
The Agrarian Land Question in South Africa in Its Historical Context, 1652-1988

Author(s): Rudolph Daniels

Source: *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Jul., 1989, Vol. 48, No. 3 (Jul., 1989), pp. 327-338

Published by: American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Inc.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3487373>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*

JSTOR

The Agrarian Land Question in South Africa in Its Historical Context, 1652–1988

By RUDOLPH DANIELS*

ABSTRACT. The highly uneven *land distribution* in *South Africa* which favors the *White* ruling minority has its roots in many historical events and legislative measures. These include the “*Great Trek*” (the *migration* of *Dutch farmers* into the interior of South Africa), *squatter laws* in *British colonies* and *Dutch republics*, and the establishment of the *Union of South Africa* in 1910 whose parliament immediately took up the issue of land distribution and passed the ultimate *land expropriation* legislation, the *Natives Land Act* (1913), No. 27. Since the passage of this landmark act, indigenous Africans have been virtually *landless* while South Africa has emerged as one of the world’s most economically advanced nations.

SINCE THE UNION of South Africa was formed in May, 1910, later becoming the Republic of South Africa in 1960, it has acquired many distinctions. Among its most celebrated distinctions is that over the past 60 years it ranks among the nations that have experienced the most rapid economic growth. Peculiarly, the Republic of South Africa achieved this growth after creating one of the most unequal land distributions, based strictly on race, in recorded history.

Presently, 81.2 percent of the 122 million hectares of land in South Africa is owned by whites in white areas. Africans in white areas occupy 3.6 percent of the land but can never attain freehold title to it. Indians and coloreds own 2.4 percent of land in White areas with the remaining 12.8 percent appropriated for black occupation in the “homelands.” In the strictest sense, whites own 84.6 percent of the land, since blacks in white areas have no legal rights to land ownership.¹

Many important events and legislative measures over the course of South Africa’s history account for the prevailing land distribution. This paper will examine these events and legislative measures as the most crucial elements in the historical progression leading to one of South Africa’s most sensitive structural problems, land monopolization by the white minority.

* [Rudolph Daniels, Ph.D., is assistant professor of economics, Florida A&M University, 411 Tucker Hall, Tallahassee, FL 32307.] The author would like to thank Ralph Turner, Della Daniels, Judy Dierking, and Louis Pratt for their helpful comments and suggestions on previous drafts of this paper. The views expressed, however, are solely those of the author.

I

The Great Trek

SOUTH AFRICA'S PRESENT-DAY POSITION as having one of the world's most disparate land distributions had its genesis in what has come to be known as the "Great Trek," the migration of Dutch farmers into the interior of South Africa.

Long before the Union of South Africa was formed in 1910, it was traditional among whites to consider the territorial segregation of Europeans and Africans and the separation of Africans from control of the land as a "natural policy." The stage was set for the "natural policy" within 50 years of the establishment of a trading station at the Cape by the Dutch East India Company in 1652. In 1700, Dutch cattle farmers began their migration into the interior of South Africa. They encountered at first thousands of indigenous Africans (Hottentots and Bushmen) and later millions of Bantu and Zulu. In two brief wars, the "trekkers" convinced the Hottentots to accept their occupation and to hire themselves out to the new settlers as farm laborers and domestic servants. The Bushmen were far more reluctant to abandon their way of life, but superior White weaponry compelled them to abandon the land. All the adult men who did not flee were exterminated, their children captured and enslaved as herdsmen.²

In the latter part of the 1700s Dutch trekkers encountered more formidable and more culturally advanced contenders for the land: the Bantu on the eastern side of Africa and the Zulu who occupied what is now a South Africa province, Natal. Wars and continuous conflicts continued with the Bantu for almost 100 years. White colonists were made aware in their conflict with the Bantu that there was no longer an endless supply of unoccupied land. Efforts to acquire new grazing lands required trekkers to avoid the Bantu by travelling to the northwestern portions of the new land, where new provinces were established (Orange Free State and the Transvaal). But the new encroachment was met with resistance by the Zulu who sought to rid the land entirely of white settlers. However, the Zulu were soundly defeated in 1838 at the Battle of Blood River. Natal was ordered annexed by the British Government in 1843.³

By 1852, the British Parliament decided additional colonies were no longer economically advantageous and resigned itself to exercising authority only in the Cape Colony and Natal, leaving the remaining new republics of Orange Free State and the Transvaal in the hands of the trekkers. Wealth in land and livestock was virtually evenly distributed among the inhabitants of these new republics, but

Many of the Africans who lived in the Transvaal and [Orange] Free State were deprived of their rights to occupy land. This was sometimes accompanied by violence and war, but much more frequently it was a silent process . . . Possession meant different things to Europeans and to Africans. To the former it meant physical possession, the right to property; to the latter it meant use.⁴

In the new republics, the trekkers, later known as Boers, recognized the sovereignty of the chiefs where there was clear, though not "legal," occupation by Africans.⁵ From these two republics and from this recognition, the idea of African reserves was born, an idea which would be formalized 61 years later by the Parliament of the Republic of South Africa, legally confining Black land ownership to a tiny fraction of South African soil.⁶

The Great Trek is directly linked to an array of historical events relating to land distribution that have made South Africa one of the world's most complex and troubled nations. These events include the facts that (1) it acquired European political control of millions of natives; (2) it contributed heavily to the rise of Afrikaner nationalism and the National Party, which came to power over the more tolerant Union Party in 1948 with promises of legal separation of the races (apartheid); and (3) it reduced native "control" of land to the reserves.⁷

Thus, it seems that from the viewpoint of European settlers, particularly Dutch Boers whose descendants now guide the destiny of South Africa, black property rights to the land resources, as natives understood such rights, ended with each encounter of trekkers with native inhabitants. The "natural policy" was underway.⁸

Even in cases where property rights were designated by treaties signed between natives and Europeans

. . . all the treaties were in reality valueless. In the first place, the chief had no power to alienate land; in the second place, what he thought he was doing was to give the European the usufruct, not the possession, of it. In their ignorance of tribal customs, Europeans of all nations made what they thought were contracts by which the land became theirs, and to this day they all argue that their particular colony was acquired by genuine treaty. What really happened was that two totally different conceptions of land ownership were in conflict, and neither side knew or recognized the conflict.⁹

But, the astute European colonists eventually identified the nature of this conflict and began implementing measures they hoped would resolve it. Such measures were designed to assure white settler dominance and would guarantee European institutions of private property and capitalism would become firmly implanted.

II

Creation of Reserves under Colonial Rule

WITHOUT GOING INTO too much detail about the creation of reserves, a few points are pivotal to the analysis. Although Dutch conception of reserves for Africans was born during the Great Trek in the 1700s as Dutch Boers advanced into what they later called Natal, the Orange Free State, and the Transvaal, the government creation of "native reserves" was conceived by the British. The first

government reserve created was the Mfengu community in 1836. It was the brainchild of Sir Harry Smith, the then Governor of the Cape Colony.¹⁰

The Mfengu were a tribe who had escaped annihilation in northern Natal in a holocaust spearheaded by Shaka, chief of the Zulu tribe. He killed or drove away from the land a multitude of African tribes in his quest to expand the Nguni empire of which he was the undisputed leader.¹¹ The Mfengu settled among the Xhosa on the eastern frontier of the Cape Colony. But, during 1835 and 1836, they witnessed a frontier war between their hosts and the white farming community apparently over rights to the land across the border of the Cape Colony, the Kei River.¹² To resolve the dispute, the Smith administration invited the Mfengu, a peaceful and submissive tribe, to settle within the Cape Colony across the Kei River on land formerly occupied by white farmers. The settlement formed by the Mfengu supposedly would serve as a buffer zone between the white border farming community and the tribesmen living on the other side of the river. Thus, the first government-established native reserve was created. Perhaps despair “. . . of being able to maintain peace by any other means” accounts for the unparalleled action taken by Sir Harry Smith.¹³

The Cape example proliferated. For instance, in Natal, another British colony, seven reservations had been created by 1849. By 1852, native reserve lands in Natal encompassed 2 million hectares.¹⁴ By the middle 1800s, Africans had become accustomed to demarcation lines drawn by European colonists, but they generally were ignored. Consequently, the number of natives in white areas grew as many became squatters on private or Crown land, oftentimes paying rent to absentee landlords, while others purchased land in white areas. Still, more Africans were incorporated into white areas by British annexation or they had been permitted to remain after conquest to become farm servants.¹⁵

To address the inevitable problems of African influx, unauthorized occupation of “white-owned” land, and contact with whites, none of which had been solved by the cration of reserves by government or conquest by Dutch farmers, Boer and British governments appropriated over 1852–1903 still more land for African occupation. For example, in Natal, the British government designated 1.5 million hectares in Zululand. Boers in the Orange Free State appropriated 100,000 hectares in the Transvaal which remained fixed at that quantity over both British and Boer administrations.¹⁶

Boers were far more restrictive in their appropriations relative to African population size. They

. . . delimited small reserves (less than 100,000 hectares all told), where, at the beginning of this century, only 17,000 people lived, compared with 200,000 on White farms. In the Transvaal, Africans were for the most part left in the undisturbed possession of the malarial regions of the north and east.¹⁷

With the creation of the reserves, which were mainly lands on which African tribes were living when they were initially defeated by the Europeans, the “natural policy” in South Africa from the Boers’ viewpoint had been given its legal form. The Boers, with every conquest and subsequent treaty violation by Africans who viewed treaties as usufruct, had been convinced before the creation of reserve areas that the laws of God were opposed to equal rights for natives and Afrikaners and that such equal rights violated common sense. The British, on the other hand, apparently pragmatic in their handling of the natives, considered reserve areas as the most humanitarian and efficient means of managing the African problem at the time. But, the Dutch and British shared at least one important similarity regarding Africans: they both viewed reserves as a solution to interracial conflict while avidly pursuing their own brand of manifest destiny in South Africa, which Dutch settlers called the “natural policy.”

It is possible that territorial segregation would have provided a long-term solution to many interracial problems had South Africa remained an agrarian society sparsely populated by African and European farmers. But the circumstances changed in the second half of the 18th century which lifted South Africa from her agricultural rut and weakened the resolve of the Europeans in minimizing their contact with the native inhabitants.¹⁸

III

Movement Toward Industrialization

BEFORE THE 1860s, South Africans, natives and Whites alike, engaged in subsistence agriculture for a living. The spectacular diamond discoveries at Griqualand West (now known as Kimberly) between 1867 and 1871 destroyed the strictly agriculturally-based economy and set it on a course toward industrialization.¹⁹ With these discoveries, and the new avenues for making money they introduced, Europeans (Dutch and British) began to lose their taste for territorial segregation in the strictest sense. With new times and circumstances, both European governments encouraged Africans to come into white areas to work as the white labor supply was too inadequate to address labor needs. Cecil Rhodes, diamond magnate of Kimberly and prime minister of the Cape Colony from 1890 to 1895, levied a nominal tax on Africans in reserve areas to force them to seek employment.²⁰ From the viewpoint of mining officials who had succeeded in urging Rhodes to impose this tax, the employment of greater numbers of African men would bid wages down and enhance profit margins.²¹ Mining capitalists went beyond canvassing government authorities to increase the African labor supply. They also jointly established recruitment agencies in African areas from within and beyond South Africa’s borders, from areas now known as Malawi and Mozambique.²²

By the time of the discovery and exploitation of minerals in South Africa, whites, in the main, had long accepted the notion that the abundant supply of cheap, disenfranchised African labor was paramount to the development of the white-controlled economy. With this recognition

. . . the White community was . . . building up a set of values in which it was considered normal that the state, rather than the private sector, should assume responsibility for ensuring an adequate supply of labor.²³

IV

White Grievances, Apprehensions, and Squatter Laws

AS SOUTH AFRICA was fast moving into an industrial revolution, many whites in the British and Boer colonies remained employed in agriculture where they faced competition from natives who continued to buy, lease, or squat on Crown or private lands. White grievances, apprehensions and clamor intensified as they agitated government authorities to take steps to become more militant against a myriad of problems which natives posed. These problems included competition in the produce market, purchase of land in the Cape Colony and Natal,²⁴ renting of land to natives by absentee landlords in the British colonies, locking up of land by land-holding companies that speculated on future land values and mineral discoveries, the right to vote by Africans based on property ownership which was allegedly influential in the Cape Colony until 1913, and a labor shortage.²⁵

The most important of White grievances was squatting (for communal or individual tenure) by renters which aggravated the labor shortage.²⁶ At the time, squatting was believed to undermine white farming productivity and the industrial revolution. Independent, rent-paying squatters (farming natives or Kaffirs) were unlikely to accept low cash or kind wages from white farmers or mining capitalists who sought to maximize their profit margins. Instead, many Kaffirs chose the more advanced economic phenomena of self-interest and private enterprise.

Numerous laws limited squatter numbers on private farms and levied either rents, taxes or both upon squatters in British colonies and Boer republics. These laws included the squatters laws of Natal (1855), the Orange Free State (1895) and the Transvaal (1895), all of which were ineffective. Magistrates and many White farmers viewed these laws as unenforceable because they required the use of force, even violence against violators. The most punitive of the laws were those enacted in the Orange Free State which were “. . . stringent, Draconian and violent,” authorizing “amazing punishments.”²⁷ The enforcement of these laws some believed would have incited discord of major proportions among white farmers. John X. Merriman, for example, in a debate in the parliament of

the Union of South Africa on the passing of the 1913 Land Act, argued "he had no doubt that there would be rebellion. They would have platforms swarming with people who would say that they could not grow one bag of mealies without the natives."²⁸

The most effective of the anti-squatting laws were those legislated in the Cape of Good Hope: the Locations Acts, the 1876 Act (6 of 1876), the 1884 Act (37 of 1884) and the last of the acts before the Union of South Africa was formed, the Private Locations Act of 1909 (32 of 1909).²⁹ These laws were more effective because they made squatting a financial burden to those who persisted and at the same time benefited government through an increase in tax revenue and helped White farmers through an enhanced labor supply at cheap wages.³⁰

In the Cape of Good Hope, the Locations Acts reduced independent squatting cultivators to farm laborers by licensing only squatters who supplied their labor to white farmers. For unemployed squatters who lived on white farms, a tax was imposed on them to assure at least their part-time employment. The 1884 Act placed greater pressure on squatters by exempting from taxation natives employed on a long-term basis. Finally, the Private Locations Act of 1909 distinguished between natives living outside the reserves. By this act, such natives were classified as regular lessees (exempted natives), ordinary tenants, labor tenants, and servants. The intent of this act was to reduce the number of labor and ordinary tenants by requiring the former to be licensed at a cost of ten shillings a head per year and the latter at two pounds per year.³¹ The Private Locations Act of 1909 was particularly successful in its purpose, but so had been the others in the Cape Colony.

Most efforts to implement similar laws in other British colonies and Boer republics were unsuccessful because the laws were not the same as in the Cape Colony and were unpopular and unacceptable. Consequently, they were withdrawn. In Natal, for instance, the Agricultural Development Bill sought to expropriate land occupied by natives on white-owned farms. An act in the Orange River Colony made sharecropping ("farming on the half") illegal and reduced all colored people who squatted to servants. Neither of these acts would benefit whites in their quest for economic well-being. The Agricultural Development Bill in Natal would have reversed, if only temporarily, the white economic development effort and diminished the net worth of white farmers. In the Orange River Colony, farm profits would have been reduced by an end to sharecropping. Moreover, the Imperial Government could not resolve the issue of where to relocate coloreds and their livestock. The issue of reserves for coloreds was never seriously considered because such individuals posed no threat to the political, social and economic aspirations of whites and such an appropriation would further diminish white control over the land. The most successful of anti-

squatting laws largely atoned the discontent expressed by poor white farmers, but such atonement was mainly confined to the Cape Colony until South Africa became a nation firmly under Boer rule.

V

The Act of Union and the African Labor Supply

EXACTLY EIGHT YEARS after the signing of the Treaty of Vereeniging, May 30, 1910, the Union of South Africa came into being. Among the first issues addressed by the parliament of the new union was labor shortage. The Boers now with control of a unified parliament, could forge a new economic, social and political order through the enactment of far-reaching legislation. Before 1913 several laws were passed by the new parliament to implement a systematic native policy. The laws would allow for economic growth largely through the creation of a cheap, abundant and disciplined supply of African labor while permitting whites to further solidify their dominance of all the economic resources of the developing nation. This aspiration manifested itself in such measures as the Mines and Works Act (1911) and the Natives Labor Regulation Act (1911).³²

It is worth noting that in the early 1900s, prior to the enactment of the Natives Land Act (1913), No. 27, numerous other factors were instrumental in creating an ample supply of labor to bolster economic development.

First, numerous Africans failed in their efforts to succeed at farming while many who were profitable were forced off their land by white farmers who sought to meet the increased demand for foodstuffs in mining towns. The increased demand for farmland also led many whites to fence off vast areas of farmland with so-called "jackal-proof" fencing, thereby sharply curtailing the number of African squatters and nomads who roamed the countryside with their livestock. Thus to provide for sustenance while, at the same time, meeting the financial burden placed on them by white authorities for the right to live in White areas, former African farmers, squatters and nomads were compelled to supply their cheap labor to white employers who dictated terms of employment.

Second, African population growth on a dwindling supply of land greatly diminished the agricultural potential of reserve areas. With the increased white demand for land which reduced the areas reserved for Africans, young tribesmen could only expect an allocation of land (land grant) from the tribal chief after the death of an elder tribesman whose land had not already been expropriated. Until such deaths occurred, young tribesmen were compelled to seek cash wages from white employers. It should be emphasized that a land grant was no assurance that ablebodied men could profitably cultivate the land in reserve areas, as increased pressure placed upon the land by population growth, overgrazing, and

an inability to adapt their farming methods to the changing soil conditions required most to join the migrant labor system. For whites a very convenient cycle was created by their increased demand for farmland. According to Nattrass

This cycle leading from low productivity to low farm incomes—to migrant labor—to still lower productivity and lower farm incomes continued; and when coupled with increasing legislation that limited the access of Africans (particularly those who were not seeking work) to White areas, entrenched the system of migrant labor so characteristic of the modern South African economy.³³

A third factor to consider is that the position of the African farmer was further eroded by the rinderpest outbreak (1896–1897) which devastated their livestock. White farmers also were affected but the losses were catastrophic to Africans because many tribes held their wealth in their stock of cattle.

Fourth, the growth of the railway system benefited only white farmers. The railways even today are noticeably absent in reserve areas.

VI

The 1913 Land Act and Its Effects

UNDOUBTEDLY the most complete and methodical means yet conceived in South Africa for dealing with the dual issues of labor shortage and land distribution was the portmanteau legislation called the 1913 Land Act. The Bill's stated purpose was "to make further provision as to the purchase and leasing of land by Natives and other Persons in the several parts of the Union and for the other purposes in connection with the ownership and occupation of land by Natives and other Persons."³⁴ Through the 1913 Land Act, slightly more than 9 million hectares of land in the provinces of Orange Free State, the Transvaal, Cape Province, and Natal were declared inalienable black territory. This was land blacks had always occupied and had come to be called reserves. The enactment of this act made it illegal to sell land outside the reserves to blacks and also ended squatting and sharecropping by blacks on white farms. Blacks who remained on white farms after the act went into effect were reduced to labor tenants.³⁵

The effects of the 1913 Land Act were many and varied. First, it limited African rights to land ownership to reserve areas on a quantity of land that was, from the start, incapable of sustaining the millions of people who lived there. Even today, when African farming methods have modestly improved, there is little agricultural potential in the homelands. Probably the most salient and revealing features of homelands agriculture is that, in 1980, it contributed R207.6 million (.3 percent) to South Africa's Gross Domestic Product contrasted with R5,494.4 million (8.7 percent) white.³⁶ These data suggest that the agricultural potential

of the homelands was about 3.6 percent of White agriculture in 1980. Moreover, they lend credence to Natrass' observation that:

The two sectors of South African agriculture are so different that when one moves from a White-owned modern capital-using farming sector to a Black subsistence oriented and tribally organized farming area, it is like stepping through a time warp.³⁷

Second, the 1913 Land Act legalized and regularized territorial segregation and the "natural policy." Early white settlers, in their many conquests, sought to minimize contact with natives as they settled the territory and merely demarcated the land they wished natives to occupy. By the time of unification and the 1913 Land Act, whites had fully recognized the economic potential of the African labor supply and therefore formalized the "natural policy" by making racial segregation throughout the fledging state official government policy, not yet called apartheid.

Third and foremost, it increased the supply of cheap African labor to South Africa's predominantly white-owned industry. Restricting the majority of Africans to a fixed quantity of land assured that population pressures on the land would diminish agricultural potential in the reserve areas. Inevitably, Africans would be obliged to supply their labor at low rates of pay, thus fostering the economic expansion of South Africa's white-oriented industry. This is precisely what happened throughout the economic development of the Union, later the Republic of South Africa, when in 1960, South Africa ceased to be a member of the British Commonwealth.

It seems apparent that the 1913 Land Act is akin to a long line of ancestors, but none had so clearly and profoundly made African landlessness the cornerstone of economic development. All that was needed to design and implement this landmark legislation was the Treaty of Vereeniging which transferred South Africa from British to Dutch control. With the act of union and the subsequent enactment of the 1913 Land Act, the Dutch were brought closer to the uniform and ideal native policy they had so long sought. It is clear from the foregoing that before the formation of the Union and the enactment of the 1913 Land Act, white South Africa was divided against itself, small farmers against "monied farmers" and absentee landlords, European extremists against European liberals who feared the violent punishment of squatters and encouraged moderation, Dutch colonists against British colonists, and so on.

In this environment white South Africa had no unified, clear-cut vision of its economic destiny. It had no blueprint or masterplan of how its future economic development would be shaped. The 1913 Land Act was a masterplan, not simple schematism, ably and eagerly pursued by those who acquired control of South Africa and who also supported African landlessness as the foundation of the fledging nation's economic development. In all probability, the 1913 Land Act

is the single most important factor in South Africa's history that is responsible for its high white concentration of land ownership. Thus the consequences of this act largely account for South Africa's dubious acclaim as one of the most economically advanced nations in the world.

NOTES

1. R. Daniels, "The Nature of the Agrarian Land Question in the Republic of South Africa," *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 46 (January, 1987), pp. 2-3.

2. P. L. Wickins, "The Natives Land Act of 1913: A Cautionary Essay on Simple Explanations of Complex Change," *South African Journal of Economics*, 49 (February 1981), p. 106.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.

4. *Ibid.*, pp. 13-15.

5. The terms Boer (farmer) and Afrikaner came to be used interchangeably among the new Dutch settlers. Boer was a name given by the Governor of the Cape Colony, Wilem Adriaan Van Des Stel, to Dutch farmers who advanced into the interior of the new land. Governor Van Des Stel allegedly resented trekkers for this advance because it interfered with his attempts to monopolize the produce market along with his friends. The term was elevated by trekkers to a badge of honor, denoting a people reared on southern African soil, imbued with a patriotism centered in the new land into which they carried the cultural virtues of western Europe. See *South Africa 1984: Official Yearbook of the Republic of South Africa* (Johannesburg: Chris Van Rensburg Publications, 1984), p. 38.

6. It is worth noting that Britain's indifference toward the Orange Free State and the Transvaal was short-lived, as economic and political events in these republics sparked renewed British involvement. In the first place, many settlers in the Cape Colony resented the balkanization of South Africa, in addition to many people in the Orange Free State and the Transvaal who espoused the notion of federation. Second, the spectacular diamond discoveries in Griqualand West (now known as Kimberly) led to bitter disputes over the ownership of the area between both Boer republics and such African tribes as the Tswana and Griqua (a mixed Hottentot and half-breed tribe led by Chief Waterboer). The land was awarded by the British to Waterboer, who was promptly persuaded in 1871 to align the Griqua with Britain in the creation of the Crown Colony of Griqualand West. This action left the Transvaal and Orange Free State bitter and suspicious of British intentions. Nevertheless, Britain forged ahead in its efforts to federate the Boer republics and, when all diplomatic efforts failed, the Transvaal was annexed in 1877. The Transvaal annexation led to the defeat of British forces at the Battle of Majuba Hill in what is referred to as South Africa's First War of Independence. Despite this defeat Britain's political and economic interests in South Africa intensified as the rise of colonial ambition in Europe brought Germany, France, Belgium, and Portugal into the struggle for Africa. Among the most important factors which account for Britain's continued efforts to expand its influence in southern Africa are: Germany's annexation of the territory now known as South West Africa (Namibia), the discovery of the world's richest gold-bearing reef on the Witwatersrand in 1886 (where Johannesburg now stands), and the unacceptable economic and political status of British subjects (Uitlanders) on the Witwatersrand, who had been accused in the Jameson Raid of 1895-96 of attempting to overthrow President Paul Kruger's government in the Transvaal. When diplomatic efforts to resolve the dispute over the status of the Uitlanders proved unsatisfactory, Britain launched the Anglo-Boer War (the Second War of Independence). The Boers were forced to become a part of the British Empire at the conclusion of the war in 1902. The Treaty of Vereeniging was negotiated on May 31, 1902, the treaty on which the Union of South Africa was formed eight years later. The most important terms of the generous treaty were these: responsible government would be

granted by Britain upon settlement of the country; the Dutch language was recognized as equal to English, which already was the case; non-European franchise was postponed until after the granting of responsible government; and the British Government agreed to assist in the economic reconstruction of the Boer Republics. For a more in-depth discussion of the early history of South Africa, the reader will do well to consult Marquard, *op cit.*, pp. 11 ff and *South Africa 1984: Official Yearbook of the Republic of South Africa*, *op cit.*, pp. 3–65.

7. L. Marquard, *Peoples and Policies of South Africa* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1967), p. 14.

8. Daniels, *op cit.*, p. 10.

9. Marquard, *op cit.*, p. 15.

10. J. Nattrass, *The South African Economy: Its Growth and Change* (Cape Town: Oxford Univ. Press, 1981), p. 190.

11. *South Africa 1984: Official Yearbook of the Republic of South Africa*, *op cit.*, pp. 199–200.

12. Nattrass, *op cit.*, p. 190.

13. Marquard, *op cit.*, p. 41.

14. Nattrass, *op cit.*, p. 190 and Wickins, *op cit.*, p. 109.

15. Wickins, *op cit.*, pp. 107–9.

16. *Ibid.*, pp. 109–10.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 110.

18. Marquard, *op cit.*, p. 41.

19. *South Africa 1984: Official Yearbook of the Republic of South Africa*, *op cit.*, p. 40 and Nattrass, *op cit.*, p. 60.

20. Marquard, *op cit.*, p. 41; Nattrass, *op cit.*, p. 68.

21. Nattrass, *op cit.*, p. 67.

22. *Ibid.*, pp. 67–68.

23. *Ibid.*, p. 67.

24. Wickins, *op cit.*, pp. 110–20.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 112.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 113.

27. *Ibid.*, p. 114.

28. *Ibid.*, p. 114.

29. *Ibid.*, pp. 114–15.

30. *Ibid.*, pp. 114–15.

31. *Ibid.*, p. 115.

32. These acts, in addition to the Native Registration and Protection Bill (1923) and the Natives (Urban Areas) Act (1923) shared common objectives: to implement a single native policy, formalize the long established view of the "natural policy," assure an adequate labor supply, and allow for economic growth and dominance of the economic resources of the developing nation by Whites. See Daniels, *op cit.*, p. 10 and Wickins, *op cit.*, p. 10 and Wickins, *op cit.*, p. 107.

33. Nattrass, *op cit.*, p. 69.

34. L. Marquard, *Peoples and Policies of South Africa* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1967), p. 38.

35. Wickins, *op cit.*, pp. 107–29. J. Selby, *A Short History of South Africa* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1973), p. 247; M. S. Jacobs, *The Law of Expropriation in South Africa* (Cape Town: Junta, 1982); Marquard, *op cit.*, p. 38.

36. Nattrass, *op cit.*, pp. 99–100 and *South Africa 1984: Official Yearbook of the Republic of South Africa*, *op cit.*, p. 233 and p. 930.

37. Nattrass, *op cit.*, pp. 99–100.