

AFRA Report no. 15 dealt with the origins of black spots and asserted that despite 20 years of removals in Natal, over half these properties have not yet been moved and some 230 000 people are threatened with removal as a result. This Report substantiates that claim. It sets out not only the figures that we have compiled on black spots but also the difficulties encountered in trying to establish the dimensions of black spot removals in Natal. Since these difficulties are revealing of state attitudes and tactics, they are discussed at some length as a background to the figures themselves.

Inconsistencies and inaccuracies: Any researcher trying to pinpoint exactly how many black spots there were in Natal in 1948, how many of these have been moved, and how many still remain under threat today, faces innumerable problems and inconsistencies. Both the definition and classification of black spots have varied as Nationalist Party policy towards the African reserves has evolved from the 'bantustan' era of the past to the 'national states' era of the present. In 1969 the Minister of Bantu Administration and Development said: "By black spot is meant land which is owned by Bantu and does not include small proclaimed Bantu reserves." (Hansard, vol. 25, col. 326). In recent years, however, officials have been less precise in their terminology; clarity and consistency are not at issue for them. Thus the widely quoted list of black spots that Koomhof supplied in answer to questions in Parliament in April 1980 included both scheduled reserves (Reserve 6) and state lands (St. Lucia). In this report 'black spot' signifies African freehold land only, as defined by the Minister in 1969. It does not include tribal land. Nor does it include church-owned but African-leased land, even though many of these places face the same threat of expropriation and removal as privately-owned land. The reason for this omission is that our information on these missions is still too sparse, but it is hoped that we will be able to produce a more comprehensive list at a later stage.

Limiting the application of 'black spot' in this way is not an endorsement of the term. It is clearly a political term, coined by the government to suit its own ends, not some pure concept to be defended against corrupt usage. It is, however, useful to maintain the distinction between freehold and tribal land in our own work. There are significant differences between the two - differences in legal status, differences in social organisation on and around the land - which need to be taken into account when analysing the process of removals and developing strategies for stopping it. The method of expropriation, the structures of authority, the relationships among landowners and between landowners and tenants, are some of the areas in which freehold communities are marked off from those in the reserves.

However, even when one limits the use of the term in this way, there are still problems with numbers. Because of shifts in government policy, the boundaries of what is and what is not the white area have not remained constant and thus the properties classified as black spots have not remained constant either. Some black-owned farms currently under threat of removal were once (or still are) incorporated into Kwa-Zulu as "released" lands in terms of the 1936 Land Act. They have only become black spots since 1975, when the government announced its intention to go ahead with the consolidation of KwaZulu and eliminate what it coyly describes as "badly situated areas". Driefontein, near Ladysmith, is one example - a large block of freehold farms, the first bought in 1867, incorporated into KwaZulu but then excised in January 1981. Its people were only notified of this in February 1982: 70 980 people transformed into a black spot by proclamation. Conversely, a much smaller number of farms formerly classified as black spots have, with the announcement of consolidation, been offered a reprieve of sorts and may end up within a redrawn KwaZulu.

Apart from problems in the changing status of land, there are many problems in the quality of the official information that is available. Much of the information one wants is not available. When asked in February 1981 how many black spots and how many people remain to be moved, Koomhof replied: "The particulars and information required are not being maintained and kept up to date ... and can unfortunately not be readily ascertained ..." (Hansard, vol. 92, col. 265). The official data that is published is not necessarily

accurate either. If one tabulates all the answers supplied by official sources at different times on how many black spots there are in Natal, one ends up with a set of contradictory, erratically fluctuating figures - 76 in 1955 (Tomlinson Report), 210 in 1961 (Bantu, July 1961), 252 in 1962 (Minister of Bantu Administration, Hansard vol. 3, col 3074/5). In March 1964 this same Minister told the House of Assembly there were 218 black spots in Natal; he told the Senate a month later there were 199. (Hansard, vol. 10, col 4854; Senate Debates 1964, col. 2267). Even the data on places moved is not reliable. Koornhof told the House of Assembly in 1980 that a black spot known as The Swamp (near Pevensey) had been moved in 1976 with 125 people. In fact it was not moved until 1978 and its population was closer to 700. (Hansard: vol. 89, col. 617).

Total number of black spots in Natal: The table that follows reflects the position as accurately as possible, from the perspective of today. It adds to the core of black spots as defined in the 1950s and 1960s other freehold properties that find themselves similarly isolated and threatened as a result of current consolidation plans. It also includes information on the Mount Currie and Matatiele districts (added to Natal after the Transkei was given its Pretoria-style independence in 1976). It is compiled from a wide range of sources, the most important being a list of black spots that the South African Institute of Race Relations (SAIRR) in Durban compiled in the late 1950s, based on local magistrates' lists; answers given in Parliament in 1969 and 1980; topo-cadastral maps and extensive fieldwork.

<u>Total since 1948:</u>	1. Total on SAIRR list	167
	2. Others in 1950s and 1960s	47
	3. Mt. Curry and Matatiele districts	16
	4. Released but threatened by 1975 consolidation	106
		<hr/>
		336
 <u>Current position:</u>	1. Removed to date	102
	2. Likely to be/have been consolidated	27
	3. Not traced yet/known	18
	4. Under threat	189

These properties under threat are scattered through most of Natal, many in the Bergville (14), Mpendle (53), Ixopo (19), Stanger (11) and Ladysmith (13) districts. Size of land varies enormously, from a few hectares to several hundred hectares. Populations vary too, from a couple of hundred to many thousands. There are no comprehensive population figures but we estimate the total number of people under threat on these 189 properties to be in the region of 230 000. In the Ladysmith district alone, some 90 000 people are under threat on the Minister's own admission. (Hansard, vol. 92, col. 266). If one refines the figures on properties already moved, one sees that the area where the most thorough eradication of black spots has been implemented, is the Newcastle/Dundee/Wasbank triangle where, in the 1960s and early 1970s, 37 were expropriated and removed. Clearly economic motives played a crucial part in this selection. Many of these black spots either are being or will be mined for coal. The ISCOR plant at Newcastle is sited on what was once a black spot called Milton, moved in 1970. In the south something similar emerges with sugar - several former black spots are now owned by sugar companies. In some cases former residents labour for these companies on what used to be their land.

"No more black South Africans" said Connie Mulder in 1978; it is still the intention of the government to pursue that goal. The above figures point out some of the dimensions of the attack that is planned.