

https://dspace.org/

Ons dak nie ... ons phola hierso: politics, protest and proletarians in Sophiatown, 1930-1955

Lebelo, Steve

1991-03
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/9029

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

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND

A F R I C A N S T U D I E S I N S T I T U T E

African Studies Seminar Paper
to be presented in RW
4.00pm MARCH 1991

Title: Ons Dak Nie...Ons Phola Hierso: Politics, Protest and proletarians in Sophiatown, 1930-1955.

by: Steve Lebelo

No. 287

"Ons dak nie...ons phola hierso":[1]
Politics, Protest and Proletarians in Sophiatown, 1930-1955

QUOTE: Then there was silence, broken only by the sound of eighty lorries and two thousand police moving into Sophiatown. There was no resistance of any sort.[2]

Existing interpretations of the failure of resistance to the forced removal of Sophiatown in 1955 have been grossly inadequate. The emphasis has been on the political programmes and strategies of organised politics which articulated the interests of property owners.[3] Sophiatown's marginalised and underprivileged classes - tenants and sub-tenants - have been largely ignored. This study focuses exclusively on tenants and sub-tenants in Sophiatown. It explores their urban experiences as shaped by the patterns of migration that charcterised them; the nature and function of the rural ties that they evolved in the city and forms of accommodation that they desired and procured. Further the study attempts to analyse elements of political apathy and acquiescence among the largest proportion of Sophiatown's population. Sophiatown and Martindale (henceforth Sophiatown) were inhabited by a community that did not share similar characteristics of urban culture with Newclare and Western Native Township (WNT). It is argued in this study that, theoretically, Sophiatown developed in sharp contrast with the other two townships. The violent unrest of 1949 and 1950 was a result of the conflict of interest between the local state and the communities in Newclare and WNT. It was a conflict in which the Sophiatown community was relatively uninvolved.

This paper is divided into four sections. In section I, Sophiatown's early history is examined. Initially, the township was inhabited by White home-owners. By 1912 Africans, most of whom were living in family circumstances and who were relatively affluent were obtaining properties in Sophiatown. However, for three decades population growth remained relatively insignificant. Section II focuses on the growth of tenants and sub-tenants in Sophiatown against the backdrop of slum clearance in the center of Johannesburg. In section III the paper examines political protest in the Western Areas of Johannesburg and how Sophiatown's tenant classes were affected by and responded to conflicts between the "agents of external authority" - the local state - and the community in the region. The concluding section focuses on the implications of the Western Areas Scheme on Sophiatown's tenants and sub-tenants. It is argued that conflicts with landlords and promises of more living space in Meadowlands were not the overriding concerns of Sophiatown's tenant classes. The threat of forced removals in 1950 would have resolved the crisis that affected tenant classes' reproductive

capacity created by changing material conditions in the rural districts. However, at this stage such a hypothesis is only speculative as evidence remains inconclusive.

I

Established in 1905 as a White suburb, Sophiatown attracted few admirers. Most were discouraged by insanitary depositing site adjacent to it. By 1912 the township had been inhabited by White and Black owners. The rate of population growth remained infinitely small, and in 1921 the total number of persons resident in Sophiatown was barely 3 000. Africans made up slightly more than half of the total population.[4] It is highly likely that Africans moving into Sophiatown up to the middle of the 1920s were property-owning families and not tenants.[5] Property-owning families were growing steadily up to 1926 when they formed a pressure group, the Non-European Ratepayers Association (NERA). Although many people migrated into Johannesburg after 1926, at the rate of 600 families annually,[6] Sophiatown still remained out of bounds for an overwhelming majority of them.[7] It was only in the middle of the 1930s that Sophiatown's population increased very sharply. Two factors seem to have accounted for the sharp increase in Sophiatown's population from 1935: (a) the enclosures in respect of insanitary areas during 1930 and 1931, and the Slums Act of 1934 which provided for the destruction of slumyards in central Johannesburg,[8] and (b) the emergence of a fast growing manufacturing sector after 1933 attracted thousands of young men and women who flooded to the city in search of employment. Historians have found it logical to explain the growth in Sophiatown's population by invoking the first explanation.[9] It is possible that the growth in Sophiatown's population (especially of the sub-tenant class who, by 1950, made up 82% of the population) can be explained by the combination of the two factors - destruction of insanitary areas and new migration. However, the developments of the 1940s and 1950s in the municipal locations and freehold townships suggest that this is no plausible explanation. Greater sensitivity is required to arrive at more plausible explanation. It is these events that the paper will focus on next.

Residents of the slumyard had been effectively proletarianized by the 1920s. Evidence of this is the fact that they migrated into Johannesburg as families.[10] Coplan has characterised them as the "sebono morao" (buttocks to the back) urban dwellers "who had left their homes permanently and thus showed their ass the village and white farms"[11] (my emphasis). The social composition of slum-dwellers was rather complex. There was a "mixture of workers, the self-employed, the unemployed, the unemployable and the middle classes, of men, women and children, and of people from a variety of rural origins."[12] And Koch suggests that in spite of the effectiveness of municipal

controls, an overwhelming majority of slum-dwellers moved into municipal locations after 1937. In that year, the manager of the Non-European Affairs Department (NEAD) happily reported that: "The resistance of natives to the slum clearance process has almost disappeared. Four years ago not more than 12 percent of those evacuated from slum areas took up residence in locations and hostels. This figure is now 90 percent...the demand is so keen that all sorts of subterfuge is employed by natives from other areas to secure municipal accommodation."[13]

Partly, this settles the crucial question relating to reasons for the sudden increase in Sophiatown's tenant and sub-tenant classes. There were few, if any, slum-dwellers who entered Sophiatown after 1937. We are therefore left with one explanation: that the growth in Sophiatown's population can best be explained by migration patterns of the 1930s and 1940s. On the basis of intensive field work done in Meadowlands, where the tenants and sub-tenants were ultimately relocated, this assertion is substantiated. And again, these new migrants have been characterised mainly by partial proletarianisation and they have had their extended families, to whom they had support obligations in the villages and on White farms. Hence, they did not migrate as families. In the majority of cases, they were single man and women from parts of the Transvaal countryside who retained constant contact with their rural folks through the wider ethnic and village networks that they had established in the city. It was through these networks that they gained access to jobs in the city,[14] as well as accommodation - mainly rented single rooms - in Sophiatown. Finally, because of their origins (Western Transvaal, Northern Transvaal and Eastern Transvaal), they tended to be of determinate ethnic groupings. The majority were Tswana-speaking from the Western Transvaal. (See Table 1)

Tenants, it seems, only began to settle in Sophiatown in the late 1920s or early in the 1930s. It has already been noted that until the middle of the 1920s Africans in Sophiatown were living in full family circumstances and in most cases were property owners in the township.[15] Although migration into the city had increased to a staggering rate of 600 families annually after 1926, the majority of these were absorbed by the slumyards. Koch points out that "in 1925 the yard population was estimated to be 8 000 and by 1927 the figure was 40 000."[16] A small proportion of migrants in this period probably slipped into Sophiatown where they became tenants. In the ten years between 1926 and 1936 Sophiatown's capacity to admit tenants was severely limited. Against the backdrop of the J.C.C.'s slum clearance programme, property owners could not be expected to shoot themselves in the leg by erecting too many backyard shacks. Physical deterioration that accompanied proliferation of shacks would have focused the J.C.C's attention on Sophiatown as a developing slum. In 19333, the J.C.C. and the Minister of Native Affairs arrived at an agreement in which the minister "indicated he would support the

inclusion of Sophiatown, Martindale and Newclare in the proclamation of the whole of Johannesburg under certain conditions, among others that Black property owners...continue to be allowed to house unexempted Africans, that licenses for all existing buildings would be issued free of charge."[17]

The spectre of slum clearance was hanging ominously over Sophiatown in the early 1930s and property owners could not erect too many backyard shacks to accommodate tenants. It is highly probable that slum-dwellers evicted between 1934 and 1937 and not entering municipal locations, were slipping imperceptibly into Newclare, a township characterised by absentee landlordism.[18] Because property owners in Newclare did not reside in the township, illicit beer brewers could carry on their trade uninhibited.[19] Until 1937, few tenants would have been able to enter and reside in Sophiatown. Between 1937 and 1950 the number of tenants and sub-tenants increased tremendously and by the latter date far exceeded that of property owners. It has already been noted that the increase in Sophiatown's population, represented by the flood into the township of tenants and sub-tenants, cannot be attributed to the destruction of slumyard communities. The plausible explanation is that the majority of tenants and sub-tenants (who, by 1950 made up 96% of the total population in Sophiatown) migrated into the township from 1937 onwards.[20] Because they were not slumyard evacuees, it is reasonable to conclude that they were "new migrants" from the countryside.[21] This fact is demonstrated below where the emergence and growth of of sub-tenants is fully analysed. It is not enough to assert that tenants and sub-tenants were mainly "new migrants" into the city. Patterns of migration that characterised them and their propensity to seek "single-room" forms of accommodation were functional to their commitments in the villages and on White farms. As prospective tenants increased in number, property owners erected backyard shacks to accommodate them.[22] Had property owners thrown caution to the wind and risked slum clearance by erecting shacks and taking in more sub-tenants? Or, was there reason to believe that the threat of slum clearance had receded? This study will explore these questions in the following section.

In 1939 the J.C.C. adopted a resolution to remove African communities from the Western Areas. Again, in 1944 a similar resolution was taken.[23] Both resolutions remained as a dead letter as no action was taken. The reasons for shelving these resolutions may not be analysed in detail here, but some points that shed light on the configuration of class forces within the local state need to be mentioned. The resolutions, later refered to as the Western Area Scheme, were intricately linked to the broader conflict between the local state and the manufacturing sector on the one hand and the central government on the other, over the provision of "the means of collective consumption", especially housing, for the African workforce. This struggle

had, in the late 1930s and early 1940s, become intense as the municipal locations were overcrowded.[24] Manufacturing and Industrial capital interests, pressurised by the state to assume responsibility for housing the African workforce resident in the municipal locations, persistently refused to do so.[25] Maybe it is for this reason that, as part of employment and labour strategies, manufacturing concerns tended to eschew urbanised youth in favour of "new migrants".[26] But, as noted above, new migrants were denied entry into the municipal locations because they were generally migrating as single males and females in the 1930s and 1940s. Thus they swelled the ranks of tenants and sub-tenants in Sophiatown between 1937 and 1950.

Notwithstanding the resolutions of 1939 and 1944, property owners continued to erect backyard shacks to accommodate "new migrants" as tenants and sub-tenants. In 1937 there were 2 103 built-up properties (those with backyard shacks) and by 1950 they had increased to 8 352.[27] On the basis of the issues raised in the preceding paragraph, it seems reasonable to suggest that the J.C.C. was dominated by the manufacturing class interest. This was categorically demonstrated in the findings of the Young Committee of 1935 and the Smit Committee of 1942. The Young Committee refuted the idea that it had to recommend strategies that would give "municipalities and the government greater powers to restrict all entry by Natives into the urban areas".[28] The Committee was alarmed that such measures would have starved manufacturing sectors of labour. In its findings, therefore, it attempted "to accommodate the changing labour demands of an economy which was then undergoing a phase of accelerated development in the secondary industrial sector."[29] The Smit Committee discounted the idea that the manufacturing industry had to take responsibility for providing "the means of collective consumption."[30] If anything, the relaxation of influx control regulations in 1942 was testimony of the dominance of the manufacturing sector within the J.C.C. The fact that this entailed the flooding of the city by "new migrants" who, realistically, could not be accommodated in the municipal locations, left Sophiatown and other freehold townships as possible alternative residential areas. Such an "analysis of the configuration of interests which induced the J.C.C. to initiate the removal proposal in 1939 and 1944, but keep it in abeyance... tells us much about the nature of the dominant social class at the local level."[31] It is argued here that it was in the interest of the manufacturing sector to preserve Sophiatown. The township was pivotal in the sector's accumulation strategies.

II

Yet how useful was Sophiatown to tenants and sub-tenants in the late 1930s and 1940s? Central to this question is the fact that tenant classes were not migrating as whole families. To most of them Johannesburg was "makgoweng" (the place of the Whites), it is this that made them "footloose" urban dwellers. More often than not, they were young males and females who had kinship ties - fictional or real - with early tenants in Sophiatown and other freehold townships.[32] And they were not exclusively from villages in the Reserves. In the Western Transvaal, where most came from, White farms had been one of the major supply sources. Hence, in 1939 it was estimated that "some 78% of the lads under 18 years of age who seek work on the Rand have come from the rural districts and have no parents living on the municipal areas." (Native Affairs Commission, 1939, p6) And farmers complained bitterly that "they were subsidising low wages in the towns because the labour tenants who migrated there left their families living on the farmer's land."[33]

Such migration patterns of individual members of rural families, determined the types of urban residential accommodation suitable for their circumstances. Houses in the municipal locations, it has already been noted, were only available to family units. The new wave of migrants were therefore restricted to single rooms in backyard shacks. Oral testimonies gathered in Meadowlands validate this hypothesis. The period of migration and residential choices confirm this pattern among almost all sub-tenants and a significant proportion of tenants. Most responses to these questions conducted randomly in Meadowlands, are typical and illustrate the historical trajectory of sub-tenants:

Q: When were you born?

A: In 1926.

Q: Where?

A: In Mafeking.

Q: When did you move to Johannesburg?

A: In 1944.

Q: Where did you stay in Johannesburg?

A: In Sophiatown, Willies Street.

Q: With whom?

A: My aunt had been staying there and I came to

live with her?

Q: Did she own the property?

A: No, she was a tenant. The property was owned by an Indian.[34]

The widespread phenomenon was that in which tenants were allowed to share rooms with other people if they chose to do so. These would be characterised as sub-tenants. It was highly unlikely that tenants would share single rooms with strangers. They appear to have felt more comfortable with relatives or with people they knew from the villages. It is in this way that kin and village networks were created, expanded and reproduced over time, and it was through these kin and village networks that new migrants were able to secure accommodation. Mrs Mashao of Meadowlands shared her experiences with many others interviewed:

Q: When did you settle in Sophiatown?

A: It was a long time ago. In the 1930s.

Q: Where did you come from?

A: From Lebowa, in the Pietersburg district.

Q: Where did you initially settle, in Johannesburg?

A: I moved in with my brother who was renting a single room with his wife in Merris Street in Sophiatown.[35]

Some new migrants moved in with friends. In most cases arrangements would have been made before the new migrants arrived. When young men left the villages or farms (where their families were labour tenants) they would have made contacts and would have thus been guaranteed of safety. The responses of Mr Makabanyane are consistent with those of an overwhelming majority of adults in Meadowlands:

Q: When were you born?

A: In 1928.

Q: Where?

A: In Mafeking.

Q: When did you begin to reside in Sophiatown?

A: Soon after World War II. It must have been 1946.

Q: Where in Sophiatown?

A: In Gibson Street.

Q: With whom? Were you married?

A: I was not married. I moved in with a friend from home who had rented a shack in the backyard.

Q: How many rooms were had he rented?

A: It was a one-roomed house.[36]

Tenants and sub-tenants were generally not living in family circumstances. In most cases there were no children in tenant families for a number of reasons. The crisis of space in Sophiatown and other freehold townships (to which the majority were restricted) made it almost impracticable that tenants and sub-tenants could live with their families. However, there were exceptions and a minority out of the total population of tenants and sub-tenants would have lived in family circumstances. In most cases, those who migrated during the 1930s and 1940s would have been single, young adults as noted above. Home-boys and home-girls kept together by village networks, inter-married and in almost all cases the children of such marriages were sent back to the countryside to be brought up, mainly, by their maternal grandparents. The Sample Survey of 1951 stresses the fact that tenants and sub-tenants were characterised by one-member and two-member families, whose family structures are explained by the unavoidable contingencies of having to leave their families in the countryside.[37] One of my informants noted that:

> ...the Shangaans, Vendas and Tswanas were not living with their wives. Wives stayed behind in the countryside while men were in the city...they lived all by themselves...women came only when men invited them - often once in three or six months. At times they (wives) would bring children along - but children generally lived with their maternal grandparents.[38]

The crisis of urban space was not the ultimate and decisive factor in shaping these families. In part, tenants and sub-tenants were drawn to the villages and White farms because of their material dependence on rapidly declining reserve economies and progressively disintegrating labour tenancy on White farms.[39] It has already been noted that village and kin networks were central to the procurement of accommodation, but they also served a higher and more crucial purpose. While employers favoured "New migrants" ahead of urban youths in their employment policies, and "kin and community represented the most useful resources in a hostile urban environment and home-boy/girl networks were the common means of actually finding a job."[40]

There are two important issues raised in this study so far. The first is that tenants and sub-tenants (who together made up 96% of the total population in Sophiatown) had only a fleeting experience of town life by the mid-1950s. One ex-Sophiatown tenant and sub-tenant stated:

> A: In 1933 when I entered Johannesburg I lived for five months in "Feitas" (Vrededorp)...then I moved on to no. 13 Ray Street in Sophiatown.
>
> Q: But why did you move to Sophiatown?
>
> A: There were not very many people I knew in Vrededorp. So I moved to Sophiatown where there were many I knew from home (Ventersburg). My younger brothers had been living there. There was a cousin who moved from Ray Street to Western Native Township (WNT). I occupied the room in Ray Street.[41]

An overwhelming majority of Sophiatown's tenants and sub-tenants have a historical experience quite unrelated to Marabic culture - a culture associated with the formulative stages of the African working classes in Johannesburg. On the contrary, throughout the 1930s and 1940s tenants and sun-tenants were largely steeped in "rural culture" that insulated them from the everyday experiences in the township - except maybe as "moegoes" and victims of urban violent culture.[42]

The second point, partly related to the first, is that tenants and sub-tenants were in a constant state of flux. The movement between town and country had been so frequent that the similarity with latter day hostel inmates is striking. An editorial in the Sowetan vividly explained this back-and-forth movement of the urban Tswana from the Western Transvaal and by far the largest ethnic group in Sophiatown:

> The burden of my article is that, however humble these places are or used to be, they were homes to some people. People who worked the factories and other jobs in Johannesburg saved diligently so that they could put some money away to go home on holidays.
>
> You should have seen the trains from Johannesburg to Ventersdorp in my day. You would have sworn to yourself these people were headed for the Bahamas or some such exotic place. You should have seen the excitement in their faces, whereas they were headed for a one-horse town and a village in the most ridiculously reduced circumstances imaginable. But for them that was - and is - home.[43]

The significance of patterns of migration; of rural material conditions that triggered off migration in the 1930s and 1940s; of length of residence in the towns and forms of accommodation for tenants and sub-tenants in Sophiatown remain largely unexplored. More curious is the fact that the impact of the insular, village, home-boy/girl networks on unionisation in sectors dominated by "new migrants" - domestic servants and manufacturing - have received little or no attention at all for the period under focus. The characterisation of Sophiatown's community as working class and ascribing to it a proletarian consciousness is stretching the analogy too far.

Sophiatown's underprivileged and marginalised classes, characteristically tenants and sub-tenants in the township were not effectively assimilated into cultural and political mainstream of Johannesburg throughout the 1930s and 1940s. Sophiatown's tenants and sub-tenants, thus characterised, could not have been significantly instrumental in shaping the tradition of political militancy ascribed to the Western Areas communities.

The foregoing analysis of Sophiatown's tenants and sub-tenants is not an index to explain patterns of political apathy and acquiescence among the township's marginalised and underprivileged classes. Tenants and sub-tenants may have been the crucial and significant urban constitutions that influenced and shaped the parameters of some of the rural struggles in the 1950s.[44] Yet, they were less keen in challenging capital and the local state in the city.[45] The absence of dramatic political events in the Western Areas of Johannesburg between the wars has been explored. But, is it a useful exercise to lump Sophiatown with other Western Areas townships?

See Table II for family patterns of Sophiatown's tenant classes.

III

In 1950 the J.C.C. adopted a resolution to implement the Western Areas Scheme - a scheme that would have cleared all African communities from the area. Resolutions adopted by the J.C.C. in 1939 and 1944 were ignored, but in 1950 the Council was far more anxious to implement the Western Areas Scheme than it had been on the two previous occasions. The City Council's assertion that the Western Areas Scheme was slum clearance has been dismissed as nothing but propaganda.[46] Nonetheless, the outbreak of violence in the Western Areas and its political significance has been overstated and should not be taken uncritically. There were far more important underlying causes prompting the City Council to implement the Western Areas Scheme than the sporadic, ephemeral and small scale violence of 1949 and 1950.

In its brief to the delegation of African leaders the J.C.C.'s Ad Hoc Committee hinted that apart from developing slum conditions, violence and unrest in the Western Areas had become intolerable. Acting Manager of the J.C.C.'s Non-European Affairs Department (N.E.A.D.), the irrepressible W.J.P. Carr outlined the objectives of the City Council re the Western Areas Scheme to the delegation of African leaders. Although the council pretended to have been concerned with developing slum conditions, the emphasis was on political violence.In his opening speech Carr remarked:

> "As you know, as a result of unrest in the Western Areas, certain unfortunate incidents have taken place in the past few months. There was a lot of trouble in connection with increased tram fares which led to boycotts, assaults, which was most regrettable."[47]

These incidents of violent unrest, he went on, "focused the attention of all concerned - the government and the local authority - on the problems that have arisen as a result of the population in the Western Areas living in overcrowded conditions and it is with the object of trying to get to the root of that problem that we are here today."[48] There seems to have been a concerted effort to link violent unrest to slum conditions flowing directly from overcrowding, but Carr and his colleagues did not view the nature and exaggerated scale of crime in starkly political terms.

From time to time N.E.A.D. officials acknowledged and condemned the anti-social character of the violence. The authorities were alarmed by the "social evils among the worst of whom are threat to health, the large measure of immorality and juvenile delinquency and the high evidence of crime among the adult population."[49] In a pacifist tone the J.C.C. committed itself to a programme "reducing and ensuring better living conditions for communities in the Western Areas."[50]

These sentiments were aimed at making an impression on the African delegation by appealing to their middle class sensibilities. It also forged an apolitical understanding of the violence of 1949 and 1950 among this group of leading African personalities in the Western Areas. For most of them such violence was intolerable if it put their freehold privileges in jeopardy. Carr, hinting at the need to rehouse some sections of the communities warned, in an obvious reference to freehold rights, that "at the outset I must make it clear that there will be no question of promises made one way or another. We will make no positive promises."[51]

There is no conclusive proof the the City Council perceived the unrest of 1949 and 1950 as a manifestation of political militancy. Neither did the majority of residents in the Western

Areas. Witnesses giving evidence to the Commission of Inquiry into Native Riots at Newclare, Krugersdorp, Randfontein and Newlands emphasized the anti-social character of the riots rather than whatever political content a stretch of the imagination could have conjured up. Property owners and some of the local branch leaders of the A.N.C. and S.A.C.P. in their responses to some of the aspects of the violence suggested that political issues were not overriding.

Among the witnesses called to testify was Mr Roux, a tram driver, who told the commissioner that "by half-past six all trams were being stoned, mostly by boys and girls between 14 and 17 years. They were neither organised nor instigated."[52] A nurse employed by the City Council Mabel Yose told the commission that "on September 21, 1949, a number of Natives came to her house in W.N.T. and threatened to assault her because she used a tram service from the township to Johannesburg; she was enraged as she believed that people in the township wanted to use trams".[53]

Some witnesses with asserted that it was police brutality that produced a sense of public resentment. However, not all policemen were subjected to severe criticism, nor was the institution of the police universally condemned. The South African Institute of Race Relations observed that "among lesser irritants was the lack of courtesy on the part of junior police officials at pass offices and on trains, trams and buses. Senior police officials on the whole were courteous, but the same could not be said for the juniors."[54]

A.B. Xuma also pointed to the resentment caused by the police during liquor and pass raids reflecting the contempt of the police towards the Africans. His overtly political statement to the commission was his condemnation of the racial composition of the body. Xuma bitterly criticised the fact that Africans were not represented in the lily-white commission. He therefore doubted its sincerity and impartiality in responding to the crisis in the Western Areas.[55] The idea that new recruits in the police force were discourteous towards Africans suggest that the ideological texture of the S.A.P. was changing with the gradual ascendancy of the Nationalist Party to the political hegemony. What evidence then, suggests that Sophiatown had developed a tradition of political militancy in the 30s and 40s?

The period between the two World Wars has been characterised as one of anguished impotence due to lack of dramatic political activity.[56] This characterisation is appropriate only to the urban communities as protest shifted to the countryside where the I.C.U. was active. Such political apathy characterised the Western Areas as well. On the other extreme, historians have focused on informal forms of protest and have concluded that their cumulative effect was both challenging and obstructive to the state and capital.

Illicit beer brewing, evasion of pass arrests and the violence unleashed by youth gangs have been characterised as forms of informal protest. On the basis of such informal protest, the community in Sophiatown is perceived to have been "able to maintain and express a working class consciousness and identity in the face of determined efforts of the ruling classes to crush it."[57]

The outbreak of violence in 1949 and 1950 and the consequence of it on the local authorities left some writers with the impression that the events represented a climax in the community's history of resistance. Even though the conflict was not overtly political, "a closer analysis of the violence suggests that there is a strong case for arguing that the riots were a spontaneous manifestation of the antagonism that existed between an impoverished but experienced working class and the agents of external authority and exploitation".[58] With a full understanding of the potential of the communities to bring about widespread disorders, based on past experiences, the J.C.C. moved boldly to destroy the Western Areas. The J.C.C.'s professed objective to clear slums, has been correctly interpreted as a cover-up. It has been argued that the desire to destroy the Western Areas was motivated by the fact that "for years the Western Areas had been a strong center for African resistance and its removal was too important a measure for the state to concede."[59]

Some writers have been justifiably wary of overstating the tradition of the militant resistance ascribed to the Western Areas. Although the political anguish that characterised urban communities is acknowledged, an attempt is made to show that it was not for want of trying on the part of organised politics. Regular meetings called by the South African Communist Party (S.A.C.P.) and the Transvaal African Congress (T.A.C.) in the late 1920s and intermittently in the 1930s have been identified.[60]

Using these meetings as an indication of the potential for political militancy has not been useful. The explanation for this has focused on the performance of political organisations without examining quite seriously the social character of the Western Areas communities. Lack of dramatic political events is blamed on the shortcomings of political figures. The absence of any coordinated and sustained resistance was the consequence of personal qualities and tactics of leaders which impacted negatively on their efforts.[61] Furthermore, "tricksters and fools not only ensured the failure of their movements but cast suspicion on the leaders of more capable groups".[62] The strength of this argument lies in its acknowledgment of the relative apathy in the Western Areas between the World Wars.

It is, however, unreasonable to suggest that sound leadership would have produced a series of sustained and coordinated mass action. It should be clear, on the basis of this argument, that the outbreak of violence in the Western Areas in 1949 and 1950 was not the culmination of a tradition of political militancy. Secondly, the events of 1949 and 1950 were not affecting the whole of the Western Areas. Each township had developed a peculiar set of social conditions that helped to produce violence or as was the case in Sophiatown, prevented it.

If the tenants and sub-tenants in Sophiatown had been somewhat indifferent during the "violent unrest" of 1949 and 1950 in the Western Areas, it would have been precisely because the active community in the township had not been directly affected by the issues in contention. It seems the tram boycott of 1949 affected residents of W.N.T. who relied heavily on its service. In Sophiatown only residents living closer to Main Reef Road relied on the tram service - the rest were bus commuters who remember the tram boycott as an irritant. While it lasted buses were becoming packed beyond their capacity as ex-tram commuters (mostly from W.N.T.) switched to buses.[62]

Illicit liquor brewing, another of the causes of unrest in the Western Areas, may have been practiced throughout the township. However, in Sophiatown it was restricted by resident property owners who rationed water to their tenants in order to keep rates low, but also because they had an aversion to beer-brewing which attracted undesirable elements and police raids. Police raids were more effective in W.N.T. and helped to reduce the rate of beer brewing there.[63] Newclare was the shebeen of the Western Areas specialising in illicit brewing for commercial purposes. Most property owners in Newclare (White and Indian) were absentee landlords. Consequently the township attracted hordes of Basotho males ("Ma-Rashea"), who were ex-miners and unemployed, along with their women. They invaded Newclare and did not live as families, but as clans.[64]

Women brewed extensively and attracted single, Zulu migrants housed at nearby hostels in Waterval. It seems reasonable to suggest that the unrest, sparked off in Newclare in 1950 by the arrest of a man in possession of illicit liquor, can be attributed to "Ma-Rashea".[65] Sophiatown residents remember Newclare as "Sgigidi" a name that conveys a sense of disorder, chaos and turbulent existence. It is hard to see how the arrest of a pass offenser could have sparked off a generalised response. Before the Sharpville Massacre, responses to pass raids had been individualised. In a nutshell Sophiatown did not have a tradition of militant politics.

Property owners and some influential local leaders interpreted the unrest of 1949 and 1950 as excesses of anti-social elements of society. Property owners, the "respectables" of Sophiatown,

seem to have been made restless by the cited threat of removals implied by the City Council in the meeting held to discuss the proposed survey of the Western Areas on 2 June 1950. They resolved to deal with anti-social acts of behaviour which, curiously, included violence and excessive drinking. An appeal was made to the Commissioner of police for permission to set up Civic Guards. Police responded unenthusiastically to this request because that would have undermined their capacity to police or lead to excesses they could not possibly control and regulate.

In spite of the lukewarm response from the police, Civic Guards were launched in Sophiatown and W.N.T. The impact of the Civic Guards on crime was immediate. In an interview Dr. Motlana insisted that the Civic Guards, set up with the blessing of (if not in collaboration with) the A.N.C. Youth League in Sophiatown, wiped out all traces of crime in the township. "Youth Gangs," Motlana recalled, "had turned Sophiatown into the killing fields of Vietnam. But, in 1951, Mr Lethoba (a prominent property owner), Robert Resha and myself set up the Civic Guards. It was only then that crime was put under control."[66]

Other meetings called by Civic Guards agonised over the violence perpetrated by the fearsome and intractable "Ma-Rashea". Such sentiments could only have alienated a section of the community that was potentially disruptive, as evidenced in the skirmish between the police and residents over the arrest of a liquor offender in Newclare. It was the menace of the "Ma-Rashea" that ensured that Civic Guards could not extend the policing function to Newclare. Yet it was not only the "Ma-Rashea" that resented the Civic Guards. Victims of the Civic Guards accused them of extortion and unprovoked assaults which landed members in court. Mr Lethoba, a well known property owner and leader of the Civic Guards, organised a women's march through the center of Johannesburg under the banner of the Sophiatown Ratepayers' Association calling all self-respecting Africans to support the Civic Guards.[67]

Civic Guards actions had unintended consequences for property owners who were strongly represented on them. It alienated them from the broader sections of the community, but more importantly, it failed in its unstated objective: to convince the J.C.C. to suspend, or abandon the Western Areas Scheme. It was hoped that once crime was wiped out, the J.C.C. would not press ahead with the Western Areas Scheme. They were dismayed when, in 1952, they received a letter from the J.C.C.'s Ad Hoc Committee set up to implement the Western Areas Scheme informing them that plans for the removal of Africans from the area had been finalised.

Much of the challenge against the Western Areas Scheme in the first few years after the 1950 resolution was mounted by property owners, formally constituted into the African Anti-Expropriation

Ratepayers' Association and Proper Housing Movement. These property owners repeatedly petitioned the J.C.C. to rescind the resolution on the Western Areas Scheme. The J.C.C. did not respond positively to these requests, and between 1952 and 1953 maneuvered itself out of the Western Areas conflict.
The City Council collaborated with the government in the formulation of an Ad Hoc Committee, but denied any involvement with a scheme hinted at by the Minister of Native Affairs. aimed at removing "Black Spots" in the Western Areas. The Ad Hoc Committee recommended the removal of Africans from the Western Areas in a report it realised in 1952. To salve its conscience, the council added a rider: "those who desired it should be allowed to buy land in Meadowlands on a freehold basis."[68]

Then early in 1953 the City Council sold Meadowlands and declared itself unwilling to implement the Western Areas Scheme. The Minister of Native Affairs responded by establishing the Western Areas Resettlement Board (and proceeded with plans to implement the scheme).[69]

It is unlikely that the J.C.C. could have taken the threat of violent protest seriously. Officials of the City Council appear to have been dismissive of the possibility of widespread protest which could have pitted them against an alliance of tenants and sub-tenants on the one hand and property owners on the other.

IV

Barring the efforts of political movements to mobilise tenants and sub-tenants against the Western Areas Scheme, how did Sophiatown's alienated and underprivileged sector perceive the scheme? Did they resist? If so, Why? How persuasive is the assertion that Sophiatown "offered a means of economic survival to a much larger group than just landlords"?[70] This section will focus on these questions, and will draw heavily from the material in section I above.

The complex social character and economic circumstances of tenants and sub-tenants in Sophiatown remain largely unexplored. A substantial literature on African workers elsewhere in Africa portrays working class communities as intrinsically and in specific ways linked up to their rural areas. Thompson argues that specific cultural and political traditions (quite unrelated to conditions in the workplace and in towns) are fundamental in shaping the way a particular working class behaves.[71] Adrian Peace's study of Ikaja workers in Nigeria suggest that a typical Ikaja worker frequently returns home to Agege. The dependents and relatives or wives are more important to workers than relations established at the workplace.[72]

In South Africa as in parts of sub-Saharan Africa, we are forced "to confront the historic truth that the working class is a long time in formation".[73] Sophiatown and other freehold townships were characterised by significantly large families for "whom wage labour was not desirable when it could not be combined with systematic exploitation of subsistence production on a household basis at the same time."[74] (my emphasis)

The Tswana (Western Transvaal), Venda and Shangaan (Northern Transvaal) were not the typical permanently urbanised sections of Sophiatown's community. And they were easily the majority in Sophiatown. Meadowlands, a location to which these tenants and sub-tenants were relocated, reflects this ethnic configuration. Ethnic patterns in the location show the predominance of these ethnic groups, and, by implication in Sophiatown too. More crucial is the fact that this ethnic pattern coincides with social class positions in Sophiatown. This section of Sophiatown's community can be loosely characterised as the "new working class" - migrating into Johannesburg largely after 1926.

The economic imperatives of their situation dictated that they became tenants, living in single rooms to enable them to service their subsistence production in their households on the Reserves or White farms. These groups were closely linked to the values of village and a sense of community kept alive by the wider village networks and the material interdependence between extended families in the countryside and the wage earners in the towns.

Children whose parents had migrated in the 30s and left them in the care of their grandparents on the farms and in the villages would have been, by 1950, in their teens and ready to enter employment. They could not be absorbed into rural economies and were often forced to join their parents in the towns. In the majority of cases the latter were average tenant families occupying single rooms in Sophiatown.[75]

Focusing on conditions in Sophiatown, to the exclusion of the rural dynamic, as most writers on the subject do, offers a narrow explanation based on the immediate impact and short term consequences of the scheme on tenant and sub-tenant families. These families were still agonising over the crisis in the Reserves and on White farms when the J.C.C. initiated steps towards the implementation of the Western Areas Scheme in 1950.

These pressures affected African communities of the Western Transvaal among whom the combination of rural household subsistence production and industrial employment in the 1930s and 1940s was particularly widespread. As argued above, those members of kinship who migrated, owing to the size of their families in the towns, the economic imperatives which obliged them to support rural based families and the legal restrictions

imposed on them by the Native Laws Amendment Act of 1937 gravitated towards freehold township where they became tenants and sub-tenants, occupying single rented rooms.

As with the Western Transvaal Tswana, they had relations who had who had become established tenants and sub-tenants in Sophiatown and other freehold townships. Such tenant and sub-tenant households (initially consisting of single and two-member families) were forced to accommodate additional members of rural-based families in their single rented rooms. Secondly, the legal restriction embodied in the Native (Urban) Areas Act of 1923 as amended - that those migrating for the first time after 1924 would not be allowed into municipal locations - fell away. Thirdly, the break-up of extended families on White farms and Trust land brought children "home" to their parents. The latter had to seek more space to accommodate the new arrivals. Meadowlands offered such relief.[76]

As more economically active young men and women entered the cities to seek employment, older men and pensioners were returning to the Reserves to take up their places.[77] This is crucial. It explains the persistence of the rural linkages even after Sophiatown tenants and sub-tenants had been relocated in Meadowlands.

Throughout the 60s and 70s, and for the better part of the 80s these families distinguished themselves from the wider community of Soweto by their tendency to focus on villages in the reserves as "home". This was particularly true of the older generation for whom Johannesburg was "makgoweng" (the place of the Whites).[78] As individuals in that age group became older and were pensioned off, they tended to move back to the villages.

It has been necessary to explain rural linkages confronting the majority of Sophiatown's tenants and sub-tenants in 1950. Their responses were not to be shaped by local tensions and conflicts. On the contrary, their wider material basis and social networks, crucial to their reproductive capacity, were subjected to extreme pressure which their urban resources could not alleviate.

Meadowlands offered a temporary reprieve in so far as more members of the extended family could be absorbed into the urban areas. The economic imperative of the 1930s and 1940s had not changed dramatically though. Subsistence production and long term investment in reserve economies persisted well into the 60s and 70s. What had changed visibly was the generational character of the Reserves - where pensioners predominated. In some cases children of school-going age remained in the reserves during this period.

Finally, it has been suggested that single lodgers in Sophiatown were destined for hostels because only family units were to be admitted to Meadowlands. Members of youth gangs were confronted with the possibility of labour camps. Yet another possibility was that both groups could be endorsed out of Johannesburg completely. In the light of these possibilities these groups called for violent resistance. For lack of space these issues will not be examined in detail.

The N.R.B. made a concession for tenants and sub-tenants (mostly male) who did not have any family at all. It introduced lodgers' permits which entitled such residents to live with families on condition that they paid a monthly fee and were entered on a waiting list for houses.[79] Once more houses were built, they were to be given first preference. Members of youth gangs were members of households.[80] They could not have taken unilateral decisions to resist once their families intended to move. The fact that to ensure only families went to Meadowlands the N.R.B. screened evacuees should not be overstated. The screening methods were a farce, designed to allow more residents to pass through than to restrict the number of those who qualified.[81] It seems the N.R.B. was more eager to remove the community from Sophiatown than it was in holding them back by imposing legal barriers that would have impeded their progress.

Conclusion

Twenty years after large parts of Johannesburg were proclaimed and slums cleared, the Western Areas remained. The frenetic and agitated appeals of White petty bourgeoise (property developers) and working classes continued unabated. In spite of such pressure demonstrated in the resolutions of 1939 and 1944, the J.C.C. failed to act against the Sophiatown community. The reason for this may be found in the fact that the manufacturing and industrial sectors' capital (still in an infant stage) required a reserve of labour. The continued existence of Sophiatown served a useful function for this sector of the economy which, in the 40s continued to dominate industry.

Not only did Sophiatown provide a reserve army of labour but it also supplied it in the form that the manufacturing and industrial sectors wanted it: docile and complacent. There was also the added advantage in drawing labour from Sophiatown that manufacturers did not have to agonize over the cost of providing decent housing for this section of the urban population as was the case with the "permanently urbanised" families of the municipal locations.

Sophiatown stood in a symbiotic relationship with the manufacturing and industrial capital. The township attracted, mainly, individuals and families drawn from the Transvaal countryside. The peculiarity of this section of the urban population is that most retained links with the rural areas in the form of extended families. Single rooms in Sophiatown were ideal forms of accommodation.

By 1950, Sophiatown ceased to serve a useful function for both the manufacturing and industrial sectors on the one hand, and the underprivileged (tenants and sub-tenants) on the other. The demand for labour in the manufacturing and industrial sector had plummeted as a result of the post World War II economic decline. On the other hand, pressures on extended families on White farms, in the Reserves and Trust lands forced extended families to release more young men to the towns. In some cases tenant families were forced to accommodate whole families who were hitherto confined to the countryside. Single rooms ceased to serve a useful function.

Political militancy was not a tradition of the Western Areas as a whole, least of all Sophiatown. There had been sporadic arrests as in the beer boycott of 1939, but as with the unrest a decade later it hardly touched the entire region. Each outbreak of violence was specific to one or other township in the Western Areas. Unrest sparked off by the tram boycott drew more substantial support from W.N.T. than any other Western Areas township. The arrest of a man carrying four gallons of illicit liquor sparked off a violent reaction from Newclare - a township in which residents were largely dependent on illicit brews. Pass arrests were personalised, directed against individuals. There never was a generalised anti-pass campaign in 1949 and 1950.

Finally, the responses of property owners, a constituency that would have, in material terms, been gravely appalled by removals, seemed to interpret the unrest of 1949 and 1950 as anti-social. Initially, influential political organisations - notably the A.N.C. - seemed to have interpreted the events of 1949 and 1950 as did the property owners. At least this was the case between 1950 and 1953. Once it had become clear that the liberal and "tolerant" J.C.C. had withdrawn from the fray, an attempt was made to draw in tenants and sub-tenants. It was left until too late.

Notes

1. "Ons Dak Nie...Ons Phola Hierso" was a slogan adopted by the 'Resist Apartheid' conference held in Johannesburg on 27 June 1954. The social composition of the crowd that attended the conference has not been analysed. However oral testimonies of Meadowlands residents, the majority of whom were Sophiatown tenant classes, suggests that most did not attend the conference and did not identify with the resistance campaign.

2. Lodge, T. Black Politics in south Africa Since 1945, Ravan, Johannesburg, 1983, pp. 107-108.

3. Feit, E. Conflict and Communication: An Analysis of the "Western Areas" and "Bantu Education" Campaigns, Ph.D Thesis, University of Michigan, 1968.

   Lodge T, has attempted to demonstrate the fact that social categories in Sophiatown were "fluid and blurred at the edges", and that, the ANC's local leadership welded the different constituencies toge'her in the resistance campaign. However, such an assertion is based on a superficial analyses of the tenant classes as a social category with distinct interests.

4. Proctor, A. "Class struggle, Segregation and the City: A History of Sophiatown, 1905-1940" in Labour, Township and Protest, Belinda Bozzoli (ed), Ravan, Johannesburg, p.83.

5. Lodge, T. Black Politics; p. 93. Here Lodge alludes to the restriction imposed on Sophiatown, namely that the township was not intended for Black occupation. For the first 25 years, Blacks moving into sophiatown were property-owning families acquiring stands and living in full family circumstances. Mr & Mrs Lekgani; Interview with M. Lebelo. January 1989, Diepkloof.

6. Proctor, A. "Class Struggle, Segregation and the City", p.59.

7. By-laws denied property-owners the opportunity for rack-renting by restricting the number of buildings on each stand to one.

8. Proctor, A. "Class Struggle, Segregation and the City", p. 65; T. Lodge, Black Politics, pp. 93-94.

9. See Proctor, A, p.69.

10. See Modikoe Dikobe's Marabi Dance.

Koch, E, argues that slumyard dwellers entered the Witwatersrand labour market as entire families. See Koch, E. 'Without Visible Means of Subsistence', Slavery and Culture in Johannesburg 1918-1940 in B. Bozzoli, Town and Countryside in Transvaal; p.153.

11. Caplan, D. 'The emergence of an African working class culture in S. Marks and R. Rathbone (eds) Industrialisation and Social Change in South Africa. African Class Formation, Culture and Consciousness 1870-1930.

12. Koch, E, Without Visible Means, p. 157.

13. Medical officer of Health Report, 1936-37, p. 41; quoted from E. Koch, p. 169.

14. Bozzoli, B. Women of Phokeng (forthcoming).

15. Author's Interview with Mr. S. Piale, diepkloof, 12 January, 1989.

16. Koch, E, Without Visible Means, p. 154.

17. Proctor, A, Class Struggle, Segregation and the City, p. 64.

18. See Deon Van Tonder, "Gangs, Councillors and the Apartheid State: The Newclare Squatter Movements of 1952". ASI Seminar Paper, 1989, pp. 4-5.

19. Author's Interview with Mrs J. Dakole, September 1988, Diepkloof; Interview with Mr Rahtebale; May 1988.

20. Non-European Affairs Department's (NEAD) Report on a Sample Survey of the Native Population Residing in the Western Areas of Johannesburg, 1951.

21. Koch, E, 'No Visible Means of Subsistence'.

22. NEAD's Report on Survey.

23. See Wilkinson, P. "A place to live in?: The Resolution of the Housing Crisis in Johannesburg, 1944-54", Unpublished ASI Seminar Paper, 1981.

Minutes of Meeting between NEAD's executive Committee and a delegation of African representatives held in His Majesty's Building, Johannesburg, on 2 June 1950. See Report on Survey.

24. French, K. "James Mpanza and the Sofasonke Party in the Development of Local Politics in Soweto" . M.A. Dissertation, Wits, 1983. See also, Stadler, a. 'Birds in the cornfield' Squatter Movements in Johannesburg, 1944-1947 in B. Bozzoli, B. (ed) Labour Township and Protest.

25. Wilkinson, P. 'A place to live'.

26. Glazer, C. 'Students, Tsotsis and the Congress Youth League' Hons. Dissertation.

27. NEAD's Report on a Sample Survey of Natives residing in the Western Areas of Johannesburg.

28. Report of the Young Committee, quoted from P. Wilkinson, 'A place to live'.

29. ibid.

30. Report of the Interdepartmental Committee on the Social, Health and Economic Conditions of Natives, 1942-43.

31. Wilkinson, P. 'A place to live in'. p. 49.

32. Bozzoli, B. Women of Phokeng.

33. Morris, M.L. "The Development of Capitalism in South African Agriculture: Class Struggle in the Countryside" in Economy and Society, Vol. 5, 1976.

34. Author's interview with mrs Mhlanga, in Meadowlands, August, 1989.

35. Mrs Mashao and Bob Mashao, interviewed by M Lebelo, August, 1989.

36. Mr and Mrs Makabanyane, Meadowlands, October 1988.

37. Report of NEAD's Sample Survey, 1951.

38. Mrs Labane, Interview with M. Lebelo, October, 1989 Meadowlands; Cameron Mashile, Interview with M Lebelo, December, 1990 at Klipspruit.

39. Moleha, Molefe, Interview with M Lebelo, 27-28 April 19.. Ramatlabama, Mafeking.

40. Bozzoli, B. Women of Phokeng, (forthcoming).

41. Mrs Maimane, Interview with author, January 1989, Diepkloof.

42. See Bloke Modisane, Blame it on History; E Mphahlele, Down Second Avenue.

43. Sowetan, 11 October, 1983.

44. See Venable H. "Orthodoxy and Counter Orthodoxy in the Bethane Anti-Levy Riot of 1940". Unpublished ASI Seminar Paper. Author's Interview with mr P Kgabitsoe, Diepkloof, August 1990.

45. Mrs N Nhlapho, Interview with M. Lebelo, June, 1989, Diepkloof.

46. Lodge, T. Black Politics.

47. Opening speech by W J P Carr in NEAP's meeting with African delegates, 2 June 1950.

48. ibid.

49. ibid.

50. ibid.

51. ibid.

52. The Rand Daily Mail, 23 February, 1950.

53. The Rand Daily Mail, 25th February, 1950.

54. The Star, March, 1950.

55. The Star, March 1950.

56. Walshe, P. The Rise of African Nationalism in South Africa, 1912-1952, London 1970, p. 129.

57. Proctor, A. 'Class Struggle, Segregation and the City' p. 83.

58. Lodge, T. Black Politics p. 100.

59. Lodge, T Black Politics p. 110.

60. Goodhew, D. "No Easy Walk to Freedom: Political Organisation in the Western Areas of Johannesburg Between the World Wars", unpublished ASI Seminar Paper, 1989.

61. Goodhew, D. "No Easy Walk to Freedom", p. 39

62. Goodhew, D "No Easy Walk to Freedom", p. 39.

63. Mrs P Nhlapho, Interview with M Lebelo June 1989.

64. Deon Van Tonder, "Gangs, Councillors and the Apartheid State", p. 6.

65. Lodge, T. Black Politics, p. 99.

66. Dr Nthato Motlana, Interview, M. Lebelo, September, 1989, Dube Soweto.

67. Rand Daily Mail February, 8, 1952.

68. Lodge, T. Black Politics, p. 103.

69. Lodge, T Black Politics p. 103.

70. ibid., Chapter 4.

71. Quoted from Freund, B. The African Worker, Cambridge, 1988, p. 53.

72. ibid, pp. 54-55.

73. ibid, p. 26.

74. ibid, p. 31.

75. Mrs Labane, Interview, October, 1989, Meadowlands, Mr Kgatitsoe, Interview, Diepkloof, June 1990.

76. From single-member and two-member families in Sophiatown (where Meadowland residents were chiefly the tenant classes) they resurfaced as entire families in Meadowlands when they were relocated after 1955.

77. See Bozzoli, B Women of Phokeng (forthcoming).

78. Cameron Mashile, Interview with M Lebelo, December 1990, Klipspruit.

79. "Unmarried Natives in Locations". Minutes of the Johannesburg Town Clerk File N/A 9/33; Intermediate Archives Depot, Johannesburg.

80. Cameron Mashile, Interview with M. Lebelo, December, 1990, Klipspruit.

81. Most Meadowlands residents suggest that screening was not aimed at limiting the number of pesons to be relocated in Meadowlands. The Western Areas Resettlement Board officials deliberately let many pass through the test by asking fairly

simple questions. Officials let through all those who could prove to have been residents in Sophiatown in 1950 if they could identify landmarks in the township.

TABLE I

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES AND PERSONS ACCORDING TO LANGUAGE GROUPS AND SEX, AS FOUND IN A SAMPLE OF 303 HOUSEHOLDS THROUGHOUT THE WESTERN AREAS. 1951 SAMPLE SURVEY.

LANGUAGE GROUPS	FAMILIES		PERSONS		PERCENTAGE OF SEXES	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	MALE %	FEMALE %
XHOSA	50	11	135	11	55	45
S. SOTHO	59	13	201	16	47	53
N. SOTHO	30	9	129	10	48	52
TSWANA	139	32	408	33	51	49
ZULU	67	15	173	14	50	50
SWAZI	17	4	47	4	49	51
SHANGAAN	23	5	67	5	58	42
VENDA	11	3	29	2	62	38
FOREIGN	25	6	49	4	73	27

TABLE II

as on Plan. Room No.	Name of Head of Family	R. / C. / D.	No. of Persons Adults M	Adults F	Minors M	Minors F	Room No.	Use of Room	F.A.	C.C.	L.A.	Sanitation etc. San.	Wat.	Lavn. Bath
1	S.Tharetha	N	2	3	3	1	1	B.R.	120	1080	10	2	1	
(2	J. Mbata	N	1	1	-	1	2	B.R.	120	1080	10			
(	J. Xaba	N	1	1	1	-								
3	S.van Seekoe	C	1	1	2	2	3	B.R.	144	1296	10			
4	E.Majoja	N	-	1	2	1	4	B.R.	144	1296	12.2			
5	M.Phukoya	N	-	2	1	1	5	B.R.	144	1296	9			
6	E.Mokbeng	N	1	1	1	2	6	B.R.	144	1296	9			
7	A.Sibisi	N	-	2	1	-	7	B.R.	79	514	2.7			
8	M.Phokoye	N	2	-	-	-	8	B.R.	134	871	5			
(9	A.Ramuthipa	N	4	1	-	2	9	B.R.	83	581	-			
(10							10	B.R.	121	847	5			
11	I.Dihalo	N	1	1	2	2	11	B.R.	172	1204	10			
12	C.Sitholo	N	1	3	1	2	12	B.R.	256	1920	15			