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Introduction
The year 1930 was momentous in South African history. The country was, like the rest of the world, slowly recovering from the ravages of the depression, but it was beset by many problems. Newspapers of the time reflect the concerns addressed by conference after conference: labour problems and the condition of poor whites\(^1\). 'Race relations' referred to the relationship between Afrikaans and English speakers. Relations between black and white were termed the 'native question'. In this era the ANC, under leadership of Dr. A.B. Xuma, was concerned with the same thing, but its conferences were almost exclusively attended by black members, to such a degree that Die Burger of 12 July 1930, while reporting in almost neutral terms an ANC meeting held at Worcester in the Boland, thought it worthwhile to mention the fact of a lone white female in the audience (Die Burger 12/7/1930:3).

In such a climate an unusual conference, in which black and white participated on equal terms, was held at Fort Hare under the auspices of the then uniform 'Students' Christian Association of South Africa', apparently, however, on the initiative of its 'native branch' (\textit{sic}). The assembly, held from 27 June to 3 July 1930, was termed the 'Bantu-European Students' Conference' and speakers were drawn from all walks of South African academic life, with guest speakers also bringing greetings from the Indian, British and American Student Christian movements.

Although the conference was by its very nature Christian, and a great part of the programme devoted to religious exercises of varying kinds\(^2\), the theme of the conference was 'Christianity in Action'. This 'action' was to be to find solutions to racial conflict through the economic upliftment of black South Africans. If the spirit of the

\(^1\) Die Burger of 18 July 1930 reported on a high profile conference held at Pretoria which could come to no concrete proposals for the upliftment of poor whites, but had called for Church and State to co-operate.

\(^2\) An average of 54 minutes per day for the week's duration was spent on devotional exercises. Topics addressed on the first four days were almost exclusively religious.
conference had been allowed to take root in South African society as a whole, the history of the subsequent sixty-five years might have been very different. However, its religious aspects were brushed aside, its economic proposals were ignored by the political establishment of the Hertzog era, and its social arrangements were made the object of a witch hunt which effectively ended all such contact for more than half a century. Worse, the practical combination of religion and politics practised within an egalitarian setting was seized upon as virtually anarchic. As will be shown below, it was made clear that in future white Christian students' interpretation of equality before God as reaching into the sports field and the dining room would not be tolerated by the white establishment.

Most participants in this historic meeting are long since dead, or, due to old age, they are no longer able to give a lucid report of all aspects of the matter. I have, however, been fortunate to obtain a copy of the programme of the conference (Figure 1), as well as a formal photograph of all participants (Figure 2), and a pre-conference document entitled 'Introduction to Conference Topics’ edited by Max Yergan, the black American who had been one of the prime movers of the conference. It has been easy enough to look up newspaper reports of the era, as well as to follow the subsequent debate in Church publications of the time. I have decided to concentrate on the reportage in Die Burger, as the mouthpiece of the Afrikaner establishment, and of Die Kerkbode, as embodying the official policies of the Dutch Reformed Church of the time. Together these reflect the reactions of the 'coloniser' to a combined effort of its own 'youth wing' and that of the ‘colonised’ in a unique chapter of the ‘colonial discourse’. The oral testimony of my mother, now 90, who was involved indirectly in preparation for the event, and of my aunt, who died in 1995 and who actually was a delegate, has been invaluable. The reminiscences of some of the other participants, and reflections on the conference in the epitomised biographies of others have also afforded certain insights (Brookes varia, Beyers 1987). What follows is, however, in the main a reflection of the shifts of focus on the conference, as these could be gleaned from the daily and weekly publications referred to above.

Preparation
There had been a great deal of preparation beforehand. A letter to Die Burger of July 21 1930 attests to the build-up of publicity before the event. Three years previously a similar conference, on a much smaller scale, had been held at the Lovedale Institute. According to one of my oral sources (Latsky), the success of this small conference,

---

3 They are Mrs C.E. Latsky and Miss M.D. Boshoff, both of Cape Town. Miss Boshoff was at the time of the 1930 conference travelling secretary for schools of the SCA. References to their oral narrative will be given by means of their surnames.

4 A contingent from the Western Cape travelled to Fort Hare by train to attend (Latsky).
arranged by Rev. Willem Conradie, then of Stellenbosch, and Rev. A. Cardcross Grant, warden of St. Matthew’s College, at the end of September 1927, had led to a decision to launch the larger meeting. Yet even this conference had not been the first of its kind. Brookes (1933:16) refers to a series, held at different venues, starting with an initiative of the Dutch Reformed Church in 1923, and repeated in 1925 under the auspices of the so-called ‘Joint Councils’. In January 1927 the DRC again convened a meeting of black and white leaders (Brookes 1933:16).

White students participating in the September 1927 conference had included seven young men from Stellenbosch, almost all from the (Dutch Reformed) Theological Seminary, six young ladies from Huguenot College at Wellington (at that time a liberal arts college for women falling under the University of South Africa) and one young lady from the University of Cape Town. The heartiness, friendship and mutual enrichment experienced by these young Bolanders and the Xhosa-speaking students at Fort Hare led to further student co-operation (Latsky). In February 1929 the Joint Councils held a leaders’ conference in Cape Town with twenty-seven black and eighty-two white delegates, ‘which evolved a programme of action, sane, liberal and practical, that is in itself a justification of the Conference movement’ (Brookes 1933:16).

So, the winter conference of 1930 was the sixth in a series. From an open letter addressed after the event to both Die Kerkbode and Die Burger by the then President of the SCA, Professor H.P. Cruse of Stellenbosch, and its General Secretary, Fred Liebenberg, it is clear that the main initiative for this larger conference had come from the ‘Bantu Section’ (sic) of the Students’ Christian Association, under the leadership of Max Yergan, who had been the driving force behind the establishment of this section eight years previously. The scope of the conference, as planned, was ambitious, encompassing the whole of its strong local membership (at both the ‘Native College of South Africa’—now Fort Hare—and the Lovedale Institute), that is, 130 black students, as well as fifty-three white students from all other South African universities. Other interested persons made up the total of three hundred and forty-four

---

5 Brookes (1933:14) explains these as co-operative bodies operating in individual towns, on which black and white representatives met to ‘serve as a rallying point [for] public opinion on race questions’. From this developed the Institute of Race Relations.

6 October 1, 1930.

7 Brookes (1933:17) lists the Universities of Cape Town, Stellenbosch, Witwatersrand, the University Colleges of Transvaal (now UP), Natal, Rhodes, Grey (now UOFS) and Huguenot, the theological Institute of Wellington and St. Paul’s Theological College, and the Heidelberg and Bloemfontein Normal Colleges. Six of these were ‘wholly or largely Afrikaans-medium’ (Idem). From a declaration issued in December 1930 by the Nusas Executive, it appears that the invitation had been circulated by that body (Die Burger 23/12/1930).
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delegates (sixty-nine black, eighty-seven white ‘senior visitors’, many of them academics from various South African universities, and five overseas visitors (Brookes 1933:17). A wide spectrum of political figures had been invited, but it appears that not all came. In particular, apart from the brilliant and liberally-minded Cape Parliamentarian, Jannie Hofmeyr, none of the Government had responded to the invitation to join the discussions.

Social Arrangements
Preparation by the local organisers had been almost ludicrously sensitive to current white prejudices and South African mores: one whole floor had been set aside for the white visitors, beds had been fitted with new cotton ticking mattresses, stuffed with fresh grass. White delegates were expected to bring their own pillows, sheets and blankets. Separate dining facilities were provided for, but it is to the credit of the visiting students that they chose to sit at unsegregated tables, initially, as one young delegate candidly confessed, from curiosity, but, after the first day, from interest and friendship (Die Burger 10/9/1930). The formal photograph of the delegates (Figure 2) shows clearly the relaxed attitude of all—something not to be wondered at in a normal society, but for the South Africa of the 1930s, remarkable in the extreme. Delegates are grouped according to age and gender, not racial appearance. My second oral source, Miss Boshoff, appears as the furthest to the right of a group of women in the second row from the rear, standing next to a local delegate, whose arms are folded before him⁸. The seated figures (third row from the front) are clearly the senior delegates, and here, too, there is clearly no social discrimination.

The seven day programme was very full, but Monday afternoon, the fourth afternoon of the conference, was set aside for relaxation. At the ‘Sports meeting’ all the individual events (a team event pillow fight, foot races, long jump, and, for the ladies, a potato-and-spoon race) were won by black students. White students from the northern and southern universities organised a rugby ‘intervarsity’, and some bold spirits then decided on an ‘interracial’ match (letter from W. Wessels in Die Burger 10/9/1930, Brooks 1933:17). Of this match more below.

Max Yergan had prepared a pre-conference document, which, as he explained in its foreword, was aimed at providing information on ‘the general line that [would] be taken at the conference’, to sharpen issues as preparation for intelligent discussion and to suggest questions for such discussion, and to suggest books for preparatory reading. He saw the conference as ‘living evidence of ... a spirit ... dissatisfied with a world where false gods are worshipped ...’ (Yergan 1930:Foreword). Clearly the conference was aimed at effecting a change in the attitudes of whites and the conditions of

⁸ Her eyes and memory had both failed her to such an extent at the time of writing so that it was impossible to ask her to identify any of the major figures.
blacks in South Africa, but this change was envisaged as the fruit of a spiritual deepening and of the discovery of common spiritual values. Yergan's Introduction (1930) does not contain all the papers to be read at the conference, and also has three papers which did not form part of the final programme. One, by the Bishop of Bloemfontein (Carey in Yergan 1930), had a spiritual content, and two were on economic and social problems of black people (Ross & Henderson in Yergan 1930). Also, judging from small discrepancies between the titles of papers printed in this document, and those printed on the programme of the conference (see Figure 1), some speakers had adapted their papers between the printing and their delivery at the conference.

In spite of Governmental non-response, the programme (Figure 1) lists an impressive array of high-powered speakers: the opening address by the Cape M.P. had been preceded by welcoming speeches from the local magistrate, the mayor (presumably of the town of Alice), the principals of the Lovedale Institute and the 'South African Native College'. Fraternal greetings were delivered from Student movements in Ceylon, Great Britain and the United States. The chairman of the World's Student Christian Federation, Francis P. Miller, chaired the conference, and was one of the first speakers, with as his topic, trends in student thought world-wide. Clerics, both white and black, from throughout South Africa, led devotional topics—a Presbyterian minister from Pretoria, two theological professors from Stellenbosch, the President and ex-President of the Methodist Church in South Africa, the moderator of the Bantu Presbyterian Church, ministers from Johannesburg, Pietermaritzburg and Lovedale, and also laymen with theological leanings.

Although the titles differ slightly, the topics appear to concur in the case of printed articles and talks by Shepherd, Pim, Phillips, Ballinger and Brookes, all 1930. Cf. Figure 1. Only Oswin Bull's written paper and oral topic appear to differ widely, but as both are spiritual matters, we shall not pursue the topic further.

Some read papers on spiritual matters, others led devotional periods. See Figure 1. The names, in order, are: Rev. A. Cardross Grant, Warden of St Matthew's College; Rev. E. Macmillan, St. Andrew's, Pretoria, who was a leading figure in the Moral Rearmament Movement (the so-called 'Oxford Group') and had been Moderator of the Presbyterian Church of S.A.; Prof. A.M.K. Cumaraswamy, Trinity College, Ceylon; John Ramsbotham, Cambridge, England; George E. Haynes, New York (an American black, perhaps, but not certainly, the same person who later became UNESCO chairman for Educational Reconstruction—Who's Who 1952); R.H.W. Shepherd, chaplain and director of publications at the Lovedale Institute, author in later years of about 700 pamphlets and books, and later moderator of the Church of Scotland, a rather conservative thinker, according to Beyers (1987:750); Prof H.P. Cruse, Stellenbosch, SCA Vice-President; Rev. Allen Lea, President, Methodists of SA; Dr. D. Moorrees, DRC students' minister and great enthusiast for missions; Rev. Edwin N. Ncwana, Pietermaritzburg; Rev. G.H.P. Jacques, Ex-President, Methodists of SA; Max Yergan, SCA Organiser; Rev. W. Mpamba, Moderator, Bantu Presbyterian Church; Oswin Bull, layman.
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Not all the clerical speakers devoted themselves to ‘devotional topics’. On Monday, June 30th, the fourth day of the conference, delegates, no doubt inspired by three days of spiritual fare and fraternal communication, turned their attention to the practical application of the spiritual call to practise justice and equity in society. The first speaker on social issues was the Rev. Ray E. Phillips of Johannesburg\textsuperscript{11}, whose paper on ‘Conditions among Urban Bantu’ had appeared in the Introduction as ‘Bantu Urban Social Conditions’ (Phillips in Yergan 1930:22f). Talks were for the most part paired, and the complement of Phillips’ paper was a talk by Mrs Charlotte Maxeke of Johannesburg on ‘Social conditions among Bantu women and girls’\textsuperscript{12}. For the remainder of the conference speakers were from a secular background, except in the periods set aside for devotions.

The list of ‘secular’ speakers reads like a ‘who’s who’ of the later South African Liberal Party and the early executive of the ANC. Some of the black speakers were lesser-known, apparently local dignitaries, such as Mr. T. Makiwane of the Transkeian Agricultural Department, who, while painting a chequered picture of African rural life, pleaded for a return to the land. He was paired with W.G. Bennie, former Chief Inspector of Native Schools\textsuperscript{13} to talk on ‘Bantu Rural Life’. Presumably their talks would have complemented the papers by Ross and Henderson (in Yergan 1930). Of these, Ross had made the important point (in Yergan 1930:15) that black labourers’ wages were often kept low by employers who erroneously assumed that black people were supported by subsistence farming and needed to work only in order to buy ‘luxuries’. Henderson’s paper (in Yergan 1930:18-21) was an extract from an address held before the ‘General Missionary Conference of S.A.’ (not dated). In it, he quoted figures from the Blue Books of 1875 that showed that, in the present era, economically speaking, blacks were losing ground:

\textsuperscript{11} A missionary of the American Board Commissioners for Foreign Missions (Congregational Church), who started both the Helping Hand for Native Girls Organization and the Bantu Men’s Social Centre. The Institute for Race Relations was constituted at his house in 1929. His book, \textit{The Bantu are Coming} appeared in 1930 (Beyers 1987:620).

\textsuperscript{12} See Figure 2 third row from front, just to the left of the middle of the row, a buxom lady in black.

\textsuperscript{13} He was grandson of the missionary genius John Bennie, known as the ‘father of Xhosa literacy’, and son of John Agnell Bennie, Free Church of Scotland minister at Lovedale. He later initiated the teaching of Xhosa at the University of Cape Town, and from 1930 on was involved in producing Xhosa literature for young people. He also revised the orthography of the Xhosa Bible, which was published posthumously (Beyers 1987:52f).
A family of six was spending in 1875 an average of 12.18s. on blankets and articles of apparel. In 1925, when the cost of these articles had increased greatly, it was spending only 2.3s.3d., which gives 7s.23d. per individual (Henderson in Yergan 1930:19).

Henderson also stressed the imperative for religious workers to concern themselves with economic objectives, and to place their expertise at the disposal of those non-religious organisations who were working to improve economic conditions, even at the risk of conceding the credit for it to the secular body. For him the Church should function 'seven days a week' in social and educational upliftment programmes (in Yergan 1930:20).

The call for an equitable economic order had further been addressed in the Introduction (Yergan 1930:16f) by Howard Pim, a chartered accountant who was a noted philanthropist and a Quaker lay worker among boys in Johannesburg. His philanthropic interests were wide-ranging. He was one of the founders of the Joint Councils movement, a former vice-mayor of Johannesburg, a nature lover, member of the Council of Fort Hare. His major concerns were the upliftment of the destitute and the criminal (Beyers 1987.V:650f). His talk would have followed the same lines. This paper, too, was supported by joint talks: by Miss Margaret Hodgson, of the History Department of Witwatersrand University, and by Professor D.D. Jabavu of Fort Hare. Miss Hodgson, who was also later to be a founder member of the Liberal Party of South Africa, was to achieve fame under her married name of Ballinger, as one of the four 'native representatives' in Parliament (Beyers 1987.V:26f). On this occasion her historical survey of parallels in labour enfranchisement in Britain and South Africa ended with a call for the recognition of black citizenship (Die Burger 2/7/1930:9). Her fellow speaker was the famous son of a famous father. D.D. Jabavu had been the first South African black to achieve a B.A. degree from the University of London. The refusal of the board of governors of Dale College, King Williamstown, in 1903, to accept him as student, had been one of the reasons why his father, John Tengu Jabavu, the educator and independent newspaper publisher, had led a campaign for the establishment of the 'South African Native College' at Fort Hare (Jabavu 1922:72-94). He had been the first academic appointee to this College (1915), and had followed his father's footsteps in the Classics, as well as branching out in Anthropology and African studies, thereby combining the Old World and the New (Beyers 1987.III:448; Mandela 1994:42,47).

We can guess the thrust of this session by examining Pim's paper (Yergan 1930:16f). In it he pointed out that a 1926 recommendation for a Commission to be appointed to carry out an economic survey of South Africa black people had not yet been obeyed, that such a commission would need to break new ground with regard to methods, and that its premise should be the economic unity of all, black and white,
under a common government in a single state, stressing that the ‘predominance of the social over the economic aspects of human life should not be forgotten’ (in Yergan 1930:16) and emphasising that black South Africans had an enormous capacity for development (in Yergan 1930:17). His call had been that the investigation preliminary to such an economic survey should proceed immediately. From a report in Die Burger of 2 July it would appear that some of his points would not be acceptable today as propagating racial stereotypes and accepting discriminating practices as ‘natural’: a call for whites to bear the expense of pass law administration, and not to inflict its costs on verskrikte naturelle (frightened natives). A later report gives more of the content of this session, including Miss Hodgson’s stress on the irrelevance of colour in what she reckoned should be seen as a class struggle. This report also emphasises Prof. Jabavu’s call for: ‘Tax according to ability and allocation of land according to need’ (Die Burger 7/7/1930:9).

The next topic clearly tied in with the previous one, and related to industrialisation. The co-secretary of the Johannesburg ‘Joint Council of Europeans and Bantu’, R.V. Selope Thema, added his voice to support a talk which had also appeared in printed form. The first speaker here was Miss Hodgson’s future husband, William Ballinger, the Scottish trade Unionist and prominent socialist who was organising for the Industrial Commercial Union, the strongest black union in South Africa at the time. He had himself been educated through the Workers’ Educational Association in Scotland, and later acquired a bursary for study in Denmark. Apparently, he came to South Africa with the intention of instituting a similar educational system for the upliftment of workers in trade and industry. Beyers (1987, V:28) portrays him as having a somewhat abrasive personality. His paper first gives a short socialist-style theoretical overview of the flaws of the capitalist system, and proceeds to show how South

---

14 A report was published soon after, and must already have been in existence, without its knowledge. Its principal thrust was the over-abundance of white labour and the under-supply of black labour. This is ascribed partly to the migratory (seasonal) nature of black labour, and the use of able-bodied men to do ‘women’s work’ as domestics, a point also touched on by Mrs Maxeke (see below). The report advocates raising living standards of rural blacks, employment of black women, and the deployment of black men in different areas, realocating certain jobs to whites (Die Burger 21/7/1930:7). To what degree this report influenced subsequent legislation is outside the scope of this paper.

15 He was later (1935) to join with Dr. A.B. Xuma and Z.R. Mahabano in founding the ‘All-African Convention’, which chose Prof. Jabavu as its president (Beyers 1987, V:955).

16 Die Burger of 10 July 1930 reports with relish that the private funds to support Mr. Ballinger’s appointment had run out and that the I.C.U. had been bankrupt for some time. See Beyers (1987, V:28) on differences between Ballinger and Clements Kadalie of the I.C.U.
African blacks are thrust ‘from Feudalism to Industrialism’. He lists, predictably, racial and tribal differences, legal and legislative bars, the lack of educational facilities and the lack of the franchise as the principle obstacles to the improvement of their conditions. The paper calls for a minimum living wage, and suggests questions for consideration, which range from the organisation of and part to be played by to the unions, the need for the redistribution of land, the responsibility of students to enlighten ‘their people’ (presumably both black and white) about such matters, and the need for Labour Colleges and similar bodies (Ballinger in Yergan 1930:26).

Only two of the seven days of the conference were devoted to social and economic matters, and the final session on the second day was again ‘devotional’, but with a difference. Two speakers addressed the practical application of the delegates’ faith to the burning matters at hand. The topic of ‘The Racial Question in the Light of Christ’s Teachings’ was treated first by Dr. A.B. Xuma, the well-known gynaecologist and obstetrician, member of the Joint Council in Johannesburg, and remarkable for the fact that in that same year the ANC had chosen him, a non-member, and in his absence, to join its executive (cf. Mandela 1994:passim17). According to Beyers (1987.V:994f), Dr. Xuma’s talk, entitled ‘The Breach in the Bridge between white and black’, compared circumstances of black people in South Africa with those in the U.S., and his conclusions were optimistic. Die Burger of 7 July comments on the speaker’s passion, and sees as his major contribution the observation that not ‘lawless Communists’ but the ‘laws of the land’ were turning the indigenous population into fertile soil for Communism to grow in.

Perhaps the most remarkable presentation at the conference was that of the second speaker in this session. It was more in the way of a confession than a scholarly paper. The printed version is predictably spiritual in its advocacy of Christian love and a search for truth in every person’s attitude to ‘the other’ (Brookes in Yergan 1930:27-29), but on his own evidence Professor Edgar Brookes deviated from this to recant much of what he had ever written before on the topic of race relations (Brookes 1977:43-45). He was an English speaker from Natal, an economist at the Transvaal University College (now University of Pretoria) who, on his own evidence, had been so impressed by the Afrikaner ‘struggle’ with which he became acquainted after his appointment at T.U.C., that he had argued in his doctoral thesis for ‘rights for all’ in the ‘separate development’ mould. Such advocacy out of the mouth of an English-speaker had been manna from heaven for the Afrikaner establishment. The

---

17 Soon after the conference he announced the ANC’s plans for the future, which would include recognition of detribalisation and the fact of permanent urbanisation of many black cities, where permanent markets would be encouraged (Die Burger 12/7/1930:3). He became its president again in 1940, led the Anti-Pass-Law Campaign in 1944, and was arrested but not charged during the ‘Treason Trial’-affair of 1958 (Beyers 1987.V:995).
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dissertation (Brookes 1924) had been published with funds made available by the Prime Minister J.B.M. Hertzog (Beyers 1987, V:98). Brookes had, however, after undertaking a visit to the American South, changed his attitude and was then further influenced by South African liberal political thinkers (who with him founded the Institute of Race Relations in 1929) and by Dr. F.N.D. Buchman of the Oxford Group. At the conference he now stood up officially to recant his own former thesis and to argue for economic integration (Brookes 1977:43-45)\textsuperscript{18}:

... I took the opportunity of standing up and publicly recanting—yes, I remember I used the word ‘recant’—the doctrines of separate development set forth in my History of Native Policy seven years before. I had now put apartheid behind me for ever .... [I had] the courage to get up and make this public statement. I am glad that I made it. It was leaping into cleaness.

For Brookes, this cleansing of the soul led to a lifetime of liberal activities and educational striving. His own personal catharsis helped him perhaps to understand the leap in thought that many of the young white delegates had undergone in the first few days of togetherness, but it was perhaps also this catharsis that spelled the death knell of the movement, as will become clear below. For the moment it was soberly reported in \textit{Die Burger} and his call for all students to commit themselves to a life of victory, also over prejudice, for white students to invite their black colleagues to a similar gathering, was conveyed without comment (\textit{Die Burger} 3/7/1930:6).

\textbf{Initial Reportage}

Initial reportage in \textit{Die Burger} appears fairly neutral, and was probably sent in by a delegate as ‘correspondent’. The first report appeared on the Wednesday of the conference, reporting on the Monday’s session on economics. Pim and Hodgson are neutrally reported, but Professor Jabavu’s talk, which laid blame on politicians for fostering misunderstanding, and a call for government intervention in the form of labour bureaux, was given the greatest emphasis by being the subject of a triple heading: ‘Politicians Taken to Task’/’Native Leader’s Outburst’/’Discussions at Conference’\textsuperscript{19}.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{18} Also in 1930 he collaborated with J.H. Hofmeyr, Ronald Currey, H. Ramsbottam, Rheinallt Jones, T.J. Haarhoff and Olive Schreiner on a book to celebrate 21 years of union (Brookes 1930:177,46). It was equally liberal in its advocacy of an integrated economy, even if its approach may now be found to be unpalatably paternalistic.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Die Polietisi (sic) Geroskam/Naturelleleier se Uitlating/Besprekings op Konferensie (Die Burger 2/7/1930:9).}}
The next day the newspaper gave its correspondent's fairly sober enthusiasm for the success of the conference, a (for the era) sensational twist by wrenching into a sub-heading the comment that 'Colour had been totally forgotten' (*Die Burger* 7/3/1930:6).

*Die Burger* next ran a much longer report, dated 2 July, with a colourless triple headline giving the topic and thrust of the conference. It carried a résumé of several of the talks, among others, Pim's, and short thumbnail sketches of some of the speakers, including Mrs Maxeke. Racist terminology is unselfconsciously applied to the venerable lady\(^{20}\), but the report itself is obviously positively meant and shows appreciation for her multilingualism, good humour and intelligence. The reporter's assertion that the Tuesday of the conference had seen 'stormclouds appearing' is not borne out by the report itself, which is redolent with the obvious good humour that prevailed. This rather ingenious report\(^{21}\) manages to convey the general atmosphere and anyone who has experienced the weariness of a week-long conference will recognise the mood that lay behind the 'loud cheers' that greeted Professor Brookes, as the last speaker on the fifth day.

Reportage in the official organ of the Dutch Reformed Church (to which perhaps more than half the white student delegates belonged) was not long in forthcoming. The first report appeared on July 16, some two weeks after delegates had returned home, in the same edition of *Die Kerkbode* that carried a longer article on a schools' SCA conference held in June at Cradock, and apparently attended by white high school students only. The article on the Fort Hare conference, by Rev. J.W.L. (Lou) Hofmeyr, was the first in a series of six, running weekly from July 16 through August 20. These were wholly positive, and, while purporting to give an overview of the entire proceedings, treated one topic each week, in turn. These were:

I  Composition and Purpose: "To Decide what Jesus would have Done—how to Apply the Golden Rule";

II  The Greatest Problem of our Time: 'How to live in Peace with One Another';

III  Greetings from the British, American and Indian (*sic*) Associations;

IV  The De-tribalised Native (*sic*) in the Cities: A Call for Black Cities 'near European (*sic*) Cities' (and grateful recognition for those already established, also an analysis of Mrs Maxeke's talk and approving report on her call for black-white women's councils);

---

\(^{20}\) Unrepeatable in this day and age. Remarkably, when quoting speakers, the writer refers to 'young men' and 'girls', (*ongetroude jong mans and meisies*), an uncommon practice at a time when pejorative racist terminology prevailed, in apparent unconsciousness, in most situations.

\(^{21}\) The writer was naively pleased that the black students had called for a hymn in Dutch (Afrikaans was not yet used in religious exercises at the time).
V The Rural Native (sic), with Positive Report of Mr. Malliwanse’s (sic) Talk on Land Reform;
VI Means to Improve Race Relations: ‘What Will be the Result of all this Discussion?’

This last section (Die Kerkbode 20/7/1930) gave a glowing account of barriers broken down, co-operation promised, friendships forged, penfriends and book lending envisaged, determination of black and Afrikaner to learn each other’s language, promises to eradicate prejudice and racist language, and appreciation for the need to recognise one another as fellow South Africans.

The outcry
Alas, except in the lives of some individuals perhaps, this good work and good will were soon undone. Already on July 11 the first negative rumbling appeared in the letter columns of Die Burger. ‘Jong Afrikaner’ from Agter-Paarl wrote, decrying ‘so-called professors’ who were trying to remove the barriers between black and white. Already, this first letter carries all the hallmarks of racist rhetoric: ‘Old Jim sleeping with my sister’, Palestine as the hub of the world, whence Ham moved into Africa and subservience, black ‘ingratitude’ for white ‘munificence’, the provision of unappreciated free education, ‘a call to drive the white man into the sea’, Voortrekker independence, the oorloos (foreign) ignorance of these liberal professors, philanthropy without indulgence exercised by noble leaders of the past like George Grey, and a call for segregation. This writer sounds as if he had ‘read the book’. The letter is a classic example of uninformed prejudice.

Ten days were to pass before the next letter was published, together with a reply from Professor B.B. Keet of Stellenbosch Theological Seminary, and F.J. Liebenberg, General Secretary of the SCA. It had clearly been held back until their reply could be prepared. The rhetoric of the correspondent is even more excessive. Another factor was involved: the writer accused Die Burger of having been led by the nose and of participating in the encouragement of ‘abhorrent practices’ such as mixed

---

22 The matter enjoyed considerable reportage in other journals as well (e.g. Het Zoeklicht, paper of the DR Mission, 15 July 1930), but I wish to keep to these two, in order to trace the nuances of establishment Afrikaner thought on the matter.

23 Die Burger of 19 July reports a meeting of the inter-varsity ‘Students’ Parliament’ where land reform was discussed. It is not possible to ascertain how many of those involved had been influenced by the Fort Hare conference, but there does seem to have been a spirit of openness about the discussion, which may indicate positive influence.
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sports. Advocates of these things, he said, were clearly ‘SAP supporters’\(^{24}\). The language of this letter does not bear repeating. The writer was afraid of the broadening influence of the conference, and reported in veiled language a schools’ SCA meeting addressed by a returned delegate (his hints were clear enough to achieve near-identification of place, educational provenance and identity of this young zealot). His less than veiled references to Fort Hare College as institution, to Mr. Yergan as a black American and to the ideals of the Conference make disturbing reading, even after more than sixty-five years, as does his attack on the Students’ Christian Association and its influence at white schools of his time. The reply was dignified and to the point:

The tone of the diatribe is aimed at confusing the reading public, the SCA does not reply to anonymous accusations, but calls for the writer to come forward openly to discuss his objections, and the general readership should not allow itself to be influenced by such a letter.

The reference to the SAP must have stung *Die Burger* to the quick. Four days later appeared a second level editorial, entitled ‘Playing with Fire’ (*’n Gespeel met Vuur*). It chose as the object of its criticism Prof. Brookes’ call for the desegregation of universities, as being the place where black and white should meet. It referred to the logical conclusion, only to deny it, that desegregation of education would lead to interracial friendship: the editor of *Die Burger* reckoned that interracial antagonism would arise from perceptions of inequality of rights, but did not conclude that this anomaly could be ended by the awarding of equal rights. Inequality remained axiomatic and segregation was the only way to keep black students pacified. The editor went on to question the wisdom of the social mixing at the conference and ended with a flourished generalisation:

The precedent created in a moment of thoughtless enthusiasm and in an artificial atmosphere, can easily have the result that the vital condition for the preservation of white civilization in S.A. could be affected, to the eventual detriment of both whites and natives.

He left his readers with the question whether it was safe to leave interracial consultation in the hands of persons ‘prepared to play with fire’. Here, too, the rhetoric is

\(^{24}\) The South African Party of Gen. Jannie Smuts were the sworn political enemies of the National Party, of which *Die Burger* still is the official mouthpiece.
familiar and the logic unimpeachable, if the basic premises of the writer are not questioned, as we now do. Its influence on its readership was devastating.

The next letter-writer was less vitriolic than the first two. ‘Questioner’ (‘n Uitvraer) from Stellenbosch criticised the Stellenbosch theologian Du Plessis for having written that the fear of ‘Equalization’ (Gelykstelling) was a chimaera that had been buried at Fort Hare. This obviously more educated (but less logical) writer quoted Dr. Eiselen\(^{25}\) on the ‘danger’ of equality as leading to French-type assimilation, and he launched a polished attack on Du Plessis’ ‘death of a chimaera’ as meaning the end of the ‘volk’—and as laying a new burden on ministers of the Church. This he contrasted with Hertzog’s ‘admirable policy of segregation’ and he called for a successor to take over when ‘the hero weakened at last’, as weaken he must in his position as ‘sole political defender of South Africa’. The threads of his argument are difficult to distinguish, but the smoothness of his prose could have swayed many (\textit{Die Burger} 12/7/1930).

Two days later the second-level editorial was again devoted to Fort Hare, and now \textit{Die Burger} coined an alliterative phrase that was hereafter to be substituted for the official designation of the conference: ‘\textit{n Flater van Fort Hare} (‘A Blunder at Fort Hare’). Apparently Edgar Brooks had said in an interview with an Anglican Church journal:

> The white students were not segregated, but ate together, prayed together, played together, and shared the same roof. It is good that this should be known .... The students are aware that they flouted convention, but the fire of liberalism is burning high in our land ...\(^{26}\).

The editor went on to call upon the executive of the Students’ Christian Association to clarify the issue ‘in the interests of the Association itself’. This editorial is a model of insidious rhetoric: subtle \textit{praeteritio} ‘it refuses to believe’ (\textit{koester vir geen oomblik die gedagte}) that the Association approves of such ‘social egalitarianism’. There is no real English equivalent available to convey the pejorative connotation of the Afrikaans \textit{saamboerdery} (perhaps ‘bundling together’), a word loaded with a heavily negative

\(^{25}\) Of later Eiselen-report fame, the basis of the notorious ‘Bantu Education Act’ of 1953. Brookes and Macaulay (1958:114) comment that the good work of the Booker Washington Tuskegee Institute, with its motto ‘Separate but equal’, could spawn an Eiselen Commission, perpetuating tribal and linguistic differences.

\(^{26}\) \textit{Die Burger} (14/8/1930:6), here retranslated from an Afrikaans translation of Brookes' words.
meaning, which was hereafter frequently to feature in the rhetoric. As the Afrikaans saying goes: the fat was now in the fire—and it was not the ‘fire of liberalism’, Brookes himself wrote, forty-seven years later,

... one afternoon there was a rugby football match between the whites and the Africans present. So far the Afrikaans-speaking world had looked on the conference with growing uneasiness, but this was too much, for Calvinism, apartheid and rugby are the threefold cord of Afrikanerdom (Brookes 1977:45).

This is in hindsight. A scant three years after the event, when he delivered the Stokes-Phelps lectures at the University of Cape Town, he was more sanguine (1933:17f):

The chief articles of the charge against those responsible for the Conference were the common meals at which black and white students sat side by side, and fraternization on the playing fields. It may not even now be generally known that this process of ‘de-segregation’, as it has been happily termed, was a spontaneous act of the students themselves, who broke down the perhaps too timid arrangements for conventional separation made by those responsible for the Conference.

This was borne out by the words of a student from the Missionary Institute at Wellington, W. Wessels, one of the few letter writers openly defending the matter. He gave a careful exposition of what Brookes called the ‘too timid arrangements’ and explained how it came about that he relinquished his original intention to ‘eat at a separate table’. He described four categories of games, at all of which the black students beat the white. His comment on the rugby match is revealing of a conventional attitude scarcely conceivable today:

---

27 This editorial was questioned and criticised in the editorial of the September edition of Nusas, the official journal of the National Union of South African Students, which approvingly quoted Leo Marquard as saying ‘Students are Revolting’ (reported in Die Burger 2/9/1930), but by December the Nusas executive felt obliged to publish a disclaimer of any responsibility in the matter, and to any opinion on it. This was reported in Die Burger of 23 December, and on the next day it carried a résumé of the comment by Die Volksblad (Bloemfontein) that Nusas had left the SCA ‘holding the baby’, and relating the Fort Hare incident to what it considered an ‘equally serious’ declaration by the Nusas ‘Students’ Parliament’ in favour of ‘free love’ (Die Burger 23/12/1930).

28 Brookes (1933:17). The speaker continues with an interesting comment: ‘Only in 1932 did a similar “de-segregation” of a prominent Native leader take place on a South African-bound mail steamer, at the initiative of the returning South African International Rugby Team.’
All honour to Mr. Howard Pim that he stopped a football match that had been arranged by the students between themselves\(^{29}\).

Wessels stated that he himself disapproved of the interracial ‘pillow fighting’ event, as being a ‘contact sport’, but referred to all other games of this nature occurring daily on farms, where black and white children played together\(^{30}\). Another participant, signing himself Afgevaardigde (Delegate), writing on 11 September, told of participating in the long jump, but not the rugby.

It is clear that after 14 August Die Burger was on the warpath. The polemic continued on the letter pages with a series of defence and rebuttal\(^{31}\) but the battle lines drawn on the editorial pages were now extended to the pages carrying news. A first informal letter by Professor H.P. Cruse, vice-president of the Association, describing the conference and explaining its aims, conduct and results, was published on an inside news page (Die Burger 21/8/1930), with the comment that the executive of the SCA would be meeting in December only, after which a ‘code of conduct’ (vaste gedragslyn) would be announced. The implication was that a code was needed. In this time the enthusiastic and positive series of weekly reports by Lou Hofmeyr in Die Kerkbode was just running out, and that the journal on 27 August had a short comment on the fact that there had been some unhappiness about ‘small matters that some of us could not approve’ (dingetjies ... wat sommige van ons nie kan goedkeur nie) but calling for appreciation for and a continuation of the newly positive attitude engendered by the conference. Die Kerkbode never did express itself more strongly, either for or against, the matter.

\(^{29}\) Alle eer kom Mnr. Howard Pim toe dat hy ’n wedstryd in voetbal stopgesit het wat onder die studente onderling gereël was (Die Burger 10/9/1930).

\(^{30}\) This was severely criticised by ‘Jong Afrikaner of Agter Paarl’, in a vitriolic diatribe which was based largely on the argument ‘the blacks don’t want it anyway’, and hauling up Piet Retief as example of guilelessness (Die Burger 12/9/1930).

\(^{31}\) Pro: Rev. W.S. Conradie of Grahamstown, who ‘had been there and seen no harm’ (Die Burger 3/9/1930); D.F.B. de Beer of Cape Town (Die Burger 26/9/1930) (see below). Con: ‘Belangstellende’ (Interested) (Die Burger 12/9/1930); ‘Jong Afrikaner’ (Young Afrikaner) (Die Burger 12/9/1930); J.J. van Zyl of Tarkastad, who considered the white students’ participation as ‘n vernedering (a humiliation/demeaning) (Die Burger 3/10/1930; Fred Hattingh of Stellenbosch, who called for continued segregation as obedience to the command ‘honour thy father and mother’, Die Burger (3/10/1930); G.D.J. Venter of Bloemhof, who attacked de Beer and the communal Communion celebrations (Die Burger 17/10/1930).
Recantation
On August 30 the SCA Executive met at Stellenbosch, and its declaration, signed by Prof. B.B. Keet, its President, and F.J. Liebenberg, its general secretary, was published as ‘news’ on page 7 of Die Burger of 11 September. A four-tiered headline appears innocuous:

Rapprochement was needed at Fort Hare Congress/Right attitude had to be created for discussions/SCA Executive answers/Eating together justified by unusual circumstances?

The insidious question mark at the end of the last sub-heading immediately undercut any impression of neutrality. Turning to the leader editorial of the same date, we find an alliterative flourish in its heading: Die Flater Vergoeilik\(^{32}\). The editorial itself gave a deconstruction of the various arguments, and quoted the unfortunate Wessels’ letter of the previous day, as indication of the corruption and decadence of the proceedings at Fort Hare. The leader’s most positive point, and one with which modern readers can agree, is that the SCA declaration was too concerned to try to counter the newspaper’s own earlier criticism by careful hedging and damage control: ‘that it had not been so bad, that life would go on as usual, the white students, as guests, could not have behaved differently, given the circumstances’. The SCA declaration does strike one as timid, and its last paragraph even went so far as to enjoin members to observe greater care in the future\(^{33}\).

The leader editorial of the next day, September 12, continued the attack under the heading Maatskaplike Segregasie (social segregation). It called into question the polarisation of attitudes, decrying the kind of attitude that considers that there is no mid-way between racial hatred and indiscriminate fraternisation. It then went on to stigmatise all that had occurred at Fort Hare as being examples of the latter extreme, which it continued to criticise in strong terms, wrenching out of context the words of the English missionary author Oldham to ‘prove’ that social integration was impossible and unacceptable. Here the editor was redefining the issue, setting his own parameters in a binary trap, and then pushing his opponents into the corner he wished to see them\(^{34}\). This rhetorical ploy was countered a fortnight later by Rev. D.F.B. de Beer of

\(^{32}\) ‘The blunder glossed over’. Afrikaans f and v are identically pronounced.

\(^{33}\) Mrs Latsky comments on this that the SCA was in the end fighting for its very continuation, and without such a recantation, it would most probably have been forced to disband. This did occur, under similar circumstances, some thirty-five years later.

\(^{34}\) See de Kock (1995:65f) for similar examples.
Cape Town, who quoted Oldham more fully, showing that Oldham’s thrust had been to show the absolute imperative for Christians not to allow for barriers between man and man, (Die Burger 26/9/1930). On the whole, however, more letters were published condemning than defending the proceedings at Fort Hare.

By October 1, Die Burger had succeeded in persuading its readership (which included many members of Dutch Reformed Church councils). On the same day Die Kerkbode carried, and Die Burger reported, a repudiation of the conference by the Church Council of the Stellenbosch DRC. The statement called in the usual terms for the finding of solutions to racial conflict, affirmed its adherence to the missionary ideal, but ‘feared that missionaries’ work would have been harmed’ by the events at Fort Hare. On 24 October Die Burger called a halt to further correspondence on the matter, with the publication of a defence of the conference by J.H. van Schalkwyk of Ermelo, who took the paper to task for its ‘unchristian’ spirit in its criticism of the event. This correspondent’s arguments appear as typical of his time, and in some ways illiberal, but it is interesting that Die Burger chose to close the polemic on a relatively positive note.

Correspondence in Die Kerkbode, a weekly, continued longer, presumably also because its readership was geographically more widespread, and postal services were slow. A writer from Bethal Mission Station, Transvaal, in December 1930 questioned the ability of black and white truly to have understood one another, ‘as so few whites were familiar with the African languages’, an admirable sentiment, but clearly based on a total misconception of the linguistic and academic atmosphere at the ‘black’ University. Another letter, published a week later, also from a missionary, from Senan, Sudan, appears even more disturbing, reflecting, as it did, an extremely illiberal attitude. The writer quoted with approval the leader of Die Burger of 12 September and joined in its criticism of the declaration by the SCA Executive. He ended by calling for the DRC to take a stand.

55 A veteran missionary, van Schalkwyk nevertheless adhered to establishment thought, for, on his own admission, practical reasons, but he did argue for contact between white and black, if only for the sake of academic ‘research’. He admitted that Christianity could not justify segregation, but deplored the prominence Prof. Brookes had given to the social mixing, which he deemed a minor matter (‘n bysaak’). He stressed the need for the intelligentsia to meet, while pointing to ‘more serious evils’—immorality and miscegenation, where white also met with black (Die Burger 24/10/1930:11).

56 Hendrik Hofmeyr (Die Kerkbode 12/12/1930).

57 J.J.A. Malherbe (Die Kerkbode 17/12/1930). My research did not produce any further official declaration by the DRC, but Die Kerkbode of 11 February 1931 carried a report by Rev. T.J. Kotze, official students’ chaplain of the DRC, on the spirit prevalent at the SCA Council meeting held at the Strand in December 1930, declaring himself satisfied with the attitudes of student participants.
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This call had in part been answered by the Stellenbosch DR parish on October 1 1930. An official statement by the Full Council of the SCA had, however, also been published. When the Council met in the Strand from 17 to 20 December 1930, the students were fully conscious of the weight of establishment disapproval that had been brought to bear. The chair at this meeting was the Professor Cruse who had been one of the participants. One can imagine that he too, experienced pressure. Their declaration was published in Die Kerkbode of 4 February 1931. It ratified the October 1 letter published by the Executive, and added two resolutions: that it would in future be more careful of ‘national feeling’ (volksgevoel) and that it acknowledged ‘the fact of existing racial differences’ (die feit van bestaande rasseverskille). With regard to this second resolution, it quoted a declaration by the Executive of the ‘South African Native College Students’ Christian Association’, who, while restating their determination to work for social justice for all, and welcoming all offers of help or invitations from the white section of society, ‘did not wish to insist on intimate social contact’38. Again one is left speechless at the tact with which the black students accommodated the timidity of their white counterparts.

Conclusion
And so the new-found unity was dissipated. The men and women at this conference were in some cases the leaders, black and white, in intellectual thought and politics for the next three decades. Some, like Edgar Brookes and the Ballingers, went on to fulfil a calling to work for justice for all, others in the conference movement went on to less spectacular careers of service39, but others, we can imagine, were scared off from any further attempt to continue the lines of discourse opened at the Conference. Only during the Sixties were similar attempts at interracial student contact explored by the SCA, and after the second of these, what had been feared after Fort Hare took place, and the unity of the Association was dissolved.

The leader editorial in Die Burger of 11 September 1930 had as its final clincher a rhetorical adynaton: would these white students, it asked, be holding a similar conference at Stellenbosch in the next year, to which black students would be invited as their guests? On Saturday, 9 July 1995 while still working on this paper, as I came from my office in the Old Main Building of the University of Stellenbosch, my head

38 Die Burger letter writer W. Wessels had, in his justification of the proceedings, also given the bizarre information that Mrs Maxeke based a belief in separate heavens for black and white on her reading of John 14:2 (Die Burger 10/9/1930).

39 Miss Boshoff retired as head of Child Welfare in Cape Town in 1965, her sister devoted a lifetime, with her husband, ministering to the poor in St. Stephen’s DRC, Cape Town.
dazed with disturbing phrases and images from the racism of most of the letters I had been reading, a rainbow throng of young people poured from the university theatre—they were attending a conference of the National Party Youth League. I could not help reflecting on the lost years.  
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STUDENTS' CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION
OF SOUTH AFRICA

Bantu-European Students' Conference
Fort Hare

27th June to 3rd July, 1930.

Programme of Conference.
(Subject to alteration if necessary)

N.B. Unless otherwise stated all meetings of the full conference will be held in the hall of the Christian Union at Fort Hare.

Friday, June 27th

4.30 p.m. Opening Ceremony of the new "Christian Union."
          (See special programme for full details).

       6.00 p.m. Supper.

       7.45 p.m. AT LOVEDALE.

OPENING OF CONFERENCE

(a) Welcome to Delegates and Visitors.
       The Magistrate. The Mayor.
       The Principal of Lovedale.
       The Principal of the South African Native College.

(b) Installation of the Chairman of the Conference.

(c) Opening Address,
       by Mr Jan H. Hofmeyr, M.P.

9.30-9.45 p.m. Evening Devotions.
Saturday, June 28th

9.00-9.45 p.m. Devotional Period
led by the Rev. A. Cardross Grant (Warden of St. Matthew’s College).

10.00-11.00 a.m. Address: “The Revelation of God the Eternal.”

11.30-12.30 p.m. Fraternal Greetings from the Indian, British and American Student Christian Movements.
Prof. A.M.K. Cumaraswamy (of Trinity College, Kandy, Ceylon).
Mr John Ramsbotham (of Cambridge University, England).
Dr George E. Haynes (of New York, U.S.A.)

1.00 p.m. Dinner.

2.30-2.45 p.m. Discussion of the morning address.

7.30-8.30 p.m. Address: “The Unique Revelation of God in Christ.”
Rev. R.H.W. Shepherd (of Lovedale).

8.30-8.45 p.m. Evening Devotions.

Sunday, June 29th

9.00-9.45 a.m. A period on Bible Study, conducted by Professor H.P. Cruse (University of Stellenbosch).

10.00-10.30 a.m. Communion Services, as announced.

11.00-12.00 p.m. Address: “What does God Require of the Individual?”
Rev. Allen Lea (President of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference of South Africa).

12.00 p.m. Council & Staff meeting

12.45 p.m. Dinner.

3.30 p.m. AT LOVEDALE.
Dr H.P. Cruse presiding.
Address: “Present day Life and Thought amongst Students.”
Mr Francis P. Miller (Chairman of the World’s Student Christian Federation).

7.15 p.m. AT LOVEDALE.
Address: “The Christian Ideal for Human Society to-day.”
Dr George E. Haynes, (Secretary of the Federal Council of Churches of N. America.)

8.30 p.m. Evening Devotions.
Monday, June 30th

9.00 a.m. Devotional Period,
led by Dr D. Moorrees (Minister of the Dutch Reformed Church for
work amongst students).

9.30-10.45 a.m. Address: “Conditions among urban Bantu.”
Address: “Social Conditions among Bantu Women and Girls.”
Mrs. Charlotte Maxeke (of Johannesburg).

11.15-1.00 p.m. Discussion of the above addresses in full conference.

1.15 p.m. Dinner.

2.30 p.m. Sports.

7.15 p.m. Addresses: “Bantu Rural Life.”
Mr T. Makwane (of the Transkeian Agricultural Department).
Mr W.G. Bennie (formerly Chief Inspector of Native Schools).
Discussion in full conference.

9.15-9.30 p.m. Evening Devotions

Tuesday, July 1st

9.00 a.m. Devotional Period,
led by the Rev. Edwin N. Ncwana (of Pietermaritzburg).

9.30-11.00 a.m. Addresses: “An Equitable Economic Order.”
Mr Howard Prim (of Johannesburg).
Miss M.L. Hodgson (of the Witwatersrand University).
Mr D.D.T. Jabavu (of Fort Hare).

11.30-1.00 p.m. Address “Industrialization and the Bantu.”
Mr R.V. Selope Thema (co-Secretary of the Johannesburg Joint Council
of Europeans and Bantu).

1.15 p.m. Dinner.

2.30-4.00 p.m. Discussion of the morning’s addresses in full conference and in groups.
Mr W.G. Ballinger (adviser to the I.C.U.)

7.45-9.15 p.m. AT LOVEDALE
Address: “The Racial Question in the Light of Christ’s Teachings.”
Dr A.B. Xuma (of Johannesburg).
Prof. Edgar H. Brookes (of the Transvaal University College, Pretoria).

9.15-9.30 p.m. Evening Devotions.
Wednesday, July 2nd

9.00 a.m. Devotional Period,
   led by the Rev. G.H.P Jacques (Ex-President of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference of South Africa).

9.30-10.00 a.m. Business Meeting.

10.00-11.00 a.m. Address: “The Witness of the Ages to God's Gift of Power.”
   Mr Max Yergan (of the Students' Christian Association).

11.30-1.00 p.m. Discussion: “How can students and others work for the Victory of God’s Cause in the World?”

1.15 p.m. Dinner.

6.45 p.m. Address: “The Influence of Christ in the Life of a People.”
   Prof. A.M.K. Cumaraswamy (of Ceylo).

9.15-9.30 p.m. Evening Devotions.

Thursday, July 3rd

9.00 a.m. Devotional Period,
   led by the Rt. W. Mpamba (Moderator of the Bantu Presbyterian Church).

9.30-11.30 a.m. Address: “The Life of Love.”
   Mr Oswin Bull.

10.30-11.30 a.m. Closing Period.
   Address: Mr Francis P. Miller (Chairman of Conference).
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