

In the sphere of political self-determination for Africans, Coloureds and Indians, the policy of separate development has reached the end of its tether. It has produced the Transkei and it can produce no more. Its one asset is the Transkeian shop window. There will, so far as can be seen, be no further Bantustans. What of its promises in the economic field?

Two vital recommendations

The Tomlinson Report made several points very clear, and the most important was that the development of the reserves only in the primary sector — agriculture, forestry and mining — would not meet the case. "Planning in the primary sector will make possible a collective carrying capacity (of all the reserves) of about 2.4m — agriculture 2.1m, forestry 0.16m and mining 0.1m." (Page 179, section 10 of Report). This means that if development were to be limited to this sector, the reserves could hold about one-fifth of the present African population of South Africa, and what is more, hold them in a backward, subsistence and peasant economy. For the other four fifths there would be no livelihood in the reserves, let alone an economic future.

The second point made clear by the Report is that secondary industry would have to be established in the Reserves at a rapid rate. "The most important factor involved is that work will have to be provided for 20,000 Bantu annually (in the reserves) in secondary industry." (page 184, section 6). For this, White capital and participation would be essential, the report states.

The Government has rejected these two vital recommendations.

A crippling blow

No private investment from outside the reserves is allowed, and the Government has limited its own investment in the area almost entirely to agricultural development. But even if such agricultural development should reach its optimum (and in fact little enough has been done even here), all the reserves in South Africa together would offer a livelihood to at most a little under two and a half million Africans. This figure will naturally become a decreasing proportion as the total African population of South Africa increases. Towards 1980, for example, there would still be at most 2.4 million Africans in the reserves, and about 13.5 million in the White-owned areas, mostly the cities.

. . . OF SLIPS AND CLUES AND KNEELING BLACKS, AND LITTLE TRANSKEI KINGS . . .

by MARGARET ORPEN

(Sunday Times)

"WON'T you walk a little Vorster?" said
the Waring to the Nel,
"There's a Keevy just behind me looking for
a Poqo cell.
My Ministry has got to get its information
out
On Freedom in the Transkei that we hear so
much about.
Will you, won't you, will you, won't you give
the facts to me,
For suitable adjustment for our friends across
the sea?"

★

"It's no good asking me, you know," Nel
peevishly replied
"I can't be held responsible for what goes on
inside.
Describe the happy voters in their pretty
tribal dress
(Whose multiracial tendencies, of course, you
must suppress).
In fact, just tell the doubting World, in
letters big and bold,
They're absolutely free to do exactly as
they're told!"

[With apologies to Lewis Carroll]

To understand more clearly what a crippling blow the Government dealt the economic life of the reserves when it limited development there to the agricultural sector and refused entry to capital from outside, one need think only what the situation in say the Transvaal or Free State would have been if, after the Anglo-Boer War, Britain had prohibited the entry of all investment capital into the two provinces. Our development would have been crippled. The situation in the reserves is much worse, since there is no previous development to build on.

To see what the result of this restrictive policy has been, one can turn to the Transkei, which is regarded as the most developed of the African reserves.

(Continued overleaf)