

UNIVERSITY OF NATAL

INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

CHALLENGE AND RESPONSE

(Report on the 9th Congress of the
South African Bureau for Racial Affairs,
Stellenbosch, 29th April - 2nd May, 1958)

by

DR. J.F. HOLLEMAN



DURBAN - MAY, 1958

UNIVERSITY OF NATAL

INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

S.A.B.R.A. CONGRESS - STELLENBOSCH - 1958.

1. SABRA met this year at Stellenbosch from 29th April to 2nd May, 1958, for an annual meeting and discussions on the theme: 'Our Task in Connection with Race Relations in South Africa'. It may prove to have been an event of decisive importance for the future relations between the races in this country.

The meeting was attended by some 340 members from all over the country. Among those present were 63 representatives of municipalities, 8 State Departments, 9 Universities, 47 'Kerkrade', and 6 Foreign Legations.

I attended as a representative of an affiliated organisation, the Institute for Social Research of the University of Natal.¹⁾

In presenting this report I do not intend to comment in detail on the contents of each of the papers (see Annexure). I should rather try to describe and analyse the attitude of speakers, the spirit of the discussions and the prevailing mood of the Congress.

2. SABRA has often been regarded as the intellectual mouthpiece and trouble-shooting handmaiden of the Nationalist Government, differing from the latter only in the more moderate, and more carefully reasoned manner in which it voiced its views. Its latest Congress and the repercussions it will probably have in the near future, seems to prove that this impression is, and always has been, wrong, and that the association between SABRA and the present Government is probably based rather on their common opposition to the idea of cultural integration, than on their agreement as regards the concept of Apartheid.

Over the years SABRA has tried to develop and formulate its philosophy with regard to 'separate development'-a term which it prefers to 'apartheid', because it reflects their essentially constructive approach (as against the 'neutral' and even negative tone of 'apartheid'). This process of formulation inevitably was not the combined effort of a large body of members, but of a small number of individuals, almost all of them academically highly qualified experts in various disciplines, with a considerable first-hand knowledge and experience of non-European communities and their problems. What they in this way contributed to an understanding of the nation's problems therefore in the first place represents their honest personal convictions. These convictions do, however, proceed from certain broad premises (of a rational as well as emotional nature) to which SABRA members (and many others) generally subscribe.

While in this way SABRA, as a body, may be said to have spoken with one voice as far as broad principles were concerned, it does not necessarily follow that the same degree of unanimity existed with regard to specific issues.

Indeed, it is likely that the SABRA leaders, when they planned this Congress, were acutely aware that on specific issues (i.e. necessary practical implications of such generally accepted but rather vague premises) the individual membership (in common with the vast majority of generally likeminded compatriots) held neither common nor, in fact, clearly formulated convictions.

1) The Institute is likewise affiliated with the South African Institute of Race Relations.

Centre for Applied Social Sciences
University of Natal
King George V Avenue
Durban 4001
South Africa

CASS/17-HOL

After ten years of dignified and earnest exposition of their points of view the leaders had earned the respect of friends and opponents of SABRA, but they could not deny that the overall picture of race relations had deteriorated, and that the time in which the situation could be saved was fast running out. It was high time to take stock of the total situation, to check the quality of the support they could expect from their membership and wider public and to re-assess their function and responsibilities towards the country.

Hence the comprehensive theme of discussion of this Congress, which may be regarded as an effort to force the membership to think constructively about the responsibilities of the leading white population group in the diverse spheres of life, of spiritual, socio-economic and administrative activity. It was a call for clear and realistic thinking, and for subsequent, prompt action.

The Rev. Landman in his Chairman's address, wasted no time in getting to the point. In short, blunt sentences, he issued the challenge: 'the theme of discussion is of paramount importance. It is clear to us that every one has a task. It is necessary for us to consult together, but we should never leave it at that. Words are not enough; there must be deeds'.

He laid down three essential requirements:-

- a) Realism and Sober Thinking: - This implied on the one hand as a fundamental and dominant premise, the recognition of 'the irrefutable right of the white population to be in this country' and its refusal to 'commit suicide', and on the other hand, the realisation that 'no people worth its salt, will for ever be satisfied without, or with only an indirect say in the political and socio-economic organisations of the country in which the interests and future of such a people are being decided. To expect this of the Bantu is not only unfair to them, but will lead to the greatest disillusion and conflict'. (quoted from Church Congress, Bloemfontein 1950).
- b) Honesty and Sincerity: - As against the realistic consideration that no immature person or people should be entrusted with full political responsibility, there is the moral duty not to deny the Bantu an opportunity to satisfy his legitimate desire to become more developed and civilized.

In no sphere of life should there be a question of perpetual subordination. He quoted with approval Kuyper (19th Century Dutch Calvinist): '..... it follows that all men or women, have no claim whatsoever to lord over one another, and that we stand as equals before God, and consequently equal as man to man'.

- c) Co-operation and Goodwill: - This concerned both the English-speaking white, and the non-European, compatriots. He considered no solution possible without the confidence and co-operation of the non-Europeans. The non-Europeans must be convinced of our goodwill and honest intentions. But we could not be expected to enjoy their esteem and respect if we did not treat them in the same manner.

He finally stressed that the problem was one which was not merely the concern of the Government, but of all of us; that the whole population needed to be educated in this respect; that there was no time to lose, and that the task would be long and hard and full of sacrifice.

Rev. Landman's prestige both as (now-past) Chairman and as Dutch Reformed Churchman, is unquestionable, and many speakers took their cue from the points he made. It is noteworthy that he made not a single reference to apartheid or 'separate development'. His address must therefore be regarded purely as a call for honest Christian morality in thought and action.

3. In his opening address Minister Sauer started on a defensive note, complaining about the press, and especially, adverse foreign publicity. But he soon struck a refreshing note of realism: Apartheid should not be a one-way process for the benefit of the European population - this could only lead to frustration.

He made one remarkable statement. Referring to the tradition of segregation, and alleging that half-a-century ago the principle of segregation was strictly but soundly applied, he said that President Kruger had not been above shaking hands with Native chieftains. 'But to-day many who are a lesser men than Kruger was, would refuse or be afraid to do so. It is still a question whether we have found the right way of appling Apartheid'.

Minister Sauer spoke 'as a politician' and was introduced as 'one of the inner circle of Government'. Referring in this capacity to the relations between SABRA and the Government, he stressed that, besides a common basis of agreement, there had been differences of opinion. But 'we need each other'. It was an indication that, in spite of SABRA's loyalty to the Government, the relations had not been without strain.

Several top executives had sent or delivered messages at the opening of the Congress.

Eiselen (Native Affairs) sent a largely negative appeal; not to 'do anything which would obstruct (belemmer) Government policy'.

Du Plessis (Coloured Affairs) on the other hand, bluntly stated that 'race relations have reached breaking point', and while he accepted the soundness of the Apartheid principle, he expressed doubt whether the right mode of application had been found, and whether the European population was aware of the sacrifices it would have to make, and whether it was prepared to make them.

Even during the preliminary proceedings the key-note had therefore been struck repeatedly and with vigour: 'search your own heart, come to a decision, then act accordingly and without delay'.

4. Historian Scholtz's main contribution, apart from tracing the uneven development of the policy of segregation in South Africa, was to find the historical explanation of the European's (especially Afrikaner's) aversion to (manual) labour, without making it sound like a justification. On the contrary. He quoted, almost with relish, certain passages by early writers who condemned and ridiculed this attitude (e.g. 'He is proud of the name Africaan; Kaapsche Burger is to him a magnificent title. This over-extended sense of pride breeds laziness' - De Jong, Reizen, etc. 1802). The inevitable result of this attitude to hard work was what Scholtz called the 'painful dependence upon Native labour'.

In 1716 already, Capt. de Chavonnes had suggested to his superiors in the East Indies Company that further importation of slaves should be stopped in order slowly to accustom the colonists to the use of white labour on the lands, which would benefit the Company, country and people. His advice went unheeded, and labour became a stigma.

Two centuries later the Transvaal Indigency Commission of 1906 and the Mining Industry Commission of 1907-08, spoke in a similar vein, rediscovered (in Scholtz's words) 'the great truth that a civilization can continue to exist only if its bearers are prepared to perform all forms of labour themselves'. But, he added, 'to such serious warnings the Whites have to this day turned a deaf ear'.

Of almost equal importance was Scholtz's evaluation of the birth of African nationalism after the first World War.

He said that 'the (Afrikaner) whites like to see the birth of the feeling of separate nationhood (volksgevoel) among their forebears as the most important event in South African history', but he predicted that future historians would regard the birth of African nationalism of far greater significance. At present, however, very few people seemed to realize that this was the new and dominant factor in South African life.

Scholtz did not go so far as to prescribe a specific course of action or change of heart. But the implications of his analysis were abundantly clear.

5. A few papers were of considerably lesser quality.

Ex-Pressman Geyer (now Chairman of SABRA) gave a fair if rather non-committal survey of the problems of the press; but with regard to its responsibilities he revealed disappointingly little crusading spirit. His opinion that the press, itself dependent upon public opinion, could give only a very limited degree of guidance to the public, was challenged from the floor.

Housewife Mrs. Schumann's view of the possible role of women in relation to the problem was not inspiring, being largely a succession of well-meant stereotypes on the theme of 'they, too, are human beings', on a plane of thought which barely rose above the mistress-houseservant sphere.

Farmer van Wyk (Frazerburg) read a paper which can only be regarded as a sincere appeal to foster harmonious co-existence on the farms, and an emphasis on the value of proper European farming methods as an educational demonstration for the non-European tenant farmhand, who thereby learned to produce more for himself. He did refer to 'sacrifices' but did not attempt to define these. And if his sole reference to Apartheid - i.e. the use of the words 'aparte saambestaan' (!) when he suggested that 'foreign ideologies and unfettered press are threatening the good and even friendly (minsame) relations of separate co-existence (on the platteland)' - is in any sense a reflection of the farmers' idea of Apartheid, then this concept means no more than a continuation of the present physical situation, but with a greater emphasis on the improved economic and cultural conditions of the non-European neighbour. It may be assumed, however, that a measure of separateness in purely social situations is implied.

Economist Sadie (Stellenbosch) read (and slightly amended) Kriel's paper on the task of the industrialist and businessman. Here again, not preparation for separate development but the improvement of industrial relations, of non-European productivity and consequent standard of income, were the main themes, although the 'development of enterprises inside or on the borders of Bantu Areas' was mentioned in passing.

He stressed that low productivity was partially due to slipshod European business organisation. But even after having put their own house in order, 'the industrialist and businessman may still have to face an insufficient stimulus on the part of the workers, especially the unskilled Coloured and Bantu'.

He quoted, with approval, industrial psychologist Theron on what stimuli (job-security, prospect of improving earnings, job-prestige) made a man give his best efforts, and concluded that 'with the conventional colour bar and measures limiting the opportunities of non-whites for advancement and even the absence of pride of achievement among their own communities, the creation of (such) stimuli seems to be very difficult'. He ingenuously suggested that 'by-passing the colour bar in a way which does not undermine the wage standards and employment of white workers appears to be the answer', but before he gave a hint as to how he would tackle this fascinating puzzle, he passed the ball to the politician.

6. Native Administrator Bourquin and Col. Wessels (reading and elaborating his Police Chief Rademeyer's paper) spoke as administrative officers in the unenviable position of the executive who is held responsible for the smooth application of policies which are not of his own making, and with which he may not, and often does not, agree. They could do little more than describe their functions and responsibilities, and give an idea of the organisation in which they worked.

Bourquin gave an admirably restrained analysis of the conflict of loyalties which tends to wear down the present-day municipal administrator. He also pressed one vital aspect: 'no opportunity should be lost of seeking advice on, and discussing with (African) leaders all major matters affecting the African people. This should be done even if they are to some extent self-styled leaders'. Especially this last qualification struck a note of realism which I found lacking in private discussions with some academic experts, who held the view that the emergence of modern-type African leadership was only a passing phase and that such leaders should therefore be ignored in favour of the 'traditional leaders'.

Police Chief Rademeyer's paper, apart from giving some data about the recruiting, training and prospects of non-European members of the Force, was interesting for the lack of criticism it evoked from the floor as regards allegedly bad police behaviour - the point was raised, parried, ('we all know that there are black sheep in any big organisation') and dropped. One noteworthy bit of information: the Police College in Pretoria makes 'generous (mildelik) provision for tuition in Bantu Languages and Ethnology'. This includes 25 lectures on ethnic distribution, Native custom, Native delinquency (tsotsi-ism), rehabilitation of Native areas (Tomlinson recommendations), a summary of Native legislation and Native law, etc. During this course 'lecturers and instructors constantly emphasize the necessity of inspiring respect and confidence by just, impartial but strict action', and of behaving as guardians and protectors rather than as prosecutors'.

7. The paper on the Role of the Church (a hazardous assignment) was an uncomfortable effort to compromise between uncompromising values, with Churchman Snijders (Dutch Reformed moderator, Natal) precariously manoeuvring between unity and differentiation in the Christian brotherhood. He did, however, venture to present one original contribution - a possible scriptural justification for cultural separation in the Church - which was roundly slapped down by a fellow churchman. In this sally Snijders made a distinction between erfskuld (original sin) and erfsmet (which may be interpreted as the inherent taint, trend, propensity to sin). 'The punishment for original sin is the human propensity to sin; erfsmet is the punishment for erfskuld'. Now the African (a 'less developed type of man'), although redeemed of original sin by his conversion like any other convert, does not 'immediately get rid of his depraved (bedorwe) sinful nature', at least not as quickly as the higher developed white. Now assume that culturally less developed implies inherently more prone to sin; while culturally more developed implies less prone to sin: follows the ingenious conclusion; a distinction, within the body Christian, of culturally-conditioned more sinful and culturally-conditioned less sinful, and a justifiable separation between them in order to protect the lesser sinful from being overwhelmed by the greater sinful.

It may well be that my layman's interpretation does injustice to the Rev. Snijder's theological argument. But it is significant that in his vote of thanks to the speaker, fellow theologian Professor Kotze (Stellenbosch) made a brilliant and devastating attack on this very point.

The only permissible distinction, Kortze said, was between believers and unbelievers. If the unbeliever became a believer, he was born a new man, and as such equal with other believers before God and Church. Nowhere does the Holy Script warrant a distinction on the basis of colour or culture.

Snijders had admitted that a number of non-Europeans had 'sufficiently shaken off this (cultural) depravity to reach the same level as the whites', but he considered these ought to have 'enough racial pride to throw their weight in with their own people in order to elevate them', and he was of the opinion that 'as soon as the non-European himself makes an effort to outgrow the erfsmet, he would succeed sooner than when he had to be lifted out by the European with the help of all sorts of levers'.

Kotze did not like this either. It was the duty of the Christian Church and all Christians to elevate the less fortunate and less developed to their own level. This was the very principle of white voogdyskap (guardianship), the earnest endeavour to prepare the ward for a full coming-of-age (mondigwording). Perpetuating voogdyskap or even unduly delaying this coming-of-age, was in direct conflict with Christianity. 'Voogdyskap without active efforts to emancipate is Tyranny'.

8. Nationalist Politician Basson gave his address on Thursday afternoon, that is, two rather placid sittings and five none-too-inspiring papers after Chairman Landman and Historian Scholtz had tried to set the pace with their hard-hitting realism. Except for the brief and lively intermezzo when Churchman Kotze engaged his brother Snijders, the meeting seemed to be settling down to a dignified but slightly boring routine of digesting a pleasant but undistinguished course of mild liberalities, which went down easily with a generous draught of not-too-potent self-criticism.

Basson came with a stronger stew, dished it up boiling hot and by the ladle-ful. Few delegates will easily forget the taste and measure of the helping which Japie Basson put before them.

An easy and obviously sincere speaker, he more or less stuck to the sten-cilled text of his speech, but on occasion ad-libbed with great fluency when he wanted to elaborate a point. Many speakers, if they so elaborate a rather bold or provocative statement, tend to soften it; Basson almost invariably hit harder on such occasions, and his written paper, strong as it is, lacks the extra punch which made his spoken address a memorable and courageous one.

Speakers before Basson had admitted that the insincere attitude of the European towards non-Europeans had much to do with the presently-strained interracial situation. Basson (and Gunter after him) turned this generalized admission into a specific accusation. 'At present very few non-Europeans are willing to accept that we have good intentions regarding them, and I'm afraid that the European politician must shoulder a liberal share of the blame for this'.

'We hear much of frustration among non-Europeans. If there is such frustration, then its origin can easily be traced to our white policy, for the observant non-European must long since have received the impression that there is no political group of any consequence which, as a matter of principle and volition, wants to see justice done to the interests of the non-Europeans'.

'In a country which calls itself Christian and civilized, surely every citizen, of whatever race and colour, is entitled to a living wage, a roof over his head, sufficient food, help in time of illness, a reasonable amount of education and respect for his person, as well as care in his old age, if he has been prepared to do a day's honest work. The politician who denies his fellowmen these things because of his colour, ceases to serve the best interest of the European, of the country and even of his party'.

Basson was impatient with politicians who failed to educate their electorate to the realities of the modern political situation. The safety of the country demanded that it adjusted itself to the changing situation in modern Africa and elsewhere. He sharply criticized the Government for its failure to have diplomatic

representation in Ghana, and if the reason for this was the alleged 'immaturity of public opinion', then prompt steps should be taken to remedy the position. 'Why lose a golden opportunity of making the right gesture at the right time, and wait until circumstances force us to do it at a later stage?'

Basson scorned those who thought of Apartheid as an end in itself, instead of a means to an end - and perhaps not the only means by which race relations could be solved without sacrificing white civilization (reference to the Central African Federation). Where an Apartheid measure did not make an essential contribution to the safeguarding of white civilization, it was merely an unnecessary demonstration for the sake of the Apartheid fetish, and apt to provoke irritation and revulsion against the white rulers.- the politician should not be afraid of exceptions.

At any rate, more consideration and even re-thinking of what Apartheid involved, was necessary, and as a first step he suggested that an unambiguous terminology be found.

His request for a Minister for Native Affairs, standing as far as possible outside the party-political battlefield, did not imply that politics should be excluded from the Government approach to racial problems, but the more realistic proposition that such a step might make a bi-partisan approach possible.

Basson prepared the ground for SABRA's boldest move at the end of its meeting. He appealed for 'more exchanges of views between European politicians and African leaders, (because) unfortunately most European politicians are completely out of touch with the non-European world around and among them. Surely voogdyskap implies contact'.

Basson clearly based his speech on the assumption that the majority of the white electorate, on the evidence presented by the recent election results, underwrote Apartheid (i.e. whatever concept they had of Apartheid), but he avoided committing himself. In his final statement he threw all dogma overboard. 'I myself believe that the convincing force of events, inside and outside South Africa, rather than arguments, will determine the ultimate pattern of race relations in our country'.

He earned an ovation from his audience.

9. Educator Gunter, who spoke after Basson, to some extent hammered at the same points Scholtz, Kotze and Basson had exposed. His was probably the most comprehensive and pointed survey of current prejudices and fallacies. But he, too, although his sincere belief in separate development was apparent, went not much further than clearly outlining the two alternatives as he saw them:

- a) a gradual development leading to complete territorial separation, demanding, especially from white South Africans, sacrifices so great that no thinking man could be blamed if he doubted whether this course was practicable;
- b) continued and increasing use and integration of non-European labour, which entitled the latter to more and more political rights, and in turn would lead to the decline of the white man. No white could be blamed if he recoiled at this ultimate prospect.

Confining himself to the task of European education, he found that schools in the past had failed in their duty to give the guidance necessary for youth to overcome ignorance and prejudice with regard to 'this, our greatest and most urgent problem (of race relations)'. He proposed a wide (too wide?) compulsory curriculum to remedy this omission, but stressed that 'the task of the teacher is not

that of indoctrination and propaganda of one particular point of view. It is the stimulation of independent thinking about different aspects and points of view'. But 'even the knowledge so acquired was not enough. The improvement of race relations starts with the individual, and for this reason children should be taught, at school and at home, to treat people of whatever colour or level of civilization with courtesy and respect, and with the honesty, sincerity and friendliness, as behoves a cultured person'.

As a point of interest I may mention that among the current fallacies which Gunter listed, was 'the idea that the concept of Apartheid implies the elimination of contact between white and non-white, as if the non-whites were untouchables'. He unfortunately did not elaborate on this.

10. Vice-Chairman Olivier spoke during the closing stages of the Congress. He had seen that SABRA members were realizing, with a sense of urgency, that it was no use denying that the racial situation was going from bad to worse, and that they were prepared to search their own hearts. He had received some indication that his people might be prepared to act, provided they could see clearly where their actions would lead to. He must have realized, however, that on the evidence presented by the speakers, SABRA was not yet ready to give clear guidance, except with regard to creating the initial, more favourable, mental and moral climate in which in fresh and realistic search for future guidance could be conducted, this time in consultation with leaders of the non-European population.

But this new realism had confined itself largely to an honest appraisal and generous affirmation of Christian moral values and obligations. This in itself was of tremendous value, and must have helped to give him the high courage to speak of his own frustration resulting from the Government's dismally inadequate attention to that essential aspect of Apartheid which would substantially benefit the non-European population and without which Apartheid lacked all moral foundation.

In this respect Olivier's carefully considered and powerfully delivered speech came close to being an ultimatum that, unless the Government act much more vigorously and judiciously in this direction; and stop doing things which SABRA could not square with its conscience, once-staunch allies like Olivier would be forced either to go their own way or to withdraw altogether.

While a day or two before, ex-politician Tommy Boydell had suggested that SABRA might well consider organizing a racially mixed conference as a tangible gesture of goodwill to non-Europeans, Olivier went much further and regarded this step as an essential part of a realistic and combined search for a just and acceptable solution of racial problems. Although he spoke as an individual member, his great prestige as SABRA leader ensured the almost unanimous adoption of the subsequent resolution to this effect. Even under normal circumstances this proposal was a bold move. But if press reports are correct and Olivier did have Minister Verwoerd's resignation from SABRA in his pocket while he spoke, he must be given credit for a rare feat of courage and conviction.

11. What, then, has emerged from this SABRA Congress?

Certainly not a clearer definition of Apartheid or separate development. On the contrary, concrete reference to the physical shape of Apartheid was almost studiously avoided.

This, again, does in no way mean that SABRA is losing faith in this principle. Nor does the proposed mixed conference itself constitute a departure from the Apartheid aim; it is a perfectly logical move to try and sort out together

what form future separation might be acceptable to both sides. It does mean, however, that SABRA had discovered that the gap between the paper solution of the Tomlinson Report and the implementation of Apartheid in the hands of the Government, had widened rather than narrowed; that the theorists of separate development had neglected or underrated one of the greatest problems of all: how to persuade both the white and non-white population to accept such a development. The theorists never expected that the non-whites would eagerly swallow Apartheid. But they were so certain of the universal benefit of their medicine that they said: 'make them swallow it, and you will see they will like it'. It is this confidence that has been shattered. The first spoonfuls, instead of whetting an appetite, produced such a revulsion in the patient that SABRA realized that there was no hope of applying the full course until the patient had been calmed down and was willing to co-operate.

This is the formidable fact of life which SABRA has learned, and this is the challenge before its leaders. It is to their great credit that they did not, in their disappointment, merely accuse the Government and public of having bungled their case. Bungling, too, and its dire consequences, now had become part of the facts of life, and therefore had to be squarely faced.

It is significant that it was Professor Gerdener, himself one-time Chairman of SABRA, who proposed that the Congress charge its leaders with the task of providing a clear definition of Apartheid as a concept of separate development. It implies that, whatever SABRA may in the past have provided in the line of definition and guidance, was felt to be falling short of what is required to-day. In other words, Gerdener, as one of SABRA's own elder statesmen, admits it is time for SABRA to readjust its approach to the problems of race relations, taking into account the new-learned facts of life.

Various resolutions were passed giving formal expression to some aspects (respect for the dignity of man whatever the colour of his skin; the need for self-education and self-discipline) which are important insofar as they are clear evidence of an awakening conscience. These are, however, less important than the two resolutions discussed above, which compel SABRA to act according to its new light.

If the leaders have understood the mood of this Congress as I understood it, they must feel that their membership is less interested in a theoretically perfect blueprint of Apartheid, than in some down-to-earth and practically attainable plan for the mutually beneficial and peaceful co-existence of the races in this country, with reasonable safeguards against the loss of cultural identity of each race within the foreseeable future; and that such a plan, provided it were realistic, would be acceptable even if it did not prescribe a hundred per cent perfect Apartheid score.

It is good to know that SABRA's racially mixed conference will take place well before the new draft is to be tabled. It will not fail to put an even keener edge to SABRA's new realism.

J.F. HOLLEMAN

DIRECTOR
INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

I.S.R.
12/5/58.
DURBAN.

NINTH S.A.B.R.A. CONGRESS - STELLENBOSCH

29th APRIL - 2nd MAY, 1958

THEME:

OUR TASK REGARDING RACE RELATIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA

OPENING ADDRESS: Minister P.O. Sauer.

Chairman's Opening Address: Rev. W.A. Landman.

- Paper (Afrikaans) - Die Ontstaan en Wese van die S.A. Rassepatroon - Dr. G.D. Scholtz.
- Paper (English) - The Press - Dr. A.L. Geyer.
- Paper (Afrikaans) - Die Kerk - Rev. H.J.C. Snijders.
- Paper (Afrikaans) - Die Vrou - Mrs. Wynnie Schumann.
- Paper (Afrikaans) - Die Boer - Mr. F.P.R. van Wyk.
- Paper (English) - The Industrialist and Businessman - Mr. C.C. Kriel.
- Paper (Afrikaans) - Die Politikus - Mr. J.D. du P. Basson.
- Paper (Afrikaans) - Die Onderwys - Prof. Dr. C.F. Gunter.
- Paper (English) - The Civil Servant - Mr. S. Bourquin.
- Paper (Afrikaans) - Die Polisie - Major General C.I. Rademeyer.

- - - - -

(N.B. Papers Nos 2, 6 and 9 were read in English. A simultaneous Afrikaans-English interpreting service operated throughout the conference. A full set of these papers is in the Institute files, and sets can be obtained from SABRA at 5/- per set).



This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons
Attribution – NonCommercial - NoDerivs 3.0 License.

To view a copy of the license please see:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

This is a download from the BLDS Digital Library on OpenDocs
<http://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/>