — Yes.

How do you get over the difficulty that you have not got anywhere to keep cattle in town? — We only use money instead of cattle in towns, for lobolo.

Yes; but to me there must be some element of cattle about the lobolo contract, must there not; how do you get over that? — By means of using cash. (Mr. Zini): Generally, the position is in connection with those people who have no cattle, that an amount of money is paid equivalent to the number of cattle that a man has to pay; for instance, £4 would be the equivalent of one head of cattle. In that way, if he has to pay £x the equivalent of 10 head of cattle, he would have to pay £40 or £50, and so on.

You say they brew beer because the wages are not enough? — (Mrs. Idaka): Yes.

If the wages are not enough, where do they get their customers from? — Through Natives employed in domestic
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service in and about Johannesburg — in Johannesburg and in the neighbourhood of Johannesburg.

Have the domestic servants money to spend? — Yes, sir; the money is constantly passing between persons; these people when they have money, if they feel like it, will go and look for a drink which is a little bit stronger than water or something else that is not intoxicating.

Do the domestic servants get enough money to spend on liquor? — Small as it is, sir, amongst those domestic servants, that little goes that way; it is wasted that way, if you wish to put it so, and that is how these women are able to engage in the traffic.

Apart from domestic servants, are there other Natives who buy liquor? — Yes, sir; Natives who work on the mines, when they get away from the mines, are able to buy.

Any other classes? — Sometimes visitors, sir; but that includes all Natives, now, I think, on the Reef.

MR. LUCAS: In your statement, you speak about the permit system at the location? — Yes.

Take Boksburg — the one you refer to; does a Native who wants to visit the location have to have a permit? — Yes.

Is there anyone from Boksburg here? — (Mr. Gwexe): We live under a permit system at Boksburg, sir; we have to have a document — we call it a permit — for the stand occupied. Children over 18 have to have a document showing that they are living there; and if persons stay there, they also — or a permit has to be obtained; I mean, people who perhaps are boarding or visiting.

Does that apply to the women, too? — Yes, everyone.

And do you have to carry that with you, or do you leave it at home? — We keep it at home, sir.

It is not like a pass that you have to carry and that
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anybody can ask for?— No, sir; it has to be kept at the house, because, if there should be an inspection by the Police, it is then available.

But supposing a visitor wants to go into the location?— He has to go to the office and get a permit to enable him to go to the location.

But how do they know how to distinguish between you and the visitor coming into the location; you do not have to carry a permit; you say the other person has to get a permit?— It is distinguished in this way; I have my document at home and if a question arises I can always produce it. In the case of the visitor, he could not produce such a document, but would have to produce his own permit.

CHAIRMAN: Is the location enclosed; have you to go through a gate to get in?— It is fenced in, sir.

How does the man at the gate know whether it is a visitor with a permit or a visit without a permit?— Because a duty is imposed upon me, sir, by the authorities to report immediately the arrival of any person who has not got a document and evidence authorising him to visit me. My permit refers only to my home and my people. (Mr. Ngqoyi): And every person has to report.

MR. LUCAS: You speak in the statement about the cruelty and vindictiveness of the permit system?— Yes.

How does it come to be cruel or vindictive?— (Mrs. Gwako): Well, we have to pay for it, sir. Each one of our children who is over 18 has to pay 2/6d for such a permit, which we think is cruel.

How often?— Monthly, sir. Those children, sir, are treated as if they do not belong to our homes. We feel as
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if they are being separated from us by these documents. Before any of our children can get work in town, that child has to get a document from the prospective employer and, then, if the authorities are satisfied, they will issue a permit — despite the fact that that child lives with us and belongs to us. The children find that burdensome, sir, and prefer often to go away from the location, altogether: we lose them. If I have a child at my home who has not got a permit, that child is liable to arrest.

CHAIRMAN: Does this man with the child over 16 have to pay a lodger’s permit to live in the location? — Although the child belongs to us, it has to have a permit.

MR. LUCAS: Is somebody is coming in to see you, just for the afternoon, does that person have to have a permit? — Yes; if he has a permit, he has to have it stamped at the office. And the person who has what we call a "special" has to go to the office also to have it stamped, before that person can visit us.

--------

PROFESSOR REINHOLD FRIEDRICH ALFRED HOERNLE,

Mrs. AGNES WINTFRED HOERNLE,
called and examined:

CHAIRMAN: In this propaganda that you have handed in, you take the line that scientifically, we have no evidence yet on the question of whether there is a difference in kind between the intellectual capacities of the White man and the Native, but such difference as there is is a difference of social heritage. Now, it seems to me scientifically, unless one can prove that the Native’s mind is of a different kind altogether, one must accept as a working hypothesis at least the possibility of the Native developing to the same
stages that the European has developed?— (Prof. Hoernle):

Quite.

You are not entitled, in the choice between the two, to say, "Well, we have not got any proof that the Native's mind does not work like ours and, therefore, it does not work like ours"; but you admit a difference, as the result of the difference in social heritage. The point that interests the Commission, not the scientific but the practical point, -- is to what extent this difference of social heritage should be accompanied by differential treatment adjusting itself to that type of difference of mind?— Well, sir, that is a question which, of course, in this particular paper, I was not considering exactly in that form; because, what I was much more concerned to argue in this paper, was against a view which is very widely prevalent, that the acknowledged difference in civilization -- I mean, that is the common basis from which we start, -- between the Natives and ourselves, entitles us to infer a corresponding difference in intellectual capacity, and that this acknowledged difference in intellectual capacity justifies the differential treatment of the Natives in social, political and economic policy in such a way that, in effect, they are, because of their inferior civilization, regarded as of inferior mentality and, of course, because of inferior mentality, as unfit to receive the vote or to be admitted into the higher forms of economic activity and so forth; and it was my main object to argue that, even though one has to admit at the present moment, in the conduct between White and Black civilization, there is a difference from our point of view and which, by tests which I discuss in that paper, may reasonably be described as a difference between superiority and inferiority, yet we cannot argue from that
that that necessarily implies a difference in mental capacity. Supposing we found from really trustworthy evidence that there was no difference of mental capacity on the average, - of course, it is a matter of averages, - that, therefore, the difference - the different nature, the cultures, must be looked for elsewhere, and if people were to argue, "But if they are of equal capacity with ourselves, how is it that they are still on the communal side, 2,000 years behind us? They are still at the civilisation at which our forefathers were," the answer to that is that must be explained in the main by the historical causes, - contact, number of population, stimulous, and any number of factors - which, as a matter of fact, have been very inadequately analysed.

So my object was merely to shew what I took to be a very widely prevalent view in this country, that you can argue from inferiority of civilisation to inferiority of mental capacity; and, therefore, too, you have the justification, so to speak, in the order of nature, for the differential treatment of the Natives so as to keep them in our social structure permanently at a lower level, -- economic, social and political.

Perhaps I may make the point clear by using an analogy that I would like to apply when the occasion arises in our classes; the only philosophical defence of slavery that has ever been offered and that has any claim to serious consideration in my opinion, is the defence that Aristotle offers in his politics when he says that some people are by nature slaves, meaning some people are, by natural endowment, inferior, by which he meant more particularly that they are lacking in the element of reason, which distinguishes superior peoples;
and from that, he argues that these inferior people can only do the best that is in them and contribute their best to the common stock of human civilization, for they are, what he calls them, living tools of those that have more reason.

The reason of the higher using them as tools enables them to make the most of themselves. The reasoning is, we are superior and they are inferior; therefore, we are justified in confining them to certain kinds of work and social and political status in our community. If that argument of inferiority corresponding to Aristotle's by nature slaves, -- if that can be made out, then I think our ordinary policy has something like a case to stand on. If it cannot be made out, then clearly we are wrong in building our policy on what is a crumbling stone.

My argument was, we too commonly assume on public platforms, in newspapers and so on, that it is perfectly obvious from the difference of civilization, the Native must be mentally inferior. If he were not, why has not he got on, and so on? That is what I am trying to hammer.

I am not prepared to make offhand positive suggestions as to how this difference of civilization should be treated in details in the difficult transition stage which would be based on the assumption that I personally assume that the Native is inherently capable of assimilating our civilization to an extent at least on the average as the average person has assimilated our civilization.

In that respect, of course, we have to remember that, if you take the White population we are after all at enormously different points even within the complex of our own civilization.
I take it what is called in this country the poor White compared with the most educated and cultured members of the community at the top, in actual difference of civilisation they stand very far apart, but I cannot refuse without further evidence to argue that that is evidence of inherent environment, intellectual inferiority, in the poor White; it may be so in some cases, - it may be so in the case of the Natives; I do not know. But it seems to me we have good reasons, from opportunity, social heritage and so on, to explain why some people exist at the moment at the level of the poor White, and why other people perhaps no better inherently endowed, are put at the very top of our social structure.

CHAIRMAN: It seems to me the 2,000 year argument does not bear out the contention of the people using it, when there is an inherent difference. It seems to me that it assumes similarity; but as you put it, a difference in social heritage; if they are 2,000 years behind, they are on the same road, otherwise you cannot compare them? -- They are on the same road; but still, the argument is, why did not they travel further along that road? Because they have not got it in them to travel further along that road, and they have reached their limit. That is the argument I want to go against.

The argument with regard to limit has been advanced by certain writers who argue that the brain cells stop development in the Native at about 16?-- That is a repeated argument.

That you will find in scientific books?-- Yes, quite.

It seems to me, the majority of people simply argue that right away back on that road on which we have travelled
there are some more people travelling, but because they are travelling back, you cannot get them along?—Yes, with that I quite agree.

But the ultimate scientific question is not really the one which is of such importance to this Commission. Admitting a certain difference in social heritage, you come up against a number of fairly intricate questions arising from that knowledge. Witnesses have taken diametrically opposite views. One set represented by Professor Lestrade have said, "We have to start from the point that the Native knows, in, for example, the administration of justice—administration generally, and in the conduct of the White men towards the Native, and certainly build up from that, and certainly allow the Native to take over as much as he can assimilate from our civilisation; but we must definitely take up our stand that we are going to build on the best that the Native has now.

There is an opposite view. I cannot tie you down to any particular person; there are a very large number of persons. The best way is to regard everything that obtains to the Native as being out of date and that, therefore, the sooner you accustom him to do the things that the European does, the better. You will admit there is a certain amount of hardship in that, but that hardship is inevitable in forcing them on civilisation at as quick a pace as possible. From that point of view, therefore, you must not take very much notice of their institutions; their tribal system—their chiefs, for example, who are very important factors in their institutions, must definitely be disregarded.

Now, there are two points of view diametrically
opposed, for both of which there is something to be said?--
(Mrs. Hoernle): They are both true in certain circumstances.
You see, you can use the one in areas like West Africa and
Nigeria, where you have large Native populations -- unmixed
with White people, like the Sudan and so on; but
where you have such very small reserves as we have and such
intermingling of the populations, it is very difficult.

CHAIRMAN: After all, they must necessarily keep up
to some extent?-- As they are doing in Nigeria, building
up on their own. They have to come into the towns here,
where no notice whatever is taken of their civilisation.

Well, Prof. Lestrange admits quite frankly, when the
Native is in the process of becoming permanently a town
dweller, there is nothing to do but to let him go along that
path as fast as he can go?-- The Natives on the individual
farms have very little real contact with the culture; they
are very much separated. Those on the individual farms,
apart from those on lands and Native reserves, they have very
little opportunity really of practising either culture.

It seems to me there is quite a good deal of quiet
contact?-- There is in regions like Sekukuniland, where the
farms adjoin the reserves;

I am thinking of the area where I know the Natives
best - the Maize Belt of the Free State?-- Yes.

There is another point which has really been a stupen-
dous thing, according to the evidence that has come before this
Commission -- the keenness of the Native all over the country
in maintaining some vestige of his chief, and the almost
poignant appeal in the case of the Ciskeian Natives to have
some sort of chieftainship back?— Among the Fingoes there
is that; they are getting together their own clans and grad-
ually building up.

As a matter of fact, they have to build up from
fragments?— They are beginning to live together again. I
consider that that is the real thing that has kept the Bantu
from disintegration—his social organization; that is, be-
cause he was very much stronger than the Hottentot and Bushman
he has been able to resist this disintegration.

It was really on that that I came to talk this
morning. I really came to talk about lobolo and cattle. It
seems to me that lobolo can really only be understood in con-
nection with the social structure of the Bantu. Lobolo is
part of the specific type of social organization, found not
only in Africa, but very widely in different parts of the
world. It is a social structure which differs in many
respects from ours.

In Bantu society, economically there is very little
differentiation between the families; each family is what
we call an economic unit. Therefore, the family is bound
to be atomic in their relations; they supply each one their
own needs.

Their families being a rather bigger group than we
consider—?— Those are economic, independent units, to a
very large extent; and, therefore, there is not very much
in the economic structure to knit those unions together into
a social whole. In these circumstances, we find this
society, if it is knit together, — the Bushmen are not knit
together; but, if it is, it is knit together on the basis
of kinship, and we have what is called a classificatory system
of kinship amongst these people.
It is built up on a very interesting system, in that "My relation to a whole group of people depends on my relation to one individual of that group". So, too, for example, "If one member of a group is my father, then all that man's brothers are also my brothers". And, correspondingly, "All his children are my sisters and brothers". "If one woman of that group is my mother, then the women of that group are my sisters, and so on".

You have there a wonderful means of knitting together a large number of people on the basis of kinship, which is one of the fundamental bases on which human relations are built up. But, as a consequence of that, you get what we call a unilateral clan: a clan as built up among our people on the patrilineal basis, which includes all those members who can trace descent to one common male ancestor. Within that clan, you have a number of different lineages and families tracing their origin to some nearer ancestor, with whom they can definitely prove genealogically their descent. And in our Bantu system, it is that lineage system that is the real working system of the people, and it is within that lineage that the classificatory system is really functioning - at work.

Now, when you have such a society built up on a kinship basis, every member of that lineage is regarded as a fundamental member of a family system; their relation to one another is brother and sister, or child and parent. Therefore, marriage is absolutely impossible within that lineage. You must seek for a mate outside that fundamental, strong human group that has been built up. That is one important thing that one has to consider in connection with the Bantu.

CHAIRMAN: In the terms of our language, there would be consanguinity inside? -- In the lineage, yes.
And there, consanguinity is a much wider thing than we claim it? — Yes; there is an assumed consanguinity within a wider circle. That is breaking down. I would deduce, from the evidence I have been able to get, was the importance of the lineage; it is much more the lineage than the clan which is the important unit.

Consanguinity assumes inside the lineage? — Yes, undoubtedly. You can trace genealogically your descent from the ancestor within the lineage. In the clan you never can; it is an assumed descent, but it is impossible to prove it genealogically. That is one thing of which we have to take account.

The other thing is, in Bantu belief the most intimate tie between two human beings is between the Mother and the child; as the calf belongs to the cow, they say, so the child belongs to the woman.

Now, since you have this strong lineage system, it is impossible for a woman to have her child in her lineage legitimately; it is regarded as incest. Therefore, she must look for her mate. What we call the principle of legitimacy, — the foundation of the family, — must be between these two very strong kinship groups. You have a number of these groups standing side by side with very strong points holding the members together, all the members being regarded as carrying on another unit of the clan, unit of the lineage, in which everybody has an interest, and in whose conduct everybody has a say. You have these clans standing over one against the other. If they are to be brought together into marriage, it can only be done by a very interesting systematic process that I have described in that paper, the gradual rapprochement of all these groups in marriage, where we have this kinship system. It is universal in
Australia. It is very widespread in Southern India, and in North America among the 'red Indians'; and also in Asia. Where you have that kinship system of society, there are three chief forms of bringing those groups together in marriage: the one is by the interchange of sisters; and men seeking a wife in one group will give their sisters in exchange to the other group. There is a balance between the two.

That system is universal in Australia. There is no other system of marriage between the Native tribes of Australia. It is used amongst some of the tribes in the Congo, but unknown amongst our Southern Bantu.

There is something of that kind among the Hottentots.

The second method that can be employed is the system of working for one's wife; that system is widespread in Southern Rhodesia. I have recently discovered it is quite frequent in the Eastern Transvaal, for example; but it is looked upon as a distinctly inferior type of marriage, and the men especially who work for their wives in that way are rather despised; but it does exist in the Transvaal.

By far the most normal method of marrying in these circumstances and by far the most important one amongst our people is what we call the lobolo system, which is only part of a gradual systematisation -- a gradual rapprochement of these two groups in marriage. There is something in it of visible tangible value, very often of ritual and even of sacred value.

Now, cattle are a very useful means of transacting lobolo, but they are by no means the only possible one. In the past, there have been very largely hoes; those are hoes difficult to make; or extremely valuable round copper rings,
of which I have examples at the University. All these different things have been transferred with lobolo in the past; but cattle are an essential and very useful means of transacting lobolo, but they are not to be inherently linked up with the lobolo system. Lobolo is a typical part of the social structure. In North America, there were no cattle before the White people came, yet a similar system of the lobolo is practised there, and also in the Congo and other regions where there are no cattle.

CHAIRMAN: Cattle have come to be an integral part. Of course, there are other things?—Yes. Even if the Natives were forbidden to use their cattle for lobolo, that cattle complex, as Professor Lestrange calls it, still exists and has to be dealt with.

The cattle complex is very much stronger than the ritual system?—Yes. I would like to explain that cattle are ritual value to these Natives; they are in trust to the present generation from the past generation; they are a medium between those who are underground and those who are above the ground, as the Natives put it, and they were only used in such ritual transactions. They are not really economic value; there is an economic value; their wealth; but they were not used as a means of purchasing other things. They were heirlooms; emblems of the status of the family.

When you have this clan system, the whole bonds of the living depend really on ancestors; so the bonds of the living really depend on those who are dead.

When an animal is sacrificed, for example, they say, "Here, father, are your cattle; you have asked for cattle; here they are." That is why, when these cattle are used in marriage, the ancestors must be appealed to to accept
a transfer of the cattle to another kraal, because they are really the cattle of the ancestors. Therefore, always, in the original marriage ceremony, an animal was sacrificed as part of the marriage ceremony, and by the animal groaning or in some other way, the ancestors gave their assent to the marriage - accept the woman into the kraal and allow the cattle to go into the other kraal.

Of course, when you have contact of our economic conception of cattle, - the actual buying of cattle, - you have a total disruption. Money, I consider an extremely bad ritual means of transacting a lobolo marriage.

There they keep the fiction of the cattle?--Yes. Of course, if they were like the Indians and hoarded their sovereigns as the Indians do - as we know, gold simply disappears into India; once there it is lost; they hold on; gold has an intrinsic value of its own; but gold never had a value with our Natives.

And the gold will not groan?--No. So that gold is an extremely bad substitute for the cattle; and, of course, as the social structure is breaking down, so that lobolo system is going to change; but that social structure is the strongest thing the Bantus have had, and it would be extremely disastrous to break it down faster than the Natives themselves are breaking it down.

Take for a moment the cattle complex - that is, apart from the lobolo; quite apart from the lobolo, we have to consider that cattle complex - cattle, not as an economic asset at all, but simply as symbols of the status of the individuals who own them. That, I think, we have done nothing to change, really; that we are very largely responsible for the fact that the Natives think of no other use
for their cattle than this ritual means of maintaining relations between human groups. For example, if a member of another clan were killed, it was transferred to the Chief because he was the representative of the tribe. They were used in homicidal cases; in marriage; if one tribe got permission to reside in the lands of another tribe; they were used between the living and the dead, and so on.

CHAIRMAN: And the European, seeing these uses -- studying them ethnologically, applied his own economic ideas? -- Exactly.

They did not understand the position? -- No, and they have not tried to make the Native understand theirs.

There is another point: It has been very frequently said that it is the lobolo transaction which has led to the overstocking of the Native reserves. I think you have received a good deal of evidence, and that I think needs very careful scrutiny. One of the fundamental reasons for the overstocking in the reserves, is our preservation of the cattle from East Coast fever and other things.

I have recently been in Sekukuniland. Where, 20 years ago there were 24,000 cattle, there are now 100,000. The Natives know that it is very largely due to regular dipping and the preventing of the young calves succumbing to these different diseases. The Native has nothing to do but to maintain that increase. He has no means of getting rid of it. The lobolo went on just as well with the 24,000 cattle as it went on with the 100,000 cattle. They are ignorant of the use of these cattle; their ignorance of the use of this cattle is responsible for the overstocking.

MR. LUCAS: Do you think it is the Europeans fault then for not educating the Natives on the uses? -- Yes, on
Because, in the Native outlook, he has cattle; there is nothing that would make it impossible to convert him to an economic use of cattle?—It is extremely difficult; it is a long task; it is not an easy task at all, because, for one thing, the Natives know that, under present conditions, highly bred stock will not live; they cannot live under these conditions. They say, "These cattle as they are, can live; highly bred cattle have died off".

I know in certain reserves it is only within the last two years that they have had a veterinary man who is beginning to try and teach the Natives to build up a better stock of cattle. They have had no scientific means of castration; no means of separating bulls from the cows: they have to begin right from the beginning. I think we are fundamentally to blame for having left things so long; for not understanding what the Native's view of cattle was. We took it for granted it was not the same as ours; we took it for granted he was "selling" his women, and we have not tried to teach them our point of view. I think we are very largely to blame for the situation.

CHAIRMAN: How is it that, in this system of descent along a particular line which is so important, a Native changes his name so very easily when he comes among the Europeans?—Well, that is very easily explained. With each change in the status of an individual, the name is changed. Even among ourselves, if a name that is used in the intimate family circle by us is used by a Basuto, we immediately say, "What confounded cheek". Well, in a much more intimate way, the Native feels that the name expresses his personality. Therefore, if that personality changes, he must change his name; and so, in Native society,
individuals are constantly changing their name.

When the boy goes into the initiation school, he becomes a different individual and receives an initiation name. When a Native has a child, he is entirely a different being from one who has none. He is, therefore, called "Father of so-and-so"; and, "Mother of so-and-so"; an honourable name, because he has become a parent, and so on.

When a man becomes a chief he very often receives another name. Upon a man coming here into our society, he leaves his social personality behind. Here he can be called "Jim", "Lillywhite", "Tuppence" and so on; that is good enough for the European society, but he keeps his own Native name. I know there is a very dark Native at the University; he is called "Lillywhite".

That is sometimes the facetiousness of the European?--

Yes; but it does not affect the Native at home.

One Native name that comes to my mind is Big Ben?--

Some are proud of the name they get in European society; and others just lop them off when they get into their own society. Many of the Hottentots, of course, have taken Dutch surnames.

They were disintegrated entirely; there was not the same reason for sticking to the thing as we have here?--Yes.

In Hottentot society, the clan was the strongest organization that they ever maintained. So that, even within a tribe, clans had vendettas against them. In Bantu society, that was absolutely impossible; every tribesman belonged to the chief, as the representative of the tribe, and vendettas between tribes were absolutely impossible.

There is an important point I would like to bring forward here, that I think is a very retrograde step that we have made, namely, in not allowing Native courts to deal
with criminal cases at all. In Native society, the death of every tribesman had to be reported to the chief; if it was not reported within a certain time, the chief had to be compensated, because every tribesman was the property, in a way, of the chief. Nowadays, the chiefs have nothing to do with criminal cases. Deaths are not reported to them — or they may be; he may know about it, but he has no responsibility for it; it is quite outside his jurisdiction. Native commissioners courts do not keep any record of marriages, births, or deaths, in Native communities; and, therefore, there is nobody that knows of the deaths that are going on in these Native societies; they are not reported to the police, and nobody knows about them officially.

Ritual murders can take place; people can be done away with and, if the Natives keep quiet, it is not their responsibility to report to the Native chief, and nobody knows a thing about it.

But the Native chief was responsible in primitive society and his tribesmen were responsible to him: and I think we too often forget that in Native society the Natives were fully responsible for the whole of human life and so on; and they did it to a certain extent successfully.

We talk of them as children; as not being responsible for this, that and the other, and I think, in many respects, we have a retrograde position.

CHAIRMAN: I take it the births had also to be notified to the chief?— No, not births as such; until the child got its name from the family, it was not a member of society; just in the same way, in Roman society, until the father had lifted the child in his arms, it could be done away with. The birth must be notified; the lineage and the clan in the first place must be notified.
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The child had to be reported and it was named; at what stage was that? -- As soon as the child is brought out of the hut; usually at the end of three weeks. Of course, if they are twins, they are killed at once, and in other cases they are killed, too.

MAJOR ANDERSON: It would be fairly easy to adopt a system of registration? -- It is part of their system, which we have not made use of.

CHAIRMAN: It seems to me everybody who has studied the Native system as a social system has a great deal of respect for it as an efficient way of dealing with the sort of problem which confronted Native society? -- There are two very great deficiencies in it. Their whole attitude to nature is a tragic one, which results in witchcraft; and their type of high culture is inefficient. Also, their ancestral cult, I think, is an extreme one, with which I have a great deal of sympathy; and I think it is a tragedy that their ancestors should be talked of as "Devils" and "Demons" as they are by many missionary societies. I cannot see any reason why, why their fine ancestral cult should not be maintained, with this difference: the ancestors are thought to be responsible for disease; but that is due to ignorance of the nature of disease. There we could have done a lot to take that whole domain out of the ancestral cult.

It has been suggested to us, too, that this broader view of consanguinity amongst the Natives is a very useful thing to preserve on account of its limiting influence on superstition? -- Yes; any sexual relations within the limits of the lineage is incest, from their point of view. That is what we call exogamy. It is a very broad concept. In addition, they have all our views on incest as well. So
there is a very wide range of prohibited relatives.

It is said there is an enormous amount of immorality among Natives in the towns; and they jump to the conclusion it is the same immorality that a European population knows?—Immorality in the Native reserves, do you mean?

No; in the towns. It is obviously a thing of a different nature?—It rather upsets me to talk of them as customary unions, because we generally talk of Native marriages; Native marriage by lobolo is generally referred to as customary unions, as distinct from civil court or Christian marriages.

Customary unions suggests something rather inferior, to my mind, in a way, to a legal marriage, and lobolo is a legal marriage?—Yes, quite; but those irregular unions are very widespread among the peasantry of Europe and in the towns at home among the poor.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Is there a wide degree of variation in the rules of consanguinity among the different tribes?—Yes; the Zulu, the Senuto, and the Northern Transvaal is much different.

MR. LUCAS: Is marriage as suggested by Prof. Lastreda a compulsory cross-cousin marriage?—In certain of the Northern Transvaal tribes, the chief wife, as a rule, must be the cross-cousin; the others need not be. But we have got what we call the close system, based on cross-cousin marriage, which is universal in Australia and Southern India. That we have not got.

Does not that mean a very close inbreeding?—Not necessarily; it does not really, because otherwise the wives and the mother's brother may come from various clans, and the father, too.
As it was put the other day, I thought it meant first cousin. It is from that house that the next chief is supposed to come?-- But then the spouses are drawn from different tribes. That is the system in Setakuniland and very largely among the Bawenda; but it does not lead to such close inbreeding.

Now, the point that worries me about some of the proposals that have been made about chiefs, is that we have gone so long reducing the status of the chiefs that, in a number of areas we have got a very inferior type of person now as a chief, and the council system has, for practical purposes, disappeared or become ineffective?-- Yes.

Under the old system, if a chief were unnecessarily objectionable, he could be removed in a forcible way?-- Yes.

And put out of the way altogether?-- Yes.

Our system cannot recognise that; we cannot recognise the stabbing of a chief if Natives are not satisfied with him?-- No; but he could be looked over; he need not be put in at all.

No; but once he was in he had to stay there until he died, whether he died naturally or not?-- Yes.

There is a very sharp trouble in Natal at the moment, owing to the attempt to pass over one man in favour of another?-- That means you were trying to pass him over.

MR. LUCAS: It does worry me how to develop the chief system again and make use of the chiefs in the way suggested in the conditions which we ourselves have now brought about. Even if we went back on that system and said, "We are going to try to make full use of the chief, and the chief of the system"?-- You can only do it by a much more intimate knowledge and much closer contact with the elders who constitute the council, so as to have a knowledge of the opinion of the
tribe. It is totally impossible for the commissioners to know Native opinion in the Territories.

Taking things as they are now in South Africa, with our break-up of the tribes, our scattered reserves with their small areas, the ineffectiveness or almost disappearance of the council system in many areas, do you think it would today be sound for us to reverse our policy and say, "We are going to let the Natives restore their tribal system as much as they can in their respective areas"? Where they have got it, you mean?

Yes? They are restoring it; among the Pindoos they are building it up; they do maintain it in spite of us.

Yes, that is an instance. I have only a very superficial picture of it, it is true; but the impression I got in Natal was that there were a lot of them very, very inferior?--Yes. Let me put it this way. The whole basis of Native society is the system of seniority; the descent from a common ancestor; and the chief is the senior lineage from the direct ancestor. Therefore, until you have broken down Native society, you are not going to break down that inherent respect for the chief, even when you put in another man. So there is a wonderful basis there for some kind of organization. When a man has no responsibility, no real authority, it is a dreadful undermining -- it seems to me personally an undermining, disintegrating factor in a man's whole life, and I can quite understand a man taking to drink and being a thoroughly bad lot -- as many of them are. We have not trained them in the right way right from the beginning.

Do you think it is worth while, as a policy, to do anything that is in our power to make the chieftain system possible today again as it was; do you think it is worth
our while to do that?-- Yes: in the reserves, where you have a nucleus of population, I certainly think it is, together with a strong educated council.

But can we get that today?-- You can only begin; you certainly cannot get it today.

But by the time we could give the training, would there be enough left in the system?-- In certain areas, my impression is it is going to last a long time; in areas like Sekukuniland and Zululand, where you have got a nucleus of Native population, this whole system is going to last a long time.

You think it is coming back among the Fingoes sufficiently strongly to make it worth while?-- I have not been down to the Fingoes. Undoubtedly those little snippets of families have gradually increased their nuclei of lineages and clans, and they are gradually getting together again; which shows nothing we have given them has worked as well as their own tribal system.

If more land were given to them, that would strengthen that movement to keep as much of the tribe intact as possible?-- Yes; to give them some piece of land of their own to which they can go back. There is this large population in the towns, which is absolutely losing its roots with the whole tribal system. We must make room for these educated Natives; they are an integral part of our system; we must recognise that. I think it is a great lack in the present Native policy that no recognition is made of these educated Natives at all. We have to have an elastic system which is going to provide for each of these sections. You cannot keep two cultures in contact and expect to have a Chinese wall behind them; you have always fusion of culture.
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There is no instance of the two contacts living side by side without an intermingling of the two cultures. If the Natives want to assimilate our culture, nothing can stop them.

In view of the tribal system that has its roots in ancestral worship, one can hardly expect that will disappear very quickly. I am told, among the Bechuanaland people -- which Dr. Shapiro is studying at the present time -- they claim to be Christians and ancestor worship has largely disappeared; but I do not think we shall really know the real state there, until he has finished his investigation. It is especially there that the London Missionary Society has treated the ancestors as devils and demons and I think it is a very tragic condition. I know that among the Hottentots I studied, I never found a Hottentot who did not claim to be a Christian, but I found all their ritual.

CHAIRMAN: In connection with overstocking, I wonder whether you can give us any view as to how, starting out from the Native's point of view with regard to cattle, one can deal with this question? Yes, I think so; I think starts are being made now in some of the reserves. The first thing is to have a veterinary officer who teaches them scientific stock breeding, first of all. The necessity for scientific castration, which they have not done; that is the very first beginning. Then the separation of the bulls from the cows, which they have never done.

That involves fencing straight away; and the improvement of the herds again involves fencing, because, as a Native very well knows, his stock -- scrub stock, will survive where the good animals will not? That is the objection to the whole thing.

We have had evidence from technical men on this
subject. What I really had in mind was whether we can find some point of departure in the Native view of cattle?--- I would not say from the point of view of departure of the Native view you give, so much as the gradual introduction of our point of view. That is being done in Bechuanaeland; for example, at the present time, from certain dairies in the Native reserves, cream is being sent to creameries. It is a very small beginning, of course, but I do not think from their point of view there is much; it is from our point of view that there must be a gradual introduction from the economic aspect in regard to cattle.

MR. LUCAS: Of course, Mr. Thornton says gradualness is no use; according to him, in 20 years' time most of the reserves will be useless; the Natives will be landless?--- They are encroaching on the arable lands for cattle. It is dreadful the condition one sees in some of the reserves. Of course, there is another point of view; dipping is not compulsory among any of the White farmers.

Oh, yes?--- No; In the Eastern Transvaal it is only when there is an outbreak of East Coast fever is it made compulsory. It was told that two weeks ago definitely down in the Lydenburg district.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Down in Natal it is compulsory?--- In the Lydenburg district, in the Eastern Transvaal, for a certain time after an outbreak; then it stops. That is why the young Natives fight against this dipping system; whereas the old Natives, knowing how the cattle have increased as a result of it, appreciate it. But they do feel it is an injustice that, for example, on the Steelport River on the one side, you have White farms where there is no necessity to dip every fortnight, and just inland, in Sekukuniland,
there is dipping every fortnight.

The reason for that might be the fencing?— There is no fencing. In the whole Lydenburg area, dipping is only compulsory on White farmers when there has been an outbreak of East Coast fever. That is information I got two weeks ago.

MR. LUCAS: It is the same in the Transkei; the Natives have had to dip constantly since East Coast fever came in?——

MAJOR ANDERSON: But there you have fencing. If a European farmer is fenced, they know it can be controlled and the risk of spreading the disease is very remote?— Of course, if you wanted really to decrease your cattle you would stop dipping; but of course it is too big a risk.

CHAIRMAN: The Director of Veterinary Services puts a somewhat different interpretation on that question of dipping. We will have another chat with him before we have finished?——

MR. LUCAS: I find, in discussing with different people questions that have arisen in our investigation, that although most of them admit that a change ought to take place on ethical grounds in our treatment of Natives, they almost all fall back on fear of miscegenation. I was wondering if you could express any opinion as to how to meet that fear; because, however groundless it may be, it is there and it trots up, as I say, from almost everybody?—— Miscegenation takes place at the bottom levels. The more you build up the self-respect and the race consciousness of the people, the less does it take place. When it takes place at the high levels of the culture, those people can look after themselves; but the whole danger is the miscegenation that is going on at the low levels. The lowest elements of
of both cultures who can least take care of the mixed progeny. But the danger becomes less and less and more you build up the selfrespect of the two races. There is only one species of man on earth, homo sapiens. All the different races of man are fertile among each other; they are biological facts and no human being can go against it.

MR. LUCAS: Is there anything else you can add or suggest to counter this fear; whether it is really a fear or whether it is just advanced as a final argument for making no change, one cannot say. But I have been struck by the way in every area and in every class of society —?— You have met with that fear.

Yes?— I think what one can say is, the very methods of repression which are being used are methods of the very worst type. And the most that human beings can do to fight against miscegenation is the building of self respect in each of the sections of the population. You can have populations of Jews and Gentiles living side by side, where miscegenation is extremely slow. We know from an anthropological point of view, if you take measurements of Jews in the different countries of Europe, we know the average is the average of the general population of the country. So miscegenation is going on, but it is so slow that in any one generation the numbers of people who are intermarrying is so slow that you would deny it. You can have Roman Catholics and Protestants living side by side, with very slow intermixture between the two. "Birds of a feather flock together"; and when they have a basic self-respect, the miscegenation is at its lowest, if there is a difference of background.

Dr. Jesse Jones suggested that the problem of
misogyny in the United States had ceased to be serious since the abolition of slavery?—Well, that is just what I am saying; just the same thing. They have a race consciousness. Of course, Dr. Jesse Jones was upset when we referred to it; but we know from our residence in the United States that people are constantly "passing over"; as soon as they become "White", they pass over into the White population.

CHAIRMAN: In the same way as the Coloured people are doing in Cape Town?—Yes. It is at its slowest with a strong, self-respecting population with different outlooks, and it is at its greatest where you have a debased class.

MR. LUCAS: Now that we have you here, are there ways that you can suggest, in other respects than those you have dealt with, that we could apply to the Native outlook so as to improve either his social or economic conditions?—Yes, certainly. The Native is, in the first instance, a hoe-cultivator and a pastoralist. Therefore, his first, if you are taking what he has got and his own Native culture — his place in the first instance is on the land — as peasants on the land; and therefore the first thing, if you really want to develop him from the basis of his own population, you will make him a peasant proprietor on the land; but that involves the giving of farms; — the intensive development of them. It is a whole question of giving land and developing them on the education side, and it is a question whether we are prepared to do that or going to make them a landless proletarian.

There is the material there on which to build up from their own population. — It is entirely a question whether
we are going to recognize that they are part of the South African population. It seems to me the fundamental difficulty we are in here - sooner or later we are going to change the nature of our population, but we do not recognize the Native population as South Africans, as part of our inherent population that we have got to deal with. In an ordinary European country, you have to take your nationals as you find them and make the best out of them; but somehow, here, at the back of our minds, we are hoping, somehow or other, we will be able to change the nature of our population. Until we once and for all get that out of our minds and recognize we have the population here, as it is here, Black and White, -- until we take the South African and the development of South Africa as our basis, we are never really going to develop our civilization.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Would you rule out the possibilities of a big change in immigration under favourable conditions such as America has done? -- I think you can increase quite largely the element of the White population; you can change the averages but unless you are going to kill out the Natives, -- which is one alternative - they are an inherent part of our South African population.

But what I mean is, the problem might conceivably be tremendously altered by very large immigration? -- We must make the best of our population at the present time and make the best of South Africans; if you are going to judge the wealth of the country as a whole, it does seem to me that is the only real basis we have to go on.

MR. LUCAS: We usually speak about populations as the number of Europeans? -- To an outsider coming in and seeing the ragged -- I remember my own son who came from
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America, when he was six years of age, saying, "Why is it that all the Black people we see on the streets are in such ragged clothes?" He had not judged them, a child of six, as South Africans and as a miserable lot of people. And that is what outsiders coming here would constantly do. I think there is room for a far and away greater development of the country and of White immigration than we have at the present time.

MAJOR ANDERSON: I would like to go back to the question of tribal government and the development of chiefs' authority again and ask you if you would consider what would be the effect - and ask you were to consider the alternatives to that policy, what would be the effects of, say, adopting an assimilationist policy, as Professor Lestrade calls it?

MR. LUCAS: Europeanising them? — Yes, but in what way?

MAJOR ANDERSON: I am not arguing for it personally; I am inclined to the other view - to your view? — The assimilationist does exist among the Bakasteri (?) and you have a Hamitic population which is dominant over a high cultured people; but there has been an assimilation of culture there. These Hamitic invaders speak the Bantu language, not their own language at all, they are still a dominant class. The mixed population is intermediate, who are pure hoo-culture people and these aristocratic pastoral people. In Uganda, the pure herdmen are simply herdmen to the chief, as in the old days, and the peasants are still the Negro Bantu people. But there has been an assimilation of culture in other instances. The Hamitic language has gone through all the Bantu-speaking people.

In the country, I would say this, that, in spite
of all the stamping out that there has been, for example, among the Fingoos, -- in spite of the ignoring of chiefs that there has been, the Natives maintain that respect for seniority and respect for the chief as the representative of the ancestors on earth, and it depends entirely on the Natives, it seems to me, and on their willingness to change, and not on what the Europeans do. You can have a repressive policy, but you will simply get something like the Czecho-Slovaks or the Irish, if the Natives still maintain their desire to keep their own cultural system. So it depends entirely on the Natives as to what their development will be, in the long run.

CHAIRMAN: The tendency of the Native seems to me to be to wish to rush to the things the European has; he thinks the best thing that he can do is throw away all his own rags and take on European clothes? -- It is a very widespread thing. I have found it even among the Hottentots. They said, "What are you arguing about these old laws for? The things we want to talk to you about are the new laws and how we are going to adapt ourselves to them". When you have these two cultures in contact with one another, only the people themselves can decide how much of that culture they are going to absorb; nothing can stop them. As we know, from instances in Europe, the people maintain their outlook and nothing really stops the maintenance of that culture at all.

If the people maintain their love for what is their own. But now, if the people are inclined to make a rush for it, it rather becomes a question for the European -- I do not know whether Professor Hoernle will agree with me -- to go into the question of the feeling that we have in regard to a Native
population which has shed everything good as well as bad in their own background and have simply become - it may be prejudice, but what is described as secondhand Europeans? - You get exactly that same sort of thing in America; these immigrants from the East, where children are ashamed of their parents. I think it is a great lack of enrichment that the Americans have missed, because they have not taken over the rich cultural background of the immigrants and tried to make a 100% level of Americanism. I think it is tragic. There is a great deal of richness that the Natives are missing by missing the whole of the background of their whole Native tradition and I think we should do everything to help them to preserve it. But our attitude is largely this: we in the past have had no respect - we have not recognised the Native had a culture; we have helped the Natives to lop off the whole of that and to assimilate a secondhand culture.

Mr. Lucas: For the reasons you mention, the Natives distrust the Europeans, but, in the interests of the Native, he is trying to reintroduce a Native background for his development? -- Yes, he does, because he says, especially in education, "What is good enough for the European, is good enough for me". He says, "Give me the European standard; I will work up to it; I will know where I stand."

Is not that likely to be counteracted in the course of a fairly short time by the rising of a national spirit? -- Among the Natives?

Yes? -- How do you mean?

Well, the race consciousness among themselves. "We are going to have our own outlook"; as a Native put it on Thursday night at a meeting, "We want to be independent". He did not mean politically independent; "We want to develop, or grow,
ourselves"?—Yes; "Take what we want from civilisation and maintain what we want of our own".

You have got quite a number of instances of European nations that have that inferiority complex about themselves, who have in recent years developed an increased race consciousness spirit of their own, and they are developing their own language, their own ideas and their own literature; is not that likely to happen with the Native?—Yes, it is happening here. There is more race consciousness among the Natives; as they are able to speak with one another through a common language — whether Afrikaans or English — there is much more intermingling between them. I consider that the real problem of survival has been solved by the Bantu system; he is now getting to a period of the development of this race consciousness, and that will go on in spite of our repression.

CHAIRMAN: Do you think the Bantu has solved the problem?—I think they have solved the problem of the contact — the worst impact of our European civilisation, I think, is over for them.

Have they really felt the impact in the whole of the Transkei, in Zululand, in Sekukuniland, in Sibaza, in the way in which the impact of one civilisation changes entirely the environment of the other — the one culture with the other? — You have always got those reserves, — if you think of England & the invasion of the Saxons, in the Fen country, in Wales, in Ireland, you always have those reserves of the old population, to a great extent.

Are not economic conditions changing with environment throughout the Territories now? I would like to add here when, after having gone through a number of other Territories, I saw the Ciskei, where the impact had very definitely been felt, I
began to wonder whether, in 50 years' time, we shall still be able to say, "We may have been very nasty to the Natives; they have survived"? -- I think they are/under in certain parts. I was speaking of the population as a whole, but I think there are areas where you are going to have them reduced, simply to a dreadful proletariat as has happened with the Hottentots and others.

But that is a matter of changing to another form -- a very undesirable form, I admit; but when I talk of the probable survival, I am thinking in the terms of the Red Indians: he is a museum specimen, and the Australian Black fellow? -- I think our people are not museum specimens; I think they will overcome it.

Even in the reserves? -- In the reserves; there is drink, disease, war, the whole disintegrating effect of our civilization has been tremendous in the past, and I believe with their culture, their social structure has enabled them to resist that.

Well, war I will admit; drink, I will put a question mark against; as to disease, I will put a much bigger question mark there? -- Do not put that question mark; I mean, for example, smallpox and measles which they have never had before -- well, it decimated the Hottentots, and it was far and away more virulent in early years than now. Syphilis, of course, has remained amongst them, but we are beginning to counteract that now by clinics - shockingly inadequate - but the movement against these things is beginning.

Smallpox was one violent pestilence that finished the whole job almost before you could think of it; but even there it is a race between the agencies that are going to preserve and the agencies that are destroyed; but, in the
economic environment, unless the race between the preserving agencies and the overstocking goes to the preserving agencies, it seems to me that the Natives are bound to go down absolutely?— Go down absolutely in their reserves, you mean?

In the country?— Yes; well, they may die out. Of course, Dr. Leuzelter (?) maintains that only in Swaziland and one or two other places did he find Natives who were not absolutely under par from the physical point of view,— underfed and showed bad signs of deficiency and disease; and he considers that the conditions among them were very serious.

Zululand, too?— Yes. I know Swaziland was omitted, I cannot remember just which they were; otherwise right through South Africa, Bechuanaland and in the Protectorates, he considered all along they shewed signs of deficiency and disease. He was a medical man. It was the presence of scurvy and the general condition of the body when he was taking measurements; it was things of that sort he was taking. It was a dreadful statement.

MR. LUCAS: When was this?— About two years ago.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Did he deduce from that that the Native population must be decreasing?— No; but he said the conditions among them economically were very serious.

CHAIRMAN: That would only be useful if one could compare it; unfortunately, one cannot compare it with anything before?—

MAJOR ANDERSON: It might have been temporary?— It was very widespread. He was here two years ago and he was here for two years making his tests and measurements on the Natives. Of course, it is very difficult to say. We have no census and so on, but when you see the state of the country and so on, I do think the economic conditions— you have had
heaps of evidence on that - the economic conditions of large portions of the Native population are very serious.

MR. LUCAS: Of course, the mines used to have a very large number of survey cases among the workers when they first arrived; but that, of course, might be explained by their getting only those who were feeling the economic pressure very severely? -- Yes; you do not know how much it is a question of their own Native food. I must say I was extremely surprised to find that in Sekukuniland, at the present time - I suppose owing to overstocking and other things, - milk has practically ceased to be an article of diet in adult population; "amaas" is no longer a serious part of their diet.

But the cattle have increased fourfold? -- The cattle have increased enormously, but the amount of milk they give is extremely small. It really is a dreadful condition there, - the veld as I have seen it in the Transkei in the Summer, in the rainy season, in December, January and the beginning of February -- cropped to the roots.

CHAIRMAN: That is where it seems to me the point has still got to be proved whether the Native has solved the problem? -- Well, let me put it this way: his structure has resisted the impact of our civilisation - the first impact of our civilisation; but whether, if we are going to crush him, we can undermine that whole physique much more and we can slowly exterminate him ---

You naturally are very much under the influence of the first impact, owing to what happened to the Hottentots? -- Yes,

But, as you know, it happened in a year? -- That was simply measles and smallpox.
It finished them in a year. There was no time to do anything. The first impact was a terrific impact?-- Yes, dreadful.

Now the impact has changed its nature; in fact, "impact" is hardly the word?-- It is insidious encroachment; but you see you have not really wiped out your Hottentot population; he is a proletarian; he is simply merged in the Coloured population - the Coloured proletarian. The question is whether you are going to do that with the Natives, too.

In the sense in which I might speak of the American Indians and the Australian Blacks, the Hottentot is not wiped out?-- No. They are, of course, very proud of a small admixture of Red Indian blood; in Canada you have a few Red Indians. Whereas the infusion of Hottentot blood into the population of the Cape Colony is really a very large amount.

You have a population of 600,000 in the Union, leaving outside West Africa; but then, of course, you must make a very considerable reduction for the Indian. The Malay, of course, is reckoned as a Coloured man?-- In South West Africa, that Malay blood hardly counts.

In South West Africa the Hottentot never felt the impact quite so much as in the Cape?-- Just like what he had with the migratory Hottentot tribes and the primitive fighting between the Hereros, Hottentot wars - fighting went on for 100 years in German South West Africa.

The 'flu epidemic is reckoned to have taken more South Africans than did the Great War?-- That is perfectly true. I think the Bantu has survived the impact of European civilisation; but whether we are going insidiously to kill him out is a different question. There is considerable danger of that at the present time. I think it is a great tragedy.
we have not got the census figures, because I think it will show the increase in the population has altered down considerably; it is pure impression, but we have no figures.

MR. LUCAS: I do not know that our census would necessarily have helped us there, because there is a great deal of suggestion anyway that all our previous censuses omitted large numbers?—I think it is a very great pity if you cannot get some system of registering births, marriages and deaths in the Native areas. (Prof. Hoernle): It is a purely speculative point to this last discussion; I think if one meditates on these things at all, perhaps one ought not necessarily to regard the population reaching a stationary, or, within limits, a slightly retrogressive point in numbers, as necessarily a disaster. Personally, I think that our modern machine—civilisation—and the consequent elimination of the worker, must necessarily tend towards stationary, if not actual shrinking populations. But the old idea of being fertile and malleable is simply becoming impracticable under our modern conditions. But I think the Native accepts he is being thrown into the economic system in which the machine, even out here, is increasingly going to play a part—and I think it will play a part in agriculture—and all that he will have to do will be to adapt himself to it the same as the European population is adapting itself. Our increase is going down in all civilised countries. That tendency, it seems to me, is going to affect Native life. We should not, therefore, argue because a population approaches a point of stationariness it is merely a matter of going backward.

CHAIRMAN: I agree with you that human beings are far too cheap; but I think there is rather a further point, as to whether the Native population is going along the same road
as the American Indian, or the Australian population. I think you will admit there is quite a serious difference?—

Yes, I quite agree, when one has more, what one can fairly call, I suppose, race suicide. Whereas I do not think the plea is necessarily race suicide.

It may mean having graded Europeans and stud Europeans, instead of scrub Europeans?—

(Mrs. Hoernle): You have not got the condition among the Bantu in Melanesia and Polynesia. They have had all the stimulus of their civilisation taken away from them. If they are killed, it will be by insidious killing out. They themselves have not lost that will to live; but the Melanesian population has no contact with our civilisation. It is a great problem of the Mandate at the present day to stop, just as the Herero, after the German war, stopped increasing deliberately themselves. They had lost the will to live, but our Bantu have not.

MR. MESHACH NOLISA PADI: Official Delegate, Randfontein Location Advisory Board,

called and examined:

CHAIRMAN: You have sent in a statement?—Yes; it is as follows:— The Randfontein Location is the only location which has no trading facilities on the Reef, in spite of the Urban Areas Act (1930) giving the Minister of Native Affairs the power to compel the local authorities to grant trading rights.

This is due to the Jewish traders who influence the Council to refuse such rights. The Natives have been fighting for these rights for the last 16 or 17 years, but in vain. Natives should be allowed to trade in their own locations.
Mr. Padi

The average family in the location consists of five persons, and the average wage £3. - - per month, the rentals charged in the location are as follows: - 10/- per month for a private house; this includes sanitary fees and water. 10/- per month for a single room; 15/- to £1.1.- for a double room, and £1.12.6 for a 3-roomed house. The rentals also include water and sanitary fees.

CHAIRMAN: Does the Randfontein Municipality definitely take up the attitude that they are not going to give trading rights to Natives? -- Yes. We have been approaching the Town Council on the question of trading rights several times. In the first instance, they said they could not agree to it and we interviewed the full Council, who were kind enough to let us meet them, and they said they would go and inspect the location. One man made an application; the answer was that there were ample facilities for the Native people with the Jewish shops round about.

When was this; when did you meet the Council? -- In December.

Last year? -- Yes.

Are the Jews shops round the location? -- Yes.

Are the shops in the location? -- No, sir; there are four Jewish shops round the location.

Now, do you think these four Jewish traders are enough to influence the Council to refuse licenses to you? -- It is clear they have been influenced in the Council not to grant us trading rights.

You say "The rentals charged in the location are as follows - 10/- per month for a private house..."; is that the Council's house? -- That is a house owned by a Native.

10/- a month for a private house includes sanitary fees and water? -- Yes.
Then you put up your own house? -- The private house I put up myself on Municipal ground.

But then you have to pay 10/-? -- I pay 10/- for the house.

A boy that comes to a Municipal single room pays 10/-? -- Yes.

And then he gets sanitary and water? -- Yes.

Mr. Lucas: And one room? -- Yes.

Or does he share a room? -- It is a room for himself.

Chairman: For a double room, you mean two rooms? -- Yes.

So that the boy who hires a single room pays just as much as you pay for the bare ground? -- Yes.

And the same services? -- Yes.

Mr. Lucas: Except that you get the services for a family at a private house, while he gets the services only for one man? -- Yes.

What sort of rooms are the Council's rooms, brick? -- They are of brick. The Randfontein housing scheme is very excellent.

Chairman: They are good houses? -- Yes.

Have they ceilings? -- No ceilings; some rooms have ceilings and some have not.

What sort of floor? -- A mud floor. What I want to point out, sir, is that the wages are very little in comparison with some of these rents. For instance, a family of five persons generally takes a house of three rooms and they have to pay £1.12.6 out of the £3; that leaves them very little money to pay for other necessities.

Another question that I would like to mention is with regard to the advisory board. The advisory board would like the functions of the board to be defined by the Commission.
The Board sometimes passes resolutions, and sends them to the Council, and we get no reply.

Moreover, in most locations, — I do not mean in all locations, but it is the general feeling of all the boys, that the Board is not being properly consulted on matters affecting the Natives, as was intended when the Board was constituted. The Board seems to be a board in name only and not in practice. The feeling is that we are rather at sea; we do not know what our functions are as members of the board.

Another question that Native members of the Board would like to bring forward is that they are not against a superintendent of a location becoming a member of the board, but they would like the superintendent to be a member of the board, to listen to Native grievances and understand his Native people; but he should not be a chairman, because, in most cases when a question is brought up which he is opposed to, he generally rules it out and this does not get to the Council. Sometimes he will not even allow the board to discuss it.

Whom would you suggest they should get to be chairman? — I would suggest that one of the Natives who is a member of the board should be the chairman of the board; in case the superintendent is absent, the assistant chairman would preside.

Does that work well? — Yes.

other ways

Two/ακτίνα have been suggested to us: one is that a member of the Town Council should be the chairman, so that he can definitely go to the Town Council and bring matters forward there; and the other is that you should get a European living in the town, who is neither a member of the Town Council nor has anything to do with the location, but who is interested in seeing that the Natives are properly
treated, to be chairman. How would you feel with regard to these proposals?— We feel that we should have what we would call a Native Affairs Committee, and that this Committee should consist of two or three members of the Council—three members of the Council should become members of the Committee as well as the superintendent, to listen to Native grievances.

Yes; that is another point. I want your answer on this question of the selection of the chairman,—either a member of the Town Council or somebody who is interested in Native affairs?— It should be somebody, not a superintendent; a Native, but not a superintendent.

Yes; we have got that. But would you view with favour the appointment of a member of the Town Council as chairman?— Yes.

Or, alternately, a White man who is interested in the Natives, who is not a member of the Town Council, and who is not interested in the location in any way?— He should be a man who is interested in both.

A man who is interested in the Natives?— Yes; one who has the sympathy of the Natives.

You think either of those would be better, in any case, than having a superintendent?— If it is a member of the Council, it comes to the same things as the superintendent, I think, because sometimes Natives may have a grievance against the Council and this man, if he is a member of the Council, may rule it out.

(No further evidence being forthcoming, the Chairman declared this to be the conclusion of the hearing of evidence.)

(12.15 p.m.)