

2.6 FUTURE RESETTLEMENT

2.6.1 Farm & squatter removals to Ciskei

Incredible though it may seem, an acceleration in the rate of rural removals to the Ciskei may be expected during the 1980s.

Despite the vast emigration in the 1970s, the african population in the white rural areas who are surplus to the labour needs of agriculture is larger now than a decade ago. The table below illustrates the point.

Table 1 RURAL POPULATION AND AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT

Areas	African farm pop.		Regular farm employ.		Dependency rates	
	1970	1980	1970	1980	1970	1980
White Corridor (excl. black spots)	93 639	80 383	13 377	8 547	7,0	9,4
Rest of Eastern Cape	245 326	224 888	35 147	26 001	7,0	8,6
Central Cape	41 736	27 728	5 912	3 812	7,1	7,3
Western Cape	48 260	39 387	18 002	13 587	2,7	2,9

Although this table should be treated with caution, because the estimates of agricultural employment are based on the 1972/75 trends, the general picture conveyed by it is certainly correct.

In the Central and Western Cape there is an increase, but it is only a marginal one, in the number of the dependants of regular farm workers who live on the farms with them. Rather, the emigration pattern of the rural population seems to have been fairly closely linked to the level of employment in agriculture. This relationship is strongly reinforced by certain aspects of the coloured labour preference policy and will moreover persist in the future as well. Thus the movement from the rural areas of the Central and Western Cape will depend on conditions in agriculture. Whether total african and coloured agricultural employment in the area will fall

even further is not clear. Nor do we know if there is additional scope for substituting coloured for african farm labour. But at least it seems highly unlikely that african employment in agriculture will increase. Thus any net increases in the african population due to natural growth will be forced to move. However this figure is unlikely to be large because many farmers rely on migrant workers, especially in the Western Cape where the coloured labour preference policy is actively enforced, and so most of the population increases associated with the farm workers occur in the reserves where their families are based.

Here it is perhaps also worth mentioning that the State may in future try to enforce the migrant labour clauses of the coloured labour preference policy on farms in the Central Cape. An aspect of this policy aims at turning settled african farm labour into migrant labour and removing the families involved to the reserves. It is clear from the above table that this has not yet occurred in the Central Cape, and it is doubtful that it ever will. But the 20 000 people concerned cannot be certain.

In the Eastern Cape the experiences of the past decade have been very different. Employment in agriculture has decreased at a much faster rate than the population, and hence the number of farm people per fulltime wage-earner has risen from 7 to 9,4 in the East London/Queenstown corridor and from 7 to 8,6 in the rest of the Eastern Cape. To some extent this simply reflects an increase in the average household size as a result of a relative influx of children from urban areas. But the main cause is the presence in the area of a large number of families without any member in fulltime agricultural employment - in other words, people who are surplus to the labour needs of agriculture. Assuming that the average household size equalled 7 throughout the past decade, the rural surplus population in the Eastern Cape was calculated to have grown to some 60 000 by 1980. This figure falls to 50 000 if we allow for shifts in household composition.

The exact residential status of this surplus farm population has unfortunately not been investigated in any detail. Some people live in dense squatter settlements on parts of white-owned farms. For example, ECAB estimates that there are about 3 000 squatters in the Addo and Coega areas still. (EPH, 24.06.78) There are also some squatters on five farms in the Sundays River valley. They pay R4 per month for the right to stay on the properties. (EPH, 27.01.79) On the other side of the Ciskei, a hostile farmer estimated that the Stutterheim/Kubusi area alone housed 4 475 squatters. All these communities are obviously highly susceptible to removal. There is considerable official concern about the extent of squatting, for instance in the Port Elizabeth/Uitenhage area. In early 1979 the Dias Divisional Council started an investigation into squatting on the land of absentee owners in the area.

In addition, a large number of squatters reside on farms in a relatively inconspicuous fashion. Many farmers have a policy of extending residential rights to a few families over and above those who are engaged in fulltime labour on their farms, provided that at least one member of each family is available for casual labour services when required. The other working members of these households are free to find employment elsewhere. There are also many farmers who allow the extended families of farm workers to live on their properties. Though this particular category of surplus people has the consent of farmers to be in the white rural areas, in effect it constitutes a squatter population albeit of a dispersed and covert type. The law certainly recognises them as such and provides for their elimination. Whether the State will, given the difficulties of enforcement, act against them effectively in the near future, is of course another matter. Nevertheless they are under threat of removal.

The existing surplus population will moreover expand during the 1980s. Although we cannot be sure that employment in agriculture in the Eastern Cape will continue to decline, there are indications that the agricultural labour force has not yet reached a stable state. It will not increase in any case. This implies that at least 90 000 people, a number equivalent to the net natural growth of the rural population, will become marginal to the needs of the rural economy in the area in the current decade.

The total number of people who will thus come under a threat of removal from farm lands during the 1980s in the Cape is as follows:

existing surplus farm population	50 000
emerging surplus population: Eastern Cape	90 000
Western and Central Cape	10 000
	<hr/>
TOTAL	150 000
	<hr/>

For many of those the threat will become a reality. The pattern of their resettlement will be similar to that seen in the 70s. There will be many farmer-initiated evictions. Others will move of their own accord. Still others will go through a GG-style removal. One way or another, almost all who go will end up in either of the already overcrowded Xhosa bantustans. Most will simply go there immediately, but some will join squatter settlements within a reasonable distance of some town in the hope of finding employment. But these squatter settlements are high-risk territory anyway. With the aid of the new Admission Act, ECAB can deport squatters forthwith to the Ciskei or Transkei, and will do so. Only a select few might be absorbed into new township developments such as Motherwell near Port Elizabeth. In short, we have every reason to expect a ruthless and dedicated continuation in the policy of forcing the rural surplus population into the bantustans. (This shows up clearly in the Stutterheim Mlungisi case below.)

Finally we should mention the contemplated controls over working conditions on farms, through minimum wages etc. If they are implemented, these may also have a significant impact on rural resettlement. Necessary though improvements are in farm working conditions, they could induce additional mechanisation and labour rationalisation programmes in capitalist agriculture and thereby swell the ranks of the rural surplus population even further. This may in fact be one of the intentions of the proposed controls. The really ominous part is that they may also be formulated in such a way as to compel farmers to evict the existing marginal population from the rural areas.

Here we should remember that the demographic discontinuities arising from State-induced improvements in farm working conditions are ultimately due to a large extent to the whole system of influx control which has already been responsible for much of the demographic turmoil in the rural areas generally. This system has induced a bad imbalance between the urban/rural distribution of the population and the economy, and it has laid the foundations of the current explosive rebalancing process. The added horror is that the imbalance between demography and economy is now being reproduced between the urban areas and the bantustans.

2.6.2 Black spot & homeland consolidation removals

So far, there have been two completed black spot removals in the Eastern Cape. with the Tsitsikama people being moved to Elukhanyweni in 1977/78 and those from Alsatia in the 'White Corridor' moved to Frankfort in mid-1982. This last removal is the first of eleven which have been projected under the euphonious rubric of 'consolidation of the Ciskei'. Their crime is that they are located in this so-called 'White Corridor' which separates the Ciskei from the Transkei. When Ciskei independence was plotted in 1972, the 'Commission for Co-operation' (as it is now described) decided that these 'badly situated black areas' could not be included and that 'they would therefore have to be made white'. More recently, the 1979 Van der Walt Commission into the boundaries of the Ciskei recommended that the white areas of King William's Town, Berlin and the Hogsback should go to the Ciskei and that the 'black spots' should be given up to the Republic. In the event, what has happened is that King William's Town, Berlin and the Hogsback will remain white but the black spots will still be removed.

MGWALI

Mgwali (official population 4 700), about 35 km from Stutterheim, is the most publicised of the threatened areas due to its unique historical associations. It was established on land granted to Tiyo Soga, the first fully ordained Xhosa missionary and great composer of Xhosa hymns, by Sandile, last chief of the independent Rharhabe (Ciskei) Xhosa, in the midst of the horrors of the Nongqause cattle-killing of 1856-7. When Sandile was killed in the last Frontier War and his people expelled across the Kei (thus creating the so-called 'White Corridor'), Mgwali mission was permitted to stay on account of its loyalty. Sandile's mother, Suthu, is buried within its confines.

Mgwali is thus representative of a genuine nationalist tradition, of the sort that Sebe purports to maintain. He has not, however, been able to incorporate Mgwali into his bogus Ciskei nationalism (see above) because the Sandile family under the late Paramount Bazindhlovu Sandile (d 1976) always rejected him and ridiculed his claims to chieftainship. The last chief of Mgwali, Dimalitshona Mpangele, was a Sandile loyalist, and was consequently detained under R252 for his part in the regency struggle which followed Bazindhlovu's death. He was released after something more than a year in prison and deported to the Transkei. Sebe is said to hold a personal grudge against Mgwali, and this may account for his actions in support of the removal.

Deputy Minister Wentzel visited Mgwali during February 1981, in the wake of the Van der Walt Commission. He seemed sympathetic, and the Mgwali people felt that they had made a positive impression. Imagine their surprise when their Prime Minister, L L Sebe, visited them in June 1981 and quite unexpectedly asked them to accept removal 'in principle'. They protested that they did not want to move. Sebe assured them that to agree 'in principle' was not the same as to agree to move, but when the Mgwali people remained sceptical Sebe turned nasty. With a dramatic disregard for geography, he told them that Mgwali was a gateway for terrorists to enter the Ciskei. Any further objections were met with the question 'Are you a terrorist? Why are you supporting terrorism?', with its clear overtones of detention under R252. Sure enough, in August 1981, six prominent opponents of the removal were detained under R252 and interrogated by Charles Sebe.

The first legal step towards the removal of Mgwali has not yet been taken (July 1982): the titleholders have not yet received notice of their expropriation. But the removal process has already commenced. The people of Mgwali are being conditioned to believe that their removal is inevitable, that there is nothing to be done, that the only possible course of action is to go quietly and hope that they will be rewarded for their obedience. The South African authorities have played a part in this. They have continually affirmed that Mgwali is to be moved. Unnamed 'men from Cape Town' moved about the settlement in January 1982 numbering houses and counting property and livestock. Then in June three property evaluators from the Department of Co-operation and Development spent two weeks there, again going from site to site. A model of the two-room prefabricated 'plank house' has been displayed outside the headman's offices, and similar plank houses are sprouting like thornbushes at the site in Frankfort district which the Mgwali people have been told is earmarked for them, and for the people at Wartburg and Alsatia. Now that the Alsatia people have been moved there (June 1982), the other removals are made to look more inevitable.

The sole source of official information to which the Mgwali people have access is the Planning Committee, composed mainly of teachers and civil servants, set up by Sebe after his visit. Opponents of the removal have publicly stated that its members have been promised the well-constructed houses vacated by the former white community of Frankfort. Members of the Planning Committee assert that they are negotiating with the government to get the 'best deal' for the people of Mgwali. They go off to Pretoria for 'top level discussions' and return, dropping hints but never fully relating what they were told or how they replied. The people know that the question of compensation is under discussion and it is widely believed that if one does not co-operate with the Planning Committee, one will not get compensation. The people are never

told that compensation is their legal right. Indeed, they are never told of their legal rights, and they were discouraged from consulting a lawyer on the grounds that they would 'only be throwing their money away'. The latest rumour sweeping Mgwali is that Mgwali pensions are to be paid at Frankfort, and that persons who do not accept the move to Frankfort will not get their pensions.

The situation is somewhat complicated by divisions within the Mgwali community. There are 152 titles at Mgwali, of which some 100 have been claimed. The only large landholder is the Reformed Presbyterian Church, which decided at its December 1981 synod held in Umtata that it was prepared to sell its land. The core of opposition is among the other landholders and the long-term tenants. The squatters - recent immigrants to Mgwali who have no rights to arable land - have supported the move so far, but they have lately heard that they will not be getting garden plots at Frankfort either, and this may change. One problem is that there is no public discussion of the removal in Mgwali. The Mgwali Residents' Committee, which opposes the move, has not been permitted to hold a meeting, and the Planning Committee closes its meetings at the first awkward question. The opposition has had to keep very quiet to avoid R252, but it seems the authorities are still trying to crush all resistance. The South African security police detained Mr Wilson Fanti, chairman of the Residents' Committee, in July 1982. According to one report, Mr Fanti was deported to Transkei, as a nominal Transkeian. People fighting removal in Mgwali and elsewhere in the 'White Corridor' are in a very delicate position since Ciskei 'went independent' in December 1981, which has made them all technically aliens in South Africa. They can be summarily deported either to the Ciskei or the Transkei.

This will not necessarily stop resistance, especially where there is so much at stake. Unlike Mgwali, which is watered by the perennial Mgwali River, there is no surface water at Frankfort. There is no sign of garden plots at the site of the plank houses, and the white farmers who formerly lived in the area were never able to grow crops. It was rumoured in January that the Mgwali people would have to sell their livestock, though this has not been confirmed. Frankfort is some 40 km from Mgwali, and within the ambit of Zwelitsha rather than Stutterheim. The Mgwali people will have to compete with thousands of other resettlement victims for jobs and pensions at Zwelitsha instead of making use of the easier facilities at Stutterheim. But this is nothing compared to the loss of their old home. 'You could build me a four-roomed house', said one man, 'and I would still not want to leave the house of my fathers.'

(See also Stop Press section in Part 4 below.)

WARTBURG

Wartburg (population 3 400) is a Lutheran station, also in the Stutterheim district. Its residents have not yet received any official notification of removal, but they are aware that they will be moved to Frankfort with the Mgwali people. One representative from Wartburg serves on the notorious Mgwali Planning Committee. Other invited residents have refused to join. The people of Wartburg are reported to be very much against removal, and it is rumoured that they chased government officials away from the mission farm in January 1982. (See annexure on p 156 below.)

GOSHEN

Goshen (population 1 200) is about 15 km from Cathcart. It is a Moravian station founded, like Mgwali, in the middle of the cattle-killing. All the residents are landowners and the titledeeds have been carefully preserved. The area is rocky thornveld but it is watered all year by the Waqu River, and the community seem prosperous. Several are market gardeners who sell their produce in Cathcart. They are members of the Cathcart Dairy Co-operative to whom they sell their cream. Houses are solidly built out of brick or stone.

Residents have long been aware of the plans for their removal. On 12 December 1981, the

magistrate of Cathcart (who is also the chairman of the Goshen Village Management Board) called the people and told them they would be moved. He was deliberately vague about the date, 'maybe next month, maybe ten or twenty years'. In February he summoned all the people and told them to hand in their title deeds. The people were reluctant, but after three successive visits they were induced to hand them in, in exchange for unstamped roneoed receipts. The magistrate told them the title deeds would be returned 'next week', but more than a month later they were still in Pretoria for 'photocopying'. The next report was that the magistrate said it was not possible to photostat all the title deeds because some were 'old and brittle'. He explained that they were in safe-keeping under lock and key in his office. (EPH, 19.04.82) The Goshen people are very alarmed about this. They are scheduled for removal to the new resettlement camp at Whittlesea North, along with the people from Lesseyton and the existing camp at Oxtan. (See below.)

LESSEYTON

This Methodist station (population 4 500) is about 10 km north of Queenstown. There is a potentially exploitable social division between the 32 titleholders, most of whom live in fine European-style houses, and the rest - called 'squatters' indiscriminately although some are clearly long-term tenants - who live mainly in close-packed mud houses.

Initially the people were told that removal would be voluntary, for those squatters who wanted land of their own. Now it seems they will all be moved. The magistrate at Whittlesea, who administers the area, addressed the people on 15 December 1981 (it is not clear what a Ciskeian official was doing in the Republic after Ciskeian 'independence'). He read them a government notice to the effect that they would be moved, though he did not know when or where. When the people objected, he responded that 'This notice does not require an answer', and left the meeting.

The government plans moving the Lesseyton people to Whittlesea North, to 'compensatory land', Dr Koornhof told Parliament. (EPH, 9.06.82) What this phrase amounts to we do not know.

KWELERHA

This area consists of four villages some 20 km east of East London. Many families have squatted there after the farm evictions of the later 1970s, and the chances are that the population is double the official estimate of 4 900. It appears that many residents had some kind of title (they are convinced it was freehold title) until 1959 when they were made to hand in their documents and move into closer settlements under a betterment scheme. They were issued with 'certificates of occupation', without compensation. It is not clear what the legal status of these 'certificates of occupation' is, with regard to expropriation and compensation. One unconfirmed opinion is that Kwelerha was mostly owned by one man who sublet to other families. Papers were taken in in the late 1950s to regularise transfer. (If it is true that there were other freeholders and their papers were confiscated, this would not affect their status as titleholders. They would still need formal notice of expropriation and full compensation for their land.)

The Kwelerha people first heard of the removal in 1975 when the Mdantsane magistrate told a Mrs Rusi that she was wasting her time expanding her shop because they were all going to be moved. In 1980, they heard they were going to be moved to 'Chalumna'. Officials have kept reiterating this with variations: they amount to saying that all those from Kwelerha, Newlands and Mooiplaats are due to go to the Chalumna-Kidd's Beach area about 30 km west of East London.

The chief of Kwelerha is D M Jongilanga, for many years an influential member of the Ciskeian cabinet until his demotion to a junior post in December 1981. People's reaction to the

resettlement proposals has been very much channelled through and conditioned by the chief. People trust Jongilanga, and credit him with resisting removal to even more unsuitable locations such as Frankfort and Peddie. Jongilanga has told them that they will not be moved until there is the same provided in the new place as they have already got at the old place. They are therefore to continue improving their land, building dams and so on. The people of one village, Tuba, have built another side onto the school and enlarged the Methodist church, for this reason. Jongilanga has also promised them that they will go straight into proper brick houses, not into temporary accommodation. The people assume that they will be given grazing and arable land, and that they will be allowed to take their livestock.

The Kwelerha people are opposed to removal.

It won't be the same as here, whatever they give us. People were born here.

Hundreds of people in Kwelerha are working on white farms. They will have to move with Chief Jongilanga, and they must be given land.

Some few people without arable land hope they will get land to plough at Chalumna, and so they want to go. But if we have to go, if we have no choice, we must try and get the best we can.

The people of Tuba (one of the four villages) seem aware of the need for unity, and insist that there should be no preferential treatment for individuals: all of them will move, or none. They will insist on a place close to Mdantsane - with the object of making the move more difficult. They intend making an independent assessment of their property for compensation. They do not want the promise of equal facilities to obscure their rights to compensation. They do not believe that the new facilities they are promised will equal the ones they are to lose. (See also Stop Press section in Part 4 below.)

MOOIPLAATS

This is a large area with an official population of 12 600 under tribal trust immediately west of the Kei River in the southern end of the 'White Corridor'. They also come under Chief Jongilanga and are due to be moved to Chalumna-Kidd's Beach west of East London along with his other people from Kwelerha and Newlands. (EPH, 9.06.82)

KWENXURHA

The Kwenxurha area lies between Kwelerha and Mooiplaats (population is included under Mooiplaats) and it is made up of land purchased by the SA Native Trust under the 1936 Act after 1940. One headman here said the people had heard nothing about moving, and would not want to leave. Quite a few people here had already been moved from other places - for example, the settlement of Soto began in 1958 when people were sent there from nearby farms. There are about 300 families in Soto now, and the place has over the years grown to feel quite settled.

NEWLANDS

The official population is officially 6 900, but the real figure is probably much bigger because this old Anglican mission (estd. 1858) is in a very popular area, just on the other side of the national road past Mdantsane. This community also falls under Chief Jongilanga, and is scheduled for removal with the rest of his people to Chalumna-Kidd's Beach.

GUBU DAM

This small area near the Pirie forest north of Dimbaza is unique among the black spots of the 'White Corridor' in being actually contiguous with the Ciskei. It seems to have been promised to the local white farmers' association in return for their consent to the buying up of certain white farms for the Ciskei. This cannot be verified.

KEANCIYA

People at KeaNciya near Izeli north of King William's Town are to be moved to Braunschweig, General Charles Sebe said in July 1982. (DD, 10.07.82) The exact site is not known. The people were originally moved here from farms in the Komgha district.

KUBUSI etc

Kubusi, SW of Stutterheim, has some 4 500 people on smallholdings. Many appear to be under threat in the context of local removal plans (see Mlungisi (Stutterheim) below) and according to the extradition agreement between South Africa and Ciskei they are to be moved to the Frankfort/Braunschweig area near King William's Town. This Frankfort/Braunschweig area is also to receive people from 'TYUTYU, SKOBENI, QALASHE and portions of PEELTON in the areas in the District of Zwelitsha', according to the agreement. The Peelton group are on the 'White Corridor' side of the railway line, with Frankfort literally over the road from them. We do not know where Tyutyu, Skobeni and Qalasha are.

3 QUEENSTOWN FARMS

These farms - Bambani 62, Tabata 63 and Xuma 77 - are named in another resettlement agreement between South Africa and Ciskei. (Government Gazette No 8204 of 14.05.82, p 75) Tabata is just north of Lesseyton. These farm clearances may be seen as part of the Lesseyton removal plan, in which case the residents may be destined for Whittlesea North.

At the time of writing (July 1982), the South African government remains committed to resettling the black communities of the Corridor. In the same week that Nationalist MP Volker came out against 'black spot' removal and some Transvaal removals were stopped, a letter from P W Botha to T Louw, Nationalist MP for Queenstown, was made public. In it Botha committed himself to buying out the areas under threat. (DD, 23.04.82) Koornhof's reply to a Parliamentary question on 8.06.82 was further confirmation.

The Eastern Cape 'black spots' are more vulnerable than those in Natal and the Northern Transvaal for the following reasons:

- 1 They are relatively small and few. It would not be too expensive to buy them out.
- 2 For the same reason, it is feasible (as it is not, with KwaZulu and Lebowa) to consolidate the Ciskei into one single territorial bloc - the ideal of geopolitical apartheid.
- 3 Land for resettlement - the main consideration in calling off the Transvaal removals - has already been purchased.
- 4 As the Mgwali case shows, the bantustan government, far from supporting the threatened communities or even remaining neutral (as is the case with KwaZulu), is actively promoting

the resettlement.

Nevertheless, the circumstances of the removal of the Tsitsikama people and their present plight have erupted into a major embarrassment for the government and, at the very least, this is going to make them more circumspect in future. This may just amount to saying that officials will be more careful about procedure, not that plans are likely to be scrapped or conditions at the new site made more viable. The removal of the Alsatia community to Frankfort in June 1982 was very neatly done. The agreement was sealed beforehand, the removal squad used no overt force, compensation was paid. Yet those 26 families have lost as much as the Tsitsikama people did, now that they have no subsistence base and have been uprooted from their home. They are dislocated, have no local work for income, must join the crowds competing for jobs at the Zwelitsha labour bureau, and will be under still greater strain as other families are moved into the area.

2.6.3 Township removals

Some uncertainty surrounds the policy of deproclaiming and removing townships close to the Ciskei. At present it seems the State will not try relocating all such townships in the Ciskei. Grahamstown's Fingo Village has had a reprieve, which is particularly valuable because this area contains freehold land. Hillside location at Fort Beaufort survived a threat of removal in 1979 and is still there. The plan for a massive R26 million township at Glenmore on the western border of the Ciskei has been scrapped, which suggests at least that there are no actual plans to move any townships west of the Ciskei into the bantustan itself. In the Corridor things are less certain. Duncan Village is to be cleared and perhaps a few of the smaller locations, yet there does not seem to be any comprehensive plan.

Even the declared plans may change, of course. ECAB announced a R542 million plan in February 1981 to upgrade and develop the townships of the Eastern Cape, concentrating on what they described as 8 crisis points: Zwide housing which Walmer residents in Port Elizabeth would be forced to occupy; Mdantsane housing for Duncan Villagers; Mlungisi township in Queenstown being upgraded for africans who would not after all have to move out for 'coloureds'; Fingo Village in Grahamstown; the main township in Fort Beaufort; a new township for africans in Seymour; Ginsberg township in King William's Town; and Mlungisi township at Stutterheim. Zwide housing has been delayed, and the Walmer families may have a slight reprieve. In fact they may end up fighting removal to Motherwell instead. Duncan Village will certainly not be cleared by the end of 1982 as was originally said (EPH, 6.02.81). Seymour is now scheduled for the Ciskei by the end of 1982. A mere R155 has been spent in Ginsberg, and nothing in Stutterheim. (Rand Daily Mail, 3.06.82) We understand that part of Mlungisi township in Queenstown is the scene of removals after all, with africans being replaced by 'coloureds'. There are therefore some apparent shifts in policy, or at least in carrying out policy. Some temporary upgrading in Walmer and Duncan Village, however, should not be taken as a sign that those communities are now free to stay.

These eight crisis points were so-called by ECAB after the Linde report to describe areas felt to be in such bad condition as to lead to violence, strikes and disruptions, and the motive in the plan seemed to be to remove or settle 'problems'. ECAB have also committed themselves to moving some townships that would not come under this heading: Riebeeck East to Alicedale; Bathurst to Port Alfred; Kenton, Bushman's River and Cannon Rocks to a new township at Kenton. The reason they give is usually that it simplifies administration. This whole subject needs to be closely watched and analysed. Meanwhile, as far as removals to the Ciskei are concerned, these relocations that ECAB have planned suggest an easing up on urban clearances to the Ciskei - at least for some groups of people.

DUNCAN VILLAGE

Removals from Duncan Village to Mdantsane have been going on steadily since 1964. Up to 1982 an official 80 000 people have been moved (though the SAIRR in East London puts it at more like 110 000).

Pretoria's policy is to clear Duncan Village completely of africans and then in the name of Group Areas turn the place over to coloureds and indians. The clearance is being done by sections. Dr Morrison for the Dept of Co-operation and Development had said it would be done by early 1983, but in fact the population is far too great for that to happen. The official figure in February 1982 was between 37 000 and 40 000 (unofficial estimates vary between 60 000 and 90 000). The SA Development Trust would have to build another 7 000 to 8 000 housing units to accommodate them in Mdantsane, Morrison said, (DD, 27.02.82) adding:

Depending on the availability of funds, the removal is expected to be completed within the foreseeable future.

But the time lag does not mean a change of government plan. In fact Morrison's comments were made in reply to the East London city council's sudden plea that the africans in Duncan Village should be allowed to stay. Meanwhile nearly 2 000 'coloured' families are on the waiting list for houses in the area (EPH, 23.12.81) and are being moved in as sections are cleared. It should be recorded here that some coloured opinion is strongly against the scheme:

We are entirely against the removal. The blacks are our brothers. We have lived with them, played with them. We grew up with them and now the Government wants to separate us. We won't move into their houses if they are moved. (EPH, 23.12.81)

The removals have actually made very little headway all these years in reducing the population of Duncan Village:

- 1 The seepage back from Mdantsane is sizeable. With no work in Mdantsane, people there seek jobs in East London - and stay in Duncan Village nearby in order to avoid the high Mdantsane bus fares. Whether people get jobs or not, it is far easier and cheaper to settle down in Duncan Village;
- 2 Natural increase in Duncan Village has in itself replaced a whole generation since the removals began in 1964; and
- 3 Ndende Street in the Village is in a terrible slum state. Although this drives away families with higher incomes who leave voluntarily to get a decent house in Mdantsane, it also draws in the more numerous poor.

The only africans legally in Duncan Village are the Section Tenners. There are many of them, lots of them now squatters. So many houses have been pulled down, and natural increase has raised the numbers so high, that people cannot be housed formally. For 19 years the houses have declined. Planning permission has been refused for any extensions or improvements, and illegal work on houses is not included in the compensation value when people leave and so most houses are left to degenerate. In the general areas living conditions are very bad, and some Mdantsane people have said it is dangerous to live in the Village. People are cramped together. Ndende Street is very unhealthy, with water and toilet facilities quite inadequate for the needs of this dense area. Yet many people still choose this dangerous, filthy place because it is cheap, close to East London, and above all, outside the Ciskei.

Before Ciskeian 'independence' people had tended to hope that Sebe would object to this endless stream of people being foisted on Mdantsane once it became technically foreign soil on 4 December 1981. Their hopes have faded now, since it is clear that Sebe and the Republic have sealed their agreement to the move, on the basis of the Republic providing 10 000 dwelling units in Mdantsane for the inhabitants of Duncan Village. (Government Gazette No 8204 of 14.05.82, p 12) This is what the authorities wanted. Pretoria wants to get rid of africans

from Duncan Village, and Sebe will be happy when the place has gone, since it will mean one less base for opposition - notably trade unionists - on the edge of the Ciskei. Mdantsane is being curbed at present as far as the powers of R252 can be made to work. Ultimately, though, and perhaps quite soon, the rising anger and solidarity there must burst forth beyond Ciskei's control. Sebe has good reason to want the East London workers bound under his regime as soon as possible before they mature any more, and to keep them as isolated as he can.

There is one group in Duncan Village that Sebe certainly does not like to accept: the Transkeians. Several hundred of them live in the migrant worker hostels, and there are many more besides. It is said that as much as 60% of the african population of the Village are Transkeians. The Transkei regime have vociferated very loudly in 1982 against the removal of Transkeians to Mdantsane. As their Foreign Affairs Minister said:

People working in another state on contract cannot be compelled to stay in a third state. In this case our nationals are the responsibility of South Africa We object most strongly to our nationals being forced to live in another state either by compulsion or implication and we will take the strongest possible action if this was to happen.

(DD, 4.03.82)

Sebe would gladly see all the Transkeians sent 'home', and their jobs going to Ciskeians instead. Local management may be playing the two groups off against each other.

Duncan Villagers have been lulled off resistance somewhat, through a false sense of security because they have escaped final removal for so long. What alertness there is, is encouraged through public meetings and good press coverage. The people face a very determined policy: R11 500 000 has already been spent on resettling Duncan Village, and a further R5 800 000 has been budgeted for it in 1982. (Rand Daily Mail, 3.06.82) (See Stop Press section in Part 4 below.)

MLUNGISI (QUEENSTOWN)

Residents here have had a long running battle to stay in Mlungisi. There seems to have been a definite plan to move everyone out to eZibeleni, 10 km east of Queenstown. Some people were actually moved there against their will, but then it passed into the hands of the Transkei because it lay just within the borders of Glen Grey, and so the scheme had to be scrapped. There was also the idea of moving the Mlungisi people to Shiloh commonage outside Whittlesea, and with this in mind the Whittlesea magistrate insisted that the Glen Grey people who were already camped there should move on to Oxton. That was in late 1977.

The Mlungisi people were in a tricky position because they were fighting removal and resisting rent rises at the same time. In one single press report (DD, 22.12.79), the community council were appealing to the Minister of Co-operation and Development not to disestablish the township, and also finding out that ECAB planned to serve 900 summonses for non-payment of the higher rents.

The whole scene was further complicated by the fact that the Mlungisi residents' representative committee accused ECAB of foisting a community council on the township against the wishes of the people, who regarded the councillors as stooges. (DD, 6.06.79)

Mlungisi was faced with a plan to relocate the african residents and move coloureds into the area instead. The split in the community - for and against the council - has made solidarity difficult even though there is a strong general wish to fight removal. The council turned to the Queenstown town council for its support in December 1979, only to learn that the whites were actually asking for the africans to be moved and replaced by 'coloureds'. (DD, 22.12.79)

The next stage reversed everything: the african residents were to stay, the government said

and not only that, but a further 300 ha would be set aside for any former residents who had been moved to eZibeleni and who wished to return. They would be able to build on this land under a site and service scheme. The old township, which had been proclaimed a 'coloured' area, would not only be reinstated for africans, but houses would be repaired and upgraded as far as possible, so the statement went. (DD, 6.02.81)

The reversal happened because Mlungisi had been defined as one of the so-called crisis points to be contained in the Eastern Cape. The planning was on a big scale - the site and service area alone was to cost about R4,5 million. Yet this huge emergency programme does not seem to have borne much fruit. A mere R3 876 was spent in the first year on 'general planning', and in the present financial year, 1982/3, R57 000 has been set aside for buying land.

Lack of funds may be the reason. There may be another change of plan again, though. We have heard that coloureds have started being moved into the Bede area, a section of Mlungisi which had been very well established. Africans are said to be very bitter here, being pushed out family by family. They had hoped they were safe, having survived the 'slum clearance' of the early 1970s when the old section called Stidiki was deliberately emptied. (These were the people, perhaps 5 000, who had to go to eZibeleni.)

Another section is also earmarked for coloureds, according to this account - the part called White City, a lunatic name which may derive from the fact that this is the 'posh' area. Over the road from here is the main 'coloured' community, the source of those who are apparently moving in now.

Mlungisi contains many thousands of people. Some estimates are around 15 000. How many are really threatened with removal we do not know. Nor do we know where evicted families are going. One guess is that some might after all be pushed to the Shiloh commonage, to the new Whittlesea North site.

MLUNGISI etc (STUTTERHEIM)

Policy has switched a few times on the Stutterheim Mlungisi township from 1979. Compared with the earlier plans, it now threatens relatively few people with removal. It is not necessarily in its final form.

This old township (population c 5 200*) has been in a very bad state for years. In 1979 there were just 636 houses and only 24 taps in the place. ECAB's idea was to scrap the site and move everyone to Glenhaven 5 km outside Stutterheim. But Glenhaven turned out to be good arable land - not to be squandered on african relocation, in other words - and then Frankfort near King William's Town was suggested for the site instead.

Whose idea was Frankfort? Sebe said it was being imposed on the Ciskei (DD, 23.05.80), and Morrison for Co-operation and Development said the Ciskei had suggested it (DD, 6.02.81). The clash of statement is trivial in the sense that Ciskei exists by virtue of Pretoria policy and will presumably always oblige it. We mention it just for the record. No doubt Frankfort was in line with the general plan of removing 'surplus' africans and pushing the labour supplies just over the bantustan border.

There was a huge outcry in Mlungisi. People were appalled at hearing they were meant to be

* For this and most other details we are indebted to the town planners' report, 'Mlungisi - Stutterheim - Memorandum of motivation for outline and layout plan', P J Coetzee and Associates, Port Elizabeth, 1982. The figures are all 1982 estimates.

uprooted and sent off somewhere 32 km away from Stutterheim. White employers in the town protested too, at how the removal would damage their labour supplies (DD, 23.05.80).

Then came the Linde Commission into township development. It reported in early 1981, and its verdict was a reprieve:

It has now been decided that Mlungisi will remain as a township for black inhabitants of Stutterheim and that efforts would be made to upgrade the houses within five years. (DD, 6.02.81)

Formally, therefore, Mlungisi is not under threat of removal. It is not listed in the removals section of the Ciskei extradition agreement.

But with the Linde report the question broadens out. Originally removal had been for the sake of improving living conditions in the township (at least ostensibly), but even at the time in 1979/80 people pointed out that the existing site could be upgraded: removal was not needed at all. The truer purpose behind Frankfort was more probably to get africans out of the 'White Corridor'. The Linde report ended up by talking about removing ALL the local africans apart from the township people:

... the 15 000 people living as squatters on the (Stutterheim) commonage are to be moved.... 'As far as the squatters are concerned they will have to be resettled in other areas as soon as possible', (Dr Morrison) said. (DD, 6.02.81)

The squatters had just been fervently damned in evidence to the Van der Walt Commission. They were described as the farmers' greatest problem by Mr N McMaster, speaking on behalf of the local white farmers' committee:

He told the commission about 60 farmers wanted to move out of the area where farming had come to a standstill because of the 'thousands of squatters located within this area'. (DD, 21.01.81)

From 4 475 squatters in the Stutterheim area at the time of the 1943 'squatters' commission, he added, numbers had soared to an estimated 22 000 in 1980, half of them in the Kubusi where they crowded especially onto white-owned unoccupied farms. Theft, trespass and harassment, and an appalling dog menace, had all grown to alarming proportions. The white farmers wanted all the squatters moved. Either that, or they wanted the whole area bought out for the Ciskei.

It seems from other parts of the evidence reported in DD, 21.01.81, that this large squatter estimate probably included people in the Wartburg/Mgwali area. Although the farmers' argument extended there, we limit discussion here to the immediate Stutterheim area.

ECAB set up a planning committee into the whole Mlungisi/squatters question in August 1981. The people being discussed were not represented. The bodies invited were: Co-operation and Development; Health, Welfare and Pensions; Education and Training; ECAB itself; the Town Council of Stutterheim; and the regional CPA medical superintendent. This planning committee decided who should be allowed to stay in Mlungisi:

- those employed in Stutterheim, or
- those with Section 10 (1) (a) or (b) rights, or
- landowners.

All others were to be moved.

Professional planners then surveyed the local populations and their standing in the area. Their report finds that the 5 200 africans in the present Mlungisi should be included in the new township plan. They will stay. Another 5 200 also qualify to stay because they are employed in Stutterheim too even though they do not live in Mlungisi. Finally they found 111 african

landowners who with their families should stay. The survey gave a final total of 11 141 for the population of the new Mlungisi, which at a growth rate of 3% a year would reach a projected 20 000 by the year 2000.

Plans for the new Mlungisi appear firm although they are still being approved. The government has earmarked R3 million for it, according to the mayor of Stutterheim, Mr N James. (Mercury, 26.08.82) The proposed site is north-east of Stutterheim on about 180 ha including the present Mlungisi and Cenyu.

If the plan goes through, those 11 000 + people will just shift locally, possibly many of them willingly and for the better. But the survey put the overall local population figure for africans at 16 500. This means about 5 400 are due for removal out of the area. These people under threat are scattered about: it seem a lot are in Kubusi, some in Cenyu and Cenyu Lands, and a few perhaps from Kalogha and from Ohlsens.

According to the extradition agreement between Ciskei and South Africa, Pretoria is to move these people to the Frankfort/Braunschweig area. (Government Gazette 8204 of 14.05.82, p 12)

We have not heard what the threatened families think. Perhaps some do not even know what is afoot. A lot of field work needs doing in the Stutterheim area.

2.6.4 Influx control & 'coloured labour preference' removals

The Orderly Movement and Settlement of Black Persons Bill was recently referred to a parliamentary select committee. This Bill is a revised version of one first tabled in 1980 and then withdrawn. The new Bill will have high priority in the coming session of parliament. In its present form, with provisions differing slightly from the recommendations of the Riekert Commission, it deals with urban residence rights and influx control.

It proposes to raise the penalties on employers of illegal labour. The maximum fine will soar from the current R500 to a massive R5 000, which would make it wholly uneconomic for anyone to employ workers illegally. In addition, anyone providing accommodation to 'illegals' will face a fine of up to R500. This may deter permanent urban africans from subletting rooms to anyone unlawfully in the area. In effect, then, the main burden of administering influx control will shift from the State to employers and permanent african householders in town. The State will then keep up or even increase its control simply by threat of fining, while saving effort and expense by being able to cut down on pass raids and court cases.

In fact the State's role will be simplified still further. Another clause in the Bill integrates it with the Admission of Persons to the Republic Regulation Act which provides for the summary ejection of any african with ties to an independent bantustan. Any african with these ties can be simply ordered out of the Republic area by any passport control officer - these officials have been granted the status and powers of influx control officers. Thus influx control removals will be streamlined. Offenders will be subject to swift deportation to a bantustan without recourse to the courts, saving delays and cost to the State. The Admission Act has already been used against influx control offenders in urban squatter settlements (e.g. Nyanga Bush) and will probably become the standard tool used by the State to deal with them.

The Quail Commission (1980, 79) estimated that 68 500 Ciskeians were living illegally in the urban areas in 1980. This figure seems a bit high and may well include most illegal Transkeians as well. Whatever the case, the threat of removal to the Ciskei (or Transkei) will reach a totally new level of intensity if the new law is passed. Already, under the Admission Act, the State can move effectively against the more inconspicuous illegals too - not only the squatter settlements but those who live among the permanent residents of normal townships. In the light of the Orderly Movement Bill, one wonders what Dr Koornhof makes of his own claim that

Squatting ... occurs all over the country and the world. The problem can only be solved if sufficient work and accommodation is provided in the Black States.

(Die Burger, March 1980)

Other aspects of the Bill may also have a bearing on removals. A controversial proposal in the Bill is the repeal of Section 10 of the Black (Urban Areas) Consolidation Act. Section 3 of the Bill allows africans to stay in an urban area only on condition that they are authorised to do so by a designated officer. Section 5 gives automatic authorisation to africans who had their Section 10 rights before, but there is the possibility that this provision may lack the statutory thrust of Section 10 qualifications. In other words - but it must be emphasised that there is uncertainty on this point - the Bill may enable designated officers to withdraw permanent urban rights. If this interpretation is correct, this part of the Bill is probably aimed at urban squatters with permanent residence rights, because the key criterion is the availability of approved accommodation, lacking which the urban rights may be withdrawn. The State may incidentally be planning to solve the acute accommodation crisis by deportation rather than by building more houses.

The Bill also makes it more difficult to get permanent urban rights. A 10-year period of continuous lawful residence will usually suffice, but not necessarily. Ultimately, the decision rests with a designated officer. Variables such as availability of housing and employment will affect the decision.

The future of Coloured Labour Preference is much less certain. The policy is definitely under review in government circles. The very poor growth record of the Western Cape in the past decade compared with the rest of the country is one factor which militates strongly against Coloured Labour Preference. This is not to say that restriction on the employment of africans was the main reason, but it was contributory. The State's attempt to use the policy only insofar as the economy of the region went unhurt could not possibly have been entirely successful. Evidence also suggests that coloureds no longer 'require' the policy's protection, which is why the Bureau of Economic Research advised against the policy in 1981.

Although we cannot be sure, it seems unlikely that the policy as a whole will be abandoned in the near future. But very probably there will be a toning down, particularly in removing the discrimination against africans with permanent residence rights. This will obviously relieve the pressures which force some people from the area.

On the other hand, the Nyanga Bush experience suggests that a Crossroads reprieve will not happen again. After all, this is what the Orderly Movement and Settlement of Black Persons Bill is all about.

2.6.5 Removals within Ciskei

In the future we can expect a quickening migration within the Ciskei to the south and east where all the industrial development in the region is concentrated. This will lead to an even greater squatter population in districts such as Mdantsane and Zwelitsha. The exact responses of the Ciskeian authorities cannot be anticipated for certain, but they would have to involve substantial resettlement, quite possibly to the remoter parts of the Ciskei.

The agricultural policies of the Ciskeian authorities are also bound to generate more internal resettlement. Irrigation schemes inevitably mean some resettlement. As these schemes increase - and this is where most agricultural funds go - so will resettlement. Glenmore is a fairly dramatic example, where pipes for irrigation are being laid even before the people are moved out, and even before the area has been formally consolidated into the Ciskei.

The policy on dryland farming is to encourage large-scale capitalist agriculture. This poses a direct threat to communities resettled by the South African State on land previously farmed by whites. The Ciskei is opposed to turning these farms, which are often valuable agriculturally, into subsistence areas for the communities settled on them. Instead the aim seems to be to get rid of the communities and generate a class of african capitalist farmers based on this good land. These considerations may underlie the projected relocation of Kammaskraal.

Hardly any assistance is given for dryland subsistence farming, so the policy is apparently to discourage it.

As conditions in subsistence areas deteriorate further, more and more people will be pushed out of the rural areas and towards the urban centres of the Ciskei. It is only the threat to the security of the Ciskeian State, if this process becomes too explosive, that stops the authorities accelerating this trend. At present they are covertly eliminating subsistence agriculture as far as possible, and resettling the subsistence population in closer settlements. They cannot afford to make this their overt policy, for fear of a dangerous stampede towards the towns.

The chiefs also have a strong vested interest in population movement within the Ciskei. It profits them personally to get more people in their area, both financially and in terms of their political status. Their lobbying will probably go on affecting decisions about where people should be moved.

The Ciskei is already so overfull, the natural population movement would be for people to move

out of it en masse. Artificial control by law not only keeps people cooped up in the area but goes on forcing more into it - a trend which, as we have said, may get worse if the Orderly Movement Bill is passed. Already a quiet 10 000 (Mr Godden's estimate) have seeped into the reception areas of Ntabethemba/Zweledinga from the Republic. Influx into the Mount Coke area, being closer to places of employment, has been enormous and will go on increasing. Removals from very congested areas can be expected - but to what? The SA Development Trust is to fund several resettlement projects within the Ciskei, under the South Africa/Ciskei extradition agreement. Ciskei has budgeted to develop and maintain Ntselamazi, Sada, Mdantsane, Ilitha, Dimbaza, Zwelitsha, Masincendane and Phakamisa, but otherwise it seems there is no money for facilities elsewhere, even at the humble Ciskei level.

It is not just a matter of housing. (Ciskei stopped paying for new houses - except for the few elite families - in 1981.) From now on, housing in the Ciskei will be almost entirely informal, and people can cope like that. But the services and facilities, and the basis for subsistence, are the crucial items that thousands of families will lack. The Ciskei has been advised that up to 283 000 additional housing units would be needed in the next 20 years, which implies a huge outlay on infrastructure. In this context, relocation sites are likely to be the barest of dumping grounds, and internal removals purely for control, the security of the Ciskei regime, the personal interest of the chiefs - in other words, for everything but helping the families themselves.

Most of the removal projects we have heard of are those involving the Development Trust:

KAMMASKRAAL

This transit camp south of Peddie has existed since mid-1980 when 1 000 people were brought here from Wooldridge nearby and from Alexandria towards Port Elizabeth. As the case study in Part 3 shows, at first the Wooldridge group were actually barred from building shanties to replace their tents, and deterred from planting, by government officials who told people to expect their next move at any time. Slowly the realities took over, though, and now the shanties and crops satisfy at least some of the basic needs.

The people are scheduled for removal to a new resettlement site on Peddie commonage, and they don't want to go. As one person said,

We are settling down now. At least I have some land of my own, although we were promised much more. I've worked hard to get this garden going and I am having good results now. It will be hard to start afresh at Peddie, where I hear there is no land.

They will be moving to a densely populated part where they will have no land apart from house plots, and jobs are virtually non-existent. They will be resented as newcomers to that poor, congested area. They will have to scrum for migrant contracts in a large, growing body of relocated workseekers.

The Trust is responsible for providing housing at Peddie and also the basic infrastructure. Temporary housing of the tomato-box type is being built there now, mid-1982, and perhaps this is all that people will get. The removal is imminent. Wooldridge families are due to go first, one report claimed. It is rumoured that this group (about 170 families) might be used to put up permanent houses for the Alexandria group who will come only when their places are ready, and after they have harvested the crops from their small gardens. We have had no confirmation of this, but if it really is the plan it will create tremendous extra bitterness, especially as the Alexandria people had been favoured before, being given housing and not tents when they came to Kammaskraal.

The Kammaskraal community has been split from the start by this favouritism. The two factions

have a flimsy bond at present, in agreeing that they do not want to move although they also feel helpless about the issue. They also share in a bulk-buying scheme started by local churchmen. This has helped to unite them somewhat. But any community spirit will probably evaporate in Peddie under the strain of another dislocation, certainly if there is unfair dealing. Stop press: The Kammaskraal people were moved to Peddie in Sept/Oct 1982. See 4.3.2 below.

GLENMORE

This camp on the Fish River west of Peddie holds about 4 200 people. The SA Development Trust bought the land and in April 1979 started moving families in, the idea being to build up a large resettled population who would then be 'consolidated' into the Ciskei along with the land. (See the case study below in Part 3.) It has still not been handed over (August 1982).

Vaunted as a R26 million model township plan ('the best in Africa') when it started, Glenmore was never more than a cheap dumping ground with tomato boxes for housing. Nearly 3 500 people were forced to go there in 1979 until public outcry stopped the removals. In late 1981, with consolidation just around the corner, another 700 were shoved in from farm areas nearby. As one resident said, 'If you go off to P.E. on Monday, there are new people in your house by Friday.' Now they are meant to go to Peddie.

Glenmore's case is very like Kammaskraal. Both communities have two main groups of people - in Glenmore it is the Klipfontein/Kenton people from the coast and those from Coega/Colchester near Port Elizabeth. In both, the split has (perhaps deliberately) kept the community at loggerheads with itself where it could otherwise have fought together for its own interests.

Consolidation is expected at any time, and the move to Peddie immediately afterwards. The South Africa/Ciskei extradition agreement commits South Africa to funding the move, at least by way of basic preparation on the Peddie site. Sebe also argued in December 1981 that South Africa should pay the transport costs too, since it was responsible for pushing all those people into Glenmore in the first place. South Africa might oblige, although there is nothing the Ciskei can do to insist on it. Now that 'independence' has been bestowed on the Ciskei, the group at Glenmore can't be returned to their places of origin; and the Ciskei values the Glenmore land far too highly for an extension to the Tyefu irrigation scheme to leave the people on it. Ciskei is so keen on clearing the land for Tyefu, in fact, that pipes are already being laid in anticipation of the people going.

Some people at Glenmore have said, 'We would rather die than go to Peddie.' Most of them would rather stay, and for the same reasons as those at Kammaskraal, especially the sense of having to start all over again just when they have begun to take root a bit after their first move. The Glenmore people also object to Peddie because it means moving further into the Ciskei. On the border, they feel closer to the Port Elizabeth-Uitenhage complex where some have found work. At Peddie they and the Kammaskraal workseekers will have to compete with thousands of the rural poor for jobs in King William's Town and East London.

Some other people can't wait to get to Peddie. They want facilities at hand and trust the labour bureau will help them. It is hard for Glenmore people to discuss the move together because the main Coega-Kenton split makes meetings, representative committees and public statements almost impossible to achieve. Besides, the very mention of moving away from Glenmore makes people return vociferously to their constant theme - that they want to go back to their places of origin or, failing that, to anywhere else in the Republic. And this theme of returning to Coega and Kenton heightens the faction feeling once again.

Pensions urgently need fixing up before the next move, assuming it must happen. The horrific fact emerged in December 1981 that some people had never even had their pensions transferred to Glenmore since their arrival in April 1979. Others had received a few payments and then nothing more. The payout clerks are accused of embezzling. Some members of the community

are taking the matter to court. Glenmore has an exceptionally high proportion of pensioners, and this bad aspect of the camp has ironically done more to unite people than anything else - because of the pension issue, which is urgent and affects such a big group.

Trouble over pensions is another fear that people have about the next move to Peddie. They expect delays, even total stoppage of pensions. The payments are being handled by the Alice magistrate already - that is, by the Ciskei - but technically the pensions are still the responsibility of South Africa because Glenmore has not been consolidated yet. As Mr Tutu Gqukani, one of the Klipfontein elders, said,

If we are having this much trouble with pensions after nearly three years at Glenmore, imagine what will happen when our pensions have to be transferred to the Ciskei.

The delays, stoppages and gaps in pension payouts at Glenmore must reflect what happens in camps throughout the country. The injustice is all the more grim because people are at the mercy of the clerks, and the disruption of a move makes pensions more invaluable than ever.

OXTON

This transit camp in the north, in Hewu district, has been going since late 1976. The people came mainly from Glen Grey one way and another, some via Zweledinga camp, some from Emadakeni next to Sada, some from Silver City on Shiloh commonage, also next to Sada. The population now is at least 7 000 and some estimates go as high as 10 000. (DD, 2.06.82 puts it at 1 600 families.)

Oxton always has been a very poor dumping ground of a site. It is dusty, stony, bare and crowded. Wood must be gathered and carried from up to 10 km away. It is far from Whittlesea, the local administrative centre. Food must be bought. The children cannot all attend school in Oxton, and some must walk to other schools, anything up to 6 km away. We understand the only water supply is from the nearly dry stream bed nearby, and some boreholes.

It was so bad even in 1977 that the Mpilo relief committee, who were feeding children in the Thornhill and Zweledinga reception areas, also worked here. People resisted coming here, and some were forced. The families from Ilinge who came to Shiloh commonage were told to move to Oxton, and 75 of them tried to stay, saying they were urban and not rural people. They refused, and the Whittlesea magistrate still insisted. (DD, 4.11.77) The details of their removal are not known but they were definitely moved to Oxton against their will - even though the Whittlesea magistrate assured the press, in the report quoted above, that the removal would be within the framework of the law and without bulldozers.

Now the Oxton people are to move again - to Whittlesea North, the very site that those Ilinge people were forced to leave in 1977. For many families it will be their fourth move within a generation. Ilinge was a resettlement camp itself, dating back to the late 1960s. The people had come from farms and townships nearby, and also from further afield, particularly the Western Cape. Along with Sada and Dimbaza, Ilinge was notorious as a place for banished politicians - ex-Robben Islanders, ANC members etc. Then in 1976 the next move began as Glen Grey people including those from Ilinge poured into Hewu. Most did not come straight to Oxton, but were sent on from the Sada and Zweledinga receiving areas during 1977/78. They are still there, along with people from the Republic, so it is said.

Whittlesea North will definitely be a better place in many ways. It will have more water, streets will have lights, it is close to Whittlesea where the labour bureau and other offices are. On the other hand people will have to pay rent there, and so for the many people in Oxton who have not even got enough money for food, it is not a place they would choose to move to.

The SA Development Trust is organising the removal regardless of what Oxton people want, apparently, and is paying for development of the new site. At least some of the houses are the relatively grand NE 51/9 ones with water piped into them, flush toilets, 4 rooms and internal doors, concrete floors. There will be shops, perhaps also a hospital. Oxton people will share the new place with thousands of other families - the site is planned for up to 10 000 house sites, say 60 000 people.

Altogether, the Oxton story reeks of coercion. People were pressurised into coming to this site by factors including the Glen Grey deal itself. It is not an easy place to live or even survive in. Now they are required to go to a site few can afford, whatever their views.

Whittlesea North is still in the early stages. Building began this year, 1982, and the first families will arrive in late 1982 or 1983.

ZWELEDINGA

Another transit camp in Hewu district, people have been passing through here ever since the first arrivals from Glen Grey in late 1976. It never was intended as a place to settle in, being terribly cold and exposed. People find life an ordeal here. It is a bad place even for temporary settlement, and has got more difficult as sparse wood supplies grew less, for example. It has a clinic (like Oxton). Water is supplied through a few communal taps (only three worked when we visited in late 1981). The only legal fuel now is costly paraffin or coal, and people collect wood too at the risk of arrest. There are some goats and chickens - the place feels less of a township than Oxton - but hunger is possibly as bad here as at Oxton. (Children were seen having hunger fits, indicating the problem of worms too.)

The final resettlement plan for the Zweledinga area - as opposed to the site of the same name - envisages permanent sites at Haytor/Esibonile, Price's Dale, Yonda and Bushby Park. Families from the transit camp of Zweledinga were moved off to other sites in the early days, notably to the Price's Dale settlement called Embekweni and to Oxton nearby. Now they are being allocated permanent house sites, and the last few hundred families are waiting to go.

This last group of about 3 000 - judging population from about 500 houses seen in 1981 - has a very good community spirit indeed. Obviously they want to move out, but only on terms they all accept. Meetings are held as issues arise, minutes are taken, and people say they work together. With Irish logic it was said that three people in particular set this democratic tone, and perhaps this was why they were the first to be offered permanent sites - which the trio refused, saying they would stay in the camp until everybody else had been resited. Our informants told the story with pride. The community, they said, had flouted an attempt by the authorities to siphon off the most articulate people first.

Their local chief, Hebe (Sebe's cousin) might prove a problem. The people have already been thwarted by him, when they planned a bulk-buying scheme to be run through the schools. He quashed it, saying that the government cares for its people. Nevertheless, the community will clearly try to safeguard and support itself through the removal programme. The people want to know beforehand that all the promised facilities have been installed, and that every single individual has been properly provided for. They expect to move in late 1982 or 1983. The whole project is the responsibility of the SA Development Trust which is preparing the sites.

THORNHILL AREA

Another SA Development Trust project is to finish its modest settlement plans for the Herschel

immigrants to Ntabethemba. Some groups have already been permanently sited, at Mitford, Spring Grove and Tentergate. Two new sites are planned: Rocklands just a little north of Tentergate, and Ntabethemba Town in the Klein Bulhoek area west of Tentergate. Another main project is to shape the disaster area of Thornhill receiving farm into something more like a focussed settlement. This latter scheme is to be done very much on the cheap, with a road plan to change the ribbon development into a better shape with some facilities such as shops and schools clustered together to give the place a centre - at least, so the planning goes. But in fact all the resettlement here is geared to a very low level of development.

The Thornhill plan is of course not to relocate but upgrade this battered place for those still there. Some real removals will occur, in the case of Rocklands and Ntabethemba Town. They may take in some families from Thornhill farm, otherwise we understand that Ntabethemba Town is meant for all the village areas in the vicinity which are badly in need of service facilities. This could mean moving some long-established people along with those from Herschel, at a guess.

Many families will be moved. Ntabethemba Town is to be one of Hewu's 'cities' along with Whittlesea North. This refers to size, not quality of infrastructure, we gather, and houses will probably be built on self-help lines. The population affected by these three schemes is well over the 10 000 mark. It could even be double that.

PEDDIE SOUTH AREA

Apparently a large number of people - again, many thousands - are to be cleared off to a new site at Wesley, down towards the coast near Hamburg. All we know is that the Ciskei intends this site to house a mass of people very cheaply indeed, and in fact to use the project to explore ideas for this kind of rural-based settlement. It is meant to work out some self-help housing procedures, for instance, which may then be applied in Ntabethemba and other areas. It would be like a blueprint for rural settlements, probably relying on traditional technology.

This may be where the squatters at Chalumna are going. We do not know for sure, but they are scheduled to be moved and no other site has been mentioned for them.

PHAKAMISA

South Africa is committed to providing a basic infrastructure in what will be the proclaimed town of Phakamisa, to accommodate the 473 families, say 3 000 people, who are at present living in a squatter settlement there. The agreement mentions a rudimentary water reticulation system with stand pipes and a proper sewer reticulation system and gravel roads. It sounds like the usual unadorned site and service scheme at the cheapest level, suggesting the squatter group is being catered for here. Yet strong rumours persist that they are going to be cleared out, perhaps to Frankfort, to make way for some prestige development at Phakamisa.

MADAKENI

Another local resettlement project for squatters is an extension to Dimbaza to take in the 760 families in Madakeni squatter settlement nearby. Each family is to have an NE 51/9 house - these are better quality, urban style houses with four rooms, flush toilets, internal doors etc. There will also be two primary schools and one Type I clinic. Water and sewer systems and roads will be provided throughout the site. This scheme is also under the South African aegis

as part of the agreement with Ciskei.

BLUE ROCK

A squatter camp, Blue Rock, near Arnoldton in the vicinity of East London, may be cleared. This comparatively small group of 60 families came here for lack of anywhere else to stay and they would like to remain but feel 'unsettled', they say, because of rumours that they will be moved.

There are no facilities at Blue Rock. A stagnant pool gives water for washing, and people rely on their white neighbours for fresh water. Most men in the camp have local jobs, though, and between the shanties are some flourishing gardens. Many of the families have been here more than two years. They say they are happy here except for the water problem.

The divisional council inspected the camp in July 1982, unaware that it fell within the Ciskei. The place could soon become a health hazard, according to the inspector, who also said that whites in the area were complaining. Blue Rock must be one of many overflow settlements near East London - some residents said they had come for lack of housing in Mdantsane and Zwelitsha. As far as the africans are concerned, they have just had to perch where they could.

The camp lies just within the Ciskei. The Ciskei Health Dept debated this point, which added to publicity about the place. Its removal could well be arranged now through sheer embarrassment.

2.6.6 Removals from Ciskei

The consolidation of Ciskei has meant that farmers in those areas given to Ciskei have to be moved. All these farmers in the Whittlesea, Victoria East, Peddie, Frankfort and Chalumna areas have been white, and although their forced removal has caused a great deal of bitterness amongst them, the pill has been sweetened by the enormous sums they have received as compensation - for example, 56 farms in the Chalumna area were bought out for a total of R7,8 million.

The situation is very different in the district of Stockenstrom, known as the Kat River valley. In 1829 this was turned into a settlement for 'Hottentots', as there was no place in the whole of the Cape Colony where they could legally own land. The settlement ceased to exist as such in 1853, after the Khoi went into rebellion in support of the Xhosa, but individual Khoi retained their titles and their descendants have remained in the district ever since, inhabiting small villages such as Hertzog, Philipton and Readsdales. The white farmers of the Stockenstrom district have been bought out, but the coloured farmers are kept in ignorance of their fate. 'Nobody will tell us what is happening ... are they going to buy us out or what?' (DD, 4.06.82)

Government officials have recently (May 1982) moved about the district making estimates of property and investigating individual title claims. There is talk of the government buying up white farms for the coloured community west of the Ciskei, and the people have been asked their opinion concerning this alternative, but no concrete site has been proposed. In the meantime, many residents have asked relatives to look out for houses in the coloured areas of King William's Town and East London, and are moving as these become available.

The land is due to be transferred to the Ciskei government on 1 January 1983. Given the fact

that the government has not yet instituted any proceedings, the coloured farmers could almost certainly ensure, by legal means, that they are still in occupation of their lands by that date. But this would mean that they fall into the hands of the Ciskei 'national State', which could easily decide by Act of Parliament to expropriate them without any remuneration whatsoever.

2.6.7 Removals west of the Ciskei

WALMER TOWNSHIP

A unique situation exists here, where 4 - 5 000 africans live in the midst of white Port Elizabeth. The township existed for many years without question but came under threat of removal in 1961 when the government decided to consolidate all the black suburbs around the city in one single area. For years nothing happened, but the place was not maintained either. Over the past 20 years it has become very degraded.

In 1979, ECAB declared that all the residents were to move to Zwide 4, part of the New Brighton complex. They were to go in June 1980. The township protested. A non-racial Save Walmer Committee formed. As it turned out, ECAB could not meet their own deadline and announced that the removal would be delayed until January 1981. Nothing happened then either. One month later, in February, the government said they would not force Walmer residents to move. 774 houses would be built for them in Zwide and they would just be 'encouraged' to go there.

Zwide has not been an encouraging prospect itself for Walmer people. Rents there would be far higher, for houses which are 'shells without ceilings and floors'. Instead of walking to work, people would have to queue long hours for buses and pay for the 22 km ride into town. Some workers fear they might lose their jobs if they ask for an increase to cover the extra transport costs. People are also loth to leave Walmer, which they consider very safe, for other areas where 'there are many tsotsis and it is dangerous to walk in the streets after dark'.

One resident seemed to express the general view:

We've been told we're to be moved to better pastures but to go to Zwide would be to go from bad to worse. Families have lived here for decades. We have electricity here in Walmer and we are near our labour market and shopping centres.

Residents also particularly resented the overbearing way in which the original removal scheme was declared:

We are more important than airports and roads. We are people. We are not to be shifted about like sacks of potatoes.

The Urban Foundation entered the lists and surveyed the township with the idea of trying to persuade the authorities to upgrade it. In fact there are some improvements being made this year, 1982, but ECAB said firmly that this does not mean fostering the place. It is clear, in fact, that ECAB are just keeping minimal facilities going and that removals are going ahead piecemeal all the time as houses are demolished in the name of slum clearance. Dr Morrison for the Dept of Co-operation and Development put it like this:

What we are demolishing are not houses, they are slum dwellings. Only shacks in slum areas in Walmer are being pulled down. (EPH, 26.01.82)

He added ominously that there were no plans at this stage to demolish sound houses.

The removal is therefore on the go already. It is being kept deliberately low-key, aimed at families one by one instead of wholesale clearance, the idea of which had united residents

so strongly before. Superficially Morrison could claim that only people 'willing and anxious' to move were being provided with housing elsewhere - but where houses are being knocked down families are being forced into this frame of mind. It is the ultimate form of 'encouraging' people to move. Once the numbers in Walmer have been whittled down far enough, it is more than likely that ECAB will rationalise their own promise away, arguing that it is not worth keeping a township for so few. Residents would be justified in holding them to their promise.

The removals have been slow because ECAB ran out of funds for Zwide housing. An extra R7 million, allocated for development in the ECAB area in mid-1982, will ensure that Zwide gets built. Then, if the Walmer community carry on fighting, they will have to dig their toes in. 760 houses in Zwide were under construction in July 1982. (EPH, 13.07.82) The place was also being electrified.

OTHER TOWNSHIP RELOCATION IN PORT ELIZABETH

Less contentious is the project to extend housing for africans with three new sites in the Port Elizabeth/Uitenhage area. Ever since the Linde Commission investigated township conditions in 1980, ECAB have been trying to improve things before the situation exploded. As it is, the density in Soweto in P.E. is 700 persons per hectare (1982) instead of the 200 it should be. The P.E. townships were short of 15 000 houses in May 1982, and the three new townships would offer 21 000 sites. These new areas must be started simultaneously and as soon as possible, ECAB director Louis Koch said. (EPH, 12.05.82) They are for lodger families in the existing townships, the squatters in the brickfields, and then 'we'll still have quite a few sites to play with', Koch added. This comes after years of very little building - only 216 new houses were built for blacks in P.E. in 1980, for instance. (EPH, 20.01.82)

The three sites are KwaMagxaki which lies between P.E. and Uitenhage on the lower end of Veeplaas; KwaDwesi on the outskirts of P.E. at Kleinskool on the right of the road to Uitenhage; and Motherwell on Markman Common between Swartkops and Coega on the Grahamstown side of P.E.

KwaMagxaki will have about 2 000 housing units, and the infrastructure will include roads, electricity and waterborne sewerage. KwaDwesi will have about the same. Both these sites are being developed now. The other one, Motherwell, is to be far bigger with 16 000 houses, some of them on self-help sites with a lower standard of services than for conventional housing. Work is to start on this township in February 1983. There has been considerable delay, not to say an uproar, over Motherwell. The Coega River Farmers' Association fought bitterly against it, saying it was on good agricultural land, the purchase price was too low, and they did not want a huge new population alongside their farms. Others have tried stopping the plan too. The site could not be properly drained, some said. It would ruin the Swartkops ecology, said others. Prestigious white housing areas at Redhouse, Swartkops and Bluewater Bay also produced objections. The authorities have steamrollered through, however, and notices have been served on the present landowners. Motherwell is definitely going to happen. As a concession to affronted whites nearby, perhaps, Koch assured those at Swartkops River that

The township will be divided into three types of housing with the higher standard of house on the river bank side. Next in line will be scheme housing and furthest from sight will be the serviced sites. (EPH, 12.05.82)

Soweto families will be going to Motherwell. Overall, at least half will be relocated there - subhumanly defined as 'approximately 500 persons a hectare from the Soweto township'. (EPH, 11.05.82) We have no information about what residents think about it, either in Soweto or any of the other congested areas. There is certainly no affection for ECAB, though, after its boorish efforts to oust squatters in Soweto. In early June 1982 about 135 shacks were demolished, and the policy was declared that 'illegal' structures would be broken down as they came up. Many former shack owners put up shelters again as best they could, and the