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HOMELAND PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS —
A GEOGRAPHIC LOOK AT THE REALITIES

Any enterprise is built by wise planning, becomes strong through common sense and profits wonderfully by keeping abreast of the facts.

(Proverbs 24: 3-4)

Mr Chancellor, members of Council, colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, on an occasion such as this the temptation is ever present to spell out to one’s audience what one’s discipline is all about, emphasizing especially its philosophical and methodological bases. If I were to yield to this temptation we would probably end up by adding another definition of geography to the already extensive list, and this I do not wish to do. In talking to non-geographers one does, however, still very frequently encounter the notion that geography is concerned primarily with place-names, with facts and descriptions pertaining, for example, to landscape features such as rivers, deserts and mountains, and to people and the things they do to keep alive. Such an image is soon dispelled if but a cursory glance is given to recent geographic literature, such as in the following list:

Controversial views on the geography of nutrition (Blyn, 1970.)
Cities as systems within systems of cities (Berry, 1972)
The geography of recreation and leisure (Cosgrove & Jackson, 1972)
Social well-being: A spatial perspective (Knox, 1975)
Human impact on African Environmental systems (Adejuwon, 1976)
Place and placelessness (Relph, 1976)
Maps in minds: Reflection on cognitive mapping (Downs & Stea, 1977)
Changes in the structure of evaporation in the Arel Sea Basin (Minayeva & Kuznetsov, 1977)
Landforms in Africa (Buckle, 1978)
Reflections on the politics of space (Lefebvre, 1978)
The manipulation of ordinary language (Symanski, 1976)
Historic South African townscapes as cultural landscapes (Haswell, 1978)
Markovian models of movement within urban spatial structures (Burnett, 1978)

Unfortunately, the uninformed will, however, probably be overwhelmed by the diversity of topics and still be left with greater confusion in his mind as to the nature of geography and the scope of geographic activities. By giving such a list I run the risk of creating the impression that "geography is what geographers do", a viewpoint to which I do not really subscribe.

I do, however, believe that a discipline’s limits are determined by the standpoints and capabilities of its practitioners. The problems facing the world in which we live today, are of such a nature and often of such a scale,
that they “regrettably” defy the traditional limits of disciplines. A standpoint which disregards the multi-faceted nature of so many of the severe and often global problems confronting us, is doomed to failure in so far as the understanding of these problems is concerned, not even to mention their solution. Consequently I find myself in accordance, for example, with Hodder (1968, 246) when he states, with reference to development studies, that “The value of the geographer’s contribution . . . can only be demonstrated by the way in which geographers tackle development problems, and not by the way in which they stop their analysis every time it seems to go outside the legitimate field of geographical inquiry”.

On this occasion I shall refrain from entering the debate on the nature and scope of geography, but would rather prefer to focus on some problems well-known to most people in South Africa. The content of my address is based on information, facts, and impressions gathered over a period of approximately fifteen years. Though at times it may appear that I am unduly critical, it is because I believe that one should take note of the problems still to be solved rather than look at achievements of the past, even if these are laudable. The intent is by no means to minimize the progress and success already attained in particular areas, but “backslapping” does not solve problems since the impression that “all is well” is easily gained — an impression that is not conducive to problem solving.

Before proceeding, I wish to break down in brief the topic of tonight’s address. Firstly the word homeland. The term as used here refers to those areas within the boundaries of South Africa which, at least in part, have been the traditional home areas of a number of black peoples, officially known as “national units”. According to the present policy of the South African Government these homelands are destined to become independent states. Two of them, the republics of Transkei and Bophuthatswana, have in fact already attained sovereignty in 1976 and 1977 respectively. All indications are that a third, Venda, will assume independence in 1979. The future political development in this sphere of the remaining seven homelands is shrouded in a haze but if full autonomy is pursued by all, the time has surely arrived that we use the term “homelands” with caution. These areas should then be viewed as quite separate entities and only data and conditions which refer to specific homelands, and not to the homelands in general (cf. Boshoff, 1977, p. 8/9), should be cited. It is of little value, if not completely erroneous — and I am sure everybody here will agree — to compare the situation in a specific state, say the Republic of South Africa, with general conditions in Africa. Why then should the homelands, and not a particular homeland, be compared to the Republic, or for that matter, to any other state?

Secondly, a problem by definition is a doubtful or difficult question and/or something which is hard to understand (Oxford, 1976). For many years, especially in the last three decades, South Africa’s attention, and in fact the attention of the whole world, has become ever increasingly fixed on the homelands, especially from the political and socio-economic angles. This interest stems mainly from the fact that people and governments realize that the homeland concept, as well as the homelands themselves, pose difficult questions and offer things which are hard to understand, that is, the homelands present problems.

Thirdly, a solution is the answer to a problem. It is not my intent to provide answers to any of the problems facing the homelands — I do not believe that anybody has the answers. I would rather focus on attempts which have been aimed at solving problems. We should, however, bear in mind that in our dynamic world situations are changing so rapidly that solutions to problems have to keep pace with the changes. Solutions have of necessity to be modified and even substituted when they become outmoded, often the challenge of a problem does not lie so much in the solution but rather in the extent to which people who can do something about the problem are prepared to change their views, their preconceived ideas or what we so often call tradition. Perhaps it is appropriate here to quote a definition which was born on this campus: Tradition is frequently a masquerade for lack of initiative and laziness.

Fourthly, a geographic look merely refers to the particular manner in which a geographer views the objects with which he wishes to concern himself. As far as the theme of tonight’s address is concerned, this look will differ from geographer to geographer depending on such aspects as training, aims, beliefs and departure points. A Marxist geographer, for example, will differ greatly in his approach from that of a capitalist geographer, as the bases from which they start vary markedly. Tonight’s geographic look is therefore my personal one for which I alone assume responsibility.

Fifthly, the realities refer to the real nature of the homeland problems and solutions which have been proposed or which have already been implemented, perhaps only partially. In other words, I hope to throw some light on some of the problems and the “size” of the solutions that have been offered. An Israeli visitor, while travelling through the particularly problematical area in Bophuthatswana north of Pretoria, once remarked to me that “a solution must be as big as the problem”. If a solution, not only in theory but also in practice, does not measure up to the magnitude of the problem, the problem cannot be solved. Hence we must face up to the realities of a problem-situation prior to attempting solutions.

I have selected two matters relating to the homelands, which I regard as problematical, for scrutiny, albeit somewhat superficially, viz. land or territorial, consolidation and expansion and population pressure on agricultural resources. In this connection I echo the words of Prof. J.P. de Lange (1977) deputy rector of the Randse Afrikaanse Universiteit, “Akademici in Suid-Afrika moet toenemend betrokke raak by die vraagstukke wat die land knei. Dit is nie nie meer voldoende om van die kantyn af kommentaar te lewer nie,” and on another occasion, “Ek wil die oortuiging uitspreek dat akademiki die verantwoordelikhed nie mag onderskak. Die toekomst om na hul vermoë wat groot is, en na hulle kundigheid, wat wyer sterk as wat ons algem wil aanvaar, ’n daadwerklike bydrae te lewer tot die oorelawingstryd waarin ons betrokke is nie.” (De Lange, 1978).
TERRITORIAL CONSOLIDATION AND EXPANSION

Territorial consolidation with reference to the black homelands refers to attempts at and proposals for either decreasing the number of the separate units of land comprising the various homelands or unifying them. Some expansion of surface area is also implied. As the homeland policy lies central to South African politics the territorial aspect of the different potentially autonomous homelands and former homelands is automatically a controversial issue. Very strong and often opposing views on the matter are held by the various parties concerned.

Sufficient historical coverage has already been provided as to how blacks and whites took possession of land in the southern trip of the African continent, how these peoples came into contact with each other, and of the ensuing border clashes and how specific areas were eventually allotted to blacks. There is no need to repeat here in detail the historical facts and events. (See, for example, Van Blijen, 1947; Tait, 1962; Van Schoor, 1968; Du Plessis, 1971). Some salient highlights will suffice.

Various acts regulating the tenure and occupation of land by blacks in the Cape Colony, Natal, the Republic of the Orange Free State and the South African Republic were consolidated in the Bantu Land Act, No. 27 of 1913 (South Africa, 1913). The Act, which embodied the concept of territorial segregation of black and non-black, reserved so called “scheduled” areas totalling 9 190 010 ha, for exclusive occupancy by blacks (Fig. 1). The appointment of a commission which had to report on what “areas should be set apart as areas within which Bantu shall not be permitted to acquire or hire land or interests in land” (South Africa, 1913) followed. Though the Beaumont Commission tabled its report in 1916 (South Africa, 1916) the recommendations (Fig. 2) which if accepted would have effected considerable consolidation as well as an increase in size, were for various reasons shelved. Twenty years later the Bantu Trust and Land Act, no. 13 of 1936 (South Africa, 1936), based on the recommendations of the Commission, was passed and more land, i.e. “released” area, was set aside for occupancy by blacks (Fig. 3). The increase in area, viz. 6 209 858 ha was to be divided amongst the four provinces. This “quota land” was to be added as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transvaal</td>
<td>4 306 643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Province</td>
<td>1 384 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natal</td>
<td>450 536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.F.S.</td>
<td>68 523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6 209 858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In referring to the 1913 and 1936 Acts, Mr C.F. van L. Froneman (1967, 63), Deputy Chairman of the Bantu Affairs Commission, stated in 1967 that land allocations had taken place without paying adequate attention to providing in the needs of the different black peoples, in fact that impression is gained that areas to be obtained for the blacks were allocated in a
Fig. 2: Black Areas, 1916

Fig. 3: Black Areas, 1936
somewhat unplanned way as extensions to existing tribal lands, and even in isolation from tribal lands. He added that the impression was further gained that in some cases labour reservoirs for white development had deliberately been created partly accounting for the scattered pattern of small released areas in Natal and Transvaal.

As a result of the addition of released areas adjacent to the scheduled areas of 1913 some territorial consolidation did take place, albeit unintentionally. Though the 1936 Act sought the strengthening of the policy of segregation between black and white it was also an attempt to increase the size of the areas reserved for blacks. It was the solution offered for a need felt 20 odd years earlier. This poor record has been surpassed as about one million hectares (or slightly less than one fifth of the quota) land still await acquisition by the South African Bantu Trust. In fact 32 years have elapsed since this solution was offered. One of the reasons for the delay undoubtedly is the rising cost of land. In 1936 it was estimated that the purchase of the total released areas would amount to nearly R20 million; today it is estimated that the cost for the outstanding one million hectares lies between R500 - 800 million. Despite what politicians may say, the slow rate of purchases clearly shows that the acquisition of released land was, and perhaps still is, not regarded as a national priority.

When all the outstanding land has been added, the combined size of the homelands will be in the order of 16.9 million hectares or 13.8 per cent of the Republic of South Africa's total surface area. Antagonists of the present government policy quote this percentage to argue in favour of a better deal for the homelands, while protagonists point out that the homelands have 20 per cent of the country's agricultural potential - much of which is not being utilised. As noted above, the habit of using data pertaining to all the homelands at the present time is basically erroneous; the situation of each individual homeland should be considered separately if the realities of the situation are to be fully grasped.

Consolidation of black areas coupled to their increase in size was really first brought to South Africa's attention when the so-called Tomlinson Commission tabled its report in 1955. In the report it is stated that “Save for a few blocks . . . the Bantu Areas are so scattered that they form no foundation for community growth . . . the fragmentation can result in nothing else than a supplementary growth attached to the European community. The fragmentary pattern also results in scattering and consequent incoherence between historically and ethnically related Bantu, and this means that cohesive forces in the social and psychological sphere are paralysed ” (South Africa, 1956a, 180-181).

Though the Commission did not make specific proposals, broad lines for consolidation and the increase of black areas was suggested. The government's response reads: “. . . it is unrealistic to indicate at present vague boundaries on maps which involve further European land the acquisition of which cannot possibly now be considered . . . this is not a practical issue” (South Africa, 1956b).

With the promulgation of the Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act, No. 46 of 1959 (South Africa, 1959) the South African Government recognised eight national units thereby changing the concept of black areas to one of black homelands. Acknowledging this, Froneman (1967) stated that a fragmentary national soil does not provide an effective national homeland and consequently the Government has given high priority to consolidation of the territories. More important is his statement about antiquated legislation which does not always fit in with our conception of the development of separate peoples.

The Hon. A.H. Vosloo (1967), Deputy Minister of Bantu Development, on the same occasion in 1967 declared that the government viewed the consolidation of isolated Bantu areas into larger entities as a matter of the widest political significance. It included and implied the establishment of a homeland for every black people in the Republic, a homeland with a cultural, social, political and - of cardinal importance — economic viability.

However both Froneman and Vosloo, despite recognising the desirability for consolidation of the various homelands into single territories, claimed that it was not a prerequisite for carrying out the policy of separate development, and also stated that for practical and other reasons completely consolidated homelands were not possible at the time. Though frequently challenged (e.g. Coetzee, 1975), this attitude still prevails, as is evident from both the 1973 (Fig. 4) and 1975 (Fig. 5) "final" consolidation proposals of the South African Government.

The 1975 proposals succeeded in reducing the roughly 100 separate units into 24 black areas but, seen in terms of separate homelands, into 35 land blocks (Table 1), six of the homelands comprising more than one single unit.

**TABLE 1: BLACK HOMELANDS: NUMBER OF LAND UNITS BEFORE AND AFTER CONSOLIDATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black homelands</th>
<th>No. of units before</th>
<th>No. of units after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1975)*</td>
<td>consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaZulu</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bophuthatswana</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebowa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazankulu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transkei</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venda</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciskei</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KaNgwane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owaqwa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ndebele</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excluding "black spots"
Subsequently Bophuthatswana, prior to accepting independence, negotiated with the South African Government and today that country is comprised of seven units. The pending independence of Venda may also bring some minor changes. The implementation of the “final” proposals will be an immense task bringing about the excision from black areas more than one million hectares, and from white area more than 1.7 million hectares. Probably about half a million blacks will have to be resettled in the process.

The solution provided by the South African Government for the problem of consolidating and enlarging the various homelands is characterised *inter alia* by the following: mass removal of people, large areas to be excised from both black homelands and white area, only four out of ten homelands comprising single units, 35% individual land blocks ranging in size from a mere 80 ha (KwaZulu) to 40 000 ha (Transkei). In fact, 20 blocks comprise only 12 per cent of the combined homelands’ area (Table 2) — a decrease of South Africa’s surface area of 13.8 per cent but a corresponding increase in international boundary length of 114.9 per cent (Hattingh, 1977); boundaries which are often ill-defined because they do not coincide with natural features; and the prospect that the execution of the proposed consolidation will take many years to complete.

**TABLE 2: BLACK HOMELANDS: SIZE RANGE OF LAND UNITS (1975 CONSOLIDATION PROPOSALS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size range of land units</th>
<th>Combined % of combined</th>
<th>No of units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total homelands’ area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 800</td>
<td>4 730</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 030 - 2 950</td>
<td>15 640</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 000 - 7 600</td>
<td>41 900</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 000 - 12 890</td>
<td>50 280</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 000 - 40 400</td>
<td>56 400</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>168 850</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on Hattingh (1977)*

Homelands. An exchange of land to bring about a greater degree of consolidation is however possible once a homeland has received independence and wishes to negotiate the matter with the Republic’s government.

Objections against the government proposals which are recurrently heard arise *inter alia* from some of their inherent features mentioned above, and claims that they do not enlarge the homelands, that insufficient attention has been given to population pressure and historical reasons, that economic viability is questionable, that the 13.8 per cent portion of the country reserved for blacks is “unfair”, that the administration and development of fragmented territories are well-nigh impossible, that extremely high costs are involved and that the intention of the 1936 legislation did not aim at providing a territorial basis for independent states (cf. Coetzee, 1978). Obviously those people who reject the homeland policy automatically reject the proposals as well.

Personally I am of the opinion that three of the objections raised above are valid, i.e., and I stress the point, if the “final” consolidation proposals are to form the basis of independent states. Firstly, the intention of the Bantu Trust and Land Act of 1936 was not for one moment that the released areas together with the scheduled areas of 1913 to which they were added, were to be the territorial components of a number of fully-fledged states. In 1936 the concepts of homelands and national units were non-existent. To consider that Owaqwa, a mere 62 000 ha in extent, is to be the home of an independent South Sotho people is inconceivable. The second point is that of economic viability, at least with reference to some of the homelands. Much has and can be said on this topic, but whatever the definition that is preferred, it is only fair to assume that the home territory should be capable of providing, at least to the majority of the people, a level of livelihood that is acceptable to them. Thirdly, the question of developing a fragmented territory. How can a government devise a national development plan and hope for an integrated economy if the territory consists of up to 10 land units separated by a foreign country?

Apparantly a homeland in such a predicament does have a choice. Either (1) it decides not to develop outlying units, then to accept independence, there-after to negotiate for land to be exchanged for the undeveloped units, and if successful, to commence developing the country on integrated economic lines; or (2) it decides that such a unit shall always remain an economic backwater; or (3) it is developed, primarily not as part of the homeland, but as part of the foreign country’s economy. A case in point: Will Thaba’Nchu ever become part of the other more closely linked units of Bophuthatswana?

Non-governmental proposals for consolidation in response to the official ones, have almost without exception aimed at creating single unit territories, but here similarities tend to end. They have varied from one incorporating massive land claims for a particular homeland, for example,
that for Bophuthatswana proposed by that country's government when still a self-governing territory; another wishes to effect a regrouping into larger blocks of land, for example that proposed by the South African Bureau of Racial Affairs (Boshoff, 1977) into which the BLS countries (Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland) are incorporated; and another (Blencik & Van der Ropp, 1977) divides the country into a northern portion for blacks, and a southern one for coloureds, Indians and whites. These counter-proposals are in turn open to criticism as some are, for example, based on erroneous assumptions. A discussion of them however falls beyond the scope of this address.

**POPULATION PRESSURE ON AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**

Many people regard the rapid increase in population as the world's major problem. In the time (c. 40 minutes) it takes to read this address South Africa's population (including Transkei and Bophuthatswana) would have increased by about 48 people, ostensibly not much, but taken over a year this means 650 000 additional people to cater for. This is a problem, a rather contentious one when, for example, mention is made of population control. Though much is apparently done to tackle this question, especially by health authorities, the attempts are not widely publicized. I do not wish to concern myself here with the curtailment of the rate of growth, but rather with the pressure of population on agricultural resources, not on the national scale, but as exemplified in a particular small area, viz. the Modjadj Location, which I have had the opportunity to research (Hattingh, 1974), and with the official package solution to the mounting pressure. It is fully realized that a case study may be so selected as to give a distorted picture. I believe however that the situation in the Modjadj Location, even if somewhat extreme, is largely indicative of many situations in rural homeland environments.

The location, 17 878 ha in size, lies in the foothills of the Transvaal Drakensberg to the north-east of Duiwelskloof (Fig. 6). It is characterized by a mountain/valley landscape resulting in two-thirds of the location being too steep (i.e. slope >12°) for modern cultivation techniques (Photo 1). The people of Modjadj, the Rain-queen, who have inhabited the Location for about 400 years, at present number probably between 35 000 and 40 000, increasing at approximately 2.7 per cent per annum, and have tended to remain very traditional (Photo 2). The average population density is more than likely close on 200 people/km², making it one of the most densely peopled areas in South Africa.

In places the density rises to well above 500 people/km². An estimated 21 per cent of the de jure male population and 2 per cent of the females were absent on a temporary basis in the early 1970's, primarily as migrant workers in white rural and urban areas. An average hut group (Photo 3) or family consisted at that time of 8,11 persons (de facto) who husbanded a total of 2,2 large livestock units, cultivated 1.9 ha of land and reaped about 3,1 bags of grain, groundnuts and beans per annum. A typical subsistence agricultural situation prevailed, but what is alarming and frightening is the 30 per cent decrease in production that had taken place over 30 odd years.
Photo 1
A typical scene in the Modjadji Location

Photo 2
A woman in traditional dress

Photo 3
A typical hut group

Photo 4
Women preparing a field for planting

In terms of the Tomlinson Commission's (South Africa, 1956) calculation that the average homeland black needs 2.5 bags of grain per year, the people of the Modjadji Location reaped a mere 12 per cent of their grain needs, i.e. 8,400 bags, whereas 72,000 bags were required. This shortfall engulfed about 50 to 70 per cent of a hut group's annual income, implying that very little if any money could be utilised in improving farming conditions. Provisions of foodstuffs from local sources will, under prevailing conditions not increase. "... and local agriculture, relative to the rapidly expanding population, will contribute to a decreasing extent in the needs of the people. Inhabitants are consequently compelled to depend to an ever-increasing degree on monetary assistance from beyond the location borders to supplement their own earnings" (Hattingh, 1975a, 62). To these people their future has become dependent on the white area. Consequently, though they live in rural surroundings and practice subsistence (or below subsistence) agriculture (Photo 4, 5 and 6) they "are becoming less soil-bound, no longer, consciously or unconsciously, regarding their local resource base as essential to survival" (64). Mounting pressure on the agricultural resource base has probably led to the stage, as Holleman et al (1964, 183) put it, "... that even bare subsistence needs are more easily bought with wage-derived cash than produced by soil ...".

The development of a situation such as in the Modjadji Location and in all the homelands may be explained in terms of a model (Fig. 7). To alleviate the mounting pressure on the resources of an agricultural area people have three alternatives. In the case under consideration over many years and through a continuous process, some decided to remain while others (mostly men) migrated either on a permanent or temporary basis. Any large-scale migration has in recent years for a variety of reasons become impossible. Rising numbers of people have increased the pressure (Photo 7) and because the process is a continuous one, the stage has been reached where basically all the people remain in their home area. Unless activities centered on making a living are intensified, devastation is inevitable.

To counterbalance such impending devastation of the agricultural base (Photo 8), which of necessity means rising pressure elsewhere in the homelands and the white area, the Department of Plural Relations and Development (formerly the Department of Bantu Administration and Development) has drawn up and implemented rehabilitation plans in many areas. The first plan for the Modjadji Location dates back to 1958, but after being rejected by the local inhabitants it was superseded by another in 1966. It is this latter plan, offered as a solution to the poor agricultural situation, which will be evaluated.

The plan divided the location into seven wards, each subdivided into four grazing camps, an area for cultivation and a residential area (Fig. 8). Detailed recommendations for field and animal husbandry, resettlement of people, and water provision were made. Because of the dispersed nature of traditional settlement in the location the plan implied that 2,000 of the 3,220 families (= 13,400 people) in 1966 would have to be resettled at a cost...
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Fig. 7
A settlement/migration model

Photo 7
A rapid population increase is evident

Photo 8
Destruction of the agricultural base
of R40 000. Eight years later, i.e. in 1974, the resettlement programme had not yet been launched while the family units to be resettled had risen to 3,600, and costs had soared to R80 000. The plan had not taken account of the rising population numbers and further, the postponement of implementation had resulted in uncertainty among the people who in turn began neglecting the agricultural activities.

Right from the start the plan did not make provision for about 2,600 people (= 484 families) as residential plots were not allocated to them. By 1974 the surplus population had probably increased to 14,200. The nearby town of Ga-Kgapane which was to absorb the surplus, had only 4,000 people of all ethnic groups in 1974.

As for agricultural planning, the concept of the economic unit (Tomlinson Commission) formed the basis. In the Modjadji Location such a unit according to calculations of the Planning Committee comprised 5.1 ha of plough-land and 13 large livestock units. Because only 13 per cent of the families in 1986 would be accommodated on this basis, the plan allotted one-fifth economic units, i.e. 2 large stock units, and 1.3 ha of plough-land per family. The plan in fact offered no immediate advantage to the people, barring perhaps further deterioration of the soil. Further stagnation of agricultural activities must of necessity follow, making the location even more dependent on migrant earnings.

More criticism can be levelled at the rehabilitation plan, but the above will suffice in showing that the solution offered for the pressure of population on the agricultural base, is found lacking.

**CONCLUSION**

In this address I have looked at two homeland problems — the one at the national scale, viz. territorial consolidation, the other local, viz. population pressure on the agricultural resources of the Modjadji Location — and the official solutions that have been provided. To my way of thinking both prove to be wanting. The solutions are just not as big as the problems, and I would venture to suggest, because of one or more of the following reasons: inadequate, if any, research; a lack of knowledge of the realities of the situation and consequently insufficient appreciation for the problems; an emphasis on policy rather than people; the bureaucratic and rigid approach; and an absence of alternatives.

Many other problems relating to the homelands exist. Some of these may well fall into the scope of a single discipline, for example geography, but others call for multi- and/or interdisciplinary research. Here one may call to mind the problems associated with urbanization, squatting, land tenure, industrialization, transport, community development, political, social and economic relationships between the interlinked and interdependent states and homelands of South and Southern Africa; the blacks outside the homelands as was, for example, dealt with recently in the inaugural address of Prof. Mapena (1978); the positive or negative effects of economic progress in South Africa on the homelands; homeland viability; and development aid.
I have knowingly and specifically not tried to provide solutions but wish to make a plea that decision-makers, so often politicians, should base their solutions, which frequently affect the lives of large numbers of people, on sound objective research and to re-examine the bases of the decisions; and to avoid, as far as possible, *ad hoc* or crisis decisions for political motives. At this point I wish to express my surprise and disappointment that a black university like the University of the North has not really been called upon and entrusted to do research on those homelands which fall within its sphere of influence.

It is only "when those most affected by a problem assume the primary responsibility for solving it" (that) they gain the understanding and skill to deal with the broader political and economic issues of their society" (Stokes, 1978, 5). I believe that after being in existence for close on 20 years the university's black and white staff and students should be capable of doing much of the research affecting blacks and homelands which several of the white universities are now officially charged with. Obviously the challenge will first have to be accepted and then carried out successfully in true academic fashion.

It is towards the goal of identifying geographical and related problems such as the two examples discussed tonight, pertaining primarily but not exclusively, to blacks and the homelands with their development problems, of facing the realities of situations squarely and fearlessly, and of seeking solutions, that I hope to direct the Department of Geography's research and training programme.

Mr Chancellor, It is my pleasure and privilege to accept the Chair of Geography at the University of the North.

**FOOTNOTES:**

1. Translation: Academics in South Africa should become more involved in the problems facing the country. Comments from the sideline no longer suffice.

2. Translation: I am convinced that academics with their great capabilities and expertise, which extend further than is often accepted, should not shun their responsibilities and contribute actively to our struggle for survival.

3. Because the former homelands of Transkei and Bophuthatswana are such integral parts of the whole problem of consolidation, they are here still regarded as part of the Republic of South Africa.

4. For more detail see South Africa (1956a) and Horrell (1973).

5. "'n Geïntegreerde volksbodem, bied nie 'n doeltreffende volkstuisland nie en gevolglik het die regering hoë prioriteit gegee aan konsolidasie van die gebiede, hoewel die taak bemoeflik is deurdat die losliggende gebiede gekonsolideer moet wees binne die raamwerk van ietwat verouderde wetgewing wat nie altyd aanpas by ons opvatting van die ontwikkeling van afsonderlike volke nie, maar waarvan die ontstaan veel eerder daarop gerig was om slegs segregasie tussen Blank en Nie-Blank te bewerkstellig" (Froneman, 1967, 65).

6. "Die regering beskou die konsolidasie van losliggende Bantoegebiede in groter gehele, in die wydste staatkundige betekenis. Konsolidasie behels vir ons dus veel meer as die bestaan van 'n paar groter geografiese gebiede. Dit omsluit en dit impliseer vir ons die totstandkoming van so 'n grotere Bantoegebied, of tuisland, vir elke Bantoevolk in die Republiek, 'n tuisland met 'n kultureel-maatskaplike, 'n politieke en van kardinale belang met 'n ekonomiese lewenskrachtigheid" (Vosloo, 1967, 4).

7. Bophuthatswana taken as six blocks, though it now consists of seven.

8. It has recently been reported (Die Transvaler, 1977) that some quota land in the Northern Cape, now part of Bophuthatswana, will be exchanged for land near Thaba'Nchu.
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