

Prof. & Mrs. Hoernle

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

Prof. & Mrs. Hoernle

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; <sup>and</sup> extremely valuable round copper rings,

Prof. & Mrs. Hoernle

of which I have examples at the University. All these different things have been transferred <sup>as</sup> ~~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 Lestrade 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

Prof. & Mrs. Hoernle

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

Prof. & Mrs. Hoernle

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 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

Prof. & Mrs. Hoernle

other uses.

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 Sasuto, 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,

Prof. & Mrs. Hoernle

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 <sup>re</sup>presentative 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

Prof. & Mrs. Hoernle

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.



Prof. and Mrs. Hoernb

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, <sup>why</sup> ~~xxxx~~ <sup>very</sup> their <sup>very</sup> 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 <sup>prostitution</sup> 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

Prof. and Mrs. Hoernle

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 Sasuto, and the Northern Transvaal is kax different.

MR. LUCAS: Is marriage as suggested by Prof. Lestrade 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.

Prof. and Mrs. Hoernle

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 Sekukuniland and very largely among the Bavenda; 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

Prof. and Mrs. Hoernle

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 Fingoes 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

Prof. and Mrs. Hoernle

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 so 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.

Prof. and Mrs. Hoernle

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

Prof. and Mrs. Hoernle

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 Bechuanaland; 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 Steelpoort River on the one side, you have White farms where there is no necessity to dip every fortnight, and just inland, in Sekukuniland,

**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.