

REFERENCES

- Adewoye, O 2000. Leadership and dynamics of reform in Africa, in Othman, H (ed), *Reflections on leadership in Africa*. Brussels: VUB University.
- African National Congress (ANC) 1997b. *Understanding GEAR: Growth, Employment and Redistribution*. <http://www.polity.org.za.innopac.up.ac.za>, quoted in Tsheola 2002:806.
- African Union (AU) 2001. *The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)*. <http://www.polity.org.za.innopac.up.ac.za>, quoted in Tsheola 2002:803, 806.
- Allen, R 1962. *Missionary Methods: St Paul's or Ours?* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Alvis, J 1995. *Divine purpose and heroic response in Homer and Virgil: The Political plan of Zeus*. Landover, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Amery, L & Childers, E (eds) 1907. *The Times History of The War in South Africa 1899-1902*, vol 5. London: Sampson Low, Marston and Company, Ltd.
- Anderson, A 2000. *Zion and Pentecost: The Spirituality and Experience of Pentecostal and Zionist/Apostolic Churches in South Africa*. Pretoria: Unisa Press.
- Anderson, L 1992. *A Church for the 21st Century*. Minneapolis MN: Bethany House.
- Arenstein, J 2003. *Corruption Notebook: Global Integrity/ The Center for Public Integrity*. www.publicintegrity.org, 2005-08-12.
- Armour, M C & Browning, D 2000. *Systems-sensitive leadership: Empowering diversity without polarizing the church*. Rev ed. Joplin, MO: College Press Publishing.
- Asmal, K, Chidester, D & James, W (eds) 2003. *Nelson Mandela: From Freedom to the Future*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball (USA publication under the title and publisher: *Nelson Mandela: In His Own Words*. NY: Little, Brown & Co).
- Bakke, R 1997. *A Theology as Big as the City*. Downers Grove IL: InterVarsity.
- Banks, Robert 1994. *Paul's Idea of Community*. Rev ed. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson.
- Barclay, W 1975. *The Mind of St Paul*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Barker, K L (gen ed) 1995. *The NIV Study Bible (Study notes)*, 10th ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Barrett, C K 1994. *Paul: An Introduction to His Thoughts*. London: Geoffrey Chapman.
- Bass, B 1998. *Transformational Leadership: Industrial, Military, and Educational Impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Battle, M 1997. *Reconciliation: The Ubuntu Theology of Desmond Tutu*. Cleveland, OH: The Pilgrim Press.
- Becker, P 1969. *Hill of Destiny: The Life and Times of Moshesh Founder of the Basotho*. London: Longman.
- Beukes, P 1991. *The Holistic Smuts: A study in personality*. 2nd ed. Cape Town: Human & Rousseau.
- Beukes, P 1994. *The Religious Smuts*. Cape Town: Human & Rousseau.
- Bevans, S B 1992. *Models of Contextual Theology: Faith and Cultures Series*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Balch, D L 2003. Paul, Families, and Households, in Sampley 2003:258-292.
- Blaiklock, E M 1970. The Acts of the Apostles as a Document of First Century History, in Gasque W W and Martin R P (eds), *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F Bruce on his 60th Birthday*, 54. Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans.
- Boer, H R 1955. *Pentecost and the Missionary Witness of the Church*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- Booth, W 1993. Individualism and the Mystery of the Social Self, in Johnson, B (ed), *Freedom and Interpretation*, 69-101, New York: BasicBooks.
- Bornkamm, G 1971. *Paul, Paulus*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bosch, D 1978. Renewal of Christian Community in Africa Today, in Cassidy, M & Verlinden, L (eds), *Facing the New Challenges: The message of PACLA*, 92-102, Kisumu, Kenya: Evangel Publishing House.
- Bosch, D 1991. *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.

- Boyarin, D 1994. *A Radical Jew*. Berkley CA: University of California.
- Boyle, B 2005. "SA Gets Mugabe off the IMF hook." *The Sunday Times Sunday*, 31 July 2005. www.sundaytimes.co.za, 2005-08-03.
- Braun & Warner 2002. The "culture-free" verses "culture-specific" management debate, in Warner, M & Joynt, P (eds), *Managing Across Cultures: Issues and Perspectives*. 2nd ed, 13-25. London: International Thomas Business Press.
- Britt, D 1997. From Homogeneity to Congruence: A Church-Community Model, in Conn, H M (ed) 1997:135-149.
- Bronz, M P 2000. *The past as legacy: Luke-Acts and ancient epic*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.
- Cameron, T 1994. *Jan Smuts: An Illustrated Biography*. Cape Town: Human & Rousseau.
- Casalis, E 1861. *The Basutos*. Morija, Lesotho: Morija Museum and Archives.
- Cassidy, M 1974. *Prisoners of Hope: The Story of South Africa at a Crossroads*. Maseru: Africa Enterprise.
- Cassidy M & Osei-Mensah G (eds) 1978. *Together In One Place: The story of PACLA*. Kisumu, Kenya: Evangel.
- Cassidy M & Verlinden L (eds) 1978. *Facing the New Challenges: The message of PACLA*. Kisumu, Kenya: Evangel Publishing.
- Cassidy, M 1989. *The Passing Summer: A South African Pilgrimage in the Politics of Love*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Cassidy, M 1994. *The South African Miracle: Message given to friends of AE at Durban High School*. (A Video Recorded Message) Pietermaritzburg, KwaZulu Natal: African Enterprise.
- Cassidy, M 1995. *A Witness For Ever: The Dawning of Democracy in South Africa –Stories behind the Story*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Cassidy, M 2005. Interview with Michael Cassidy on Mandela, conducted by RPB Williams at the African Enterprise Conference Centre, Pietermaritzburg on Wednesday 25 May 2005 at 5:30pm (See Appendix 3 for extracts of this interview).
- Cassidy, M 2005B. Michael Cassidy's Electronic Newsletter: 15 August 2005.
- Chan, S 2003. *Robert Mugabe: A Life of Power and Violence*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Chang, E T & Diaz-Veizades, J 1999. *Ethnic Peace in the American City: Building Community in Los Angeles and Beyond*. New York: New York University Press.
- Clapp, R 1996. *A Peculiar People: The church as culture in a postmodern society*. Downers Grove IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Commission for Africa 2005. *Our Common Interest: Report of the Commission for Africa*. March 2005. Published by the Commission for Africa.
- Conger, J A 1992. *Learning to Lead: The Art of Transforming Managers into Leaders*. San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Conn, H M (ed) 1997. *Planting and Growing Urban Churches: From Dream to Reality*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.
- Coomes, A 2002. *African Harvest: The captivating story of Michael Cassidy and African Enterprise*. Mill Hill, London: Monarch.
- Costas, O E 1982. *Christ Outside the Gate: Mission Beyond Christendom*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis
- Crossan, J D & Reed, J L 2004. *In Search of Paul: How Jesus's Apostle Opposed Rome's Empire with God's Kingdom*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Daneel, M L 1970. *Zionism and Faith-Healing in Rhodesia: Aspects of African Independent Churches*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- Daneel, M L 1970B. *The God of the Matopo Hills: An Essay on the Mwari Cult in Rhodesia*. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- Daneel, M L 1971. *Old and New in Southern Shona Independent Churches*, vol 1. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- Daneel, M L 1974. *Old and New in Southern Shona Independent Churches*, vol 2. The Hague: Mouton & Co.
- Daneel, M L 1987. *Quest for Belonging*. Gweru, Zimbabwe: Mambo Press.

- Daneel, M L 1988. *Old and New in Southern Shona Independent Churches: Leadership and Fission Dynamics*, vol 3. Gweru: Mambo Press.
- Daneel, M L 2004. African Initiated Churches in Southern Africa: Protest Movements or Mission Churches?, in Lewis, D M (ed), *Christianity Reborn: The Global Expansion of Evangelicalism in the Twentieth Century*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Daneel, M L 2005. Interview with Prof Inus Daneel, Missionary to Zimbabwe with the Dutch Reformed Church conducted by R P B Williams regarding Bishop Samuel Mutendi, on Friday 23rd September 2005 at 9:30am at the University of South Africa (UNISA), Pretoria, Tshwane (see Appendix 4 for extracts of interview).
- Daniell, M H 2000. *World of Risk: Next Generation Strategy for a Volatile Era*. Singapore: John Wiley & Sons (Asia).
- De Klerk, W 1984. *The second (R)evolution: Afrikanerdom and the Crisis of Identity*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball.
- DePree, M 1993. *Leadership Jazz*. New York, NY: Dell Publishing.
- De Visser, A J 2000. *Kyrios and Morena: The Lordship of Christ in African Township Christianity*. Gezina: Victoria Drukkery.
- Dimbleby, D 2004. *Mandela: The Living Legend*. Film written and presented by David Dimbleby. Distributed under licence from BBC Worldwide Americas Inc. Princeton NJ: Films for the Humanities and Sciences.
- Dlamini Zuma, N C 2003. *South Africa in Africa and the World: Address by the Minister of foreign affairs Dr. Dlamini Zuma*, October 2003. <http://www.info.gov.za>, 2005-12-12.
- Dreyer, J 2005. Interview with Jacobus (Cobus) Dreyer, Archaeologist, conducted by R P B Williams, regarding Moshoeshoe, on Friday 11th March 2005 at 9:00am in Bloemfontein, University of the Free State (see Appendix 1 for extracts of interview).
- Dreyer, V 2002. Leadership in the world of the Bible: (De)institutionalisation as an ongoing process. *Verbum et Ecclesia* 23(3) 2002, 625-641.
- Dunn, J D G 1995. *I Corinthians: New Testament Guides*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Dunn, J D G 1998. *The Christ and The Spirit*. Vol 1, *Christology*. Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans.
- Dunn, J D G 1998B. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans.
- Du Boulay, S 1988. *Tutu: Voice of the Voiceless*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Du Plessis, J 1919. *The Life of Andrew Murray of South Africa*. London: Marshall Brothers.
- Du Plessis, S 1990. *The Sunday Star Magazine* 23 December 1990, My Favourite Room-Desmond Tutu, p12.
- Du Preez, M 2004. *Of Warriors, Lovers and Prophets: Unusual Stories from South Africa's past*. Cape Town: Zebra Publishing.
- Du Preez, M 2004P (Producer). *Morena Moshoeshoe 1786-1870*. Video produced and directed by Max du Preez for the University of the Free State Centenary Project 2004. Bloemfontein: University of the Free State.
- Earley, P C & Ang, S 2003. *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Eldredge, E 1993. *A South African Kingdom: The pursuit of security in nineteenth-century Lesotho*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellenberger, D F 1912. *History of the Basuto: Ancient and Modern*. Morija, Lesotho: Morija Museum and Archives.
- Emerson, M O 2006. *People of the Dream: Multicultural Congregations in the United States*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ferguson, J 1970. *The Religions of the Roman Empire*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Flood, RL & Romm, N A 1996. *Diversity Management: Triple Loop Learning*. Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fourie, D 2005. Interview with General Deon Fourie, conducted by RPB Williams, at his home in Lukasrand, Pretoria, South Africa at 10am on Wednesday 20th April 2005 (See Appendix 2 for extracts from this interview).

- Fraser, G 2001. *Christianity and Violence: Girard, Nietzsche, Anselm and Tutu*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Frazer, R 2001. *The Connecting Church: Beyond Small Groups to Authentic Community*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Friedman, B 1975. *Smuts: A Reappraisal*. Johannesburg: Hugh Keartland Publishers.
- Gardenswartz, L and Rowe, A 1993. *Managing Diversity: A Complete Desk Reference and Planning Guide*. Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin; San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer (Co-Publishers).
- Gay, J, Gill, D & Hall D (eds) 1995. *Lesotho's Long Journey: Hard Choices at the Crossroads*. Maseru: Sechaba Consultants.
- Geysler, O 2001. *Jan Smuts and His International Contemporaries*. Gauteng: Covos Day.
- Gibbs, E 2005. *LeadershipNext: Changing leaders in a changing culture*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.
- Gibbs, E & Bolger, R K 2005. *Emerging Churches: Creating Christian community in postmodern cultures*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.
- Gill, S 2004. Comments made on Moshesh's cavalry and his conversion by Stephen J Gill, curator of Morija Museum and Archives, in Du Preez 2004P.
- Gilliland, D S 1998. *Pauline Theology & Mission Practise*. Eugene OR: Wipf and Stock.
- Gilliland, D S 1999. *Doing Theology in Context: MT 510 Syllabus*. Pasadena CA: Fuller Theological Seminary, School of World Mission.
- Gish, S D 2004. *Desmond Tutu: A Biography*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Glasser, A F 1989. *Kingdom and Mission*. Pasadena: Fuller Theological Seminary.
- Goodspeed, E J 1965. *Paul*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada.
- Gorman, M J 2004. *Apostle of the Crucified Lord: A theological introduction to Paul and his letters*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Gornik, M R 1997. Between Resurrection and Reconciliation: The Story of New Song Community Church, in Conn, H M (ed) 1997:235-243.
- Grant, M H 1910. *History of the War in South Africa 1899-1902*, vol 4 (Compiled by the direction of His Majesty's government). London: Hurst & Blackett Ltd.
- Grant, N 1981. *Moshoeshe: Founder of a Nation*. London: Longman Group UK Ltd.
- Grassi, J A 1978. *The Secret of Paul the Apostle*. Maryknoll NY: Orbis.
- Green, M 2003. *Evangelism in the Early Church*. Rev ed. Lottbridge Drove: Kingsway.
- Groenewald, H 1996. Intercultural Communication: "Risking" a Change of Heart, in Steyn, M E & Motshabi, B 1996:13-26.
- Group of Eight 2005. *Highlights of the G8 Communiqué on Africa*. www.number-10.gov.uk, 2005-08-13.
- Hahn, F 1995. *Christologische Hoheitstitel. Ihre Geschichte im fruhen Christentum*. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (cf De Visser 2000:243 – List of References).
- Hancock, W K 1962. *Smuts: The Sanguine Years 1870-1919*. London: Cambridge Univ.
- Hancock, W K 1968. *Smuts: The Fields of Force 1919-1950*. London: Cambridge Univ.
- Harnack, A von 1908. *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, vol I. New York NY: Putman.
- Harrison, D 1987. *White tribe of Africa: South Africa in perspective*. Johannesburg: Southern Publishers.
- Harvey, H 2001. *The Fall of Apartheid: The inside story from Smuts to Mbeki*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Hayles, R & Russell, AM 1997. *The Diversity Directive: Why Some Initiatives Fail & What to Do About It*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hengel, M 1974. *Property and Riches in the early Church*. London: SCM Press. Translated by John Bowden (Orig. in German–Published in Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag).
- Henshaw, P 2004. South African Territorial Expansion and the International Reaction to South African Racial Policies, 1939 to 1948. *South African Historical Journal* May 2004 Issue 50, 65-76.

- Hersey, P, Blanchard, K & Johnson, D 1996. *Management of Organizational Behaviour: Utilizing Human Resources*. 7th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Horwitz, FM 2002. Wither South African management, in Warner & Joynt 2002:215-220.
- Hughes, A J B 1956. *Kin, Caste and Nation among the Rhodesian Ndebele (The Rhodes-Livingstone Papers Number 25)*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Hugo, S 2005. Interview: Stefaan Hugo at 75 Moderfontein, Halfway House, Midrand. Interviewed by R P B Williams at 3 pm on 22 September 2005.
- Hulley, L, Kretzschmar, L, and Pato, L 1996. *Archbishop Tutu: Prophetic Witness in South Africa*. Cape Town: Human & Rousseau.
- Hutton, W & Giddens, A (eds) 2000. *On the Edge*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Hybels, B 2002. *Courageous Leadership*. Grand rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Ignatieff, M 1984. *The Needs of Strangers*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Jacobs, S & Calland, R (eds) 2002. *Thabo Mbeki's World: The politics and ideology of the South African President*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.
- Jewett, P K 1985. *Election and Predestination*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Kelly, G 1999. *Retrofuture: Rediscovering Our Roots, Recharting Our Routes*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Kennedy, K 2004. *Speak Truth to Power: Human Rights Defenders Who are Changing Our World*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- Knight, I J 1994. *Warrior Chiefs of Southern Africa*. Poole (Dorset UK): Firebird.
- Kock, A 2005. Interview with Mrs Arina Kock, conducted by R P B Williams as regards Smuts, at her home in Gasfontein, Pretoria at 11am on Feb 11th 2005 (See Appendix 2 for a written record of this interview).
- Koester, H 1992. Jesus the Victim. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111(1), 3-15.
- Kouzes, J M & Posner, B Z 1995. *The Leadership Challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kramer, K 2003. *Nelson Mandela: From Political Prisoner to President*. London: Franklin Watts.
- Kretzschmar, L 2002. Authentic Christian leadership and spiritual formation in Africa. *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 113 (July 2002), 41ff.
- Kritzinger, D (ed) 2002. *No Quick Fixes: The challenge of mission in a changing South Africa*. Pretoria: IMER Publication, University of Pretoria.
- Kummel, WG 1975: *Introduction to the New Testament*. Rev ed, translated by HC Kee. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Kunnie, J E 1990. Bridges across the Atlantic: Relating black theologies in the United States and South Africa focussing on social analytical methodologies and utilizing James Cone and Desmond Tutu as respective symbolic figures. Published ThD Dissertation, faculty of the Graduate Theological Union, Berkley, CA.
- Lean, P S 1995. *One Man in His Time: A Pictorial Review of the Life of Jan Christian Smuts*. 3rd ed. Irene: General Smuts Foundation.
- Le Grys, A 1998. *Preaching to the Nations: The Origins of Mission in the Early Church*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK).
- Lelimo, M 2004. Comments made on Moshoeshoe's military strategy and restoration of cannibals by Martin Lelimo, Lesotho Historian and Educationist, in du Preez 2004P.
- Lodge, T 2002. *Politics in South Africa: From Mandela to Mbeki*. Cape Town: David Philip; Oxford: James Currey; Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Long, J 1997. *Generation Hope: A strategy for reaching the postmodern generation*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.
- Machobane, L 2004. Comments made on the missionary Casalis' role and Moshoeshoe's cavalry by Dr Machobane, Historian, University of Lesotho, in Du Preez 2004P.
- Mackay, D and Motsi, P 1988. Some Contemporary Trends in Independent Churches in Zimbabwe: The Cases of ZCC (Zion Christian Church) and AACJM (Jo[h]ane Maranke's VaPostori), in Hallencreutz, C & Moyo, A (eds), *Church and State in Zimbabwe*, 361-374. Gweru, Zimbabwe: Mambo Press.

- Mandela, N 1980. Response to the Soweto Uprising of 1976, smuggled out of Robben Island Prison, published by the African National Congress, 10 June, 1980, in Asmal, K, Chidester, D & James, W (eds) 2003: 43-46.
- Mandela, N 1990. Opening address at the African National Congress/ Inkatha Freedom Party Summit, 29 January 1990, in Asmal, K, Chidester, D & James, W (eds) 2003:116-119.
- Mandela, N 1993. Statement at the opening of the Cultural Development Congress, Civic Theatre, Johannesburg, 25 April 1993, in Asmal, K, Chidester, D & James, W (eds) 2003:288-290.
- Mandela, N 1993B. Address to the plenary session of the Multi-Party Negotiations Process, world Trade Centre, Kempton Park, 17 November 1993, in Asmal, K, Chidester, D & James, W (eds) 2003:128-129.
- Mandela, N 1994. *Long Walk to Freedom: The Autobiography of Nelson Mandela*. New York, NY: Little, Brown & Co.
- Mandela, N 1994B. Address to the nation at the inauguration of Nelson Mandela as President of the Republic of South Africa, Union Buildings, Pretoria, 10 May 1994, in Asmal, K, Chidester, D & James, W (eds) 2003:68-70.
- Mandela, N 1995. Message on Day of Reconciliation, 16 December 1995, in Asmal, K, Chidester, D & James, W (eds) 2003:137-138.
- Mandela, N 1996. *Mandela: An Illustrated Autobiography*. New York: Little Brown and Co.
- Manley, M 2005. Interview with Mark Manley, ex-Team Leader for African Enterprise –South Africa from 2001 till 2003, conducted at his home “the Knoll”, Hilton on Thursday 11th August 2005 at 5:30pm (Interview by R P B Williams).
- Martin, M L 1975. *Kimbangu: An African Prophet and His Church*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mathebe, L 2001. *Bound by Tradition: The world of Thabo Mbeki*. Pretoria: Unisa Press, University of South Africa.
- Mbeki, T 1997. Address by Deputy President Thabo Mbeki at the launch of the Business Arts South Africa (BASA), Pretoria, 3 February 1997.
- Mbeki, T 1998. Statement by Deputy President Thabo Mbeki on the occasion of the adoption by the Constitutional Assembly of the Republic of South Africa Constitutional Bill, 1996, Cape Town, May 1998.
- Mbeki, T 2005. *Statement of The President of South Africa, Thabo Mbeki, at the Joint Sitting of Parliament on the Release of Hon Jacob Zuma from his responsibilities as Deputy President*, 14 June 2005. <http://www.info.gov.za>, 2005-12-12.
- Mbigi, L & Maree, J 1995. *Ubuntu: The Spirit of African Transformation Management*. Johannesburg: Knowledge Resources.
- Mbigi, L 2000. *In search of the African Business Renaissance: An African cultural perspective*. Randburg: Knowledge Resources.
- Mbiti, J S 1969. *African Religions and Philosophy*. London: Heinemann.
- McLaren, B 2003. The Method, the Message and the Ongoing Story, in Sweet, L (gen ed), *The Church in Emerging Culture: Five Perspectives*, 191-230. Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan.
- McRay, J 2003. *Paul: His Life and Teaching*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Meeks, WA 1983. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Meiring, K 2003. *In Interesting Company*. Cape: Print24.com.
- Meiring, P 1974. *Jan Smuts die Afrikaner*. Cape Town: Tafelberg.
- Meiring, P 1975. *Jan Smuts the Patriot*. Cape Town: Tafelberg.
- Meiring, P G J 1999. *Chronicle of the Truth Commission: A journey through the past and present – into the future of South Africa*. Vanderbijlpark: Carpe Diem Books.
- Meiring, P G J 2002. Leadership for reconciliation: A Truth and Reconciliation Commission perspective. *Verbum et Ecclesia* Vol 23(3) 2002, 719-735.
- Meiring, P G J 2005. Interview questions posed to Prof Piet Meiring, Missiologist with Faculty of Theology, University of Pretoria, on Thursday 20 October 2005 at 9:00am.

- Mfekane, C 1991. Understanding the Church Situation and Obstacles to Christian Witness in South Africa. Response by, in Alberts, L & Chikane, F, *The Road to Rustenburg: The Church looking forward to a new South Africa*, 103-108. Cape Town: Struik Christian Books.
- Morgan, N 2004. Comments made on Casalis' role and Moshesh's conversion by Professor Naomi Morgan of the University of the Free State, in Du Preez 2004P.
- Morgan, N 2005. Interview with Prof Naomi Morgan, head of French Dept., University of the Free State, conducted by R P B Williams regarding Moshoeshe, on Friday 11th March 2005 at 11:30am in Bloemfontein (see Appendix 1 for extracts of interview).
- Morrison, J 2005. Interview with Jamie Morrison, Personal Assistant/ editor to Michael Cassidy, conducted at the African Enterprise Training Centre, Pietermaritzburg on Wednesday 25th May 2005 at 3:30pm (Interviewer –Richmond Williams).
- Motjuwadi, S 1984. *Drum*. December 1984, noted in Du Boulay, S 1988, Tutu: Voice of the Voiceless, p29 and 267. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Mutendi, N 2005. Interview with Nehemiah Mutendi, Bishop of the Zion Christian Church (Zimbabwe), conducted by R P B Williams regarding Bishop Samuel Mutendi, on Tuesday 13th September 2005 at 10:30am at his home in Harare, 1024 Mt Pleasant Heights, Harare (see Appendix 4 for extracts of interview).
- Natthass, G & Spies, S B 1994. *Jan Smuts: Memoirs of the Boer War*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball.
- Neill, SC 1958. *Paul to the Galatians*. World Christian Books: Lutterworth.
- New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) 2001. *The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)*, October 2001. <http://www.nepad.org>, 2005-11-22.
- Newbiggin, L 1995. *The Open Secret: An Introduction to the Theology of Mission*. Rev ed. Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans.
- Nuttall, M 2003. *Number Two to Tutu: A Memoir*. Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Pub.
- Nuttall, M 2005. Interview with Michael Nuttall – retired Bishop of KwaZulu Natal, conducted at 238 Johan Rissik, Waterkloof Ridge, Pretoria-Tshwane, on Saturday 27th August 2005 at 5:00 pm (Interviewer –Richmond Williams).
- Okullu, H 1978. The African Context and its Issues, in Cassidy, M & Verlinden, L 1978:30-33.
- Ortiz, M 1993. *The Hispanic Challenge: Opportunities Confronting the Church*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Ortiz, M 1996. *One New People: Models for Developing a Multiethnic Church*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Paterson, R 2000. *The Antioch Factor: The Hidden Message of the Book of Acts*. Tonbridge, Kent: Sovereign World.
- Peerbolte, L J 2003. *Paul the Missionary*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Perkins, S & Rice, C 1993. *More than Equals*. Downers Grove IL: InterVarsity.
- Pollock, J 1985. *The Apostle: A Life of Paul*. Colorado Springs CO: Cook.
- Prior, D 1985. *The Message of 1 Corinthians: Life in the Local Church*. Vol –“1 Cor”, *The Bible Speaks Today*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity.
- Rich, P B (ed) 1994. *The Dynamics of Change in Southern Africa*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Roy, K 2000. *Zion City RSA: The story of the church in South Africa*. Cape Town: South African Baptist Historical Society.
- Sampley, J P (ed) 2003. *Paul in the Greco-Roman World*. Harrisburg PA: Trinity Press.
- Sampson, A 2000. *Mandela: The Authorized Biography*. New York: Vintage Books- Random House, Inc. (First published by HarperCollins Publishers: London in 1999).
- Sanders, P 1975. *Moshoeshe: Chief of the Sotho*. London: Heinemann.
- Sanneh, L 1997. *Translating the Message: The Missionary Impact on Culture*. 8th print. Maryknoll NY: Orbis.
- Schaller, L E 1993. *Center City Churches: The New Urban Frontier*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.
- Schreiter, R J 1985. *Constructing Local Theologies*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Seeiso, S 2004. Comments made on Moshesh's talent for diplomacy by Prince Seeiso Bereng Seeiso, direct descendant of Moshoeshe, in Du Preez 2004P.

- Sham, B 1999. The Contemporary Role of Leadership in Organizational Transformation: A Qualitative Approach. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Pretoria.
- Shank, D A 1994. William Wade Harris ca. 1860-1929: God Made His Soul a Soul of Fire, in Anderson, G H et al (eds), *Mission legacies: Biographical Studies of Leaders of the Modern Missionary Movement*, 155-165. Maryknoll NY: Orbis Books.
- Shearing, T & Shearing, D 2000. *General Jan Smuts and His Long Ride*. Sedgefield RSA: Taffy and David Shearing (Private publication).
- Shenk, W R 1990. The contribution of the study of new religious movements to Missiology, in Walls, A F, Shenk, W R (eds), *Exploring New Religious Movements: Essays in Honour of Harold W Turner*, 179-205. Elkhart, IN: Mission Focus.
- Shutte, A 1996. Philosophy for Africa: Community and Individual Freedom, and Conceptions of Humanity, in Steyn, M E & Motshabi, B 1996:27-36.
- Sibanda, S 2005. Interview with Sibhekinkosi Sibanda at 79 Twickenham Drive, Mount Pleasant, Harare. Interviewed by R P B Williams at 3pm on 15 September 2005.
- Sine, T 1999. *Mustard Seed vs McWorld*. Crowborough England: Monarch.
- Smith, A 1984. *Now I Call Him Brother*. Basingstoke: Marshall Morgan & Scott.
- Smith, C 1999. *Mandela: In Celebration of a Great Life*. London: New Holland/ Struik.
- Smith, E W 1959 (ed). *African Ideas of God*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh House Press.
- Smuts, J C 1951. *The Thoughts of General Smuts*. Cape Town: Juta. (Compiled by his private secretary P B Blanckenberg).
- Smuts, J C 1987. *Holism and Evolution*. Cape Town: N&S Press (First Published 1926; This Edition 1987).
- Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) 1999. *A Guide for Planting Multicultural Churches*. Alpharetta, GA: North American Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention
- Sparks, A 2003. *Beyond the Miracle: Inside the New South Africa*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Stepp, P L 2005. *Leadership Succession in the World of the Pauline Circle*. University of Sheffield, Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.
- Steyn, M E & Motshabi, K B (eds) 1996. *Cultural Synergy in South Africa: Weaving Strands of Africa and Europe*. Randburg: Knowledge Resources.
- Stott, J R W 1986. *The Message of Galatians: Only One way*. Vol – “Galatians”, *The Bible Speaks Today*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity.
- Stott, J R W 1986E. *The Message of Ephesians: God’s New Society*. Vol – “Ephesians”, *The Bible Speaks Today*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity.
- Stott, J R W 1994. *The Message of Acts: The Spirit, the Church & the World*. Vol – “Acts”, *The Bible Speaks Today*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity.
- Stott, J R W 1994R. *The Message of Romans: God’s good news for the world*. Vol – “Romans”, *The Bible Speaks Today*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity.
- Sundkler, B 1961. *Bantu Prophets in South Africa*. 2nd ed. London: Oxford University Press.
- Sundkler, B 1976. *Zulu Zion and some Swazi Zionists*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Swart, M 2005. Interview with Martiens Swart at Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk, Arcadia, Pretoria. Interviewed by R P B Williams at 9:45am on 6 December 2005.
- Swindoll, C R 2002. *Paul: A Man of Grace and Grit*. Nashville TN: W Publishing Group.
- Taylor, C 1992. *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Taylor, J V 2001. *The Primal Vision: Christian Presence Amid African Religion*. New ed (1st ed published 1963). London: SCM Press.
- Thatcher, M 1991. *A Time for Greatness: Jan Smuts Memorial Lecture*. Johannesburg: The South African Institute of International Affairs.
- The Center for Public Integrity. *Global Integrity: Public Integrity Index*. www.publicintegrity.org, 2005-08-12.
- Thompson, L 1975. *Survival in Two Worlds: Moshoeshe of the Lesotho 1786-1870*. London: Oxford University Press.

- Thompson, L 2001. *A History of South Africa*. 3rd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Tibaijuka, A 2005. *Report of the Fact-Finding Mission to Zimbabwe to assess the Scope and Impact of Operation Murambatsvina by the UN Special Envoy on Human Settlements Issues in Zimbabwe*. United Nations Publication.
- Townsend, P 1978. *Time and Chance: An Autobiography*. London: Collins.
- Tsheola, J 2002. South Africa's form of globalisation: a continental posture paradox for insertion and dependence. *Political Geography* 21, 789-811.
- Tutu, D 1989. The Bias of God. *The Month: A Review of Christian Thought and World Affairs*. Nov 1988, 27.
- Tutu, D 1994. *The Rainbow People of God: South Africa's victory over apartheid*. London: Doubleday (Edited by John Allen).
- Tutu, D 1997. *The Essential Desmond Tutu*. Cape Town: David Philip (Compiled by John Allen).
- Tutu, D 1999. *No Future Without Forgiveness*. New York: Doubleday.
- Tutu, D 2004. *God Has a Dream: A vision of hope for our time*. New York: Doubleday.
- Umteteli Wa Bantu 1932. "Civilized" labour policy. October 29th, 1932, quoted in Tim Couzens and Essop Patel, eds, *The Return of the Amasi Bird*; quoted in Du Boulay, S 1988, Tutu: Voice of the Voiceless, 21-22. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Van der Merwe, W J 1981. *From Mission Field to Autonomous Church in Zimbabwe*. Pretoria: Institute for Missiological Research (ISWEN), University of Pretoria.
- Van Engen, C 2004. *Is the Church for Everyone? Planting Multi-Ethnic Congregations in North America*. <http://www.globalmissiology.net>, 2005-06-23.
- Van Zyl Slabbert, F 2003. The Introduction to Negotiating Reconciliation, in Asmal, K, Chidester, D & James, W (eds) 2003:95-100.
- Venter, D 1999. Language, Nation and Congregation: World-System and World-Polity Perspectives on Language Integration in South African Churches. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Stellenbosch.
- Vertovec, S 1996. Multiculturalism, culturalism and public incorporation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 19 (1) Jan 1996, 49-69.
- Vertovec, S 2001. *Transnational Challenges to the 'New' Multiculturalism*. Paper presented to the ASA Conference held at the University of Sussex, 30 March - 2 April 2001. University of Oxford.
- Villafane, E 1995. *Seek the Peace of the City: Reflections on Urban Ministry*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Villa-Vicencio, C 1994. Theology and Culture in South Africa: Beyond Multi-culturalism. *Theology Today* 51, 115-126.
- Von Allmen, D 1975. The Birth of Theology. *International Review of Mission*. Vol 64, No 253 (Jan).
- Walls, A F 1996. *The Missionary Movement in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission of Faith*. Maryknoll NY: Orbis.
- Warner, M & Joynt, P (eds) 2002. *Managing Across Cultures: Issues and Perspectives*. 2nd ed. London: International Thomas Business Press.
- Weber, O 1983 *Foundations of Dogmatics*, vol 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- West, C 1999. *Power, Truth and Community in Modern Culture. Christian Mission and Modern Culture*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press.
- West, M 1975. *Bishops and Prophets in a Black City*. Cape Town: David Philip.
- White, L M 2003. Paul and Pater Familias, in Sampley 2003:457-487.
- Williams, P 2002. *The Paradox of Power: A Transforming View of Leadership*. United States of America: Warner Books.
- Yancey, G 2003. *One Body One Spirit: Principles of Successful Multiracial Churches*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.
- Ziesler, J 1990. *Pauline Christianity*. Rev ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zvobgo, C J M 1996. *A History of Christian Missions in Zimbabwe, 1890-1939*. Gweru, Zimbabwe: Mambo Press.

GLOSSARY OF TERMINOLOGY

- Apartheid* – Separate development
agape – God’s unconditional love
Amandla ngawethu! – The power is ours! [Nguni]
amakhandas – royal homesteads
balimo – ancestral spirits
Basotho – the Southern Sotho People
baas – boss
bohali – cattle paid as the bride-price / the marriage cattle
burgers – comrades; soldiers; commandos; “rugged outdoorsmen”
carpe diem – seize the moment
charismata – spiritual gifts
Chimurenga – the Liberation War.
Cosmic – Universal; all-encompassing
cosmos – world; the human or created domain; visible and invisible universe
cum laude – with distinction; with honours
dare – court; church council (of Mutendi)
dei filius – Son of God
die Swart Gevaar – the Black Danger
domas – atrium houses
Dominee – Church Minister or Pastor [Afrikaans]
eikon – icon
ekklesia – the town assembly
ekklesia theou – the assembly called by God
episkopoi – bishops
familia – extended family network or Roman household
familia caesaris – Caesar’s household or extended family network
gravitas – a persona of seriousness
Harambee – pulling together (Swahili)
he kat` oikon – house church or home fellowship
hole he ekklesia – the assembling of the whole church in any one city or place
huis toe – go home; return home [Afrikaans]
hy of sy is, tweetalig – he or she is bilingual [speaks fluently in Afrikaans and English]
imago Dei – image of God
Imana – God
imprimatur – imprint; insignia
insulae – apartments
Induna – Chief or state officials [or *izinduna*]
kairos – the moment of truth; divine timing
Komotso – the one who comforts the afflicted
koinonia – fellowship or sacrificial service associated with the voluntary societies or Christian House Church
kugadzira – the traditional rite of the veneration and communion with the deceased
kupira midzimu – the worship of ancestors; ancestor worship
Kyrios – Lord; Divine One
laager – larger; an enclosure that traditionally was formed by circling the wagons
lekhotla – the Sotho chief’s court
Letlama – The binder

letona – a councillor [plural see *matona*- councillors]
lifaqane – the period of savage raiding [Sotho]
Lingaka – a common word for all herbalists, diviners and rainmakers
lingua franca – universally recognized language of choice
logos – word
mafisa system – the state was the technical owner of the cattle which in theory was incorporated into the national herd, but in practice its subjects retained them in a stewardship arrangement.
Mai – Mother; Mrs
Mambo – King
Maranatha – Come, Lord
Matla ke a rona – The power is ours! [Sotho]
Matlama – The binders
matona – councillors [singular see *letona*]
Melimo – The deceased chiefs having served their people well, who are given divine status
Melimo e mecha rapelang Molimo oak hale – New gods, pray for us to the God of old
Messiah – The Christ
mfecane or *mfekane* – the period of savage raiding [Nguni]
mhondoro – senior tribal spirits or “hero-gods”
midzimu – ancestors (plural)
moderamen – executive (of the General Synod)
modus operandi – mode of operation; model of life
Molimo – the Supreme Being; the God of old; the “Creator”
Morena – Chief
Morena e Moholo – a Great Chief, or King
Mosuto – a Sotho person
Muali – God the sower; the God of Fertility
mudzimu – ancestor (singular)
mufundisi – minister
mukuru – senior; elder
musterion or *mysterion* – mystery
Mwari – God; Lord of the Heavens; the Highest God
Mwari vaMatonjeni (or *Mwari waMatonjeni*) – the God (or the high god) of Matonjeni
Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk – Dutch Reformed Church (*N G Kerk*- DRC).
Nkosi – King
Nkosi Sikelel' iAfrica – God bless Africa
oikonomia – the community of a household
oikos – family or household
pater patriae – father of the country
Paulus – Paul in Greek
pax (of Augustus) – peace (during the reign of Augustus)
Pax-Romana – the Peace extended by the Roman Empire; the “Peace of Rome”.
Pax-Humana – the Peace of Mankind.
pitso – a tribal gathering where Sotho men participated in a process of decision making that affected the whole tribe or the whole nation.
polis – public affairs
politeia – public life of the city-state
potestas – the authority of a husband/ married man over his family in Roman society
runyaradzo – a ceremony of consolation and conducting the deceased to heaven

Ruach – spirit; wind; Breath of God
Satyagraha – Philosophy of non-violence (used by Gandhi)
Saul – Paul in Hebrew
Sekuru – elder; senior
Shema – A Jewish holy saying: “Hear O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord.”
slim Jannie – clever (small) Jan
Soter – Saviour
Swart Gevaar – Black Danger
Tertium genus – a third race
thiasos anthropon – human association
tsotsis – bad people, thugs, bullies
Tu Quoque – you also
ubuntu – one exist because the people exists; you can do nothing apart from others
Umkhonto we Sizwe – The Spear of the Nation
Umteteli Wa Bantu – Spokesperson for The People
Unkulunkulu – the Great/great/One [Zulu for God]; the Greatest of the great [Ndebele]
Vafundisi – ministers
vahosi – the lead women
vanyai – messengers
vaRosvi – the Rozvi
volk – people [often referring to the Afrikaners]

BIBLICAL REFERENCES

All biblical references are taken from the New International Version (NIV) unless otherwise specified or unless they appear as part of a quotation. Other translations as specified in the text were used to provide clarity or emphasis where the NIV was seen not to provide the necessary concepts or perspective, or for comparison or contrast, and are the:

NRSV- The New Revised Standard Version

Author’s Paraphrase- The author of this thesis has deliberately paraphrased

All other scripture texts quoted directly by the author (without qualification in the text such as NRSV) of this thesis, RPB Williams, are from the Holy Bible, NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION Registered. NIV Registered. Copyright 1973, 1978, 1984, 1995 International Bible Society. Used by permission of Zondervan Publishing House.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Interviews Regarding Moshoeshoe

Interview with Prof Naomi Morgan, Head of the French section, Dept. of Afrikaans, Dutch and French for the University of the Free State, on Friday 11th March 2005 at 11:30am in Bloemfontein, South Africa (Interviewer –Richmond Williams).

Professor Morgan, an expert on French Missionaries, Casalis and Arbousset, has also done a significant degree of research into Moshoeshoe and his relationship to the missionaries.

Question by the interviewer: “Was there ways in which Moshoeshoe’s thinking as he imbibed a western thinking actually permanently changed the way the BaSotho looked at life. Or do you think it was mostly a ‘semi-state’ [of thought] for while he was still alive?”

Prof Morgan: “I think the answer is pretty complex. I think on a religious level the change was pretty permanent. Lesotho today is a very religious country. ...It is a Christian country and interestingly if you were to compare the present day King Letsie with for example Mswati from Swaziland, Letsie is a monogamous king, which is not the case with the Swazi king. So in a sense it has come full circle – the one problem that Moshoeshoe had and Moshoeshoe did not want to give up (a hundred wives) either. And in the same way that cattle were part of your riches, so were your wives. And it did take time, there was a permutation process, but if you look at where we are today, the fact that it is virtually a monogamous society, maybe there are social circumstances in which people have affairs or whatever, but it’s no longer part of their culture to be polygamous. In many instances I can understand that from a leadership point of view polygamy is a good thing. Just because in a polygamous society women are in a sense protected. You have no unmarried women. They may be ill-treated within their own marriage, but you don’t have to worry about women living alone, women having to fend for themselves. Everyone is in a sense sort of within a framework and the idea and social concept of celibacy does not exist. In a sense ... I’m trying to understand why polygamy exists and I think the original idea was not just because men have exaggerated needs, I really don’t think so. I think its because its just a way of having close knit community. ...And it is a way of genetically drawing people into the same tribe.”

Professor Morgan then went on to compare what happened with the French Huguenot settlers in Stellenbosch and there integration into the Dutch community by the insistence that their daughters marry outside their immediate community.

Morgan: “...The best way to integrate is cross-cultural marriages.”

Professor Morgan then related the well known account of how Moshoeshoe sent two hundred head of cattle to appease the Ndebele invaders whom he had already beaten off.

Morgan: “The concept of sending cattle, which is also in a sense almost a Christian value. It’s turning the other cheek, but you don’t even need to because you were the one that slaps. Which is unthinkable – there had been no precedent, no model – where did this shrewdness come from, this diplomacy. But at the same time it is really pragmatic – he knew that there would be more battles, and that a small kingdom such as his was in dire need of allies. He was shrewd, but also pragmatic as well as innovative: there were no role models who could have inspired such behaviour. Once again if you remember what

happened in Shaka's time – remember that episode where he's interested in the way human life develops within pregnant women and he cuts them up alive to see. And you take another example – the Xhosa prophetess Nomquasi – who says they must kill all their cattle and then new cattle, will come from the sea....”

“So on the one hand you have these scenes of complete desolation, cattle skulls and whatever, and this doesn't seem to bother the chiefs, and on the other hand you have these really wonderful descriptions in the missionary excursion by Arbousset where he travels with Moshoeshe. And Moshoeshe is absolutely pained and says: ‘When I was a young boy this was fertile land, look at it now and look at the skulls, look at the bones. This is complete desolation, this cannot go on, we have to change the ways’. And that to me is real statesmanship! In other words: ‘I will have to make concessions’. And he really makes them! He includes people from other tribes, he invites missionaries, he accepts a religion that goes contrary to everything that he knows and believes, like polygamy. He even changes the way people are buried.”

Talking about the controversy surrounding Moshoeshe's turning or not turning to Christianity, Professor Morgan went on to relate the following:

“There is the idea that if he were to convert he would have gone the Catholic way, because he liked the idea of spectacle, the incense, the music and the colours, these things that really appealed to him, as he had a sense of theatre. I don't mean in a frivolous or superficial way.”

Interviewer: “Where do you see his values /model of leadership coming from? Traditional world view/ belief system or some from slightly Christian inputs? How do you see that?”

Morgan: “I see his style as being very pragmatic. And his pragmatism to me is a mixture of many things. I think he was (sometimes nations are lucky and they get) the right man at the right time. Even if it didn't last, Lesotho had its golden era or its golden century and many countries only have that once. For many it was the seventeenth or eighteenth century, at least it had that! He did come from a traditional background but at the same time he was never hampered by traditionalism. ...If he were a pure traditionalist it implies not changing, keeping to the known paths, but at the same time he realizes this isn't going to help him much. Once again if we take the comparison with Shaka, Shaka also evolved as far as his military techniques were concerned but in a sense it was within the traditional framework. There is that famous horn formation and we know he did some research on the spear and the shield [modifying both] – evolving existing weaponry. But Moshoeshe – he makes this enormous jump, he's never seen a horse before and he has this idea that he could have cavalry. They have always used assegais and their spears and he sees what guns can do and Shaka did not do that. He [Shaka] probably saw them being used by the English but he did not make the jump across. A traditionalist yes, but [for Moshoeshe] pragmatism always has the last word!”

As far as the Christian religion is concerned it is always difficult for us to see whether he did this out of a certain belief or just because he saw the good effects of religion. And maybe we need to be pragmatists ourselves and tell ourselves if a leader can see it's better to have the good effects of Christianity even if you are not a Christian yourself, then it's the next best thing! If we can compare what Napoleon, who converted cathedrals into temples

of reason and then brought back the Christian religion, even though he probably thought it's just a lot of humbug, because it was easier to rule people not because it's the 'Opiate of the masses' but because it gives them a moral code. He can appeal to their sense of moral responsibility. Whereas without that you've got nothing – this I think Moshoeshoe saw as well. What is extraordinary is that Napoleon came from a Bourgeois family, so he was exposed to Catholicism, so he knew what it could do. Moshoeshoe just didn't know – he came into contact with the Christian religion via the Christian missionaries from the 1830's onwards – and for him to realize that this can have a beneficial effect! To me its pragmatism.”

Professor Morgan went on to explain that though much can be attributed to traditional values, where does a value system start?: “Often values may in other instances have been Christian but through evolution such as in socialism the roots are lost. So it could have been with some of Moshoeshoe's values, that they may well have had roots in Christianity, especially when one is talking about inclusivity.” Morgan later relates: “Moshoeshoe's shrewdness and leadership resided in the fact that he was not arrogant about his victory, that he respected his opponent (this is obvious in the case of Louw Wepener, for example); in fact, he did the unthinkable: he treated the opponent as the victor. Ironically, the conduct of this 'unconverted' man was almost biblical to the letter.”

Morgan next commented on the long term benefits of Moshoeshoe's policies for the nation of Lesotho: “In the material things they probably lost a lot. They lost land, they lost power, they lost many other things. But what they gained in the end is what they did not lose – their pride and their autonomy. Many writers and historians often remark that there is a difference almost in the gait, in the body language of a Sotho, in the South African mines and in going back to Lesotho when he comes across the border he is his own man again. There's a sense that although the price that was paid was extremely high I think there was always self respect. South Africa was always the richer brother, there was autonomy even if it meant relative poverty – there was a sense of self respect and there was a sense of pride. They were their own people even though they lost a lot; they were reduced to the poor brother in the Southern African context.”

Interviewer: “There is such a high value attributed to land in Africa. I look at my own country Zimbabwe –would you say that land even though a critical issue, that maybe possibly a higher value than land is actually self esteem for Moshoeshoe.”

Morgan: “The two are probably linked, a little bit. They lost a little land but they gained self esteem. ...Lesotho remained independent, it never was a homeland. I don't know if you can really separate the two. Isn't that what the whole Palestinian question is about? Can you go and be proud and independent somewhere else with no land? Can you be landless and independent?”

Interview with Jacobus Dreyer, Archaeologist, University of the Free State, Friday 11th March 2005 at 9:00am, in Bloemfontein (Interviewer –Richmond Williams).

Dreyer: “The story goes that Moshoeshoe went to this seer or diviner by the name of Mohlomi and he told him not to kill people, to provide a safe haven and so on during these wars of devastation – that was one of the things you mentioned – is one of the differences between Moshesh and Shaka. There is that story that Moshesh’s first wife – that she died tragically of a nock on the head because there was this rumour that she had an affair with somebody else. But the Basotho people don’t want to hear this story!”

“The other thing I picked up was that there was this guy living on the mountain; on Thabo Bosiu when they came there in 1824; a guy by the name of ‘None’. Now to this day if someone where to take you to Thabo Bosiu, they will tell you that this area [pointing to ruins at the base of the mountain] here where you can see the ruins are the remains of None’s place. But I stumbled on a report that is published by the British government in the 1850’s. Probably what they did was – the ‘Tommies’ they kept a record of everything and that is my experience when I did the research on the Anglo-Boer war – they would take all their [meticulously] written records and they sent them home and they were published in thick volumes. Incidentally I got hold of one of these volumes and there was the story that None, after the occupation of Thabo Bosiu by the Basotho; Moshesh’s people; this None was actually killed during a beer-party that was held on his behalf – that he was murdered – the Basotho don’t want to hear this story. It’s one of the skeleton’s in the cupboard [of the Basotho] and so even the great King Moshoeshoe has them.”

Interviewer: “What was Moshesh’s leadership style?”

Dreyer: “On some occasions he acted in a very humanitarian way, but in other cases he also had people shoved off the cliffs and so on, so it is difficult to give a final answer to.”

Interviewer: “... Sometimes a founding leader puts his mark on whatever context, was this true of Moshesh in the founding of Lesotho?”

“If I think of more recent times from my experience, the Basotho people feel very strongly about the fact that the nation was actually made by the Great King Moshoeshoe. If you look at all the different tribes today which you can still identify amongst the people in Lesotho. They have Nguni people from the other side of the mountain and even Tswana people from the west came in to take refuge and so in that case I would say yes definitely. And the way he structured his set up by marrying into senior lineages and so on and also to put certain people in charge of certain areas – so I think there was quite some motive in his madness to get the people together – to keep the people together.”

Interviewer: “He incorporated a lot of tribes in the Basotho – did these separate tribes change at all or did they retain their distinctive tribal customs, languages etc.?”

Dreyer: “I think they must have. For instance Moshesh himself was not a real Sotho; he was from the Bamokoteli tribe which is more or less Nguni. They must have changed because the people started to use what we know today as Sotho. ... Also he encouraged his people to attend church but he himself was never converted into Christianity, you know that.”

Appendix 2 Interviews Regarding Smuts

Interview with Mrs Arina Kock, Curator of the Jan Smuts Memorial Museum from Oct 2000 till February 2002, conducted at her home in Gasfontein, Pretoria, South Africa on Friday 11th February 2005 at 10:45am (Interviewer –Richmond Williams).

Interviewer: “How would you describe Jan Smuts’ style of Leadership?”

Mrs Arina Kock: “Jan Smuts was rather autocratic. He was an extremely hard worker who expected the same of all his staff. He would rather do the work himself, and was a leader who did not have the confidence in his underlings – for example when he was on commando. He did not plan with his junior officers. When he was a young man and he was an extremely pious young man he always read the bible and was very fond of the New Testament which he only read in Greek. Holism with Smuts already started [to take shape] as a young student in Cambridge.”

“Pantheism was possibly Smuts’ final position but not as worshipping the created, but in that ‘God is all’ or ‘all is God’. But others would say he was a Christian with a very far sighted perspective and deep insight into Christianity.”

“Smuts was not good in a team but was a brilliant individual. He started in June 1900 as a commandant – already a year later he was a General. He had extremely brilliant leadership qualities and had an aura around him.... He was a strategist and tactician and kept on evading the British and he had perseverance.”

Interviewer: “What can you tell me about the structures of leadership that Smuts used?”

Mrs Arina Kock: “He was appointed state attorney by Paul Kruger and had to get rid of the head of police almost immediately. He seemed to be able to make the tough calls with ease, even early on, and was most comfortable with top down command.... He, Smuts pushed General Louis Botha, he was the brains but he couldn’t bide fools! Botha was by no means a fool and he had great respect for Botha. [In like manner] Paul Kruger was not a well educated man, but religious and Smuts had great respect for him. He was perfectly bilingual.”

Interviewer: “And his values?”

Mrs Arina Kock: “Smuts was an honest man but at the same time he was a shrewd man. His weakness as a political leader was that he never addressed the racial question. He was of the opinion that the educated black man should be ‘liberated –emancipated’, by going out and uplifting the blacks they could be gradually brought into the democratic process. He left this in abeyance [and largely] took his view point from the electorate. He however was seen as a ‘kafferboetie’ which was held against him in 1948. He was loyal to his fellow Boers but was non-partisan and looked beyond his immediate culture. He did not like to live at enmity with his enemies, a value he had from his Christian early beliefs. Smuts was the only one who came out of the Anglo-boer war unscathed by the experience. ... Lastly he was a difficult man in the house but they [his family] adored him!”

Interview with General Deon Fourie, expert in Smuts' military leadership, conducted at his home in Lukasrand, Pretoria, South Africa on Wednesday 20th April 2005 at 10:00am (Interviewer –Richmond Williams).

Gen. Fourie: “Hancock himself wrote a pretty poor biography from the point of view of his military life.... I have a suspicion that Smuts like a lot of other Boer Generals, I say a lot – some of the other Boer Generals had had military training before hand. They all went to Stellenbosch University which was the ‘Victoria College’. They had had –it was a social thing – what in England was called the ‘Officers Training Core’ and at Stellenbosch they had the ‘Victoria College Rifle Volunteers’ who all wore scarlet jackets and white helmets and did things for the Queen until Oct 1999, then resigned en-mass. That would be with officers for the most part from the English with a few exceptions were lecturers. A lot of the officers for the most part were clerics; it is very interesting they were lecturing traditional subjects, not necessarily theology.”

“...They had a pretty thorough military training – they weren’t just ‘being drilled’. They learnt things that sort of built leadership and the model of leadership that Smuts would have had –it would have been in the first place a leadership model of command. And so Smuts’ model really would have been a command model. And being, if they were trained properly there and I think his experiences in the war showed him to be. And I think if one takes account of the military training he had he probably would have learnt to plan and to think ahead and so on, which might have been part of his personality as well.”

“...When he was involved in the outbreak of the Anglo-boer war he got ill, and he was confined to bed around about August or September, and he sat down with a pad of foolscap paper and wrote out a plan for the war. Which is fantastic, it didn’t take account of the fact –it didn’t take account of realities but since he was only twenty eight years old, one could barely scorn him for that. But it’s a master plan for the war –it looks at economic things, agricultural aspects of the economics, war production, total mobilisation, pre-emptive attack on the British in the Cape and Natal before they could bring out their troops that they were bringing out to reinforce. All those factors and that carried over in later life. And you find as you read about him odd things appear –when he went to the constitutional conference in Durban for example he sat down there with virtually a written constitution in his possession which nobody else had done.”

...When he became Minister of Defence he wrote the defence act. ...So he sat down and drafted the act himself, which shows again that he was taking the lead in the situation. So it is very much a command model, what he’s actually doing is to say, ‘I know more about this than you, so I’m taking the lead, you can come back with a counter draft, but this is what it is going to look like.’”

Interviewer: “Is there also an essence of the legal background and of course his unique genius, the ability to do it that way in the first place and some upfront command model leaders may not have had the ability in the first place to write a constitution?”

Gen. Fourie: “The fact of the matter is that he did have the brains, he did have the intelligence to sit down and know what it was going to be.”

“...This is the important thing about Smuts is that he had the knowledge and the determination to impose his will in the Boer war. Imposing a future set of circumstances on people – he’s planned for the war, although he was only state attorney or Attorney General as they called it, but he was an advisor to the president. So twenty eight years old or not he was a clever guy and in many ways he was right.”

“...The preamble to the United Nations Charter is really Smuts, but the fact is he did draft a preamble, and he wrote a booklet proposing the ‘League of Nations’ along with a lot of other people, after the first world war and in the course of the first world war. So he had that sort of capacity in the political side. You know to pre-empt that, to take the lead and to show the way to go. This is what the future should look like.”

“... His long ride down to the Cape involved attacking the British and fighting a guerrilla war, but that wasn’t his vision. His vision was to go down to the Cape and say to the Cape Afrikaanders, the war is not over and if you all rise in rebellion we will win this war. ...Not just a few chaps who were leaving home and going to fight with the British with the nearest passing commando, but he wanted big numbers, and he got big numbers, there were about ten thousand who eventually joined up. But the Brits were clever too, they had read this kind of possibility so they took the horses away from the farmers, so it wasn’t any use becoming a rebel if you were going to march into the middle distance and everybody else was mounted, so it failed. And yet it was his vision, if only you could create the war in British territory – which the Cape was, that’s why he said pre-empt the war, fight in Natal, fight in the Cape before the Brits get here. Get to the landing places and stop them landing there with reinforcements. You know, in many ways not really practical because all you needed was a cruiser to sail into town and start firing big guns and the idea might have flopped.”

“...Quickly under Botha he learnt from Botha what to do in the field. He made one plan for the invasion of Southern South West Africa while Botha was in the north. And Botha said to him ‘I don’t agree with that’ and explained to him why and then he learnt his job. Once the South West Campaign was over in mid 1915 he was off quite quickly to East Africa where they gave him command of British regular troops and Indian army troops and people like that and this was a hateful thing to these Brits because the British regular army can’t stand colonials at the best of times, and when its someone who has been fighting them a few years before, it was an even more bitter pill to swallow. And they loathed this guy, the fellow generals. I don’t know whether they changed their minds, the fellow generals and the fact that he had been made the Supreme Commander [of the East African Campaign] upset them a great deal. But that’s what he did there, he took over East Africa and won a conventional war against the Germans, drove them away from the settled part of East Africa into the south which was really bush and mud and horrible condition.”

“Francis Brit-Young describes this one case ...They would get to a river ...and everyone would say we can’t cross here we will have to go back and suddenly this green car would arrive and the general would say hang on. And if he couldn’t go any further in his car he would be on somebody’s horse and he’d be off and would go and do a personal rekkie and he’d be back half an hour; an hour later and say; ‘there is another way, we go this way.’ And off they went. Taking the initiative and real personal, Smuts was a leading from the front kind of Rommel general.”

“...He had to do a lot here, because we had no arms. We started the war with fifteen Bren guns – light machine guns – and about seventy eight artillery pieces –but they were of mixed kinds, very old – we didn’t even have ammunitions for a mornings shoot on the range. We had two tanks that were unusable and two or three armoured cars and that was all. But he got into the declaration of war and then he got Dr van der Byl to start an arms industry in the country and in less than two years we were building armoured cars, ordinary military Lorries, all with the help of Ford chassis and things like that. But they were being constructed here. We were producing small arms, ammunition; we eventually produced shells for British cruisers and battle ships, sights for guns which is quite a job because it’s all optical stuff. When the war started the only thing electrical industry in this country was large scale armature windings, for these things you put on the corner the street [transformers]. By the end of the war we built radios which even went to Russia.”

“...Again leadership, by finding the right people during the war and getting them going and developing. The arms industry has an interesting feature. It was the first time we had produced a real secondary industry. Before the war we were a few large repair things, Stewarts and Lloyds, the railways and things like that. All of which were pooled into arms. And agriculture and mining, that is all we had.”

Gen Deon Fourie then went on to talk about Smuts’ political career when he joined the SAP together with Hertzog and formed the United Party: “Hertzog had that sought of very gentle public manner, although he could loose his temper very quickly and loose control of the situation which Smuts did not do. Smuts was ice cold, kept control of the situation and knew how to massage egos as well but without being a buddy. His friends were his intellectual friends -the people he could talk to.”

“...There was Beeves who was a colonel in the Union Defence Force ultimately. He was a British attorney who had come out here during the war and come into the South African ambit, still British army and Beeves did studies of the Australians and the Swiss and various things like that and Smuts could understand that and use it and he knew why it was there and so that is why the Defence act was amended in 1923 to sort of change the permanent force structures –the original permanent forces were pretty vaguely structured, very unsatisfactory structure. There was no chief of staff, everyone spoke to the minister, and it was a ridiculous thing. I’ve got a diagram of that it shows it looks like a spider’s web, so many channels of communication. So those things were changed and he [Smuts] could understand those changes. [“Then it became much more hierarchal pyramid?” the interviewer asked, Fourie concurred] and then from 1917 [date blurred] the chief of staff was appointed, gradually that expanded.”

Interviewer: “What was it that enabled Smuts in his values to be almost all things to all people and at the end of his political career to have been almost “twee-talle” in his political outlook and in his electoral following.

Gen. Fourie: “I think he was honest with people; in his experience of war as a soldier. In the Boer War and the First World War, he lived in exactly the same circumstances as the people he was commanding. Somewhere here I have a slide that shows a little shelter he slept in, in East Africa, a bed on the ground and a shelter to keep the rain off that was all. And he lived with the men exactly as they were in the Boer war and I think that accounted for the great following he had. So he was honest with the people he was dealing with

directly, and he had this technique of leadership of not expecting more of the people he commanded than what he expected of himself. He wasn't politically honest I noticed this in the debate over the Defence Act. He would jump into some change in the Defence Act just like that and I could just see in my opinion that he was doing this for political reasons."

"...And people regarded him amongst the Afrikaaners as being duplicitous because of the way we entered the First World War. He and Botha really slipped on that because they had agreed, or Botha had agreed in 1911 at the colonial Prime Ministers conference to enter war against Germany with no consultation of his cabinet or anything. When the war came Britain sent us a cable saying would we take care of South West Africa so that the radio stations there would not be used to tell German shipping what was happening to British shipping. And they just went ahead and they didn't place this before parliament from August until I think its 9th September 1914. Things like that were regarded by people as highly dishonest and also to keep political power he tended to sought of play the political game. And that was unfortunate. Smuts' other weakness reflected in a certain value was he found international relations fascinating and that was an important thing. It made him someone who could draught a preamble to the United Nations; write about a future League of Nations and so on. He found internal politics bored him out of his mind. So he wasn't a success there. He didn't have values that said balance them."

General Fourie went on to say that as an eight year old boy he can still remember with sadness in listening to the inauguration of the Voortrekker Monument that people were getting up to leave and talking among themselves as Smuts spoke. Malan had to quiet the crowd whose disturbance was clearly heard on the radio. He then went on to conclude that; "...His weakness was that he drifted away from Afrikaaners, and he didn't see that it was that important because he said in the future we would all be together. But if he had had an interest in the internal politics he would have said we must work towards being together, its not just making speeches or alleging."

Appendix 3 Interviews Regarding Mandela

Interview with Michael Cassidy, founder and International Team Leader for African Enterprise, conducted at the African Enterprise Training Centre Pietermaritzburg on Wednesday 25th May 2005 at 5:30pm (Interviewer –Richmond Williams).

Interviewer: “What impacts on your life have political leaders had, maybe the negative impact, but particularly the positive impact, in terms of reconciliation?”

[Cassidy, also mentioned just prior to this, other important political figures in his life –see Appendix 5 –then went on to talk about FW De Klerk and Mandela before turning his full attention to Mandela.]

Cassidy: “Botha never did cross – he could only put his foot in it; dip his toes in – the Rubicon; he never could cross it! But I think people like De Klerk did cross it. I never knew him well but we went to government buildings in ’93 to pray with him in order that, that story’s in “Witness Forever” which I think you may have seen. And I thought that was an act of phenomenal courage because he must have known on one level that was committing political suicide. To release Mandela, to un-ban the liberation movements including the communist party, I mean he knew he was history. And so I think I would definitely say that he – I found him very inspiring – obviously, it goes without saying! Mandela’s reconciling spirit, spirit of forgiveness was the flip side of that coin and De Klerk had a moment, I like to believe a kind of a repentance and a readiness to seek forgiveness. Then mercifully for South Africa there was a Mandela figure ready to accord forgiveness. And the fact that Mandela could come out of prison after 27 years and talk reconciliation was really something.”

Interviewer: “Do you think ... with Mandela, that part of that ability is found not only in the 27 years that somehow faired him well rather than injured him, but also is there an element of his churchmanship being a Methodist in that? How do you read that?”

Cassidy: “On that occasion there [pointing to a photograph of himself and Mandela] in March 1993 when that particular picture was taken, I had another time with him in 1996 ... but he told me at that time when he was in prison that he never missed a bible study or a service or –you know something that was happening in the prison. He read his bible, I believe, faithfully and there was some kind of infusion of the Christian spirit there. I remember him telling me a very moving story about the *Dominee* who used to come to prison and whom he saw quite often and they began to strike up a bit of a friendship. And he said that one day he – when the *Dominee* was coming – he kept a piece of fruit that he had been given for his lunch, a guava, and he presented this guava to the *Dominee* to give to his wife. And the *Dominee* was just overwhelmed by this act of graciousness and generosity. And then Mandela said the prison authorities realised that he was building up a relationship with this *Dominee* and he never saw him again. That sort of thing just made you want to cry and made you realise, you know, what culpability we have to answer for - what we did to black people, and where would we be but for the spirit of forgiveness that is in blacks generally and in Mandela particularly.”

Interview questions posed to Prof P.G.J. Meiring, Missiologist with the Faculty of Theology, answered by way of a written record in his office, University of Pretoria, on Thursday 20th October 2005 at 9:00am (Interviewer –Richmond Williams).

Interview questions posed to Prof Piet Meiring, to which he provided a written response as follows directly after the questions below, which has been left in the original format without any adjustments to the format used, and thus speech marks have not been included save for a heading to indicate that this is Professor P Meiring who is answering, and reporting on various meetings between the N G Kerk (The Dutch Reformed Church) and a reported conversation between Bishop Mvume Dandala, who served as presiding bishop of the Methodist Church in Southern Africa, and Mandela.

Interviewer: “What were Mandela’s political/Christian convictions?”

Interviewer: “Did these extend or emanate from a personal faith for Mandela. Did he have his own personal belief?”

Professor Meiring’s written reply:

Many have asked the question since Mr Mandela’s release from prison. To the majority of South Africans it was (and is) important to know whether the man they held (and are holding) in high regard, is a committed Christian.

During the 1990-1994 period, Mr Mandela often invited church leaders - as well as the leaders from the other faith communities – to discuss the issues of the day with them. From time to time he wanted to explain his position on some of these issues and to test some of his ideas on them. At other occasions he discussed with the religious leaders the role that the faith communities may play in the New South Africa, often challenging them in this regard.

In 1994, just after his inauguration as president, he visited the General Synod of the N G Kerk in Pretoria – the first national leader ever to do so. He addressed synod in Afrikaans. He did not mince his words when he mentioned the apartheid past of the church, but he was also very gracious in honouring changes that had, at that time, already taken place in the church. He invited the N G Kerk to play its part in the New South Africa, living up to its own creed and convictions. He received a standing ovation. The hundreds of dominees and elders spontaneously sang: “Laat Heer U seën op hom daal” (May the Lord bless you). There were tears on many faces, in the pews, among the visitors, as well as in the press gallery.

Is President Mandela a committed Christian?

During the above mentioned period Mr Mandela visited the head office of the N G Kerk on a number of occasions, meeting with the moderamen (executive) of the General Synod. I, as Director for Ecumenical Affairs of the N G Kerk, had to organise these meetings – and had to liaise with Mr Mandela and his office in this regard. At lunch in the church office in Visagie Street, after one morning session, one of the dominees raise the million dollar question; “Sir, forgive me for asking, but we *do* want to know: Are you a committed Christian? Have you accepted Jesus Christ as personal saviour?” I vividly remember the future president’s answer. With a quiet smile, he put down his knife and fork, looked the

dominee in the eye and said that the answer was “Yes” – but that he had long ago in prison decided that he will never use his personal faith as a political argument. That has too often happened in the history of our country, with dire and often very painful results.

Subsequently many close friends and associates of Mr Mandela have confirmed this to me. Bishop Mvume Dandala, who served as presiding bishop of the Methodist Church in Southern Africa, once told me of a conversation he had with the president. The bishop explained to Mr Mandela that he should not only be a member ‘in general’ of the church, but that his name should be recorded in the books of a local church.

“I am aware of that”, the president said. “Will you please see to it that it is done”. With a smile Bishop Dandala answered: “I have already done so”. “You have already recorded my name?”, Mandela reacted with surprise. “Of which congregation am I a member?” “Mr President, your name is recorded in the books of the Qunu Congregation in the Eastern Cape”. “That’s correct. That is how it should be”, was Mandela’s reaction. “That is where I grew up as a young boy. That is where my home is”.

Mr Mandela has very high expectations of the role that *all* the faith communities may – and should – play in the future of our country. He made a point of it, to ensure that the ‘other’ faiths – although they constitute a minority in South Africa – are not left out. At state occasions they needed to be present, to help conduct services, and in discussions around the table their advice and input were frequently sought.

Appendix 4 Interviews Regarding Mutendi

Interview with Bishop Nehemiah Mutendi of the Zion Christian Church (ZCC) in Zimbabwe, conducted at his house in Harare, 1024 Mt Pleasant Heights, Harare on Wednesday 13th September 2005 at 9:45am (Interviewer –Richmond Williams).

Interviewer: “Can you tell me when he was born and a little about his early background?”

Mutendi: “To try and trace the date of his birth, we proceed by saying that anyone who could have joined the BSAP, the British South African Police force, and quitted in 1913 (1913 is so significant because that’s when he had his vision for the founding of this church and that is when he quitted the BSAP). So he could have joined the BSAP in 1910 or so, and for someone to have joined, they must have been in their early 20’s, so we can presume that his birth date is around 1890 from this. In 1913 he would have been about 23, and yet for someone to have left home in our culture and to have been married again he normally would have been over 25, so we are unable to get at exactly what date he was born on [this secondary comment gives Samuel Mutendi an approximate date of birth around 1888].”

“He was interested in social activities like traditional music, he was good [on a traditional instrument] and he would lead his group ... and he would really perform. He was not known for anything else besides entertaining his people; you would say he was an artist. Those people who were trained in the forces were tough people, he must have been a tough person, and he must have been strong.”

Interviewer: “Can we assume that he received some kind of schooling to have been in the police force, or in those days was this not a prerequisite?”

Mutendi “He did not. He talks about his schooling when he comes back from the police. That’s when he has been in a spiritual trance, he speaks in tongues, and he dreamt at that moment. He had to be still on parade, you must not sway or speak in tongue, so they asked him; ‘What is wrong with you, don’t move if you speak’ and he was still speaking in tongues and they said no, no, no you are not fit for the force and they dismissed him. But now he was spiritually inclined, he was searching, so he went to school. His brother was a teacher in the Dutch Reformed Church, and he said; ‘My brother this is what I saw and I am searching for a church.’ But the young brother said; ‘My brother God would not want you’, and he [Samuel Mutendi] says; ‘Why would he not want me’, and the brother replied; ‘God would not want someone with two wives – and so he can’t accept you.’ [Samuel Mutendi replied] ‘What should I do’, the younger brother replied, ‘You send one of your wives away’ and so he sent his first wife away.”

“The brother went to the missionaries saying; ‘My brother wants to learn to read and write. But [ultimately] he is seeking baptism. ...He sent his wife away. He describes how he bid her farewell, he cried, and she cried. He explained this to his wife by saying; ‘I don’t know when I will meet you, (he did not know where she was going to go) but I want to go to heaven so you must go.’ They part, only to join when I was a big boy.”

“...After his catechism they prepared to baptise him, but he said; ‘No, are you going to baptism me on my forehead, I want to be baptised in the river now.’ And they said, ‘No, we will baptise you here.’ ...And after all that, while he was in the church he would speak

in tongues and they would say; ‘No we don’t speak in tongues in the church.’ I think he struggled, so he says for ten years, from 1913 till 1923, so he decides to go – he sees other people who are going to look for work in South Africa – so he goes south to look for work. He asked people along the way about the church he sought, but there was nothing like ‘Zionist’ in southern Rhodesia. They went to sleep, in his sleep, a man he saw in his dream appears to him and says; ‘You have been arguing about the church of God!’ [Mutendi]; ‘Yes we want to know the right one’, so he shows him a card and on that card is written a word. He wakes everyone up, and says; ‘Hey, I’ve got the right church – Zion. ...The man [angel] who came to me in 1913 is the one who showed it to me.’ [The ‘man’ from this first encounter in 1913 had said that he would one day have his own church – mentioned as an aside]. When they get to South Africa, there is this church ‘Zion’ Apostolic Faith, and he says yah this is it and everyone is speaking in tongues, and just like that he was baptised. He was caught in a powerful spirit and in tongues and the other prophet there said; ‘You go back to your country, go do God’s work.’”

“He started it in the Shona area; the first people who were against him were the chiefs, the traditional chiefs. They said [of Mutendi] to the *n`anga`s*, the spirit medium; ‘There is someone who can pray with his stick-rod, his staff and the rain falls. [How can this be], they must brew beer, they must go to Matopos, the spirit medium must give them the rain.’ That’s what every chief and tribe must do, the *n`anga* of an area, or the chief of that area must go the medium and ask for rain. But here is this person who says they must pray for rain, and it falls! The *n`angas* were against this! But he said; ‘You must believe in the Holy Spirit and if you seek you will be prayed for and be healed.’ The first miracle was a crippled woman, whom I also saw when I grew up, they pulled her [close to] her baptismal pole and when she got out she walked. There was this chief, this headman, whose daughter fell from a tree and she died. ...And he arrives, and the Spirit says that they should not take the women for burial, bring her back into the house. When they queried this, he [Mutendi] said that he wanted to pray for her. The people said; ‘This is the chief’s daughter and if you play funny games you are in trouble – really.’ Then when they brought her in, he prayed, he prayed and she came back to life and he said, ‘This is your daughter’, and they were amazed.”

“The chiefs in Gutu or Bikita did not interact, but then they finally came, all of them. ‘What is the use of going to Matopos to ask for rain when we can do that here?’ They all came together. My brother used to make a joke and say that when you want to practice love, don’t behave like chiefs!”

Nehemiah Mutendi carried on by saying the chiefs tried to send him back to South Africa under the pretext that that is where he got this “speaking in tongues”, but he argued with them that he was doing that before he even left for South Africa.

“The DC [District Commissioner] was such an important man in the area, but he would come to his home and eat. It was strange to see a white man eat in a black man’s home [in those days], some of the missionaries would come and sit with him, and the priests from the Catholic Church, and from the DRC [Dutch Reformed Church] would also come. It was those early days when a white person and the race relations between the whites and blacks were better than between the Matabele and the Shonas. His church spread to Matabeleland, but then the Shona people would see all these Ndebele preaching and ask,

‘Why do you get all these Ndebele people, they have taken all our cattle.’ He said no, ‘They are worshipping God now, it does not matter’, so they would worship together.”

Interviewer: “There was the *Mhondoro* and the *Mwari* cult in the Matopos (the cult of Matonjeni), how did he deal with these things?”

Mutendi: “They were resentful of him. He preached openly against them, our ancestors did what they did before they knew Jesus, now we have more of the light, now the heavenly kingdom is recognised. Because this ‘Kingdom of Heaven’ has replaced all others, these have been replaced now with this Holy Spirit, and he said to the dissenters; ‘Now you go to Chaminuka and ask for rain, you takes days, you brew all this, we don’t brew beer here, we only call on the name of the Lord Jesus here and the rain comes. Now what is the point of going there, of brewing all that beer, of doing all the killing all your *mombies*, when you can get it for free in the name of Jesus?’ And all of them were very ‘hot’ but he insisted that what they had, mixed with what they saw should be dealt with – the things that belonged to the spirit mediums that would harm them. He would say bring all those sticks, bring all those blankets and cloths, and put them here, I’ll burn them and let us watch and see what will happen? Those traditional things of the *n`anga`’s*, their ancestors, and the traditionalists believe that if you touch it then you will be afflicted. He said; ‘Bring all those things that are of your ancestors, that are powerful and in the name of Jesus we will burn them and we will wait to see what will happen!’ Nothing happened.”

Mutendi then related a story about his father when a man brought his magic, his witchcraft which was used to kill and he instructed one of his juniors to burn it. However a man went with him and asked to look at it, without the permission of the “Man of God” and once he had his mouth was fixed open. The object was duly burnt but the man remained with his mouth wide open. Mutendi challenged the *n`anga`* whose magic it was, was asked if he could do anything to remove the curse but he said that he could not, so the “Man of God” gave him water to drink, his mouth was freed, and was told not to do that again!

Mutendi continued: “There were two powerful forces, fighting against each other, it was not like the other one was useless, or had no power, and there was power in it. ...Joel the prophet said, ‘I your God, you must know, I caused the drought, I caused the pestilence to eat your crops, and I can stop it!’” So this is what he was proving. But some of the chiefs said, if this is what you say, what you are doing and there is drought then we will go to Matopos. But they go to Matopos, nothing happens there and the Man of God says; ‘this year is a drought, it is the plan of God, but if you want to prove that God is there it can rain, but it won’t help your crops.’ And it rained – proof that God controls everything! No other medium, no other spirits could work while the Kingdom of Heaven was in operation, which is depressing every other Kingdom. He would often preach about the idea that; ‘we are not fighting a warfare of flesh and blood, but against principalities.’ That is what he was fighting against.”

Interviewer: “What was his style, was he a strong preacher, was he a gentle man, or both?”

Mutendi: “He spoke very softly, and when people went to him for help, went the women went with their problems, they would say that he had spoken to them very quietly. As if nothing was going to happen, but when they were going, then things would happen. But even if he spoke so softly, you could not change his mind. All of us as children, we would

knew if father says no, that's it! No-one could then persuade him. He would say, 'I'm a servant of God', he would not normally use the word Bishop, he would say 'I'm a servant of God, don't ask me to change God's approval or direction.'"

Interviewer: "Did he have many ministers around him to advise him, or was he one of these men who spoke forth?"

Mutendi: "He had ministers, he listened to his wives, he listened to his sons, but most of all as a prophet he heard what the Spirit would say, and then it would be finished. But he would consult everybody, even us."

Nehemiah then went on to explain how during the liberation struggle in Zimbabwe it was difficult to cross the border, but there was a problem as he wanted to go and see his people in Zambia but he could not easily get there, but there was a need for him to go for it is only the Bishop who serves communion and Mutendi made everyone discuss this issue. In general, decisions were reached through a series of meetings, and as the sons would know that even if their father had met with them, but he had not consulted his *vafundisi* or his wives, then the decision was not final. If however they were the last to be consulted then they could rest assured that the decision reached by the end of the meeting would be final.

Interviewer: "Did your father have anyone between the ministers and himself to help him with the ministry, and on the administrative side did he have a large competent staff as you have today?"

Mutendi: "It was not that big [in the administrative staffing]. However when he moved, he moved with many people, and you would not find him without some of a group of ministers. If he moves he would move with others, but now, look at me, I am here on my own. The people at the Masvingo office now, they know what they are doing, the people at Mbungo, in Harare, they have their own committees."

Nehemiah Mutendi then went on to explain that between his father and the other *vafundisi* was a minister called the "Minister in Charge" or "First Minister" and in fact this same person is also Nehemiah's "Minister in Charge", who has an office of about ten ministers. This person is a *sekuru*, what Nehemiah would call an Uncle, but in English he is actually a slightly younger cousin to him, or nephew of his father, born to his father's older sister. In the administration there are professionals in charge of certain areas, one in charge of finances, one in publications, and someone with properties, and also as per an earlier conversation, his staff mentioned spiritual training and education, as well as agriculture.

He then went on to relate how they were disadvantaged by the mission schools not wanting to accept their people, and there were very few government schools at the time, so they put up six of their own schools. He then related how he himself attended a mission school, he was number 6, but all of the five before him were too busy wanting to drive around in cars and ended up in mischief borrowing the headmasters motorbike and so on. His father wanted him to go to school, learn how to be a teacher and to teach in their schools. Apparently six of the Zionist schools had been burnt down but they planned to reopen at least one of them. Samuel Mutendi opened the new community school in 1965, it was a beautifully built school according to Nehemiah, and his father was commended even by the Catholics. They were so sad to leave that beautiful school when they were moved; the first

thing when they arrived at their new destination [for Zion city] was to put up a school. He – Nehemiah – went to teacher with the Seventh day Adventists, he had mislead them that he had been baptised in Selous, but later on when a very good friend of his told them that he was not baptised he was asked to produce his baptismal card and he could not! From there he went back to his father, who said to Nehemiah that it was just in time for now he could teach for the church! Nehemiah, in contrast to his older brothers was very obedient and did not cause his father any grief, which he points to as a significant reason for him being chosen to succeed his father as Bishop.

His father's title was superintendent of the church. So when it came to opening the new school, the Minister of Education wanted to know once they opened it who would be their superintendent of schools? So Nehemiah was given the title, but no-one at the time realised the significance of this! Years later when he called his elders together to choose a successor, and they were focused on Enginasi (the number two son), he pointed out that Nehemiah's title was already superintendent and that they were the ones who had agreed to put his name forward a long time back, so they had already agreed as to who should succeed Samuel Mutendi, saying to them: "That's what you have agreed!" [i.e. already agreed]. This meeting occurred in 1962 and Nehemiah took over the church in 1977, fifteen years later, and in this manner Nehemiah showed how his father was a shrewd leader who could use long term foresight in planning and cunning negotiating to bring about the desired result!

Interviewer: "What were the most significant values in your father's life?"

He answered this by saying that each of the sons and the daughters would argue that the father loved them most. One person once asked how each of the wives could love each other so much, infact like sisters. Nehemiah said that this had something to do with his father's fairness, how he treated each of his wives. Samuel Mutendi was known for his love, he loved his people and this was particularly sensed by his ministers, for whom he loved, the elders would stress that Nehemiah's father loved his ministers more. Yet as Nehemiah's son went around and asked various people who all said (even the ministers) that he loved them more, the pointy that Nehemiah made about his father was that his heart was so big that everyone thought that he loved them the most!

Nehemiah in contrast to his father is an impatient man, and has high expectations of his leaders to make timely decisions and deliver "the goods", especially at this time when they are preparing to build a huge auditorium and building costs just keep escalating. He was not impressed when they sat on a decision to buy certain materials (actually the window frames required) – for which they set aside \$400 million – that had already been made for two weeks, now the same materials would cost \$700 million and he was understandably impatient and unimpressed by then, but afterwards his wife told him that he had been too hard on his Harare leaders. "My, father was 'cool', a man of peacefulness, who hardly ever raised his voice. He ... fought for justice for his people; he wanted schools for his people."

Interviewer: "How has your father brought lasting changes to the tribes and the nation?"

There was a witchcraft suppression act passed sometime after 1923 when the government in Southern Rhodesia became a "Responsible Government" which Nehemiah likes to associate with his father, because he was denouncing the *n`angas* as they were pretending

to be providing relief and healing and some of them were instead bewitching the people. For the first time the *n`angas* were denounced for their witchcraft, for their evil and the government decided to implement a witchcraft suppression act. While the Catholic and the Dutch Reformed Churches did not approve of it they did not go out of their way to actively denounce it.

He was uncompromising in his stance against the witchcraft of his day and he would also be outspoken against the missionaries saying that they were not giving the true Christian message to the people of Zimbabwe. He would say in this church we don't tolerate the brewing of beer for the dead, God does not want this and he will not accept you to enter the Kingdom of God. Then he continued; "They once told me that two wives will stop you going into heaven. I don't think that two wives will stop me going into heaven, but I think that the worship of other gods will. These spirits – the Holy Spirit is a God, these other spirits and gods, and if you worship them [the spirits] there is no way you can see heaven. ...In the past we used to have to kiss a dog's parts in order to have a baby, we would do weird things, now there is a change in the way we live."

He went on to say that another area that Mutendi brought in was in the area of agriculture. To use modern techniques that the government was advocating like contour ridging he added his weight to and also to use cooperative farming. He infact stated this way back and got his people to form groups in a communal farming operation.

Interviewer: "How did he view God the Son (Jesus) in his preaching but also personally?"

Mutendi: "He Believed in Jesus as the 'Son'. Now we believe in him as [the] real God, but he knew God's son as being close to God. But my mothers have told me that they have heard him sing a song about the crucifixion of Jesus, and everyone knows this song, and they would say every time he went to pack for a trip he would sing that song. And when he sang it, he would break down. And we would ask him about it and he would say; 'I cannot sing without imagining the pain, the pain ... I cannot imagine someone dying for someone the way Christ did, for us!' Yes he knew him as his saviour, and he preached this."

"Although the people would want to emphasis and say; 'You are just like Christ', but he would rebuke them there and then! And he would say; 'No way, there is no way any person can be just like Christ, Christ was the son of God!' But people would insist, 'When you do your things it is just like Christ did.' Christ wanted us to do more than him, yet not to be him. We [the Zionist people] talk about the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; we also say the Christ of Enginasi and Samuel. The men who introduced this God, this Jesus to us. This Jesus who they talk about is the Jesus who does not smoke. But the other people talk of a Christ who does not mind smoking. ...But we know that Jesus is for everybody, even the Chinese, they would eat even snakes, and they love them!"

They have a congregation now in London, one in Indiana, one in Massachusetts –Boston; one in Indiana and many in Mozambique, DRC, Botswana, Namibia and the whole of the SADAC region. Many of the boarder towns and major city ZCC churches in Zimbabwe use Shona as the overarching language, but in the present context, many of their people have had to go and find employment elsewhere, even as far afield as New Zealand! The current membership includes both rural people right up to a CEO of a commercial bank such that their church is beginning to reflect the whole spectrum of society in Zimbabwe.

Interview with Prof Inus Daneel, Missionary to Zimbabwe with the Dutch Reformed Church, conducted at the University of South Africa (UNISA), Pretoria-Tshwane on Friday 23rd September 2005 at 9:30am (Interviewer –Richmond Williams).

Interviewer: “Could you let me know what happened towards the end of his ministry in the handing over to his son and do you have any record of when he would have died?”

Daneel: “While I was doing the final stages of my research in the early sixties I was in the community – the Holy City at Bikita when he made together with the chief a court case against the District Commissioner, the Provincial Minister and the Minister of Internal Affairs. He was a resistance figure, he was a Moses figure, and they knew they couldn’t win it, but I was praying with the ministers. There were CID [Central Intelligence Department] people running around all the time observing what was going on and his stature grew just before he moved his headquarters to chief Chireya’s place in Gokwe, around about 1967. ...The District Commissioner had decided in favour of Mukangangwi, who was chairman in the chief’s council in the government. And Mutendi was far too influential and he had more than 15 Paramount Chiefs in his church and they would roll in the dust at his feet, recognising him as a Rozvi Mambo, so Mutendi was appealing to the dynasty of the Rozvi in earlier centuries and which has a very politically strong unifying effect. So the District Commissioner told me, he was very scared about Mutendi’s influence in the country being weighed above what it should be, so they were trying to cut him down and sending him, together with the Rozvi chief, Chief Jiri, up into Gokwe which was a way of neutralising him.”

“So when I came back in the 70’s, and while I was doing Fambidzano ecumenical movement I visited him, and that’s the last [time I saw him]. He was then old and frail, he was not embittered, he had actually grown in stature as a liberator, as a resistance figure in relation to the white administration. So even at that stage still hanging back from total support of *Chimurenga* – the liberation struggle – because in the 60’s he was actually having the prophets detect the political cards of ZANU and ZAPU and they had to burn it to retain membership in the church. So it was also that conflict, on the one hand he was a total nationalist and appealed to the past, on the other hand he did not want too much political involvement, but I think he was already leaning a lot towards supporting a *Chimurenga* towards the end there. But then, after his death I visited, I went there and visited his two sons, Reuben is an older son who had a lot of followers go after him, and this other son was a younger teacher, more modern – Nehemiah.”

“But going there was interesting because they were then in the phase of monitoring what Mutendi’s influence was in his state of death, through prophets dreaming about him, in visions about his directives to the church. So there is something of the old again, like spirit mediums, but they were prophets and the guidance they were getting was not that of tribal politics but how to run the church.”

Interviewer: “Who were they seen to be getting the guidance from?”

Daneel: “Direct from him, from Mutendi, having passed away but sort of mediating the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. In other words his directives were aligned – they were very concrete things that they had to do – but aligned to the work of the Holy Spirit. And of course it is very similar to ancestor veneration, but in a Christianized manner I would say.

Mutendi junior himself said that they go up every year to charge their batteries, meaning establishing through these prophets direct contact with the deceased and gaining a lot of inspiration from it for their outreach. Because Samuel Mutendi was a great missionary, he was sending out – after each of the three big meetings they call Pasika – he would send out these missionaries all over the country, so for them to maintain that momentum, that's why they went up to ... their new church headquarters."

Interviewer: "Was Samuel Mutendi's link to the royal Rozvi Mambo's a direct link or was it more tenuous, and you speak into that?"

Daneel: "I have not been able to penetrate that very much but I know it was enough for them to establish their own genealogy, in which they went all the way to the top, Dombo Dhlembewu, which was one of the best known Rozvi Kings, and after that came Chirisamuru. Chirisamuru, meaning the sympathetic one, who was looking after the calves of the cattle, but meaning of the people under him. After that comes Gumboremvura, which means the rain foot, which means the one who was very much involved with the rain because at that stage the headquarters was in the Matopos area, and so that indicates involvement with the 'Rain Cult'. After Gumboremvura, then comes Ngweremweze, Mutinhima, and then Jiri Zihumbwa, the one that Mutendi was relating to, but he claimed that whole genealogy of Rozvi Mambo's directly. But where his father's house, his grandfather's house appears in relation to the different Mambo's I could not establish, some people said that it was a sham, but it worked for his people. And so that's the more important thing, that it established a link in the past that they could be proud of."

Interviewer: "Moving on with some leadership questions, what would you say the late Samuel Mutendi's style was? Did he have a predominant, and also a secondary style?"

Daneel: "He was a policeman when he became a member, then actually when he became a co-founder with Enginasi Lekhanyane, who was Edward of Basutoland. So he was a strong leader, very capable, fairly soft spoken but very decided and insisting on his authority and that the people would follow him. He also had a side that was very interesting, his own sense of humour, he made all kinds of asides, sometimes even a bit brazen, and when he was not only humorous, but also very serious when he was talking about the people's relations to the whites, that they should not be docile, that they shouldn't sit down and cringe, that they should stand up for themselves, which of course was important in the white-black relations in Zimbabwe. And religiously he had a great influence; he knew the needs of his people to relate to their own religion. He understood that it was their identity. So he was preaching a lot about ancestral spirits, but as a threat or as a way of deviating from the scriptures. So he tried to adapt to the needs of the people – for example for rain – because working in the rural areas with people of a subsistence economy totally dependant on rain. He substituted the Matopos things, where the chiefs are always sending their delegates to go and ask for rain, with the Zionist equivalent, but then replacing the God of Matonjeni, whom he then called Satan with the Biblical deity."

"And I think many of the chiefs played a double role, they would send traditionalists; because they had Traditionalists and Christians within their area of jurisdiction; there [to Matopos], they themselves would bring some gifts [to Mutendi] and ask for rain. And then the sermons, during the 'Seed Conference' in October just before the rainy season, they would use that for witness sermons by the chiefs and other prominent people how they did

get the rain from the ‘Man of God’. So in that way; he sort of established himself; reinforced his position regularly, and that was just before sending people out with the ‘Good News’, which is how God was working through the bible, but in an African situation now. So it was very well adapted, but also Christianised, the way he Christianised the ‘Cult of Matonjeni’, it showed the intent of saying very clearly; ‘No!’ even in spite of him knowing that the chiefs are probably making compromises.”

Interviewer: “How would you describe the way he went about asking for rain?”

Daneel: “He was very influential. It was totally a comprehensive approach, one on one he would talk about it with conviction; he would talk about it in his *dare*, in his church council, quietly but with a lot of charisma. He was a quiet charismatic man, but make no mistake, without flinching, he was courageous. Seldom would he brag about it, but he saw to it that he gave enough scope – that when his old elders were talking about his feats – that he did not undercut them but he capitalised on the loyalty of his followers who themselves were senior people. And he gave them amply time in the *dare* to talk and to build his image as a resistance figure against white domination. So he had a lot of Charisma, but he was not a braggart.”

“He was much more persuasive than domineering, he did not come across as a domineering figure at all, he seldom raised his voice, but he was very serious. But he also knew when he could see people were getting restless, how to use comic relief – throw in a joke, you know! And he would for example say if something is predictable and bound to happen he would say that is as certain as a man going and taking a pee after sex, for example. That would draw roars of laughter because it would be abrupt and sudden, and one could say in a sense in bad taste, but it is so true to life that I think even the Lord would smile sometimes at some of those things. And then he would, after having brought in a little bit of humour, carry on again, and he could carry on for a long time without raising his voice very much. And then he was a good background figure that he allowed his key figures in the court to talk. He patterned his leadership on the chiefly [model], in other words the chief that does not talk all that much. He is sitting there, allowing the councillors to give their opinion and then he would summarise towards the end and be the wise one, and in doing that endeared himself to his own people.”

Interviewer: “In a one-on-one situation how could we describe his leadership style?”

Daneel: “I would say it was more by example, he persuaded his people. He would not in a one-on-one indulge in a very long conversation with them. He would be cutting pretty close to the bone, if there was a problem with a particular leader he would tell the person what it was and what he expected, and then leave it there, but make sure the others were aware of what his verdict was. He would give encouragement, but not only that he would also say what his expectations were, so that people knew that if they kept antagonising him, he would get rid of them.”

“He had, according to his own account, 17 wives and more than seventy children, but every day he had a meeting with all his wives and urged them to live a life of witness, particularly because women often get into serious conflicts in polygamous households. And so he was insisting on that, and he was praying with them, and reading the bible with them. And he knew that there was some of them accusing each other privately of

witchcraft.... But the fact is that he loved his children a great deal and was very caring of them. And because I became adopted into his household myself, I was often invited for breakfast, and then his *vahosi* which is the lead woman, she would bring in the food, and she would do something that African women would never do in a white man's presence, she would sit on his lap for a while and you could see that they were totally in love and it was good to see! It was private but I was allowed to see it. It was not a game, it was something very natural and when some of the other women came in, she would take their feelings into consideration and stand up and stand to the side and allow them to address him. So I would say there was a lot of compassion. I think some of the conflicts were kept private, understandably so, but it's a whole conglomerate of things, you can't pin point it on one thing, but I would say compassionate, caring and really loving his family and taking good care of them. Where he lived he had two nice huts built for each of his women, where the one was a cooking hut and the other for her and the children to live. Also the inter-relations were well organised, with a common plan as to who sleeps where and when and so forth."

Interviewer: "Did he undergo any leadership mentoring process or learning curve. Was there any point at which he was 'a student' before establishing the church in Zimbabwe?"

Daneel: "I think like most of the Independent Churches, because they don't have theological facilities, it is an in-service training. With Mutendi, he was party to establishing a specific pattern, together with Lekhanyane, where the leader would always be in the presence of a number of senior minister and through expressions of wisdom or discussions of a certain part of the bible. Teaching them – so it is very praxis orientated, reading the bible, bringing up verses that could relate to a specific situation, and which the group will discuss, in which there is scope for the other leaders who come from various churches, to also bring in their own insights."

"So he was from an early stage he was dependant on Sotho people he was relating to and Lekhanyane, being mentored by them probably, as well as making his own contribution, because he was a co-founder of ZCC here in South Africa. [In some ways he was junior to Lekhanyane but in other ways he was a co-founder] and so creating an offshoot, but wasn't an offshoot because it was a branch, a legitimate branch of the ZCC, it still is actually. He obtained total autonomy over the course of time but in the beginning it was more like a fledgling group with a lot of communications, virtually belonging to Lekhanyane, but also to Mutendi. Because Mutendi was the missionary and leader who had gone out to establish what Lekhanyane was establishing, but in Zimbabwe, then gaining in autonomy because more due to geographic distance than intentions in my view to establish his own ZCC."

Interviewer: "Was there any apprenticeship of Nehemiah as he took over the church?"

Daneel went on to say that a lot of the sons were there for spells. Nehemiah was a teacher but during some long weekends he would be at the church participating in the proceedings, and sitting in the *dare*. Such that there was a degree of apprenticeship or in-service training. Reuben was the older one, and had been placed in Gutu and was establishing churches, and was himself a 'Bishop in the making', but obviously the teacher in a modern world was viewed as someone who could lead in modern times. Reuben since has established his own branch, but this is also called the ZCC and Daneel relates how there are times when the two brothers still relate as brothers without antagonism to each other. This

is in like manner to the two sons of Lekhanyane who have their own branches of the ZCC [but are perhaps more autonomous].

Interviewer: “What were Samuel Mutendi’s most striking values?” [Daneel starts with some of his chief qualities or character traits].

Daneel: “I would say for his own context he was marked by courage, regardless of opposition. He was determined, so its perseverance, courage, and he was determined to have his own educational facility. He collaborated for some time with the Dutch Reformed superintendents, who supervised him for some time, that was the condition, but he kept going and at an early stage was repeatedly put in prison. ...He was determined like all the missions to have his own autonomy, his own church, his own hospital – he had two hundred huts where all the patients came and the prophets working with them, and his own school. And he was imprisoned a number of times and that boosted his image, he was courageous, he was not afraid of the whites, and there is a certain consistency and integrity in that! That was his image and he lived according to that.”

Interviewer: “He quickly moved out of the Rozvi and established an inter-tribal church, but what gave him the ability to cross tribal boundaries? What leadership did he have between the first minister and himself? And, was there some form of Belief System that he had?”

Daneel: “I think that for African people the lineage and therefore the clan is very important, and so the nucleus of the leadership is built around lets say the Rozvi for the ZCC to a large extent, but not with such exclusiveness, and I think that is the influence of scriptures that they very quickly realised that this is not only for Rozvi, and if it was only Rozvi it would be a very limited church, the message of Christianity is for all people. And since African people have an ability to operate well beyond the boundaries, I think that they were able, partly because of their own ability and partly because of the conviction that Christianity is about Christ and that crosses boundaries. And they were willing to do it, and if their need for expansion, and there may have been a motive of self-promotion, how do we discern that – we have our own ambitions too. ...In that way they crossed the boundaries, established congregations all over and appointed people who were senior in their own locale.”

Daneel went on to say that he had a number of senior advisors who would sit in the church council with him and help in decision making, and on the female side in spiritual matters he had *Mai* Solomon, and in practical matters it was his *vahosi* – his lead wife who would advice him. Some of his senior councillors were Rozvi and some were his relatives – brothers of his, and there were some advisors in Gutu who supported the chief on his behalf and played a significant role who were not and so there was a degree of Rozvi influence but this was by no means total.

Next Daneel mentioned that they visualise their Zion city as an African understanding of the ‘Kingdom of God’, of ‘Jerusalem’ and they read scriptures as directly applying to their ‘Holy City’. Here widows and orphans are housed and fed by the produce brought, which is like a tithe but more than a tithe and is also used to feed areas which got insufficient rains. “It was a compassionate manifestation of God’s concern with people which comes out in that colony through a black man, through a ‘black Christ’, he personified Christ for them in a very special way, much more than any missionary could have done, and that is why it was so effective.”

Appendix 5 Interviews Regarding Cassidy

Interview with Michael Cassidy, founder and International Team Leader for African Enterprise, conducted at the African Enterprise Training Centre, Pietermaritzburg on Wednesday 25th May 2005 at 5:30pm (Interviewer –Richmond Williams).

Interviewer: “In all the ministries you have got involved in what are the major values, the passions that drive you, that drive your ministry and underpin what you do?”

Cassidy: “Well everything that has happened in my life in terms of ministry emanates and comes out of my conversion back when I was a university student, back in Cambridge. And that was where it happened for me.”

Cassidy then went on to describe the two influences in his life, politics and conversion.

“In South Africa there were a lot of Christians that professed to be converted people, committed Christians and yet they were supportive of apartheid, they were supportive of racism they had segregation and all that sort of thing. And that led me into a struggle with the issue of the relationship between the vertical and the horizontal. The relationship between the personal faith and a socio-political expression of him. I was much influenced at the time by two leaders. The first was Billy Graham who came to Cambridge not long after my Christian commitment and I saw evangelism in action and was inspired by it. In 1957 I was in New York and Billy Graham was preaching night after night in Madison Square Garden and I was inspired and at the same Martin Luther King was preaching in the streets of Montgomery Alabama and all these sorts of places and it was all on television. It was at the time that Eisenhower was sending troops into Arkansas and all this kind of stuff to try and sort the place out. And I thought – what do I make of this, Billy Graham on the one hand and Martin Luther King on the other, who was going up and down the streets of Montgomery Alabama and other cities of the South calling for racial justice.”

“The penny sort of dropped for me in those years for me between 1957 I suppose and about 1958 /59, when I was a seminary student, that these were two sides of the same coin. That became a very powerful value, a powerful commitment in me, in my life. The gospel spoke in both directions. It spoke of a vertical relationship with the Lord and the importance of calling people into that vertical relationship. And secondly it spoke horizontally into the contextual issues that were around us. In terms of race; in terms of justice and all that kind of thing. I saw to put it differently, that on the one hand we were called to love the Lord, and we were called to love other people. And that love of other people was not just at a personal level but at a structural level. And that justice was love built into structures. And in a way from that time on the formula was very simple and plain to me. I never struggled from the time I did my first mission here in 1962, the coming together of the personal and socio-political, it was almost second nature to me and to the team I was with at that time. So our ministry over the years has been an expression in a sense of these two commitments. We are evangelists but our ministry has to be contextual, therefore the issues around us whatever they are, we need to address them in the name of the Lord. In South Africa it was race and injustice, our team in Uganda were involved in hunger relief, in the immunisation of people against disease. Because people are not going to respond well to the gospel if they are hungry or are sick. And our other kind of deed

projects. Whether it's our team in Ghana with prostitutes or street children or our ... reconciliation ministries."

"Now people do say Michael's passions are Evangelism on the one hand and reconciliation on the other. And in a sense, yes the evangelism yes that is accurate, but my concerns though profoundly embracing reconciliation, they go beyond reconciliation to what the issues are. So if the issue is a gap between black and white then reconciliation is a need. If the issue is tribal struggle between Hutu and Tutsi, reconciliation is a need, but we believe the gospel applies itself to all sorts of other issues than relational breakdown. I mean it speaks to poverty; it speaks to crime it speaks to sexism; it speaks to family and sexuality issues. All these issues the Bible addresses; it speaks to ecology; and unemployment. I think if I had to sum up the two particular driving forces they would be expressing and working out the vertical dimension of the gospel and then the horizontal dimension, not only in terms of the relational side but in terms of the issues and the needs that are on the ground in the places we go to."

After answering the question what the beliefs were that drove his passions which was very similar to his views expressed in his book; "The Passing Summer", he then continued along the theme of the "Cosmic Christ", but first he mentioned that:

Cassidy: "The first and most basic conviction of my life and what has driven me more profoundly and passionately than any thing else is a conviction that Jesus is the Christ, is who he claimed to be. In other words the deity of Christ is something absolutely fundamental to my conviction." He then continued by saying;

"I wrote to a prominent politician in South Africa, I wrote to a member of parliament of Botha's cabinet and said that the issue in front of you is not whether apartheid is particularly good or bad, the issue is whether we live in a moral universe or not and whether Jesus is the 'Cosmic Christ', that's what you've got to grapple with. Because I said that if this universe is random, unpredictable, irregular, chaotic – does not have Jesus behind it, you can go ahead with apartheid and get away with it. But I said if it is a moral universe and has Jesus behind it, you'll never get away with it. You will produce a mounting fury that is like sand in a watch, it starts to foul up the works and there's a kickback when the watch stops working. You'll have a mounting social fury – a kickback which will disintegrate the South African society. And that came from my understanding of Jesus as the 'Cosmic Christ'."

"Now the second thing I would say is that if I believe that Jesus is the 'Living Word' and the 'Cosmic Christ', the second absolutely key conviction that holds my life together from the time of my conversion until now, is that I believe that the Bible is the 'Written Word'. Jesus is the 'Living Word'; the Bible is the 'Written Word'. I have a high view of the inspiration and authority of the bible. And I believe that if one studies the new testament, one can see that Jesus had a very, very high view of the canon of scripture which bound the Jewish society at that time. And I look at that view and I say I want to embrace that view. If I look at the Apostles view of the old testament, if I look at the Apostles view of their own writings and each others writings, I believe one sees a very, very high view of the inspiration of God and of the Bible. I believe that when the canon was closed in early 4th Century or something, that that was that. Not to say that there can be no other living words from God passed to people. But in my mind that was where the scriptural canon was

closed and our job now is to understand what the Bible says, to exegete what the Bible says, to obey what the Bible says, to hold onto its authority and to stand by it. And so as I look at issues around me, you know, whatever those issues are, I bring them to the touchstone of scripture and that for me has been absolutely key.”

Interviewer: “How would you say that your value of reconciliation, as the flipside of evangelism, has impacted the structure that you built within African Enterprise, within the relationships in African Enterprise?”

Cassidy: “Well I don’t think you can look at the New Testament with any seriousness or thoroughness and not realise that it gives a vast amount of time within its pages to the relationships that are within the Church. The very fact that Jesus started out telling his disciples to love one another. What he was telling his disciples was; ‘By this will all men know that you are my disciples if you love one another.’ So the most distinctive thing about Jesus that probably any non-Christian would pick up who knew almost nothing about him was that he preached love and was a loving person. As soon as you talk love you talk relationships, you are talking the horizontal, you are talking human relationships as an outward expression of an inner love for the Lord. ...In the wider developing community in the book of acts, you find that the thing that was distinctive about them, they were an alternative messianic community. I mean it had people in it who were government people, system people, it had people who were zealots bent on overthrowing the system by violence –like ‘Simon the Zealot’. You find when you step into Acts 13 that the church in Antioch it had whites and blacks. It had Niger or the black man, it had Simon of Cyrene, probably an Arab and I mean an Arab-African. He came from North Africa, might have been a black person out of that world back there. You had Jewish people, you had old you had young you had government people, someone had worked in the court of Herod. And those were the people there, those were the leaders. And that was why in Antioch they had to find another name for people who had these incredible relationships, could not call them Jew, could not call them Gentile, and they called them Christians, ‘Christ-ones’.”

“...And of course as we came back into South Africa, in 1962 and then full time at the end of ’64, we came back into a drastically polarised society. Because we were committed to a gospel in word and deed we had no option to begin applying ourselves to the problem that stared us in the face. Around every corner this was the issue, around every corner it came. People tried to tell us that we could not have interracial meeting, people tried to make life difficult when we added interracial components to our team. So the circumstances thrust the relational issue into our faces. We found English-white and black at odds, we found English and Afrikaner at odds; we found several of the tribal groupings at odds. And if you were to carry out a gospel with any credibility at all, it had to be relational, you had to talk reconciliation and you had to take your Lord’s word in Matt 5:23 for example; ‘If you are bringing your gift to the altar and you find that your brother has something against you (not even you against him, but he against you) go and first be reconciled and then come bring your gift to me.’ ...So we began to preach it, we began to get into trouble for it, we found ourselves hounded by the security policy, by government people giving us a hard time, and by whites giving us a hard time. But we were very sure of our ground; we were not people who arrived at this late in the day.”

Michael mentions here the many impostures in the Church of late who say they never believed in Apartheid, but where were they when AE was being grilled for its stance?

“You mention Festo, 1968-69 we were preaching in Nairobi and it was logical for the two of us to preach together. Then when we went off to do our first ministry tour in the States, the theme that the Spirit of God seemed to give us was the one from 2 Corinthians 5: ‘God has given to us the ministry of Reconciliation’. And we did not plan that to be the theme song of our first tour, but it just happened everywhere we preached. And it was a big thing may I say for Festo, to take me into his life, much bigger than for me to take him. Because I was a white man, I was young, a lay person. I came from the pole-cat country of the world and he now already had a world ministry, but he saw that if he had come to Jesus and I had come to Jesus then we had to come to each other. Then out from there that ministry began and the Lord prospered it wherever we went. And of course our team here we saw very, very early – we started Full time in ‘64 and within months we had our first black person. That became our commitment, so we became a non-racial or interracial ministry as well as interdenominational. The very fact that AE is together today as a team and a ministry after 44 years, is a testimony to that commitment. Because Africa over those years has had massive fragmenting forces at work within it, and if you bring people in from every background, from East Africa, from West Africa, from South Africa, you bring in whites from South Africa, you bring in old time white Rhodesians you know and the developing black Zimbabweans from those early years. And then you bring in a couple of touch Aussies and some rather sensitive gentle Englishmen and a few rash Americans and you really stir the pot to almost impossible levels of requirement. And I need to be absolutely honest it was not all plain sailing.”

“There were times when we had to struggle, there were times when there were tears, there were times when there was misunderstanding, there were times when there were probably suspicions, there were times when we lost each other, but we knew that the rendezvous point was the cross, and if you got to the cross you could find one another. It was a place to repent, a place to say I’m sorry. It was a place to put ourselves together again and become reconciled. And it was really out of those struggles that AE still exists today. Any non-racial ministries in Africa that are honest probably would acknowledge the fragility that will always be there. The wounds from this racial thing in the past, they don’t just heal overnight. Just ask white and black Americans! They had their civil rights legislation first passed in ’62 and they are still working it out. So you know it all flowed from the love requirements of Jesus and then the context we were in. You could get nothing [evangelistic crusades/ missions] to work unless you based it on reconciliation.”

Interviewer: “Backtracking slightly to Festo, can you describe how that worked structurally and relationally how that worked. Did you see yourselves as peers, as father and son, who reported to whom? Describe the relationship both structurally and relationally?”

Cassidy: “Let’s take the structural one first. The structural relationship when Festo came into the work was that we became co-leaders. We weighed in each at 185 and $\frac{3}{4}$ pounds, I mean we were absolute peers structurally. We were co-leaders of a ministry; neither was more senior than the other, and neither reported to the other per se in like an accountability line. That was structurally how it was and it was considered a pretty unique kind of set up across the world. But we had basically a very good and a precious and a very sound relationship. But the practicalities of working it out were really quite difficult. Because Festo lived in Kabali and I lived down here (Pietermaritzburg), it was very hard and expensive to get together in those years phones and that were not at all reliable. We did not

have e-mail things; you know the way that you can communicate today. So that what really happened was that we came together when we did ministry and when we met for inter-team meetings or our international council, or with our international partnership board. And in those times we would connect, we would share, we would pray. We would seek to orchestrate together, and I think both for him and for me it was difficult, the structural arrangement was difficult.”

“Because what often happened because many people saw me as the founder of the work or else as more easily accessible because I was in a place that phones and systems worked a lot of things landed on my desk as if I were CEO, but I wasn’t really organisationally CEO. So what it meant was that I couldn’t make any decisions till I had got hold of Festo or tried to talk to Festo, and I found it very difficult at getting to Festo. It was an arrangement that as we went along I found it personally increasingly difficult and I think he did to. There would be sometimes that I would go into Nairobi and Festo would be up in Uganda and many people would perceive me to be like the founder of the organisation. So if there were problems in our teams in Kenya or some staff issue or money issue – when I would go to Kenya people would start rocking up and say can I talk to you off the record. Then that of course became difficult for Festo, because it almost looked like I was stepping into his bailiwick and trying to almost take over his turf, none of which was ever my intention or desire. But people found him hard to access, not only was he in another country –in Uganda – but he wasn’t even in Kampala, he was in the boondocks down in Kabali and beyond that he was an Anglican Bishop as well.”

“So I need to be honest and say that structurally I found it difficult. So that when Festo died, I took a very deep breath and I knew it would be misinterpreted by some and there were some people who said, oh Michael is just in a power grab, but when Festo died I started to say to the ministry I actually think you need a single leadership. It’s really a very very difficult way practically to work [a dual leadership]. Although we a successor in a wonderful brother called Bishop Graceford Chitema, we were kind of co-leaders for a while, but the point came when just so much was happening it needed me to make decisions, and Graceford was in Tanzania. I finally just said to [my board] listen, either downgrade me to something else or upgrade me to a single leadership because I’m finding this very very difficult and stressful.”

“Now as far as Festo and my relationship goes, we had many years that were fantastic years. The decade of the seventies was really a great decade, but towards the end of the seventies, we began to get into some hassles. It never meant we could not preach together, but so many issues were coming at us, money issues, medical issues, Idi Amin, all of that and we never fell out, but we got into some tension relationships.”

Interviewer: “Was it an unusual relationship where age did not really factor in? Was there some situations when you would advice him, were there others where he advised you?”

Cassidy: “That sort of thing happened all the time we were an interchange, interface with each other, the sharing of ideas and I honestly think a high percentage of the time we had a good synergy. As we went around the world ministering I was definitely the junior partner, in terms of the perceptions of the public. He was the real starter and the people acknowledged that we were together and be were an unusual combo, but he was older than I, more senior than I, he was a Bishop, I was a ‘layman’, and he had this world-wide fame

through this Idi Amin thing. And I remember once when we were in Australia in 1978, one of the ministers saying to me, isn't it a bit difficult for you sort of being in the shadows, being like sort of an also ran with Festo. And I was so thankful that I was able to say to him, I am junior to him in spiritual maturity and accomplishment, it's just a privilege for me to carry his briefcase round the world and be with him, be an associate, be a colleague and how much greater a privilege to minister with him. ...So that's how we went, we would preach on the reconciliation message, one of us would take the horizontal, the other the vertical and people were quite captivated with this sort of thing. We shared together, he was an awesome colleague to have and to be around, and you know I loved him, really, really profoundly. And Festo in full flight – I've never ever heard another preacher or colleague like that.”

Interviewer: “What impacts on your life have political leaders had, particularly the positive impact, in terms of reconciliation? Often we talk of the Church's impact on the State, but on a personal level has there been an impact back from some political figures on you?”

Cassidy: “I could never answer that question without talking about Patrick Duncan. Cause he was my childhood hero. They lived next to us, he and his wife, his mother lived opposite us, she was the widow of Sir Patrick, you know the Governor General of South Africa under Smuts. And um, people would say to me who was the most interesting human being you have ever met, I would say without any hesitation Pat Duncan. He was incredible, he was captivating, exciting, inspiring, energising, but the dominating passion of his life was to see justice for black people, and the dominating antagonism of his life was apartheid and all its works and its injustices. So Pat politicised me at age about 10 or 11 and he explained to me as a little boy and he explained to me in 1948 when Malan came in and Smuts lost. He really explained to me what a tragedy this was for South Africa and how we would pay a dear price. So he was quite significant. Then I suppose I would have to say people like Alan Payton made an impact in my life because ‘Cry the Beloved Country’ came out when I was a school boy and Michael House at the time was really quite a liberal school. My house master was involved in anti-government politics – the schools posture was very clear where it stood against apartheid. So Michael house was a positive political influence on me. And of course I also began doing bits and peaces of reading and Patrick Duncan had inspired me with Gandhi – Mahatma Gandhi. Because Gandhi was the man of peace. Gandhi was a man of passive resistance, of sole-force what they call *Satyagraha*, which was Gandhi's philosophy of non-violence. People say Gandhi loved the British out of India, and Pat for most of his life until the very end when he did become converted to violence and we parted company then. But he had really proclaimed the way of Gandhi and I took that subconsciously into my heart and life.”

“As I got to Cambridge I was quite a bit influenced by Trevor Huddleston, who although he was an Anglican Monk in the Community of the Resurrection he was also quite a powerful political figure as well. I met him and found him quite inspiring, and you mentioned Smuts I found him quite inspiring. I never knew Smuts, but the Duncan family all knew Smuts. And I had a letter today from John Duncan, Pat's brother, who is still alive and we go to the bush together every year. And John Duncan can regale you with stories of Smuts because they lived all around government house, up there. And one of the things I was intrigued about Smuts, he had a global vision of how the world should go. He helped I think in forming the “League of Nations” and things like this. He was bigger than South Africa and that was something that I thought was good. I don't know whether I

consciously thought I would like to be bigger than South Africa. I would like to have interests that go beyond the parochial. I'd like to think more about the continent, about the world."

"I must say also I was very inspired by Louis Botha, because although he failing in taking up racism, he had a tremendous heart in burying the hatchet after the Boer war. He and Smuts were such key figures in that, magnanimous, gracious, Statesman-like. And they were also joined by someone who interested me a lot, but right there you see a letter from Deneys Reitz written to my grandfather. He was a Boer War General and a mate of Smuts and of Louis Botha and writes there to my grandfather in which he says that my grandfather helped him get a bigger vision and swallow the pride and hostilities and bury the hatchet from the past and begin to rebuild a new South Africa. And my grandfather used to speak to me with incredible affection about the role that Deneys Reitz had played in his life. So I found Deneys Reitz a very inspiring figure, he brought some political influence into my life. And I've mentioned to you 1957, Martin Luther King, that I got from his wife [she had signed a photo of Martin Luther King]. I went to see her when I was writing 'The Passing Summer'".

"I believe I was also touched and affected by De Klerk. I think history is going to be kind to De Klerk. There wouldn't have been a Mandela happening had it not been for the De Klerk happening. I mean FW De Klerk came to some sort of light bulb, some kind of political Damascus road. I like to think that the spiritual played into it as well. And he realized that apartheid was wrong. I think the 1986 decision of the Dutch Reform synod, my friend, he was a very good friend to me –he was assassinated after that verdict of the NG Kerk synod in '86. He led the charge, he was much affected by SACLA I in 79' and then he kind of led the exegetical studies that brought about the conclusion in the Dutch Reformed church that apartheid was wrong."

Interview with Jamie Morrison, Personal Assistant and “Editor-Writer” for Michael Cassidy, conducted at the African Enterprise Training Centre, Pietermaritzburg on Wednesday 25th May 2005 at 3:30pm (Interviewer –Richmond Williams).

Interviewer: “What Style(s) and Structures is Michael comfortable with/ uses regularly, in the AE ministry?”

Morrison: “I think he’s quite an informal, relational, hands-off kind of leader. His way of operating is that he’s a very motivated self-starting sort of person. And I think he sort of expects other people to be that. The structures of AE, the thing is about AE is that it does not really have any middle management. There is Michael who is ‘International Team Leader’ and then we have 10 teams in Africa and each of those have a team leader and they also have a board of directors in each country over that team leader. [The team leader is] answerable to the board and to Michael. There is not really anyone between the team leaders and Michael. In the same way we have support officers in six countries overseas including Australia and New Zealand and those people also report have boards that they report to, but they also report to Michael as International Team Leader. I don’t know what all the management and leadership literature says but I think that’s quite a large number of people reporting directly to him as head of the ministry. Then there are a couple of other people who they call ‘Pan African Executive Officers’ – there is a guy in Tanzania who does ‘Reconciliation Ministry’; we have a guy here who does ‘Training and Leadership Ministries’; technically our director of our Australian office handles ‘Aid and Development in Africa’ even though he’s an Australian; then we used to have a guy who was ‘Human Resources and Organisational Development’ although he just left a couple of years ago.”

Interviewer: And do they each relate to all sorts of people in all sorts of countries. Do you have a matrix structure where the “Pan African” leader relates to people concerned with for example ‘Reconciliation’ in all sorts of countries outside of Tanzania or is that not really the case?”

Morrison: “I think in theory that is how it would relate but he has done most of his work in Burundi where we don’t have a team. But we do have one in Rwanda. He’s done work in the Congo as well, though we do have a team, it is a very new team, so those people also report directly to Michael. So probable there is about twenty people reporting directly to him.”

Interviewer: “You say his style is pretty ‘hands-off’ but does he get more ‘hands-on’ when you are running a campaign somewhere?”

Morrison: “Some missions are Pan-African where we call on members of quite a number of AE teams across Africa and some missions are more a national mission where one country will do a mission. In either situation really Michael does not get too intimately involved in the preparation for the mission. That’s the job of the Pan-African Missions Department or that’s the job of the national office in the country that they are doing the national mission. Mostly his role in a mission is to be there – to preach and to speak. ...The top leadership is who he normally speaks to. Normally in our missions they try to end it with a big stadium type rally and normally Michael is the one to give the main message at that stadium event.”

Interviewer: “What are his passions – like his involvement in ecumenism, and reconciliation – and what do you see as Michael’s underpinning values?”

Morrison: “I do think evangelism is got to be the underpinning value. He is probably an evangelist above all. ...You had mentioned reconciliation, and he’s done some pretty amazing things in reconciliation but I would say he has gotten involved in reconciliation as an outflow of the gospel – of bringing the gospel to bear in whatever situation. And the fact is he’s lived in and worked in South Africa for most of his life – it has been a situation that has so needed reconciliation with all the alienation and divisions here. I think that’s one of the main reasons he has got so involved in reconciliation. I think that if he had worked and grown up in a context that was not so divided I’m not sure that he would have gotten so involved in reconciliation. He still would have been preaching the gospel and he still would have been bringing the gospel to bear in a way that related to the issues wherever he was.”

“But I think that evangelism is his main thing and probably a very close second is a relating to and gathering the church. When you think of spiritual gifts I think that Michael has the apostolic gift and he’s able to call the church together. You see that all the way from ’73 and the ‘South African Congress on Mission and Evangelism’ in Durban when he got the church together there and from all across the spectrum – from Pentecostals to the real conservative evangelicals to the main-line churches and everything; to PACLA in ’76; SACLA I in ’79; ‘The National Initiative for Reconciliation’ in ’85; PACLA II in ’94 and then SACLA II in 2003. It seems like in Africa and in South Africa – I may be wrong – but I don’t think there has been anyone-else who has been able to call the church together as fruitfully and as successfully as Michael has.”

“...The other thing is that evangelism has been his main thing but evangelism targeted especially at leadership. I mean not exclusively but especially at leadership. I think from the beginning at Fuller Seminary, leadership was one of the things that he got hooked into, especially into the prayer-breakfast ministry in Washington DC.”

Interview with Mark Manley, Team Leader for African Enterprise –South Africa from 2001 till 2003, conducted at his home “the Knoll”, Hilton on Thursday 11th August 2005 at 5:30pm (Interviewer –Richmond Williams).

Mark Manley: “We had a very good two years, able to turn the ministry around. When I entered it was in a state of serious decline, financially troubled, I wouldn’t say crisis, but troubled. So financially we were able to turn that around to a 25% year on year funding improvement. We were able to increase the ministries, the actual ministries themselves, so for example the opening up of a new reconciliation ministry (well it was not new it was revitalising something that had been defunct for 12 years or so. We were able to set up a new leadership development; we were able to increase the evangelistic ministry of African Enterprise by probably 50% on what was expected –so great things! We were able to extend the net work of African Enterprise to a lot of places where it hadn’t been, particularly some of the church streams where AE had not penetrated effectively. So ministry overall probably increased by about 50 to 70%. Staff increased by about 20%, which is not necessarily a good thing but in the midst of transition it is quite a good indicator. The attrition rate because of the changing culture –we lost 2 people”

Interviewer: “You have been referring a change in organisational culture here, away from a ministry-appeasement culture to one of a business culture where leadership can be unpopular. Do you think that there was also a change in the makeup of the staff and so in that sense the overall dynamic of culture from a staffing point of view in AE?”

Manley: “... But yes, new staff came on board it was younger it was guys that had a different type of orientation but the thing is that the people that were in the positions of power were the people that had been with the ministry on an average for probably about 30 years. So the culture was changing outside of the realms of the powerbrokers and that lead to a certain amount of tension”

“The culture was essentially tactical or short term as opposed to strategic. And that probably was the greatest change that we brought about – was moving from a tactical culture – responding to that which is going to make us successful and hopefully still pay the bills, to being strategic – saying here are our long term goals and our objectives which defines what I have to do now. It means also going out and doing unsolicited ministry and that was different and was very uncomfortable for those who were more reactive as opposed to being proactive.”

Mark then discussed the changing culture made up of many new particularly young people whose individual culture was at first bound by the old but found wings, a liberty and expression!

“I think what started to emerge, certainly amongst the youth is that they found a voice, certainly for the first time, and even after I left, up until last week I had people who were given liberty to express their new culture and their new paradigm orientation been given wings within a new AE kind of framework – suddenly there was that new kind of framework – that new found success. That yes we can embrace the new as opposed to just forcing you to conform to the old. So as a result of that within eight months of me leaving most of the new people had left, most of the youngsters had left and were asking me for

jobs! Please start up another AE, please start up another ministry which I have been very reluctant to do.”

“I don’t know if this in answering your question, but the black-white issues are deeply seated and there is a great amount of anger and discontent and people do not see AE as a new South African organisation – certainly not historically in terms of what my experience of it was. It was obviously part of my desire to make it a new South African organisation – it does not necessarily mean a black organisation but it means a new South African non-racial organisation, but at the same time not making excuses for its empowerment of previously disadvantaged people. Because we would not have to make excuses because we were excellent and so empowerment and excellence operating simultaneously –that was my ideal. Sort of a la Albert Luthuli: ‘Somewhere in there beckons a civilization, it will be African but it might not be all black.’”

“I think what had emerged in the people’s pursuit of non-confrontation –making sure people were happy as opposed to accountable was that people who were not competent and who were not leaders were given a position. And so you had this very top heavy situation where many people were called funny things which amounted to being managers and had a voice on the “Exco” [Executive Committee]. So it was a bit like a sky-scraper as opposed to a pyramid, which is a very unhealthy situation. But now what that should have allowed for was greater expression because now everyone’s got a say. But we all know it does not work like that because it did not have a formalised matrix approach. It was still hierarchical, very hierarchical. More disturbing was the unofficial hierarchy, the one that operated in parallel to the hierarchy that was in the formalised structure and this had to do with access to the power, and the power in this instance was Michael and those who could influence Michael and the old cleek – the old boys club. Those who could influence, these people, although they might have had no structural power, were the people with the power.”

“One of the things I did was to flatten the organisation and we had three levels. If the Catholic church can operate on five levels from the Pope to the person in the pew there is no reason why an ultra-tiny organisation like AE of (when I got there something like) 23 people needed to have levels of management-supervision – it was bazaar! And so we flattened the whole thing. ... It didn’t work, it was essentially sabotaged. Look within me leaving, let me tell you within two months, every new ministry had been shut down, every new initiative had been sidelined – it is as simple as that. The 67 year old previous interim leader had been re-established as the leader and the funding was once again in trouble. It was like I never happened.”

Interviewer: “What is Michael’s leadership style?”

Manley: “So Michael comes in as this fresh faced youngster and brings in this new paradigm –this brings in this breath of fresh air. And starts doing things ‘busking’ to a large extent because no one has done it before. So he comes in with this new way of doing things and its great and people respond and people get behind it and its wonderful and Michael has an anointing and he is an evangelist and nobody can ever take that [an anointing] away from anybody, even though they might want to. He is a very effective evangelist. And so his ministry if seen in terms of Ephesians 4 would fall on the evangelism side, he is not a very good administrator. He is not so pioneering or prophetic

– there are certain elements to his evangelism that are prophetic – yes and we saw that in the context of striving for justice in South Africa. I think he does not fall into the justice side of the political spectrum, he falls more into the liberal side. I think that [his political persuasion] is more a function, not of his prophetic nature but more of a function of his Lesotho childhood culture and then finding a theology to support it as opposed to being prophetic and saying this is justice and it fits into this theology, rather he found a theology to support it – he actually said as much to me! And so he’s not a great teacher, and he is not a great pastor. His primary gifting in ministry is as an evangelist – that is where he functions best.”

Mark explained, summarised as follows: The change in the initial style, from the style that has sustained AE over the last 45 years or so, it has been a damping up and impounding of those initial heady days, where there was an entrepreneurial-pioneering style, now there is a style that “maintains”. This was explained by looking to Michael’s roots and his Lesotho childhood culture: “In terms of his world-view its essentially colonial – ‘we have to do the right thing on the basis of what is right’ as opposed to a more contemporary view – ‘you have to do that which works.’ Michael comes out of ‘Systems 4’, I come out of ‘Systems 7’ and there we couldn’t see eye to elbow. ...He probably thought I was ‘Systems 5’, and ‘Systems 4’ folk are very threatened by ‘Systems 5’. Part of the sadness I have is that they are still clinging to power, still unable to make the transition.”

“Michael’s style is now autocratic or directive. I was in disbelief – here’s Michael the champion of democracy and he’s behaving like a dictator – this cannot be, and yet you scratch the surface and there it is, and it is done in the nicest way and I think that fools everybody. ...So here we have SACLA [II] and it is all the “old toppies”, speaking and hogging the show, nobody young with a new idea or paradigm. And so that’s the juxtaposition, that it is done in such a nice way but it is still dictatorial. Even in SACLA [I], when I spoke to the black guys – Caesar Molebatsi had to do the keynote address at the end of SACLA I – now he is now older than me, but he was then this black young buck, but he has no real time for Michael, he tolerates Michael but there is bad blood there. ...He told me that when he was given the platform for this keynote address, wrapping up SACLA, Michael sat down with him and tried to influence Caesar in what he had to say. “No you can’t say that ...” and so on, it was like a censorship sort of thing, a one man censorship. So Michael is a control freak, but he’s so nice about doing it, because he has a desperate desire to be liked. He has a fragile ego.”

Interview with Michael Nuttall – retired Bishop of KwaZulu Natal, conducted at 238 Johan Rissik, Waterkloof Ridge, Pretoria-Tshwane, on Saturday August 2005 at 5:00 pm (Interviewer –Richmond Williams).

Interviewer: “How do you see Cassidy’s style of leadership within the context of AE?”

Michael Nuttall: “Well in the nature of things it has been a very much Michael Cassidy lead organisation, and he has had his team surrounding him. The big challenge as I understand it, and I know they have been wrestling with it themselves is what is going to happen when Michael Cassidy moves on or out? And they are talking about it as a second generation leadership. And my perception, frankly for what it is worth, I am not in on the inside of the workings of AE, I’ve never been on any of their boards or committees, but my perception looking on from the outside as it were, is that they are having difficulty working on that one. There have been quite a few fairly strong characters who have come in, second generation leadership, the most recent being Mark Manley. But there was an Anglican priest actually from Singapore, whom I got to know quite well as I had to relate to him as one of our clergy in Natal, who came a ‘cropper’ for whatever reason – I’m not quite sure. His particular style, what he had to contribute was not acceptable, so he had to move out! So I think they are having some difficulty. I said to Michael at one point: ‘How is it Michael that you are on the SACLA executive representing AE and Mark Manley isn’t. Because my understanding is that you are ‘International Team Leader’ now, not the South African leader. Michael just looked at me.”

“I know nothing about what happened, Mark Manley as far as I am concerned just disappeared off the AE map and I don’t know why, and it was never made public, perhaps it couldn’t be. Naturally one drew one’s own conclusions –there had been a clash of some sort. I think AE and Michael personally are finding it difficult to let go of the Mike Cassidy *imprimatur* – imprint, style in relation to AE. And it is going to be an enormous challenge for AE to continue and to survive, particularly in its South African face when Mike moves out. Michael says he does not believe in retirement – he’s going to be leader emeritus, he’s made that public. They have just appointed a new ‘International Team Leader’ though, who will take over in two years time – Stephen Lungu who is in Malawi. Michael has had this extraordinary mission, and he has persisted with that vision and that has been a very positive thing and has lead to the expansion of AE, essentially as we’ve seen it. But it has had its negative side, in that it has brought with it such a strong Cassidy mark – water mark as it were – into the organisation that the challenge for the organisation and indeed for Michael himself, I think, to move on without him.”

Interviewer: “How does this style differ when he is outside of his immediate organisation?”

Nuttall: “I don’t want to give the wrong impression; he likes to work with colleagues, very definitely, colleagues who are congenial, theologically, there is an interesting co-patronage with Cardinal Winfred Napier, the leading Roman Catholic in South Africa at the moment and with a Cardinal no less. They are co-patrons of this marriage alliance and they are fighting these contentious issues through to the constitutional court to try to safeguard the traditional understanding of marriage in South African society. And he’s got his co-hosts of SACLA and all of that – so Michael likes to work with colleagues, but he plays a very definite prominent role in that he himself is almost the leader number one in those working relationships. My perception is that the situation Michael is involved in with Cardinal Napier and others is very much Michael’s main arena with others in support.”

Appendix 6 Interviews Regarding Tutu

Interview with Desmond Tutu, Archbishop Emeritus of the Church of the Province (Anglican), conducted in transit between Pretoria and Soweto in the interviewer's vehicle, Tuesday 15th March 2005 at 11:00pm (Interviewer –Richmond Williams).

Interviewer: "What are your primary values?"

Tutu: "I think that the values that one has are mainly ones that one has unconsciously assimilated over the years, informed by one's faith. What the bible says about God, about human beings, the things that our Lord says about things [such as]; 'If you want to be first you must be last.' They are there without always intruding [consciously thinking about them], you hope they become part of your life, you hope that it could become as normal as breathing. And so I suppose all of us would say we try to take our Lord as our model, a person who affirmed others and is constantly looking for ways to serve others as the highest form of leadership."

Interviewer: "You are known for a value of Reconciliation, would you say that you draw your inspiration for some of the things you do from the Lord Jesus himself?"

Tutu: "Yes, I mean our faith which is fundamentally a reconciling faith, I suppose one of the most devastating things you could say about the first five books of the Bible is the image of a world that is torn apart, a world that is alienated, that needs atonement, at-one-ment, and how it is Falcrano or whoever, who says that the proto-history shows how sin happens and God punishes sin and then gives grace, and then this is seemingly broken with the tower of Babel with sin and punishment and grace has not appeared. But then you realise – they say that it is first the patriarchal stories but ultimately the call of Israel is the "Grace". God's project is seeking to restore the primordial harmony. I think its Gocal they say who says that the end time becomes like the beginning time. When you read Isaiah and he has that vision of the lion and the lamb lying together, and a child playing over the hole of a snake and not being harmed. Our faith is one that is one that is fundamentally reconciling, reconciling human beings to God, human beings to one another, human beings to the rest of creation. And our Lord says of his coming crucifixion: 'I, if I be lifted up I will draw all to me ...', and St Paul speaking about how we have been given the ministry of reconciliation."

Interviewer: "On the style of leadership that you use?"

Tutu: "It is because I don't have all the gifts, I'm very smart at getting good people around me; they then make me look good, able. No that's quite true, even at the TRC it was that way – we had wonderful commissioners, committee members and staff persons – they did the work and I got the credit. Even as Archbishop the other bishops were just outstanding people, most times, and I was a very good captain because I had a winning side."

Interviewer: "Would you say that in areas of disagreement that you tried to find out your staff's opinions?"

Tutu: "I tried. There have been times, I hope infrequent, where you have to say well this is what we have to do even when it might infact not be popular. For instance the bishops

decided soon after the political processes were being normalised that our clergy should not become card carrying members of any political party because whereas in most societies that would be a matter of indifference, at that time for us it was that we were in a very volatile situation and wanted to have priests who could minister to everybody, and have their ministrations accepted. Because you can imagine if you had a man who was known to be an ANC and he had to go and minister in an Inkatha area, it would be very, very difficult! It wasn't a popular decision, especially quite rightly people were feeling that they had been held back so long and now that you could become a member of any political party without any penalties being imposed by the government, that they thought that the church was being reactionary. And we just had to be firm and say we believe – and I think we were right for that particular period – that it should be so.”

“And so yes, there would be times when you hold on to a particular position which might not have been so popular. And my own position say over things like sanctions, not everyone agreed with me, that's putting it mildly, even in our church, even the bishops, we were not of one mind for a long time. They did come to a point where they were saying, they could agree to some extent.”

Interviewer: “Would you say from your position that you allowed some consensus to come through, as eventually if I remember correctly the whole sanctions was targeted toward investment sanctions?”

Tutu: “Well you try to be inclusive as possible, I think that looking back there must have been times when I was insufferable, because it is very easy to become self-righteous when you do look like, I mean, that you are right. I think that there were times when I could have been less abrasive than I was. There is a lot of truth in the saying that, ‘you catch more flies with honey than with vinegar.’ And I say that maybe we lost some people, alienated some people by not always being accommodating and being tough.”

Interviewer: “As an Anglican coming up through the ranks, your structure is chosen for you and is fairly hierarchical. Was there any difference in the structure you adopted for the TRC, or in any of your other dealings?”

Tutu: “The first thing to say about the first months, the first part of our time together – very difficult, very, very difficult. I think each one of us wanted to establish themselves and lay out some of your turf, they were some of the most difficult meetings I have ever had to preside over. I had been accustomed to our church meetings, where yes there was consensus, although I think there was deference also for the Archbishop. At the beginning [of the TRC], some of the women for instance took umbrage that some were addressing me as ‘father’, and they said that now they were not going to accept all that paternalism. It was rough, but I think some of the things that I had learned in the church did infact come in handy. We were Jews, Muslims, Christians, Hindus and Atheists and we had to be welded into a team and in addition we were all of us people who had been wounded by apartheid. In the end I think we came to be more united than we had been at the beginning.”

Interviewer: “With the context you have just described did it tend to be a flatter structure?”

Tutu: “One of the things, that I hope to some extent is a gift of mine, was the fact that I like to give people space, I like letting everyone to have the opportunity to show-off their

ability, and I have mercifully learnt that I am not omniscient and omni-competent – that other people know certain things a great deal better than I. For instance, we would really have been up ‘Queer Street’ if we had not had Alex Boraine as the Deputy Chair. His managerial skills are superb. It was really because of him that we were able to have started as quickly as we did. He was good about putting down the structures that we needed and calling the staff that we should have had, because we had to start from scratch and I don’t want to wish that on my worst enemy. Other governments if they want to have a TRC should ensure that they have a structure in place. We didn’t have any of that, we had to find our offices, we had to find staff, and I would quite frankly have been completely out of my depth if we had not had someone with the considerable skills that Alex Boraine had! And the people who headed up our regional offices they too, turned out to be just out of the ‘top draw.’ I think I have got to the point where I am not too threatened by the competence and skills of others. And so allowing people to have space, and they came to realise that I really like affirming others and letting them take the bit between their teeth and to run with it.”

Interviewer: “So would you say that while you were the overall leader, you and Alex Boraine made a very good ‘team of leaders’ at the top, almost co-captains?”

Tutu: “He is quite outstanding and you can see he left the TRC and went and set up an institute for transitional justice – “The International Centre for Transitional Justice” – in New York. He got 30 million from Ford and now it is a flourishing concern. He has now stepped down as President and he’s now the ‘Chair’. But they are working in eighteen different countries. It was one of the wonderful things that we were able to work so smoothly together and it helped that I didn’t have to be looking over my shoulder, to know that he was loyal to the hilt and would not do anything to subvert me. Which isn’t something that you could take for granted, because we were – as I said – as wounded and brittle as our whole community, and we could have fallen apart.”

Interviewer: “How has your leadership both in the church and the TRC affected the nation? Has there been a felt positive impact from the church back into the nation itself?”

Tutu: “It is always interesting to find that they appointed an Archbishop to head up the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, which was a quasi-legal body. That it is an interesting thing that they didn’t, as you could have expected, go for a judge, and I think that that says a great deal. And once we were meeting as bishops in our church and we were meeting in the Free State and we invited the Premier of the Free State to come and talk to us. And he said that he is surprised that we are surprised that they should have chosen to walk the path of reconciliation. Because he said the church is to blame if you want someone to blame [for choosing this path] because most of them were educated in church schools, and most of them are practicing Christians and therefore all of this should have been natural. Now if that is so, then one could expect that the results of the TRC would have been percolating through society and percolating through the leadership. But that does not mean we always obey or do the right things, when we may know that this is what should be happening.”

Interview with Michael Nuttall – retired Bishop of KwaZulu Natal, conducted at 238 Johan Rissik, Waterkloof Ridge, Pretoria-Tshwane, on Saturday August 2005 at 5:30 pm (Interviewer –Richmond Williams).

Interviewer: “Talk me through a brokering situation that comes to mind, that you and Tutu were involved in between Mandela and Buthelezi, or something similar?”

Nuttall: “We managed to get Mandela and Buthelezi to a joint meeting that went on for nine hours with their delegations in June ’93 if I remember correctly. And that was the point where Buthelezi had called the Inkatha Freedom Party [IFP] out of the CODESA negotiations because of the Nationalist Party and the ANC had reached a “Record of Understanding”. And they had agreed on a date for the elections, 27th of April 1994 and the IFP had not been part of that decision, and they pulled out of CODESA, not for the first time! So when we met, the IFP was standing out side. There was this terrible violence going on between the IFP and the ANC, in Natal, on the East Rand and so on. It was a desperate, desperate situation – and I think the hope in the media was that we would be able to persuade Buthelezi to come back in on the negotiations. Well Mandela and his team didn’t manage to persuade him to do that, but our view was that the fact that they were meeting in that way when the IFP was currently out of such discussions was a significant moment.”

“As I said in my book, “Number Two to Tutu”, my view is that the best thing we did that day was to arrange for Buthelezi and Mandela to have lunch together on their own. We don’t know what went on between them over that lunch but I believe they were able to find each other person to person, not just politician to politician, because they have a profound mutual respect for each other actually. It was the political dynamics of the situation that made them sought of “enemies” in adverted comas. And less than a year later, April ’94 the ANC wins the election and who comes into Mandela’s cabinet, Mangosuthu Buthelezi as Minister of Home Affairs together with others leaders of the IFP as well, there were three or four in his first cabinet. So I think that meeting played an important part in unlocking the doors to reconciliation.”

“Three times Mandela appointed him [Buthelezi] Acting President [when Mandela was out of the country], and I’ve spoken to Buthelezi about that. In fact I saw him here in Pretoria, when these new Bishops were consecrated here this year, February I think it was, and I commented to him on this, and his face just lit up he was so proud to have that trust place in him three times, okay short spells. But during one of those spells – you know – the decision was made and he had to make the decision, he obviously consulted with Mandela, you remember our troops went into Lesotho, post ’94, Buthelezi made that decision, they were asked to come in by the government because Lesotho was in an uproar. So three times Buthelezi was Acting President of this nation.”

Interviewer: “Is there something you can tell me about Tutu’s style, his brokering, what is it about Tutu’s style that he is able to get people to meet together?”

Nuttall: “He has got an amazing knack in which he uses his humour, he allows himself to be nudged to take advantage of an opportunity. I mean the way he got that meeting together; because there was a certain reluctance we were aware, not so much between Mandela and Buthelezi, but by some of their colleagues for this meeting to happen at all.

And it all happened over one weekend in Pietermaritzburg in my home town. Desmond Tutu was up for two events, on the Saturday the new bishop of Zululand was being consecrated in the Cathedral in Pietermaritzburg and Desmond came to do that consecration and because it was the bishop of Zululand who was being consecrated, Buthelezi was in the congregation because he is from Zululand. And during the peace, we were giving the peace to one another, Desmond goes straight to Mangosuthu Buthelezi who was sitting in the front of the Cathedral, gives him the peace and says to him in passing, ‘If I were able to get a meeting between you and Mandela would you come to it? Are you willing to come?’ To which Mangosuthu Buthelezi says, ‘Yes I would come, yes your Grace, I would come.’ He called him ‘your Grace’ and then we carry on passing the peace; he’s got his acceptance right there in the middle of the service. That’s part of Tutu’s style – ‘seize the moment’ – *Carpe Diem*.”

“Next day the city was unveiling a wonderful new statue of Mahatma Gandhi, you know Gandhi was kicked off the train on the Maritzburg station in 1893, on a cold night, because he was in the wrong compartment, he was sitting in the first class. In the cold night of the station, that’s when he thought up his philosophy of *Satyagraha*, non-violent, passive resistance which he eventually applied in India to great effect but he also applied it in South Africa, and this was 1993, a century later when the statue of Mahatma Gandhi was unveiled, and Desmond Tutu and Nelson Mandela were invited to come and do the unveiling. So no he’s got this contact with Mandela and Buthelezi the day before. So he said we are going to speak to Mandela over lunch, and he took me with him, got Mandela into a corner of the room over lunch, and said, ‘Look I saw Mangosuthu Buthelezi yesterday and he’s agreed to meet with you, are you willing to meet with him.’ ‘Oh yes, yes of course I am’, says Mandela. Right, now he says, ‘I’ve got to go overseas tomorrow, I’ve got a commitment overseas, so this Bishop Nuttall, he is your contact.’ And Mandela gives me his personal phone number to set up this meeting. Now that is Tutu’s style.”

“When we get to the meeting itself, about a month later, when we eventually managed to arrange a date and a venue, and those things are not easy to arrange! As co-chair, we involved Bishop Stanley Mogoba as well, presiding bishop of the Methodist Church, a very well respected leader at the time and we thought lets involve him as well. So we brought him in on this, and he was very willing to cooperate. Stanley and Desmond co-chaired the meeting; I just sat on the edges as a little consultant and a listener. Stanley and Desmond chaired the meeting, and if I remember correctly they were fairly laid back in the way they did it, because the politicians were essentially talking to one another. But Desmond’s style is that he does not hesitate to nudge, to make a suggestion – ‘perhaps this is the way to go now’, or, ‘Don’t you think...’ He can be almost forceful but he does it with a humour that enables him to carry it off. Now look at the way he brokered that meeting. He just took advantage of those circumstances that weekend, and thought: ‘This is now God’s opportunity, I cannot let God down on this one.’ And he pulled it off.”

Interviewer: “And yet in the meeting itself, if I am understanding you correctly, he understood his as a facilitating role, so then he pulled himself back, but not so far that he could not interject when he wanted to.” (Nuttall responded; “That sums it up well.”) “Talk me through the styles and structures he was comfortable with in his many different capacities he lead in and any new structures he may have created that I am unaware of?”

Nuttall: “My experience was the more he came to trust me as a colleague and a friend alongside him, the more he was willing and wanted to consult as well. And to delegate tasks to me, he would freely delegate tasks, like he would leave me to prepare with one of our executive officers, he would leave me to prepare the agenda for a senate of bishops, and he would not interfere with that process at all, and would just receive it as something we would have done for him. He did not enjoy being engaged in that sort of thing, it wasn't that he was weak on administration as some leaders are on that sort of thing, he was I think a good administrator, an efficient administrator and was very particular about keeping up with correspondence and that kind of thing. But he would be very willing, as soon as he trusted somebody to say, ‘You take charge of that and prepare that and I'll come in at the right point.’ So he would preside forcefully and strongly, but he would work with an agenda that somebody else had prepared for him and he would not interfere with the process of that preparation, he would take it on trust. In our meetings, for example, as bishops, and any Synod that he presided over, he had an eye – he had a desire – for people to participate. It was a strange paradox in a way because his leadership was very much from the front, he was forthright, and would take a lion [lion's share] himself, but he would also want to involve others in a participatory way.”

“And so it was a paradoxical thing really, it could have been the one or the other, but rather a laid-back leadership style. And he would sometimes catch the look on somebody's face and say, ‘I think you want to say something don't you?’ And he would thereby encourage that person not to hesitate but to speak. And very often he would be right on target, that person was a little bit hesitant but as soon as he got the encouragement from the ‘Chair’ that person would contribute. So it became a very participatory experience working under Desmond's leadership and chairmanship of meetings, while at the same time making room for this diminutive person coming across with very strong contributions of his own. Not that he always won every argument, sometimes he lost, but he definitely had points of view that he would not hesitate to express from the ‘Chair’. And you had to take the measure of him, and give as much as you got, and not to cow-tow. It was something we bishops had to learn, because after all, here we were with a ‘Nobel Peace Prize’ winner. A famous international figure becoming our archbishop, now he's one of us and we are working with him for the wellbeing of the church for which we all share a responsibility in leadership. And we had to learn to adjust to one another and do that [leading the church] together.”

“The person who was his deputy on the TRC, Alex Boraine, who became his next number two, he said that Desmond had quite a sharp learning experience after his first meeting with the TRC. And he makes the comparison of him leading the bishops of the church because he said, he now found himself with a much more objectionable lot, and people who are far less willing to fall into line under him than would have been the case in the church where his bishops would be far more willing to fall into line. And I was struck by that comment and said well you must not just assume that the bishops were just yes men because we weren't. We had a great range of – a difference of – opinion. For example on the next question we struggled on in the ordination of women, a great range of opinion, and it was not just an easy ride for Desmond with the Bishops.”

“But with the TRC it became an even more difficult ride, because he had to deal with a more varied group of people, of different faiths or no faith at all, and coming from different professions and not quite as willing as we Anglicans tend to be to acknowledge authority in the life of the church. Not all Anglicans maybe but many Anglicans are very willing to

acknowledge the place of authority especially the bishop in the life of the church. Put him on a pedestal, we tend to do that in our church and it is not necessarily good for the bishops to have that done to them, but it is a feature of our church. But he came up against a different kind of environment with the TRC, the colleagues he was working with. But Alex Boraine goes on to say how brilliantly he moulded that group in all their diversity into a team. And he did exactly the same with us, it didn't come immediately, he had to work at it, he had to work with us and win our confidence, and he did. And he did the same with the TRC, as far as I can tell, winning their confidence. And then Boraine says; 'If there was any one person who was essential to the success such as it was of the TRC, that person was Desmond Tutu as the leader.' His skill was fairly considerable in moulding a team of people, especially for someone who had such strong views himself, non-the-less accommodating other people – and other views – and making them all feel important, making them feel that they belong and have something to contribute."

Interviewer: "You have mentioned a lot to do with 'teams', yet the Anglican structures are very hierarchical, what would you say are the structures he was most comfortable with?"

Nuttall: "When you go to a Synod, there you have got clergy and laity equally represented, presided over by the bishop, yes, but the bishop can't outvote them or anything like that. And he would preside over Synod, but he said openly he most enjoyed his meetings with his fellow bishops, he felt most comfortable at those meetings. They were consultative, they were not meetings that made decisions that governed the life of the church on the whole, they were influential, but they were not like Synodical meetings, which makes the canon of law that governs the church or something like that. The Synod of Bishops is a different kind of meeting for mutual encouragement and council, one from another and he was most comfortable – he was most relaxed in those meetings. You should also remember, Rich, his role as a prophet, because that was part of his style, speaking out as the prophet: 'Thus sayeth the Lord.' Which is what he did visa-a-vie society, visa-a-vie the state. So he was fulfilling that role quiet stridently, perhaps sometimes too stridently, but the circumstances were such that we needed to hear a stridden voice, knocking them [the politicians] back on their heels if necessary. So he was doing that with his strident call for economic sanctions, his leading of protest marches, his statements to the media and all of that. And then he had to hold together, with that prophetic style, a more consultative style among his fellow bishops in the life of the church, and a more democratic style himself as he presided over Synods in the life of the church. He had to actually adjust; he had to make room in his own qualities of leadership for these different elements of style [required in the varying situations]."

Interviewer: "We talk about his prophetic style or role, but is there also a pastoral style, is there a Pastor Desmond Tutu?"

Nuttall: "Desmond Tutu is first and foremost a pastor actually. He is not first and foremost the prophet, in my view. It was the circumstances in which he found himself which launched him into his prophetic ministry. Long before that he had already been the pastor, and he remained the pastor. He was in some ways the reluctant prophet, he was first and foremost the pastor, and what makes him the authentic prophet is precisely the fact that he has a pastoral concern for individual people, and for crowds of people. That is what galvanised and kept his prophetic ministry going, carrying for people. And that is what lay at the heart of his work for the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, because he cared for

victims and perpetrators alike. And came alongside them pastorally. I call him in my book, ‘the Prophet, the Pastor and the Pray-er’, because undergirding both the pastoral and the prophetic ministry is an incredible work of prayer, of intercession. He is a great intercessor. He is always taking his intercession book with him wherever he goes, he takes it out whenever he can, he dives into it. So those are the three characteristics of Desmond.”

Interviewer: “What would you say are his main values?”

Nuttall: “He is utterly human, very humane, and compassionate. His concern is with the human family, not just the church family, so he is utterly human. He has an ardent doctrine of creation. The doctrine of creation is so utterly important to him. Every human being is made in the image and likeness of God. That is what galvanised his prophetic ministry as well, he called apartheid a blasphemy, not just a mistake. [Tutu says,] ‘Why have you got into conflict with the fundamental belief of Genesis 1, that we are all made in the image and likeness of God, therefore how could you treat people like that? It is a blasphemy.’ So he is human, he is humane, he represents *ubuntu* supremely, that difficult concept that is difficult to define. It is close to hospitality, it is close to sharing, compassionate. You know Descartes said, ‘I think, therefore I am.’ *Ubuntu* says, ‘I belong therefore I am.’ He is a representative of *ubuntu*, and *ubuntu* is very close to the Christian ethic of compassion, of sharing, of togetherness, of belonging to one another.”

Michael Nuttall the goes on to say ...

“One of the remarkable things about Desmond is that very often his jokes are at his own expense. ... He was born in Klerksdorp and yet in the mystery of it all, with the integration of gospel and culture, of *ubuntu* and his Christian faith and life he has become a person very secure in himself. And out of that personal security he had been able to give this leadership, as pastor, prophet, pray-er.”

Interviewer: “Was there any process to the development of Desmond’s theology that you are aware of?”

Nuttall: “His churchmanship reflects an essentially Catholic theology, strongly sacramental; he will celebrate the Eucharist every day of his life, provided he can find someone to do it with him. When we went overseas for example, to the Holy land, we stopped off in Frankfurt and had a few hours there, first things we were doing, we were looking for bread and wine to have a Eucharist right there in the Frankfurt airport. He will celebrate the Eucharist wherever he is, he is strong on sacramental life and liturgical worship, he will say his morning and evening prayer without fail. So his theology is Catholic, and outwardly he is Catholic, he is comfortable with the ceremonial. But he is adaptable, he can adapt to a Charismatic or Evangelical setting, but he is most comfortable in a Catholic kind of setting. I think from my personal observations – and here one speaks with caution – but just from my observations his position is very straight forward and simple, uncomplicated, and he operates in relation to God as a child. And he does not talk very freely about personal experience and he gave an interview once at a diocesan council about a very profound experience that he had early that morning in his bedroom, and I’ve quoted it in my book, about how he became aware that he was God’s child and Leah next to him in the bed had to sought of dangle him like a baby as he wept and wept and wept. But they were not just tears of sorry, they were tears of joy, and they were sought of echoes of certain scriptural passages from Isaiah 43, and Isaiah 49, that God’s love being like the

love of a mother. And he went to the diocesan council and he said that God was saying to him through that experience that there is no time to hate. This was in the 90's just before the TRC, that there is no time to hate we haven't got time for it; we all have to love one another. We must love one another as God loved us. And it was an experience of God's love. I think that just confirmed the spirituality of his, outwardly he is very Catholic, sacramental, but inside he is very simple, straightforward, childlike."

Michael Nuttall went on to describe a confrontation between Desmond and a minister who was more evangelical when he described those outside of the church as all God's children. The evangelical brother confronted him with the scripture, "for as many as received him, to them he gave the right to be children of God." Desmond flashed back with Genesis 1 again and said that if we are all made in God's image then surely we are all God's children. So he is strongly Catholic, almost falling on the Universalist side, that Christ has redeemed all mankind, and if he were pushed this is where he would probably fall. But he is criticised for being vague and not strong on his Christology by evangelicals, but this fits well with his brief, his calling, which is not just to the church but to the whole world. However he has a strong personal faith and he is strongly Trinitarian, addressing each of the persons of the trinity by name in prayer. He has a favourite prayer to the Holy Spirit to renew the whole earth from Psalm 104 which he loves to quote. Nuttall continued: "So his theology is very wide, its not confined. But there is no doubt about his orthodox Trinitarian faith in my view, but he doesn't have a strong love for Jesus theology on his shoulder. He wouldn't put an 'I love Jesus' sticker on his motor car. He is quite liberal of course in his theology."

Nuttall went on to say from this liberal basis, "... this belief in the motherhood of God, this drives him – and also on the grounds of justice – this drives him to believe that it is just to ordain women on the grounds that they have no control over their sex, just as blacks have no control over their colour so it is a justice issue. In regard to homosexuality and the acceptance of such, Desmond would go so far as to say, even though this is very controversial, that their sexual orientation is what they were born with, it is in this way God given so we have no right to demand that they change. In this way he is extremely liberal."

Interviewer: "What is it about Desmond that gives him the ability to transcend socio-political boundaries?"

Nuttall: "It is extraordinary. I think its life's experience partly; he is a widely travelled, experienced person now. You think of his background, he used to caddie on the golf course for pocket-money on the golf course at Klerksdorp as a youngster. He is bright; intellectually he is very, very bright. He was a brilliant teacher in his short teaching career so his past pupils. Absolutely brilliant. He has got a very powerful imagination, he has a zest for life, he just has this intense interest in people and everything around him. All that contributes I think, to this capacity that he has shown to transcend. Undergirding it all is his faith in a God, who is at the heart of everything, everywhere, everyone. And therefore he must relate to everything, everywhere, everyone. Because this is where God is, and that is where I want to be, he would respond. So he sees this as part of his calling, it is part of his calling to identify. Even though he clothes it in a Christian clothing, he is unquestionably Christian, but he is bigger than Christian. He made this controversial statement that God is not a Christian God. It is a very controversial statement. In other words you are not going to confine God to Christianity; you are going to see God as being

bigger than even the Christianity, which of course is true. And he is committed to that God, that notion of God, that belief in God. That forces him out into everything, that makes him transcendent.”

“A key text for him would be, ‘In Christ there is no Jew nor Greek, slave or free, male or female...’ and all the rest. He would add black or white, straight or gay. He said that, he said that! In Christ these things don’t matter any more. And we are all in Christ, not just for Christians, we are all in Christ. So he enlarges the Pauline meaning of that Galatians text, but that is crucial for him, it is absolutely fundamental, and that is what galvanises his philosophy of reconciliation, to be a reconciler. He also recognises wounds; this concept of being a wounded healer was at the heart of the TRC: “We are dealing with wounded people; I too am a wounded person. I carry my wounds but I also acknowledge that by God’s grace and love and mercy towards me that I am healed, so I am a wounded healer. I am a healed person, but I am also still a wounded person, and I work with other wounded people”, and I think that prompts his reconciling approach. Jesus on his cross, must be at the heart of his meditation a lot of the time, how can I be like Jesus, arms out, wounded, willing to embrace everybody, everybody. He has written a book, ‘No Future Without Forgiveness’, that comes not only from his work for the TRC but his contemplation of that word from the cross, ‘Father forgive them for they know not what they do.’ It is part of him; it is part of his spiritual life.”

“One of his parents was Xhosa and one was Tswana, and when he said that to Bill Cosby, Bill Cosby said, ‘That must make you a Zulu then.’ That is one of Desmond’s jokes about himself. He is trans-tribal in his parentage, so while he is Xhosa, and I think you could say that is his mother tongue at home, they all speak Xhosa, he and Lea would speak Xhosa when they speak an African language to each other, and when they speak to their children that is the language they use. But somehow they are bigger than all of that, he speaks about six languages, he speaks Sesutu, he speaks Tswana, he speaks Zulu, he speaks Xhosa, he speaks Afrikaans, he speaks English.”

Nuttall goes on to explain why the tribal aspect is not nearly so strong in Desmond as it was in Mandela. Desmond comes from the Fingo, infact the umFingo immigrated into Xhosa territory to escape the Shaka onslaught, and infact were badly treated by the Xhosa, true blood Xhosas. “And some of them went into the colony itself to get away from the Xhosa hinterland, way back in the nineteenth century, infact there is a Fingo village in Grahamstown, and they were given freehold tenure, why?, because they fought on the colonial side in the frontier war. And so Queen Victoria gave them freehold as a reward. They fought against the Xhosas. Now Desmond comes from that Xhosa grouping, there is nothing royal about him at all, he is a commoner. He is a complete commoner; therefore the tribal will be not nearly as strong in Desmond. Chief Luthuli is another one of these Nobel Peace Price winners, he is another one of these royals, tribal royal, royal line figures, and very much the chief, known as the chief to all his political comrades, and Desmond who is the complete commoner, from Klerksdorp in the Western Transvaal, TerreBlanche territory. That is one reason why maybe he does not have that Latin quality called *gravitas*. Mandela’s got *gravitas*; Luthuli had *gravitas* – a persona of seriousness. Desmond is a home grown product, whereas these other chaps bring it in their blood, these tribal chiefs!” Nuttall addressed how it was he had the nerve back then to be a home grown leader! “Let’s make room for God’s grace shall we.... He had all the potential, Desmond could have been a Prime Minister, but God took him and used him in this other way.”