



UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, JOHANNESBURG

HISTORY WORKSHOP

STRUCTURE AND EXPERIENCE IN THE MAKING OF APARTHEID

6 - 10 February 1990

AUTHOR: B. Freund

TITLE: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Peasantry in Natal

AFRICANA LIBRARY

THE RISE AND DECLINE OF AN INDIAN PEASANTRY IN NATAL

INTRODUCTION

This paper represents a detour in a detour of a research itinerary. In trying to understand the distinctness of Natal and Durban in particular as a regional economy through historic analysis, I have been led to examine the history of Indian workers in and around Durban. At a certain point, I came further to realise that I needed to understand better where the Indian working class came from. Between the phase of indenture and that of commitment to industry and the city, there was an important, unexplored phase of rural commodity production which played the central role in Indian economic and social life. One motivation therefore in this paper is to highlight this largely unexamined history.

However, it has as well taken on a life of its own. It seems to me that there are few, if any, equivalent examples on South African soil of a rural population which was largely given over to commodity, rather than subsistence, production and which relied very heavily on household labour, i.e. self-exploitation. The economic conditions under which this mode of production was carried on are worthy of investigation in the light of broader theoretical perspectives on peasant societies but also in the light of the expanding debate on the "land question" in South Africa and the kind of prospects that might be open in the future to poor people in the countryside. Apart from recreating the rise, therefore, of the Indian peasantry, I will try to explain as well why this class has declined. The experience of other peasantries, including the Xhosa cultivators about whom Bundy and Lewis have written¹, are very relevant.

The relationship of this topic to *apartheid* is of some interest as well. While the primary theme will be the relationship of Indian cultivators to changing patterns in

South African capitalism, it will be argued that segregation to some extent encapsulated this class of people in such a way as to lead to their stagnation and decline. *Apartheid*, however, particularly after 1960 tried to buttress and advance the interests of the remnant of Indian farmers in Natal albeit with only limited success. It is 1960, rather than the institution of tricameralism in 1984 or later chinks in the edifice of *apartheid* which marks a turning point here.

THE HEYDAY OF THE INDIAN FARMERS OF NATAL

In the most recent South African census in 1985, no less than 91% of the Indian population are listed as urban, a higher figure than even the white population. The popular conception, including that held by Indians themselves, also identifies Indians as a commercial, industrial and urban population even though there is a widespread awareness that Indians came to Natal in large part as indentured workers on the coastal sugar plantations between 1860 and 1911.

By contrast, when the journalist L.E. Neame wrote his polemical study, The Asiatic Danger in the Colonies in 1907, the heart of his message with regard to Natal was the danger that an industrious Indian peasantry able to reproduce itself on tiny budgets, was in the process of ousting the white population of rural Natal.² Sir John Robinson, journalist and politician, portrayed in his memoirs a typical colonial image of the "frugal and irrepressible 'coolie.'"³ According to the census of 1904, while "Europeans or whites" largely outnumbered Indians in urban Natal, by some 3:1 in fact in the female population, in rural districts, the Indian advantage was some 2:1, with 38,076 whites and 76,540 Indians.⁴ While the white population of Natal was only 39% rural, the Indian population, of course including indentured workers on the cane fields and in other agricultural operations, was more than 75% rural.⁵

The attitude of white Natal to Indian immigration in the colonial period was deeply ambivalent. On the one hand, whites defined themselves as an exclusive racial community, whose cultural and material interests must always come to the

fore. Indians were feared as competitors and as bearers of a cheap labour economy that would make impossible the transformation of the entire white population into a community of prosperous property owners and skilled workmen. This was particularly the view of the less affluent elements in the white population. The introduction and maintenance of the indenture system always had many enemies in the settler community and was probably never supported by the majority.

By contrast, the great employers of labour not only supported the indenture system and relied on it for their agricultural and other enterprises, they also favoured the dense settlement of free Indians who could offer the colony inexpensive services and supplies. The indenture system offered to the Indian migrant to Natal the chance to remain in Africa. In fact, provision existed for the grant of land in lieu of passage back to India. Even if it seemed preferable to some that Indian migrants should come to South Africa, work as labourers and then be packed off when convenient without any further prospects in a new country, the lure of such a system for the workers would have been non-existent, given the harsh circumstances of their lives as bondsmen and women.

In practice, such grants were very rarely made but ex-indentured workers were well able to secure access to land for agricultural purposes. While some undoubtedly made their way directly into urban employment, it was in fact the route through agriculture that most engaged the newly-free Indian worker.⁶ Even under indenture, some possibilities for small-scale independent agricultural activity existed. In 1883, the Protector of Immigrants reported that even indentured plantation workers often were able to return home at noon in order to cultivate a private garden and tried to raise produce or poultry for private sale.⁷ Such workers looked hungrily at the available land that lay beyond the borders of the planters' land, perhaps land of lesser fertility or on a steep grade, perhaps simply left alone because there were no settlers to take it up. A biography of such an indentured worker family reports what next happened with clarity:

Across the river in Blackburn to the south, some early settlers had bought a hundred and fifty acres of land and this land had been rented out to free Indians.

There were smallholdings of two to five acres and on each plot a settler Indian lived. Most of the houses were built of mud walls thatched with grass [as in an Indian village, in fact]. Some were built of flattened out paraffin tins and some of reeds thatched with grass.⁹

The Blackburn Indians were too poor to purchase land but they were able to rent their patch of ground. They continued, moreover, to work for the planter on a contract basis. Until the iniquitous and much-hated annual £3 tax on free Indians was introduced (for those indentured after 1875), few immigrant Indians renewed their indenture, particularly outside years of severe recession.⁹ According to the 1882 divisional report for Umlazi near Durban, they "prefer the independence of a farmer on one acre of land, to employment in European service."¹⁰ In that year, the Protector of Immigrants reported that:

The facility with which land can be obtained in this Colony, while injurious to the employer of labour, enables any Indian who desires to raise himself in the social scale to do so; with a little industry and moderate good fortune, the man who was yesterday a labourer becomes an employer, competing with his late master.¹¹

Any inspection of records that relate to social or economic conditions in Natal in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, will quickly reveal numerous references to the expansion of a free Indian peasantry in the sugar cane country and elsewhere. While early references are very largely to tenant farmers, by the 1890s, there is also growing mention of Indian land purchase.¹² Following Neame, Indians owned some 10,000 acres and cultivated 50,000 as owners and tenants by the first years of the twentieth century.¹³ In 1898, the statistical yearbook recorded that Indian farmers grew crops to a value of £90,227. More than half of this value lay in the maize crop. Second was beans worth £15,953 and third, tobacco, £9,756. The value of the Indian sugar crop was only £2,001.¹⁴ According to the 1904 Natal census, Indians owned 6,052 cattle (compared to 314,000 owned by whites and 343,000 by Africans), 24,039 goats (compared respectively to 176,000 and 797,000) and 148,602 poultry (compared respectively to 463,000 and 613,000).

In the late nineteenth century, Indian farming enterprise was extremely diverse but aimed largely at the domestic market. There are numerous references to Indian maize production. In addition, tobacco was an important early crop grown. Both could find a large market amongst Africans.¹⁵ Reports also mention the cultivation of rice and there was undoubtedly a general expansion of crops aimed at Indian consumers. In Inanda, in the vicinity of the sugar heartland, Indians were the main producers of all crops other than sugar.¹⁶ At the same time, Indians took to the general production of fruit and vegetables and this was largely aimed at the white market. The agricultural commodities that Indians grew became far more abundant than they had been before and also much cheaper, to the delight of the principal figures in the Natal economy. This is why a Natal governor could say with pride that Indian "agriculturists are the keystone of South Coast industries", for instance.¹⁷

It is thus clear enough how small-scale Indian farming fitted into the broader capitalist development of colonial Natal. Indians rented and purchased land at a time when speculators were unable to find customers who would put it to profitable use.¹⁸ The Natal Land and Colonisation Society, as well as other landowning companies, were quite prepared to sell farms of 40-80 acres to Indians in the early twentieth century.¹⁹ The very success of Indian peasants brought down prices of the commodities that they produced, requiring them to survive on margins which would have been intolerable to settler farmers. Early Indian farmers clustered on the edge of the sugar plantations and thus had a dependent relationship to the plantation owners, producing cheap goods for them and their workers and serving as an occasional workforce to supplement the permanent employees.

Indian agrarian producers in Natal in the early twentieth century are best understood as simple commodity producers. In analysing their mode of production, two elements need underscoring. One is the intensity of their market commitment. Undoubtedly, some goods were produced for home consumption as on virtually any farm anywhere. However, what is striking is that the economic basis for Indian owners and tenants lay in production for a market. The contrast is

marked with the many agrarian producers in South African history who have rather used market involvement to help buttress or sustain a subsistence way of life whose extended reproduction is based on essentially non-market relations. This, according to Lewis, is largely the case for the nineteenth century African market producers of the eastern Cape and it was also true for the *trekboeren*.

Secondly, at the same time unlike most categories of white farmers in South Africa, the Indian peasants did not primarily at first rely on the exploitation of an unfree or even paid labour force. Most of the labour in their system of production was performed within and by the family. Even to the extent that Indian rural producers remained tenants, they were not themselves exploited significantly as labour tenants or rent-paying tenants on the whole. There is some development of an exploited sugar-producing tenantry in parts of the sugar belt in time, but in general, rents were low and exploitation basically took a different form, through the relationship between peasant cultivators and those who mediated between them and the market, particularly money-lenders and transporters.

The characteristic production unit was the extended family. According to an Inanda Division report for 1892/3, the typical Indian smallholding consisted of perhaps five acres, rented for ten shillings up to perhaps one pound per acre, and farmed by a partnership of two males.²⁰ Partnerships typically consisted of fathers and/or brothers but might, often less formally, embrace a further generation or wider connexions. This kind of corporate family structure allowed for a large number of adults to engage in diverse activities and, in particular, for agriculture to be combined with wage labour and most crucially, for the products of the farm to be marketed without going to an outside party. It is only through the possibility of alternative cash sources, that small commodity selling cultivators can in fact survive through times of adversity and strain.

In addition, as Sir James Liege Hulett quite correctly put it in a speech, "a free Indian made his wife and children work as well as himself."²¹ In an account written by an Indian writer

in 1906 about Newlands, north of the Umgeni from Durban, it was said that "all the Indians here, men and women and children, are busily ploughing the hillsides and planting same with mealies, tobacco, beans, etc."²² Only in desperation did an Indian woman ensconced within the household turn to wage labour but in fact she was normally intensively involved in agricultural production and marketing. One does not get a realistic sense of her life to describe her as a housewife. Thus the Indian smallholding was a family enterprise.

Moreover, the smallholding was itself incorporated into a nexus of activities, sometimes conducted on bases of equal exchange but not necessarily so, that brought together what can be considered to be a community that may well have crossed class or race lines. One account refers to the creation, in the periphery of Durban of a *panchayat*, or Hindi village commune, in which the author's successful family played a central role.²³ Indian village communities in Natal were central in preserving or reforming cultural structures in a new world, structures that relate to language, to cuisine, to forms of entertainment such as music and to religious practice. They also marked the characteristic forging of new relationships with Africans and whites.

It has already been mentioned that Indian agrarian activities in Natal were very diverse and extended throughout the province. At least until the period before World War I as well, it was possible for some Indians to accumulate to a significant extent within agriculture. As early as 1871, the will of Cathasamy Chetty of West Street, Durban, a merchant who had branch shops in the countryside, revealed the ownership of a sugar farm at Isipingo, near the site of Louis Botha Airport today, called "Puddles".²⁴ The Coolie Commission of 1872 indicated a significant number of Indian-owned farms, growing cane, tobacco, maize and vegetables both around Durban and on the North Coast.²⁵

Others combined agriculture with related business dealings. In Richmond, the son of an indentured worker turned the purchase of old cows into the creation of a soap factory.²⁶ Tongaat was the site of Desai's rice mill that came to employ

well over 100 labourers and many skilled workers.²⁷ Perhaps the first really wealthy Natal Indian of southern origin, R.B.Chetty, who came as a free immigrant via the Seychelles and Mauritius, grew betel and tobacco on a big scale and used the latter to manufacture cigars in the factory he established on Umgeni Road, Durban in 1904.²⁸ Fungavanam Moodley, an indentured worker, later became a small farmer near Port Shepstone and eventually succeeded in tobacco farming and land speculation on the basis of the 100 acres he secured.²⁹ Also on the South Coast, R.D. Chowtee established a tobacco estate of some 1200 acres at Sawoti.³⁰ More modestly, smallholders were sometimes able to establish shops based on the sale of produce from their own ground.³¹

The most spectacular case of all was that of Babu Bodasing. According to family stories, Bodasing came to Natal as an indentured worker in 1874 from the Agra region. A *kshatriya*, (relatively high caste) he came from a prosperous family who knew about the manufacture of sugar. In South Africa, Bodasing worked in the New Guelderland mill as a sugar maker and/or foreman.³² Although he at first served a renewed indenture contract, he emerged from indenture with six acres in 1884, farmed with a white partner, growing mealies, tobacco and fresh produce and owned 100 acres within four years. By the early years of the twentieth century, having married an indentured worker's daughter and procreated a family, he owned shops, stock farms in inland Natal and thousands of acres of prime cane land. His family claim that, when he died, each son inherited 1000 acres of cane. It is said that his greatest regret on his death in 1919 was that he had never had the opportunity to own a sugar mill.³³ There is nobody quite like the Bodasings in Indian agriculture in Natal; they have something of the status of the Oppenheimers in Rand mining.

Nonetheless mention should be made as well of E.M.Paruk. The Paruks have perhaps been the one consistently important, wealthy family in the business history of Natal Indians for a full century. Not long after Bodasing's death, the Paruks actually did acquire a sugar mill and became the only Indian miller-cum-grower outfit in South Africa. The first Indian sugar miller at Glendale was a man named Ramcharan, who sold crude sugar and treacle, of a kind that was typical of millers' production in India itself, as well as grinding

maize, to a largely African clientele. The moneylending Paruks acquired the Glendale mill through a foreclosure and greatly expanded it before World War II. They owned it until selling out to Lonrho in 1969.³⁴ At Glendale, they employed hundreds of Indian millworkers at all skill levels and hundreds of Indian families served as tenants producing for their mill as well.

Fascinating as is the story of the Indian agrarian capitalists, it must be emphasized that it was hardly typical. As we shall see, most of the Indian peasantry in Natal remained extremely poor and found less and less opportunity to advance their fortunes. Such diverse historians as Bundy and van Onselen have pointed out or suggested that early capitalism in South Africa and particularly the conditions that prevailed in the wake of the onset of the so-called Mineral Revolution, both ground people down and gave them new opportunities, opportunities which often vanished again once big capital was able to fill particular economic niches profitably or when the need for a pliant labour force took precedence and state policies were remoulded accordingly. The golden age of Indian farmers in Natal ended perhaps with the severe economic downturn of the last years before Union and certainly in the wake of World War I.

By that time, moreover, the Indian farming population could largely be divided into two distinct groups. In the historically key sugar-growing regions, Indians themselves turned to growing cane, a tendency that begins to be noted officially around the turn of the century.³⁵ It is important to point out that Bodasing made his money in sugar. However, much of the Indian agriculture in Natal focussed on peri-urban market gardening, particularly in the rich if flood-prone alluvial valleys near to Durban. Our Blackburn source beautifully epitomises this development in a family story.

A visitor from Springfield gave a glowing account of the nearness of Springfield from the town of Durban--the rich soil, plenty of water and firewood. My great-grandparents went to Springfield and found that the Springfield Flats were like Heaven on Earth for growing crops. Everything that a peasant farmer required was there.

The specific conditions of farming in these two distinct zones needs to be explored more fully and in the context of the declining capacity of Indian family agriculture to expand in the inter-war years.³⁶

THE NORTH COAST CANE FARMERS

In 1970, it was estimated that 32,7% of Indian farmers in Natal were situated in "Lower Tugela".³⁷ These and some of the 35,8% found in Durban-Pinetown constituted a distinct set of rural communities between Durban and the border with Zululand.³⁸ In terms both of acreage and number of farms, the 1920s had marked the end of the period of growth. The overall number of Indian-owned farms in Natal reached 2.575 in 1920/21 and declined to 2.545 in 1925/26.³⁹ In 1945, 1.229 cane growers farmed (and largely owned) 71.620 acres of land.⁴⁰ The number rose to 1.604 in 1961, to 1.835 in 1970/71 and fell to 1.817 in 1979/80 and again to 1.713 in 1988/89. Acreage was quite stagnant, however. Growers farmed 68.485 acres in 1954, 56.992 in 1961 and 61.040 in 1970/71 with little further increase thereafter.⁴¹

From this, two important points follow. First, the turn towards cane growing by Indian farmers away from the Durban metropolitan market; cane growing for most became a monoculture.⁴² Perhaps the one exception to be noted is the continued significance past World War II on the South Coast of a second industrial crop, tobacco, where a co-operative movement made marketing more economical. Tobacco production amongst Indian growers also declined massively in the 1960s, however.⁴³

The reasons for this shift to an industrial crop are several. First, cane is more suitable to marginal land and the vagaries of rainfall in coastal Natal than most other crops.⁴⁴ Second, and more importantly, the creation of a marketing and milling network tied in heavily to the availability of credit, exactly in that sphere of exchange where exploitation threatened most severely to squeeze the Indian peasantry, made it possible for the farmer to get a small but steady return for his crop.

Thus even if other crops, for instance, vegetables, yield a bigger return per acre, cane remains the most practicable crop for the smallholder away from the city.⁴⁵ The creation of the sugar quota system in 1936 confirmed this possibility and promoted the development of monoculture planting, while seriously inhibiting the overall growth possibilities for Indian cultivators.⁴⁶

Secondly, while the amount of land that Indian farmers work has remained basically stagnant, from the inter-war years land increasingly began to be divided between heirs and the size of landholdings diminished on average.⁴⁷ Particularly closer to Durban, smallholdings give way to dwarfholdings with limited economic possibilities.⁴⁸ Fragmentation is itself a cause for absenteeism and out-migration.⁴⁹ Especially in the more remote corners of the North Coast, community life could not be so easily sustained and the most important social linkages became those amongst family members, involving those no longer resident on the farm.⁵⁰ In fact, for reasons of familial solidarity which depended on the possibility of equal inheritance, representatives of Indian farming communities, apart from the pre-war South African Indian Congress which then represented the most successful elements, actually wanted to exclude Indians from the provisions of legislation that might block "unbeneficial" over-partition of the land.⁵¹

On average, Indian North Coast farming remains technically backward and the farmers are poor men. In 1975, it was estimated that 81% of Indian farmers there and on the South Coast had incomes of under R1000 p.a. and some 62% under R500.⁵² A little earlier, one-third surveyed were said to be illiterate.⁵³ While Natal Indians at the start of the 1970s constituted more than 20% of all sugar growers in the province, they owned only one-twelfth of the cane acreage and produced only one-sixteenth of the sugar, a considerable decline from a generation earlier. Their yields were far below those of white farmers on average.⁵⁴ Particularly after World War II, their average age rose and increasingly, incomes were balanced with wage work off the farm.⁵⁵ By the early 1950s, it could be said that while independent farmers lived better and had a larger income than the declining number of Indian fieldworkers on white-owned sugar farmers, they actually earned less money under harsher living conditions than the skilled and even semi-skilled workers in the mills.⁵⁶

In the course of the capitalisation of cane country, when Indian farmers held land that was relatively desirable, the tendency was for whites to buy them out. In exchange, they moved to the steeper and dryer land on the edge of African reserves.³⁷ Indian farmers largely owned their own land but they lacked facilities for irrigation, fertilizer, electrification and capital improvements.³⁸ The majority lacked the ploughs, harrows and especially tractors essential for profitable development.³⁹ Access to fertilizer and effective use of fertilizer was poor, compared to white farmers.⁴⁰ According to David Rix, an agricultural expert for the state, Indian farmers around 1970 relied above all on sugar mills (67%) and private individuals (65%) for loans. Only 21% went to the bank for capital.⁴¹ It was largely the top class of Indian farmers who could get bank loans.⁴² The rest depended on transporters and on the millers (and independent usurers, themselves richer farmers or shopkeepers) who absorbed much of the potential profits.⁴³ In the early 1960s, for instance, the Indian growers' association estimated that they were obliged to pay 10% minimum interest rates to mills and private lenders as their only source of credit for fertilizer or implement purchase.⁴⁴ According to Rix, around 1970 less than one-third of Indian cane growers could reap or transport their own cane.⁴⁵

The particular needs of sugar cane, especially at harvesting time, meant as well a growing dependence on the hired labour of even poorer African workers (to an important extent women by the 1960s) and with it on labour contractors.⁴⁶ Most African farm workers commuted from the reserves (Mapumulo or Ndwedwe) or were temporarily housed on Indian farms and the availability and cost of this kind of labour became an important constraint to progress. In the Greyling study of Indian farmers on the North Coast, approximately half of those surveyed, 1.322 farmers, hired some 7.637 labourers of whom 91% were African and 27% women.⁴⁷

In the early twentieth century, land ownership and farming retained an enormous emotional hold on many Natal Indians but in more recent times, this has become less and less the case.

Although the allure of farm land is not entirely gone and still has a certain value as security for one's old age, fewer and fewer Indians are interested in farming as a full-time occupation and the ownership of land in coastal Natal has often become a residual activity.⁶⁹ Some land is let, mainly to Indians, when the owner actually works in town but wishes a friend or relation to maintain his plot, usually not on a strictly commercial basis.⁶⁷

Linked to this has been the declining commitment of the Indian bourgeoisie to agriculture. The ownership of land and production of sugar cane is highly skewed with a few big landowners. Maasdorp found in the early 1960s for the Verulam-Tongaat area that while 59% of farmers controlled under twenty acres, the top one per cent of growers owned over 200 acres apiece.⁷⁰ If 62% of Indian farmers surveyed in 1975 made under R500 p.a., four per cent made over R3000.⁷¹ However, there is little reason to think that this differential has become more marked with time. The agricultural fortunes of the pre-1920 era have not really been followed by later success stories of any great scope. It is moneylenders, transporters and labour contractors who have been best placed to make profits from Indian agriculture. The stagnation of the small farm sector is accompanied by the relative stagnation of the bigger farm sector.

It is possible to picture this picture of stagnation through two lenses, one emphasizing the racist strictures of the segregation era and the other emphasizing the actual course of capitalist development. Both are significant but the argument here is that the latter is more important. In two ways, segregation did play a crucial role in discouraging the development of Indian farmers. For one thing, it made the further acquisition of land more difficult. In 1923 the recently-passed Durban Land Alienation Ordinance permitting the institution of racially exclusive restrictive covenants concerning land transfers was extended to the entire province of Natal. In 1946, the Asiatic Land Tenure Bill actually restricted the right of Indians to purchase land and the Group Areas Act from 1950 resulted in Indians losing land that was proclaimed for whites only.⁷²

Probably more important, however, (and this is where capitalism and segregation came together) was the fact that in the very era when the state was becoming deeply committed to supporting and assisting white farmers who possessed the franchise, it did virtually nothing for Indian farmers apart from the granting of quotas for cane production from 1936.⁷³ Indian farmers had no access to state lending institutions or assistance in the recruitment of labour or equipment. They were excluded from membership in the Marketing Boards.⁷⁴ Moreover, Indian proclaimed land because of its scarcity acquired a money value that could not actually be realised by the farmer, further discouraging investment.

Nonetheless, it is probably the more acquisitive and capitalist-orientated Indian farmers who lost out the most as a result of intensifying racism. For the majority, capitalisation of the land itself directly squeezed the peasantry.⁷⁵ The kind of poverty would not have been loosed simply were more land available legally. The problem was rather that of the cost of improving the land and labour conditions. Inexorably as land became more valuable and developed in conjunction (necessarily!) with state assistance, the smallholder became more marginal. As Indian peasants withdrew from agrarian commitments, moreover, they produced relatively less sugar and their general economic importance declined.

THE HOUR OF THE MARKET GARDENERS

In the 1970 census results cited above, the largest single grouping of Indian farmers resident in Natal were in the Durban-Pinetown area. Some belonged to the North Coast rubric that we have been examining but many were market gardeners and their numbers were yet far larger a generation earlier. In a number of important respects, the market gardeners farmed in a different way to the rural cultivators of the North Coast. To begin with, they were not generally owners of land. In 1930, whereas market gardeners were more than twice as numerous as cane farmers, they owned far less than one-tenth the amount of land of the latter.⁷⁶ Two acres was a larger than average size garden.⁷⁷ Except on steeper ground, notably Stella Hill

(Carrington Heights) where plots were far larger, vegetables rather than fruit dominated market gardeners' production in Durban.⁷⁰ In 1942, the borough of Durban contained some 2,326 acres of market garden, excluding Cato Manor.⁷¹ The most thorough student of the gardeners, I.G.Halliday, characterised the holdings by their "scattered nature and small size."⁷² Most market gardeners leased land, either from private landowners or, more likely, from the Corporation or South African Railways & Harbours.⁷³ Even where they owned a small patch of ground, it was apt to be for living space while they actually planted their fruit and vegetables elsewhere.⁷⁴

Superficially, this paucity of land would suggest that market gardeners were apt to be yet poorer than sugar farmers. It is true that very few indeed ever were able to accumulate capital significantly in this way. This sector unlike cane growing virtually lacked a kulak or real capitalist farmer element. However, market gardening had its attractions for the poor with its potential of "quick returns" and cash payments on the head and consequently it lured many ex-indentured workers and their children away from the canefields early in the twentieth century.⁷⁵ Land such as the Springfield Flats, which formed a little valley near the mouth of the Umgeni river, the South Coast Junction-Clairwood-Bayhead area that stretched south of the harbour and the low-lying countryside south of the Umgeni mouth and north of the Greyville race track, was often very fertile.

Access to customers was relatively easy even though members of the extended family had to spend long hours distributing and marketing the produce.⁷⁶ Typically, the early morning Squatters' Market served the needs of the market gardeners of Durban. In 1938, the Squatters' Market sold some 1000-1200 tickets to individuals on a Saturday morning for the right to sell produce.⁷⁷ Even the Cliffdale farmers from the Mist Belt marketed their own wares in Durban daily during the season.⁷⁸

Above all, small-scale agriculture could be combined with other activities, either suitable to an uncontrolled urban periphery or to wage work in town. Market gardening could be part of a larger and more diverse household economy; it was

social security as much as a viable occupation.⁸⁷ From the 1920s, market gardeners' sons began to walk to work in Durban factories in large numbers. Especially near the expanding factory zone south of the harbour, post-war gardeners were part-time gardeners; industrial work was distinctly more remunerative when available.⁸⁸

The ownership or inexpensive leasing of land itself provided the basis of a relatively cheap way of life around which a dense social nexus developed. Gardeners lived in wood and iron shacks, sometimes quite sprawling, with little in the way of amenities or sanitation, a poor water supply (at best a communal tap) and no electricity.⁸⁹ What little cash was accumulated was placed under the mattress or buried in the ground, perhaps invested in a child's education or the purchase of a small bit of land somewhere.⁹⁰ Although Indians in the region of Durban were more statistically likely than whites to own a home, however humble, their diet was poor. Consumption of butter or fruit was a luxury. The peripheral Indians of Durban lived on beans, cheap bread and poor cuts of meat.⁹¹ Despite the low income of market gardeners, in general it was essential to hire temporary African labour for harvesting (at wages so low Indian men would not accept them) and, for lighter work such as weeding and planting, Indian women were sometimes hired at even less pay.⁹²

While Indian market gardeners were not at first so affected by the growing difficulties Indians experienced in purchasing land in Natal, they were also in time the victims of the capitalisation of land values and the growing development of capitalism in South Africa. Improvements in transport and state assistance of a varied kind (such as favourable rail rates) were crucial in allowing for the competitive importation of vegetables of many kinds into Durban from inland destinations by rail and later road.⁹³ Marketing constraints ate heavily into any garden profits.

In 1931, Durban municipality succeeded in substantially expanding the region under its control. This was done both in order to allow for economic development and for undesirable activities of a variety of sorts and by inhabitants of all

colours to be brought under harness or eliminated. The flat land where Indians grew vegetables was desired for industrial expansion and eventually the possible zone where market gardening could flourish became more and more limited.⁷⁴ Moreover, the very most desirable, low-lying land was also subject to disastrous floods from time to time. In 1905, 137 people died when the Umhlatuzana stream flooded, of whom 113 were Indians.⁷⁵ The great Springfield flood disaster of 1917 caused many to abandon the fertile Umgeni river plain.⁷⁶

In certain areas, the expansion of white residential housing, taking advantage of the Group Areas legislation, also grew at the expense of market gardeners. Just inland from the Berea Ridge, where perhaps the greatest concentration of Indian landownership was found in Mayville-Cato Manor, market gardening gave way to shack renting, especially with the great expansion of the African urban population during and after World War II. This was a more remunerative, easier way to make money than by farming. Finally, the whole of peripheral Indian Durban, under the impact of state urban design policies directed from Pretoria, was forcibly shifted towards the new, massive, working class townships to the south-west and north-west of the city. This coincided in time with the remarkable industrial growth rates of the 1960s which mopped up Indian unemployment and undermined the complex survival patterns of an earlier age. Only remnants of market gardening have survived here and there.

However much Indian Durbanites may today regret the destruction of communities that were held together by a rich network of social ties, it is hard to think that market gardening itself offered to them a remunerative way of life compared to their present situation. The conditions of market gardening, whereby the producers owned little land, and were obliged to work very hard for small and unreliable rewards in marketing what they grew, held by itself little real possibility for the creation of a better way of life. Its most appealing aspect was the form in which it introduced Indian families to the urban economy. In practice, the shift towards industrial employment was one that must have been welcomed by most who made the change. Halliday noted already in 1940 that "it was rather interesting however to note the number to whom 'farming did not pay' and very few wished their

sons to follow in their footsteps."⁹⁷ Industrial employment, in fact, has long since become seen as the more secure way of making a living.⁹⁸

CAPITALISM, APARTHEID AND THE FATE OF THE INDIAN PEASANTRY

In 1934, 36,8% of all Indians in gainful employment in Natal were working in agriculture, a figure that of course included the cane field and millworkers. By 1951, this figure had fallen to 20,3% and manufacturing and services had overtaken the agricultural sector in this respect. In 1960, a further fall to 12,0% and then to 4,6% in 1970 saw agriculture also overtaken by construction and transport as well.⁹⁹ The number of Indian employers in agriculture, including the self-employed, had shrunk to 2.140.¹⁰⁰

The early years of National Party rule may have marked the nadir of relations between Indian cultivators and the South African state with the passage of the Group Areas Act and the consequent uncertainty about the rights of Indian property owners. South Africa's massive labour recruitment system excluded Indian agricultural employers.¹⁰¹ However, after 1960, the situation in some respects improved with a change in the party's policy towards Indian South Africans. Hopes that any significant proportion of the Indian population would emigrate to India vanished. The Verwoerd government accepted that the Indians were in South Africa to stay, perhaps as junior partners of the whites, and proceeded to try and fit them into the framework of *apartheid*.

State propaganda made it clear that there were some kinds of Indians who represented an unhealthy element in the population. There were too many Indian traders and too many Indian workers who were informally skilled but not legally qualified. What were needed were those men and women who could be fitted into the burgeoning South African economy and idealised social order: nurses, policemen, sailors, skilled craftsmen, manufacturers. The right sort of farmers belonged to this category. The government publication most directly

aimed at the Indian population, *Fiat Lux*, contained many articles from the late 1960s, aimed at improving the quality of Indian agriculture and encouraging Indian farmers.

To this encouragement, there certainly were limits. The Group Areas Act remains in force and, although I suspect that it has recently become easier for Indians to get some access to rural land in white areas, on the whole the restriction on Indian land purchase has remained. However, gradually the state has been prepared to create favourable conditions for the maintenance of Indian farmers on the basis that has been in operation for whites since the days of the Pact and the Fusion ministries of the inter-war years. Agricultural extension officers were assigned to Indian areas and eventually Indians themselves trained in this work with a diploma course introduced at the M.L.Sultan Technikon.¹⁰² Indians were permitted to belong to the national, regional and crop-specific farmers' associations.¹⁰³ The facilities of the Land Bank were made available to Indians and eventually Indian land assessors appointed so as to make loans more available by the end of the 1970s.¹⁰⁴ The Agriculture Credit Board of the South African Sugar Association loaned money at low rates to farmers, although not for land purchase and insufficiently for mortgage and improvements.¹⁰⁵ From 1972, the Sugar Association offered extension services to Indian cane growers.¹⁰⁶ Disaster fund aid became available as well and it is perhaps in the wake of Cyclone Demoina in 1983 that for the first time, the South African state responded with significant assistance to a fairly large number of rural Indians.¹⁰⁷ The institution of the House of Delegates in 1984, however, came after the major shift in policy and has added rather little to it.

The growing willingness of the South African state to intervene benignly in Indian-owned farming needs to be qualified in one important way, however. It is a willingness that reaches out for those who can be transformed into capitalist farmers on the South African model, just as earlier remedies in favour of the "poor whites" were discarded for those policies that would help those who could help themselves in a capitalist environment. For the top Indian farmers, conditions have certainly improved. The Botswana interests have substantially increased their production of sugar cane

over the past fifteen years. They and some others have found the means to invest in improved equipment and farming methods. The Natal Indian Cane Growers' Association overtly addresses its members as a community of rural bosses in discussing (fearfully) the possibility of African farmworkers' unionisation.¹⁰⁸ The most successful Indian farmer in Cliffdale has been able to avail himself of African convict labour.¹⁰⁹ For the market gardeners who remain, the move from Squatters' Market to the modern produce market in Clairwood that took place in the 1970s, by increasing the salience of middlemen, represented in this sense a dovetailing by the local state aiming ostensibly at hygiene and efficiency, with national state policies.¹¹⁰

However, the decline of the Indian peasantry as a whole has not been reversed.¹¹¹ If they produced seven per cent of South Africa's sugar in 1961, Indian growers now produce no more than four per cent. The kind of measures the state has introduced have neither aimed at helping, or been able to do much for, the "middle peasant" (who is neither a real exploiter of labour nor is himself exploited within the productive sphere). Despite the significant differences between them explored above, both market gardening and cane growing shared in common by 1960 the reality that they had become in large part economically residual activities for this class. For the smallholder, no capital has been made available for land or infrastructural assistance. Legislation has been planned to squeeze the least efficient grower who makes consequently poor use of the soil.¹¹² While the desire to retain land does remain, the Indian peasantry has basically been incorporated into a much bigger wage-earning class and is disappearing from the Natal population as a distinct element of any size. On the North Coast and elsewhere, African cane growers have become economically more important than Indians overall.¹¹³

BY WAY OF CONCLUSION

While the wider purpose of this study is to examine how the Indian farmer became a worker, this paper seeks to conclude with a few remarks on the significance of the peasant stage in Natal Indian history for the South African "land question"

more generally. There seem to be a number of lessons to draw here. One is to underscore the possibility of the capitalist state to develop policies that effectively direct agrarian production along particular paths. At a certain point, such policies allowed an Indian peasantry to develop in Natal. At a later phase, it was constrained and marginalised. The South African state has generally tried to assist white farmers to master large numbers of labourers, to convert tenants into wage-workers, and to create an industrialised, high energy and machinery-consuming agrarian enterprise system. Until fairly recently, Indian farmers were left out of these efforts (although it must be said that a few succeeded anyway). More recently, they have been brought in to the winners' circle to some extent but the large majority are in no position to benefit and continue effectively to be proletarianised.

There is no *prima facie* reason, however, why the state could not instead have directed its assistance to family farmers through a different orientation. Different policies aimed at smallholder credit and technical assistance as well as co-operative marketing would have had a very different historic effect. Nevertheless, drawing this lesson should not let us forget the other side of the coin, that there are also real limits to the possibilities of peasant farming for large numbers of people. Let us review the realities of the past.

Small-scale agriculture offered to Indians in Natal a prospect that was very appealing after escape from the indenture system. It offered a productive base for extended family life, an inexpensive retreat when the economy was in recession and jobs hard to get, as well as the special rewards of a life on the land. Market-orientated family farming can offer something to many poor black South Africans now and in the future by analogy. However, looking particularly at the situation of the market gardeners, it also seems very salient to point out that farming on this scale was never an attractive alternative to industrial employment, even when industrial jobs were very poorly rewarded. The social security peasant farming offered, moreover, was a shared poverty, not a substitute for a modern welfare system that provides a reasonable modicum of health, education and basic amenities fairly generally. Only a small number of Indians were ever able to accumulate from agriculture. Without ruling

out the importance, for the short to medium term, of providing some access to the resources of the land for many impoverished South Africans, particularly when they have some prospect of production for and access to a market, it is a delusion to think that land reform would be able on its own to provide a good way of life to very large numbers of people in the modern world. The peasant road can only play a fairly limited part as a solution to South Africa's problems of poverty and unemployment.

Bill Freund
University of Natal,
Durban

FOOTNOTES

1. Colin Bundy, The Rise and Fall of the South African Peasantry, (Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979); Jack Lewis, "The Rise and Fall of the South African Peasantry...", *Journal of Southern African Studies*, XI, 1984.
2. L.E. Neame, The Asiatic Danger in the Colonies, (London: George Routledge & Sons, 1907).
3. Sir John Robinson, A Life Time in South Africa, (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1900), pp. 76-77.
4. Neame, p. 138.
5. Ibid., p. 30.
6. For a recent, useful general survey see Joy Brain, "Indentured and Free Indians in the Economy of Colonial Natal" in Bill Guest & John Sellers, eds., Enterprise and Exploitation in a Victorian Colony, (Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 1985).
7. In the circle of Stanger. Protector's Report, Natal Blue Book, 1863, FF 57.
8. S. Rampersad, Biography of Jaichoo Nango, University of Durban-Westville History III essay collection, Documentation Centre collection.
9. Moreover, according to the Wragg Commission, between 1860 and 1885, 26,954 indentured workers arrived in Natal from India but only 1,716 returned to India and already some two-thirds of the Indian population in Natal were free.
10. Umlazi Division Annual Report, Natal Blue Book 1882, GG 35.
11. Protector of Immigrants' Report, Natal Blue Book, 1882, FF 35.
12. Natal Blue Book, 1894/95, 821; Natal Blue Book, 1900, Protector of Immigrants' Reports, A14.
13. Neame, p. 35. Ginwala has found a figure of 14,000 acres owned in the Verulam-Tongaat region alone by 1900 from the Lands Commission. Perhaps 6% of cultivated land in Natal was farmed by Indian tenants and landowners. Frene Ginwala, "Class, Consciousness and Control: Indian South Africans 1860-1946", Oxford University D.Phil, 1975, pp. 85-86.
14. Natal Blue Book, 1899, Protector of Immigrants' Report, annexures, A42. The accuracy of such figures is not to be highly rated and the figures are probably underestimates, as in other official reports.
15. Wragg Commission Report, p. 62; Natal Blue Book, 1882, Inanda Division report, GG46; Natal Blue Book, 1883, reports for Lower Tugela Division, GG16, for Inanda, GG 25, for Alexandra, GG 45; Natal Blue Book, 1885, Inanda Division report, B10; Natal Blue Book, 1887, B 18-20.
16. Natal Blue Book, 1887, Inanda Division report, B8 18-20.
17. Sir Henry McCallum, cited in *Indian Opinion*, 25 November

- 1906.
18. Henry Slater, "The Changing Pattern of Economic Relations in Rural Natal, 1838-1914" in Shula Marks & Anthony Atmore, eds., Economy and Society in Pre-industrial South Africa, (London: Longman, 1980).
 19. R.J.Davies & J.J.C.Greyling, Indian Farming on the Natal North Coast, (Pietermaritzburg: Natal Town & Regional Planning Commission, 1978), Natal Town & Regional Planning Reports v.39, I, pp.26.
 20. Natal Blue Books 1892/3, Inanda Division Report, B53. Particularly further up the coast, Indian landholdings tended to be somewhat larger.
 21. Reported in *Indian Opinion*, 14 September, 1903.
 22. J.S.Done writing in *Indian Opinion*, 23 December 1906.
 23. The *panchayat* may well be compared to the more famous Russian self-governing *mir/obshchina*. S. Rampersad, biography of Jaichoo Nanoo, History III essay, University of Durban-Westville, Documentation Centre collection. According to one essay, the mist belt Indian community of Cliffdale was established around 1930 following the immigration and land purchase of one key family. S. Govindasamy, "The History of the Indian Market Gardeners of Cliffdale," History III essay, 1987, University of Durban-Westville, Documentation Centre collection. However, a social survey rejects the idea that full-scale agricultural communities existed on the North Coast, at least by the 1960s. Instead of Indian style village life, extended family heads are able to play an important role within communities. R.J.Davies & J.J.C.Greyling, I, p.15R.
 24. Natal Archives, MSC/137/SUPREME COURT. I owe this reference to Vishnu Fadayachee.
 25. R.J.Davies & J.J.C.Greyling, I, p.25.
 26. J.C.Coulson, Richmond: Its People and History, (Richmond: Women's League Institute, 1986).
 27. *Fiat Lux*, II(1), 1967, p.3.
 28. V.Chetty, History III essay, University of Durban-Westville, Documentation Centre collection. This essay obviously relates family history and claims that the first Chetty owned 5000 acres of tobacco land near Spitzkop.
 29. R. Moodley, Biography of Fugavanam Moodley, History III essay, University of Durban-Westville, Documentation Centre collection.
 30. *Fiat Lux*, XVIII(4), May, 1983.
 31. N.D.Naidoo, University of Durban-Westville History III essays, 1984, Documentation Centre collection.
 32. It is certainly true that not all indentured workers were labourers, despite the great hostility of white working class Natalians to the indenture of skilled men. Perhaps success stories often had to do with such individuals.
 33. In 1983/84, two descendants of Bodasing wrote History III essays on family history which are deposited at the

- Documentation Centre, University of Durban-Westville. Obviously the business history of the Bodasings would make an extraordinary tale.
34. N.R.Kandosamy, A Brief History of the Glendale Sugar Mill, History III essay, 1985, University of Durban-Westville, Documentation Centre collection.
 35. Natal Blue Book, 1900, Protector of Immigrants' report, A14.
 36. It is a striking aspect of the difference between the two types of smallholder farming that, whereas, the majority of North Coast farmers have been from originally Hindi-speaking families and thus of North Indian origin, around the city of Durban and on the South Coast, the large majority are and were of South Indian origin. However, in both cases, the religious affinities of the overwhelming majority are Hindu. J.J.C Greyling, "Problems of Indian Landownership and Land-Occupation on the Natal North Coast: A Socio-geographic Investigation", Ph.D, University of Natal, Durban, 1969, I, p.47. Information about Durban and the South Coast from V. Padayachee; see also the survey in University of Natal, Department of Economics, Studies of Indian Employment in Natal, Natal Regional Survey XI, (Cape Town: Oxford University Press, 1961), p.32.
 37. This category seems to be rather intended to mean the north coast of Natal well away from Durban below the Tugela. The more substantial Natal Indian rural population of 1960 lived to the extent of 60% between Durban and the Tugela. Greyling, I, p.40.
 38. *Fiat Lux*, VIII(8), 1973.
 39. S.A.Waiz, Indians Abroad Directory, Bombay, May, 1934.
 40. Natal Indian Cane Growers Association Annual Report, 1945.
 41. Figures from the annual reports of the Natal Indian Cane Growers Association. I am grateful to the Association, which has now dropped Indian from its name, for allowing me to look at its copies in the Stanger headquarters.
 42. In a survey of the Verulam-Tongaat region in the early 1960s, 118 of 154 farmers only farmed cane and a mere 19 farmed no cane at all. G.G.Maasdorp, "A Socio-economic Survey of the Indian Community in the Tongaat-Verulam Region", M.Comm thesis, University of Natal, Durban, 1966, pp.134, 172. See also the shorter version published by the Economics Department of the university in 1968 entitled A Natal Indian Community. Greyling found that there was no correlation between size of farm amongst Indian farmers and the use of land, apart from the tendency for very small holdings to be used for non-agricultural purposes. Greyling, I, p.217. In his massive survey, he found that no less than 78.7% of North Coast Indian-owned land was in cane. Small farmers often practised more intercropping, presumably in order to allow for some food production for their own use. Even very near to Durban, sugar cane dominated land

- use, I, pp. 202-03. Yet another study of this period surveyed North Coast Indian-owned farms and found 62% cultivated only sugar and only 11% no sugar. David Rix, "Indian Agriculture on the North Coast of Natal: Technical Aspects," University of Pretoria, M.Agric., 1972.
43. Rix, p. 18.
 44. More "regular and reliable", according to Rix, p. 16.
 45. Rix, p. 140.
 46. Rix, p. 16; NICGA annual report, 1945.
 47. Maasdorp, 164ff.; Greyling, I, p. 56. In Greyling's massive survey of 2700 farms, the median size in the late 1960s was 11,215 acres with only one quarter of farms larger than twenty-two acres, I, p. 59. Less than ten per cent of land was owned by women. I, p. 114.
 48. Greyling, I, pp. 67-68. Although they are slightly less likely to be sugar farmers, Rix, p. 121.
 49. Davies & Greyling, I, pp. 72ff.
 50. Surprisingly few of the farmers in the Greyling survey owned farms on a share basis-25,7%. Greyling, I, p. 77.
 51. I.G. Halliday, "The Indian Market Gardeners of the Durban Peri-Urban Area", University of Natal masters' thesis, 1940, p. 108.
 52. D.M. Scotney & D.M. Rix, "Land Use Problems in Indian Agriculture", *Fiat Lux*, X(1), 2/1975. For some figures from 1962/63, see Davies & Greyling, I, p. 144.
 53. Davies & Greyling, I, 35. The authors also reported a poor ability to comprehend English.
 54. Rix, p. 61.
 55. Maasdorp, p. 162; Rix, p. 173; Greyling, I, p. 65; Davies & Greyling, I, p. 144. Many Indians on the North Coast farms were living below the Poverty Datum line in the 1960s according to the latter. Rix suggests around 1970 this was true of the majority with only nine per cent well above it, p. 135.
 56. B.A. & J. Naidoo, "Economic Opportunities and Mode of Living of the Indian Community" in The Indian as a South African, (Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations, 1956), pp. 35-36..
 57. Greyling, I, p. 40; A 1921 government commission pointed out already that Indian growers "gradually get squeezed out as the sugar industry expands," Rix, p. 15. See also US 4/1921, pp. 41-42. For the steep grade of Indian-owned land on average, see Davies & Greyling, II, p. 25, who claim that 57% of the total has a 15%+ slope.
 58. According to Greyling, the Indian peasantry of the 1960s listed their biggest problems as lack of water, lack of land, lack of capital, lack of labour (especially the bigger farmers), inadequate marketing arrangements and inadequate transport. Greyling, I, p. 266.
 59. Greyling, I, pp. 250, 252.
 60. Rix, p. 74.
 61. Ibid., p. 180.

62. Davies & Greyling, I, p.136.
63. Maasdorp, p.167; Greyling, I, p.236. For problems of Indian cane growers with millers, see the annual reports of the Natal Indian Cane Growers Association.
64. NICGA annual report, 1963/64.
65. Rix, p.85.
66. Maasdorp also points to the use of Indian child hired labour.
67. Of the few Indian wage labourers involved, most lived on the premises. This was true of relatively few Africans and especially few women, Greyling, I, p.244. According to Rix, "few Indian farmers keep permanent labourers", p.114.
68. Greyling, I, p.70, 227.
69. *Ibid.*, I, p.124.
70. Maasdorp, p.157.
71. Scotney & Rix, 1975.
72. G.G.Maasdorp & P.N.Pillay, "Occupational Mobility among the Indian People of Natal" in H.W. van der Merwe & C.J. Groenewald, eds., Occupational and Social Change among Coloured People, (Cape Town: Juta, 1976), p.81; Davies & Greyling, I, p.28; Greyling, I, pp.32-34; Rix, p.16. For an example of an Indian entrepreneur who lost substantial amounts of agricultural land in the wake of the application of Group Areas legislation, see the biography of moneylender and grain trader Mohangi in the *Daily News* supplement, 23 August 1883, p.12. The president of NICGA claimed in the annual report for 1975 that 30,000 acres had been lost to Indian farmers under the Group Areas Act.
73. For a recent examination of rural social protest in South Africa in the 1920s that looks at the development of capitalist farming in Natal and elsewhere, see Helen Bradford, A Taste of Freedom: The ICU in Rural South Africa 1924-30, (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1987) and see M.L. Morris, "The Development of Capitalism in South African Agriculture: Class Struggle in the Countryside", *Economy and Society*, V, 1976.
74. Halliday, 1940, p.109.
75. It is probably the most serious problem with social surveys such as those by Maasdorp, Rix and especially Greyling, that they do not consider class and do not examine different strata distinctly. They were all bound to consider Indians as a total ethnically-defined "community" instead. It is particularly the small class of successful rural accumulators who, as a result, are not illuminated by their otherwise immensely valuable research studies.
76. A.J.Arkin, Contribution of the Indians to the South African Economy 1860-1940, University of Durban-Westville Institute of Social & Economic Research, Report 14, 1981, p.145.
77. Halliday, 1940. A survey in 1949 found an average of only 1.4 acres, University of Natal, Department of

- Economics, Studies of Indian Employment in Natal, Natal Regional Survey XI, (Cape Town: Oxford University Press, 1961), p.16.
78. Yet fruit production was in fact less time-consuming. University of Natal, p.25.
 79. I.G.Halliday, "Durban's Food Supplies", University of South Africa D.Phil, 1942. A Public Health Department survey itemised the acreage by sub-district as follows: 640 acres, Clairwood Flats; 220, Bay Head; 130, Mayville; 108, Umhlatuzana; 337, Sea Cow Lake; 117, Prospect Hill/Umgeni/Riverside; 245, Springfield Flats (including some of the most fertile plots). See also Halliday, 1940.
 80. Ibid., p.24.
 81. University of Natal, p.17.
 82. Halliday, 1940, p.50. Yet by this time, most Indians surveyed had actually lived in the same place for a considerable period of time.
 83. Neame, p.30.
 84. For problems of marketing vegetables, see Rix, p.98 and K.K.Naidoo, biography of Narayaddu, History III essay, University of Durban-Westville, Documentation Centre collection. Yet few permanent stallholders were also gardeners, Halliday, 1942, p.72.
 85. I.G. Halliday, 1940, p.30; University of Natal, p.28.
 86. S.Govindasamy, "The History of the Indian Market Gardeners of Cliffdale", History B.A. Honours essay, 1987, University of Durban-Westville.
 87. University of Natal, p.19.
 88. Ibid., p.20.
 89. Halliday, 1940, p.30. For living conditions, see also University of Natal, p.31.
 90. Halliday, 1940, p.35.
 91. Halliday, 1942, p.94.
 92. Ibid., 1942, p.55.
 93. Davies & Greyling, I, p.93; Arkin, p.148.
 94. M.A.Tatham, "A Study of the Urban Morphology of Durban", M.Sc., University of Natal, Durban, 1955; Maasdorp & Pillay, p.245; Menaka Padayachee, "A Socio-economic Profile of Four Market Gardening Communities in Metropolitan Durban", University of Durban-Westville, Institute of Social and Economic Research, Fact Paper 6, 1986. The latter is a fascinating study which focusses especially on Cliffdale, a community of Indian farmers in some respects sharing the characteristics of the North Coast sugar farmers and the Durban market gardeners. It was less Hindi-speaking than the North Coast sugar lands Greyling studies but less Tamil and Telugu-speaking than the Durban periphery as well. Cliffdale is well above Durban-Pinetown off the national highway to Pietermaritzburg but it is essentially a vegetable marketing zone. It was examined a generation earlier in the University of Natal Economics Department study, pp. 36ff. See also H.L. Watts, "The Indian Community of

- Wyebank; A Socio-economic Survey in the Borough of Kloof", University of Natal, Durban, Institute for Social Research, 1971, on a community near the places that Padayachee later investigated.
95. *Indian Opinion*, 22 July, 1905.
 96. S. Rampersad, biography of Jaichoo Nanoo, History III essay, University of Durban-Westville, Documentation centre collection.
 97. Halliday, 1940, p. 71.
 98. M. Padayachee, pp. 4ff.
 99. Figures from Maasdorp & Pillay.
 100. *Fiat Lux*, VIII(8), 1973.
 101. NICGA annual report, 1958; 1965.
 102. *Fiat Lux*, VIII(8), December, 1973. At this time, a division of agriculture was also created in the Department of Indian Affairs.
 103. They were admitted to the Natal Agricultural Union by 1980. *Fiat Lux*, XV(2), March, 1980. By the late 1980s, Pat Bodasing was on the executive committee of the South African Cane Growers' Association and the council of the South African Sugar Association and the officials of the Natal Indian Cane Growers' Association were regularly being co-opted for government boards, etc. dealing with agriculture. NICGA annual report, 1989.
 104. At first, however, this provision was largely nominal. The NICGA annual report for 1976 declared that "in the eyes of the Indian grower, the Land and Agricultural Bank has become a laughing stock." See also NICGA Report, 1979/80. The appointment of Indian valuers was crucial in order to overcome the problem of land being artificially overvalued due to the Group Areas Act making it artificially scarce for Indian purchasers. *Fiat Lux*, XV(2), March, 1980, 6-7.
 105. NICGA annual report, 1983/84.
 106. *Rix*, p. 5.
 107. Some 117 Indian farmers got loans of R1.174.250 from the Land Bank. NICGA annual report, 1982/83. Aid was also fairly widely available in the wake of the September, 1987 floods. NICGA annual report, 1989.
 108. NICGA annual report, 1986.
 109. M. Padayachee, p. 44
 110. *ibid.*, section seven.
 111. M. Padayachee, p. 10.
 112. NICGA Annual Report, 1970/71.
 113. A current estimate suggests 23,000 African growers, ten times the number in 1961 (see NICGA annual report) and some thirteen times the number of Indian growers. They produce perhaps 8% of South African sugar cane, or double the Indian farmers' quota share. *Financial Mail*, 23 December 1989. Anne Vaughan of the Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Durban-Westville, is engaged in a major study of sugar cane producers in Kwa Zulu.