

of things, such as supplying stolen property in order to support their families.

And for the rest they make beer. Now who buys the beer?- The workers in town.

You think that they have enough money to be able to waste some of it on beer?- Not because they have enough but because they like it and it is more like a luxury to them.

But can they afford it?- Well, they manage to afford it somehow.

They can pay for it?- Yes, they can pay for it.

How is it they can pay for it?- Well, they can pay for it because they think it is better than anything else.

They must have the money to pay for it and they must have food?- Most of these people are fed by their masters, and when they get their wages they rush to the location to spend it.

In other words, they are much better off than those natives who are not fed by their masters?- Yes.

MR\* LUCAS: And the man who is fed by his master has not got his wife with him?- That is so.

Now you spoke of detribalised natives. Which natives would you regard as being entirely detribalised?- (Thema): I think the one side who have lost all their pastoral origin and are dependent entirely on wages.

How would we be able to recognise them if we found them in town?- It is rather difficult to recognise them, but they are there.

If a man has his wife in the location, can we take that as an indication that he is detribalised?- Yes, you can.

You do not find tribal natives bringing their wives

here?- Very rarely.

And do you find that natives who come here and take wives here go back to their tribes?- That you find very rarely indeed.

So if a man has his wife here in the location he is detribalised?- Yes.

DR. ROBERTS: But if he is only living with her he is not detribalised?- Yes, that is so.

THE CHAIRMAN: But if he is married to her then he is detribalised?- Yes.

Now with the wages as they are in town at present, the man who goes away from his tribe, who has no more right to his lands and to plough or to keep cattle -- that man earns money here, is he in any worse position than the man who is still a member of his tribe?- Yes, he is in a worse financial position.

All the natives who are detribalised have certain tribal rights?- They had some tribal rights.

How did they shed those rights?- They came into town and they thought that they would make the town their home.

They thought they would be better off in town?- When a man comes here he gets married. He is either forced to live in a country town and he meets a woman and he is detribalised.

He does not pay lobola for that woman?- No.

If he took her back to the tribe? - She would not agree to go.

Why not?- She would want to make concoctions of beer and such things.

So they marry women who have been engaged in the beer trade?- Yes, that is so.

And the woman does not want to go back?- That is so.

DR. ROBERTS: Would the tribe accept her?- Yes, it would.

THE CHAIRMAN: But would that native have to pay lobola for her if he took her back?- He has his parents there and when they get home the parents would arrange for the lobola. They would not just ask her to stay before lobola was paid.

If he stays in town he does not need to pay lobola?- No, that is so.

DR. ROBERTS: But if she is a strange woman she could not go back to her tribe. The tribe would not receive her. Supposing she is a Zulu woman and she met a Shangaan or a Mavenda. Would the Shangaans or the Mavendas receive her?- They would make things very uncomfortable for her if she was not lobolaed. She would not be respected and he would marry other wives and she would be nothing.

Do not the natives know these things you have been telling us?- The natives outside who come in from the reserves do not they know that if they are away from their tribes they are economically worse off if they take a wife here and they cannot go back to their tribes? - I would not say that they know it. (Mopola): I think they prefer to be detribalised. They are earning money every day and seeing it, and they prefer to be in town.

If you are using money every day and you have not got enough food, are you better off?- I would not be. But with them - they seem to be quite satisfied with the little money they get and they seem to be more satisfied

than if they are outside. The work here is not heavy and although they get very little money they are not worried about that and they are content. It is only when they are in town for a longer period that they begin to realise the strain of town life.

Now let us come to your Peculiar Group. Those must be original natives who come from the reserves?-(Thema): Quite so.

What makes you call them the Peculiar Group? Is there any difference between the native who comes from the reserve and goes back, and that native?- It is this native who makes some of these people feel their position. They earn £2 and they spend the whole of it on intoxicants and other things. They have no money to send home, and they are afraid to go home themselves. They just keep in town. They are so fond of drink that they drink up all they have. They are fed by their masters.

If they saved up enough money to go home, do you think they would go home from time to time, like the tribal natives?- Yes, I think so.

Have they got into difficulty, so that they are afraid to go home?- Yes.

DR. ROBERTS: Is not that much more true of the women than of the men?- No, it is much more true of the men.

MR. MOSTERT: This is a class of native who is in and out of gaol?- Yes, very often.

THE CHAIRMAN: Both the criminal classes and the others?- I should call them the confounded ones. These natives are confused - they do not know what to do with themselves. The money they get is so little and

their desire for drink is so much that they spend every penny they get on it.

How would you say in your own language "the confounded class"?- It means the confused ones.

Do not these people become detribalised in time?- Yes, they sometimes do become detribalised.

MR. VAN NIEKERK: But do not they go back to their tribes?- Yes, they do.

THE CHAIRMAN: They become detribalised in that sense; But why do not you consider that they belong to the same group as the one that you belong to?- Because we have our wives here and they have their wives at home. They do not go back home even to see their children.

If they take another wife here, which they can do according to your custom, then it means that they have a wife here and a wife at home? What prevents them from becoming detribalised afterwards in the same way as you are detribalised?- They have their children, they have another family at home.

But if they do not take any notice of that family at all?- Then they become detribalised.

They are an intermediate sphere between the tribal and the detribalised natives?- That is so.

DR. ROBERTS: Now supposing that your chief, to whom you owe a certain allegiance, were to send for you. Supposing he wanted to see you. Would you go?- I would not go.

Are you sure?- I am detribalised.

That is to say, that you would not give him any recognition at all if you were to meet him, you would not salute him?- Oh yes, I would salute him.

DR. FOURIE: But you would not obey him?- No,

I am detribalised, so how can I live in the reserves?

DR. ROBERTS: Supposing he wanted to discuss a matter with you, would you go?- Yes, I would obey him there- I would go to discuss a matter.

You would go?- Yes, I have done that several times. I am called by him I obey.

THE CHAIRMAN: But if he told you to live there you would not?- That is so.

MR. LE ROUX VAN NIEKERK: You spoke of the migration of natives after the 1913 act. Where was this migration from?- From the reserve and from the farms.

In what way? Why did they migrate from the farms after the 1913 Act?- Because they were not allowed to lease any more in the white area, so they had to go to the towns.

Thosenatives who were leasing at the time were allowed to go on?- Did many natives lease land before 1913?- Yes, on the half-share system.

And that was stopped?- Yes.

Was that carried on to any extent here?- Yes, there was much leasing on the halfshare system.

Was that in this district?- Yes.

You spoke about the bad management of a farmer. What do you mean by that?- What I mean is this. These natives are asked by a certain farmer to do ninety days' work and they have to do two days per week so as to complete the ninety days. They have no time to work for themselves because they have to be on the farm every week. They would like to go and do other work, but they cannot. They are given a certain acre and they are told to finish that acre otherwise "I shall not write a ticket for you ". That man is struggling along, but his

ticket does not get written. But the native is advancing and he sees that he is not well managed.

Now this system of working two days a week. It is peculiar to this area in the North. We do not know about it further south. Do you think it is slowly disappearing?— Yes, it is.

There is an improvement in that?— Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why is it disappearing?— The farmers must have noticed that the natives are leaving their land because of it.

MR. LE ROUX VAN NIEKERK: You spoke about the congestion of the locations. You think that if the natives had better methods of cultivation they could exist on the same land for a considerable time still. Would the congestion disappear?— No, but matters would be made more attractive to the natives, but the congestion would not disappear.

Generally speaking, when a place is congested it does not naturally mean that there are too many people living in the place but that there are too many people to make a living. If they were to improve their methods of agriculture they would be able to live on the same land, more people would be able to live on the same land?— I think so.

And do you think the native can considerably improve their ways of agriculture?— Yes.

And you are therefore in favour of agricultural training being given to the natives?— Yes.

You spoke of the Land Act of 1913. You said that it was promised that land would be given permanently to the natives. Where was that said?— The recommended areas were not made permanent. Still, up to this day they remain recommended areas.

But the Government does allow the native to buy in that recommended area?— Yes, but what we want is that they should be permanent. They should be given to the natives permanently.

You want to release the recommended areas?— Yes.

Do you want them to be given for nothing?— I want them to be allotted for natives.

Although the law has not been passed, there is no difficulty for a man to buy land in a released area?— There is no difficulty, but the whites are allowed to buy land in the areas recommended for natives.

Do they allow the whites to buy here and there?— Yes.

Your contention is that it should be permanently laid down that only natives can buy there?— That is so.

THE CHAIRMAN: In those recommended areas, if a native buys now, the title can be given to the tribe?— Yes.

Your objection is that title cannot be given to an individual native?— Yes, and also that whites can buy in the recommended native areas.

MR\* LE ROUX VAN NIEKERK: We have had many complaints from native chiefs elsewhere that they do not like the idea of their piccanins coming to town. They say that they turn into Amalaitas. Do you agree with that?— No.

Do you agree that it is not advisable to allow the small piccanins to go into the towns?— Yes, we do not want them to be apprenticed by Europeans who are not qualified.

When we are speaking about apprenticing a native boy to a European, the idea is that there should be a board constituted of the white man and a representative



of the native, and whenever a contract is entered into it should come before this board. Now if this board considers that a farmer is no good, and that he is not properly training his people, or not properly treating them, the Board will say "No, we will not give you an apprentice". But if there is a good farmer who is treating his men well, you would not object would you?— No, I would not.

Do you think that would be preferable rather than sending the boys into town?— We would not object if the farmers were qualified. Our fear is only that some people may take advantage of the piccanins and use them only for labour and not apprentice them.

When we speak of apprenticing them, then they must work in such a way that they will learn something?— Yes, I understand that.

And you have no objection to that system?— No, none.

You spoke about the Government and the Land Bank. Are you acquainted with the Regulations of the Land Bank?— No, I am not.

Have you ever given it any thought, that it would be a most difficult thing to advance natives money living in the Reserve?— I thought that as the Government has got the Native Reserves and as they have got the control over the Reserves, that they should be able to do something to see that the natives do not simply borrow the money and do not return it.

You thought that some system could be devised whereby the natives in the reserves could be helped?— Yes.

Now, what would be your idea of helping natives through some agency like the Land Bank?— What do you want the money for and what do you think these natives in

the Reserves require the money for?- In times of depression, only in times of depression.

There should be a system of helping that native over that period?- Yes.

DR. ROBERTS: You know of course that the Native Affairs Department just now advances money to natives to buy farms?- I did not know that.

THE CHAIRMAN: They sometimes have difficulty in making the money accept the money, because they say "If we owe so much money to the Government, what will the Government do with us?" ? - I did not know that.

MR. LE ROUX VAN NIEKERK: Now, Molopa, you spoke of a wage of £6. Did you take into account the wages earned by the women, too?- Yes.

Did you mean to say that it would be sufficient if a man and a woman together earned £6.- Yes. I have in mind that the wages of a man and a woman put together today does not amount to £3. The wage of a man alone should be in the neighbourhood of £6, but of course the woman cannot be expected to earn much. She gets very little for the washing she does.

Would you reckon that in?- Elsewhere you reckon the two together. Would you not reckon the earnings of the woman together with the man to be £6.? Would that meet the case? - Yes.

We had a statement here this morning from the Superintendent of the Location that the women who brew the beer were generally unmarried women, the lowest woman of the town. Is that so?- In some cases that is so. But I want to explain. In the location we get more married people, legally married women, than others. They work for the Europeans, but these people also brew

beer. Of course, there are some people who do not.

Now, you made what was to be a rather strange statement, that if a man earns low wages he is bound to steal?- Quite so.

Now, in your opinion the majority of the natives in Pietersburg, or you can practically say all over the Union, do not earn £6 per month. So the majority must steal, must be thieves?- I mean that these people have earned very little and they cannot get any other means to buy food, so they have to go to the stores who have to supply them with the goods.

You are putting a stigma on the native. You say that the majority do not earn £6 and to get that they must either steal, borrow or sell?- Yes.

There are only a certain amount who sell beer, not too many, because the police are always on the look-out, so a good percentage of the natives in the town must be stealing?- Yes, quite so.

I do not know if the native will bear you out. We always thought that the native was a fairly honest man?- If we reason this out it comes to the same thing. We have to reckon out if the cost of living is so much, where do they get the money from?

Do you agree with that Thema?) (Thema): I do not to the extent of saying that the majority of our people are thieves, but I say this - there is a lot of thieving going on because of the low wages.

Now you spoke of the Peculiar Group. That is the man who comes to town, he earns £2 per month, and he has a wife and family in the location? - Yes.

He spends his money principally on intoxicants?-  
Yes.

That man should be better off than the tribal native. That man has a wife. He has to plough, he works the land, and he has children to look after his cattle. His family therefore have food provided for them if it is not a bad year. He earns cash here, and if he sends that cash back to the location he is better off than the man who has a wife here? - No, I do not think he is better off. That is the man who is confused.

He is in a better position. His wife lives here, but she does not pay rent. He only pays 10/- a year. He has land to plough. He has cattle and a place to run them on, and he earns cash here. He should be in a better position than you are? - He is not. This native at home has not got enough room for cultivation.

It does not matter, he may not have enough but he has something? - Yes, he has something.

He has land to plough and a place to run his cattle on? - Yes, and he must come to town to get money for taxes.

And he may earn just as much as a native who has his wife here in the location? - Yes.

But he has no wife to support, no rent to pay, no sugar to buy, and therefore he is better off? - Yes, that is so.

You say that he misuses his opportunities? - That is so.

He does not send any money back? - No.

Could you suggest how we could rectify that position? - I asked for a Land Settlement scheme.

But he has a place to go to? - He has no money.

I want to know whether you can suggest some scheme

by which he could be compelled to send money to his wife so as to give her a better living? - He should be paid better wages.

Then he would buy more beer? - (Molopa): If he had better wages it could be seen to by the Native Affairs Department that part of his money were paid to the Native Affairs Department and then sent to his wife.

THE CHAIRMAN: You think some money should be kept back to be sent to the wife and then he will not get confused? - that is so. (Thema): If he gets more money there will not be more beer sold.

MR. VAN NIEKERK: You go out from the idea that beer is drink because beer is sold. Is not beer made because people want it? - I say that the reason why these natives drink is because they want it.

If a man earns more money do you think he will not drink beer? - Oh yes, he will still drink beer.

When he gets more money he will drink more beer? - Of course, there is a huge profit on beer today.

Do you think that this beer drinking in the towns is about the worst evil that the natives have to contend with? - I do not think so.

Don't you think it is an evil? - Do you think it is bad for the natives that this selling of beer is going on? - Yes, it is bad.

You think it should be under restricted control? - My contention is that beer drinking cannot be stopped and the best thing is to allow them to have consumption at home to satisfy themselves.

But do you want us to stop people from buying beer? - If it is made only for home consumption people will not buy it.

The selling should be stopped? - Yes.

MR. LUCAS: And it would be cheaper than, because people would not have to risk paying a fine?- That is so.

You said that beer was manufactured because of the low wages. Do you think if wages were higher they would not make beer?- (Molopa): I think there would be less beer made. Many people are simply compelled to make beer today so as to sell it.

You say that because the wages are so low the women have to make beer so that they may sell it to make money?- Yes.

Is it your argument that if the wages were higher the men would not want their wives to sell beer?- Many of the wives would stop it. If the wages of the husband were higher they would soon stop, because many of the husbands do not want their wives to brew beer, and it is only because of the economic pressure that they make beer.

You say that some wives take in washing?- Yes.

And they can only make 10/- per month?- That is so.

That is very little. How much does a woman get for doing all the washing for a European house?- It varies according to the bundle. If the bundle is big enough it runs to 10/- but if it is a small bundle it goes from 3/- to 5/- and to 7/6d.

And these women have to supply their own soap?- Yes, sometimes.

Sometimes they get the soap thrown in?- Yes.

This 10/- is for the whole month?- Yes.

How often do they take it?- About twice a week.

The take the washing every Monday and send it back on the Friday and they are paid at the end of the month.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do they take a week to do a family's washing?— Yes, they take it home. Some days for washing and some days for ironing.

And they get 10/- for washing and ironing?— Yes.

MR. LUCAS: Do they do their washing in their own homes?— Some of them. I am speaking chiefly of those who do it in their own homes.

And some do it at the houses of the Europeans?— Yes.

MR. LE ROUX VAN NIEKERK: What do they get in those cases?— They get a little less, because they are given dinner and breakfast. And perhaps they get a few crumbs of bread for their children, so they are paid a little less money.

Is that a general price paid for washing here — 10/- for the whole house?— That is the average, some get more than 10/-.

How do you strike the average?— Some get up to £1. and others get £1.10.0. But I think the average is 10/-.

MR. LUCAS: When the work is done at the European house, what happens to the family while the mother is away?— The children run about the streets unattended.

Are there any cases like that in the location here?— Yes.

How long has this location been in existence?— I do not know. I found it in existence when I came here in 1924. (Thema): It was in existence before the Boer War.

Are many of the children left to run about unattended?— (Molopa) : Yes.

Have you been able to form any idea as to what

happens to the children who run about unattended? - How they grow up? - I remember some time ago there was a general complaint about the children running about loose, and it was said that something should be done. It was said that the only thing that could be done was to have someone looking after them during the absence of the parents.

Has anything been done? - No, except in regard to those who go to school.

Now you told us a good deal about the Peculiar Group. What happens to the wives and families in the tribes that are deserted? - (Thema): According to the native custom they are married by the brothers or the cousins.

It takes a long time before they know that they are deserted? - Yes, but even if a man has gone for a long time, according to native custom the brother during the absence of the man has the right to cohabit with the wife.

Now in the town location here, is there any arrangement for recreation? - It is done by us. But we have tennis, cricket and football.

And the Advisory Council that is there, does that deal with that question? - We have asked the Municipality to arrange some ground for us, but we have not yet had a reply.

MR. LE ROUX VAN NIEKERK: Have you any knowledge as regards wages in other towns, towns of a similar size as Pietersburg, or Middleburg, or P.P.Rust in the Transvaal? How do the wages here compare with those towns? -



P.P. Rust is about the same as this. The average wage is about £2.

MR. LUCAS: That is without food? - Yes, that is without food.

What would be the general wage of the native here in Pietersburg? What would the most of them get? - There are many natives here who are getting £1.10.0. with food.

And house-boys? - They are getting £2; some get £1. and some £2, with food.

THE CHAIRMAN: And the boys in the shops? - They are a little better paid, £2 to £3.

Without food? - Yes.

And in the factories, the cold storage? - They would get that too, from £2 to £3.

Without food? - Yes, without food.

DR. FOURIE: I could not understand from you what the detribalised native is. I am afraid you are a little bit confused about it. Are you a detribalised native? - Yes, I am a detribalised native.

You have broken with the tribal religion? - Yes.

And you have broken with tribal rites? - Yes.

You have broken with the tribal customs? - Yes.

And have you also broken with the tribal authority? - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you would obey your chief if you got certain orders? - Well, I have broken with that so far as the chiefs are concerned. The only authority is the Native Affairs Department. I do not know what you mean by authority. I would not obey a levy from the chief.

But you would obey an order from the Chief to come and see him? - Yes.

But you would not acknowledge an order which would

affect your status?- No, that is so, I would not.

MR. LE ROUX VAN NIEKERK: When the chief calls you to see him you will go back? But you would go to him because you think that he might want you to do a service for your people?- Yes, that is so.

Or do you think that it would be a command which must be obeyed?- I would go there because I would think it is a command.

So you admit that he can command?you?- Well, I would go and see what he wanted.

So you would obey his authority?- In that respect, yes.

THE COMMISSION ADJOURNED AT 6.30 p.m.  
to meet again at DUIVELSKLOOF, on  
FRIDAY, the 8th AUGUST, 1930, at 10 a.m.

---

**Collection Number: AD1438**

**NATIVE ECONOMIC COMMISSION 1930-1932, Evidence and Memoranda**

**PUBLISHER:**

*Collection funder:- Atlantic Philanthropies Foundation*

*Publisher:- Historical Papers Research Archive*

*Location:- Johannesburg*

©2013

**LEGAL NOTICES:**

**Copyright Notice:** All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

**Disclaimer and Terms of Use:** Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of paper documents and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document is part of the archive of the South African Institute of Race Relations, held at the Historical Papers Research Archive at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.