

Colonization by Concession . Capitalist Expansion in the Bechuanaland Protectorate. 1885-1950.

O. Selolwane

INTRODUCTION

The spread of capitalism from Europe in the 19th century to 'Third World' countries had a tremendous impact on the history of these countries. Technologically more advanced, the Europeans were able to colonise and dominate the peoples of the Third World countries and to impose upon them an advanced level of commodity production. The reactions of these people to the colonization and domination have also been of significant influence in the shaping of their history viz à viz the new force. Imperialism has thus received considerable attention from contemporary scholars, and it is not the intention of this paper to dwell on the various interpretations of what is meant by imperialism.

This paper seeks to examine the character of capitalist expansion into Southern Africa from 1885 to 1950 but with specific reference to the southern portion of what used to be called the Bechuanaland Protectorate (now Botswana). Since this is a study of a particular epoch in history, an epoch that can never reoccur, imperialism is taken to mean basically the expansion of capitalism from one geographical confine (in this case, Europe)

into another (in this case Southern Africa). This expansion occurred through the movement of Europeans into Africa and the domination of the Africans by these people, as well as the incorporation of the pre-capitalist economies into an internationally spread division of labour and commodity production. The colonization of the Africans occurred through conquest, concessions or through both and was influenced by economic potential and/or the strategic value of the particular territory.

The Bechuanaland Protectorate was economically unattractive and did not invite wholesale domination by the Europeans. Also her colonization was mainly through concession rather than conquest. Concession in this context is taken to mean an agreement between two parties actual or alleged, written or spoken. In the earlier period of colonization the country was visited by agents of commercial companies seeking signatures from the chiefs which could be used as 'proof' that the chiefs had given the holder certain rights in their territory. The imperial government later took complete control over the territory not merely by means of the original 'agreement' of protection against 'civilized nations' or that of concessions acquired by the companies but over and above these 'agreements,' and as dictated by the economic and political transformations in Southern Africa. Since the Protectorate came to be colonized through concessions acquired by companies and also through Batswana 'consent' to British overrule the process of concession-granting has been given special emphasis as a minor agency of imperialism. Commercial companies as major agents of capitalist expansion constituted private rather than public imperialism. They are thus also given specific attention in this paper. However it must be made clear from the beginning that although there were significant differences between public and private imperialism these differences were merely superficial and demonstrate the competitive character of capitalism where the state represents the interests of

certain powerful monopoly capitalists and not others. A close scrutiny of the structure of any capitalist state would reveal the intricate links between the state and the stock-market which make it impossible to clearly demarcate the two.

In Southern Africa too, a closer look at the structure of government reveals the link between the colonial officials and the stock-market. Sir Hercules Robinson for instance became the High Commissioner for South Africa in 1895 and the Bechuanaland Protectorate was under him. He was a substantial shareholder in some of the dominant companies in the region. In October 1889 he was recorded as holding 250 shares in Central Search, a company whose shares formed the core of the British South Africa Company (B.S.A.) In 1890 he was registered as holding some 2 500 shares in the United Concessions while by January 1892 his shares had increased to 6 256. Before he became High Commissioner, Robinson as a petty imperial official in Matebeleland had in fact helped the agents of what came to be the B.S.A. Company to obtain the necessary concession from King Lobengula (see Gallbraith, Crown and Charter, p. 67). Robinson eventually became director of De Beers Consolidated Mines. Sir Sidney Shippard, Resident Commissioner for Bechuanaland, was also involved in commercial companies and was appointed director of the B.S.A. Company in 1896 when he resigned from the imperial service.

The grasp of these intricate links between the polity and the stock-market serve to reveal the economic motives behind capitalist expansion. This does not, however, mean that every imperial official had some commercial interests in the colonies because by the very nature of capitalist production are the means of production owned by a few, and the rest are simply agents who may have other motives like 'prestige' and 'power', but who nevertheless serve the interests of capitalism. This will help us to understand how powerful monopoly capitalists were able to use state power to further their own ends and even to have greater bargaining power over their

rivals. To this end this paper has been divided into three major sections. The first part deals with concession-hunting (by companies), as a minor agency of imperialism; the second treats imperialism in the Protectorate from the initial company colonization to the later stage of state dominance or public imperialism. The last section covers an analysis of the impact of this expansion on Tswana society.

CONCESSION-HUNTING AS A MINOR AGENCY OF CAPITALIST EXPANSION : THE SCRAMBLE AND CONCESSION-GRABBING: 1885-1893

In the late nineteenth century European capitalists descended on Southern Africa to exploit the mineral wealth rumoured to abound in the region. This scramble was precipitated by the discovery of gold in 1866 in Griqualand and gained momentum with more discoveries in the Witwatersrand (1885/6) and in Kimberly.

The industrial revolution had completed its cycle in Europe; capitalism had developed from the earlier stage of 'primitive accumulation' (whose supply of labour and capital had been obtained through the expropriation of the peasantry and the formation consequently of a wage labour force from those dispossessed, and also by the plunder and robbery of newly discovered colonial territories)¹ to that of capitalist accumulation marked by the merging of industrial capital with bank capital and the creation thereof of finance capital² and giant capitalist oligarchies. A very important feature of capitalism at this stage was that privately-owned capital, rather than commodities, could now be exported and invested in the colonies where, with capital-intensive ventures like mining, large profits could be procured. The amalgamation of capital into giant financial oligarchies gave the resultant combines substantial bargaining power, by which they were able to monopolize resources and markets. Their expansion into colonial territories in search of new markets gave rise to the development of an international division of labour; thus

between themselves the capitalists share the world resources and markets. This imperialist expansion was accompanied and reinforced by direct rule of the new territories in order to safeguard the investments as well as procure necessary cheap labour from the indigens.³

Concession-acquisition came to play an important role in the expansion of monopoly capitalism. Often the metropolitan government, due to financial constraints, was reluctant to acquire new territories for her empire.⁴ Therefore, a royal charter would be granted to a company which undertook the exploitation as well as the administration of the colonies. Individual companies would then spearhead expansion either through conquest or by acquiring concessions from the colonial people and then immediately hoist up the metropolitan government's flag in the territory to keep out other imperial rivals. Concessions were also important among competing companies because by finding a foothold in a new territory through 'agreement' with the indigenous rulers before other rivals could come in, the particular monopoly, with its great bargaining power, firmly established itself. When other companies later came into the territory, the concession-holder was entitled to an owner's share in the profits subsequently accrued in his concession area. Once acquired, a concession was valueless until and unless it could be taken over by a company with substantial capital backing. Concession-hunting, therefore, acted as a minor agency of capitalist expansion. In Southern Africa, international capital gave rise to, and, unlike anywhere else in Africa, combined with, an indigenous capital to produce a formidable indigenous capitalist oligarchy which manifested itself in combines such as the Chartered British South Africa Company (B.S.A. Co.),⁵ De Beers Consolidated Mines and Gold Fields Consolidated. The fortunes of these indigenous capitalist giants were largely responsible for the successful penetration of British imperialism into the interior of Southern Africa.

The history of imperialist penetration into the Bechuanaland Protectorate can be meaningfully

analysed only within the context of the character of capitalism in the Southern African region as a whole. The emergence of an indigenous capitalist oligarchy in the Cape Colony and the economic transformations that followed reverberated into and shaped the socio-economic structures of the neighbouring territories. Without this context the historian might be led to make analytically useless assertions like '...the history of Bechuanaland Protectorate is a series of accidents.'⁶

As John S. Galbraith correctly states, 'In the 1880s any African people in possession of riches, or reputed riches were destined for early European domination; the question was not whether but when and by whom.'⁷ The early colonization of the Protectorate was not so much influenced by the territory's reputation of possession of mineral wealth as by its strategic position between territories possessing, or rumoured to possess, great mineral wealth. To the south lay the Witwatersrand and its wealth resources while to the north lay the lands of Mashona and Matebele, territories rumoured to harbour as much wealth as the Rand, and coveted by giant capitalists. Although it was regarded as essentially poor in mineral wealth, a myth that continued up to the nineteen-sixties, the Protectorate was an important corridor for British imperialists because it provided an inlet to the legendary wealths of Matebeleland/Shonaland. It also provided a buffer zone for other imperialist rivals who hovered to the east and west of the coveted area. British imperialists feared concerted competition against them from imperial Germany in South West Africa (Namibia) and Tanganyika, imperial Portugal in Angola and Mozambique, and also from the rebellious Boer republic of the Transvaal. In 1885 Britain proceeded to declare a Protectorate over Bechuanaland both as a buffer zone against her rivals as well as a stepping-stone into the interior.

Unlike the earlier small groups of European traders, hunters, travellers and missionaries, the Europeans of the late nineteenth century gold rush in

the Rand who spilled over into the Protectorate were more interested in mineral exploitation than in quick-profit ventures. Mineral concessions were therefore more important than land grants per se. The types of concessions that these Europeans grabbed from Protectorate chiefs ranged from rights of establishing and maintaining law courts, banks, communication systems, houses of accommodation, farms and trading rights as well as rights to extract minerals. Altogether, these concessions conferred upon their European holders the right to dominate Batswana legally, politically and economically: thus ensuring the establishment of a permanent European settlement.

To illustrate how the concession-granting process usually occurred the following examples have been chosen from three different chieftaincies in the southern Protectorate. On 28 August and on 9 September 1889, and again on 29 January and 16 June 1890, Stephen A. C. K. Allaway, a European trader living in Kanye (Bangwaketse capital) obtained from the chief of Bakwena, where he was trading, four grants for Sidney Morris. Having come to the country only in 1889 Allaway had to get the assistance of another trader, Henry Boyne, to interpret his requests to the chief. These two traders had interests in the companies for which they were obtaining the concessions,⁸ and from which they hoped to get capital to expand their trading. The rights they obtained in the name of Sidney Morris were later ceded to the Secheleland Concessions Syndicate and Allaway became its manager in Molepolole where he later (18 April 1893) proceeded to procure a land grant of 6 000 morgen from the chief.⁹ In this he was still assisted by Henry Boyne. The four concessions conferred upon their holders not only a monopoly to mineral rights but also a monopoly to construct railways, telegraphs, tramways, bridges, etc., and also to build trading stores, hotels and houses of accommodation, as well as a monopoly for making ordinances, and establishing courts of justice and a police force.¹⁰

In Bangwaketse territory Gregor Riesle James Nicholls and John Wooley acquired from Chief Bathoen a mineral concession dated 13 October 1887. Before coming to Ngwaketse country the three men had first obtained a letter of recommendation from the Administrator of Bechuanaland, Sydney Shippard, which they gave to the chief.¹¹ They had also obtained from Shippard's office a draft of the concession for which they sought the chief's signature, and which was translated for the chief by Reverend James Good, a missionary who had been living in Kanye for the past twenty-five years. The missionary's fluency in Setswana was acknowledged by the chief although it was subsequently proved that neither him (i.e. the chief) nor any of his councillors had grasped the purport of the documents. It was a normal practice for the Administrator to give concession-seekers letters of reference to the Protectorate chiefs,¹² a practice through which it was hoped that concession-hunters would be screened before they entered the Protectorate. This method was not altogether foolproof however and was quite open to abuse by concession-hunters. Not all concession-seekers went through the Administrator's office, and even those who went through it did not guarantee that they would not give away their references to colleagues. Besides the colonial government was not particularly interested in the Protectorate and thus tended to be lax in its dealings with the Territory.

Charles Riley, another trader from Mochudi, the capital of Bakgatla, obtained for his company, also with references from Sydney Shippard, a monopoly (99 years) for trading and manufacturing in Bathoen's country. Together with his partners, J. Potler Ablett and R. Fenton Riley, he obtain a land lease (200 square miles) and a concession to construct railways, electric telegraphs and telephones or electric lights for 99 years. Riley, in obtaining those grants had laid a lot of emphasis on the creation of stores. The chief and his people were given to understand that Riley would first

erect ten cheap-selling stores for them and that another ten would be erected if gold was discovered in their country. Consequently the chief who was eager to have trading stores from which, as he had been informed, his people would buy more cheaply than they had done before, consented to these well phrased demands. He later claimed however, that although he consented to the erection of the stores he did not intend that the trading rights should include sole rights to waters and ploughing grounds that might be included in the areas to be marked off for the stores. When he signed the document proffered by Riley, he understood it to be 'merely to show where the store was to be erected. They told me it represented the land they would mark out.'¹³ Bathoen's headmen also testified that they were brought to believe that Riley's interest was primarily to erect stores for them. The Reverend Good also translated the documents.

Another interesting claim along this line was one acquired by Edward Wilkinson on 7 January, 1891 from Letlogile, a de jure but not de facto chief of the western Barolong. Wilkinson gave Letlogile and his people to understand that he was interested in digging wells and finding water for them. Once water had been found, Letlogile was informed, Wilkinson could come and make fresh agreement with him whereby he would hire some of Barolong land. When Letlogile signed the concession document he thought he was merely giving Wilkinson right of way through his territory down to the Molopo River where the concession-hunter would look for suitable ground to sink wells, and if he struck water he would come and inform the Rolong.¹⁴ According to Wilkinson's concession documents, Letlogile had granted him a land lease of 200 000 morgen with rights to wood, minerals and water and an option at the end of 1894 of purchasing another 200 000 morgen at quitrent of five shillings per 1 000 morgen and payment of £10 per annum.¹⁵

The manner in which concession-seekers often got their grants was to give the chiefs the impression that the Europeans were doing them some great services

which it would be folly not to accept. By emphasizing much needed services like trading stores and wells the concession-hunters were able to win the confidence of the chiefs who learned only later that the documents they signed contained wider, more subtle and sinister implications than they had realised at the time of signing. In a number of cases money was proffered at the 'signing' of the documents without the chiefs being clearly told exactly what it was for and thereby obfuscating the issue. Maps were also often attached to the documents; evidence that the concession-hunter had already delimited the area he wanted, as in the example of the Wilkinson-Letlogile grant.

Traders and missionaries played a very important role during the concession-granting process as interpreters and advisers to the chiefs. The missionaries, although they often cautioned the chiefs against accepting monies proffered by the concession-seekers, were nonetheless eager to see European expansion into the territory. They thus often helped their fellow Europeans to acquire the necessary documents. The traders in turn were almost always interested in the companies and were usually the ones who actually obtained the chiefs' signature for the documents. Boyne for instance had interests in the Kanye Concessions Company for which he helped obtain the concessions which were sought by Riesle, Nicholls and Wooley (his partners). Such interpreters who had vested interests in the concessions they helped to translate, were inevitably biased and therefore made the best representations for their companies. Due to the alien nature of the conceptions that had to be translated to the chiefs, the interpretation could not always be accurate; it was virtually impossible even for the interpreters, Europeans as they were, to translate some of the conceptions into the African language since there were no equivalents. In order to appreciate the behaviour of both Europeans and Batswana during the process of concession-granting, it is necessary that they both be

placed within the perspective of their respective cultural orientation and their differing levels of material production.

Among Batswana whose economy was still essentially pre-capitalist, cattle were a major source of wealth as well as a major medium of exchange:¹⁶ they were owned by a few notably the chiefs and other important traditional families.¹⁷ A considerable number of these people who did not own any cattle managed to live by looking after other people's mafisa cattle and/or by selling their labour to cattle-owners in exchange for crops or drought-power during the ploughing seasons. Land, on the other hand, was communally owned, even though in practice the chiefs and the headmen occupied the best portions of the available arable lands and pastures. Land had no exchange value among Batswana and therefore could not be permanently alienated as private property for any individual.¹⁸ Cattle and other livestock which were individually owned could be easily traded in by the individual owner. With land the individual, especially strangers or refugees, had to seek the permission of the headmen or the chiefs before they could settle on any portion in a particular chieftaincy's territory. Even the indigens had to ask permission from their rulers before they could settle on any new and unclaimed land. In the case of land claimed by someone, witnesses within the family or in the neighbourhood had to be called if the individual wanted to lend his land to someone else; land transactions were made without any form of recompense.¹⁹

Not surprisingly when European-concession-hunters came with legal documents for the chiefs to sign, the Africans could not conceivably have grasped the implications of what they were signing, especially in the case of grants pertaining to land rights: Their culture orientation did not encompass private ownership of land, let alone the alienation thereof as a commodity. When, for instance, Letlogile of Barolong signed documents

proffered him by Edward Wilkinson, he thought he was giving him the right of way to pass through his country down to the Molopo river! Never realising that the documents they signed and the money they received alienated their land permanently according to European law and in fact prepared them for colonial domination, the chiefs actually perceived themselves as having the power and authority to grant complete rights of usufruct and still have the last say as for the ownership of the land. The Lete chief, Ikaneng, granted two clashing monopolies to two different companies, but when questioned about this he simply stated that 'I want both these concessions carried out. I did not stop Mr. De Beers (one of the claimants) from prospecting by granting Mr. Smith a concession... After I had signed this document I thought I still had the power to grant similar rights to others.'²¹ Lacking in the comprehension of the powers they were up against, the chiefs when they found that they had been caught up in legal niceties with concessionaires, simply offered to return the monies they had been offered. They discovered, often too late, that the monies they received legally and permanently alienated the concessions areas.

Within the European capitalist economy, on the other hand, land was an essential commodity and had been so as far back as the Middle Ages (i.e., the pre-capitalist mode of production). Like cattle and other commodities, it could be privately owned and was conceived as permanently exchangeable: it not only contained valuable minerals but it could also be used for commercial agriculture. Thus, when concession-seekers came into the Protectorate the majority of their concessions either pertained to surface land rights or mineral rights. Judging from the percentage of land grants and leases acquired by Europeans in the southern Protectorate it is evident that land was relative quite important. More than 50% of the claims brought before the concessions commission of 1893 were land grants, while mineral concessions formed a quarter of the total number and the rest pertained to trading, infrastructure, establishment of law courts,

banks, etc. The quantity of land acquired (2 000 to 6 000 morgen) also suggests that the European settlers envisaged living by agricultural farming and ranching.²² Because of the sandy layers covering the Protectorate territory, especially the western and southern regions, and also the lack of sophisticated mining technology for such terrains,²³ mineral concessions were not very important in the Territory. Mineral exploitation would have been very difficult with the level of technology at that time. This, however, did not deter fortune-seekers from acquiring mining concessions in the southern Protectorate. The activities of these concession-hunters in fact came to cause considerable concern to the Colonial government, since the southern chiefs seemed to prefer treating with the small individual concessionaires, than with government itself or with the Chartered British South Africa Company. These chiefs were especially noted for their lack of co-operation with the B.S.A. Company's attempts to build a communication system through their country.²⁴

While some official observers noted that southern Protectorate chiefs were totally in the hands of small syndicates who offered them substantial sums of money, other colonial officers noted also that even were government to offer the chiefs money they still would not treat with Government as they did with the smaller companies.²⁵ Clearly it was not simply money which attracted these chiefs to private syndicates. Although no figures for monies the Crown might have offered the chiefs are available to compare to those offered by the small companies, there is abundant evidence to show that the chiefs were afraid of losing their sovereignty. When for instance, the Crown questioned their wisdom in indiscriminately granting exclusive monopolies to companies, the chiefs interpreted this as interference in their sovereign rights. Sebele, most notably, complained bitterly about the Crown's interference with his territory. He protested that he had never recognised the right of the British Government to his country or over his people beyond a 'protecting power as against foreign

powers or civilized nations;' that he had never been conquered by the British nor made treaty with them nor ceded his sovereign rights 'to any government or civilized power'. He also pointed out that he had never heard of any proclamation or notice giving sovereign rights over his country or his people to the British government. Nor he went on, had he been informed of any Royal Charter to any company nor was he even asked to recognise such company's rights. Lastly he pointed out that as the sovereign of the land or soil he had full rights to make grants and give concessions without his action being questioned.²⁶

When the Protectorate chiefs realized they were going to be handed over to the B.S.A. Company for administration they went in a delegation to England, where they vehemently protested against such a possibility. For a compromise, however, they were asked to cede parts of their land to the Crown for company use, and to retain the rest of the land where they would rule as their tradition dictated. While the government's and the B.S.A. Company's threat to their sovereignty was overtly apparent to the chiefs, not so the threat from smaller companies, the chiefs thought they had unlimited power to grant concessions to whichever small company came asking, without realizing that granting exclusive monopolies automatically limited and curbed their rights to grant more concessions. The chiefs' ignorance of the powers they were dealing with is borne out by their very relations with concessions viz à viz their inter-chieftaincy relationships. For petty chiefs like Ikaneng of Balete, the act of granting a concession was interpreted as a declaration of independent sovereignty from the paramouncy of chief Bathoen of Bangwaketse: Although Ikaneng had fought and defeated him, Bathoen still claimed his paramouncy over Balete.²⁷ So in giving away concessions, Ikaneng saw this as an ascertainment of his equality to the Ngwaketse chief. Linchwe's Bakgatla were also regarded as subordinate to Bakwena, but by their being able to

grant concessions independently of Sechele or Sebele they asserted their autonomy.

While petty concessions were being grabbed indiscriminately in the Protectorate, elsewhere in Southern Africa giant capitalists were also competing for concessions in more wealthy regions. The colonization of the much coveted territories of Mashonaland and Matebeleland could only be successfully achieved with considerable capital backing which only the Rand was capable of producing. The most powerful British capitalists contending for this coveted area were Cecil John Rhodes, on the one hand, and Lord Gilford-George Cawston (of the Bechuanaland Exploration Company) on the other. However, they resolved their conflict by amalgamating their interests and acquiring a royal charter for what came to be known as the British South Africa Company.²⁸

It was largely in order to safeguard the chartered company's interests on whom was laid the obligation to colonise territories up to the 22nd line of latitude, that the British government set up a concessions commission in 1893. A land commission had been set up in 1888 but due to its half-hearted efforts it had been largely a failure in resolving the problem of conflicting concessions: some of the claims invalidated in that commission continued into 1893.

THE CONCESSIONS COMMISSION 1893

For British imperialists in the late nineteenth century, Southern Africa, a reliable communication link between the Cape Colony and Rhodesia through the Protectorate became a very urgent need. European settlement in Rhodesia was threatened by African wars of resistance which stretched from 1893 to 1897, and by the ravages of rinderpest epidemic of 1896 which not only decimated their livestock but made former means of transport very costly.²⁹ Under the unsympathetic government of President Kruger, economic ventures in the Transvaal were being throttled,³⁰ making some capitalists like Cecil John Rhodes turn more and more towards Rhodesia.

Furthermore, although it might have been more profitable for the railway to go through the European-settled Transvaal republic, the intrigues of the Boers made it imperative that the line pass through the Protectorate; a largely Tswana reserve and therefore easily manipulable.

In order to construct the desired railway line through the Protectorate, the B.S.A. Company had first to rid the territory of a number of concessions held by petty companies which might otherwise hinder their objective. It was highly unlikely, however, that with the sizeable financial obligations in Rhodesia the B.S.A. Company could invest any significant capital on small and unprofitable mineral concessions in the southern Protectorate. In 1893 a commission was set up to clear all concessions in the Territory which might be at variance with the position of the chartered company as a future candidate for the administration of the region. Furthermore, official policy was that prospectors should all be given a fair chance to prospect at their own expenses, but that when they struck wealth they had to pay taxes and other dividends to government;³¹ for government this was an inexpensive bargain with commercial companies. In the southern Protectorate, only twenty-one claims were brought before the commission. Each claim comprised from one to four or five concessions or grants, the majority of which pertained to land (i.e., surface land rights): a quarter of the total were mineral concessions while another quarter covered other rights and about half of the total was taken up by land grants. The procedure followed by the Commission was to set up a court where the claimants and witnesses were sworn under oath before they gave their testimony. Traders played a significant role in this court as witnesses since they not only had claims in which they backed one another, but they had, in a number of cases, interpreted the concessions to the chiefs and thereby helped in the acquisition of such claims: especially concessions of companies in which they had some interests. Henry Boyne, a trader in Gaberones and Molepolole, had interpreted for Sebele requests by

Gregor Riesle and James Nicholls for land lease in his territory.³² He also translated these men's requests for concessions from Bathoen in Kanye and actually assisted in interpreting it favourably to the chief. During the commission's court he testified that on both accounts the chief knew exactly what was purported by the concession documents since he had seen to it himself. He also testified to the validity of claims made by the Secheleland Concessions Syndicate of which company S. A. C. K. Allaway, another trader, was the local agent. Boyne's company was the Kanye Exploration Company to which was ceded the Riesle-Nicholls-Wooley concessions. Although it can never be known exactly how men like Boyne interpreted concepts like 'perpetual lease' or 'concession' to the Tswana chiefs, it seems reasonable to suppose from his involvements with the companies he interpreted for that he made the best representations in order to procure the grants. Even the commissioners themselves often saw through this alliance and pronounced that the documents had not been properly interpreted and that they were therefore not a genuine reflection of the chiefs' intents. On the whole, witnesses who had acted as interpreters were usually closely related to the concerns for which they testified, so that there was always a bias in their testimony. However, there were a couple of instances where such witnesses asserted they were professional interpreters and had no interests in the claim; as in the grants claimed by Edward Wilkinson in western Barolong (Letlogile's) territory. Even then these interpreters were in the pay of the concession-hunters and were therefore not impartial .

In making recommendations for the claims, the commissioners were not only influenced by the validity of the concessions but also by the expenses already incurred in cases where such validity was questionable. Julius Weil, a trader in Mochudi, brought before the Commission two concessions dated 25 August, 1890. The one was a trading monopoly by which the holder had rights lasting 999 years with, initially, twenty trading stations of

one square mile each. The other was a mineral concession conferring upon its holder the right to prospect over an area of 400 square miles in aggregate. Weil had already expended £3 000³³ in the erection of trading stations at Palla (Phala), Mochudi and Sikwane. Because of their monopolistic tendencies both concessions were not according to the terms of reference for the commission, open to recognition. However, seeing that Weil had already expended a considerable sum of money on the trading grant his trading concession was recommended for modification and recognition while the mining claim was invalidated. Two other mining concessions were modified by the commission which would otherwise have been rendered invalid. These were the Secheleland Concessions Syndicate grant of 28 August 1889, originally granted to Sidney Morris by Sebele, and Eclipse Gold Mining Syndicate's claim of 4 February 1888 and originally granted Edgar Rowland by Montshioa. These concessions conferred upon their holders exclusive prospecting rights for between thirty-three and fifty years in their (Eclipse Gold Mining Syndicate) to respective concessions territories, and on an area not exceeding 400 square miles in aggregate. The commission recommended that they be modified to a five year duration from a date to be fixed and on an area not exceeding a hundred square miles in aggregate.

When the commission finally folded up there were several outstanding concessions whose business had not been finalized. These included the two mineral concessions recommended for modification and for recognition by the Secretary of State, and several land grants whose validity had been outrightly not recognised by the commission but which because of their nature as small holdings could be validated according to the commission's terms of reference on such grants. To circumvent this problem the colonial government had decided as far back as 1892 that, since southern Protectorate chiefs did not readily acquiesce in giving away their land to the Crowns, all land claims by Europeans should as much as possible be recognised and the claimants informed that they held

from government. This decision was made during consultation between the Governor of the Cape, the Administrator of the Protectorate, as well as Reverend Moffat and W. H. Surmon³⁴ (Surmon presided over the concessions commission) in 1891. By 1894, the railway line had reached Mafeking and was about to be continued into the Protectorate. By Proclamation No. 227 BB-1895, the High Commissioner for South Africa conferred upon the Rhodesia Railways Limited, a branch of the B.S.A. Company, a hundred yards wide strip of land as right of way through the Territory.³⁵ This strip coincided with the land grants that the 1893 commission had recommended for consideration by the Secretary of State. By clearing out monopolies in the Protectorate, the commission of 1893 paved the way for the domination of the Territory by a single administrative and commercial monopoly company: a way which it had started to pave with the 1891 Proclamation by which the chiefs of the Protectorate were relieved of several executive and judicial powers and indeed, gradually lost their rights to grant concessions independently of the Resident Commissioner.³⁶

Since the southern chiefs had been resentful of Crown interference with the concession-granting process, it was feared that they might be even more resentful of interference with their income which by virtue of the invalidation of the monopolies, had to be discontinued. Therefore the B.S.A. Company undertook to provide the affected chiefs with some compensatory allowance to buy their peace.³⁷ The allowances were as follows:-

£225 per annum to Sebele, chief of Bakwena
£150 per annum to Bathoen, chief of Bangwaketse
£ 50 per annum to Ikaneng, chief of Balete
£ 70 per annum to Linchwe, chief of Bakgatla

The Bakgatla allowance was withdrawn by the imperial government as unnecessary since Julius Weil, the only claimant in the Kgatla region still paid some concessions money albeit modified, for his trading rights. He was later, in 1898, allowed to obtain another mineral concession in the area.

The success of the Commission is usually attributed to the Commission itself and the failure of the Swaziland commission is often used for comparison. A closer scrutiny of the economic potentials of both the Protectorate and Swaziland brings up some fundamental evidence that throws a different light on the question. Why was it that the concessions commission failed in Swaziland and yet made commendable successes in the Protectorate? Was it because the terms of reference for the Protectorate commission were more adequate than those for the Swaziland one?

It is important to note that the Protectorate occupied a geographically strategic and economic position vital for British imperialist expansion into the interior, since it was sandwiched between the Rand the coveted regions of Rhodesia, while at the same time on the other sides hovered other rival imperialists who were also covetous of Rhodesia. Although poor itself, the Protectorate offered a Suez Canal into the land of Ophir.

Swaziland had good arable land ideally suited for European settlement: by concession these lands were virtually all ceded away to Boer farmers of the Transvaal republic. But beyond or within, there were no alluring mineral deposits to attract giant capitalists as was the case with the Protectorate. Therefore, although Swaziland had attractive pastures and good arable land, it was not coveted by any powerful capitalist like the B.S.A. Company while the Protectorate, a largely barren territory, was very important as a stepping-stone into the interior. The combination of the Territory's poverty on the one hand, and its strategic importance on the other, resulted in the relative ease with which petty concessions were brushed aside in favour of the B.S.A. Company. In Swaziland, however, the land which was given away to concessionaires came to play a singularly important part in the rise of Swazi nationalism.³⁸ In Rhodesia, too, where the myth of abounding wealth soon exploded the good arable lands were taken away by the B.S.A. Company and given to European settlers, while the Africans were

dispossessed.³⁹ The Protectorate never experienced wholesale land dispossession, and therefore the rise of Tswana nationalism was non-violent and largely influenced by regional or sub-continental circumstances.⁴⁰

THE THRUST OF CONCESSION COLONIZATION: 1893-1940
THE COMPANIES - 1893-1934

Since commercial companies and syndicates were the ones directly involved in the actual process of capitalist accumulation they were the major agents of imperialism. Because their major goal was profit-making the companies largely determined where capital should be invested and where it should not. In Southern Africa where the development of an indigenous capitalist oligarchy gave the companies a very strong political voice, government usually acquiesced in the companies' decisions. In the Protectorate the geological structure of the territory, coupled with the lack of advanced mining technology⁴¹ for sandy terrains led to the impoverishment of the companies engaged in prospecting since no minerals were discovered. Therefore the structure of economic underdevelopment in the Territory was influenced by activities of companies outside rather than inside the region, and also by the Crown's attitude toward the territory. After the 1893 commission, the only remaining companies in the southern Protectorate were the Chartered B.S.A. Company and Balkis Consolidated Limited, a London-based syndicate which came to dominate all mining concessions in the south. The B.S.A. Company held preferential rights to minerals and land which, initially, it was not too keen to exploit due to its heavy financial commitments in Rhodesia. The capital-backing enjoyed by the B.S.A. Company came from the diamond fields of Kimberley as well as from the gold fields of the Rand:⁴² it is therefore within the light of these financial ties that the activities of the company in the Protectorate can be meaningfully analysed. By an informal agreement, the company was to take over the administration of the Protectorate. In 1895/6 there occurred several incidents

that were to influence the companies' activities in the region. First the technique of deep-level mining⁴³ was introduced in the Rand, which made profit-making much more easier and quicker than before, thus making available more capital for imperial expansion into the interior.

Kruger's unsympathetic government in the Transvaal throttled the company's capitalist pursuits in the Boer republic, thus antagonising the British capitalists. Cecil Rhodes and others organised a conspiracy to overthrow Kruger and replace him with someone more sympathetic.⁴⁴ The need was made even more urgent by the discouraging economic conditions of Rhodesia which were caused by the rinderpest epidemic of 1895/6, the African rebellions and the failure to realise the 'Second Rand'. The notorious Jameson Raid (December 1895) was a disastrous failure. For the people of the Protectorate, however, it was godsent in that it put an end to any further negotiations for handing their country over to Company rule. The availability of capital from Kimberly and the Rand for the B.S.A. Company made it possible for the company successfully to put down the African rebellions first in 1893 and then in 1896/7 in Rhodesia. It also helped the Europeans to withstand the ravages of the rinderpest epidemic which threatened their settlement. For the Protectorate, all these occurrences (i.e. the failure of the Jameson Raid as well as that of the Matebele/Shona uprisings) meant that she continued to provide the necessary link between the Cape Colony and Rhodesia. In 1896/7 the railway link running through the Territory was successfully completed.

When prospects of administrative transfer of the Protectorate to the B.S.A. Company fell through, the Company's rights to Crown lands also lapsed. Its preferential rights remained intact, however, and using them, the Company was able to procure a new concession in the Bakgatla country in 1898 for its subsidiary, the Linchwe Concession Company. Julius Weil, a trader who had previously lost all his mining rights in 1893, obtained the necessary concession for the Linchwe

Company. The B.S.A. Company also obtained another mineral concession from the Secheleland Concessions Syndicate. When the B.S.A. Company realised they had lost ownership rights to all the land in the Protectorate due to the Jameson Raid, they strongly protested to the Crown that their rights should not be impaired by the actions of some of their members. However, they were reminded that ownership rights in any colony went with administrative obligations as they would have done if the company had not been relieved of such duties. The High Commissioner's declaration that concessions subsequently to the charter would not be recognised had only been a guide to the concessions commissioners in 1893 and was therefore not a guide for policies regarding later concessions.⁴⁵ However, they were informed that their preferential rights were not impaired. The Company was now required by the Crown to buy certain land grants from other companies as a pre-condition for receiving certain crown lands. From the Secheleland Concessions Syndicate, the B.S.A. Company purchased for £12 000 the Riesle-Nicholls 800 square mile landlease of 4 February 1893, and from the Kanye Exploration Company they acquired some two-hundred square miles of land in exchange for land in Rhodesia. By 1901, the B.S.A. Company possessed the following amount of land in the southern Protectorate: Two large tracts of land handed over by the Crown and known as the Lobatsi and Gaberones Blocks - the Lobatsi block, containing an area of about a hundred and fifty square miles, said to have been ceded in 1895 to the Crown by chief Gaseitsiwe, and the Gaberones block, comprised of eighteen farms of 3 000 morgen each which were ceded by chief Sechele to the Crown. There were also the two land leases from the Secheleland and Kanye Exploration Companies which were 800 square miles and 200 square miles respectively.⁴⁶

The failure to discover the 'Second Rand' in Rhodesia had resulted in the mining companies turning to land and land speculation in a bid to recoup the losses incurred from overcapitalization of the mines. The B.S.A.

Company was responsible for fostering the emergence of a white rural bourgeoisie in Southern Rhodesia.⁴⁷ Agriculture came to dominate the capitalist sector of that economy. The success of the rural bourgeoisie may have influenced the Company's policies in the Protectorate because by the 1920s, and after a considerably long period of apparent neglect, it was clamouring to be allowed to exploit and develop its rights (viz. the lands ceded to the Crown, the Kanye Exploration Company and the Secheleland Concessions Syndicate) and two mining concessions possibly with a view of fostering an agricultural industry based on a white rural bourgeoisie as it had done in Southern Rhodesia.

In a memorandum to the Secretary of State dated 2 January 1925⁴⁸ the B.S.A. Company argued that:

'The whole history of British South Africa suggests the answer that if what is aimed at be, as assuredly it must be, the advancement of the natives in civilization and in wealth, such advancement must come about through increased production from the country in which they live. Such increased production is not likely to come about otherwise than through European enterprise.'

The Company was protesting against the Crown's view that mining operations by concessionaires in 'native reserves' was undesirable in the 'interests' of the 'natives.' It was also against the idea of framing a policy to give effect to this view. Company Directors pointed out that:

'If the natives in what is now the Union of South Africa have made remarkable progress in the desired direction, as undoubtedly they have... it is because they have had their share of the wealth flowing from the great material production which has taken place... This has been primarily mineral production... Not only have the natives shared directly in this wealth, it has enabled their government to make a degree of provision for the extension of the railway system, for the preservation of peace and order among natives... It is submitted that these results could not have been obtained if mining operations had not been carried

'on by white "cessionaires" in these territories - "cessionaires" being in fact persons possessing mining rights.'

The Directors went at length to show how the Crown's closure of the Protectorate to 'European enterprise' had led to negligible 'progress among the natives in civilization and material well-being.'

Being the most influential of all the companies in the Protectorate, the B.S.A. Company, although speaking mainly for its own interests, was voicing the fears of other companies, and for whom the Crown had either refused to allow extension of the period of prospecting, or had entertained the ideas of, in the case of the Balkies Company handing over their rights to other companies in South Africa.⁴⁹

It is very important at this juncture to note the differences between the companies and the Crown because they affected the Territory's structure of underdevelopment. The initial capital which was employed in the process of profit-making in Southern Africa had been imported from the British metropole,⁵⁰ and it was metropolitan shareholders' directors who decided where their capital should be invested. In the sub-continent, accumulation came to be based on the super exploitation and expropriation of surplus created by cheap African labour and it was this surplus that made possible further imperialist penetration into the interior of Southern Africa. Since the imperial government represented largely the interests of the metropolitan capitalists, rather than local South African magnates, these often came into conflict with local shareholders like Cecil Rhodes and others.⁵¹ In a bid to rid themselves of the imperial government the companies, notably the B.S.A. Company, moved further into the interior away from Crown dominance. Therefore, although most of its capital-backing came from the south, the B.S.A. Company's interests lay in Rhodesia. Interests of the Imperial government remained in the south, especially in the Witwatersrand. While the company was trying to recoup its losses brought about by the

failure to discover the 'Second Rand', it encountered government resistance in the Protectorate from where came a considerable amount of cheap migratory labour for South African industries - especially the southern regions of the Protectorate. The imperial government hid its interests behind the cover of 'protecting native interests', even while it drew revenue from these same 'natives', through the hut tax which was used primarily by white settlers.⁵² The Crown systematically discouraged mining companies from operating on a large scale in the Protectorate, because in the first place, the territory did not seem to have any worthwhile mineral resources to warrant deviation of capital from the Rand. Secondly if other companies like the B.S.A. Company concentrated activities in the region they might offset the flow of migratory labour into the fast developing mining industries of the south. The number of southern and central Protectorate Batswana working in South African mines (i.e. those recruited by the Native Recruiting Company) rose from about 2 000 in 1913 to 5 000 in 1933 and 12 000 in 1940.⁵³ Having dismissed the company as a possible candidate for taking over the administration of the Territory, the imperial government was now systematically engaged in preparing the region for incorporation into the Union of South Africa. Therefore, company activities had to be controlled and geared towards this objective.

From 1902 the Protectorate companies had been requesting the Crown to issue mining laws which would protect their prospecting ventures and thereby encourage capital to flow in for the development of the mining industry. But the Crown dragged its feet for twenty-nine years before such ordinances were issued and even then, after curtailing the activities of companies in the region. This delay affected the flow of capital into the Territory to such an extent that very few companies ventured into the region, and even the few that existed, predominantly the B.S.A. Company and Balkis did not choose to exploit the Protectorate directly, but instead leased out their rights to other smaller syndicates. The

system of leasing out options to several companies was beneficial to the concession holder in that the financial risks were shared, and the monopoly holder was entitled to an owner's share in the event of profit materializing. The B.S.A. Company, for instance, was entitled to 50% share of the profits made by companies working within its concession territory. Balkis' lessee subsidiaries were entitled to only 33% of the profits. Lessee companies were in turn at liberty to lease out their options to others. Richard Kowland, for example, obtained some mining options from Balkis Consolidated and proceeded to grant some of these to Mend of a Johannesburg company. Mend in turn sold part of his interests to Solomon of another Johannesburg syndicate, whereby the shareholders of this last mentioned formed a working company called the Kanye Asbestos Company, to continue the development of asbestos properties situated ten miles west of Kanye.⁵⁴

The lessee system was often wide open to abuse since it was clear neither to the Crown nor to the chiefs who was prospecting for whom and under what concession. In a number of cases, individuals questioned of their prospecting rights simply stated that they were working under Balkis but could not produce credentials to prove their story.

Although several attempts at prospecting were carried out by different companies in the southern Protectorate, they yielded no mineral discoveries. By the mid-nineteen-twenties it was quite obvious that no gold would be struck in the region: The companies were suffering losses. This lack of success was finally driven home by the failure of outstanding companies like De Beers Consolidated to discover mineral deposits. A few asbestos deposits were found around Kanye in 1927⁵⁵ but mining proved unprofitable because of lack of markets and the small quantities of the mineral. They were consequently abandoned. By the late nineteen-twenties, Protectorate concessions companies had lost the possibility of ever developing mining industries enough to compete with the faster developing neighbours

in the Union of South Africa. Batswana, firmly engrained into the capitalist economy, became wholly dependent on migrant labour to pay taxes when the 1929 world economic depression decreased the price of cattle.⁵⁶ The Crown, on the other hand had, in anticipation of incorporating the Territory into the Union taken the first step towards this goal by tying it into an economic partnership with the Union through the Customs Union of 1910. The Protectorate came to be totally dependent on the economy of South Africa, the development of which did not as had been anticipated, cause any capital to overflow into its dependent. South African capitalists so jealously guarded their markets that not only could Protectorate goods not penetrate these markets but the Territory's infant industries were destroyed in order that it may depend on South African products.⁵⁷

The Promulgation in 1932 of Mining Ordinances brought about a new stage in the history of concession companies and mining in the Territory. Formerly the companies had not been required to register as there had been no laws governing mining activities. Also there had been no time limit to the duration of prospecting and mining so that most concessions were of an indefinite character. The new mining laws provided for protection of property against damage during prospecting thereby making conditions easier for mining companies. By then the only mining concessions in the southern Protectorate still operative were the two held by the Balkis covering the Bangwaketse Reserve and the Lobatsi Block, one held by the B.S.A. Company in the Bakwena Reserve, and another by the Linchwe Concessions Company in the Bakgatla Reserve.⁵⁸ Having registered under the 1932 Mining Ordinances, the B.S.A. Company was obliged to pay £750 per annum to government for their prospecting rights as well as £180 payable to the Bakwena Tribal Fund.⁵⁹ Balkis Company were not yet registered and therefore were not obliged to pay such monies. Meantime, the B.S.A. Company had transferred their diamond prospecting rights to De Beers Consolidated which now sought to

register in its own right and acquire a grant to prospect over areas not already held under concession by the B.S.A. Company. It therefore came to own diamond rights over the Gaberones (and Tuli) Block(s) in perpetuity.⁶⁰

The interest that the imperial government was beginning to take in mining activities in the Protectorate in the 1920s was due partly to the experience of the two World Wars 1914-18 and 1939-45. Unlike the companies which prospected for particular minerals the government learnt from the war that it was important to have a sound knowledge of all mineral resources in its empire, especially metals, which might be useful not only for industrial and economic development but also for production of arms and ammunition.⁶¹

In 1919 a Bureau had been set up in Britain whose duty was to collect information regarding mineral resources and the metal requirements of the British empire. This Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau had from time to time to advise the various British colonial governments and the companies on the action to take to enable the development of mineral resources to meet the requirements of the Empire. Geologists were sent to different corners of the empire, and although their geological surveys were not so well equipped as those of the mining companies, they enjoyed better opportunities for finding minerals since they were interested in all mineral substances.⁶²

The mining companies, unlike the imperial government's geological survey, had their shareholders to consider and these were mainly interested in profitable minerals which could find a ready market. Their exploitation of minerals was largely determined by the market and market conditions. After the high production of minerals and ensuring high prices of 1930 there followed a period of depression so severe that mining of minerals (except gold) became unprofitable.⁶³ The Kanye asbestos mine, for instance, closed for lack of market.⁶⁴ The failure of De Beers' competent prospectors to find workable minerals created a very pessimistic attitude among

companies towards prospecting in the Territory. Victoria Prospecting Company, a Rhodesian subsidiary of the B.S.A. Company, did more prospecting than any other company which worked in the Protectorate, but they too found no mineral deposits worth working under the economic circumstances of the Great Depression. They did remark however, that copper might warrant developing if and when its price rose again.⁶⁵ Prospecting grounded to a halt until 1959 when companies once again resumed serious activity. [This was pointed out by Dr. David Gould, a geologist in the Botswana Geological Survey in Botswana.]

While the companies receded from the forefront as forces of colonization, the imperial government became increasingly dominant. Initially it had been content to let the chiefs rule their people as dictated by their traditions and the changing economic situation. The companies had been the major agents of imperial expansion, as they had had the capital with which to venture into new territories and exploit the minerals there. As the territories of the Rand area became relatively economically independent, those areas sought responsible set of government and finally total political independence from Britain which, however, continued to invest heavily in the industries there. Having been relieved of political responsibilities in the southern colonies by the Act of Union of 1909 and with its investments secure, the Crown gradually shifted its attention to the Protectorate, whose colonial status had been rather amorphous.

The first few years after the declaration of the Protectorate (1885) had seen very little imperial government presence. In 1891 a Proclamation placed the territory under the High Commissioner for South Africa,⁶⁶ and also curtailed the powers of the chiefs to make concessions of mineral rights.⁶⁷ In 1899 the Crown had delimited the Tribal Reserves as well as imposed the Native Poll Tax to make the Protectorate pay for its own expenses: and between 1912/13-1932/33 and again between 1941/42-1955/56 the Protectorate met its recurrent expenditure from its domestic revenue.

Between the 1920s and 1930s Britain began to formulate very clear policy regarding government of the Protectorate. First a commission was set up in 1930 to look into the financial and economic position of the Territory. Its report of 1933 was followed in 1934 by Proclamations numbers 74 and 75 on 'Native Administration' and 'Native Tribunal',⁶⁹ respectively. These Proclamations were designed to control the powers of the chiefs which hitherto had been given substantial backing against other traditional authorities, but which had not been given any clear-cut legal standing vis a vis the European government. These proclamations were subsequently modified in 1943.

The administration of the Protectorate drew the biggest portion of its revenue from the Africans through the Native hut tax which formed about 40% of the general revenue. Customs and excise also brought in about 30% income. The system of indirect rule practiced in the Protectorate was such that a European administration was imposed over a traditional Tswana organisation, thus duplicating staff to some extent as well as expenditure. The European administrative bureaucracy drained substantial revenue collected within the Territory, so much that the expenditure involved could not be met within the available resources. Needless to say the Africans bore the burden but gained very little themselves since the biggest portions of the revenue was used in the interests of the European settlement community.⁷⁰ With the 'natives' now firmly under control and the mining companies also brought to heel by the Mining Ordinance of 1932, the imperial government was now firmly entrenched into the political and economic developments of colonial rule in the Protectorate. Not only was Tswana labour flowing into the industries of South Africa where the imperial government had vested interests but Tswana men could and were actually used to fight Britain's wars. They were recruited into the British armies abroad. In the 1930s when I. Schapera was studying the effects of

migrant labour in the Protectorate, he discovered that about 11% of the male population was abroad in the British army.⁷¹

Although the Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau had not yet discovered any mineral resources in the Protectorate, the prospecting activities in the territory soon revealed that in time the area might yield significant quantities of minerals like copper, diamond, coal and others. The importance of British colonies to the metropole may be summed up by a quotation from a report (1949) by a prominent British geologist, E. J. Wayland, who worked in the Protectorate for some time:

The long dreamt of days of global peace are far ahead. They may never come. Meanwhile, war is more than possible. In the 'old days' a nation could prepare after war had started. In the future, surely to be unprepared will be to court disaster. In the mineral sphere, we suffered by unpreparedness in both wars; particularly World War I; and even in the Second World War Germany, through lack of foresight (preparation) blundered badly more than once. As in the second of these appalling tragedies almost from the start Germany was short of tungsten and, to my firsthand knowledge, in 1941 she was buying wolfram (the more important of the two ores of the metal) from Portugal at the incredible price of £5 500 a ton. Finally, because of the dollar-sterling position it has become necessary to find, if possible, within the British Empire, deposits of minerals which hitherto we were content to buy from America.⁷²

Competition among imperialist powers which had culminated in the two World Wars, induced Britain to search more diligently within her empire for minerals which, if they were not known then to possess any economic value might in the long run prove useful. In Southern Africa conflict and competition between the Boers and the British imperialists culminated in the Anglo-Boer war of 1899 and had led Britain to grant full political independence to the South African colonies and republics; Britain could now shift her attention to encompass the Protectorate.

IMPACT OF CAPITALIST PENETRATION ON BOTSWANA (1885-1940)

The nature of colonial impact on pre-capital societies has been determined by the socio-economic as well as other conditions peculiar to the particular territory. Nowhere in Africa has colonization been as direct as it has been in Southern Africa, where a permanent settler community came to be entrenched to the extent of intransigence. The subcontinent came to be vital to capitalist expansion both for strategic as well as economic reasons.

It was (and still is) very important for the expansion of trade from western Europe to the East since not all big ships could pass through the Suez Canal in Egypt. Secondly, the gold deposits of South Africa and other mineral substances were themselves very important for capitalist accumulation. By and large the climate was also conducive to European settlement and commercial agriculture. Once well established in South Africa, the imperialists began to look further inland in search of more new mineral resources and markets. The Bechuanaland Protectorate came to acquire strategic importance because of imperialist rivalry for areas of influence further inland, especially in Matabeleland and Mashonaland (Rhodesia). It must be made clear that the nature of colonization was not consciously pre-determined by the imperial powers, but was influenced by the economic conditions. It was not due to any conscious effort or plan on the part of Britain that in Southern Africa direct or indirect rule should prevail.

It has been said before and it cannot be emphasized enough that Bechuanaland Protectorate was never climatically or economically attractive to European capitalists. Therefore the colonization of this Territory never became as vicious as say in Rhodesia where not only the land but the minerals were coveted by European capitalists.⁷³ In Swaziland,⁷⁴ also, the arable lands attracted settler colonists from across the Transvaal, who used them for grazing purposes. In South

Africa⁷⁵ too, mining companies and settlers were attracted by the wealth of the country. In fact, South Africa attracted giant capitalists and multinational corporations as well as a formidable settler community.

The few settlers who ventured into the Protectorate were doomed to failure and poverty and were too small in number to poise a threat to the available arable land and water resources. The Territory therefore never witnessed, as did South Africa, Rhodesia and Namibia, wholesale bitter Afro-European confrontations. Between 1893 and 1897 the indigens of Rhodesia revolted against the settler domination and exploitation, but were effectively repressed. South Africa, too, witnessed its Bambata rebellion and other 'Kaffir Wars'. Namibia witnessed the heroic battles of the Nama and the Herero against the Germans before they were subsequently annihilated and handed over to the Union of South Africa.⁷⁶ Even the Portuguese territories, saw their peasants revolts, which culminated into the Barue rebellion of 1904-1917.⁷⁷ All these African armed resistance movements failed to check colonial expansion, mainly because the Africans lacked a common identity and also because they were technologically backward, fighting powerful internationally linked capitalist forces. Nonetheless, they serve to expose how economic considerations on the part of imperial forces determined the degree of viciousness of the colonization of the indigenous people.

The different conceptions of property relations have been alluded to before as an important factor in explaining the understanding of both African and European in the transactions they engaged in during the process of concession-granting. It must, however, be again emphasised that the nature of imperialism, especially the economic interests which are so fundamental to capitalism, eluded the Africans. They no doubt may have perceived the political aspect of imperialism which, however, merely forms the superstructure of society: thus for instance the southern Protectorate chiefs preferred to treat with small concession companies rather than the

imperial government or the B.S.A. Company, which they regarded as an organ of the colonial government. Note also how Batswana generally preferred British rule to Boer settler domination. Given their inferior level of commodity production they could not have clearly grasped the economic force of imperialism.

By the late nineteenth century the Tswana societies, like all other pre-capitalist societies in Southern African, had begun to be gradually incorporated into the world market and international capital through barter trade with European settlers, concessions money and companies, migrant labour, hut tax and, later, the customs union with the more industrialised Union of South Africa. All these contacts eroded the pre-capitalist economy to such an extent that capitalism came to dominate the economy and Batswana came to be increasingly dependent on the world market; with the inevitable result that as dependence strengthened a structure of under-development⁷⁸ emerged. European traders, hunters and missionaries had constituted the initial step toward the colonization of the Territory. From the 1830s⁷⁹ when they made contact with Batswana the hunters and traders were mainly interested in making quick profits by bartering their goods. However, the Europeans who came in the late nineteenth century were interested in profit-making through capitalist accumulation and were in fact lured by the discovery of minerals to look for concessions in Southern Africa by which they could establish their interests.

In the initial period of concession-acquisition in the Protectorate the Europeans were dealing with illiterate African rulers. Since no records were kept that might throw some light on these illiterates' perception of concessions, it is difficult to ascertain how they interpreted the concession money given them by the Europeans. In some Tswana tribes, like Bakgatla, trading transactions with strangers or foreigners could not take place before the aliens had offered gifts to

the chief as 'gate-openers' or 'mouth-openers' (go bula kgoro).⁸⁰ It may therefore not be far fetched to say that such chiefs may have perceived concessions money which in many cases was offered during or just before negotiations for concessions as 'gate-openers'.

Anyway, the Tswana chiefs were offered considerable sums of money by the concessionaires, which found its way into their personal bank accounts. By 1898, for instance, chief Sebele was reported as having in his account in the Mafeking branch of the Standard Bank a sum of £14 000⁸¹ paid him by John Riesle and his partners for the land lease he granted them. By 1925, the B.S.A. Company alone had made the following payments to the Protectorate chiefs:

RESERVE	CHIEF	REASON FOR PAYMENT	ANNUAL AMOUNT NOW PAID	ESTIMATE TOTAL RECEIVED TO DATE
Bakwena	Sebele	compensatory	£225	£ 6 500
Bangwaketse	Bathoen	compensatory	150	2 500
Bamalete	Seboko	compensatory	<u>50</u>	<u>1 500</u>
		TOTAL	£485	£12 500
Bamangwato	Sekgoma	Mineral Concession	£300	£ 2 500
Bakgatla	+ Successor to Linchwe	Mineral Concession	100	2 500
Bakwena	Sebele	Mineral Concession	180	7 500
Batawana		Mineral Concession	<u>300</u>	<u>10 000</u>
		TOTAL	£880	£32 500

+ The Bakgatla payment for the mineral concession was made by the Linchwe Concession Company. Therefore by 1925 the B.S.A. Company had paid approximately £32 500 to the Protectorate of which £20 000 was paid to the southerners alone, plus the £2 500 paid to Bakgatla by the Linchwe Company. Here again no records have been kept on how tribal funds were used: whether the chief took the concessions money as his personal income or not.

The earliest records on the handling of tribal monies by chiefs only date back to the nineteen-thirties, with the establishment of tribal treasuries. These records reveal that there was no demarcation between the chiefs' personal income and tribal revenue.⁸³ The chiefs simply made withdrawals from revenue collected not only from concessions but also from stand rents and other levies. For example, an amount of £220 payable as stand rent in the Bangwaketse Reserve went into Bathoen's pocket.⁸⁴ Whichever way it may have been it is clear that the chiefs and other tribal authorities had at their disposal ready cash which enhanced their financial position in the new economy vis à vis other members of the tribes. They were thus in a better position to buy more herds of cattle for themselves, send their children to school and open up businesses like trading stores. Some of the best examples of this trend can be found among the Ngwaketse chiefs, notably Bathoen II.

The introduction of hut tax in 1899 was singularly a major force which compelled Batswana into the money economy. They were required to pay it as much as possible in cash which they could only obtain by selling either cattle or their labour. Since a large portion of the population did not own enough cattle to sell annually,⁸⁵ their only way out was to sell their labour in South African labour markets. As a matter of fact both government and labour recruitment agencies collaborated to find ways and means of coercing the African into wage labour. For those Africans who had enough cattle to sell the economic depression of 1929 dealt them a big blow. The value of cattle fell⁸⁶ drastically thus making the sale of livestock not enough to meet the financial demands of the money economy. By encouraging Batswana to join the stream of migrant labour to South Africa, the colonial government gained revenue from the hut tax and also subsidies from the South African government for the migrant labourers. The tribal authorities also often used migrant labourers from their tribes to generate tribal revenue.⁸⁷

Whereas migratory labour, the Protectorate's major export until the 1960s, informally tied the Protectorate to South Africa, the formal ties were established by the incorporation of the Territory into a Customs Union with South Africa which was actually an administrative necessity⁸⁸ rather than an economic partnership. By this customs agreement South Africa, in her stronger bargaining position as a relatively highly industrialized power, would monopolise fiscal discretions and the customs and excise policies governing the customs area.⁸⁹ In this way, she determined and controlled price-raising standards, and consequently the growth of industry in her less developed partner. The items of trade between the two partners reveal that South Africa came to have an upper hand in determining the structure of industrial development in the Protectorate and of establishing its own markets in the less advanced country. Whereas the Protectorate exported her primary products, first migrant labourers and later beef, she imported processed consumer goods which were often exports returned after processing. The implications of primary export were that no intermediary industries were generated.

All these economic changes had a profound effect on the socio-economic structure of Tswana society. The main sources of income came to be as follows:⁹⁰ The sale of agricultural produce (31%), Army allotments (8%), Employment outside the Protectorate (43%), and employment inside the Protectorate (18%). In his study of the impact of migrant labour on Tswana societies, Isaac Schapera estimated the average minimum expenditure per family at £12 13s. 6d. in the 1930s.⁹¹ As the dependency on the money economy increased, new class relations emerged. The feudary structure of Tswana society was soon dominated⁹² by a capitalist structure. The commercialization of the cattle industry gradually transformed cattle owners especially the chiefs and other noble families into a petty-bourgeois class. This petty-bourgeoisie was also reinforced by non-traditional authorities who had acquired European education. In fact, the Native Administration

Proclamation of 1934 made provision for the inclusion of educated persons who had no traditional standing into the 'Native' Council.⁹³ The skewed distribution of cattle which characterised pre-colonial social structure continued into the capitalist period with some slight recruits for the class of owners.

Although no minerals were discovered in the Territory during the colonial era, by the late nineteenth forties, Europeans strongly suspected that some Batswana possessed secret knowledge of mineral deposits in the country.⁹⁴ The Colonial Geological Survey thought they had reason to believe that some Africans did know of mineral showings in their country which necessitated the clarification of the problem of mineral development and exploitation as well as reformulations of principles 'designed reasonably to protect Native interests'.⁹⁵

CONCLUSION

Bearing in mind the alliance between the polity and the capitalists the process of concession-colonization in the Protectorate can be summarized as follows: first came the small concession-hunting individual companies; then followed amalgamation of monopoly syndicates and the absorption of the original small companies, resulting in the dominance of two major companies, viz., the B.S.A. and Balkis Consolidated. When the monopoly companies were established they then leased out options to other companies but retained possession of the original concessions which entitled them to an owner's share of any profits that the leasee companies might have made. In granting a royal charter to the B.S.A. Company in 1899 the British imperial government was merely establishing political control over the process of concession-colonization spearheaded by various companies, and through the cheapest way possible. For the most part, the Crown showed the least economic interest in the Protectorate⁹⁶ as prospecting activities yielded no mineral deposits. So the Crown did not foster any economic developments in the Territory as there did not seem to be any. It hoped

that the prospecting of the companies would discover something worth spending money on.

Some historians, and even some Tswana nationalists, tend to interpret Britain's failure to develop industries in the Protectorate as simple negligence:⁹⁷ thereby implying that Britain was morally bound to do good by the Territory. It is even argued that the policies the Crown adopted in the Protectorate were motivated by humanistic ideals of 'saving' the 'natives' both from themselves and from the intrigues of land-hungry Boers and other European capitalists. The myth that the Protectorate had no mineral wealth and also the fact of scarcity of arable land are often quoted as 'proof' that British activities in the Territory were non-economic and therefore were mainly in the interests of the 'natives'.⁹⁸ This interpretation is superficial and is based on naive humanistic sentiments which are not borne out by the nature of capitalism which although social at the level of production is nonetheless characterised by private ownership of the means of production. For the obvious reason of the discovery of the Rand, British capital was mostly sunk into the mines of the wealthy territory. The humanistic protestations of unmoneyed pressure-groups or even imperial officials could not divert any of this capital from the lucrative Rand to the poverty-stricken underdeveloped Protectorate. The capitalists were the ones who decided where their capital should go, and this was not dictated by the strife of the colonized societies but by the wealth potential of the particular territory. Where capital went there went the Crown; so it was not until the late 1950s when serious prospecting resumed that the Crown began to seriously consider proffering substantial grants-in-aid to the Protectorate. Therefore the humanistic ideals were contradicted by the dictates of monopoly capitalism.⁹⁹

The position of the colonial government was summed up by the white settlers when they said:

'From the inception of the Protectorate up to almost present times (i.e. 1932) the history of colonial office rule is a very sad one to relate, especially in regard to this territory. It seems as if, once the Territory had been declared a Protectorate, its responsibility ended there and then fortunately for the Protectorate, there were certain establishments such as the big Police force, and the conditions which prevailed at the time of the development of Rhodesia which increased the cash circulation of the country and thus enabling the combined territories, i.e., the Crown Colony and the Protectorate, to carry on'.¹⁰⁰

The economic field was not the only one left to stagnate and underdevelop; politically too, the territory remained underdeveloped. Since the Protectorate's poverty was one of its salient and distinctive characters, the territory was not envisaged to ever develop on its own.¹⁰¹ So that politically as well as economically, it was not prepared for autonomy and was instead progressively being incorporated into the Union of South Africa. Although political incorporation failed to materialise the Crown still did not foster the development of modern politics until a decade later than the period covered in this paper, (i.e., until the 1960s).

Due to the territory's lack of overt economic potential European colonization in the Protectorate was neither vigorous nor vicious and therefore did not generate violent Afro-European confrontations as did most of the countries of Southern Africa where there was an intransigent white settler community.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹Thompson George, Capitalism and After. London 1973 pp. 60-61
- ²Kemp, Tom, 'The Marxist Theory of Imperialism' in R. Owen and B. Suitcliffe (eds.), The Theory of Imperialism, London 1972. p. 23
- ³Leys, Colin, Underdevelopment in Kenya. London 1975. p.9
- ⁴For division of opinion among British Authorities concerning the method by which the Imperial Government could extend her power see Lord Hailey, The Republic of South Africa and the High Commission Territories, London 1963; and Lord Lugard, The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa. (5th ed.) London 1965
- ⁵The other chartered companies were the Royal Niger Company (1886) and the Imperial British East Africa Company (IBEAC). The climatic conditions of the territories covered by these two companies were not mineral wealth so that the companies, especially the IBEAC tended to be financially weak and dependent on the imperial power.
- ⁶Greaves, L. B., The High Commission Territories, London 1954. p. 9
- ⁷Galbraith, John S., Crown and Charter : The Early Years of the British South Africa Company. London 1974. p.24
- ⁸Minutes of Concessions Commission 1893. Botswana National Archives (hereafter BNA) RC 3/11.
- ⁹Ibid.
- ¹⁰Extract from Report of Concessions Commission, BNA HC 118
- ¹¹Op. cit. RC 3/11
- ¹²Ibid.
- ¹³Ibid.
- ¹⁴Lord Ripon to the High Commissioner, 15th January 1895
BNA HC 119
- ¹⁵Op. cit. RC 3/11
- ¹⁶Schapera, Isaac, A Handbook of Tswana Law and Custom. London 1970. p. 214

- 17 In his study of economic conditions of the Bakgatla Reserve, I. Schapera's survey revealed that between them the chief (Molefi), the ex-regent Isang, Isang's brother, Bogatswe Pilame, Isang's brother-in-law Bogatswe Matlapeng and Ditshote Monametse owned 20% of the cattle of the whole reserve - see I. Schapera, 'Economic Conditions in a Bechuanaland Native Reserve' in South African Journal of Science, Vol. XXX 1933, p. 650. For a comprehensive study of wealth distribution among Batswana see I. Schapera, A Handbook of Tswana Law and Custom, and his study on impact of migrant labour on the economy of the Territory in BNA S 437/1/2
- 18 For land tenure system among Batswana, see I. Schapera, A Handbook of Tswana Law and Custom. pp. 195-213
- 19 Ibid. p. 203
- 20 Minutes of Concessions Commission 1893. BNA RC 3/11
- 21 Ibid.
- 22 Financial and Economic Position of the Bechuanaland Protectorate - Report of the commission appointed by the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs. London 1933
- 23 Smit, P., Botswana : Resources and Development, A Qualitative View. Pretoria 1970. p. 36
- 24 Silley, Antony, Founding a Protectorate. London 1965 P. 139
- 25 Notes on consultation between the Governor of the Cape, the Administrator of the Protectorate, Robert Moffat and W. H. Surmon. BNA, HC 182/1
- 26 Ashburn (Gaberones) to Imperial Secretary (Cape Town), 10th May, 1893. BNA, HC 118
- 27 Mongatane, Tebogo, Balete and the Scramble. UBLS, Gaborone 1976
- 28 Galbraith, John S., Crown and Charter. op. cit.
- 29 Phimster, I. R., 'Rhodes Rhodesia and the Rand' in Journal of Southern African Studies. Vol I October 1974 p. 85
- 30 Ibid. p. 83
- 31 Colonial office to Mr. Bauman (Secretary of the Secheleland Concessions Syndicate) 4th August, 1892 BNA, HC 152/4
- 32 Minutes of Concessions Commission BNA, RC 3/11

- 33 Ibid.
- 34 The High Commissioner's Instructions and Terms of Reference for the Concessions Commission 1893. BNA
- 35 Consultation meeting between the Governor, the Administrator, Reverend Moffat and W. H. Surmon 1891. BNA HC 182/1
- 36 Memorandum on the B.S.A. Company's rights in the Protectorate. BNA, 536/2
- 37 Schapera, I., Tribal Innovators. London 1965. p.5
- 38 British South Africa Company's memorandum to the Secretary of State. BNA BNB 175
- 39 Lord Hailey, Native Administration in the British African Territories Part V. London 1953. p. 374
- 40 On the rise of Tswana nationalism, see O. N. Parsons, 'Shots for a Black Republic', 'Simon Ratshosa and Botswana Nationalism' in African Affairs, 73(293 1974) and R. P. Stevens, Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland London 1967
- 41 Smit, P., Botswana Resources and Development : A Qualitative View. Pretoria 1970. p. 43
- 42 For financial ties between Rhodesia and the Rand area see I. R. Phimister, 'Rhodes Rhodesia and the Rand' in Journal of Southern African Studies, I, i 1974; and John S. Galbraith, Crown and Charter, op. cit.
- 43 Phimister, I. R., Ibid., p. 77
- 44 Ibid., p. 83
- 45 Memorandum on the British South Africa Company's Protectorate Rights. BNA, S 36/2
- 46 Survey of land in the Protectorate belonging to the B.S.A. Company 1901. BNA RC 5/8
- 47 Arrighi, Giovanni, The Political Economy of Rhodesia. The Hague 1967. p. 19
- 48 The British South Africa Company's memorandum to the Secretary of State 1925. BNA, BNB 175
- 49 The Secretary of State to the High Commissioner, 23 January, 1929. BNA, BNB 176

- 50 Britain was the first and the biggest investor in South Africa. The other imperialist powers like the United States of America and France, came much later into the scene. For British investments in South Africa see Ruth First, J. Steele and C. Gurvey, The South African Connection London 1972. pp. 23-24; and Robert Ley, 'South African Goldmining 1976', 'the gold of migrant labour' in African Affairs 74, 1975, pp. 196-208
- 51 De Kiewit, C. J., The Imperial Factor in South Africa. London 1905. p. 310
- 52 Memorandum by the Resident Commissioner summing the position of the question of Transfer from 1921-1935 with special reference to the viewpoint of European settlers, 16 February, 1935. BNA S 337/6
- 53 Schapera, I., 'Effects of Migrant Labour on Economic position of the Bechuanaland Protectorate' in BNA S 437/1/1-2. The Native Recruiting Corporation (NRC) only recruited in the south and central districts of the Protectorate. The other major recruiting agency was the Witwatersrand Native Labour Organization (WNLA)
- 54 Correspondence relating to question of mineral concessions 1922-26. BNA, BNB 175
- 55 Wayland, E. J., Minerals in the B.P., 1949 p. 12 and Asbestos in B.P., 1949, Lobatse, Botswana Geological Survey
- 56 Schapera, I., Effects of Migrant Labour op. cit.
- 57 A soap industry in Lobatse was strangulated by South Africa
- 58 Memorandum on B.S.A. Company's Protectorate rights, BNA, 536/2
- 59 Financial and Economic Position of the B.P. - A report of the commission appointed by the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs, March 1933. London. p. 20
- 60 du Toit, A. L., 'Report on Diamond Prospecting in the Bechuanaland Protectorate' Lobatse, Botswana Geological Survey 1934. p. 6
- 61 Wayland, E. J., Minerals in the B. P., op. cit., p.1

- 62 Ibid., p. 27
- 63 Ibid., p. 27
- 64 Ibid., p.2
- 65 Ibid., p. 27
- 66 Greaves, C. B., The High Commission Territories
London 1954. p. 9
- 67 Lord Hailey, Native Administration in British African Territories, Part V, London 1953. p. 324
- 68 Hermans, Quill, 'Towards Budgetary Independence : A Review of Botswana's Financial History 1900 to 1973' in D. L. Cohen and J. Parsons (eds.) Politics and Society in Botswana. UBS 1976. p. 97
- 69 Stevens, R. P. R. P., Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland. London 1967. p. 130
- 70 Europeans monopolised the few markets available so Batswana could not compete with them on an equal footing. Further such government loans as were available were given to Europeans with the excuse that it would be too risky to give Africans money loans. But even the Europeans who received these loans often could not pay them back and the scheme had to be dropped. The settlers were the major market for African products, especially cattle and other livestock which could not possibly enter the European-controlled markets of South Africa. Resident Commissioner to High Commissioner, 16 February, 1935. BNA S 337/6
- 71 Schapera, I., Effects of Migrant Labour op.cit.
- 72 Wayland, E. J., Minerals in the B. P., op. cit.
- 73 For the origins of the myth of mineral wealth in Rhodesia, see J. Charles van Onselen, Chibaro : African Mine Labour in Southern Rhodesia 1908-1933 London 1976; and G. Arrighi, The Political Economy of Rhodesia, The Hague 1967
- 74 The land question in Swaziland is dealt with in Lord Hailey, Native Administration in British African Territories, Part V London, 1953; R. P. Stevens, Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland London 1967

- 75 For African resistance to colonial rule in South Africa see S. Marks and A. Atmore, 'Firearms in Southern Africa,' and H. Saker and J. Aldridge, 'Origins of the Langerberg Rebellion', in Journal of African History XIII, 4, 1971: and for conflict over cattle and land see R. Oliver and A. Atmore, Africa since 1800. London 1967
- 76 Marks, S., and Atmore, A., 'Firearms in Southern Africa, Ibid., pp. 520-522
- 77 Isaacman, A. E., and Isaacman, B., The Traditions of Resistance in Mozambique : anti-colonial activity in the Zambezi Valley. London 1976 p. 167
- 78 Wanji, Bari, 'Botswana Landlockedness : The Structure of underdevelopment and options for disengagement'. An unpublished paper for the Council for Development of Economic and Social Research in Africa Workshop, Arusha Tanzania, 1977
- 79 Schapera, I., 'Effects of Migrant Labour on Economic position of the Bechuanaland Protectorate' BNA S 437/1/2
- 80 Schapera, I., A Handbook of Tswana Law and Custom London 1970. p. 275
- 81 Williams, H., to Surmon, W. H., 8 June, 1898. BNA, RC 4/7
- 82 B.S.A. Company's memorandum to Secretary of State BNA, BNB 175
- 83 Bangwaketse Tribal Treasury - need to regularize Tribal and Chieftainship Finance, BNA, S 433/4. RC 3/11
- 84 Ibid
- 85 Schapera, I., Effects of Migrant Labour, op. cit.
- 86 Ibid.

- ⁸⁷Schapera, I., 'Economic Conditions in a Bechuanaland Native Reserve' in South African Journal of Science XXX 1933, p. 650
- ⁸⁸Turner, B., 'A Fresh Start for the Southern African Customs Union' in African Affairs, 70, 280, July 1971 p. 269
- ⁸⁹Ibid. p. 270. For 1910 Customs Agreement see Surveys on African Economies Vol. 5, Washington DC, International Monetary Fund, 1973
- ⁹⁰Schapera, I., Effects of Migrant Labour, op. cit.
- ⁹¹Ibid. The only markets available for Batswana were the European settlers, who monopolized the few external markets available.
- ⁹²Prah, K. K., 'Notes and Comments on Aspects of Tswana Feudalism in the pre-colonial period'. Gaborone, National Institute for Research in Development and African Studies, 1977
- ⁹³Lord Hailey, Part V. op. cit., pp. 212-221
- ⁹⁴Wayland, E. J., Minerals in the Bechuanaland Protectorate, op. cit., p. 1
- ⁹⁵Ibid., p. 1
- ⁹⁶After the lapse of the British South Africa Company's administrative rights in the Protectorate the country continued to be financed from the Cape Colony rather than direct from Britain. Further, the circulation of money in the Territory was generated by company activities in the development of Rhodesia.

97 Quill Hermans, in his 'Review of Botswana's Financial History, 1900-1973' shows how Britain finally accepted responsibility towards its Protectorate and recognised that the standard of public services fell far short of minimally accepted levels. 'Towards Budgetary Independence : A Review of Botswana's Financial History, 1900 to 1973' in D. L. Cohen and J. Parson, eds., Politics and Society in Botswana. Gaborone 1976. J. E. Spence also tries to apologise for this 'neglect' by arguing that in fact Britain had never meant to interfere in the affairs of the Protectorate. 'It is not surprising that in these circumstances little, if any attention was paid to developing the economic and political potentials of the territories'. 'British Policy Towards the High Commission Territories' in Cohen and Parson eds., Politics and Society in Botswana, p. 52. The Proclamations that delimited tribal reserves (1899), imposed taxation on the Africans (1899), brought the institution of chieftainship formally and legally under the British government (1934) are regarded by Spence merely as 'forced on the authorities by the circumstances of the time' and as constituting 'the basic minimum of interference necessary for even a limited degree of administration' (p. 52) and which did not involve interference such as would have been necessitated if Britain had tried to develop the politics and economy of the country. For further reference on Britain's 'neglect' of the Protectorate, see Lord Bailey, The Republic of South Africa and the High Commission Territories Oxford 1963.

98 British officials also believed that their policies were in the interests of the natives. See memorandum on the British South Africa Company's Protectorate Rights in BNA, S 36/2

- 99 Notably Britain's policies towards her colonies changed considerably after World War II when she began to be more vigorous in her search for minerals and more appreciative of the need to collaborate with the 'natives' in order to safeguard her interests. E. J. Wayland, Minerals in the B.P., op. cit., p. 1
- 100 Resident Commissioner to High Commissioner, 16 February, 1935. BNA S 337/6
- 101 Up to the eve of independence all economic commissions sent here had declared the territory inviable. See Quill Hermans, 'Towards Budgetary Independence,' op. cit., p. 96