



UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/AC.22/RT.68/1*
4 November 1969

ENGLISH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

AD HOC WORKING GROUP OF EXPERTS ESTABLISHED UNDER RESOLUTION 2 (XXIII)
OF THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

RECORD OF TESTIMONY TAKEN AT THE ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-THIRD MEETING

- Held at the United Nations Office at Geneva
on Thursday, 7 August 1969, at 10.50 a.m.

Mr. BOYE (Chairman)

- Conditions of Africans in the so-called "native reserves" in South Africa:
Testimony of Dr. Z. Conco

* This record consists of two parts: E/CN.4/AC.22/RT.68 and E/CN.4/AC.22/RT.68/1.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): . Conco, what is your full name, age and profession?

Mr. CONCO: My name is Wilson Zamindare Conco. My profession is medical practitioner, Mr. Chairman. I was born on 11 May 1919. My home is Natal, South Africa.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Dr. Conco, you have just heard the relevant provisions of resolutions 21 (XXV) of the Commission on Human Rights and 1412 of the Economic and Social Council, which define our mandate. You have a choice between two formulas. The first formula is: I swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. The second formula: I declare solemnly on my honour and conscience that I will tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Which formula do you prefer?

Dr. CONCO: The latter, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French); Mr. Conco, you declare solemnly on your honour and conscience to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

Dr. CONCO: I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Dr. Conco, will you please make your statement.

Dr. CONCO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank you very much for affording me this opportunity to give some testimony on the conditions in the South African reserves. This is a very broad subject covering almost the history of South Africa. I will sub-divide my presentation into several headings, and there will be a lot of overlap, of course, and repetition, and I hope, Mr. Chairman, you will bear with me.

In the first place, the question of terminology of South African native reserves: there are so many terms used to describe one thing, putting a certain connotation on it. The terms "native reserves", "native areas", "Bantu areas", "bantustans", and the incidents then as the speaker pleases, that is to say, the Transkei, the Zulustan, and so forth -- all probably referring to one and the same thing, but using it with the intention of creating an impression for other people. The latest, Mr. Chairman, is Bantu homelands. This is a new addition, and these terms work within a context, and the context is that of apartheid, of separateness.

Now, we can understand this. For instance, the Minister of Bantu Administration Development said his object was to give a definite shape, in 1966, to every Bantu nation. Now he introduces a new word; he never used that before; that is, he tends now to "Bantu nation in accordance with its national character", and he says: I want to bring a most interesting point to the attention of all of us who are speaking in regard to all the various natives we have here. The white nation, the coloured nation, the Indian nation, the various Bantu nations -- now, the various Bantu nations before the national issues were called tribes, but for outward consumption you have just changed and called them "nations". Something to which we have given -- he goes on -- too little regard is the fact that numerically the white nation is superior to all other nations in South Africa. And the Minister goes on: "It is a very wide indication for us all; firstly, it demonstrates the utter folly of saying that a minority government is ruling others in South Africa. This is a very clever way of doing this for outside consumption, for a person who has never been in South Africa and knows very little about the conditions, because he creates in the minds of the world the existence of separate Bantu nations.

I just want to point out the terminology, because a lot of confusion arises when we discuss this question of the native reserves, or any question on apartheid.

He goes on:

"Our policy is based on facts. Facts of what? Of the separateness and diversity of the various Bantu nations and other nations in South Africa, as separate national groups set on separate courses to separate destinies".

And then finally he says: "In the final instance, our work is directed at eventual geographic partition".

The above concepts are used in a context of separateness, as I have already said -- diversity of the various Bantu natives. Since the most distinguishing fact of diversity is colour -- black and white, and the diversity of the Bantu nations' languages -- geographical separation and partition is the ultimate aim.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, to have kept you on this question of terminology, of Bantu nations, of Bantustans, and so on. But if the reserves are to be understood properly, one has to understand the use of the terms.

In 1965 there was formed -- they were using the same concept again -- the Bantu Homelands Development Corporation, in which the term "Bantu Homelands" appeared for the first time; it was the "Bantu Areas" before. In its terms, it puts the concept of separate homelands into effect as follows: the Minister is empowered for the development of a corporation in respect of the homeland of each national unit, to promote the economic development and the general welfare and advancement of the homeland. They do not use "reserve" now, they use "homeland". That is, post-1965 there is no more use of "native reserves"; they become now "Bantu homelands".

I have attempted, on such a broad subject, to give a sort of summary, and from that summary -- and this will not take us very long -- what I then propose to do is to deal with two or three sections which I will more or less cover, depending on what time we have.

In the first place, the historical summary of the evolution of the native reserves. We must know what we are talking about when we talk about reserves. The concept of reserves is a colonial concept. It arises out of splitting human beings and allocating them to an area, or to the level, of animals. This is done

(Dr. Conco)

very cleverly. You have the native reserves, and then you have the game reserves. And this is very clear in Dr. Verwoerd's pronouncement -- I do not have the year, I do not remember the year; I think I will refer to it more in detail later. When he was asked in Parliament: "Mr. Prime Minister, are you aiming at integration in South Africa?" He said:

"In South Africa you must understand this one thing. If you people say the native is to be integrated, you might as well say the asses and oxen and tractors should be integrated."

Now, that is a very clear enunciation of apartheid and this question of using the name "reserves", as something which is kept apart for people who are sub-human or who are not human at all.

You get a sort of duality in politics, duality in economics, duality in morals, duality in religion -- a complete separation. Thus you will understand the whole situation about the reserves.

Now, what is this land of the native reserves like? What are we talking about when we talk about the native reserves? Here I shall pinpoint only important aspects. The subject is so big. A lot, of course, has been written and a lot of commissions have been appointed by the South African Government from the early days, from 1913: the Glomen Commission, the 1932 Commissions, the Tomlinson Commission. There is all that voluminous material reporting on the native reserves. There are facts and figures, estimates and evaluations that have been made by the commissions on the conditions in these areas. And of course, they suggest something; they describe these areas as semi-deserts. And usually nothing is done.

Perhaps you would also like to know about the physical characters of the reserves. What type of South African terrain are these areas in? Geographically, are they really areas where human beings can make a living? Has there been any geographical research in order to find out whether these areas can actually produce what the Nationalists are now trying to convince the world that they will do? All these facts I will try to give you. I cannot put them all down here, I can just indicate some main points on them.

The Nationalists are attempting to assemble geographical data for practical purposes of foreign and domestic policy. They are trying to convince the world that the economic geographers are now finding the locations of the good soil in these reserves and that they can develop the skills of the Africans to work those areas. And from their own records, these places are semi-deserts -- from the records of the various commissions themselves. All you need is to take the Government records themselves and they will tell you the story of the reserves.

Now, in my view, this is really a very cruel thing that is being done by the South African Government, who claim now that they can put Africans into the semi-deserts of the reserves, squeeze them in there. This is very inhuman, and the methods used to do this are the most inhuman that people have ever made. You have only to live there to know what these people are capable of doing. I will point out some facts. There is such a lot that I could not really cover the whole thing.

Describing the conditions of the reserves, of course one has to think about the people there, those who live there. They live in these reserves. They did not choose to do so; historical events led to this. They were born there. Some have never been out of the reserves. Some have never even seen a train. Able-bodied men who go to Johannesburg will tell the untutored about the big towns, the trains, the cars and the streets, while the others have never seen these things. By the way, even the Transkei has not got a single railway going through it. Communications -- there are none.

There is also regional ethnic grouping, which will always be referred to. There are Zulus, there are Xhosas, there are Chwanas, there are Sothos; and you have, for instance, terms like Zululand, Swaziland, Ovamboland, and so on.

There are these differences. They are linguistic and also tribal. But as time goes on, these things in industrial towns are dying off.

The Government, as I have already pointed out, has classified separate Bantu entities and allocated them to definite geographical reserves now, in terms of the Bantustan policy: Zulus, Xhosas, Northern Sotho, Southern Sotho, Swazi, Tonga, etc.

(Dr. Conco)

The ethnic grouping is a characteristic political system comprising the chiefs. Now, where a chief does not agree with the Government, where a chief does not agree with the Government policy, from the old colonial days, he is arrested, he is deported. I will take, for instance, an example like Dinizulu, the Zulu Chief who was arrested, deported and exiled to St. Helena, and who died in Middelburg under deportation in the Transvaal. The veteran chief Makomo was also deported, and he died on Robben Island.

(Dr. Conco)

There have also been many instances, especially in the Cape in war-time, where chiefs have been deported. As long as they do not agree with Government policy, they are put out, and the Government then creates new chiefs who will agree with Government policy.

That is the position now in the Transkei, the showpiece of the nationalist Government -- the Bantustans. The chiefs who are in power must be in agreement with Government policy. If they are not, they are put out.

Now, there is also a point of terminology which is very interesting because it shows how apartheid works, especially in relation to the reserves and these new chiefs. For instance, in the Transkei, you do not have a prime minister: you have a chief minister. That chief minister had been created a paramount chief and then became the chief minister, because he cannot be a prime minister in South Africa. The post of prime minister is reserved for the white Government.

In this connexion, I would refer to some instances where there is a test of the sincerity of the apartheid policy in the reserves -- instances where the South African Government is on test to prove its sincerity on this question of Bantustan. I shall just cite one instance. I come from Gollel, a small border village between Zululand and Swaziland. There is a big dam which is being built there. Now, they are going to build that big dam, which will irrigate a vast area -- I do not know the acreage of it -- a vast area on the other side of the Ovambo Mountains towards the sea. Now, that area, known as Makatini Flats, is right in the middle of an African reserve; and because it is so fertile, a 36-million-Rand-worth project at Chosini is being made for European farmers to be settled in Makatini Flats; and before these are settled, massive removals of Africans, who have never known any other place in their lives -- they have lived there for generations; since the times of Chagavelli they have been the "Makatini Flats people" -- but because it was found that this area is very fertile, the Africans had to move out and give way to the white farmers. And when the Government spokesmen are asked, "What about developing this area for Africans?" they say, "Well, we will give them a few acres to cultivate under irrigation."

(Dr. Conco)

Now I will go on to the conditions in the reserves; and, of course, these are described, as I have already said, in quite a lot of books written on this, and I will also testify about my experience when I was in the reserve as a doctor, and that will come later when I finish this brief summary. Of course, what is very interesting is that, to a visitor, to a chap who is not aware of conditions, life goes on as if nothing were happening: there is still music; there is still art; people do their carving or their clay-work. But what is interesting is that in their clay-work they do not show their past; they are showing the future all the time. Little boys are making cars instead of making the buffaloes of old. In other words, they are moving forward instead of backward; and, of course, sometimes there is a very interesting musical play by Africans, such as the African musical play, Sikalo. It takes its inspiration, in my view, from the Transkei Veldt, where you get the burning sun and the droughts; those places can be terribly affected by drought. And the singer says: "Who is going to help me carry my sins when I cross the River Jordan? I am afraid to cross the Jordan today because my sins are too heavy for me. O Lord, help me; O Lord, the fire is coming behind me; O Lord, help me before it burns me, O Lord."

Now, that is the language of a people that is oppressed. They see a river -- a flood -- in front of them; they see a fire burning behind. Now, you can imagine what you are going to do: Are you going to go to the river and drown, or are you going to allow the fire to burn you? These people cannot speak; they have no Press. These people can only speak through their music; they can only speak through their poetry. And they call on the world for help, and the world is silent.

I shall also comment on the population records, if you will allow me. That will take me a bit longer, because there I shall try to show, by a comparison of population records in the reserves, why vital statistics are not kept -- the reason why deaths are not registered and births are not registered. There is definitely a reason behind that. South Africa is one of the rich African States, and still there are no vital statistics -- no facts of life -- nothing.

Now, the fact that this is not done is all part of a scheme aimed at producing geographical separation of the races, and thus we have no measure of what happens to them. They take the natives and shunt them into reserves. They are born and they die. So if you take these figures and you register their births, you are going to shock the world, because once you start publishing these things, the world is going to be alarmed at the conditions in these areas. So, theoretically, by statute, births are to be registered; but, in practice, they never are.

Now, I know that every calf that is born in South Africa must be reported to the local registrar within a week of its birth. If a cow or an ox dies or is slaughtered, a portion of the spleen must be taken to the local veterinary registrar, who then makes a smear on a glass slide which he then sends to the local veterinary office in that area. Failure to report a dead cow or a dead calf or new-born calf is punishable by imprisonment. But not human beings -- nothing. Theoretically, every birth should be registered and reported, as I have said; but, in practice, no registrations are made.

Now, I shall dwell some more on this in the section on health, and will show the conditions in the "last resort". Health usually gives you the "last resort" -- the answer -- to the arithmetic of the reserves. You now get the last resort -- the "sediment" -- what this whole thing leads to.

(Dr. Conco)

I will not dwell much on the political and social objectives in the reserves themselves. I will mention a few things in the Verwoerd context of apartheid. As I will show later, Africans, like asses and oxen, have no social or political objective. Now, they have no free will in the sense of apartheid. Their future and welfare is determined by the master race. The food they have to eat and the air they have to live in is all determined by forces beyond their control. Laws are made for Africans. Africans do not make laws. They are made for them, and there is a whole subject of native administration, where people who can qualify to the highest, which is a special study of how to administer natives, more or less like how to look after animals in the reserves. It is a science as well as an art of how natives are ruled. Such a special section, so-called native administration, arises out of the context of the conditions in the reserves in South Africa.

Another point. Because Africans have no say, because somebody has got to have a say for them, in other words, the law is made, and they have just to take it, and if they do not, then there is this recourse to force. It is born of the old colonial days, where they are forced to accept law because it is good for them. Now I will refer to instances like the Bulok massacre, where Africans in a reserve refused to move and said, "Look, we are not moving from here; we have been here for so many years, and we are not moving." The whole Union Army was sent to shoot them, and 600 of them were shot dead. Sharpeville was a later one, and there are many others which I am not going to mention here. So you get the violence of apartheid arising out of this conviction, out of this metaphysical religious faith, where you actually put people into a position of animals, and when you shoot a chap you are not shooting a human being. You are actually dealing with a thing.

Now you ask me, Mr. Chairman, are the people in the reserves politically alive, active? What are they doing, to take so much suffering? Is there suffering at all? Why do they do nothing? We do not hear a thing, no revolution, nothing, no fight. Some people will say, "Well, but people in other areas, when they are kept like your people, they fought", but all I can summarize here is that, if there ever have been people who have been a patriotic group who have resisted now and again the incursions of the South African Government, United Party, the Nationalist Party, it is the people in the reserves. Against all odds,

(Dr. Conco)

they have shown an unconquerable spirit of resistance, resilience and aggression. I can just point, for instance, to a few instances where rebellions, so-called rebellions, have been features of the reserves ever since they were created. The 1878 rebellion in the Cape, the Langalilabele episode, the Bombata rebellion in 1906, the Bulok massacre which I have referred to, the Wisishoek disturbances in 1950-1952, the Pondoland rebellion, which was so serious that the whole Union force had to go to quell it, and the most interesting one was in Hadi district, which is near the district where I practiced for twelve years, Imzim Kulli, in the Transkei. There was a tribe called the Matu tribe. They had been arrested -- some people had been arrested in regard to some dipping matter with the Bantu Affairs Commission, and the people were so dissatisfied about the arbitrary action taken by the Government that they collected, the men collected and marched on to a small village, Hadi, carrying guns, which are not allowed to be held in South Africa -- illegally -- and the whole town was scared, and the children were evacuated, and these people were going to release some people in gaol. It was through the help of the sergeant, who pleaded with these chaps without showing force -- he pleaded with them and said, "Look, I am not carrying a gun; will you please stop, and we will see to your affairs," and so on and so forth. I did not want to digress so much, but it is just to show that there have been conditions, there have been dissatisfactions in the reserves. It is not so quiet, as perhaps the world might never know, as the world is made to think. In the district of Bizana, that is, the 1958-1959 disturbance -- this was the most serious one -- it arose out of the question of reclaiming land. Now, Pondoland, the most beautiful part of the Transkei -- if I can use the word "beautiful", because other areas are just desert-like conditions -- but Pondoland, which is on the east Pondoland coast, Locki area -- now, they have held this since the times of Fargu, 300 or 400 years ago. The Pondos have never moved from that area. Then the Government came, introducing its Bantu authorities policy. Then it started cutting the land, making paddocks, then moving villages, then to congregate together in one area, and the Pondos objected to this. The paramount chief, who had agreed that the thing be done, had to flee the area, that is, Bizana, and the Union defence force was sent there for about two or three months -- I am not sure exactly of the time -- to go and quell the rebellion, because now the

(Dr. Conco)

Government had encouraged some people to accept the Bantu authorities, but really the majority of the people did not want it, and so they had to use force in order to get these people to accept the system. In Natal at the same time, 1958-1959, there were widespread demonstrations by women filling up stones in the dipping tanks, and it all arose, as I shall show later if I should be called on, it arose out of the intensification of the apartheid laws and the refusal to allow Africans to go and work in towns, because the reserves have no money -- so men have got to go away, and then there is influx control, and the Government refuses these people to go to work, and they come back home and then seethe with discontent, as it happens. Then we have the Secunaland revolt. We had the Riveras revolt, where a book was written by an authority on the question of the Riveras revolt. Mr. Chairman, there are many such open demonstrations and revolts in these reserves, which are signs of discontent. Of course, as I have already pointed out, the most serious one was the one in Pondoland, and of course there was another one in Zululand, where people wanted to attack people who were putting up fences. Those people were arrested and some were severely sentenced. Now, arising out of these disturbances, there are men and women in gaol who are charged for one or other thing. Either they are charged for murder or creating a disturbance. They are serving sentences in gaol, especially arising out of the Pondoland section, because chiefs who were pro-Government died. The people went and just attacked them. So the people were charged and they are in gaol and they are suffering, arising out of the conditions in the reserves.

I am now pointing out the politics of the reserves as shown by the people living there. There are the politics of the reserves, which are the politics of the South African Government.

What the people do, what their policies are, they show by their reactions: revolts, disturbances and so on. What you read about in South African report is politics of the Government in the reserves. Within that context of separate development, then you have of course the Transkei, the showpiece, where you have the Chief Minister, you have the mimicking of a semi-democratic régime. You have the Chief Minister, you have the cabinet, you have the rest in name only. But even in the structure which the nationalists have built, even in this maze of politics of the Government, there is always a voice of reason, there is always a voice which asks a question which sometimes embarrasses the Government, a voice that says, "Father, have I not come of age now? Shall I be free to have my own free home, where I will have my own visitors and friends, where I shall live, on my own income, where I shall make my own arrangements to defend my home? Is it not time, Baba" -- "Baba" means father -- and the father mumbles, "Well, it takes you time, my son, but when you are ready we will give it to you". One member asked in Parliament, "When are they going to be ready?". The Minister has not answered that one.

It is a question of law and justice. The law and justice of the reserves, as I pointed out, is a list of commands made by the master to a servant: "Thou shalt say baas to me when I speak to you". That is the impact of it: "Thou shalt say this" -- and if you say something else, I will punish you or I will take you to gaol. Justice in South Africa in the traditional sense is that the natives must just obey the laws made for them. The Bantu authority laws in the reserves are just made for you and you have to obey them because there is no other voice. Then you have the disturbances which I will refer to later.

(Dr. Conco)

Then there is the question of land. How much land is in these native reserves? If that would be of interest to your Committee I could dwell on the land question, the respective areas of European and African occupation, the native reserves and the African privately owned farms. We must make a distinction between this. The Government, in trying to make the reserves big to the world, will take my farm which I bought with my own sweat and then will lump it as a reserve, that is, the land provided by the Government. It is not true. There are certain lands which were bought by the Africans, who sold their cattle and bought those farms which are privately owned. But the figures that you see represented of the area of the reserves, these farms are just pushed in.

Then there is the difficulty of getting more land for Africans. There is a law on the statute books from 1913. In South Africa there was only about 10 million morgen of land left for Africans after the rape of the land. Then a commission was appointed to look into the matter to see whether more land could be provided for Africans. There is a lot of material on this and I do propose, if you will allow me, to dwell on it if it is relevant to this testimony.

Then there is the question of black spots. Black spots in Biblical language are Naboth vineyards. Those are lands which should never have fallen into the hands of the natives and therefore they must be expropriated and given to European farmers. I have a letter that I got from one of the people who is affected by it. I shall read this when I deal with the question of land.

On agriculture I can just say that the type of agriculture which is carried on in these reserves is what we call primitive. It is primitive because the man is usually not at home, and it is the women who do the scratching of the land, and little boys and girls are behind the hoe. It is very interesting to come upon stations in the Transkei on my way to see patients in the district and you will see an African woman with a baby on her back sometimes leading oxen and a little girl driving them with a boy holding the plough -- because if she does not do this there is no food in the home. So the women do that and of course they have got to

(Dr. Conco)

provide the means while their husbands are in Johannesburg and there is very little money.

Then there is the question of overstocking. It is the concept of overstocking. It takes the blame away from the Government. When you say people are overstocking, the reason the reserves are such a drain, the reason the reserves are such deserts is because these people just keep too many cattle and while in fact it is overcrowded the population in these areas is growing and more homes are appearing.

There is the question of agriculture, of educational and cultural agencies. I shall not deal with that. There is also economic development in the reserves as presented by the Government. There is quite a lot of material on this which I have with figures, and the projects as determined by the South African Government for the Transkei are fitted within a policy of course of separate development. There is the question of labour in the reserves. I do not propose to deal with that here, but there is a relationship because these reserves in the 1932 commission which investigated the question of reserves -- it was either in 1918 or in 1932; I am not quite certain about it -- they had a paragraph which startled me in which one of the commissioners said, "Let us delimit areas to these people -- enough for them just to make a living, not too much, for them to be too independent. We must make areas so that they keep moving and looking for jobs. If we do not do that, these people will not work". That is the question of labour. The native reserves are the reservoirs of South African labour. There is where you draw the labour. If there is a strike in the town, they just phone the Bantu Affairs Commissioner and say "These people have gone on strike. Will you send me about 100 natives?" So he calls and they come and the strike becomes ineffective. In other words, there is always a reservoir of labour and the Government meets certain situations by drawing labour, people who want work, from these reserves.

I propose now to go into the question of land in the reserves, and health, social and economic conditions. Those are the four headings which I should like to go into. There is the question of black spots. I have already referred to most of the historical aspects, and before I go into the question of land, I should like to say that on the question of apartheid there is usually a confusion of categories.

(Dr. Conco)

People usually say, well, apartheid does something; the acts help the natives. I use that term; I do not agree with it, but that is what is usually said. And people judge the acts. In the true Verwoerdian context of apartheid, where you have a category of asses, oxen and tractors, and then you have a category of humans, you must be able to make a difference there.

If I build a garage for my tractor, I want to protect it from rain. If I build a shed or a stable for my ox or my ass, I want it to be in good shape for work. As regards just these acts of building stables, judged on the question of comfort only, that is all right; it is a different level. But the principle of doing the thing is different. Building a stable for a horse, on what principle is that based?

When you ask the question of principle, then apartheid is exposed. But, of course, people will say, well, the Government has spent so much money; you know, it has provided you with health; it has provided you with this. Well, this is all right, it has. But then the principle of what the Government is doing is that it is just keeping its stables. That is all right, because they are the reservoir of labour. They are indispensable in the sense that a tractor is indispensable. In other words, human beings are indispensable in the same sense as tractors and asses are indispensable.

As regards the area of South Africa as a whole, we have the figure. It is 472,511 square miles. The figure for 1960 is: land under European occupation, 420,000 square miles, for a population of 3,088,492. The total area of land for African occupation is 51,565 square miles. The 1960 figure for the African population is 10,927,922. If we now go to investigate the conditions of the reserves in terms of density of population, the land-load, what the land is able to carry in human beings, we see in the area of whites -- the figure of 420,946 I worked it out to be seven persons per square mile. And the land-load on the density for Africans is 215 persons per square mile. I am subject to correction; I did not have a computer. I did some arithmetic and there might be a few mistakes. But it is around that figure. The land-load, the density for the whole of South Africa, for the whole population, comes to thirty-four persons per square mile. That is what we call the hypothetical equitable distribution of the South African land area.

(Dr. Conco)

How is the population distributed for this land? In the 1964 survey we find that the total population of whites is 3.35 million, and that the population of Africans is 11,915,000. Between 1960 and 1964 it is alleged that the white population increased by about 8 per cent and that the African population increased by about 9 per cent. The geographical distribution in 1960 shows Africans in urban areas.

We take the 1960 population of Africans as 10,927,922. It is about 31.8 per cent of the total population. All these figures are plus-minus. As for the Africans in Bantu areas -- that is, the reserves with which we are now concerned -- the figure is 4,811,141 Africans in the reserves -- of course, the reserves and the Bantu Homeland. Of course, there is always this migratory labour shifting up and back. The census figures in South Africa do not reflect what is actually happening. When they say that there are 4,811,141 Africans, there might even be more than that.

Then there is another group, about which I am not going to talk here, which forms a third of this African population in European farms. Those are the serfs, the slaves of the South African semi-feudal system. I am not talking about them. So little is usually known about them. At least more should be known about those people. I am talking about the Africans who are in these reserves. The land which is left for natives is land that was left over after the good land had been taken away. As I have already said, in 1913 it was found that there were only 10,729,455 morgen of land for Africans. Then, in 1913 the Land Act was passed which defined the above areas as scheduled native areas. This was the initial step towards the application of the principle of territorial segregation between Europeans and Africans.

Then, in 1936, under the Native Trust and Land Act -- the policy of further entrenching segregation under Herzog -- there was a body formed called the Native Trust. Its functions were to protect, safeguard and promote the material, moral and social welfare of the native population. The Board was empowered to acquire land for native settlements, until the land so acquired, together with certain Crown land, totalling 1,784,731 morgen, was vested in the Trust. This body had to get land for Africans, to add it to the 10 million morgen. The land was apportioned as follows. The Transvaal had to contribute to this interim increase of native land about 5 million morgen. The Orange Free State was to give

AW/ep

E/CN.4/AC.22/RT.68/1
28-30

(Dr. Conco)

80,000 morgen. The Natal Province was to give 526,000 morgen, and the Cape Province was to give 1,616,000 morgen.

Let us see, in short, what happened with this. Let us see as regards the Native Trust, promoting these material interests, the moral and social welfare of the African people, how much land there was from about 1936 to 1958. After twenty-two years a state body was required to get 7 million to add to the African land. They only acquired about 1,911,968 morgen. Only a third of the land in a grand twenty-two year plan. They could not get the land. In the Cape they only got 441,000 morgen, only a quarter of the target. In the Orange Free State they only got 76,114 morgen. The Orange Free State had never had a reserve. The Africans were just shoved off. Natal got 144,308 morgen, only a quarter of the target too.

I am sorry, I said they got 1,911,000. The total miserable sum is 2,574,136 morgen, the total land which they bought for Africans from 1936 to 1958, after twenty-two years.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Would the witness please repeat the figures, more slowly, so that the interpreters may be able to interpret them?

Dr. CONCO: Land was apportioned as follows: the Transvaal was supposed to get 5,028,000 morgen, that is, land to be bought for Africans, from 1936 to 1958; the Orange Free State was to get 80,000 morgen; Natal Province was to buy 526,000 morgen; and the Cape Province was to buy 1,616,000 morgen. That made a total of 7,250,000 morgen.

What was the land actually acquired? The land actually acquired was as follows: in the Transvaal, only 1,911,968 morgen, which is only a third of the land in a grand twenty-two year plan; in the Cape, only 441,746 morgen, which is only a quarter of the target number; in the Orange Free State, 76,114 morgen -- as I said before, the Free State had no reserves at all; in Natal, 144,308 morgen, which is only a quarter of the target number. That gave a miserable total of land acquired of 2,574,136 morgen. Such a poor achievement did not show the interest of the Native Trust to promote either the material, moral or social welfare of the native population. Meanwhile the population was growing in twenty-two years.

What are the areas, of African reserves, then at the present moment? I will give the figures for 1960. According to the agricultural census of 1963, the land in Bantu areas at the end of August 1960 totalled 16,501,129 morgen, and the annual report of the Social Conservation Board 1962-1963 gives the area of Bantu Territories, that is, the native reserves, as 17,220,185 morgen in 1960, and 16,829,727 morgen in 1962. It does not explain this sharp decrease in the native reserve land -- a sharp drop which contrasts with the difficult acquisition of land. My own surmise is that it may be related to the removal of the Black Spots, because most of these Black Spots had been privately owned lands which had been included in the figure for native areas. As soon as you removed them, the land allotted to Africans shrank.

(Dr. Conco)

What is the meaning of those figures concerning the land question? We find that from 1913 to 1964 the native reserves gained only 6,000,000 morgen of land. From 1913 to 1964 only about 6,000,000 morgen of land had been allotted to Africans. That is to say, in short, the Government of South Africa in a half century had acquired only 6,000,000 morgen of land for four-fifths of its population. Is that promoting the social material and moral welfare of the native population?

In addition to that, they still had Black Spots, and in order to make them white, they removed thousands of Africans to already crowded reserves or abandoned white farms which had been bought by the Native Trust because they were not economical for the whites to work. In my view, that is tantamount to herding people into camps of extinction so that they may perish -- perish not by bullets this time but by natural forces assisted by disease and starvation. That is what, in effect, the native land policy of the reserves of the South African Government is. At the end of the wars of conquest of South Africa, which took 100 years, Africans were, as I have already said, packed into 10,000,000 morgen of land from 1879 to 1900. That was the period of sharing the spoils. After the conquest, then the Powers started sharing the spoils, and the Africans were indiscriminately removed, herded into inaccessible areas. That is the evolution, in short, of the native reserves, like the game reserves, for instance, which were kept, such as Kruger National Park, which occupied 8,000 square miles and was carved out by President Kruger as a place for hunting and keeping wild animals.

I have now shown that the land is insufficient for the development of the African people in the reserves. There is also the question of Black Spots which we have been bringing up now and again and with which I will shortly deal, Mr. Chairman. It is not very long and it brings in the question of the way these removals were done and the question of Limehill and other areas. Here you will see the conditions that exist in these areas.

(Dr. Conco)

In the total area of white-occupied land in South Africa the covetous eye of the Nationalist farmer Government notices certain areas which appear in this extensive white mass of 472,511 square miles. These are called "black spots" -- "black" because the land is really too good to be in the hands of the blacks, or it juts out into a white area which is arbitrarily decided on. It was a mistake for previous Governments to have allowed the land to be in native hands; for instance, areas in northern Natal, like Donhouzer Alkokstroet, and all those areas where Africans bought farms before the Land Act of 1913. Now these areas have big spots. What really is cruel is the way these "black spots" are removed, how the Government does it. Before showing how it does it, I will say that I have got quite a lot of descriptions here of how it is done; some of it I will read in, but some of it I will leave because it is quite too long.

Now, as to the "black spots", I will just give you an analysis of figures, of where they exist. Where are these "black spots" and what is their extent and distribution? These so-called badly situated Bantu reserves and parts jutting out into white farming areas are as follows, divided among provinces:

In Natal the figure is given that there the number of "black spots" was 242; blocks of land belonging to Africans in various areas of Natal number 242. The area of the Natal "black spots" is 70,385 morgen. That is the area of "black spots" in Natal and then there are additional areas to be cleared. Here the Minister was given a report of the areas, in morgen of "black spots" to be removed. And then he gave information about the additional areas which are still going to be dealt with. Additional areas to be cleared were 203,894 morgen. So the total of "black spots" in Natal was 274,279 morgen.

In the Transvaal, the number of "black spots" was given as 55; the total area to be removed, 179,699 morgen.

In the Free State, the number of "black spots" was 4; the total to be removed was 9,602.

In the Cape, the number of "black spots" was 168; the total to be removed, 264,957.

This makes a grand total of 728,537 morgen -- land which has to be wrested from the Africans who must leave that land, which is considered as "black spots" there.

(Dr. Conco)

There are also some figures about the number of areas cleared, and so on, and I am afraid it might take too long to give them. I have already given an indication of the magnitude of this "black spot" area. How are these people to be removed, you may ask. They own the land. Then you will ask me, If the Government takes their land, are they paid anything? The position is this. The Government will say: "We pay them back compensation and we give them an additional amount of 20 per cent of the total inconvenience allowance." That is the official version. But in South Africa there are two market values always, as I have said before. I will give an example. There is a white market value and there is a black market value. Black in the colour sense. Well, in both senses, it might be both: it becomes black in the sense of colour and black in the sense of morals. Take the example of ox "B" sold in the native sale organized by the Department of Bantu Affairs and Development. Ox "B" -- black -- belongs to an African. It is bought by a white farmer, Dabyu, who pays fifty rand for it. It is black native stock. A few weeks or a month later, the farmer, Mr. Dabyu, will take ox "B" and label it now ox "White" into a local farmers' association sale. It is now white stock; it is on Mr. Dabyu's stock, his farm. It is Mr. Dabyu's ox; it will now sell probably for 120 rand.

When I say that the market value of African land is black market value, I mean what I am saying. You are told: "Look, you have got to move here. The Government has decided. You are telling us your land is valued in the same way as white farms. You must remember that as a black man you cannot be the same as a white man. So you had better forget about getting that money. These lawyers are spoiling you and you people think now you are Europeans. You must remember, you are Kaffir-men." That is the attitude adopted.

I will limit my comment on the "black spots" only to the Natal ones. I know these areas; though I do not come from there, it is not very far from where I am and I have visited them, working for my organization, the African National Congress, and we have tried earlier to deal with these conditions. We dealt with them then. Here is a view which was expressed by one of the residents of these areas where his father bought a farm. Before 1913 there was a syndicate formed which bought farms in northern Natal. This syndicate, very interestingly,

(Dr. Conco)

was formed by Dr. Serma, who was the founder of the African National Congress, and he could foresee that Africans would not be safe without land. In other words, there was no land in the reserves, and so he organized them to sell cattle and buy this land. So they bought the block of land, and "Limehill refers to people who are now being displaced. He says:

"My own view is that the most important aim of the mass-removal schemes in South Africa is to make sure that Africans have no security of tenure anywhere in the land of their birth. At any given moment they could be swept away like dust. They must be forever hamba" -- hamba is a Zulu-Xhosa word meaning 'go', 'for ever moving' -- "They must either be tenants of a white farmer, working on the farm as serfs and under his complete control, or they must be in a location" -- 'location' here means a town location -- "under the thumb of a white superintendent during the night and off work, while during the day they produce wealth for the comfort of the white industries, and they must be in a reserve under the eye of a chief or some other stooge.

(Dr. Conco)

"Those who do not fall within these categories must be shunted around so that they fit into the strait-jacket. This is the cruelty of apartheid. The people who have been regarded as most offensive in this respect are those with freehold rights. It means that these people are secure within the walls of their homes, even if there is persecution and oppression all around them. And this cannot be allowed to continue. So, says the Government, areas where blacks owned land have been the first target".

Now, most of these lands were acquired before the coming into operation of the Land Act of 1913, which forbade Africans from buying land from other races. After 1913, Africans were forbidden from buying land from other races. And it says here that people could organize their lives there with a certain measure of dignity in comparison with other places. What particularly annoyed white farmers -- now, he is talking from experience, because this affects his home -- was seeing Africans who had land; they were annoyed by the fact that those Africans who found oppression unbearable on the white farms eventually found asylum in these freehold areas. There they could send their children to school. So the agitation for removal began -- and this is very important -- the agitation from the white farmers for removal of these African areas began; and this was intensified as early as in the 1930s - it is not a thing of now -- at the time of Herzog, and gathered new force after 1948.

Now, the Herzog 1936 Land Act was trying to pander to these demands by the farmers. The first to fall victim were those African townships which were within his reach -- the first to fall victim to the removal of towns -- and within easy means of transportation, such as railways or main roads. Invariably, these areas have been declared "black spots". How an area qualifies to become such a "black spot" has never been defined in law or in any other context. In actual practice, it simply means that any area which the whites envy or fancy could be so declared. It is the old story of the depriving of Naboth of his vineyard by the evil-eyed Ahaz -- that is his reference here. This is what happens in the western areas of Johannesburg and in the various parts of northern Natal. People are being shifted forty or more miles from areas they owned; and where various conveniences were available, the amount of compensation given for capital development and improvement of the land has been nominal. In other words,

(Dr. Conco)

that is the native compensation -- and, almost invariably, below one-sixth of the current value of the properties involved, even for homes built in European style, he says. No value is attached to African-tupe houses; these are just destroyed. If it is made of mud and wooden poles, the bulldozer just destroys it completely; no value is attached to it; it means nothing.

Now, obstacles are placed in the way of those who are about to be moved to prevent them from getting legal advice and facilities with regard to compensation. In any case, legal costs, too, become too high, and these people cannot afford to go to lawyers.

And he goes on to say -- I shall not read the whole letter -- that the expelled community is dumped into an open veldt, without any amenities. Often it is a dry, barren region, without natural water for the people and their stock. There has been an outbreak of epidemics in these areas, leading to heavy casualties, especially amongst children. There are a lot of figures here, and reports about the same area of Limehill; some of them are just extracts, and I shall not read the lot. There is quite a lot of information about it, describing the conditions of the Africans in these displaced areas or camps.

I propose now to deal briefly with the various types of reserves. Now, I have referred so far just to reserves; I have not classified them for you as to what type of reserve it is, and so on, because they differ in type, and I think this would be quite relevant. As I say, I have already referred to reserves, which are divided into native reserves, and then you have the game reserves, where the wild animals are kept. Now, on this question of reserves, certain usages are very interesting. First, you have the South Africa-proper civilized white area; second, you have the reserves, which, as I have said, are divided into native reserves, where natives live, and game reserves, where wild animals stay. Now, the following practice is recognized by law: if a white person leaves civilized South Africa to visit a native or game reserve, he requires a permit to enter the reserves; he is liable to prosecution if he is not in possession of a permit or a pass. That is true apartheid. If an African native wants to visit South Africa-proper, he must be in possession of a permit or pass, or passport, allowing him in.

(Dr. Conco)

Since July, as reported by the Minister -- I got this from a guide to southern Africa for tourists, page 317:

"Since July 1963 Bantu from outside the Republic have had to hold passports to enter South Africa". In other words, Bantu are foreigners in the whole 400,000 square miles; they belong to the reserves; that is where their home is, so they must carry a passport. When you move from the Transkei, say, to Johannesburg, you must get a passport, because you are now outside your area; you are a foreigner in this sense.

If an African moves from a native reserve to a game reserve, he also requires a permit at the gate of, say, the Kruger National Park. He must carry a permit. He is moving from one area to another. If an animal is to be moved from a native reserve or a game reserve to white South Africa, it must have a removal permit -- an animal pass -- and vice versa. Now, these are apartheid idioms which really help probably to clinch the intentions behind, really the true meaning of this policy. In the Bantu homelands, the idiom has it, the typical Bantu tribal home. Now, an African does not have a home. He has got a kraal. The senior male of the collection of huts is a kraal head. He is therefore described in one context as a kraal dwelling native. So what I am describing to you is a group of people living in the reserves under the conditions that are sometimes referred to as kraal dwelling natives. They do not have homes. Where cattle live, where cattle and goats are kept, is called a kraal -- cattle kraal. That is the context by which we must understand the use of these terms.

The reserves, shortly, in brief, Mr. Chairman, not to worry you, comprises the following areas -- so-called Bantu areas. The Transkei, which is recorded by one historian to have been an area which was referred to as kept for the barbarians -- it was cut out for barbarians living earlier. That is the historical area. The other area is the Ciskei. This consists of pockets of African reserves left after the conquest of the Xhosas. Then you have got, secondly, Zululand and Natal. They are pockets of reserves left after the 1379 Zulu war. Of course there were other reserves which were declared by Shepston during the Natal administration. They cut up quite a lot of land for Africans. Then in the Western Areas there are six large and small reserves, in the Northern Cape and the Western Transvaal. Then you have -- that is the Western Areas -- the number four. You get the Northern Areas -- African reserves in the Northern Transvaal, which are Northern Sutusmitje and the Fristaje is very short of reserves. You have only got one small reserve -- Litsoshoek reserve. I have not got the extent of all these -- how big they are.

(Dr. Conco)

Now, there is so much about the Transkei that has been written that I have nothing very much to add about what has been written about the Transkei. Now, it might also be of interest, time allowing, that the Transkei, its evolution, came by accident. It was not a policy to form the Transkei. After the conquest of the Motosa, Woodhouse in 1364 decided to keep the Transkei as a reserve -- just accidental -- he thought this area must be kept for African occupation. It has got its capital, Mutata, the centre of the New Tableland, as at that time they described it, and the Transkei survives to become the proudest boast of South African native administration. There is a lot which has been written about it as a show-piece of South African Government administrative brilliance and it has tended to be a show-piece of separate development. We have had the Transkei Parliament, which was the Buma before, which was the General Council before and which has had so many names as people would change in policy. Now, what is interesting to observe about the Transkei is also that there are areas which are scooped out. It is the only area which is geographically continuous. But you will find that there are areas which happen to be rich or to be of strategic importance, which are scooped out, like, for instance, the Mount Kari district, which is right at the corner, towards Basutoland -- that is the area where I was working, East Griqualand -- Mount Kari district, consisting of Matatiele, Kokstadt, and I think there is another one -- I am not sure but I think it is Macalay. These do not belong to the Transkei, though geographically they are within the Transkei territory itself. Then there is the Ciskei, which I referred to. It was the remnants after the conquest of the Xhosas. That is where you have very few reserves. It does not have many people now. It is only about 350,000 people in the Ciskei. That is about all, as far as the division of these areas -- so that when one talks about the reserves one really talks about certain areas, and you must define what one is talking about.

Now, there is a very interesting extract here which I propose to read, on the Bantu homelands, because it is a recent concept. Bantu reserves, Bantu homelands, Bantu areas, native reserves -- all refer to one thing: where natives are kept and added. Now, the Minister explains -- Mr. M.C. Botha here is explaining the policy of Bantu homelands as now seen by the Government of late.

He says:

"As a result of the process of emancipation of Africa, the concepts of Bantu and African began to lose their significance. They were replaced by proper names, and individuals are now regarded as members of a certain nation and as citizens under a certain authority."

He goes on:

"In order to fulfil the obligations of the policy of separate development, each of the different nations will in future have to be assisted in its process of emancipation. It does not matter where the various subjects are born, whether on a farm or in one of the urban Bantu residential areas. The decisive factor by which the nationality of a person is determined is not his birthplace but rather his race descent."

Now, the important thing about this -- it might look just innocuous -- the Minister is now preparing to take, to remove, useless Africans -- what are called the industrially useless in towns, the maimed, the widows, the sick who are not working. He is preparing now a home for them. So he calls the reserves now Bantu homelands. Then, in order to be able to take these people back, to take these people and give them a place -- and some of these people who are in town have never been to the reserves. They are people, some of them, that have been born in Johannesburg, but now it says here that it does not matter whether a chap was not born in the reserve itself, if he is a Xhosa -- so now I will take him and dump him in the area which I have defined as Xhosa. He never says it is not his home. He has got to find a home. In other words, the policy is: a native does not belong here in Johannesburg; I must find a home for him; I must use the law and make it such that I find a home for these people; so I will define citizenship in terms of language.

(Dr. Conco)

If you talk Torsa, though you were born in Johannesburg and you have never been to Torsaland, you talk Torsa and I talk Zulu. You see, your home, Kaffir, is Zululand, and your home is Torsaland; you do not even know where it is. So now the law is made use of to try and make this contract clear. You have got to be able to dump him. Otherwise you would say, "This is cruel, you just dump people." It is cruel"; I am saying this. But they are trying to justify the policy. Then he says, "Another important fact by which the nationality of a peasant can be determined is the language he speaks. Membership of a nation is a sociological fact"-- he goes into platitudes -- "which ultimately will have to be recognized formally and legally. Positive steps in this direction are being considered and it is hoped that legislation will soon be introduced to enable the various authorities to issue documents of citizenship to their subjects." The authorities that he is referring to are local authorities in towns who must now classify all the Africans in the towns. There are many of them living in towns. They must now be classified and be given citizenship in order that when they become old and maimed they will be dumped to that respective place where they belong, even if they have never seen it.

"Membership of a certain national community is acquired automatically, for every person is born within a certain national group and is loyal to it. It is the responsibility of everyone", says the Minister, "whites as well as non-whites, to differentiate properly between the separate nations of South Africa and to distinguish them one from the other. Every separate Bantu nation is to establish its own foundations, to settle down, to grow and develop as separate nations." That is what he said about apartheid and development.

Lastly, I will deal with conditions as we see them as doctors. The other things, as I said, I will omit as there is not sufficient time. I will deal now with the conditions as seen by doctors. Economists have their own way of looking at economic conditions of poverty, which is appalling. What is the end result of those people being crowded in? What do they look like when they come into the post mortem, into the hospital as invalids of a system? What are they like? I shall shortly deal with that.

(Dr. Conco)

I should like to consider the question of health. Health is usually a quite good measure of how people are living. It is a measure of the conditions of a society, of the economy, of the educational standards and so on. As a medical practitioner I worked in the reserves for twenty years. I have never gone to town. I spent twelve years in the Transkei and eight years in the border of Swaziland and Zululand. These areas of course are relevant to this testimony, that is, Zululand and the Transkei. There is a consistent pattern of disease resulting from a pattern of social, economic and environmental conditions of the people living in these areas, which is ultimately the result of government policy, of apartheid.

We usually refer to health as a stage of physical, mental and social well-being, not just merely absence of disease or infirmity. In medicine we try to deal with the whole human being, his physical, mental, social, cultural, educational, political and economic bearing to his welfare or well-being. I shall deal with them separately. I have two cases in point. I should just like to describe to you a case of Kwashiorkor, a case of malnutrition. Kwashiorkor, is a condition which happens in children when they are weaned, when they leave their mother's breast. We diagnose a child as having kwashiorkor when we see he has oedemas. It is the most miserable condition that a child can have. Many have passed through my hands, puffed, swollen and miserable, dying and dead. Sometimes the mother brings a dead child; she is not aware of it, and the mother sheds tears, because she has lost her only possession in the world. These children die by the thousands. There are no figures available on this. There is no notification of this and that, in my view, is done within a scheme. They lack proteins and calories, the very staffs of life. They are starved. Why is malnutrition so prevalent? How prevalent it is I do not know. What are the figures? No one knows who is to blame. There is no milk, no meat. Instead of encouraging the raising of cattle because land is in short supply, the Government says, "No, look, we have got too many cattle," so many people are cut off from milk -- no milk, no meat, no food -- and these children, I repeat, die by the thousands. A medical doctor from Durban, a man of conscience -- I shall not mention his name as I do not know it, but I remember reading the article -- felt some guilt in the situation obtaining in the reserves and urban areas.

(Dr. Conco)

I have indicated the ravages of malnutrition. I have referred to a condition which we recognize as kwashiorkor, and I have referred to a medical doctor, of conscience, who wrote as follows -- these are not his exact words:

"Is it not a fact that these thousands of young children are deprived of life by malnutrition and disease because of me and you? We are responsible for their death even if we think we are remote from the picture. We are involved in the chain of causal relations."

He went on:

"All of us, every one of us in South Africa, is guilty, for each and every one of those children are dying every hour of disease, malnutrition and starvation. We are all guilty. We rationalize and try to absolve ourselves by saying: ignorance, superstition, neglect and poor, primitive farming conditions. That is not true. The fact is that we are involved and we do not want to accept it. We have a guilt of wilfully perpetuating a system" -- now this is a white doctor writing -- "of oppression and human slavery under the guise of separate development, of enacting or allowing in the statute book the laws which dehumanize four-fifths of South Africa's population. We enjoy the highest standard of living in the world, with the best of comforts, by the sweat and blood of the African people, whom we pay so little. Hence malnutrition. We are guilty of allowing the existence of those very areas called the reserves -- the reserves of labour which become the reservoirs not only of labour but of disease and human decay. And we put a covering, with these areas apartheidized, in the name of Christian civilization, as homelands, Bantu areas, when we perfectly know that they are neither homes nor lands for 30 million blacks in 13 per cent of the land of South Africa. And we allocate to the whites, again in the name of Christian civilization, 87 per cent." -- that is the latest estimate -- "of South Africa's land mass to only 3 1/2 million people, whites.

"Still, in the chain of causal relationship, for every one of these children who die, we shape the bullets. These are invisible bullets. They kill, maim and affect the genes of a race. For killing we are guilty of a crime against humanity. For maiming, we are guilty of allowing a

(Dr. Conco)

new type of maimed human being, sub-human. That is the ultimate result of the perpetuation of the system. Kwashiorkor, malnutrition, takes a heavy toll of human lives in the African reserves."

This doctor is telling the truth. It is an example of a man-made disease, a phenomenon which the South African racialist Government has introduced for profit or pleasure, or in the name of progress, separate development and separate freedoms. These children, as the African name says, are deprived children.

Kwashiorkor is a West African name meaning a deprived child, I am told. He is deprived of food and a chance to live. We have what I would call national kwashiorkor, a people deprived of the means of living. How many of them die? Kwashiorkor is only a case of a broader aspect called malnutrition -- which is even worse. How many people die of malnutrition we do not know. I do not think anybody knows. I do not think the South African Government cares to know. In fact, I can go further and say that it does not want to know.

When a Minister of the Crown reached South Africa -- developed, Western, with millions of pounds spent for defence and security -- and the Minister was questioned in Parliament about how many children died of malnutrition at Limehill, his reply was that he did not know because it was not a notifiable disease.

The interesting thing is this. Actually, kwashiorkor was made a notifiable disease in 1962. But in 1968 this was rescinded. Why? Because the figures which were collected showed an alarming increase, instead of a decrease, in this condition. And so the Minister hides behind the fact that it is not a notifiable disease. That is neglect of a people by a State and it is calculated to cause human suffering.

I will not dwell on the question of tuberculosis, which is another of the greatest killers in South Africa. Next to malnutrition, there is tuberculosis. For 1963, the Bureau of Statistics lists tuberculosis as the number one notifiable disease causing great concern. According to one estimate, in 1963 forty people a day died of tuberculosis in South Africa. And there are about 200,000 cases of T.B., new ones, every year in South Africa.

AW/vr

E/CN.4/AC.22/RT.68/1
58-60

(Dr. Conco)

This reminds me of one medical officer who said: "These figures are only scratching the surface. We do not see the real suffering in the rural areas".

So that in those so-called native areas, when one now looks at the conditions as a doctor and the end result of what is happening, one gets the true meaning of separate development and the reserves.

I remarked earlier, Mr. Chairman, that there are no figures for infantile mortality rates in South Africa. There are estimates which are taken from towns, probably dealing with children from the neighbouring areas, probably hospital statistics. I have here some estimates by an authority giving figures of official infantile mortality rates. The word "official" means those who are registered by the registration of births and deaths. That does not apply to Africans. For 1968 the official figures of children under one year of age dying were: for whites, 24.1 per 1,000; for Asians, 54.7 per 1,000; for coloureds, 136.8 per 1,000 -- the word "coloureds" means Euro-Africans, people of descent from Africans; "coloured-men" means a different thing in South Africa from what it means in other connotations -- and for Africans no figures are kept, this authority says.

In 1967, in Port Elizabeth, infant mortality rate for whites dropped from 22.02 per 1,000 in 1965 to 13.69 in 1967. For Africans, in Port Elizabeth, a town, it rose from 247.3 per 1,000 in 1965 to 269.8 in 1967. Note: it is accepted that urban figures -- I am quoting the Port Elizabeth figures, which are urban figures -- are much better, very much better than the rural. No official figures are available for rural areas. And in Durban they reported the infantile mortality among Africans as about 250 per 1,000. In some areas in the reserves this authority surmises that actually from 400 to 500 children per 1,000 died before the age of one year. Nearly half of those born died before the age of one year.

The average incidence of kwashiorkor in Africans per 1,000 cases per year -- I just have a few figures here by another authority -- in 1967 there were seven cases of kwashiorkor reported in whites. This is a race relations handbook of 1968, and that figure is official, since kwashiorkor is now notifiable there. It goes on to say that in the rural areas most children who died would not even have been seen by a doctor. That is the point I wanted to stress very much.

(Dr. Conco)

We as doctors get figures of what we see. We get children and analyse figures of what comes to us. But there are those that never come, that die unseen and are never reported. That is really the seriousness, Mr. Chairman, of the whole situation and of the conditions in these reserves.

Before I come to the final summary I just want to say a few words on the question of population. We as doctors observe what happens to people, but now when you broaden the concept and you think of population, what is this going to mean eventually to the African population? If such a policy is persisted in for long, what is it going to mean? If there are no figures of deaths, if an African dies and his death is not registered, it is very difficult to comment on what will actually happen, because the figures are just not made available on purpose. The Government of South Africa has all the money to be able to enforce the system, but they are not doing so.

Before I close, Mr. Chairman, I should like to quote what is usually a very disturbing feature, what is usually an argument for apartheid, people who are for it, people who cultivate a pro attitude about it. Here is a newspaper cutting which says: "Who is worse off?" He is now comparing Africans and referring to the situation in Nigeria and the Commonwealth, etc. He is now referring to the Africans in South Africa and those in other African States. That is usually the biggest weapon in an argument for apartheid. "Who is worse off — the voteless Nigerian cultivator of a generation ago, with his peace assured by British justice and, as a result, a rising standard of living, or his bombed, homeless successor enjoying the titular blessings of one man-one vote democracy?" And he goes on: "For the paradox — so painful and disturbing to great progressive minds — is that even in a country given over to racial discrimination and inequality like South Africa or Rhodesia, the ordinary indigenous African is far better protected as an individual against lawless violence, rapine and famine than his liberated brother under independent and democratic governments which prove incapable of preserving peace and public order. Much as we may rightly deplore the humiliation and degradation of racial discrimination and apartheid, it is becoming increasingly hard to avoid the conclusion that the vote is not the first but almost the last product of civilized society

that the African cultivator needs if he is to enjoy for himself and his family the blessings of peace, physical security and the rising standards of living. It was our duty and responsibility to help teach Africans to govern themselves in peace and great prosperity, but was it either just or humane to abandon them prematurely to the fate which is now befalling all too many of them as a result of our own mistaken assumptions?"

Mr. Chairman, that is an argument for apartheid: that apartheid is justified in South Africa because it gives protection, because they are better off than their brothers in the other African States. Those are the arguments used -- I want to bring this up because I feel it is relevant to the question of the reserves -- and that can just be dismissed. The Africans in the African States have a rational choice, they are human beings, as I said from the beginning, they choose who is going to govern them. We in South Africa have no choice. We are drilled into accepting laws which are not of our own making. That is the difference.

(Dr. Conco)

Then in closing, my final observation and submission is that the conditions in the reserves are perpetuated by the South African Government irrespective of and in contravention of fundamental human rights. Thus, people are herded like animals and treated with the most cruel methods of removal and they are not given a chance of improving their conditions in these reserves. They are classified as animals, and that is therefore inhuman.

Another point which I wanted to stress is that apartheid has international connexions in this sense: that at no time ever was the South African Government able to contain the South African situation without foreign aid. In the colonial days, no Boer Government, no Republican Government, was ever able to contain the situation in South Africa until some foreign Power came in. And it is my submission here too that the people to blame are those Powers which are helping South Africa to maintain its régime; that this whole edifice of apartheid is built because some people are making a profit out of it. South Africa offers ideal conditions for investment, irrespective of whether children die of kwashiorkor, irrespective of how many are killed by malnutrition -- as long as we get our profits.

In terms of the international balance-of-power politics, it is becoming quite clear that we are being made the football ground for the balance of power, that southern Africa must remain a white centre of power, and that this whole policy, this whole separate development, is all in a context of keeping us slaves, slaves for ever.

My final submission is this. In medicine we diagnose a person of abnormal behaviour by saying, "He is suicidal"; we say of a person, "He is homicidal". We do not mean by that that he has committed an overt act for which he can be charged by a law court. Rather, when I say that so-and-so has got homicidal tendencies I am describing what he is likely to do in certain situations. A statement was made here by Mr. Kambode about a genocidal campaign. While I can give no overt act committed as a crime of genocide, I can, as a doctor, say this, that the cumulative effect of all these actions makes the South African State genocidal. I have no overt acts to substantiate that. They are capable of doing this under certain conditions, and those conditions are their neglect of the basic human rights which everyone must enjoy: the right to life, the right to liberty, and the right to self-determination.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Thank you, Dr. Conco, for your very detailed and useful testimony. You have given us figures, and you have also, as a doctor, given us very valuable information. This question of the reserves is one which we always discuss with some reservations. We know that in South Africa the richest lands, something like 80 per cent of the land, are occupied by the white South Africans, while the rest of the land, the poorer areas amounting to something like 15 per cent, are occupied by the blacks. These we know are the facts of the situation, and when we seek to examine this, there is, as you said, the possibility of confusion. And we wish to avoid such confusion. There are these two facts: the rich lands belonging to the whites, and the extremely poor lands on which something like 13 million human beings are forced to live.

Another interesting point you referred to is that of the Bantu homelands. I think they show what is in the minds of the Pretoria authorities what it is they are after, what they seek to achieve. They establish these so-called Bantu homelands for the Africans, meanwhile reserving the richest lands for the whites; and in cases where some of the richer land belongs to blacks, the whites do everything possible to expropriate that land, giving very little compensation for it, as you said. You gave some figures indicating the difference in what land costs when it is transferred from a black man to a white man and when it is transferred from one white man to another, and how little compensation is given to an African when his own land, which happens to be rich land, is expropriated. I thank you for all the information you have given us. I believe the Working Group will derive great benefit from your testimony.

It is now half-past one, and if the Working Group has no objection, and if Mr. Conco is agreeable, we shall leave our questions to the witness to another meeting, on Friday, 8 August.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.