

https://dspace.org/

Segregation, science and commissions of enquiry: The contestation of native education policy in South Africa 1930-36

Krige, Sue

1996-04-29
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/9009

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED SOCIAL RESEARCH

SEMINAR PAPER
TO BE PRESENTED IN RICHARD WARD BUILDING
SEVENTH FLOOR, SEMINAR ROOM 7003
AT 4 PM ON THE **29 APRIL 1996**

TITLE: Segregation, Science and Commissions of Enquiry: The Contestation of Native Education Policy in South Africa 1930-36

BY: **SUE KRIGE**

NO: 398

SEGREGATION, SCIENCE AND COMMISSIONS OF ENQUIRY: THE CONTESTATION OF NATIVE EDUCATION POLICY IN SOUTH AFRICA 1930-36

BY SUE KRIGE
(Education Department, University of the Witwatersrand)

Paper for Institute of Advanced Social Research Seminar
29 April 1996

DRAFT: DO NOT QUOTE

INTRODUCTION:

This paper focuses on debates around African education which emerged from two State initiated commissions and an education conference in the period 1930-1936: the 1932 Natives Economic Commission (NEC), the 1935-6 Interdepartmental Committee into Native Education (Welsh Committee) and the New Education Fellowship (NEF) Conference of 1934. The paper highlights the responses of the English-speaking Protestant missions to two major and intermeshing trends which affected African education during this period, secularisation and segregation. In the history of South African education, a clear but neglected theme which emerges in the period after the First World War is the desire of the mission churches to resist State control, and to retain control of their schools in terms of administration, appointment of staff and curriculum content. Implicit in the struggle over control of African education were important issues such as the location and nature of expertise, what constitutes worthwhile knowledge, the most appropriate schooling system for imparting knowledge and the political consequences of such policy. Through the lens of debates around African education, global and colonial trends such as the rise of science, the secularisation of knowledge and the concomitant emergence of the "expert" can be seen. This paper argues that church responses to these trends incorporated more than merely an outdated reliance on nineteenth century Cape liberalism and notions of assimilation. They drew on an emerging critique of segregation and the illiberal use of science and expertise which emerged both from South Africa and from the British colonial experience elsewhere in Africa.

The paper takes its lead from Fleisch's work on the impact of Teacher's College at Columbia University on an emerging professional elite in education, including CT Loram, EG Malherbe and PAW Cook, in South Africa. His work has added a major dimension to the study of the way ideas about science, anthropology, efficiency and psychology were interpreted by this particular intellectual elite for South Africa during the inter-war years.[1] The paper also draws on literature on the struggles between church, state and the indigenous people in British colonies elsewhere in Africa which has highlighted tensions over secularisation and the

[1] B Fleisch, "The Teachers College Club: American Educational Discourse and the Origins of Bantu Education in South Africa, 1914-1951" (Unpublished Phd, Columbia University 1995); B Fleisch, "Social Scientists as Policy Makers: EG Malherbe and the National Bureau for Educational and Social Research, 1929-1943", *Journal Of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 21, No 3, Sept 1995, 349-374.

influence of American ideas.[2] Shingler's neglected early work on secularisation in South African education provided important insights which have been expanded on here. [3] Of significance too are the ideas of Adam Ashforth on the role of commissions of enquiry in establishing who could claim to be an expert and in "silencing unauthorised political voices". He argues that

> [M]issionary discourse was fragmented and variegated; hopelessly so for the modern South African state-makers of the early twentieth century ... Part of the process of solving the 'Native Question' ... involved establishing a capacity to speak of 'Natives' independently of missionaries. [4]

PART 1 : THE LEGACY OF CT LORAM, OBJECTIVE EXPERT

The legacy of CT Loram, Teacher's College alumnus, during the period 1918-1930 has yet to be fully evaluated. [5] Elsewhere it has been argued that Loram, as Chief Inspector of Native Education in Natal, member of the Native Affairs Commission (NAC) and founder of the Joint Council movement represented the intrusion of secular forces, both in and outside the central State on the mission

---

[2] S Sivonen, *White Collar or Hoe Handle ? African Education Under British Colonial Policy 1920-45* (Helsinki, 1995); S Ball, "Imperialism, social control and the colonial curriculum in Africa", *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, Vol 15, 1983; J Mangan, ed., *The Imperial Curriculum: Racial Images and Education in the British Colonial Experience* (London, 1993); J Anderson, *The Struggle for the School: The Interaction of Missionary, Colonial Government and Nationalist Enterprise in the Development of Formal Education in Kenya* (London, 1970)

[3] J. Shingler, "Education and the Political Order in South Africa, 1902-1961" (D Phil thesis, Yale University, 1973).

[4] A Ashforth, *The Politics of Official Discourse in Twentieth Century South Africa* (Oxford, 1990), 6, 26-7.

[5] For early attempts see R Heyman, "CT Loram: a South African Liberal in Race Relations", *International Journal of African Historical Studies*, 5 (1972); R. Hunt Davis Junior, "Charles T Loram and the American Model for African Education in South Africa", in P Kallaway, ed., *Apartheid and Education* (Johannesburg, 1984). More recently, Shapiro and Fleisch have examined aspects of Loram's career. See K Shapiro, "Doctors or Medical Aids - The Debate over the training of Black Medical Personnel for the Rural Black Population in South Africa in the 1920s and 1930s", *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 13/2 (January 1987) and Fleisch, "Teachers College Club", Chapter 3.

dominated area of African education. [6]

Loram's work in Natal was based on principles developed at Teachers' College, Columbia University, articulated in his book, *The Education of the South African Native,* published in 1917. His reforms of African education involved attempts to extend State control over African schools and develop a secular, scientifically conceived "adapted" curriculum. In doing so, he excluded the missions completely. [7] His appointment as expert advisor to the government in the NAC in 1920, involvement in two subsequent Phelps-Stokes Commissions into education in Africa and founding role in the Joint Council movement, enabled him to attempt to set precedents in the secularisation of state and private welfare work on a grander scale.

The Phelps-Stokes commissioners' love affair with the Hampton-Tuskegee model for Negro education and with Thomas Jesse Jones' "Four Essentials of Education" which made up the "adapted education" solution to the "Native problem" in Africa in general has been well documented. Its racist assumptions have been clearly demonstrated, but its claims to be a modernising secular scientific model have not merited much mention. James Anderson makes the point that the model was essentially one which Northern businessmen, including the trustees of foundations like Phelps-Stokes and Carnegie, attempted to impose on Southern Negro education and that it was by no means accepted by African Americans and White church leaders in the South. Much of the critique of its approach was constructed in Christian "Social Gospel" terms. [8] Its application to colonial Africa was also resisted by missions and by the indigenous elites, both for its secular nature and for its racist assumptions. The most extended critique of this nature came from Christian educationist, Victor Murray, Professor of Education at the University of Hull. Murray had been involved in two investigations of colonial education in the late 1920s. [9] His ideas drew on notions of the Social Gospel and its role in social

---

[6] See S Krige, "'Solving the Native Problem': Experts, Missions and African Education 1920-1929" in P Kallaway and A Paterson eds., *The Bible and the Slate,* forthcoming.

[7] S Krige, "'Trustees and Agents of the State' ? Missions and the Formation of Policy Towards African Education, 1910-1920" (Unpublished African Studies Seminar Paper, April 1993); Fleisch, "Teachers College Club", Chapter 4.

[8] JD Anderson, The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860 - 1935 (The University of North Carolina Press: 1988), Chapter 2.

[9] Sivonen, *White Collar,* 106.

reconstruction and meshed closely with South African critics of segregation and "adapted" education. The historian WM Macmillan was a close friend of Murray.[10]

In South Africa, Loram had come into direct conflict with the "amateur" missions and related individuals in African education. In 1925, using ideas presented in the Phelps-Stokes reports, he drew up a set of guidelines for a secular and scientific "adapted" form of education for Africans which the NEC was later to interpret as providing the rationale for its own recommendations. These were fiercely resisted by the Eastern Cape based Association of Heads of Native Institutions.[11]

Apart from the Association of Heads of Native Institutions, the mission educators used the Provincial Native Education Advisory Boards to put pressure the State and to exercise control over the direction of African education. Paterson argues that the formation of Native Education Advisory Boards had its origin in attempts to "institutionalise missionary influence" in the face of increasing bureaucratization, secularisation on one hand and the burgeoning African independent church movement on the other.[12] The Boards varied in composition, but by the early 1930s they were dominated by mission representatives and included Provincial Education Department officials, Chief Inspectors of Native Education, Joint Council members and African Teacher Association representatives.

Ironically, Loram was not party to the intense debates of the early 1930s, except from afar. In 1929, Loram resigned from the NAC and returned to the Natal Education Department. When the Natives Economic Commission was established, he offered his services, but was rejected by the Minister of Native Affairs, EG Jansen.[13] He left South Africa to take up a post at Yale University. Loram's alienation from Hertzog and Jansen had much to do with the decline in the importance of the NAC under the Pact Government. Loram told Malherbe that the NAC was no longer of any use once Hertzog had

---

[10] A Victor Murray, *The School in the Bush: A Critical Study of the Theory and Practice of Native Education in Africa* (London, 1929). Murray acknowledged Macmillan's help in the introduction.

[11] See Krige, "'Solving the Native Problem'".

[12] A. Paterson, "Contest and Co-option: The Struggle for Schooling in the African Independent Churches of the Cape Colony, c 1895-1920" (Unpublished D. Phil, University of Cape Town, 1992), 117-128.

[13] KCA, Malherbe Papers, KCM 57030, File 619/1 (70), C.T. Loram Circular Letter 30 July 1931.

made "the Native Question .... a matter of politics".[14] His perceived role as objective expert was over.

With Loram's departure, the NAC was no longer the centralising force and lobbying point for African education which it had been during the 1920s. The Great Depression and the drought had a devastating effect on African education. By late 1929 and early 1930, the total expenditure on African development began to exceed the revenue of the Native Development Fund (NDF), and by 1933 the NAC declared the NDF to be bankrupt. [15] Faced with concerned missionary memoranda and pressure from the Advisory Boards, EG Jansen argued that he could not address the crisis until the Natives Economic Commission had made its Report.

PART 2: SOCIAL EDUCATION, ANTHROPOLOGY AND EDUCATION ADAPTATIONS: THE NATIVES ECONOMIC COMMISSION (NEC) OF 1932 AND THE NEW EDUCATION FELLOWSHIP CONFERENCE OF 1934

The NEC Report focused on education as the key to the development of the reserves. Ashforth maintains that the NEC was informed by demands that the "Native Problem" be approached scientifically, which included the use of economic experts and the insights of anthropology. The Report contended that the principal locus of the "native problem", and undesirable and uncontrolled urbanisation in particular, was in the reserves. Ashforth also points out that there was an assumption of homogeneity in the African population which implicitly denied the legitimacy of the African "middle class struggle to defend and extend their limited rights of citizenship" and reinforced demands for the abolition of the franchise. It saw the African elite's failure to use its talents in the reserve areas as a cause of reserve decline, and blamed mission education for this. Implicit in this is the important political function which mission education served. Such education was seen as providing the ideological underpinning for the franchise, as well as access to it. [16] The NEC's assumptions were also based on the provisions of the 1927 Native Administration Act, which entrenched a

---

[14] KCA, Malherbe Papers, KCM 57030, File 619/1(70), CT Loram Circular Letter 30 July 1931. See also P. Rich, *White Power and the Liberal Conscience: Racial Segregation and South African Liberalism* (Johannesburg, 1984); S. Dubow, *Racial Segregation and the Origins of Apartheid in South Africa, 1919-1936*, (New York, 1989)

[15] *Welsh Report*, para 250.

[16] Ashforth, *The Politics*, 72, 78.

"retribalisation" as an aim of segregation. This legislation was intrinsically hostile to the educated African elite.

Ashforth argues that the setting up of commissions of enquiry in this period was designed to deny the voices of both the mission and educated African elite. The opinion of the African masses was

> silent and mysterious, capable of being fathomed only by experts in touch with the 'stolid' gentlemen of the 'Tribes' who are implicitly antagonistic to their educated brethren. [17]

Drawing on anthropological notions, the NEC had isolated the "primitive mentality" of reserve based Africans as the cause of the wasteful farming methods and the attendant poverty which stimulated urbanisation. In a direction which was not originally indicated in its terms of reference, the NEC focused on education as a means to transform this mentality. The remedy proposed was the provision of a different kind of education which would promote the development of the reserves and appropriate political and social aspirations: "social education". Social education probably the crudest version of "adapted" education yet to be formulated. It was defined as follows:

> For the tribal native there is a great deal that precedes the three R's and that is definitely more important than the three R's. The great bulk of the Native population will derive much more good from teachings on *simple hygiene, elementary agricultural methods ..... rather than from ordinary school teaching.*[18]

Drawing heavily on Phelps-Stokes notions, the NEC envisaged two tiers of education for Africans. It advocated a form of "adapted" education, where all pupils would undergo a "social education" course, but a minority would then be given a more conventional school education to provide a limited professional elite. The NEC saw this as the logical extension of Loram's statement of education aims in 1925.

There were parallel attempts to do this in British colonies elsewhere in Africa during the same period. These were driven by a growing concern over the emerging educated elite and possible challenges to British Rule. Sivonen and Ball note that after 1920 colonial governments began to encroach on mission controlled education. The Colonial Office itself attempted to coordinate such policies for the first time. In Nigeria, Kenya, Northern and Southern Rhodesia, in line with the policy of indirect rule, colonial authorities made

> renewed efforts ... to orient the school curriculum to

---

[17] *Ibid*, 34.

[18] *Report of the Native Economic Commission*, (UG 22-32), (hereafter the Holloway Commission) paras. 630-631. The emphasis is mine.

the village, to aspects of traditional culture and to bolster traditional forms of tribal authority."

Attacks on traditional missionary academic and literary secondary education became more frequent as it was seen as "the disrupter of political stability". These proposals were bolstered by references to the Phelps-Stokes reports. [19]

There was a certain continuity of ideas between the NEC Report and the debates at the New Education Fellowship Conference in 1934.[20] Loram's departure in 1930 had given JD Rheinallt Jones far more room to manoeuvre in liberal circles, particularly in education. The NEF conference correspondence reveals the way in which he along with other liberals attempted to apply anthropological ideas to educational problems. It highlights how a commitment to anthropology made for close links between liberals, such as Rheinallt Jones and the Hoernles, with apologists for segregation such as Werner Eiselen and P. A. W. Cook.[21] However, these ideas were by no means accepted by mission educationists.

The NEF Conference is particularly interesting in its concern with science, culture and anthropology and the applicability of "culture contact" ideas to African education. In published form, the report of the NEF Conference could be read as a triumph for the anthropological perspective, but its pages conceal the struggle around who should decide the direction of African education, and what its aim and content should be. At the end of the conference, a "Joint Statement of Anthropologists, Educationalists and Missionaries" was produced. This was the result of what Rheinallt Jones described as "private meetings" at which the stakeholders "wrestled to find common grounds for co-operation". Revealingly, in the draft document from which this quotation is taken, Rheinallt

---

[19] Ball, "Imperialism", 247-8; Sinoven, *White Collar*, 105-6.

[20] The New Education Fellowship was a British based organisation founded in 1915. It held international conferences every few years, and the July 1934 Conference in South Africa was one of these. The NEF was a consciously secular movement which sought to include all creeds and beliefs. Its theme was "Educational Adaptations in a Changing Society". The Conference took place in Cape Town and Johannesburg, with the Johannesburg sessions following immediately on the end of the Cape Town sessions. EG Malherbe, ed., *Educational Adaptations in a Changing Society* (Johannesburg 1937)

[21] For more detail see S. Dubow, "Race, civilisation and culture: the elaboration of segregationist discourse in the inter-war years", in S. Marks and S. Trapido, eds, *The Politics of Race Class and Nationalism in Twentieth Century South Africa*, (Longman, 1987), 81-2; C Kros, "Origins of Bantu Education: The Prelude" (Unpublished MA Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 1995) Chapter 3.

Jones had written "common" over the original "any".[22] The Joint Statement conceals the "wrestling" which took place during the Conference as a whole, as well as over the statement itself, and it overemphasises consensus about the need for an anthropological departure point. The closing statement has no reference to Christianity as a major component in education, important for stabilising African society in transition. Instead the statement concluded that:

> [D]ue recognition must be given to those elements in indigenous African culture which are not only living social forces at present but are also capable of development and re-fashioning ...."

It qualified this for urban Africans by saying that expert "guidance [needed to be] given in the development of new forms of social organisation." [23]

Originally, the convenor of the conference, E. G. Malherbe, who was seconded from the Bureau for Social and Economic Research for this purpose, gave the African Education Conference to Rheinallt Jones to organise. As it turned out, Rheinallt Jones had nothing to do with organising the Cape Town African education discussions. [24] This had two consequences. Given the resources available to Rheinallt Jones through the SAIRR and his own personal influence, the Johannesburg conference was a much bigger and more prestigious affair, and much more focused around anthropology in terms of content. The Cape Town event's lack of anthropological emphasis, however, provided a challenge to the focus of the Johannesburg conference.

It is clear from the correspondence surrounding the conference that, in the name of a more scientific and anthropologically based approach to African education, Rheinallt Jones tried to exclude both the main stream English-speaking missions and prominent African speakers. In this he had the full support of EG Malherbe. Except for the Dutch Reformed Church, none of the missionary organisations was formally invited to send delegates. Rheinallt Jones' efforts to drum up DRC support extended to Southern

---

[22] UWA, Records of the South African Institute of Race Relations, Part 2, (hereafter SAIRR/2), AD 843/RJ, Kb 10.1 (File 1)

[23] Malherbe, ed., *Educational Adaptations*, 520.

[24] UWA, SAIRR/2, AD 843/RJ, Kb 10.1 (File 1), J. Burger (Chairman of the Organising Committee of the NEF in Cape Town) to Rheinallt Jones, 7 Dec. 1933; KCA, Malherbe Papers, KCM 56982, File 505/6/1 (55), E.O. Vaughan (Gen. Secretary of SATA) to Malherbe, 23 April 1934.

Rhodesia, from which a strong official contingent was coming. [25] Aside from the DRC, both mission and African speakers were under-represented. In the case of the missions, one of the main reasons appears to have been a deliberate attempt by Rheinallt Jones and Malherbe to move the debate around African education away from the churches into the "scientific" or "anthropological" domain. Malherbe wrote as follows to Anson Phelps-Stokes:

> "In order that we may get a lead on the more *purely scientific* (i.e. anthropological) side of this section, we have invited Dr. Malinowski from London."[26]

All Rheinallt Jones' draft programmes placed heavy emphasis on "indigenous life", and "cultural change" which Rheinallt Jones saw as an essential context for discussion of African education. In a letter to Professor Malinowski, he said that this discussion of context would take up more than half the conference.[27]

Malherbe's attempt to persuade Thomas Jesse Jones, author of the Phelps-Stokes Reports, to attend is testimony to the link he perceived between theoretical anthropology and its application in "adapted education". He told Anson Phelps-Stokes that Jones' presence would "bridge the gap" between the purely scientific side and "the more *practical and applied* side." [28] However, Jones was not available.

For the more practical side, Rheinallt Jones invited professional people - officials from the education departments in South Africa and "experts" in "native affairs" in the British colonies in Africa.[29] The English-speaking Protestant missions, which were responsible for most of the "practical" side of African education, were hardly represented. From the correspondence surrounding the

---

[25] AD 843/RJ, Kb 10.1 (File 2), Typed list of organisations and people invited to attend the Conference; Rheinallt Jones to E.D. Hanson, 30 Jan 1934; Rheinallt Jones to H Jowitt, 26 Feb. 1934, 5 March 1934.

[26] Ibid, Kb 10.1 (File 1), Malherbe to Anson Phelps-Stokes, 6 Nov. 1933, existing emphasis.

[27] Ibid, Kb 10.1 (File 2), Rheinallt Jones to Professor Malinowski, 26 Feb. 1934. A large number of people related to the discipline of anthropology spoke at the Johannesburg Conference. Malinowski was guest of honour, but we was supported by Professor R. F. A. Hoernlé, Mrs. A. W. Hoernlé, Dr. I. Schapera, Dr. W. Eiselen, Dr. P. A. W. Cook, Dr. Monica Hunter and Professor G. P. Lestrade..

[28] Ibid, Kb 10.1 (File 1), Malherbe to Anson Phelps-Stokes, 6 Nov. 1933, existing emphasis.

[29] UWA, SAIRR/1, AD 843/RJ, Kb 10.1 (File 1), Malherbe to Anson Phelps-Stokes, 6 Nov. 1933. Professor Fred Clarke was Professor of Education at London University. Colonial experts included H.E. Dumbrell who was Director of Education in Bechuanaland, H. Jowitt who occupied a similar position in Uganda, and had been Director of Native Development in Southern Rhodesia.

Conference, it is clear that some mission representatives were included as an afterthought, but it was primarily the DRC which was encouraged to contribute speakers. In March 1934, three months before the Conference was due to begin, Rheinallt Jones told Jowitt that Malberbe had courted DRC educationists

> because he has been severely criticised in several quarters because of the overloading of the Conference Programme with English speaking persons from overseas.

There might have been other reasons for the wooing of the DRC. Perhaps Rheinallt Jones and Malherbe felt that the DRC was more sympathetic to the "cultural" focus of the anthropologists. Loram had felt that this was the case during the 1920s, and by 1930s the DRC was becoming increasingly critical of existing academic mission education. [30] They were probably also influenced by the idea, articulated by Loram in the 1920s, that the DRC would have more influence over the State than would the English Churches.[31]

A notable omission was Edgar Brookes, a staunch Anglican and now Head of Adams College. It is clear that his Christian critique of anthropology in his book *Native Education in South Africa* (1930) was influential in his exclusion. He challenged assumption that Native Education was something separate "from general educational philosophy". He was extremely critical of Loram's ideas and of the Phelps-Stokes reports as being narrow, denigrating religious education and racially conceived. Indeed, Victor Murray told Rheinallt Jones that "[t]here was far more stuffing in that book than there is in the Phelps-Stokes Reports".[32] Rich notes a growing distance between Brookes and Rheinallt Jones during the early 1930s after Brookes was pushed out of the SAIRR.[33] Brookes was given a late invitation after Victor Murray intervened on his behalf.

The lack of missionary input drew criticism from Murray himself. Murray was not initially invited to speak but he invited himself in March 1934. Rheinallt Jones tried to palm him off on the Cape Town Conference, but was unsuccessful.[34] Murray was extremely cynical about the value of anthropology and the role of related experts in

---

[30] See for example *Die Basuin*, September 1930.

[31] See Krige, "'Solving the Native Problem'".

[32] E Brookes, *Native Education in South Africa* (1930), 21-39; AD 843/RJ, Kb 10.1 (File 4), Prof. A.V. Murray to Rheinallt Jones, 26 April 1934.

[33] P Rich, *Hope and Despair: English-Speaking Intellectuals and South African Politics 1896-1976* (London: British Academic Press, 1993), 77.

[34] UWA, SAIRR/1, AD 843/RJ, Kb 10.1 (File 3), Rheinallt Jones to W. Mears, Chairman of the Cape Town Sub-Committee on the Native Education section, 16 March 1934.

the field of education". In *The School in the Bush* he wrote,

> Anthropology gives the scientific method by which we understand primitive people, but it affords no basis to indicate the future of that people in the modern world..... We may doubt ... whether it is the business of one race or class to determine arbitrarily the vocation of individuals in another. [35]

He responded to Rheinallt Jones' draft programme by saying that:

> "We are told on all hands that African education must be based on Religion, meaning by that, for the most part, the Christian religion, yet there is nothing about that, as far as I could see, in the programme... I don't see how you can cut it out entirely, and I think there could be something on the contribution of Christianity (not just religion) to the future of the African people. The man to do this emphatically is Edgar Brookes and as he is not down on the programme couldn't he be put in that context ? While I greatly sympathise with Malinowski I do not think that vague approval of "Religion-in-general" is going to be nearly good enough."[36]

Rheinallt Jones' stated reason for the lack of African speakers was that there were not many African educationists who were of the same standard as Whites, and he did not want to embarrass them or lower the standard of the Conference. An exception was Z.K. Matthews, who, as Kros argues "consciously phrased himself as a student of 'culture contact'". He was studying in Loram's programme of Studies in Race Relations and Culture Contact at Yale University.[37] Rheinallt Jones had favoured inviting Matthews, but Matthews was unable to attend. As a result of pressure from Teachers' College, he invited Dr. A. B. Xuma, Mrs. E. M. Morake and Reverend K. T. Motsete of Tati Training Institution in Bechuanaland.[38] D. D. T. Jabavu and D. G. S. Mtimkulu spoke at the Cape Town Conference, but they were not on Rheinallt Jones' list of competent Africans.

A comparison between the Cape and Johannesburg programmes is

---

[35] Murray, *The School in the Bush*, 314, 333.

[36] AD 843/RJ, Kb 10.1 (File 4), Prof. A.V. Murray to Rheinallt Jones, 26 April 1934.

[37] C. Kros, "'Deep Rumblings': Z. K. Matthews and African Education before 1955" in *Perspectives in Education*, Vol. 12, No 1, (Summer 1990/91), 26-9.

[38] UWA, SAIRR/1, AD 843/RJ, Kb 10.1 (File 2), Rheinallt Jones to Prof. Mabel Carney, 7 February 1934. See also File 3, Rheinallt Jones to D. McMalcolm, 5 March 1934. Mabel Carney was Professor of Rural Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. It was at her behest that Rheinallt Jones invited Eva Mahuma Morake.

illuminating. The Cape Conference was organised with little or no reference to Rheinallt Jones, who received a belated draft programme from its organisers in March 1934. While it made use of Schapera and Malinowski as speakers, there is no sense that an anthropological viewpoint was being pushed. It is interesting to note that WM Eiselen had been scheduled to speak in Cape Town on "Should the Content of Native Education be on academic or practical lines?", but his name was scratched off the programme. Malherbe had tried unsuccessfully to ensure that the Cape Conference included Cook.[39] The anthropological input was to take one of the six days of the Cape Town Conference, whereas Rheinallt Jones was intending to spend five of the ten days putting African education in an anthropological context. In Cape Town, an African voice was far more evident. There were only nine papers in all, and little sense of any organising theme. All the local speakers were from the Cape.

A report on the NEF Conference was edited by Malherbe and published in 1937. The section on African education was edited by Rheinallt Jones, who combined the proceedings of the Cape Town and Johannesburg Conferences. The Cape Town contributions were almost all put together in a section called : "The African Child and What School Makes of Him", which basically did not interfere with the anthropological focus which Rheinallt Jones had wanted.

The Report contains a sustained attack on mission education by a range of anthropologists. The debate was couched in similar terms to those in the NEC Report. The destruction of African social systems and the decline of the reserve areas informed much of the debate about the appropriate or inappropriate nature of the content of mission education.[40] This was reiterated when relations with missions were briefly discussed. Malinowski presented an indictment of schooling "out of harmony with real conditions". Educationists needed to ascertain what remained of African culture and to see what ought to be preserved.[41] Reflecting most strongly the criticisms of mission education expressed by the Natives Economic Commission, Dr John Holloway, chair of the NEC, together with Eiselen and Cook, advocated "adapted" curricula which would

---

[39] Ibid, Kb 10.1 (File 4), Ts manuscript "Native Section: New Education Fellowship: Cape Town Meetings."KCA, Malherbe Papers, KCM 56982, File 505/6/1 (47), Malherbe to J.F. Burger 3 Feb. 1934.

[40] See Malherbe, *Educational Adaptations*, Chap XV, "The Changing African Society" and Chap XVI, "Education as a Reintegrating Agency".Also Fleisch, "Social Scientists"; S Dubow, *Scientific Racism in Modern South Africa* (Cambridge, 1995), Chapter 6.

[41] Malherbe, *Educational Adaptations*, Chap XVI, "Education as a Reintegrating Agency", 425.

fit most Africans for life in the reserves.[42]

These ideas were justified on the grounds of cultural relativism rather than on the grounds of African intellectual inferiority. Indeed, it would appear that Rheinallt Jones set up the section on "The Educability of the Bantu" as an attempt to showcase the "cultural" approach and to show up the limitations of the scientific racism inherent in Dr. M. L. Fick's work presented at the conference. Fick was, as Fleisch points out, "the most outspoken defender of white intellectual superiority".[43] Dubow notes that "it was the pluralism and relativism characteristic of anthropological thought which offered a way out of the evolutionist constraints of biological determinism" inherent in scientific racism, which was equated with repression.[44] Fick's work was directly challenged by a general conference discussion of the validity and cultural specificity of tests. [45]

PART 4 : CONTESTING "THE PURELY SCIENTIFIC SIDE"

The scientific and anthropological perspectives elucidated in the NEC Report and the NEF conference did not go unchallenged by the missions, nor by some liberals in the Provincial Education Departments and Advisory Boards. This is clear in the minority report of the Natives Economic Commission, the 1933 European Bantu Conference, mission and other evidence to the Provincial Finance Commission (PFC) of the same year and at the NEF conference itself. The critique which emerged may not simply be characterised as the result of the residual assimilationist ideas of the old Cape liberal tradition, but as something more robust.

The NEC Report was not unanimous. The only educationist on the Commission, A. W. Roberts, was the predominant author of the minority findings, especially on education. Roberts had served on the NAC with Loram from its inception. [46] The minority report objected strongly to "social education" and defended the existing

---

[42] *Ibid.*, "Education as a Reintegrating Agency", 429-30, "The Content of African Education", 482, "The Economic Environment", 418. UWA, SAIRR/1, AD843/RJ, Kb 10.1 (File 3), Holloway to Rheinallt Jones, 12 March 1934.

[43] Dr. M.L. Fick was a Harvard trained psychometrician who worked on intelligence testing in the Bureau from 1929. Fleisch, "Social Scientists", 358-9; See also Dubow, *Scientific Racism*, 230-3.

[44] Dubow, "Race, civilisation", 80.

[45] Malherbe, ed., *Educational Adaptations*, "The Educability of the Bantu". 446.

[46] Dr. A.W. Roberts had been Headmaster at Lovedale for many years. He was a talented mathematician and astronomer.

content and approach of mission schools. [47] The fact that the NEC had not originally been asked to consider African education meant that many educationists felt that the NEC was unqualified to comment on African education. Indeed, the Report's critics challenged its claims to be "scientific". When the Report of the NEC was tabled in May 1932, the *South African Outlook*'s editor called into question the competence of the commissioners to comment on the area of African education. The *Outlook* rejected the majority reports' critique of the methods of existing mission education as "based on insufficient or unrepresentative data", and defended the existing content. It dismissed the idea of social education preceding the three R's as ridiculous.[48]

This critique was not confined to the mission educationists in the Cape. In June and July of 1933, the last European-Bantu Conference was held in Bloemfontein. It was arranged by the SAIRR, and had 232 delegates from a wide range of organisations, including mission societies and churches, Joint Councils, the Industrial and Commercial Workers Union (ICU), the Bantu Youth League and municipal advisory boards. ANC members also attended as individuals or Joint Council members.[49] At the Conference, the Chief Inspector of Native Education of the OFS, Herman Kuschke, rejected the argument that mission education had been responsible for the breakdown of traditional society, and cited the many other economic and political forces behind this process. He also accused the NEC of being confused and unrealistic in its support of social education. The Education Committee of the Conference was generally dismissive of the whole section of African education, saying that this section was so inadequate that "it is evident that the Commission found itself faced with a problem beyond its powers".[50]

The Conference not only provided a central place to develop a consolidated critique of the NEC, but also a place for sections of the liberal-mission network to unify their evidence concerning the financial crisis to the imminent Provincial Finances Commission. Out of this came a clearly articulated critique of fiscal

---

[47] Holloway Commission, paras. 656-7 and 660.

[48] "The Native Economic Commission Report: Native Education", *SAO*, Oct. 1 1932, and "The Native Economic Commission: The Share of Natives in Public Revenue and Expenditure", *SAO*, Dec. 1 1932.

[49] *Report of the Fifth National European Bantu Conference* (SAIRR Press, Johannesburg, 1933).

[50] *Some Aspects of the Native Question: Selected Addresses Delivered at the Fifth National European Bantu Conference, Bloemfontein, July 5-7, 1933* (Johannesburg, 1933), 145-55; UWA, SAIRR/1 AD843, B 40.4.10., Memorandum entitled "SAIRR : Fifth National European-Bantu Conference: Findings of the Education Committee".

segregation, the NAC and possible NAD control. Implicit in the issue of control was a rejection of the secularisation of control and the direction of segregation policy.

Herman Kuschke's presentation appears to have been very influential in the findings of the Conference and in the memoranda presented by the Advisory Boards to the Provincial Finance Commission.[51] It is clear that from the early 1930s, the Advisory Boards became increasingly well organised and united in their criticism of state and provincial education policy. This was possible because of the sympathy which three out of the four Chief Inspectors of Native Education had for mission perspectives and their hostility to the direction of segregation in general and to the NAC and NAD. GH Welsh (Cape), Herman Kuschke (OFS) and D Mc Malcolm (Natal) all had strong mission and Joint Council connections.

A similar critique was emerging in Natal mission and education ranks, particularly at Adams College. Brookes' critique of what he called "pseudo-scientists", anthropology and adapted education has been mentioned earlier. By 1934 he spearheading an Advisory Board campaign for a Union Advisory Board for African education and against NAD control. He was extremely critical of the provisions of the 1927 Native Administration Act which allowed for increasing expansion of bureaucracy in the NAD. He wrote as follows to Malherbe in 1934:

> Most of us feel that the Minister of Native Affairs, while the kindliest of fathers to the backward tribal population, has not the same modern, progressive outlook on Native education which characterises Mr Hofmeyr; also that the Native Affairs Department in general is bureaucratic, conservative, and known to the Natives principally as an agency for collecting taxes and maintaining law and order.[52]

A neglected figure at Adams is Karl Brueckner, vice-principal and head of the Industrial Department. He is characterised by Fleisch as South African "social reconstructionist". Brueckner was also a Teachers College Alumnus, but his ideas were different from those of Loram and Cook. Brueckner regarded the "Native Problem" was not one brought on by cultural contact but by economic issues such as low wages, inefficiency and poverty, and that South Africa could never be anything else but an integrated society. In this he appears to reflect many of the ideas of Victor Murray, Lovedale educationists Henderson and J Macquarrie, as well as WM Macmillan.

---

[51] *Some Aspects of the Native Question*, 145-55; UWA, SAIRR, B 70.1.3., Memorandum entitled "The Finance of Native Education. Joint Statement by Native Education Advisory Boards of the Cape of Good Hope, Natal, the Transvaal and the Orange Free State to the Provincial Finance Commission".

[52] KCM 56980 (153), Brookes to EG Malherbe, 25 Oct. 1934.

He was under no illusion about the capacity of the existing reserve lands and favoured a radical redistribution of land alongside an agricultural curriculum. [53]

As regards the future control of African education, there was consensus in the evidence given that provincial control should be retained, but that if Union control was envisaged, the NAD should not manage African education. [54] The Joint Advisory Board memorandum on the subject of control reflected the escalating hostility of missions and liberals to the NAC. Implicit in it was the question of who could be considered an "expert" in African education and on what this expertise was based. The memorandum characterised the NAC as lacking the necessary expertise, out of touch with African educational needs. It accused the NAC of blackmailing the missions by "earmarking grants and threatening to withdraw sums if they were not devoted to purposes of its own choosing". It concluded that the framing of educational policy should be done by a Union Advisory Board which included "those who are *in touch with the education needs of the people, and have knowledge of the actual problems* of administration". [55]

In many ways, Kuschke and mission members on their advisory boards were aligning themselves with a critique of the direction of segregation which was increasingly linked to Macmillan's rejection of segregation in 1927. At the NEF conference where the focus was on the content and control of African education, Kuschke and D McMalcolm were among a number of speakers who challenged the "retribalisation" focus of the conference. In Johannesburg McMalcolm had made his position clear by recommending that funding should come from general revenue, be controlled by the Union Education Department and that education, in general, should be controlled by a central advisory board. [56]

The issue of NAD control had embedded in it a number of issues. Dubow has pointed to the increasing power of the NAD after the passing of the Native Administration Act, and the decline of the

---

[53] Fleisch, "Teachers College", 185.

[54] UWA, SAIRR, AD 843, B 70.1.5., Memorandum entitled "Union Control of Native Education" and B 70.1.3., OFS Education Department: Native Education. Memorandum Presented to the Provincial Finance Commission, 1933, by the Native Education Advisory Board of the Orange Free State.

[55] UWA, Pim Papers, A 881, Fa 9/5, "Administration: Joint Statement by Native Education Advisory Boards of the Cape of Good Hope, Natal, the Transvaal and the OFS.", my emphasis.

[56] Malherbe, ed., *Education Adaptations*, "Relations Between Education and the Native Affairs Departments", 514-5.

NAC. [57] After the report of the NEC, EG Jansen, George Heaton Nicholls and other segregationist ideologues argued more and more forcefully that African education should come under the control of the NAD, a recognition of its separate nature from white education and its possible function in enforcing retribalisation. All four Advisory Boards feared that education in the hands of the NAD would be reduced to being an agent of intensified segregation. What also underpinned educationists' fears about NAD control was concern about what impact this would have on their professional status as alternative experts to those who favoured NAD control, as well as on their practice.

The Cape Conference of the NEF served as a direct challenge to the secular and scientific focus of the conference in Johannesburg. At the Cape Conference, G. H. Welsh, the Chief Inspector of Native Education, was openly critical of the attempts to adjust existing education "on the strength of some new prophecy of the Native's economic future in some dreamland of adequate reserves".[58] He made what the *Outlook* called "a brilliant vindication of the present system". [59] Welsh clearly drew on Macmillan's ideas and also on Henderson's work on rural decline in the Eastern Cape. [60]

Similar ideas were expressed by educationists who had experience elsewhere in Africa. In reaction to the attack on mission education, Victor Murray and H Jowitt, Director of Education in Uganda, gave a defence of Christian basis for education. They argued that it would be foolish to reconstruct old institutions which had declined because they were no longer appropriate. They contended that African society was far from homogenous and many of the old institutions were not relevant to people's lived experience. They emphasised the positive benefits of Christianity and Christian education which, rather than being divisive, were cohesive and dynamic.[61]

---

[57] See Dubow, *Segregation*.

[58] Malherbe, ed., *Educational Adaptations*, "The Influence of Primary Education", 437.

[59] J.W. Macquarrie, "The New Education and the Natives", *SAO*, Aug. 1 1934.

[60] For more detail see W Beinart, "WM Macmillan's Analysis of Agrarian Change and African Rural Communities" H Macmillan and S Marks (eds), *Africa and Empire: WM Macmillan, Historian and Social Critic* (London 1987), 170 and P Rich, "The Appeals of Tuskegee, James Henderson, Lovedale and the Fortunes of South African Liberalism, 1906-1930", *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, Vol. 20, 2 (1987).

[61] Malherbe, ed., *Educational Adaptations*, "Education as a Reintegrating Agency", 427-8.

PART 5: THE WELSH REPORT: COMPETING CONCEPTIONS OF ENQUIRY

In April 1935, the Welsh Committee was set up as the first national investigation into African education after Union. It reported in March 1936, at the same time as the passing of the Native Trust and Land Act and the Native Representation Act. When the Welsh Committee was set up, it was clear that the issue of African education was, itself, a vehicle for the much broader question of the future place and role of Africans in society. This role was being debated through discussion of the "Hertzog Bills" in a Joint Select Committee which represented its last report to Parliament in April 1935. When, in their final Report, the Welsh Committee members denied that education should be an agent of segregation, avoided engagement with "culture contact" ideas and intelligence testing, rejected NAD and NAC involvement in African education, they were, in their own way, rejecting the basic tenets of the 1936 legislation and the "scientific" attack on the control and nature of mission education. Rich tentatively suggests that the Welsh Report showed "signs of new thinking on race differences".[62] The relationship of the Welsh Report to the legislation of 1936 has been explored elsewhere. [63] This paper concentrates on the Reports' relationship with emergent secular authorities in the area of both ideas and methodology.

The Welsh Committee was asked to consider two main issues about African education policy: the control and the aim of African education. Here the focus was quite markedly different from the terms of reference recommended by the 1934 Provincial Finance Commission, which had advised that the extension and finance of African education be investigated. Embedded in the issues of control and aim of African education were the much larger questions about the role of Africans in society. Fundamental to the segregation Bills was the idea that Africans, particularly the educated elite, could no longer aspire to a place in White society - their aspirations were to be focused on the reserves. The logic of the Bills for African education was clear; a shift of control from the provinces to the NAD, and a manifest differentiation of aim from White education. Malherbe was aware that Hertzog wanted recommendations which would be in line with broader segregation

---

[62] Rich, *Hope and Despair*, 32

[63] S Krige, "'Should Education Lead or Follow the Social Order?' The Welsh Report and the Policy of Segregation, 1935-1940", *South African Historical Journal*, No 28, (May 1993)

policy. [64]

This was also clear from the "Government's" opposition to a liberal presence on the Committee. Originally, Hofmeyr had favoured the establishment of a full scale Commission rather than an interdepartmental Committee investigation. Early correspondence indicates that a Commission was to set up, including Brookes and Hoernle, but this was vetoed by other cabinet members. The Cabinet decided on a more limited Inter-Departmental committee rather than a Commission. [65] Ironically, the majority of Native Education Department Heads who sat on the Committee in sympathy with the people who had been excluded.

The Committee consisted of the Chairman, W. T. Welsh, Cape Provincial Councillor and former Chief Magistrate of the Transkei; the three Chief Inspectors of Native Education of Natal, Orange Free State and the Cape - D. McMalcolm, H. Kuschke and G. H. Welsh. The Transvaal's most senior inspector of Native Education, G. Franz, was on the Committee because the Transvaal had no Chief Inspector of Native Education until 1936. E. G. Malherbe was the sixth member. Hofmeyr seems to have chosen WT Welsh because he saw him as enjoying the confidence of the African elite and sympathetic to African aspirations. Welsh did not regard himself as an expert on education and was initially rather diffident about the appointment. [66]

Malherbe's position and role in the Report exemplifies the a dimension of the Report which has not been explored. It embodies the tension which existed on the Committee between competing conceptions of how a commission of enquiry should set about analyzing a problem and making recommendations. On one hand, there was the existing standard format which characterised the Natives Economic Commission and the Provincial Finance Commission, where the commission members travelled around to hear evidence from a wide variety of what Malherbe would have regarded as "amateurs" involved in the area under investigation. The evidence itself consisted mainly of opinion and anecdotes, and there was almost no attempt to quantify and measure data in a scientific way. Malherbe was extremely critical of this approach as it lacked a systematic

---

[64] KCA, Malherbe Papers, KCM 56982, 505/14 (267), Malherbe to Prof. Fred Clarke, 27 March 1935.

[65] SAB UOD Vol 1188, E53/6, "Interdepartmental Committee on Native Education", JH Hofmeyr to J Gordon Watson, Administrator of Natal, 17-5-35; KCA, Malherbe Papers, KCM 56982, 505/14 (267), Malherbe to Prof. Fred Clarke, 27 March 1935.

[66] SAB UOD Vol 1188, E53/6, "Interdepartmental Committee on Native Education", JH Hofmeyr to WT Welsh, 18-3-35

scientific base. [67] The Carnegie Poor White study was the first commission in South Africa to make use of the "cutting edge of a scientific fact" which emerged from large scale surveys and the analysis of statistics. It set what Fleisch calls a "paradigmatic precedent ... for the relationship between social science and policy making".[68]

As head of the National Bureau for Educational and Social Research, Malherbe was required to sit on interdepartmental committees concerned with education. However, on the whole, the Welsh committee did not differ from the NEC and PFC in the way it heard evidence. A wide range of individuals, liberal organisations, missions, teachers organisations, State, provincial and municipal bodies presented evidence. Malherbe did attempt to push the parameters of the Committee by setting up a detailed empirical survey of African education. He commissioned Cook to conduct the research. Cook attempted to institute Arithmetic and English vocabulary "achievement tests" to African student teachers and secondary students at Standard Six level, as well as surveys of the age levels of students and the finances of the schools.[69]

Malherbe tried to have the period of investigation lengthened so that he could embark on serious quantitative research. He and WT Welsh seem to have had a "serious difference of opinion over the procedures" and the length of time allotted to the investigation. He asked MC Botha to request Hofmeyr to intervene. Hofmeyr was more interested in the political value of the Report and asked for it to be complete before the next Parliamentary session. Malherbe aired his regret to Mc Malcolm in June 1935.

> [T]his will mean a much less thorough going investigation than we had contemplated when we stipulated twelve months as a reasonable period. I am personally very disappointed about this curtailment because it will reduce the fact finding aspect of our enquiry very considerably.[70]

Circulars were sent out by the UED in early October 1935. The operation showed the "experts" complete disregard of the "amateurs". Teachers and inspectors were simply expected to carry

---

[67] Fleisch, "Social Scientists", 349.

[68] Ibid, 350.

[69] Cape Archives, (hereafter CAD), BEK 14 CE 360, "Native Education Committee".

[70] SAB UOD Vol 1188, E53/6, "Interdepartmental Committee on Native Education", MC Botha to EG Malherbe, 24-5-35. The original Afrikaans refers to "'n diepgaande verskil van mening oor die prosedure"; EG Malherbe to D Mc Malcolm, 28-6-35

out instructions; there was no attempt to elicit the support of teaching personnel. The timing shows a lack of understanding about the pressures teachers and inspectors faced at that time of year. There were problems from the beginning. Tests and scripts went astray in the post. There was also resistance from teachers to the intrusion of the tests on normal end of year exams. They also found the nature of information required unfamiliar and they had great difficulty in filling in what were obviously lengthy and complex forms, particularly those to do with finance and "Age Standard Tables". Inspectors, who were supposed to administer all the tests in the interests of control and validity, were unable to carry out their normal duties and found themselves caught in the middle between irate teachers and the UED, from which the Bureau operated. Malherbe was completely unsympathetic and instructed the inspectorate to get the information in as fast as possible. He cited Hofmeyr's desire to get the Report for the beginning of the parliamentary session. By January 1936, three major schools in the Eastern Cape, Shawbury, Healdtown and St. Matthews, had not completed the tests at all or had completed only the English tests.[71]

J. W. Macquarrie, Head of Lovedale Secondary School, still bristled from the experience in 1937. In a talk to the South African Teachers Association he remarked,

> But whilst there is plenty of scope for scientific investigation with batteries of intelligence tests and psychometric material into the relative backwardness of Native pupils, the fundamental cause ... is only too apparent. It is essentially economic.[72]

A general reading of the Report reveals that the commissioners were critical of the social and economic constraints on Africans' advancement which had developed in the name of segregation, and the consequent impact on education principles and practice. Indeed, as a preamble, the Report launched a scathing attack on the segregationist idea that Africans should "develop along their own lines" in the reserve areas. Echoing Macmillan's critique of Hertzog's 1926 Native Bills, it averred that all people were bound up in a single economic system, which was "moulding their institutions and ways of living more and more upon the European pattern". The Report attacked the NEC's recommendations for

---

[71] CAD, BEK 14 CE 360, Malherbe to Mr. C. Kitchin of CED, copy to G.H. Welsh, 26 Nov. 1935. See also telegrams from acting Chief Inspector of Native Education, Baldwin in OUD, VOL 1188, E53/6 "Interdepartmental Committee on Native Education".

[72] J.W. Macquarrie, "Some Needs of Native Education", *SAO*, Aug. 2 1937.

"social education" as being impractical and misconceived.[73] The Report made it clear that it did not see education as an instrument to encourage segregation. "It is certainly not the function of education to keep Natives in reserves or to segregate into reserves those who are not there." [74]

The Welsh Committee members themselves were initially sharply divided over the issue of control of African education. Kuschke and Welsh favoured the retention of provincial control. They eventually came up with a scheme whereby native education would be transferred to the UED, under a special Native Education Department (NED).[75] Provincial structures would remain in place, but report to the new NED. When the Report came to advocate UED control, this separation was not advocated on grounds of the principle of segregation. The proven inadequacy of the existing system and the crises engendered by it, meant that African education could be dealt with only at a central level.[76] Echoing Brookes' sentiments, the Report vigorously rejected the idea of NAD control, saying that education should not be linked to a department that had a negative image among Africans, and was basically a "regulatory" body.[77] It proposed that the NAC should not be represented at all in the new Department of Native Education, while the input of the Secretary for Native Affairs was limited to a voice on the Union Board of Native Education which would be dominated by a mission presence.

Ashforth notes that commissions "should be scrutinised as much for what they obscure or conceal as for what they reveal...". [78] Silences in the Report are also significant. Cook's work on African attainment levels in English and Arithmetic and age standard distribution was dealt with very cursorily by the committee members. Citing "external handicaps" on African schooling, they questioned the validity of Cooks' tests. Most of Cook's research did not appear in the Welsh Report, but was published by the Bureau in 1937 in the form of three monographs. This might have been related to the disorganisation which pressures which surrounded the process, which precluded the use of many of

---

[73] *Welsh Report*, paras. 491-7.

[74] *Ibid.*, para 454.

[75] UWA, J.H. Hofmeyr Papers, A1 Dd, Memorandum entitled "Native Education", dated 20 Nov. 1936.

[76] *Welsh Report*, para. 288.

[77] *Ibid*, para. 320.

[78] Ashforth, 10.

the findings in the Report. In fact the data was used later in the Eiselen Report. It appears, however, that the other commissioners were actively hostile to the results of Cook's work, which represented a different paradigm and approach to African education.

They were also very hostile to the ideas of Dr. M. L. Fick, who also presented evidence to the Committee. [79] In that sense, Hugh Macmillan's comment about the historian Macmillan would apply equally to the majority of the Welsh committee members.

> 'Macmillan differed from the majority of liberals in his certainty that there was no evidence for either racial inferiority, or superiority, and no need for further investigation of the topic.

They shared Macmillan's hostility to anthropology. They too were "quick to see the illiberal uses to which it could be put in South Africa".[80] The Welsh Commissioners did not take up the New Education Fellowship Conference perspective of anthropology. There is almost no reference to the debate about culture and education in the Welsh Report. In contrast to the NEF statement in 1934, the Report denied the role of anthropologists in African education by saying that

> [T]he Native should be allowed to decide for himself which elements in his indigenous culture should be preserved. [81]

Its recommendations for continued mission control of schools is also testimony to its rejection of the notion of the consolidation of African culture as a basis for differentiation.

Many witnesses from the missions emphasised the key socialising role of the missions in a period of social upheaval and urged that they remain major partners in the provision of African education. A Lovedale memorandum held that, "[a] full public system of control is better suited to a land where there is a strong ethical and religious life". Here the Report was completely in line with what many of the members of the missions recommended and echoed Murray's notions of Christianity as an reintegrating factor in a rapidly changing world.[82]

---

[79] *Ibid.*, paras. 526-30.

[80] H Macmillan, "Introduction", in H Macmillan and S Marks (eds), *Africa and Empire*, 21.

[81] *Welsh Report*, para. 466.

[82] Cory, PR 4127, W.G. Bennie Papers, Memorandum entitled "Native Education Committee 1935 Memorandum of W.G. Bennie"; Lovedale, "Memorandum submitted"; WUA, SAIRR/1, AD 843 B 80.2.1 Memorandum entitled "Native Education: Evidence

While the Report noted problems of denominationalism which led to duplication, and African opposition to the missions' "paternal form of control", it emphasised the role of the mission schools in socialising their pupils in a period of transition and change. It was important, the Report noted, to "*direct and control* the process (of 'Europeanisation')". [83] The Welsh Commissioners' attitude to Africans themselves reflected the missions' need to "direct and control" social processes. While they recognised the need for more African participation at the highest levels and on the ground, such participation would be more than balanced by a substantial white presence. For example, the missions were to have eight representatives on each Provincial Advisory Board, compared to a maximum of three African representatives.[84] At the same time that the Report condemned mission rivalry, favoured amalgamation and increased African participation in local school committees, it was also not prepared to countenance more than a very limited growth of African run independent schools.[85]

CONCLUSION

This paper has attempted develop a new perspective on relations between church and state in South Africa in the arena of African education during the inter-war years. It has shown that the notion of "adapted education" was essentially secular as well as racist. Its proponents in the state and universities linked it to emerging scientific approaches to education which centred on anthropology and psychology. This presented a challenge to the English-speaking Protestant mission educators who in turn resisted state interference and control. They developed a strong Christian critique of "illiberal" use of science in relation to education and broader political issues. This critique was part of a wider set of "social gospel" ideas which had emerged in the US and British African colonies in response to attempts to make the Phelps-Stokes notion of "adapted education" hegemonic in African education.

---

to be presented on behalf of the Transvaal Missionary Association and the Johannesburg Joint Council of Europeans and Africans to the Commission on Native Education".

[83] Welsh Report, paras. 342-3, 465. The emphasis is mine.

[84] *Ibid*, para 320.

[85] *Ibid*, paras 366-370.