

## CHAPTER 3

### **ANALYSIS OF SOME REASONS FOR FORCED REMOVALS WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE BAKWENA BA MOGOPA**

#### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

The main objective of this chapter is to establish and analyse the reasons for the forced removal of the Bakwena ba Mogopa from Mogopa in the Ventersdorp district to Pachsdraai in the Madikwe district. The general reasons for the forced removals in South Africa will be discussed. The land policy in South Africa, which resulted in forced removals, will be discussed briefly. This policy was aimed at obtaining separate development in geographical, political, economic and social terms for different and/or ethnic groups.<sup>1</sup> A number of acts were passed to achieve these aims and will be discussed to provide a background to the forced removals.

#### **3.2 THE LAND POLICY AS BACKGROUND TO THE FORCED REMOVALS**

There was no uniform land policy in the 19th century in South Africa, but different land policies for the different colonies (Cape and Natal) and Boer republics (Transvaal and Orange Free State). Both the colonies and Boer republics restricted the right of black people to land. This was applied differently. The Cape Colony allowed black ownership on a limited scale. While the Orange Free State rejected it, Transvaal and Natal favoured forms of trusteeship.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> L. Platzky and C. Walker (eds.), **The surplus people: Forced removals in South Africa**, p.291.

<sup>2</sup> M. de Klerk (ed.), **A harvest of discontent: The land question in South Africa**, p.47.

The white farmers did not always agree in their attitude towards the black farmers and their access to the land. Some preferred the system of share cropping whereby blacks farmed their land and they received half of the produce in return. However, the white farmers increasingly pressed for a good, cheap labour supply. They demanded that black farmers be restricted in their access to land so that they would have to work on the white farms.<sup>3</sup>

The South African Native Affairs Commission of 1903-5 recommended that land should be reserved for black occupation or ownership. The commission further recommended that purchase of land by blacks should in future be limited to certain areas which would be defined, delimited and reserved by legislative enactment.<sup>4</sup> This resulted in the passing of the Native Land Act, no. 27 of 1913, by the South African Party in 1913. The act entrenched racial territorial segregation between blacks and whites in the Union of South Africa. The act prohibited all purchase of land by blacks outside the areas reserved for them and vice versa. They could not buy, lease land or enter into any share-cropping agreements in the areas reserved for "white" South Africa. Whites also could not buy land in the areas reserved for black occupation. Property rights of those blacks who managed to acquire title deeds before the 1913 Native Land Act were to be withdrawn. This led to the uprooting of thousands of black South Africans from white-owned farms.<sup>5</sup> The application of the act resulted in between 7-7,3% (10,5 million morgen) of land been reserved for black occupation.<sup>6</sup>

In 1915, 55% of the blacks in the Union of South Africa lived in the areas reserved for them. These areas were too small, overcrowded and it was

---

<sup>3</sup> C. Malherbe and C. Saunders, **Struggle for land**, p.75.

<sup>4</sup> U.G. 25-16, Union of South Africa, **Natives Land Commission**, p.1; P. Alberts, **The borders of apartheid: A chronicle of alienation in South Africa with portfolio of photographs on Bophuthatswana today**, pp.7-8.

<sup>5</sup> Union of South Africa, **The Statutes of the Union of South Africa, 1913**, p.438; W.L. Seriti, **Legislation affecting the removal of black people from certain areas from the perspective of ownership and occupation of land by black people in South Africa** (unp. L.L.M. dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand, 1987), p.11.

<sup>6</sup> R.H. du Pré, **The making of racial conflict in South Africa: A historical perspective**, p.54; K.Spink, **Black Sash: The beginning of a bridge in South Africa**, p.106.

difficult for blacks to develop themselves in these reserved areas.<sup>7</sup> The Natives Land Commission, also known as the Beaumont Commission, was appointed in 1916. The work of the commission was the delimitation of the areas to be set aside for white and black occupation. It also had to investigate the conditions in the reserves. The commission recommended that an additional 8 365 700 morgen of land be obtained for black occupation.<sup>8</sup> The proposals of the commission met with much opposition from the white landowners who regarded them as being too generous to blacks. Apart from giving blacks land, it would result in white farmers losing black labour. The Government yielded to white opposition and the recommendations were never implemented. This position remained until the Smuts government lost power.<sup>9</sup>

In 1920 and 1923, the Native Affairs Act of 1920 and the Natives (Urban Areas) Act of 1923 were passed respectively. The two acts were segregationist in structure and were intended to exercise uniform control over the reserves and to keep the urban areas in white hands. These acts helped enforce the restriction of blacks to 7,3% of land.<sup>10</sup>

After the 1924 election, victory of the pact government of the National and Labour parties, prime minister General J.B.M. Hertzog proposed more segregation and enlargement of the black areas. In his speech at Smithfield on 13 November 1925, he stressed that additional land should be allocated for black occupation to enable them to develop on their own.<sup>11</sup> He introduced the Natives Land Amendment Bill in 1926. The bill recommended that an additional 7,25 million morgen of land be allocated for black occupation. In

---

<sup>7</sup> P. Alberts, **The borders of apartheid: A chronicle of alienation in South Africa with portfolio of photographs on Bophuthatswana today**, p.11; U.G. 25-16, Union of South Africa, **Native Land Commission**, p.5.

<sup>8</sup> M. Lacey, **Working for Boroko: The origins of coercive labour system in South Africa**, p.27; U.G. 25-16, Union of South Africa, **Natives Land Commission**, p.14.

<sup>9</sup> E.M. Letsoalo, **Land reform in South Africa: A black perspective**, p.39.

<sup>10</sup> R.H. du Pré, **The making of racial conflict in South Africa: A historical perspective**, p.54.

<sup>11</sup> B.J. Liebenberg and S.B. Spies (eds.), **South Africa in the 20th century**, p.208.

addition to the reserves, it recommended "released areas" where whites and blacks would compete to buy land. Due to opposition, the bill was delayed until the promulgation of the Native Trust and Land Act, no 18 of 1936.<sup>12</sup> Hertzog became a driving force for the implementation of the segregation policies.

Another act which contributed to the forced removal of blacks, is the Native Administration Act, no. 38 of 1927. It gave the Governor-General as the supreme chief of all black tribes within the Union of South Africa powers to determine tribal boundaries. Through the department of Native Affairs, he regulated occupation of land in black locations and reserves.<sup>13</sup> This act further legalised removals of black people. Chapter 2, section 5(1)(b) of the Act gave the Governor-general powers to order the removal of any tribe from any place to another within the Union of South Africa, upon such conditions he may determine.<sup>14</sup>

The Native Service Contract Act of 1932 imposed labour contract agreements on farm workers. Blacks on white-owned farms lived there, provided that one of the family members provided labour on that farm. Failure to adhere to this resulted in the eviction of the family from that farm. The Slums Clearance Act of 1934 laid down minimum standards of housing and gave powers to officials and police to expropriate property and evict tenants from areas deemed to be slums.<sup>15</sup> These two acts resulted in the removal of many black people.

The Native Trust and Land Act, no.18 of 1936 stipulated that additional land (7,25 million morgen) should be set aside for black occupation. It instituted the South African Native Trust to acquire more land for black occupation, to

---

<sup>12</sup> B.J. Liebenberg and S.B. Spies (eds.), **South Africa in the 20th century**, pp.209-210; W.L. Seriti, **Legislation affecting the removal of black people from certain areas from the perspective of ownership and occupation of land by black people in South Africa** (unp. L.L.M. dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand, 1987), p.19.

<sup>13</sup> Union of South Africa, **The Statutes of the Union of South Africa, 1927**, pp.213-215; E.M. Letsoalo, **Land reform in South Africa: A black perspective**, pp.36-37.

<sup>14</sup> Union of South Africa, **The Statutes of the Union of South Africa, 1927**, p.214.

<sup>15</sup> E. Unterhalter, **Forced removal: The division, segregation and control of the people of South Africa**, p.151.

develop such land and to promote agriculture in the reserves.<sup>16</sup> The proposed land to be released for black occupation would have increased the black reserves to between 12,4% and 13,7% of South Africa.<sup>17</sup> This was not achieved due to the reluctance of white farmers to make more land available for black occupation. They further feared to lose cheap black labour and thus opposed any scheme of segregation which would result in independence of blacks.<sup>18</sup>

The Native Laws Amendment Act of 1937, restricted the acquisition of land by blacks in urban areas from whites and limited churches, schools and other institutions attended by blacks to black townships.<sup>19</sup> It further sought to reinforce the system of urban segregation and influx control. It gave the Government powers to compel the municipality to remove "surplus" blacks to reserves.<sup>20</sup>

In the 1940s, restrictions on land occupation by black people was done through the Native (urban areas) Consolidation Act of 1945. It consolidated the laws controlling blacks' presence in urban areas, strictly specifying the conditions under which blacks might live and work in urban areas.<sup>21</sup> Blacks in the townships rented dwellings but did not own land. Permits were given to the holder of certificate of occupation which allows him and his dependants to

---

<sup>16</sup> Union of South Africa, **The Statutes of the Union of South Africa**, 1936, p.92; C.J. Maritz, **Voogbestuur en nasievorming by die Batswana van die R.S.A.** (unp. Ph.D. thesis, PU for CHE, 1976), p.259.

<sup>17</sup> B.J. Liebenberg and S.B. Spies (eds.), **South Africa in the 20th century**, p. 298; W.L. Seriti, **Legislation affecting the removal of black people from certain areas from the perspective of ownership and occupation of land by black people in South Africa** (unp. L.L.M. dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand, 1987), p.19.

<sup>18</sup> E.M. Letsoalo, **Land reform in South Africa: A black perspective**, p.39.

<sup>19</sup> E. Unterhalter, **Forced removal: The division, segregation and control of the people in South Africa**, p.152.

<sup>20</sup> P. Alberts, **The borders of apartheid: A chronicle of alienation in South Africa with portfolio of photographs on Bophuthatswana today**, p.11.

<sup>21</sup> E. Unterhalter, **Forced removal: The division, segregation and control of the people in South Africa**, p.152.

live there. The board had powers to evict any person not included in the permit and send him to the reserves.<sup>22</sup>

The 1948 election victory of the National Party gave momentum to the urgency of implementing apartheid. The territorial segregation which had been based on segregation of races and white supremacy, was designed to achieve a new meaning. The National Party started territorial segregation among blacks based on ethnicity. The Promotion of the Black Self-Government Act 46, of 1959, classified people as ethnic groups thus created dispersed and less threatening ethnic groups. This excluded them from centres of power and wealth. Ethnicity provided a key to an ideal state where blacks would feature as "international" units of labour only.<sup>23</sup>

The Group Areas Act of 1950 forced Africans to move out of areas proclaimed for white occupation and ownership. Those with a freehold title to land in such an area would own it for the rest of his life but his heirs would have to sell it to a racially relevant person within a year following the death of the owner. This enabled the Government to force many blacks to move from white areas.<sup>24</sup>

The Bantu Authorities Act of 1951 also strengthened barriers between whites and blacks. It was intended to sever black political aspirations in the white areas.<sup>25</sup> It resuscitated tribalism and blacks had their own administrative institutions. The act further reminded the blacks that their future did not lay in white areas but in their respective ethnic homelands.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> W.L. Seriti, **Legislation affecting the removal of black people from certain areas from the perspective of ownership and occupation of land by black people in South Africa** (unp. L.L.M. dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand, 1987), pp.53-56.

<sup>23</sup> C. Albertyn, "Forced removals and the Law: The Mogopa case, *More v Minister of Co-operation and Development* 1986(1) SA 102(A)", **The South African journal on human rights**, vol.2, part 1, March 1986, p.93.

<sup>24</sup> M. Horrel, **Laws affecting race relations in South Africa 1948-1976**, p.85.

<sup>25</sup> B.J. Liebenberg and S.B. Spies (eds.), **South Africa in the 20th century**, p.376.

<sup>26</sup> B.J. Liebenberg and S.B. Spies (eds.), **South Africa in the 20th century**, p.347.

The enactment of the Promotion of Black Self-Government Act, no. 46 of 1959, extended and linked apartheid to a coherent policy of "separate development" which entrenched ideological justifications of self-determination, ethnicity and nationhood. The control of black political demands and exploitation of black labour within the framework of apartheid depended on the creation of homelands which would provide political and territorial rights to blacks. The plan of separate development divided black areas into a number of ethnically divided homelands.<sup>27</sup> The areas which were designated for black occupation by the 1913 Native Land Act, were proclaimed homelands. These areas were widely scattered, giving the homelands a fragmented character and posing a problem regarding administration. With further planning of independence, it became difficult to have an independent state comprising of many isolated pieces of land.<sup>28</sup>

The Blacks Laws Amendment Act, no. 42 of 1964, intensified the forced removals in South Africa. The act amended Chapter IV of the Native Trust and Land Act of 1936. It intensified the abolition of the labour tenant system and forced removals of squatters and labour tenants from white farms. It resulted in the forced removals of about 340 000 labour tenants and about 656 000 squatters from white farms and 97 000 squatters in the "badly situated" areas (black-owned/occupied land acquired prior to 1913 outside scheduled areas) between 1960 and 1970.<sup>29</sup>

The black areas comprising homelands, as mentioned previously, were so scattered that they formed no foundation for community growth. To the outside world, this depicted homelands as fragmented pieces of land made up of grotesquely shaped black islands spattered across the map of "white"

---

<sup>27</sup> C. Albertyn, "Forced removals and the law: The Mogopa Case, *More v Minister of Co-operation and Development* 1986(1) SA 102(A), **The South African journal of human rights**, vol.2, part 1, March 1986, p.92; L. Platzky and C. Walker (eds.), **The surplus people: Forced removals in South Africa**, pp.113-115.

<sup>28</sup> E. Unterhalter, **Forced removal: The division, segregation and control of the people of South Africa**, p.104.

<sup>29</sup> C. Murray and C. O'Regan (eds.), **No place to rest: Forced removals and the law in South Africa**, p.197.

South Africa. In that way, it confirmed that the end product of apartheid was territorially impractical.<sup>30</sup> This necessitated a plan to correct this.

The homeland consolidation plan was laid out in 1973. Consolidation was a term used by the Government to refer to a policy developed to reduce the number of separate isolated pieces of land making up the various homelands. It was part of the process of turning these areas into geographical consolidated "independent national states". Some of these areas (trust-owned land) within scheduled areas have been deproclaimed. These were referred to as "badly situated" areas which were usually not situated close to the boundaries of any of the homelands and therefore could not be incorporated into the homelands. The occupants were therefore removed to areas within homeland borders by deproclamation.<sup>31</sup>

The implementation of the 1977 homeland consolidation programme involved inter alia the forcible removals of vast numbers of black people from "white" South Africa. Many black tenant farmers and squatters were removed from white-owned land. In the case of Bophuthatswana alone, the programme led to the removal of more than 17 000 people from the Transvaal and Cape Province. The programme continued beyond 1977.<sup>32</sup>

The National Party also intended to eradicate all the "black spots" as soon as possible. "Black spots" was a general term created by the Government to refer to black-owned/freehold land that was purchased prior to the 1913 Native Land Act. This land often lay outside the scheduled and released areas. The occupants were removed because their land fell within what was considered "white" rural areas. "Black spots" also referred to "badly situated"

---

<sup>30</sup> L. Griffiths, "When homeland is not a home", **The geographical magazine**, vol. 56, December 1984, p.629; E. Unterhalter, **Forced removal: The division, segregation and control of the people of South Africa**, p.104.

<sup>31</sup> N. Hayson and A. Armstrong, "Second Carnegie enquiry into poverty and development in South Africa", **Carnegie conference papers**, no. 86, 13-14 April 1984, Cape Town, p.22; C.J. Coetzee, **Die strewe tot etniese konsolidasie en nasionale selfverwesening by die Ndebele van Transvaal** (unp. Ph.D. thesis, PU for CHE, 1980), p.402.

<sup>32</sup> W.F. Lye and C. Murray, **Transformation on the Highveld: The Tswana and Southern Sotho**, pp.99-100.

areas that were to be removed in terms of the Government's consolidation policy. The Native Trust and Land Act empowered the Minister of Agriculture to expropriate land owned by a black or held in trust for a black tribe if it fell outside the scheduled area.<sup>33</sup> The occupants of such areas were to be relocated to homelands.<sup>34</sup>

A long-term plan for the eradication of the "black spots" in pursuit of homeland consolidation was drawn up and implemented. From the 1960s, the Government started moving black communities settled on "black spots" into homelands and white farmers acquired their land at knockdown prices.<sup>35</sup> In some areas, people were forcibly moved from the "black spots" to the land designated for inclusion into a homeland. This land was in most cases owned by the South African Native Trust (later called the South African Development Trust).<sup>36</sup> The clearance of "black spots" was done through the Natives Resettlement Act, no. 19 of 1954.<sup>37</sup> The "black spots" removals were also facilitated by the Bantu Laws Amendment Act, of 1973. This act allowed removals from "black spots" to be executed without the period of consultation as stipulated in the Native Administration Act, of 1927. The Native Administration Act stipulated that if the tribe ordered to move neglected to withdraw from the area they occupied, the order would be invalid until it was approved by the Houses of Parliament. The Bantu Laws Amendment Act

---

<sup>33</sup> N. Haysom and A. Armstrong, "Second Carnegie enquiry into poverty and development in South Africa", **Carnegie conference papers**, no. 86, 13-14 April 1984, Cape Town, pp.15-16; Union of South Africa, **The Statutes of the Union of South Africa**, 1936, p.100.

<sup>34</sup> C. Cooper et al., **Race relations survey 1983**, pp. 302-303.

<sup>35</sup> E. Unterhalter, **Forced removal: The division, segregation and control of the people of South Africa**, p.105.

<sup>36</sup> E. Unterhalter, **Forced removal: The division, segregation and control of the people of South Africa**, p.17.

<sup>37</sup> B.J. Liebenberg and S.B. Spies (eds.), **South Africa in the 20th century**, p.349.

removed this stipulation to enable the Government to continue with such removals without waiting for the approval by Parliament.<sup>38</sup>

Land policy was one of the bases of the forced removals of thousands of black people in South Africa. It was aimed at separate development in geographical, political, economic and social terms for different racial categories. Different governments passed a number of acts to carry out separate development. Some of the major acts are: the Native Land Act, no. 27 of 1913, the Native Trust and Land Act, no. 18 of 1936, the Native Administration Act, no. 38 of 1927, the Native Resettlement Act, no. 19 of 1954 and the Promotion of the Black Self-Government Act, no. 46 of 1959. These acts helped the Government to move black people from one area to the other within South Africa.

### **3.3 GENERAL REASONS FOR FORCED REMOVALS IN SOUTH AFRICA**

In general, forced removals of black people in South Africa were carried out due to a number of reasons. Some of these are:

- ✦ Removals from farms: These were due to the abolition of the labour tenancy system and of cash tenancy on white-owned farms in the 1960s and 1970s in Natal. Some farm workers were evicted because they were redundant to the needs of capitalist agriculture.<sup>39</sup>
- ✦ Clearance of "black spots": This refers to the forced removal of the occupants of the "badly situated" areas, which are outside areas designated for black occupation in terms of the 1913 and 1936 acts. Some people were removed from areas because their areas - although within scheduled areas - did not fit in a particular ethnic group. These

---

<sup>38</sup> E. Unterhalter, **Forced removal: The division, segregation and control of the people of South Africa**, p.17; W.L. Seriti, **Legislation affecting the removal of black people from certain areas from the perspective of ownership and occupation of land by black people in South Africa** (unp. L.L.M. dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand, 1987), p.22; B.J. Liebenberg and S.B. Spies (eds.), **South Africa in the 20th century**, p.493.

<sup>39</sup> C. Cooper et al., **Race relations survey 1983**, p.302.

people were therefore removed to consolidate homelands into cohesive ethnic entities.<sup>40</sup>

- ⊕ Urban relocation: This involved the removal of black people from locations which were deproclaimed because they were near “white” towns. The residents were relocated within the homelands.<sup>41</sup> There were also removals of informal settlements and slums from urban and peri-urban areas.<sup>42</sup>
- ⊕ Removals due to the application or execution of influx control legislation and the execution of the Coloured labour preference in the Western Cape.<sup>43</sup>
- ⊕ Group areas legislation: This involved the rearrangement of townships to ensure that they were occupied on ethnic lines.<sup>44</sup>
- ⊕ Removals due to infrastructural development schemes (dams and roads) and conservation of agricultural projects (forestry and plantations).<sup>45</sup>
- ⊕ Removals due to the institution of betterment schemes: Abolition of labour tenancy had moved many farmers who needed land desperately. Betterment schemes were planned to create a permanent farming class. This involved demarcating arable land, residential areas and common grazing fields. Many people were moved into these betterment schemes to “closer settlements”.<sup>46</sup>
- ⊕ Removals for strategic and military purposes: This involved the removal of people due to the establishment of military test sites. In some cases these took place because of clearance of a border zone against guerilla

---

<sup>40</sup> G. Mare, **African population relocation in South Africa**, pp.2-4.

<sup>41</sup> C. Cooper et al., **Race relations survey 1983**, p.302.

<sup>42</sup> M. Zotwana, **Relocations: The churches’ report on forced removals**, p.19; C. Cooper et al., **Race relations survey, 1983**, p.302.

<sup>43</sup> C. Cooper et al., **Race relations survey 1983**, p.303.

<sup>44</sup> Surplus People Project, **Forced removals in South Africa: The Transvaal**, vol. 5, p.128.

<sup>45</sup> C. Cooper et al., **Race relations survey 1983**, p.303.

<sup>46</sup> C. Cooper et al., **Race relations survey 1983**, p.303; G. Mare, **African population relocation in South Africa**, pp.29-30.

incursions such as in Namibia and the North-Eastern Transvaal. People were also removed from the proposed sites for strategic roads, airstrips, or other military installations.<sup>47</sup>

### **3.4 REASONS FOR THE FORCED REMOVAL OF THE BAKWENA BA MOGOPA**

Not all the reasons mentioned in 3.3 will be discussed in this section, only those of specific relevance to the forced removal of the Bakwena ba Mogopa. These include clearance of “black spots”, homeland consolidation, economic reasons and removals due to the Group Areas Act.

#### **3.4.1 Clearance of “black spots”**

The Bakwena ba Mogopa bought the two farms Swartrand and Hartebeeslaagte in the Ventersdorp district in 1911 and 1931 respectively. They had occupied part of this area since 1913 before the 1913 Land Act restricted black occupation and ownership of land. This area was called Mogopa.<sup>48</sup>

When the 1913 Native Land Act divided South Africa into separate areas for black and white occupation, Mogopa was not included in the schedule areas for black occupation. As it was outside the areas designated for black occupation, it was eventually classified as a “badly situated” area (“black spot”) in a “white” rural farming district.<sup>49</sup>

Mogopa remained a “black spot” in “white” South Africa. The introduction of the clearance of “black spots” through the Native Resettlement Act, no. 19 of 1954, signalled problems for its residents. As the occupants of a “black spot”,

---

<sup>47</sup> G. Mare, **African population relocation in South Africa**, p.31; C. Cooper et al., **Race relations survey 1983**, p.303.

<sup>48</sup> M. Kgaitsoe, **personal interview**, 14 May 1995; C.L. Peart, “Forced removals: One community’s experience”, **Arena**, 1994, pp.21-22; **New Nation**, 7 March 1991.

<sup>49</sup> M. Kgaitsoe, **personal interview**, 14 March 1995; Union of South Africa, **The Statutes of the Union of South Africa, 1913**, p.100; C. Albertyn, “Forced removals and the Law: The Mogopa case, *More v Minister of Co-operation and Development* 1986(1) SA 102(A), **The South African journal on human rights**, vol. 2, part 1, March 1986, p.93.

they were liable for removal from a “white” area. It was for this reason that Mogopa people were removed to Pachsdraai in the interests of grand apartheid.<sup>50</sup>

### 3.4.2 Homeland consolidation

The Bakwena ba Mogopa were moved to Pachsdraai among others due to the homeland consolidation policy. Bophuthatswana was highly instrumental in the forced removal of the Bakwena ba Mogopa to Pachsdraai. Both the South African and Bophuthatswana governments wanted the consolidation of Bophuthatswana completed.<sup>51</sup> The 1975 consolidation schedule estimated land to be released to Bophuthatswana at 250 000 hectares and people to be moved from the deproclaimed areas were estimated at between 100 000 and 120 000. The areas from which people were to be removed as indicated in the approved consolidation proposals included Mogopa in the Ventersdorp district.<sup>52</sup>

Pachsdraai was earmarked for incorporation into Bophuthatswana. With the envisaged resettlement of the Bakwena ba Mogopa, the president of Bophuthatswana, Chief Lucas Mangope, put more pressure on the South African Government to speed up the consolidation programme. He demanded the expansion of the Bophuthatswana border to include some farms in the Marico strip, including Pachsdraai. From his independence speech during the night of 5 December 1977, it became clear that the consolidation of Bophuthatswana would be seriously pursued. He stressed that independence and consolidation were two sides of the same coin. Without the consolidation of Bophuthatswana, the coin would lack integrity and credibility, and would

---

<sup>50</sup> C. Albertyn, “Forced removals and the Law: The Mogopa case, *More v Minister of Co-operation and Development* 1986(1) SA 102(A), **The South African journal on human rights**, vol.2, Part 1, March 1986, p.93; **New Nation**, 7 March 1991; Land Affairs Department (LAD), Pretoria, Konsolidasie van Bantoetuislande, UB 188/1716/7: Opruiming van swartkollie: Distrikte van Ventersdorp en Koster, 14 Februarie 1967.

<sup>51</sup> P.G. Koornhof, **telephonic interview**, 11 July 1996.

<sup>52</sup> Mogopa Tribal Office (MTO), Pachsdraai, Tribal correspondence: Consolidation: Bophuthatswana, 1975.

therefore be regarded as a fake. Independence would mean very little without consolidation. This put more pressure on the South African Government to speed up the consolidation process.<sup>53</sup>

The Bakwena ba Mogopa were removed from their ancestral land to Pachsdraai in pursuit of the consolidation of Bophuthatswana as a homogeneous ethnic group. This was in accordance of the Government's apartheid policy. They were moved to the "national state" which they failed to recognise.<sup>54</sup>

The homeland consolidation resulted in the removal of people from their own areas to areas within the homelands and areas designated for inclusion into the homelands. Bophuthatswana under President Mangope played an important role in the forced removal of the Bakwena ba Mogopa from Mogopa to Pachsdraai which was earmarked for incorporation into Bophuthatswana.

### 3.4.3 Economic reasons

Mogopa was part of the Maize Triangle. It was a fertile and well-watered land, very good for the cultivation of maize. It became the focus of attraction to the white farmers. They therefore influenced the policy for the removal of the Bakwena ba Mogopa. As white electorates, they managed to pressurize the government in their own way.<sup>55</sup>

The land was also rich in diamonds, metals and other minerals.<sup>56</sup> According to Mrs. Hellen Suzman, the Progressive Party member of Parliament for Houghton, the diamond rights were held by the tribe and the Government moved the tribe from their area to deny them the right to utilise the benefit of

---

<sup>53</sup> L.M. Mangope, *A place for all*, pp.38-39.

<sup>54</sup> *Pretoria News*, 29 November 1983; P.G. Koornhof, *telephonic interview*, 11 July 1996; Republic of South Africa, *Debates of the House of Assembly: Fourth Session, Seventh Parliament, no. 114*, 16 February 1984, col. 1204.

<sup>55</sup> Cheadle Thompson and Haysom Attorneys (CTH), Johannesburg, *Mogopa removal papers*: H. Winkler, Land proposal for Mogopa, Annexure 2, July 1990, p.11; *The Sowetan*, 24 September 1985.

<sup>56</sup> *The Sowetan*, 24 September 1985.

its diamonds. They were moved to the area where such rights were not available.<sup>57</sup> The removal was also a continuation of a process of dispossession of land and denial of access to land by black people.<sup>58</sup>

#### **3.4.4 Removals due to the Group Areas Act**

Andrew Pooe, a member of the Mogopa Development Forum, stated in an interview with Lillian Sebolao of **Seipone** that the Bakwena ba Mogopa were forcibly removed from Mogopa in terms of the Group Areas Act. The act was intended to rearrange the black areas on ethnic lines. The Bakwena ba Mogopa were therefore relocated to Pachsdraai which was earmarked for incorporation into Bophuthatswana, as stated earlier. This was done to ensure that the apartheid policy of dividing "black" South Africa into ethnic homelands was achieved and that Bophuthatswana became a homogeneous Tswana homeland.<sup>59</sup>

### **3.5 CONCLUSION**

Land policy in South Africa resulted in the forced removal of a large number of people from one area to the other within South Africa. A number of laws were passed to implement the land policy. Major acts that were passed to execute forced removals included among others the Native Land Act of 1913, the Native Administration Act of 1927, the Native Trust and Land Act of 1936, the Population Registration Act of 1950, the Group Areas Act of 1950, the Bantu Authorities Act of 1951, the Promotion of Black Self-Government Act of 1959 and the Black Laws Amendment Act of 1964. These were major laws which were passed to implement and justify the removal of thousands of people.

Although an overview of the general reasons for forced removals has been given, specific reasons for the forced removal of the Bakwena ba Mogopa

---

<sup>57</sup> Republic of South Africa, **Debates of the House of Assembly: Fourth Session, Seventh Parliament**, vol. 114, 16 February 1984, col. 1200.

<sup>58</sup> C.L. Peart, "Forced removals: One community's experience", **Arena**, 1994, p.22.

were discussed. Clearance of “badly situated” areas (“black spots”) and homeland consolidation were major reasons for the forced removal of the Bakwena ba Mogopa. These two reasons are inter-linked. Clearance of Mogopa as a “black spot” was done in pursuit of the Bophuthatswana consolidation as a Tswana ethnic homeland. The Bophuthatswana Government under President Mangope played an important role by pressurising the South African Government to speed up the consolidation of Bophuthatswana. The other reasons for the removal of the Bakwena ba Mogopa are economic reasons and group areas legislation.

---

<sup>59</sup> **Seipone**, 13 Phatwe 1991.