

https://dspace.org/

The 1907 strike: A reassessment

Shear, Keith

1994-08-22
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/9864

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND
INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED SOCIAL RESEARCH

Seminar Paper
to be presented in RW 7003 SEMINAR ROOM
AT 4.00pm 22nd AUGUST 1994

Title: **The 1907 Strike: A Reassessment.**

by: **Keith Shear**

No **363**

The 1907 Strike: A Reassessment.

Keith Shear
Northwestern University

The 1907 white miners' strike on the Witwatersrand has often been used to illustrate significant trends and changes in the political economy of early twentieth-century South Africa. The principal themes are well-known. First, the maintenance of production during the strike by African and Chinese workers demonstrated that some of the skills of immigrant white miners could be dispensed with, marking the beginning of a long struggle to remove white underground workers from productive to mainly supervisory roles.[1] Second, a significant number of Afrikaners, introduced as strike-breakers, entered the mining industry for the first time.[2] This provided one element in a convergence of interests between the industry and the new Het Volk government, which, anxious to assist the Afrikaner unemployed who constituted both a social threat and a section of its electoral support, requested Imperial troops in support of its 'right to work' policy during the strike.[3] This indication of good faith in helping mining capital to reduce working costs through an attack on white labour was also a signal to potential foreign investors and lenders that the Transvaal was 'safe for capital'; its government had accepted the idea that in fostering the industry it was promoting the state's major source of revenue and financial security, a goal to which any competing social concern would henceforth be subordinated.[4]

Despite being used to illuminate such important issues, no detailed account of the 1907 strike has been published, while the few books and articles that offer more than a bare outline of the chief events before commenting on their significance are not always accurate.[5] From this first major conflict between capital and organized labour on the Rand a good deal more can be learned than the bald summary of its outcome conventionally rendered in statistics demonstrating reductions in working costs or an increase in the percentage of locally-born whites employed. Such figures, while doubtless important, contribute little towards an understanding of how these results were achieved, and can be misleading if used to support far tidier metanarratives about relations between state and capital than a detailed discussion of the progress and resolution of the conflict would suggest. The purpose of this paper is to offer a careful reconstruction of the strike that will situate the course of events in the context of the production imperatives of the mining industry; that will shed light on the coercive capacity of the post-reconstruction state; that will illuminate the texture of white workers' experience; that will permit a reading of the significance of the strike against the background of the political history of the period; and that will above all convey something of the magnitude of a conflict that has tended to be diminished by being seen as the first and smallest of a series of increasingly menacing challenges by white labour to the power of state and capital in early twentieth-century South Africa.

When, towards the end of April 1907, the management of Knights Deep, a mine near Germiston on the East Rand controlled by the Gold Fields group, announced that from 1 May white stopers would have to operate three machine drills instead of two, it was not the first occasion that miners on the Rand had been invited to assume this additional responsibility.[6] For nearly a year, the companies under Wernher, Beit & Co., the leading group, had urged the miners to accept the three-machine system. In April 1906, Ross E. Browne, an American mining engineer, had submitted a report to Wernher, Beit & Co. in which he deprecated the level of efficiency of labour on the Witwatersrand. Such inefficiency, he maintained, presented the principal obstacle to the reduction in working costs needed to alleviate the sustained profitability crisis in the industry; under "the most favourable conditions," the "average efficiency of the white labour, especially in directing the coloured labour, and

of the coloured labour itself, [would] undergo radical improvement." These conditions would not be attained by piecemeal and half-hearted measures, but necessitated "concert of action by the representatives of the industry."[7]

Lionel Phillips, the senior local representative of Wernher, Beit & Co., looked forward to the time when capital would "be able to push the work in the way it ought to be pushed, without bothering... much about the effect from a political point of view."[8] For with elections pending early in 1907, the mineowners had been circumspect about implementing any such scheme immediately. In October 1906, when stopers at the Crown Deep received notice that they would have to supervise more machines, they threatened to strike and the Manager promptly retracted the order.[9] At other mines, however, the transition to three-drill supervision had not been challenged to the same extent, although on the eve of the strike it was reported that in each case the miners had displayed resentment before the situation had been smoothed over.[10] While awaiting the outcome of the election, industry officials, although taking no direct action, were tireless in "pressing the working cost and efficiency question."[11] Phillips and his colleague Schumacher toured their mines, addressing the white workers "face to face (no reporters) in an informal way," to remind them of their "special duty, responsibility, and dignity" as white men. The refractory workers at the Crown Deep were told "that it was for their own special benefit to run three machines."[12] At the time of the strike, the South African Mines, Commerce and Industries, the industry's mouthpiece, was to insist that the lesson of the conflict was that the white miner was "beginning to fail"; only "higher efficiency" and an "energetic sense of responsibility" would qualify him "to fill the place in the economy of the Colony designed for him." This place, according to the journal, was that of a "highly skilled overseer of labour," requiring the adoption of "the necessary point of view."[13]

A further objective of the mineowners in the months preceding the election was to ensure that sufficient reserves of ore were developed to maintain the recovery process should a protracted struggle materialize. For while imported skilled miners might be dispensed with in stoping, this could not so easily be done in development work; managers and engineers readily exempted miners who specialized in development work from the general charge of inefficiency.[14] In addition to its greater skill content, this work was more dangerous to workers' health, and some miners avoided it where possible. The rapid increase in the number of machine drills in use after the South African War had added greatly to the incidence of miners' phthisis. Silas Crowle, giving evidence to the Mining Industry Commission, announced his intention to abandon developing, as it was "suicide without a doubt to be developing in those mines."[15] Clearly an appeal to strike on grounds of health would be sympathetically considered by these workers, who alone among the white rock-drillers retained the capacity seriously to hinder production, if only over a lengthy period. On many mines, then, a large quantity of ore in excess of that stoped was blocked out in the months preceding the strike.[16] This was also consistent with the Randlords' policy--given a marked shortage of new capital--of curtailing work on non-producing mines and concentrating resources on the working mines to maximize output.[17]

The policy of expansion on producing mines provided the context for a further innovation that could influence the outcome of a strike: the establishment of learners' schools underground.[18] The idea was to broaden the local labour market, and thereby trim wages and reduce the notoriously high turnover rate of white rock-drillers. Although their easy hiring and firing practices had much to do with it, industry officials had decided that the chief cause of this turnover was a scarcity of adequately trained white miners. They believed that a larger supply would put a premium on

underground employment, impose greater discipline on the work-force, and eliminate the so-called "'slacker' or 'waster' class" of worker. At the suggestion of Lord Selborne, the High Commissioner, Phillips considered bringing in more British miners and their families, but this he soon rejected as politically inexpedient. Not surprisingly, therefore, the mineowners turned to the "surplus Boer population." The learners' schools, they hoped, would produce "efficient rock drillers" who, unlike the "jealous" immigrants, would be prepared to train their compatriots. In time, Phillips anticipated optimistically, a new group of workers would be formed who would not only be less likely to join unions or strike, but whose dependence on the industry would encourage circumspection in a future Het Volk government potentially contemplating measures hostile to the industry. In the meantime, many of the learners were bound to the mines for up to three years by contracts that rendered them sufficiently vulnerable to ensure that they would remain at their posts during a strike.[19]

By May 1907, then, the mineowners had for some while been implementing a strategy of production that both increased the likelihood of a confrontation with the white miners, and was consistent with preparations for dealing with one. The argument is not that the mineowners conspired to force the strike. Structural pressures on the industry over a longer period were more relevant than the short-term calculations of individual capitalists. Certainly, the evidence confirms that magnates from at least three of the groups debated the merits of "a stand-up fight" with the white workers. They concluded, however, that "to carry through any drastic measures [they would] require the active support of the Government." And of this support they were not yet sufficiently confident, despite "private assurances of co-operation." Against the risks of "drastic measures" they juxtaposed "the policy of gradually weeding out inefficient men and if possible carrying on the work" with fewer whites "without creating unnecessary difficulties or disturbances." This was a policy that L.J. Reyersbach, the President of the Chamber of Mines, wanted to see "pushed ahead." It was a false distinction, for the cumulative pressures of the gradual approach were always likely, now that electoral considerations had been removed, to cause a localized dispute to flare into a full-grown conflict over an issue of general principle. If this happened, Phillips argued with reference to the Knights Deep dispute, "the time [was] not unfavourable," and the mineowners would ensure that work would be resumed under "<u>quite</u> different conditions."[20]

Capital's bare fist was thus not slow in emerging after the election. In March, Reyersbach stated publicly that during 1906 white workers' wages had risen while their productivity had declined, a state of affairs that could not be allowed to continue. He acknowledged that the high cost of living on the Rand necessitated high wages, but maintained that the mines would insist on "obtaining efficient work" in return.[21] Elaborating later, he contended that there were three possible solutions: more work could be done by the same number of men, or the same amount by fewer, with no reduction in wages; or "the eventual alternative must be an actual reduction in the wages paid." He, at least, was satisfied that the action of the workers at Knights Deep proved that the last of these was the only feasible route to lowering working costs, thus bringing declining yields within the pay limit, increasing profitability, and attracting fresh capital from abroad.[22]

As we have seen, the miners, while evidently dissatisfied at having to take on three machine drills, nonetheless generally had done so after arriving at an accommodation with management. But at Knights Deep there was to be no compromise. Indeed, the Manager went out of his way to inflame the dispute. Even Reyersbach conceded that he could not approve of "the actual handling of the beginning of the thing" by the Manager.[23] Competing

accounts circulated of the order in which the events that precipitated the conflict occurred. All sources agreed that the stopers at Knights Deep were notified that they were to supervise three machines, and that the price per fathom would be cut from 70s. to 60s. The differences concerned the timing of the introduction of these changes. One version asserted that they were announced simultaneously, apologists for the new conditions adding disingenuously that the extra machine was allocated to enable the miners to break sufficient rock to recover or even exceed the reduction in pay.[24] Another version suggested that the order to operate three drills preceded the notice of the new rates, which then "intensified the situation."[25] This would appear to be more consistent with the conduct of the Manager in the dispute.

The instruction to supervise three machines angered the workers, and a number vowed to defy it. M. Trewick, the General Secretary of the Transvaal Miners' Association (TMA), had come out from Johannesburg to discuss the issue with the miners. A meeting of the local branch of the union on Sunday 28 April had been poorly attended, however, resulting only in a condemnation of the three-machine system. A decision to strike would not lightly be taken by the miners, many of whom feared being replaced in the current depression. Still hoping that a compromise could be reached, a meeting at the shaft the following Tuesday morning resolved to appoint a deputation to see the Manager, who peremptorily refused to consider the men's objections, adding that it would be pointless for them to appeal over his head to the directors as he "had plenipotentiary powers to deal with the matter." It was at this point, according to the second version, that the proposed reduction in pay was communicated to the workers, who did not have long to wait to experience the Manager's "powers," it being soon thereafter reported that two members of the deputation had been dismissed.

A strike now seemed increasingly likely, and already miners were saying that two further properties controlled by the Gold Fields group would be implicated in the dispute: the Simmer and Jack East, under joint management with Knights Deep; and the Robinson Deep, where an altercation over contract prices was in progress. A notice was circulating warning miners that a strike was pending at Knights Deep. The final decision, however, was not taken until early the following morning, 1 May, at a meeting at the shaft of the day and night shifts. But even at this gathering the miners hesitated, opting to appeal one last time to the Manager, who spurned their overtures, stating that they should accept the new conditions or "leave their work." Only at this point, and after a further meeting, did the men resolve to strike, the day shift then returning to their quarters.[26]

From the first there were intimations of the formidable conflict to come. The Manager took "energetic measures" to ensure that production continued. He immediately found five men to go down the mine in place of the morning shift. The miners did not intervene, but when they learned later that further replacements were being brought out from Johannesburg for the afternoon shift a number of workers collected to await their arrival. When the replacements appeared, the miners attempted to persuade them not to act as strike-breakers. One of the recruits then displayed a revolver and a scuffle ensued in which the man was knocked down. A police patrol arrived soon after and dispersed the crowd. Four policemen were posted on the mine overnight, but this did not dissuade some 60 or 70 strikers from turning out at 6.30 the next morning on picket duty. The Manager ordered the men off the property, telling them they had been dismissed. The miners refused and, after a sharp exchange of words with a prominent TMA member, the Manager apparently drew a revolver, pocketing it again when challenged to use his fists instead. The constables eventually broke up the fight, the property was cleared, and thirty mounted police were called in to prevent further incidents.

That afternoon six men went down the mine and an additional fourteen arrived to replace the strikers. The Manager conceded that the strike had caused some inconvenience, but added: "... in a few days... with police protection we hope to replace all the strikers, and the trouble will fizzle out."[27]

The Manager was not incorrect in assuming that the police would provide protection; the next day, 3 May, twelve constables and two sergeants from Johannesburg were seconded to the Germiston division of the Transvaal Town Police.[28] He was to be quite wrong, however, in his estimation of the duration of the conflict. This miscalculation can be ascribed to the almost universal refusal of industry officials to acknowledge that the white miners had legitimate grievances. Few images were more readily adduced to support the charge of inefficiency than that of the extravagantly paid, indolent supervisor who sat on his box smoking a pipe while the African or Chinese workers under him did all the hard work. Indeed, so assiduously was this image propagated in the press that one of the strike-breakers, under the impression that it was his prerogative, sat down to watch the workers in his charge and was instantly dismissed by the mine captain.[29] The President of the Chamber argued that the miners' reasons for striking would be shown to be "rather sentimental than real." And few mineowners could resist the observation that, in the words of one, the strike was "an artificial one put up by half-a-dozen agitators."[30] The Governor, too, expressed incomprehension, stating that the "strangest feature" of the strike, one "never yet... manifested in the industrial world," was that "none" of the strikers was earning less than £20 a month while some were paid up to £200.[31]

With such pervasively disseminated views to oppose, the miners lost little time in formulating their own arguments, most of which had been clearly articulated by 6 May, when the strike first spread beyond Knights Deep. While it is true that miners on the contract system could earn good wages, many, after the cost of 'unskilled' labour and stores had been deducted from their pay, came out with very little, or even in debt.[32] The question of wages was inseparable from the even more pressing issue of health. One investigation into the causes of death of Cornish miners had already ascertained that Cornishmen who had operated rock drills in the Transvaal died at the average age of 36.4 years, having worked an average of 4.7 years at the rock face.[33] Three drills meant greater exposure to the lethal dust responsible for miners' phthisis. On the first day of the strike the workers circulated a handbill emphasizing precisely this danger: "The Life of a Miner on two Machines is from five to seven years. If he takes three Machines it will be from three to five years..."[34] Figures such as these understandably led the miners to the conclusion that they were entitled to high wages. "We don't live very long," said one, "and I don't think we are overpaid. We are practically giving our lives under present conditions."[35] When, on Saturday 4 May, a deputation from the Knights Deep miners met the Minister of Mines, Jacob de Villiers, they placed health concerns at the head of their list of grievances. The Minister was asked to amend the mining regulations to specify that one miner could not control more than two machines.

Other arguments and demands put forward at this meeting would also frequently be reiterated in the coming months. First, if no restriction was placed on the number of machines or hand-drillers that a white miner had to oversee, the work would effectively pass into the hands of his African and Chinese counterparts, resulting in a decrease both in wages and in the number of whites employed. This was an argument repeatedly resorted to by the miners at their public meetings and at subsequent interviews with a government that was thought to be sympathetic towards a white labour policy in the mining industry. And the white community on the Rand, experiencing the ravages of depression, could be expected to identify with the miners' claim

that the magnates' machinations undermined efforts to create conditions that permitted the workers to feel sufficiently secure to settle permanently in the Transvaal. Thus, one of the Knights Deep strikers was to declare at a public meeting that the miners were "fighting the battle of white civilisation in South Africa."

The miners also told de Villiers that the additional responsibilities expected of the white miners would render strict observation of the regulations impossible, particularly those pertaining to the handling of explosives. The deputation wished to see an end to the insufficiently regulated system of issuing blasting certificates, and requested stricter enforcement of the existing blasting regulations by the Mines Department. Finally, the miners asked for arbitration machinery with the power to settle disputes. In his response, de Villiers was non-committal. The government, he said, "intended to see that justice was done to all sections and classes of the community." He sympathized with the men's desire for healthier working conditions, stating that a Commission was about to consider such matters, and that this would be the appropriate venue to argue their case.[36]

Such advice was unlikely to appease the miners confronted with a lock-out at Knights Deep. In the event, the final report of the Mining Regulations Commission was published only in 1910, while the contemporaneously appointed Mining Industry Commission, whose recommendations were ignored by the government, did not report until March 1908. Meanwhile, the mineowners were displaying few indications that they intended shelving their plans for reorganizing underground work until these Commissions had completed their work. The next evening, 5 May, rock-drillers on contract at the Simmer and Jack East met the Manager to secure an assurance that he would not introduce the three-machine system at the mine, but, despite the workers' offer to accept a reduction in pay if the question were dropped, the Manager refused to discuss the matter. A meeting of the miners then resolved to strike in sympathy with the men at Knights Deep, although only after a protracted discussion which revealed a reluctance to strike among the men on day's pay, the "sixteen and eights," many of whom were married and had few savings.[37] Indeed, a concert had been held in Germiston the evening before to raise money to assist the married miners of Knights Deep and their families. But all miners were liable to suffer hardship if unemployed for even a short time. One TMA official later estimated that half the miners (younger, single men prominent among them) required assistance from the union within the first two weeks of having struck work.[38]

Most traumatic of all was the threat that the mines would use the 24 hours' notice clauses in the workers' contracts to evict them from their rooms and houses. With so many dependent on mine accommodation, this threat was always a powerful deterrent to strike action. As William Hallimond, Manager of the Crown Deep, put it, the clause was "meant for the class of man who misbehaves himself." Thus, when the miners at the Simmer and Jack East joined the strike on Monday 6 May, they were ordered to vacate their rooms at once; several who boarded up their houses were ousted by the police. Similar orders were ruthlessly enforced at one mine after another in the following weeks as managers sought to corrode the miners' morale. In some instances, workers' furniture and belongings were dumped outside their rooms as they searched frantically for alternative quarters.[39]

The rumble of wagons transporting furniture through the streets of Germiston thus became a familiar sound to the town's residents as the strike spread to other mines on the East Rand.[40] By Wednesday 8 May over 1,000 miners in this area alone had downed tools. The previous day had seen the strike extend both to the Robinson Deep on the central Rand and to mines other than those controlled by Consolidated Gold Fields. By Saturday 11 May

1,400 workers from ten mines had joined the strike.[41] At this stage, the miners were reasonably confident of success. Committees at each mine organized strong pickets, strikers' meetings were held twice a day, and although the bars in Germiston and Boksburg were doing a brisk business, there was very little drunkenness. Groups of strikers visited the mines where the three-drill system was in operation to persuade fellow workers to join their ranks.[42]

The rapid spread of the dispute was causing considerable anxiety in a number of circles, and during the second week more than one attempt was made by third parties to end it. On 8 May, clergymen from the Germiston area met miners' delegates and promised their assistance. Local tradespeople, already squeezed by the depression, feared a protracted withdrawal of the miners' purchasing capacity. They could also be a vehicle of capital's pressure on the miners; during the strike, at least one tradesman received an instruction from his backers to stop all credit on mines where workers had struck. Lost custom and reduced turnover appeared inevitable, and on 9 May a deputation from the Germiston Chamber of Commerce appealed to the President of the Chamber of Mines to use his influence to end the dispute. Reyersbach refused, stating that his Chamber had no mandate to intervene in a matter affecting individual employers and their workers, thus prefiguring his remarkable assertion a week later that the Chamber was "not in any sense an association of employers." Unofficially, the Germiston Chamber was told that the mineowners intended "to bring the men to their knees."[43]

The Acting Commissioner of Police, Lieutenant-Colonel C.R.M. O'Brien, had also followed developments closely. Now 47, he had joined the Transvaal Town Police at its inception in May 1901. Having spent many years in the army, including a period in India, he had been President of the Military Tribunal during the South African War, and had forgone the possibility of commanding his regiment in the hope that he would eventually become Commissioner of Police. Acting Commissioner since the beginning of 1907, and serving a government determined to effect swingeing retrenchments in the civil service as a whole, and to streamline the Colony's elaborate policing arrangements in particular, it is possible that he saw in the strike his last opportunity to stake a claim to the most senior position.[44]

The spread of the dispute had very quickly overextended the Town Police. By 7 May, 65 constables and non-commissioned officers, nearly half of them mounted, had been assigned to strike duty on the mines, and no more, in O'Brien's opinion, could "be spared with any safety" from normal duties. The day before, he had discussed the situation with de Villiers, who had authorized him if necessary to call on the South African Constabulary (SAC). Now, with more mines joining the strike, he requested Colonel Curtis, the Inspector-General of the SAC, to send 30 men and an officer to Germiston.[45] On 8 May, all police leave was suspended and trainees were placed in uniform. Curtis was asked to provide further Constabulary to be held in reserve at Auckland Park, and two officers and 75 constables (50 of whom were mounted) arrived the following day from Potchefstroom. While acknowledging that the strikers were "as a body well behaved," O'Brien maintained that these preparations were necessary "in case of the strikes developing into lawlessness," which he considered likely "when so many men [were] idle."[46]

When the first serious incidents of violence occurred in mid-May, however, idleness was the most marginal of causes. Several more convincing reasons can be advanced to account for the strikers' growing anger. First, as their movement spread to the central Rand, it began to lose momentum. Workers in this part of the Reef were hesitant to commit themselves, despite large demonstrations of strikers on these properties. Miners would refuse to go on shift one day and be back at work the next. In some instances secret

ballots were held resulting in decisions not to strike. From about 12 May, rank and file criticism of the way in which the strike was being conducted by the TMA became more pronounced. Meetings of miners still at work revealed that, although sympathetic to the strike, they felt that it was so poorly organized that it was bound to fail. Production, they argued, did not appear to be seriously affected; the strike had been started at the wrong time, and without adequate preparation; and only a general strike of all the miners on the Rand would be effective.[47]

On its own, this rank-and-file hesitation was unlikely to produce widespread violence. It was the formulation by the state of a coherent policy for dealing with the strike, combined with a determined effort by the Randlords to replace the miners by recruiting strike-breakers on a large scale, that impelled the strikers beyond methods of peaceful persuasion. On 13 May, Reyersbach led a deputation of mineowners to de Villiers to request "adequate police protection" for strike-breakers. The Minister "promised to do all in his power," thus confirming assurances given individually to employers the week before.[48] The same morning, de Villiers instructed O'Brien to station twelve constables on each affected mine "to afford protection to men willing to work and ... to stop intimidation." He also told O'Brien to call on all available members of the SAC, even though many would have to come from as far away as Swaziland. That afternoon, O'Brien drew the attention of his officers to the legal apparatus at their disposal, including Law 6 of 1894, which would later be invoked to disperse assemblies on the mines.[49] Meanwhile, on many properties, management was erecting tall corrugated iron fences to prevent the miners on strike from communicating with strike-breakers. Recruiters--encouraged and assisted by notables close to the Cabinet, such as the industrialist Samuel Marks, and Dr Engelenburg of De Volkstem--were actively at work in Pretoria, Klerksdorp, Potchefstroom, and the Orange River Colony signing up the Afrikaners who would be quartered behind these barricades.[50]

In the context of concerted efforts by the strikers to impart fresh momentum to their movement, it is hardly surprising that violence should swiftly have succeeded these measures by state and industry. Indeed, a reporter from the Rand Daily Mail had been struck by the demeanour of the Fordsburg and Langlaagte miners before energetic steps had been taken to replace them, their having employed "no other means further than talking the would-be blacklegs over, and in many instances paying their fares back to where they came from, over and above giving many of them a good square meal."[51] In Germiston, the "first show of force" was occasioned by the arrival of a consignment of strike-breakers on 13 May.[52] Here too the local strike committee had followed a policy of helping those who had been persuaded not to act as strike-breakers to return home. And they did not have to work hard on a number of Afrikaners recruited with promises of far better wages than they were offered on their arrival at the mines.[53] For those strike-breakers and miners still at work who resided permanently on the Rand, the TMA reserved the tactic of publishing lists of their names.[54]

By mid-May, however, their places being quickly filled, the miners began to lose patience. At Germiston station on 13 and 15 May, large crowds of workers gathered to meet trains arriving with strike-breakers from Krugersdorp and Pretoria. In the first incident, they rushed the platform, chasing the new arrivals; those offering resistance were "severely handled."[55] In the second, police prevented a crowd of 500 miners from entering the station. The strike-breakers were put in cabs to take them to the Rose Deep. The convoy reached the mine, but only after the miners had stoned the cabs and the police. Some 200 strikers later made for the nearby Simmer and Jack East, where they showered stones on the workers' quarters and attempted to

break down the barricades before being dispersed by the police.[56]

The same day, a rumour that between 50 and 60 strike-breakers were on their way from Pretoria to Braamfontein station to replace miners on the central Rand brought groups of strikers out onto the Main Reef Road at different points between the Robinson mine and the Langlaagte Deep. Several hundred, many with cycles and armed with sticks, later assembled in Fordsburg before congregating on the Main Reef Road with the appearance, in the words of one witness, "of a determined and dangerous lot of men." When the two wagons of strike-breakers, escorted by 40 mounted police, were spotted on their way through Fordsburg, they were immediately pursued by crowds of strikers hurling abuse and stones. Thinking that all the men were headed for the Langlaagte Deep, the miners had not taken the precaution of stationing lookouts near the Crown Deep, where the convoy succeeded in introducing approximately half the strike-breakers without hindrance. Not long after the police had left the Crown Deep with the remainder, however, they were met by some 300 or 400 strikers. Major MacGregor, the officer in charge, led the escort through the crowd of workers, ordering them off the road and to put down their sticks. This only angered the miners further, and from this point to the entrance of the Langlaagte Deep, they hurled stones, sticks and anything else within reach at the convoy. Repeated attempts were made to drag the strike-breakers off the wagons. Having placed their charges beyond the barricades, MacGregor and his men departed, and the infuriated miners prepared to rush the fencing. Their attention was distracted from doing so, however, by the arrival of a wagon containing bedding for the strike-breakers. After unloading the wagon, the crowd set its contents alight, the few remaining constables not daring to intervene.[57]

No further incidents on this scale took place during the week that followed. However, assaults on individual strike-breakers by small bands of miners became widespread. In one of the most serious, a man named Botha was nearly beaten to death by a group of forty strikers.[58] Everything now pointed to an escalation of the struggle. The TMA, stung, on the one hand, by the criticism of its organization of the strike levelled at it by miners who had refused to join the movement, and propelled forward, on the other, by the militancy of those already on strike, was rapidly being forced to consider calling a general strike of all underground workers. The strike could not be terminated without alienating the miners who had already been paid off (1,288 on 15 May, according to Reyersbach)[59]; nor could it be continued on a mine by mine basis as before if the TMA wished to overcome rank-and-file hesitation and thus successfully extend the movement.

On 14 May, it was reported that Trewick of the TMA--in pursuit of a speedy end to the struggle--had written to his counterpart in the South African Engine Drivers' and Firemen's Association (SAEDFA), Peter Whiteside, a Labour Member of the Legislative Assembly, asking the engine drivers to join the miners. The engine drivers, it was generally acknowledged, "held the key of the situation," "the number of certificated engine drivers capable of running hoisting engines" being "very little in excess of the demand."[60] Whiteside, though patently unenthusiastic, could hardly spurn the miners publicly, and thus sought to delay committing his union one way or the other for as long as possible. On 15 May, he led a deputation of his union to de Villiers to request the government to appoint an arbitration court, but was told that this could only be done if both parties to the dispute agreed. The next day, therefore, the deputation took the same proposal to a meeting with the mineowners, who stated that in their opinion "there was nothing to arbitrate upon."[61]

This refusal of arbitration enabled the TMA to pose the question of a general strike in a way that would reconcile the various demands being placed

on it. A meeting in Germiston that evening decided, first, that the miners would return to work under the old conditions while an arbitration court sat, provided no-one was victimized for his part in the strike; and, second, that there would be a general strike if the mineowners refused arbitration. On Sunday 19 May, delegates from 27 mines met at Trades Hall in Johannesburg to discuss the recommendation of the TMA's Executive Committee that as the Chamber of Mines could settle the question if they wished, "their refusal of arbitration [would] at last justify the men in going the whole hog." The meeting resolved to call a general strike against supervising three machine drills or more than 25 hand-drillers, to begin on Wednesday 22 May on all producing mines affiliated to the Chamber of Mines, thus exempting those controlled by J.B. Robinson, who had assured the TMA that the three-machine question would "never be raised on his mines." All miners who disobeyed the call would be considered "blacklegs," and their names and birthplaces advertised. Strike leaders felt confident that those who had refused to join the movement on the grounds that it was poorly organized now had "no alternative left but to come out."[62]

The government meanwhile was reinforcing its coercive powers to meet any intensification of the conflict. Ministers became more open about affording protection to the strike-breakers. Immediately after receiving the engine drivers on 15 May, de Villiers delivered an important speech at a luncheon of the Agricultural Society. "I feel," he declared, reflecting the concerns of the wealthy rural supporters of Het Volk, "if our mining industry does not progress and does not go on, agriculture must necessarily also be at a standstill." The government, he continued, did not wish "to figure as partisans on one side or the other." As he warmed to his theme, however, it became clear that the miners would draw little comfort from his words:

> "[The government] regrets immensely to see some of the scenes of riot and disorder which have taken place. We cannot sit still and see people intimidated... [I]t is the sacred right of every individual to work wherever he likes and whenever he likes, and no man should be disturbed in that right. The Government will see that no one is intimidated in this country."[63]

As he spoke, the Northern Rifle Volunteers, on orders from the Acting Prime Minister, J.C. Smuts, were preparing to mobilize at an hour's notice.[64] The next day, O'Brien reported that he had arranged with the mining houses to transport strike-breakers to the mines along the coal lines rather than by scheduled trains. He instructed his officers to counter "any further rioting" with "strenuous efforts to make arrests of the ringleaders in order that they may be made an example of."[65] They were also empowered to swear in special constables "vouched for by a responsible person (such as Manager of Mine) as discreet and proper persons" to be employed in "safe guarding of the life and property on which they reside [sic]." Managers were advised to station African mine police at "such vulnerable sites as magazines."[66]

Managers were not slow in taking advantage of these measures. By 17 May, over 100 special constables had been enrolled on the Simmer and Jack alone. In all, between 1,500 and 2,000 would be employed across the Reef during the course of the strike.[67] Most were drawn from amongst the surface workers, for by now few categories of underground worker were unrepresented among the strikers.[68] Although suddenly thought to be "generally of greater intelligence"[69] than the underground workers, the surface workers' reliability had more to do with their vulnerability to dismissal and eviction. After the South African War, a large number of artisans had come to the Transvaal believing that rapid development would take place and that work would be readily available. Now, with work on non-producing mines curtailed, many roamed the Rand in search of employment,

and had begun to organize themselves, causing disquiet in ruling circles.[70] Henry Hay, Manager of the Witwatersrand Deep, told the Transvaal Indigency Commission in June 1907 that there was "a surplus of surface labour... there [were] far more carpenters, smiths, and fitters than [could] get work."[71] One of the miners on strike argued that the surface workers "have to do what they are told, or face ruin. They dare not refuse. If they did, there are 20 men who would offer to take each vacant job."[72] Surface workers had tended to settle on the Rand with their families, and many occupied married quarters on the mines, making them doubly reluctant to join in the miners' struggle.[73]

While surface workers were being sworn in as special constables on the weekend preceding 22 May, the day the general strike was to begin, O'Brien was pressing Colonel Curtis to provide him with a reserve of at least 100 additional South African Constabulary. Saturday and Monday being holidays, he was expecting trouble.[74] The Manager of the Roodepoort United Main Reef, meanwhile, reassured perhaps by the government's public commitments to upholding 'law and order,' and by the TMA's neglect of the area, chose this moment to announce new conditions of employment, thus ensuring the spread of the strike to the West Rand for the first time.[75] By the afternoon of 20 May, workers were meeting at mines across the Rand to discuss the call for a general strike. The managers assured O'Brien that many mines would not be affected by the call if the workers could be sure of receiving "adequate protection."[76] While miners at some properties were certainly cautious about joining the movement, others were now satisfied with the TMA's change of tactics. That evening, for example, a "quite spontaneous" private meeting of miners at the Meyer and Charlton voted in favour of strike action, despite the fact that on this mine each white miner supervised only two machines and an average of 20 hand-drillers. They resolved to strike in support of "the principle of unity," for if the movement failed all would "suffer alike."[77]

The extension of the strike on 22 May rapidly drained O'Brien's reserve of Constabulary. The arrival that morning of a contingent of the SAC Special Burgher Police, a force originally raised from farmers and former Republican police in and around the Witwatersrand to capture Chinese deserters, did little to allay his concern.[78] Magistrates in 11 rural districts were told that the SAC in their areas had been withdrawn and that they should, if necessary, swear in special constables.[79] It was evident by now, however, that there would never be sufficient police to cope with a strike across the 50 miles of the Rand. O'Brien was "strongly of opinion" that unless there was "a considerable demonstration of force throughout the whole Rand," it would "be difficult to keep the men who [were] desirous of working at their work..." For this he wanted at least another 500 men in addition to the 550 police already on strike duty. O'Brien advised against calling out the Volunteers, however, "a large proportion of whom [were] likely to be in sympathy with the strikers."[80]

The miners, believing that the general strike call had put their house in order, now felt justified in taking all necessary steps to secure the allegiance of waverers. Greatest support came from the East Rand, where the movement had started. Here, joint marches of strikers and the unemployed paraded past the mines to well-attended meetings. In the central area, where workers on a number of mines still intended going on shift, large crowds of strikers surrounded shafts and boarding-houses to ensure that they could not. In one incident at the Robinson Mine that evening, 500 men assembled to prevent the night shift from going down, tearing down the corrugated iron fencing around the shafts. By late the next afternoon, 23 May, 48 mines were affected, and a very large demonstration of miners and onlookers had convinced workers at the Ferreira Deep to go on strike. This crowd, numbering 1,500, then marched to the Robinson Deep, broke down the

barricade, and wrecked the boarding-house. Shots were fired and several constables were severely beaten before the crowd was dispersed with hoses turned on at full pressure. To the reporter of the South African News, there appeared to be "every probability of all the regular underground men from Krugersdorp to Springs being forced out."[81]

The government, heeding O'Brien's advice, applied to the Governor for the use of Imperial troops stationed in the Transvaal. Selborne consented at once. An astonished Colonial Office official, receiving Selborne's telegram on 24 May, by which time 200 mounted troops and 500 infantry had already taken up positions along the Reef, remarked that it would be difficult for the British government to veto this unprecedented move from such a distance, especially when the Governor had been convinced that it was "absolutely necessary." "The prevention of disturbance," he continued, "is the most elementary function of government, and the assignment of this duty to forces not subject to the orders of Ministers is really inconsistent with self-government." Churchill, however, then Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, was captivated by the ironies of the situation:

> "This is a growing cloud, and I wish we knew more about it. Fancy what a mixture of British [...?] prejudices and antagonisms. A Boer Government, ordering British cavalry, with the approval of a Liberal Ministry, to charge British strikers and protect Dutch blacklegs in the interests of Rand magnates! On the whole I am inclined to approve. We promised to help Botha and I think we should stand by him and his government. I think Parliament will take or at least accept this view."[82]

Within a few days, as the number of cavalry was increased to 910, making a total of 1,410 troops in addition to the SAC, Town Police, and Burgher Police, the Rand had become "an armed camp." Mine recreation halls were turned into barracks, the Main Reef Road was studded with patrols, and all approaches to shafts and mine quarters were guarded.[83]

O'Brien had lost no time in pressing his reinforcements into service. On the morning of 24 May, he drew up a police notice, quickly approved by de Villiers, in terms of Law 6 of 1894, prohibiting "all assemblies of Six or more persons within a radius of 300 yards of any Mine-headgear, Machinery, Building, Dwelling or Premises attached..." Three thousand copies were conspicuously posted on all mines, on roads approaching mines, and in working-class suburbs. One was specifically delivered to the strike headquarters of the Fordsburg miners at the Tramway Hotel, where a plain clothes policeman had been observing the strikers' movements since 20 May. From the Tramway, on the boundary of the suburb, miners had been able "to make a sudden rush on any of the mines in the vicinity." Officers were "strictly enjoined" to enforce the notice, and to ensure that they had "sufficient force on the spot" to do so. With the troops now on hand for this purpose, O'Brien thought it was "quite time that the mob should be shown that violence [could not] be tolerated."[84]

That afternoon, two episodes altered the course of the strike. The first took place at the Geldenhuis Deep, the only important mine in the Germiston district that had not yet joined the strike. On their way there, a large column of strikers passed the site where 50 Cameron Highlanders were camped in time to see the latter march off. The miners cheerfully greeted the soldiers with calls of "good old Camerons." When an equal number of the Queen's Bays rode by a short time after, they extended similar praise. Their mood changed, however, as they neared the Geldenhuis Deep, where they found the path blocked, first by the Bays, then by a second line of mounted police under Inspector Samson, and, finally, by the Cameron Highlanders. A further 50 Camerons were posted at an entrance facing towards Johannesburg,

from which direction a second column of miners was approaching. As the second column neared, Lieutenant Heathcote, commanding the infantry, ordered his men to fix bayonets. This angered the miners, who turned round to join the men from Germiston. Inspector Samson then came forward and ordered the strikers to disperse in terms of Law 6. Interrupted by caustic comments about British freedoms, he warned that he would break up any meeting with violence. With many in this crowd of 700 determined to retaliate, calm was preserved only by permitting a party of six to speak to the Geldenhuis Deep miners. When the delegates later returned with news that the latter would join the strike, the miners' columns re-formed to return.[85]

The second episode did issue in violence. Workers meeting at the Tramway Hotel in Fordsburg had marched to the Consolidated Langlaagte. A few mounted police just managed to insert themselves between the entrance and the crowd, which now numbered several hundred. Not long after, some Constabulary arrived on foot to support them. Fearing that the mine would be rushed, Superintendent Miller allowed a deputation of six through the fence to see the Manager. At this point, Colonel O'Brien appeared on horseback, having ordered 50 of the Queen's Bays to follow him. There are conflicting accounts of what happened next. O'Brien and his subordinates later reported that the crowd was violent, openly threatening the police and preparing to rush the fence armed with sticks. At least one man had drawn a revolver from his pocket, many had been drinking heavily, and there was "a considerable number of foreigners," who were "dangerous persons... ready to proceed to extremities." In O'Brien's opinion, this was "certainly the most threatening exhibition throughout the strike trouble and a salutary effect was needed."[86] Strike leaders, on the other hand, contended that the gathering had been quietly awaiting the return of the deputation.[87] Whichever version is correct, when the Queen's Bays arrived, O'Brien sounded a trumpet and called on the crowd to disperse in terms of Law 6. When the men did not comply, O'Brien ordered the Bays to charge the crowd, which they did with swords drawn, scattering the miners in all directions. R.J. Stickland, identified as a leader, was arrested and warned by O'Brien before being released. Before long he would be giving "secret assistance" to the police.[88]

The effect on the miners' morale of the two incidents on Friday 24 May was dramatic. As we have seen, some attempts were made to fraternize with the soldiers. When the troops had arrived on the East Rand on the evening of 23 May, it was said that many strikers had friends among them. Archie Crawford, of the Independent Labour Party, addressing a meeting of the unemployed and the miners, drew cheers when he said that "the time was coming when the soldiers and police, if ordered to fire on their fellow-workers, would drop their arms and refuse."[89] After 24 May, the miners debated wearing their medals "gained in the service of the Empire" to remind the troops that the strikers "were fellow-workers and their own flesh and blood." The idea was rejected, however, for fear of offending the Afrikaner strike-breakers, to whom the TMA had appealed for support as "fellow South Africans."[90] The miners made little progress on either front. Early the following week, O'Brien reported that "the arrival of [the] troops in such numbers [had] had good effect," and that his men were escorting strike-breakers to the mines unopposed. Strike leaders admitted cancelling demonstrations because the miners were "all frightened of the soldiers and police."[91] When a deputation met Botha and de Villiers on Saturday 1 June, Lieutenant Heathcote and Colonel O'Brien were bitterly criticized. Trewick considered it "a disgrace" that "in a country under the British flag" bayonets had been pointed "at the breasts of British subjects." Thomas Willis, the TMA President, stated that after O'Brien's charge miners who had been present had come to him "white" with shock. Such behaviour by the authorities, the

deputation contended, was "directly inciting to rebellion."[92]

In his response, the Prime Minister, who had returned two days previously from attending the Colonial Conference in London, attempted to persuade the deputation that the use of the troops was "not a movement against the miners." Referring to incidents in the past in which Chinese deserters had assaulted and murdered whites[93], he argued that with the miners on strike there was "no protection against the Chinese":

> "If the Mine Manager says: 'Assist me here,' he will get the miners to assist him, but when they have gone there is no protection. Supposing then the Chinese had come out and murdered 500 or 600 people in one night, who would have the blame?"

Moreover, there were "always a lot of scoundrels of white men in the country" who, in the present crisis, could "get opportunities for working their schemes." The soldiers, Botha concluded, "are there to protect you as well as anybody else. As I said before, if anything should go wrong there the people would blame you and that we want to prevent."[94] This profession of solicitude for the TMA's public image was not the first occasion that the canard of the Chinese threat had been exploited to justify the deployment of troops on the Rand. The press had widely publicized Churchill's statement in the Commons on 27 May that "the presence of 50,000 Chinese on the Rand was an element which added to the general insecurity of the country and which justified the High Commissioner in affording additional assistance." A similar declaration by Smuts was also reported.[95]

But what role did the Chinese, and indeed the 93,000 African, workers play during the strike?[96] Officials concluded that the African workers had viewed the conflict with "supreme indifference."[97] The response of the Chinese miners, however, had initially caused concern in ruling circles. At the start of the strike, the TMA had claimed that the Chinese would "come out in support of the men." The correspondent of the South African News reported that Chinese miners at the Simmer and Jack East had expressed an unwillingness "to work for any new men who were sent down the mine." Another journalist observed "many attempts on the part of the strikers to explain the position to the coolies with the evident intention of gaining sympathy if not support."[98] On 8 May, the issue drew a stern leader from the Rand Daily Mail:

> "A strike among the Chinese, instigated by the miners, might lead to riots and outrages of a nature which we are confident the miners themselves could never for one moment countenance. It is a disgrace to civilization if two bodies of white men, between whom there exists a difference of opinion, cannot settle those differences without calling in the assistance of Chinese coolies."[99]

That the Chinese had only to continue working to assist one side did not matter to this commentator. After this date, however, there were no further reports of the white miners' involving the Chinese workers in their struggle. The Chinese, of course, had no reason to participate in the conflict. More closely policed even than the African workers, not least, as Botha noted, by the white miners themselves, they had developed their own forms of resistance.[100] African workers were equally unlikely to support the movement; although miners' phthisis also killed large numbers of Africans, this was seldom considered by the white workers.[101]

There is ample evidence to suggest that the experience and skill required to carry on the work in the absence of the white miners was provided by their African and Chinese counterparts. Although the Mines Department's inspectors denied that African and Chinese workers, and uncertificated whites, had infringed the regulations by conducting blasting operations, describing the evidence as "conflicting," the observation of an

official in the Colonial Office that this denial amounted to "not guilty, but don't do it again," was certainly more accurate.[102] On 28 May, at the greatest extent of the strike, only 455 stamps out of 5,095 on the affected mines were hung up, 360 of these being on the East Rand Proprietary Mines. Development work on most mines was suspended--made possible by the large reserves of ore opened up prior to the strike--and all available resources were concentrated in the stopes to keep the mills supplied. Many of the Afrikaner strike-breakers were put in charge of tramming and other unskilled underground work; George Farrar, a principal mineowner and Leader of the Opposition in the Assembly, considered those "accustomed to farm life" to be the "most suitable." Learners, mine captains, shift bosses and others, including surface workers, oversaw stoping.[103]

With output thus maintained, and effective picketing prevented, some of the miners returned to work. On 25 May there had been 4,171 men on strike; by 31 May there were 3,768.[104] The groups laid down harsh new conditions before taking back workers. Towards the end of May, at meetings of consulting engineers and managers, William Lincoln Honnold of Consolidated Mines Selection appraised the industry's position. He drew two conclusions: first, current grades of ore dictated an immediate fall in working costs; second, because yields would decline still further, a context had to be created in which costs could be reduced progressively in the future. The strike put both goals within reach. Lower rates of pay could be set across the industry to achieve the first, but Honnold was vaguer on the second, insisting only that "a radical reconstruction of [the] system of labour organisation" was required. For the miners, though, the consequences were inescapable: they would have to work "without tacit or implied limitations as to the scope of their activities." Robert Raine, Manager of Village Main Reef, later elaborated:

> "The men have come back to work, and they ask, 'What are the conditions?' I say, 'The conditions are these. You have to do what you are told. If I want you to work two or four or ten machines then it is for me to find out the efficiency, not for you.'"

This also meant no unions, for the mines had to "be free to make the most of [their] labour conditions." Trade unionism, argued Honnold, was the "main issue" of the strike; to prevail on this question justified "any temporary sacrifice" by the industry.[105]

Not all the miners, however, were prepared to return to work on such terms. On 10 June, 3,000 were still on strike, while at the beginning of July O'Brien calculated the number at 1,647.[106] The miners who remained out first placed their hopes on the engine drivers' joining the strike. The cautious Whiteside eventually announced on Saturday 25 May that the members of his union would be balloted the following week. By then, however, the effect of the troops on the course of the strike had become perfectly clear, and the engine drivers voted by five to one against supporting the TMA.[107] The TMA still hoped to persuade the government to intervene with some form of compulsory arbitration; the deputation to the Prime Minister on 1 June presented a petition, signed by 3,271 miners, requesting the appointment of an arbitration court to settle the dispute. Botha replied that there was no statute that the government could invoke to impose a settlement. Like de Villiers on previous occasions, he argued that legislation would have to await the Commissions' reports, and that the government could only mediate if both sides agreed to such a step.[108]

Botha nonetheless wrote to Reyersbach after seeing the miners' delegates to ask whether there was any possibility of the Chamber's settling with the strikers.[109] The mineowners in turn sent a deputation to see Botha and de Villiers on Friday 7 June. At this meeting, they reiterated their objections to arbitration, Farrar stating bluntly that "it would have been all

very well to speak of arbitration if [the miners] had managed to hang up the industry. But they had failed." Reyersbach thought that the "only trouble" was that "3,000 men were out of work and that when they realised this violence might be resorted to." Botha reminded the deputation that troops could not be kept on the Rand indefinitely "without there being big trouble on the other side of the water." But if they were withdrawn before the dispute had ended, there was the likelihood that the strike would "become worse." Above all, he feared that if the miners "were turned out of employment permanently" they could become "a sort of canker in Johannesburg." This was an outcome that neither state nor industry desired. The Randlords, though feeling the costs of barricading their properties and maintaining a large force of special constables, were prepared however to concede little more at this stage than a vague promise to take back the strikers as positions became vacant, Farrar adding pointedly that they "would have to be absolutely fair to the new men they had taken on."[110]

The TMA did not finally abandon its attempt to secure a pledge from the government to mediate in the dispute until 10 July, when Whiteside, who had been expected to introduce a motion in the Transvaal Legislative Assembly condemning the mineowners' refusal to arbitrate, and requesting the government to introduce legislation to deal with such disputes in the future, amended his motion when the government indicated it could not support it in its original form. All references to the strike were eliminated and the motion was then carried unanimously. De Villiers announced that while the government would carefully consider introducing legislation, this would have no bearing on the current dispute. For the TMA, whose call for a general strike to begin on 4 July--"Independence Day for all white workers in the Transvaal"--had drawn no additional support for the movement, this betrayal destroyed the last hope of compelling the mineowners to take the strikers back on the latter's own terms.[111]

By now, the miners were enduring great hardship. Those with savings could leave the country; Reyersbach estimated that between 500 and 700 miners had done so. But for the majority, penury and hunger prevailed, exacerbated by one of the coldest winters on record.[112] The TMA established camps for those evicted from their quarters, providing the miners with tents. J.B. Robinson was rumoured to have donated a large sum to the strike fund[113], but the TMA clearly had limited means to assist its members. On 3 June, the union put up a notice at its headquarters warning that "no one but certified men need apply for assistance." This was directed at the many unemployed urban Afrikaners who, believing themselves entitled to some reward for agreeing not to act as strike-breakers, had sought relief from the TMA.[114] By 22 June, the union was using most of its funds to support the families of 600 married men.[115] A month later, shortly before the strike was called off, James Coward, Chairman of the Germiston Strike Committee, informed Smuts, Botha and de Villiers of a resolution passed by the strikers requesting the government to repatriate them rather than that they should accept the humiliating terms imposed by the managers. The men were "face to face with starvation," their children "absolutely shoeless." The mineowners, he said, were "grinding the men down to the lowest stage."[116]

In this context of hardship and humiliation, with open remedial action stifled by the state, a section of the miners turned to arson, sniping, and waylaying of strike-breakers. Examples of the last had occurred since mid-May, but the attacks became more premeditated after the troops arrived. In one of the first incidents, on the evening of 28 May, a fire was discovered in the single men's quarters of the Wemmer. A burning rag tied to a stick had been thrown through the window of the room of two brothers, one of whom, Bill Polgrane, had returned to work that day. Soon after, Polgrane received

an anonymous letter threatening to "rid the country of such dirty underhand curs as you," and left the Transvaal. On 2 June, a shift boss and mine captain employed on the Treasury were returning from the Cleveland station when five revolver shots were fired at them. At many mines workers were afraid to go outside after dark.[117] O'Brien reported rumours that some strikers were planning "acts of violence in the shape of incendiarism," but he was experiencing difficulty obtaining information as they had formed "Secret Societies." The police suspected the TMA of sending spies to the mines to discover the identity of strike-breakers; managers were warned to exercise particular care in hiring workers.[118] On 15 June, O'Brien learned that the mineowners' residences might be attacked, and the next day an attempt was made to burn down his own house; a dismissed policeman had plotted the deed with some miners.[119] Most ominous of all for the rulers were shipping company returns showing that many more women and children had departed for England than men, who remained behind to see the struggle through to the end.[120]

With each week the incidents multiplied: murder and attempted murder; threats to mine property; hotels dynamited; water pipes blown up; explosions at the homes of strike-breakers. Mounted troops escorted workers to and from the mines, and patrolled the working-class suburbs of Johannesburg.[121] The police made little headway in tracing the perpetrators, despite O'Brien's having a "Confidential Intelligence Department working all along the Rand" to infiltrate the movement.[122] His only conclusion, a perennial explanation of last resort for embattled officialdom, was that "the strikers include in their ranks a large number of the criminal classes." This "dangerous element" of "violent persons" comprised mainly "foreigners":

> "Irish American, Italian and Austrian, and of the Australian 'larrikin' class, and curiously enough a certain number of young Africanders, who, having once been induced to come out on strike are very aggressive against their own people who are continuing to work."

The English miners, however, were quite as likely to number among the "violent persons." By O'Brien's own reckoning, the hard core of the strikers was fashioned from "North-country Englishmen," and it was these men and their dependants that the government feared to see become "a sort of canker in Johannesburg."[123] But if the police were unable to discover its authors, the underground campaign was equally unsuccessful in forcing the mineowners to alter their terms, despite Reyersbach's private acknowledgment that the stopes were "undoubtedly beginning to suffer" from being worked by "raw hands."[124]

By the end of July, a resolution to the conflict was in view. The TMA threatened to carry on by obtaining £3,000 from England, but it could not support its destitute members for much longer. Botha and Smuts pledged their assistance if the union called off the strike. The government could then dispense with the troops, which were a political embarrassment and financial burden. Managers were willing to employ experienced miners on the new terms. Clearly the industry had least to lose in these somewhat obscure negotiations, but then it had dictated the terms of the struggle from the outset. Thus, the TMA agreed to call off the strike, while the Randlords promised to take back all the miners, with the exception of the leaders, as vacancies occurred. The leaders, it was said, probably would find work on J.B. Robinson's mines. The government was soon able to withdraw the troops, but it was months before all the miners found work. When the government gave £2,000 to the TMA early in September "for relief of deserving cases," 800 were still unemployed.[125] The South African Mines saw little harm in this surplus. There was no room, it concluded complacently, for "indifferent miners," either Afrikaners or erstwhile strikers:

> "Doubtless the best men will not long want for work. The very proper competition among managers, who ... are anxious to secure the services of the really good miners, cannot fail to quickly absorb that class."[126]

The last word, though, belongs to Tom Mathews of the TMA:

> "It is not only the economics as laid down by Allen Smith [sic] which is at stake ... if you hand us over to the Chamber of Mines and say that you can do nothing for us, to whom can we look for redress?"[127]

This plea to Botha during the strike served notice that it would not be many years before the white miners would again challenge state and capital.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing account suggests a number of levels on which a reassessment of the 1907 strike might proceed. Strikes are favoured subjects for historians because, as instances of overt conflict, they promise to expose for analysis the most salient trends and contradictions. The 1907 strike is no exception. Most commonly it has been interpreted as a crushing victory for the mineowners. Indeed, if the outcome is rendered in terms of a fall in working costs it certainly was. The South African Mines later gloated that the "strike movement enabled the mines to bring about a reorganization of wages in a few months, which under normal circumstances would have taken years to achieve." Some mines recorded falls of over 40 pence in the expenses per ton of ore milled at the end of 1907 compared with the previous year.[128] In other respects, the battle was less conclusive. As Honnold pointed out to his colleagues, there were two goals that the industry ideally hoped to achieve. These declines in costs represented the attainment of the first, but the second--a continued uniformity of control over the conditions of employment for white labour--was much more difficult to reach. This ongoing struggle brought out tensions between the smaller and the larger groups.[129] The pressures particularly on the smaller groups were ever likely to spark off a conflict over irritating everyday work conditions that might spill over into a strike involving the industry as a whole. Given the close supervision exercised by mining capital over the minutiae of white working-class life, and over civil society in general, these workplace struggles could proceed rapidly to threaten the entire colonial social order. But once the conflict was over, the smaller groups again were likely to be the first to buckle to the white workers' attempts to claw back some of their wages and privileges. A less linear conceptualization perhaps is needed of changes in labour organization in these years than the literature suggests.

The strike also reveals aspects of white workers' experience that deserve further study. In struggling to secure the solidarity of constituencies fragmented along lines of ethnicity, language, occupation and political affiliation, the striking workers were compelled to adopt a range of contradictory ideological positions. As British subjects and volunteers they hoped to enjoy greater liberties and win over the police and troops, to whom they also appealed as "fellow-workers." They could show their anger towards the mineowners and the British connection with the symbolism of July 4th. To the strikebreakers and the new government they could be South Africans claiming that their struggle against the mineowners was analogous to that of the Boers in the war only recently concluded.[130] To the white community at large they could argue that they were defending "white civilisation," a double-edged blade that their class enemies were greatly more adept at wielding against themselves, as the episode with the Chinese in the early part of the strike well illustrates.

In part such tactics were opportunistic, but they also reflect the insecurities and fluidity of white working-class life and identity in this

period. In 1907 most white miners were recent arrivals in South Africa, and those who had even ten years' experience on the Rand had known several governments, none of which could claim their unreserved loyalty. Formed as miners during the phase of unprecedented international migration and exploitation of raw materials feeding the second industrial revolution, many had had experience in several countries with a variety of political complexions and industrial conditions. These circumstances meant that they possessed an extensive repertoire of political symbols that was both a strength to be drawn upon in industrial conflict, and a weakness that had them juggling too many ideological balls in a context in which local politics was equally fractured. Many had families overseas to whom they fully expected to return; indeed, in marked comparison with the later strikes, police and press reports mention little about women's militancy in this conflict. It is true that many of the workers who held out longest appear to have lived with their families on the Rand, suggesting a connection between the strike and the stabilization of the white work-force. Against this, however, we have to juxtapose the evidence that a number of the most determined fighters sent their dependants out of the country.

As noted at the outset, the strike most often has intrigued historians as a valuable indicator in the development of the vexed relationship between the state, capital, and white labour in early twentieth-century South Africa. Although not incorrect in this respect, many studies, resting on an imperfect empirical foundation, have tended to simplify the meaning of the episode in ways that can be misleading. David Yudelman's work is a good instance of this tendency, not least because, in a monograph that otherwise exemplifies the value of careful primary research, he has constructed from secondary and partial primary sources an inaccurate narrative[131] that ironically leads him, despite his own strictures on "turning-point theory," to construe the 1907 strike as symbolizing precisely such a turning point.

Yudelman draws a connection between the suppression of the strike and the new government's urgent need to raise loan capital abroad. In support of this, he positions in his argument information about the British government's agreeing to guarantee a loan of £5 million in such a way as to convey the impression that there was a causal link between breaking the strike and obtaining the loan.[132] The difficulty, however, is that Lord Elgin, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, had consented in principle at a meeting with Botha on 29 April 1907 to guarantee the loan in exchange for the Transvaal's meeting the Liberals on the repatriation of Chinese labour. Formal notice of Treasury approval of the guarantee was sent to Botha on 4 May, when the dispute was still confined to Knights Deep. At the meeting, moreover, Botha had convinced Elgin that without this separate source of finance he would be at the mercy of mining capital.[133] Thus, the need for capital, identified by Yudelman as the lever ("the Achilles' heel of the fledgling Transvaal state") with which Smuts and Botha were moved by the mineowners to comprehend the link between "the raising of finance capital and the lowering of working costs on the mines," and consequently to suppress the strike, had been met before the conflict.[134] This is not, of course, to deny either that the Transvaal state had an interest (even a preponderant interest) in fostering the mining industry, or that the behaviour of the government in breaking the strike can usefully be interpreted in this context. Nor does it imply that international financiers were not heartened by this action,[135] although it is not clear that an absence of strikes would not have been a surer sign, from their perspective, of a stable investment climate. It does suggest, however, that an adequate historical contextualization of the strike should take into account the role of the imperial power, and concomitantly confront the continuities and disjunctions in the social order

before and after 1907.

Yudelman, for a number of reasons, undervalues the British connection and plays down the continuities. First, he implicitly takes issue with scholars who have located the origins of the most characteristic and persistent South African institutions and policies of rule in the years of intense British intervention immediately following the South African War.[136] By contrast, he dates the beginnings of the formative dialogue between state and capital to the withdrawal of direct British rule in 1907, arguing that this "marked more than a mere change of government: it also marked a change in the form of the state."[137] Second, his principal sources, the papers of Smuts and Phillips, cause him to overemphasize the significance of their individual rapprochement, and to conclude that this preceded an as yet non-existent institutional relationship.[138] Third, his account presupposes that Smuts and Botha were reluctant to accept the primacy of mining capital and its profitability imperatives in the political economy; that they needed to be socialized into seeing things this way; and that the events surrounding the 1907 strike achieved precisely this.[139] Fourth, for one concerned to demonstrate that what is most important in recent South African history is not that which sets it apart from, but rather that which makes it typical of, the history of modern industrial states, Yudelman is surprisingly unreceptive to the contribution of the leading capitalist power of the time. One can only speculate that he is captive here to his idea that South Africa was more innovator than follower in the development of state-capital relations, causing him to portray this process as much more autochthonous than he could if he took full cognizance of the British connection.[140]

In construing 1907 as a turning point, Yudelman has been misled by the nervous rhetoric of the mineowners between the ascendancy of the Liberals at Westminster and the breaking of the strike. This is precisely the type of rhetoric that he shows has seduced historians of later decades. Doubtless the uncertainty was real, but there is no reason to assume that the change of executive caused capital more concern in 1907 than it did in 1924, the centre-piece of Yudelman's critique of turning-point theory. Yudelman maintains that "with a little help from the state bureaucracy" the Pact government after 1924 came to understand the relationship between the state and mining capital much as its predecessor had done.[141] Likewise, in 1907, the British did not bequeath a bureaucracy that was neutral in the imperatives to which it responded, or in the worldview it promoted, but one geared to a given set of assumptions about relations between state and industry, and between capital and labour. In dealing with the strike, the new government was guided as much by inherited officials such as O'Brien as it was by the exhortations of individual mineowners. An institutional framework, in other words, was already in place. It makes for absorbing drama, but not necessarily reliable history, to plot the course of relations between state, capital and organized labour through the correspondence of such powerful personalities as Smuts and Phillips. Phillips's letters to his London principals certainly emphasized his cultivation of good individual relations, but this need not mislead us. Referring to the example of 1907, he later recommended approaching the Pact in the same way. Yudelman, citing this advice, comments that the two situations were not analogous because an impersonal relationship between the state and mining capital, which had not existed in 1907, had been formalized by 1924.[142] If an institutional framework was already in place in 1907, however, there is no need to claim that Phillips was in error.

Whatever rapprochement there was on a personal level between members of the new government and the leading mineowners had been preceded by, and presupposed, the policy of conciliation long advocated and then implemented by Het Volk and the British Liberals. An interpretation of the

1907 strike thus needs to replace Yudelman's triangle of state, capital and white labour with a quadrangle adding the British government. The Liberal settlement extended early responsible government to the Afrikaner leadership in exchange for a loyalty to empire that implied continuity in the public service and sympathetic treatment of the mining industry. Smuts and Botha, reformers in the Kruger era, were well aware both of how a modern state should function and of the power and importance of the mining industry, and were content to abide by the rules of the settlement. The Liberals had no wish to squander the gains of the South African War, but sought rather to conserve them by pursuing an alternative strategy to that of their Conservative opponents.[143] Having undoubtedly taken a risk in this, they had too much at stake to see it fail, which accounts for their willingness to guarantee the loan, and for Churchill's comments on learning of the use of the troops. The presence of these troops, which entered into both Conservative and Liberal calculations, underlined the limited sovereignty of the Transvaal state. During the 1913 strike, Lord Gladstone, the Union's first Governor-General, concluded that the government was "not yet in a position to stand alone in such a crisis."[144] How much truer then was this in 1907 of the Transvaal government, whose own coercive resources were so rapidly overtaken by the strike. Botha and Smuts knew this well, and clearly understood that they could in future emergencies again resort to the Imperial troops, for even before the strike was quite over they had endorsed plans to reduce the strength of the South African Constabulary to levels that Selborne believed risked leaving "the arm of the Executive perilously weak."[145]

ENDNOTES

1. R.H. Davies, "Mining Capital, the State and Unskilled White Workers in South Africa," Journal of Southern African Studies 3, 1 (1976), 62-63.

2. P. Richardson and J.J. Van-Helten, "Labour in the South African Gold Mining Industry, 1886-1914," in S. Marks and R. Rathbone (eds.), Industrialisation and Social Change in South Africa: African Class Formation, Culture, and Consciousness, 1870-1930 (London, 1982), pp.81-82.

3. D. Yudelman, The Emergence of Modern South Africa: State, Capital, and the Incorporation of Organized Labour on the South African Gold Fields, 1902-1939 (Westport, Connecticut, 1983), p.57.

4. Ibid., pp.76-78. For examples of the types of financial pressure the mining industry could bring to bear in the event of government hostility, see A.H. Jeeves, Migrant Labour in South Africa's Mining Economy: The Struggle for the Gold Mines' Labour Supply 1890-1920 (Johannesburg, 1985), pp.75-76; L. Phillips to J. Wernher, 28 January 1907, in M. Fraser and A. Jeeves (eds.), All that Glittered: Selected Correspondence of Lionel Phillips, 1890-1924 (Cape Town, 1977), pp.171-172.

5. Among the most important are R.K. Cope, Comrade Bill: The Life and Times of W.H. Andrews, Workers' Leader (Cape Town, 1943), pp.88-92; I.L. Walker and B. Weinbren, 2000 Casualties: A History of the Trade Unions and the Labour Movement in the Union of South Africa (Johannesburg, 1961), pp.22-25; David Yudelman, "Lord Rothschild, Afrikaner Scabs and the 1907 Strike: A State-Capital Daguerreotype," African Affairs 81, 323 (1982), 257-269; Yudelman, Emergence, pp.56-78, covers the same ground.

6. Rand Daily Mail (hereafter RDM), 30 April 1907; "The Miners' Mistake," South African Mines, Commerce and Industries (hereafter SA Mines), 11 May 1907; Public Record Office (PRO), Colonial Office (CO) 291 (Transvaal Original Correspondence), 117/21321, Report on the Strike of Machine Men on the Witwatersrand, 21 May 1907, enclosed in Minister of Mines to Selborne, 22 May 1907; Transvaal Archives Depot (TAD), Prime Minister's Archive (PM), 33, 77/8/1907, Report of Proceedings of a Meeting between the Honourable the Prime Minister of the Transvaal and a Deputation Representing the Miners on Strike on the Rand, 1 June 1907 (hereafter Report of Proceedings). A strike had occurred at Village Main Reef in 1902 when F.H.P. Creswell, in his experiment with unskilled white labour, had enforced a similar requirement. Although the reasons for the miners' actions were much the same as in 1907, the intentions of the Manager were clearly different. See E.N. Katz, A Trade Union Aristocracy: A History of White Workers in the Transvaal and the General Strike of 1913 (Johannesburg, 1976), pp.80-81.

7. Ross E. Browne, "Consisting of a Pamphlet on Working Costs of the Mines of the Witwatersrand," Mining Industry Commission Minutes of Evidence (Pretoria, TG2-1908), Part IV, Appendix I, pp.1622, 1626, 1595 (hereafter MIC, TG2-1908). Significantly, the report was first given widespread publicity during the strike. Writers who have drawn attention to its influence on industry policy include Davies, "Mining Capital," 57 (note 71), 62-63; and A. Jeeves, "Het Volk and the Gold Mines: The Debate on Labour Policy 1905-1910" (African Studies Institute, University of the Witwatersrand, June 1980), 21.

8. L. Phillips to Wernher, Beit & Co., 18 June 1906, in Fraser and Jeeves (eds.) All that Glittered, pp.164-165.

9. MIC, TG2-1908, Part III, statement of G.H. Somers, p.993; South African News Weekly Edition (hereafter SA News Weekly), 15 May 1907.

10. RDM, 30 April 1907; L. Phillips to Wernher, Beit & Co., 18 June 1906, in Fraser and Jeeves(eds.), All that Glittered, p.163, noting that at "many mines now men are running three rock drills."

11. L. Phillips to Wernher, Beit & Co., 18 June 1906, in Fraser and Jeeves (eds.) All that Glittered, pp.164-165. He was discussing the mines controlled by his own group, but as both the strike and the continual appeals for efficiency in such organs as the SA Mines indicated, this perspective was more broadly shared. See B. Bozzoli, The Political Nature of a Ruling Class: Capital and Ideology in South Africa 1890-1933 (London, 1981), pp.98-100.

12. L. Phillips to J. Wernher, 8 October 1907, in Fraser and Jeeves (eds.) All that Glittered, pp.168-169 (emphasis in the original); MIC, TG2-1908, Part III, statement of G.H Somers, p.993.

13. "A Straight Talk to Strikers," SA Mines, 11 May 1907.

14. See, for example, MIC, TG2-1908, Part IV, evidence of F. Hellman, pp.1365, 1402, paras.19693, 20224.

15. Ibid., Part II, evidence of S.S. Crowle, p.324, para.3097. For similar sentiments see also the evidence of T. Willis, G.W. Sullivan and A.E. Musson, Parts II and IV, pp.373, 1162, 1217, paras.3832-3, 17313, 17838. Also G. Burke and P. Richardson, "The Profits of Death: A Comparative Study of Miners' Phthisis in Cornwall and the Transvaal," Journal of Southern African Studies, 4, 2 (1978), 158-160.

16. PRO, CO 291, 117/22214, Report on the General Strike of Miners on the Witwatersrand (May 22nd. to June 3rd.), encl. in Minister of Mines to Selborne, 3 June 1907; "Labour and Ore Reserves," SA Mines, 2 March 1907.

17. Jeeves, Migrant Labour, pp.59-62; P. Richardson, Chinese Mine Labour in the Transvaal (London, 1982), pp.21-23, 181-182.

18. Discussed in part by Katz, A Trade Union Aristocracy, pp.130-132.

19. L. Phillips to Lord Selborne, 24 January 1906; L. Phillips to Wernher, Beit & Co., 18 June 1906; L. Phillips to F. Eckstein, 30 June 1906 - all in Fraser and Jeeves (eds.) All that Glittered, pp.147-148, 163-164, 166; MIC, TG2-1908, Parts I-IV, statement of L.J. Reyersbach, p.96; evidence of S.S. Crowle, C.C. Smith, T. Willis, T. Mathews, E. Moore, C. Lock, P. Harvey and F. Hellman, pp.323, 348, 385, 389, 516, 686, 783, 919, 1365, paras.3082-3, 3442A, 4053-5, 4117-4121, 6034, 8800, 11121-3, 13562, 19694-7; TAD, Private Secretary to the Governor (hereafter GOV...PS), GOV 1106, PS 76/16/07, Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 10 July 1907; "Knights Deep Limited: A Promising Outlook," SA Mines, 2 November 1907.

20. Barlow Rand Archives (BRA), Archives of H. Eckstein and Co. (HE), 152, Phillips to Wernher, Private, 27 April 1907; BRA, HE 98, Reyersbach to Wernher, 29 April 1907; Ibid., Phillips to Eckstein, 6 May 1907 (original emphasis); Ibid., Reyersbach to Wernher, 6 May 1907.

21. Reported in SA Mines, 23 March 1907.

22. MIC, TG2-1908, Part I, statement of L.J. Reyersbach, p.96; see also Part II, evidence of G. Albu, p.241, paras.2384-5.

23. Ibid., Part I, evidence of L.J. Reyersbach, p.110, paras.797-798.

24. "Miners' Grievances," SA Mines, 4 May 1907; "Knights Deep Limited: A Promising Outlook," SA Mines, 2 November 1907; PRO, CO 291, 117/21321, Report on the Strike..., 21 May 1907, encl. in Minister of Mines to Selborne, 22 May 1907.

25. RDM, 30 April 1907; RDM, 1 May 1907.

26. Previous two paragraphs based on RDM, 30 April 1907; RDM, 1 May 1907; RDM, 6 May 1907; "Miners' Grievances," SA Mines, 4 May 1907; MIC, TG2-1908, Part II, evidence of T. Mathews, p.462, para.5123.

27. "Miners' Grievances," SA Mines, 4 May 1907; RDM, 2 May 1907; RDM, 3 May 1907; MIC, TG2-1908, Part II, evidence of T. Mathews, p.686, para.8799.

28. TAD, GOV 1106, PS 76/16/07, General Mine Strike Report.

29. For this incident, and more generally on the stereotype, including the miners' resentment of it, see MIC, TG2-1908, Parts I-III, evidence of L.J. Reyersbach, T. Willis, J.H. Bridgman, S.A. Smit, F. Crean and P. Harvey, pp.116, 377, 509, 627, 700, 924, paras.897, 3896-7, 5953-5, 7684-5, 9061-2, 13650-2.

30. Annual Report of the Transvaal Chamber of Miners (ARTCM) for 1907, Report of Proceedings of Monthly Meeting Held on 16 May 1907, p.415; PM 33, 77/8/1907, Report of an Interview between a Deputation of Several of the Mining Houses and the Prime Minister, 7 June 1907 (hereafter Report of an Interview).

31. PRO, CO 291, 117/21321, Selborne to Elgin, 27 May 1907.

32. E. Katz, "White Workers' Grievances and the Industrial Colour Bar, 1902-1913," South African Journal of Economics, 42, 2(1974), 141-142.

33. Burke and Richardson, "The Profits of Death," 150-151.

34. RDM, 2 May 1907.

35. MIC, TG2-1908, Part II, evidence of S.S. Crowle, p.313, para.2935. See also evidence of C.C. Smith and E. Moore, pp.343, 519, paras.3360, 6074. Others objected to the additional machine because of the speed-up it entailed. See Part IV, statement of J. Blane, p.1099; RDM, 7 May 1907.

36. PRO, CO 291, 117/21321, Report on the Strike..., 21 May 1907; RDM, 6 May 1907; RDM, 11 May 1907 for "white civilisation" speech. In addition to being Minister of Mines, de Villiers was the Attorney-General, and thus responsible for policing arrangements during the strike.

37. SA News Weekly, 8 May 1907; RDM, 7 May 1907; RDM, 8 May 1907.

38. MIC, TG2-1908, Part II, evidence of T. Mathews, p.458, paras.5070-1. For the concert, see RDM, 6 May 1907. For a brief account of single, white male working-class culture, see C. van Onselen, "The World the Mine Owners Made: Social Themes in the Economic Transformation of the Witwatersrand, 1886-1914," in Studies in the Social and Economic History of the Witwatersrand, Vol.1 (Johannesburg, 1982), p.39.

39. MIC, TG2-1908, Part II, evidence of S.S. Crowle, T. Mathews, E. Moore, W.T. Hallimond, S. Richards, pp.318, 447, 519, 614, 671-2, paras.3001, 4905, 6084, 7472-5, 8566-8575; Select Committee on European Employment and Labour Conditions (Cape Town, SC9-1913), evidence of R.B. Waterston, pp.568-9, para.4024 (hereafter SC9-1913); SA News Weekly, 15 May 1907; SA News Weekly, 29 May 1907; RDM, 7 May 1907; RDM, 9 May 1907; RDM, 28 May 1907.

40. Annual Report of the Government Mining Engineer (ARGME) for Year Ending 30 June 1907, p.10.

41. RDM, 11 May 1907; TAD, GOV 1106, PS 76/16/07, General Mine Strike Report.

42. MIC, TG2-1908, Part III, evidence of G.J. Hoffman, pp.928, 951, paras.13711-13712, 14209-14217.

43. SA News Weekly, 15 May 1907; RDM, 23 May 1907; ARTCM for 1907, Report of Proceedings of Monthly Meeting Held on 16 May 1907, p.415.

44. PRO, CO 291, 119/32169, O'Brien to Selborne, 14 August 1907; Debates at the Fifth Ordinary Annual Meeting of the Inter-Colonial Council of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony (Johannesburg, 1907), 29 May 1907, columns 21-22; PRO, CO 291, 118/27753, Selborne to Elgin, 15 July 1907. The Town Police operated primarily on the Rand and in Pretoria, the remainder of the Transvaal being policed by the South African Constabulary.

45. TAD, Law Department, Attorney-General's Correspondence (hereafter LD...AG), LD 1446, AG 1937/07, Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 7 May 1907.

46. Ibid., Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 8 May 1907 and 9 May 1907.

47. TAD, GOV 1106, PS 76/16/07, General Mine Strike Report; SA News Weekly, 15 May 1907; SA News Weekly, 22 May 1907; RDM, 13 May 1907; RDM, 16 May 1907; RDM, 20 May 1907.

48. BRA, HE 91, H. Eckstein & Co. to Wernher, Beit & Co., 13 May 1907; BRA, HE 153, Phillips to Wernher, 13 May 1907.

49. TAD, LD 1446, AG 1937/07, Memorandum Re Police Employed on Mine Strike Work, 13 May 1907. Law No. 6 of 1894 was one of the measures enacted in the closing years of the South African Republic to discipline its refractory Uitlander residents. It allowed the state to control and prohibit meetings of six or more people "in the interests of public order." Wet No. 6, 1894, Op Het Recht van Vereeniging en Vergadering van Personen, Staatscourant, 18 July 1894.

50. For fencing arrangements, see SC9-1913, evidence of R.B. Waterston, p.568, para.4021; RDM, 14 May 1907; SA News Weekly, 15 May 1907. For recruitment, see TAD, LD 1446, AG 1937/07, O'Brien to Secretary to the Law Department, 16 May 1907; RDM, 16 May 1907; SA News Weekly, 22 May 1907. For Marks and Engelenburg, see BRA, HE 143, Marks to Phillips, Strictly Private and Confidential, 14 May 1907; Ibid., Marks to Phillips, 18 May 1907.

51. RDM, 16 May 1907.

52. RDM, 14 May 1907.

53. RDM, 11 May 1907; SA News Weekly, 22 May 1907.

54. RDM, 9 May 1907; SA News Weekly, 22 May 1907.

55. RDM, 14 May 1907.

56. TAD, LD 1446, AG 1937/07, Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 16 May 1907; RDM, 16 May 1907.

57. TAD, LD 1446, AG 1937/07, Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 16 May 1907; RDM, 16 May 1907; SA News Weekly, 22 May 1907.

58. TAD, GOV 1106, PS 76/16/07, General Mine Strike Report; PRO, CO 291, 117/19251, Selborne to Elgin (Telegram), 29 May 1907; SA News Weekly, 22 May 1907.

59. ARTCM for 1907, Report of Proceedings of Monthly Meeting Held on 16 May, p.415.

60. PRO, CO 291, 117/21321, Report on the Strike..., 21 May 1907; and 117/19251, Selborne to Elgin (Telegram), 29 May 1907; SC9-1913, evidence of R.B. Waterston, pp.569-570, para.4031.

61. SA News Weekly, 22 May 1907.

62. RDM, 17 May 1907; RDM, 20 May 1907; RDM, 21 May 1907.

63. SA News Weekly, 22 May 1907.

64. Ibid. Botha, the Prime Minister, was in England attending the Colonial Conference.

65. TAD, LD 1446, AG 1937/07, Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 16 May 1907.

66. Ibid., Acting Commissioner of Police to Inspector in Charge, Johannesburg, 16 May 1907; TAD, GOV 1106, PS 76/16/07, General Mine Strike Report.

67. TAD, LD 1446, AG 1937/07, Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 17 May 1907 and 21 May 1907; TAD, GOV 1106, PS 76/16/07, General Mine Strike Report.

68. PRO, CO 291, 117/21321, Report on the Strike..., 21 May 1907. The majority of strikers, of course, were machine-drillers, who outnumbered hand-drillers by approximately 2.5:1, and shovellers and trammers by 3:1. Drill packers, timbermen, pipemen and others had also joined the movement.

69. TAD, GOV 1106, PS 76/16/07, Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 2 July 1907.

70. See C. van Onselen, "The Main Reef Road into the Working Class: Proletarianisation, Unemployment and Class Consciousness amongst Johannesburg's Afrikaner Poor, 1890-1914," in Studies, Vol.2, pp.135ff.; PRO, CO 291, 119/33657, Botha to Selborne, Ministers' Minute No. 432, 29 August 1907.

71. TIC, TG11-1908, evidence of H. Hay, p.345, para.8523.

72. SA News Weekly, 5 June 1907.

73. MIC, TG2-1908, Part II, evidence of E. Moore, p.519, para.6084.

74. TAD, LD 1446, AG 1937/07, Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 18 May 1907.

75. RDM, 20 May 1907. The mine was controlled by the Albu Group (General Mining). The TMA had paid limited attention to the West Rand as many of the mines there were comparatively small. It was also where most of the mines controlled by J.B. Robinson were located. See ARGME for Year Ending 30 June 1907, p.10.

76. TAD, LD 1446, AG 1937/07, Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 21 May 1907.

77. RDM, 21 May 1907. See also PRO, CO 291, 117/21321, Report on the Strike..., 21 May 1907.

78. On the origins of the Special Burgher Police, see Debates at the Fourth Ordinary Annual Meeting of the Inter-Colonial Council of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony, 30 May to 4 June 1906 (Bloemfontein, 1906), columns 138-9; PRO, CO 526 (South African Constabulary Original Correspondence), 8, Inspector General's Report of the South African Constabulary, 1900-1908

(undated). The force was formed when the SAC mobile columns policing the Chinese were sent to the border with Natal during the Bambatha rebellion.

79. Copies of telegrams in TAD, LD 1446, AG 1937/07.

80. Ibid., Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department (Urgent), 22 May 1907. On the Volunteers, see also CO 291, 117/19251, Selborne to Elgin (Telegram), 29 May 1907; and Ibid., 118/27753, Minute by Just on Selborne to Elgin, 15 July 1907.

81. SA News Weekly, 29 May 1907; RDM, 24 May; TAD, LD 1446, AG 1937/07, Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 23 May 1907 and 25 May; PRO, CO 291, 117/22214, Report on the General Strike of Miners on the Witwatersrand (May 22nd. to June 3rd.), encl. in Minister of Mines to Selborne, 3 June 1907.

82. PRO, CO 291, 117/18380, Selborne to Elgin (Telegram), 23 May 1907, including minutes by R.V.V., 24 May 1907 and Churchill, 25 May 1907.

83. RDM, 27 May 1907. For numbers and distribution of troops, see TAD, GOV 1106, PS 76/16/07, Captain Fraser-Clarke, Roberts' Heights, to Selborne, 28 May 1907.

84. TAD, LD 1446, AG 1937/07: Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 25 May 1907; Circular No. 79 (very urgent) from C.R.M. O'Brien, 24 May 1907; Inspector "B" Division to Commissioner of Police, 28 May 1907, encl. Affidavit of F.G. Webb (Plain Clothes Constable), 28 May 1907. See copy of police notice in TAD, GOV 1106, PS 76/16/07.

85. RDM, 25 May 1907; TAD, PM 33, 77/8/1907, Report of Proceedings, 1 June 1907.

86. TAD, GOV 1106, PS 76/16/07, General Mine Strike Report; TAD, LD 1446, AG 1937/07, Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 25 May 1907, 28 May 1907 and 30 May 1907; Report by Sergeant E. Witt, 25 May 1907; Superintendent "B" Division to Acting Commissioner of Police, 25 May 1907.

87. RDM, 27 May 1907, containing letter from R.J. Stickland. See also TAD, PM 33, 77/8/1907, Report of Proceedings, 1 June 1907. Newspaper reports, while suggesting that the miners had attempted to force their way onto the property, mention nothing about arms or drunkenness. See RDM, 25 May 1907; SA News Weekly, 29 May 1907.

88. RDM, 25 May 1907. On Stickland, see TAD, GOV 1106, PS 76/16/07, Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 29 June 1907 and 11 July 1907.

89. RDM, 24 May 1907.

90. RDM, 28 May 1907; SA News Weekly, 29 May 1907. See also van Onselen, "Main Reef Road," p.140.

91. TAD, LD 1446, AG 1937/07, Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 27 May 1907 and 28 May 1907; RDM, 31 May 1907.

92. TAD, PM 33, 77/8/1907, Report of Proceedings, 1 June 1907.

93. See Richardson, Chinese Mine Labour in the Transvaal, pp.174-5. See also note 80.

94. TAD, PM 33, 77/8/1907, Report of Proceedings, 1 June 1907.

95. Ibid.; Parliamentary Debates, volume 174, columns 1311, 1638.

96. ARGME for Year Ending 30 June 1907, p.3. On 30 June 1907, there were 92,743 African workers on the producing mines of the Witwatersrand.

97. Ibid., p.12. See also PRO, CO 291, 117/22214, Report on the General Strike of Miners on the Witwatersrand (May 22nd. to June 3rd.), 3 June 1907; 118/27753, Selborne to Elgin, 15 July 1907.

98. SA News Weekly, 8 May 1907; SA News Weekly, 15 May 1907.

99. RDM, 8 May 1907.

100. See, for example, PRO, CO 291, 118/28828, Selborne to Elgin (Telegram), 12 August 1907.

101. For an important exception, see MIC, TG2-1908, Part II, evidence of T. Mathews, p.459, para.5088.

102. PRO, CO 291, 117/22214, Report on the General Strike of Miners on the Witwatersrand (May 22nd. to June 3rd.), 3 June 1907; SC9-1913, evidence of R.B. Waterston, pp.567-8, paras.4017-4023; MIC, TG2-1908, Parts I-IV, evidence of G.E. Webber, T. Mathews, J. Coward, F. Crean, J. Oosthuizen, G.H. Somers, H.L. Phooko and W.T. Hallimond, and statement of J.M. Makhothe, pp.200, 443, 494, 694, 991, 999-1000, 1084, 1303, 1443, paras. 197-9, 4840, 5640-3, 8941-2, 14715-8, 14777, 16065-16081, 19150.

103. PRO, CO 291, 117/22214, Report on the General Strike of Miners on the Witwatersrand (May 22nd. to June 3rd.), 3 June 1907; 118/26853, Report on the General Strike of Miners on the Witwatersrand (No.7), 8 July 1907; ARGME for Year Ending 30 June 1907, p.11; "Quarterly Reports: Effects of 'The Strike'," SA Mines, 3 August 1907; "Glen Deep, Ltd.: Annual Meeting," SA Mines, 19 October 1907; SA News Weekly, 12 June 1907, for statement by Farrar.

104. ARGME for Year Ending 30 June 1907, p.10; SA News Weekly, 5 June 1907.

105. BRA, HE 253, File 148 ("Labour"), Part 6, No. 932, Notes on the Strike Situation submitted by Mr Honnold at the Meeting of Consulting Engineers on 28th May, 1907, and at the Joint Meeting of Engineers and Managers on the 29th.; MIC, TG2-1908, Parts II-III, evidence of W.T. Hallimond and R. Raine, pp.613, 644, 834, paras. 7439, 8032-8038, 12118-12123.

106. PRO, CO 291, 117/23161, Report on the General Strike of Miners on the Witwatersrand, 10 June 1907; TAD, GOV 1106, PS 76/16/07, General Mine Strike Report.

107. SA News Weekly, 29 May 1907; PRO, CO 291, 118/25884, Report on the General Strike of Miners on the Witwatersrand (No.6), 1 July 1907.

108. TAD, PM 33, 77/8/1907, Report of Proceedings, 1 June 1907.

109. Ibid., Prime Minister to L. Reyersbach, 4 June 1907.

110. Ibid., Report of an Interview, 7 June 1907. Botha's allusion to the consequences at Westminster of retaining troops on the Rand was edited out of the version of these proceedings released to the press. See draft in Ibid.

111. SA News Weekly, 10 July 1907; SA News Weekly, 17 July 1907; PRO, CO 291, 118/27753, Selborne to Elgin, 15 July 1907.

112. TAD, PM 33, 77/8/1907, Report of an Interview, 7 June 1907; SA News Weekly, 5 June 1907.

113. RDM, 6 June 1907. Estimates of the amount donated vary from £2000 to £10 000. See Katz, A Trade Union Aristocracy, p.133; The Progressive Monthly, 1 June 1907, suggesting that Robinson might also have granted a piece of land at Langlaagte for a strikers' camp.

114. RDM, 4 June 1907.

115. TAD, PM 33, 77/8/1907, Note of an Interview which a deputation of strikers had with the Right Honourable the Prime Minister and the Honourable the Attorney-General, 22 June 1907.

116. Ibid., Report of a Meeting Held in the Prime Minister's Office, 23 July 1907. See also SA News Weekly, 17 July 1907.

117. TAD, LD 1446, AG 1937/07, Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 30 May 1907, 31 May 1907, 4 June 1907, and 14 June 1907; SA News Weekly, 12 June 1907. For further examples, see van Onselen, "Main Reef Road," pp.143-4.

118. TAD, LD 1446, AG 1937/07, Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 11 June 1907; Chamber of Mines Archives (CMA), Strikes on the Mines 1907, Reyersbach to George Albu, Private and Confidential, 19 June 1907; BRA, Crown Mines Repository, Box 854, Group, File No. 1445/2. Strikes (General), G.E. Webber, Confidential Circular Letter to Managers No. 77/07, Policing of Mines, 19 June 1907.

119. TAD, LD 1446, AG 1937/07, Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 17 June 1907; TAD, GOV 1106, PS 76/16/07, Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 4 July 1907.

120. CMA, Strikes on the Mines 1907, Group Meeting following on the Special Meeting of the W.N.L.A., 15 July 1907.

121. See the correspondence in TAD, LD 1446, AG 1937/07 and GOV 1106, PS 76/16/07.

122. TAD, LD 1446, AG 1937/07, Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 28 June 1907.

123. TAD, GOV 1106, PS 76/16/07, Acting Commissioner of Police to Secretary to the Law Department, 29 June 1907 and 6 July 1907; Ibid., General Mine Strike Report.

124. BRA, HE 98, Reyersbach to Eckstein, 17 June 1907; Ibid., Reyersbach to Wernher, 24 June 1907.

125. TAD, PM 33, 77/8/1907, Report of a Meeting Held in the Prime Minister's Office, 23 July 1907; PRO, CO 291, 118/29570, Report on the General Strike of Miners on the Witwatersrand (No.10), 29 July 1907; Ibid., 118/31441, Selborne to Elgin, Confidential, 12 August 1907; Ibid., 119/33657, Botha to Selborne (Ministers' Minute No.432), 29 August 1907; Ibid., 119/32409, Deputy Governor to Elgin (Telegram), 9 September 1907; SA News Weekly, 31 July 1907.

126. "The 'Blacklegs'' Fate," SA Mines, 10 August 1907.

127. TAD, PM 33, 77/8/1907, Report of Proceedings, 1 June 1907.

128. "The Reduction of Working Costs," SA Mines, 2 November 1907.

129. BRA, HE 98, Reyersbach to Wernher, 19 August 1907.

130. TAD, PM 33, 77/8/1907, Report of a Meeting Held in the Prime Minister's Office, 23 July 1907.

131. See, for example, Emergence, p.74, the first full paragraph of which contains no fewer than four factual errors.

132. Ibid., p.77.

133. British Museum (BM), Campbell-Bannerman Papers, Add. MS 52,516, Elgin to Campbell-Bannerman, Private, 29 April 1907; PRO, CO 291, 123/15509, Elgin to Botha, 4 May 1907.

134. Yudelman, Emergence, pp.61, 77.

135. See "Comment of English Press," SA News Weekly, 29 May 1907, for evidence that they were.

136. For example, S. Marks and S. Trapido, "Lord Milner and the South African State," History Workshop Journal 8 (1979), 50-80.

137. Yudelman, Emergence, p.59.

138. Ibid., pp.60-62, 69-70.

139. Ibid., pp.62, 71.

140. Ibid., pp.5, 9, 13-15.

141. Ibid., p.42.

142. Ibid., pp.218-219.

143. M. Chanock, Britain, Rhodesia and South Africa 1900-45: The Unconsummated Union (London, 1977), pp.34-35, 249.

144. BM, Viscount Gladstone Papers, Volume XVI, Add. MS 46,000, Gladstone to Harcourt, 5 July 1913.

145. PRO, CO 291, 118/27753, Selborne to Elgin, 15 July 1907.