



UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

A historical-critical analysis of the Church of England in South Africa's historiographical claim of apoliticism during apartheid (1948-1994)

by

Daluxolo Gerald Mbebe

(21790478)

Submitted in partial fulfilment in accordance with the requirements for

the degree of

Magister in Theologiae

University of Pretoria

Faculty of Theology and Religion

Department of Systematic and Historical Theology

Church History and Church Polity

January 2023

Promoter: Prof. Johan M. van der Merwe

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

1. I understand what plagiarism is and am aware of the University's policy in this regard.
2. I declare that dissertation is my own original work. Where other people's work has been used (either from a printed source, the Internet, or any other source), this has been properly acknowledged and referenced in accordance with departmental requirements.
3. I have not used work previously produced by another student or any other person to hand in as my own.

I have not allowed, and will not allow, anyone to copy my work with the intention of passing it off as his or her own work.

SIGNATURE OF STUDENT:.....

DATE: 10 January 2023

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the role of the Church of England in South Africa during the apartheid years from 1948 to 1994. It examines its Truth and Reconciliation Commission claim of political disengagement, which resulted in it being classified as a victim, not an agent, of oppression. It traces the history of Evangelical Anglicans in the Cape Colony and argues that its Erastian and Reformed theology made it a natural receptor of apartheid political ideology. This study also demonstrates that CESA aligned itself with the government from 1954 when it was used by the state to discredit prophetic voices from the Church of the Province of South Africa. It argues that CESA should be viewed as a historically Right-Wing Christian Group which advocated for State Theology. It questions the claim that its 1985 Synod resolution against violence and discrimination indicated a departure from its historical position. It argues that CESA did not condemn apartheid until the Truth and Reconciliation Commission hearings and thus proves that it obfuscated the truth before the commission. Last, this study demonstrates that the commission failed to investigate CESA and recommends the retraction of CESA's TRC statement because of its historical inaccuracy.

KEYWORDS: Church of England in South Africa, Truth and Reconciliation Commission, historiography, church history, apartheid.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

1. First, I want praise God for His grace and strength in enabling me to finish this study. I have done this for your glory. Augustine said 'He loves Thee too little, who loves anything together with Thee, which he loves not for Thy sake.'
2. To the love of my life, Dr Keolebogile Mbebe, thank you for your unconditional love, your encouragement and for being an example of excellent scholarship. I hope this work impresses you.
3. To my beloved daughter, Amani Mbebe, you are the sunshine in my life, mommy and daddy work so that you may inherit a better tomorrow.
4. To my supervisor, Prof. Johan M. van der Merwe, thank you for your guidance and patience.
5. To the proof-reader and editor, Nontsikelelo Mgxabayi, this worker is richer because of you.
6. To the staff at the University of Pretoria library, especially Ms Christine Nel, thank you for your timeous reply to my numerous emails.
7. To the staff at William Cullen Library at the University of Witwatersrand (Wits Historical Papers), thank you for your willingness to go an extra mile to help with locating primary sources.
8. To the staff at Moore Theological College Library, especially Ms Erin Mollenhauer, thank you for making this study possible by scanning documents I would otherwise not have had.
9. To the staff at the REACH-SA administration office, especially Bishop Glenn Lyons, thank your encouragement and willingness to provide assistance.
10. To the various scholars, friends and fellow students who answered questions or simply listened to help me make sense of the past. I cannot name all of you but I want thank Dr Vuyani Sindo, Mfundisi Phumezo Masango, Mfundisi Dr Craig Bartholomew, John Child, Sibusiso Mdluli, Katlego Meslane, Musawenkosi Ntinga, Madhush Mathews and many more whose names are written in the Book of Life.
11. To the University of Pretoria, thank you for funding this work through the fee remittances and the Masters Research Scholarship.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACC	Australian Council of Churches
ACR	Australian Church Record
CABM	Cape Area Black Ministers (CESA)
CESA	Church of England in South Africa
CLSA	Christian League of Southern Africa
CPSA	Church of the Province of South (later Southern) Africa
DI	Department of Information
DRC	Dutch Reformed Church
ECBM	Eastern Cape Black Ministers (CESA)
EM	National Executive Committee Minutes (CESA)
GAC	Gauteng Area Council (CESA)
GBM	Gauteng Black Ministers (CESA)
GDL	Gospel Defence League
GWC	George Whitefield College
KD	Kairos Document
MTC	Moore Theological College
OMC	Ovambo Mission Churches
PNUR	Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act 34 of 1995
REACH-SA	Reformed Evangelical Anglican Church of South Africa
RICSA	Research Institute on Christianity in South Africa
RWCG	Right-Wing Christian Group
SACC	South African Council of Churches
SADF	South African Defence Force
SAPA	South African Press Association
SM	National Synod Minutes (CESA)
SMEC	Social, Moral and Ethics Committee (CESA)
TRC	Truth and Reconciliation Commission
WCC	World Council of Churches

LIST OF TABLES

1. Abbreviations	v
2. Summary of CESA and Right-Wing Propaganda	95
3. Composition of the National Executive Committee in 1998	142

ANNEXURE

The Church of England in South Africa's TRC Submission

144

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COVER.....	I
DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY	II
ABSTRACT.....	III
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	IV
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	V
LIST OF TABLES	VI
ANNEXURE	VII

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... VIII

1. CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION..... - 1 -

1.1. INTRODUCTION	- 1 -
1.2. AIM AND OBJECTIVES	- 1 -
1.3. BACKGROUND.....	- 1 -
1.4. RESEARCH GAP	- 6 -
1.5. SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH	- 7 -
1.6. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	- 7 -
1.7. RESEARCH QUESTION.....	- 10 -
1.8. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	- 10 -
1.9. HYPOTHESIS.....	- 12 -
1.10. CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	- 13 -

2. CHAPTER 2: HISTORIOGRAPHY - 14 -

2.1. INTRODUCTION	- 14 -
2.2. AIM AND OBJECTIVES	- 14 -
2.3. DEFINITIONS	- 14 -
2.4. THE FORMATION OF THE TRC	- 16 -
2.5. CRITICISM OF TRC'S HISTORIOGRAPHY.....	- 16 -
2.6. THE TRC AND THE PAST	- 17 -
2.7. CESA'S UNDERSTANDING OF ITS TRC'S SUBMISSION	- 22 -
2.8. CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	- 24 -

3. CHAPTER 3: CESA'S HISTORY AND PUBLIC THEOLOGY DURING THE EPISCOPACY OF FREDERICK MORRIS (1948-1965)..... - 25 -

3.1. INTRODUCTION	- 25 -
3.2. AIM AND OBJECTIVES	- 25 -
3.3. A BRIEF HISTORY OF CESA	- 26 -
3.4. CESA CONSTITUTION OF 1938.....	- 31 -
3.5. FOUNDATION OF CESA'S PUBLIC THEOLOGY	- 32 -
3.6. EPISCOPAL OVERSIGHT	- 34 -
3.7. MISCLASSIFICATION OF CESA BY THE TRC REPORT	- 36 -
3.8. APARTHEID COLLABORATION	- 37 -
3.9. CESA ON APARTHEID BEFORE 1966	- 44 -
3.10. PRESENTED REASONS FOR LACK OF PROPHETIC WITNESS	- 50 -
3.11. THE BENEFITS OF COLLABORATION	- 55 -

3.12.	LACK OF MORAL LEADERSHIP FROM MORRIS	- 57 -
3.14.	CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	- 59 -
4.	<u>CHAPTER 4: THE EPISCOPACY OF STEPHEN BRADLEY (1965-1984).....</u>	- 61 -
4.1.	INTRODUCTION	- 61 -
4.2.	AIM AND OBJECTIVES	- 61 -
4.3.	STEPHEN BRADLEY (B 1909-2003)	- 62 -
4.5.	APARTHEID ADVOCATION	- 66 -
4.6.	CESA'S REACTION.....	- 69 -
4.7.	GOVERNMENT'S REACTION.....	- 69 -
4.8.	AUSTRALIAN ANGLICAN REACTION.....	- 73 -
4.9.	CESA: A RIGHT-WING CHRISTIAN GROUP.....	- 83 -
4.10.	THE BENEFITS OF PROXIMITY	- 96 -
4.11.	'MAXIMUM SUPPORT WITH MINIMAL CRITICISM'	- 97 -
4.12.	A CHALLENGE TO STATE THEOLOGY.....	- 101 -
4.13.	CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	- 103 -
5.	<u>CHAPTER 5: THE EPISCOPACIES OF DUDLEY FOORD AND JOSEPH BELL (1985-1994).....</u>	- 105 -
5.1.	INTRODUCTION	- 105 -
5.2.	AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	- 105 -
5.3.	WRESTLING WITH STATE THEOLOGY (1985-1987).....	- 105 -
5.4.	REFORMING A HISTORICALLY RWCG.....	- 107 -
5.5.	THE KAIROS DOCUMENT	- 113 -
5.6.	CESA AND DESMOND TUTU	- 117 -
5.7.	FOORD RESIGNS IN 1987	- 118 -
5.8.	EMBRACING CHURCH THEOLOGY (1988-1994).....	- 120 -
5.9.	RWCG LEADERS AND DEMOCRACY	- 130 -
5.10.	ST. JAMES CHURCH MASSACRE.....	- 131 -
5.11.	CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	- 131 -
6.	<u>CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</u>	- 133 -
6.1.	INTRODUCTION	- 133 -
6.2.	AIM AND OBJECTIVES	- 133 -
6.3.	SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH FINDINGS.....	- 133 -
6.4.	THE FAILURES OF CESA'S TRC SUBMISSION.....	- 136 -
6.5.	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CESA.....	- 142 -
6.6.	CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	- 143 -
	<u>ANNEXTURE 1.....</u>	- 144 -
	<u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	- 155 -

1. CHAPTER 1: Introduction

1.1. Introduction

In June 1997, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (hereafter 'TRC') invited all faith-based communities to make submissions regarding their role during the apartheid years of 1960 to 1993 (TRC Report Vol. 4 1998:59). One commissioner, Piet Meiring, stated that it was deemed necessary for religious leaders 'to tell their stories: stories of guilt and shame, of pain and suffering, also stories of courage and conviction, of forgiveness and reconciliation' (c. 2015:2).¹ The TRC Report averred that these communities were called to account because they were 'involved and implicated' in the past being investigated (Vol. 4 1998:59). They were thus called to account to be reconciled and be agents of reconciliation in the new democratic South Africa (Vol. 4 1998:59-60).

1.2. Aim and Objectives

This chapter aims to raise questions on the account of the Church of England in South Africa (hereafter 'CESA'), which changed its operating name to the Reformed Evangelical Anglican Church, and thus provide a basis for a historical-critical investigation of the historical events behind its submission.

- It will survey internal and external criticism of its TRC submission.
- It will highlight the research problem and gap.
- It will also survey existing relevant literature on the subject.
- It will indicate how the research question will be answered by noting the method and theoretical framework to be employed.
- And will lastly present a hypothesis.

1.3. Background

1.3.1. CESA's First TRC Submission

CESA was among the churches called to account to the TRC. It made two submissions. The first, a three-page response on the 18th of July 1997, asserted that

¹ The earliest version of this article was published under a different title 'Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa: the role of the faith communities' in *Verbatim et Ecclesia* in 2005, the version referenced in this study has a slightly different title 'Faith in Reconciliation in South Africa: insights from the South African Experience' and has an internal dating note of having been delivered 'exactly twenty years' after 1995 (2005, c. 2015:1).

the church had always been apolitical. It argued that it had had a non-discriminatory policy since 1985 and had privately advocated for change. It apologised for its 'actions or omissions' and added that it should have been 'more aggressive in campaigning for government reform' (Bell 1997a:1-3).

This submission was presented to CESA's National Synod in 1997 (hereafter 'Synod') along with an apology from its Presiding Bishop, Joseph Bell, to all who had suffered under apartheid (Bell 1997b:7-8). On behalf of the black CESA membership, a black minister, Elias Majazi, accepted Bell's apology and stated that 'he now looked forward to a bright future where the stigma of the past was eradicated' (CESA SM 1997:2).

1.3.2. CESA's Second TRC Submission

A more extended oral submission followed the short submission to a special hearing for faith-based communities on the 17th of November 1997 in East London (Cameron 2017:21, annexed to this study).² CESA expanded and clarified the assertions of the shorter submission.³ It explained that its participation in the state funeral of HF Verwoerd and the inauguration of FW de Klerk gave an incorrect impression that it supported apartheid (Cameron 2017:22).

CESA also argued that it was small and focused on recovering from its separation from the Church of the Province of South Africa (hereafter 'CPSA'). It did this by focusing on its primary task—preaching the gospel, and not adding political elements to it. It claimed to have had no theologians of note and was thus easily deceived by state propaganda. It asserted that it was ignorant about the suffering caused by apartheid and that it feared liberation theology with its Marxist leanings (Cameron 2017:23-26).

The church highlighted its good works, arguing that it did its best by establishing charity centres, pre-schools and feeding schemes. In the 80s, leaders such as Murray Hofmeyr and Frank Retief privately voiced the denomination's protest at government commissions discussing the Group Areas Act (Cameron 2017:26-29).

² CESA's TRC submission can be found in three places, each with a slight variation: the prepared version is at William Cullen Library. The second in the Department of Justice website, this version includes *ex tempore* commentary by Frank Retief and Martin Morrison, questions, and answers. The third version, like the prepared version, is printed in full in Cameron's *A Candle Still Burns in Africa* (2017:21-32). All three will be referenced interchangeably.

³ The only notable contradiction between the two is the first submission's assertion that ecclesial discriminatory laws were systematically removed (Bell 1997a:2-3). The second submission prefaced this statement with an assertion that discrimination was not practiced at all (CESA 1999:5 of 12).

The presenters added that it grew to appreciate the plight of black people as some of its white leaders, namely Martin Morrison and Bell, worked in Soweto and Natal, respectively. However, the full appreciation of black suffering was realised when its members suffered during the St. James Church massacre in 1993. The Pan-Africanist Congress (Azanian People's Liberation Army) operatives attacked CESA's St. James Church Kenilworth members—killing 11 and wounding 58 (Cameron 2017:29-30; CESA 1999:9 of 12).

The submission explicitly stated that it, 'especially the whites, must accept collective responsibility for its role in the injustices of the past' and added that '[w]here our actions, our silence or our acquiescence has been the cause of added hardship, pain and suffering to any of our Christian brothers and sisters, to any of our other fellow South Africans, we ask for forgiveness' (CESA 1999:6 of 12). Along with a commitment to do better in the future, they also stated that their repentance was genuine (CESA 1999:7 of 12).

1.3.3. Classification of CESA by the TRC Report

The repentant posture of the leadership and the content of the submission gave it some verisimilitude.⁴ The TRC Report thus classified CESA as a victim of apartheid who only committed acts of omission by failing to act courageously and translate Synodical resolutions into meaningful action (TRC Report Vol. 4 1998:73-78; Leeman 2016:82; cf Meiring 2015:7).⁵ Their status as victims was because they were held to have been apolitical, but the commission noted that such apoliticism was impossible—as seen in the attack at St. James (TRC Report Vol. 4 1998:78; cf *SAPA* 1997). The commission understood the attack as indicative that neutrality was implicit support of the *status quo*, an assessment which accorded with CESA's submission and has been accepted unqualified by scholars (see Balcomb 2004:14; cf Villa-Vicencio and Verwoerd 2000:280; cf Cochrane *et al.* 1999:34-35).

⁴ The SABC *Special Report* on the proceedings highlighted CESA's apologetic submission without any critical commentary (SABC 2011).

⁵ The TRC Report classified faith-communities under three categories; agents, victims or opponents of oppression (Vol. 4 1998:65-79). Jeremy Bergen's *Ecclesial Repentance* adopted a three-fold classification of namely support, apoliticism and opposition (2011:80-81). This study will adopt Pillay's more nuanced four-fold classification of collaboration, withdrawal, ambivalence and opposition (par. 3.7). The aforementioned classification is employed because of CESA's claim of having withdrawn from politics because of its protectionist theology (Cameron 2006:309; Cameron 2017:22; cf par. 4.9).

1.3.4. Criticism of CESA's TRC Submission

Criticism of CESA's TRC submission came first from its Synod delegates, resulting in further clarification of its statement. Scholars have taken its submission for granted, except a CPSA historian—Robert George Clarke. CESA's Black ministers also raised concerns about its historicity in 2020.

1.3.4.1. Internal Criticism

1.3.4.1.1. 1998 CESA National Synod

The 1998 Synod delegates questioned the historicisation of the second submission—especially the implication that it had done wrong for which to repent. The National Executive Committee had prepared the statement on behalf of the denomination in line with CESA's *Handbook of Procedure*, which mandated it to promote the best interest of the denomination *ad interim* Synod sessions (REACH-SA 2014:26; Wright 1998:3). The longer statement had also been submitted after broad consultation; approximately 50 members had seen and commented on it before its presentation (Wright 1998:3).

In response to Synod delegates' objections, the Synod Minutes note,

The leadership felt that they were speaking on behalf of the majority of those within the Church. Bishop Frank Retief said that it had been felt that it was necessary to express *our own associated guilt* by being involved in a system that was, in retrospect, palpably unrighteous. This did not mean that we as the Church ever maliciously oppressed or committed any form of personal persecution against other people in our Church. We were aware of the fact that there was a snare of being dragged into political correctness, and hence we ended on a very clear Gospel note (CESA SM 1998:12, emphasis added).

The Executive thus perceived the submission as an apology for associating with those guilty of racism— not as an incrimination in the explicit acts of racism and support for the policy of apartheid as stated in the submission (compare CESA 1999:7-8 of 12). There are at least two problems with this qualification. First, it was a *prima facie* reversal, or to the least, a modification, of their submissions, especially the request for forgiveness for their racist actions (not merely association with racists); at the 1998

Synod, the existence of these actions was being denied.⁶ Second, it undermined Bell's apology a year earlier to those who had suffered under apartheid, it had implied that they had suffered partly because of the church. Bell was not asking for forgiveness on behalf of the broader South African white community (see Bell 1997b:7-8). Similarly to the first submission, the second TRC submission was nevertheless ratified by the 1998 National Synod as the official apology of the denomination (CESA SM 1998:12).

1.3.4.1.2. 2020 Black Ministers

The second significant internal criticism came from the black clergy.⁷ In June 2020, Martin Morrison, who had represented the church at the TRC, convened a meeting with the black CESA clergy of Gauteng to assist the denomination on 'how to improve race relations within the church' (Morrison 2020).⁸ This meeting resulted in the formation of a sub-committee consisting of black ministers. They held discussions over six weeks and produced a Kairos Document-styled critique of CESA's history, structure, and *praxis*. The so-called Gauteng Document became a catalyst for other black ministers of CESA, which, except for the KZN Indian and Coloured document, penned responses that concurred with the overall accusation of structural inequality within CESA (CABM 2020:1; KZNBM 2020:1; ECBM 2020:2). But it angered some of the CESA members. They called it liberal, Marxist, inspired by Critical Race Theory and unchristianly angry (Seccombe 2020, KZNCI 2020:1; CABM 2020:6-14).⁹

The document argued that CESA's training institution, George Whitefield College, hereafter 'GWC' — had a colonial curriculum, and is intolerant of faculty of colour, structurally racist and bore a name of an enslaver, a fact that demonstrated CESA's historical insensitivity (GBM 2020:15-17). It questioned the repentance on the TRC submissions (GBM 2020:5),¹⁰ stating that, 'We now know from a written account of an eyewitness that Presiding Bishop Stephen Bradley...expressed his support for

⁶ Pumla Gobodo-Madikizela aptly analyses this phenomenon of white dissonance as the need to preserve a sense of humanity which risks being crushed by the effects and implications past. As result, the past is denied and or nostalgically idealised (2012:252-253).

⁷ The researcher was among the signatories of the Gauteng Document and served as the secretary of the subcommittee.

⁸ Martin Morrison was the Area Bishop of Gauteng; this meeting was convened via email sent to approximately 40 Synod delegates in the Gauteng region.

⁹ At this time, David Seccombe had retired as the Principal of GWC, but he referred to the discussions in CESA in a sermon that was published in his website. See, <https://davidseccombe.com/kgindomthoughts/god-and-racism/> (Accessed on 2 October 2020).

¹⁰ The argument of the Gauteng Document was not novel; the claims contained therein were comparable to ones made by a GWC alumnus, Sihle Mooi, in 2007 and a GWC lecturer Rev Phumezo Masango, in early 2020. These documents alleged systemic racism in CESA, which was said to stem from the denomination's lack of repentance because of its interpretation of the past and its unjust structures (GBM 2020:4-7; Mooi 2007:3-5; Masango 2020:5-6).

apartheid in Australia at Moore College in the '60s (Giles, 2016), having gone there at the invitation of Dr David Broughton Knox who also thought apartheid was good, since "separation is what we all want for ourselves" and argued that apartheid was supported by the Scripture (Knox, 1981)' (GBM 2020:5).

It further argued that CESA's TRC statement obfuscated the truth. Claiming that the founding principal of GWC, Dr David Broughton Knox, the second Presiding Bishop, Stephen Bradley, and others were 'staunch defenders of the evil policy of apartheid in South Africa' (GBM 2020:15).¹¹ It decried the preference for a 'sanitised version' of history and asserted that it emboldened white clergy to resist efforts for denominational structural transformation (GBM 2020:5).

1.3.4.2. External Criticism

A CPSA priest and historian, Robert Clarke, stood alone in his critique of CESA's historical relationship with the apartheid state and contradicted its TRC submission.¹² He asserted that Bradley's 1966 eulogy, which praised the character and deeds of Verwoerd, 'left no doubt regarding CESA's unfettered support of the government and its policies' (2008:231, emphasis added).¹³

1.4. Research Gap

The background analysis above indicates incongruities between the historicisation of CESA's public theology during the apartheid era and the collective memory of its own members. Even if Clarke's criticism was laid aside; the internal criticism alone provides a basis for this research. There is also scholarly interest in such an investigation. More broadly, Philippe Denis commented that, 'The South African churches' confessions of guilt for their participation in apartheid were widely commented upon at the time, but have never been studied in depth by historians and scholars of religion' (2017:3). Petersen also added, 'it is almost impossible to find any sustained theological justification for separation of races, either politically, or more significantly,

¹¹ Christopher Ramsbottom also added that CESA needs to revisit its TRC submission at a Cape Area Council meeting, stating 'He feels the TRC submission was an apology with a 'but', with excuses. We need to acknowledge and own the sin' (CESA-CAC 2020:7).

¹² Robert George Clarke sometimes writes as Bob Clarke, see https://books.google.co.za/books/about/Anglicans_Against_Apartheid_1936_1996.html?id=vWYmAQAAIAAJ&redir_esc=y (Accessed on 12 August 2022). See also footnote 15 below.

¹³ Clarke's criticism is liable to dismissal for it could be argued that memorial services (especially the eulogy) are typically uncritical of the deceased. However, the researcher asserts that Clarke points to a worthwhile line of inquisition.

ecclesiastically, emanating from the English-speaking churches' (2001:120). More narrowly, Frederick Hale laments that 'relatively little has been published about many of the other Christian denominations' responses to apartheid, including the 'conservative evangelical' denominations, which traced their roots to Anglo-American Protestantism, such as... the Church of England in South Africa' (2006:754).¹⁴ The researcher asserts that the information is available but is in a scattered form.

1.5. Scope of the Research

This research will be limited to CESA. Where essential, comparison will be made between CESA and the CPSA or the DRC. CESA's historical link with the Sydney Anglican Church will necessitate a brief discussion of the diocese's influence on CESA. As a primarily a historical analysis of CESA's public theology—a critique of theology will be undertaken only for the sake of bringing historical clarity. This study is an examination of a claim of historical-political disengagement made by CESA to the TRC. Much of the analysis will peruse primary sources and compare them with statements made to the TRC to establish their historical validity. It will present a counter-history to that presented, at some instances, affirm and/or clarify historical claims made by CESA to the commission.

1.6. Literature Review

Unlike the larger and well-known Church of the Province of South Africa, now the Anglican Church of Southern Africa, CESA is small and has thus received tangential mentions in scholarly assessments. Even among its members, it has received little interest as an investigative subject. This study hopes to fill this gap.

Anthony Ive's *The Church of England in South Africa* (1966) and an expanded version, *A Candle Burns in Africa* (1992) are the most authoritative historiographies on CESA. These books are a compilation of articles, authored by various CESA members, which were published in the *Church News* magazine between 1955 and 1978. Brian Cameron's *A Candle Still Burns in Africa* (2017) is an attempt to update this volume. Unfortunately, it casts more shadows than light on the historical relationship of the church to the state. Ive's historiography of CESA states that the

¹⁴ In 1992, Hale had argued, from CESA's Synodical minutes and church periodicals, that it 'remained one of the consistently apolitical, white-dominated denominations in South Africa' (1992:520).

church avoided politics, only making its views known when the government violated clear Biblical principles (apartheid is implicitly not considered a violation) (Ive 1992:228-229). Scattered throughout these books are instances where CESA was given preferential treatment by the state, but these were acceptable under the general assessment of apoliticism. He alleged that the church had always maintained a 'clear witness to its truth and to avoid entanglement in other matters, particularly party-political questions' (Ive 1992:28). Ive devotes only two out of a 250 pages volume to society and the Bible. In this, he lamented the political change in South Africa towards a libertarian democratic order and attributed it to the rising 'false philosophy of humanism' (Ive 1992:229, 231).

CESA's 1997 and 1998 presentations to the TRC are foundational documents for this research. Both were entered on record as submissions of CESA, but the RICSA Report seemed to have based its assessment entirely on the second submission. The assessment of CESA's historical public theology is comparable to both the RICSA Report and the final TRC Report. This was CESA's first attempt at historical introspection regarding its role during apartheid. It is an excellent indicator of its collective memory in 1998 and it does not seem to be informed by primary written sources.

John Newby's chapter on CESA in Pieter Ceotzen's *350 Years Reformed* (2002) offers a brief and helpful critique of CESA's stance on apartheid. He was critical of its failures to speak truth to power, but he too failed to engage with primary sources; instead, he relied on Ive, his experience of CESA and oral history from Stephen Bradley and Joseph Bell—who argued along the same lines as the TRC submission to justify their participation in government functions.

The former Presiding Bishop, Stephen Bradley's *The Great Adventure* (2003), was candid in his memoir about his relationship with the apartheid state and provides a useful perspective from someone who was involved in leadership from 1936 to 1984. In this book, he demonstrated explicit support for the government and scepticism about democracy in Zimbabwe and Namibia, but CESA's historiographies ignore his book despite its apparent contradiction to numerous claims in its submissions. It was underutilised by (CESA's) Gideon Louw and has gone unnoticed by scholars.¹⁵

¹⁵ Louw seemed to have utilised the unpublished version from 1990.

Gideon Louw's *Servant-leadership* (2003) has critiqued CESA's leadership bias in his dissertation. Still, he did not link the cause of its leadership failures to its theology on race apart from pointing out its segregated congregations between settler and mission churches. His supervisor, Anthony Balcomb's *From Apartheid to the New Dispensation* (2004), did a brief comparative study which included CESA's response to the democratisation of South Africa. His analysis of CESA's theology is insightful, but it accepts the historical presuppositions of its TRC submission.

Robert Clarke's *Anglicans Against Apartheid* (2008) provides a valuable tool with which to compare CESA to the Church of the Province of South Africa.¹⁶ His mention of CESA is tangential and contradicts its TRC submission. His assessment of CESA's supportive relationship with the state stems from limited data, namely Bradley's sermon at Verwoerd's memorial service and CESA's coverage of the event in its periodical. The cause for this is that his research was concerned primarily with the Church of the Province of South Africa's historical public theology.

The archive, at William Cullen Library, offers the wealthiest mine of historical data on CESA's relationship with the state. They contain National Synod and Executive Committee minutes along with personnel files containing notes and memorandums pertaining to pertinent discussions. They also contain multiple boxes titled Government with hundreds of correspondences between CESA leaders and government officials. This source remains unexplored by scholars. There is sufficient information for a substantive historical analysis. Sources can be corroborated and supplemented with additional data on CESA from the National Library of South Africa (especially their collection of CESA *Church News* periodicals from 1955 to 1978) and Moore Theological College's Ark Digital Repository.

This study will enumerate and discuss primary sources in the above archives. It will anchor each chapter on key neglected texts. Chapter 3 will discuss CESA's critique of the prophetic CPSA voices, such as Trevor Huddleston, Ambrose Reeves, Joost de Blank and others, contained in CESA's *Political Bishops* (1954a), *Die Aanvallie van Dr de Blank* (1958b), and Mills' "Apartheid" in South Africa (1958a).¹⁷ Chapter 4 will trace CESA's relationship with the state through its letters, press statements and *Church News*—paying special attention to the impact of Bradley's

¹⁶ Clarke's book is a synthesis of his 1200 pages doctoral thesis titled *For God or Caesar: A Historical Study of Christian Resistance to Apartheid by the Church of the Province of South Africa, 1946-1957* (1983). The content and findings of this study are also comparable to Worsnip's *Between the Two Fires: the Anglican Church and Apartheid 1948-1957* (1991).

¹⁷ These statements were drafted by members of the Propagation Committee, a Synod subcommittee constituted in 1947.

1967 press statements in Australia. It will also highlight Dick Begbie's *Freedom Under Authority* (1981).¹⁸ Finally, Chapter 5 will discuss the historical circumstances of the 1985 Synod resolution on discrimination, CESA's critique of its prophetic voices who introduced progressive resolutions on race, and its critique of the Kairos Document and arguments against the implications that social concerns were gospel concerns. These are found in Synod Minutes, Synod presentations such as John Newby's *Report on Apartheid* (1984), Craig Bartholomew's *Church and Society* (1989) and more.

1.7. Research Question

The question to be answered by this research is this: *What is the essence and scope of the Church of England in South Africa's historiographical claim of apoliticism during the apartheid years of 1948 to 1994?*

1.8. Research Methodology and Theoretical Framework

1.8.1. Methodology

This research will focus on literature comparison of primary and secondary sources against CESA's submission to the TRC. It will apply a critical reflective historical approach in its analysis of the historiographies of CESA. The research question will be answered in the following manner:

- **Chapter 1** has introduced the background of the assessment and laid out the question to be answered and the methodology to be employed.
- **Chapter 2** will define terms, examine the TRC's view of history, and a discussion of how CESA understood the TRC's historical mandate.
- **Chapter 3** will briefly discuss the history of CESA and its public theology from its founding. It will discuss the formative years of CESA's relationship with the apartheid state before and during the episcopacy of Bishop Fred Morris. It will demonstrate that the TRC Report mis-classified CESA. This chapter will cover 1948 to 1965.
- **Chapter 4** will analyse the episcopacy of Stephen Bradley: special attention will be paid to events leading to Verwoerd's funeral, and its aftermath. It will demonstrate that CESA should be viewed as a Right-Wing Church Group who

¹⁸ Begbie was a CESA clergyman whose book was had a glowing recommendation from Bishop Stephen Bradley.

embraced State Theology during the apartheid years. This chapter will cover 1965 to 1984.

- **Chapter 5** will discuss CESA's policies on discrimination, its responses to the Kairos Document and the relationship between the gospel and social action. It will argue that it did not distance itself from apartheid—as alleged in its TRC submission. This chapter will cover 1985 to 1994.
- **Chapter 6** will summarise the research findings and make recommendations for CESA considering this project.

1.8.2. Theoretical Framework

An interdisciplinary theoretical approach will be used in this study. Scholars in this field do not seem to adopt an obvious theoretical tool for analysing primary sources (Coertzen 2017:2). Some have argued that historians intuitively use hermeneutical tools for uncovering meaning in texts (Bethke 2020:3). The researcher does not assume all meaning will be revealed in the exploration of sources written seventy years ago, but asserts that some light is shed through logical connections and comparisons of sources. Much of the arguing by the researcher will be through the enumeration and assessment of previous undiscussed texts to critique the official narrative. These texts will realign historical narratives and call into question CESA's submission (Rigney 2013:183-185). The researcher will thus construct, from primary sources, a perspective of CESA's history that will compete for space in the meta-narrative of the denomination.

Deborah Posel (2008:132) asserted that 'The link between truth and virtue lay at the heart of the [TRC]'s mandate.' Therefore, a hermeneutical tool without an ethical component would be inadequate for examining the TRC. Resultantly, this study will also adopt an ethical theoretical framework from the moral philosopher Avishai Margalit. Margalit's *Ethics of Memory* (2002) addresses the following questions: 'Are we obligated to remember people and events from the past? If we are, what is the nature of this obligation? Are remembering and forgetting proper subjects of moral praise or blame?' (Margalit 2002:7). He asserts that thick relations, meaning close relations anchored by a shared memory as opposed to thin relations anchored by shared humanity, have ethical demands to bear moral witness about the past (2002:7-8, 147-148). This research will assert that those who made the presentation before the

TRC were, according to Margalit, agents of collective memory and thus had an ethical obligation to remember and preserve the past (2002:147; cf Ricoeur 2004:86-87).¹⁹

The *Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act 34 of 1995* (hereafter 'PNUR') empowered the TRC to '... establish the truth in relation to past events and the motives for and circumstances in which gross violations of human rights have occurred and to make the findings known in order to prevent a repetition of such acts in future' (South Africa 1995:2). This research will compare the content of CESA's submission to primary sources to determine, by using Margalit's framework, if it should be viewed as a moral witness of the past and assess if it aided or undermined the commission in fulfilling not only its hermeneutical but also its ethical mandate (2002:147-151).

If a question is asked: is the historiography of CESA a reliable source of the past? The answer requires both hermeneutical tools (finding and interpreting texts to arrive at the 'truth') and an ethical tool. Margalit sets the criteria for a moral witness by stating:

The authority of the moral witness has to do with his sincerity. That is, it has to do with a strong congruence between his emotions and his avowals, and with his not making concessions to himself. But sincerity is only part of it; authenticity is another. An authentic person is one who gets rid of all his personae (masks) and gives expression to his 'true self,' especially in the extreme circumstances of being unprotected by a civilised moral environment (2002:170, emphasis added).

The TRC demanded this authenticity. CESA pleaded sincerity, but was it authentic? Did it make concessions to itself? Did it bear witness to the unmasked truth regardless of the risk of embarrassment?

1.9. Hypothesis

The hypothesis of this study is that the TRC Report mis-classified CESA for two reasons; first, CESA's TRC submission obfuscated the truth by presenting a narrative that the (white CESA) majority could agree on—not a well-researched one. It will demonstrate that this was subterfuge because some present in the leadership were involved in historic acts which undermined a narrative they later presented to the TRC.

¹⁹ Paul Ricoeur distinguishes between 'passive deficiencies of collective memory' and active modes of abuses of memory (2004:70-75, 80). The research will be concerned with the latter.

Second, the commission failed to investigate CESA's historic position beyond its two submissions. Instead, they deemed the repentant posture sufficient and trusted CESA to be truthful. Cochrane *et al.* contain the full RICSAs Report. The TRC Report chapter on the role of faith communities is based on the RICSAs Report (1999:5-7). They argue the TRC was meant to be the first step in unmasking the past, thus setting a framework for truth-telling (1999:5-7; cf Posel and Simpson 2002:11-12). However, instead of using the TRC submissions as the foundation for further investigation, as with the submissions made by the amnesty applicants, the RICSAs Report based its analysis of CESA entirely on TRC submission and thus drew conclusions (of apoliticism during apartheid) that would have been different—had the submission have been supplemented with additional data (Cochrane 1999:7, 53, 73, 213-218). As a result, it will be demonstrated that CESA's TRC submission calls for a correction and invites disputation.

1.10. **Concluding Remarks**

This chapter has highlighted incongruences between CESA's history, as understood by its members and scholars, and its TRC submission. It demonstrated the need for further research of CESA's historic public theology to understand the role of the church during the apartheid years. It has argued that recent scholarship has not properly examined this subject, as it pertains to CESA within CESA. This chapter presented a hypothesis that underplayed its historical role and argued that the TRC Report is thus based on inadequate information.

2. CHAPTER 2: Historiography

2.1. Introduction

Most church histories are more concerned with the content of the history being presented than about the metaphysics of history.²⁰ As a result, they are silent on whether the historian can represent the past (realism) or tell a version of the past coloured by the motives and limitations of the author or theological tradition (anti-realism). The cause for this, suggests Tinyiko Maluleke (in Drayer and Pillay 2017:118), is that church historians are too narrowly focused on their field and pay little attention to historiographical approaches in the social sciences. Therefore, this study will begin broadly by examining discussions about the historiography of the TRC and afterwards narrow the debate to CESA's understanding of their submission.

2.2. Aim and Objectives

This chapter aims to discuss the nature of history as understood by the TRC, and CESA's understanding of its TRC presentation. It shall achieve that this way.

- By first defining the terms to be used in this research.
- By stating a brief genealogy and criticism of the TRC.
- By outlining the TRC's conception of the past.
- By outlining CESA's understanding of the TRC's historical mandate.

2.3. Definitions

It is essential to define what we mean by History, Historiography, Public Theology and Collective Memory.

2.3.1. (Church) History

This research will discuss (church) history as a narrative interpretation of (the church's) past practices and thoughts (Bradley and Muller's 1995:6; White 1984:3; cf Ferguson 2005:27). It is narrative because it is not an objective construction of facts about the past. Paas (2006:11) argues that 'the events of the past are not automatically ready

²⁰ A brief survey of the formative texts in the researcher's undergraduate studies includes Justo González' *The Story of Christianity* (1985), Roger Olson's *The Story of Christian Theology* (1999), Everett Ferguson's *Church History* (2005) and Alister McGrath's *Historical Theology* (2013). All these pay little to no attention to the type of 'past' being presented.

for consumption by readers or listeners. They need to be dug out, to be written, to be told' (cf White 1980:7-8). The telling is interpretation.

Carr and Evans argue that facts do not make up history; only when facts are interpreted do they become history; therefore, 'the main job of a historian is not to record but to evaluate: for if he does not evaluate, how can he know what is worth recording?' (2001:15; cf White 1980:24). The *facts* 'represent chains of interpretations' of real events (Munslow 1997:62; cf White 1973:283). For instance, archival minutes, which form the bedrock of this research, are an invaluable interpretation of real meetings. The reader is enabled to imagine the meeting. They do not reproduce history; they present it coherently (cf Bunzi 1997:23-24; White 1973:281).

2.3.2. *Historiography*

Tucker (2009) describes historiography as what historians write about past events and other historical writers. Maylam (2001:2) states that 'all history is essentially historiography.' White concurs that all history is essentially a compilation of histories because the historian must find, select, arrange, and interpret material to form a plausible narrative (1973:281; 1984:3). Therefore, history is not a comprehensive and objective record of the past; it is a collation of selected historical interpretations arranged to form a valuable and coherent narrative (Kosso 2009:9-10). It is creative, for it is not a perfect representation of the past; it requires judgment about data and is influenced by the interpreter.

2.3.3. *Public Theology*

Markham defines Public Theology as 'the explication of, witness to, and agency toward the vision that God intends for social life within the parameters of the Christian tradition' (2020:187). It is *explication* because Christian doctrine needs to be explained and analysed (*ibid*). Markham also argues that the role of Christianity in the public square is advocacy (which includes witness and agency) for the concerns of God. It attempts to shape the ordering of society in light of the Christian narrative (2020:180,189).

2.3.4. *Collective Memory*

Wertsch and Roediger (2008:318) define collective memory as the 'form of memory that transcends individuals and is shared by a group.' (Collective) memory births

history and amends history; historians write from accepted narratives and either affirm or correct them (see Ricœur 2004:87). Collective memory creates an ideal image of the past (a meta-narrative) to justify the current institutional order's existence and stimulate a sense of belonging (Nesterenko 2019:1969; cf Karn 2015:6-8). If core pillars of this meta-narrative are undermined, group members become disillusioned. For instance, Sakhaulelo (2016) attributes the discrediting of the religious justification for apartheid as among the reasons for the decline in the membership of the Dutch Reformed Church. When collective memory is undermined, group unity—which is fuelled by confidence in the meta-narrative—is threatened.

2.4. The formation of the TRC

The *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act 200 of 1993*, hereafter 'Interim Constitution,' envisaged itself as a 'historic bridge' between a divided past and a united future (South Africa 1993). It called for a mechanism to help the country transition into a democratic society. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission, hereafter 'TRC,' was established by the *Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act 34 of 1995*, hereafter 'PNUR.' The commission was designed to display the illegitimacy of apartheid and affirm those who had historically opposed it (Asmal *et al.* 1997:10). It was also designed to establish a culture of respect for human rights, democracy, and justice by uncovering the truth of what happened, why, and who was responsible for preventing their recurrence (Du Toit 2000:122; Rotberg 2000:3).

2.5. Criticism of TRC's Historiography

Much of the TRC's historical method literature is critical of its process, methodology, and report (Verbuyst 2013:1-2). Posey and Simpson (2002:11-18) argue that the TRC Report only arrived at 'fractured, incomplete and selective truths' because of a flawed methodology and the formulation of the PNUR. Much of the criticism is about the commission's conviction that historical truth was accessible, and if it were revealed, it would lead to reconciliation. Some placards at the TRC hearings read 'REVEALING IS HEALING' and others 'THE TRUTH HURTS BUT SILENCE KILLS' (in Charton 2021:2; cf Gobodo-Madikizela 2012:253). Bervernage argues these goals are unachievable because historical events are unalterable, and therefore, unrepairable; any attempts to find healing or closure were thus futile (in Karn 2015:229; cf Omar

n.d.:2). Charton (2021:3) held the TRC's conception of truth to be narrow, for it prioritised the future (forgiveness) and not the past (justice).

In response to this criticism, Villa-Vicencio (2000:22-30) argued that the TRC should not be understood to be concerned only with establishing factual or objective truth. However, it was a quasi-judicial enterprise designed to allow space for healing through storytelling (cf Margalit 2002:5). He concedes the TRC may be perceived to have failed in the academic sense but succeeded politically in providing some measure of closure, and avoided a political impasse (Verbuyst 2013:4; cf Boriane 2000:73; cf Omar n.d.:1-2). Even though the TRC Report (Vol. 5 1998:257) denies that it was writing South African history in an academic sense, it was, as Villa-Vicencio argues, engaged in writing history, which resulted in a 'historical narrative'—albeit one with political and moral ends; thus, reflecting compromises characteristic of a negotiated political mechanism (Verbuyst 2013:5). Asmal *et al.* (1997:26) also add that the commission did not need to 'attempt original or path-breaking historical analysis' nor avoid it. Alex Boraine, a TRC commissioner and author of PNUR, concedes that errors can be found in its work, but asserts that South African TRC is still considered 'the yardstick' of peace commissions (Boraine n.d:4; cf Rotberg 2000:5).

2.6. The TRC and the Past

Simpson (2009:31) argues that the model of processing the past adopted by the TRC did not begin in South Africa but had been adopted internationally in approximately thirty commissions, especially in Latin America—where the reconciliation element was not heavily stressed (cf Maluleke 1997:60).

The following four principles may be extrapolated from the process and report of the TRC's understanding of the past:

- First, it held that historiography is the basis of group identity.
- Second, historical truth is knowable.
- Third, historical inquiry can lead to reconciliation on the condition that,
- Fourth, it is accompanied by a (sincere or authentic) apology.

2.6.1. Historiography as a Basis for Group Identity

Historiography is the foundation for forming group identity (Nesterenko 2019:1967; cf Barkam and Karn 2006:10). Christianity is a historical religion (Denis 2019:2-3). The

conceptualisation of the past (history) defines the group's boundaries and forms the basis for its distinction from other groups (*ibid*). This is because a group (like a country) 'exists in the minds of the individuals,' often in an idealised state (Nesterenko 2019:1976, 1979; Bunzi 1997:24; cf Denis 2019:2). Put differently, the group is a social construct based on the imagination of the individuals in the *corpus*. Each group has 'fixation points' or *lieux de mémoire* (sites of memory), which include—but are not limited to—texts, holidays, buildings, and events (Nesterenko 2019:1968; Wertsch and Roediger 2008:320; cf Margalit 2002:95; Ricœur 2004:90-91).

Group identity, among other things, depends on the continued propagation of a shared meta-narrative or collective memory. Gibson argues the TRC sought to create a collective memory of apartheid for all South Africans (2004:89; cf Tutu 2000:26-27; cf Asmal *et al.* 1997:10; *contra* Villa-Vicencio 2000:22). Cochrane *et al.* (1999:2) also state that it was meant to provide a 'record of gross human rights violations.' Similarly, the Holocaust commissions have created the 'foundational narrative' for Europe (Karn 2015:235). Through the TRC, South Africans could collectively mourn apartheid and build a new identity (Verbuyst 2013:17). What was meant to result from the TRC was a collective understanding of apartheid as a reprehensible crime against humanity and that South Africa was never to embrace racism again.

2.6.2. Knowability of Historical Truth

Some have argued against the search for historical truth, for subjective recollections cannot replicate the past—they can only paint a version of it (Nesterenko 2018: 749-750; Karn 2015:6; Munslow 1997:1). Historical anti-realists like Munslow and Nesterenko state that 'Historiography is selective and biased, always a response of a concerned person with a certain standpoint' (Nesterenko 2018:751). The researcher concedes to this notion, and so did the TRC.

The Interim Constitution of 1993 entrusted the commission to paint 'as complete a picture as possible' of the past injustices (in TRC Report Vol. 1 1998:104; Omar n.d.:2; *contra* Poley and Simpson 2002:11, 18).²¹ This was an acknowledgement that

²¹ The Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act tasked the commission with 'compiling a report providing as comprehensive an account as possible of the activities and findings of the Commission contemplated in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c), and which contains recommendations of measures to prevent the future violations of human rights' (South Africa 1995:5, emphasis added).

a perfect reconstruction of the past was impossible. Therefore, the interim Constitution of 1993 should not be read as historically realist in its envisaged historical method.

The commission did not envisage the production of an official objective truth (Villa-Vicencio and Verwoerd 2000:279; TRC Report Vol. 1 1998:110-114). Therefore, it distinguished between four kinds of truths:

- *Factual or Forensic truth*: this is legal or scientific truth obtained through investigations whose facts have been corroborated and are regarded as objective (cf Posel 2008:132).
- *Narrative or Personal truth*: this is a perspectival truth that comes from personal narratives. This truth sought to validate ‘... individual subjective experiences of people who had previously been silenced or voiceless’ (TRC Report Vol. 1 1998:112).
- *Social Truth*: the truth that is obtained through the experience of interaction, discussion, and debate. This truth affirms the dignity of people and recognises that the need for catharsis is as critical as the findings of the commission (Posel 2008:133).
- *Healing Truth*: this is described as the type of truth ‘... that places facts and what they mean within the context of human relationships both amongst citizens and between the state and its citizens.’ It is the truth that recognises the healing value of acknowledging past wrongs to affirm the pain of the victims (TRC Report Vol. 1 1998:114; cf Omar n.d.:1).

The combination of all these truths is what Gibson called ‘the truth of the commission,’ a broad truth designed to actualise its mandate (2004:89). Posel criticised this conception of truth as weak in its ability to ‘bear the weight of critical scrutiny’ (Posel 2008:133; cf Maluleke 1997:64-65).²² The TRC acknowledged the limitations of truth-telling, with however numerous grids one applies, to achieve perfect historical reproduction. Therefore, it concurred with Ignatieff’s negative conception of its mandate as ‘to reduce the number of lies that can be circulated unchallenged in public discourse’ (in TRC Report Vol. 1 1998:111; Boraine 2000:74). Put positively; it was ‘setting the record straight... exposing the ethical transgressions and the complicities of societies at large’ (Posel 2008:135). The PNUR had charged the commission to

²² Margalit argues convincingly that these ‘truths’ should have been understood as elucidations instead of truths (2002:170).

advance 'national unity and reconciliation in a spirit of understanding' (South Africa 1995). That understanding would be achieved through truth-telling or confession about the past by perpetrators and forgiveness by victims.

White argues that all narratives, being written in the present, will be imperfect interpretations of reality. They will contain 'adequately and inadequately explained facts... congeries of established and inferred facts' (1973:281-282). A historical inquiry investigates events to compile the most probable narrative (White 1984:2). The TRC Report did not seek to be historically realist; it was understood as foundational for further historical inquiry and invited critique of its historicization (Vol. 1 1998:2; cf Cochrane *et al.* 1999:6-7; Posel and Simpson 2002:12; Villa-Vicencio 2000:22ff).

2.6.3. Historical Truth Leading to Reconciliation

The purpose of the TRC was to create an inclusive collective memory of the past to help the country (as a community of memory) move forward (Gibson 2004:89-90; Villa-Vicencio and Verwoerd 2000:279; cf Tutu 2000:21-24; *contra* Karn 2015:229; Villa-Vicencio 2000:22ff). The criticism is of the kind of truth articulated by the commission, and the conceptualisation of the TRC mandate by the PNUR led Karn and Villa-Vicencio to dispute this claim. The researcher concurs with Gibson and Tutu that the imperfection of the collective memory does not invalidate it; by knowing the truth of what happened, it was hoped that South Africans might find closure and catharsis through truth-telling (Tutu 2000:23; Rotberg 2006:33; cf Posel and Simpson 2002:9-10; cf Cochrane *et al.* 1999:60-61; cf Charton 2021:1). Gibson argues that the 'truth leads to reconciliation' hypothesis was used by the TRC, hoping those who knew the truth might be more likely to be reconciled with the perpetrators (2004:89; Rotberg 2000:7; *contra* Maluleke 1999:106; Margalit 2002:6). Boraine argues differently by stating that the TRC was not intended to bring about reconciliation but was meant to facilitate reconciliation that was already taking place (2000:74-75).

The TRC was established to balance the delicate requirements of 'justice, accountability, stability, peace, and reconciliation' (Tutu 2000:23; cf Rotberg 2000:15). South Africa, therefore, decided that it was better to restore, through truth-telling and reconciliation, those who had wronged members of the group and would not be cast out of the group via retributive justice characteristic of the Nuremberg Trial (Tutu 2000:24-29; cf Barkan and Karn 2006:8-9). The commission prioritised national unity

instead of 'retributive justice,' and it was hoped that it would become part of the national ritual (Barkan and Karn 2006:8; cf Maluleke 1997:83-84).

2.6.4. Reconciliation Through Confession

The call for an apology for complicity with the apartheid state was not new. Cochrane *et al.* highlight that the prophetic voices in South Africa had long been calling for the church to confess its guilt and work towards social justice from as early as 1966 (1999:3-4). In 1988, the SACC even held a conference on 'Confessing Guilt in South Africa' (Maluleke 1997:71). Ramose (2012:21) also notes that the SACC had a Commission of Justice and Reconciliation. Setting the record straight was essential not because it was religious to confess, but, as Posel (2008:129) argues, that it was about the restoration of *ubuntu*. Confessions were meant to unite the country as perpetrators and victims recognised one another's humanity. Gobodo-Madikizela argues that the lack of confession resulting in accountability becomes an obstacle reconciliation between the offenders and the offended (2012:254). Asmal *et al.* state that the TRC was a 'necessary process of historical catharsis as the previously excluded speak at last for themselves, and the privileged caste joins the South African family for the first time' (1997:11). What was needed for reconciliation was acknowledging past violations and affirming the dignity of the victims (Du Toit 2000:133-134). This dignity was to be affirmed through recognition that the suffering of the victims was not imagined but actually happened and it was unjust. Confessions thus became mechanisms of what Paul Ricœur termed the 'transitional structure between memory and history' (2004:21).

Ramose asserts that the offender has a dilemma to overcome, for the 'internal dimension of justice... demands the promise to oneself in the first place, to be truthful and honest in the quest for justice to the extent of placing one's own survival, one's life at risk' (2012:21). It is this risk that defines a moral witness (Margalit 2002:149). On the other hand, the apologist (immoral witness) may offer perfunctory concessions that are not grounded in meaningful investigation and careful history (Rotberg 2006:35-36). The TRC Report (Vol. 1 1998:16-17) asserts that the intention of the confessions was

not to humiliate whites but was intended to reveal the full extent of racism so that the 'correct medicine' may be prescribed for it.²³

The Explanatory Memorandum of the PNUR states that the Act was 'based on the principle that reconciliation depends on forgiveness and that forgiveness can only occur if gross violations of human rights are fully disclosed' (South Africa n.d, emphasis added). The confession was expected to be based on a 'deep, exhaustive analysis' of historical hurts; it had to exhibit repentance for past wrongs that showed that the offenders had truly broken with the past and intended to do better (Teitel 2006:103). The content of the confession (particularly for those seeking amnesty) needed to be consistent with historical facts when they were verified; otherwise, its authenticity was questionable (Rotberg 2006:38-39). The RICSA Report was satisfied with the authenticity of the apologies of the faith communities when it contrasted them to the evasive accounts of the business community (Cochrane *et al.* 1999:17).

2.7. CESA's Understanding of its TRC's Submission

2.7.1. Reconciliation to fellow South Africans

CESA's June submission (Bell 1997a), its November submission (CESA 1999) and Cameron (2017) offer insight into how CESA understood the mandate of the commission. They understood the commission to be engaged in national healing through confession. They confessed their guilt and provided insight into the reconstruction of South Africa into a democratic nation that respects human rights.

A letter from the TRC to CESA called on them to answer questions 'about post [sic] human rights violations and to give suggestions to foster reconciliation' (Bell 1997:1). Joseph Bell's letter to the commission argued the denomination's apoliticism, and the 1985 statement indicating its 'abhorrence for all violence and all oppression' indicated its stance during the apartheid years (1997:2). Cameron (2017:20) quotes the letter received from the commission seeking clarity on how faith communities acted as well as the 'motivation for their viewpoints and actions' (Cameron 2017:21). It understood that all sides were historical objects and perpetrators of those human rights abuses (Cameron 2017:20). Therefore, it knew that it had to state how it was a

²³ The TRC chairman, Desmond Tutu, would at times go further than the report by stating that the confessions, specifically 'the truth', were intended to set the offenders free 'not so that people must be prosecuted, the truth so that people must become free' (in SABC 2011).

victim of apartheid, the human rights violations it had committed and justify the reasons for its actions or inactions.

O

2.7.2. Conditional Reconciliation

CESA understood that TRC's offer of indemnity for human rights violations was conditional; the conditions were truth and remorse. These were tools employed to move the country from a racist past to a democratic society (TRC Report Vol. 1 1998:48; cf Villa-Vicencio 1999:195). This was expected from those who had attacked St. James. CESA indicated its statement to be the truth. The submission specified its litany of mistakes; it alleged that it was 'truly repentant' (Cameron 2017:29, emphasis added).

'The link between truth and virtue lay at the heart of the commission's mandate' (Posel 2008:132). Accordingly, this research is concerned with whether CESA met the prerequisites for reconciliation, those being, full disclosure and remorse. For the group member seeking to belong (reconciled) cannot genuinely derive meaning from being part of the group (a democratic South Africa) with a shared memory of the past if they did not engage in the process of restoration authentically.

2.7.3. A Break from the Past

The church gave the commission the impression that the CESA of the past differed from the CESA of the present (CESA 1999: 5-7 of 12).²⁴ The past CESA was ignorant, insensitive, and socially unconcerned, but the present CESA equipped itself to be prophetic in democratic South Africa (CESA 1999:7-8 of 12). It presented a three-fold evolution in its historicization, from struggle to awakening to commitment to social justice (Cameron 2017:23-28). It requested forgiveness for what it was in the past and committed to doing better (CESA 1999:8 of 12). It gave no sign that some of its members contested the history presented before the commission. It gave the impression that the 1985 resolution denouncing discrimination signalled a decisive break with past thinking.

²⁴ The author concurs with Denis (2017:3) and de Gruchy and de Gruchy (2005:1686) that Reformed Churches have a difficulty with a concept of a 'Confessing Church'. It will be revealed later in the study that CESA would have preferred individuals to confess because it had supposedly left the matter of the Church's public theology to individual witness and not the *corpus* (see Iwe 1992:228-229 and par. 5.5.1).

2.7.4. *Perspectival Confession*

CESA's submission was perspectival, but not in the manner described above. It only presented the evolutionary growth of its white membership. It was silent on whether its black leaders were as deceived by state propaganda as the whites (CESA 1999:3 of 12). They named no black leader among those whose thinking on apartheid evolved; those who changed were white leaders, namely Joseph Bell, Murray Hofmeyr, Martin Morrison, and Frank Retief (Cameron 2017:25-28). It confessed that whites could not 'fully understand' the suffering of black members (Cameron 2017:25, 29). The whites were apologising to black CESA members and black South Africans (CESA 1999:6-7 of 12).

2.8. **Concluding Remarks**

This chapter has discussed the intention of the Interim Constitution in establishing the TRC mechanism. It has been argued that the TRC was meant to be a historical bridge between a divided past and a democratic South Africa. The TRC sought to create a collective memory of apartheid by exposing it to all as a crime against humanity. It has also been argued that the TRC did not understand itself as recreating history, but was concerned with perspectival history (from victims and perpetrators) to aid national reconciliation.

It has also been argued that CESA understood the mechanism of the TRC as a space to confess its wrongs fully and make suggestions about how to build a united country. CESA's submission also showed that those who made the presentation understood that the country's forgiveness for wrongs was conditional; it required sincere and exhaustive confessions to show that it had indeed broken with the past. It claimed to have changed and was growing to be more socially aware. As we enter discussions about what CESA did during the apartheid years in the following three chapters, the question is whether they were authentic in their presentation, as claimed (Margalit 2002:170).

3. CHAPTER 3: CESA's History and Public Theology During the Episcopacy of Frederick Morris (1948-1965)

3.1. Introduction

In defending Evangelical Anglicans' passivity on social concerns, Phillip Jensen, argues that 'CESA was not a racist church, and it has long had black and white congregations and bishops. It did not provide a theological justification for the apartheid policies of the South African government' (2012:120, emphasis added).²⁵ All three claims are contested by CESA's Black clergy (CESA GBM 2020:44-5). Though the first two parts of this claim deserve rigorous academic scrutiny—that is beyond this research. The last assertion (the defence of apartheid) will be the primary concern of this study and the focus of the current and following chapter.

3.2. Aim and Objectives

This chapter aims to present a counter-narrative to Jensen's by outlining CESA's relationship with members of the apartheid state before and during the episcopacy of Bishop Fred Morris to argue that it would have been uncharacteristic of CESA not to align with the state.

- It will outline the history of CESA, particularly the state's role in the preservation of Evangelical Anglicanism in South Africa. It will also briefly examine CESA's public theology and its historical foundation.
- It will argue that its Erastian theology made it a fertile receptor of the apartheid ideology.
- It will argue that the TRC mis-classified CESA when it assessed it to be a victim of apartheid.
- It will demonstrate its close relationship with, and agency for, the apartheid state from at least 1954 to 1965.

²⁵ According to James Packer, evangelical Anglicans are Christians whom, in addition to subscribing to key Anglican founding documents such as the *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion* and the *1662 Book of Common Prayer*, described as those who hold to 'the supremacy of Holy Scripture, the majesty of Jesus Christ, the Lordship of the Holy Spirit, the necessity of conversion, the priority of evangelism and the importance of fellowship' (Turnbull 2010:58). Par. 3.3.1. will discuss the relevant aspects of the differences between Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholic Anglicans.

3.3. **A Brief History of CESA**

Evangelical Anglicans (Church of England in South Africa, hereafter 'CESA') have been accused of Erastianism (Ive 1992:246; cf Bethke 2020b:35; Suberg 1999:38; Hinchliff 1963:24, 58-61). Erastianism holds that civil authorities have power over the church even on ecclesial matters (Suberg 1999:5-6). This is a doctrine that CESA rejected. Its TRC submission argued that it believed in a separation between Church and State, between politics and religion (Bell 1997a:2; Cameron 2017:23; Leeman 2016:82-83). However, the analysis below will argue that this accusation is historically merited and was a significant factor leading to CESA's acceptance and defence of apartheid.

John Newby held that CESA was in disarray when the National Party took over the government of South Africa in 1948. It had been since 1870 when a handful of evangelical settler churches refused to join the Church of the Province of South (later Southern) Africa, hereafter 'CPSA' (2002:1 of 8). CESA's relationship with the CPSA in 1948 was characterised by animosity—often playing itself up in the press and courts. The causes of this division are complex and deserve a much more detailed study. The following brief and oversimplified account is relevant for this research.

3.3.1. **Ideological Reasons**

In 1833, the Tractarian movement began in Oxford. It spread its views through ninety-nine essays called the Tracts for the Times. These were conceived and mostly penned by John H. Newman between 1833 and 1841 (Brown and Nockles 2012:1; Ive 1992:15). Those who refused to join the Tractarians characterised themselves as Evangelicals who did so to remain faithful to the founding documents of the Anglican Church; the *1662 Book of Common Prayer* and the *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion*. Those who embraced the Oxford Movement claimed to do so to reform the Anglican Church.

3.3.1.1. **The Difference Between Tractarian and Evangelical Anglicanism.**

The analysis below will describe the relevant points of distinction between Tractarians and Evangelicals in South Africa (as perceived by Evangelicals). Of course, this list is not exhaustive, and the differences are generalised, thus lacking nuance, but this

selectiveness and generalisation was (and still is) characteristic of CESA's understanding of Tractarianism.²⁶

3.3.1.1.1. *The Catholicity of the Anglican Church*

Tractarians sought to recover the historic church, which had long been enriched by centuries of church traditions (Brown and Nockles 2012:1). Brown and Nockles assert that 'It was also, as the late Frank Turner has argued, a response to the predominant evangelical ethos—what John Henry Newman called 'the religion of the day'—with its emphases on individual piety, the conversion experience, justification by faith and personal Bible study and its sense that the Ordinances of the Church were relatively unimportant when compared to the religion of the heart' (2012:1). Newman accused Evangelicals of rejecting revealed truth as passed down by the church through the ages for educated opinions of Reformation theologians (Geck 2012:52).

The Evangelicals argued the Reformation did not indicate a decisive break from the catholicity of the historical church with theology that affirmed the doctrines of the Patristic church (Beckman 2011:38). What the Tractarians saw as a distortion of the historic faith was perceived by the Evangelicals as recovering the faithful and historic Church without human embellishments found in the Roman Catholic tradition.

3.3.1.1.2. *Apostolic Succession*

Beckman states, 'It is instructive to see the weighty significance of this doctrine for the South African Tractarian historian, Wirgman, who painstakingly traces Bishop Gray's direct line from Archbishop Laud and then goes into the discussion of various independent lines of succession' (2011:40). This was to give the office gravitas and inspire unquestionable obedience to the episcopacy (Beckman 2011:40-41).

This theology was viewed to be papish by the Evangelicals, for it was held to be against the Anglican doctrine of sin and made the episcopacy susceptible to abuse. 'Evangelicals saw the Tractarian view of Apostolic succession as fundamentally flawed due to their erroneous views of the visible and invisible church' (Beckman 2011:40).

²⁶ This selective understanding can be observed in Ive's *A Candle Burns in Africa* (1992:15-18). The researcher has engaged with CPSA scholars on some points, but the intention was to demonstrate the partisan historical interpretation of the evangelicals. A more robust examination of the schism is lacking and is beyond the parameters of this study.

3.3.1.1.3. *Ritualism*

Tractarians held that Evangelicals had an individualistic view of communion with God. Davage states that 'the importance of the church is that she prevents the individual from leaping into subjective religiosity. The salvation of the individual is accomplished in and through a redeemed society' (in Beckman 2011:41).

For Evangelicals, rituals were perceived to impede access to God. They held that the purpose of the *Prayer Book* was to make worship intelligible to all (Beckman 2011:43; Ive 1966:49). The re-introduction of ritualism in worship seemed a step back to Catholicism, 'superstitious sham of priestcraft' and a rejection of traditional theology (CPSA 1982:29; Reynolds 1869:3).

3.3.2. **Bishop Robert Gray (b 1809-1872)**

The Tractarians and Evangelicals co-existed reluctantly in South Africa until the arrival of the first bishop of the Anglican Church in the Cape, Robert Gray, in 1848. CESA historiographies such as Ive (1992) and Beckman (2011) argue that Gray was a Tractarian (or at least a sympathiser). CPSA scholars, such as Suggitt (1998:79) and Bethke (2020b:11ff) argue that the Tractarian movement influenced him. Bethke (2020b:33ff) argues convincingly that Gray began as a High Churchman who increasingly became more Tractarian because of the context of the Province, where most clergy were Tractarians (cf Burnett 1953:68; Hinchliff 1963:58; Lee 2001:234-35; *contra* Cameron 2006:298).

In 1857, Gray called a Synod 'to discuss and accept rules and regulations' that he had drawn up for the diocese (Ive 1992:23). The Evangelicals believed he had started divorcing the church in the colony from the mother church. One hundred thirty-five lay members of the Anglican Church in the Cape signed a petition in protest (CPSA 1982:26; *contra* Wirgman 1895:173). Six Evangelical churches refused to take part in this Synod—citing that it violated the Canons and Constitution of the Church of England (Ive 1992:23; Robinson 1959:1).

Despite Evangelical protest, the new constitution was accepted by Synod delegates, and a new voluntary association was created in 1870. They called themselves the Church of the Province of South Africa, hereafter 'CPSA.' Proviso 3 of their constitution concerned the Evangelicals (cf Morris 1959:5). It empowered the CPSA Synod to become the final appeal tribunal for all ecclesial matters (CPSA 1982:27). The 1870 constitution also allowed for amendments of the 'liturgy, practice

and doctrine provided that any change was done in the spirit of the general Anglican ethos and did not infringe on the Book of Common Prayer of 1662, the accepted creeds and the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion' (Bethke 2020b:36).

The Evangelicals perceived the enactment of the CPSA constitution and its provisions as an attempt by Gray to 'throw off the fetters of the Reformation' (CESA 1954a:2; Morris 1959:3). Having the CPSA Synod as the final authority was understood by Evangelicals to be a ploy to give the bishops 'dictatorial powers' over helpless Evangelicals and subject them to be judged by a group with which they had no spiritual affinity (Bradley 1954:2; Ive 1966:49). However, Gray understood the CPSA to be a 'transplant' of the Church of England to the Colony (in de Gruchy and de Gruchy 2005:448). The CPSA's Peter Hinchliff argues that the purpose of proviso 3 was to prohibit Erastianism, for the original draft rejected the authority of the Privy Council by name (1963:114-115; cf CPSA 1982:27).²⁷

3.3.3. Procedural Reasons

The Evangelicals held the civil courts to be impartial bodies that could protect their parishes from dictatorial bishops. For instance, when the Evangelicals and the CPSA could not resolve a dispute over church property in Grahamstown in 1879, the *Merriman vs Williams* court case ensued (Hinchliff 1963:122-124). This civil case between Merriman (CPSA) and Williams (Evangelical) sought to decide whether the Church of England in the colonies could exist as an established body outside of England. On appeal, the Privy Council, the highest court in the British Empire, found that the Church of England could not exist as an established church outside Britain but could exist 'as a voluntary society' with its laws and practices (Ive 1992:26). By enacting the 1870 constitution and its third proviso, the court held that the CPSA had separated itself 'root and branch' from the church of England (CPSA 1982:27; cf Ive 1992:27).

Although this judgment implied that the Evangelicals were *de jure* heirs of the Anglican Church in the colony—this was irrelevant. The CPSA was significantly larger than Evangelicals and was recognised by Canterbury as being in full communion with the Church of England (Cameron 2006:299). The significance of this judgment was that it gave the Evangelicals moral confidence that they were the proper (and only)

²⁷ O M Suberg adds, without citing a credible source, that CESA was not prepared to accept Gray 'without formal support of a court of law' (1999:38). However, this point is undermined by the fact that Gray served with Letters Patent from the Queen.

Anglican Church in South Africa. The negative ramifications of the *Merriman vs Williams* judgment were corrected by the CPSA (without the repeal of the third proviso) (Hinchliff 1963:125-127).

3.3.3.1. **John William Colenso (b 1814-1883)**

What occurred in the Natal colony demonstrates the impact of the growing European liberalism in the nineteenth century and its impact on South Africa. The Natal diocesan conflict played into the pre-existing divisions primarily concentrated in the (Metropolitan of the) Cape. An alliance was formed between Evangelicals and a liberal Colenso against Gray and the CPSA (Ive 1992:40ff).

In 1843, Bishop Colenso was appointed by the Church of England by law established (the mother church) as the first Bishop of Natal (Guy 1983a:1). Colenso published works that questioned the contemporary understanding of the doctrines of atonement, the inspiration of scripture, and the Anglican view of the sacraments (CPSA 1982:28, Hinchliff 1963:82-83, Guy 1983a:2). ‘His ideas emphasised reason rather than revelation, culture, and nation rather than Church, a liberal rather than orthodox theology’ (Hinchliff 1963:61).

Colenso was called to account for his writings by Gray but refused to make an appearance because Gray’s authority, as defined by his Letters Patent, was not coercive over the Natal bishop, which was an independent colony and diocese (Ive 1992:40; cf Wirgman 1895:188-189). However, in 1863, Gray held an ecclesial court that convicted Colenso of heresy and declared the see of Natal vacant (Ive 1992:41). Colenso appealed first to the civil courts in Natal and later to the Privy Council, which declared the decision of the ecclesial court invalid (Bethke 2020b:35; Ive 1992:41). Gray appealed to the Queen-in-Council, which also concurred with the Privy Council (Robinson 1959:2).

Gray ignored both decisions; with the support of most of the bishops in South Africa, he expelled Colenso (CPSA 1982:28). Hinchliff states, ‘the Tractarian Movement originated partly as a movement of reaction against the threat of disestablishment, but in time Tractarians came to resent most bitterly one aspect of the establishment—State interference in what they regarded as “spiritual” affairs of the church’ (1963:88). Therefore, the CPSA felt justified in ignoring the decisions of the civil court.

3.3.3.2. **Colenso Excommunicated**

The result of the conflict was a schism in Natal. Colenso was prohibited from preaching in European churches but kept control of the Zulu churches (CPSA 1982:28). CPSA established a parallel diocese of Maritzburg in Natal (CPSA 1982:28-29). In 1869 Gray consecrated William Kenneth Macrorie (b 1831–1905) as Bishop of Maritzburg (Robinson 1959:2).

When Gray called the Synod to decide on the constitution in 1870, Colenso and his supporters (primarily Evangelical laity) did not attend but for distinct reasons (CPSA 1982:31). Colenso argued for close ties to the Mother Church to preserve his position as the Bishop of Natal (Villa-Vicencio 1988:61). The Evangelicals did not attend—protesting the formation of the CPSA and the encroachment of Tractarianism.

3.3.3.3. **Colenso (and Evangelicals) versus the CPSA**

Villa-Vicencio (1988:16) aptly states that the Evangelicals inherited ‘Colenso’s rebellious spirit but not his theology’ (cf Cox 1888:3, 16-17). For instance, the *Church of England Defence Association* — originally formed to advance the Evangelical cause against supposed popish practises by Colenso — supported the more liberal Colenso despite their theological differences (Hinchliff 1962:206-207; Hinchliff 1963:66, 82, 93; Cox 1888:15; cf Bradley 2003:71).

3.4. **CESA Constitution of 1938**

The Evangelicals and Colensoite churches struggled to keep their properties for forty years. Attempts were made to unite the Anglican Church in South Africa, but all failed. So, in 1938, the Evangelicals who had been part of the *Church of England Defence Association* came together under the name *Church of England in South Africa* and promulgated their own constitution (Robinson 1984:5; Hinchliff 1963:224-225). The draft of the Constitution was prepared by the Chancellor of the Sydney Diocese, Thomas. C. Hammond, and by a prominent layperson, Minton Taylor, at the request of its archbishop, Howard Mowll (Bradley 2003:71; Cameron 2006:299). CESA organised itself into one diocese with a federation of independent churches and became a voluntary association that could manage its properties under its name (Ive 1992:102).

3.5. Foundation of CESA's Public Theology

One of the significant distinctions between the Evangelical Anglicans and Tractarians is the latter's disapproval of state (and civil courts') involvement in ecclesial affairs (Bethke 2020b:21; cf Hinchliff 1963:114-115; CPSA 1982:27; Conser 1983:326-328). CESA relied on the state to protect them against perceived unfair treatment by the CPSA and thus maintained a favourable disposition towards the state— whether the British monarchy (and its representatives) and later the apartheid government. The researcher could not locate a single instant of Evangelical Anglicans in the Cape or Natal engagement in sustained opposition to colonialism. This stems from an Evangelical interpretation of the *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion*, which makes the Anglican Church Erastian— with the monarchy as the head of the church and with the English Parliament as its governing body (Bethke 2020b:21; *contra* Jensen 1981:447-450). It thus would have been contrary to Evangelical Anglicanism to disobey the monarch or her viceroys

3.5.1. State as Protector of the Faith

Historically, CESA has claimed dogmatic fidelity to the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* and the *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion*.²⁸ Article 37 states that 'The King's Majesty hath the chief in this Realm of England, and other his Dominions, unto whom the chief Government of all Estates of this Realm, *whether they be Ecclesial or Civil*, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, not ought to be, subject to any foreign Jurisdiction' (in Begbie 1985:118).²⁹

Evangelicals held the CPSA's rejection of the authority of the Privy Council as a contravention of this article. CESA's Vicar-General, Alan Ewbank, explicitly stated, 'a Church that by its 'third proviso' repudiates the authority of Privy Council, i.e. the final Court of Appeal in matters Ecclesiastical, that is to say, the 'Voice of the King,' or in other words, having taken the most solemn vows of loyalty, he demands of Churchmen in South Africa that in the highest matters of all, spiritual, they repudiate the authority of the King, who is the head of the Church of England' (1940:7). This may

²⁸ The 1662 Ordinals are interestingly not added as part of the formularies (see Centre for Reformed Anglicanism 2022).

²⁹ The 1992 CESA Prayer Book simply omitted this paragraph from the articles—leaving a prohibition of the state from interfering in the administration of the sacraments (*CESA Prayer Book* 1992:156). However, the corresponding paragraph with the prohibition of the authority of the Bishop of Rome over the realm was left in the article—thus obscuring the meaning of the article (*ibid*). There is no Syndical resolution authorizing the modification of article 37.

be why Bill Barnett's assertion about Natal Evangelicals, whom he claimed viewed the 'Established Church as the State at worship' (1950:67). For instance, despite being in South Africa, in 1953 and 1954, the Synod sent a resolution assuring the Queen of their devotion and loyalty (CESA SM 1953:25; CESA SM 1954d:69). Similarly, St Paul's Church in Pretoria displayed an English flag behind the sacramental table and honoured fallen British soldiers in its stained-glass windows (Ive 1966:48). The state was understood to be the last line of defence on ecclesial disputes and an authority on matters of spiritual discipline (Begbie 1985:118-119; CESA SM 1955:86).³⁰ Evangelical Anglicans perceived themselves as equally bound to 'maintain loyalty to truth and duty—to God and the State' (Raynolds 1869:2).

Therefore, it is not surprising that the Evangelical cause (through the Church Council, which acted as a Synod for Colensoite churches in Natal) was led by the hand of the King in the Natal colony, Governor Theophilus Shepstone.³¹ Later, the authority of the King was replaced with the authority of the South African state, and obedience was mandatory—unless the state undermined the liberty to proclaim the gospel (Burnett 1953:69-70; Hinchliff 1963:106; Begbie 1985:119).

3.5.2. State as Helper

Primary sources also show that Evangelicals had relationships with state officials from the Anglo-Boer war (1899-1902). These relationships enabled them to block a bill that would have given the CPSA authority over Evangelical parishes in Natal in 1903, though this bill would eventually pass in 1910—their influence over the legislature was significant (Hinchliff 1963:109-110; Robinson 1959:7; Burnett 1953:123-124).

Furthermore, CESA's Stephen Bradley (2003:41-42) also records that on his arrival in Durban from Australia, he encountered difficulties with Customs and Immigration because he had an Egyptian passport; the quota of Egyptians allowed in South Africa was filled for that year, therefore, he was denied entry into South Africa. However, he was given two weeks to appeal; he travelled to Pretoria, where he met with CESA's Norman Bennet (2003:42). Bennet was an 'ordained commissioner to

³⁰ CESA Synod minutes indicate concern by delegates during the deliberations prior to the election of Morris that such an act would result in discipline by Canterbury, the Chairman, presumably Stephen Bradley, assured delegates that the ultimate authority was not the Canterbury but the Privy Council or its delegated courts and thus they need not fear partaking in the election even if such an act was against the Archbishop of Canterbury (CESA SM 1955:86).

³¹ The Church Council was led by Shepstone from 1862 to 1865 while Colenso was in England defending his theological views and his episcopacy (Etherington 2019:14-15). This continued after the death of Colenso (see footnote 1 in Wirgman 1895:174).

English public schools and made friends in high places' (*ibid*, emphasis added). Bradley informed him about his issue with Immigration, and Bennet arranged a meeting with General Jan Smuts, then the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Justice; the issue with Bradley's passport was resolved forthwith (*ibid*). After that, Bradley travelled to Durban and was offered a post as Rector at (then CESA's) Christ Church Addington, where he states, 'My salary of £25 per month was paid by the state!' an arrangement made with the government of Natal (Bradley 1998e:6).

3.6. **Episcopal Oversight**

CESA had no Episcopal oversight from 1938 to 1955. The primary concern of synodical deliberations was about securing a bishop. In Anglicanism, ministrations such as ordinations of clergy and confirmations are exclusively bishopric functions: the reluctance of Canterbury to appoint one was perceived to be an attempt to stifle Evangelical Anglicanism in South Africa (Ewbank 1940:1-5). Denominational leadership was provided by Vicar-Generals Alan Ewbank (1938-1949), Norman Bennet (1950-1952) and Stephen Bradley (1953-1955). Their inability to convince Canterbury to consecrate a bishop for them meant they had to find one whom the Anglican Communion already recognised.

3.6.1. **Frederick Morris (b 1884-1965)**

George Frederick Bingley Morris was a missionary in Congo and later in Morocco (Douglas 1995). Archbishop William Temple consecrated him in 1943 as the bishop of the Anglican Church in North Africa (Ive 1992:26). He had a relationship with CESA from at least 1950, as shown by a synodical resolution asking him to ordain some of its men (CESA SM 1950:3; cf CESA SM 1952:11-12).

3.6.1.1. *Anglican Disapproval*

In August 1955, without Canterbury's approval, CESA elected the retired Morris as their Bishop. CESA's Synod must have been aware that this election would be controversial. The Synod Chairperson reassured delegates that 'neither the discipline nor the authority of the Church of England rested in the Archbishop of Canterbury. According to law, it was the Queen, as represented by her Privy Council and other

compliant Courts,' therefore they were in the right because they were not doing anything illegal (CESA SM 1955:86).³²

The Archbishop of the Anglican Diocese of Sydney, Marcus Loane, conducted Morris's consecration. Canterbury was not pleased; Morris was ordered to withdraw from his position or risk being declared '... out of communion with the see of Canterbury and outside the fellowship of the Anglican Communion' (Gill 1984). He reminded Morris that taking up the episcopacy of CESA made him 'guilty of breaking his vow' (Mills and Bradley 1955:1).

Morris replied that the grounds for ex-communication had not been met (1955:3). In response, Fisher amended his initial declaration; he stated Morris was not excommunicated *per se*, but he had put himself 'outside the fellowship of the Anglican Communion' and emphasised that the CPSA was the only recognised Anglican Church in South Africa (Editorial 1955:3-4; Douglas 1995; Gill 1984).

3.6.1.2. *CESA's Response*

The Registrar, the legal officer, and Vicar-General, Gordon Mills and Stephen Bradley, respectively, also sent a reply to Fisher; stating that his press statements about CESA had 'stirred up the might of Anglo-Catholics against us,' but the result was an overwhelming sympathy and support for their cause (Mills and Bradley 1955:3; cf CESA SM 1988:26). The tone of their reply was uncharitable and probably added to CESA's alienation. They criticised Fisher for his 'cruelty,' 'irresponsibility and absurdity,' and they accused him of blasphemy and characterised his opposition as 'an attack of Satan' (Mills and Bradley 1955:3-4).

3.6.1.3. *CESA's Exclusion from the Anglican Communion*

Fisher's declaration had two significant consequences for Morris and CESA, the first of which is most consequential for this research. First, Morris had been a member of the 1948 Lambeth Conference, a gathering of Anglican bishops in good standing with the see of Canterbury, but was not invited in 1958, nor was his successor, Stephen Bradley, in 1968 and 1978, and neither was Joseph Bell in 1988. Second, Morris' name (and those of other Anglican clergy serving in CESA) were removed from *Crockford's Directory of Church of England Clergy* (Hammond 1967:1-11; 1988:4; Mills 1965:2).

³² The chairperson is presumed to be the Vicar-General—Stephen Bradley.

³³ That was an official yearbook containing names of licenced Anglican clergy in good standing. Hebert Hammond, the Registrar of CESA, would later claim that Fisher had unilaterally excommunicated Morris without an ecclesial trial and thus side-lined CESA from the global Anglican community (1988:7; cf 1967:8-9). ³⁴

This made CESA antagonistic towards the Anglican Communion and the CPUSA by extension. They regarded themselves to be persecuted for their faith. Their only Anglican allies were Sydney Anglicans (Cameron 2006:146-147). It will be demonstrated that this animosity towards the CPUSA was exploited by both CESA and the state for self-serving ends.

3.7. **Misclassification of CESA by the TRC Report**

Gerald Pillay (2001:59) identifies four patterns to analyse how the South African church has historically related to the apartheid government. He states,

1. Those who supported government uncritically as long as they were given the freedom to undertake their missions (collaboration):
2. Those who withdrew as much as was possible from any contact with the government or its agencies (withdrawal):
3. The largest group remained ambivalent about the government with which they dealt—they needed the protection the government offered and acknowledged the rights of the government, even if they did not always agree with its policies or methods or governance (ambivalence):
4. Those who remained a thorn in the flesh of the government—they openly criticised its policies (especially its attitude to the indigenous population) and used every opportunity to publish their criticisms (opposition) (Pillay 2001:59).

CESA historiographies, namely Ive (1966 and 1992), its TRC submissions (1999), Cameron (2017), Bradley (2003) and the designation of the TRC Report (1998) give the impression that it falls under the third category—ambivalence. ³⁵ However, recent

³³ CESA threatened legal proceedings against the editors of Crockford, after a five year of letters between lawyers, Crockford issued an apology to Morris, Bradley and CESA (Ive 1992:160-179).

³⁴ CESA took offence at the symbolism of this removal, but it failed to notice that its clergy were removed from this yearbook as far back as 1951 (see Robinson 1951:11).

³⁵ The TRC Report classified faith-communities under three categories; agents of oppression, victims of oppression and opponents of oppression (Vol. 4 1998:65-79). CESA was classified as a victim (1998:73-78).

questions raised by the Gauteng Document (2020) and Clarke (2008) advocate for a classification under the first category—collaboration.³⁶

Historical data point to CESA's uniqueness from other protestant churches of Anglo-Saxon origin discussed in Richard Elphick's *Equality of Believers* (2012), Charles Villa-Vicencio's *Trapped in Apartheid* (1989) and the Kairos Document (1985 and 1986). CESA was not caught in between the state and the Christian natives.³⁷ It was more sympathetic towards the Afrikaner nationalist cause and against British enlightenment, which prompted missionaries to preach equality between races as the 'civilised way' from the 1920s (Elphick 2012:4-5). It appears to have collaborated with the apartheid government to reject political equality and criticised those who advocated for it.

3.8. Apartheid Collaboration

Jonathan Leeman (2016:14) notes that CESA refused to address the question of apartheid, and this decision was based on the belief that such pronouncements would detract from its primary mission. The researcher asserts that this view is misinformed. Primary sources point to ideological alignment with the apartheid state and active state propagation.

3.8.1. The Propaganda Committee of CESA

As far back as September 1947, Synod 'Resolved that the incoming Vicar-General be asked to organise Propaganda for South Africa in England and Australia and to co-opt clergy and laity for this purpose' (CESA SM 1947:5, emphasis added).³⁸ The reference to 'for South Africa,' instead of the Church of England in South Africa, indicates the broad scope of the intended publicity for the benefit of the Union (cf Mills 1954:2). That should be distinguished from publicity on behalf of CESA, Synod was explicit about it. For instance, in 1950, the following resolution was passed in response to what was considered deliberate acts of persecution by the CPSA, 'Synod resolved

³⁶ Ricœur notes the implication of self-misclassification and argues that it deceives the offender into wanting reparation themselves when they are meant to be repairing (2004:89).

³⁷ These English churches are described by the Kairos Theologians as those who had embraced 'Church Theology' because of its moderate criticism of apartheid and advocacy for '*false peace and counterfeit reconciliation*' without genuine repentance and justice (Kairos Theologians 1986:55). Explicit collaboration is a category usually reserved for the Reformed Afrikaaner churches (Bergen 2011:83).

³⁸ The word propaganda in the context did not denote a negative connotation such as disinformation but was synonymous with publicity in the printing press.

that the Registrar should draft a letter to the Archbishop of Cape Town, when approved by the Vicar-General it should be sent. More regular and intensive propaganda also approved' (CESA SM 1950:3).

In 1954, the Propaganda Committee was formalised into the structure of the Synod, consisting of Stephen Bradley, Norman Bennet, Gordon Mills, RJ Tyser, and Hebert Hammond. All of them were members of the National Executive Committee. This committee had two functions: first, it had to respond to 'misleading letters' by the Archbishop of Canterbury on behalf of CESA, and second, it had to produce and distribute pamphlets making known the positions of CESA as distinct from that of the CPSA (CESA SM 1954d:68).

3.8.2. Political 'Anglican' Bishops

Therefore, on the 17th of December in 1954, the Propagation Committee sent a letter titled *Political Bishops* to the Minister of Native Affairs—Hendrik F Verwoerd.³⁹ It sought to distance CESA from the 'uninformed and regrettable accusations and condemnation of the Dutch Reformed Church and certain Government policies by Anglo-Catholic bishops and clergy' (CESA 1954a:1). It perceived the criticism against the DRC's support of the apartheid to be akin to the persecution it had suffered for over a hundred years from the CPSA (CESA 1954a:2). It understood the criticism to be an attack on the Afrikaners and their way of life by people who cared 'little for [South Africa's] background and traditions' (Bradley 1954:1). It added that CPSA's criticism was inspired by Catholicism (CESA 1954a:2). It alleged that the Anglo-Catholics (CPSA) did not recognise the validity of the orders of the ministers of the DRC because they were not ordained in accordance with the doctrine of 'apostolic succession' (CESA 1954b:2-3).⁴⁰

Fred J. Barnard, the private secretary to Verwoerd, replied to the above letter on the 2nd of February 1955, stating, 'My Minister wishes me to assure you that he is most interested in the facts mentioned in your letter and will bring your letter to the attention of some of his colleagues. Dr Verwoerd is of the opinion that you should decide for yourself whether the general public should not, through the medium of the Press, be informed in regard to these matters' (1955:1). Mills' version of this letter had

³⁹ The Registrar, Gordon Mills sent a separate letter from committee on the same day on the same subject (Mills 1954:1-3).

⁴⁰ This claim is historically uninformed, for the CPSA had considered a merger with the DRC between 1840 and 1870 (Bethke 2020a:10; cf Suggitt 1998:80). Moreover, the CPSA and the DRC had a cordial relationship as members of the South African Council of Churches. They even invited Archbishop Clayton to their Synod in 1949 (Clarke 2008:57)

ended with this line 'If needed we shall assist with information or otherwise at our disposal, we shall be very happy to do so' (1954:3).

In this statement, it had joined the National Party in discounting the moral witness of the church as '*politieke prediking*' (political preaching) while it ingratiated itself to the state. Condemnation of apartheid by CPSA clergy, primarily through the English foreign press, concerned the government (Giffard *et al.* 1984:230). The criticism of the CPSA was more politically potent in the public sphere. Having that criticism of the CPSA come from the Reformed Evangelical expression of South African Anglicanism was thus better coming directly from CESA instead of the state—hence Verwoerd's proposal that such a statement be made out directly to the press.

Unknown to Verwoerd was that CESA did not need the encouragement; duplicates of this statement were already distributed to the press in South Africa, Australia, and England on the 20th of December 1954. Ntlha states evangelicals were 'easy targets for co-option in their programme of "winning the hearts and minds" of the people' (1994:139; cf Cochrane *et al.* 1999:42-43). The *Political Bishops* statement indicates that CESA did not need to be won over; it had already ideologically cast its lot with the apartheid state despite its professed apoliticism (*contra* Bradley 1964a:8; Newby 2002:6 of 8).

This CESA statement on apartheid was drafted on the 14th of October 1954 and circulated to members of the Propagation Committee for their comments (CESA 1954b:1-3; 1954c:1-3 cf Bradley 1954:1-3). Bradley's version of the draft argued these bishops were not to be regarded as Anglicans at all—for they held to Romanist doctrines and practices (Bradley 1954:2-3). He even titled his version *Political 'Anglican' Bishops* (1954:1). He concludes it by pleading with the DRC to continue to invite CESA into fellowship and not let the criticism by 'Anglo-Catholic bishops and clergy' soil their (DRC and CESA's) relationship of 'help and fellowship' (1954:4).

3.8.3. The Achievement of the Political Bishops Statement

The *Political Bishops* statement established CESA as an ally to the government and the DRC, thus aligning itself with apartheid ideology. The content of this statement, along with a 1946 Synod resolution about distinction between CESA and the CPSA, was referenced in correspondences with other government departments to avoid confusing CESA with the CPSA (Bradley 1958:1; CESA SM 1946:9; cf Brandreth 1962). Additionally, Synod minutes (CESA 1955:93) note, presumably emboldened by

the government's response, CESA passed a resolution to act on the advice of the Minister of Native Affairs (HF Verwoerd); he urged CESA to petition the Minister of Interior and other government departments to recognise CESA as the only church authorised to use the name 'Church of England' in the country.

This resolution also formed the basis for their request that the national census indicate that there was the Church of England in South Africa and the Church of the Province of South Africa—distinct denominations. Secondly, this distinction was done to avoid associating CESA with the World Council of Churches (and later the South African Council of Churches). They insisted that both the government and the press use the former title exclusively for CESA (Mills 1959a:1-2; *Rand Daily Mail* 1959:6; *Church News* 1960b:7-8). Thirdly, they held it erroneous that a CPSA parish in Johannesburg would refer to itself as the 'Anglican Church (Church of England)' in advertisements for Sunday services in the *Rand Daily Mail*. After a failed attempt to get the editor to amend the wording on the advertisement to the 'Church of the Province of South Africa,' CESA purchased advertising space next to the CPSA advert on behalf of Christ Church Hillbrow, which read 'CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN SOUTH AFRICA—Reformed and Evangelical' (*Rand Daily Mail* 1959:6; *Rand Daily Mail* 1960:14; Mills 1959b:1).

The *Political Bishops* statement did not explicitly state CESA's views on apartheid, but implied support for it. The word 'apartheid' did not appear anywhere on the three-page statement or the draft versions. It merely rejected the CPSA position on 'certain Government policies' as unfortunate and ignorant (CESA 1954a:1; cf Bradley 1954:3-4). However, the context logically implies that it referred to apartheid: CESA's reference to this statement in letters to the Postmaster-General in 1960 and to Mrs Elizabeth 'Betsie' Verwoerd in 1966, held these letters to be an indication of its alignment with not just the government but 'the National Party' (Bradley 1960a:1-2; Mills 1966a:1). Ironically, it did this while advising clergy not to have politics in the pulpit but to be salt as individual voters (Wright 1963:14-16; Bradley 1964a:8). The researcher asserts that this duplicity meant such statements should be left to the Propaganda Committee.

3.8.4. Which Political Bishops?

This statement does not clarify which CPSA leaders it was referring. The CPSA Archbishop, Geoffrey Clayton, was moderate in the mid-50s (Clarke 1989:131; Lee

2001:233; Goedhals 2003:63). He was critical of apartheid but would not condemn a government policy because he believed it was not a priest's or the church's role to get involved in civil disobedience (Worsnip 1991:96-97, 136-137; cf Clarke 1989:135; cf 2008:49-53).

3.8.4.1. **CPSA on Apartheid**

The CPSA had shown its opposition to racism in line with the Anglican Communion. In 1948, in response to the crimes which led to World War II, the Lambeth Conference issued a resolution declaring that all human beings were equal bearers of God's image, objects of his love and, therefore, deserved equal rights before the law regardless of colour. It also called upon the church and the state to recognise and safeguard these rights (Anglican Consultative Council 2005a:6; Britton 1999:232ff). Lambeth Conference resolutions are not binding on Provinces until they have been ratified by respective Provincial Synods (Bethke 2020b:35; cf Wright 1963:279). Therefore, the CPSA Episcopal Synod issued this statement in 1948, thus ratifying Resolution 6 of the 1948 Lambeth Conference earlier that year.

The only hope in our judgment for the future of the men, the women, and the children of Southern Africa lies in the creation of harmonious relationships between our various racial groups. And harmony can only be achieved if the Europeans, who at present wield power, engender a spirit of confidence amongst the non-Europeans. But if, on the other hand, Europeans seek to preserve to themselves the exclusive benefits of Western Civilization, and to allow the non-Europeans merely its burdens, South Africans will inexorably draw apart into mutually antagonistic racial groups. (In de Gruchy and de Gruchy 2005:889-892).

The CPSA recognised that apartheid was not the solution to the racial problems facing mid-twentieth century South Africa. Instead, they saw that the whites had to give up some privileges of western civilisation for the sake of peaceful co-existence. Although that was a significant statement, the extent to which the CPSA was willing to go to realise this ideal was another matter altogether.

Patrick Duncan and Michael Scott were both active in the Defiance Campaign. Trevor Huddleston was another known Anglican cleric publicly critical of apartheid (Worsnip 1991:86). Huddleston argued that apartheid was an unbiblical and oppressive policy passed to ensure the perpetual domination of the white race over

the Africans (1956:34-35). These clerics stood up to the state while being opposed from within the CPSA for being too radical.

Despite the 1948 statement, which led to the CPSA Provincial Synodical 1950 resolutions condemning race discrimination and the prohibition of mixed marriages on scriptural grounds, the CPSA leadership was firm in their resolve not to get involved in radical activism. It was also critical of socially active clergy like Huddleston (Clarke 2008:66-67). For instance, in 1953, the CPSA bishops issued this statement:

We recognise that racial discrimination, as practised in any country, raises moral issues as to which it is right that Christian opinion throughout the world should find expression. But we deprecate the tendency to isolate the Union of South Africa in this matter. Racial discrimination does in fact occur in other parts of the world also, and expressions of moral indignation directed against this country alone are likely to arouse among South African[s], even among men of goodwill, a sense of unfairness which goes far to deprive such expressions of Christian conscience of the influence which they might otherwise exercise. But it is a duty laid upon us, as the Church of the Province of South Africa, to give expression to that worldwide Christian opinion which we ourselves share in its relation to the situation in our own country; and we desire to make it plain that no attempt has been made by those in authority to prevent us from doing so (in Worsnip 1991:97).

In response to this posture by the CPSA leadership, Huddleston would state, 'the blunt truth is that the Church... is not prepared to regard the State as the aggressor in South Africa' (in Worsnip 1991:99). The CPSA merely issued statements in the segregation era. It was unwilling to appear forceful in its approach to the government. Duncan, Scott, and Huddleston were the exceptions, not the norm. Joost de Blank would later accuse them of issuing empty proclamations and internal policies (de Blank 1977:114).

Bishop Richard Reeves was another CPSA cleric who opposed apartheid during this era. He was opposed to the Bantu Education Act; which had been tabled in parliament by Verwoerd in June 1954, this Law led to the closure and handover of mission schools to the government, which planned to withhold all subsidies to private mission schools (Clark 1989:143-145; cf Goedhals 2003:63; cf Elphick 2012:181). The CPSA leased some of its buildings to the state while clarifying that the Act would '... retard the true education of the African' (Hinchliff 1963:236). In contrast, CESA had handed over their mission schools to the government long before 1954; it gleefully stated that it did this, 'anticipating the government decision to take them over by some

years' (*Church News* 1965a:7). While he was the Bishop of Johannesburg from 1941 to 1961, Reeves rose to prominence in the early 1960s when he spoke on behalf of the victims of the Sharpeville Massacre and helped the accused in the Treason Trial (1995: iv). Huddleston and Reeves were such irritants to the government that in 1954, one parliamentarian accused them of 'poisoning the soul of the Native against the white man' (Clarke 1989:151).

Lee (2001:233) argues that the response of the CPSA varied according to individuals. The denomination was snapped out of its moderate approach by Prime Minister Johannes Strijdom and the Minister of Native Affairs, Dr Verwoerd, they introduced Clause 29 (c) of the Native Laws Amendment Bill of 1957 — the so-called Church Clause, which sought to force blacks to worship where they lived and thus tried to implement apartheid in the church's life (Horell 1961:17; Worsnip 1991:136; cf de Gruchy and de Gruchy 2005:952). Clayton's Damascus moment was a letter to the Prime Minister indicating his intention to disobey this law and encourage Anglican clergy to do the same (Clarke 2008:46; cf Lee 2001:233). St. George's Cathedral in Cape Town (CPSA) put up a sign stating, 'This cathedral is open to all men and women of all races to all services at all times' (in *ACR* 1957:7). This act signalled a change in the CPSA's attitude towards the government's policies; Lee states it moved from 'protest to defiance' (2001:233). Clayton died suddenly on the same day he signed this letter (Worsnip 1991:137).

3.8.4.2. **Archbishop Joost de Blank (b. 1908-1968)**

Contrary to Mills' assertion that de Blank was critical of apartheid within weeks of his residency in South Africa (1958a:1), Archbishop Joost de Blank, the successor to Clayton, was unwilling to pass judgment about apartheid until he had seen it in practice (de Blank 1977:96-97). Although he averred that the press and clergy pressured him, and 'all manner of people tried to convince me of the basic Christian nature of apartheid' shortly after his arrival, he did not pronounce on it until he had seen its impact (de Blank 1977:112).

His confrontative stance began in December 1957 when he witnessed the forced removal of black people from a squatter camp called Windermere in Cape Town; black people were being forced out of their homes by police and forced into hostels at Langa township (de Blank 1977:112; cf de Gruchy and de Gruchy 2005:981-987). Those who

were not eligible to stay there were forced to go to the Bantustans (de Blank 1977:112-113). At this moment, he wrote,

The time for sitting on the fence was over... Now I had seen the doctrine of apartheid in action. There was no doubt despite the soft words of theorists in practice it was filthy, sinful, and satanic. The only thing to do with sin is to resist, and if possible, destroy it. Here, the moral law is called in question and there can be absolutely no doubt where Christian duty lies (de Blank 1977:113).

Unlike Clayton, de Blank made his views about apartheid known to all; he aired them to the press and via his diocesan newsletters, hoping to rouse Anglican consciousness towards what he perceived to be the evil of apartheid (de Blank 1997:114). One target of his campaign was the DRC—which Alan Boesak stated, ‘provided moral and theological justification for apartheid’ (in Villa-Vincecio 1983:59: cf TRC Report Vol. 4 1998:66-68).⁴¹

The CPSA was not spared in his criticism; he decried the segregated Anglican school system and refused to offer ministration to any parish which practised segregation (de Blank 1977:114; cf Haddad 1998:61). The DRC, the Government Ministers, and parliamentarians responded to this criticism by reminding de Blank that he had not been in South Africa long enough to understand its problems (de Blank 1977:114-115). He replied that his opposition had nothing to do with experience gained from the longevity of his residency but was based on biblical principles, for ‘Christian principles do not change by travelling across the sea’ (1977:115). De Blank’s effort inspired some black clergy, but he received little support from the white CPSA clergy, some of whom started an unofficial ‘Joost-Must-Go’ movement (Haddad 1998:60).

3.9. CESA on Apartheid Before 1966

It is considering the above context and against de Blank that on the 3rd of June 1958, Gordon Mills, in his capacity as the Chancellor of CESA, issued a three-page press statement titled *“Apartheid” in South Africa*.⁴² Unlike the restrained but arguably

⁴¹ See par. 3.9.2 for specific comments by de Blank on the DRC and CESA’s response to them.

⁴² The Chancellor is a legal official of CESA. Mills served as a Registrar (Public Relations Officer) of the Church of England Defence Association from 1928 to 1938, he transitioned to being the Registrar of CESA from 1938 to 1956, thereafter he served as the Chancellor from 1956 to 1969 (Ive 1992:169).

supportive *Political Bishops'* statement of 1954, this statement was much more explicit and defensive of the government and the DRC.

In it, he echoed the criticism by the state and the DRC against de Blank, arguing that the racial situation in South Africa was unique, complex, and thus required an extended stay in the country to be understood (1958a:1). He viewed the criticism of the apartheid government and the DRC by de Blank as biased, destructive, and had resulted in grave injustice and harmful international propaganda against South Africa (*ibid*). He reminded the readers that the DRC spent approximately £1,000,000 annually in its missionary work, therefore, de Blank's characterisation of its 'warped theology' was inconsiderate of its generosity (*ibid*).

On the voting rights of blacks, Mills stated,

We all know that splendid citizens are found among the Bantu, Coloured, Indian, and Malay peoples numbering about a. We know, too, that there are splendid Christians among them and that some are educated and cultured, but these constitute only a very small minority. Speaking generally, the vast majority is simply not ready for equal social, political, or citizenship status, and many of them admit this, quite frankly. Over 40 years ago, a notable Governor (an Englishman from England) in a farewell speech after having lived at the Cape for some years advised a policy for a future based upon "apartheid" (1958a:2).

For Mills, the requirements for stewardship of the franchise were Christianity, education, and civility/culture. Mills' reasons for supporting the deprivation or at least an indefinite delays in granting full citizenship to blacks were based on the assumption that, even though they may have been some of them who were Christians, in his mind, a necessary requirement for the right to vote, few of them were civilised enough to be entrusted with democratic responsibilities, and argued that such deprivation was, therefore, necessary until the civilisation of the natives (Mills 1958b:2; cf Manning 19:1964:136; cf Begbie 1981:60-61 and 79-80).

According to Troup, Christianity was viewed as essential for the right to vote because the state was understood to be created by God—entrusted to do his will (1972:292). The right to vote was considered a treasure for those who would use it responsibly—that is, to support or vote out the government that was not doing God's

will (*ibid*). Troup adds that for this reason, communists and those susceptible to communism, the disempowered blacks, were barred from voting (1972:233).⁴³

On the 11th of June 1958, an updated version of Mills' statement was sent to the editor of the *Manchester Guardian*. Mills added a criticism about the economic impact of the boycott of South African goods because of the 'harmful propaganda' by the leaders of the CPSA, singling out de Blank; he again condemned this criticism as 'unfair, ill-advised, and... irresponsible' (Mills 1958b:2). He pointed out that such propaganda had resulted in the maltreatment of 'white girls while travelling overseas' for being South Africans (1958b:1: cf Manning 1964:137). One of the *English Churchman* readers replied to one version of this statement with a challenge to Mills, asking him if CESA supported apartheid or not? (Daunton-Fear 1958:1)

Mills' statements, though not explicit about CESA's support of apartheid, indicate that CESA's leadership *ipso facto* embraced what Bill Burnett (in Suggitt 1998:81) called the 'false faith' of separation for peaceful co-existence; it opposed equality, and those who advocated for it. Mills' epistemology accords with how apartheid defenders such as Charles Manning, whom Northedge described as a 'distinguished authority on law and jurisprudence and a controversial writer on South Africa,' (1979:1). The arguments articulated in *In Defence of Apartheid* (1964) are comparable to Mills'. To Mills, apartheid just meant separation—a separation practised in England, Rhodesia, and Australia with no international outrage (1958a:1, 3; cf Manning 1964:139). He attempted to defuse the indignation of irresponsible onlookers against apartheid by pointing to the fact that it was a British invention; reminding the readers that it was a British governor who pointed out that blacks were not ready for legal equality, a probable reference to Alfred Milner (Mills 1958a:1; Maylam 2001:144; Elphick 2012:103-104; cf Manning 1964:136-137). Mills perceived nothing wrong with segregation in the schools and Sunday schools (1958a:2).

3.9.1. Preserving Whiteness

Mills' support for segregation and rejection of integrated schools and churches was motivated by a fear of the corrupting influence of black culture. He seemed to side with the DRC on race and endorsed their views instead of the views held, at least in word,

⁴³ This is discussed further under par. 4.9.

by the Anglican Communion. This endorsement was for preserving white domination in the Union and the church (comparable with Begbie 1981:90-93).

Mills was not a theologian by training; he was a lawyer and a leader in CESA who wrote these statements in his capacity as the legal brain of the denomination. He presented no theological justification for these views, but these statements showed that Mills' theology of man was not shaped by Christian principles but by stereotypical anthropology about black people (Maylam 2001:208; cf Manning 1964:139-140).

Prof. Simon Maimela argues that this anthropology is the 'white Christian's view of the human self... as a creature who is dominated by self-centred social drives, seeking to acquire as much wealth, power, and privilege as he can for himself or his group or class, and caring for no others except as they are necessary tools for his personal gratification' (1983:51). To succeed in his analysis, he needs to portray black people as brutes that the white man and his progeny must be protected from (Maimela 1983:51-52; cf Maylam 2001:208-209). This distrust of Africans stems from 'White anthropology [that] teaches us that blacks have uncontrollable fratricidal drives which even the Gospel and conversion cannot tame' (Maimela 1983:52). Where Christianity ceased, civilisation filled up what was lacking.

Mills' views did not envisage a time in which one-person-one-vote would happen without endangering white interest; inclusive schools and Sunday schools would not occur without corrupting the white child, and this way deemed it necessary to 'keep the native in his place' (Mills 1958a:2; cf Maimela 1983:53; cf Manning 1964:139). That was probably the reason behind the lack of coloured children from the St Mark's Church at the annual CESA youth camp every year at Firgrove Campsite in Cape Town—a property owned by Mills (Ive 1965a:10-11; Bradley 2003:112). Blacks posed a danger to whites but not *vice versa* because, similarly to the white government, whites were considered benevolent and, therefore, could be entrusted to only exert a positive influence on the uncivilised Africans.

3.9.2. Friend of the DRC

Mills concluded the 3rd of June 1958 statement by praising the DRC and denigrating the CPSA—arguing that the moderators of the DRC should be taken as authoritative on race rather than the newcomer Anglican Archbishop of the CPSA (1958a:3). When de Blank criticised the government in Canada in 1963, Mills wrote to the Prime Minister, stating, 'I should like to assure you personally and on behalf of my Church,

that we deplore the further evidence of the hatred and animosity which Dr de Blank and his Church have shown against your Government and this country' (1963:1-2). He held de Blank responsible for the negative international perception of South Africa and the DRC (1963:2).

The DRC's theology of race is well documented (Kingham 1990:57-80). It was often referred to as the 'National Party at prayer' (Duncan 1991:28). The decision to align CESA with DRC further indicates apartheid support and warrants the same public theological classification. CESA vigorously defended the DRC—more specifically the protestant theology of the DRC as expressed in racial *praxis*. Consider the following press statement issued on the 11th of June 1958 by the Propaganda Committee. For some unexplained but obvious attempt to curry favour with the state, an Afrikaans version was sent to Prime Minister Verwoerd for his notice (CESA 1958b:1-2). It again condemned de Blank's criticism of the DRC, stating,

The Church of England viewed the bitterness and irresponsibility of Dr de Blank's attacks on the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa, as reported in the United States of America, with dismay. It conveys its deepest sympathy to the Dutch Reformed Church, of which many pastors were intimately associated as fellow Protestants with the Church of England in South Africa in the last century. The Church of England expresses the hope that before the proposed inter-church conference can possibly be held, we will certainly not be present unless the Dutch Reformed Church demands the withdrawal of the archbishop and also unless the Dutch Reformed Church is free to attend the conference in person (CESA 1958c:1-2).

The CPSA had organised this meeting with DRC officials to discuss comments made by de Blank during a sermon in New York on the 1st of June 1958. He stated, 'It is a sad commentary on the work of the DR Church in South Africa... that it spends a great deal of money on missionary work, but it believes in keeping its African and white congregations separate. It has a warped and inaccurate Calvinistic outlook' (in Clarke 2008:147). Clarke adds CESA joined other Protestant churches in condemning de Blank for the aforementioned comment (*ibid*).⁴⁴

The cause of this may also be that the Evangelicals felt abandoned by the Anglican Communion and that the CPSA had abandoned reformed theology— as seen in de Blank's criticism of Calvinism. Thus, the attack on the DRC was perceived

⁴⁴ CESA's letter was written on 11th June 1958.

to be an attack on the reformation.⁴⁵ A 1960 *Church News* (CESA) article alleged that the Communion's favouring of the CPSA over CESA was tantamount to 'rigid ecclesial apartheid' and that de Blank was fanning the flames of discord in South Africa (Douglas and Ive 1960:13; cf *ACR* 1960:3). Their advice to de Blank was that 'the right hand of fellowship extended to the D. R. C. and [CESA's] Bishop Morris would be of more practical value than a thousand denunciations and boycotts' (*ibid*). Thus, placing desires for ecclesial unity above the human rights violations. Ironically, 'ecclesial apartheid' was viewed as unjust, but the real apartheid de Blank opposed was said to be misunderstood.

3.9.3. Friend of the State

CESA was defensive towards the state and did not link the suffering of black people to the injustice of the apartheid policy. A *Church News* article by Tom Barlow of Christ Church Hillbrow encouraging CESA members to get involved in township ministry in Soweto reads more like a speech from an official of the apartheid government than an unbiased assessment. It failed to acknowledge the hundreds of years of the suffering of black people and portrays a reality untainted by colonialism, segregation, and apartheid. It shows wilful blindness that evades white guilt. In explaining what townships were like, he stated,

Outwardly they are of two kinds. Firstly, the old locations in which many Africans are still living in most degrading squalor. This has come about as a largely inevitable result of our South African industrial revolution, with the tremendous movement of population to the urban areas. Secondly, the new townships which have been built largely by government money and which house Africans in respectable conditions. The small, neat, simple houses, many with electricity and running water, set in well-lit streets, with recreation centres close at hand are a vast improvement on the old slums which we are thankful to say are gradually disappearing. The government has seen the problem of urban housing as an urgent one and is doing much to cope with the rapidly increasing population (Barlow 1961:3).

The Department of Information's *Multi-National Development in South Africa (1974)* made a similar assessment about the impact of urbanisation on non-homeland blacks.

⁴⁵ The researcher speculates that part of CESA's anger towards this statement was because it too was generous towards its native churches and had kept black and white churches separate. De Blank's attack on the DRC could have been perceived as an attack on CESA's *praxis*.

In 1974, it was also imploring critics to give the government time to improve the conditions of blacks in the townships (1974:54-55).

3.9.4. Expatriate Apathy?

Bongani Finca, a commissioner at the TRC, asked Frank Retief about CESA's historical attitude towards social justice (CESA 1999a:10 of 12). His ex-temporaneous answer tried to attribute CESA's indifference to expatriates; he stated,

Our theological training was limited, and we had a largely lay leadership in those days because of the historical aspect of our church's beginnings. Many of those lay leaders, many of them, came from overseas and they had their own view of things, and we were younger and not always able to understand what they [were] doing or saying or thinking. It is only as we grew and developed and matured ourselves, that things began to change (*ibid*).

This response implies that the apathetic attitude of CESA emanated from overseas laity and not from whites who were born in South Africa. The 1947 Synod resolution and the letters from the South African-born Mills undermine this assessment. Ironically, being a foreigner was used by CESA to dismiss the prophetic voices of moral witnesses such as de Blank. This point is also undermined because those who opposed the CPSA's stance were doing so as members of the Synod (Propagation Committee). Mills' statements were epistemologically aligned with CESA's 1954 *Political 'Anglican' Bishops'* statement. Therefore, it was disingenuous to attribute social apathy to a few expatriates. The whole denomination bears the responsibility.

3.10. Presented Reasons for Lack of Prophetic Witness

CESA's TRC submission states that 'the apartheid years, with the struggle for liberation, caught [it] completely off guard and unprepared,' some of its members who unwittingly supported apartheid were 'children of their culture,' and they were ignorant about the true nature and scope of apartheid (Cameron 2017:23, 28). These extenuating factors need to be examined. The following argument shall demonstrate that apartheid was known to be evil and accepted because CESA's support for the state was beneficial to the church.

3.10.1. Surprised by Apartheid

Excursus: Ecclesial Apartheid in CESA

CESA had no cause to be surprised by apartheid; the race question had occupied the minds of the settlers for over two hundred years before 1948. The 'introduction' of apartheid did not require structural change within the already racialised CESA. Unlike other English-speaking denominations with Anglo-Saxon lineage, there was no need for CESA to decide on whether it should be broken up into different branches according to race because it was already segregated along racial lines in the black Mission Church and a white CESA (Bradley 1960b:1; see Villa-Vicencio 1989:19-21). This segregation was accepted and advanced by CESA without the promptings of the government, as evidenced by the 1952 Synod resolution proposing that black members at St Mary's Church Maritzburg move out of their church to make space for white CESA congregants because the area was designated for Europeans (CESA SM 1952:9-10).⁴⁶

- *Children of their Culture*

Another argument to justify CESA's actions during the apartheid years is that those who practised racism or held racist attitudes 'were children of their culture' who were products of their environment (Cameron 2017:28). This argument was presented to the TRC and several times during discussions about the content of the 2020 Black ministers documents. It is presented as an attempt to absolve the actors of culpability by implying that social pressures deprived them of agency. However, the researcher finds this explanation unsatisfactory because historical data demonstrates that CESA voluntarily embraced apartheid when it was known to be 1) contrary to international trends, 2) contrary to international law and 3) rejected by global Anglicanism— which CESA desired to belong.

- *Against International Trends*

Maylam (2001:180) argues that apartheid was 'essentially a continuation of segregationism.' For instance, the removal of blacks from the Cape Common Electoral Roll was passed during the segregation era in 1936 (Clarke 2008:3). Beinart and Dubow also note that the model of the Bantustan system began in Natal under an Evangelical Anglican leader and governor of the province—Theophilus Shepstone.

⁴⁶ This point is important and deserves a much more detailed analysis, unfortunately it will not be the focus of this investigation.

The removal of blacks from urban areas occurred as early as 1901 as means to curb the spread of the bubonic plague (1995:12-13).⁴⁷ What made apartheid more egregious, among other things, was its rigid enactment and application of pre-existing spatial laws, legislated state terror, its repression of political dissidents and the fact that it was counter to international trends and international law. African countries were gaining independence from colonists, and the civil rights movement was gaining moral support in the southern states of the United States (Maylam 2001:189-190; Rotberg 2000:5; cf Beck 2000:104-105).

According to Freda Troup, in 1957, there were only four independent countries in Africa, namely Ethiopia, Algeria, Egypt and South Africa. By 1967, only four countries remained under European colonies (1972:290-291). Segregation era legislation and practices in South Africa were comparable to those in other British colonies and the American South. While the rest of the world was systematically doing away with repressive laws, South Africa was entrenching them to preserve the last refuge of white settlers (Maylam 2001:90; Troup 1972:291).

- *Against International Law*

In 1959 and again in 1962, the United Nations issued resolutions condemning apartheid as more than a domestic issue but a 'threat to international harmony' (United Nations 1986:4; Troup 1972:365 cf Maylam 2001:189). The next chapter will demonstrate that CESA developed a disdain for the international community for two reasons; first, they perceived them to be influenced by communists ANC, SACP and labour unions, whom they considered as illegitimate representatives for South Africa. Second, they understood the universal human rights movement to be an encroachment into domestic affairs and a liberal ploy to liberalise the more protestant South Africa (Bradley 1975:2; cf Troup 1972:292).

Dick Begbie's *Freedom Under Authority* (1981) indicates that CESA was aware of international discussions about racism but perceived the global trend towards united voices against injustice as another Babel, 'unity without God and without the Lordship of the One whom he has appointed' (1981:40). That the gospel had social implications was dismissed as a Marxist (and later humanist) initiative to fan the flames of a revolution against legitimate civil authority (Begbie 1981:43-44; Mills 1958:1-3).

⁴⁷ A more exhaustive discussion of the subject can be found in Welsh *et al.*'s *The Roots of Segregation* (1973).

- *Against Anglicanism*

CESA defended apartheid even while it offended global Anglican sensibilities. It disregarded Resolution 6 of the 1948 Lambeth Conference, which was passed before the 1955 disagreement with Fisher. In 1948, and thus before Morris' alienation, 329 Anglican bishops issued a resolution against discrimination (Clarke 2008:49). In 1954, Archbishop Fisher asserted that 'the application of the policy of apartheid seems to us a fresh violation of Christian principle and common justice' (ACR 1954:16). Again in 1960, the Convocations of York and Canterbury issued resolutions condemning apartheid, this was criticised in CESA's *Church News* magazine (Douglas and Ive 1960:13).⁴⁸ Therefore, the justification for supporting apartheid ought not to rely on cultural pressure or ignorance. There were prophetic Anglican voices, but CESA sided with the state.⁴⁹ CESA was aware of the international condemnation of apartheid, but it disagreed with the global Anglican Church because it often concurred with the World Council of Churches on race and politics in South Africa (Anglican Communion 2022b).⁵⁰

3.10.2. Ignorance About the Extent of Apartheid Evil

CESA's TRC submission also claims that whites were ignorant about the evils of apartheid until the '80s, when they made private petitions to the state to end discrimination (1999:3-5 of 12; cf Meiring 2005:161-162). However, this is undermined by historical data. It is clear from primary sources that they publicly decried (ecclesial) discrimination directed towards themselves and privately communicated unease with the policy of apartheid, for it created an unpeaceful environment in South Africa.

- *(Ecclesial) Apartheid as Unjust*

CESA understood itself to be discriminated against by the CPSA and the Archbishop of Canterbury, who failed to appoint an Evangelical bishop for CESA, thus enabling them to exist independently of the CPSA (The Church of England Defence Association 1935:6-7). That was perceived as an act of spiritual deprivation and an unjust limitation

⁴⁸ Convocations are synodical gatherings of bishops and clergy of the two provinces who comprise the Church of England (Church of England 2021).

⁴⁹ The next chapter will argue that these voices were ignored because they were not considered evangelical.

⁵⁰ Also see paragraphs. 4.8 and 5.4.

of their religious freedom. This argument is articulated by its Vicar-General, Alan Ewbank's pamphlet, *A Call for Justice—Not Favour* (1940). Canterbury's preference of the CPSA over CESA in South Africa was also perceived as 'rigid ecclesial apartheid' and criticised as unfair (*Church News* 1960a:13). CESA undertook a rigorous public relations campaign to bring their plight to the world's attention—through the formation of the Church of England Defence Association. Therefore, CESA understood that discrimination was unjust, but this understanding was not extended to actual racial apartheid—the term was merely hijacked to bring attention to the Evangelical cause.

- *Apartheid as Evil*

Second, in 1956, the Executive resolved to ask the Archbishop of Sydney for his assistance in consecrating an assistant bishop to Bp Fred Morris. A crucial private letter by Bradley to Archbishop Mowll of Sydney in 1957 provides a window into Bradley's internal struggles with the policy of apartheid. In this letter, he informs Mowll that he had been nominated for the position by Synod but revealed discomfort with staying in the country. He states,

After 21 years here, we are keener than ever to return to Australia. Much more so now that John is growing up; I do not want him to grow up in a land where apartheid is taken for granted, with all its attendant evils. And as I said in a previous letter, the constant controversy has weighed very heavily if this step is taken, then the opposition and bitterness will be multiplied. And yet, for the sake of the Africans, I suppose that once again we will have to put our plans aside (Bradley 1957:1, emphasis added).

This confession reveals an awareness that South Africa was not an ideal place to raise a child. The Bradleys considered returning from the mission field that Mowll had sent them in 1936. That was so because, in South Africa, apartheid was 'taken for granted.' The Miriam-Webster English dictionary has two definitions of this idiomatic phrase; First, one takes something for granted when they 'assume it to be true without questioning it,' and second, one takes something for granted when one 'fails to appreciate its value' (2021). The context of the phrase indicates that the first meaning of the definition was intended; the Bradleys loved their child, and apartheid had 'attendant evils.' The Bradleys did not want their son to grow up where the evil apartheid policy, with all the violence and international criticism against it, was regular.

He also adds that they had been on the receiving end of ‘opposition and bitterness,’ which would increase if he were made bishop in CESA (Bradley 1957:1).

In another letter to the Australian Prime Minister in 1973, Bradley listed several problems with South Africa; included in the list was the application of apartheid, the white electorate system, unequal pay, and the migrant labour crisis (1973a:1). He argued that apartheid was being applied unfairly.

The above letter indicates Bradley believed and accepted that apartheid (or its associated results) was evil. He believed that South Africa in the 1950s was no ideal place to raise a child and only stayed ‘for the sake of the Africans’ (*ibid*). He took it for granted and accepted that CESA’s support of it would significantly increase opposition if he were elevated to a leadership position. However, it is unclear why he vehemently opposed those who pointed out what he believed to be evil. De Blank’s realisations led him to oppose apartheid, but Bradley learned to live with it. It is also unclear why he did not have the same compassion for the Africans who endured apartheid’s ‘attendant evil’ as he did for his child. Unlike his family, the Africans had no option to leave, to stay for their sake but not speak up for them while criticising those who did was not loving them as he loved his child. CESA was supportive because its support was beneficial.

3.11. **The Benefits of Collaboration**

De Gruchy and de Gruchy assert that ‘If the ‘church clause’ shocked the churches into action, the whole country was rudely awakened by Sharpeville’ (2005:975). The killing of 69 and wounding of 186 peaceful black protestors by the police at Sharpeville made the public notice the brutality of the apartheid state (Ross 2008:139). The ensuing protest caused the state to declare a State of Emergency. The African National Congress, the Pan-African Congress, and their leaders were banned. Nelson Mandela, Albert Luthuli, Robert Sobukwe, and others were arrested and charged under the Suppression of Communism Act of 1950 (de Gruchy and de Gruchy 2005:978).

3.11.1. *Protection from State Surveillance*

De Blank and Reeves, among others, issued condemnations of the apartheid state and the DRC for its support of it—resulting in the DRC leaving the South African

Council of Churches (de Gruchy and de Gruchy 2005:987; cf Phillips 1995:95-103). Apartheid received wholesale condemnation from the international community, and foreign investment in South Africa declined significantly (de Gruchy and de Gruchy 2005:979).

The censorship that followed the Sharpeville Massacre in the early 60s was indiscriminate (Ross 2008:141). Bradley was taken aback by the government's monitoring of his communication. Letters from him were returned to sender, a knitted pullover sent to him did not arrive, mail that arrived did so opened or appeared tampered with, and letters he sent to his sister in Australia had arrived unsealed (Bradley 1960a:1; Bradley 1960d:2).

Bradley was perplexed by why he was under state surveillance. In a letter to the Postmaster, he requested an explanation and/or an investigation (Bradley 1960c:1). In another letter to the Postmaster, Bradley's pontifications are an insightful indicator that CESA was supportive of the state; he urged the Postmaster to direct his attention to the CPSA leaders such as Joost de Blank and Ambrose Reeves instead of CESA (Bradley 1960c:1-2).

When Bradley received what he considered an unsatisfactory reply from the Postmaster-General, stating that the matter was receiving full attention, he instructed CESA's legal official, Gordon Mills, to write to Verwoerd, now Prime Minister, who referred the matter to Dr Albert Hertzog, the Minister of Posts and Telecommunications, for an '... urgent and thorough investigation' of the loss and damage of letters (Fourie 1960:1). This indicates that Verwoerd viewed Bradley and CESA as allies to the state and thus could be cleared from suspicion.

3.11.2. Access to Elites

CESA's support of the state enabled it to acquire what Cochrane *et al.* called 'legitimacy in the eyes of the powerful' (1999:16). From as far back as 1960, CESA was among those churches that enjoyed a privileged status denied to other faith communities (cf Report Vol. 4 1998:59). It gladly welcomed the state's patronage in exchange for supporting its policies (cf TEASA 1999:2-3). It received the first of numerous invitations to state dinners (Morris 1960:1).

In a 1962 memorandum to the Executive and clergy, Bradley recounts the 'great honour' bestowed upon CESA as indicated in him being one of two clergymen (the other belonging to the DRC) who was invited to a function to mark the opening of

parliament (CESA EM 1962:1). The manner in which he spoke indicates the acceptability of his attendance. Other leaders were aware of it, which encouraged the pattern; he continued to attend these dinners well into the late 70s (Bradley 2003:172). This is another sign that Bradley did not perceive these benefits as exclusively personal, but as extended to the church.

In 1964, when Bradley and his wife needed a permit to enter the black reservations, he wrote to Verwoerd's office directly, reminding him he '... knows us and what we stand for' while asking the Prime Minister to instruct the Minister of Bantu Affairs to grant the requested permit (Bradley 1964b:1). This letter hints that CESA did not receive preferential treatment from the state merely because it was not seen as an opponent, but because it was ideologically aligned with the state (cf Cochrane *et al.* 1999:16; *contra* Newby 2002: 6 of 8).

3.11.3. *Access to Instruments of Gospel Growth*

John Newby (2002: 4-6 of 12) argued that denominational growth should not be attributed only to its evangelistic zeal. Historiographical assessments should mention the fact that some of the white evangelicals left other mainline denominations to join the professedly 'apolitical' CESA and that some of the growth is due to, but not limited to, the support it received from the apartheid through broadcasting allotments that were disproportionate to its size (Balcomb 2004:7; cf Tutu 2000:169; cf Cochrane *et al.* 1999:47; *contra* Goodhew 2000:363). Like all para-statal, the SABC was firmly in the hands of the state (Tutu 2000:169-170). Bradley's Charge in 1964 announced that CESA was one of the eight English-speaking denominations that would get at least one radio preaching slot every eight weeks (1964a:6). The 1990 Synod minutes noted a complaint that the allotment had been reduced to 13.5% of the overall religious segment (CESA SM 1990:11).

3.12. **Lack of Moral Leadership from Morris**

Bishop Fred Morris's leadership is noticeably absent in CESA's policy pronouncements about apartheid. This is astonishing because the views of CESA were inconsistent with Resolution 6 of the 1948 Lambeth Conference. One would assume that Morris, a delegate in good standing, would sway the leadership of CESA to align themselves with the Anglican Communion— even if only to appear to act

Anglican and thus silence those who viewed CESA as schismatic. However, this did not happen. There are four reasons for this.

- *Age and Health Problems*

He was seventy-one years old when he became the Presiding Bishop of CESA in 1955 (see his age in Douglas 1995:1). Bradley notes Morris would not chair Synodical and Executive meetings because of his hearing (2003:131). His advanced age and ill-health caused him to consider leaving the country from as early as 1957, leading the Executive to ask him to continue to be the Bishop of CESA even if he was domiciled outside of the country and to consecrate an assistant bishop (CESA EM 1957:1). He was only in South Africa for four years, having resigned as Rector of Christ Church Hillbrow in 1959 and moved to Nakuru in Kenya (*Church News* 1960a:7; *Church News* 1960c:5). The Executive (CESA EM 1958:1) minutes show that from 1958, CESA committed to paying Morris's travel expenses, and the Executive nominated Stephen Bradley to be consecrated as Morris' assistant bishop in 1959.

- *Short Residence in South Africa (de Blank criticism)*

If Morris propagated different views to those of CESA, as discussed in the 1954 *Political Bishops* statement and subsequent proclamations, he would have been liable to the same accusations labelled against de Blank, namely he could not understand the South African context because he had not been in the country long enough. This may be why Mills, a South African born in 1885 in Cape Town, was the chief communicator of CESA's position until 1961, when this role gradually shifted to Bradley (1820 Settlers 2021).⁵¹

- *The Pressure of Anglican Communion Condemnation*

Most of the surviving correspondence to and from him was concerned with addressing the consequences of his decision to be CESA's leader (Morris 1955:1-2, 1956:1-3, 1958:1, 1958:2). The CPSA (1982:34) notes that Archbishop Geoffrey Fisher made three more attempts to reconcile CESA and the CPSA after 1955. The marginalisation of CESA from the Anglican Communion weighed heavily on Morris. In a confidential

⁵¹ This point is strengthened by the resignation of CESA's Presiding Bishop Dudley Foord in 1987, Foord was a foreigner who appeared to hold different views than the majority of the CESA leadership on apartheid (see par.5.7).

letter to Bradley, just months after taking the role of Bishop of CESA, he informed him he was burdened by pressure from his wife—who was having doubts about their mission in South Africa in their twilight years (1956:2).⁵²

After the decision was made that Bradley would be consecrated as an Assistant Bishop, the CESA Executive could not find a second Anglican bishop to bear witness to the consecration. Even Archbishop Howard Mowll, who had been an ally of CESA, could not assist Morris without embroiling the Anglican Church in Australia into controversy (Mowll:1958:1). Morris was reluctant to act alone in the consecration of Bradley even though the Executive had secured legal advice from the Chancellor of the Sydney Anglicans and four unnamed sympathetic Anglican bishops, stating that they regrettably could not assist, but urged Morris to act alone (CESA EM: 1957:1-2).

This unease even spurred Morris to seek help from the CPSA. In a letter to Robert Gurney, a member of the Executive, Bradley writes, ‘the bishop had chosen, against everybody’s advice and wish, to write to de Blank asking him to recognise us... Remember if 15 or 30 bishops were to write to Morris and particularly Mrs Morris, I question very much whether there would be a consecration’ (1959:1). Ive (1966:88) asserts that Morris followed through with this unpopular path, but de Blank rejected the proposal.

3.13. Transition to Bishop Bradley

In the end, Bradley was consecrated by Morris alone as the Assistant Bishop on the 8th of March 1959 (Bradley 2003:123, Newby 2002:2 of 8; cf Hinchliff 1963:225). He may have held the title of Assistant Bishop, but he was the *de facto* leader of CESA. From 1959 to Morris’ passing in 1965, Morris’s name did not appear regularly on the minutes of those present in the quarterly Executive meetings; he attended only two Synods between 1959 and 1965. Bradley assumed leadership of all Synod and the Executive meetings in Morris’ absence.

3.14. Concluding Remarks

This chapter has briefly traced the history of CESA with a focus on its public theology. It has discussed the theological and procedural reasons for the separation of CESA

⁵² This doubt from Mrs Morris can also be read in the letter by Bradley to Robert Gurney below indicating that she was the weakest link in the denomination’s resolve to distant itself from the CPSA (see Bradley 1959:1).

from the CPISA. It has demonstrated that it relied on the state for its preservation. Its theology, reliance on the state and antagonism towards the CPISA made CESA a ripe receptor of apartheid state theology before and during the episcopacy of its first bishop, Fred Morris.

It accepted and promoted apartheid when it was universally condemned as unjust. CESA was thus incorrectly classified by the TRC as ambivalent during the apartheid era. It has been asserted that CESA should be understood as an apartheid collaborator—who defended apartheid as a just application of the Bible. It has examined the reaction of CESA to the CPISA's moral witness on apartheid. CESA's historiographies until 1965 gloss over its interactions with the state despite the abundance of historical data pointing to its moral complicity. It has demonstrated that CESA initiated the relationship with the state. CESA knew and accepted that apartheid was evil, but aligned itself with an evil state. Its proximity to the state benefited it by enabling it to become the representative of the English church in South Africa. Therefore, the authenticity of the central aspect of CESA's TRC submission, the lack of theological defence of apartheid, is questionable.

4. CHAPTER 4: The Episcopacy of Stephen Bradley (1965-1984)

4.1. Introduction

In 1988, CESA's (then former) Presiding Bishop, Stephen Bradley, was called to assist the government against a public relations campaign for further economic sanctions on South Africa. He was asked because he 'ought to know what sanctions would mean for our African people' (Bradley 2003:196). Accordingly, he travelled with Prof. Pieter de Lange, the Human Sciences Research Council chairperson, and Dr PJ van der Merwe, the Director of Manpower and Labour Relations (Bradley 2003:196; Bradley 1998b:1). Together they travelled to Washington to meet with Senators and to take part in media interviews—speaking against sanctions on South Africa (*ibid*; CESA 1988a:3). These sanctions were an economic response by the USA to the South African government's decision to ban all black opposition groups and prohibit all political activities by trade unions (*Washington Post* 1988).

CESA's TRC submission did not understand this type of advocacy (and others discussed in this chapter) as indicative of apartheid support, even though those who assisted the state in similar ways were perceived as apartheid collaborators. For instance, Bishop Isaac Mokoena regularly went on such campaigns. He was honoured by the state with a Decoration of Meritorious Service in 1987 for opposition to the repealing of the Mixed Marriages Act and his advocacy against economic sanctions on South Africa (Walshe 1997:389; *Crisis News* 1988:4; Wren 1989:3; Duncan 1991:28; cf *Orlando Sentinel* 1985; Elphick 1997:389). Bradley was not perceived to be an apartheid co-conspirator.

4.2. Aim and Objectives

This chapter aims to argue that from 1965 to 1984 CESA was not 'passive and compliant' or 'consistently apolitical' as alleged in its TRC submission and by Frederick Hale, respectively, but was a highly active advocate of apartheid ideology (Cameron 2017:29; Hale 1992:521).

- It will posit that the 1988 trip was a culmination of decades of such advocacy on behalf of the state.

- It will outline how CESA, and its international partners were complicit in supporting apartheid theology.
- It will highlight CESA's relationship with the Department of Information Affairs and the Department of Foreign Affairs as indicators of its (probable) involvement in Muldergate.
- It will argue that CESA should have been viewed as a Right-Wing Christian Group by the TRC.
- It will also highlight ways in which CESA opposed the state and argue that this was not prophetic.

4.3. **Stephen Bradley (b 1909-2003)**

Stephen Carlton Bradley was born in 1909 in Egypt to Irish missionaries (Bradley 1998c:2). He grew up in Australia, where he studied theology at Melbourne Bible Institute and Moore Theological College (Makinana 2003:30; Cole-Edwards n.d.:12). In 1934, he was ordained as a presbyter in the Anglican Diocese of Sydney. Two years later, at the advice of the Sydney Anglican Archbishop, Howard Mowll, he, and his wife moved to South Africa to become missionaries to the Zulu (Bradley 1998c:2). In 1959, he became an assistant Bishop and in 1965 became CESA's Presiding Bishop until his retirement in 1984.

4.3.1. **Bradley's Influence on CESA**

Peter Hammond's eulogy paid tribute to Bradley as an extraordinary evangelist and church planter. He was 'the primary human instrument in building up the Church of England in South Africa as a Gospel preaching, Bible-loving denomination' (2003). He served the denomination for forty-six years and 'left an indelible mark on the CESA' (Hammond in Bradley 2003:1; cf Louw 2003:18; Cole-Edwardes n.d.:11). He was its chief evangelist and defender.

- *Chief Evangelist*

His legacy is a church that is staunchly conservative and evangelical in its theological outlook and fiercely evangelistic in its *praxis*. CESA's second bishop was more of an evangelist than a theologian (cf Earngey 2011:9 of 25). Like the Sydney Anglican clergy of his time, what Bradley lacked in ecclesiastic preferment, he made up in

evangelistic zeal and entrepreneurial spirit (Newby 2002:2 of 8; cf Jensen 2012:4). His legacy is of a conservative-evangelical denomination with its theology and pietistic in its ethical outlook (Newby 2002:2 of 8; CESA SM 1948:3; Balcomb 2001:6). CESA is a low church in the Anglican spectrum; its liturgical *praxis* is minimalist, geared more towards those searching for faith than for Christians seeking comfort and enrichment from traditional Anglican liturgical worship.

- *Chief Advocate*

Bradley dominated CESA's public pronouncements from 1965 to 1984. Later, attempts were made to separate his views from those of the denomination. This was an attempt to insulate the denomination from his controversial utterances (see Gill 1982:1; 1984:24). This attempt is undermined by the fact that CESA's *Handbook of Procedure* prescribes the function of the Executive Committee, which is chaired by the Presiding Bishop, to promote the best interest of the denomination (REACH-SA 2014:26). A 1988 Synod resolved that the Presiding Bishop would be the 'de facto the public face of the Church' (in REACH-SA 2014:25).

From its inception, the office of the Vicar-General (later Presiding Bishop) was understood to be the 'voice of the Synod, its servant and not its master and must act definitely within such limits as shall from time to time be laid down by Synod' (Ewbank 1940:3). The researcher has found no text indicating the church's displeasure with Bradley during his episcopacy.⁵³ He was annually appreciated for his tireless efforts on behalf of the denomination. Therefore, Bradley must be understood as acting to the denomination's service as a 'leader among equals,' not a lord over subjects.

4.4. Hendrik F. Verwoerd (b 1901-1966)

The general impression of CESA as an apartheid supporter for its participation in Verwoerd's funeral was said to be unwarranted in its TRC statement (Cameron 2017:22). However, a close examination of the episode demonstrates affection, respect, and praise for Verwoerd's Christian character and wise leadership.

⁵³ The closest the denomination came to censoring him was during the episcopacy of his successor, Dudley Foord, who expressed discomfort with views expressed in Bradley's *Friends Letters*. He asked Hebert Hammond to talk to Bradley, when he was unsuccessful, he asked Murray Hofmeyr to talk to him. No further update is provided by the minutes (CESA CA-EM 1987:2). After Foord's resignation, Bradley continued to play a central role in helping the state discourage economic sanctions against South Africa.

4.4.1. Friend of CESA

Bradley's participation at Prime Minister H. F. Verwoerd's funeral in 1966 set the tone for CESA's public theology during his episcopacy. As admitted in the previous chapter, CESA's relationship with Verwoerd stemmed from 'assistance and advice' when he was the Minister of Native Affairs (Bradley 1960:1; Barnard 1955:1). Correspondence between the Verwoerds and CESA leadership was regular and indicated an intimate friendship (Mills 1966a:1; 1963a:1). CESA's Chancellor, Gordon Mills states this explicitly in his letter to Mrs Verwoerd after the Prime Minister's death (1966:1). At the beginning of each year, Bradley often sent letters to the Prime Minister stating that CESA was praying for him and his cabinet (Bradley 1962:1; 1963:1; 1965:1). Unlike most of the replies to letters written to government officials, which would be replied to by private secretaries, shortly before his death—Verwoerd responded to CESA personally, demonstrating familial knowledge of the members of CESA's Chancellor's family—Gordon Mills (Verwoerd 1966a:1).

Contrary to CESA's TRC statement, its relationship with the government was not a cause for embarrassment for Bradley or CESA. For example, on the 20th of January in 1966, Bradley's memorandum to CESA ministers and National Trustees stated that he was one of two clergymen at a presidential banquet. The other was from the DRC; he considered this a 'great honour to our church' (1966b:2, emphasis added).

4.4.2. Beloved Christian Leader

Their reaction to his death can also measure CESA's relationship with Verwoerd. In contrast, other religious leaders expressed horror at his death through press statements (*Rand Daily Mail* 1966b:3). One-fifth of CESA's periodical (*Church News*) was plastered with pictures and statements dedicated to mourning his passing. Faced with opposition to apartheid, Verwoerd's resilience was admired and praised; he was hailed as 'a person sufficiently sure of himself that he could stand alone.' Others mourned that 'A prince among men has been taken from us. He was gifted with great intellect, developed almost to the level of prophetic vision,' his leadership and resolve in the face of opposition were compared to that of Israel's King David (*Church News* 1966b:2-5).

Additionally, a press statement was issued indicating the denomination's 'thankfulness to God for his wise leadership and Christian witness' (*Rand Daily Mail* 1966:3, emphasis added). CESA leadership further added that it had instructed all CESA churches to conduct special memorial services on Sunday the 11th of September 1966 to mourn the Verwoerd's death (*Church News* 1966b:5; *Rand Daily Mail* 1966:3). An extraordinary honour never to be repeated, even after the passing of Nobel laureates Nelson Mandela, F. W. de Klerk, or Desmond Tutu.

Bradley's participation at the funeral service appears to have been beneficial. It elevated the profile of a small denomination by presenting Bradley as the 'face of the English church' in South Africa (Bradley 1973a:2; cf Newby 2002:6 of 8). The funeral service was also broadcast internationally on radio and television (cf British Pathe 2020). Because of this publicity, Bradley was admired by African Enterprise's John Tooke for having his 'own ministry within government circles' (1975:1).

Bradley's participation was at two events; he was at the state funeral in Pretoria, where he read the text for the sermon on II Samuel 10:1-12. A friend of the Verwoerd family and Vice-Chancellor of Stellenbosch University, Jacobus S. Gericke, preached the sermon (Bradley 1973c:1; Jones 1966:1; South African Government 1966; Manenzhe 2007:22). Pictures indicate him walking alongside the casket with DRC ministers and the military (*Church News* 1966b:3). The second appearance was at a memorial service in the Groote Kerk in Cape Town, where, according to Clarke, he gave a eulogy praising Verwoerd (2008:231).

4.4.3. Anglican Communion Perception

In Robert Clarke's *Anglicans Against Apartheid* (2008), it is noted that in 1966, Bradley sought to establish CESA's position in the Anglican Communion by soliciting support from the Evangelical Fellowship in the Anglican Communion in a bid to secure an invitation to the 1968 Lambeth Conference and to negotiate reunification with the CPSA (2008:231; cf Bradley 2003:143).⁵⁴ As a result, one leader of the Anglican Fellowship, John Stott, arranged a meeting between Bradley and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Michael Ramsey. Negotiations about CESA's participation at the upcoming conference and the status of CESA clergy ordained by the now late Bishop

⁵⁴ The Evangelical Fellowship in the Anglican Communion was led by the Australian Archbishop Marcus Loan and Rev John Stott (Clarke 2008:231). Bradley's account differs slightly, he recalled that it was named the Evangelical *Alliance* not Evangelical Fellowship as stated by Clarke (2003:144).

Fred Morris ensued (Clarke 2008:231). These negotiations were ongoing when Verwoerd was assassinated on the 6th of September 1966.

Contrary to CESA's TRC claim, Clarke asserts that Bradley's 'eulogy in praise of Dr Verwoerd left no doubt regarding CESA's unfettered support of the government and its policies' (2008:231). At one of Bradley's meetings with Ramsay, after Verwoerd's funeral, Bradley gave Ramsay a pamphlet of CESA's history and the aforementioned edition of CESA's *Church News* with a significant section dedicated to passing of Verwoerd (Clarke 2008:232). Ramsay was taken aback by Bradley's pro-government demeanour; he stated, 'This aspect of the matter was rather an eye-opener to me... I was startled by Bishop Bradley talking rather in a way Dutch Reformed churchman might talk. I was led to suspect that this church must tend to a kind of 'spiritual' evangelism of saving souls with little relation to the context of life in which people live' (in Clarke 2008:232).

Bradley was unsuccessful in securing an invitation to the 1968 Lambeth Conference. Instead, Ramsay, persuaded by the CPSA bishops, advised that any CESA clergy who sought to minister in any other Province in the Anglican Communion needed to apply for conditional ordination in that Province (Clarke 2008:232; *contra* Ive 1992:180). It is reasonable to surmise that CESA's political ideology directly influenced its perception by Ramsay— entrenching the alienation of CESA from global Anglicanism.

4.5. **Apartheid Advocation**

After Bradley became CESA's Presiding Bishop in 1965, his commentary on South Africa became less concentrated on the CPSA's critique of apartheid to a more explicit defence of racialised separation. Bradley's visit to Australia in 1967 and its preparation are significant.

In October 1966, he attended the Congress on World Evangelism in Berlin. Before the conference, he visited England to meet with CESA supporters and hold discussions with the Evangelical Fellowship of the Anglican Communion (Bradley 2003: 142-144; Bradley 1966c:11). While there, he encountered considerable interest in South African politics. In a letter to the new Prime Minister of South Africa, Johannes Vorster, he informed him about conversations with British parliamentarians who were eager to hear an 'objective view' from a resident of South Africa to correct

the 'often wickedly untrue perception of the country' (Bradley 1967a:1). Recalling this visit, to prepare for an upcoming sabbatical in Australia and in anticipation of similar interest; he wrote to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, asking for a letter of introduction to the South African attaché or information officers in Sydney and Melbourne; he also asked for 'the loan of films and other material that they may make available. It might be possible to let me have a letter of introduction to your officers there' (Bradley 1967b:1). He was specifically interested in information and statistics about the homelands (*ibid*). A sign that his so-called 'objective view' was to be in service of and be informed by the state, he even explicitly stated that he was not opposed to the apartheid government (*ibid*).

4.5.1. Unpleasant Australian Reception in 1967

Bradley and his family's visit to Australia in 1967 had far-reaching consequences for CESA's public witness. Before this, the church's views were relatively unnoticed. Their arrival in Sydney for his sabbatical thrust him into the spotlight; his reception and the fallout were not what he had experienced in England. He found reporters awaiting him at the harbour. He suspected that they had scanned the manifest before his arrival and 'expected [me] to be highly critical of the South African government, however, the line I took was that just as the Australian government was keeping things going in Australia, so the South African government was doing in South Africa, but they under very, very difficult conditions' (Bradley 2003:146).

Bradley's claim that the media sought him out does not align with what he stated before his arrival. On the contrary, his letter to the Department of Foreign Affairs suggests he expected questions, but he may not have expected hostility to his views. He was puzzled by the media's assessment, which he stated was unfairly 'determined to brand me as a racist for no purpose other than to cause trouble' (Bradley 2003:148). In his memoir, he states that all this led to accusations that he approved of apartheid (*ibid*). However, his statements to the press will demonstrate that this accusation was warranted.

4.5.2. CESA Not Against Apartheid

Bradley's words—which were reported in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, the *Sun* (Australian) and the *Rand Daily Mail* in South Africa—portray a progression from CESA's views expressed by Gordon Mills' *Apartheid in South Africa* (1958) and the

Political Bishops (1954) statements in defence of apartheid (cf Schmidt 1984). He states,

Apartheid is a good thing for South Africa, and Africans know it... The Church of England is not against apartheid. The Church has a lot of people, and there are a lot of voices. But the people who live in South Africa by and in large accept Apartheid as part of local development... There are anomalies and injustices in any system. But in South Africa, the Natives know where they are and where they are going. In the United States, Negroes have equal rights Constitutionally, but society will not accept them. We have the idea in South Africa that the world is gradually coming to see our point of view—but maybe that is conceit. You have to face the facts that Whites and Natives are equal in ability, but they are different in states of development. As long as there are Whites to think and plan ahead; Africans would willingly work under them. It would not be a kindness to develop Natives faster than they could accept responsibility. They have to develop at their own pace (*Rand Daily Mail* 1967a:6).

In a follow-up report, he stated, 'Apartheid—separate development, as I prefer to call it—was an experiment that was working well' (*Rand Daily Mail* 1967b:5).

Responding to questions about section 215 of the Criminal Procedures Amendment Act 96 of 1965, which empowered the state to detain political prisoners for up to 180 days without trial— during which many of them were tortured and killed (SAHO 2021) ⁵⁵ Bradley commented,

Many government Ministers were against it. I know the Prime Minister who was interned during the Second World War is very much against it. But what people do not realise is that several African States, including Kenya, Tanzania, Ghana, and several Central African countries have actually declared war against South Africa. They have no army to carry out threats, but they have communist-trained infiltrators operating in South Africa. When you are dealing with infiltrators, you have to use unsavoury measures (*Rand Daily Mail* 1967b:5).

This was the frankest statement by CESA about the brutality of the government. It was not criticising anyone else (such as the CPSA or the Anglican Communion), its Presiding Bishop expressed the church's views.

Bradley's account on this visit decades later demonstrated remorse for some of its aspects; he regretted stating that South Africa had a right to defend itself against the communist threat but indicated no repentance for his comments about apartheid

⁵⁵ SAHO stands for South African History Online.

even though these comments proved problematic for his successor in 1984 (2003:146, see par. 5.3.2).

4.6. **CESA's Reaction**

Bradley's 1967 statements were in keeping with the denomination's public theology. Besides being comparable to those issued by the Propagation Committee (par. 3.8). They were a natural progression of its alignment with the government. For instance, in 1964, it published a statement criticising the call for sanctions against South Africa. It praised the apartheid government for providing 'peace and increasing prosperity for all people' (*Church News* 1964:21, emphasis added). The 1966 Synod passed a resolution commending the government's efforts against the 'Communist-trained guerrillas in S.W.A' (CESA SM 1966:8).⁵⁶ The 1967 statements were thus not scandalous. CESA's *Church News* (1968a:7) only reported that journalists had tried and failed to involve Bradley in a political debate; the edition did not mention what Bradley said but focused on the Primate of the Anglican Church in Australia, Archbishop Philip Strong's reaction to Bradley's views, labelling them as 'unwise', 'ineffective' and later regretted by Strong (see par. 4.8.1 for more.). The *Church News* article provided no defence, denial or correction of what Bradley said about apartheid.

CESA's Dick Begbie (1992:271-272) also recalled reading about Bradley in the *Bulawayo Times* on his visit to Rhodesia (Zimbabwe); CESA was accused of being a 'sect which supported anti-Christian apartheid'. Tellingly, Begbie took no issue with the accusation of being an apartheid supporter, but only the reference to CESA as a sect (Begbie 1992:72-74; cf *ACR* 1967b:2).

4.7. **Government's Reaction**

The South African government welcomed Bradley's statements in Australia. In 1968, Bradley received a letter from the South African Ambassador to Australia, Johan C. H. Maree, who praised him for his 'courageous defence of South Africa' (in Bradley 1969:1; cf Bradley 1977a:2).⁵⁷ This spurred him to continue to seek state support and report back on his efforts for the benefit of the Republic. When he visited Australia

⁵⁶ S.W.A stands for South-West Africa, the modern-day Namibia.

⁵⁷ The wording of this praise of Bradley 'courageous defence of South Africa' contradicts CESA's assertion to the TRC that it lacked the courage to speak up on behalf of the victims of apartheid. Primary sources indicate that this courage was present, but it was in defence of the perpetrators and not the victims of apartheid (*contra* Meiring 2005:155-156).

in 1971, he reported to Vorster that he was well-received despite the sporadic protest of apartheid (Bradley 1971:1).

In 1977, Bradley again turned to the government, this time the Department of Information, hereafter 'DI,' to prepare for a trip to England, where he expected to encounter 'false propaganda' (Bradley 1977c:1-2). To help this state dispel this view, he asked, 'If you can give us access to any available materials, we will be very grateful. While I generally depend on my own observation, I am sure that you have facts and figures, particularly relating to the development of the homelands, that will be invaluable' (Bradley 1977c:1-2).

This had been the government's concern since Sharpeville, the latest treatment of the subject, had been published by the DI in a book titled *Multi-National Development in South Africa: The Reality* (1974). It sought to present 'a more realistic appraisal of the situation in South Africa' and to counter its criticism from the UN, SACC, and OAU (1974:9).⁵⁸ To achieve its goal, it argued that Bantustans were rich in mineral and agricultural resources, the South African natives enjoyed a higher standard of living compared to other Africans, were more educated and preferred the homelands because they were more culturally orientated (1974:9, 41-49, 58, 78-79).

In a letter to Vorster in the same year, Bradley informed him about the gratitude of the South African Ambassador to Australia and, more recently, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs and the Department of Information for his (Bradley's) role in dispelling negative propaganda against South Africa (Bradley 1977c:2-3). This indicates that CESA was not deceived by the state, as claimed by its TRC submission (and as held by post-TRC historiographies) but was actively deceiving others with the state's help (*contra* Cameron 2017:23; *contra* Leeman 2016:82; *contra* Cochrane *et al.* 1999:47).

4.7.1. Friends Letters

In addition to extensive writing in the press from the 50s to the 80s, Bradley's alternative medium was a newsletter called *Friends Letters*. The focus of these letters was to report on his ministry, elicit donations for the native mission work, and request prayers for CESA. Unfortunately, few of the letters have been preserved, but their content can be gleaned from Bradley's mention of them and reactions to them by

⁵⁸ OAU stands for the Organisation for African Unity, later renamed the African Union.

friends and government officials. His memoir is also written from these letters and most placed copied exactly (Bradley 2003:215).

In one of his letters to Vorster, he informs him that his newsletters were correcting the bad press about South Africa in the U.S.A. Canada, India, and Japan, 'In this way, *Uitlanders*⁵⁹ are able to show our appreciation' (Bradley 1978-09-28). Marcia Cameron's comments about interviewees who received these newsletters are insightful; they historically viewed as CESA as 'markedly racist, condoning and supporting white supremacy' (2006:147).

4.7.2. Department of Information (DI)

Bradley was also associated with officials in the DI and together they sought to present the lighter side of apartheid. Giffard *et al.* assert that 'Political warfare involves two basic strategies: censorship and propaganda' (1984:229). CESA's relationship with the officials of the DI points to its involvement in state propaganda. As part of the DI's 'guest programme,' from time to time, Bradley met with international visitors to give a 'truer account of the situation in South Africa' (1977:2). He also aided the DI by availing the addresses of the recipients of his *Friends Letters* so that they may receive free copies of the DI's magazine—*South Africa Panorama* (Director-General 1980:1).

When he authored articles favourable to South Africa or found articles that warranted responses from the South African government, he would send them to the Minister of the DI (seldom the Minister of Defence) along with his lament about the biases of the press (Bradley 1982:1; 1983a:3; 1984b:1). Bradley arranged for the DI to receive the editor of the *Canberra Times*, Ian R. Mathews, as its guest because he had written several 'objective' articles about South Africa (Mathews 1975:1; Bradley 1975c:2-3).⁶⁰

When Bradley had foreign visitors, he would arrange for them to meet officials from the DI who would answer questions about politics in South Africa (Koornhof 1983:2-6). Dr Adeyemo, Mr Stephen C Shadegg, Dr Philip Hughes, Rev Campbell

⁵⁹ *Uitlanders* means foreigner: a derogatory term used by the Afrikaners shortly before the Anglo-Boer war to refer to people of English descent.

⁶⁰ In the end Mathews could not come to South Africa on official capacity because his employers did not grant him permission, an arrangement was made for him to come on his personal capacity to attend the Transkeian Independence celebration (DI 1976a:1).

Egan, and Bishop Donald Robinson were among the DI's guests.⁶¹ On Bradley's arrangement, Robinson received tours of Johannesburg, Soweto, Durban, Transkei, and the Cape, with various chaperons provided by the DI and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Robinson 1975:1-2; Bradley 1975c:3; 1977d:1; Department of Information 1975:1; 1976b:1). The DI also offered to pay for these guests' travelling and hospitality expenses (Bradley 1975e:1).

Bradley was not alone in arranging these kinds of visits; in 1977, CESA's Dick Begbie arranged a similar tour for the representatives of the *English Churchman*, a British evangelical English newspaper which was also paid to publish a portion of CESA's *Church News* (CESA SM 1951:8; 1965:184; 1969:33). After it published an article critical of South Africa, Begbie invited the editor to 'ascertain the truth.' This trip was paid for by a congregant of CESA's Christ Church Blairgowrie (Begbie 1992:311-312). The *English Churchman* sent representatives who met with unnamed South African government officials, the Transkei Minister of Finance, Bradley, and a Namibian Bantustan leader—Peter Kalangula (Begbie 1992:312). It was the English Churchman representatives who facilitated the link between CESA and the Ovambo Independent Churches (Bradley 1979a:1; see par. 4.9.2).

4.7.3. Heads of State

Bradley's need to correct the facts was not only directed toward supporters of CESA and the media but he also gave (unsolicited) commentary on the political situation in South Africa to foreign leaders. A letter to the Prime Minister of Australia is such an example. After detailing his long history as a missionary, Bradley explained what he understood to be the role of Europeans in Africa, stating,

We employ African contractors and builders on all our constructions. One of the best of these remarked that "the Lord has been good to South Africa—He has given us whites who can think and organise and plan, but who cannot work, but he has given us Africans who can work but cannot organise and plan." This is, of course, a generalisation, but it is fairly accurate (Bradley 1973a:1).

⁶¹ See an example of Bradley's telegraph to the DI regarding Egan, he states 'The Rev Egan is the Governor of the Church and Nation Committee of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in New South Wales. This committee examines and makes recommendations regarding the Church's activities in connection with the so-called freedom movements and the Third World. He wishes to extend his understanding of policies and attitudes of various Church groups in South Africa' (1976d:1).

Regarding the historical role of the whites in South Africa, he argued Europeans found the vast portion of the country empty and where there were people, they were killing each other through tribal wars (Bradley 1973a:1). He added that colonisation was beneficial to the natives,

Today, three or four million whites have produced a stable, progressive nation with great benefit to themselves and African people. In 36 years, the situation has never been static, there has been development—guided development certainly—in the right direction. The Prime Minister himself has majored on a task of enabling the African people to train for and ascend to independence. I appeal to you Sir, to rethink your own attitude, and the attitude of your Government to the Government of South Africa (Bradley 1973a:2).

In a letter to Margrett Thatcher, regarding the granting of independence to Rhodesia, Bradley wrote, ‘To us, it appears to be essential that the present arrangement should remain, whereby security and law-and-order be directed by ‘whites.’ This is not racism; it is common sense’ (Bradley 1979a:1).⁶² Another letter to the Australian Prime Minister in 1980 expressed a desire to meet with him to discuss South African politics, intending to express ways in which the ‘... so-called “self-rule” has only brought grief in this continent’ (Bradley 1980b:1). Similar letters were sent to the heads of the state of Kenya, Rhodesia, and India.

4.8. **Australian Anglican Reaction**

The RICSA Report notes that faith communities had international partners who were ‘mobilised both to defend and to oppose apartheid’ (Cochrane *et al.* 1999:16). Contrary to the TRC submission claim of being completely cut from global Anglicanism (Cameron 2017:23), the Sydney Anglicans were CESA’s link to the Anglican Communion (Gill 1984:24; Hughes 1951:1,10). Together with Moore Theological College, hereafter ‘MTC,’ they stood by the apartheid state despite the global Anglican condemnation of racism.

⁶² It is unclear what the ‘us’ to which Bradley refers is.

4.8.1. **Anglican Church of Australia**

Shortly after the 1967 statements, the Primate of the Anglican Church in Australia, Archbishop Philip Strong, issued a statement distancing the Australian Anglican Church from Bradley. He stated, 'Bishop Bradley could speak only for himself and his small, self-constituted Church... Bishop Bradley's Church was in close contact with the Dutch Reformed Church, which views Black people as the servant race' (*Rand Daily Mail* 1967a:5). The press read Strong's statements to be implying that Bradley was banned from preaching in Australian Anglican parishes because of his views on apartheid, but Strong later corrected this view, stating that 'I only said that he was unlikely to preach in Brisbane' (*Reuters* in Begbie 1992:271; cf *ACR* 1967b:3).

Strong's statement concerned Bradley to the extent that Bradley sought a meeting with Archbishop Marcus Loane of the Anglican Diocese of Sydney; Loane reassured him that the press statements would not affect the diocese's support of CESA (Bradley 2003:148). Strong's statement was further softened; he wrote to Bradley and publicly issued an apology for the misunderstanding, adding that 'we have different views in regard to the policy prevailing in South Africa, I would say that Bradley has given many years to devoted Missionary Service in South Africa and his parents were pioneer missionaries in Palestine and Egypt' (*ACR* 1967a:3). Bradley interpreted this comment of irreconcilable views on apartheid but respect for his service as a sign of support from Strong (*CESA News* 1968a:7).

4.8.2. **Anglican Diocese of Sydney**

The Sydney Anglican diocese condemned racism in its public statements, but private letters reveal that it did not do so from a Biblical conviction that it was wrong but to avoid public embarrassment. CESA continued to receive support from the diocese while it knew and accepted its view on race was questionable, but publicly the diocese gave the impression of being against racism (Bradley 2003:149). Consider the following statement by Archbishop Marcus Loane published in *Southern Cross* in May 1968, decrying the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr, he averred, 'The race problems in the United States and South Africa, even in England, highlight the need for constant vigilance on such issues in our own country' (in Blanch 2015: 4013). In the same year, the Lambeth Conference issued Resolution 16 condemning racism and ecclesiastical segregation (Anglican Communion 2022b). Publicly, Sydney

Anglicans appeared concerned about the race problem in South Africa; privately, they were supportive of those who supported the apartheid government, namely CESA.

Similar incongruities can be seen on its 25th of June 1971 statement on Apartheid. It averred that,

One of the byproducts [sic] of historical Christianity has been an enlightened attitude towards the importance and dignity of individual persons. When Christianity has been ignored or overturned, as in the totalitarian regime of Adolf Hitler, one result has always been favouring one race over another or the attempt to breed a super-race at the expense of so-called weak persons. Christianity must always stand out against racial prejudice whatever form it takes.

Every individual person, black or white or yellow, has an equal importance in God's sight, and must have equal opportunities, equal freedom, and equal recourse to law, if the human race is to live together harmoniously. For this reason, it is stated unequivocally that the suppression of the majority race by a minority race, whichever is black or white, is contrary to the laws of God (Loane 1971:1).

However, this condemnation of apartheid was performative, it came because of questions from the media after the arrest of the Dean of Johannesburg, Gonville Aubrey French-Beytagh. He was charged under the Terrorism Act for allegedly possessing and distributing African National Congress and Communist Party pamphlets (Clarke 2008:259-261; Nichols 1971a:1; cf *The New York Times* 1971:11).

The Sydney diocese Public Relations officer, Alan Nichols, was the director of this performance. He stressed that the matter needed to be handled delicately, noting the complexities of the politics at play (Nichols 1971c:1). In a memorandum to Loan that accompanied the above statement, he stated that 'the diocese supports the CESA which supports "separate development" of races in South Africa.' He advised Loan against issuing a statement that would appear to contradict CESA's views on apartheid, further stating, 'On the other hand, it seems to be very awkward to remain completely silent about colour prejudice. Could a general statement be issued in your name which spoke out against colour prejudice (rather in the terms of the January letter in "*Southern Cross*" about totalitarianism) but did not intrude into the political policies of a sovereign state or comment on a particular case' (Nichols 1971a:1).

Nichols attached a reprint of the SACC's *A Message to the People of South Africa* published by the Australian Council of Churches as a reference (ACC 1968).

Publicly, the 1971 statement was general and vague enough to exonerate the Sydney Anglicans, even though it was not explicit about apartheid or South Africa and implied that the majority race (black) might have intentions to suppress the minority race (white); in so doing demonstrated underlying fears of the Afrikaner nationalists about being driven into the sea by blacks. However, the accompanying memorandum indicates it was issued under pretence. He was playing to the gallery of public opinion instead of standing up for what he considered a righteous cause.

A 2nd of February 1971 memorandum from Nichols to Loan shows the same duplicity. A CPSA Bishop, Edward Crowther, was due to arrive in Australia. He had been expelled from South Africa for his anti-apartheid activism. He was invited to Australia by the South Africa Defence and Aid Fund, part of a university student society called *Christian Action*. Crowther sought permission to preach at some churches in the Sydney diocese (ACR 1971:1). Nichols (1971b:1) advised that it would be scandalous to ignore his arrival. Instead, he thought it better to acknowledge it and permit him to preach at a single church, emphasising that 'I do not suggest that we endorse the reasons for his visit or his opinions' (*ibid*). Loane's handwritten reply to this request on the same memorandum expressed concerns about Crowther's association with the South Africa Defence and Aid Fund, and thus did not recommend that he preach in the diocesan cathedral (*ibid*).⁶³ On the hand, Nichols saw no contradiction between this above advice and authoring an article for the *Sun-Herald* about the same Crowther—praising his courageous stance against injustice but cautioning against activism that draws Christians to the streets in protest of apartheid (1971d:1-2).

4.8.3. Moore Theological College

The insensitivity of the diocese to the plight of black South Africans was causal to it being a target of violent apartheid protest. In 1972, the *Sydney Morning Herald*, reported that a tree had been petrol-bombed at Moore Theological College, hereafter 'MTC.'⁶⁴ The People's Liberation Army later admitted having planted the bomb

⁶³ In 1967, Bradley was allowed to preach at St. Andrews Anglican Cathedral, Sydney, on condition that he did not speak on apartheid—not because his views were held to be contrary to Scripture, but 'for fear of organised protests' (*Rand Daily Mail* 1967b:6).

⁶⁴ Moore Theological College is a training institution of the Anglican Diocese of Sydney (Moore Theological College:2021).

(Cameron 2006:222). 'Police believe the bombing was a protest against Dr Jacobus Vorster, the brother of the Prime Minister of South Africa, who is attending a conference at the college. The college received a message that a bomb was in the dining room at 6.50 pm on Tuesday, but police found nothing' (*Sydney Morning Herald* 1972). Vorster was also the moderator of the DRC and a friend of the Bradleys (Bradley 2003:126).

Anti-apartheid activists had campaigned— unsuccessfully—for the expulsion of Dr Vorster, a delegate of the Reformed Ecumenical Synod, hereafter 'RES,' from being hosted at MTC; the RES was dominated by the DRC in South Africa (Gill 1984:24).⁶⁵ Loane later argued that the venue was merely leased to the conference; it was not a sign that MTC, as an institution, supported apartheid (1984). However, this explanation is not satisfactory. Cameron points out that Knox was directly involved with the RES (2006:222).

Gauteng black clergy have called for an apology from the Anglican Dioceses of Sydney, MTC, and the renaming of the David Broughton Knox Centre—a library at GWC—because of their complicity in aiding CESA in its defence of apartheid (GBM 2020:21-22). Including MTC was born out of a post by a former student of Moore Theological College, Kevin Giles, who recalled, 'I first heard the "biblical" case for Apartheid at Moore College, Sydney, in the mid-sixties from the lips of Broughton Knox, the principal, and Donald Robinson, the vice-principal. Twice while I was in college, Stephen Bradley, the bishop of the breakaway Church of England in South Africa, spoke to us students in support of Apartheid at the invitation of Knox (2016).

This allegation is consistent with narratives from other sources. Broughton Knox and Donald Robinson, then Principal and Deputy Principal at MTC, had penned a joint statement in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, following criticism of Bradley's views in 1967. In this statement, they asserted that 'The personal views of Bradley on the subject of apartheid were to be respected as coming from an Australian evangelical Christian who has worked among all the classes in South Africa for 31 years' (in Gill 1983). MTC is also Bradley's *alma mater* (Knox 1959:8). Knox and Robinson's views on apartheid need to be outlined. These two are not chosen randomly. Williams (2020:78-84), Jensen (2012:119-121) and Edgar (2008:127-128) all argue that their influence on Sydney Anglicanism was significant.

⁶⁵ CESA was a member of the Reformed Ecumenical Synod until 1984 (CESA SM 1984:41).

4.8.4. David Broughton Knox (b1916-1994)

Contrary to Knox's biographer, Marcia Cameron's assertion that he 'neither promoted apartheid nor criticised it' (2006:308),⁶⁶ Knox accepted apartheid but criticised how it was applied. He argued that apartheid was biblically justifiable and had been consistent on this since 1957. He stated that the way it was practised in South Africa was contrary to the New Testament (Knox 1957:2; Cameron 2006:147). He even argued for a balanced critique of the 1957 'Church Clause', because it was difficult to assess the situation from Australia (*ibid*).

His clearest views can be seen in a radio presentation in 1978. He taught that separation was a result of sin from the Tower of Babel account in Genesis 11; and that God continues to use this separation to keep peace among the nations (Knox 1978:1-2). He condemned both the greed of whites and the jealousy of those calling for equalisation between races; he also refused to call apartheid evil (Knox 1978:3-4; Jensen 2012:120). He believed Christians should not condemn the policy of geographical separateness, but should condemn how it is applied. He also stated that the deprivation of a right to vote should not be seen as an injustice that warrants condemnation (Knox 1978:4; cf *ACR 1968:6*).

In another radio programme in 1981, he taught that apartheid was an essential separation for good neighbourliness, stating that this separation will not be necessary eschatologically but because of sin in this world 'God has separated the nations giving each its territory. This is taught in the Bible (e.g., Acts 17:26)' (1981:1). Using the example of the aboriginals of Australia, he exhorted whites to apply apartheid generously, to give 'blacks fertile land in proportion to their numbers together with gold mines and diamond mines and other natural resources' (*ibid*; cf *ACR 1968:6*). Similar sentiments about the necessity of separation to encourage good relations between racial groups were the objectives of the apartheid government and supported by the DRC (de Gruchy and de Gruchy 2005:1163). John Thew also shared similar views on an opinion piece in the *Societas*, a Moore Theological College student magazine (1971:71).

Knox also held that the yearning for social justice was a humanistic invention that sprung from anger and envy, not gospel-inspired-generosity (Knox 1980:43; cf

⁶⁶ Cameron contradicts herself on assessment of Knox on this issue (2006:222-223).

Jensen 2012:119-120). To illustrate, he argued that compassion, not justice, sustained William Wilberforce's efforts to end slavery (Knox 2006:164). Moreover, Jesus refused to act on matters of social justice, using the examples of Martha, who complained about the unequal amount of housework and a man who came to Jesus to complain about being cheated from his portion of an inheritance; Knox pointed out that it was the complainers who were corrected, not the wrongdoers (2006:165).

These views are consistent with Knox's ethical framework described in his book *Not by Bread Alone* (1989), where he states that 'The Christian life is very simple. It is to live in the circumstances God has put us in a Christian way, keeping the commandments of God' (1989:41). The demands of social justice activists, according to Knox, were going to be met at the eschaton (Knox 1980:42; Luke 10:38-42 and 12:13-14.).

Therefore, under Knox's framework, the demand for an end to apartheid was unjustifiable for two reasons; first, apartheid was ordained by God. Second, Christians were called to accept the circumstances God had providentially put them. They were breaking the command against envy and displaying impatience in their protests for equalisation. His view was that the Afrikaner people, like the white Australians, were called to administer apartheid justly by not being greedy in their supervision of the black people. According to Knox's logic, faithful black Christians patiently and obediently wait on the benevolence of the whites and the return of Christ. The Kairos Theologians criticised this 'State Theology' advocated by Knox as one that 'blesses injustice, canonise the will of the powerful and reduce the poor to passivity, obedience and apathy' in the face of dehumanising injustice (in TRC Report Vol. 4 1998:69).

This approach to change was tried by the Christian Institute and abandoned in 1972 because it was found wanting due to its ineffectiveness (de Gruchy 2005:1519). The Institute found that the path to ending Apartheid was not through '... education and moral appeals directed at the privileged' but the education of the black populous and the relinquishing control to black leaders (de Gruchy 2005:1526-1529). Knox's view, which was not dissimilar to the apartheid governments and CESAs, did not consider that the black people had been waiting three centuries for their rights. To chastise them for demanding justice demonstrated a gross disregard for their present suffering and unethical historicization.

Apart from the hermeneutical flaws in Knox's argument, which ignored Paul's assertion of his rights as a Roman citizen to avoid being dealt with unjustly,⁶⁷ and the account of the underprivileged Hellenistic Jews who complained that they were overlooked in the distribution of food .⁶⁸ It ignored that Jesus' disposition was towards the oppressed, not the oppressors⁶⁹. His argument is also historically unsound; it presupposes that the (rights) land whites were to administer justly was theirs to give or withhold. It took no account of the unjust dispossession of the natives' rights.

Knox's influence on CESA is significant—as evidenced by Andre Visagie's article on CESA's website advocating for compassion and not social justice (Visagie 2016).⁷⁰ Cameron also argues that his most enduring influence on CESA is its theological college and its 1992 Prayer Book (2006:323-325). Knox conceived and became the first principal of CESA's GWC in 1989 (George Whitefield College 2021; Knox 1986b:1-2; CESA SM 1987:12). He wrote critical sections of the current CESA Prayer Book, he exemplified and taught Anglican liturgy at GWC (Cameron 2006:310).

The researcher hereto disagrees with the black ministers of the Cape Area Council who are keen to preserve Knox's name; it is insensitive to honour men like Knox in the South African context, though his contribution may be significant. Honouring him in a country where his type of thinking caused considerable damage to Africans is not morally defensible (*contra* CABM 2020:28).

4.8.5. Donald Robinson (b 1922-2018)

There is an indication that Robinson's views on apartheid aligned with CESA's and were informed by the DRC (and the state). In 1968, he authored a book review where recommended W. A. Landman's *A Plea for Understanding* (1968) in the *Australian Church Record* (Robinson 1968:7). This book was a response to the critique of the 1967 General Synod of the Reformed Church of America statement 'deprecating the apartheid policy of South Africa and the support of churches for that policy' (*ibid*). Landman, the Synod Secretary and Director of the Information Bureau for the DRC,

⁶⁷ Acts 16:37-38 and Acts 22:25-28.

⁶⁸ Acts 6:1-7.

⁶⁹ Luke 4:18.

⁷⁰ This argument has also been used by CESA white clergy to argue against black clergy who are calling for structural changes in the denomination, a reassessment of the federal structure to a more diocesan structure typical of the Anglican Communion, they have argued that historically privileged churches should show compassion on previously disadvantaged churches—who are calling for a more just distribution of resources.

advocated for 'the creation of separate, independent and self-respecting communities free from the more serious frictions that are bound to arise under any policy of attempted forceful integration' (in Robinson 1968:7). This book contained chapters from government officials (such as Hendrik F Verwoerd), DRC academics, jurists, and business executives. Robinson recommended this book as it 'presents a very good case for South Africa' (Robinson 1968:7).

When he visited South Africa in 1975, he met with leaders of the DRC, CPISA, CESA, and Beyers Naude; his views about separate development had not changed from those expressed by Landman above. In a letter to a friend after the trip, he reported,

Despite freely expressed complaints of inequalities of various kinds; the blacks, Indians, and coloureds whom I met were all surprisingly optimistic about the future. Though none of them would endorse the policy of separate development as such, and all would like direct representation in the Government of the Republic, all whom I met are co-operating cheerfully in the actual programmes of separate development and see them as more or less open-ended. Clearly, most people expect both coloureds and Indians to line up with the white community, and meantime many in these groups genuinely appreciate the degree of independence their various representative councils make possible. I found no support either at all for the idea that outside pressure on South Africa either by trade sanction or support of the liberation movements, was in the interest of better conditions in South Africa. The blacks and Indians in particular, whom I spoke to regarding this policy based on ignorance by outsiders, and in the case of liberation movements coming from other African countries as political immaturity (Robinson 1975:1-2).

The government chaperones had succeeded in presenting a 'softer side of apartheid' to Robinson, with non-whites who were cheerfully accepting it. The non-whites that Robinson spoke with personified the Knoxian faithful. They were optimistic about the future. They may not have enjoyed equal rights to the whites, but appreciated the representation granted to them by their benevolent white overlords. The assessments of these people were regarded as more authoritative than the exiled and imprisoned freedom fighters who had rejected separate development (de Gruchy 2005:1519). Ironically, the Christian Institute was assessed to have 'overplayed its hand' (Robinson 1975:1). It was not afforded the same respect as Bradley in 1967 despite its decades of work in South Africa.

After Robinson became the Archbishop of the Sydney Anglican Diocese, his support of CESA was consequential. First, questions were raised during his election about his support for CESA, which supported apartheid (not separate development). Robinson replied that his 'interest in the CESA is a personal one, which goes back more than 40 years. One has nothing to do with the particular views of Bishop Bradley, just as I am totally unaware of how far Bishop Bradley's views may be shared by the Church of which he is a bishop' (in Gill 1982). The views which were understood to be of CESA in 1972 were now restricted to Bradley. This attempt to separate the views of Bradley from the denomination was also contrary to his 1967 press statement. At this moment, Bradley's experience was no longer to be respected but disregarded for no reason other than the fact that its affirmation would have been unpopular. Karn (2015:234) refers to this as the 'parenthesis theory,' the disassociation of the leader from the organisation she leads to avoid associated culpability (cf Gill 1984:24). Conveniently, this disassociation was only applied to actions perceived in a negative light. His support for CESA led outsiders to perceive him as a racist. Second, his letter to the Registrar of CESA recalled difficulties in obtaining a travel visa to Nigeria because its government perceived him as 'an unreconstructed racist and a supporter of CESA!!' (Robinson 1987:2).

4.8.6. Let Down from Down Under

This is a further sign that the leadership of the Sydney Anglicans was playing a public relations game on a grave matter for black South Africans. Sydney Anglicans functioned as enablers to CESA. As their only link to the Anglican Communion, they failed to move their white cousins towards a more Anglican ethos on race and failed black Evangelical Anglicans in CESA. As fellow Evangelicals—they were not as enthused about fighting for the plight of black Anglicans (and by extension, black South Africans) as they were in advocating for the rights of Evangelical Anglicans to exist unencumbered by the perceived yoke of Tractarianism. Therefore, the researcher concurs with the Gauteng black ministers in CESA; if Sydney Anglicans are to enjoy unbitter fellowship with them—an apology from the diocese is in order (GBM 2020:22).

4.9. CESA: A Right-Wing Christian Group

CESA submission argues that 'in the wider Anglican Communion, we have been stigmatised as a recalcitrant, schematic group of unreasonable right-wing evangelicals' (Cameron 2017:22). Hebert Hammond (in Cameron 2006:309) also asserted that 'CESA has sometimes been castigated as being too right-wing and too political.' The TRC Report (Vol 4 1999:70) states that 'this term refers to a number of groups that espoused extreme conservative politics and justified them with Christian symbols. They were strongly anti-Communist.' CESA held this view to be an unfair criticism of its protectionist theological position, which it alleged was merely apolitical (Cameron 2006:309; Cameron 2017:22).

However, the discussion below will demonstrate that this assessment is founded. The type of corporation provided to the DI points to CESA's involvement in behaviour characteristic of organisations associated with *Muldergate*: an information scandal born out of a scheme established by the Department of Information, headed by Minister Dr Petrus Cornelius Mulder, after whom the scandal is named, during Vorster's administration in the late seventies. This scheme was designed to 'influence public opinion by presenting a softer image of apartheid' to the international community (Knight 1989:2 in Arendse 1999:91)

Between 1974 and 1979, it is estimated that 73 million US dollars from the Department of Defence were used, without parliamentary knowledge, to establish and fund organisations to counter the propaganda against the state (Murphy 1979; cf *Time Magazine* 1979:42-43; Giffard et al. 1984:230). The DI sought to undermine the SACC and WCC⁷¹ by funding Right-Wing Christian Groups, hereafter 'RWCG,' as well as *The Citizen* newspaper as part of its counter-revolutionary strategy (Arendse 1999:91-93; 1988:120-122; cf Bankston 2009:543; cf TRC Report Vol. 4 1998:70; cf Scarborough 2016; cf TEASA 1999:2-3). Vorster held that this was 'in the highest national interest ... to assist in a delicate and unconventional way in combating the total onslaught against South Africa. The purpose was to withstand the subversion of our country's good image and stability' (Murphy 1979). Mulder concurred with Vorster, stating that the use of state funds was essential because 'when the survival of South Africa is at stake, rules don't apply' (*ibid*). According to Les de Villiers, a government official in charge of the project was to call a 'Masterplan for bribery, deceit and

⁷¹ The South African Council of Churches and World Council of Churches respectively.

infiltration in the media, political circles, churches, labor unions, publishing houses, and every other possible avenue of influence peddling' (in Giffard 1984:37-38).

The above historical data could be interpreted to indicate the right-wing propagation of state theology before 1974. The researcher hereto adds that the link with Mulder and officials of the DI is much more explicit. Like the 1954 *Political Bishops* letter to Verwoerd, CESA seems to have initiated a relationship directly with Mulder.

The earliest available correspondence in the archives is a letter from Mulder thanking Bradley for his 'Pro-S.A. letter' to the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Australia (Mulder 1974:1). To Mulder's surprise and appreciation, he had been sent the draft of this letter for his comments before its postage (*ibid*). Mulder further states, 'In your letter to the Australian Foreign Affairs, you refer to your letter being *'the voice crying out in the wilderness.'* I can assure you that every bit helps. If we all abstain from trying to put South Africa's case to the outside world just because we think that we are the only ones doing it, we wouldn't get any further' (*ibid*).

Mulder's analysis is pointed. Bradley took it upon himself to be the South African voice in the Australian print media. He sent letters to the *Australian Church Record*, the *Mercury*, *The Torchbearer*, *Sydney Morning Herald*, and the *Canberra Times*, all with similar themes and logic: 1) an appraisal of settler-colonisers as liberators and civilisers in Southern Africa, 2) the praising of separate development and cautions against the settler and native integration if peace was desired, 3) criticism of the UN and/or OAU 4) criticism of the Australian government for voting for UN resolutions critical of apartheid and colonial rule in Africa and 5) imploring the Australian government to give separate development a chance (Bradley 1974b:1-2; 1974a:1; 1974c:2; 1975a:1; 1975b:1-2; 1975c:1).⁷²

Another letter from Mulder to Bradley in 1975 indicates that his efforts were appreciated. It states,

Thank you very much for your letter of April 28. It was brought to my attention when I returned from an overseas trip. I am very glad to see that all the trouble that you went to put South Africa's case in Australia, did bear some fruit. I must congratulate you on the success you had. I appreciate that you have kept me informed. Thank you very much.

⁷² It is difficult to ascertain if these letters were ever published, however, the CESA archives contains one—titled *Bishop Defends South African Government* published by the *Canberra Times* (Bradley 1975f:2).

PS: the facts you used in your letter to the press are not only correct, but so logical that no objective person could doubt the intentions of the S. A. people and government. Thank you once more (Mulder 1975b:1).

This indicates that CESA's historical *praxis* and theology should be viewed with similar lenses as the DRC, which admitted to receiving funds from the DI to spread state propaganda (Thesnaar 2013:389). Again, CESA did not need to be co-opted by this department; it was already engaged in such behaviour from as early as 1955 with a Synodical mandate from 1947.

Crisis News (1988:2), Hale (1992:517-525) and Arendse (1999:90) came to similar findings.⁷³ They identified five characteristics of RWCGs: antagonistic dualism, fanatical anti-communism, sacralised capitalism, legitimisation of state militarism, and limited social ethics (Arendse 1989:99-104; *Crisis News* 1989:2-4).⁷⁴ CESA does not fit neatly into these categories, but there was significant alignment.

4.9.1. **Militant Activists of State Theology**⁷⁵

Some of its leaders, clergy, archived material, and theological pronouncements indicate the propagation of state theology espoused by similar RWCGs. There is evidence of direct and indirect involvement in the organisations such as the Christian League of Southern Africa, Gospel Defence League, United Christian Action, Christian Action Africa, and Protestant Association of South Africa (Arendse 1999:94; Stephenson 1979:11; Walshe 1997:390).⁷⁶ One of the Gospel Defence League founders, hereafter 'GDL,' was Peter Beyerhaus—whose writings CESA relied upon to critique the *Kairos Document* (Ive 1998:2; cf Arendse 1988:123-124; cf *Crisis News* 1988:2-3).

RWCGs were committed to fighting communism, humanism, and black liberation theology (TRC Report Vol. 4 1998:70). The leaders of these organisations

⁷³ This was a news bulletin by the Western Province Council of Churches which was Associated with the South African Council of Churches (*Crisis News* 1986:4).

⁷⁴ CESA was directly named by *Crisis News* as a RWCG, it held the accusation to be offensive and defamatory, it submitted its 1986 (to be discussed in the next chapter) statement on racism to disprove this allegation (Hofmeyr 1989b:1-2).

⁷⁵ The term State Theology is used to refer to churches who uncritically embraced state propaganda and aided the state in fulfilling its ends (Kairos Theologians 1986:49-54). The researcher asserts that the classification of an institution as a RWCG *ipso facto* means it should be understood as having embraced State Theology as defined by the Kairos Document.

⁷⁶ Rev Jeffrey James (Chairman of PASA) was offended by the mention of the Protestant Association of South Africa in a list of RWCGs. *Crisis News* replied and argued that James was right wing by virtue of his close association with the GDL and his critique of the Kairos Document (*Crisis News* 1989:1-3).

were also involved with the state-sponsored right-wing magazine—*Vox Africana* (GDL 2020). Balcomb (2004:12) asserts that one of CESA's churches, St. James Kenilworth, was directly involved with United Christian Action '... an umbrella for fourteen organisations widely believed to constitute the extreme right-wing of the South African church' (cf Hale 1992:330-331; Taylor and Francis 1991:191; *Crisis News* 1988:2). Gordon Mills was the founder of the Protestant Association of South Africa, an organisation classified as a RWCG by Francis and Taylor (Bradley 1998c:3; Francis and Taylor 1991:91; *Crisis News* 1988:7).

The 1988 visit to Washington highlighted in the introduction to this chapter was not without precedent. Bradley, along with Moolman and Shabangu of the DRC, Rev Trevor Swart of the Baptist Union of Southern Africa, and the Bishop Isaac Mokoena of the Reformed Independent Church Association in South Africa, willingly availed themselves to assist the government in countering propaganda against apartheid in 1983. Bradley wrote,

That evening we had a working dinner with the director of the public relations firm and his staff and were given a diary of the meetings that would keep us busy for the next two weeks, together with the thumbnail sketch of the people we would meet. There would be twenty-two meetings with members of parliament, newspaper editors, radiomen, diplomats, and the pastor of the church EKD (Evangelical Church of Germany). Beginning in Bonn, we went to Cologne, Bielefeld, Hamburg, Munich, Hanover, Frankfurt and Königstein (2003:184).

Bradley added that they were not briefed before this trip and were urged to speak freely (*ibid*). It is unreasonable to expect the reader to be convinced that this campaign, paid for, organised by the state, and curated by a paid public relations firm, would be anything but self-serving for the apartheid government. This group was deliberately chosen because the government knew that they would be helpful (and, to the least, not damage the state's reputation). All these men, who belonged to denominations that were not part of the SACC, were chosen to advance state theology (Walshe 1997:389; *Crisis News* 1988:4; Hale 2006:772-773). Mokoena was notorious in the USA for discrediting Desmond Tutu, Trevor Huddleston, the liberation movement, and speaking out against economic sanctions on South Africa; logically, he continued to do this during this visit (Richard 1989:27-28). CESA's Executive minutes indicate that these visits were beneficial for the church; the contacts created therein were also used to solicit donations for training clergy (CESA EM 1983:4).

4.9.2. Pro-Government Denominations

CESA used its pro-establishment stance for denominational gain. Anthony Ive's twentieth chapter in *A Candle Burns in Africa* (1992), named Cross Border Outreach, records the church's exploitation of political differences in neighbouring countries to extend its reach.

4.9.2.1. CESA-Namibia

It established CESA in Namibia — with a South African backed political leader who was the Minister of Education in Ovamboland, a member of the Democratic Turnhalle Alliance—Peter Kalangula (Herbstein and Evenson 1989:109; cf Arendse 1999:95; cf Begbie 1992:290; cf Francis and Taylor 1991:92-93). Kalangula was a leader of approximately 13 000 African Anglicans who broke away from the CPSA in 1970 because of political differences with Bishop Colin Winter. The South African government exiled Winter for his anti-apartheid activism and accusations of being 'pro-terrorists and pro-SWAPO' (Bell and Hofmeyr 1978:1, 4; cf Ive 1992:223; Chipenda 1991:51).

The link with the Ovambo Mission Churches (Anglican), hereafter 'OMC,' appears to have been welcomed by the South African government. It arranged travel and accommodation for Ken Terhoven during its exploratory phase (Terhoven 1978:1-3)⁷⁷. The foundation for CESA and OMC's relationship was not evangelical opposition to Tractarianism; Terhoven (1978:2-3), Bell and Hofmeyr (1978), and Bradley (1981) all noted the need to train OMC leaders on evangelical Anglicanism. Bradley (1981) drafted a forty-page teaching manual for aspirant deacons to respond to this need. Terhoven even doubted its leader's (Kalangula) faith because he could not remember his conversion experience (1978:2). A noteworthy similarity between CESA and OMC was that they were both anti-SWAPO (cf Katenda 2019:13). Furthermore, CESA supported the occupation of Namibia, for it resulted in significant economic development in that country and halted the red wave from infiltrating South Africa (Bradley 1984e:1-2).

⁷⁷ Rev Ken Terhoven (c1978:1-3) reported on a trip to Namibia accompanying government officials, he also participated in meetings between the South African diplomats, Namibians, and United Nations delegates. Bradley also states that 'Last week I took Bishop Foord with me to Ovambo...We stayed *as usual* at the Government Guest House in Oshakati' (1984d, emphasis added). Oshakati was and still is a town in northern Namibia.

4.9.2.2. CESA-Zimbabwe

It established another division of CESA in Zimbabwe in 1968 from a splinter group of twenty white members from the Church of the Province of Central Africa (hereafter 'CPCA'). It insisted that this breakaway was motivated by a desire for theological purity and not politics (*Church News* 1968b:10-11). However, there were signs of government (at least government officials) support for CESA in Zimbabwe; a 1966 memorandum from Bradley to the Executive states, 'A request from Rhodesia: would we consider expansion in that direction if we are offered a measure of financial and other support from certain Government circles there? This is still decidedly exploratory, but I am sure that if we show any interest at all, there will be an immediate response' (Bradley 1966d:1, emphasis in the original). When Begbie visited Rhodesia in 1967, he was informed that the splinter group disagreed about two things in the CPCA: ritualism and the 'strong political attitude adapted by many CPCA clergy' (Ive 1992:218-219). This group was first led by a retired Royal Marines Major, Bryan Elvy, and later led by David Peterson, a senior government official (Bradley 1984a:3 of 5; Ive 1992:218-222).

4.9.3. Ecumenical Movements

CESA mentioned nothing about its views of the ecumenical movements to the TRC. The researcher submits that this avoided questions about its opposition to ecumenical bodies such as the SACC and the African Enterprise. Doing so would have questioned its claims of isolationism and the lack of progressive theologians. The cause may be that some within CESA perceived the ecumenical movements as a second Bebel infiltrated by Marxists (Begbie 1981:31-32). Nevertheless, the denomination was open to some partnerships.

It took part in the 1966 World Congress on Evangelism in Berlin. Unsurprisingly, Bradley's report emphasised evangelism more than the other aspects of the conference slogan 'One Gospel, One Race and One Task' (*Church News* 1967:2-7). He (and Murray Hofmeyr) also attended the 1974 Lausanne Congress, again emphasising the need for evangelism in his report and not the discussions on the intersection between evangelism and social action— especially John Stott's significant departure from the Berlin covenant (Bradley 2003:155-157; Woodhouse 1988:16-18; CESA EM 1974:4). In South Africa, it was courted by African Enterprise,

but CESA's narrow view of evangelism (without social concerns) strained those relationships (Tooke 1975:1; cf 2010:5).

It was anti-progressive ecumenicalism. Despite Ive's claims of political tolerance within CESA, associations that spoke out against apartheid were unacceptable or kept at arms-length (1992:229). For instance, Bradley described a Lausanne Congress follow-up meeting organised by the African Enterprise, which discussed the social implications of the gospel as filled with 'political diatribes that (to my mind) have nothing whatsoever to do with the Gospel' (1975d:1). This meeting was attended by Bradley, Frank Retief, Ken Terhoven, Joseph Bell, and Noel Wright.⁷⁸

Peter Hammond's eulogy of Bradley states that he had the phrase '*In no way affiliated to the World Council of Churches* printed on every CESA bulletin, pamphlet and letterhead' (Hammond 2003; cf GBM 2020:5). This was in line with a 1979 decision stating,

The Church of England in South Africa has never been a member of the World Council of Churches or the South African Council of Churches. It deplores every kind of injustice, all racism, and all discrimination on the grounds of colour, in South Africa and anywhere else. It deplores equally the violence of terrorists which the WCC and SACC seem to condone, as well as the pronounced tendency of both these bodies to intervene in matters which are not the chief concern of the Church (in Ive 1992:193-194).⁷⁹

This statement formed the basis for the 1985 Synod resolution condemning violence from both sides. Interestingly, CESA quoted the 1985 statement to the TRC and presented it as if it had always been the denomination's stance from 1985 but excluded that its earlier version criticised the WCC and the SACC explicitly for their prophetic stance on apartheid (compare Bell 1997a:2).

4.9.4. **Dick Begbie (RWCG Leader)**

- *A Brief Biography*

Dick Begbie is noteworthy. His involvement with CESA dates to 1958, when he came from London and became a member of Christ Church Hillbrow (Begbie 1992:238).

⁷⁸ Frank Retief, Joseph Bell, and Noel Wright were still actively involved as members of the National Executive Committee when the TRC submission was drafted. Bell was the Presiding Bishop, Retief and Wright appeared before the commission on behalf of CESA.

⁷⁹ In 1974, Synod had resolved that 'the World Council of Churches must be rejected by all Christians until it can establish that it neither morally or financially subsidizes violence, terrorism or revolution in Africa or elsewhere' (*Church News* 1974:7).

Soon, he was licenced as a Lay Reader and preached at various churches along the Reef (modern day province of Gauteng). In 1969 (without evidence of theological training), he was ordained by Bradley as a presbyter (Begbie 1992:353).

He planted five CESA churches; Christ Church Blairgowrie, Holy Trinity Church Scottburgh, St John's Church Maclear and St Philip's Church George. Between 1970 and 1992, he also held rectorships at Holy Trinity Church Cape Town, Hogsback Evangelical Church,⁸⁰ Christ Church Hillbrow and helped to start CESA in Zimbabwe and Namibia (Begbie 1992:243-245, 290, 312; 1981:1; 1985:126; Ive 1976b:7; Bradley 1998d:62). In addition, Begbie served in the British Royal Engineers during WWII and for twelve years as a Chaplain in the SADF—where he was awarded the *Pro Patria* medal for his tours in Namibia and Angola (Begbie 1992:353-354).

- *Christian Dominion*

CESA's TRC statement states, 'until the early '70s, our largely white leadership and I am sure, all too many of our white Church members, being children of their culture, no doubt practised some form of discrimination either in action or attitude' (Cameron 2017:29). Begbie's *Freedom Under Authority* (1981) and *Christianity and the Military Service in the Context of Southern Africa* (1980) undermine this claim. They point to the propagation of white supremacist attitudes well into the early eighties. In his memoir, Begbie states that *Freedom Under Authority* (1981) was an attempt '... to show how democracy ought to be remodelled on [biblical] principles to ensure that power remained on godly and responsible hands' (1992:311). The RICSA Report called this the 'Christian alternative' (in Cochrane *et al.* 1999:16).

Bradley's views about apartheid in South Africa are comparable to Dick Begbie's—whose book Bradley endorsed.⁸¹ However, Begbie was much more incisive in defending his views than Mills (1958) and Bradley. He (1992:311) states that his public theology in *Freedom Under Authority* (1981) was influenced by the founder of American reconstructionism—Dr Rousas John Rushdoony, whom McVicar described as 'the Ayatollah of the religious right' (2015:213; cf Worthen 2008:400-401). Rushdoony held that Christians had a creation mandate to subdue all things

⁸⁰ This was a CPSA church, Begbie was granted a general license by Bishop Bill Barnett, with permission from Bradley, to work in a CPSA church that would only accept an evangelical priest (Begbie 1992:302).

⁸¹ The concept of a Christian nation under white stewardship echoes Colenso and Shepstone's 1855 to 1861 vision of a 'Black Kingdom' in Natal (Etherington 2019:4-6, 12-13). It will not be discussed in this project because it falls outside the parameters of the research.

and bring them under the lordship of Christ; this meant the replacement of secular government with Christ's viceregents and the replacement of democratic laws with strict observance of the Bible to reverse the impact of the fall (McVicar 2015:5-11; cf Worthen 2008:405).

Begbie's book was widely circulated within CESA and South Africa. The researcher found copies at Christ Church Blairgowrie, St Paul's Pretoria, CESA's archives at William Cullen Library, National Library of South Africa (Pretoria) and Broughton Knox Library at GWC. Copies were also sent to every Member of Parliament and the State President (Begbie 1992:311). Bradley's (Begbie 1981:2) endorsement of this book, to the least, suggests that his views were not so scandalous within CESA that the Presiding Bishop would distance himself from it.

- *Christian League of Southern Africa and Gospel Defence League*

Freedom Under Authority (1981) and RWCG's ideology were aligned: their opposition to humanism, naturalism, Marxism, and ecumenicalism were also shared by CESA. More explicitly, Begbie (1992:307; 1981:3) acknowledged his involvement in the leadership of the Christian League of Southern Africa, hereafter 'CLSA' and a longstanding friendship with Mrs Dorothea Scarborough—the editor of *Vox Africana* who was also involved with CLSA. *Christianity and the Military Service in the Context of Southern Africa* (1980) was published by the CLSA. CLSA's chairperson, Fred Shaw of the Methodist Church, was fingered by the Department of Information's Secretary, Dr Eschel Rhodie, as a recipient of some *Muldergate* government funds (Stephenson 1979:11). Begbie acknowledged that when the media brought to light that the CLSA was a state-sponsored front for the government, he and Mrs Scarborough resigned (Begbie 1992:307). However, they still saw the need for an organisation like the CLSA. He stated that 'we were both convinced that there was a crying need for an inter-denominational fellowship which would stand to defend the Gospel in a far more militant way than churches which adhered to Evangelical Christianity were doing. So, we founded the Gospel Defence League, which Mrs Scarborough became the spokeswoman through the monthly circular letters which she began to write' (*ibid*).⁸²

⁸² CESA depended on the analysis provided by GDL to critique the South African Law Commission's Working Paper, called Project 58: Group and Human Rights, where it decried newfound obsession with human rights as 'a new gospel of salvation' (Hofmeyr 1989a).

4.9.5. **Begbie's State Theology (endorsed by CESA)**

Dick Begbie's anthropology, right-wing political views, Rhushdonian influence, and the hermeneutical framework articulated in his books deserve a much more detailed critique beyond this study. Nevertheless, the following points are noteworthy, for CESA shared them.

- *Limited Suffrage*

In Begbie's Christian dominion or theocracy, he held that the right to vote should be limited. He advocated for the limitations based on personal, spiritual, and cultural development— not race (1981:79-80). Reasoning that only adults—ideally 30-years old or to the least 25-years old, and mature believers should be entrusted with this responsibility, stating. Stating that 'the vote should only be exercised by people who have reached an age at which they have some knowledge of Scripture and the world' (Begbie 1981:80; cf Mills 1958a:2). Even when the right was conferred, those who demonstrated personal growth (through age and worldly experience) and God-given abilities would be afforded more votes than the immature and unbelievers (Begbie 1981:81).

- *On Blacks and Whites' Abilities*

Second, Begbie dismissed the maxim 'all men are created equal' as a humanistic invention (*ibid*; 1980:12). He argued that equality was regarding sinfulness, not natural abilities (1980:12). Adding that 'as far as mankind is concerned, we are given different and unequal physiques, intelligences, and abilities' (*ibid*). He argued that recognising differences between nationalities and races was not racist but an acknowledgement of facts; failure to do so was irrational and a rebellion against God who created such differences (1981:59).

Begbie held that abilities were allotted disproportionately in favour of Europeans. He argued that whites were innovative, ingenious, and much better at applying knowledge to solve practical problems than blacks, whereas blacks were ideally suited for manual work as per their rationalising abilities (Begbie 1981:90-92). For 'powers of reasoning seem to be limited to only a very few men of colour. Those with experience of black men in Africa testify to the same characteristics' (1981:61;

cf Bradley 1973a:2). Similarly to Mills, he held that entrusting blacks with complex government tasks would be irresponsible because no black man had proven themselves able to manage industry, farms, and sophisticated government as capably as whites (Begbie 1981:60-61, 107-108; cf Mills 1958a:2).

- *On Apartheid*

Begbie held that racism was inherent in all people because of the fall; although he conceded that this was undesirable, he argued that the hope for a non-racial society advocated by liberals would occur at the eschaton (1980:12-13). He posited that the only path for a peaceful co-existence of races in South Africa was the separate and fair development system currently implemented by the apartheid government's policy of separate development (1980:13; 1981:59-60,90). This meant separate education systems, prohibition of inter-racial marriages and interactions of different races (Begbie 1981:91-92; cf Bradley 1973a:1-2). He conceded that it seemed unfair that three-quarters of land was held by whites, but argued that such stewardship was a temporary necessity for the sake of food security (Begbie 1981:92).

4.9.6. **Begbie's Theology was CESA's Praxis**

What is remarkable is not that Bradley endorsed Begbie's book, but that the ideas in it were found in CESA long before its publication. The separate development policy of the state was mirrored in the existence of CESA and the Mission Church of CESA. Begbie's idea of limited voting rights for blacks was practised in black churches' eight votes despite being the majority in the denomination (Hammond 1978:1). Begbie's ideal of more votes for the spiritually mature was echoed in Hammond's aspirant comments about conferring more votes to senior clergy at CESA's Synod and Bradley's assessment about being 'too early to extend the franchise to [African] people' (Hammond 1978:2; Bradley 1984c:1). His denigration of the rationality of blacks was evident in the paternalistic relationship between CESA and the Mission Church, where blacks were treated like children who were not yet ready for independence. As Bradley stated in a letter to the Australian Prime Minister about the mission work, 'our business is to produce an African middle class that can provide the thinking and initiative traditionally been left to the whites' (1973b:2). This perception was common within CESA (Terhoven 1978:2).

4.9.7. Legitimation of State Militarism

RWCGs believed in the necessity of the South African Defence Force and South African Police, hereafter 'SADF' and 'SAP,' respectively; therefore, they supported them uncritically (*Crisis News* 1988:8).⁸³ Begbie's *Christianity and the Military Service in the Context of Southern Africa* (1980) was the most comprehensive defence of state militarism by a CESA clergyman.⁸⁴ It dealt with the biblical objections against taking up arms—arguing for self-defence. In addition, it indicated opposition to communism and a desire to maintain whites' economic and political position. This led him to view SADF as a godly instrument of good carrying out a holy and just war against terrorism (Begbie 1980:8-11; cf Arendse 1988:125-126; cf *Crisis News* 1988:8).

- *For God and Country*

Like the Christian crusaders of the twelfth century, the SADF was viewed as God's hand whose actions were commended even by CESA's Synod (CESA SM 1966:8; *contra* Gill 1984:24). Using force in Namibia, Angola and Mozambique was understood to be comparable to the good works of a Samaritan in defence of the helpless against communist terrorists (Begbie 1980:16-17; cf *Crisis News* 1988:8-9). Communism was perceived as an imminent threat to Christianity; Bradley's financial appeal in the *English Churchman* on behalf of the Evangelicals in Damaraland (Namibia) emphasised that the liberation movement was anti-Christian. He stated that 'Both in Rhodesia and S. West Africa, the Communists, have given notice if they take over then no more Christianity will be permitted' (Bradley 1978:2).⁸⁵

- *For God and Purse*

The violent actions of the liberation movements were not perceived to be motivated by a holy and just cause but by a lust for power and envy of the economic and political position of whites, so taking arms against them was justifiable because 'Scripture clearly condemns force to satisfy lust and envy' (Begbie 1980:9). Conveniently, he ignored the lust evident in the economic and political discrimination against blacks in

⁸³ This is another the reason the researcher would place CESA under State Theology of the Kairos Theologians' categorization because of its belief in the supremacy of law and order above compassion (1986:51-52).

⁸⁴ Begbie's book was published by the Christian League of Southern Africa.

⁸⁵ Bradley's letter to the editor was edited to remove allegations against the UN, it read, 'Both in Rhodesia and S.W.A., the Communists, backed by the United Nations Organisation ...' (1978b:1).

South Africa. The biblical injunctions to love your enemies, show compassion, and forgive were discarded when it came to communists (Begbie 1980:4-6; cf Arendse 1988:126).

- *For God and Peace*

Begbie also argued that the peacemakers were blessed in the New Testament, ‘not blessed are pacifists’ (1981:105). He called those who discouraged military service treasonous and ‘deserving restraint by the Law’ (Begbie 1981:108; cf George Whitefield House 1982). He considered the liberation fighters in South Africa, Angola, and Namibia terrorists. Therefore, it was dutiful for every Christian who hated sin, sin defined as rebellion against an established authority, to destroy it; further arguing that ‘terrorism is the most despicable plague to afflict the human race’ (Begbie 1981:106). His methodological framework of peace (making) by the gun excluded negotiations with the liberation movements; he considered it spiritually and morally wrong to ‘sit down with terrorists instead of putting them on trial for their lives for their crimes’ (*ibid*).

CESA understood military service to be a means of defending the country. Consider these statements by Bradley about conscientious objection to military service; Bradley strongly discouraged it. As a World War II military veteran, he argued that the Christian was biblically *mandated* to defend. ‘What did the Lord say about military service except ‘whoever will compel thee to go a mile, go with him two’? What did Paul say about slavery? ‘Slaves be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh’ (Makinana 2003:30; *CESA News* 1990:2). CESA’s training college, George Whitefield House, also advised the leadership that military service was not only lawful but mandated by article 37 of the *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion* (1982). This went further than the 1979 CESA statement on the subject (in Ive 1992:193-194).⁸⁶When other denominations, such as the DRC and the Methodist Church, held that imprisonment for conscientious objection was unwarranted—Bradley contended that ‘everyone fit and able to defend, *should* defend’ (*Cape Times* 1982:11). Whether what was defended was worth the sacrifice was taken for granted.

⁸⁶ Article 37 states that ‘It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars.’ (Anglican Communion 2022a:6 of 6). It is thus unclear which aspect of this article mandated (not just permitted) the taking up of arms.

4.9.8. Summary of CESA and Right-Wing Propaganda

The below table summarises CESA's direct and indirect involvement in right-wing propaganda.

Propagandist Group	(CESA) Person or Org. Involved	Citations
Department of Information	Stephen Bradley	Mulder 1974:1; 1975b:1; Bradley 1977a:1-2
Gospel League of S A	Dick Begbie	Begbie 1992:307; 1981:3
Gospel Defence League	Dick Begbie	Begbie 1992:307
Protestant Ass. of S A	Gordon Mills	Bradley 1998c:3; <i>Crisis News</i> 1988:7
Christian Action Africa	St. James Church Kenilworth and CESA ⁸⁷	Balcomb 2004:12; <i>Crisis News</i> 1988:2; Hale 1992:329-330
KwaSizabantu Affirmation 1991 ⁸⁸	CESA	Ive 1992:248-255; CESA SM 1991:8-9

When the media exposed the whole Muldergate scheme, CESA sought to discredit the English press as enemies of the state and defend the DI (Bradley 1979b:1). Bradley argued that 'We believe that the Government should not apologise for actions in connection with the former Department of Information and its off-shoots. Everybody knows that any business—let alone a Government facing the enemies we have—must carry on a lot of its work in secrete, by secrete Diplomacy and other methods not open to an irresponsible Press' (Bradley 1979b:1). The morally responsible thing would have been to distance the denomination from the DI or any department responsible for state propaganda after the Muldergate scandal, but this was not the case. The government still invited Bradley as an honoured guest, but this time of the Department of Foreign Affairs.

4.10. The Benefits of Proximity

CESA's (Cameron 2017:23) claim of being uninfluential does not accord with historical data; the above analysis and the following paint a different narrative. Their timidity towards the state bought them proximity to the government and was beneficial.

⁸⁷ Peter Hammond's tribute to Dorothea Scarborough, at CESA's Holy Trinity Church, implied that she was close to Frank Retief—the Rector at St James (2022).

⁸⁸ In 1991, CESA became a signatory to the *KwaSizabantu Affirmation* statement (CESA SM 1991:8-9).

The following are but a few instances that demonstrate support for the government.

- CESA could get permission to register two black students at the Bible Institute when this was not allowed (Bradley 2003:172; CESA EM 1979:93).
- Bradley continued to be invited to official state functions, and those interactions were relationally beneficial to the church. In addition, Bradley became close friends with government officials, especially P. W. Botha, who later became the president (Botha 1976:1; Bradley 2003:172; Cameron 2006:309; Bradley 1979c:1-2).
- Bradley was called to intervene on a private bill that would have directly impacted CESA. Sometimes, Bradley was invited to give evidence and make submissions to parliamentary committees on urban development (Ive 1992:188-190; Bradley 1973:1-2).
- They received at least eight preaching slots per year from the SABC, where CESA's Bernard Wright was a member of its Religious Broadcasting Committee. CESA ministers were paid by the state for the sermons on SABC TV and radio (Retief in Cameron 2006:309; CESA 1976a:24; 1976b:15; 1976c:27; CESA SM 1983:11-12).
- They could travel with and be accommodated by the South African government while undertaking church business in Namibia in 1978 (Terhoven 1978:1-2).
- Bradley assisted Alan Goodman from Japan in getting a job as a teacher in South Africa by writing directly to Ferdinand Hartzenberg, then Minister of Education and Training (Ministry of Education and Training 1980:1; Hammond 1980:1; Goodman 1980:1-3).

4.11. **'Maximum Support with Minimal Criticism'**

CESA's TRC statement states that there were numerous occasions after its annual Synod when the leadership sought meetings with government officials to protest about various matters privately (Cameron 2017:25). CESA's Synod resolutions indicate a mandate to approach the government concerning the perceived falling moral standards. The submission is selective; it merely mentions some occasions from the eighties which painted the denomination in a good light and neglects its advocacy for apartheid.

It should be noted that CESA's on-record protests below were not about dismantling apartheid, nor did they link the social ills of South Africa to apartheid but were about the application of apartheid and 'petty apartheid' (Gill 1984:24). John Tooke's assessment of CESA is correct; it failed to be 'the conscience of the State' by adopting the 'maximum support with minimal criticism' approach (1977:1-2; *contra* Hale 1992:11).

4.11.1. **Siding with the Government on State Brutality**

CESA (2017:23-24) and Bradley (1997a:4) claim to have been unaware of the apartheid government's brutality revealed during the TRC. However, Bradley's 1967 press statements about detention without trial and the following 1977 letter to Prime Minister John Vorster undermine this claim. In it, it is stated that,

As you are aware, the Church of England in South Africa does its best to keep clear of politics. We accept the teaching of the Lord to "render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's." We also accept the teaching of the Apostle Paul in Romans chapter 13, that "the powers that be are ordained of God". Further, I have personally attempted to correct the blatant untruths that are told about South Africa in such lands as England and Australia. Some years ago, Ambassador Maree thanked me for my efforts in Australia: more recently the Hon. Minister of Information has done so. However, I must express my deep concern, and that of my colleagues in this Church, over the death, while in detention, of 18 persons this year—as reported in the local press. I know that the police have a difficult and often dangerous role to play. I know, too, that some of the 18 have committed suicide. But the fact that 18 have died while in detention, this year, suggests that there has been extreme brutality perpetrated on helpless people. I sincerely trust that there is a proper explanation available to the Prime Minister for each case: (I do not ask to be made aware of such explanation) for it is certain that we, in South Africa, depends on the Almighty for his protection, and He judges righteously (Bradley 1977a:1-2).

This is the most confrontational recorded statement. It acknowledged the brutality of the state. However, it made no connection between these deaths and the policy of apartheid; it did not alter the relationship of CESA with the government, nor did it cause it to make similar 'soft' condemnations of the government via Synod resolutions or press statements until 1989 (Hofmeyr 1988:1). It is also an indicator that, despite this letter, CESA was still committed to a form of 'apoliticism' that voiced concerns

but would not dare interfere with government policy or administration—even in the instances of palpable abuse of authority. The Kairos Theologians would later label this position ‘State Theology,’ in this letter CESA ‘blesses injustice, canonises the will of the powerful and reduces the poor to passivity, obedience and apathy’ (1986:49). There was no outrage about injustice, no real concerns about these deaths or even the circumstances that would drive a person to commit suicide than have their body—made in the image of God—continue to be violated by the state, which claimed to be Christian. CESA was unwilling to see that the government had ‘ceased to become the servant of God of Romans 13 but [had] become the beast from the sea of Revelation 13’ (Boesak 1989:30).

CESA was more sympathetic towards the state than to its victims. When it stood up to the state, it did not do so on its feet—with strong condemnations on Biblical grounds but preferred to be on its knees—humbly imploring and seeking ways to evert responsibility from the state. For instance, when it decried the Group Areas Act—it did not complain about the fact that St. Thomas was moved from the Cape Town area to Heideveld but that such a move scattered its coloured congregation and made it difficult for some, especially the elderly, to continue to attend services at a CESA church. However, instead of condemning the act—it offered to work with the state to arrange suitable accommodation near a CESA church (Bradley 1980d:1).

Even in his memoir, Bradley was still more sympathetic toward the violent actions of the government when remembering the 1976 Soweto uprising; he wrote that ‘The police had the unenviable task of maintaining law and order and protecting life and property; the situation was not clear-cut’ but was clear cut in his reference to the protesters as thugs; thus indicating that even after the 1997-1998 revelations about the brutality of the state, the protestors were still to blame (Bradley 2003:163; cf Bradley 1976b:1; *compare* Huddleston c1985).

When the police arrested, assaulted, and detained teenagers of a CESA minister in Soweto—Ambrose Zuma, CESA’s *Today* magazine was unsympathetic towards the victims; it reminded the readers that ‘the police are not always able to discriminate between lawbreakers and the law-abiding’ and considered it wise for the Zumas to revert to separation with their children by sending them to Natal after their release without charge from police custody (Ive 1976a:14; cf Villa-Vicencio 1990:193).

During range practice, a motor bomb fired by the SADF exploded in a civilian area—killing four people, including a CESA (Namibia) Lay Reader, Elikana Makapunda (CESA 1981:1). CESA’s statement following this tragedy did not question the ethics of the occupation of Namibia and the biblical mandate to preserve life; instead, it advised the South African government to do target training in remote areas and apologise to the family and pay for the funeral expenses. It also suggested that the government needed ‘to promote good relations with the local people’ to prevent such an incident from being used by SWAPO to elicit sympathy for liberation (*ibid*).

The TRC RICSAs and Report (Vol. 4 1998:80; cf Cameron 2017:26; Cochrane *et al.* 1999:53) claim that CESA was not comfortable with confrontation; this discomfort was only reserved for the apartheid state. Bradley’s criticism of the Australian government was much more confrontational. Perhaps because the Australian government was not expected to respond to criticism with expulsion or imprisonment. In a letter to the editor of *The Mercury* in Australia, he declared,

The [Australian] government makes us look very foolish when it continues to support the attacks of Idi Amin and his associates against South Africa in the U.N.O. Again, today the Australian government abstained from voting: although Britain, France, America, etc., all voted to against a childish resolution declaring the South African Government outlawed. And that various terrorists’ organisations are true representatives of South Africa... Australians living in South Africa wish the Australian government would grow up! (Bradley 1975a-11-05).⁸⁹

By contrast, the letter to the South African government, with much more immediate concerns, was timid. It required no explanation or corrective steps, but contained a veiled warning about the judgment of God.

4.11.2. **Permissive Society**

CESA’s most decisive stance against the state was on lowering moral standards in the country. There was the myth that the early years of colonisation were accompanied by godliness that the country needed to go back. It decried the taking in vain the Lord’s name on television and radio, the decline in Sabbath observance, gambling and immodesty on television and print media (CESA SM 1965:189; Bradley 1975a:1-2; Bradley 1983b:1; CESA SM 1981:2). Hofmeyr reported that ‘[Hebert Hammond] and Bishop Douglas have just been involved in an attempt to prevent evil presentations on the state and T.V. screen. Keep your eyes open. ‘Ye that love the

⁸⁹ Both Bradley and Begbie tended to refer to the United Nations as the United Nations Organization. Hence U.N.O.

Lord hate evil' (1978a:1).⁹⁰ It protested over the opening of cinemas on Sundays, longer pub hours and the Comrades Marathon taking place on Sundays (Hofmeyr 1976:1; 1977a:1; 1977b:1; cf Hammond 1983:1). Synod even encouraged an engagement with the publication board to voice its protest over nudity on print media (CESA SM 1981:2). Their reason stemmed from the belief that South Africa was a Christian country with standards that were 'the envy of visiting Christians to this country;' therefore, they held that Christian morality should be legislated (Hammond 1983:1).

Besides correcting negative press about the country, in the mid-'70s, Bradley adopted a combative tone towards the media, especially the English press. For instance, in 1976, he petitioned the Minister of Justice to develop a strategy to prevent the 'writing of salacious reports', for they eroded moral standards in the country (Bradley 1976c:1). For fifty years, CESA was a member and financial supporter of the South African Temperance Alliance; Synod typically passed resolutions bemoaning the government's liberal approach to alcohol consumption (CESA SM 1949:5; 1951:8).

The falling moral standards were regularly mentioned in the Presiding Bishop's Charges, but apartheid was never criticised (CESA SM 1971:2; 1973:1; 1978:2). Synod even resolved to send a letter to the Prime Minister in 1983 to urge him to prioritise the arresting of falling moral standards, which were tolerated and propagated on stage and in cinema (CESA SM 1983:2).

In 1983, some members of the Synod criticised CESA for not showing the same outrage on social justice as it did on the falling moral standards. As a result, Synod resolved to form a sub-committee to investigate the matter further and report back with recommendations the following year (CESA SM 1983:2).

4.12. **A Challenge to State Theology**

Despite all the above, CESA's leadership still understood the church to be apolitical. It still encouraged its clergy to focus on preaching the gospel and discouraged them from social concerns. However, some Synod delegates were dissatisfied with this position in the early eighties.

⁹⁰ The initials H.H. read to refer to Hebert Hammond, the Registrar of CESA.

- *Focus on the Gospel*

Hebert Hammond's report to the 1979 Synod reminded CESA that both Jesus and Paul ignored the social concerns of his day and did not start a political party (1979:1). He encouraged CESA not to follow the crowd with their concern for structural issues, 'social justice and poverty,' but should focus on the gospel, which at its core was concerned with personal sin (*ibid*). In 1980, Bradley's Synodical Charge concurred with Hammond and added that 'we accept that the powers that be, whether in Cape Town or Windhoek or Salisbury, are ordained of God. He knew what He was doing when He raised up Nebuchadnezzar or Caesar. He knows what he is doing now' (Bradley 1980c:2). Tellingly, Hammond and Bradley accepted the existence of structural problems and unjust rule in South Africa, but the state and its rulers were defended as righteous to the outsiders.

- *Christian Solution*

The solution to the South African crisis was not viewed to be the end of minority rule or apartheid, but was going back to God. For instance, Begbie criticised Desmond Tutu and WCC's strategy of aligning itself with what he viewed as the 'Marxist liberation movement.' He stated that,

Change is needed to conform society to the Laws of God. We need to change our whole set-up and law system from a humanistic one to a godly one. We need as a nation to fear God and to keep His Law, and frame our laws according to His Laws, and not Marxist theory (1981:43).

Begbie then spent half of his 130-page treatise critiquing humanism, ecumenicalism, and Marxism—while advocating for paternalistic Christian dominion instead, but was silent on the crimes of the apartheid state. This call for the return to the Christian morality was often used as a silencing mechanism toward prophetic voices. It was also contradicted at times by claims of South Africa being a nation that depended on God (and on the other hand, comprehensive statements were made about government leaders, asserting that 'The leaders of the State acknowledge the authority of God as he has revealed his mind in Holy Scripture. Perhaps this is truer of them than any other leaders in the world at present' (Knox 1986a:4-5; cf Huddleston c1985)).

In a letter to the Prime Minister commenting on the state of emergency and advising a National Day of Prayer, Bradley also argued that he did not believe the chief problem in South Africa to be political, military, or race relations, but spiritual.

He impressed on PW Botha that the country needed to go back to its Christian heritage, to arrest the erasure of moral standards in the country, and God would heal South Africa (Bradley 1980a:1; Bradley in Hammond 1980:1).

- *Social Justice*

In 1983, Synod delegates became disillusioned with CESA limited social ethics that excluded apartheid (CESA SM 1983:8-9). The 1983 Synod minutes noted, 'Criticism had been received of the apparent silence of the Church on matters of social justice contrasting with its strong stand on the permissive society.' Resultantly, the Executive Committee asked its Cape members to investigate the formation of a sub-committee to deal with the subject (CESA SM 1983:2). This was a significant transition in CESA's public theology. The next chapter will reveal the complexities of trying to move away from right-wing state theology.

4.13. **Concluding Remarks**

It is challenging to reconcile CESA's claims that it was an uninfluential, ignorant, and apolitical denomination during the apartheid years because those claims do not seem to be grounded on historical data. The above accounts do not portray an 'ignorant and unwitting' compliance with the state, as claimed in the TRC submission (Cameron 2017:29). The facts point to a different direction altogether. This study's interpretation of primary sources asserts that having the ear of the Prime Ministers, Ministers, and other low-level government officials *is* influence. They chose to use that influence to support the apartheid state. However, they claimed to be apolitical.

Meanwhile, Bradley inserted himself in the political arena and was used by the government to make apartheid seem compassionate. Bradley did this knowing that (some of) the government's actions were barbaric. CESA's TRC submission only mentions Primes Ministers PW Botha, and FW de Klerk on the list of government officials who listened to their complaints, but this revelation is partial.

This chapter has revealed that CESA's advocacy was not for change but intended to make it easier to defend its policies and claim to be a Christian nation. Again, the only people that suffered from this concealment were the black people who were harmed by the actions and words of CESA and their partners. It also missed an opportunity to use the TRC to start a reconciliation process within the church. This

brings doubt to CESA's sincerity about its repentance. If CESA wanted to cleanse itself of right-wing theology—it should have admitted, it and began dealing with it. Otherwise, it would surface again—as it did in the criticism against the 2020 black ministers' documents.

It has been argued that CESA's Australian partners were complicit in defending apartheid and CESA's views on it. It has been posited that the Sydney Anglicans were indifferent to the suffering of black evangelical Anglicans in South Africa—they chose the side of the oppressors while demonstrating an understanding that apartheid was (at least in its application) unjust. This group had the most considerable influence on CESA; it helped form it and provided half of its apartheid era Presiding Bishops and continues to influence its training institution—GWC. The black ministers are not being unfair in questioning its benevolence. Historically, it has not been a friend to black Anglicans.

The church does not have to be historically perfect. It cannot go back in time to correct its errors, but it can, in the present, own up to them and seek to do better. This chapter indicated that the leadership failed to present the whole picture to the commission. The commission also neglected to question CESA for not saying anything about its past leaders—as if the assessment of the denomination's response to apartheid merely concerned the experiences of those presenting the submission. Failing to mention anything about the Vorster administration, Bradley's overseas campaigns, and his relationship with the DI should have raised red flags to the commission to ask probing questions about a version of the past being presented before it.

5. CHAPTER 5: The Episcopacies of Dudley Foord and Joseph Bell (1985-1994)

5.1. Introduction

The exculpatory data presented by CESA to the TRC was based on actions taken and policies adopted between 1985 and 1994. Special attention was drawn to the 1985 resolution declaring that the church was against all violence and discrimination. This resolution was held to be retrospectively indicative that CESA had 'always divorced itself from party political activities' (Bell 1997a:2; cf Cameron 2017:28-29; Hammond 1985:1, emphasis added).⁹¹ It was not disclosed as a new policy borne out of criticism for selective advocacy by the 1983 Synod delegates.

5.2. Aims and Objectives

This chapter will demonstrate that the denominational resolution on race in 1985 appeared reformist but was an inadequate compromise and did not signal meaningful change within CESA. Despite the condemnation of discrimination, it did not condemn apartheid explicitly and did not extricate the church from apartheid ideology.

- It will trace the circumstances of the 1985 resolution which were referenced in the TRC statement.
- It will discuss Bishop Dudley Foord's influence on CESA and the resistance to change that led to his resignation as its Presiding Bishop—citing its response to apartheid as one reason for his short tenure.
- It will critically assess the episcopacy of Bishop Joseph Bell up to 1994 as the country was transitioning into a democratic society.
- It will evaluate CESA's understanding of the relationship between the gospel and social justice.

5.3. Wrestling with State Theology (1985-1987)

In the analysis of CESA's history, the period from 1985 to 1987 was incredibly significant. During this era, the church tried to (re)define its public theology. Its newly elected Presiding Bishop led it to wrestle with its historic support of apartheid — State

⁹¹ An editorial of *The Australian Church Record*, after quoting the 1985 statement in full, added that CESA 'has frequently been portrayed as tacitly pro-Government by its opponents. This clear statement shows how this is not so' (1986:3).

Theology.⁹² The publication of the Kairos Document in 1985 was also a significant moment, whose reaction further illuminated CESA's position as pro-state.

5.3.1. Bishop Dudley Foord (b 1923-2013)

In 1984, another Australian, Dr Dudley Tucker Foord, was consecrated as the Presiding Bishop of CESA. A friend of the denomination, the Archbishop of the Sydney Anglican Diocese—Donald Robinson, conducted the ceremony.⁹³ Bishop George Swartz of Kimberly and Kuruman represented the CPSA. Also in attendance was the Primate of the Anglican Church of Australia—John Grindrod. The media saw this as an ecclesiastical theatre designed to 'heal the rift' between the two warring Anglican denominations in South Africa—CESA and the CPSA (Williams 1984:7; cf Bruyns 1984:11).

In 1983, an extraordinary CESA Synod had elected Foord to succeed Bishop Stephen Bradley as its Presiding Bishop. His consecration occurred in Australia on the 12th of February in 1984 (CESA 1983:3; Williams 1984:7). The consecration of Foord was a significant step toward the reconciliation that had been in discussions since 1976 (Clarke 2008:319; Robinson 1984:1). Robinson appeared to be succeeding where his predecessors had failed; he had brought peace between CESA and the Anglican communion. For the first time in CESA's history, the Anglican Communion recognised its leader as a bishop of the Anglican Church (Downie 1984:24).

However, things did not go according to plan; three years later, Robinson realised that he had underestimated the benefits of CESA's opposition to the CPSA. The *Church Times* reported him stating he no longer considered CESA a truly Anglican Church. 'CESA's membership is growing—it is attracting CPSA people who dislike Archbishop Desmond Tutu and CPSA's political stance—so that CESA no longer feels the need for the acceptance of the wider Anglican Church' (1987:1).⁹⁴ CESA's practice was to profit from the opposition to the CPSA's prophetic witness by attracting CPSA

⁹² See par. 4.9ff for an analysis of CESA's embrace of Wright-Wing theology, which the researcher asserts is synonymous with State Theology as described by the Kairos Theologians below (par. 5.5).

⁹³ The Sydney Anglicans still played a significant role in CESA, Foord was recommended to it by the former Archbishop of the Sydney Diocese—Marcus Loane. He was the fourth choice after Bishop Kent Short, Dean Lance Shulton and Rev Hanlon (Hofmeyr 1983; cf Ive 1992:203-204).

⁹⁴ In a letter to Murray Hofmeyr, Robinson contested the accuracy of this statement for he held it to be misquotation of his answer. He had been asked by the reporter why he thought CESA no longer felt the need to be closer to the Anglican Communion, he stated that 'I told her that I thought it was due to a number of reasons, one of which was that CESA felt much more self-reliant as vigorous growing church and having received very little from outside itself for so long it had really lost the taste for support and comfort from the Anglican churches elsewhere and that it had really moved away from an Anglican ethos' (Robinson 1987:3).

members who preferred its professed 'apolitical stance' (Clarke 2008:409; Bradley 2003:192-193; Downie 1987:22). This practice did not endear CESA to the CPSA. For example, in 1986, Robinson lobbied for Foord to be invited to the Lambeth Conference, but the CPSA opposed this (Clarke 2008:409-410).

In 1987 (against Robinson's persuasion), Foord resigned as CESA's Presiding Bishop—halfway through his first term (Robinson 1987:1-2). John Newby commented, Dudley, before he left to go back to Australia, made three points in my hearing in a public meeting, to the effect that; (a) our Church suffered from the fact that ministers were not adequately trained; (b) that the Church was not adequately concerned with social issues in the State of South Africa, and (c) it was not actually true to its Constitution in terms of the following of its Liturgy and so on. And I remember listening and saying, "You are absolutely right on all three" (in Earngey 2011:14 of 25, emphasis added).⁹⁵

5.3.2. Noncommittal on Apartheid

Foord was reluctant to comment on apartheid before becoming the Presiding Bishop (Downie 1984:24). He held he had not lived in the country long enough to have an opinion on the matter and thought that Bradley's statements from 1967 had been misunderstood by the press (Deily 1984). Furthermore, he had been informed that 'CESA had not made any official statement on the matter of apartheid' (*ibid*).⁹⁶

5.4. Reforming a Historically RWCG

When Bradley retired as the Presiding Bishop in 1984, criticism of CESA's response to social injustice still loomed. As soon as Foord took office, he challenged CESA to prepare for an inclusive democratic South Africa (CESA EM 1984:3; 1985:1; 1986:2). As a result, CESA discussed race relations on all three of the Synods and in most of the National Executive Committee meetings that he chaired. Even though these discussions yielded little to no change, the discussions themselves are significant because they took place in the presence of leaders who would later appear before the TRC to plead ignorance (see par. 6.4.3.1).

⁹⁵ Points (a) and (c) deserve a much more detailed analysis beyond the scope of this research. Point (b) is the focus of the current project. Dr Mark Earngey's essay on the late Bishop Dudley Foord is stored under his personnel file at CESA's head office in Cape Town.

⁹⁶ Chapter 2 of this research argues that this statement is misinformed.

5.4.1. John Newby's Report on Apartheid

To prepare for the 1984 Synod, and in response to the 1983 Synod resolution to form a sub-committee to formulate CESA's social justice policy, the Social, Moral and Ethics Committee, hereafter 'SMEC', was formed. It elected John Newby as its chairperson. Newby prepared and submitted a report to the National Executive Committee, challenging CESA's views on apartheid.

In his brief and cogent report, he argued that apartheid was a theological issue that violated the church's doctrine of God (his justice and impartiality), the doctrine of man (the unity of humanity in Adam), the doctrine of redemption (the unity of the redeemed in Christ), and the doctrine of the church (affecting the unity of the church) (Newby 1984:1).

Newby was critical of CESA's theology by arguing against its articulation in the DRC's *Report on Human Relations in South Africa* (1974).⁹⁷ It stated, 'The New Testament accepts and upholds the fact of diversity of people' and 'In specific circumstances under specific conditions, the New Testament makes provision for the regulation based on separate development of the co-existence of various peoples in one country' (*ibid*).

His argument for refuting these claims was that 'Ethnic diversity is relative; the unity of the human race is absolute,' and if these assertions were allowed 'the South African situation is not a fulfilment of the inference inasmuch as one ethnic group has imposed separate development on other groups and had not made this provision with them' (*ibid*, emphasised by the author). He thus urged the church to condemn apartheid as unbiblical publicly and to advocate for reform in South Africa (*ibid*).

Newby's short critique stands out in CESA's historiography as the first challenge to its public theology. It presented apartheid as more than just political (undemocratic), legal (crime against humanity) and economic (exploitation of natural and human resources). Instead, it argued that it was a theological problem stemming from anthropological, ecclesiastical, and soteriological misunderstandings of the gospel (Newby 1984; cf Wyngaard 2017:1; Bosch 1983:25-38; Maimela 1983:49-57). Before this report, CESA had not interrogated the epistemological underpinnings that caused it to respond in the manner seen in the last two chapters of this research.

⁹⁷ The researcher speculates that Newby was probably not informed about the 1954 and 1958 CESA statements on apartheid. Additionally, the fact that he argues against CESA's position from the DRC policy statement is a testament to CESA's close ties with the DRC and further strengthens the argument that CESA should have been categorised similarly to the DRC.

5.4.2. John Newby Proposal in 1985

Newby's report is not noted as discussed in the 1984 Synod. However, in 1985, he presented this report at Synod and made this proposal; 'This Synod affirms its stand against the principle of apartheid as the Social, Morals and Ethics Committee defined in their report, being inconsistent with the teaching of the Bible and Synod encourages Christian people to work for negotiated reform and avoid any form of words or action which may promote violence' (CESA SM 1985:9).⁹⁸

Out of fear of alienating delegates who were unwilling to accept portions of Newby's report, which lay the foundation for the above proposal; this motion was withdrawn and replaced with the Registrar's motion as a temporary measure until the SMEC had proposed a much more acceptable policy proposal for synodical consideration (CESA SM 1985:9).

5.4.3. Murray Hofmeyr Temporary (Recycled) Resolution in 1985

Newby's motion was replaced with the softened and reworked version of the 1979 resolution on race relations (see part 4.9.3).⁹⁹ The following was a proposal by Murray Hofmeyr,

This Synod expresses its grave concern at the terrible violence in South Africa at present. It expresses abhorrence of all violence and oppression and prays for everyone suffering therefrom. Synod totally rejects discrimination on the grounds of colour, sex, or race as contrary to the Bible. Since the root cause of every evil in human society is sin and that before God all men are sinners regardless of who they are, Synod affirms that the only answer to sin has been provided by God in the death of his Son on the Cross. He died for all men that they might be reconciled to God by faith in Him.

Because reconciliation to God means the reconciliation of man to man, it also means regeneration of society and is the answer to South Africa's needs. This is the Gospel which the Church is called to proclaim, and there is no other. Synod calls on all members of the Church to pray regularly and earnestly for all in authority that they may be conscious of their duty to God and His Word (CESA SM 1985:9).

⁹⁸ Proposed motions are usually submitted to delegates prior Synod. Rev John Newby's file and Murray Hofmeyr's box at William Cullen Library contain drafts of Synod motions that include this proposal by Newby. The 1985 Synod minutes included the full wording of Newby's motion and indicated that it was withdrawn to be replaced with Hofmeyr's proposal.

⁹⁹ References to the South African Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches condoning violence was removed (compare Ive 1992:193-194).

Unlike Newby's proposal, this resolution did not mention apartheid by name, but spoke generally about discrimination. Instead of singling out the violence of the apartheid state as causal for the retaliatory violence of the liberation movement, this resolution condemned all violence and avoided conflict with the apartheid state while seeming to be progressive (cf Duncan 1991:30-31). It gave the impression that all violence deserved similar condemnation (TRC Report Vol. 4 1998:83-84; Villa-Vicencio 1990:93; cf Ntliha 1994:140). Contrastingly, similar resolutions from the CPSA which were adopted by the Lambeth Conference condemned apartheid explicitly and accented the unjust imprisonment of children without trial as especially evil (Anglican Communion 1987:8 of 17; 1988:22).

CESA was silent on the violence of the state. In a clear contradiction to the intentions of the 1985 resolution and while the global Anglican community issued clear condemnations of the South African troop presence in Namibia and voiced support for the liberation movement, CESA continued to encourage sending chaplains and soldiers to the SADF even though the 'Defence Force serve[d] to defend something intrinsically indefensible—apartheid' (Tutu 1990:238; *CESA News* 1988:4; Anglican Consultative Council 2005b:21-22).

Some perceived this resolution to be a betrayal of CESA's historical position. For example, Dick Begbie (1992:317) alleged that this development and others like it indicated a shift away from CESA's 'conservative evangelical position', leading himself, Hebert Hammond, and others to seriously consider forming a breakaway denomination or a 'fellowship of like-minded CESA churches' that were discontent with the new direction of the denomination (Begbie 1992:341). However, on Broughton Knox's advice, they started a Christian magazine instead, called *Christian Digest* (Begbie 1992:341-342).

5.4.4. Foord's Reformations

At the same Synod, Foord emphasised that transferring power from whites to blacks was inevitable. In his 1985 Charge, he challenged the denomination to prioritise the development of black leaders for the future. He believed that the responsibility of white leadership was to equip the Black Church and black leadership '... in order that they may take on the 'baton' (Foord 1985:9). In his 1986 Bishop's Charge, he mentioned that he had attended an international conference in Amsterdam; while there, he stated,

It came as a further surprise to me to discover, that although our Church is not well known overseas, where it is known, then[sic] CESA is under the microscope. The image we project, I am told, in the eyes of other Christians is that "we are pro-white, staunchly pro-government, wanting to entrench white attitudes, anti-black and politically Right" we must ask the question: is this an accurate image, and are we happy with it?

As I move around amongst our Church, I find an increasing number of Christians are asking deep questions about how they are to live out the implication of the Gospel in the South African crisis? If Christ's death abolished the dividing wall between Jews and Gentile (Eph.2), so in the Church, must not the dividing wall be abolished in South Africa? I am further asked if our Church claims to be apolitical and appears to vote for the status quo; isn't that a very political stance? There are a whole cluster of question clamouring for clear answers.

I have been challenged as to why there is only one black African on our Executive Committee and Trustees, comprising 24 people. Again, I am asked, why do we not phase out all references in our Constitution to "Missional and Regional" churches and establish a pattern to permit these churches to become constituent churches in their own right? (Foord 1986a:2-3).

The Synods and Executive meetings after 1986 were marked by an effort to make the changes that Foord suggested.¹⁰⁰ However, the pace of reform was slow and overall unsuccessful. Church leaders at the Executive and Synodical levels did not understand structural inequality or apartheid to be biblically undesirable, and therefore, there was no urgency to bring about its end in CESA or condemn it in society. The discussion of the following 1986 motion on racism illustrates this point.

5.4.5. Murray Hofmeyr Proposal in 1986

The Natal Mission Executive Committee had desired that the 1986 Synod would issue a much stronger statement.¹⁰¹ Their minutes from a meeting before the National Synod state, 'Our Church confesses, we have sinned in supporting unjust laws towards our black fellowmen, all in the name of separate development and protection of white culture' (CESA Mission EM 1986:2). However, they feared the impact of the above resolution, so it was suggested to keep it private (*ibid*).

Murray Hofmeyr (Registrar) presented the following motion in 1986 to replace the 1985 temporary resolution.

This Synod,

¹⁰⁰ The granting of Constituent church statuses to mission churches only took place in 2000 (Cameron 2017:23). In 1998 there were only three black people in the National Executive Committee.

¹⁰¹ This committee was led by Rev Joseph Bell and comprised of only black clergy and laymen. There was a parallel committee in the same region but with only white clergy and laymen.

18.1. Takes note with appreciation of the positive steps, even though partial and incomplete, that have been taken by the South African government in the past year in removing certain unjust, unrighteous, and discriminatory laws and practices.

18.2. Affirms its support of the government in such actions and encourages it to continue its policies of reform and urges that these should lead as soon as possible the removal from the Statute Book of all unrighteous and discriminatory laws and practices throughout the country.

18.3. Deeply conscious of the intense suffering experienced by so many South Africans in consequence of the continued economic recession, political unrest, and violence in our Land, totally repudiates and condemns all actions which increase unemployment, violence, and further polarise our already divided society. It rejects as unbiblical the concept of doing evil that good may come and calls on all Churchmen practising such policies to eschew them.

18.4. Acknowledges that both this Church and its members have sinned in thought, word, and deed by allowing inbred racism and tribalism to cause us to sin against our Brothers in Christ. We confess our sin and seek forgiveness from God and our fellow men[sic]. In repentance, we pray that God will so unite us that together we may express that unity, peace, and reconciliation made possible in Christ by,

Firstly, meeting to pray together.

Secondly, discussing ways of achieving a greater understanding of the problems being experienced by our congregations both in and outside the unrest areas.

Thirdly, the more materially privileged churches looking for ways to help the less privileged to help themselves.

Rev Seed and Rev Bulawayo suggested the following addition at the end of the tabled statement.

Fourthly, that our Church itself seeks to eradicate any evidence of discrimination or apartheid in our structures (CESA SM 1986:26).

The responses from Synod delegates to this proposal reveal the challenges of reforming a church entrenched in the status quo. Decades of teaching that apartheid was biblically justifiable, the apartheid government was benevolent, and the equating of any criticism of state policies to the church entering the forbidden field of politics was deeply entrenched.

Dr D Aeschlimann questioned why the word apartheid had been omitted from clause 18.2. Rev D Rhatigan, Mr Anthony Ive and Mr Hebert Hammond complained that the wording was designed to make them 'feel bad for being white.' Rev R Begbie argued it was not only whites who had sinned, but all had sinned. Rev John Newby and Rev M Ndlovu asserted CESA should first deal with its racist structures before making such a statement. Mr D Hendricks and Rev Murdo Gordon argued that the proposal was a political statement and was thus going to bring division into the church. Bishop Ngubane and Bishop Bell were concerned that CESA churches would be targeted if this motion were made public. In response to these concerns, Hofmeyr

argued that the 1985 resolution was merely a theological statement that did not go far enough and questioned whether any of CESA churches had taken any significant action in response to it (CESA SM 1986:27).

The discussion on this motion indicates that it was introduced to delegates who did not understand its need. There was a lack of appetite for reform because many perceived nothing wrong with the status quo, and some feared the state. There was a failure to grasp the thrust of Newby's 1984 report, which argued that apartheid was a sin and that the lack of reform was a commitment to that sin. This discussion deteriorated to the extent that the issue was referred to the SMEC for further consideration and rephrasing (*ibid*). In the meantime, the woefully inadequate 1985 statement was reaffirmed.¹⁰²

5.5. The Kairos Document

The *Kairos Document*, hereafter 'KD,' presented a challenge to CESA's public theology. Only one CESA minister, Jacob Mabaso, signed the KD. The *Kairos* moment in 1985 was an opportunity for CESA to align itself with the prophetic voices of change in South Africa. Its critique of it demonstrated that it had not changed.

Its authors stated that the 'Kairos Document is a Christian, biblical and theological comment on the political crisis in South Africa' (Kairos Theologians 1985:5). It was a challenge to the Church of South Africa, which was divided on how to respond to apartheid (Kairos Theologians 1985:7). It advocated for a more prophetic stance to tackle the country's problems (Kairos Theologians 1985: 22-29).

It was critical of State Theology based on Romans 13:1-7, which was used by the church and the state to justify uncritical obedience to unjust state laws (Kairos Theologians 1985:9-10).¹⁰³ It was also critical of 'Church Theology,' specifically the church's warped understanding of biblical concepts such as reconciliation, justice, and liberation—which were caricatured and reduced to interpersonal relations while

¹⁰² In 1989, Hofmeyr proposed the following motion to supplement the 1985 motion. It stated, 'the Church:

1. Calls upon all clergy and others to avoid demonstration as provoke or lead to violence [sic].
2. Calls upon the police to exercise utmost restraint in seeking to maintain law and order and to take every possible step to avoid violence.
3. Calls upon Government to promote goodwill and peaceful co-existence by acting more rapidly in the removal of laws and practices that are hurtful to so many South Africans and to expedite promise of greater dialogue' (1989c:2). This proposal was meant to be added under item 21 (Church and State) of the Synod agenda, but it is absent in the minutes and no explanation is provided for its exclusion.

¹⁰³ Par 4.9.1 has argued that CESA, by virtue of being historically classified as a Right-Wing Christian Group, embraced State Theology.

structural issues were ignored (de Gruchy and de Gruchy 2005:2634). It questioned the church's commitment to non-violence while the apartheid state was violent towards its black citizens (Kairos Theologians 1985:18-19).

It called for a prophetic stance from the church, a theology that spoke into the situation in South Africa, speaking for the cause of the weak and oppressed (Kairos Theologians 1985:25-27; Ntlha 1994:139). It challenged the church to side with the oppressed, take part in the struggle against oppression, and engage in civil disobedience towards the government's policies (Kairos Theologians 1985:31-32).

5.5.1. CESA and the Kairos Document

CESA's response to the KD demonstrated an unwillingness to attribute the blame to the state for the turmoil in the country. The KD was made public ten days after the 1985 Synod meeting. That may explain the fierce resistance to any suggestion that affirmed the thrust of the KD during the discussion of the 1986 proposal on race.

In 1986, a CESA clergyman and former Principal of the Bible Institute, Murdo Gordon, published a critique of the KD in CESA's magazine—*Christian Living Today*. The KD was also discussed in September 1986's National Executive Committee meeting. It decided that the response by the former Principal of Moore Theological College, Broughton Knox, be circulated to all its churches (CESA EM 1986:4).

- *Murdo Gordon*

Gordon believed the KD was to blame for providing a theological justification for the continued violence in South Africa (1986:2 of 7). He held the document was not an objective and well-researched attempt to find a solution but was intended to promote a clash between Christians and the government (*ibid*). He labelled the KD's call to action as 'rubble-rousing... much like Hitler's speeches in the 1930s,' to create discontent among the youth, something contrary to the New Testament teaching and would thus lead to the deterioration of national ethics (*ibid*).

Gordon asserted that sin was not to be found in the structures of society but in the individuals and decried the fact that the KD was only advocating for the change of Western capitalist structures in South Africa while saying nothing about the Russian communist regimes' structures (1986:3 of 7). He asserted that the calls for structural changes were inspired by teachers of Liberation Theology, not the New Testament (*ibid*). Gordon pointed out that the attack on the structures indicated a lack of trust in

individual conversion to change society and thus held that these calls must be rejected (*ibid*).

He cautioned Christians against getting involved in revolutions, urging them to remember the example of David in 1 Samuel 24-26, where he would not wage a revolution against Saul even though he knew he was the chosen king (Gordon 1986: 4 of 7).¹⁰⁴ He held that obedience to the state was commanded by the Bible under all circumstances, apart from when it prohibited Christians from preaching the gospel (Gordon 1986:5 of 7). About the apartheid state, he argued that 'worldwide propaganda machinery makes the right-wing government seem atrocious and new regime a paradise—but they are just as atrocious once they take over. Then the massive confidence trick becomes a nightmare' (Gordon 1986:6 of 7). Gordon's solution to South Africa's problems was to preach the gospel and await the new heaven and earth for a just world order (1986:7 of 7).

- *David Broughton Knox*

Knox's critique focused on the epistemology of the authors instead of the document's content. He argued the KD was part of the Marxist-Leninist propaganda penned to destabilise South Africa and attain communist ideals (Knox 1986:1). Consequently, he held that 'no one, but an instructed and committed communist could draft the basic thrust of this document' (Knox 1986:2).

He further argued that the KD's interpretations of Scripture were untraditional, anti-establishment, anti-law and order, and against the biblical mandate that Christians should seek peace always (Knox 1986:3-4). About the South African government's obedience to Scripture, he stated, 'The leaders of the State acknowledge the authority of God as he has revealed his mind in Holy Scripture. Perhaps this is truer of them than any other leaders in the world at present' (Knox 1986:4-5). He held the KD contradicted Christian ethics, and the Spirit was absent. It was not encouraging people to call on God for help and trust him (*ibid*). He cautioned against the communist-inspired calls for a revolution and encouraged Christians not to allow themselves to be influenced by it (Knox 1986:6).

¹⁰⁴ This assertion demonstrates an awareness on Gordon that the apartheid government, like the biblical figure Saul's rule, was illegitimate but he proposed no alternatives for deposing it nor did he affirm the righteousness of those who desired its deposal—such as the liberation movements.

- *Foord on the Kairos Document*

Foord was under pressure to respond to the KD. Mabaso sent him articles in defence of the document, one by Bishop Godfrey Ashby, who praised the Kairos moment for 'exposing easy speeches that comfort cruel men' (1985:3). On the other hand, friends of CESA in the government, such as the member of parliament, Graham McIntosh, sent him an article he had written in the *Sunday Times* where he cautioned Christians to doubt the theology of revolution advocated by the Kairos Theologians (1986). The Deputy Minister of Finance, Kent Durr, also sent him an article from *Leadership* magazine, which urged Christians to embrace the 'theology from below' propagated by the Kairos Theologians (Durr 1987:1; Cloete 1987:90). However, Durr's handwritten comments on the article's margins indicated strong disagreement with Cloete's arguments and an attempt to elicit similar condemnation from Foord.

Foord's response to Durr reveals an attempt to balance the historic CESA position and those of the reformists. He stated,

At this junction, two things stand out clearly in my mind. Firstly, somehow this article reflects a heart cry from black people in South Africa which needs to be heeded. Secondly, it is never easy to argue a case when one's metaphysical presuppositions are so utterly different from the authors of the Kairos Document. We simply stand on different grounds and therefore our hermeneutical understanding is divergent from theirs. This has the potential to create misunderstanding and hostility. However, this is not my last word (Foord 1987b:1-2).

The contrast between Foord and other leaders of CESA is stark. Foord acknowledged that even though he had a different hermeneutical framework to Cloete's—a signatory of the KD—his concerns were valid and needed attention. This willingness to listen was a radical contrast to Bradley's episcopacy and Gordon and Knox's responses to the KD.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁵ There were other similar responses to the KD in the CESA archives. Namely, Rev Dr P.E. Hughes *The Kairos Document Considered* (1987), Cain E. *The Kairos Document and You* (1987), Peter Beyerhaus *Kairos Document: Danger or Challenge to the Church?* (1987), and *DRC News's A critique of the Kairos Document by the Plenary Executive of the Dutch Reformed Church* (1986). It is not possible to ascertain if these were widely circulated among CESA churches and therefore they will not be discussed.

5.6. CESA and Desmond Tutu

Bishop Desmond Tutu—who campaigned against apartheid—was intensely disliked by CESA for his extremism, his call for sanctions against South Africa and embrace of Liberation Theology (CESA EM 1979a:2). In 1986, the CPSA invited CESA to attend Tutu's enthronement, just as the CPSA was invited to Foord's consecration in 1984. Foord asked the regional Executive Committees and the National Executive Committee for their opinions. They all decided that no one should attend. Some of their reasons are noted in the Cape Area Executive Minutes,

Noted, no one from the Church of England in South Africa will attend the enthronement. Mr Hammond believes this to be a great mistake. Reported that all replies to the Registrar's circular in connection with this matter were unanimous in recommending non-attendance. Mr A Human is overseas, and Mr Hammond had refrained from replying. The point was made that the Minister or Bishop is not a free man to make up his own mind but had to make decisions on a pastoral basis, on what is best for the Church. It was also noted that all should support any decision anyone makes as having been made in integrity and in the light and wisdom available to one (CESA CA-EM 1986:2).

The Natal Executive Committee also concurred, 'The meeting unanimously resolved to send a Telegram to the Registrar, urging that our denomination should not be represented at the enthronement. Messrs Mann, Shearer, and Newby would be entrusted with the exact wording of the Telegram' (CESA Natal-EM 1986:1).¹⁰⁶ However, some national Executive Committee members were willing to accept the invitation only if Tutu renounced the SACC, the WCC and Winnie Madikizela-Mandela (Foord 1986).¹⁰⁷

This disdain shows that even though CESA was making statements against discrimination, it was still not ready to declare apartheid evil or align itself with those who opposed it. It benefited from its opposition to Tutu, and it thus made no sense to be associated with him or the CPSA. Foord led an organisation that was content with being outside of the Anglican Communion and indicated no desire to befriend the CPSA—whose favour was needed to be welcomed back into the fellowship.

¹⁰⁶ The register of people present at this meeting indicates that no black person was present, the researcher thus concluded that there were two Executive Committees in Natal: one for the black Mission Church and the other for the European churches.

¹⁰⁷ The voting ballots: all, except Hammond. voting no and providing reasons for doing so are stored under Foord's file at William Cullen Library.

Tutu was enthroned in Cape Town on the 8th of September in 1986—leading the ceremony was the Archbishop of Canterbury, Robert A.K. Runcie (Claiborne 1986). Foord's absence from the event was probably embarrassing to him and Robinson—who had lobbied Runcie to recognise Foord as a bishop in the Anglican Communion three years earlier (Runcie 1984:1-3). In October 1986, Foord sent a letter to the then-retired Archbishop Marcus Loane expressing his intention to resign as the Presiding Bishop of CESA but was persuaded to stay until the end of 1988 to avoid creating a scandal (Loane 1986:1-2). However, this would prove difficult.

5.7. Foord Resigns in 1987

Anthony Ive argues that the cause for Foord's resignation as the Presiding Bishop was his frustration with the denomination's refusal to establish a training institution (1992:209).¹⁰⁸ However, Foord's resignation letter (sent to clergy) mentioned two additional reasons. First, he believed it was inappropriate for a foreigner to lead the denomination during a national crisis; second, CESA's attitudes and liturgical practices were inconsistent with their Constitution (Foord 1987b:1).

Foord's resignation caught the denomination by surprise (Ive 1992:209; cf Robinson 1987:1-3). Nevertheless, they accepted it, but the Executive still requested a meeting to discuss the 'real reasons' for his resignation; for they disagreed with all the furnished assertions in his resignation letter (Hofmeyr 1987a:1-2; cf CESA EM 1987a:2-3).¹⁰⁹ Foord's reasons for his resignation were 'discussed with him in full' by the Executive, but no light is shed by the minutes of that Executive meeting (CESA-EM 1987b:1)). A memorandum by Hofmeyr to all members of CESA, after the aforementioned meeting, argued that the true reasons were his foreign citizenship and CESA's lack of adherence to liturgy (*contra* CESA EM 1987b:1).¹¹⁰ They disagreed with both assertions (Hofmeyr 1987b:2).¹¹¹ The Executive did not want this resignation

¹⁰⁸ Ive contends that Foord tried and failed to get the denomination to understand the reasons for his resignation, he therefore narrowed it to the Church's failure to establish its own training institution (1992:209ff). However, Foord's letter to clergy was very clear and added one additional reason stating that CESA was not adhering to its own constitution regarding Anglican liturgy.

¹⁰⁹ The second reason for his resignation is briefly discussed by Mark Earngey's *Theological Education and Liturgical Reform: The Belated Success of the Bp. Dudley Tucker Foord Tragedy in the Church of England in South Africa (1984-1987)* (2011) essay which can be found under Foord's personnel folder at CESA's Cape Town Office.

¹¹⁰ In a special meeting between with the Executive after sending the resignation letter, Foord repeated the reasons given in his resignation letter, the researcher supposes that these were the three reasons given in the letter to the Executive Committee, but these were later reduced to just two—excluding the Church's position on social issues (CESA EM 1987b:1).

¹¹¹ It should be noted that this list included all white members of CESA but omitted the back congregants, who at this time were members of the Church of England in South Africa Mission Churches, it is uncertain if this omission is intentional or the reasons behind it. The Executive had decided that 'all Clergy and Churches' be sent letters by the Registrar (CESA-EM 1987a:1).

to cause a scandal. They regretted that damaging reports had been printed overseas and resolved not to issue a public statement in the South African press (CESA EM 1987b:3). This privacy also extended to the rest of the church.

The denomination was also not privy to the entire narrative about his resignation. The letter to the clergy only noted the following reasons:

Firstly, I think the time has come for a South African to lead the Church in this time of national "crisis". Many observers are predicting that conditions in the Republic are going to deteriorate and that the future will be somewhat bumpy and stormy. It is inappropriate that I, as an expatriate, should be in the position of senior leadership at such a time as this.

Secondly, I have been struggling with a crisis of conscience. In my judgement, in the life of the Church, there are certain aspects which by attitude and practice are not true to the Church of England in South Africa. (Foord 1987c:1).

This additional paragraph was added to the separate letter to the National Executive Committee, stating, 'I have no desire to make comments on political issues nor to involve our Church in politics, but I find it intolerable to have my lips sealed from saying anything on such matters when a specific application of God's Word is appropriate' (Foord 1987b:1).

Foord's frustration is understandable. What complicated the matter was that not only was the Word of God violated by the apartheid policy, but the denomination was indifferent towards it. The opinions voiced by the denomination towards the KD displayed an unwillingness to even listen to the concerns raised by others in the South African Christian community and thus confirmed the international perceptions about CESA. Their refusal to attend Tutu's enthronement demonstrated their non-commitment to reconciliation with the Anglican Communion.

Later in his life, Foord was more upfront in his interview with Marcia Cameron. She stated, 'CESA's stance on apartheid was one reason for his short tenure as presiding Bishop in South Africa' (2006:309). Foord commended Knox for his ability to focus on building CESA's theological college and not get involved in what Foord considered 'big issues around him' (Cameron 2006:309).

There was also pressure from having to defend Bradley's views, who continued to send out his *Friends Letters* even after his resignation. The Cape Area Executive was also concerned about their content that it urged his long-term friend and former Registrar, Herbert Hammond, to talk to him. After Hammond failed to persuade him, it

was agreed that the current Registrar (Murray Hofmeyr) would approach him (CESA CA-EM 1987:2).

Foord was frustrated by the denomination's leadership and their insensitivity to the plight of black people. Three months before his resignation, he reported this to the Cape Area Executive Committee, stating, 'I wonder, are we aware of the situation in black townships? Life in these areas for Christians is appalling. We can no longer sit tight in our easy White Areas. South Africa is going to be a 'different country' in the future. Are we preparing for it?' (1987d:1-2). Unfortunately, CESA was unprepared, but it was also unwilling to listen to those who would help it prepare. Foord thus had no choice but to resign or act out of concert with the denomination.

5.8. Embracing Church Theology (1988-1994)

During Bell's episcopacy, the culmination of this is reflected in the *KwaSizabantu Affirmation* in 1991. CESA embraced what the Kairos Theologians called Church Theology (1986:55ff). It advocated for unity without understanding, reconciliation without justice, the gospel without social action and democracy without nationalisation. It again avoided white guilt by averting responsibility away from the white minority, who enjoyed the privileges of whiteness but sought to paint all as guilty of apartheid.

5.8.1. The Episcopacy of Bishop Joseph Bell

After Foord's resignation, Bishop Joseph Bell transitioned to the leadership of the National Executive Committee on the 16th of September 1987 (CESA EM 1987:73). 'As Senior Bishop,' it was agreed that he would also chair the upcoming Synod meeting—where he was nominated and eventually elected as the Presiding Bishop of CESA (*ibid*).¹¹²

5.8.2. John Child's Proposal in 1987

Bell's episcopacy demonstrates the struggle to reform the church during an era of tremendous change in South Africa. CESA continued to try to formulate better policies

¹¹² Jeremiah Ngubane and Joseph Bell were nominated and consecrated on the same day, there is a picture of them kneeling side-by-side being consecrated at Christ Church Pinetown on the 2nd of December 1979, but Ngubane was the 'Bishop of the Mission Church', implying lower status than Bell (CESA SM 1988:24-25; 1979:5). Ngubane had also been held to be weak administratively prior to his nomination as bishop, so much so that it was proposed that he spend three months under the then Rev Frank Retief apprenticeship at St James Church Kenilworth to grow in this skill while Bell was trusted to lead the native work in Natal and be nominated for the position without a need to be upskilled (CESA EM 1979b:3; CESA EM 1978a:1).

on race. In the 1987 Synod, a young minister, John Child, proposed another motion on apartheid, which stated,

We confess that racial discrimination is a grievous sin wherever it is practised: whether in politics, the economy, or the Church, or in our personal dealing and relationships. We thus reject all policies of legalised discrimination on the basis of race or colour as unbiblical and unjust. We too confess our sins of racial discrimination, both as a Church and in our lives.

We acknowledge our guilt before God and ask him for forgiveness through Jesus Christ our Saviour from sin. We now, in the power of the Spirit, desire and intend to obey God's Word and law by committing ourselves to eliminate all forms of racial discrimination and injustice in our Church and lives (CESA SM 1987:24-25).

This motion was rejected because one delegate pointed out that they had not been given sufficient notice to consider it and were thus reluctant to vote (CESA SM 1987:24). In the end, it was agreed that the 1985 resolution would be reaffirmed for the second time. John Child's motion was the third resolution to be rejected by Synod. All three had two things that the 1985 resolution lacked: first, greater specificity about the wrongs done (apartheid in Newby's motion, unrighteous and discriminatory laws in Hofmeyr's notion and legalised discrimination in Child's motion) and second, they all had an acknowledgement of CESA's guilt, not a mere declaration of universal human guilt for being a sinner. Instead, in the tradition of the Reformers, they called for the repentance of a particular sin (apartheid) particularly.

CESA was reluctant to issue more assertive statements about racism than the 1985 resolution. In 1987, without a Synod resolution, the Executive decided that the SMEC would become a sub-committee of the Executive (CESA EM 1987a:4).¹¹³ In a report to the Executive in 1988, the SMEC advised against issuing further guidelines about race relations in the denomination but stated that these should come 'from regular preaching and teaching from the pulpit' (CESA EM 1988:90). However, it was bold in issuing strong condemnations of nudism, topless bathing, and blasphemous movies (CESA EM 1988:184, 195).

¹¹³ What is peculiar about this resolution is that the SMEC was intended to be a Synod sub-committee that was formed due to disaffection with the positions taken by the National Executive Committee on social justice (see CESA SM 1983:2). Having it report to the Executive does not make sense.

5.8.3. Resistance to Change

Contrary to CESA's assertions, the episcopacy of Bell was characterised by a commitment to supporting the state and the softening of the impact of apartheid on non-whites. There was some acknowledgement that there were problems in South Africa, but there was a reluctance to be prophetic in its engagement with the state. Discrimination was condemned, but there was a caution against participation in processes that would bring apartheid to an end. A more just society was desired, but there was reluctance to embrace justice at the expense of the church's relationship with the apartheid state.

5.8.4. Compassionate Apartheid

CESA continued to enjoy an audience with government officials after Bradley's resignation. Bradley introduced Foord, Bell and Hofmeyr to PW Botha and FW de Klerk (CESA 1984:4). When Bell became the presiding bishop, meetings with the state president still occurred, together with Murray Hofmeyr, Hebert Hammond, and Frank Retief (CESA 1988:90). In 1986, CESA was offered a position in the President's Council on Relations. This advisory council was established to help the apartheid government improve race relations in the country (CESA CA-EM 1986:3; Hofmeyr and Retief 1989:1-3).

The TRC statement portrays CESA's altruism on behalf of blacks in its interactions with the government (Cameron 2017:26-29).¹¹⁴ Primary sources give insight into their concerns and the solutions they proposed. The signed submission to the President's Council Committee on Relations is instructive. It advocated for alleviating the suffering caused by the Group Areas Act and for greater racial reconciliation (Hofmeyr and Retief 1989:1).¹¹⁵ It called for the easing of segregation laws—not for the abolishment of the Act altogether, it advised for the 'sharing of facilities where possible' and 'contact of a healthy nature at school level' (Hofmeyr and Retief 1988:1-3, emphasis added). Thus, implying that it might not be desirable in certain circumstances for blacks and whites to share facilities and that some contact between black and white children at a school level might be unhealthy.

¹¹⁴ The TRC Report also added that CESA 'spoke of how their leaders discreetly approached PW Botha and FW de Klerk to express "concern about wrongs." They did not, however, indicate what the response of the state was, nor did they spell out precisely what their "concern" was.' (TRC Report Vol. 4 1998:80, footnote 35).

¹¹⁵ The copy of this statement is only signed by Hofmeyr but there is space for Retief to sign with his initial and surname printed.

It also decried how the Group Areas Act was applied — particularly the effects of the state mis-classifying some of CESA's members as 'coloured' and the mistreatment that followed that categorisation (Hofmeyr 1988:1; Hofmeyr and Retief 1989:1). These presentations indicate the nature and scope of CESA leaders' advocacy on behalf of the blacks. It demonstrates that it was willing to accept a more compassionate form of discrimination and not a total abolishment of apartheid.¹¹⁶

Hofmeyr's complaint to the Minister of Law and Order about the violent investigative methods used by the police—the researcher understands this to imply torture and beatings while in custody—adopted the same posture as the 1977 letter to the Prime Minister about police brutality (Hofmeyr 1989d:1; cf Bradley 1977a:1). In 1989, two CESA pastors had to be moved to different churches because of police mistreatment; however, the complaint letter blamed the brutality on community unrest—not on the police directly. It ended the letter with the reassurance of CESA's support for the government, stating, 'We are sure this is a matter of great concern to your Department that there should be so much unrest in the Zulu areas in Natal and would like to assure you of our encouragement and support as the Police seek to maintain law and order' (Hofmeyr 1989d:1-2). Again, the importance of law-and-order trumped compassion—even towards those closest to the church.¹¹⁷

These details are missing in CESA's TRC submission, a point noted with suspicion in the TRC Report (Vol. 4 1998:80). It sought to present CESA as against apartheid, but the above accounts indicate continued support for segregation and a lack of total condemnation of apartheid. It was against its rigid application or 'petty apartheid.' It also demonstrates that the church was still more empathetic towards the state, while some of its own members fell victim to its human rights abuses.

5.8.5. A Challenge to Church Theology

The Kairos Moment had no impact on CESA's understanding of its relationship with the state. A 1987 sermon exegeting Romans 13 by John Frederick Allen did not mention the KD by name, but its argument rebutted the Kairos Theologians' analysis of the same passage (Kairos Theologians 1986:49-51). It called for obedience to the

¹¹⁶ CESA is comparable to the DRC in advocating for apartheid to be applied 'with compassion and humanity' (Meiring 2005:162).

¹¹⁷ Hofmeyr reported to the Executive that a letter had been sent to the minister asking for an investigation into police methods and the violence in Natal (CESA EM 1990a:5).

apartheid state and the church to not concern itself with social action or revolutionary protests (1987:1-5, 10-12, 19-23).

In 1988, Bell's synodical Charge conceded that Jesus was aware of the social challenges facing Israel during his ministry. However, he also reminded delegates that 'And yet, when all this has been said (and more instances of our Lord's social awareness can be given), there is not a recorded word, one instance, either implied or insinuated, of our Lord setting out to change these scandalous injustices and social wrongs as part of His preaching message' (Bell BC 1988:105-106). Bell used this observation to encourage clergy to focus on preaching the gospel of the coming Kingdom of Christ and not focus on this world's things (*ibid*).

On the other hand, Bradley spoke out against sanctions on South Africa in the United States; sanctions that were the catalysts for the very reform CESA Synods was encouraging (Bradley 2001:196). It appears as if the government was using Bradley to discredit Tutu, who was in America at the same time campaigning for imposing such sanctions (*CESA News* 1988:3). The Executive did not note any discomfort with Bradley's views or actions. Bradley's 1988 trip to Washington was celebrated in *CESA News* with no mention of the fact that it undermined the Spirit of the 1985 resolution and was contrary to its professedly 'apolitical' stance. In fact, in October 1989, Bishop Frank Retief took part in a televised debate against Archbishop Desmond Tutu, where Retief criticised Tutu for calling for sanctions against South Africa, labelling them as immoral and those advocating for them as those who were fighting evil with evil (*SAPA* 1989:11).

5.8.6. **Against the Social Gospel**

During the 1988 Synod, Jacob Mabaso (black) asked CESA to assist black ministers by developing biblical and pastoral guidelines to help them respond to 'Political, Cultural, Economic, and Educational Issues' in their context. However, Synod was unwilling to do so (CESA SM 1988:17).¹¹⁸ Martin Morrison pleaded with Synod, stating that 'this was a cry for help... the church did not seem to be responding' (CESA SM 1988:18). The Church emphasised the importance of evangelism over social action, it argued that 'evangelism brings converts whereas social involvement brings problems!'

¹¹⁸ Mabaso was then a minister of a church in Soweto.

(SMEC c. 1992:9). But resultantly, between 1989 and 1993, many teaching sessions were dedicated to exploring the subjects. Some of them are noteworthy.

- *Craig Bartholomew*

In 1989, Craig Bartholomew was asked to give a presentation on the role of the Church in society. The researcher asserts Bell may not have known the content of Bartholomew's presentation because it contradicted his 1988 Charge. Bartholomew's presentation was titled *Church and Society*. The anticipation of synodical scepticism to his argument was evident: he began by reassuring delegates he was still an evangelical and that Oxford University, where he had just finished his Masters, had not influenced his views, but he had arrived at them from careful study and observations while in South Africa (1989:2, 12). Like Newby's, this presentation was significant in CESA's history, but later historiographies have unfortunately ignored it.

119

Bartholomew asserted the following regarding CESA's professed apoliticism:

The CESA is perceived as a denomination that avoids political involvement of any sort. It may get involved socially but certainly steers clear of politics. Our bishops may urge PW/FW to move away from the Group Areas but we have no formal commitment to such an opposition. Certainly, we are not encouraging our people to get involved at a socio-political level—I wonder how many of us who serve in predominantly white congregations thought it necessary to give our people some instruction about Christian citizenship in the lead up to the latest white elections. I suspect that you would hardly know there have been elections from our preaching. We have some statements out on nudity, and we are wrestling with Sabbath observance, but we have no statement on apartheid, conscientious objection, the ways in which SA policies are racist [sic], practical ways in Church can combat racism, etc... (1989:5-6).

He held that CESA 'sees socio-political involvement as a distraction from evangelism, or more seriously as a betrayal of evangelism. Evangelism is to be the way in which the Church is to relate to the world and socio-political involvement is seen as altogether secondary, if not undesirable' (1989:7). He criticised the separatist ecumenical approach as seen in its lack of involvement with the Lausanne Movement. He challenged its narrow interpretation of the Great Commission as only evangelism

¹¹⁹ The exception is Fredrick Hale who interviewed Bartholomew in 1992 for this thesis.

without social responsibilities and advocated for socio-political involvement of the church—while still maintaining the primacy of evangelism (1989:7-13). Bartholomew commended Dr Knox's analysis of the Kairos Document for engaging with Black Theology but questioned why an equivalent analysis of 'White Theology' was lacking (1989:4). He encouraged the church, inspired by Scripture, to be salt and light; to challenge socio-political structures when those were contrary to the Bible (1989:17-21).

- *Reaction to Bartholomew*

His presentation was well-received by some. John Child proposed distributing copies to all CESA churches (*CESA News* 1990:4). However, two months after Bartholomew's presentation, the Registrar of CESA published a statement clarifying the denomination's socio-political stand. He reiterated CESA's 1985 statement and assured readers that the leadership is in constant engagement with political leaders but would not be issuing socio-political pronouncements because CESA believed national leaders were servants of God elected to do good (*CESA News* 1990a:1). The second issue of the 1990 *CESA News* published the former Presiding Bishop Bradley's rebuttal of Bartholomew's argument. In it, he stated,

If the C. of E. in South Africa changes its historical stance re socio-political involvement, then it will surely be launched into "another Gospel." The church has one single mandate from its Lord—"Go into all the world, preach the Gospel to every person." We have a splendid examples from our active bishops, who preached wherever they could, who went out seeking the lost in the streets and from door to door. We pay lip service to "preach the Gospel to every person," BUT DO NOT DO IT... The Church of England in South Africa must rediscover that the service of God is a calling to evangelism, not to socio-political involvement. What did the Lord say about the tyrannical Roman Empire but "render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, to God the things that are God's"? What did the Lord say about military service except "whoever will compel thee to go a mile, go with him two"? What did Paul say about slavery? "slaves be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh" (1990b:2).

The discouragement of socio-political involvement followed Bartholomew's presentation. For instance, Bell's response to violence in Natal was an encouragement to be part of the solution through prayer, love, and trust in the sovereignty of God—nothing was said about being involved in negotiations for peace despite many CESA members in the region and the church's relationship with the government (1990:2).

Bell's 1990 Charge included a sizeable portion dedicated to warning its clergy against the perils of preaching the 'social Gospel' in an attempt to correct the emphasis of the past (Bell 1990:2-7). He rejected the pull towards being apologetic about the past, reminding clergy he had advocated for black people in his interactions with Botha (Bell 1990:3). This Charge was received with a standing ovation by Synod delegates (CESA SM 1990:1). It is difficult to read it and not understand it as a rejection of Bartholomew's 1989 presentation. Bartholomew perceived it as so in an interview with Frederick Hale in 1992 (in Hale 1992:524-525). In 1991, the Executive issued a resolution prohibiting all clergy from political involvement (CESA EM 1991a:4).

The criticism against Bartholomew was entirely unwarranted: his views did not differ from those of CESA's Evangelical cousins — the Sydney Anglicans such as John Woodhouse. He held Christians should be concerned with both evangelism and social action (Woodhouse 1987; 1988:22-23; Bartholomew 1989:12). Like Woodhouse, and contrary to the 1974 Lausanne Covenant, he still advocated for the supremacy of evangelism as the primary function of the Church and understood social action as subservient to spiritual concerns (1989:14-15, 23). He was suspicious of Liberation Theology and the influence of communism. He indicated the same concerns about moral decay in society. He renounced violent revolutions and advocated for apoliticism (Bartholomew 1989:4, 19, 21, 23).¹²⁰ The only novel emphasis from Bartholomew was that CESA should adopt a more aggressive posture against apartheid (1989:21-22). However, the target of his critics was the socio-political aspect because that was understood to lead to a more aggressive approach or what I've termed as 'the extreme' (Ive 1992:229). In CESA, to declare apartheid unbiblical was considered extreme, political, and venturing outside ecclesial bounds.

5.8.7. **Social, Moral and Ethics Committee**

A more acceptable methodology of teaching about socio-political involvement could be seen in CESA's SMEC workshop handout titled *The Church's Response to the Social Needs and Changes in the New South Africa* (c.1992). This workshop occurred in Transvaal and was part of a campaign designed by SMEC to prepare the church for

¹²⁰ In a seminar reflecting on this paper in 2022, Bartholomew conceded that his views on the subject had changed and developed. He added that if he were addressing the same subject, he added that he would have been 'far more careful in my assessment of the insights of liberation theology, without appropriating it uncritically, I would emphasise contextualisation more strongly. I would emphasise that the glory of God who has come to us in the face of Christ, and the wellbeing of the world, are at stake in this debate. It cannot and must not be relegated to a secondary status' (Bartholomew 2022:4).

racial integration and increased secularism that would characterise the democratic order (Grazioli 1992:98 of 112). A sample of this workshop included in the 1992 Synod report by SMEC had questions such as ‘What is racial discrimination and prejudice? What does the Bible teach about discrimination? What is the attitude of our church members to racial discrimination? How can the Church help her people relate to increased cultural integration in our society? (e.g., mixing in the workplace/the suburbs/ racially mixed marriages?’ (Grazioli 1992:94 of 112). Unfortunately, no answers have been recorded to these questions, but Grazioli reported that ‘an average 30% improvement in knowledge was recorded in pre-workshop vs post-workshop surveys. 80% of those who attended said their attitude had significantly changed to either one or all the topics covered’ (1992:92 of 112).

Unlike Bartholomew's, which took the ecumenical approach in its critique, the SMEC presentation in Transvaal relied on the Bible to argue for CESA members to care for the whole man, not just his spiritual concerns (c.1992:2-4). It argued that social responsibilities were part of biblical stewardship and encouraged Christians to get involved in all social causes to reach the lost (SMEC c.1992:5-8). It added that socio-political concerns should be understood as vehicles for evangelism, not as ends in themselves. The presenter illustrated this by noting that his church was involved in an adult literacy programme as evangelistic aid (SMEC c.1992:9). However, the presentation did not address the underlying cause of illiteracy among previously disadvantaged ethnicities—except that inequality is a result of sin. Unlike Bartholomew, this workshop sheet did not challenge CESA to confront structural inequalities or renounce apartheid. Instead, it sought to encourage people by challenging them to do more for society so that they have more opportunities to share the gospel.

5.8.8. Ecumenicalism and Social Justice

From the early nineties, CESA saw the value of ecumenical relations in South Africa—more so to exert its influence than to be persuaded to change. It was critical of frameworks that did not neatly fit into its definition of evangelicalism (see Norman 1999:5-6).¹²¹ For instance, Martin Morrison's report to Synod about an ecumenical

¹²¹ Mark Norman's report to Synod after the 1999 Rustenburg Conference (the so-called Rustenburg II) where conservative evangelicalism was criticised for being individualistic and unconcerned with social change. Instead of responding directly to the criticism, his response was that the country needed to be educated on what the conservative evangelicalism was (1999:5-8).

conference avers, 'the Conference was of value. Although the majority of the delegates were evangelicals in the broad sense, the discussion and papers presented were not Biblically based. CESA needs to contribute on an inter-church basis within South Africa and find out what other churches are saying and doing to make our contribution' (CESA SM 1990:12).

- *Rustenburg Declaration*

CESA was invited to the 1990 Rustenburg Church Conference. Van der Merwe (2021:1) described it as the second most significant Conference in the Church in South Africa—second only to the Cottesloe Conference of 1960 (cf Clarke 2008:479). The Rustenburg Declaration, hereafter 'RD,' rejected apartheid as 'a heretical policy,' it confessed that the South African Church was complicit in supporting it and called for justice to bring about reconciliation (RD 1990: 1 of 4). It confessed the 'colonial arrogance' of apartheid beneficiaries and the timidity of apartheid victims (RD 1990:1-2 of 4). It acknowledged the church's failure to speak prophetically to the state and that the violence of the late eighties and early nineties was caused by the 'denial of full political rights to most South African' (RD 1990:3 of 4).

CESA rejected the Rustenburg Declaration. A report to the Executive notes: 'Bp. Bell reported on his attendance of the Conference and his impressions. It was AGREED to communicate the Church's reservations regarding the Declaration arising from this Conference to the State President' (CESA EM 1991a:4).¹²² His Synodical report also stated that there were 'aspects of the Declaration with which we might not identify,' consequently, it was mentioned in passing and not presented for a vote by Synod (CESA SM 1991:8).

- *KwaSizabantu Affirmation*

Instead of the RD, CESA became a signatory of the less known 1991 *KwaSizabantu Affirmation* (Ive 1992:248-255; cf CESA SM 1991:9-10). This affirmation resulted from a meeting of conservative evangelical Christians under the banner of 'Christianity and Religious Freedom' (Bradley 2003:202).¹²³ The Executive minutes note,

¹²² The reason the note was sent to the President was because was his initiative to convene the conference, even though he later withdrew his attendance (van der Merwe 2021:1; Denis 2017:8; Gous 1993:249).

¹²³ It is submitted that Bradley is mistaken in dating this conference to 1992, the Synod considered this affirmation in September 1991. Therefore, it must have taken place earlier in 1991 (see CESA SM 1991:9-10).

'KwaSizabantu Affirmation: It was AGREED to inform the State President that the Church was in sympathy with the Biblical stand in the Affirmation' (CESA EM 1991a:4). This affirmation rejected 'racial discrimination and class hatred' by both black and white Christians who both failed to live out the command to love their neighbours (Ive 1992:250; cf CAA 1991:5-6).¹²⁴ It expressed regret for an ideology that enabled the domination of one race over the other and feared that it would be replaced by classism (Ive 1992:250). It was pessimistic about the upcoming democratic society and displayed underlying fears about communism, humanism, and the interfaith movement's involvement in drafting the Interim Constitution (Ive 1992:251-252; cf CAA 1991:15).

It was also concerned that the economic policies of the upcoming government would lead to the expropriation of land owned by whites. Therefore, it rejected 'any form of 'nationalisation' and forced redistribution of wealth and Land. It is an observable fact that whenever this Biblical law has been violated, as in Socialist countries, the result has been starvation, wastage, and death of millions' (Ive 1992:254). The foundation for that rejection was the understanding that it was against the biblical law against stealing and coveting, implying that the Land, then possessed by whites, was not a result of covetous theft but merit or racial favouritism (cf CAA 1991:7-8). It held to the four-fold spheres of government; personal, family, church and civil, with differing responsibilities (Ive 1992:253; Swain 1993:32-33). There were fears that the democratic government would introduce laws which would encroach on personal, family, and religious liberties. These views indicated remnants of Rhushdonian reconstructionism. An article by Michael Swain in CESA's *Christian Living Today* (1993) advertised an international symposium for the 'biblical reconstruction of South Africa' (1993:33).

5.9. RWCG Leaders and Democracy

Dick Begbie (par. 4.9.4), who had been prominent in CESA from the sixties to the eighties, was displeased by the government's decision to free political prisoners ' , "Nelson Mandela and his atheistic Marxist associates' (1992:343). He left South Africa

¹²⁴ Until 1997, during its TRC submission, CESA never condemned discrimination specifically by whites towards blacks. It preferred to include blacks because of its belief that all people are sinners.

for Scotland because of concerns that law, order, responsible government, and Christian standards would decline.

Additionally, CESA's Owen Fourie, who was also involved with the Gospel Defence League, indicated similar sentiments in a presentation given at a Foreign Missions Club in London. He sought to defend the historical position of Europeans in South Africa, arguing that structural development would have been impossible without the Western, Calvinistic, and Puritan ingenuity (1990:1). Furthermore, he expressed fears that democracy, which is governed by the will of the people, was going to replace the voice of God and with 'rule-by-fallen-people' (1990:2). Also influenced by Rausas Rashdoomy, he longed for the restoration of Christian rule in South Africa and was sceptical about democracy (Fourie 1990:4-10).

5.10. **St. James Church Massacre**

CESA stated it learned empathy towards black South Africans after the St James Church Massacre (Cameron 2017:29-30). In 1993, the Azanian People's Liberation Army members killed 11 and injured 58 church worshipers at CESA's St. James Church in Kenilworth, Cape Town. The church was not targeted out of revenge for anything St James or CESA had said or done, but CESA represented white domination. One attacker, Bassie Mkhumbuzi, stated that 'I felt that whites were using churches to oppress blacks' (DOJ 1997).¹²⁵ The transcripts of the amnesty hearings do not indicate that the attackers knew anything about the political utterances of CESA or its leaders. However, it is revealing that CESA's St James Church was targeted and not a CPSA church or any other English church. Balcomb (2004:12) argues that even CESA's postulations about the attack failed to realise the connection between the attack and its historical support of apartheid. The researcher concurs with Balcomb and adds that no written sources were found to corroborate its claim about learning empathy from this tragedy.

5.11. **Concluding Remarks**

The episcopacy of Foord was marked by an earnest effort to align CESA with the rest of the Anglican communion on its views about race. This era had the most significant discussions about CESA's race policy and its relationship with the apartheid state. His

¹²⁵ DOJ stands for Department of Justice.

resignation from CESA was unfortunate. The reforms he suggested would take longer, and CESA was less coherent in its theological position on race and its relationship with the government. There was a willingness to accept that discrimination was unbiblical, but that concession did not extend to apartheid.

The episcopacy of Bell was marked by incongruities in the messages and actions of CESA regarding race and its relationship with the state. CESA was still committed to supporting the state and, at the same time, wanted to be viewed as apolitical or progressive. The reformists within CESA had no impact on CESA's policies. The 1985 compromise resolution stood as the historical policy of CESA. By 1997, it was touted as though it was the denomination's policy from 1948, but the historical data has argued that this is a misinformed and a misinforming perception.

It is submitted that the change of attitude towards apartheid has its origin during the TRC hearings. The 1985 resolution was not anti-apartheid but was a compromise statement used to refute the claims of the church's support for the state. The change that CESA leaders advocated for in their private meetings with state officials was about the arrest of the moral decline in the country and the softening of apartheid legislation, not its abolishment. It was only during the TRC that CESA distanced itself from apartheid (Bell 1997:1-2; CESA 1999:7 of 12). The claim that it has always been apolitical or divorced from party politics is not supported by historical data.

6. CHAPTER 6: Summary, Findings and Recommendations

6.1. Introduction

The authors of the *RICSA Report*, from which the *TRC Report* chapter on the role of faith communities is based, were aware that some narratives presented before the TRC were untrue. They argued that ‘truth is something, ironically, that we will build on the back of lies, untruths and deceit’ (Cochrane *et al.* 1999:7). For they understood that some churches gave vague accounts of their actions. Bergen added that the confessions were not necessarily what they did, but ‘what the churches *said* they did’ (2011:85, emphasis in the original). This research has been an attempt to uncover the truth from a submission whose narrative does not accord with primary sources. It has been concerned with whether CESA told the ‘whole truth and nothing but the truth’ or, as Villa-Vicencio asked, did it explain or did it explain away its role during apartheid? (1999:200). The researcher asserts that CESA’s submission did not tell the whole truth but instead explained away its role.

6.2. Aim and Objectives

This is primarily a summary and concluding portion of the research; this chapter aims to:

- Summarise the research findings.
- Bring attention to the failures of CESA’s submissions.
- Make recommendations to CESA on how to respond to these findings.

6.3. Summary of the Research Findings

The question addressed in this research was this: *What is the essence and scope of the Church of England in South Africa’s historiographical claimed apoliticism during the apartheid years of 1948 to 1994?* It has demonstrated that CESA was not apolitical, but it advocated for State Theology and should have been classified as an agent of oppression in the TRC Report.

In 1998, Joseph Bell and Frank Retief were the most senior active members of the National Executive Committee (par. 6.4.3). Together with the other members of the Executive, they failed to appraise the commission about the active role taken by former CESA leaders such as, but not limited to, Gordon Mills and Stephen Bradley,

in defence of apartheid. They omitted significant and relevant historiographies such as, but not limited to, the reasons behind resignation of Foord and the responses of the denomination to internal calls for the reform of their public theology. They failed to be specific about the nature and scope of their engagements with government officials in the 1980s and omitted to mention the denominations desires for a theocracy as expressed by CESA clergy such as Dick Begbie and the synodical adoption of the *KwaSizabantu Affirmation*.

The TRC also failed to investigate the denomination beyond their submission (*contra* Bergen 2011:85-86). The most glaring negligence occurred during the in-person hearings in 1998. It was as though the chairperson of the commission, Desmond Tutu, had no prior knowledge or engagement with the denomination on the matter of apartheid even though he had debated Frank Retief (who presented CESA's statement) on sanctions nine years earlier in a nationally televised episode (see par. 5.8.5).

6.3.1. Chapter 1

The introductory chapter highlighted the incongruences between CESA's historiography and its TRC submission, namely the criticism of the 1998 National Synod delegates—noting that CESA had done nothing for which to apologise. Critique also came from CESA's black ministers in 2020, who alleged that the narrative presented to the TRC was sanitised. Finally, attention was also drawn to scholarly criticism, which claimed that CESA unquestionably supported the government by drawing attention to Bradley's eulogy at HF Verwoerd's funeral. All this resulted in doubt about CESA's long-held assumption of always been a politically neutral church. It is that doubt that formed the basis for this historical-critical investigation.

6.3.2. Chapter 2

This chapter discussed the theoretical framework of the TRC and CESA's understanding of the TRC mandate. It explained the working definitions of Church History, Historiography and Collective Memory used in the research. It outlined the TRC's conception of the past and its understanding of whether it was involved in writing a real history of apartheid.¹²⁶ It argued that the TRC's historical mandate was

¹²⁶ Real historical writing is an antiquated attempt to reconstruct the past. It also claims to write objectively (Vörös 2017:784).

not to write real history but to paint as complete a picture as possible of the past to facilitate reconciliation. Finally, it noted that CESA understood that its forgiveness and reconciliation were conditional on it submitting an authentic historical account.

6.3.3. Chapter 3

The third chapter briefly described the history of CESA, paying particular attention to its separation from the CPSA in 1870, its historically Erastian theology and the role of the state in mediating ecclesial disputes against the CPSA. It further examined CESA's public theology and the formative years of its relationship with the apartheid state. It argued that the TRC mis-classified CESA and asserted that it should be viewed as an apartheid collaborator because of the pronouncements made by members of its Propagation Committee in support of the government (and to distinguish itself from the historically more prophetic CPSA). Last, it traced CESA's relationship with Verwoerd from 1954 to 1965 and noted the benefits of its collaboration with the government, such as its exclusion from state surveillance.

6.3.4. Chapter 4

The fourth chapter detailed CESA's public theology from 1965 to 1984. It demonstrated that CESA was not apolitical but was actively advocating for apartheid as an acceptable political system to mediate peace between races until the evolutionary maturity of the blacks. It brought attention to Bradley's 1967 trip to Australia as pivotal in making CESA a long-term ally of the government. It discussed two overseas trips by Bradley to Europe and America, where he spoke on behalf of the state against sanctions on South Africa. It noted the role of the Sydney Anglicans in supporting CESA's defence of apartheid. It highlighted CESA's relationship with the Department of Information Affairs and the Department of Foreign Affairs as indicators of its involvement in Muldergate. It argued that CESA should have been viewed as a Right-Wing Christian Group by the TRC. Last, it highlighted how CESA stood up to the state by noting its opposition to the moral decline in South Africa and the liberalisation of the state in the 70s and 80s. This era ended with a synodical complaint about CESA's selective advocacy and resulted in the 1985 resolution.

6.3.5. Chapter 5

The fifth chapter demonstrated that the 1985 resolution on race appeared reformist but was an inadequate compromise, which did not signal meaningful change within the church. Despite its condemnation of discrimination, it was reluctant to condemn apartheid explicitly or extricate the church from the government. It briefly discussed Ford's influence on CESA and the resistance to change that caused his early resignation as its Presiding Bishop. It also critically assessed Bell's episcopacy up to 1994 and held that it was a progression from State Theology to Church Theology. Finally, it evaluated CESA's understanding of the relationship between the gospel and social justice, noting its opposition to any implication that the Church, as an institution, was called to be concerned with social justice.

6.4. **The Failures of CESA's TRC Submission**

The failures of CESA's submission may be classified under two inseparable categories: hermeneutical and ethical; these two are inseparable because it is ethical beings who make hermeneutical decisions. Writing history requires both hermeneutical skills (gathering and collating data) and ethical conduct (making moral judgments about which avenues are legitimate sources of data, which data to include or exclude and how to interpret data).¹²⁷ CESA made moral judgements on whose narratives were a representation of the church. Avishai Margalit argues that thick relations, such as those of members of the same denomination, have ethical demands to bear moral witness about the past (2002:7-8, 147-148). In his *Ethics of Memory*, he argues that our care for other human beings comes with burdens on our memory.¹²⁸ That care is demonstrated in historicisations, such as the submission to the TRC.¹²⁹ Paul Ricœur makes a similar argument from another angle, 'The duty of memory is the duty to do justice, through memories, to an other than the self.' (2004:89).

The selected methodology of the current research has limited the investigation to literature analysis. This limitation makes an ethical-hermeneutical point; it has demonstrated that if the Executive sought to honour the victims of apartheid, the information needed to form an authentic narrative, even if those involved in the

¹²⁷ Harold Brietenberg Jr. makes a similar argument about the inherent ethical nature of Public Theology, his argument is extended to the writing of this history because it is a history of CESA's Public Theology (in Markham 2020:82-83).

¹²⁸ This book is inspired by public moral outrage towards an Israeli commanding officer who failed to remember the name of a young soldier who had been killed under his command (Margalit 2002: IV). Margalit argues, 'On the face of it, asking about remembering the name of the soldier is just a metonym for asking about remembering the young soldier himself' (2002:19). He does this to demonstrate that memory is a necessary condition for caring. Thus, failure to remember is failure to care (2002:30).

¹²⁹ Merriam-Webster defines to historicise as 'to make historical' (2022).

leadership during apartheid years were not forthcoming with data, was available. The absence of this information in CESA's TRC submission is an ethical-hermeneutical failure.

6.4.1. Ignoring the Testimonies of Former Leaders

At least three former leaders of CESA were still alive during the TRC process. Ideally, it should have been these leaders who appeared by the TRC. Stephen Bradley, Hebert Hammond, and Anthony Ive all served during the Commission's investigation period of 1960 to 1993.¹³⁰ These leaders may not have represented the current views on race, but the Commission was not only interested in the current position. Ignoring them did not invalidate the past, which they were an essential part.

- *Hebert Hammond*

Hammond, the former Registrar, and member of the Executive objected that the statement was drawn up and presented without adequate consultation with former leaders. He perceived the extended submission to be contrary to the church's historical position (Hammond 1998:1; Hofmeyr 2009). He argued that it would have been better not to make a statement than do so only to appear contemporary (Hammond 1998:1). He added that '[t]he commandment is to honour your parents which in the New Testament includes your 'elders' and [to] humiliate them by public repudiation is surely the opposite' (Hammond 1998:2, emphasis added).

Hammond's comments indicated that the narrative presented before the TRC differed from the views he had propagated during his tenure as the spokesperson for the church. His service should have rendered his views essential, but he was excluded.

- *Anthony Ive*

Ive, another former Executive Committee member, editor of *Church News* and *Today Magazine*, and CESA historian, argued that the 'backwards-looking' Commission would not achieve true reconciliation (1998b:3). He criticised CESA's submission, stating that,

¹³⁰ By this it meant the era under investigation by the Commission.

The letter dated 18 July 1997 to the TRC by Bishop Joe [Bell] was not contested at Synod although possibly others, besides myself, felt it was at the borderline of acceptability in its effort to be conciliatory. However, the tone of this longer submission can be described as pathetic grovelling and I must disassociate myself from it. We have all been exposed to the ANC/SACP propaganda for the past thirty years which has intensified since 1990 and even more so since 1994 when the electronic media was taken over. The success of this propaganda was certainly reflected in the submission of which the writers seem to have been thoroughly brainwashed (1998a:1).

Ive highlighted the inaccuracy, claiming that CESA had no theologians of note by reminding the Executive that the Kairos Document was 'subjected to effective analysis by Murdo Gordon, Broughton Knox, and Philip Hughes, while we had full access to the analytical critic of the Kairos Document by the internationally well-known Lutheran theologian Peter Beyerhaus' (1998a:2). He also concurred with Hammond that the submission was a reversal of its historical position, which had been done without adequate consultation (Ive 1998b:1).

Ive's comments demonstrated the aggressive defence of State Theology, which was characteristic of CESA during the apartheid years. He was correct about the church's criticism of the Kairos Document. He accused the drafters of being brainwashed because the submission was a radical departure from the church's historical position (*ibid*).

- *Stephen Bradley*

In a newsletter to the then Principal of Moore Theological College, Peter Jensen, in March 1997 (prior to the first submission by CESA); Bradley was supportive of the idea of a truth commission, but he was still defensive of the state's historic position. He wrote:

The Truth Commission goes on and on. We have referred to this in previous letters. It is very important... The Commission's job is to dig up the past with threats, summons, and subpoenas. As we said in a previous letter, South Africa was unwittingly involved in a cold war which kept on breaking out in hot spots. We are hearing with horror of beastly cowardly torture meted out to prisoners, but worse than that to suspects. That is inexcusable. There is no defence for that. But it must be seen in the context of total war. Germans., Russians and Japanese did far more terrible things wherever they fought (Bradley 1997a:3-4).

He had changed his disposition after CESA's June 1997 submission. In a letter to Ive on the 2nd of February 1998, he expressed admiration for PW Botha's antagonistic attitude towards the TRC and his protracted refusal to appear before it despite the subpoenas (Bradley 1998b:1; Tutu 2000:36-37; cf Borraine n.d.:5-6).

In a letter to Frank Retief four days after CESA's appearance at the Commission, he stated, 'I feel that I can write now—having gotten over my rage!.' He then reminded Retief about the communist threats facing South Africa during the apartheid years to justify the government's combative attitude towards activists. His opinion of the Commission had changed (Bradley 1997b:3). He argued that,

I believe the TRC is an evil thing. It knows nothing of Paul's dictum, "forgetting the things that are behind, stretching for the things ahead, we press forward towards the high calling of God." These things happened in wartime, they should not, but they do, be dug up. The Boers remember the concentration camps, the Jews remember the holocaust. Our business is to make disciples, to be blessed examples of this "take the Gospel to every man" (Bradley 1997b:3-4).

Bradley had been consulted on the draft statement by the drafters, and he was displeased by the final draft, but his objections were ignored (see Wright 1998:3; Grazioli 1998:2).

The researcher submits that the exclusion of Bradley's comments and actions in the final submission to the TRC was an attempt to protect him from public embarrassment. It was thus decided that his reputation was more important than truth and that his honour was worth more than the dignity of those who suffered under the system he defended.

6.4.2. Ignoring the Black Anglican Experience

The submission revealed a lack of historical egalitarianism within CESA. Black narratives of discrimination and courage to (publicly) speak truth to power were marginalised in favour of white suffering, white brainwashing, white guilt, and white benevolence on behalf of blacks (see CESA 1999:5 of 12). There was no direct mention of the suffering of black Anglicans. For instance, Synod had been informed about the dispossession of their churches by the state to make space for white farmers in 1965 (Chamane 1965:1-2). *Church News* had published a story of police brutality endured by teenagers of a CESA minister during the 1976 Soweto uprising (Ive 1976a:14). Additionally, there was the letter by Murray Hofmeyr to the Minister of Law

and Order, discussed in the last chapter, copied Bell, Retief, Ngubane and Wright (Hofmeyr 1989:1).

There was no direct mention of the marginalisation of outspoken black Anglicans who were part of the Concerned Evangelicals (see Louw 2003:38). The cause for this was that CESA was considered a white church; therefore, the white experience was considered normative. Black Anglican experience came second, even in the historicization of CESA. The church, with members from different ethnicities, was not remembered equally.

It is also telling that the Cape Area Council, CESA's second biggest region and one with the least number of black or coloured churches, was the only region privileged to comment on the draft TRC submission (Wright 1998:1). The statement claimed to represent a majority-black church, but only three of the twenty members of the Executive Committee, which authored the submission, were black. Furthermore, only one of the five representatives who appeared before the TRC was black. Black Anglicans were referred to vaguely as those who suffered as black South African victims of apartheid. On the other hand, white leaders such as Retief, Morrison, Bell and Hofmeyr were cast as progressively enlightened and empathetic advocates for change (CESA 1999:5 of 12).¹³¹ The resulting impression was of some white leaders as signals of hope for a more prophetic church.

6.4.3. Ignoring Primary Sources

The researcher is sympathetic that the leadership may not have had the benefits of time, training, and modern technology to compile a comprehensive report for the Commission. However, this limitation did not prohibit it from seeking assistance from GWC (where John Newby and Craig Bartholomew were lecturers) or making corrections to its submission after the criticism from its former leaders. Instead, CESA chose to present a submission that spoke 'on behalf of the majority' instead of a narrative that helped the church face the past—even if that version was unpopular with the majority (CESA SM 1998:12).

¹³¹ Jeremy Bergen adds that this response was, in part, the fault of the TRC which asked churches to detail its complicity and its opposition to apartheid, CESA may have felt the pressure to answer both aspects as though they always went hand-in-hand. (2011:83).

- *William Cullen Library*

CESA's historical records have been stored at William Cullen Library at the University of Witwatersrand since 1990. Some of the Executive members in 1997 were part of the meeting that decided (on Noel Wright's advice) to deposit the material at William Cullen Library and thus should have known about their existence (CESA EM 1990b:4; CESA EM 1991:5).¹³² Additionally, Rene Johnson sent Bell copies of approximately twenty letters, submissions and memorandums detailing CESA's interactions with public officials. These letters were written by Bradley, Hammond, Hofmeyr and Retief. Bell planned to use them to inform his 1990 Synodical Charge (Johnson 1990:1).¹³³ This bundle proved essential for this research—it is unclear why its content was not deemed relevant by Bell, who drafted the 1997 short statement and was part of the Executive in 1998.

- *Moore Theological College*

CESA information was also available at Moore Theological College. Letters from Broughton Knox, Donald Robinson and Stephen Bradley were beneficial. The research material used by Peter Sportalis, containing minutes of CESA's Synod minutes from 1938 to 1955, was deposited at the college. The college's online repository, the Ark Digital Repository, proved extremely valuable—especially the *Australian Church Records*.

6.4.3.1. Ignoring Collective Memory

The Executive, which received and replied to the chairperson of the TRC, should have been aware of some of the information presented in this study. The table below summarises its composition in 1998 and the years they were elected or first appeared in the Executive or Synod minutes. The longest-serving members were Bishops Bell and Retief, who were ordained as deacons in 1966 and were elected to the Executive in 1975.¹³⁴

Composition of the National Executive Committee in 1998

¹³² The destination was suggested by Wright, but the execution was undertaken by Brian Cameron—to whom a special present was given during a Cape Area Council Meeting in appreciation for this task (CESA EM 1991b:5).

¹³³ There is a handwritten note on the cover-page of this bundle, which reads 'For the Charge'.

¹³⁴ * Marks those who were part of the delegation present during CESA's TRC submission in East London, along with Rev Ernie du Plooy, who does not appear to be a member of the Executive (CESA 1999:1 of 14).

Name	Elected	References
1. Rt. Rev Joe Bell (Presiding Bishop)	1975	CESA EM 1975:24
2. Rt. Rev Frank Retief (Area Bishop) *	1975	CESA EM 1975:24
3. Rt. Rev Martin Morrison (Area Bishop) *	1988	CESA SM 1988:31
4. Rt. Rev Jeremiah Ngubane (Area Bishop)	1980	CESA SM 1980:7
5. Rev Elias Majozi*	1990	CESA SM 1990:20
6. Rev Donald Kirkwood	1997	CESA SM 1997:15
7. Rev Alan Gray	1990	CESA CA-EM 1990:2
8. Rev T Tobson	1990	CESA CA-EM 1990:2
9. Rev Desmond Ingelsby	1997	CESA SM 1997:15
10. Rev Dr A Grazioli	1986	CESA SM 1986:30
11. Rev Brain D Cameron (Secretary)	1979	CESA SM 1979:2
12. Mr Alistair McIntosh	N/A	No data ¹³⁵
13. Mr I. Ndlovu	1980	CESA SM 1980:7
14. Mr Peter McIntosh	1984	CESA SM 1984:8
15. Prof. J. van Bever Donker	1986	CESA SM 1986:30
16. Mr J. Neild	1990	CESA SM 1990:20
17. Mr Chippie A. Brand	1982	CESA SM 1982:7
18. Mr Noel R. Wright*	1980	CESA SM 1980:7
19. Mr N. Fraser	N/A	No data
20. Mr L. Falconer	N/A	No data

6.5. Recommendations for CESA

CESA's role is revisited because apartheid was not a victimless crime. Its impact continues to linger, and millions of people suffered and continue to suffer its consequences. Those people deserve to know what happened; knowledge is essential for reconciliation. A 2005 United Nations Commission on Human Rights Report stated that 'every people [sic] has the inalienable right to know the truth about past events concerning the perpetration of heinous crimes,' especially the victims (in Hayner 2010:23-24). Karn argues that human rights and redress exist in tension;

¹³⁵ The researcher speculates that members of the Executive who had not been elected by Synod were co-opted members of the GWC board.

human rights are often not respected in a context where there has been an entrenched pervasion of historiographies (2015:20). He further argues that historically marginalised groups have a right to know the truth about their history so that it may aid them in seeking remediation (Karn 2015:21). Ricœur (2004:89) emphasises that the moral priority of memory is always the victims.

Therefore, first, there needs to be an official acknowledgement of CESA's role in preserving apartheid. Hayner states, 'Official acknowledgement can be powerful precisely because official denial can be so pervasive' (2010:21). Gobodo-Madikizela also states that 'the moral complicity of many White South Africans who were beneficiaries of privileges of the apartheid state by virtue of their Whiteness is left unexplained, slipping into a downward spiralling cycle of denial whenever legacies of apartheid play out in repetition' (2012:253). Continuing to hold to the narrative of apoliticism during the apartheid years, while faced with overwhelming evidence to the contrary and the legacies of its support, is untenable and demonstrates insensitivity to the victims of apartheid and a low regard for truth. This is much more shameful for the church—which claims to be the bastion of eternally consequential truth.

Second, the church needs to revise its historiography. What is taught about CESA's history to students at GWC is woefully inadequate, outdated and entrenches the narrative discredited in this research. It is unfortunate that the main text for the Anglicanism course at GWC remains to be Anthony Ive's *A Candle Burns in Africa* (1992).

6.6. Concluding Remarks

The intention of the researcher has not been to shame CESA, but to correct a narrative that has thwarted true reconciliation in the denomination. It has demonstrated that this narrative does not accord with historical data. It is hoped that this correction will lead to a much more informed discussion about structural inequality in CESA with a clearer picture of the denomination's role in the past injustices. It also hoped that CESA would learn from its history and come to God in repentance. Mandy Goedhals reminds us that 'the judgment of history ... is often less merciful than the gracious judgment of God' (1989:110).

ANNEXTURE 1

Testimony of the Church of England in South Africa Before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission

Introduction

The Church of England was established in this country around 1806, with the first Bishop being sent from England by the Colonial Office in 1847. The church in those days was largely evangelical and reformed in character. In 1870 a well-documented division took place which resulted in the formation of the Church of the Province of South Africa. These developments had a huge impact on the life of the Church of England. It lost most of its properties and congregations and was finally rejected by the rest of the Anglican Communion. It was left to a small community of Christians, both black and white, to struggle for survival. Coloured and Indian congregations were established at a later stage. It finally emerged from its struggle as the Church of England in South Africa, a small group of people who were committed to the evangelical reformed and Protestant convictions of its forebears.

Development

When I entered the ministry in 1966, there were no more than five churches in Cape Town and only two and a half ministers, one being retired. In fact, there were no more than twenty-five churches countrywide. I came into a denomination that was very small but committed to the bible as the word of God. It was strongly pietistic in its ethos and consequently according to the times in which we lived, separatist in its mentality. In the wider Anglican Communion, we had been stigmatised as a recalcitrant schismatic group of unreasonable right-wing Evangelicals. Now, to some extent, we have no one to blame for these views but ourselves. We saw our theological position under threat and we acted accordingly. When the government made legislation that accorded with our moral or biblical understanding we supported them. However, on the great issue of justice for all, we were often insensitive. We had not made the connection between the gospel and society. One of our Bishops took part in the state funeral for the assassinated Dr Verwoerd. Another of our Bishops by synodical decision took part in the inauguration of FW de Klerk. These actions were performed under the influence

of our belief that we needed to support and pray for the authorities ordained by God. We would have done the same under other circumstances whoever the dignitaries were, but we now see that these things contributed to the impression that we endorsed the system. We consequently gave the impression that we were supporters of the regime. This impression has caused many of our members great pain in the past and all of us great embarrassment in the present.

Thus, some of the impressions we gave were justified. However, we ignored all these things because we felt we had a priority to preach and teach the gospel, consolidate our work and begin to build it up. By 1979, there were 54 ordained clergy in active ministry and within a further 10 years, the number had increased to 96. The denominations are administered as a single unit, with area councils in the Cape Province, Kwa Zulu Natal Province and the Gauteng/Free State region. There are presently 153 congregations in South Africa, 14 in Namibia and a similar number in Zimbabwe, which are all self-administered. So you can see we're a very small show. The establishment in 1989 of our own theological institution, George Whitfield College, has produced clergy and ...[indistinct] with a new awareness and involvement in the controversial moral, ethical and social issues of the day. Our new academics and generating valuable insights into the ongoing debates and tensions between faithfulness to the gospel and social responsibility, something we deeply lacked in the past.

The Struggle Years

The apartheid years, with the struggle for liberation, caught us completely off guard and unprepared. There were several reasons for this:

1. Our tiny group of churches was simply trying to survive. We considered ourselves as nobodies. We had no influence, no outside contacts, apart from a few exceptions, no money, and no property of note. Yet we found a ready response to our message in all sections of our society. While the struggle for liberation was deepening, we got on with the job of building our churches.
2. We had no theologians nor thinkers of note in our ranks, having been cut off from the rest of the Anglican communion, we were not exposed to the thinking and debate taking place there, nor were we privy to the wider network of

information to assist in raising awareness. Our church was led largely by lay people because of our lack of clergy. It was only in later years that theologically trained men arose who were able to see things from a better perspective and better understood the times in which we lived.

3. Many members of the Church of England in South Africa generally and honestly believed the government's propaganda about the Communist threat. Like most other whites, our white elect church believed that we were in a struggle for western values and freedom and that the liberation groups were all pawns of the Communist regime.
4. Many victims of apartheid and oppression find it hard to believe whites when they plead ignorance. We ask them to moderate their judgement. Most of you here today will remember that Jesus once performed half a miracle. He touched a man's eyes, who was blind, and he only half saw and described his experience as seeing men as trees walking. He needed a second touch. The truth is that the full extent of the atrocities exposed by the TRC was in fact not known to us. Many suspected but were probably reluctant to believe these stories. Previously, when stories of atrocities leaked out, it was usually attributed to Communistic forces trying to undermine the government. The exposures by the TRC have filled many white people and many of us in the Church of England in South Africa with shock, shame and revulsion. Looking back, it is amazing that we were so naïve. Be that as it may, the fact of the matter is that we allowed ourselves to be misled into accepting a social, economic and political system that was cruel and oppressive.
5. A further complication was the development of liberation theology. Now the impact of this particular ideology on evangelicals must not be underestimated. First of all, evangelicals have often been misunderstood and misrepresented in the popular media. Sometimes, of course, it is their own fault because of their unwise behaviour, but fanatics, unschooled rejecters of technological development, bible punchers who are unconcerned with the social needs of people and huge hysterical performances of healing and hysteria are not representative of true evangelicals. But this is the way evangelicals were sometimes represented in the media and by some who expounded liberation theology. We certainly deserved a lot of the criticism we received as evangelicals. But we ask that the difficulties we faced at least be understood,

even though not condoned. Some evangelicals saw liberation theology as a sell-out of the gospel of Christ crucified and risen to a secular vision of Utopia on earth. There was a sense of dismay among evangelicals as we saw the gospel of Christ's redemption redefined to suit the mood and the agenda of the day. Many evangelicals felt that while liberation theology had recaptured the important truths of justice in society, it had in the process assimilated an ideology that undermined the basic message of the gospel. That is how we, in the Church of England in South Africa felt at the time. And therefore we in the Church of England in South Africa found ourselves in a dilemma. To get on board the social action programs and protest movements was to identify with the theological emphasis, which we saw as a betrayal of Christ's message. As we distanced ourselves from liberation theology, we were therefore seen to support the system even further. Yet we knew by this time that the struggle for justice was justified. We, however, had different views and were uncertain about what to do. The Church of England in South Africa thought that, because of its smallness and insignificance, because of our lack of debating power, and also because of the reigning confusion of the age, our way forward was to continue with the teaching and the preaching of the word of God and to establish churches and help programs where we could. We declared ourselves to be a-political and in this way failed to adequately understand the suffering of our many black members who were victims of apartheid. Our failure to be involved in the political struggles of our land was a major error in both understanding and judgement and this mistake has caused us a great deal of embarrassment, heartache and pain.

6. In spite of these failures, during those tumultuous years, we established social community projects such as feeding schemes in underprivileged schools, a community centre with various activities in Khayelitsha where one of our white volunteer workers was shot and maimed, AIDS centres for adults and children in Kwa Zulu Natal, nursery schools countrywide, amongst other things. We held to our conviction that Christ's kingdom is ultimately not of this world. But we did believe as do most Christians, that it must be demonstrated in this world. And yet we remained confused at the every deepening political crisis and the challenge to our own theological presuppositions.

7. There were occasions after our annual synods when we communicated with and sought meetings with various government officials to protest privately about various matters. A delegation of senior leaders once met with Mr P.W. Botha when he was State President to express concern about the wrongs in South Africa. While on several occasions our presiding Bishop, personally encouraged Mr F.W. de Klerk when he was State President, to hasten change. We found both men receptive to our approach, although we do not know what it accomplished. It was dialogue rather than confrontation. That was our modus operandi. However, we now see that instead of helping our cause, it hindered it. The reason for this was our failure to report back to our local leadership and their congregations and this reinforced the view that we were supporters of the government and not critics. It must also be said that on local levels, stands were taken on certain issues which we failed to publicise or to which we failed to draw attention. For instance, one of our churches in the Northern suburbs of Cape Town opened a preschool education facility which was open to all race groups. They resisted considerable government pressure to change their policy. In addition in years gone by, protest was made by our previous leadership to the army's activities in Ovambo. And also after World War 2, to the educational policies of the government as they applied to black people. In 1988 the late Reverend Murray Hofmeyr and I spent two hours with a government commission discussing the question of the Group Areas Act in which we vigorously argued for the abolition of that Act. In addition to that, we also over the years, voiced our opposition to the migratory system which had a disruptive impact on families. Now, these things are mentioned not to exonerate us, but to indicate that we were not entirely unaware or silent. However, we were too naive to keep minutes and records because many of these activities took place spontaneously off the cuff, so to speak. Nor did we think it important to inform all our church members of what we were doing. In any event, we recognise and fully admit that whatever we did was too little and too late.
8. It should be noted at this point that when we were able to travel overseas, we were surprised by queries concerning segregation in the churches. Many of our friends thought segregation was practised by all churches, including us. But this has not been our practice. Our understanding of the gospel led us to believe that all I people should be welcome at any worship service. While some

denominations may have held to a policy of segregation, the Church of England in South Africa did not. However, it must be added that while our services were always open to all, not all could come. The apartheid laws had created both geographical and language problems so that it remained true that most of our congregations were either predominantly white, coloured, Indian or black. During these times, the leadership of the Church of England in South Africa was not discerning enough to see the significance of this. But since the early eighties, any indications of discrimination in the Church of England in South Africa's constitution, in our national structures and practices have been systematically removed. This is an ongoing process, assisted greatly by new awareness and sensitivity as well as new thinking by all in leadership. Now, these reasons are not offered as excuses, but rather as an explanation of whom we were during the struggle years. We do not apologise for our stand on the central message of the bible. However, we do want to express our apology, our sorrow and our regret at the things we left undone. We refer to article 12 in our statement of faith, 39 Articles of Religion entitled: Good Works. Quote: "Although good works, which are the fruits of faith and follow after our justification, cannot put away our sin and are subject to the severity of God's judgement. Yet inasmuch as they are done in Christ and for his sake, they are pleasing and acceptable to God for they spring necessarily from true and vital faith and are indeed the evidence of a vital faith, just as a tree is recognised by its fruit". Insofar as the search for justice is part of the Christian's good works, we believe we have failed.

The Awakening

Our own awakening to the true state of oppression in our nation developed gradually. In the Cape particularly, where contact with the coloured community was easier than with the black community, the heartache and injustice were increasingly conveyed to us. Bishop Martin Morrison worked in Sowed and Bishop Joe Bell worked in Natal. They were regularly faced with the consequences of the political system and became increasingly distressed. The tense years of the early nineties, with the freeing of Nelson Mandela and the subsequent election brought political reality home to us all. The culmination for the Church of England in South Africa came on Sunday night the

25th of July 1993 with the massacre at St. James Church, which had from its inception been a non-racial church. Apart from other considerations at the time, we realised with what fear many people in the oppressed communities lived. It brought a new awareness to us. As stated, the subsequent revelations made the truth and reconciliation commission have left us all deeply shocked and our own experience reinforced this sense of shock. The truth had come home to us.

Conclusion

As we reflect on the past and look to the future, there are several things we would like to say.

1. Notwithstanding that many in the white community saw the evil of apartheid and its out working, many did not and may not have chosen to. That stands as a sombre lesson of how whole communities and countries can be misled by skilful leaders. It has happened before and no doubt it will happen again.
2. 2 While we believe that many of the government officials of the old regime were sincere Christians, nevertheless, we were a witness to how the bible and its message can be misused to support an evil ideology. The national government used the Bible to support its policies and to give the impression that they were a Christian government. But then so did some liberation theologians who finally supported violence as a means of continuing the struggle. They argued that the crucifixion of Jesus sanctioned violence as a method of obtaining freedom. At least we heard that argument. This particular interpretation of the death of our Lord was highly offensive to us and served only to alienate us and other evangelicals even further from those involved in the more visible aspects of the struggle. It is well worth noting at this commission that many evangelicals would have been more involved in the struggle had it not been for the particular theological justification which was presented and which served to confuse us even further. In the Church of England in South Africa, we remain convinced that the primary task of the ordained minister is to explain the true message of the bible without adding his own agenda to it. This message fully explained and applied includes the proclamation that Jesus is Lord overall, including our society and its laws. It further includes the command to love our neighbour with special reference to the poor, the needy, the oppressed and the doing of good

works. Not as a ground for our justification before God, but as our expression and fruit of it as explained in article 12 referred to earlier. We in the Church of England in South Africa, therefore, feel the need to pray the words of the confession in our morning service: Almighty and most merciful Father, we have strayed from your ways like lost sheep. We have left undone what we ought to have done and we have done what we ought not to have done.

3. The Church of England in South Africa, especially the whites, must accept collective responsibility for its role in the injustices of the past. Although largely ignorant and unwitting, we were nevertheless passive and compliant. We benefited from the status quo. Up until the early 1970s our largely white leadership, and I'm sure all too many of our white church members being children of their culture, no doubt practised some forms of discrimination either in action or attitude. With hindsight, we should have been more aggressive in campaigning against the evils and injustices of apartheid, more vociferous in opposing violence in all its forms and far more active in our programs of social upliftment and evangelism. We should have been more aware, more vocal and insightful, but we were not. For this we are guilty. We confess our imperfections and are truly repentant. Where we have been negligent, careless and insensitive to biblical injunctions and mandates as we have been, may the Lord graciously forgive us. Where our actions, our silence or our acquiescence has been the cause of added hardship, pain and suffering to any of our Christian brothers and sisters, to any of our other fellow South Africans, we ask for forgiveness. In regard to the black members of our own denomination, we admit that we were unable to fully understand the full extent of their pain and suffering. However, we attempted to provide leadership in terms of financial support for their churches and families, spiritual encouragement and the arm of fellowship. There were occasions when we spoke to the authorities on behalf of our members who were harassed or in trouble. In fact, it is true to say that all our presiding Bishops gave a great deal of time and effort, probably most of their time and effort to minister, encourage and assist our black congregations. In our ranks at present, various discussions are taking place to facilitate confession, repentance, reconciliation and healing. Our stance that we were not a political church was an attempt to emphasise our commitment to the central message of the gospel. But it was also a great failure to truly understand

and apply the gospel. In this regard, we were guilty of sinning against our Lord and our brothers and sisters. We pray for grace that never again will fail in our duty.

4. We are conscious that any participation we may now have in public debate must arise out of the context of our understanding of our past failure to speak out. Our response to society must arise out of a response to the gospel and not out of political pragmatism. Or a hypocritical desire to create the right impression. As our understanding of the gospel and its implication grows, so must our obedience. This includes a new understanding of the need to seek greater understanding and fellowship with other church groups, even those with whom we may not see eye to eye.
5. The Church of England in South Africa remains convinced that its function is to continue to clearly teach and preach the word of God. To this task we re-dedicate ourselves. We have no wish to repeat past mistakes, nor to compromise our message in any way in the future. But Christians now face new challenges. The rebuilding of our society and the establishment of an ongoing culture of justice and compassion is an obvious case in point. To this end, our theological institutions are training a new generation of thinkers equipped to minister within the socio-political realities of South Africa and to enter into dialogue and debate with those with whom we formerly had very little contact. Another challenge is the ongoing struggle to uplift the poor and needy and to think through the issue of the redistribution of wealth from a Christian perspective. To this end, we shall continue to develop our existing programs dealing with education, health and poverty. In addition, there are other ethical challenges of the day in relation to crime and corruption, abortion, pornography, gambling and the proposed decriminalisation of prostitution, to mention just a few. To this end, we remain committed to active participation in these debates. One of the most challenging issues is the rise of religious pluralism. We agree that respect and tolerance are called for and we welcome the opportunity for other faiths to state their case. If I may pause here for just a moment to say that during the days of the trauma of the massacre in our church, there were representatives of the other faiths who were there at our doorstep as soon as they could get there to express their solidarity and condolences with us, for which we are deeply grateful. However, we need to say that we do not feel able

to accommodate all the compromises asked for in relation to other faiths. We have distinctive convictions which are non-negotiable. The fact that the bible was used in the past to condone injustice does not mean its true message may be ignored today. We believe in the uniqueness not only of Jesus but also of the God of the old and new testaments. We believe the message of the gospel to be as relevant today as it was 2000 years ago. We still believe that that message is the message of reconciliation to God first and foremost and that reconciliation of one to another is a fruit of our reconciliation to God. The re-establishment of a moral framework referred to earlier this morning also in our opinion stems from a living relationship with God, the power of the Holy Spirit and the teaching of the bible. We believe in the return of our Lord Jesus Christ to this world and in the setting up of a day of judgement. To this end, we work in witness. We pray for courage to hold to the truth and for endurance to reflect that truth in the way we serve our Lord in society and for humility in all aspects of our witness. We do not expect all to agree with us and we pray for grace to accept any criticisms. We pledge ourselves, nevertheless to the search for fellowship where possible, and to work for Christian reconciliation as far as we are able. I conclude by saying that we received very little notification that we were to make a submission and consequently were not able to consult extensively with all concerned parties regarding this document. Nevertheless, the sorrow and repentance that we express today is real. Our desire to truly live for Christ and proclaim his gospel is genuine. Our determination to right past wrongs in our own ranks as far as possible is sincere. In spite of sins and imperfections, we still declare ourselves Christians. We can do no other except pledge ourselves to do better. It is our belief that this day and hour calls for men and women of conviction and integrity to apply the message of the bible more accurately and faithfully to our emerging society. Regretful though the past may have been, we know that we cannot live in it forever. Changes have come and no doubt will still come, but the duty of all Christian churches is to preach Christ Jesus, who is the same yesterday, today and forever. As representative of and on behalf of all members of the Church of England in South Africa, I thank you Chairperson for the opportunity to make this public submission on our particular role in South Africa's history. May we all by God's grace grasp this opportunity

to secure a righteous and just future for those who have suffered and especially for our children.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. 1820 Settlers, 2021, *Family: Daniel Gordon Mills / Mary Elizabeth Anderson (F25431)*,
<https://www.1820settlers.com/genealogy/familygroup.php?personID=I69463&tree=master> (Accessed on 6 June 2021).
2. Allen, F. J., 1987, *State of the Nation*, Sermon Delivered to CESA Ministers at Mount Grace Hotel, Magaliesburg, 23 to 25 March 1987, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
3. Anglican Communion, 1987, *Resolutions of ACC-7*, Anglican Communion, <https://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/65379/resolutions-acc-7.pdf> (Accessed on 26 June 2022).
4. Anglican Communion, 1988, *Resolution 39-South Africa*, Anglican Communion, <https://www.anglicancommunion.org/resources/document-library/lambeth-conference/1988/resolution-39-south-africa?subject=Racial+equality&tag=South+Africa> (Accessed on 26 June 2022).
5. Anglican Communion, 2022a, *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion*, Anglican Communion, <https://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/109014/Thirty-Nine-Articles-of-Religion.pdf> (Accessed on 19 June 2022).
6. Anglican Communion, 2022b, *Resolution 16-Racism*, Anglican Communion, <https://www.anglicancommunion.org/resources/document-library/lambeth-conference/1968/resolution-16-racism?subject=Racial+equality> (Accessed on 26 June 2022).
7. Anglican Consultative Council, 2005a, *The Lambeth Conference Resolution Archive from 1948*,
<https://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/127737/1948.pdf> (Accessed on 23 April 2021).
8. Anglican Consultative Council, 2005b, *Resolutions Archive from 1988*,
<https://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/127749/1988.pdf> (Accessed 26 June 2022).
9. Arendse, R. A., 1988, *The Gospel Defence League: A Critical Analysis of a Right-Wing Christian Group in South Africa* in EDICESA, *Religion and Oppression: The Misuse of Religion for Social, Political and Economic*

- Subjugation*, Symposium for General Secretaries of National Christian Councils and Church Leaders from Eastern and Southern Africa, 1-3 August 1989,
<https://www.sahistory.org.za/sites/default/files/DC/pro19890801.026.009.726/pro19890801.026.009.726.pdf> (Accessed on 7 October 2021).
10. Arendse, R. A., 1989, 'The Gospel Defence League: A Critical Analysis of a Right-Wing Christian Group in South Africa', *Journal of theology for Southern Africa*, 69, pp.95-105, <https://search-ebSCOhost-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=rh&AN=ATLA0000823290&site=ehost-live&scope=site> (Accessed on 8 October 2021).
 11. Arendse, R. A., 1999, *Right-Wing Church Groups* in Cochrane, J. R., De Gruchy, J. W and Martin, S. W., *Facing the Truth: South African Faith Communities and the Truth & Reconciliation Commission*, David Philipp. Cape Town.
 12. Ashby, G., 1985, 'Don't Hide Behind this Biblical Text', *Seek*, November 1985, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
 13. Asmal, K. *et al.*, 1997, *Reconciliation Through Truth: A Reckoning of Apartheid's Criminal Governance*, David Philipp, Cape Town.
 14. Australian Church Record, 1954, 'Archbishop Condemns "Totalitarianism" in South Africa', *Australian Church Record*, 11 November 1954, The Ark Digital Repository,
https://moorecollege.access.preservica.com/download/file/IO_97cb0e47-854e-42d2-9aa0-b9f9a75560e8 (Accessed on 7 October 2021).
 15. Australian Church Record, 1957, 'Cape Town Cathedral Makes Position Clear on Racial Law', *Australian Church Record*, 23 May 1957, The Ark Digital Repository,
https://moorecollege.access.preservica.com/download/file/IO_02c71fc8-b315-4549-9fd7-c4e5b0cc92bd (Accessed on 21 March 2022).
 16. Australian Church Record, 1960, 'Attack on Apartheid in Church', *The Australian Church Record*, 9 June 1960, The Ark Digital Repository,
https://moorecollege.access.preservica.com/download/file/IO_7d7d9277-eebe-4396-a9f0-71bccda14d31 (7 October 2021).
 17. Australian Church Record, 1967a, 'Primate and Bishop Bradley', *The Australian Church Record*, 2 November 1967, The Ark Digital Repository,

- <https://myrrh.library.moore.edu.au/handle/10248/8553> (Accessed on 7 October 2021).
18. Australian Church Record, 1967b, 'Editorial: The Church of England in South Africa', *Australian Church Record*, 21 September 1967, The Ark Digital Repository, https://moorecollege.access.preservica.com/download/file/IO_36e5c584-f159-43df-a41c-c1d55e06c077 (Accessed on 7 October 2021).
 19. Australian Church Record, 1968, 'Reformed Attitude to Apartheid', *The Australian Church Record*, 13 June 1968, The Ark Digital Repository, https://moorecollege.access.preservica.com/download/file/IO_621b9152-2f86-4c01-ab17-6fa32e1cd335 (Accessed on 7 October 2021).
 20. Australian Church Record, 1971, 'The Church's Mission is Unique, Says Bishop', *Australian Church Record*, 2 December 1971, The Ark Digital Repository, <https://myrrh.library.moore.edu.au/handle/10248/8553> (Accessed on 7 October 2021).
 21. Australian Church Record, 1986, 'The South African Church Rejects Violence', *Australian Church Record*, 10 February 1986, The Ark Digital Repository, https://moorecollege.access.preservica.com/download/file/IO_36538ba5-48ad-4af9-948d-9fc1d32b453d (Accessed on 11 March 2022).
 22. Australian Council of Churches, 1968, *South African Churches and Apartheid*, 14 November 1968, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
 23. Balcomb, A. O., 2001, 'Evangelicals and Democracy in South Africa – Helpers or Hinderers, Another Look, Another Method', *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa*, 42 (109), pp. 3–15, <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/evangelicals-democracy-south-africa-helpers/docview/213352161/se-2?accountid=14717> (Accessed on 8 June 2021).
 24. Balcomb, A. O., 2004, 'From Apartheid to the New Dispensation: Evangelicals and the Democratization of South Africa', *Journal of Religion in Africa*, 34 (1/2), 5-38., <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1581479> (Accessed on 11 July 2021).
 25. Bankston, C. L., 2009, *Great Events from History*, Salem Press, Pasadena.
 26. Barkan, E and Karn, A., 2006, *Taking Wrongs Seriously: Apologies and Reconciliation*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.

27. Barlow, T., 1961, 'The Dorothea Mission', *Church News*, January-February 1961, CESA, P1376, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.
28. Barnard, F., 1955, *Letter to the Registrar of CESA*, 2 February 1955, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
29. Bartholomew, C. G., 1989, *The Church and Society*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
30. Bartholomew, C. G., 2022, 'Reflections on Church in Society 30 Years On', Seminar Delivered on the 22nd of March 2022, *The Kirby Laing Centre for Public Theology in Cambridge*, Cambridge.
31. Beck, R. B., 2000, *History of South Africa*, Greenwood Publishing Group, Westport.
32. Beckman, A. P., 2011, *A Clash of Churchmanship? Robert Gray and the Evangelical Anglicans (1847-1872)*, Masters Dissertation, North-West University.
33. Begbie, D., 1980, *Christianity and Military Service in the Context of Southern Africa*, Christian League of Southern Africa, Cape Town.
34. Begbie, D., 1981, *Freedom Under Authority*, Hogsback Evangelical Church, Grahamstown.
35. Begbie, D., 1985, *The Anglican Faith: A Lay Man's Guide*, Home Journal Press, Durban.
36. Begbie, D., 1992, *Back Again Mr Begbie: A Christian Man's Testimony of Three Careers in One Life*, Ross House books, [eBook],
<https://www.scribd.com/document/375368035/Back-Again-Mr-Begbie-the-Life-Story-of-Rev-Lt-Col-R-J-G-Begbie-OBE> (Accessed on 1 August 2021).
37. Beinart, W and Dubow, S., 1995, *Segregation and Apartheid in Twentieth-Century South Africa*, Routledge, London.
38. Bell, J and Hofmeyr, J. M., 1978, *The Owambo Independent Churches: As Told to Us by Peter Kalangula; CESA Executive Committee Report*, 12-15 May 1978, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
39. Bell, J., 1978, *Fact-Finding Mission to Owambo Independent Church*, 17 May 1978, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
40. Bell, J., 1988, *Bishop's Charge*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
41. Bell, J., 1990, *Bishop's Charge*, CESA Office, Cape Town.

42. Bell, J., 1997a, *Church of England in South Africa: facsimile to the Chairman of the Truth and Reconciliation Committee*, 18 July 1997, CESA Office, Cape Town.
43. Bell, J., 1997b, *Bishop's Charge*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
44. Bell, J., 1990, 'From the Presiding Bishop,' *CESA News* no 26, George Whitefield College.
45. Bergen, J. M., 2011, *Ecclesial Repentance: The Churches Confront their Sinful Pasts*, T & T Clark International, London.
46. Bethke, A. J., 2020a, 'Fledgling South African Anglicanism and the Roots of Ritualism', *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, 46 (3), p. 18, <http://ref.scielo.org/b8syp8> (Accessed on 11 March 2021).
47. Bethke, A. J., 2020b, *Anglican Ritualism in Colonial South Africa: Exploring Some of the Local Discourses Between 1848 and 1884*, Masters Dissertation, University of Kwa-Zulu Natal, Pietermaritzburg.
48. Beyerhaus, P., 1987, *Kairos Document: Danger or Challenge to the Church?* The Gospel Defence League, Cape Town.
49. Blanch, A., 2015, *From Strength to Strength: A Life of Marcus Loane*, Australian Scholarly Publishing, Melbourne [Kindle Edition].
50. Boesak, A., 1989, *Your Days are Over!* in Wallis, J, and Hollyday, J., *Crucible of Fire: The Church Confronts Apartheid*, Orbis Books, Maryknoll.
51. Borraine, A., 2000, *The Language of Potential* in James, W. G. and Van de Vijver, L., *After the TRC: Reflections on Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa*, pp. 73-80, Ohio University Press, Athens.
52. Borraine, A., n. d., 'Dealing with the Past: Complex Choices,' *Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and Research*, University of Cape Town, http://www.kaplancentre.uct.ac.za/sites/default/files/image_tool/images/151/OccasionalPapers/OccPaper9-A-Borraine.pdf (Accessed on 10 October 2021).
53. Bosch, D., 1983, *Nothing but A Heresy* in De Gruchy, J, W and Villa-Vicencio, C. *Apartheid is a Heresy*. David Philipp, Cape Town.
54. Botha, P. W., 1976, *Letter to Bishop S. C. Bradley*, 23 April 1976, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
55. Bradley S. C., 1964a, 'Bishop's Charge', *Church News*, Christmas 1964, CESA, P1376, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.

56. Bradley S. C., 1979c, *Letter to the State President and Mrs Vorster*, 6 February 1979, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
57. Bradley, J. E and Muller, R. A., 1995, *Church History: An Introduction to Research, Reference Works, and Methods*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids.
58. Bradley, S. C and Mills, G., 1955, *Letter to the Archbishop Fisher of Canterbury*, 7 December 1955, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
59. Bradley, S. C., 1951, *For Synod Members Only; Hon. Superintendent's Annual Report of the CESA Missions 1951*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
60. Bradley, S. C., 1954, *Political "Anglican" Bishops; A Draft Memorandum for the CESA Executive*, 17 October 1954, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
61. Bradley, S. C., 1957, *Letter to Archbishop Howard Mowll*, month and day not mentioned, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
62. Bradley, S. C., 1958, *Letter to Dr J. G. Meiring*, 22 May 1958, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
63. Bradley, S. C., 1959, *Letter to Robert Gurney*, 4 February 1959, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
64. Bradley, S. C., 1960a, *Letter to the Postmaster*, 27 July 1960, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
65. Bradley, S. C., 1960b, *Letter to the Secretary of Bantu Administration and Development*, 24 May 1960, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
66. Bradley, S. C., 1960c, *Letter to the Postmaster*, 21 September 1960, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
67. Bradley, S. C., 1964b, *Letter to the Prime Minister*, 8 August 1964, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
68. Bradley, S. C., 1965a, *Letter to the Prime Ministers*, 23 January 1965, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
69. Bradley, S. C., 1965b, *Superintendent's Statement: Central Council-CESA Missions in Natal*, 4-7th August 1965, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
70. Bradley, S. C., 1966a, 'Letter to the Editor', AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.

71. Bradley, S. C., 1966b, *Memorandum from S.C. B to the Ministers and Trustees*, 29 January 1966, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
72. Bradley, S. C., 1966c, 'Bishop's Charge', *Church News*, September-November 1966, CESA, P1376, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.
73. Bradley, S. C., 1966d, *Memorandum: SCB to DGM. HH. DD. JMH. RHW.*, 9 February 1966, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
74. Bradley, S. C., 1967a, *Letter to Dr John Vorster*, 16 January 1977, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
75. Bradley, S. C., 1967b, *Letter to the Minister of Foreign Affairs*, June 1967, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
76. Bradley, S. C., 1971, *Letter to the Prime Minister*, 1971, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
77. Bradley, S. C., 1973a, *Letter to the Australian Prime Minister*, 23 October 1973, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
78. Bradley, S. C., 1973b, *Letter to the Prime Minister of Australia*, 4 January 1973, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
79. Bradley, S. C., 1973c, *Letter to Dr J. S. Gericke*, 23 April 1973, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
80. Bradley, S. C., 1975c, *Letter to the Secretary of the Department of Information*, 3 December 1975, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
81. Bradley, S. C., 1975d, *Letter to John Tooke*, 18 November 1975, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
82. Bradley, S. C., 1975e, *Letter to the Secretary for Information*, 3 December 1975, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
83. Bradley, S. C., 1975f, *Bishop Defends South African Government*, *Canberra Times*, 21 April 1975, pp. 2, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
84. Bradley, S. C., 1976a, *Letter to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Information*, 19 June 1976, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
85. Bradley, S. C., 1976b, *Letter to the Prime Minister*, 21 June 1976, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
86. Bradley, S. C., 1976c, *Letter to the Minister of Justice*, 15 January 1976, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.

87. Bradley, S. C., 1976d, *The Rev Campbell Egan (40) Australian*, Telegraph to Mss H. E. de Beer, Department of Information, 31 May 1976, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
88. Bradley, S. C., 1977a, *Letter to the Prime Minister*, 19 August 1977, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
89. Bradley, S. C., 1978a, 'Call for Help', *English Churchman*, 1-8 December 1978, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
90. Bradley, S. C., 1978b, *Letter to the Editor: The English Churchman*, 16 November 1978, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
91. Bradley, S. C., 1979a, *Letter to Mrs G. Bowers*, 10 December 1979, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
92. Bradley, S. C., 1979b, Letter to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, 9 May 1979, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
93. Bradley, S. C., 1980a, *Letter to the Prime Minister of South Africa*, 21 July 1980, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
94. Bradley, S. C., 1980b, *Letter to the Prime Minister of Australia*, 24 October 1980, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
95. Bradley, S. C., 1980c, *Bishop's Charge*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
96. Bradley, S. C., 1980d, *Letter to the Director of Housing at the Department of Community Development*, 26 November 1980, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
97. Bradley, S. C., 1981, *What is the Gospel: A Training Manual for Ovamboland Ordinations*, unpublished.
98. Bradley, S. C., 1983a, *Letter to the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Information*, 6 June 1983, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
99. Bradley, S. C., 1983b, *Letter to the Minister of Industries, Commerce and Tourism*, 3 August 1983, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
100. Bradley, S. C., 1984a, *Letter to the Director-General of Foreign Affairs and Information*, 23 January 1984, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg
101. Bradley, S. C., 1984c, *Letter to the Prime Minister of Australia*, 14 March 1984, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
102. Bradley, S. C., 1984d, *Letter to the Minister of Foreign Affairs*, 6 June 1984, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.

103. Bradley, S. C., 1984e, *Letter to the Minister of England*, 7 June 1984, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
104. Bradley, S. C., 1990, 'Church's Mandate is Evangelism', *CESA News* no. 26, George Whitefield College, Cape Town.
105. Bradley, S. C., 1997a, *Friends' letters*, March 1998, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
106. Bradley, S. C., 1997b, *Memorandum of a Letter to Frank Retief*, 21 November 1997, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
107. Bradley, S. C., 1998b, *Letter to Antony Ive*, 2 February 1998, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
108. Bradley, S. C., 1998c, *The History of Evangelism in the Church of England in South Africa: A Presentation at George Whitefield College*, 12 September 1998, George Whitefield College Library, Cape Town.
109. Bradley, S. C., 1998d, *Memo from Stephen Bradley to Dr P. Jensen*, 22 February 1998, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
110. Bradley, S. C., 1998e, *The History of Evangelism in the Church of England in South Africa: A Presentation at George Whitefield College*, 12 September 1998, George Whitefield College Library, Cape Town.
111. Bradley, S. C., 2003, *The Great Adventure: Bishop of the Church of England in South Africa-His Story*, CESA: Cape Town.
112. Bradley, S. C., 2003, *The Great Adventure: Stephen Bradley; Bishop of the Church of England in South Africa; His Story*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
113. Bradley, S. C., 1960d, *Letter to the Postmaster*, 3 August 1960, AC2234, William Cullen Library Johannesburg.
114. Bradley, S. C., 1962, *Letter to the Prime Ministers*, 7 January 1962, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
115. Bradley, S. C., 1963, *Letter to the Prime Ministers*, 1 February 1963, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
116. Bradley, S. C., 1973a, *Letter to the Australian Prime Minister*, 23 October 1973, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
117. Bradley, S. C., 1974a, *Letter to the editor of Sydney Morning Herald*, 28 March 1974, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
118. Bradley, S. C., 1974b, *Letter to the editor of The Torchbearer*, 27 September 1974, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.

119. Bradley, S. C., 1974c, *Letter to the editor of Sydney Morning Herald*, 22 March 1974, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
120. Bradley, S. C., 1975a, *Letter to the editor of The Mercury*, 4 November 1975, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
121. Bradley, S. C., 1975b, *Letter to the Minister of Justice*, 21 March 1975, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
122. Bradley, S. C., 1977b, 'Appeal to Help in Clergy Training', *Australian Church Record*, 23 June 1977, Sydney.
123. Brandreth, H. R. T., 1962, *Letter to the Registrar of the C of E*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
124. British Pathe, 2020, *South Africa—Dr Verwoerd's Funeral 1966*, <https://www.britishpathe.com/video/south-africa-dr-verwoerds-funeral> (Accessed on 21 July 2020).
125. Britton, J., 1999, "'Dispersed Authority": A Historical and Theological Critique of the 1948 Lambeth Conference Report', *Anglican and Episcopal History* 68, no. 2, pp. 231-59, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42612021> (Accessed on 22 April 2021).
126. Brown, S. J and Nockles, P. B., 2012, *The Oxford Movement: Europe and the Wider World 1830-1930*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
127. Bruyns, N., 1984, 'Church Rift being Closed', *Cape Time*, 6 February 1984, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
128. Bunzi, M., 1997, *Real History: Reflections on Historical Practice*, Routledge, London.
129. Burnett, B. B., c. 1953, *Anglicans in Natal*, St. Paul's Churchwardens, Durban.
130. Cain, E., 1987, *The Kairos Document and You*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
131. Cameron, B., 2017, *The Candle Still Burns in Africa: 1989-2015*, REACH-SA, Cape Town.
132. Cameron, M. H., 2006, *An Enigmatic Life: David Broughton Knox: Father of Contemporary Sydney Anglicanism*, Acorn Press, Brunswick East.
133. Cape Area Black Ministers, 2020, *Towards a More Equal Unity: A Few Pertinent Proposals*, unpublished.

134. Carr, E. H and Evans, R. J., 2001, *What is history?*, 40Th Anniversary Edition Basingstoke, Palgrave.
135. Centre for Reformed Anglicanism, 2022, 'The 1996 Ordinals', *Anglicanism.info*, <https://www.anglicanism.info/1662-ordinal> (Accessed on 3 August).
136. CESA News, 1988, 'Young Men on the Border Need Earnest Prayer', *CESA News*, Issue no 18, George Whitefield College Library, Cape Town.
137. CESA News, 1990, 'CESA Can't Escape from Society', *CESA News*, Issue no. 25, George Whitefield College Library, Cape Town.
138. CESA, 1946, *Synod Minutes*, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
139. CESA, 1947, *Synod Minutes*, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
140. CESA, 1949, *Synod Minutes*, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
141. CESA, 1950, *Synod Minutes*, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
142. CESA, 1951, *Synod Minutes*, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
143. CESA, 1952, *Synod Minutes*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
144. CESA, 1953, *Synod Minutes*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
145. CESA, 1954a, *Political Bishops, Letter to the Minister of Native Affairs*, 17 December 1954, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
146. CESA, 1954b, *Political Bishops: Memorandum to the Executive*, 17 December 1954, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
147. CESA, 1954c, *Political Bishops*, 20 December 1954, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
148. CESA, 1954d, *Synod Minutes*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
149. CESA, 1955, *Synod Minutes*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
150. CESA, 1956, *Executive Committee Minutes*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
151. CESA, 1958b, *Die Aanvallie van Dr de Blank, Letter to the Prime Minister*, 11 June 1958, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
152. CESA, 1958c, *Re: Archbishop Dr de Lank, Press Release, 11 June 1958*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.

153. CESA, 1962, *Executive Committee Minutes*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
154. CESA, 1965, *Synod Minutes*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
155. CESA, 1966, *Synod Minutes*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
156. CESA, 1969, *Synod Minutes*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
157. CESA, 1971, *Bishop's Charge*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
158. CESA, 1974, *Executive Minutes*, 16 March 1974, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
159. CESA, 1975, *Executive Minutes*, 7 June 1975, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
160. CESA, 1976a, *Today: The Magazine of the Church of England in South Africa*, June 1976, CESA, Roodepoort.
161. CESA, 1976b, *Today: The Magazine of the Church of England in South Africa*, September 1976, CESA, Roodepoort.
162. CESA, 1976c, *Today: The Magazine of the Church of England in South Africa*, December 1976, CESA, Roodepoort.
163. CESA, 1978a, *Executive Minutes*, 15 September 1978, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
164. CESA, 1979, *Synod Minutes*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
165. CESA, 1979a, *Executive Minutes*, 25 October 1979, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
166. CESA, 1979b, *Executive Minutes*, 10 March 1979, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
167. CESA, 1980, *Synod Minutes*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
168. CESA, 1981, *Statement Made by Bishop S. C. Bradley Re the Death of Mr Elikana Nakapunda, A Preacher of the Church of England in South Africa*, 8 February 1981, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
169. CESA, 1981, *Synod Minutes*, CESA Office, Cape Town.

170. CESA, 1982, *Synod Minutes*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
171. CESA, 1983, *Executive Committee Minutes*, 5th-6th August 1983, CESA Office, Cape Town.
172. CESA, 1983, *Synod Minutes*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
173. CESA, 1984, *Report of the Executive Committee to Synod*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
174. CESA, 1984, *Synod Minutes*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg
175. CESA, 1985, *Executive Committee Minutes*, 18 October 1985, CESA, Office Cape Town.
176. CESA, 1985, *Synod Minutes*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
177. CESA, 1986, *Cape Area Executive Committee Minutes*, 21 February 1986, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
178. CESA, 1986, *Executive Committee Minutes*, 11 September 1986, CESA Office, Cape Town.
179. CESA, 1986, *Natal Area Executive Committee Minutes*, 4 September 1986, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
180. CESA, 1986, *Synod Agenda*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
181. CESA, 1986, *Synod Minutes*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
182. CESA, 1987, *Cape Area Executive Committee*, 24 April 1987, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
183. CESA, 1987, *Synod Minutes*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
184. CESA, 1987a, *Executive Minutes*, 16 September 1987, CESA Office, Cape Town.
185. CESA, 1987b, *Executive Minutes*, 29 August 1987, CESA Office, Cape Town.
186. CESA, 1988, 'Bishop Bradley Speaks in US', *CESA News*, Issue 18, George Whitefield College Library, Cape Town.
187. CESA, 1988, 'Natal Churches Linked Up', *CESA News*, Issue 18, George Whitefield College Library, Cape Town.
188. CESA, 1988, *Executive Committee Minutes*, 4 June 1988, CESA Office, Cape Town.

189. CESA, 1988, *Synod Minutes*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
190. CESA, 1988a, 'Bishop Bradley Speaks in U.S.', *Church News*, Issue 18, George Whitefield College Library, Cape Town.
191. CESA, 1989, *Executive Committee Minutes*, 2 June 1989, CESA Office, Cape Town.
192. CESA, 1990, Cape Area Executive Committee, 30 August 1990, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
193. CESA, 1990, *Synod Minutes*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
194. CESA, 1990a, *Executive Committee Minutes*, 12 and 14 September 1990, CESA Office, Cape Town.
195. CESA, 1990a, *Executive Committee Minutes*, 2-3 February 1990, CESA Office, Cape Town.
196. CESA, 1991, *Synod Minutes*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
197. CESA, 1991a, *Executive Committee Minutes*, 22 February 1991, CESA Office, Cape Town.
198. CESA, 1991b, *Executive Committee Minutes*, 7-8 June 1991, CESA Office, Cape Town.
199. CESA, 1992, *Prayer Book of the Church of England in South Africa*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
200. CESA, 1997a, *CESA Submission to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
201. CESA, 1997b, *Synod Minutes*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
202. CESA, 1998, *Synod Minutes*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
203. CESA, 1999, 'Church of England in South Africa: Testimony Before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission', *Religious Institute of Christianity in South Africa*, 17 November 1999, http://www.uct.ac.za/sites/default/files/image_tool/images/113/Institutes/Archives/submissions/Church_of_England_in_South_Africa_sub.pdf (Accessed on 2 July 2020).
204. CESA, 2020, *Cape Area Council Minutes*, 30 November 2020, CESA Office, Cape Town.

205. CESA, c.1992, *Social, Morals and Ethics: The Churches Response to the Social Needs and Changes in New South Africa*, Workshop for Transvaal Area Council, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
206. Chamane, P., 1965, 'Synod Report on the African Mission Church', *Church News*, November-December 1965, CESA, P1376, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.
207. Charlton, E., 2021, *Improvising Reconciliation: Confession after the Truth Commission*, Liverpool University Press, Liverpool, doi:10.2307/j.ctv1r1nr31 (Accessed on 21 August 2021).
208. Chipenda, J., 1991, *Namibia—A Sign of Hope* in Hallencreutz, C. F. and Palmberg, M., *Religion and Politics in Southern Africa*, pp. 48-56, Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, Uppsala.
209. Christian Action Africa, 1991, *A Manifesto for Christians in Southern Africa*, Sigma Press, Pretoria.
210. Church News, 1960a, 'Bishop Morris', *Church News*, January-February 1960, CESA, P1376, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.
211. Church News, 1960b, 'Doubtful Tactics', *Church News*, January-February 1960, CESA, P1376, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.
212. Church News, 1960c, 'A Letter from Bishop Morris,' *Church News*, September-October 1960, CESA, P1376, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.
213. Church News, 1964, 'Sanctions Statement', *Church News*, November-December 1964, CESA, P1376, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.
214. Church News, 1965a, 'African Church News', *Church News*, March-April 1965, CESA, P1376, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.
215. Church News, 1966a, 'Ordination and Wedding', *Church News*, March-April 1966, CESA, P1376, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.
216. Church News, 1966b, 'God is Sufficient: in Memory of Dr H.F. Verwoerd,' *Church News*, September-November 1966, 01858, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.
217. Church News, 1967, 'World Congress on Evangelism,' *Church News*, January-February 1967, CESA, P1376, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.

218. Church News, 1968a, 'News', *Church News*, March-April 1968, CESA, P1376, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.
219. Church News, 1968b, 'A New Church in Rhodesia: Why Another Church?', *Church News*, October 1968, CESA, P1376, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.
220. Church News, 1968c, 'African Church News', *Church News*, October 1968, CESA, P1376, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.
221. Church News, 1974, 'News', *Church News*, December 1974, CESA, P1376, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.
222. Church of England, 2021, *Convocations*, Church of England, <https://www.churchofengland.org/about/leadership-and-governance/general-synod/convocations> (Accessed on 14 October 2021).
223. Church Times, 1987, 'Archbishop Robinson's View of CESA', *Australian Church Record*, 8 June 1987, The Ark Digital Repository, <https://myrrh.library.moore.edu.au/handle/10248/8573> (Accessed on 24 June 2021).
224. Claiborne, W., 1986, 'Tutu Installed as Archbishop in Joyous Cape Town Ceremony', *Washington Post*, 8 September 1986, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1986/09/08/tutu-installed-as-archbishop-in-joyous-cape-town-ceremony/aa579e29-b315-4dc4-9a0d-7bf0bfee5e45/> (Accessed on 14 April 2022).
225. Clarke, R. G., 1983, *For God Or Caesar: An Historical Study of Christian Resistance to Apartheid by the Church of the Province of South Africa, 1946-1957*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Natal, <https://ukzn-dspace.ukzn.ac.za/handle/10413/20253> (Accessed on 11 August 2022).
226. Clarke, R. G., 1989, *Confronting the Crisis: Church-State Relations in* King, E, L, England, F, and Paterson, T. *Bounty in Bondage: The Anglican Church in Southern Africa: Essays in Honour of Edward King, Dean of Cape Town*, pp. 130-158, Ravan Press, Johannesburg.
227. Clarke, R. G., 2008, *Anglicans Against Apartheid: 1936-1996*, Cluster Publications, Pietermaritzburg.
228. Cloete, D., 1987, 'The Meaning of Kairos', *Leadership*, Vol. 6 1987, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.

229. Cochrane, J. R. *et al.*, 1999, *Facing the Truth: South African Faith Communities and the Truth & Reconciliation Commission*, David Philipp, Cape Town.
230. Coertzen, P., 2007, 'Thoughts on a Methodology for Church History', *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, Vol. XXXIII, no. 1, pp. 41-54, <http://hdl.handle.net/10500/4455> (Accessed on 3 May 2021).
231. Cole-Edwardes, W., n.d., *Sentinel Points in my Life: The Five Men Who Shaped Me*, Footprints into Africa, <https://footprintsintoafrica.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Sentinel-Points-in-my-life-Part-5.pdf> (Accessed on 15 June 2022).
232. Conser, W. H., 1983, 'A Conservative Critique of Church and State: The Case of the Tractarians and Neo-Lutherans', *Journal of Church and State*, 25 (2), pp. 323–341, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23916212> (Accessed on 21 August 2021).
233. Cox, G. W., 1888, *The Life of John William Colenso, Bishop of Natal*, Vol. 1, W. Ridgway, London.
234. CPSA, 1982, *Anglican Division in South Africa*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
235. Crisis News, 1986, 'What is WPCC?', *Crisis News*, Issue 6, March 1986, Western Province Council of Churches, <http://www.sahistory.org.za/sites/default/files/DC/Cnn686/Cnn686.pdf> (Accessed on 8 October 2021).
236. Crisis News, 1988, 'Right-Wing Church Groups: RWCGs Part of the 'Total Strategy'', *Crisis News*, Issue 26, November 1988, Western Province Council of Churches, https://disa.ukzn.ac.za/sites/default/files/pdf_files/Cnn2688.pdf (Accessed on 15 September 2021).
237. Crisis News, 1989, 'An Open Response from Crisis News to the Rev Jeffrey James of the Protestant Association, World Vision and Rhema Ministries', *Crisis News*, 9 March 1989, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
238. Daunton-Fear, 1958, 'Letter to the Editor', *English Churchman*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg

239. De Blank, B., 1977, *Joost de Blank: A Personal Memoir*, Ipswich, Boydell Press.
240. De Gruchy, J. W and de Gruchy, S., 2005, *The Church Struggle in South Africa: Twenty-fifth anniversary ed./1st Fortress Press edn*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis [Kindle Edition].
241. De Gruchy, J. W and Villa-Vicencio, C., 1983. *Apartheid is a Heresy*. Cape Town: David Philipp.
242. De Gruchy, J. W., 1997, *Grappling with a Colonial Heritage: The English-speaking Churches under Imperialism and Apartheid* in Elphick, R, and Davenport, T, R. H., *Christianity in South Africa: A Political, Social & Cultural History*, David Phillips, Claremont.
243. Denis, P., 2017, 'Germany, South Africa and Rwanda: Three Manners for a Church to Confess its Guilt', *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, 43(2), p. 20 pages. DOI: 10.25159/2412-4265/2721 (Accessed on 6 July 2021).
244. Department of Foreign Affairs and Information, 1980, *Official Yearbook of the Republic of South Africa*, 7th edition, Chris van Rensburg Publications, Pretoria.
245. Department of Information, 1974, *Multi-National Development in South Africa: The Reality*, Department of Information, Pretoria.
246. Department of Information, 1975, *Letter to Bishop S. C. Bradley*, 4 September 1975, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
247. Department of Information, 1976a, *Letter to Bishop S. C. Bradley*, 27 January 1976, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
248. Department of Information, 1976b, *Letter to Bishop S. C. Bradley*, 20 July 1976, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
249. Director-General, 1980, *Letter to Stephen Bradley*, 30 September 1980, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
250. Douglas, J., 1995. *Twentieth-Century Dictionary of Christian Biography*, <https://dacb.org/stories/southafrica/morris-georgefb/> (Accessed on 12 February 2021)
251. Douglas, W. D and Ive, M. A., 1960, 'Ecclesial Apartheid', *Church News*, July-August, CESA, P1379, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.

252. Downie, G., 1984, 'Truth Before Attachment for Bishop Foord', *Canberra Times*, 15 February 1984, National Library of Australia, <http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article116390084> (Accessed on 4 February 2021).
253. Downie, G., 1987, 'Racial Groups Cut off', *Canberra Times*, 5 August 1987, National Library of Australia, <http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article132151114> (Accessed on 4 February 2021).
254. DRC News, 1986, *A critique of the Kairos Document by the Plenary Executive of the Dutch Reformed Church*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
255. Dreyer, W. A and Pillay, J., 2017, 'Historical Theology: Content, methodology and relevance', in 'Theology at the University of Pretoria - 100 years: (1917-2017) Past, present and future', *Verbum et Ecclesia*, suppl. 2, 38 (4), a1680, <https://doi.org/10.4102/ve.v38i4.1680> (Accessed on 11 May 2021).
256. Du Toit, A., 2000, *The Moral Foundations of the South African TRC: Truth and Acknowledgment and Justice as Recognition* in Rotberg, R. I. and Thompson D. F., *Truth v Justice: The Morality of Truth Commissions*, pp. 122-140, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
257. Duncan, G. A., 2007, 'Historiographical Issues Related to the Writing of Contemporary History of Christianity', *Verbum et Ecclesia*, 28 (1), pp. 127–149, <https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC114119> (Accessed on 11 May 2021).
258. Duncan, S., 1991, 'In Humble Submission to Almighty God'—*Church, State and Conflict in South Africa* in Hallencreutz, C. F and Palmberg, M., *Religion and Politics in Southern Africa*, pp. 27-40, Scandinavian Institute of African, Uppsala.
259. Durr, K., 1987, *Letter to Dudley Foord*, 17 March 1987, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
260. Earngey, M., 2011, *Theological Education and Liturgical Reform: The Belated Success of the Bp. Dudley Tucker Foord; Tragedy in the Church of England in South Africa (1984-1987)*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
261. Edgar, B., 2008, 'Marcia Cameron, An Enigmatic Life: David Broughton Knox—Father of Contemporary Sydney Anglicanism' (Canberra: Acorn, 2006), ISBN 0908284608, pp. 343, RRP AUS\$49.50,' *Journal of Anglican Studies*, 6 (1), pp. 127–128, Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1177/1740355308091391 (Accessed on 15 February 2022).

262. Editorial, 1955, 'Notes and Comments', *Australian Church Records*, 24 November 1955, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
263. Elphick, R., 2012, *The Equality of Believers: Protestant Missionaries and the Racial Politics of South Africa*, University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville.
264. Etherington, N., 2019, 'Bishop Colenso and Theophilus Shepstone: Partners in Christian Imperialism', *Journal of Natal and Zulu History*, 33:1, 1-22, DOI:10.1080/02590123.2019.1672206 (Accessed on 24 July 2022).
265. Ewbank, A., 1940, *Vicar-General's Charge*, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
266. Ferguson, E., 2005, *Church History: From Christ to the Pre-Reformation: The Rise and Growth of the Church in Its Cultural, Intellectual, and Political Context*, Volume One, Zondervan Academic, Grand Rapids.
267. Ferrington, A., 1984, *Evangelists Bishop Defends Segregated Church Services*, Canberra Times, 3 October 1984, National Library of Australia, <http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article136919561> (Accessed 21 May 2021).
268. Foord, D. T., 1986a, *Bishop's Charge*, CESA Office, Cape Town
269. Foord, D. T., 1987a, *Letter to Kent Durr*, 20 March 1986, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
270. Foord, D. T., 1987b, *Letter to the Trustees and Executive Committee Members*, 31 May 1987, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
271. Foord, D. T., 1987c, *Letter to Clergy*, 5 June 1987, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
272. Foord, D. T., 1987d, *Report: Cape Area Executive Committee*, 24 April 1987, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
273. Fourie, F. F., 1960, *Letter to Gordon Mills*, 1 December 1960, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
274. Fourie, O., 1990, *Black Theology in South Africa*, A Paper Delivered on 23 October 1990 in London, George Whitefield College Library, Cape Town.
275. Francis and Taylor, 1991, 'Right-Wing Christian Groups', *Review of African Political Economy*, no. 52, pp. 88–93. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4005960> (Accessed on 2 October 2021).
276. Gauteng Black Ministers, 2020, *Equal before God but Unequal Before Each Other: Gauteng Black Ministers on Racism in REACH-SA*, unpublished.

277. Geck, A., 2012, *From Modern Orthodoxy Protestantism to Anglo-Catholicism: An Enquiry into the Probable Causes of the Revolution of Pusey's Theology* in Engelhardt, H. C. and Strong, R. *Edward Bouverie Pusey and the oxford movement*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
278. George Whitefield College, 2021, *Our History*, <https://youtu.be/RuofU5TpfOg> (Accessed on 15 July 2021)
279. George Whitefield House, 1982, *Non-Military Service for Religious Objectors*, Memorandum to S.C.B., AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
280. Gibson, J. L., 2004, *Overcoming Apartheid: Can Truth Reconcile a Divided Nation?* Russell Sage Foundation, New York.
281. Giffard, C. A. et al., 1984, *The Press and Apartheid: Repression and Propaganda in South Africa*, Macmillan, London.
282. Giles, K., 2016, 'Justifying Injustice with the Bible: Apartheid', *Christians for Biblical Equality*, <https://www.cbeinternational.org/resource/article/mutuality-blog-magazine/justifying-injustice-bible-apartheid> (Accessed on 29 June 2020).
283. Gill, A., 1982, 'Now the Archbishop Gets a Grilling', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 3 April 1982, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
284. Gill, A., 1983, 'I'm no Rebel, says new Bishop of South Africa's Fringe Flock', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 December 1983, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg
285. Gill, A., 1984, 'The CESA and Apartheid a Problem for Solomon', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 1 March 1982, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
286. Gobodo-Madikizela P., 2012, 'Remembering the Past: Nostalgia, Traumatic Memory, and the Legacy of Apartheid', *Peace and Conflict*, 18(3), pp. 252–267. DOI: 10.1037/a0029078 (Accessed on 12 June 2022).
287. Goedhals, M., 1989, *From Paternalism to Partnership? The Church of the Province of Southern Africa and Mission 1848-1988* in England, F. and King, E., *Bounty in bondage: the Anglican Church in Southern Africa; essays in honour of Edward King, Dean of Cape Town*. Ravan Press, Johannesburg.
288. Goedhals, M., 2003, 'African Nationalism and Indigenous Christianity: A Study in the Life of James Calata (1895-1983)', *Journal of Religion in Africa*,

- 33 (1), pp. 63–82, <https://doi.org/10.1163/157006603765626712> (Accessed on 13 March 2021).
289. González J. L., 1985, *The Story of Christianity*, Harper & Amp, San Francisco.
290. Goodhew, D., 2000, 'Growth and Decline in South Africa's Churches, 1960-1991', *Journal of religion in Africa*, 30(3), pp.344-369, <https://search-ebscohost-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=4201025&site=ehost-live&scope=site> (Accessed on 17 October 2021).
291. Goodman, A., 1980, *Letter to Bishop Stephen Bradley*, 1 November 1980, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
292. Gordon, M., 1986, *The Kairos Document: Is This the Solution?* AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
293. Gous, G., 1993, 'From the Church Struggle to a Struggling Church: A Tale of Three Conferences: Cottesloe, Rustenburg and Cape Town,' *Missionalia: Southern African Journal of Mission Studies*, 21(3), pp.253-271, DOI: 10.10520/AJA02569507_923 (Accessed on 6 February 2022).
294. Grazioli, A., 1992, *Social, Morals and Ethics Committee: Synod 1992 Report*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
295. Grazioli, A., 1998, *Facsimile to the CESA Executive, 25 March 1998*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
296. Guy, J. J., 1983a, 'The Religious Thinking of J.W. Colenso: The Theology of a Heretic', *Religion in Southern Africa*, Vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 3-20. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/24763695 (Accessed on 12 March 2021).
297. Guy, J. J., 1983b, *The Heretic: A Study of the Life of John William Colenso 1814-1883*, Raven Press, Johannesburg.
298. Haddad, B., 1998, 'Neither Hot nor Cold: The Church of the Province of Southern Africa as an Agent of Social Transformation in the Western Cape, 1960-1990', *Journal of theology for Southern Africa*, 101, pp. 59–68, <https://www-proquest-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/scholarly-journals/neither-hot-nor-cold-church-province-southern/docview/213326753/se-2?accountid=14717> (Accessed on 11 June 2021).

299. Hale, F., 1992, *The Social Ethics of the Baptist Union of Southern Africa*, Doctorate Thesis, University of Natal,
https://researchspace.ukzn.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10413/11358/Hale_Frederick_1992.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Accessed on 31 March 2022).
300. Hale, F., 2006, 'The Baptist Union of Southern Africa and Apartheid', *Journal of Church and State*, 48(4), pp. 753–777,
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/23921476> (Accessed on 9 November 2021).
301. Hammond, H., 1967, 'Crockford and the Church of England in South Africa', *Church News*, June-October 1967, CESA Office, Cape Town.
302. Hammond, H., 1978, *Memorandum from H. H. to S. C. B./J. M. H. /J van P: Re Owamboland Church*, 18 July 1978, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
303. Hammond, H., 1979, *Registrar's Synod Report*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
304. Hammond, H., 1980a, *Memorandum from H. H. to S. C. B.*, 23 September 1980, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
305. Hammond, H., 1980b, *Memorandum from H. H. to S. C. B Re: Alan Goodman*, 18 November 1980, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
306. Hammond, H., 1983, *Letter to the Hon. P. W. Botha*, 3 June 1983, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
307. Hammond, H., 1998, *Facsimile to Bp Frank Retief*, 23 February 1998, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
308. Hammond, P., 2003, 'Bishop Stephen Bradley: From Cairo to Cape Town-A Soldier for Christ', *Frontline Ministries*,
<https://www.frontlinemissionsa.org/in-memorium/bishop-stephen-bradley>
(Accessed on 20 June 2021).
309. Hammond, P., 2022, 'A Tribute to Dorothea Scarborough SC', *Gospel Defence League*, <https://www.gospeldefenceleague.org/index.php/test-3/164-a-tribute-to-mrs-dorothea-scarborough> (Accessed on 6 August 2022).
310. Hayner, P. B., 2010, *Unspeakable Truths: Transitional Justice and the Challenge of Truth Commissions*, Routledge, London.
311. Herbstein, D. and Evenson J., 1989, *The Devils Are Among Us: The War for Namibia*, Zed Books, London.

312. Hinchliff, P., 1962, 'John William Colenso: A Fresh Appraisal', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 13(2), pp. 203–216, Cambridge University Press, DOI: 10.1017/S0022046900068342 (Accessed on 13 June 2021).
313. Hinchliff, P., 1963, *Anglican Church in South Africa: An Account of the History and Development of the Church of the Province of South Africa*, Darton, Longman & Todd Ltd, London.
314. Hofmeyr J. M and Retief, F. J., 1989, *Memorandum: President's Council on Relations*, 16 March 1989, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
315. Hofmeyr, J. M., 1976, *Letter to the Prime Minister*, 3 September 1976, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
316. Hofmeyr, J. M., 1977a, *Letter to the Town Clerk of Cape Town*, 25 June 1977, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
317. Hofmeyr, J. M., 1977b, *Letter to the Prime Minister*, 25 August 1977, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
318. Hofmeyr, J. M., 1978a, *Memo to Ministers, Executive C of E in S.A*, 28 September 1978, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
319. Hofmeyr, J. M., 1983, *Archbishop Loane: Possible Replacements for SCB*, 15 May 1983, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
320. Hofmeyr, J. M., 1987a, *Letter to Dudley Foord*, 21 June 1987, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
321. Hofmeyr, J. M., 1987b, *Memorandum to Bishops, Trustees, Executive Committee Members, Constituent Churches, and Members of the Church of England in South Africa*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg
322. Hofmeyr, J. M., 1988, *Letter to the Minister of Constitutional Development and Planning*, 15 March 1988, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
323. Hofmeyr, J. M., 1989a, *Memo to Rt Rev J Bell, Rt Rev F J Retief, Dr A Grazioli, Mr N Wright*, 18 July 1989, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
324. Hofmeyr, J. M., 1989b, *Letter to the Editor: Crisis News*, 23 March 1989, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.

325. Hofmeyr, J. M., 1989c, *Church of England in South Africa: Draft Resolution to Presented at Synod 1989 Under Item 21*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
326. Hofmeyr, J. M., 1989d, *Representations Regarding Methods Used to Control Unrest and Violence, Letter to the Minister of Law and Order: Adriaan Vlok*, 19 December 1989', AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
327. Hofmeyr, S., 2009, 'The Church of England Outside England', *Virtue Online: The Voice of Global Orthodox Anglicanism*, 27 October 2009, <https://virtueonline.org/church-england-outside-england> (Accessed on 12 April 2021).
328. Huddleston, T., 1956, *Nought for Your Comfort*, Doubleday & Company, New York.
329. Huddleston, T., c. 1985, *Apartheid and the Christian Conscience*, Conference at Eremos Institute on c 1985, Moore Theological College, https://moorecollege.access.preservica.com/IO_faa0c848-45fd-478c-be85-275528be5107/ (Accessed on 10 February 2022).
330. Hughes, P. E., 1951, 'Evangelical Churchmen in South Africa', *Australian Church Record*, 12 July 1951, pp. 1, 10, The Ark Digital Repository, Moore Theological College, https://moorecollege.access.preservica.com/download/file/IO_4c7453c9-86d0-4ad4-83da-a714ec3d9b98 (Accessed on 23 February 2021).
331. Hughes, P. E., 1987, 'The Kairos Document Considered', *The Christian Challenge*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
332. Ive, M. A., 1998b, *Letter to Dr Angelo Grazioli*, 30 March 1998, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
333. Ive, M. A., 1965a, 'Archers and Commandos at Firgrove Camp', *Church News*, January- February 1965, CESA, P1376, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.
334. Ive, M. A., 1965b, 'Why Missions?', *Church News*, May-June 1965, CESA, P1376, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.
335. Ive, M. A., 1966. *The Church of England in South Africa: A Study of its History, Principles and Status*, Church of England Information Office, Cape Town.

336. Ive, M. A., 1976a, 'St. Mathews Church, Orlando', *Today: The Magazine of the Church of England in South Africa*, December 1976, CESA, Pinetown.
337. Ive, M. A., 1976b, *Today: The Magazine of the Church of England in South Africa*, June 1976, CESA, Pinetown.
338. Ive, M. A., 1992, *The Candle Burns in Africa*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
339. Ive, M. A., 1998a, *Thoughts on the TRC Submission*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
340. Jensen, G. E., 1981, 'A Comparative Study of Prussian and Anglican Church-State Reform in the Nineteenth Century', *Journal of Church and State*, 23 (3), pp. 445–463, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23916756> (Accessed on 11 March 2022).
341. Jensen, M. P., 2012, *Sydney Anglicanism: An Apology*, Wipf and Stock Publishers, Kindle Edition.
342. Jensen, M. P., 2013, 'The Church and the World: The Politics of Sydney Anglicanism', *ABC Religion and Ethics*, <https://www.abc.net.au/religion/the-church-and-the-world-the-politics-of-sydney-anglicanism/10099742> (Accessed on 19 July 2021).
343. Johnson, R., 1990, *Letter to Bishop Joseph Bell*, 18 August 1990, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
344. Jones, R., 1966, *Letter to Stephen Bradley*, 30 September 1966, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
345. Kairos Theologians, 1985, *The Kairos Document: A Challenge to the Church*, http://ujamaa.ukzn.ac.za/Libraries/manuals/The_Kairos_Documents.sflb.ashx (Accessed on 5 March 2021).
346. Kairos Theologians, 1986, *The Kairos Document: A Challenge to the Church*, Revised Second Edition, http://ujamaa.ukzn.ac.za/Libraries/manuals/The_Kairos_Documents.sflb.ashx (Accessed on 5 March 2021).
347. Karn, A., 2015, *Amending the Past: Europe's Holocaust Commissions and the Right to History*, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.

348. Katenda, L. K., 2019, *Contend for the Faith: A Conceptual Guide to Mission and Ministry of the REACH Namibia*, REACH Namibia, unpublished.
349. Kinghorn, J., 1990, *The Theology of Separate Equality: A Critical Outline of the DRC's Position on Apartheid* in Prozesky, M., *Christianity Amidst Apartheid: Selected Perspectives on the Church in South Africa*, pp. 57-80, Palgrave, New York.
350. Knox, D. B., 1957, 'Events in South Africa', *Australian Church Record*, 29 August 1957, The Ark Digital Repository, https://moorecollege.access.preservica.com/download/file/IO_02c71fc8-b315-4549-9fd7-c4e5b0cc92bd (Accessed on 21 March 2022).
351. Knox, D. B., 1981, *Apartheid*, The Ark Digital Repository, <https://myrrh.library.moore.edu.au:443/handle/10248/10735> (Accessed on 17 June 2021).
352. Knox, D. B., 1978, *The Bible Teaching about Race*, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
353. Knox, D. B., 1986a, *Analysis of the Kairos Document*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
354. Knox, D. B., 1986b, *Report by David Broughton Knox to the Executive of the Synod of the Church of England in South Africa on Theological Education*. Moore Theological College, Sydney.
355. Knox, D. B., 1989, *Not by Bread Alone: God's Word on Present Issues*, Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh.
356. Knox, D. B., 1959, 'From the Principal's Desk', *Societas*, The Ark Digital Repository, <https://myrrh.library.moore.edu.au/handle/10248/8450> (Accessed on 4 September 2020)
- 357.** Knox, D. B., 2006, *Broughton Knox Selected Works: The Christian Life*, Vol. 3, Matthias Media, Sydney.
358. Koornhof, P. G. J., 1983, *Letter to Stephen Bradley*, 2 June 1983, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg
359. Kosso, P., 2009, *Philosophy of Historiography* in Tucker, A., *A Companion to the Philosophy of History and Historiography*, Wiley (Blackwell Companions to Philosophy, v. 107), DOI: 10.1002/9781444304916 (Accessed on 24 October 2021).

360. Kwa-Zulu Natal Indian and Coloured Ministers, 2020, *Discussions on Gauteng Paper on Racism: KZN Indian and Coloured Clergy Evaluation*, unpublished.
361. Lee, P., 2001, 'Anglicans in Johannesburg: A Divided Church in Search of Integrity', *Transformation*, 18 (4), pp.232-246, <https://doi.org/10.1177/026537880101800404> (Accessed 13 January 2022).
362. Leeman, J., 2016, *Political Church: The Local Assembly as Embassy of Christ's Rule*. InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove.
363. Loane, M. L., 1971, *Press Statement by Archbishop M. L. Loane on Apartheid*, Moore Theological College, Sydney
364. Loane, M. L., 1984, 'Church of England in South Africa: Letter to the Editor', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 20 March 1984, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
365. Loane, M., 1986, *Letter to Bishop Dudley Foord*, 9 October 1986, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
366. Louw, G., 2003, *Servant-leadership as a Paradigm of Leadership for the Church of England in South Africa at this Time of Transformation and Beyond*, Masters Dissertation, University of Natal, https://ukzn-dspace.ukzn.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10413/4100/Louw_Gideon_2003.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Accessed on 23 March 2021).
367. Mabaso, J. M., 1985, *Letter to Dudley Foord*, 1 December 1985, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
368. Maimela, S., 1983, *An Anthropological Heresy: A Critique of White Theology* in De Gruchy, J. W. and Villa-Vicencio, C., *Apartheid is a Heresy*, pp. 48-58, David Philipp, Cape Town.
369. Makinana, S., 2003, 'Obituary of Bishop Stephen Bradley: Man of Prayer who Walked his Faith', *Cape Argus*, 9 July 2003, Sabinet, <https://reference-sabinet-co-za.uplib.idm.oclc.org/document/SAM302003919> (15 August 2021).
370. Maluleke, T. S., 1997, 'Truth, National Unity and Reconciliation in South Africa: Aspects of an Emerging Agenda', *Missionalia: Southern African Journal of Mission Studies*, 25 (1), pp. 59-86, https://dx.doi.org/10.10520/AJA02569507_864 (Accessed on 9 December 2021).

371. Manenzhe, J., 2007, *The Politicisation of State Funerals in South African in the 20th Century*, Masters Dissertation, University of Pretoria, <https://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/25082/dissertation.pdf;sequence=1> (Accessed on 20 June 2021).
372. Manning, C. A. W., 1964, 'In Defense of Apartheid', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 43, no. 1, 1964, pp. 135–149, www.jstor.org/stable/20039084 (Accessed 22 May 2021).
373. Margalit, A., 2002, *The Ethics of Memory*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
374. Markham, I. S., 2020, 'Public Theology: Toward a Christian Definition,' *Anglican Theological Review*, 102(2), pp. 179–191, doi:10.1177/000332862010200202 (21 June 2021).
375. Masango, P., 2020, *My Honest First Take on the Question of Institutional Racism*, George Whitefield College Library, Cape Town.
376. Mathews, I. R., 1975, *Letter to Rt Rev S. C. Bradley*, 19 December 1975, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
377. Maylam, P., 2001, *South Africa's Racial Past: The History and Historiography of Racism, Segregation and Apartheid*, Ashgate, Hampshire.
378. McVicar, M. J., 2015, *Christian Reconstruction: R. J. Rushdoony and American Religious Conservatism*, 1 edn, University of North Carolina Press, <https://search-ebshost-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=965072&site=ehost-live&scope=site> (Accessed: October 6, 2021).
379. Meiring, P., 2005, 'Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa: the role of the faith communities,' *Verbum et Ecclesia*, 26(1), 146-173, DOI:<https://doi.org/10.4102/ve.v26i1.217> (Accessed on 4 June 2022).
380. Meiring, P., c. 2015, 'Faith in Reconciliation in South Africa: Insights from the South African Experience', <https://www.otago.ac.nz/ctpi/otago106231.pdf> (Accessed 23 June 2021).
381. Merriam-Webster English Dictionary, 2021, 'Take for Granted: Idiomatic Phrase', *Merriam-Webster English Dictionary Online*, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/take%20for%20granted> (Accessed on 8 June 2021).

382. Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2022, 'Historicise,' *Merriam-Webster Online* <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/historicize> (Accessed on 3 May 2022).
383. Mills, G. D., 1965. 'GFB Morris: A Tribute,' *Letter to the Editor: Australian Church Record*, 26 July 1965, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
384. Mills, G. D., 1954, *Letter to the Minister of Native Affairs*, 17 December 1954, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
385. Mills, G. D., 1957, *Letter to the Minister of Native Affairs*, 30 April 1957, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
386. Mills, G. D., 1958a, "'Apartheid": Letter to the Editor', *Australian Church Record*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
387. Mills, G. D., 1958b, "'Apartheid": Letter to the Editor', *English Churchman*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
388. Mills, G. D., 1959a, *Letter to the Prime Minister*, 25 September 1959, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
389. Mills, G. D., 1959b, *Letter to the editor: Rand Daily Mail*, 3 March 1959, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
390. Mills, G. D., 1963a, *Letter to Dr Verwoerd*, 27 August 1963, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
391. Mills, G. D., 1966a, *Letter to Mrs Verwoerd*, 22 August 1966, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
392. Mills, G. D., 1966b, *Letter to Mrs Verwoerd*, 7 September 1966, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
393. Ministry of Education and Training, 1980, *Re: Letter Mr Alan Goodman of Japan*, 22 December 1980. AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
394. Mooi, S., 2007, *Transformation*, unpublished.
395. Moore Theological College, 2021, *History*, <https://moore.edu.au/about/> (Accessed on 15 July 2021).
396. Morris, F. G. B., 1955, *Letter to Mrs Morris*, 12 December 1955, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
397. Morris, F. G. B., 1956a, *Letter to Gordon Mills*, 3 April 1956, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.

398. Morris, F. G. B., 1956b, *Letter to Stephen Bradley*, 8 July 1956, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
399. Morris, F. G. B., 1960, *Letter to the Minister of Interior*, 21 May 1960, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
400. Morris, G, F, B., 1959, *Letter to the Members of the Church of England in South Africa*, CESA Office, Cape Town.
401. Morrison, M., 2020, *Racism: Email to Gauteng Area Council*, 22 June 2020, unpublished.
402. Mowll, H., 1958, *Letter to Bishop F.G.B. Morris*, 24 April 1958, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
403. Mulder, C. P., 1974, *Letter to Bishop S. C. Bradley: Ref INL.20*, 27 November 1974, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
404. Mulder, C. P., 1975, *Letter to Bishop S. C. Bradley: Ref INL.21*, 31 July 1975, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
405. Munslow, A., 1997, *Deconstructing History*, Taylor & Francis Group, Florence.
406. Murphy, C., 1979, 'South Africa's Scandal-At Home...', *Washington Post*, 25 March 1979, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/opinions/1979/03/25/south-africas-scandal-at-home/f197531f-4cad-4dba-8a08-005c8a245d57/> (Accessed on 18 October 2021).
407. Nesterenko, A., 2018, 'The Problem of Truth in Historiography: Proceedings of the International Conference on Contemporary Education, Social Sciences and Ecological Studies (CESSSES 2018)', *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, <https://doi.org/10.2991/cessses-18.2018.165> (Accessed on 21 July 2021).
408. Nesterenko, A., 2019, 'Historical Memory as the Basis of Group Identity', 4th International Conference on Contemporary Education, Social Sciences and Humanities (ICCESSH 2019), *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, Vol 329, pp. 1967-1970, Atlas Press, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334373040_Historical_Memory_as_the_Basis_of_Group_Identity (Accessed on 21 July 2021).
409. Newby, J., 1984, *Social, Moral and Ethics Committee: Final Report for the Executive Committee-Apartheid*, unpublished.

410. Newby, J., 2002, *Jubilee of Grace in Coertzen, P, 350 Years Reformed*, CLF, Bloemfontein.
411. Nichols, A., 1971a, *Memo to the Archbishop*, 25 January 1971, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
412. Nichols, A., 1971b, *Memo to the Archbishop*, 2 February 1971, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
413. Nichols, A., 1971c, *Letter to Bruce Rothwell: Editor of The Sunday Australian*, 10 March 1971, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
414. Nichols, A., 1971d, *Special Feature Article for the Sun-Herald*, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
415. Norman, M., 1999, *Report on the National Consultation of Churches in South Africa: Towards Spiritual and Moral Healing of a Nation*, 22-26 February 1999, CESA Office, Cape Town.
416. Northedge, F. S., 1979, 'In Memoriam: Charles Manning 1894-1978', *British Journal of International Studies* 5, no. 1, pp. 1–5, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20096848> (Accessed on 16 January 2022).
417. Ntlha, M., 1994, 'Evangelical Witness in South Africa: The Story of Concerned Evangelicals', *International Review of Mission*, 83 (328): pp139-141, DOI: [10.1111/j.1758-6631.1994.tb02351.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-6631.1994.tb02351.x) (Accessed on 10 May 2021).
418. Olson, R. E., 1999. *The Story of Christian Theology: Twenty Centuries of Tradition and Reform*, InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove.
419. Omar, D., n.d., *Justice in Transition: Booklet Explaining the TRC*, Ministry of Justice, <https://www.justice.gov.za/trc/legal/index.htm> (Accessed on 28 October 2021).
420. Orlando Sentinel, 1985, 'South African Ministers Say Sanctions Will Hurt Blacks', *Orlando Sentinel*, 11 September 1985, <https://www.orlandosentinel.com/news/os-xpm-1985-09-11-0330020049-story.html> (Accessed on 15 November 2021).
421. Paas, S., 2006, *Digging Out the Ancestral Church: Researching and Communicating Church History*, 3rd ed. Zomba, Kachere.
422. Petersen, R., 2001, ... *In the "English-Speaking" Churches in Maritz*, P. J., and the University of Pretoria. Institute for Missiological Research, *1948 Plus Fifty Years: Theology, Apartheid and Church: Past, Present and Future*, pp. 120-129, University of Pretoria, Pretoria.

423. Phillips, F. D., 1995, *Richard Ambrose Reeves: Bishop of Johannesburg 1949-1961*, Masters Dissertation, University of South Africa, <http://hdl.handle.net/10500/15770> (Accessed on 7 June 2021).
424. Pillay, G. J., 2001. *Church, State and Apartheid* in Maritz, P. J, and the University of Pretoria. Institute for Missiological Research. 2001. *1948 Plus Fifty Years: Theology, Apartheid and Church: Past, Present and Future*, pp. 57-67, University of Pretoria, Pretoria.
425. Posel, D and Simpson, G., 2002, *Commissioning the Past: Understanding South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission*, Witwatersrand University Press, Johannesburg.
426. Posel, D., 2008, 'History as Confession: The Case of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission', *Public Culture*, 20 (1), pp.119-141, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-2007-019> (Accessed on 29 October 2021).
427. Ramose, M. B., 2012, 'Reconciliation and Reconciliation in South Africa', *Journal on African Philosophy*, 1 (5), pp. 20-39, <https://www.africaknowledgeproject.org/index.php/jap/article/view/1649> (Accessed on 24 November 2021).
428. Rand Daily Mail, 1959, 'Church Services', *Rand Daily Mail*, 10 October 1959, News Bank, <https://infoweb-newsbank-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/apps/readex/doc?p=HN-SARDM&docref=image/v2%3A135DEF57238F5FC5%40EANX-15D1B82C8F072EE8%402436852-15D17A900795ECD0%405> (Accessed on 11 November 2021).
429. Rand Daily Mail, 1960, 'Church Services', *Rand Daily Mail*, 15 April 1960, News Bank, <https://infoweb-newsbank-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/apps/readex/doc?p=HN-SARDM&docref=image/v2%3A135DEF57238F5FC5%40EANX-15D1C83C677FCD18%402437040-15D1729DCD176120%4013-15D1729DCD176120%40> (Accessed on 11 November 2021).
430. Rand Daily Mail, 1966, 'S.A. Religious Leaders are Horrified', *Rand Daily Mail*, 7 September 1966, News Bank, <https://infoweb-newsbank-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/apps/readex/doc?p=HN-SARDM&docref=image/v2%3A135DEF57238F5FC5%40EANX->

- 15CB2644DC9FD9B0%402439376-15CADD9EEFDBC138%402-15CADD9EEFDBC138%40 (Accessed on 15 March 2021).
431. Rand Daily Mail, 1967a, 'Anglican Reply to Bishop's Claim', *Rand Daily Mail*, 5 September 1967, News Bank, <https://infoweb-newsbank-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/apps/readex/doc?p=HN-SARDM&docref=image/v2%3A135DEF57238F5FC5%40EANX-15CA85CE78AB5EB8%402439739-15C8D65C0C16A678%404-15C8D65C0C16A678%40> (Access on 15 March 2021).
432. Rand Daily Mail, 1967b, 'Bishop is Apartheid Supporter', *Rand Daily Mail*, 2 September 1967, News Bank, <https://infoweb-newsbank-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/apps/readex/doc?p=HN-SARDM&docref=image/v2%3A135DEF57238F5FC5%40EANX-15CA85CC758AD538%402439736-15C8D65B70F90878%4034-15C8D65B70F90878%40> (Access on 15 March 2021).
433. REACH-SA, 2014, *Handbook of Procedure*, REACH-SA, <http://reachsa.org.za/handbook-of-procedures2/> (Accessed on 2 June 2020)
434. REACH-SA, 2014, *Handbook of Procedure*, REACH-SA, <http://reachsa.org.za/handbook-of-procedures2/> (Accessed on 23 May 2020).
435. Registrar, 1965, *The Church of England in South Africa*, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
436. Registrar, 1990, 'CESA's Political Stand', *CESA News*, Issue 24, George Whitefield College Library, Cape Town.
437. Reynolds, J., 1869, *The Bishop of Natal and his Anglican Assailants: An Assay and Critique of the Natal Church Controversy*, Trübner and Co., Durban.
438. Richard, L., 1989, *Apartheid Whitewash: South Africa Propaganda in the United States*, Africa Fund, <http://www.aluka.org/action/showMetadata?doi=10.5555/AL.SFF.DOCUMENT.af000257> (Accessed on 15 November 2021).
439. Ricœur, P., 2004, *Memory, History, Forgetting*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
440. Ridney, A., 2013, *History as Text: Narrative Theory and History* in Partner, N. and Foot, S. eds., *The SAGE Handbook of Historical Theory*, SAGE Publications, Los Angeles.

441. Robinson, D. W., 1951, 'The World of Books: The Official Year-Book of the Church of England, 1951', *Australian Church Record*, 5 April 1951, pp. 11, The Ark Digital Repository, Moore Theological College, https://moorecollege.access.preservica.com/download/file/IO_4c7453c9-86d0-4ad4-83da-a714ec3d9b98 (Accessed on 22 February 2021).
442. Robinson, D. W., 1959, *Memorandum: The Church of England in South Africa*, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
443. Robinson, D. W., 1968, 'A Plea for Understanding, by W.A. Landman, Information Bureau of the Dutch Reform Church in South Africa', *Australian Church Record*, 19 September 1968, The Ark Digital Repository, <https://myrrh.library.moore.edu.au/handle/10248/8554> (16 February 2022).
444. Robinson, D. W., 1975, *Letter to Mr Weidman*, 11 September 1975, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
445. Robinson, D. W., 1984, *Letter to Archbishop of Canterbury*, 14 January 1984, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
446. Robinson, D. W., 1984, *Letter to Hebert Hammond*, 31 January 1984, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
447. Robinson, D. W., 1987, *Letter Rev Murray Hofmeyr*, 16 July 1987, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
448. Ross, R., 2008, *Apartheid in A Concise History of South Africa*, Cambridge Concise Histories, pp. 122-153, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, doi:10.1017/CBO9780511805806.008 (Accessed on 15 July 2021).
449. Rotberg, 2006, *Apologies, Truth Commissions, and Intrastate Conflicts* in Barkan, E and Karn, A., *Taking Wrongs Seriously: Apologies and Reconciliation*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
450. Rotberg, R. I., 2000, *Truth Commissions and the Provision of Truth, Justice and Reconciliation* in Rotberg, R. I. and Thompson D. F., *Truth v Justice: The Morality of Truth Commissions*, pp. 279-294, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
451. Rotberg, R. I., 2000, *Truth Commissions and the Provision of Truth, Justice and Reconciliation* in Rotberg, R. I. and Thompson D. F., *Truth v Justice: The Morality of Truth Commissions*, pp. 279-294, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

452. Runcie, R., 1984, *Letter to Donald Robinson: Lambeth Palace SE17JU*, 11 January 1984, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
453. Rustenburg Declaration, 1990, 'Rustenburg Declaration: National Conference of Churches in South Africa, November 1990', *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa*, 74 Mar 1991, pp. 64-71, <https://search-ebscohost-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=rfh&AN=ATLA0000837989&site=ehost-live&scope=site> (Accessed on 7 February 2021).
454. Scarborough, D., 2016, 'Gospel Defence League and UCA NEWS Report 2015', *Gospel Defence League*, 6 February 2016, <http://www.gospeldefenceleague.org/index.php/uca-news/104-gospel-defence-league-and-ucanews-report-2015> (Accessed on 14 September 2021).
455. Schmidt, G., 1984, 'CESA and Apartheid', 9 March 1984, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
456. Seccombe, D. P., 2020, 'God and Racism: Ephesians 2:11-22', sermon Preached at St Margaret's Nedlands, 23 August 2020, <https://davidseccombe.com/kgindomthoughts/god-and-racism/> (Accessed on 2 October 2020).
457. South Africa, 1995, *The Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act 34 of 1995*, <https://www.justice.gov.za/legislation/acts/1995-034.pdf> (Accessed on 21 May 2021).
458. South Africa, n.d., *Explanatory Memorandum to the Parliamentary Bill*, <https://www.justice.gov.za/trc/legal/bill.htm> (Accessed on 1 February 2022).
459. South Africa. 1993, *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act 200 of 1993*, <https://www.gov.za/documents/constitution/constitution-republic-south-africa-act-200-1993> (Accessed on 13 November 2021).
460. South African Broadcasting Corporation, 2011, 'TRC Episode 75, Part 04', *YouTube*, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-FzZ16zUM8> (Accessed on 26 September 2020).
461. South African Government, 1966. *Program of The State Funeral of the Prime Minister Dr the Honorable H. F. Verwoerd*, 10 September 1966, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.

462. South African History Online, 2021, 'The Detention Weapon', *SAHO*, <https://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/detention-weapon> (Accessed on 15 June 2021).
463. South African Press Association, 1989, 'Sanctions Only Weapon—Tutu', *Cape Times*, 23 October 1989, pp. 11, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
464. South African Press Association, 1997, 'Church Accepted Oppressive System', *Business Day*, 18 November 1997, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
465. Stephenson, B., 1979, 'Rev Fred Shaw Keeps Christian League's Secretes to Himself', *Rand Daily Mail*, 14 September 1979, pp. 11, News Bank, <https://infoweb-newsbank-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/apps/readex/doc?p=HN-SARDM&docref=image/v2%3A135DEF57238F5FC5%40EANX-15BA08F140B240D0%402444131-15B9FDB9D4642F30%4010-15B9FDB9D4642F30%40> (7 October 2021).
466. Suberg, O. M., 1999, *The Anglican Tradition in South Africa: A Historical Overview*, University of South Africa, Pretoria.
467. Suggitt, J., 1998, *The Church and its Unity: Change and Challenge* in Suggitt, J. and Goedhals, M., *Change and Challenge: Essays Commemorating the 150th Anniversary of the Arrival of Robert Gray as First Bishop of Cape Town (20th February 1848)*, pp. 79-87, CPSA, Marshalltown.
468. Swain, M., 1993, 'GOD and government', *Christian Living Today*, Issue 49, pp.32-33, 200 Christian, University of Pretoria Libraries, Pretoria.
469. The Evangelical Alliance of South Africa, 1999, *Testimony Before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission*, 18 November 1999, http://www.uct.ac.za/sites/default/files/image_tool/images/113/Institutes/Archives/submissions/Evangelical_Alliance.pdf (Accessed on 15 October 2021).
470. Terhoven, K., c. 1978, *Ovamboland Visit Report-By Rev Ken Terhoven*, not dated, Moore Theological College, Sydney.
471. The Cape Times, 1982, 'Non-Military Service Backed', *The Cape Times*, 1 May 1982, Sabinet, <https://reference-sabinet-co-za.uplib.idm.oclc.org/document/SAM201982874> (15 August 2021).

472. The Church of England Defence Association, 1935, *An Interesting Correspondence Which Appeared in the Columns of the Cape Times*, CEDA, Cape Town.
473. The Evangelical Alliance of South Africa, 1999, *Testimony Before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission*, 18 November 1999, http://www.uct.ac.za/sites/default/files/image_tool/images/113/Institutes/Archives/submissions/Evangelical_Alliance.pdf (Accessed on 15 October 2021).
474. The New York Times, 1971, *South African Police Rebuff Protests on Dean's Arrest* <https://www.nytimes.com/1971/01/26/archives/south-african-police-rebuff-protests-on-deans-arrest.html> (Accessed on 18 June 2021).
475. Thesnaar, C., 2013, *Reformed Churches' Struggle for Justice: Lessons Learned from their Submissions to the TRC* in Plaatjies-Van Huffel, M. A. and Vosloo, R., *Reformed Churches in South Africa, and the Struggle for Justice: Remembering 1960-1990*, pp. 385-399, Sun Press, Stellenbosch.
476. Thew, J., 1971, 'Face to Face', *Societas*, The Ark Digital Repository, <https://myrrh.library.moore.edu.au/handle/10248/11416> (Accessed on 18 June 2021).
477. Time Magazine, 1979, 'Vorster Quits: A Final Report on Muldergate', *TIME Magazine*, 113 (25), <http://search.ebscohost.com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=53524825&site=ehost-live&scope=site> (Accessed on 19 July 2021).
478. Tooke, J., 1975, *Letter to Bishop Stephen Bradley*, 24 November 1975, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
479. Tooke, J., 1977, *Letter to Bishop Stephen Bradley*, 16 March 1977, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.
480. Tooke, J., 2010, *Michael Cassidy: Lay Apostle to the Cities of Africa*, Doctoral Thesis, University of Pretoria, <https://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/30390/Complete.pdf?sequence=8> (Accessed on 21 March 2022).
481. Troup, F., 1972, *South Africa: A Historical Introduction*, Eyre Methuen, London.
482. Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 1998, *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa Report*, Vol. 2, Commission, <https://www.justice.gov.za/trc/report/> (Accessed on 21 May 2021).

483. Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 1998, *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa Report*, Vol. 1, Commission, <https://www.justice.gov.za/trc/report/> (Accessed on 21 May 2021).
484. Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 1998, *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa Report*, Vol. 4, Commission, <https://www.justice.gov.za/trc/report/> (Accessed on 21 May 2021).
485. Tucker, A., 2019, *A Companion to the Philosophy of History and Historiography*, Wiley (Blackwell Companions to Philosophy, v. 107), DOI: 10.1002/9781444304916 (Accessed on 24 October 2021).
486. Turnbull, R., 2010. *Anglican and Evangelical?*, Bloomsbury Publishing, New York.
487. Tutu, D., 1990, *Afterword: A Christian Vision of the Future of South Africa* in Prozesky, M., *Christianity Amidst Apartheid: Selected Perspectives on the Church in South Africa*, Palgrave, New York.
488. Tutu, D., 2000, *No Future Without Forgiveness*, Doubleday, New York.
489. United Nations, 1986, 'United Nations Centre Against Apartheid: United Nations Actions Against Apartheid', *JSTOR*, https://jstor.org/stable/10.2307/al.sff.document.nuun1986_13 (Accessed on 31 August 2021).
490. Van der Merwe, J., 2021, 'The Rustenburg Church Conference of 1990: A call to the churches in South Africa after 30 years', *Verbum et Ecclesia*, 42 (1), pp.1-8, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/ve.v42i1.2232> (Accessed on 4 January 2022).
491. Van Wyngaard, C. J., 2017, 'The Theological Anthropology of Simon Maimela: Democratisation of Power and Being Human in Relationship', *Verbum et Ecclesia*, 38 (1), pp. 1–8, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v76i3.6109>. (Accessed on 8 July 2021).
492. Verbuyst, R., 2013, 'History, historians and the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission', *North-West University*, <http://repository.nwu.ac.za/handle/10394/9030> (Accessed on 11 September 2021).
493. Verwoerd, H. F., 1966, *Letter to Gordon Mills*, 2 August 1966, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.

494. Villa-Vicencio, 2000, *On the Limitation of Academic History: The Quest for Truth Demands Both More and Less* in James, W. G. and Van de Vijver, L. *After the TRC: Reflections on Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa*, Ohio University Press, Athens.
495. Villa-Vicencio, C and Verwoerd W., 2000, *Constructing a Report: Writing up the "Truth"* in Rotberg, R. I. and Thompson D. F., *Truth v Justice: The Morality of Truth Commissions*, pp. 279-294, Princeton University Press, <https://search-ebscohost-com.uplib.idm.oclc.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=305790&site=ehost-live&scope=site> (Accessed on 13 November 2021).
496. Villa-Vicencio, C., 1988, *Trapped in Apartheid: A Socio-theological History of the English-speaking Churches*, Orbis Books, Maryknoll.
497. Villa-Vicencio, C., 1990, *When Violence Begets Violence: Is the Armed Struggle Justified?* in Prozesky, M., *Christianity Amidst Apartheid: Selected Perspectives on the Church in South Africa*, pp193-207, Palgrave, New York.
498. Villa-Vicencio, C., 1996, *The Spirit of Freedom: South African Leaders on Religion and Politics*, University of California Press, Berkeley [eBook] <http://ark.cdlib.org/ark:/13030/ft4p3006kc/> (Accessed on 7 July 2021).
499. Villa-Vicencio, C., 1999, 'Living in the wake of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission: A retroactive reflection', *Law, Democracy & Development*, 3 (2), pp.195-207, <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/idd/article/download/138049/127619>(Accessed on 1 August 2021).
500. Visagie, A., 2016, 'Social Justice or Compassion', *REACH-SA*, <https://reachsa.org.za/social-justice-or-compassion/> (Accessed on 19 May 2021).
501. Vörös, L., 2017, 'Social Demand and the Social Purpose of History: What is Missing from Alun Munslow's Classification of Historiography?', *The Hungarian historical review: new series of Acta Historica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 6 (4), pp.776-803, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Laszlo-Voeroes-2/publication/322618402_Social_Demand_and_the_Social_Purpose_of_History_What_is_Missing_from_Alun_Munslow%27s_Classification_of_Historiography/links/5b05d2c7aca2725783d89b1a/Social-Demand-and-the-Social-

Purpose-of-History-What-is-Missing-from-Alun-Munslows-Classification-of-Historiography.pdf (Accessed on 2 May 2022).

502. Walshe, P., 1997, *Christianity and the Anti-Apartheid Struggle: The Prophetic Voice within Divided Churches* in Elphick, R. and Davenport, T. R. H. *Christianity in South Africa: A Political, Social, and Cultural History*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
503. Welsh, D et al., 1973, *The Roots of Segregation: Native Policy in Colonial Natal, 1843-1910*, Oxford University Press, Cape Town.
504. Wertsch, J and Roediger, H., 2008, 'Collective Memory: Conceptual Foundations and Theoretical Approaches', *memory*, 16 (3), pp. 318–326, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658210701801434> (Accessed on 10 October 2021).
505. White, H., 1973, 'Interpretation in History', *New Literary History*, Vol. 4 (2), pp. 281–314, Johns Hopkins University Press, <https://doi.org/10.2307/468478> (Accessed on 4 November 2021).
506. White, H., 1980, 'The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality', *Critical Inquiry*, 7 (1), pp. 5–27, <https://www.proquest.com/docview/1297264722/fulltext/48675FA0A6E44C38PQ/1?accountid=14717&imgSeq=1> (Accessed on 4 November 2021).
507. White, H., 1984, 'The Question of Narrative in Contemporary Historical Theory', *History and Theory*, 23 (1), pp. 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2504969> (Accessed on 4 November 2021).
508. Williams, D. A., 2020, 'Mission and Care for the Poor in Sydney Anglican Perspective', *Mission Studies*, 37 (1), pp.78-100, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/15733831-12341697> (Accessed on 24 January 2022).
509. Williams, R., 1983, 'Foord Consecration Looks to Heal Rift', *Australian Church Records*, 20 February 1984, The Ark Digital Repository, <https://myrrh.library.moore.edu.au/handle/10248/8570> (Accessed on 11 September 2021).
510. Wirgman, A. T., 1895, *The History of the English Church and People in South Africa*, Longmans, Green & Co., London.
511. Woodhouse, J., 1987, *Evangelism and Social Responsibility: A Review of Issues*, An Audio Presentation at the School of Theology, 1 January 1987, The Ark Digital Repository, <http://myrrh.library.moore.edu.au/handle/10248/1977> (Accessed on 26 September 2021).

512. Woodhouse, J., 1988, 'Evangelism and Social Responsibility' In *Christians in Society*, pp. 3-26, Lancer Books, Homebush West.
513. Worsnip, M. E., 1991. *Between the Two Fires: The Anglican Church and Apartheid: 1948-1957*, University of Natal Press, Pietermaritzburg.
514. Worthen, M., 2008, 'The Chalcedon Problem: Rousas John Rushdoony and the Origins of Christian Reconstructionism', *Church History*, 77 (2), 399–437, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20618492> (Accessed on 6 October 2021).
515. Wren, C., 1989, 'Manoeuvring by South Africa Blacks', *The New York Times*, 22 November 1989, pp. 3, <https://www.nytimes.com/1989/11/22/world/maneuvering-by-south-africa-blacks.html> (Accessed on 15 November 2021).
516. Wright, B., 1963, 'The Church and Politics', *Church News*, March-April 1963, CESA, P1376, National Library of South Africa, Pretoria.
517. Wright, J., 1989, 'The Authority of Lambeth Conferences 1867-1988', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, 58 (3), pp. 278-290, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42610340> (Accessed on 11 July 2021).
518. Wright, N., 1998, *TRC Statement: Facsimile to Antony Ive*, 24 February 1998, AC2234, William Cullen Library, Johannesburg.