

https://dspace.org/

Trade Union Strategy And The Labour Process: Tucsa Trade Unions In The Transport And Building Industries, 1955-1977.

Crankshaw, Owen

2015-01-15
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/16548

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

For further examples of this type of formulation see:

"White labour policies emerged from an all-white franchise. Having concentrated political power in the white minority, the British administration in the Transvaal connived at giving it control of industry, commerce and the skilled trades. *Political power opened the door to economic privilege.*".(my emphasis), Simons, J. and Simons, R.(1983), *Class and Colour in South Africa, 1850-1950*, International Defence and Aid Fund for Southern Africa, London, p.98

And also;
"...*non-whiteness equalled rightlessness equalled powerlessness equalled cheapness.*" (original emphasis); "...wage rates were determined by the rights and opportunities of workers...and... such rights and opportunities were distributed on the basis of race and colour...". Johnstone, F.(1970), "Class Conflict and Colour Bars in the South African Gold Mining Industry, 1910-1926", *Collected Seminar Papers on the Societies of Southern Africa in the 19th and 20th Centuries, Volume 1*, Institute of Commonwealth Studies, University of London, p.16.

In a later contribution, Johnstone argues that white skilled labour was more expensive because of its relative political freedom, and because of the scarcity of skilled labour. Johnstone, F.(1976), *Class, Race and Gold: A Study of Class Relations and Discrimination in South Africa*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, pp.55-56

[14] Davies, R.(1973), *op cit*, p.51

[15] Ensor, L.(1976), *op cit*, p.26

[16] *ibid*, pp.29-30

[17] Wolpe, H.(1976), "The 'White Working Class' in South Africa", *Economy and Society* 5(2), p.212

[18] Innes, D. and Plaut, M.(1978), "Class Struggle and the State", *Review of African Political Economy* 11, pp.51-52

[19] Clarke, S.(1978), "Capital, Fractions of Capital and the State: 'Neo-Marxist' Analysis of the South African State", *Capital and Class* 5, pp.35 and 37

[20] For a more detailed examination of the logical structure of the fractionalist explanation of the racial division of the South African working class, see Crankshaw, O.(1986), "Theories of the White Working Class in South Africa", Paper presented to the Association for Sociology in Southern Africa Conference, July 1986, University of Natal, Durban.

[21] Emdon, E.(1984), "Co-option and Control: TUCSA and the African unions in the sixties", *Africa Perspective* 25; pp.40-64

Greenberg, S.(1980), *Race and State in Capitalist Development: South Africa in comparative perspective*, Ravan Press, Johannesburg.

Lewis, J.(1978), "Trade Unions and Changes in the Labour Process in South Africa, 1925-30", *Collected Seminar Papers on the Societies of Southern Africa in the 19th and 20th Centuries Volume 9*, Institute of Commonwealth Studies, University of London, pp.97-106

Lewis, J.(1983), "Steelworkers, Craft Unions and Afrikaner Nationalism", *South African Labour Bulletin* 8(6), pp.45-46

Lewis, J.(1984), *Industrialisation and Trade Union Organisation in South Africa, 1924-1955: The rise and fall of the South African Trades and Labour Council*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge; pp.6-7

Webster, E.(1983), "The Colour of Craft: Changing Forms of Job Protection among Members of the Iron Moulders' Society, 1944-1968", *Town and Countryside in the Transvaal*, B. Bozzoli (ed.), Ravan Press, Johannesburg, p.309

Webster, E.(1983), "The Labour Process and Forms of Workplace Organisation in South African Foundries", Doctoral Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand.

Webster, E.(1985), *Cast in a Racial Mould: Labour process and trade unionism in the foundries*, Ravan Press, Johannesburg, p.17

[22] Webster, E.(1985), *ibid*, p.26

[23] Lewis, J.(1984), *op cit*, pp.20-22

[24] *ibid*, pp.44 and 179

[25] *ibid*, p.108

[26] Greenberg, S.(1980), *op cit*, p.284

[27] *ibid*, p.19 and 285

CHAPTER TWO

TUCSA'S RELATIONSHIP WITH AFRICAN TRADE UNIONS

1. Introduction

The history of TUCSA is fraught with dissent over the question of an alliance with African workers. This conflict over the period 1954 to 1974 is demonstrated by TUCSA's vacillating policy on the affiliation of African unions. This chapter first outlines the periodisation and broader social context in which these divisions within TUCSA took place, and then proceeds to identify the different positions adopted within TUCSA, and the unions which supported them.

There were two important developments which contributed to the crisis in TUCSA in the late sixties. The first of these was the political ascendence of the Nationalist Party in 1948 and the second was the rapid industrial growth in the sixties. In the years between 1934 and 1948 Afrikaner nationalists had fought for the control of trade unions in the transport, mining, iron and steel, clothing and leather industries. By 1948 their only real successes were in the Mineworkers' Union and the *Spoorbond*.[1] Even after its electoral victory, the *Herenigde Nasionale Party* had failed to win the support of artisans and semi-skilled workers in unions with a history of militancy.[2] The enactment of the Suppression of Communism Act of 1950 by the Government was specifically aimed at removing the radical leadership of these unions. Further legislation aimed at destroying non-racial trade unionism soon followed. The Native Labour (Settlement of Disputes) Act, introduced in 1953, excluded Africans from membership of registered trade unions and set up a separate

industrial conciliation system for African trade unions,[3] and a few years later the passage of the Industrial Conciliation Act of 1956 placed restrictions on the organisation of mixed (coloured and white) unions.[4]

As the result of a campaign against the segregationist proposals contained in the new Industrial Conciliation Bill, TUCSA was established in 1954.[5] The specific features of the Bill which TUCSA opposed[6] were those clauses which prevented the registration of new mixed unions; made special provision for the splitting of mixed unions on racial lines; and provided for the reservation of specific occupations for persons of a defined race group.[7] This conflict between TUCSA and the State was reflected within the registered trade union movement itself. In the late 1940s, this same conflict split the non-racial South African Trades and Labour Council (SATLC) into a number of different trade union groupings.[8] During the fifties, these registered trade unions were divided into those which supported the State's policy of protecting the interests of white workers through job reservation and the racial segregation of the trade unions, and those who supported mixed unionism and the policy of the rate for the job. The former position was represented by the Coordinating Council of South African Trade Unions (CCSATU) and the Federal Consultative Council of the SAR&H Staff Associations (FCC). In opposition to this strategy, the latter position was supported by TUCSA and the South African Federation of Trade Unions (SAFTU). The difference between TUCSA and SAFTU was restricted to the question of the affiliation of African unions which was strongly opposed by SAFTU. Most of the unions which opposed the break-up of of the SATLC, and the exclusion of African unions from TUCSA in the mid-fifties joined up with the Council of Non-European Trade Unions to form the non-racial South African Council of Trade Unions.[9] Soon thereafter, the pinnacle of conservative trade union unity was

reached when SAFTU, CCSATU, FCC and TUCSA formed the South African Confederation of Labour (SACOL). This unity was short-lived, however, as the divisions between TUCSA and the other trade union groupings over trade union strategy resulted in TUCSA's resignation from SACOL in 1958.[10]

The Industrial Conciliation Act of 1956 had profound implications for TUCSA during the sixties when the rapid expansion of the economy resulted in the large-scale introduction of semi-skilled African labour. Because TUCSA was committed to the trade union strategy of organising cheap labour to prevent undercutting, rather than excluding such labour from trade unions, it necessarily found itself in opposition to the State and right-wing trade unions when it came to these aspects of labour legislation. When undercutting by cheap African labour intensified in the sixties, and TUCSA embarked on a drive to organise African unions, this precipitated a confrontation with the State which brought out the different positions within TUCSA on the organisation of African unions.

2. Divisions within TUCSA over the Affiliation of African Unions

The Second Unity Conference in 1954, which led to the formation of TUCSA,[11] voted to exclude African unions from the new trade union body.[12] In 1962 the constitution was changed to allow African unions to affiliate.[13] Subsequently, the African Affairs department was established for the purpose of organising African workers,[14] and TUCSA made a concession to African trade unions by permitting them to affiliate to both the Federation of Free African Trade Unions of South Africa and the Council.[15] At the 1966 Annual Conference the question of the affiliation of African unions was debated and referred to the incoming National Executive Committee for further consideration.[16]

In the years between 1962 and 1967 the African Affairs Department was active in attempting to organise African workers into separate unions,[17] but without much success. Concluding that African unions only grew independently of outside help when they operated as a parallel union of an effective registered trade union, TUCSA closed the African Affairs Department in 1967,[18] and began to pursue a policy of encouraging its affiliates to organise African workers into parallel unions.[19] This had the result of evoking a public attack on TUCSA by the Minister of Labour, Mr M. Viljoen.

> "It is evidently TUCSA's policy to organise so many Africans that the Government will be forced to recognise them. I want to say to the TUCSA leadership...that the Government will not tolerate this undermining of our national policy. If TUCSA wants to undermine Government policy and create new problems then it must take note that the Government will not hesitate to take the necessary measures."[20]


Directly following the Minister's attack, a number of TUCSA affiliates began to express dissatisfaction with the Council's policy towards African unions.[21] In response to these pressures the TUCSA National Executive Committee called a Special Conference in December 1967 to test the support of its affiliates.[22] Earlier in the year at the Annual Conference a resolution calling for the exclusion of African unions had been placed on the agenda but the issue was dropped when the resolution was withdrawn.[23] But later, at the Special Conference delegates voted to recommend to the Annual Conference that African unions be excluded from TUCSA.[24] However, when the issue was raised at the 1968 Annual Conference, this recommendation was not upheld.[25] In protest, 12 of the 18 unions which had voted for the exclusion of African unions, disaffiliated during the following year.[26] Figures 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 demonstrate that these disaffiliations represented the single most dramatic withdrawal of support for TUCSA during the sixties. Figure 2.1.2 shows this decline of support as a function of trade union affiliation, and Figure 2.1.1 shows how this affected the actual number of trade union members represented by TUCSA. In order to regain the membership of these

unions, the 1969 Annual Conference reversed this decision, and African unions were once more excluded from TUCSA.[27] By 1974, however, the constitution had been amended yet again to allow African unions to affiliate to the Council.[28]

It is clear from a reading of these debates that the different positions on the issue of African unions represented the conflict between two different trade union strategies. Both sides of the debate over the organisation of African workers agreed that changes in the racial division of labour, themselves the product of mechanisation, were resulting in the undercutting of the membership of registered trade unions. Because all registered unions in TUCSA had a common interest in protecting the living standards of their white, coloured and Indian members against undercutting by cheaper African labour, the division within TUCSA's ranks was limited to the question of which was the best method whereby this protection could be secured. So, although it is certain that the aggressive posture of the State towards TUCSA's liberal policy towards African unions was the catalyst to the subsequent debates and splits in the late sixties, it is also true that changes in the organisation of the labour process and the racial division of labour were the very condition for the development of these tensions within TUCSA.

FIGURE 2.1.1


Number of Unions Affiliated to TUCSA, 1955-1975



SOURCE:
See Table 2.1 (Appendix)

FIGURE 2.1.2

TUCSA Membership, 1955-1975



SOURCE:
See Table 2.1 (Appendix)

3. Identifying the Divisions within TUCSA

The division within TUCSA over the organisation of African unions corresponded roughly to a division between the white craft and transport unions on the one hand and semi-skilled coloured unions on the other. However, there are important exceptions to this pattern. The following sections of this chapter demonstrate that this division within TUCSA was a division over trade union strategy, and that it did not correspond exactly to occupational or racial divisions.

The following sections examine two different types of evidence. The first section examines the positions adopted by trade union delegates at the TUCSA Conferences. Clearly, this is only a partial picture, since not all union delegates expressed an opinion on this issue. The second section examines which unions disaffiliated in protest from TUCSA in 1968, and which unions did not. This also, is not a complete picture: since not all unions that disagreed with TUCSA's decision to include African unions went so far as to disaffiliate from the Council.

Tables 2.2 and 2.3 summarise the periodisation of these positions adopted by TUCSA unions, and Tables 2.4 and 2.5 summarise the periodisation of disaffiliations by unions as a result of conflict over the question of African unions. The occupational and racial scope of organisation of the unions, the industries in which they organised, and their membership strength are all detailed in these tables in order to demonstrate that the positions adopted by these unions does not correlate directly with any of these variables. Table 2.2 lists the unions which opposed the affiliation of African unions to TUCSA, and Table 2.3 lists the unions which supported this policy. Table 2.4 lists the unions which disaffiliated in protest

at TUCSA's policy of allowing African unions to affiliate to the Council, and Table 2.5 lists those unions which remained affiliated.

3.1 Positions Supported by TUCSA Unions

Trade unions which supported the exclusion of African unions from TUCSA did so for two reasons. Firstly, they believed that if TUCSA pursued its policy of organising African workers, the State would split existing mixed unions into separate coloured, white and Indian unions. Secondly, they expressed a deep mistrust of the strategy of organising African workers into parallel unions. The desire to have coloureds, Indians and Africans organised as members of existing registered unions was motivated by the fear that unless they were under the direct control of the union (i.e. as members), they would undercut white wages. Rather than antagonising the State by organising African workers, they believed that TUCSA should comply with State policy and thereby be in a stronger position to demand that Africans be allowed to become members of existing registered trade unions. These unions found it preferable that, rather than being organised into independent unions, African workers were not organised at all. To support this position they argued that it would not run against attempts by registered trade unions to prevent undercutting by negotiating the wages and conditions of employment of African workers.

In the debates of the Annual and Special TUCSA Conferences during the sixties, this position was advanced by some of the powerful white and mixed craft unions (see Table 2.2).

In 1962, when the TUCSA National Executive Committee proposed that African unions should be permitted to become members of the

at TUCSA's policy of allowing African unions to affiliate to the Council, and Table 2.5 lists those unions which remained affiliated.

3.1 Positions Supported by TUCSA Unions

Trade unions which supported the exclusion of African unions from TUCSA did so for two reasons. Firstly, they believed that if TUCSA pursued its policy of organising African workers, the State would split existing mixed unions into separate coloured, white and Indian unions. Secondly, they expressed a deep mistrust of the strategy of organising African workers into parallel unions. The desire to have coloureds, Indians and Africans organised as members of existing registered unions was motivated by the fear that unless they were under the direct control of the union (i.e. as members), they would undercut white wages. Rather than antagonising the State by organising African workers, they believed that TUCSA should comply with State policy and thereby be in a stronger position to demand that Africans be allowed to become members of existing registered trade unions. These unions found it preferable that, rather than being organised into independent unions, African workers were not organised at all. To support this position they argued that it would not run against attempts by registered trade unions to prevent undercutting by negotiating the wages and conditions of employment of African workers.

In the debates of the Annual and Special TUCSA Conferences during the sixties, this position was advanced by some of the powerful white and mixed craft unions (see Table 2.2).

In 1962, when the TUCSA National Executive Committee proposed that African unions should be permitted to become members of the

Council, it was strongly opposed by E. Eloff of the Motor Industry Employees' Union of South Africa (MIEUSA),[29] E. McCann of the Amalgamated Engineering Union (AEU),[30] C. Crompton of the Iron Moulders' Society of South Africa (IMS),[31] and L. Peterson of the Transvaal Leather and Allied Trades Industrial Union (TL&ATIU).[32] In 1966, after the AEU[33] and the MIEUSA[34] disaffiliated because of the affiliation of African unions to TUCSA, R. Cowley of the South African Electrical Workers' Association (SAEWA)[35] and T. Rutherford of the South African Typographical Union (SATU)[36] also began to demand that African unions be excluded from TUCSA. In the late sixties, after the attack by the Minister of Labour, these trade union leaders[37] were joined by D. Erasmus of the Johannesburg Municipal Workers' Union (JMWU)[38] and C. Botes of the Transvaal branch of the coloured National Union of Furniture and Allied Workers of South Africa (NUF&AWSA).[39] The following extracts from the debates on this question are typical examples of this position:

> "We are not prepared to sacrifice the non-White [coloured and Indian] members of the S.A. Typographical Union at this stage, or at any stage in the future, simply for the sake of having African trade unions, whose interests, in any case, we always protect."[40]
>
> "...[T]his is what my union fears more than anything else...we are going to be faced with a complete splitting of Whites and non-Whites [coloureds and Indians] into separate unions."[41]
>
> "If they [African unions] were not affiliated to TUCSA we could create the correct atmosphere with the Government to further discuss the matter, and have them allowed into proper trade unions."[42]
>
> "I believe that now, despite the resolutions we took in December, the Minister of Labour will take steps to legislate TUCSA out of existence, and then there will be nothing left to help anybody. The Africans need that help, and I say to you: Fight for the right to have the Africans in your trade-unions, but not in separate trade-unions. That is where they belong. Only there can you really discuss and consult with them. You cannot discuss with them as a separate organisation. If they have their own organisation they will want to have things their own way, and, as sure as eggs are eggs, they will fall into the wrong hands. Under the wing of a registered trade union they will become responsible and trained by you, the leaders of the trade union movement in South Africa."[43]

TABLE 2.2

Registered TUCSA Unions which Opposed the Affiliation of African Unions in Conference Debates during the 1960s

UNIONS WHICH OPPOSED THE AFFILIATION OF AFRICAN UNIONS IN 1962				
Union	Registered Scope	Type of Union	Industry	Membership (1962)
AEU	white	Craft	Metal & Engineering	17608
IMS	mixed	Craft	Metal & Engineering	2400
MIEUSA	white	Craft	Motor Repair	14340
TL&ATIU	mixed	Craft	Leather	3000

UNIONS WHICH OPPOSED THE AFFILIATION OF AFRICAN UNIONS IN 1966				
Union	Registered Scope	Type of Union	Industry	Membership (1966)
IMS	mixed	Craft	Metal & Engineering	2062
SATU	mixed	Craft	Printing	15569
SAEWA	white	Craft	Many (Electrical)	8000

UNIONS WHICH OPPOSED THE AFFILIATION OF AFRICAN UNIONS IN 1968				
Union	Registered Scope	Type of Union	Industry	Membership (1968)
NUF&AWSA	coloured	Craft	Furniture	5272
IMS	mixed	Craft	Metal & Engineering	2358
TL&ATIU	mixed	Craft	Leather	2992
NAF&AWSA	white	Craft	Furniture	75
SATU	mixed	Craft	Printing	15569
SAEWA	white	Craft	Many (Electrical)	8000
JMWU	white	Semi-skilled	Municipal	573

SOURCES:
University of the Witwatersrand, Church of the Province of South Africa Archives Collection, Records of the Trade Union Council of South Africa (AH1426), Reports of Proceedings;
i) Eighth Annual Conference, March 1962 (Ad1.9), Minutes of Proceedings, pp.150-162
ii) Twelfth Annual Conference, May 1966 (Ad1.13), Minutes of Proceedings, pp.182-184
iii) Fourteenth Annual Conference, April 1968 (Ad1.16), Minutes of Proceedings, pp.499-567

In contrast to this position, the unions that supported the affiliation of African unions to TUCSA argued that the decreasing numbers of coloured, Indian and white workers relative to African workers, diminished their bargaining strength in the Industrial Councils. As a result it was becoming increasingly difficult for registered trade unions to prevent undercutting by negotiating the wages and conditions of employment of African workers. Thus, these unions supported the organisation of African workers, whether in registered unions or not, and saw the opening up of TUCSA to African unions as a step in this direction. As far as the threat of splitting mixed unions was concerned, trade unions supporting this argument saw the exclusion of African unions as the beginning of a process which would end only when coloureds and Indians were also excluded from registered unions.

In the debates of the Annual and Special TUCSA Conferences during the sixties, this position was supported by a wide range of trade unions (see Table 2.3). They included a white craft union, two mixed craft unions, white and coloured semi-skilled unions, a mixed white-collar union, and small white professional union.[44] The following extracts from the debates are typical of this position:

> "The Government is responsible for the present situation because it will not allow Africans to join trade unions which are registered. The unions which are registered are having difficulties in negotiating new agreements for preserving rates of pay and the conditions they were forced to build up over the years. I fully understand this, but what puzzles me is how what is now proposed [the exclusion of African unions] is going to prevent fragmentation of these jobs, the underpaying and exploitation of Africans, and make it easier to maintain the standards of the Coloured and White workers. If we throw the African workers out of TUCSA, for the life of me I cannot see how this will be possible. Surely the correct thing is to say that we must completely organise the Africans, be it in our own registered unions or not. We must continue to encourage African unions to affiliate to TUCSA for that very reason."[45]

> "All around us we see an ever-increasing number of Africans entering industry...Notwithstanding the luck of the Typographical Union in having such understanding employers,

who are prepared to allow the Typos to negotiate on behalf of their African workers and notwithstanding legislation, the majority of the trade unions here find themselves unable to negotiate and represent the African workers in industry. What is the practical effect of this? The employer is largely able to determine the conditions of service for Africans doing the same job as the trade union members."[46]

TABLE 2.3

Registered TUCSA Unions which Supported the Affiliation of African Unions in Conference Debates during the 1960s

UNIONS WHICH SUPPORTED THE AFFILIATION OF AFRICAN UNIONS IN 1962				
Union	Registered Scope	Type of Union	Industry	Membership (1962)
SABS	mixed	Craft	Metal & Engineering	6000
SAEWA	white	Craft	Many (Electrical)	8000
ACFW	coloured	Craft	Furniture	160
FWIU(C)	coloured	Craft	Furniture	1480
FWIU(N)	mixed	Craft	Furniture	875
GWUSA	mixed	Semi-skilled	Clothing	11315
NULW	mixed	Semi-skilled	Leather	12340
NL&CTEU	mixed	Semi-skilled	Catering	1500
OBC&CU	mixed	Semi-skilled	Baking	469
NUOBM&P	coloured	Semi-skilled	Baking	1157
NUDW	white	Semi-skilled	Distributive	11522
CS&ATAU	white	Semi-skilled	Distributive	510
SASBO	white	Semi-skilled	Banking	12177

UNIONS WHICH SUPPORTED THE AFFILIATION OF AFRICAN UNIONS IN 1966				
Union	Registered Scope	Type of Union	Industry	Membership (1966)
SABS	mixed	Craft	Metal & Engineering	8282
OBC&CU	mixed	Semi-skilled	Baking	442
NUDW	white	Semi-skilled	Distributive	13869
SASBO	white	Semi-skilled	Banking	13022
GWUWP	mixed	Semi-skilled	Clothing	18000
GWUSA	mixed	Semi-skilled	Clothing	14620
HB&CTEA	coloured	Semi-skilled	Catering	1000

UNIONS WHICH SUPPORTED THE AFFILIATION OF AFRICAN UNIONS IN 1968				
Union	Registered Scope	Type of Union	Industry	Membership (1968)
GWUWP	mixed	Semi-skilled	Clothing	20000
GWIU(N)	mixed	Semi-skilled	Clothing	10000
GWUSA	mixed	Semi-skilled	Clothing	13590
NBTU	Indian	Craft	Clothing	143
SABS	mixed	Craft	Metal & Engineering	8813
NULW	mixed	Semi-skilled	Leather	13067
BaEU	mixed	-	Baking	809
NUDW	white	Semi-skilled	Distributive	13003
NUC&AW	coloured	Semi-skilled	Distributive	800
NUC&TW	mixed	Semi-skilled	Tobacco	772
SAHEIU	mixed	-	Hairdressing	3775
CMA	white	Professional	Musicians	50

SOURCES:
See Table 2.3

3.2 Unions Which Disaffiliated from TUCSA in Protest at the Decision to Include African Unions in 1968

It was commonly accepted that the main reason for the mass disaffiliation of unions in 1969 was TUCSA's policy of promoting the organisation of African unions, and their affiliation to the Council.[47] However, where I have found further evidence to support this explanation, this has been referenced in the notes to this section.

The registered unions which disaffiliated from TUCSA in 1969 predominated in the building, motor transport, municipal, printing and electrical sectors of the economy (see Table 2.4). In the building industry, the mixed Amalgamated Union of Building Trade Workers of South Africa (AUBTW) and Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers (ASW),[48] and the white Operative Plasterers' Trade Union of South Africa (OPTU), all disaffiliated. Only the weak Coloured, Malay and Asiatic Building Workers' Union (CM&ABWU) remained.[49] In the motor transport industry, the all-white Tramway Officials' Staff Association (TOSA), Motor Transport Workers' Union (MTWU)[50] and East London Municipal Transport Workers' Union (ELMTWU), the mixed Johannesburg Municipal Transport Workers' Union (JMTWU)[51] and Tramway and Omnibus Workers' Union (T&OWU) and the Coloured Transport Workers' Union (CTWUSA), all disaffiliated. Since the Durban Municipal Transport Employees' Union (DMTEU) had disaffiliated as early as 1959,[52] this left the relatively small coloured Republic Transport Workers' Union (South Africa) (RTWU) and Natal Passenger Transport Employees' Union (NPTEU) as the only representatives of the industry.[53] In the municipal sector all the white unions, the Johannesburg Municipal Workers' Union (JMWU)[54] and the East London Divisional Council Employees' Association (ELDCEA), disaffiliated, leaving only the Durban Integrated Municipal Employees' Society (DIMES). In the furniture industry, the white National Association

of Furniture and Allied Workers of South Africa (NAF&AWSA) disaffiliated, leaving the mixed Furniture Workers' Industrial Union (Natal) (FWIU(N)) and the coloured National Union of Furniture and Allied Workers of South Africa (NUF&AWSA). Important craft unions which disaffiliated were the mixed SATU[55] and the all-white SAEWA.[56]

3.3 Unions which Remained Affiliated to TUCSA in 1969, Following the Decision to Allow African Unions to Remain Affiliated to the Council

Registered unions which remained affiliated to TUCSA in 1969 predominated in the baking and confectionary, banking and finance, distributive and catering, clothing and furniture, leather and tobacco and the metal and engineering industries (see Table 2.5).[57] Out of a total of eight registered unions in the baking and confectionary industry, not a single union disaffiliated. In the banking and financial sector, the only registered union, the South African Society of Bank Officials (SASBO), also remained affiliated. The only representative of the brewing industry, the Brewery Employees' Union, also disaffiliated, but this was for financial reasons.[58] In the clothing industry, out of a total of five registered unions, only one union disaffiliated, and this was also because of financial difficulties.[59] All seven of the distributive and catering unions remained affiliates of the Council, as did the leather and tobacco unions. Although the IMS had opposed the affiliation of African unions, it remained affiliated to the Council, as did the remaining two metal and engineering unions: the mixed SABS and the coloured Engineering Industrial Workers' Union of South Africa (EIWUSA).

TABLE 2.4

Registered TUCSA Unions which Disaffiliated in Protest at the Affiliation of African Unions in the 1960s

UNIONS WHICH DISAFFILIATED IN 1966				
Union	Registered Scope	Type of Union	Industry	Membership (1966)
AEU	white	Craft	Metal & Engineering	17608
MIEUSA	white	Craft	Motor Repair	15599

UNIONS WHICH DISAFFILIATED IN 1968				
Union	Registered Scope	Type of Union	Industry	Membership (1968)
OPTU	white	Craft	Building	200
AUBTW	mixed	Craft	Building	5595
ASW	mixed	Craft	Many (Carpentry)	2398
SAEWA	white	Craft	Many (Electrical)	8000
NAF&AWSA	white	Craft	Furniture	75
SATU	mixed	Craft	Printing	15569
TOSA	white	Semi-skilled	Transport	97
T&OWU	mixed	Semi-skilled	Transport	2072
JMTWU	mixed	Semi-skilled	Transport	1500
ELMTWU	white	Semi-skilled	Transport	65
MTWU	white	Semi-skilled	Transport	850
JMWU	white	Semi-skilled	Municipal	573
ELDCEA	white	Semi-skilled	Catering	59

SOURCES:
University of the Witwatersrand, Church of the Province of South Africa Archives Collection, Records of the Trade Union Council of South Africa (AH1426), Reports of Proceedings;
i) Twelfth Annual Conference, May 1966 (Ad1.13), National Executive Committee Report.
ii) Fourteenth Annual Conference, April 1968 (Ad1.16), National Executive Committee Report.

TABLE 2.4

Registered TUCSA Unions which Disaffiliated in Protest at the Affiliation of African Unions in the 1960s

UNIONS WHICH DISAFFILIATED IN 1966				
Union	Registered Scope	Type of Union	Industry	Membership (1966)
AEU	white	Craft	Metal & Engineering	17608
MIEUSA	white	Craft	Motor Repair	15599

UNIONS WHICH DISAFFILIATED IN 1968				
Union	Registered Scope	Type of Union	Industry	Membership (1968)
OPTU	white	Craft	Building	200
AUBTW	mixed	Craft	Building	5595
ASW	mixed	Craft	Many (Carpentry)	2398
SAEWA	white	Craft	Many (Electrical)	8000
NAF&AWSA	white	Craft	Furniture	75
SATU	mixed	Craft	Printing	15569
TOSA	white	Semi-skilled	Transport	97
T&OWU	mixed	Semi-skilled	Transport	2072
JMTWU	mixed	Semi-skilled	Transport	1500
ELMTWU	white	Semi-skilled	Transport	65
MTWU	white	Semi-skilled	Transport	850
JMWU	white	Semi-skilled	Municipal	573
ELDCEA	white	Semi-skilled	Catering	59

SOURCES:
University of the Witwatersrand, Church of the Province of South Africa Archives Collection, Records of the Trade Union Council of South Africa (AH1426), Reports of Proceedings;
i) Twelfth Annual Conference, May 1966 (Ad1.13), National Executive Committee Report.
ii) Fourteenth Annual Conference, April 1968 (Ad1.16), National Executive Committee Report.

TABLE 2.5

Registered TUCSA Unions which Remained Affiliated after the 1968 Decision to Include African Unions

UNIONS WHICH REMAINED AFFILIATED IN 1968				
Union	Registered Scope	Type of Union	Industry	Membership (1968)
CM&ABWU	coloured	Craft	Building	140
FWIU(N)	mixed	Craft	Furniture	884
NUF&AWSA	coloured	Craft	Furniture	5272
GWUWP	mixed	Semi-skilled	Clothing	20000
GWIU(N)	mixed	Semi-skilled	Clothing	10000
GWUSA	mixed	Semi-skilled	Clothing	13590
NBTU	Indian	Craft	Clothing	143
TWF&DU	white	Craft	Clothing	300
EIWU(N)	coloured	-	Metal & Engineering	1020
IMS	mixed	Craft	Metal & Engineering	2358
SABS	mixed	Craft	Metal & Engineering	8813
MICWU	coloured	Semi-skilled	Motor Assembly	3700
WPMAWU	coloured	Semi-skilled	Motor Assembly	500
TL&ATIU	mixed	Craft	Leather	2992
NULW	mixed	Semi-skilled	Leather	13067
WBEA	white	Craft	Baking	200
NBaIEU	coloured	-	Baking	100
BEU	mixed	-	Baking	809
NUOBM&P	coloured	Semi-skilled	Baking	1069
SWU	mixed	Semi-skilled	Confectionary	800
WPSWU(COL)	coloured	Semi-skilled	Confectionary	400
T&CWU	coloured	Semi-skilled	Confectionary	100
WTR&CTEU	mixed	Semi-skilled	Catering	1000
HB&CTEA	coloured	Semi-skilled	Catering	1000
NL&CTEU	mixed	Semi-skilled	Catering	3000
ELL&CTEU	coloured	Semi-skilled	Catering	154
NUDW	white	Semi-skilled	Distributive	13003
CS&ATAU	white	Semi-skilled	Distributive	382
NUC&AW	coloured	Semi-skilled	Distributive	800
CTWU	coloured	Semi-skilled	Transport	350
RTWU	coloured	Semi-skilled	Transport	200
SASBO	white	Semi-skilled	Banking	13582
NUC&TW	mixed	Semi-skilled	Tobacco	772
DIMES	Indian	Semi-skilled	Municipal	500
NSIEU	Indian	-	Sugar	500
SAPWU	coloured	Semi-skilled	Pyrotechnichal	200
T&LFU	mixed	-	Fishing	700
SAC&RWU	mixed	-	Rope & Canvas	443
DRIU	mixed	Semi-skilled	Rubber	361
UL&AW	-	-	Lampshade	100
GWU	mixed	-	Glass	313
PEA	white	-	Photography	100
SAHEIU	mixed	-	Hairdressing	3775
LC&DWUSA	white	Semi-skilled	Laundry	300
SAT&CEU	mixed	-	Theatre & Cinema	1000
FUU	-	Semi-skilled	Undertaking	61
GD&CEU	-	Semi-skilled	Undertaking	98
SAADME	-	-	Dental Technicians	55

SOURCE:
See Table 2.4

4. Conclusion

Although the division in TUCSA over the organisation of African unions corresponds roughly to a division between white craft and transport unions on the one hand and industrial (semi-skilled) coloured unions on the other, there are some important exceptions to this pattern. White unions which supported the organisation of African workers were the SASBO, the NUDW and the CS&ATAU who represented white bank tellers and shop assistants. Similarly, the white SAEWA also supported the affiliation of African unions in 1962, although it began to oppose this position a few years later. Another example was SABS, a mixed craft union with a predominantly white membership, which supported the organisation of African unions throughout the sixties. There is also evidence that a branch of the coloured craft union, NUF&AWSA, was dissatisfied with TUCSA's policy of organising African workers.

The importance of these exceptions to the craft/semi-skilled division within TUCSA (which roughly corresponds with a racial division of labour), is that they demonstrate that the relations of production embodied in a particular labour process do not specify which form of trade unionism will prevail. The labour process can only specify the broad limits to a range of trade union strategies. My argument is that during the 1960s, the particular developments which were taking place in the labour processes of the different industries were such that the relations of production embodied in these labour processes were compatible with both open and closed styles of trade unionism. It was within this range of organisational possibilities which were set by the labour process that racial and political relationships were capable of determining which style of trade unionism prevailed.

4. Conclusion

Although the division in TUCSA over the organisation of African unions corresponds roughly to a division between white craft and transport unions on the one hand and industrial (semi-skilled) colou unions on the other, there are some important exceptions to this pattern. White unions which supported the organisation of African workers were the SASBO, the NUDW and the CS&ATAU who represente te bank tellers and shop assistants. Similarly, the white SAEWA also supported the affiliation of African unions in 1962, although it began to oppose this position a few years later. Another example was SABS, a mixed craft union with a predominantly white membership, which supported the organisation of African unions throughout the sixties. There is also evidence that a branch of the coloured craft union, NUF&AWSA, was dissatis ed with TUCSA's policy of organising African workers.

The importance of these exceptions to the craft/semi-skilled division within TUCSA (which roughly corresponds with a racial division of labour), is that they demonstrate that the relations of production embodied in a particular labour process do not specify which form of trade unionism will prevail. The labour process can only specify the broad limits to a range of trade union strategies. My argument is that during the 1960s, the particular developments which were taking place in the labour processes of the different industries were such that the relations of production embodied in these labour processes were compatible with both open and closed styles of trade unionism. It was within this range of organisational possibilites which were set by the labour process that racial and political relationships wer capable of determining which style of trade unionism prevailed.

Of the seventeen registered unions which disaffiliated from TUCSA in protest at the decision to include African unions, nine of them were found in only two sectors; the building and motor transport industries. The remaining eight unions, however, were spread over seven industries. Because a labour process analysis requires a thorough examination of the specific characteristics of the labour process of the industries in which unions are organised, there are various benefits to studying a cluster of unions within a limited number of industries. For this reason, and also because the Records of TUCSA yielded the richest material on the building and motor transport industries, these two sectors were chosen as the focus of this study. The following two chapters, chapters three and four, are therefore devoted to an examination of these two industries and their unions.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

[1] O'Meara, D.(1983), *Volkskapitalisme: Class, capital and ideology in the development of Afrikaner nationalism, 1934-1948*, Ravan Press, Johannesburg, pp.89-90

[2] *ibid*, p.242

[3] South African Institute of Race Relations (1982), *Race Relations as Regulated by Law in South Africa, 1948-1979*, South African Institute of Race Relations, Johannesburg, p.106

[4] *ibid*, pp.106-107

[5] Lewis, J.(1984), *Industrialisation and Trade Union Organisation in South Africa, 1924-1955 The rise and fall of the South African Trades and Labour Council*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, p.172-3

[6] *ibid*, p.172

[7] South African Institue of Race Relations (1956), *A Survey of Race Relations in South Africa 1955-1956*, South African Institute of Race Relations, Johannesburg, p.176-178

[8] Alexander, R. and Simons, H.(1959), *Job Reservation and the Trade Unions*, Enterprise, Cape Town, pp.26-27

Grobbelaar, J.(1976), "An Overview of Industrial Relations in South Africa", *Industrial Relations in South Africa: An event-structure of labour*, J. Coetzee, Juta, Cape Town, p.182

Hepple, A.(1954), *Trade Unions in Travail: The story of the Broederbond-Nationalist plan to control South African trade unions*, Unity Publications, Johannesburg, pp.84-85

[9] Horrell, M.(1961), *South African Trade Unionism: A Study of a Divided Working Class*, South African Institute of Race Relations, Johannesburg, pp.22-23

Horrell, M.(1969), *South Africa's Workers: Their organisation and patterns of employment*, South African Institute of Race Relations, Johannesburg, p.20

Lewis, J.(1984), *op cit*, p.173

[10] TUCSA opposed the other trade union groups over the registration of SACOL (which meant that the Confederation would not be allowed to hold mixed conferences) and over their support for the policy of job reservation. University of the Witwatersrand, Church of the Province of South Africa Archives Collection (hereafter CPSA), Records of TUCSA, Reports of Proceedings, Three Special Conferences: The Urgent Special Conference, September 1958 (Ad1.5), Minutes of Proceedings, pp.7-15

[11] Originally the South African Trade Union Council, but renamed the Trade Union Council of South Africa (TUCSA) in 1962. CPSA, TUCSA, Report of Proceedings, Eighth Annual Conference, March 1962 (Ad1.9), Minutes of Proceedings, p.150

[12] CPSA, TUCSA, Report of Proceedings, Eighth Annual Conference, March 1962 (Ad1.9), Minutes of Proceedings, p.150-151

Imrie, R.(1979), *A Wealth of People: The Story of the Trade Union Council of South Africa*, Trade Union Council of South Africa, Johannesburg, p.22

Lever, J.(1979), "The Trade Unionism of Moderate Opposition, 1954-1970", *Society in Southern Africa, 1975-1978*, F. Orkin and S. Welz (eds.), University of Witwatersrand Press, Johannesburg, p.255

Lewis, J.(1984), *op cit*, p.173

[13] CPSA, TUCSA, Report of Proceedings, Eighth Annual Conference, March 1962 (Ad1.9), Minutes of Proceedings, pp.42-43 and 150-164

[14] CPSA, TUCSA, Report of Proceedings, Ninth Annual Conference, March 1963 (Ad1.10), Minutes of Proceedings, p.30

[15] *ibid*, National Executive Committee Report, p.5

[16] CPSA, TUCSA, Report of Proceedings, Twelfth Annual Conference, May 1966 (Ad1.13), Minutes of Proceedings, p.184

Author Crankshaw Owen
Name of thesis Trade Union Strategy And The Labour Process: Tucsa Trade Unions In The Transport And Building Industries, 1955-1977. 1987

PUBLISHER:
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.