In these days, when scientists are becoming more and more concerned with the wider social implications of their work, it will hardly be taken amiss by a body, one of whose main functions is to help bridge the gap between the scientist and the layman, if I venture to address you, not on some purely academic topic, but on the part which I, as a social anthropologist, think that my subject ought to play in the public life of South Africa. In doing so I shall but be following the examples of my colleagues elsewhere, who for many years now have been repeatedly, and often successfully, insisting upon the practical value of anthropology. It is, in fact, so generally accepted nowadays that a knowledge of anthropology is indispensable in dealing with questions of race relations that I ought rather to apologize for arguing again the case in its favour. But in South Africa there is still need for this, since in few other countries with similar problems has the influence of the anthropologist been so small. It is true that as an academic subject anthropology receives proportionately more attention here than in most other parts of the world, and that facilities for studying it exist at each of our Universities. But in the sphere of practical affairs,
affairs, and especially of Native policy, where the anthropologist may justly claim some authority, he has so far failed to render all the service that he could. For this he is himself partly to blame, but the Government and the public at large cannot be absolved from indifference and even wilful neglect.

Let me first state briefly the case for anthropological research, considered not as a contribution to science but as an instrument for the promotion of human welfare. In South Africa, as in all other parts of the world where heterogeneous populations live together under a single administration, the study of their respective forms of culture is not only desirable but politically essential. We have here several major groups of peoples — Afrikaners, Britishers, Bantu, Coloured, and Indian, to mention only the numerically most important — whose traditions, languages, and social institutions are often widely divergent. The future welfare of our country demands that we find some social system in which all these peoples may live together peacefully, without that increasing unrest and ill-feeling that will inevitably develop owing to lack of unity and friendly co-operation. The solution of this problem calls for more than the mere application of conventional administrative principles. It needs to be based upon a sympathetic and thorough understanding of each of the various cultures between which we have to establish harmonious relationships. We can never hope to appreciate the differences between the Britisher and/
and the Afrikaner, the Native, the Indian and the Coloured man, nor can we succeed in our task of reconciling their often conflicting claims and aspirations, until we have studied fully the history, customs, beliefs and ideals of them all. Misunderstanding and lack of sympathy, both due to ignorance, have so frequently led to strife in the past, and are still so powerful a source of friction, that the necessity for knowledge of this kind cannot be sufficiently emphasized. The touchiness of the Afrikaans-speaking European over the slights, real or imaginary, against his language, his traditions, and his political desires is but one manifestation of a tendency which elsewhere has found expression in such phenomena as the Bulhoek affair, the Zulu rebellion, the South African career of Mahatma Ghandhi, and the formation of the Dominion Party.

It is here that the anthropologist can be of initial service. His task is to study the different forms of social institution that exist, and to interpret them in the light of the general laws of sociology and psychology. In carrying it out, he relies partly upon the observations of others, but he also spends much of his time making first-hand investigations of his own, by means of which he obtains the factual knowledge upon which theory can be based. Trained in comparative studies of culture and in the methods of observation, and speaking the language of the people among whom he is working, he knows what information to look for, how to look for it, and how to ensure the accuracy of what he records, and while in the field he concentrates upon this one task alone, and has no/
no other occupation to distract him. As a result, he is usually far better qualified than anyone else to provide the knowledge we need for each of the peoples of South Africa.

Hitherto the anthropologist working in this country has confined himself to the study of what we call its Native peoples — the Bushmen, the Hottentots, and the Bantu. He has not yet paid special attention to the cultures of its other inhabitants, whether Europeans, Indian or Coloured. But, let me say at once, there is nothing in the nature of anthropology itself to preclude him from extending his researches to these peoples as well. The idea that anthropology is essentially the study of primitive societies, an idea due to the historical development of the science, is being rapidly discarded. In other parts of the world professional anthropologists are now busy studying not only such comparatively advanced peoples as the Arabs, the Malays, and the Chinese, but European communities also, especially in Great Britain and the United States. The day will soon come, I hope, when in South Africa too there will be sufficient workers to enable us to do the same for all the different elements in our population.

In the meantime, however, since the anthropologists here have so far restricted their studies to the Natives, I shall for convenience do so too in this address, and show how in my opinion anthropology can assist in solving the /
the special problems that arise from the relations between these Natives, especially the Bantu, and the Europeans governing South Africa.

There was a time, not so long ago, when the anthropologist doing fieldwork in South Africa concentrated upon what he regarded as the truly Native elements of Bantu culture, and attempted as far as possible to reconstruct a picture of tribal life on this basis alone. But, as we all know, Native life has altered considerably since the coming of the White man. The traditional manners and customs of the Bantu no longer survive intact, but have been modified, in varying degrees, by the combined influence of administrative action, missionary teaching, education, and above all the introduction of the European economic system. As a result, many Natives have been divorced from tribal rule and tradition, and approximate to the European in standards of living, occupation, and outlook. Others, still the great majority, retain much of their ancient culture, but are participating to an increasing extent in the new civilization. Even in the most "backward" tribal areas one generally finds European magistrates, missionaries, traders, and labour recruiters, all symptoms of the new order, and although the influence they have exercised in the direction of cultural transformation may at times have been small, it is nevertheless everywhere perceptible. There is hardly a single Native tribe at the present time which/
which can be considered completely untouched by European civilization.

By ignoring these changes, and attempting only to compile a record of Native life as it was, or might have been, before the coming of the White man, the anthropologist went astray. His first task, the very reason for his presence in the field, is to obtain as detailed and faithful a picture as possible of tribal life as it actually exists, and any attempt to overlook the presence of the European factor cannot but result in an erroneous and distorted impression of the Native as he now is. Moreover, to the European inhabitants of South Africa the Native is more than merely an object of ethnographical curiosity. His presence has affected the structure of our whole civilization, and upon his future welfare depends the future welfare of the country. We need to know, in our own interests at least, if not in his, what is happening to him, how he is being affected by and is reacting to the civilization we have thrust upon him. The anthropologist more than anyone else should be in a position to speak with authority upon the present-day life of the Native, and he is failing in his duty, both to his science and to his country, if he neglects the changes due to contact with the Europeans, and studies only the possibly more glamorous but nevertheless obsolescent institutions of the past.

Fortunately/
Fortunately, anthropological aims and methods have also changed. The modern fieldworker in South Africa studies the life of a Native tribe as it exists at the moment of his visit, and in doing so gives due prominence to elements taken over from the Europeans. He studies the activities, influence and personality of the missionary, the Native commissioner, the trader, and the labour recruiter, just as he studies those of the chief and the magician. Where Christianity has been introduced, he investigates its organization, doctrines, ritual, and other manifestations just as he investigates any other form of religion found in the tribe. He treats the trading store, agricultural show, and cattle dip as features of the modern economic life, the school as part of the routine educational development of children, and the Administration as part of the existing political system. He tries to ascertain how far the traditional Native institutions persist, not only in memory but also in practice; but in addition he tries to ascertain how widespread is the adoption of European elements of different kinds, what sections of the tribe have been most affected through contact with Europeans, and to what extent European practices and beliefs have become substitutes or merely additions.

Although investigations of this kind are still fairly new, there can be no question of their outstanding importance in relation to questions of Native policy. Seventeen years ago Professor Radcliffe-Brown, the first occupant of the Chair of Social Anthropology at the University
of Cape Town, could write (1922: 38): "Every day the customs of the native tribes are being altered, by the action of the legislature and the administration, by the action of our economic system, through the teachings of missionaries and educators, and through contact with ourselves in innumerable ways; but we hardly have the vaguest ideas as to what will be the final results of these changes, upon the natives and upon ourselves". To-day the position is not quite so depressing. We are at last beginning to know, on the basis not of superficial impressions but of painstaking and accurate scientific investigation, what is actually becoming of the Native in South Africa. We are acquiring a mass of concrete information telling us how far the people have succeeded in adjusting themselves to the new conditions under which they are living, whether they are contented or dissatisfied, how their health and general well-being have been affected, what they think of the various European agencies impinging upon their life, and what sort of civilization they are tending to develop. To the Government attempting to pursue a well-defined policy of administration and development, to the missionaries preaching the message of the Gospels, to the educationist building up his schools and curricula, to the trader, and to the employer, it is obviously essential to know just what has happened and is happening to the Native as a result of the diverse and often conflicting forms of civilization that they bring to him. The anthropologist is now supplying this information, and the accusation formerly made against/
against him, that his investigations were remote from the realities of present-day life, is no longer possible today. Moreover, it is not merely the tribal Native with whom he is concerned. The Natives working on the farms or living in the towns are also being studied intensively, so that it is already possible to make preliminary generalizations regarding the trend of Native development in general.

The modern anthropologist, however, goes further in his researches. He is no longer content merely to describe what he finds. He also analyses the culture as it now exists, and tries to determine why contact with the Europeans has modified Native life along certain lines, and why the Natives have reacted in certain ways to the new influences bearing upon them. He studies the history of contact between them and the Europeans, the order and manner in which different aspects of European civilization were introduced into their lives, the policies that governed the relations of the Government, missionaries and others towards them, the influence of the personal factor in promoting or hindering the acceptance of new beliefs and institutions, and the attitude of the Natives themselves towards all these innovations. Basing his conclusions upon investigations of this kind, the anthropologist tries to explain why some Native institutions seem to have disappeared completely or lost their vitality, while others still survive, and why on the other hand some innovations were readily accepted, while others were resisted or rejected.
This inevitably leads him to examine critically the activities of the various European agencies which have influenced the life of the Natives. Here we are confronted with the question of the anthropologist's relation to matters of policy. It has sometimes been suggested, and even forcibly maintained, that it is not his business to interfere with practical issues; the missionary, the government, and the others have their particular tasks to perform, and it is not within his province to criticize their work, let alone attempt to dictate what their work should be. There seems to be some confusion here between the criticism of aims and the criticism of methods. It may be granted that the anthropologist as a scientist should concern himself solely with the facts of the situation, and not question the motives which have led to their introduction. He may have his own ideas about the advisability of evangelization or labour recruiting, of segregation or the pass system, of abolishing lobola and polygamy or attempting to bolster up the chieftainship, but whether he approves or not of the ends at which they aim is personal and not an anthropological problem.

On the other hand, the anthropologist is certainly justified in discussing the methods by which the realization of these aims is attempted. His criticism, in fact, should be welcomed by those who have practical dealings with the Natives. The Government, the missionary, the teacher, the trader, and the labour recruiter are all trying, in some form or other, to alter the existing basis of Native life. Have the methods employed by them been successful/
successful in accomplishing the changes they desire, or have they proceeded in such a way as to produce results other than those expected? The anthropologist is often in a better position than they are to evaluate the effects of their activities, and to point out where they have gone astray, or along what lines they should have proceeded, and this he can do without questioning their motives at all.

Dr Edwin Smith, himself one of the most distinguished African missionaries of recent times, has stated the position of the anthropologist in this respect very clearly in the Presidential Address he delivered to the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain in 1934 (1934 : xxv).

"Just as an educationist", he says, "would not concede that Anthropology had any claim to challenge his opening of schools among pre-literate peoples; and just as Government would not listen if Anthropology declared that it had no right to unfurl the Union Jack over a great part of the world; so the Christian missionary could not admit that Anthropology had any right to question his obligation to carry out the commission given by Christ to the Apostles — an obligation inherent in the very nature of his religion. He acts on a motive that is beyond the reach of scientific criticism; his duty is a realm over which science has no jurisdiction. But the Christian faith has vast sociological implications. The objective of the enterprise is not simply individual conversion but the creation of a community inspired by Christian ideals. The ingemination of new ideas inevitably affects the attitude of people to..."
their traditional culture. And by virtue of their understanding of that culture anthropologists have every right to warn and advise missionaries as to the sociological effects of their teaching. That is to say, while Anthropology cannot touch motive and obligation it can, and ought, to criticize missionary methods. To my mind, any missionary would be culpably foolish who should refuse to give heed to such criticism if it were founded, not upon prejudice, but upon sound knowledge. If this is understood the way is open for alliance between Anthropology and Christian missionary enterprise — an alliance to be made effective by the training of missionaries in Anthropology".

There are some who would go further. Like Professor Malinowski (1937: viii), they would like to see the anthropologist become the spokesman not only of the Native point of view, but also of Native interests and grievances. "It has always", he says, "appeared to me remarkable how little the trained anthropologist, with his highly-perfected technique of field-work and his theoretical knowledge, has so far worked and fought side by side with those who are usually described as pro-Native. Was it because science makes people too cautious, and pedantry too timid? Or was it because the anthropologist, enamoured of the unspoiled primitive, lost all interest in the native enslaved, oppressed, or detribalised? However that might be, I for one believe in the anthropologist's being not only the interpreter of the Native, but also his champion".
On the other hand, the accusation has sometimes been made by protagonists of greater liberalism in Native policy that Anthropology "is an enemy of progress, because it seeks not only to record but to stereotype the past" (Smith, 1934: xxxii). Dr. Brookes, indeed, actually says of what he terms the "older anthropological school, which regarded the tribal Native as the only phenomenon of study", that the most important influence it has exercised on policy has been the negative one of preventing reforms! (1934: 141). He fully realizes and stresses the recent changes in anthropological methods to which I have already referred, but maintains that the older outlook is so far from dead that "to those chiefly responsible for legislation and administration it appears as the orthodox school, with the right to monopolize the term 'scientific'" (1934: 137). Professor Macmillan, again, denies that anthropology can be of any assistance at all nowadays in matters of policy. "At the present time", he says (1930: 8), "it is more urgent that we see (the Native) is provided with bread, even without butter, than to embark on the long quest 'to understand the Native mind'".

Professor Victor Murray is equally impatient of the anthropologist's pretensions, but on somewhat different grounds. "The anthropologist", he said (1938: 316), "examines Bantu handicrafts, the custom of ukulobola, methods of agriculture, ways of thought, the quality of ubuntu, and all the other characteristics of a primitive people of the present day, and he describes these things to/
to us as 'African culture'. So far, so good, but when he goes further and declares that these things represent the 'law of the African's own being', and that these are necessary if he is to be educated 'along his own lines', he has forsaken the province of the anthropologist. He has ceased to deal with the present, and has laid down a rule about the future. He has become a prophet, and in so doing he has had to lay aside the authority which clothed him as an anthropologist.

With this sentiment I fully agree. It is not the task of the anthropologist to provide a solution of the Native problem, nor to advocate which of several rival policies is the one that should be followed, any more than it is his task to tell the Christian churches that ancestor-worship is more suitable for the Bantu than the New Testament, or to remind the employer of Native labour that it is "unfair" to pay very low wages. The formulation of policy must be left in the last resort to those in whose hands lies the responsibility for administering the affairs of South Africa, and the grievances under which the Natives suffer are essentially the concern of the humanitarian and the social reformer. The anthropologist in his private capacity, as a citizen of South Africa with a better knowledge than most people of the conditions under which Natives live, may have his own views on matters of policy, and he is entitled to express them; but he must always remember, and make it clear, that in doing so he is speaking as a private citizen, and not in the name of anthropology.
anthropology. On this point most, if not all, of my colleagues, including Professor Malinowski himself, would probably agree. Anthropology as such is concerned with Native society as a concrete phenomenon capable of objective study; what is to become of Native society is a problem for South Africa as a whole — for the Government and the Missions, the farmer and the mine-owners, the humanitarian and the Natives themselves — and not for the science of anthropology.

II.

So far I have been dealing with the anthropologist as an independent student of Native affairs. I have made it clear, I hope, that he cannot and does not claim to provide a solution of the Native problem. All that he can do is to furnish the exact information regarding Native life upon which policy must be based, no matter what other considerations are also involved, and he can further, if invited to do so, suggest along what lines action should be taken if certain results are desired. Let me now indicate somewhat more fully the manner in which I think anthropology can be employed in these two capacities in South Africa.

It has long been recognized here, as elsewhere, that a knowledge of at least certain aspects of Native life is essential in matters of administration. And, as is so often the case in this country, the usual method of obtaining the information was to appoint a special commission of inquiry. Thus, we have had, since the middle of last century, several commissions on Native law and customs/
customs, while, since the formation of Union, similar commissions have investigated problems of Native land tenure, marriage customs, separatist churches, economic life generally, farm labour, and a variety of other topics. Although primarily concerned with administrative problems, these commissions in each case also had to ascertain the facts upon which their recommendations were to be based. They generally did so fairly competently, but it cannot be denied, I think, that they would have succeeded more fully in this respect had their personnel included one or more trained anthropologists, whose occupation, after all, is to make investigations of this kind, and who are specially qualified to do so. By way of contrast, we may note that the Bechuanaland Protectorate Government, when it recently decided to make a compilation of Native laws and customs for the information and guidance of its officials, entrusted the task not to a miscellaneous commission, but to a professional anthropologist, whom it has since employed to study the historical development of chieftainship before and after the coming of the European administration.

In other parts of Africa, notably Nigeria, the Gold Coast, the Sudan, and Tanganyika, the administrations concerned, recognizing the value of anthropological inquiry, have appointed special Government Anthropologists whose full-time occupation it is to carry out investigations on those aspects of Native life falling within the sphere of administrative concern. This lead was followed by the Union Government/
Government, which in 1925 created an Ethnological Section of the Native Affairs Department, "firstly, with a view to promoting scientific investigation and research into Bantu ethnology, sociology, philology, and anthropology, and secondly, in order that the Department might have at its disposal the services of an academically trained anthropologist conversant with the ethnological and linguistic side of Native affairs, accurate information in regard to which, it was realised, was likely to prove of the greatest assistance in the smooth and harmonious administration of tribal affairs and in the prevention of friction" (Rogers, 1933: 250-1). This was an extremely important and welcome step, and, judging from the fact that the Section has very recently been enlarged, it has apparently been regarded as fully justified.

Nevertheless, the Ethnological Section is far too small, considering the diversity of South African Bantu peoples and the conditions under which they live, to be able to provide anything like all the information that is still required. The research work done by the anthropological departments of the Universities must, as things are, remain for a long time to come the principal source to which the Native Affairs Department and others can look for assistance. That this was appreciated by the Government itself was seen in 1926, when a sum of £1400 annually was allocated for the promotion and conduct of researches into Native life and languages, and an Advisory Committee on African Studies, consisting mainly/
mainly of representatives of the Universities, was set up to supervise the work. There was, in consequence, a rapid development of field investigations during the next few years, and a marked increase in the number of scientific publications.

In 1930, however, owing to the financial depression, the Government grant was completely withdrawn. But the Universities decided to retain the system of co-operation and co-ordination developed by the Advisory Committee, and set up an Inter-University Committee for African Studies to take its place. This Committee, which now includes among its members official representatives of the Union, the High Commission Territories, and the Southern Rhodesia Government, has done some excellent work, notably in surveying the state of our knowledge concerning Native cultures, languages, and kindred topics, planning the lines of future research, and publishing standard works for students and others on ethnography and linguistics. But it has been greatly handicapped by lack of funds. Through the agency of the International Institute of African Languages and Cultures in London, grants for research were for a while made available to a few South African anthropologists, but this source too has now failed. The Research Grant Board of the Union has also helped to finance some investigations, but it cannot do so to anything like the extent that is desirable. Appeals to the Government for renewed assistance have been consistently rejected, on
the ground that the Universities should out of their ordinary funds make provision for anthropological research. It can only be regarded as a pity that a Government which annually spends some £3300 on maintaining a Bureau of Archaeology should not find it possible or advisable to make similar provision for what is, after all, the far more important and urgent task of collecting information about people who constitute a living administrative problem, and are not, as yet, merely dead relics of South Africa's ancient past.

In this connexion the words of the Native Economic Commission are of direct relevance. After discussing the policy to be adopted in administering and developing the Native Reserves, the Commission says (1932, § 249):

"If the method of dealing with Natives in the Reserves which your Commission has outlined in the foregoing paragraphs is adopted, it will be necessary to devote more attention to the scientific study of the Natives than has hitherto taken place. The Universities have for some time devoted their attention to this subject, and a good deal of investigation has taken place by private research. Your Commission considers that greater encouragement should be given to such work, and that steps should be taken to facilitate co-operation between officials dealing with Natives and scientific investigators, to enable the results of such work to be used to assist in dealing with administrative questions dependent on a knowledge of Native customs".

It/
It is not only the Governments which have seen the advantage of employing trained anthropologists to make investigations on their behalf. Several years ago the Tea Expansion Bureau, a world-wide organization, employed several anthropologists in South Africa to inquire into the tea-drinking habits of the Natives, with a view to exploring the possibilities of extending the local market for tea. More recently, the Johannesburg Municipality has attached to the staff of its Native Affairs Department a permanent anthropological research worker to study the social life of Natives dwelling on the Rand and the transformations through which it is passing. These are welcome indications that the importance of anthropological research is gaining increased recognition.

There are many other directions in which the assistance of an anthropologist would be of value. Lord Hailey, in his "An African Survey" (1938 : 58-59), lists malnutrition, agricultural improvement, the collection of vital statistics, the problem of soil erosion, and the effects of labour migration, as among the topics for investigation requiring the co-operation of the anthropologist. The Mission Churches, again, faced with the rapid growth of Native separatist churches, would find it extremely useful to add an anthropologist to the body of inquiry which they are planning to set up to deal with the problem. It would also benefit them greatly to foster similar inquiries into the beliefs and practices of Native Christians which sometimes assume forms differing widely from what is taught/
taught in Church, and into the effects produced by the abolition of polygamy, lobola, and various other customs generally regarded by them as incompatible with the principles of Christianity. One such inquiry, I understand, is actually under way, into the different forms of marriage prevailing to-day among the Natives.

The anthropologist, however, need not only be an investigator. He can also be useful in an advisory capacity. Without himself being committed to any particular line of policy, he can show from his knowledge of Native life what the probable effects would be of certain measures, or, if certain results are desired, what the most suitable methods of achieving them would be. As Mr Driberg says (1927: 157), perhaps more confidently than I might have done myself: "Anthropology does not and cannot decide pragmatically on the respective merits of, for example, direct and indirect rule or the policy of native reserves; what anthropology does is to demonstrate that applied to this or that culture direct rule would be followed by certain results and indirect rule by other equally definite results; that segregation in native reserves must have some inevitable sociological or biological consequences; and so on". This does not mean that the advice of the anthropologist need necessarily be accepted. Considerations of policy may demand that a certain line of policy should be followed, whatever the results; but at least, by seeking the advice of the anthropologist, the authority concerned, whether administrative, religious, economic or educational, will be able to visualize more clearly what the consequences of its actions are likely to be.
Here again South Africa provides a few illustrations in which this fact has been appreciated. Several years ago the Swaziland Administration consulted various anthropologists, among others, on the possibility of adapting the traditional military organization of the Swazi to modern educational needs and methods. The Bechuanaland Protectorate Administration has for some time now had a professional anthropologist on its Board of Advice on African Education. Very recently, again, the Administrations of the Union, South West Africa, and Bechuanaland Protectorate, in setting up a Joint Standing Committee on the Bushman problem, included an anthropologist as one of the members. This system of consultation could be extended in many other directions, especially in the Union, where under the present Native policy a comprehensive scheme of development is being planned for the Native Reserves. It is surely not being too bold, for instance, to suggest that the Native Affairs Commission would stand to gain considerably if one of its members were a trained anthropologist, or that future Government Commissions on Native questions should include anthropologists as well as other technical experts.

III.

There is one other field in which anthropology may claim much more recognition than it has so far received in South Africa, and that is in the training of persons who intend to work among the Natives. A large number of Europeans are engaged, as officers of the Native Affairs Department.
Department, as missionaries, as teachers, and in other capacities, in occupations bringing them into intimate daily contact with the Natives. It does not need to be emphasized that a knowledge of Native life and languages would be of the utmost value to them in their different spheres of activity. As Dr Edwin Smith has said, with particular reference to administration (1934: xviii-xix):

"It makes all the difference when a man has, and the people know he has, an informed sympathy with them, talks with their mother-tongue, appreciates and practises their code of etiquette, understands their laws and customs, can follow the workings of their mind. The best administrators have always been those who are most able to see the world through the eyes of the people over whom they are placed". And the Chiefs of Bechuanaland Protectorate, when on their famous visit to England in 1896, implored Mr Joseph Chamberlain to give them as Resident "a good man who knows our speech and customs, and is not bad-tempered and impatient, one who loves us" (Blue-Book C. 7962, 1896: 14)

This point has been so repeatedly made during recent years that it need not once again be elaborated. It is far more instructive to see what has actually been done about it in practice. All candidates for the British Colonial Service, which now includes the three Native Protectorates of South Africa, must, after selection for appointment, spend an academic year at either Oxford or Cambridge. Here they receive a special course of instruction which includes, among other subjects, lectures on/
on general and regional anthropology, and in the language of the territory to which they are assigned. Selected candidates for the French Colonial Service spend two years at the École Coloniale, and here again anthropology and native languages are among the subjects studied. In Belgium there is a similar course extending over four years, in each of which anthropology and Native languages are taught; while in Holland candidates for the Colonial Service undergo a five years' course of instruction. Many overseas Mission societies, too, have now arranged that their missionaries should receive some training in these subjects before proceeding to the field.

In South Africa the position is very different. In Southern Rhodesia officers of the Native Affairs Department are appointed for a probationary period in the first instance, during which they must pass special examinations in Native languages and law, and during the past few years facilities have from time to time been given for study leave to be spent at some University teaching these subjects. Very recently, again, the Native Affairs Department of the Johannesburg Municipality requested the University of the Witwatersrand to institute a two years' diploma course in Native Administration to be taken by candidates for service in the department.

But the Union Government itself has lagged far behind even Southern Rhodesia and the Johannesburg Municipality. The situation as it exists here is well summarized in a memorandum/
memorandum recently drawn up by the Inter-University Com-
mittee for African Studies, in which renewed proposals are
made for the training of candidates for the Native adminis-
trative service: "The training in Bantu Studies and kindred
subjects offered at the Universities", says the memorandum,
"is not recognized as any form of qualification for entry
to administrative services which deal chiefly with Native
affairs, nor does the student who qualifies in such sub-
jects obtain any seniority or monetary advantage. The £50
bonus formerly given to members of the Service who took
the Diploma in Bantu Studies has now been withdrawn, and no
provision is made for members of the service to attend
courses in Bantu Studies at any subsequent period of their
career, as is the practice in a number of British Colonial
Services and those of Belgium and France. The Native Af-
fairs Department has recently agreed to give five years'
seniority to students who have taken their LL.B. degree,
plus one year of Native Law, Anthropology, and a Native
language, but such a long training does not qualify the
holder to pass into the first grade of the service, and
the provision naturally only applies to a very small number
of entries to the Native Affairs Department. Thus, any
University student who desires to specialise in subjects
likely to fit him for service as highly specialised as
Native Administration has little advantage over those who
enter the service with Matriculation Certificates only, in
fact he is penalised for the qualifications he has obtained
since he loses three years' seniority by taking this train-
ing".

"In/
"In view of these facts", the memorandum continues, "it is not surprising that students applying to the Bantu Studies Departments of the Universities often announce their desire to enter the Native Affairs Department of the British Colonial Service and not that of South Africa, although territories like the Union and Southern Rhodesia should be able to attract the pick of the young men of this country, rather than the less healthy areas such as Nigeria and the Sudan, in which it is impossible for a man to bring up his children or settle permanently."

"South Africa", the memorandum adds, "is in fact the only Government administering so-called 'Native territories' which does not recruit or train specially qualified administrative officers for the task, either by selecting its candidates for the higher grades of the service by means of a competitive examination from among students already possessing University degrees, or by establishing a special Institute for training students in Colonial administration, and which does not provide facilities for further training for officers already in the service by means of special courses for which extra leave is given."

The position, as revealed by these quotations, is most disappointing and disquieting. Officers of the Native Affairs Department must speak the two official languages of the country, and pass the Civil Service Law examinations; but they are apparently not required either to speak the languages of the peoples with whom they are most directly concerned, nor is any special knowledge demanded from them.
of the Native laws and customs which they have to administer. There have actually been, and still are, officers of the Department who can be considered experts in both Native law and Native languages, and there are many others studying in their spare time to acquire a similar proficiency. But there is no official insistence upon this, nor any obvious encouragement. A training in Native law, anthropology, and Native languages will not of course in itself make a man into a perfect administrative officer, but it will at least render him more efficient, and should therefore be an essential requisite for admission into the service. The Native Economic Commission has emphasized the desirability for some such system of training, especially in regard to Native languages. "It will be evident from the general tenor of this Report", it says (1932, § 243), "that your Commission lays great stress on basing all action in regard to the Natives on an intimate knowledge of these people, of their languages, their mode of thought, their manners, and particularly of their social and economic systems. It was made abundantly clear to us how frequently misunderstandings arose and ill-feeling was generated owing to a lack of comprehension of these factors. We wish also to stress the need for Government officials being able to speak the local Natives' own languages. The general advantage to the State, in many ways, of a knowledge of the vernacular on the part of European officials, and police, is self-evident".

In/
In view of this explicit statement, and of what has been done elsewhere, I need not discuss more fully the case for the training of our administrative officials. It is somewhat ironic that in a country where at least six Universities and University Colleges have Departments of Bantu Studies, none of these Departments is actively engaged in preparing candidates for acceptance by the Native Affairs Department, although several young South Africans who have made a special study of Native life and languages have found their qualifications a decided asset for admission into the Rhodesian and British Colonial Services. Among the students who have passed through the School of African Studies at the University of Cape Town, there are some in the administrations of Southern Rhodesia, Bechuanaland Protectorate, Tanganyika and even Nigeria, but none, so far as I know, in the Union Native Affairs Department. Here, it would seem, is one field at least in which science has failed to reach the people by whom it could most usefully be employed; and if this Association would join with the Universities in their effort to produce a change that cannot but benefit Native administration in South Africa, and with it Native affairs as a whole, I shall feel that my address to you to-day will have achieved something of value.