



UNITED NATIONS  
ECONOMIC  
AND  
SOCIAL COUNCIL



Distr.  
GENERAL

E/CN.4/AC.22/RT.68/1/Add.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-FIFTH MEETING

Held at the United Nations Office at Geneva,  
on Friday, 8 August 1969, at 3.25 p.m.

Mr. ERMACORA  
(Chairman)

- Allegations concerning conditions of Africans in the so-called "Native Reserves" in South Africa: Testimony of Dr. W.Z. Conco

The CHAIRMAN: We have once more before us Dr. Conco who yesterday made a very thorough statement about the situation in the reserves. He is prepared to answer questions which we will put to him.

Since Dr. Conco has already made a solemn declaration, it is not necessary to repeat that.

I would ask Mr. Jha to put questions to Dr. Conco.

Mr. JHA: Actually, Dr. Conco's evidence was so comprehensive that almost any question would sound a bit repetitious. But I should like to ask him one question. This is a very interesting point which he made, namely, that the lands of the African peasant are taken away, all are lumped together in a single reserve, called a native reserve. It is made to look as if the Government, out of the goodness of its heart, has given away that part of the land to the Africans for their reserve. Now, when the individual African farmer loses his land under this arrangement, is he paid any compensation for it? How is he compensated?

Dr. CONCO: Thank you for that question, because I have just made some short notes on it.

This, of course, you will understand, is a very small proportion of Africans, who happen to own some land; and I think I gave the figure for the land which is in private ownership by individuals and tribes and, sometimes, by mission stations.

Now, as to the compensation usually paid by the Government. I do not have proper figures which I can give that would show how much was paid for the land, what the market value was, and so on; but from the letter I read yesterday from one whose family has been moved, the compensation must always be charged in terms of the two-level system in South Africa itself. African property has a different market value than other properties. In other words, if you own a farm, it is rated as an African farm, and its market value is an African market value -- the black market value, as I say. Sometimes they are paid compensation; sometimes their land is exchanged -- they barter their land for other land.

I will give you an example. A friend of mine, whom I know very well -- I will not mention his name -- in Newcastle owned a piece of land where on prospecting it was found that there were coal deposits. Now, the Department offered him other land in exchange for his land with the coal deposits. I do not have the compensation figure here, but he was just told: "You move to this land; there is no use in your trying to sell it, because it is the law now that you must move, and you cannot have your price for the land."

I wonder if that satisfies you.

Mr. JHA: Yes, that is a fairly comprehensive picture. But would you say that, in most cases, whatever compensation is paid is adequate, or would you feel it is much below the actual price that could be paid -- even according to the black market standard, and not referring to the white? Is it an arbitrary sort of manner in which this compensation is decided upon?

Dr. CONCO: That is very interesting. Actually, the manner of deciding the compensation is that you are told you are going to be paid this value "X"; and if you say, "Well, but so-and-so has sold his farm for so much", they say:

"Look, man, don't try to make yourself a European." You understand, you just have to be paid that amount; it is finished; it is arbitrary. You have no bargaining as a farmer; you cannot bargain with the Government; they do not recognize that. Once the law says your land is in a European area, you have got to move.

Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY: Like my friend and colleague Mr. Jha, I find the deposition of Dr. Conco extremely comprehensive, quite penetrating, and obviously the considered views of a man who has made this field of study a specialized field. He seems to be singularly qualified for this, because not only is he a qualified medical doctor, but he has had experience in the practice of his profession in the reserves. He is a South African by birth; therefore he knows the area from time immemorial, almost.

Against this background, when one considers, first of all, the fact that the Human Rights Commission indicated in our mandate that we should deal specifically with this question of native reserves, and when we recall, too, that earlier this year in our meetings -- Mr. Jha will correct me on this if I am wrong on any particular -- I think we agreed that we would engage a team of experts on various elements of our mandate, and that the Secretary of the Division of Human Rights, together with the members of this Working Group, would agree on a joint effort, especially concerning the African part of the mandate, and that we would engage these experts in order to assist us by way of submitting working papers and helping us out in the opinions of experts -- when we consider all this, it seems to me that we should benefit from the expertise of Dr. Conco in this respect, and that we should agree formally to have Dr. Conco submit to us a memorandum on the whole question of native reserves, their history, their traditions, the practice of native reserves, and what effects they have had on the African peoples -- indeed, the essence of what he has indicated to us in his testimony to us today -- and that he should therefore be engaged in the capacity of an expert. We have had provisions for this in the budget approved by the ACABQ, and he should be paid at that level, as well.

(Mr. Waldron-Ramsey)

That is the first sort of procedural point I should like to make -- that we agree to engaging Dr. Conco as an expert in this field, and that he should be paid the necessary fees which are provided for as usual in these matters, at the level of expert.

Then the second point I want to make is that I want to go into the rather deeper philosophical questions which Dr. Conco's testimony raises. These are particularly attractive to me not only because Dr. Conco made them in a deeper, academic, well-considered manner -- the manner in which a person who is concerned with these matters, who has studied these matters deeply would make them -- because they tend to reactivate in my own mind certain philosophical concepts which I myself used to deal with when I was in another capacity altogether. Therefore, I have about four questions on this aspect. That would be the sum total of my questions, because I think his testimony on the factual conditions is so pervasive and penetrating that we would benefit from the sum of his testimony when we have time to see it in its written form and can ruminate over it and consider the propositions involved in today's testimony for our report and submission to the Commission on Human Rights, and subsequently to the Economic and Social Council.

(Mr. Waldron-Ramsey)

Now, going to this whole question of the deeper philosophical concepts which your testimony raised, Dr. Conco, the first question I want to put to you is this: It has been the considered view of people who have studied the South African question, not only since 1948 but long before, in the last century, for instance, and particularly of analysts who have studied and written on the Boer War of 1904 and the wars which anteceded the Boer War — the wars especially between the Zulu people and the Boers and the wars which, as you know, took place between the Zulus and the British, on the one side, and the Boers, the Afrikans, on the other — there is one generally agreed conclusion as a result of that great cataclysmic experience of the Zulu, the Xhosa and the Bantu peoples and their contacts with the Afrikans over the last 300 or 400 years, namely, that as a result of the many defeats in earlier years which the Boers sustained at the hands of the various great African nations in that part of the world, two propositions arose in order to give some psychological explanation for the typical Afrikan attitude of the leaders in the Republic of South Africa. The first one is — and indeed you alluded to it in your testimony when you spoke of some of the attitudes of President Kruger — some of these writers concluded that the philosophy of the Boers in South Africa might be summed up in their intention to create — and I think it was Kruger himself who referred to this — a Kruger or a Boer Republic out of the Limpopo, that this Republic should be the homeland in the real sense as distinct from the euphemistic sense to which you alluded yesterday. It would be the real homeland of the Afrikans, of the Boers. This must be the place to which they can always retreat and find refuge. This must be the place to which they must attach pride of ownership, and pride of birth. To this place they must therefore attach their blood, the Boer Afrikans' blood to this land. Therefore, they sought to divide up what was the South African Republic into two sections. The northern part, the high veldt, was to be the homeland of the so-called Xhosa land, the Bantu nation and the Zulu nation, out of the Limpopo. That was to be the Kruger or Boer Republic. Then the second proposition, with which most analysts agree, is that following the final defeat of the Boers at the hands of the British and the Zulus combined, the Boers, or the Afrikans, have always felt that there was a certain international conspiracy against the Afrikans, this

(Mr. Waldron-Ramsey)

conspiracy having its constituent elements in the Boer Republic itself. Therefore, everyone with a homeland or a nationality, with a language which is not Afrikaans, is a constituent element in this conspiracy. Therefore, you have the English linked with the Africans and the Jews and the Indians. All of these form a certain conspiracy against the Afrikan way of life and what the Afrikan, the Boers, stand for. When these four elements in the Republic of South Africa are conjoined with the sort of international tendency to be against the Afrikan way of life, then this international conspiracy becomes complete.

These are the two philosophical foundations which certain historians -- certainly in the days when I studied this question in a very serious manner -- they tended to feel that these two elements really provide the answer for the Boer behaviour today in the Republic of South Africa and that from this first premise one must take all the other subsequent logical steps in order to understand clearly why apartheid exists in South Africa and why it has taken the turn that it has taken.

Now what sort of response would you give to this type of consideration?

Dr. CONCO: That is quite a long question and a very thorough analysis of the South African situation. Some of the points raised I might not have investigated; on some of them I have quite definite views. Some of them, of course, I might have to investigate further because they are very much involved. With respect to the particular philosophical questions about the reactions of the South African Government and the reactions of the Afrikan, we have to go back even further than the confrontation with the African tribes. That is where really you will find the divergence of a group of human beings, discarding all the norms and the norms of the country where they came from in Europe, this being an outcome of separation in the African cape, exposed to the elements of drought and the sun which they had never had. The only book which they kept was the Bible. Then this veldt philosophy developed.

(Dr. Conco)

Now from the Dutch East India Company days there was always prohibition of contact with the Africans on the part of the companies and various administrations prohibited the intermingling of the Afrikaner with the Africans. These people had cut themselves off. They had no other home. Their only home was there, South Africa, the Cape. Their farming orientation and their education orientation and so on were veldt-minded. Then they went in for cattle raising and that is where the trouble started. A lot of wars took place, and in fact the Zulu wars -- you hear a lot about them, but they come later, after a longer struggle. Now you get this trouble between the Afrikans, the Boers and the farmers. And then you have the English administration coming into a situation which the Company itself could not contain. These people cut themselves off from Europe and all they had was their Bible, and a philosophy developed in the veldt: "But look, we are here as the appointed people by God -- like the children of Israel -- in this veldt we carry the Bible and the word of Christ. We have, on the other hand, barbarian tribes. It is our duty to bring civilization to these people. It is our duty as Christians to have them as our servants, the hewers of wood and the drawers of water."



(Dr. Conco)

I will show this by referring to a few instances in South African history. Now the word "reserve" started to be used in South African history in 1688. It was used earlier: a "reserve" for slaves, when slavery was still there. The reserve was used for slave children. For the first time it referred to slaves. And then, later on, this concept grew up, because slaves were regarded as servants: hewers of wood and drawers of water. So you get this at a very, very early date.

Now the coming out into the open of the Afrikaner metaphysical article of faith -- it is a religion -- occurred when slaves had to be freed in the Cape. Then you got chaps saying: Look, this is the end; we are leaving this Government and we shall move into the interior where we shall establish our republics, where the relation between black and white shall be well-defined in our laws. This emancipation of slaves is an English government affair and we shall leave them and proceed to build our State, the republic in the north.

Now this republican attitude persists up to today. This is the republican attitude which now develops the tendency to separate all the time. You must have a master, a boss, and you must have a servant.

Now you referred to the question, for instance, of the Boer War and the Zulu War. That is a later instance. After the conquest of the Cape, which was in the 1850's, the last really big war which brought the conquest of the African tribes in South Africa was in 1879, the Zulu War. That was the last really big war. Then, from the Zulu War, you could see now -- I do not know how to put it -- from the Zulu War, when the English forces, the English Government put down all resistance from the Africans, then the Afrikaners felt free to claim their rights.

There was then a competition as to who was going to be the boss. And events then worked to the Boer War. After you defeat people, these people feel that they are not afraid of any -- the natives have been humiliated; they are finished; they are no more a factor. And then you get the struggle which took place between the English and Boers.

(Dr. Conco)

You are quite correct in saying that the attitude developed that the Boers believed in being persecuted. This persecution developed not only at home. It was felt against the humanitarians, the chap who likes the Kafir — you know, the communists. You still hear it even right up to today: the communists, who are thinking in terms of humanism as far as the natives are concerned. All those peoples are to blame for whatever takes place. Whether there is a revolt, or anything, these people are blamed.

I would also mention, for example, the missionaries who were then active. The only opposition, earlier, when this situation was developing, was from the missionaries. The first people to be blamed for anything going wrong with the Africans and the Boers were missionaries. Then came the English, who also were regarded as siding with the African. And then they were also not liked. Then, as I say, in the latest addition you get the communists, and anybody who says something about the welfare of the Africans.

The creation of a Boer Republic is one thing in South African history which is very interesting. Hardly a movement has ever succeeded as the Afrikaner movement for the Boer Republics of South Africa as a safety area. It started in 1834. All the troubles they had right up to 1910, the Union, and then up to 1960 when Dr. Verwoerd withdrew from the Commonwealth — and then South Africa is known today as the Republic of South Africa.

So actually the culmination of an aim which had started at the time the slaves were freed blossoms at this time when we have organizations like the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. Then you find quite a lot of people who are now blamed for whatever uprising there might be in South Africa. So that it was the Boer Republics which gave rise, for instance, to the South African Republic, which was the Kruger Republic. Then from there we got to the Union of South Africa when all the different provinces came together.

But still they were not satisfied. Still the ideal State for the Afrikaners was a Boer Republic where the African will be kept in his place. And this is keeping the African in his place. These reserves are the place

where the native belongs. If he increases in numbers, we do not care. We are just going to fit him into that, irrespective of the consequences.

I think I have touched on some of these problems. I hope I have dealt with the whole question. That is my interpretation.

Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY: This leads to another logical element, it seems to me, and that is the evolution of the Afrikaner dream into the South African Republic and then the Boer Republic, which culminated in the Union of South Africa, of the independent province of South Africa in 1910 when the British Government handed over political responsibility to the Republic of South Africa.

Now this is a very deep historical question, because it attempts to find a theoretical answer for some of the very practical political problems that are confronting the world today. Let me show you what I mean. In the West Indies the British imported Indians into most of the big plantation Islands at the time. So that you have a vast number of Indians in Guyana on the mainland of South America; you have them again mainly in Trinidad. They brought in the Indians as indentured labour, as they did in East Africa, as they did in South Africa, as they did in Aden. But indentured labour was the same thing as slavery. This was just the English euphemism for slavery.

(Mr. Waldron-Ramsey)

These two populations, these two different nationalities of different cultural backgrounds and aspirations, worked side by side. But the British kept them deliberately apart in order the better to rule them. This was all right while the British were still in command; but when the British left, because of the historical experience of living together but at the same time apart, there resulted friction in the body politic in the West Indian islands. The same thing happened in the East African colonies of Great Britain and in the Central African colonies, in Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. These all have different names now, but they are still geographically the same places. In East Africa and in Southern Rhodesia, for instance, Britain again divided the populations into three separate groups, racially distinct, with different levels of social behaviour and social mores. There were the white people, who are normally British, on the first level, on one social stratum; you had the Indians living on another social stratum; and then there were the Africans living on yet another social stratum. And in every instance, whether in the West Indies, in Aden, in East Africa, Central Africa or South Africa, the Africans enjoyed the worst treatment of all.

In all of these places, without exception, since independence that friction has continued to exist between the three racially distinct groups living in the same political entity.

In essence, then, and in fact, Britain, in order to follow its policy of Machiavellian colonialism and make its domination and rule easier, practised the separation of the races in the different populations. The Africans word for separation is apartheid. They consider that apartheid means the separate development of racially identifiable nations, based upon established custom, established tradition, established language, and living in an identifiable homeland.

My point to you in this context of South Africa is this: That, given this historical analysis of the situation which is the pattern of British colonialism, a situation which was good from the point of view of the colonialists but not from the point of view of having an integrated, homogeneous political entity; and given the fact, too, that South Africa became independent only in 1910, two principal questions seem to me, from an academic point of view, to arise.

(Mr. Waldron-Ramsey)

First, was separate development practised by the British in South Africa before 1910? Am I right in saying that, just as in Tanganyika, Kenya, Uganda, Nyasaland, Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia, Trinidad and Tobago, and British Guyana, those communities remained separate, so too in South Africa, under the British, while the British were still in power before 1910, the communities were separately demarcated, and therefore there was a separate development before the Boers took over in 1910, practised by the British themselves? And if that is so, if the answer to that question is yes, that is where deep theoretical and scientific speculation arises in these questions. Is it really true to say that the Afrikaners in South Africa initiated separate development, or apartheid, or is it more accurate to say that the Afrikaners used the method of separate development already created by the British, as the colonial masters, but intensified it further, and that the beginning of that intensification occurred with the Malan Government in 1948?

This is of extreme importance on the theoretical level as well as on the level of deep political science, because it helps us to understand the genesis of this entire problem, and also to understand where the blame lies. We are here not really interested in the political elements; we want to see a number of logical political conclusions following from this type of analysis.

Dr. CONCO: I agree with the analysis you give of this question. For instance, in the West Indies, as far as I have read -- I am not really an expert on this -- where separation -- let me call it that -- was practised, when independence was granted that separation conflict came into the open. It was practised purposefully by the colonial rulers such as Britain.

I agree also that we should not say it was only the Afrikaners who introduced apartheid, or rather who introduced separation of racial groups. The colonial era as a whole, you see -- the movement of colonial exploitation of foreign peoples -- developed a certain outlook which was that "These people are not the same as us, and therefore the norms and standards which we use in our Western society do not apply when we are dealing with these people". That was the broad generalization: wherever there was a colonial people subjugated by force -- and all the subjugation was by force -- the standards and limitations

(Dr. Conco)

which were practised in Western societies were sort of loosened because these were foreigners; that the norms that were used at home -- that meant in Europe -- did not apply as far as these people were concerned.

Therefore you find that the so-called "divide and rule" had to be used in order to make the colonial peoples quarrel amongst themselves, because they were greater in number. That was used in India, it was used all over, that "You are not the same as us men". So people then developed the idea that they were not the same as each other, and internal strife was caused that served to help the colonialists rule the people.

Now as to the question of South Africa, you asked me whether separate development was practised by the British before 1910, and if so, is it true to say that the Afrikaners introduced it, that is that they introduced separate development and called it apartheid. I would say that that general outlook, that general philosophy of the "white man's burden", that whole philosophy of the subject peoples, the peoples entrusted to us -- you know, the missionary outlook, that the peoples "have got to come back to Christianity" -- created therefore two levels of peoples -- the civilized and the uncivilized peoples.

(Dr. Conco)

Now, with the Afrikaners, with the coming of the colonization in the Cape, as you say -- which I agree with you -- there was now an accentuation into the Afrikaner philosophy, a metaphysical article of faith, a belief which even in their religion is there, that an African will never be the same as a white man -- as an Afrikaner. He is a separate person. So that it is true they are not the only people really -- I must be quite agreeable -- that the Afrikaners are not the only people who practised separate development. But they differ with the other colonial groups in this way. For instance, in Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia and Northern Rhodesia, apartheid, you know, was worse than it was in South Africa. When you visited these places, before there was talk of independence, you had to stand in a tea room and buy a cold drink -- I was told, I never experienced it -- and it was set outside the window to you. But yet in Durban we could go into a tea room and drink it while we were inside but we could not sit down. I am just making an example to say it would be unfair, definitely, to say that I put all the blame on the Afrikaners as the only people that practise this. No, no, no; one must be quite frank.

Now in Rhodesia and Northern Rhodesia the things used to be terrible and in Nyasaland. And people used to be flogged -- this was under the English. But there is a difference. With the English it was a means to an end. With the Afrikaner it is the end; that is really where the difference is. With the English administrator it was an administrative measure to control these people. "Well, don't let them come near you, you know, they must always look right up." But with the Afrikaner it had now become a philosophy of life, a way of life, and a view of life. It is the end itself; the separation will always be parallel and it does not matter what you are, it shall never meet. So now that is where the difference lies. They now canonized the separation into a religious faith. And now they took this religious faith and made it law.

So now you have got a ceiling; it does not matter how brilliant you are as an African; you can bind yourself up, you will never rise. It does not matter how brilliant you are, you will never rise in the same sense as a South African white will. You are just bound within the native enclosure; that is all -- in the reserves.

So that is my feeling. It is true that they only accentuated it and then gave it a name. This giving of names, of course, has got a psychological cementing of the Afrikaner people, too, because they say they have no home to go to. Mr. Chairman, I must point out that this thing is the same, this belief is the same as when the people feel threatened. When a nation is insecure, it can believe anything; you can make people believe anything. Hitler did the same. The Germans felt insecure. The whole social system, you know, after losing the war and the economics crumbled, the depression and so on.

So now in South Africa today it is a laager mentality which has developed -- the wagon that was used with the Zulu armies and the armies of the Africans. So now people who feel fear, they are afraid, they are struggling for survival. The saying usually is, "They will get this land over our dead bodies." In other words, "we would rather all die rather than give this land to a free South Africa." So that it ends being really purely a political war. It is a political and a religious war.

The thing which is important here: you cannot convince the South African Government that they are not right. The metaphysical faith can never be disproved by any appeal to facts. You can marshal all your facts. It is a question of attitude. They have just made up their attitude that this is the end. "Whatever facts you bring, we are not changing."

Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY: You have brilliantly led me to my third philosophical consideration by mentioning two indicative points. You have mentioned the conditions of Germany before Hitler's rise to power and the economic considerations which helped to accentuate this. And you touched again on the metaphysical elements in the Afrikaner philosophy which tend to predominate this entire philosophy. Now this updates my mind against a background of history and against a background of pure philosophy. The Afrikaner has always argued that he was a separate and distinct person, an elect of God. He followed certain Calvinistic principles from the Low Countries -- Holland -- in the 17th and 18th centuries. These principles led him to feel that God intended that there were to be certain inequalities in man's human experience. Therefore, the



black man, because he is black, cannot be the same as the white man; and similarly the white man, because he is white, cannot be the same as the black man. This Afrikaner philosophy has led the Afrikaners in South Africa during the last fifty, sixty years to follow rather closely the type of political philosophy which activated the Germans in the twenties and the thirties -- Hitler's Germany, to the extent that during the last war certain members of the Afrikan community identified themselves with Hitler and Mussolini and the sort of Calvinistic providential correctness of the position taken by Germany. So that men like Vorster and his General whom he has now put in charge of the secret security system, what is called BOSS, were both detained under the Smuts régime during the war for open exposition and advocacy of the cause of Hitler, of nazism. This is the factual historical attitude.

(Mr. Waldron-Ramsey)

Now the deeper philosophical consideration involves the following. There were many great German thinkers, and in particular Hegel, who thought this way. I think it was Hegel's philosophy which laid the philosophical foundations for the rightness of the German cause in the 1920s and in the 1930s under the Third Reich under Hitler, who, in searching for a higher metaphysical and philosophical justification for his philosophy, turned to Hegel, whom I myself consider to be one of the most brilliant philosophers ever. He was certainly the most clever German philosopher. He postulated for the German nation a philosophy of nationalism, to which you referred yesterday, on this linguistic-blood-metaphysical nexus. But if these two elements coalesce or coincide, then the foundation exists for the establishment of a nation. If a given population speaks the same language, the German language, and if they tend to be essentially of the same race, the Aryan race, and if there is no inter-mixture of that blood which could lead to contamination and therefore inferiority, then the foundations are set for an elect people, a chosen people, a people ready to take the torch of domination and leadership of the world.

When you consider the disposition on the part of the present leaders of the Government of the Republic of South Africa to be strong-willed in this philosophy, this German philosophy of blood, language and metaphysics in a definable homeland, to have espoused the sanctity of this position in the last war to the extent of their incarceration by the British, and consider today the clear and overt manifestations of separate development for different nations -- a matter to which you clearly referred yesterday as the identifiable nations in an identifiable homeland, the Xhosas in one homeland, the Zulus in one homeland, so that as long as you spoke the Xhosa language, whether or not you were born in an area which the authorities feel is the Xhosa homeland, you are automatically part of that homeland, part of that nation, and whether or not you were born in Johannesburg or Durban you belong by nationality and by definition, pursuant to that philosophy and jurisprudence, to that homeland, to that nation, to that tribe; therefore, you go into that reservation.

(Mr. Waldron-Ramsey)

Now let me put all of these things together. Do you see in this, therefore, an expression of the same type of animation among the leaders in the Government of the Republic of South Africa as that which animated the thought and the philosophy of the Germans in Hitler's day. If this proposition is correct, then is it not logical to assume that this philosophy and the political system which they have followed, in which they consider themselves the master race and everyone else, certainly all the African nations, as inferior nations, flow from that type of political metaphysical and philosophical experience.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Waldron-Ramsey, since I am in the Chair I want merely to say the following. This is certainly very interesting, but the whole statement that you have made is an expression of your opinions, and if we were together privately I would contest many of those points. But since you think that this may be worthwhile in fact-finding, you may put your question. However, since I am in the Chair, I want to state that in my opinion this does not concern our fact-finding mandate.

Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY: Mr. Ermacora, I understand your philosophical position and you deeply understand mine. I think we both have had respect for our two separate positions since we started in 1967. I am sure that no argumentation of yours will ever convince me that you are correct, and that equally no argumentation on my part will suffice to convince you that I am right. So we have agreed, then, to disagree on these very deeply held philosophical considerations. This, of course, does not prevent our friendship. But with respect to fact-finding and the question of relevance, I do not agree that we are here to establish facts alone. That is not how I read the mandate at all. Our mandate is much deeper and more pervasive than that. And even from the point of view of pure procedural law, as distinct from fact-finding, Dr. Conco has brought the deeper philosophical considerations into evidence, considerations which I think are incontestable. He has also brought into direct evidence factual situations to buttress his philosophical propositions. Now starting with that premise from the point of view of pure procedural law, it seems to me that I am entitled to cross-examine

Dr. Conco on this position and to lead him to give further clarification. In leading him into giving further clarification of these positions, I am equally entitled, in accordance with the background of jurisprudence with which I am familiar and in which I need to receive no lessons, to put certain matters to the witness in order to elicit from him the type of clarifications I require, and I am entitled to do so in a fashion which I alone subjectively consider feasible. That is not open to question. The style and the manner in which I want to put my questions are not open to question. I think we have now cleared that away. We have not done this since 1967 in Dar es Salaam. Therefore I ask Dr. Conco to reply to the question I put to him a few minutes ago.

Dr. CONCO: In the first place, I agree with you when you say that the Afrikaner has argued that he had become a separate and distinct person. But, as you put it so well, the basic philosophy of life of the South African Boer was also determined by a Calvinistic approach of predestination. When they found these blacks, they were predestined to be the hewers of wood and drawers of water. And this of course coalesces. I agree with you quite perfectly. It is true. It is not a question of opinion. These are facts; these are the real facts with regard to what happened in South Africa.

It is true that Vorster was detained, was in a detention camp during the war. He was released by the Smuts Government afterwards. But there was a group of Afrikaners, including a certain Lee Brandt, who was charged and found guilty of high treason -- who were imprisoned by the United Party Government during the war and found guilty. You will remember these things very well -- when we, the African National Congress, had our treason trial case. These men, immediately after the Nationalist Government came into power, were released without explanation. Just right off they were let off; they were free men. They had been charged with high treason and they were let off.

So that any onlooker, anybody observing a situation like that, and also in addition to the pronouncements of Osswag Brandwag, of certain groups -- I still remember the names, if I am not mistaken; I am subject to correction -- that they were for a victorious Germany during the war, and that they did not support the war effort against nazism. So that it is not really a question of opinion; it is a question of fact. These facts can be produced. Paper cuttings and proof of statements can be made available. Even the trial of Lee Brandt is a public document. It is true that this philosophy -- in fact that is what I usually say -- of apartheid is the grandson of nazism, of fascism. They have the same element. You referred to the elevation of the State above the human being. I have just read a little about Hegel's philosophy, the State being elevated into a divine thing. You know, it is the thing and it is the end. Well, that part of it was used by Hitler. So far as we are concerned, the State is the end. The Government says things and we have to obey. We have no say in the State. So to us, really, apartheid and nazism are exactly the same thing. It is derived from the other.

I must mention one thing which I did not point out and which I should like to point out. What follows from this type of philosophy? Yesterday, I wanted to point out the discrepancy between the "haves", which are racially defined in South Africa, and the "have-nots", which are also racially defined. Then you will have an explosive situation at some time where the "haves" and the "have-nots" will have to settle it. The thing is so delicate because the "have-nots" have the sympathy of the non-white section of the human population. Naturally, the other "have-nots" will have sympathy with the "have-nots" in South Africa; and the "haves" in South Africa will receive the sympathy of the "haves" elsewhere in the world. Here is a country which is allowed to go on with an explosive situation, and it exists in the world as a whole. There are the "have" nations and the "have-nots". Here is a country which is allowed to continue with its system, in fact to intensify it. This can lead to a world conflagration in exactly the same way as the German system, nazism, led to it, as fascism led to it. All this is being brewed in South Africa, and any conflagration between black and white in South Africa will lead to a racial war.

May I just point out another thing which I wanted to mention. I do not know whether I am qualified to say this. I must say that what facts are important when we are discussing a question like apartheid depends on our theoretical system as a whole. Everybody will pick his facts. It is the same thing with apartheid. It is the same trouble all over. What facts become important depends on our theoretical system, on our interpretative point of view. It is no easy matter for your Group to decide on an issue like this because you have to approach it from all theoretical assumptions. What facts become important in any field depends on your theoretical assumption.

I hope that I have been able to answer some of your questions. Some of them I could not answer. With regard to some of the facts, I am really not an expert. I am not a philosopher. I am just a medical doctor.

I wanted to state that apart from being a medical practitioner, I am an official of the African National Congress and I have taken part in political work for a number of years. In fact, the African National Congress asked me to appear here. What I state here are some of their views. Some of the views

(Dr. Conco)

are my own. It does not mean that all that I say represents the views of the African National Congress. But some of the interpretation, really, is from observing the picture for quite a long time.

Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY: I have no difficulties at all in asserting that, as far as I am concerned, you are not only learned in medicine, but you stand from an unqualified pinnacle of competence to make the assertions and the penetrating and learned analysis that you are advancing. I think that your vantage point of competence is unquestionable, and I also think unquestionable the assertions and formulations that you have established.

This is an aside -- it is an aside and yet it is not an aside, because this consideration led to the earlier decision to which I was referring on the question of expert witnesses and experts in assisting this Group.

We on the African continent have suffered for too many years, centuries almost, in having people who are not conversant with our position or conditions, our total experience, putting themselves forward as experts on the African and the black man in a general sense. Over the years nobody has paused to ask the African himself what he thinks about himself. After all, the best expert on any individual is the individual himself.

But the international political system has attempted to make us bereft of this biological and first-premise consideration so that we have been the sufferers over historical time.

(Mr. Waldron-Ramsey)

But let me go on to my final philosophical consideration and invite your clarification on it. You were speaking yesterday rather learnedly about the sociological and anthropological concepts of the system in South Africa, and you represented the black man as cattle: that you have to protect your cattle since, in an agricultural society, you need the cattle for tilling the land as well as for food, and you place the cattle on a reservation and provide for its protection and safety; you provide it with fodder and with shelter because of its importance as an economic factor in the total microcosmic development of the society. You went on to indicate that the Verwoerdian philosophy tended to draw a parallel: just as one had to register each head of cattle when it was born and when it died -- this was very important -- and if the African did not register the birth or death of the head of cattle he could be punished by imprisonment, so also some such consideration should be made for the registration of the birth and death of the African. Verwoerd -- you may correct me on this -- is a scholar and a professor, I think, of sociology of some reputation in South Africa and abroad. As I recall it -- it is now fifteen or twenty years since I looked at these matters -- he was a very learned teacher in the field of sociology. When he first came to power, if not before -- and this is what I really want to get from you -- Verwoerd saw the importance of each human being as an economic element, an important human economic factor in the total economic development of the country; therefore he was anxious to identify this clearly.

Now, the point I want to raise with you for clarification is this. Verwoerd came to power and took over the reins of Government for a few significant years. Did you get the impression, perhaps while Verwoerd was at the Univ university, that he was the master-mind of apartheid? As I understand it -- I have no direct knowledge of this -- he was a very eminent theoretician in sociology. Did you get the impression that he was the brains, the master-mind who laid out clearly the philosophical-political foundations for apartheid, since 1948? Did Verwoerd develop then in most specific terms the theory which brought, perhaps the Strijdom Government, in any case the Nationalist Governments, around to the theory that Africans must be regarded as of greater importance because of their importance as human economic factors in the total development of the



(Mr. Waldron-Ramsey)

Republic? That is to say, did Verwoerd advance the theory that the Nationalist Government and leaders should not be so callous with Africans, considered as heads of cattle, as they had been, because Africans are of tremendous importance as crucial factors of development in the economy?

You know, of course, when it comes to economics, two major factors of development are capital and labour. The white people, the Boers, would have of course have control of capital formation and capital investment. But no society, no economic entity, can exist unless there is another proper and solid factor of development, and that is labour. So that with labour, land and capital, one has the major economic factors for economic development.

This is an involved question, but it has to be an involved question because you have raised some very serious and as I say, very deep and learned considerations in advancing your philosophy as you gave your deposition yesterday, and I have been anxious for the longest time to get involved at this type of level, in these deeper questions rather than in simple political fulminations against apartheid. This latter type of exercise I think is important, but I hope you understand the point I want to get.

One element in the historical development, cattle, was more important than Africans. Verwoerd was a very important and learned theoretician in sociology, in the sociology of the Republic, which includes the sociology of the Africans as well as of the Afrikaners, the white people in the Republic. Verwoerd was a professor in these matters and wrote some very distinguished books. I remember reading a lot of them at my university in England, and from the point of view of pure theory and the science of sociology, they made tremendous sense. Did you, however, get the impression that he was the theoretician? All political philosophies must have their theoreticians. I think Hegel was the great theoretician behind the German philosophies. And then there was Kant, and in England there were people like Sir Stafford Cripps, and in India there were certain other great theoreticians. So that every political philosophy has theoreticians who set out the intellectual basis upon which that particular philosophy ought to stand.

(Mr. Waldron-Ramsey)

So then, did you get the impression that Verwoerd was the master-mind in all this, and that, as a result of his foresight, he saw the importance of considering Africans not only as disposable quantities, but also as very important elements in the total economic development of the country?

Dr. CONCO: Yes, as you say, it is quite an involved question. But I will try my best to say what I know about the question, whether I would say that Verwoerd was really the exponent of the deep philosophical basis of the Nationalist Party Government, of the whole belief, the whole philosophy underlying Afrikaner Nationalism.

(Dr. Conco)

Now, it is true -- well, it is my view -- when I analysed black men as cattle I was trying to draw a distinction of using standards. Now, Verwoerd -- and it is well documented -- when he was asked in Parliament said, "Look, if you say an African is to be integrated, you might as well say an ass or an ox or my tractor is integrated in our society." Now there he clearly explicates -- in other words, he brings forward in a way I do not know whether he really meant to do -- he comes out with a fundamental saying that, "Look, of the classes we are dealing with when we are discussing this question of separation, there is class one of ourselves and class two, tractors, cattle and Africans." So now you get this clarification. He was really -- he explicated, in other words, he made the concept of apartheid clearer than anybody else that put it before. So, as you say, he was a very clever man. No doubt about that, he was, and he was, I think, a professor of applied psychology. He was a very highly qualified man. About the other things I do not know very much. I mean, there are things, of course, in his life which, Mr. Chairman, I would not be able to put the facts here, but this one thing I know -- when it comes to the theoretical foundations of apartheid, that it is a distillation of many minds. It is not personalities as such really of whom I could say that Verwoerd is the only one. It is the distillation of many minds at work. Now, there was teamwork. The theoreticians are to be found in psychologists, economists, political leaders and the religious leaders of the Dutch Reformed Church, because apartheid is an article of faith too in religion. So it was their whole thing, it is a whole faith, in religion, in the Church, that is, the Dutch Reformed Church, and it is all distilled in practice now by the State. But now the boss, if I could use the word, under which even Verwoerd could not say anything is the Broederbond. Now, there is a secret movement called the Broederbond, the band of brothers, which really controls the policies of South Africa on a theoretical basis -- actually not so much the theoretical as the practical part of it. There is this secret society, the Broederbond, from which the scholars derive their inspiration to expound on apartheid.

(Dr. Conco)

Now, Mr. Chairman, I must say I have really not studied the articles of the Broederbond. I do not know the language Afrikaans very well, but from what I usually read -- I have not read Afrikaans, in fact I do not know Afrikaans, which is a pity, because one gets some of the finer meanings by knowing it from the language of the people. So it is the Broederbond, and he was also under the Broederbond. He was a member of the Broederbond. No South African Prime Minister in the Nationalist Party is not a member of the Broederbond. Otherwise he would not be a Prime Minister. That is just the deciding body which says so-and-so is going to be Prime Minister, and whatever the elections say, it is followed. So this teamwork of experts to keep this metaphysical article of faith, that is, apartheid and separateness of nations, is being kept by this body.

Now, you have raised a very interesting question. I do not know whether I have answered it in full. I will try to. For instance, Verwoerd points out the usefulness of Africans as a means to an end -- in other words, that therefore, even when you have got your ox and your tractor you must be careful in using it carefully so that it gives you more. There is an element of that, but then it is not an element based on human feelings. You are saying the man is a means to your end, and I think it is one of the basic sayings of the basis of human rights that no human being is a means to any end. He is an end in himself. So I am not an end to Verwoerd's end, nor to the Nationalist Party's end. I am a human being. I have got my basic rights to life, and my life is no end to anybody. I must live my life as I want to, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that is a relevant -- in a Commission like this -- that it does not matter what you do, you cannot use human beings as a means to an end and then say, "I will provide bread -- I will provide so much bread, so that he will be able to give me so much work". Well, even if you feed me and I become a fat chap -- I mean, I have all the food in the world -- still I say my right of rational decision has been taken from me. Even if you give me all the food that is necessary, I will still reserve -- I have not got that right of being human. So that is what happens then in South Africa. It is true Verwoerd did point that out, and I will point out certain interesting situations of late. I have just read that in a city in

(Dr. Conco)

the northern Transvaal -- this is the stronghold of the Nationalists -- the Government has decided now to implement apartheid fully. This town, this little village, supports the Nationalists. So the Government says, "Look, now we must practise apartheid properly. All servants must sleep out. They must leave the town. Now housewives must be able to scrub their floors and do everything." But, very interestingly, the people -- that is, Afrikaners, the supporters of the Government, say, "Nothing doing", and they went into a protest and told the Government, "We cannot have that. We want our servants. We want our tea in the morning. We want milk delivered. We want our stoops polished. We want these people to live near us so that they can look after our babies." So it is a question now of apartheid, that is, of human beings being means to an end. They are all right as long as you are using them, you know, and when the Government says "geographical separation", then some say, "No, no, no, I think you are going too far with this apartheid", because they want you to be near them. It is quite contradictory actually to have situations like that. It is not as simple sometimes as one puts it. In another context again, we usually say in medicine if a parasite kills its host -- say a worm enters my system and kills me -- then it is a very bad parasite, because really a parasite must make the host live so that the parasite always receives from him. So now once you apply that principle, there is that fact that to keep these people in the reserves in a way that we will use them -- let them be a reservoir of labour, of our way of life. We really do not want them to be finished. We want them to be there as a reservoir for our labour. But you never know, of course, if the effect of what you do might have -- the effect might not be what you want to do with them. So really it is a very complicated question. I do not know whether I have really satisfied all the aspects of the question -- but this question -- on the question of the mastermind -- the Broederbond is the mastermind of the Nationalist Party and it really controls the philosophy of the South African Nationalist Government and Verwoerd was one of the good people who explicated, in fact he made clear, apartheid.

The announcement, for instance, now of "border industries". Now if you separate people geographically -- I must point out this, that the Government starts encouraging people to have industries on the borders of the reserves. So that Africans do not step on the white soil, they are on the border of the reserves. And the argument is that "we give them work and they will earn a living; they will earn money so they will be better off than their brothers up north." So now these border industries, the development of border industries is still a Verwoerdian explication. It came during his time. And the Government has preferable charges of taxation for companies building factories on the borders. There are quite several of them. And whether that also, when judged now on human rights, is it correct to decide for people -- is it correct to make human beings a means to your ends? Human beings are ends in themselves. That is my basic submission: in whatever way you say, human beings can never be an end to another human being; they are an end in themselves. That is the way they differ from oxen, cattle and tractors.

Mr. WALDRON-RAMSEY: That is an extremely interesting philosophical point you ended on. It has importance to me from two vantage points. One is that Verwoerd himself by stating that one should treat the African as a means to an end has departed from the Kantian categorical imperative which stipulates that man should always be treated as an end in himself. It leads to this other important consideration -- and you have touched upon it when you indicated that Verwoerd, in formulating the Afrikaner policy on this, indicated that one should always treat the African in the sense of a good parasite, that you exploit him and you use him to a certain degree, but you never completely kill him off. You made the correct assertion, I think, that sometimes one is not able to control the extent of this policy; that by peradventure, for instance, you kill off the parent body, you kill off the African, you kill off the body upon which the parasitic vulturism is taking place.

(Mr. Waldron-Ramsey)

You see, part of our mandate is to examine what elements of genocide exist in this noxious system of apartheid. This point you just raised will be of tremendous importance when we come to analyse this, because, you see, there are, as we have seen the evidence so far, two possible theories. One is that ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> South Africans mean genocide and intend to kill off the African people. There is the other theory, which seems from your thesis to be more the Verwoerdian theory, that no, you should not kill off the African, at least not altogether, because you need him as a means to the better life of the Afrikaner in the Republic. So you must kill him off up to a certain point. Now this third consideration, of killing him off up to a certain point, again, goes into the deeper jurisprudential question of the meaning and manifestation of genocide, because in my considered opinion, genocide is not only killing off in the absolute sense of elimination of a group of people at a given time together, but it could be an erosive process -- and this point you have just raised will certainly assist us a lot when we come to deal with both the law and the philosophy of apartheid which touches and concerns this whole question of genocide.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I must conclude my questions of because I have exhausted all of the questions which I should like to put to this eminent witness, Dr. Conco, but because the hour is advanced and I have the impression that he, like ourselves, has other pressing things to attend to. I will, therefore, reluctantly conclude my question on this point, but hope, as I say, that I shall have the opportunity later, either in the course of this year or next year to put some further questions to him, either by virtue of his memoranda, which we hope he will be invited to submit as an expert on this whole question of reserves, or as a deponent in advancing fresh testimony for this group.

The CHAIRMAN: May I put the following question to you, Dr. Conco. You told us that Verwoerd said that tractors and oxen should be integrated, but not the black population. Could you tell me more exactly where he has stated this. This is a very interesting statement.

Dr. CONCO: Yes, it is. Mr. Chairman, I think I can get you the reference. I have got the reference. It is in Walker. The History of Southern Africa, and it is taken from --

The CHAIRMAN: If you tell me "Walker", then I will find it.

Dr. CONCO: You look under "Reserves", he has pages under "Reserves", and you will come across that statement.

The CHAIRMAN: I am familiar with that book. The second point is, you spoke yesterday about centres of European farmers in the reserves.

Dr. CONCO: Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Can you tell us under which regulations these centres are placed? The law of the reserves does not concern the centres? Or how is this managed?

Dr. CONCO: Oh, yes, Mr. Chairman, I see your difficulty. I gave two instances in the Transkei, which is part of the reserve. Now in the Transkei there are certain districts -- the district of Mount Currie -- it is the Kokstad and Matatiele. Now, they are in the Transkei itself. But they have been scooped out and made into a white area, for the reason that they are good farming areas for sheep farming and so on. Now, when I say they have been scooped out, I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that I gave the impression that when the Transkei was made, these were scooped out. These farms were taken over during the grabbing of the land; and when the reserve, the Transkei reserve itself was declared, they were already in the hands of certain Europeans. Now, they fall under an area which was made by the Governor then -- I think it was Woodhouse



AP/ck1

E/CN.4/AC.22/RT.68/1/Add.1  
54-55

(Dr. Conco)

in 1850 something or 1860 something, as the so-called buffer area. Now, there was Basutoland, which is now Lesotho, in the north, and so the Governor cut out a piece of land called East Griqualand, where Adam Kok was put with the Griquas.

(Dr. Conco)

It was in that area where the whites bought land, in the district of Mount Currie, including Kokstad, which is a town derived from Adam Kok, and Matatiele, and I am not sure about the third one. The white farmers bought these farms from the Griquas, and the Griquas were bought out completely. So now it is not as though it is being planned by a Government -- this land being scooped out for the white farmers. So when they had bought the land, when the Transkei now is made the Transkei territory, sort of a semi-independent entity, then the Transkei Constitution excludes these districts -- Kokstad, Matatiele and the other one. And in addition -- I did not say this yesterday -- it excludes Port St. Johns. Now the Transkei has got a port called Port St. Johns, and it is usually a holiday resort. I do not know whether the harbour is working; I have never been there. But the Transkei excludes it as part of the Transkei or Bantu homeland. It is a white area. It was done by an act; it was cut out of the native area. Now that is one aspect of the white area in the reserves.

The other one which I pointed out concerns an area which was a reserve from time immemorial, from the Zulu wars onward, a very big reserve on the other side of the Ubombo in Zululand, and is known as the Makathine Flats. This reserve belonged to African people and there were no white farmers there. On the investigation of the Agricultural Department, it was discovered that the land was so fertile, that with sugar cane the farmers did very well there, so the Government started a scheme called Pongola Spot. They dammed the river, the Pongola -- I lived just about six miles from Pongola before I came here. They dammed this river -- the Pongola Dam, and the whole scheme cost, I think around about 36 million rand, to dam the Pongola River and provide water for irrigation of this land where Africans were expropriated.

In addition, again in the same area, a game reserve which had been left as a Crown land, which is the Mkuze Game Reserve, is now being de-declared as a game reserve, not into an African reserve, and it is going to be made into farms. Now this is right in the centre of an area which one could call Zulustan.

(Dr. Conco)

I might point out again just before I finish, Mr. Chairman, that the most difficult area for the South African Government to create a state like they have, a sort of a semi-state, like they have in the Transkei, is Zululand. There are several reasons for that. One is geographic. The land is so fertile -- the Zululand was the elect land in southern Africa. That is where you get sugar cane plantations, you get timber -- it grows beautifully. It has the highest rainfall. After the Zulu war the land grabbing was greater, and of course Zululand was annexed into the Natal colony. It wasn't kept as a separate entity, because they had to break the Zulu power. They divided the Zulu kingdom into thirteen kingdoms so that they would owe no allegiance to the Zulu king. And then farms were cut in order to split them. So now the Government itself had admitted that in Natal and Zululand it is almost impossible to create a Bantustan in the sense they are having in the Transkei. The land is so intermingled. The most interesting thing was that all the Prime Ministers, when they come to Zululand, they are not prepared to talk about land to be given over to Africans, because they are afraid they will lose votes, because the farmers are not prepared to let the land go, despite the government policy of separate development and so on. It is separate development when it suits people. So that is another instance which I wanted to point out, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: You have expressed your views very clearly. Do you believe that these reserves are used as a labour reservoir for white areas or do you believe that the so-called self-government in the Transkei has hindered that practice?

Dr. CONCO: Well, there are two things, Mr. Chairman, that you are asking me, whether in fact the Transkei is a reservoir of labour, and whether the so-called self-government -- it is not self-government at all, as far as I am concerned, and I will explained why it is not -- whether the so-called self-government -- I didn't get the last part of that question.

The CHAIRMAN: Whether the so-called self-government can prevent the Transkei from being used as a labour reservoir, that is to say, whether the Bantu authorities in the Transkei are so strong that they can prevent the people of the Transkei from being sent to work in white areas outside the Transkei?

Dr. CONCO: That is a very interesting question, Mr. Chairman. I'll try to answer it the best I can. In the first place, the first part is whether the Transkei is in fact a reservoir of labour.

The CHAIRMAN: Do most of the African workers who are working in white districts come from reserves outside the Transkei, or are there many people from the Transkei who are working in white districts?

Dr. CONCO: Mr. Chairman, I will try my best. It is like this. It is a fact that people in the reserve generally are a reservoir of labour for white areas, that is, in towns. Now the Transkei is a case of these people who go out. It has a bigger population than the others. The number of people leaving the Transkei to go and get work in Johannesburg or Durban is quite great. I think, if I am not mistaken, it is about 200,000 people probably, able-bodied men that leave for work outside the Transkei. It has been so for quite a long time. As soon as you crowd people into areas there -- some of the things I did not explain probably yesterday -- as the reserves deteriorate and they do not produce subsistence for the African population, then you have got to go out and look for work and support your family at home. So that the Transkei contributes into the region about 200,000 people, who are in migrant labour, working outside -- also in places like Zululand and other reserves. Now to prevent too many workers from coming into town, you get what is called the influx control laws. There are various native urban areas acts which are to cut down this piling up. As a result of the volume of Africans going into town increases, so that you get these laws being created to stop them from coming into the towns.

(Dr. Conco)

Now, prosecutions of people coming into the towns from the pressure of staying in the reserves amounts sometimes to a million people who are prosecuted for having broken the influx-control laws. The whole thing is a system: you have the Pass Laws, which are used to prevent Africans from coming into the towns, and you have influx controls.

The Transkei is really the reservoir of labour in the towns, and, as I say, you will hear now a lot of talk about border industries. To stop this influx to the towns, which embarrasses apartheid, you must now start having factories along the borders so that they do not flock into the towns: they go to work, and then go back to their homes.

The CHAIRMAN: You say they want to prevent African labour from coming into the white areas?

Dr. CONCO: Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN: Then they are preventing the reserves as a reservoir of labour?

Dr. CONCO: Yes, well, the reserves are meant to be a reservoir -- I do not know whether I made that clear -- whether there are border industries or whether the industries are in town. They are the place where you get South African cheap labour. The reason you get profits in South Africa so high so investors are interested is that you have there a slave-type system of economy, where people are being used as labourers; in fact, they have no other way of escaping this.

So when I say the Transkei is a reservoir of labour -- I do not know whether I have made it quite clear -- I mean it is where the African industries and labour are drawn from. Now, when it is excessive, then it embarrasses the Government, and the Government says now, "Let's have border industries to control the excesses" -- because it has become very excessive as conditions deteriorate in the Transkei. So then they have these border industries, in an attempt to stem the influx.

Now, the second question is about the so-called self-government -- whether it is able to prevent this going out of people into the European areas. Now,

one thing which must be understood is that when we talk of government, when we refer to the Transkei régime, it is not a government in the true sense of the word. I made this distinction yesterday between a chief minister and a prime minister. The Transkei has no prime minister; it has a Chief Minister. And the Prime Minister is the Prime Minister of South Africa, including the Transkei itself. So that there has been a transfer of the Transkei Territories General Council, which was meant for local government; that was created in about 1885. What is presented to the world as a self-governing Bantustan is nothing but a renovation, a change in name, of the General Transkei Regional Council -- the so-called Ipunga in our language -- and it was moved from being General Council, then the Ipunga, and then it became the Bantu Authorities. Then it changed when Verwoerd saw what world opinion was saying -- I mean, to suit world opinion, he said, "Now, I am giving independence to the Transkei." Then it becomes the Transkei Parliament. Now, an interesting thing in this context -- and this must be very clear, because there has always been confusion -- this Government, or this local authority as I could call it, in fact has not even got the powers of a provincial council as we have in South Africa. For instance, we have the Natal Provincial Council, the Transvaal Provincial Council, according to each province, which has its budget and is responsible for certain things in the administration of the country, like hospitals, education and so on. This government is a puppet government. It is a puppet government of the Nationalist Party Government. So really, when you ask me the question, "Aren't they able to prevent Africans having to go to the urban areas?", in fact why they are unable to do that shows another proof that they could not do it, because the Transkei is unable to support these people. They would never do that. So they must have people going out all the time to avoid -- I mean, it would be terrible. If they stopped people having to go to Johannesburg to look for work, I do not know what people would do. They would die of starvation. They would have no means of livelihood. The land cannot carry them. It has long failed to carry these people. The Government tried by reclamation schemes to cut the number of their cattle. Now, people are still increasing, of course. You cut the number of their cattle -- the population increases anyway, though I am not sure of the figures, as I have pointed out. So the local government, or the so-called local authority, or the puppet government, is unable to stop the movement out,

NR/gh

E/CN.4/AC.22/RT.68/1/Add.1.

63

(Dr. Conco)

because it would be calling for trouble within its own bounds -- I mean, the people just would not eat. I do not know whether that satisfies you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. We are very grateful to you for the learned statement you have made and your answers to the questions.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.