

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

who have nothing beyond the sentimental attachment (if that) towards their traditional chief". Now, do you not think that you are over-stressing the point of the attachment of labour tenants and squatters to their chiefs?-- In what way?

You say that it is nothing beyond a sentimental attachment. I query that?-- You think it is more?

Yes, it is a good deal more?-- Yes, I should be prepared to accept that, and to modify that statement. I do not know that I have sufficient intensive knowledge to say that. My own observations may be somewhat scattered. My own impression was that the authorities could not use the chiefs for any purposes of control.

You mention the Native labourers, too. The great bulk of the Native labourers are very definitely subject to the chiefs. For instance, take those who come ^{to} ~~from~~ the mines?-- Yes, but they come from very special Native areas. I was speaking there of Native labourers on European farms.

DR. ROBERTS: Do you think there is any possibility, even if we did whatever we possibly could, to retain the policy of Government by Chiefs in the future, in the long future?-- I was very much struck by an article which I read the other day in "Africa". That is a journal. It was an article written by, I think, the late Native Chief Commissioner of Northern Rhodesia, on the position of the chief, and he expressed the view quite definitely that it is going to be more and more difficult to use the chief as an administrator and controlling officer and, so far as I can see, his views are very much on the lines which I have raised here.

Except that you suggest using him?-- He also says that we must use him as far as possible in individual

MR. REEHNALLT JONES

cases. You have to take individual areas into account, but by and large, the chieftainship is going because the chief cannot maintain it, either by his prowess in war or his skill in negotiation -- he is simply a recognised appointed chief and the tendency is for the Government to use the hereditary principal and, by the second or third generation, he is no great personality and so the interest disappears. I realise that here is something which still has a measure of value, and the chiefs have influence, no question about it and, if we can take chief by chief and see whether we cannot use this chief or that one in a particular way indicated by me here, in that way I believe we shall be making the best use of the resources at our command. But to make chieftainship a sort of basis for Native government, that, to my mind, is impossible.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Do you think that the Tanganyika scheme is bound to fail?-- In Tanganyika, they are still pretty well integrated in tribes according to Mr. Mitchell, the present Secretary for Native Affairs, but even he recognises the difficulty. If you once have to get to a settled state of affairs where the chief is chief because he is his father's son, then, unless he maintains his personality, unless he has a personality of such a type that he is able to maintain his influence, the tendency is for the man of personality to have more influence than the chief.

Do you think that the chief's councils could be made more use of?-- Well, they are very hopeful in Tanganyika about that. They have not gone so far in disintegration, so as not to be able to use the tribal organization, but they quite realise that it is a sort of experiment which may have to justify itself in the future.

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

They have a clearly defined policy in the matter ?--

Yes.

Have you seen their instructions ?-- Yes.

CHAIRMAN: In the tribal system, without the influence of the European, was there not a certain factor tending to the correction of the failing of the hereditary system? Now and then, you could resort to the use of the assegai to correct the failings of the hereditary system ?-- In the Bantu life, the position of the righthand house is an important factor. The righthand house has a very important and very definite status and a person of independent character belong^{ing} to the righthand house could develop into a chief from the very fact that his house is rather an independent house and, according to all investigations, one can find from Kenya, right down to this part of Southern Africa, the Bantu has always tended to disintegrate. Tribes have always tended to disintegrate. I do not know whether you have seen a little book written by Driberg. Driberg, in his book, makes it clear that the Bantu tribes have been very democratic and have hived off when there was any need for it without any supreme authority.

Yes, the word Bechuana means people who have gone in different directions ?-- Yes.

That is one method; but they did get rid of a weakling who was the next in the line of succession, in order to make room for a strong man when the weakling went out, They made room for the strong man in a way in which a civilised community could not, - that was through the assegai ?-- Yes, and not only that.

An accident would happen ?-- Yes. The position of the regent in Bantu life is interesting. Owing to their

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

method of succession, the heir was usually a young child and time and time again a regent was necessary. Usually, the regent was a man of outstanding personality and, if he was unscrupulous at all, he would quickly assume to himself all the power, even though the heir grew up and had to establish himself. It is true that it required a man of considerable force to do that, but from what we read of the history of Bantu tribes, right from the earliest beginnings, we find that constant breaking up ---- the influence of one particular personality seems to have been constant. It seems to me that one can say that among the Bantu people there is a greater tendency towards disintegration than towards integration. That is the point I am trying to make here, and one finds that right through their history.

MR. LUCAS: What did you have in mind when you made this quotation on the first page of your statement, that the hereditary system had gone mad. You say there, "Our present idea of chieftainship is 'the hereditary system gone mad'. The old system was not hereditary." ?-- Yes, that is putting it in rather an extreme way. It was hereditary in a sense, but there was always this tendency to break away, first of all, because of the position of the righthand house and its tendency to become independent.

DR. ROBERTS: Would you tell us what you are quoting from ?-- It is a quotation from my own notes, - from my own rough notes.

CHAIRMAN: But actually, the cases which one knows of, where the person who was the next one to succeed has not succeeded, or where his run has very soon been broken, are very few compared with the cases where it has been strictly hereditary and, in these cases, there has^e been

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

exceptional circumstances like, for example, the Ndlambi ?-- I think there is a distinction to be made between the heir and a person of the blood. My argument still holds so far as the blood is concerned. (Mr. Faye makes a remark to the Chairman in regard to succession by the direct heir or a person of the blood.) I make a distinction between Mr. Faye's point and mine. He makes the point that he does not know of any case where the chieftainship has remained in the blood. My point is that the succeeding heir, the line has been broken, and constantly been broken, because of the tendency of this righthand house to be independent and the tendency of the regent to be all powerful. When you come to apply the hereditary system to Native administration, your first tendency would be to say, that because ^{so-}and-so is the heir to his father, he must succeed. But he may prove to be a very unworthy man and he may be quite incompetent to carry out his administrative duties. The Government, on such occasions, has had very great difficulties in regard to whom they should select instead. Then you are right up against it. It is very difficult to say how far one has to carry out the hereditary system in the appointment of a chief.

CHAIRMAN: In Native tribal government, what did they do when they had a useless heir ?-- Well, he very often disappeared.

There were other corrections too for the failings of the hereditary principle ?-- Well, you cannot do that today.

MR. LUCAS: And supposing you adopt a scheme of educating the chief, then whom are you going to chose to educate, or do you want all the people of the blood to be

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

educated ?-- I think a chief should certainly see to it that his family are properly educated. Quite a number of chiefs have said to me, "I feel I am not good enough for this job today and I want my son to be educated properly so that he can do the job." Is there any way by which they can be helped to help their people?

DR. ROBERTS: But there are very few chiefs especially among those in the Transvaal, who do not see to it that their sons are educated. They send their children to the various colleges, such as Fort Hare and Lovedale ?-- Yes; they want them to be educated in such a way that they will be able to be leaders.

CHAIRMAN: You consider there should be training of an administrative nature for sons of chiefs ?-- Yes; but I would not specialise too early.

You suggest that they should go at least up to Standard VII ?-- I say Standard VIII. That is a stage at which it is possible to begin to make a differentiation in education.

MAJOR ANDERSON: You want to use the chiefs where they seem likely to give good results -- other tribes in the same area might ignore the chiefs ?-- I do not suggest that. The extent of his powers and functions would depend on the character of the man himself.

Would not differentiation create difficulties; one chief having power and another not having power, would not that cause trouble ?-- No. There have been so many changes throughout South Africa that you cannot apply one system throughout the country. One thing may be very good in Zululand, but in the Transvaal it may not be good at all.

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

One has to recognise that one cannot apply an uniform system.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Would you differentiate within one particular area, such as Sekukuniland?-- I would consider that according to the facts of the situation; but I do plead in a general way for differentiation.

CHAIRMAN: I want to go to page 3 of your statement, on land. At the top, you say "On the other hand, many friends of the Natives are troubled because of the wastage in freehold ownership. I advocate freehold since I believe that it gives greater inducement to saving and to cultivation." I should like you to explain more fully what you mean by that?-- I notice that in the copy which you have before you, the word "committee" appears after "ownership". I do not remember using that word there and I would ask you to delete it. What I meant was that the selling to Europeans of land bought by Natives freehold, was causing a good deal of uneasiness. Natives get rid of their land very quickly. We know their tendency -- they get into debt, mortgage their land and, in the end, lose it.

That is the old freehold title, where there was no reservation in regard to the sale to Europeans?-- Yes.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: On that question of land, you take strong exception to squatting and to labour tenants. You take it from the point of view of the Native, but usually it is the other way about. I mean, that you find people say that, from the European point of view it is a bad policy to have either squatters or labour tenants. Do you not think that, after all, a farmer will tell you that it is not an economic proposition to employ labour tenants -- leaving out squatting for the present?-- Yes.

But surely, taking everything into consideration in

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

regard to the labour tenant, do you not think he is better off than the labourer if you define him as a paid man ?-- In a sense I hold that the Natives like labour tenancy, because they can have their cattle with them and with wage paid labourers, the cattle usually are taboo; but looking at it from the point of view of development, I am quite satisfied in my own mind that, however comfortable a Native may feel as a labour tenant, he has no inducement, no real inducement to progress, because he has no status.

What do you mean by the word "status" there ?-- He has no real anchor, no real stake in the land. He is there by the nature of things on sufferance.

Yes, but he has some stake. What has the pure labourer got ?-- A man who works on a cash basis gets an immediate return for his labour, which is a matter for considerable satisfaction.

Now, of course, you must know that there are stages in labour tenancy ?-- Yes, all sorts of stages.

In my part of the country, that is the Northern Transvaal, we have labour tenants who are on a three months' basis, which I think is the lowest basis in the Union. But there are others where they are on a nine months' basis ?-- Yes, I know. One finds different conditions in different parts of the Union.

Now, I have always considered that, if we farmers in the Northern Transvaal, in the Waterberg area and the Zoutpansberg area, had to turn our labour tenants into pure labourers, it would be a very definite hardship on these Natives ?-- Yes, as things are, I think so.

CHAIRMAN: What do you mean by as things are ?-- Well, he cannot go away from there, he is landless, he cannot

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

go to any of the Native areas because he has nothing there.

Assuming that he can get occupation as a wage labourer ----?

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: Take the labourers at my place. They are labour tenants there and they work for three months in the year. In my case, they work three calendar months. That labourer - that boy, gives me three months labour for nothing; he has his house free and his land, and he gets his crops from that land. He stands the same chance as I stand, there may be bad years when he will get nothing at all, but, on the other hand, there may be exceptionally good years. But he has something at stake. His wives and children are busy, they get moroch. They scuffle the lands; the women are kept busy. Now, if I turned these people into ordinary labourers, they are bound to degenerate. I have had experience of this sort of thing. I know what the position is in the Cape, where I originally come from. The labourers there at one time were also labour tenants in a different sense of the word, a man was allowed to have a garden and fruit trees, but he was engaged as a day labourer. Whenever he was required, he was called in, but economic pressure afterwards forced the farmers to say, "No, we are not going to give you any land to cultivate for yourself", and the result has been that your Cape Coloured man on any farm in the Cape has nothing to cultivate, -- he can hardly run a few fowls. It has brought down the status of these people. Possibly they may get a little more money, but they do not profit by that?-- I quite appreciate that, from the point of view of comfort, the labour tenant on a good farm is pretty well off, and a good many Natives with whom I have discussed it are

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

terrified of a position being created in which they might not be able to have their cattle and their land which they cultivate, although they say that the whole position as it is at present is full of trouble.

It may be full of trouble, but look at this. A Native may have only one or two cows, but still, from these one or two cows, he gets enough milk for himself and his children?-- You see, from the statement which I have attached to this, it is quite clear that the Native gets far more in kind than he ever realises.

Why should you people be up against this labour tenancy?-- For this reason, that the whole thing, to my mind, does not lead anywhere. It is uneconomic because the Native does not realise that he is getting what is given to him and, secondly, he does not give the labour which the farmer is entitled to expect from him for what he gives him. Of course, I am speaking of conditions in certain areas, but there are so many degrees and conditions and in a great many cases I have come across conditions which are really deplorable, where the whole family worked the whole year through without any cash payment being made at all, and nevertheless, the family have to pay taxes and have to find cash for all sorts of things. To give you an example, I was in the Court House at Vryheid one day. I went there to have a talk with the Magistrate. A Native came into the court who was a labour tenant; he was asked by the Magistrate "Why have you not paid your wheel tax?" He replied, "I have not got any money, I have not received any money from my baas for nearly two years". He put that to the Magistrate, and the Magistrate asked him, "Why did you not call

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

and tell us?" The man told him, "I could not get permission to leave the farm to come and tell you". Well, the Magistrate postponed the case for investigation. I made some enquiries as to whether that was not an extreme case, but I was told that there were quite a great many of those cases in that area, and I found myself that that was so.

I found that there were cases where no cash of any kind was paid - there was no such basis between the labour tenant and the owner, yet the labour tenant has to find the cash somehow and so he generally has to get rid of his stock -- which, of course, is quite a useful way of reducing overstocking. On the other hand, he feels aggrieved, because he gets nothing for his labour.

I find the same sort of thing in the Southern States of America. It still exists there, although it is disappearing. Until 1916, 1917 and even later, there was a great deal of that kind of thing going on in the Southern States, and, as the Negroes put it, "They were working for a dead horse", and it was not worth working at all. Life had nothing in it. On account of the tremendous demand for Negro labour in the North and in the East after that time, things changed. Labour had to be revolutionised, the farmers began, more and more, to engage their people on a cash basis and the latest information which I have got is that the position is today infinitely more satisfactory both from the point of view of labour and from the point of view of the employer, and they are getting more and more to a common basis on which they feel it worth their while going on. The negroes feel that they are getting cash

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

for their labour and the farmers feel they are getting more labour for their cash. I quite realise that a change here would bring about a big social alteration, but I do feel, at the same time, that, to go over to a cash basis, would be of the greatest benefit in the long run.

CHAIRMAN: One need not go entirely to a cash basis ?-- One has to go very gradually. I do realise that it would be a catastrophe in South Africa if we were to go over to a cash basis entirely, all at once.

As a matter of fact, the rural Natives do not want to go to a cash basis, because it means giving up their stock? ?-- Well, the question is whether, in the long run, it would not be better for them, whether going ^{on} /as they are doing at present is of any benefit to them themselves and to the White farmers.

MR. LUCAS: Your point is that they have a definite status if they are placed on a cash basis ?-- Yes, they will have something to work for.

MAJOR ANDERSON: Do you know Mr. Thornton's view about the share basis ?-- Yes, I know he is keen on that, but I would rather see a cash basis than a share basis.

MR. LUCAS: Well, his is also partly a cash basis. The employer has to do the marketing as well and hand over the cash ?-- Well, you know the story of the Negro who constantly felt that he was being done down by his boss. One year, he brought his cotton bales to the employer and his employer said, after disposing of the bales, "That is all there is for you. That is all you get." But the man had kept one bale back and he was chuckling to himself all the time because he had that other bale of cotton on the shelf. They

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

always feel that they are done down. I quite realise that labour tenancy has to remain a long time, and when I advocate a change I advocate it with a full realisation that the social and economic changes have to be brought about very carefully and gingerly. But you should aim at a cash basis all through. There are three types:- lease, cash basis, and ownership. The question is, which would be the most economic.

SENATOR VAN NIEKERK: I can see that it is going that way, when the farmer will not allow any Native to do any ploughing for himself or have any stock?-- Yes, in that time you will have to have cash leasing.

If you come to cash leasing, then you go against the whole policy of segregating the Natives as far as land is concerned, and then we cannot agree with that policy?-- I am prepared to agree with you as a matter of expediency, apart from principle. As a matter of expediency, you might have separation of ownership and where there is ownership involved, it should be in particular areas. But there are two factors which you have to keep in mind. The one is that the areas which are going to be possible for ownership, will be extremely limited and the second factor is that agriculture must be supplied with labour.

I am just as much concerned to see that agriculture is properly organized as to see that the Native is protected and, if you are going to segregate the Natives merely into areas where they are owners on such a basis that they will not be able to go and work for a period on a cash basis, then you are not going to give agriculture

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

a steady supply of Native labour. ^{by} a system of cash leasing, properly regulated, you are also supplying the farmer through the families of the lessee with the supply of cash labour which he wants. You have your tenants on your land, - you have a certain fixed number there. That tenant is there, he is there on a sound basis and able to make a decent living, and his children are able to see the possibility of themselves becoming lessees, but, in the meantime, they are available as cash labour.

Your idea is alright, but it will not work in practise, apart from the policy now. In actuality, you are reverting to squatting, because you give the farmer the right to lease his land to Natives. Surely that is just the same as squatting?-- No; I make it clear in my statement that every lease should be authorised by a land committee, and that it should be subject to very definite provisions in regard to cultivation.

I agree with your conditions, but the principle is the same?-- No.

Today, we say we do not want ~~your~~ Europeans to allow their land to be run by Natives, to hire it out to squatters, because these Natives are under no control and they deteriorate the land and they are a nuisance to the farmers generally. If they want to go in for squatting, they must go into their own areas. That is the policy which has been adopted in this country and I feel sure that very few people indeed will uphold squatting. Now, you say we must have a system of leasing which, to my mind, is very much the same as squatting. You take my Natives under the Native tenant system; you want me to do

MR. RHEINALLT JONES

away with that and I have to make another arrangement, but I may say to my Natives, "You can have part of my farm on a proper lease". Well, it would probably pay me to leave my farm all at once and, instead of having ten Natives there, just allow 100 Natives to go and plank themselves down there?-- Well, the committee which I provide for would not agree to your doing that, because it would at once be uneconomic.

I do not know, it would be economic from my point of view?-- It might be economic from your point of view, but it would not be so from the point of view of agriculture and that is what the committee would have to look at, for one thing. That is what I provide for in my statement.

Quite so, then you go back on the whole statement. On portion of my farm I might give a lease to my labourers, but they are bound to give me 90 days' work, but if I give those people a proper lease and I want to call upon them after that to work for me, and I want them to plough for me, they would say, "No, I am not going to plough for you; I want to plough for myself"?-- Yes; that may be. Your line then would be to go in for cash labour.

How can I go in for cash labour? If I am a farmer, if I own my property, I may own more than one property -- on the one property I may have the Natives who work for me for 90 days, and they have to come over to my other property to work. How can I afford to pay cash to those people? That is where I cannot see your argument. You are going back to the squatting system?-- I am not contemplating anything like squatting, but I am contemplating a very progressive system of farming, under which your lessees will have to

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.