

THE AGRARIAN CLASS STRUCTURE OF THE TRANSVAAL COLONY

Jeremy Krikler

In October 1902, a journalist described the regime under which Africans were settled on white owned farms in the Transvaal as "resembling a sort of feudal tenure". Lord Milner himself used a feudal category - the fief (he appears to have confused it with the term "serf") - in a brief discourse on pre-Boer War black sharecropping. And these examples do not exhaust the number of direct references made to feudalism in the early twentieth century Transvaal. [1] This paper commences with these contemporary allusions because they point, however clumsily, to a basic social fact of the time: the prevalence of pre-capitalist relations of production in agriculture. It is the purpose of this essay to demonstrate the existence of these and to assess their significance.

Any notion of pre-capitalist relations is, of course, predicated upon an anterior conception of capitalism itself. What, then, is meant here by agrarian capitalism? Following Marx: an order of agricultural production in which the capitalist exploiters' "driving motive" is profit and in which "the immediate tillers of the soil" are proletarians - i.e. workers separated from the means of production and compelled to sell their labour-power as a commodity. [2] The first constitutive element of agrarian capitalism so defined - i.e. commercial production for profit - has been analysed in another place. [3] It is the second - the nature of the immediate producers in the agrarian world - which is considered here.

Pure proletarians - i.e. workers utterly separated from the means of production - are notoriously difficult to find in agriculture. Even on advanced capitalist farms, workers may exercise all their resourcefulness to maintain a small plot of crop-producing ground to which they can turn their attention when their time is no longer claimed by their exploiters. Very often, then, they possess some access to means of production, even if this is merely a paltry garden adjoining their homes. The produce from their personal agricultural pursuits is, however, incapable of sustaining them and their dependents and - consequently - the vital part of their subsistence comes from the sale of their labour power. Such people are, as Raymond Williams movingly wrote of his father and grandfather - both of whom had strong ties to farming - born to the land but unable to live by it. [4] In this, they are to be distinguished from the working people soon to be described. For the latter were born to the land, they could live by it and they would have lived considerably better by it had they not had to meet the demands of landlords. In short, it was not a separation from the means of production which dictated their performing alien labour for white farmers.

The Marxian concept of "alienation" is, in fact, fundamental to the analysis which follows. It has hitherto never explicitly been employed in the analysis of South Africa's agrarian development and experience. Why this is so can safely be left to historiographers. Certainly, the Althusserian inspiration of much South African Marxism in the seventies and early-eighties provides part of the explanation. Althusser, as is well known, banished the concept from his interpretation of historical materialism altogether. Branding this allegedly pre-Marxist idea as "arch-Hegelian", he asserted that the concept was present only in Marx's earliest work and that it was shed in the epistemological break by which Marx became a Marxist. [5] Whilst Althusser's claims for the primacy of the late Marx over the early Marx are here accepted [6], his claims concerning alienation are not.

According to Marx, the fount of alienation lies in the rupture of the unified triad of human existence. In order to live, people must act upon their environment and thereby produce their necessities. Put crudely: the subject of labour (the human being) must engage in labour

(productive activity) upon an object of labour (the environment) to produce useful goods. Under capitalism, a profound disintegration of this inter-relationship occurs. First, human beings are sundered from one another into groupings of opposed property-holders and dispossessed labourers: human society is thus itself fractured. Second, what Istvan Meszaros has called the original reciprocity between people and their own productive activity is broken; people no longer treat their labour as a capacity which they should develop: it becomes an alien power commanded by others, and attempts to increase its productivity become despotic and threatening. Third, that reciprocity which should exist between labour and its product, and between labour and its environment, is similarly shed. Both now become alien: the working environment because the worker is brought into contact with it only if he or she can be exploited; the product because it is immediately appropriated. [7]

This is the bare essence of Marx's conception of capitalistic alienation. If it is accepted, then one way of determining the proletarian status of particular groups of workers - or, indeed, their level of proletarianisation - is to ascertain how closely their alienation approximates to that delineated above. In the case of agrarian direct producers whose class position is not immediately determinable, the central questions are: to what degree has the land - the fundamental means of production and working environment - become connected with exploitation? Does the soil confront the worker as, essentially, an alien power? Is it associated largely with alien labour? In a word, is it capitalist private property? And, allied to this, is most of the productive activity in which the rural worker engages alien? Questions such as these are not always explicitly posed and answered in the narrative which follows but they are an ever-present concern. Their novelty - if they do possess any - lies in their implicit posing of another question: to what degree have the exploiters succeeded in converting the ground which they formally own into an alien power confronting the direct producers?

This chapter restricts itself to a consideration of the position of black working people on white owned farms in the early twentieth century Transvaal. [8] These myriads - half a million strong and constituting almost three fifths of the African population of the Colony as a whole - were locked into relationships of exploitation with the lords of private property and with the colonial state itself. [9] For such people were overwhelmingly members of rent and tax-paying households. Whatever the differences which existed between the latter - manifested in such phenomena as size, the degree of "multi-generationality" and polygamy (the latter characteristic of only a small proportion of households), the extent of participation in a communal life beyond the family - these very rarely overrode a fundamental similarity: almost all households were overwhelmingly centred upon an agricultural enterprise whose basic work-team was the family, and whose activities were directed mainly towards the production of the essential needs of that family and the dues enforced by the holders of economic and political power. In other words, they were peasants. [10]

In the early twentieth century (as at other times) tensions and conflicts intrinsic to the household were obviously of great importance to the peasants themselves and to their relations with the landlords. At a later historical point, as M. L. Morris has demonstrated, they were to become decisive. For when an advanced state of primitive accumulation made evident to younger (particularly male) family members that they were unlikely ever to reap the benefits of a peasant household of their own, they deserted the rural estates en masse: and in the same instant the authority of their fathers (who had contracted the youths' labour power to the landlords), and the demands of the white farmers, were flouted. [11]

In the Transvaal Colony, landlords invariably struck tenurial agreements with the male head of the peasant household. This person wielded considerable power within his familial domain and was expected to ensure that family members fulfilled their dues to the landlord. The social dominance of the household by the peasant patriarch is undeniable: it tended to remain stamped upon the memory of his dependents all their lives. [12] Unquestionably, the burden of labour service to the landlords fell most heavily upon youth and the unmarried. Women, too, were subjected to considerable patriarchal control. Points such as these, however, do not negate the fact that the class oppressors of the peasantry preyed upon the

households in their entirety. For these were integrated social and economic units and the withdrawal of a member's labour power invariably affected the family as a whole: typically, the remaining members of the household would be forced to exert themselves more intensely to ensure that their production did not fall too dramatically. Moreover, the social violence visited upon the peasantry was generally inflicted upon it as a whole. Eviction, for example, did not make nice distinctions between the particular members of a household.

The class structure of a society - the subject of this paper - is not the same as the domestic constitution of the classes which compose it, however important the latter is in its own right, and despite the undeniable articulation which occurs between the two. Such questions, however, are not the focus of this essay and they do not find a place within it. One other boundary should be delimited before the analysis proceeds. The miniscule number of fully proletarianised black agricultural employees and that small grouping of workers (often children) whose position could approximate to that of slaves are not considered here. [13] Such people existed in the interstices of a world in which the rent-paying peasant was overwhelmingly preponderant. An exploration of the latter must necessarily take precedence over an analysis of the former. "In all forms of society", wrote Marx, "there is one specific kind of production which predominates over the rest, and whose relations thus assign rank and influence to the others. It is a general illumination which bathes all the other colours and modifies their particularity." [14] It is a "general illumination" which is sought here.

The itinerary of our tour through the social relations of the Transvaal countryside is an (inevitably) complex and detailed one. Archival, published and indeed oral sources reveal that the immediate producers on private property in the early twentieth century were overwhelmingly members of tenant households but that the conditions of tenancy, whilst kindred, were diverse. Moreover, differences between the various districts of the Transvaal - a colony well over 100 000 square miles in area - require regional specificities to be given their due in a period in which, for example, the degree of absentee landownership was of critical importance to the peasantry. One of the many insights which Robert Brenner's work has bequeathed to historians of pre-capitalist class structure is that peasant communities, living even in areas adjacent to one another in a particular region, may suffer significantly differing degrees of exploitation. Indeed, they might be held ever more crushingly within the vice of the landlords in one place only to be able to dispense with their rule in another, not far off. [15] Any serious generalisation of a rural order as a whole, such as is attempted here, must be constructed in a way which does no violence to facts such as these.

Our journey through the predominant social relationships of the Transvaal's farms will begin in the south-east of the territory (an area which looms large in the next chapter) and we shall then traverse the other administrative zones of the Colony in a counter-clockwise movement.

i. The South-Eastern Transvaal

The south-east of the Colony, with its variety of tenant relationships, presents a complicated picture but one in which it is possible to discern that black farm workers were members of peasant households whose economy was not yet subordinate - in the very lives of the primary producers themselves - to that of the landlords.

This area of the territory comprised the districts of Bethal, Carolina, Ermelo, Piet Retief, Standerton and Wakkerstroom and in it, wrote the NC responsible for the region, "all native squatters on private farms occupy land conditionally upon their providing [such] labour as farmer[s] may require." "Some pay rent", he continued, "and receive wages" for the labour they provided whilst others, who paid "no rent" (i.e. in cash or kind) either performed labour services for a "portion of the year" for "nothing" or for a mere "nominal wage". [16] This is a description which requires considerable nuancing. In the Bethal District, for example, labour tenants might render their services to landlords for two days per week rather than for the set "portion of the year" mentioned above. [17] Nevertheless, aspects of the NC's

description could be corroborated by peasants themselves. Xegwana Mahlaba, who petitioned the authorities on behalf of five Zulu leaders of rural communities in the Piet Retief District, for example, claimed that "[a]ll the people whom" he represented were "tenants of Boer farmers" and that the "conditions of tenancy in the majority of cases" required "that the Natives shall supply labour". In "a number of cases" they had "to pay rent" as well. [18] The archival evidence, then, points to rent in labour or cash as the primary forms of exploitation of black people living on farms in the south-eastern Transvaal. [19] Only in the Standerton District does the record depart from this rule, sharecropping being a notable feature of its agricultural economy: indeed, in April 1904, a report from the area claimed that "Black labour" was demanded "principally on the share system". [20]

Given the primarily tenant status of African farm workers suggested by the above evidence, as well as the facts concerning the monetary remuneration they sometimes received, it is well to consider the significance of the latter in the agricultural economy of the day. The following figures refer to wages paid to black farm workers in the south-eastern Transvaal. It was customary for such employees to receive food in addition to their money wages.

Wage-Rates for Black Farm Workers in the South-East Transvaal

a. BETHAL (late-1903 and throughout 1904):	£2 to £3 per month [21]
b. CAROLINA [22]	
i. 1903:	10s. to £1.10s and, exceptionally, £3 per month.
ii. early 1904:	£2 to £3 per month.
c. ERMELO [23]	
i. 1903:	15s. to £3 per month, some evidence suggesting that migrant workers (i.e. labourers without plots of land on their employers' estates) received the highest wages.
ii. late 1904:	£1.16s per month, perhaps an average constructed by an administrator.
d. PIET RETIEF (mid-1903):	£1 to £1.10s. per month. [24]
e. STANDERTON [25]	
i. late 1902:	£2 per month with food, £3 to £3.10s without.
ii. early 1903:	£1.10s to £3 per month with food.
f. VOLKSRUST [26]	
i. mid-1903:	\$1.10s per month.
ii. mid-1904:	£1.10s to £3 per month.
g. WAKKERSTROOM [27]	
i. mid-1903:	15s. to £1 per month.
ii. early-1904:	10s. to £2.10s per month.
iii. mid-1904:	10s. to £2 per month.

The above table and the apparatus of references upon which it rests prove that wages were a significant element in the agricultural economy of the early twentieth century Transvaal. (The data are from the south-east of the territory but I have constructed similar charts for every administrative zone of the Colony and provide a sampling of the evidence they contain in an appendix to my thesis). [28] However, the historian who extrapolated from this

relatively widespread payment of wages a concomitant and pervasive presence of proletarians on farms would be erring seriously. Firstly, the wages that were paid tended to be provided to people whose prime status on the farm was a peasant one. Tenants paying cash rents to their landlords, it will be recalled, received wages for any labour services which they performed; some labour tenants, as the evidence cited earlier proves, were given "nominal wages" for their spells of work for landowners; and, as shall shortly be demonstrated, such wages in the south-eastern Transvaal could be more than merely nominal - i.e. doubling or trebling the minimum monthly remuneration cited in the above wage series. Moreover, as shall be made manifest by evidence from elsewhere in the Colony, it was not unusual for farmers to remunerate tenants for any labour which they performed over and above their agreed dues.

Between a vast number of landlords and tenants, of course, there existed only the flimsiest cash nexus, or none whatsoever. [29] Returning from a tour of the area under his command, a native commissioner concerned with the impending collection of taxes from black men, reported that: "The Carolina and Ermelo men said they did not see how they could possibly pay, as they were working for Boers on their farms and did not get paid for their services." [30] The sub-NC of the Wakkerstroom District, likewise, noted the tendency of landlords with few tenants to press heavily upon the latter for labour services "for probably no pay". [31]

Finally, the payment of money to tenants for their labour services, far from suggesting an incipient proletarianisation, could actually be symptomatic of its opposite: the increasing assertion by the tenant households of their relatively independent peasant status and the need, consequently, for landlords to "compensate" those enduring a spell of alien labour. Why, after all, should landlords pay for services which they might extract for no remuneration? The answer could well be because peasants insisted upon this, especially in the wake of the upheaval of the South African War when direct producers on rural private property in the Transvaal enjoyed a leverage greater than any before or since. The years of that conflict, as I have demonstrated elsewhere, were also years of an acute and often violent agrarian class struggle: a struggle momentous enough to rupture the rural class order of the Transvaal and compel British imperialism to restore it in the aftermath of the war. The Boer War, thus, witnessed a deepening of black peasant society in the Transvaal in general, and on its white-owned land in particular. And there is certainly some evidence from the south-eastern Transvaal that labour tenants who, before the war, had only ever been paid wages for "special work" (presumably tasks over and above their corvees), were now being paid for their obligatory labour services as well, at the rate of £1.10s. per month. [32] This could well have reflected the increased power of the immediate producers in the wake of the "peasant war" of 1899-1902.

To sum up, then: the wages that were paid by Transvaal landlords to black people in the early twentieth century were, overwhelmingly, not paid to people definable as proletarians. Indeed, a farmer like N. J. Breytenbach in the Ermelo District who, with his sons, employed a relatively large work-force on his farm, paid the vast bulk of the wages he laid out to labour tenants resident on his land. For their labour-services he paid them the £1.10s. per month referred to above. But this - as we shall demonstrate shortly - appears not to have been crucial to the sustenance of the households from which came those rendering the services. On Breytenbach's farm, a worker receiving wages without access to land was the great anomaly. There were, of course, times when he had to employ "natives...from outside sources" and these people he might pay "as much as £3 per month". But such workers can never have been numerous on the farm. Indeed, they could be obtained only with "the utmost difficulty", despite the relatively high wages he paid. [33] Like other landlords, Breytenbach had to bow before one of the basic facts of the early twentieth century Transvaal: the general absence of rural proletarians.

In his general discussion of "labour rent", Marx identified the worker compelled to perform labour service as - of necessity - "self-sustaining", a "direct producer ... in possession" -

though not in formal proprietorship - of his or her "own means of production". Such people, Marx argued, were in control of those "objective conditions" needed "for the realization" of their own labour and, of course, for "the production of" their "means of subsistence". [34] As the narrative of this study unfolds, it will become evident that this description pertains to the labour tenants of the early twentieth century Transvaal, including those of them who received wages for their stints of labour-service. As M. L. Morris has powerfully demonstrated, such payment of wages can - if they constitute the fundamental element in the sustenance of the direct producers - signify the basically proletarian status of a tenantry. [35] But this was not the case in the Transvaal at the turn of the century. As a preliminary illustration of this, let us return to the labour tenants who performed remunerated services for Nicolaas Jacobus Breytenbach in the Ermelo District.

Breytenbach and his sons employed no fewer than fifty black workers drawn from households living on his farm. Whilst such workers received, on average, 30s. per month for the duration of their labour services, this cash was only a minor contribution to the sustenance of the families from which the labourers came. (The wages may well have been used for the payment of taxes). The crucial resource provided the labour tenants was land. Of this, they were given enough "to cultivate sufficient to meet their requirements" and for "the raising of stock". And that the tenants were not compelled to sell their labour power to their landlord because of an incipient separation from the means of production is suggested by the ability of some of them to produce their staple crop in quantities above a subsistence level: "some" of the black tenants "living on my farm", noted Breytenbach, "have sold as many as 25 bags of mealies at 50s. per bag." [36]

If the tenants living on Breytenbach's farm were successful in maintaining viable peasant enterprises despite the exactions of their landlord, then thousands of others in the south-eastern Transvaal did much better, escaping the physical clutches of their exploiters entirely. In that wedge of the Transvaal between Swaziland and Natal, where black peasants congregated "in large numbers", "not 5%" of them on "many farms" were said to "be required to work for their landlords". [37] In the extreme south-east of the Colony, multitudes lived on the land of absentee landowners. In the Piet Retief and Wakkerstroom Districts, in fact, the population of black communities living on such land was said to number almost 22 000, the vast bulk of them living in the district of Piet Retief. [38] But the nearer the districts of the south-east approached the epicentre of Transvaal capitalism, the Rand, the less absentee landlordism prevailed. Standerton was said to possess no black peasants residing on the land of absentee landowners, Bethal a tiny community of 22 on a single company-owned farm. [39]

The precision of such figures is open to question. A few months before they were submitted to the administrator concerned, the Transvaal Land Owners' Association - the representative body of the great land companies of the Colony - was seeking suggestions for a rent-collecting agent for the Standerton District. And, in 1908, its secretary "was instructed to establish" such an agency for the Bethal and south Middelburg Districts as well. [40] Nevertheless, as an indication of approximate magnitudes the statistics should be trusted. The well-nigh complete absence of cash rent tenancy - its presence was usually a reliable indicator of absentee landlordism - in the Bethal District, and the prevalence of labour tenancy there, is confirmed by an early twentieth century farmer from the area. [41] Districts such as Bethal - later to be a byword for the violence of agricultural exploiters - appear to have been avoided by peasants seeking a more congenial life away from the physical presence of landlords. The Native Commissioner administering the south-eastern Transvaal did not doubt the tendency of black peasants to congregate on farms in the more far-flung zones under his control - "in the district of Piet Retief and parts of Ermelo and Carolina". It was precisely in regions such as these that "landlords" had "little control" over "the natives owing to their [i.e. the landlords] being absent therefrom for the greater part of the year." [42] And this link between absentee landlordism - often associated with rents extracted in cash - and a peasant existence of relatively great independence and strength is clear. "I have recently been down in the lower end of the Piet Retief District", reported a sub-NC, "where

natives are in larger numbers than on the high veld". He had "learned" that "some" Boer landlords "had sent word to their tenants to go and seek labour" to pay their annual rent "of £3 per hut". "One man told me", exclaimed the somewhat startled official, "that out of 40 huts on his farm only 2 men had gone out to work!" [43]

ii. The Eastern Transvaal.

In this administrative zone of the colony, rent in labour appears to have been the primary form of exploitation of producing landlords. It was said that, in the eastern Transvaal, only "in some few cases" did Boer farmers allow peasant households to live on their land "in return for rent [i.e. cash] paid". [44] It is not clear, however, if this description applied only to the farms upon which Boer exploiters themselves lived, and not to those estates of which they were absentee proprietors. For, as shall shortly be demonstrated, absentee rentiers drawing cash from tenants were certainly a significant element of the local agrarian order. It may have been, however, that this form of exploitation was dominated by corporate rentiers and that local farmers benefited from it only marginally. For the abiding image of the latter is of men extracting labour services from their tenants. "Farmers as far as I can see", declared the NC responsible for the region, "pay their natives nothing expecting an unlimited supply of labour in return for the doubtful privilege of living on their farms." [45] And upon this "doubtful privilege", the NC declaimed a few months later: "Some cases have come under my notice", he was to write, "in which practically the whole time of the tenant and his family have to be given in return for being allowed to live on the farm and cultivate a few acres of land." No longer possessing livestock, as they did before the South African War, "natives" were paying "too high" a price to be tenants, he felt. [46]

We need not doubt that in particular cases the terms of tenancy were particularly harsh in the eastern Transvaal [47], nor that cash was not generally paid to tenants for labour services. At the same time, we should also be aware of the possibility that an official in a bourgeois state administration might well place a particularly high premium upon the monetary element of remuneration, and see in the absence of a cash nexus only an absolute dominion of landlord over tenant. The NC's comments, in fact, contain paradoxes, the exploration of which point to the solidly peasant nature of the primary producers for whom he expressed sympathy.

If, in reality, "practically the whole time" of tenant families had "to be given" to a landlord, their chief right as stated by the NC - access to cultivable land - is inexplicable. Members of households forced to expend the overwhelming bulk of their labour-time for an exploiter would have been able to do little more than stare upon lands they were ostensibly given to cultivate. Moreover, could the NC have been correct in referring to the farmers' expectation of an "unlimited supply of labour" from tenants? It would appear not. If, as the NC reported, these tenants were paid "nothing", there was a limit to the amount of labour power extracted from them. For labourers expected (by their exploiter) to produce their own sustenance have to be allowed the time they require to do this. And, indeed, if their exploitation is to be ever-renewed, they must also be permitted the period necessary for them to maintain the conditions essential to the production of their subsistence. Marx's pithy discussion of workers rendering rent in labour implies just this. Serfs, he argued, had to produce "sufficient" both to meet their requirements of "subsistence" and "to replace" their "conditions of labour". This, he insisted, was a basic pre-requisite for "any continuing production, which is always also reproduction...of its own conditions of operation". [48] And this takes time. Indeed, a period of time is required which generally sets a maximum limit upon the quantity of alien labour a landlord can expect such tenants to perform.

This limit can, of course, be violated. The attempt - generally undertaken by pre-capitalist landlords determined to market large quantities of products, as Marx demonstrated - to squeeze ever larger surpluses out of people rendering labour-service manifests itself in "a direct hunt for days of *corvée*". [49] If the "hunt" be successful and particularly merciless, the household economy of peasants can be ruptured, threatening not only their social but

even their physiological existence. This, however, was not the case in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century Transvaal. Stanley Trapido has demonstrated that even where the regimes of labour tenancy were harshest in the ZAR - on the farms of less substantial landowners with few tenant families - the households were, nevertheless, "not reduced to mere subsistence". [50] Whatever the reasons - the low level of commercial production evinced by Transvaal landowners, the efficacy of the class defences of primary producers - it is obvious that the Transvaal tenantry was not being pushed beyond the limits of its ability to reproduce itself as a peasantry. This paper attempts to demonstrate that this was so for all regions of the Colony in the early twentieth century. Our present concern, however, is to correct the misleading implications of an administrator's statements vis-à-vis the eastern Transvaal in this regard, so we shall restrict our present analysis to that region.

Consider, for example the tenorial regime under which "30 native families" lived on a farm in the Middelburg District, a zone under the jurisdiction of the NC of the East. These tenants were refugees during the Boer War and they were said to possess "no cattle at present"; so, using criteria which include at least one used by the NC himself to discern poor conditions, we may confidently assert that they were not a particularly privileged community. "[U]nder their agreement with the owner", "each family" was required to provide a single member of its household to labour for the landlord "for three months in each year". This was the fundamental "rent" they paid. It was, however, a rent which could not be extracted from them to the satisfaction of W. Clark, the farm manager. And this gentleman appeared to have had no better luck in adequately drawing upon labour power from tenants whom he remunerated. For another stipulation of the contract of tenancy was that unmarried men who had fulfilled their labour dues were to work "for wages" if the services of such tenants were "wanted" by the white farmer. This want of the exploiter, however, also appears to have been regularly violated by the tenants concerned. [51]

The tenant community upon the farm which W. Clark managed was undoubtedly successful in maintaining a relatively independent peasant existence. One way of proving this is by demonstrating that it was compelled to spend only a very limited amount of its total productive time in alien labour. For it is an incontrovertible fact that, at any one time, very few of the peasant families were providing a labourer for the landlord. Of "55 able-bodied natives" amongst the tenants - a designation which, it is likely, the farmer used to describe adolescent and adult males capable of arduous productive labour - only two (both of them "youths") were "working for rent" in August 1903. Another three - "the average" for months past - were "away at work" - i.e. engaged by employers off the estate upon which they were tenants. Only the impending collection of state taxes earlier in the year had led to a sudden and high efflux of peasants from the farm. Significantly, the score or so people who migrated in search of wages all "returned within six weeks with sufficient to pay" their taxes. Others could quite easily have met the tax demands of the new colonial administration by selling their surplus produce for cash. Indeed the farm manager considered the tenants' ability to cultivate an acreage which enabled them to market some of their crop to be one of the root causes of the scarcity of labour power which afflicted his enterprise: "that", he moaned, "is why they are so independent" : "The natives are too well off", complained Clark of these people, "they have got the ground too cheaply, they are near a good market and get a good price for their produce, so that they have no need to work." "To work", that is, for him. And that such conditions of tenancy were not unusual in the eastern Transvaal is suggested by Clark's contention that, "[a]s a rule", landlords did not restrict the land available to the tenant household to a bare subsistence patch. [52]

This latter fact was powerfully borne out by the experience of Colonel Airey, a farmer recently arrived in the Middelburg District, who was desperately and unsuccessfully attempting to settle black peasant households on his land: "well", he remarked, exasperated by now (December 1903), "I offer as much land as they can cultivate with the use of my oxen and ploughs and rations for those who work for me. They can make a permanent home on my farm", he elaborated, "and in return they [the households?] give me" the "labour(sic)" (of one member of each family?) for "six months...yearly". This, he was convinced, would be

"equally to the...advantage" of the tenants as to himself. But black peasants - despite the promise of "as much land as" they could cultivate - disagreed. Perhaps they found his intended exactions of labour power too onerous. At any rate, the peasantry duly starved the unfortunate colonel of the households he so critically required. [53]

If labour tenants in the eastern Transvaal were able to preserve their overwhelmingly peasant status, there was another grouping of tenants there able to secure this even more successfully: the thousands of Africans paying relatively low cash rents for land, their possession of which was untrammelled by the irksome presence of a landlord. In the west of the Lydenburg District and the upper reaches of that of Middelburg, approximately 20 000 people lived on the ground of absentee landowners. [54] The rents they paid varied. Peasants in the De Kaap valley in the Barberton District were paying rentiers "£2 a hut, some of them". [55] But many tenants on other, generally company-owned, land paid "a sum...approximating to £1 each per annum for the right of occupation and cultivation". [56] And it was the land companies, after all which were the great rentiers of the day. The single greatest extractor of rent in cash in the eastern Transvaal, for example, was undoubtedly the Transvaal Estates and Development Company, most of whose 6 000 shareholders resided in Britain. In the District of Lydenburg alone, it owned "some fifty eight farms" and on "two blocks" of these - situated "in the ward Ohrigstad" - 1 300 black peasant families lived. [57] That much of their surplus labour, transformed into cash, found its way to Britain is a measure of the ability of even a far-flung bourgeoisie to be predatory upon people far from proletarian in status.

iii & iv. The Northern and North-Western Transvaal

Of all the administrative regions of the Transvaal, it was the north - i.e. the gigantic Zoutpansberg District, "an area almost as large as the kingdoms of Belgium and Holland added together" [58] - whose peasantry on private property most probably enjoyed the greatest independence from landlords. Although over 300 000 black people lived in this overwhelmingly rural area, the size of the landowning class there was smaller than in any other area of the Colony. The Zoutpansberg's total white rural population was less than 6 000 persons [59], and of this number a relatively low percentage was constituted by landowning families. For, as the Transvaal Indigency Commission was later to discover, the Zoutpansberg was one of those districts in which the so-called "poor whites" were "particularly" concentrated. [60] The "white population" of the "Northern portions" of the Transvaal, moreover, was not only "very small", it was described as "nearly all migratory, in that" it was composed of people who were said "only" to "visit these portions in winter for the purpose of grazing their stock". [61] This description may well have been hyperbolic, but it does point to an important feature of the rural order in the northern Transvaal which afforded many black tenants the joy of not having to relate to their landlords for most of the year.

Another component of the agrarian configuration in this part of the Colony must have afforded a relative independence to the peasantry on private property: the overwhelming dominance of rent in cash over other forms of rent, and the overwhelming dominance of the absentee corporate rentier over the resident landlord as the extractor of this rent.

There is, of course, a sense in which the payment of money rent implies a peasantry's greater integration into a broader society and economy than one rendering labour-service. In its pristine form, after all, rent in labour, is consonant with a peasant household having direct relations with nobody beyond those resident on the agrarian estate upon which it lives. And the production of the tenant household itself can be directed entirely towards its own needs. Cash rent - and of course monetary taxation - immediately spin a web of connections around the peasant household, however, and insert it into a much wider social context. Money must be found to pay the rent. To find it, peasants are typically forced to produce goods for sale - i.e. commodities. Thus, "[e]ven though the direct producer[s] still" continue "to produce at least the greater part" of their "means of subsistence" themselves, "a portion" of their

"product must now be transformed into a commodity and be produced as such". In this way, wrote Marx - with an over-emphasis which poses too stark a dichotomy - household production "loses its independence", its general "separation" from a wider economy and society. [62] Certainly, movements in the prices of commodities now have a more direct bearing upon the peasant economy.

It is, of course, possible for peasants to meet cash-rent demands in another way: by engaging in wage labour to procure the requisite monies. But this, too, is another way of saying that the world beyond the rural estate has directly (and further) broken into the life of the peasantry. For, if in this case, the peasants do not carry produce to market, they nevertheless do carry a commodity there: labour power. And fluctuations in the labour market will now have a direct impact upon the peasant household. They will, for example, decide for how long crucial productive members are absent from it.

If in these ways, cash tenancy leads the peasantry to lose "its independence" - as Marx wrote with reference to the effects of the infiltration of commodity production into tenant households attendant upon the introduction of money rent - in other ways it gains a certain freedom. The prevalence of money rents in the northern Transvaal, after all, was not just a product of extensive land company holdings and absentee landlordism in the area. It was also the upshot of a successful class struggle waged by the peasantry. Despite the restoration of the class rule of the landlords after the Boer War, and the disarmament of the black peasantry, the new assertiveness of tenants in the northern Transvaal manifested itself, in part, in the several instances in which they compelled their landlords to convert labour tenancies into cash rent tenancies. [63] Wherein lay the advantage to them in so compelling their landlords? A brief discussion of some of the social ramifications of labour tenancy provides an implicit answer.

Conditions of labour tenancy were not particularly harsh in the northern Transvaal. For access to the means of production, tenants were "obliged to [provide one or two household members to?] work one, two, or three months a year" for their landlords. [64] Some farmers did extract labour services in a different way. Henry Molyneux, who farmed in the New Agatha region, did not draw labour-power for that "stated period each year" which appears to have been standard in the north. [65] Instead, he compelled one member of each household on his land to work for him "2 days a week". [66] But there may have been an unstated advantage in such an onerous regime. For, as one of the divisional heads of the Department of Agriculture noted, it was "common" for farmers in the north-eastern Transvaal "to claim two days' work per week from the occupier" of their land but "to pay the hut tax (£2 per annum)" demanded of the tenant by the state. [67]

If, however, on a scale of relative harshness, the terms of labour tenancy in the northern Transvaal were perhaps better than in most other regions - note that labour service for one month a year was not uncommon - the oppressions intrinsic to the system were still operative. The incursions of the landowner into the peasant household still occurred; the transporting of peasants from their functioning economy into an enterprise, "alongside and outside" their own, where they worked for alien purposes, still befell them. This "burdensome" and often "constant interruption of labour for the landowner", which Marx identified as a characteristic of the rent-in-labour regime, is central to the alienation suffered by peasants rendering labour services. [68] For one of the primary distinguishing features of the peasant household is the extensive "integration of the peasant family's life with its farming enterprise". [69] The landlord's labour demands, therefore, cannot but be an invasion into both the material (i.e. the productive) and the family lives of the tenants. Such intrusions into the domestic life of the peasantry - the appropriations of its labour-time, the intermittent rupturing of its members' production for need - these would have been worse for tenant households compelled to perform weekly labour-service for landlords. But even those performing set annual spells of alien labour would have felt them acutely. Can there be much surprise at the fact that, in the immediate aftermath of the Boer War, a militant peasantry on private property initially refused to render any labour service to Transvaal landowners on a

massive scale?

It should now be evident why peasants would have preferred cash tenancy to labour tenancy. Basically, under it, the peasant household had a much greater chance of preserving its integrity. Even though cash tenancy entailed that surplus production - "in the sense of production over and above the indispensable needs of the immediate producer" - had "become the self-evident rule", the tenant would now have much greater control over the way this surplus was produced. This, of course, did not terminate exploitation: "one part" of the tenant household's "labour-time" (that used to produce rent) still went gratis to the landowner, but it was not a spell of productive activity actually supervised, controlled or used by the landowner. "In this relationship", therefore, "the immediate producer[s]" have "the use of more or less...[their] entire labour time". The baas is absent and that physical (sometimes violent)"interruption" of the rhythm of peasant life, fortunately, "disappears" with him. [70] A greater degree of integration of the family's life with its farming enterprise is achieved and peasant existence thereby receives affirmation.

This is not to say that a rural idyll now descends. Even free peasant existence carries with it a set of oppressions: strict (usually patriarchal) control over family members flows directly from the household's need to prevent the depletion of the productive power and skills of its work-team; and the tyranny of natural forces over small (largely though not exclusively) subsistence producers is cruel. Landlords extracting labour rents, however, do not make their repeated incursions into the peasant household for the purpose of mollifying the oppressions within it. And if peasants are wont to be tenants, then cash rents provide one of the best buffers against these unwelcome incursions. This would have been so (though, of course, to a lesser degree) even when Transvaal tenants paying money rent to their landlords laboured for them as well. There are certainly examples of this in the northern Transvaal in the early twentieth century. The NC responsible for the region noted cases in which tenants paid money rent to their landlords and worked for them as well, being paid "cash" by their employers "at the rate of 1/- a day for the labour required". [71] In such cases, whilst the peasant household might still be vulnerable to the direct disruption of its operations by a landlord, this vulnerability was less than that faced by the household of the labour tenant. In the early twentieth century, the remuneration of tenant labour generally implied the diminution (though not termination) of the landlords' arbitrary capacity to command labour. And the fact that the tenant households referred to by the NC paid their rents in money must suggest - in the general context of the Transvaal agrarian world of this time - that labour undertaken directly for a landlord constituted a lesser part of their exploitation than it might have done. Put simply: such tenants controlled a much greater aliquot of their labour-time than did those from whom rent in labour was extracted.

The north was unquestionably the location of one of the Transvaal's most considerable and formidable peasantries paying money rent. What can be stated with certainty is that wherever black peasants in this zone lived on farms in violation of the Squatters' Law (i.e., where their numbers exceeded the five household limit) [72], they did so overwhelmingly as tenants paying rent in cash - "from £1 to £3 per annum" noted the local NC" - rather than as labour tenants. [73] And it was the lower end of this range of possible rents which tended to prevail, a pound being the average levied on the household with the land companies doing most of the levying. [74] Such extraction was big business. For in the early twentieth century in the northern Transvaal, black people belonging to households paying cash rents may have numbered more than a hundred thousand souls. [75]

In the north-western Transvaal - a separate administrative zone with its own NC at this time - the levying of rents in cash (very often £1 per annum) and that common concomitant of it, absentee landlordism, were also significant features of the rural world. Scores of farms in this zone were owned by land companies, and there were hundreds of farms from which the proprietors were absent for most of the year and upon which lived thousands of peasant families. It was, in fact, estimated that the total number of peasants living on such land was 24,000. [76]

The producing landlords of the north-western Transvaal benefited from a range of exploitative tenures. Labour-power might be extracted from the tenant household enjoying access to land in the time-honoured fashion: without remuneration. This had been, after all, as a Waterberg farmer said in 1903, the "usual custom" and was, no doubt, why the local NC referred to the "old sort of feudal tenure" characteristic of the district. [77] But where tenant households engaged in sharecropping, or where they paid money rents, and were "besides" required "to supply labour" to a landlord, they did so "at a fixed rate of payment". [78]

The balance of the evidence suggests, however, that the farmers of the north-western Transvaal had their lands tended primarily by labour tenants. The ten peasant households on the farm 'Rietfontein' in the Naboomspruit area, for example, were required "to give their services free for one week in each month" to their landlord. [79] At the very least, then, 75 per cent of the labour-time of these peasants was under their control. And given that it would have been uncommon for the entire peasant household to be compelled to perform labour-service, it is likely that this percentage was somewhat higher. In truth, the peasants of "Rietfontein" were no more than knee-deep in exploitation, if one compares what they suffered with the level of alien labour which the direct producers of the Transvaal's farms were progressively to be steeped in. This, of course, is not to diminish that which they did suffer. Unremunerated labour service, symbol of the personal unfreedom of tenants, caused much revulsion amongst rural producers in the early twentieth century north-western Transvaal. "The great thing that sticks in the native mind", wrote the NC of this region, in an idiom of facetious fraternalism, "is the fact that...he does not get paid for his...work, ie, that his rent to Brother Boer is paid by his labour." [80]

v. The Western Transvaal

And what of the working denizens of private property in the western Transvaal, that great beak of the Colony which comprised the districts of Marico and Rustenburg, Bloemhof and Lichtenburg, Wolmaransstad and Potchefstroom? Its NC's description of the tenurial conditions in this zone had the nuance and charm of a telegram. The conditions, he said, were wont to "vary considerably". "Rent is charged ranging from twenty to seventy shillings per annum per head male adults(sic) but if labour [tenancy prevails then] two to three months [labour service] in [each] year is given [to the landlord]". [81] There was some evidence, moreover, that farmers remunerated, or "specially paid", members of peasant households for that labour, "special work" as it was called, which they performed over and above their contractual labour dues. And it appears - furthermore - that labour tenants were "free to cultivate as much land" as they could. [82]

Relationships of sharecropping were also a feature (though not a predominant one) of the agricultural order of the western Transvaal. Indeed, its NC forwarded a sharecropping contract as one of the "specemens (sic) of Agreements under which land is leased to Natives in my division". [83] It revealed that sharecroppers such as Josiah Mamogopole or Japhta Masonoa had to provide "the Lessor" (Johannes Botha) one "half of every winter harvest" and a "third of every summer harvest". [84] But this "Lessor", Johannes Botha, did not merely extract a surplus from sharecroppers. On the very same farm on which they lived, Botha allowed labour tenants to settle under a contract whose provisions are of some interest. Botha struck the agreement with Stephanus Mogopole, Paul Mosito, Rooikraal and Simon Mpete, Mantos Metope and, finally, Aaron and Abinew(?) Matabuge on the "6th day of July 1903". At least some of these men must have been household heads and they were given "the right to live, plough" and graze their cattle "on the farm Schaapkraal No. 41 on condition that each and every one" of them ("the said natives") worked for Botha on another farm, "Elandsfontein No. 225" in the Rustenburg District, for "two months in every year" from the date of commencement of the contract (6 June 1903) until 6 July 1908". [85]

In effect, this was a five year contract of labour tenancy by which the signatories were compelled to give only a little over 15 per cent of their annual labour-time to their landlord.

And, given that the signatories are likely to have been the representatives of peasant families, the percentage of the potential productive activity of their households as a whole actually tapped by the landlord is likely to have been considerably less than this. It was after all only "the said natives", not their families, who were required to perform alien labour for Botha. Such computations are made not to slight the exploitation suffered by the early twentieth century western Transvaal tenantry, but to stress the impressive degree of independence which it had carved out for itself on private property. Precisely how impressive this relative independence is can be grasped if we shift the focus even briefly to the crushing exploitation of the western Transvaal labour tenants only two decades later. Thomas Thlolone, one such tenant in the Rustenburg District, suffered such extremities of exploitation and loss of freedom, that in 1921 he was driven to write to the magistrate's office in Pretoria asking what the legal position "of a Native working on a farm under a white man" was and what remuneration such a person was entitled to. In March 1921, the point at which he wrote his letter, he had been working under his landlord for six months and found that he had "no time to do something for my selfe [sic]". A "white man", he concluded, had the right "to do what ever he like[s] with a Native like me". [86]

It is, of course, important to take note of those early twentieth century exceptions in which the demands of labour service might approximate to the later norm. For an unfortunately placed and desperate labour tenant could suffer near total control by an exploiter. David Mahuma, for example, bore what may have been the greatest burden of labour service inflicted upon any labour tenant in the Transvaal of his day. By a contract of tenancy signed in September 1904, Mahuma and his family were provided with "sufficient land for cultivation and pasturage for the grazing" of their beasts. They were also permitted "to erect houses or huts" for their habitation and "to hew sufficient wood" for their "immediate wants". But the price paid for these means of production was enormous. For Mahuma "bound himself to perform" ten months of service for his Rustenburg landlord, Carl Pistorius, "at such time" as the latter demanded it and for no monetary remuneration. [87] It was, no doubt, only the fact that David Mahuma could return to the arms of a peasant household when his master no longer claimed him that made his lot bearable at all. The struggle to maintain such a household, even at the expense of a serious diminution of the liberty of its head, was clearly one of the great and conditioning facts of the agrarian Transvaal at this time.

It would, however, be an error to generalize from the exceptionally harsh regime under which David Mahuma lived to that which subordinated the tenantry in the western Transvaal as a whole. In the west of the Colony, some of the most exploitative relationships of tenancy - certainly the highest money rents - obtained in that portion of the region neatly bisected by the railway to the Witwatersrand, the Potchefstroom District. "[A]ll farm natives", declared the sub-NC of the district, "either pay a rent of from £3.0.0. to £6.0.0. for the lands they occupy or give more than an equivalent in labour." But it was nevertheless the impression of this official that Potchefstroom's peasants on private property fared better than its black urban workers. "The benefit derived by the farm natives from" their agricultural produce, continued this sub-NC, "perhaps rather more than counterbalances the greater amount of wages earned by those in towns." [88]

In the western Transvaal, as the evidence already cited suggests, rent in cash was a common phenomenon. [89] This tended to be paid directly by household heads such as those on the Pilansberg estate "Putfontein". This farm was tenanted by hundreds of Kgatla and "Batlako" peasants and "[e]ach married native" amongst them paid "£3 a year rent to the owner". [90] But if such individual payments were the norm, there is some evidence of communal disbursement of rent. Matope Matope, the leader of one black rural community, appears to have leased a farm (Jacobus Coetzee's affectionately named "Freddie") on behalf of all households owing allegiance to him - initially for £50, and later for £60, a year. [91] And there are examples of other farms - such as "Melorane" or "Paarkskraal" in the Marico District - which were "rented and occupied by natives" in their entirety. [92]

The absolute numbers of peasants on the ground of absentee landowners in the western Transvaal, however, was lower than those on such ground in any other administrative zone of the colony. There were perhaps 10 000 people on this category of land in the west. [93] Significantly, of all areas in this zone, that which boasted the largest black population on the farms of absentee landlords was the Pilansberg. [94] There was nothing fortuitous in this. The Pilansberg was, after all, the location of the militant Kgatla tenantry, wagers of perhaps the most impressive struggle against the landowning class during the Boer War and its immediate aftermath. And the destruction of landlord authority which they wrought was to be operative on many farms in the Pilansberg until after World War One. [95]

v. The Central and Southern Transvaal

Our tour of the Transvaal nears its end. It only remains for us to consider the tenurial regimes which prevailed in the zone commanded by the NC responsible for the Haman's Kraal, Pretoria and Heidelberg Districts. The majority of farmers in these districts, too, lay under that social law to which virtually every Transvaal farmer was subject in the early twentieth century: landowners could procure agricultural labour-power only if those from whom they intended to procure it were guaranteed an effective peasant existence on private property. "In almost every case", noted a Haman's Kraal official, "natives are allowed to squat on condition that they perform a certain amount of farm labour during the year." [96] The official, as was the custom of his kind, here observed the situation from the vantage point of the landowner. But by shuffling his words he could quite easily have presented the perspective of the peasant: "In almost every case natives perform a certain amount of farm labour on condition that they are allowed to squat". And "to squat" in the early twentieth century Transvaal meant to maintain a peasant's household and enterprise.

The extant data from the central and southern regions of the Transvaal is of exceptional interest in that much of it enables the historian to determine the level of alien labour performed by black farm workers. As was emphasised earlier, this level of alienation can be used as a guide to the essentially proletarian or non-proletarian status of agrarian workers. Marx, after all, conceived of capitalism as an order in which the worker suffered "the most extreme form of alienation". The "propertylessness" of proletarians, attendant upon their divorce from the means of production and their lack of control over the products of its process, entailed the complete usurpation of the "creative power" of their labour by the exploiter and its establishment as "an alien power confronting" them. [97] The degree to which this divorce, this lack of control, and this usurpation exist in an agricultural economy should, therefore, be a reliable indicator of the progress of proletarianisation amongst the direct producers. To what degree, then, had the "creative power" of the labour of farm workers in the Transvaal been converted into "an alien power confronting" them?

Since we have implicitly considered this question for other regions of the Colony, and as we are now in the administrative region for which the NC Central Transvaal was responsible, let us answer it with reference to one of his districts, Haman's Kraal, a region whose farmers had relatively good access to the line of rail and, therefore, to the great urban markets of the Transvaal. Our starting point is an analysis of the tenurial regimes in force on five Haman's Kraal farms tenanted by black peasant communities collectively numbering approximately 4,000 people.

On four of these farms, upon which lived over 3 400 people, relations of labour tenancy obtained which were unadulterated by any monetary transactions between peasant and landlord. Against the communities on three of these farms - "Leeuwkraal", "Wynandskraal" and "Witpanskloof", together owned by no less than eleven proprietors - the NC penned remarks so terse as to allow the historian to discern from them no more than the skeleton of social relations. But against the peasant community on the fourth, "De Putten", owned by four Prinsloos (M, B, P and D) and a Botha (M), the information provided allows the quantity of alien labour performed by the tenantry to be computed with some exactitude. Out

of a total black population just short of 800 people, noted the NC, "2 Natives are sent to each of the 4 Prinsloos & Botha, every month making 10 Natives supplied monthly from De Putten". If the number of married men on "De Putten" is a guide to the number of peasant households which subsisted on the estate, then there were 113 of these. In any one month, then, not 10 per cent of the households were sending a single worker to labour for the landlords. Quite obviously, the "4 Prinsloos & Botha" had made only the slightest of dents into the peasant society living on their land. [98]

A study of the fifth Haman's Kraal farm under consideration, H. P. Van der Walt's "Butefontein", reveals one of those "endlessly varied combinations in which the different forms of rent may be combined, mixed together and amalgamated". [99] For the tenant community of over 550 people on this farm suffered both rent in cash and exactions of labour service. Indeed, on the estate, "each adult Native" - which invariably meant each African man (and possibly each married man) - had to pay a rent of thirty shillings a year. But, in addition to this, "two small boys" had to be sent to labour for Van Der Walt "every month" as well. It was unheard of, in the early twentieth-century Transvaal, for an individual tenant household to pay an annual cash rent and provide the labour of two of its members to a landlord throughout the year. Indeed, these would have been exceptional terms of tenancy even for a household only rendering rent in labour. So we may safely postulate that the "two small boys" provided to Van der Walt referred to the total number of workers provided by the entire peasant community to its landlord, a man who is likely to have lived on another farm. Indeed, the NC's allusion to the children going "to work every month" suggests that the various households rotated, as it were, in providing the youths concerned [100] - a practice confirmed from another source. [101] Indeed, such a regime would not have been unusual on Transvaal farms in the early twentieth century. The young Kas Maine, son of a labour tenant in the south-western Transvaal at this time, confirmed this rotational (and rather rare) performance of labour service for the landlord: "Yes, after six months someone else takes over. We used to interchange with each other even if it were not your own brother...I only went once. There were so many people on the waiting list." [102]

Hence, with over three and a half score households on "Butefontein", it would have been only once in every three years that a child left one of the farm's peasant families to engage in a month long stint of labour for Van der Walt. Indeed, one of the officials of the Transvaal Labour Commission, in discussing tenurial conditions on this farm, asked the NC in whose jurisdictional area it fell, if "the free labour to be got off the farm in the form of rent" was "just about equal to 1 per cent" of that actually available to the tenant community. "Yes, just about", replied the NC: "One per cent scattered over one year." [103]

A purely statistical analysis of alien labour, however, is clearly inadequate. One needs, in this case, to emphasise the social violence entailed in the exploitation of children wrenched from their families. Indeed, the steady monthly turnover of children labouring for Van der Walt is likely to have prevented the development of those elements of paternalism which, however antithetical they are to human relationships of equality, nevertheless do serve to inhibit the worst excesses of the exploiter. [104] It is the vulnerable who suffer such excesses, and who is more vulnerable than a child? Indeed, that which children under the control of Van der Walt endured is perhaps suggested by the experience of Ranchawe Pooe, an eleven year old member of a tenant household on a Transvaal farm some years later. His failure "to perform some chore around the farmstead" led a farmer to want "to beat him". And what would the neighbouring farmer - he who was known as "Ra-Sjambok" - have wanted to do? [105]

One needs to recall the hardships and cruelties intrinsic to the landlord-tenant relationship, perhaps especially in an analysis seeking to demonstrate the relative strength of the peasantry. Tenant households on "Butefontein" and "De Putten" clearly suffered the exploitation of family-members, many of them children, and their landlords' power of eviction was a real one which was sometimes exercised. [106] Moreover, during the winter, the peasants on "Butefontein" would be "call[ed] upon...to attend to" Van der Walt's stock whilst "once a month" he might "send his wagons" to be filled with wood. And still more

labour might be required by this landlord "during the reaping season or when there" was some "special stress of work" - but for this "he would pay", as was "the usual arrangement". [107] So the burdens of appropriation were ever-present. And yet one cannot fail to be impressed by the achievement of these peasants in holding down the level of alien labour in which they were immersed. Living on land to which people other than themselves held formal title, they had nevertheless seriously contained and circumscribed the rights of private property. Such containment and circumscription - as will be revealed in chapter 6 - had much to do with the incessant struggles of peasants. Elsewhere in the Haman's Kraal region, an attempt to force tenants into more onerous (three month) spells of alien labour met with tenacious resistance. [108]

Van der Walt's farm and, indeed, that which witnessed the tenacious resistance just referred to, were "Bushveld" farms under the jurisdiction of the NC Central Transvaal. Such farms tended to be used by landowners for specific reasons. For many of these landowners clearly possessed at least one other farm - where they would have concentrated their major agricultural enterprise - and they utilized their "Bushveld" properties for "obtaining wood", for "shooting" (i.e. hunting) and for wintering their cattle. From tenants located on such farms they might demand labour service alone; or extract "a ground rent varying from 10s. to £3 per hut per annum", the latter rent being "very exceptional", and draw labour-power in a quantity and manner similar to that which characterised Van der Walt's wringing of labour from the tenants of "Butefontein". [109] Whatever the specifics of the relationships of tenancy on the "Bushveld farms", however, this much is clear. The primary producers on them were peasants enjoying control over the overwhelming bulk of their labour-time. And this control flowed from their prior exercise of another power: the effective possession (as opposed to formal proprietorship) of the most fundamental means of production, the land. Not for nothing did the local NC refer to that "unlimited cultivation by the native" which characterised these agrarian estates. [110] To recall this is to emphasise just how far these direct producers were from that fundamental "presupposition" of proletarian status: "release of the workers from the soil as their natural workshop". [111]

What of the numbers of peasant families on private property in the central and southern Transvaal who rendered rent in cash alone? There were thousands of these, most of them paying a rental of £2 to £3 per annum and some paying even less than this. [112] There are, of course, examples of much higher rents, exclusively from those zones proximal to the Rand where primary producers might devote a notable portion of their time to the production of commodities. In the Witwatersrand District, corporate landlords could "sometimes" extract "a rental of £10 per annum" from black rural households; whilst in the district of Heidelberg, "nearly every Company owning Farms...and...a few Absentee Landowners" as well, allowed congregations of tenants on their land in excess of the numbers stipulated by the Squatters Law, and drew rents varying "from £2-10/- to £10 per Annum from each Native family resident on their property." [113] But it was on a company farm in the Pretoria District that perhaps the highest rent in cash was extracted from black tenants in the Transvaal in the years after the Boer War. For on the ground which had once been the Edendale Mission Station, "£12.10.0. a year" was demanded from the households, although few were ultimately prepared to pay this. [114]

Such a high rent, however, was not the norm in this administrative region of the Colony: the evidence cited earlier, after all, suggests that the average rent was lower than a quarter of this. And one should note that the lower rents might be combined with the effective absence of the rentier from the tenanted estate for much of the year. In the area commanded by the NC of the Central Transvaal, there were almost 15 000 black peasants - two-thirds of them in the Haman's Kraal District - living on over seven score farms "not regularly occupied or tenanted" by their owners. Significantly, the further south one went - that is, the closer one came to the heart of the South African highveld with its increasingly commercial production for the great market of the Rand - the less absentee landlordism prevailed. In the Heidelberg District, there were fewer than a thousand black peasants enjoying the non-residence of their exploiters. [115]

One cannot leave the early twentieth century southern Transvaal without a consideration of what Tim Keegan has called "the sharecropping Highveld". [116] If, in the Transvaal portion of this zone, sharecropping never attained - in the years immediately following the Boer War - the prominence it had in the Orange River Colony at this time, it nevertheless provides some striking examples of this social relationship. The Transvaal, after all, shared with the ORC perhaps the largest single sharecropping enterprise in South African history - Vereeniging Estates - which straddled the colonies in the mid-Vaal region. And within a decade and a half, on company lands "within ten or twenty miles of the gold fields", large numbers of sharecroppers produced for the Rand market, their extraordinarily high productivity suggested by the exploitation they suffered; for these sharecroppers "commonly paid cash rents of £6 or £7, sometimes even £10 or more in addition to the share of the crop" which they provided to the landowners. [117]

If, as Keegan suggests, sharecropping arrangements tended to be utilized by white farmers until the productive forces under their command permitted them to enforce still more exploitative relationships [118], it is well to recall that sharecropping is often a path to the fruits of greater exploitation not for the landlord, but for the tenant. In his analysis of "The Genesis of the Capitalist Farmer" in England, for example, Marx noted that tenant farmers, "whom the landlords" provided "with seed, cattle and farm implements" and whose condition - despite a certain exploitation of wage labour - was "not very different from that of the peasant", evolved into sharecroppers and then capitalist tenant farmers. [119] And, indeed, in a later work, he explicitly conceived of "the system of sharecropping" as a "transitional form" through which rent passed in its gestation into fully "capitalist rent". [120] It is possibly considerations such as these which have led Mike Morris recently to enquire if perhaps sharecropping in South Africa could not potentially "have been an alternative path (from below) - in Lenin's terms an American path - to rural capitalism". [121]

There is little doubt that the black sharecroppers of the South African highveld displayed some elements which suggest that at least a number of them, had they not been penalised for their race, would have evolved into rural capitalists in the fullness of time. Many effectively controlled their enterprises, cultivated large acreages of land and were intent upon (often significant) commercial production. [122] Moreover, as Stanley Trapido has most convincingly demonstrated, sharecropping communities evinced a notable degree of differentiation, some of their members possessing considerably more resources than others. [123] This may have been the product of incipient class formation, in both directions, although - given the errors frequently made by those (such as the early Lenin) determined to discern the dissolution of the peasantry into antagonistic classes - much more research and considerable care in the handling of the data it yields will be necessary to establish this. [124] Nevertheless, the more prosperous sharecroppers appear to have benefited from something akin to class exploitation, particularly of the black labour tenants living on the same estates as themselves. [125] Finally, and perhaps most startlingly, given Marx's description of the evolution of the sharecroppers into capitalist tenant farmers, there is clear evidence of black sharecroppers who had amassed sufficient wealth leasing entire farms from white landowners. To circumvent the law which forbade such leasing, poorer whites were used as intermediaries and these - as a high official complained - might become the "servants" of the effective black lessees. [126]

In these ways, then, Marx's view of sharecropping, as a "form" "transitional" to agrarian capitalism from below, appears confirmed by the processes at work amongst the black sharecroppers of the highveld. In the absence of the state onslaught which was shortly to victimise them, perhaps a few of these sharecroppers would have become rural capitalists. But if a small number would have become such, most would not have done so. White sharecroppers, let it be remembered, were not subjected to the kind of state barrage directed at blacks, yet none of their notable trajectories led to a privileged place in the triad of 'landowner - capitalist tenant farmer - wage labourer'. The vast majority of both black and white sharecroppers was, from the start, imbricated in a very different process from that

described by Marx. They were resident on ground owned by a landowner who tended to be a farmer as well. Indeed, as Keegan has demonstrated, it was generally the producing white landlords, desirous of truly commercial production but lacking the requisite resources, who struck the sharecropping agreements, often in order to acquire - by exploitation - the wherewithal to begin significant enterprise under their direct control. [127]

As this wherewithal was built up - by extractions from the sharecroppers and through state aid - the landowning farmers needed the sharecroppers less and pressed ever more heavily upon them, grinding them down into labour tenancy and wage labour, sometimes expelling them from the countryside altogether. In Marx's scenario, it was the sharecropper alone who was the farmer; the landowner appeared not to have been bent upon production as well. [128] On the South African highveld, the landlord was so bent and this inevitably circumscribed the sharecroppers' potential development. The more they produced, the more the white landlord drew in rent and thereby accumulated the resources for greater production. As that greater production was set in motion, the more ground and labour-power the white farmer required and the less, consequently, that would be allowed the sharecroppers. There is a real sense, then, in which the sharecroppers of the highveld were locked into an immiserating relationship from the outset in a way in which sharecroppers taking the path to agrarian capitalism "from below" are not.

vi. The Proto-Capitalist Farms

So powerful was the black peasantry on private property in the early twentieth century Transvaal that even the few proto-agrarian capitalists of the day had to accommodate themselves to it. A. G. Robertson, a Wakkerstroom farmer, who cultivated an exceptionally large area (400-500 acres) and employed on average "40 natives every day of the year", unquestionably paid wages to workers, some of whom worked for year-long stretches at a time. But he could only procure them by settling perhaps a hundred peasant families on as many as three farms. It was from these households, which were permitted to cultivate "as much" ground as they could and run hundreds of cattle, that the remunerated workers were drawn. [129] David Forbes, whose "Athole" was one of the more formidable agricultural estates of the day, regularly paid wages on his farm but, to procure the labourers to whom these were paid, he had to settle a great number of peasants on his fifty-thousand acre farm: there were, in fact, so many African families on his farm that, in 1903, a sub-Native Commissioner took five days to collect taxes from them. [130]

Consider, too, Hugh Hall, whose 200 cultivated acres were also exceptional for a landlord at this time. Unable to run a fully capitalist enterprise, Hall was nevertheless thoroughly bourgeois in his sensibility. So wedded was he to the cash nexus that he elevated it to an ethical plane: wages, he considered, were the only way "to give the native justice". These were indeed paid on his estate. But the direct producers are likely to have found justice, if any on this farm, not in their remuneration for long (4-6 month) spells of alien labour, but in the right of their families to plough "as much land" as they chose to and to run "any number" of stock as well. [131]

If one is seeking contractual evidence of the proto-capitalist nature of a landlord, one cannot do better than explore the tenorial agreement between Johannes Muller and his nameless (and apparently polygamous) tenants. Muller's ground was private property in a way in which few Transvaal farms in the early twentieth century were. Far from his tenants having the right to cultivate as much land as they could, they were "in no case" to put more than six morgen under the plough and - in a radical departure from the Colony's tenorial custom - they were to rent this land by the morgen. (This rent per morgen - a unit equivalent to just over 2 acres - was equivalent to the cash rent paid by thousands of Transvaal tenants at this time for their entire cultivated acreage.) Yet the claims of private property did not end at the boundary of cultivated land. If a tenant's herd of cattle exceeded a certain number, a grazing rent had to be paid - one which increased as the herd multiplied. And if beasts in this herd should damage

the cultivated lands of "the Lessor or his representative", then woe betide the tenant to whom they belonged. Severe conditions? Unquestionably. Yet these refer largely to the cash rents extracted from tenant households and even so do not exhaust them. Onerous - though remunerated - labour services were demanded, too. And they were demanded in such a way that the landlord appears to have been able to press into wage labour almost any member of the household, the burden falling chiefly upon adolescents- both male and female.

Differential wage rates were fixed in advance (£2 per month with food for men; 7s.6d. for adolescent males; 4 shillings for adolescent females) and, significantly, the landlord seems to have been given considerable latitude in deciding how large his work-force should be at any one time. The cash nexus between Muller and his workers, his incipient severing of their links to the soil - these were more developed on his farm than they were on most agrarian estates of the Transvaal at this time. (The exceptional nature of this contract is made evident by the context in which a resident magistrate forwarded it). And yet even in this case, the landlord was forced to guarantee the households their peasant enterprises: aside from the cultivable ground allotted to "each kraalhead", the latter was permitted to graze the first fifty head of his livestock "free of charge". So the fact of peasant existence on Muller's farm was very real. This, no doubt, is why the landlord built into the contract as his prime punitive right not the docking of wages but the seizure of crops. [132]

It is notable that even when industrial capitalists sought to diversify into agriculture, they found themselves forced to accommodate themselves to the peasantry. Lewis and Marks's rural enterprise on Vereeniging Estates - set up by men commanding profits derived from the mining and marketing of diamonds - found itself patterned from below in this way. That sharecropping arose on these Estates was not in part the upshot of the landowners' lack of resources, as it was elsewhere. On the contrary, in the immediate aftermath of the Boer War, it was the Company which loaned resources - over £8 000 worth - to the tenants to enable them to renew their impressive productive activity. But this gigantic commercial enterprise which, in 1903, had twenty thousand acres under grain crops, had initially to base itself upon a multiplicity of household economies in order to guarantee its viability. [133] Even the most advanced agricultural estate in the early twentieth century Transvaal was fettered to unfree labour.

And the demands of the peasant economy regularly broke into that of the landowners. "Do you find that when you want the Kaffir most the Kaffir wants to put his own crops in?" enquired a government commission of a Bethal farmer. "Yes", he replied unequivocally, "that is my experience". The NC commanding the most agriculturally productive region of the Colony noted that a common complaint made of tenants by producing landlords was their "refusal to work at certain times." [134] And even the operations of a proto-capitalist farm, such as David Forbes's "Athole" was subject to the rhythms of peasant life. His diary is littered with references to his labourers (who were paid wages) going off to tend their enterprises: [135]

"Lent Gobaaz the yankie plough to plant his mealies" (4/10/1903);
"The 4 natives that were planting mealies under the garden are not at work to day[;] Umgaku was to have that plough today and I expect the 4 boys have gone to him" (16/10/1903); "We have... 4 double furrow ploughs at work planting mealies. We will now have to let the Kafirs get their own crops in" (24/10/1903); "Kafirs gone home to plant their mealies" (27/10/1903); "Have let the Kafirs that were getting out stone go back to their hoing (sic)" (11/12/1903);
"The Kafirs that were getting out stones gone home to do their hoeing for a week" (5/1/1904).

The tone is not one of exasperation but of acceptance. Such events were commonplace, even on a highly commercial enterprise like Forbes's.

Conclusion: the absence of economic compulsion; the necessity for extra-economic coercion.

The direct producers on Transvaal farms in the early twentieth century were overwhelmingly peasants, and peasants belonging to households initially powerful enough - in the main - to ensure that they controlled the bulk of their labour-time. When a contemporary administrator wrote that "in most cases the native obtains his land in return for a very few weeks labour a year for the farmer" [136], he may have overstated the case but he did point to a basic fact of the day: the relatively low level of alien labour performed by the rural masses. [137] And it was the peasantry's ability to keep this level low, an ability flowing from deep within the agrarian class structure of the Colony and from the determinate class struggles of the day [138], which was the central cause of the acute scarcity of labour power afflicting the landowners of the Transvaal. For despite the very limited size of the work-force required by the Transvaal's poorly developed commercial agriculture, landlords failed even to secure this. At the end of 1903, it was estimated that the white farmers had access to only a third, at most one half, of their actual labour requirements. [139] And this at a time when the peasantry on private property numbered half a million. In the District of Boksburg, wages for black farm workers were driven considerably beyond the point at which farmers could produce for profit and yet still they were afflicted by a scarcity of labour power. [140] So were thousands of other farms scattered across the Colony.

It needs to be remembered, too, that peasants possessed and actually utilized a much greater proportion of white-owned land than did landowners. The latter, it should not be forgotten, were expected to cultivate that tiny proportion of their estates alluded to in the preceding chapter if they were present upon them. These tiny pockets of agriculture directly controlled by the landlords were lost in what seemed to contemporaries like a seamless expanse of collective peasant production. So dominant was the latter that an early twentieth-century observer confessed to having "almost" called "the native" "the sole cultivator of the land" - rather than merely "the principal agriculturalist" - "over the greater proportion" of the Colony. [141] The view of a government administrator that the black peasantry "deprived" "the farmer" "of the use of a great portion of his arable lands" [142] was perhaps expressed in too purposive a way. But it was essentially correct. The preceding narrative - let us not forget it - abounds with references to the "unlimited" cultivation frequently exercised by the peasant on private property. These references need to be tempered by G. A. Cohen's comment that one "cannot have unrestricted enjoyment of means of production" if one's "labour power is even partly owned by another." [143] But they do, nevertheless, point to the exceptional degree to which the land had not yet become capitalist private property.

In the main, what compelled the peasantry to engage in alien labour for landlords was not economic compulsion but **extra-economic coercion**, the key element employed by Marx to define the extraction of surplus labour in a pre-capitalist class society. [144] The black rural communities that Boer colonists subordinated during the nineteenth century were fundamentally rural subsistence producers in control of their means of production. In the Grundrisse, Marx warned of the fate of such people should they fall victim to pre-capitalist conquest. "If human beings themselves are conquered along with the land and soil as its organic accessories, then they are equally conquered as one of the conditions of production, and in this way arises slavery and serfdom". [145]

The forms of coercion adopted in the ZAR to extract labour-power from black communities are known well enough. Aside from the direct subjection to virtual slavery of Africans taken captive in war [146], there was the notorious forcible allocation of black families to Boer landowners: some of the most dramatic forms of struggle from below during the Boer War, in fact, arose when those who had been so allocated violently threw off the yoke of their landlords and reconstituted their communal existence - as did the Ndebele and Kgatla tenancies. It may be true, as Trapido has argued, that in "the last two decades of the nineteenth century coercive relationships, though they were still being created, were being transformed into a variety of unstable landlord-tenant linkages". [147] But almost every pre-

capitalist order will generate customary norms at the boundary where the violence of the exploiters and the resistance of the exploited meet. Perhaps such customs were at last being created in the ZAR. Certainly, the last thing these linkages were generating was clearly defined contracts - a fact which was pointed out over and over again in the early twentieth century. [148]

At any rate, one of the (well-nigh feudal) functions of taxation in the ZAR suggests its landlords' continued dependence upon extra-economic compulsion to procure labour power. As both Trapido and Peter Delius have demonstrated, taxation in that state was little better than an arbitrary and often violent exercise in plundering the peasantry. [149] Tenants settled on white owned farms were, however, exempt from at least poll taxes: [150] consequently, a peasant's acceptance of a landowner's authority "was one means of acquiring protection against arbitrary and rapacious tax raids". [151] Given that it was the representatives of the landowners in any particular district who were directing the tax raids, the "protection" the tenants received possessed a certain Chicago quality.

Finally, in the pre-war Transvaal, there existed that very personification of pre-capitalist coercion in the figure of the veldkornet, that sinister landowning representative of the farmers in each district who hovered above the tenantry, violently intervening - when necessary - to ensure the rendering of labour-service. Disagreements over the latter were commonly settled by what one commentator termed "the arbitrary adjustment of a Field-Cornet" [152], a euphemism callous in its choice of mechanical imagery, given that such an official in a Boer Republic could strap insubordinate workers across a wine barrel, arms and legs tied to pegs in the ground, and beat them to death. [153]

The centrality of extra-economic coercion to the agrarian order of the Transvaal became only too apparent when imperial Britain shattered forever the ZAR state administration (including its system of veldkornets) during the Boer War. This was coterminous with the peasant war of 1899-1902, and together these effectively liquidated the ability of Boer landowners to coerce the tenantry into paying rent of any kind. Boers returning to their farms were faced with a well-nigh universal refusal of peasants to render labour-service. The British Administration rapidly realised that no purely economic force could restore labour-power to the landowners. Consequently, a comprehensive political and ideological campaign was launched by which peasants were disarmed and disciplined into rendering surplus labour once more. [154] And the post-war Transvaal state, a state bent upon systematically (if cautiously) initiating proletarianisation, was compelled to maintain this extra-economic pressure upon the rent-paying peasantry. Indeed, the recently vanquished landowners viewed the state's role in this as merely a substitute for their own wreaking of violence upon tenants. Any "alteration in the present supervision of Natives", warned the landowners, will not lead farmers to the "uncertainty of law quibbles" with workers, but to "recourse to the sjambok" [155], an instrument - no doubt - to which recourse was made anyway.

Hence it happened that a capitalist state administration, organically linked to a bourgeois imperialism, restored and maintained relationships of rural exploitation that were far from capitalist. Private property had been restored. But this was most definitely not capitalist private property. The agrarian variety of the latter, after all, is very distinctive. Its cold ground can be turned only by the most alienated labour. And, as we have demonstrated, after the restoration of Boer property rights, most labour poured into the soil on the farms of the Transvaal was not yet alien.

-----o0o-----

Notes

- 1 *Diamond Fields' Advertiser Weekly*, 11 October 1902, p 27, "Native Labour" (Johannesburg Report); SNA, Vol 128, NA 1065/03, copy of Governor to Chamberlain, July 1903; and see also SNA, Vol 47, NA 1569/02, Scholefield to Windham, 10 July 1902.
- 2 See K Marx, *Capital*, Vol 2 (1978), p 436; see also K Marx *Capital*, Vol 3 (1981), p 751.
- 3 In chapter 3 of my DPhil thesis, "Revolution from Above, Rebellion from Below: alienation and class struggle at the political transition to capitalism in the rural Transvaal" (Oxford, 1989).
- 4 Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City* (London, 1973), p 4. The fact is conveyed with great power in the figure of Harry Price in Williams's autobiographical novel, *Border Country* (London, 1988; first published in 1960).
- 5 See Louis Althusser, *For Marx* (London, 1977), pp 221-47. The quotation in the text, however, is from Perry Anderson, *Considerations on Western Marxism* (London, 1979), p 71.
- 6 As Anderson notes in his *Arguments Within English Marxism* (London, 1980), p 63, Marx's writings of the 1840s "which Althusser calls the Works of the Break, do not yet possess the basic historical concepts that were to constitute the cornerstone of the theory of historical materialism as such - the 'forces and relations of production'".
- 7 This analysis is based upon I Meszaros, *Marx's Theory of Alienation* (London, 1982). See pp 108-09 for a compressed and graphic rendering of these elements.
- 8 I do not consider the much smaller and less significant grouping of white direct producers. Their historical experience was very different: the blacks, unlike the whites, were to be subjected to a politically-directed process of primitive accumulation.
- 9 These statistics should be considered as accurate as any. They are based upon an adjudication of a large quantity of (sometimes conflicting) data. An appendix at the end of my thesis explains how these figures were computed.
- 10 The definition which I follow, and many of whose phrases I use, is that of Teodor Shanin. See T Shanin, *Russia as a "Developing Society"*. *The Roots of Otherness: Russia's Turn of Century*, Vol 1 (London, 1985), p 66.
- 11 See M L Morris, "The Development of Capitalism in South African Agriculture: class struggle in the countryside", *Economy and Society*, 5, 3, 1976, pp 327-29.
- 12 See, for example, University of the Witwatersrand, African Studies Institute, Oral History Project, Transcript of interview with Josephine Jiyane, p 3, where her grandfather - clearly the patriarch - looms large. Thus, in signalling her maiden name, she refers to her grandfather not to her father: "I am married to the Jiyanes. My grandfather was a Ndlovu." She goes on to imply her grandfather's control over cattle. Josephine Jiyane was the daughter of a labour tenant in the Ermelo district in the early twentieth century.
- 13 I hope to present an analysis of the latter grouping at a later point.

- 14 K Marx, *Grundrisse* (1981), pp 106-07.
- 15 Brenner's evidence for feudal France is very startling in this regard. See R Brenner, "Agrarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-Industrial Europe", in T H Aston and C H E Philpin (eds), *The Brenner Debate: Agrarian class structure and economic development in pre-industrial Europe* (Cambridge, 1987, ed), pp 21 and 25.
- 16 SNA, Vol 204, NA 460/04, NC Volksrust to CNA, 29 February 1904.
- 17 Note the comments of P Erasmus, a Bethel farmer, interviewed by the Transvaal Labour Commission in September 1903. See Cd 1897. *Reports of the Transvaal Labour Commission. Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of His Majesty. February 1904* (London), p 364, para 8 815.
- 18 SNA, Vol 115, NA 635/1903, Marwick to Sec NA, dd 4 June 1903, and Marwick's memorandum re "Representations" of 12 March 1903.
- 19 See also SNA, Vol 106, NA 491/03, Hogge to Sec NA, 19 February 1903.
- 20 See *Transvaal Agricultural Journal (TAJ)*, Vol II No 6, January 1904, p 244, and No 7, April 1904, p 468.
- 21 *TAJ*, Vol II No 6, January 1904, p 242; No 7, April 1904, p 465; No 8, July 1904, p 618; and Vol III No 9, October 1904, p 168.
- 22 *Cd 1897*, p 25, para 561, and *TAJ*, Vol II No 7, April 1904, p 466.
- 23 *Cd 1897*, p 328, para 8020; *TAJ*, Vol II No 5, October 1903, p 77; No 6, January 1904, p 243; and Vol III No 10, January 1905, p 372.
- 24 *TAJ*, Vol II No 5, October 1903, p 81.
- 25 *TAJ*, Vol I No 2, January 1903, p 8, and No 3, April 1903, p 70.
- 26 *TAJ*, Vol I No 4, July 1903, p 125; and Vol II No 8, July 1904, p 620.
- 27 *TAJ*, Vol II No 5, October 1903, p 85; No 7, April 1904, p 470; No 8, July 1904, p 621.
- 28 So great is the quantity of data concerning the payment of wages to black workers in agriculture that wage series can be constructed for dozens of districts in the Transvaal at this time. In the appendix concerning wages at the end of my thesis, some comparative rates - for black industrial workers and for white wage labourers - are provided.
- 29 See the comments of a Carolina farmer - in *CD 1897*, p 26, paras 600-03 - who asserted that unremunerated labour service was the norm on the agrarian estates of the Transvaal at this time.
- 30 SNA, Vol 151, NA 1698/03, Hogge to Sir Godfrey, 13 November 1902.
- 31 SNA, Vol 115, NA 635/03, Report of Sub-NC Wakkerstroom, 16 March 1903.

- 32 *CD 1897*, p 329, paras 8 028 and 8 030; N J Breytenbach (an Ermelo farmer) interviewed.
- 33 Quotations from *Cd 1897*, p 328, para 8020; other evidence from the interview generally.
- 34 Marx, *Capital*, Vol 3, p 926.
- 35 See Morris, "The Development of Capitalism in South African Agriculture", *op. cit.*, esp pp 301-03.
- 36 *Cd 1897*, pp 328-29 and 331, paras 8 020, 8025-8 and 8 110. Breytenbach may well have been exaggerating in giving 50 shillings as the price at which the bags of maize were sold.
- 37 SNA, Vol 115, NA 635/1903, Report of Sub-NC Wakkerstroom, 16 March 1903, with reference to Piet Retief District.
- 38 Calculated from statistics in SNA, Vol 239, NA 2572/04, "List of Farms in the Piet Retief District not Regularly Tenanted by Europeans", July 1904, and a similar list for Wakkerstroom.
- 39 SNA, VOL 239, NA 2572/04, Roberts to Sec NA, 21 May 1904.
- 40 Johannesburg Public Library (JPL), Transvaal Land Owners' Association, Minute-book volume of 462 pp dealing with 1903-1919 matters, pp 22 and 303, minutes of meetings of 30 March 1904 and 15 May 1908.
- 41 *Cd 1897*, p 363, para 8 788, evidence of P J D Erasmus.
- 42 SNA, Vol 138, NA 1390/03, Brabant to Sec NA, 24 February 1904. My brackets.
- 43 SNA, Vol 115, NA 653/03, Report of Sub-NC Wakkerstroom, 16 March 1903. The context of the document suggests that the farm referred to was not one upon which its owner resided.
- 44 SNA, Vol 89, NA 102/03, Hogge to Sec NA, 9 January 1903.
- 45 SNA, Vol 77, NA 2640/02, Hogge to Sec NA, 17 December 1902. See also SNA, Vol 106, NA 491/03, Hogge to Sec NA, 19 February 1903, and SNA, Vol 89, NA 102/03, Hogge to Sec NA, 9 January 1903.
- 46 SNA, Vol 89, NA 102/03, Hogge to Sec NA, 9 January 1903.
- 47 See Hogge's evidence in *The South African Native Affairs Commission*, Vol IV, pp 456-57, 467-48. Note, however, that the failure to fulfil contracts of tenancy was "a constant source of complaint ... more from the farmer than from the Native": see p 465, para 40 155.
- 48 Marx, *Capital*, Vol III, p 926.
- 49 See Marx, *Capital*, Vol I (Harmondsworth, 1982), pp 345-48; quotation from p 346.
- 50 S Trapido, "Landlord and Tenant in a Colonial Economy: the Transvaal, 1880-1910", *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol 5, No 1, 1979, pp 30-31.

- 51 *Cd 1897*, p 215, para 5 068; p 216, paras 5 090, 5 106-8 and 5 111; and p 221, para 5 272.
- 52 *Ibid.*, p 215, para 5 068; p 216, paras 5 088-91; and p 217, paras 5 119-25.
- 53 SNA, Vol 188, NA 3114/03, Airey to Commissioner of Lands, Middelburg, 2 December 1903, and SNA, Vol 139, NA 3151/03 (placed with NA 1390/03), Airey to Commnr Lands Tvl, 6 December 1903.
- 54 SNA, Vol 239, NA 2572/04, "Summary of farms not regularly occupied or tenanted by Europeans with native population thereon".
- 55 *Cd 1897*, pp 290-91, evidence of S J Hully, a pass officer.
- 56 SNA, Vol 193, NA 221/04, "Report upon the Land Tenure & distribution of Natives in the Transvaal".
- 57 SNA, Vol 180, NA 2746/03, Hogge to Sec NA, 30 November 1903, and Braimbridge to Lyttleton, 20 October 1903.
- 58 Otto Menzel, "Farming in the Zoutpansberg", *TAJ*, Vol VIII No 29, October 1909, p 33.
- 59 See *Cd 2103. Census Returns of British South Africa* (London, 1904), pp 12-13.
- 60 See *TG 13-'08. Report of the Transvaal Indigency Commission 1906-1908* (Pretoria, 1908), p 54, para 98.
- 61 SNA, Vol 45, NA 1458/02, F M Allenberg, "A Scheme for the Settlement of Natives in the Transvaal & ORC", n.d. but the document of which it is an enclosure is dated 21 July 1902.
- 62 Marx, *Capital*, Vol III, p 933. Marx would have done well to stress a loss of relative isolation. Peasants rendering rent in labour are far from existing in the utter isolation implied by Marx. Demands made upon them by landlord have much to do with the place of the latter in the wider economy and society. Moreover, where have peasants - even those not under the fist of a landowner - existed without some connection to a general social and economic world beyond their households?
- 63 See J Krikler, "The Transvaal Agrarian Class Struggle in the South African War, 1899-1902", *Social Dynamics*, Vol 12, No 2, 1986, p 21. In addition to this, Colin Bundy's point must be borne in mind: the "increased freedom of movement" allowed Africans in the post-war Transvaal saw "significant numbers" of "peasants ... moving ... out of labour tenancies into rent-paying tenancies on the land of absentee proprietors". See Colin Bundy, *The Rise and Fall of the South African Peasantry* (London, 1979), pp 208-09.
- 64 See *CD 1897*, p 11, para 211, comments of the Rev Creux, a missionary particularly acquainted with conditions in the Zoutpansberg District.
- 65 The quotation is from SNA, Vol 239, NA 2577/04, Acting NC Northern Division to Sec NA, 3 November 1904. The letter also details the means of production afforded tenants.
- 66 SNA, Vol 139, NA 2773/03, Molyneux to Director of Agriculture, 26 October 1903.
- 67 Herbert Ingle, "Some Agricultural Aspects of the North-Eastern Transvaal", *TAJ*,

Vol III No 11, April 1905, p 461.

- 68 Quotations from *Capital*, Vol III, p 931.
- 69 Shanin, *op. cit.*, p 66.
- 70 All quotations are from Marx, *Capital*, Vol III, p 931; my brackets. Marx was actually discussing the advantages of rent in kind over rent in labour to direct producers. All his comments, however, would apply to those paying rent in cash, the discussion of which he begins on the very next page. See Trapido, "Landlord and Tenant", *op. cit.*, pp 34-35, for an analysis of some of the advantages which accrued to tenants from cash or kind, as opposed to labour, tenancy.
- 71 SNA, Vol 239, NA 2577/04, Acting NC N Division to Sec NA, 3 November 1904.
- 72 Chapter 6 of my thesis provides a comprehensive analysis of this Law.
- 73 SNA, Vol 204, NA 460/1904, NC Zoutpansberg to CNA, 29 February 1904.
- 74 See Vol 193, NA 221/04, "Report upon the Land Tenure & distribution of Natives in the Transvaal", and *Cd 1897*, p 225, paras 5 382-91, B H Dicke interviewed.
- 75 Let us consider merely one (albeit the largest) category of the northern Transvaal population on private property to prove this. As a "rule", "Undefined locations on private land" were farms - "mostly owned by large Companies" - upon which were settled black communities paying rent in money (see SNA, Vol 193, NA 221/04, "Report upon the Land Tenure & distribution of Natives in the Transvaal", n.d., by an official in the Department of Native Affairs). According to government calculations in 1903, 67,221 people were said to be living in such "locations" (see SNA, Vol 139, NA 1390/03, "TRANSVAAL - Estimated Number, Distribution and Density of the Native Population - 1903"). These calculations, however, suffered from an underestimation which I discuss and explain in an appendix at the end of my thesis. They gave the total "Native" population of the northern Transvaal as 201,539. The Census was to discover it to be almost 310,000 (see *Cd 2103*, p 13). We must, in fact, upwardly revise the initial figure by one-third. As this is 67,221, it takes the statistic to over 100,000.
- 76 For the common rent levied, see SNA, Vol 193, NA 221/04, "Report upon the Land Tenure & Distribution of Natives in the Transvaal". A breakdown of the farms of absentee landlords, who their proprietors were, and the numbers of black peasants settled on them in the north-western Transvaal may be found in SNA, Vol 239, NA 2572/04, "List of Farms Unoccupied by Europeans in the Warmbaths sub-district of Waterberg ..." and similar lists for the Nylstroom and Potgietersrust sub-districts. The estimate is from the "Summary of Farms not regularly occupied or tenanted by Europeans with native population thereon" in the latter file.
- 77 See *Cd 1897*, para 8 909, J J van Staden interviewed, and SNA, Vol 47, NA 1569/02, Scholefield (the NC) to Windham, 10 July 1902.
- 78 SNA, Vol 47, NA 1569/02, Scholefield to Sec NA, 31 July 1902.
- 79 SNA, Vol 144, NA 1577/03, Capt Hamilton Fowle to CNA, 8 July 1903, and Patten to NC N-W Transvaal, 27 July 1903.
- 80 SNA, Vol 47, NA 1569/02, Scholefield to Windham, 20 July 1902.
- 81 SNA, Vol 204, NA 460/04, NC Rustenburg to CNA, 1 March 1904. My brackets.

- 82 *CD 1897*, p 273, paras 6 479-81, General De La Rey interviewed with reference to the Lichtenburg District.
- 83 SNA, Vol 239, NA 2577/04, Griffith to Sec NA, 1 December 1904.
- 84 *Ibid.* Enclosure.
- 85 *Ibid.* Enclosure.
- 86 Quoted by Helen Bradford, "'A Taste of Freedom': capitalist development and response to the ICU in the Transvaal countryside", in B Bozzoli (ed), *Town and Countryside in the Transvaal: capital penetration and popular response* (Johannesburg, 1983), p 128. My brackets. See pp 128-32 for the condition of the Transvaal labour tenantry in the 1920s.
- 87 Enclosure of SNA, Vol 239, NA 2577/04, Griffith to Sec NA, 1 December 1904.
- 88 SNA, Vol 291, NA 1059/04, Sub-NC Potchefstroom to Res Mag Potchefstroom, 31 May 1904.
- 89 For more evidence of it, see SNA, Vol 60, NA 2122/02, Griffith to Sec NA, 28 October 1902 (Potchefstroom evidence).
- 90 SNA, Vol 228, NA 1815/04, esp Hunt to NC W Tvl, 28 September 1904.
- 91 Enclosure of SNA, Vol 239, NA 2577/04, Griffith to Sec NA, 1 December 1904.
- 92 SNA, Vol 63, folio 156, comment of C Griffith. It is unclear if these farms were leased collectively. Their effective possession by tenants, however, is not in question.
- 93 Calculated from SNA, Vol 239, NA 2572/04, enclosure of SNC Lichtenburg to Res Mag Lichtenburg, 28 May 1904: "Return of Native [sic] residing on farms in the District of Potchefstroom owned by Companies and Europeans and not regularly tenanted by Europeans"; and "Summary of Farms not regularly occupied or tenanted by Europeans with native population thereon" (SNA, Vol 239, folio 117). The latter document, a colony-wide one, does not provide statistics for the two smaller districts of the south-western Transvaal: Bloemhof and Wolmaransstad. It is possible that these were included in the returns from Potchefstroom and Lichtenburg, the larger districts which they adjoined.
- 94 See SNA, Vol 239, NA 2572/04, Griffith's "Reply to Circular No 44/04", 30 June 1904.
- 95 See *ibid.* for the dozens of farms of absentee landlords in the Pilansberg, and see Krikler, "Transvaal Agrarian Class Struggle", p 22, for the long-term effects of the Kgatla peasantry's onslaught on Boer landowners. A narrative of that onslaught can be found in J Krikler, "Agrarian Class Struggle and the South African War, 1899-1902", *Social History*, Vol 14, No 2, May 1989.
- 96 SNA, 138, NA 1390/03, Hook to Acting NC C Tvl, 22 January 1904.
- 97 Marx, *Grundrisse*, pp 515, 832 and 307. In one sense, slaves suffer as great an alienation: all their labour power is under command by others. But, in another sense, their alienation is less than that of the proletarian. For the slave, typically, is not separated from the means of production but radically assimilated to them (see *Capital*, Vol 1, p 303, note). This, of course, entails a fundamental unfreedom which the proletarian does not suffer, but it also implies the inability of the slave-holders to

separate the primary producer from the means of production and, therefore, of sustenance. To do so is to diminish their wealth. Proletarians are more alienated, but also freer, than slaves.

- 98 SNA, Vol 171, NA 2213/03, Taberer to Sec NA, 19 September 1903, and enclosed schedule.
- 99 Marx, *Capital*, Vol III, p 932.
- 100 SNA, Vol 171, NA 2213/03, Taberer to Sec NA, 19 September 1903, and enclosure. It should be noted that further (but complicating) information concerning some of the Haman's Kraal farms which I have discussed in the preceding paragraphs may be found in SNA, Vol 81, folios 6-7 and 11, Taberer to Sec NA, 30 January 1903, and attached schedule. There are discrepancies between the two sets of documents and I have used the information provided in the schedule enclosed in Taberer's September 1903 letters since it is more comprehensive. The discrepancies may be accounted for in a number of ways: 1) the errors and silences of the NC; 2) his reference in the January documentation, as he made clear, to particular communities of tenants who had just been evicted from "Bultfontein" ("Butefontein" in the later schedule) and to those threatened with removal from "De Putten"; some of the data in the January schedule may, therefore, have referred to particular relationships of tenancy which did not exist by September; 3) finally, changes in tenurial conditions on some of the farms may well have occurred during the course of 1903. The period immediately after the Boer War, it needs to be remembered, was a period of fiercely contested and sometimes rapidly shifting tenancies.
- 101 See *Cd 1897*, paras 5 680-92, NC Central Transvaal interviewed, for a discussion of Van der Walt's farm which, *inter alia*, confirmed this. "I think you will find", noted the NC of the departure of labourers for labour service, "that two will come out for two months and be replaced by two others." In his evidence, the NC gave the population of Van der Walt's farm as higher than it appeared in the SNA schedule. This, and other discrepancies, may have had their origin in his speaking from memory.
- 102 Quoted in Malete Nkadimeng and Georgina Relly, "Kas Maine: the Story of a Black South African Agriculturalist", in Bozzoli (ed), *Town and Countryside*, p 96.
- 103 *Cd 1897*, paras 5 691-2.
- 104 See Eugene Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, pp 3-7, and 661-65, for a nuanced discussion of both the cruelty inherent in paternalism and its mollifying qualities. Genovese's analysis is not restricted to slavery, and explicitly encompasses the relationship between landlords and tenants.
- 105 See T Matsetela, "Aspects of Sharecropping and Proletarianisation in the Northern Orange Free State, 1890-1930" in S Marks and R Rathbone, *Industrialisation and Social Change in South Africa: African class formation, culture and consciousness, 1870-1930* (London, 1982), pp 226-27. The particular incident took place in the early twenties on a farm in the Transvaal, just north of the Vaal River, near Lindeque's Drift. A "sjambok" is a hide whip.
- 106 Note the information in point 2 of footnote 99.
- 107 *Cd 1897*, paras 5 690 and 5 692.
- 108 See SNA, Vol 174, NA 2277/03, for evidence of this.

- 109 See *Cd 1897*, paras 5 554-5, 5 557, 5 560, 5 566 in text of the example of "Bushveld" tenancy on Van der Walt's farm (paras 5 680-93), given by the NC Central Transvaal. For an example of a peasant community - thousands strong - apparently located on several "bushveld" farms and supplying labour services to absentee landowners, see SNA, Vol 81, folios 6-7 and 11, Taberer to Sec NA, 30 January 1903, and attached schedule.
- 110 *Cd 1897*, p 236, para 5 563.
- 111 Marx Grundrisse, p 471. The quotation has been altered slightly to allow it to refer to a plurality of workers.
- 112 See SNA, Vol 204, NA 460/1904, NC Pretoria to CNA, 1 March 1904; SNA, Vol 81, folio 11, schedule attached to Taberer to Sec NA, 30 January 1903; SNA, Vol 180, NA 2746/03, Bainbridge to Under Sec of State, Colonial Office, 15 December 1903; and the references to the communities on "De Kuil", "Walmansthal", "Doonpoort" and "Kliprand" in SNA, Vol 171, NA 2213/03, Taberer to Sec NA, 19 September 1903, and enclosed schedule.
- 113 *TAJ*, Vol IV No 132, October 1905, p 126, and SNA, Vol 138, NA 1390/03, Sub-NC Heidelberg to NC Central Transvaal, 21 January 1904. It is unclear if the rents cited by the sub-NC referred both to those extracted by the absentee landowners, to which they certainly did refer, and to those drawn by the land companies.
- 114 See SNA, Vol 196, NA 346/1904, "History of Edendale" by C Hoffman, 15 February 1904, for evidence of this exceptionally high rent per household, the highest such cash rent I have been able to find.
- 115 SNA, Vol 239, NA 2572/04, folio 117, "Summary of Farms not regularly occupied or tenanted by Europeans with native population thereon"; "Return of Farms owned by Companies and Europeans and not regularly tenanted or occupied" for Heidelberg (dated 21 June 1904); and "Return of farms not regularly occupied in the Central Division", Pretoria and Hamans Kraal sub-Districts (covering letter dated 7 July 1904).
- 116 T J Keegan, *Rural Transformations in Industrializing South Africa: the Southern Highveld to 1914* (London, 1987), p 86. His chapter 3 is the most comprehensive and nuanced account of sharecropping in South African historiography.
- 117 *Ibid.*, p 66, using evidence from a 1916 government commission.
- 118 *Ibid.* Note the implications of the analysis, pp 86-95.
- 119 Marx, *Capital*, Vol 1, p 905.
- 129 Marx, *Capital*, Vol 3, p 939.
- 121 M Morris, "Social History and the Transition to Capitalism in the South African Countryside", *Africa Perspective*, December 1987, p 15.
- 122 For sharecroppers cultivating large acreages, see Keegan, *op. cit.*, pp 56, 74, and S Trapido, "Putting a Plough to the Ground: a history of tenant production on the Vereeniging Estates, 1896-1920" in W Beinart, P Delius and S Trapido (eds), *Putting a Plough to the Ground: accumulation and dispossession in rural South Africa 1850-1930* (Johannesburg, 1986), p 346; for the commercial nature of production, see Keegan, *op. cit.*, pp 67, 74, 76, and Trapido, "Putting a Plough", pp 351, 353-55; and for the sharecroppers' effective control of their enterprises, see Keegan, *op. cit.*, pp 59-60 and Trapido, "Putting a Plough", p 346.

- 123 See Trapido; "Putting a Plough", pp 350, 353-54, 357-58; see also Keegan, *op. cit.*, pp 74-75.
- 124 I allude to an aspect of the early Lenin's errors in this regard - the imputing of proletarian status to peasants - in the Preface to my thesis.
- 125 Keegan, *op. cit.*, pp 78-79. See also Trapido, "Putting a Plough", p 349, for a hint of this.
- 126 Keegan, *op. cit.*, pp 69-72. An acting governor, no less, was the complainant.
- 127 See Keegan, *op. cit.*, pp 87 ff, and T Keegan, "The Sharecropping Economy, African Class Formation and the 1913 Natives' Land Act" in S Marks and R Rathbone, *Industrialisation and Social Change in South Africa: African class formation, culture and consciousness, 1870-1930* (London and New York, 1982), pp 199-200.
- 128 See *Capital*, Vol 3, p 939.
- 129 For the "proto-capitalist" nature of this farmer, as well as the data cited in the text, see his evidence to the Transvaal Labour Commission, esp *Cd 1897*, paras 11 403-15, 11 429-32 and 11 457. At the time the evidence was given, however, the peasants, whilst cultivating hundreds of acres of land, were not grazing "a large number" of cattle. This appears to have been an effect of war-time losses. Before the war, their cattle numbered 600.
- 130 For "Athole's" impressiveness, see *TAJ*, Vol VI No 23, April 1908, pp 500-01; for the tax collection, see TAD, Private Collections, Forbes Collection, Vol 20, Diary of David Forbes, 1903 volume, entries for May 11, 12, 13 and 16. The Forbes Diary is often punctuated by references to the payment of wages. It is possible that peasants other than those residing on the farm paid their taxes during the five days referred to (although such peasants are not mentioned in the diary), for Sub-NCs, as the next chapter of my thesis reveals, frequently set up tax camps in particular localities. This may have been one of them. If it was, the very fact that it was sited on "Athole" suggests the considerable population located there.
- 131 For this information, see the TLC's interview with Hugh Hall, a farmer in the Barberton District, esp *Cd 1987*, paras 4653-5, 4681-2, 4 689-4 706, 4 711, 4 725, 4 733-4, 4 749-54. Hall's "proto-capitalism" is suggested by, *inter alia*, his consciousness of the maximum wage compatible with profitability. Cash rents were also extracted on his estate.
- 132 The contract is an enclosure of SNA, Vol 119, NA 740/1903, Stone to Sec NA (early 1903?). The context in which Stone sent this (Standerton) contract to the Secretary of Native Affairs was, as his letter makes clear, one of a general refusal of tenants to labour for landlords. He sent the contract as an example of his ideal and spoke of it as "satisfactory" "if it could be made generally applicable" (my emphasis).
- 133 For the statistics, see SNA, Vol 193, NA 138/1904, "Grand Totals. Vereeniging Estates' Tenants Census and Report - December 1903" and the "Remarks" upon this: enclosure of Marks to Lagden, 8 January 1904. For the roots of the funds which set up Vereeniging Estates, see Trapido, "Putting a Plough", pp 337-38.
- 134 *Cd 1897*, p 363, para 8 785; SNA, Vol 2212, NA 1258/04, NC Central Division Monthly Report for May 1904.
- 135 See Forbes Collection, Vol 20, Diary of David Forbes (1903 and 1904 volumes), entries as listed in the text.

- 136 SNA, Vol 45, NA 1458/02, F M Allenberg, "A Scheme for the Settlement of Natives in the Transvaal and ORC": enclosure of a document dated 21 July 1902.
- 137 And that this was generally characteristic of the pre-war Transvaal is proved by Stanley Trapido: see "Landlord and Tenant", esp pp 28-32.
- 138 I consider these throughout my thesis.
- 139 Transvaal Labour Commission. *Report of the Transvaal Labour Commission: together with minority report, minutes of proceedings and evidence* (Johannesburg, 1903), "Majority Report", p xvi, and "Minority Report", p xlv. The first estimate is from the Majority Report; the second from the Minority Report. The former needs to be treated with caution. It appears to have had a tendency to inflate the figures pertaining to the shortage of workers in order to provide statistical ammunition for Lord Milner and the mineowners who were bent upon the controversial introduction of tens of thousands of indentured workers from China. The Minority Report, however, was written by people who believed that the Chamber of Mines and its witnesses to the TLC were involved in some kind of interested manipulation of the Commission. It tended, therefore, to downplay the Transvaal "labour crisis". The relationship between Milner and the mineowners' desires, on the one hand, and the findings of the TLC, on the other, is suggestively described by Peter Richardson in *Chinese Mine Labour in the Transvaal* (London, 1982), p 22.
- 140 For the wages and the scarcity of labour in Boksburg, see *TAJ*, Vol I No 3, April 1903, p 67, and Vol II No 5, October 1903, p 76. The wages, ranging from £2.10s. per month to £5 per month, compared very favourably with those offered to mineworkers. The maximum wage compatible with production for profit was much lower than these. Farmers tended to give it as £1.10s. to £2 per month with food (see, for example, *Cd 1897*, p 201, paras 4 746-9; p 226, paras 5 404-5; and p 218, para 5 179): that wages such as these could be paid may have been one of the many indications that land-owners were not producing for profit. One administrator enjoined a correspondent of his to "remember that every 1/- above 30/- makes it impossible for a farmer to grow crops in competition with imported stuffs": Rhodes House Library (Oxford), Sir Godfrey Lagden Papers, MSS Afr s 174 (Letter-book containing MS copies of private letters from Lagden, 1901-03), copy of note from Lagden to Spender, 1 January 1903, part of a letter dated 29 (?) December 1902.
- 141 See Benjamin Kidd, "Economic Problems in SA", *The Star*, 30 January 1903, p 8. Kidd referred to "South Africa" as a whole in his article but it was to the Transvaal - where the article was published - that such a description would have been most apt.
- 142 SNA, Vol 45, NA 1458/02, Allenberg, "A Scheme ...".
- 143 G A Cohen, *Karl Mark's Theory of History: a defence* (Oxford, 1982), p 67.
- 144 See Perry Anderson, *Lineages of the Absolutist State* (London, 1974), p 403.
- 145 Marx, *Grundrisse*, p 491.
- 146 See Peter Delius and Stanley Trapido, "Inboekselings and Oorlams: the creation and transformation of a servile class" in Bozzoli (ed), *Town and Countryside*, and R Wagner, "Zoutpansberg: the dynamics of a hunting frontier, 1848-67" in A Atmore and S Marks, *Economy and Society in Pre-Industrial South Africa* (London, 1980), pp 332-33.
- 147 Trapido, "Landlord and Tenant", p 28.

- 148 The fact that contract was largely alien to both landlords and tenants can be proved without difficulty. Evidence of this is provided in chapter 2 of my thesis. See also SNA, 193, NA 221/04, "Report upon the Land Tenure & Distribution of Natives in the Transvaal". The introduction of registered contracts between landlords and tenants was, in fact, one of the novelties of British rule in the Transvaal. See Krikler, "Transvaal Agrarian Class Struggle", p 20. Subsequent research has, however, convinced me that the introduction of contract was very much less widespread than I implied and, moreover, that it was not "foisted" upon the landlords.
- 149 Trapido, "Landlord and Tenant", pp 33-34; P Delius, "Abel Erasmus: power and profit in the eastern Transvaal", pp 187, 189.
- 150 I consider the exemptions in chapter 5 of my thesis.
- 151 Trapido, "Landlord and Tenant", p 34.
- 152 SNA, Vol 47, NA 1569/02, Taberer to Sec NA, 14 August 1902.
- 153 Tim Keegan, *Facing the Storm: Portraits of Black Lives in Rural South Africa* (London, 1988), pp 9-11. This particular manifestation of the brutality of the *veldkornets* took place south of the Transvaal border in the Lindley District. Peter Delius's "Abel Erasmus" is suggestive on the role of the ZAR's veldcornets and native commissioners in ensuring a supply of black labour power to Boer land-owners and others: see esp pp 181-82, 185-88, 196, 200, 204, 206-07. At one point he notes the forcible allocation of black families to farmers.
- 154 The analysis of this paragraph is based upon chapters 1 and 2 of my thesis. Their findings have been presented in a preliminary form in my *Social History* and *Social Dynamics* articles.
- 155 SNA, Vol 169, NA 2059/03, Scholefield to Sec NA, 18 September 1903. It should also not be forgotten that the South African Constabulary appears to have paid monthly visits to farms.