Witness seminar
The Churches and the Anti-Apartheid Movement

Institute of Commonwealth Studies, London
Saturday 9 December 2000

Contributors:

Rob Skinner (Department of History, Bristol University)
Kevin Ward (Department of Theology and Religion, Leeds University)
Paul Oestreicher (Director, British Council of Churches Division of International Affairs, 1981–85)
Jim Wilkie (Africa Secretary, British Council of Churches, 1976–79)
Baldwin Sjollema (Former Director, WCC Programme to Combat Racism)
Pauline Webb (Former Vice-Moderator, WCC and Head of Religious Programmes, BBC World Service)
Brian Brown (Former Deputy Director, Christian Institute and Africa Secretary, British Council of Churches, 1980–94)
David Haslam (Founder, End Loans to Southern Africa)
David Craine (End Loans to Southern Africa)

Convenor: Shula Marks

The Churches and the Anti-Apartheid Movement
Institute of Commonwealth Studies, London
Saturday, 9 December 2000

Shula Marks: Welcome to the Institute of Commonwealth Studies and the third of our oral history seminars, which we've been holding together with the Archives Committee of the Anti-Apartheid Movement to record participants' memories and perceptions of the Anti-Apartheid Movement and their relationship to it. We are particularly delighted this afternoon to have such a large number of distinguished visitors joining us, coming from as far afield as Baldwin Sjollema from Geneva and the Reverend Jim Wilkie from Scotland, and I think people from Coventry and around the country as well. I'm really delighted to see all of you here and the response that we've had to our invitation. Now, as many of you will know from my letter of invitation, the idea is to gather people who have some memories in common, but also their own stories around particular episodes, events, sets of relationships. The object of the seminar is to invite people involved in significant historical events to discuss and reflect upon those events, usually in response to some questions that get asked at the beginning, or in response to one another's memories. And I think the value of these occasions really depends very much on the way in which participants stir their own memories, and I certainly don't want to impose any kind of straitjacket on proceedings this afternoon. I'm also very aware that we have so many distinguished participants that we can hardly do justice to these memories in the time that we've got this afternoon. We've got just under four hours. As I mentioned in my note, we don't expect people to talk at very great length, but I know that a lot of people in this room have a great many memories which I think we would want to share with them. And if possible, I'd like us to focus on the relationship of the church to the Anti-Apartheid Movement – it was both a fruitful, and I think, at times, a tense one – and not the broad story of the churches' struggle against apartheid, which is of course a much wider issue, on which we could hold not one afternoon's workshop, but a whole series of days of workshops.

Rob Skinner and Kevin Ward are two academics who've been working on that wider struggle in a sense. Rob, on the church and the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa in the 1950s, and Kevin, most recently, on Bishop Ambrose Reeves. I think he's writing the national biography of Ambrose Reeves. I thought we might just start with giving them each about 20 minutes maximum to contextualise that story for us before we get started. I thought after that that we might find it useful to ask Baldwin Sjollema and Pauline Webb and Paul Oestreicher to speak to us before tea, simply because I know that Canon Paul Oestreicher has to leave roughly at tea-time. And then in the second half of the afternoon I'd hopefully go round the room and people would speak as they wanted to, but everybody should have an opportunity to intervene. Before we start, I wonder whether it mightn't be worthwhile just going round the room and saying who we are and what we do. And I realise I should have done that in relation to myself. I'm Shula Marks, I'm a historian, I'm working on Southern African history and I work at the School of Oriental and African Studies. I also serve on the Anti-Apartheid Archives Committee.

Albert Mosley: I'm Albert Mosley, retired Methodist minister, from '52 to '62 I worked in Zimbabwe, then was in Birmingham, and finally General Secretary of the Methodist [inaudible] division.

[Name indistinct]: I'm from South Africa actually. I've been here in this country for quite a while. My interest is in the arts and culture in South Africa, that's the kind of thing that's been interesting to me.

Jim Wilkie: I'm Jim Wilkie. I was in Zambia with the Church of Scotland from 1961 to 1976, and then from '76 to '79 was the Africa Secretary of the British Council of Churches, and then the Divisional Secretary of the Conference for World Missions, also the British Council of Churches, then went back to Scotland and became the Secretary of my own denomination, the Church of Scotland. And I'm now retired.

Paul Oestreicher: I'm Paul Ostreicher, a political scientist by training, Anglican priest. My involvement began with my friendship with Trevor Huddleston when he returned from South Africa, and I was Secretary of the British Council of Churches in the '60s, and the International Division in the first part of the '80s, and my other hat which was relevant to this involvement [inaudible].

Baldwin Sjollema: I'm Baldwin Sjollema, I'm here with my wife, who's sitting there. We are both originally from Holland, but we have been living for the past 42, 43 years in Geneva. We have been responsible for the Programme to Combat Racism.

Kevin Ward: Kevin Ward. I teach African Studies in the Department of Theology and Religion in Leeds. I'm a priest of the Church of Uganda, where I lived for 20 years. I became interested in South Africa when I was Uganda because so many Ugandans went into exile there, and I visited quite a number of them in the '80s and '90s. And recently I've been living with a South African who was a Xhosa and Afrikaans speaker, and I'm very interested in that dimension of black South African engagement with Afrikanerdom.

Pauline Webb: I'm Pauline Webb. I was in the World Council of Churches and helped set up the Programme to Combat Racism, and I was very much involved with that. And I was also working with the Methodist Church in Geneva at that time, and comparing what was happening in Geneva to what was happening in Britain, and then I went to the [inaudible].

Ethel de Keyser: I'm Ethel de Keyser. I worked in the Anti-Apartheid Movement from '65 until the end of '74, but remained on the Executive until '86, I think. I left there and I worked subsequently in the British Defence and Aid Fund from 1980, and then went on to [inaudible].

Christabel Gurney: I'm Christabel Gurney. I worked in the Anti-Apartheid Movement from the late '60s [inaudible]

Mike Gerrard: I'm Mike Gerrard. I am retired now. I was a long-time activist in the Anti-Apartheid Movement, and member of the [inaudible] movement for quite a number of years too.

David Craine: My name's David Craine, and I'm quite a newcomer in that I started to get involved in about 1982 in anti-apartheid work. I was involved from '86 onwards full time, with End Loans to Southern Africa, and then with a group called Embargo, that worked on the oil campaign. I'm a Methodist local preacher and also did some work on the Methodist church position around that time, and then worked there until the end. And now I'm working in the South African High Commission as an information officer, so times have moved on a bit.

Alex Kirby: My name's Alex Kirby. I worked for several years during the 1970s with the Programme to Combat Racism with Pauline Webb and David Haslam.

Elizabeth Williams: [inaudible]

Dorothy Robinson: I'm Dorothy Robinson, I'm a member of the AAM Archives Committee. I was the first ever secretary of the Anti-Apartheid Movement until 1966 and I later worked for the International Defence Aid Fund.

Mike Terry: My name's Mike Terry. I was the second secretary of Anti-Apartheid from 1975 until the situation resolved itself, and now teach physics. And I'm secretary of the AAM Archives Committee.

Brian Brown: I'm Brian Brown, Methodist minister. I was deputy director of the Christian Institute of Southern Africa at the time of its closure in 1977. I came to Britain after a banning order, what was quaintly called 'exile' at the time. And for 16 years I worked as either the Africa Secretary of the British Council of Churches or of my own Methodist Church, and I am now a Methodist parish priest or minister in the metropolis of Tooting.

Deborah Gaitskell: I am Debby Gaitskell, and I'm teaching in the … department at SOAS [inaudible]

Rob Skinner: I am researching into the role of the church and religion in laying the foundations for the Anti-Apartheid Movement, and in particular in the '40s and '50s.

Neil Overy: My name is Neil Overy and I'm a PhD student at the School of Oriental and African Studies. I'm looking at mission church reactions in South Africa to the National Education Act.

David Haslam: David Haslam, another Methodist minister. And I was a member of the Anti-Apartheid Movement executive committee for about six years during the '70s, and again during the '80s.

Yvonne Cassim: I'm Yvonne Cassim. I'm on the ACTSA NEC at the moment. I was with Anti-Apartheid, and I was on the Multi-Faith Committee.

Peggy Preston: I'm Peggy Preston. I met Trevor Huddleston in 1960 and he gave me money from the Sharpeville Fund to go to South Africa. I went there in 1961, I worked at Baragwanath hospital for one year and I went back there in 1982, worked in Cape Town. I was with Anti-Apartheid on the Children's Committee, the Multi-Faith Committee and with SATIS [Southern Africa the Imprisoned Society]. I'm now with the ACTSA committee.

Miles Larmer: My name's Miles Larmer. I was a student activist in Anti-Apartheid during the late '80s, and I'm a DPhil student at Oxford studying Zimbabwe and Zambia.

Carla Tsampiras: Hi, I'm Carla Tsampiras. I recently completed my MA at SOAS, but I'm born and bred South African, and was very involved in student politics during the '90s, until the end of Apartheid.

Shula Marks: Well thank you all very much. I wonder if we'd like to start ourselves off – the shorter the better, let's put it that way.

Rob Skinner: OK. Do you know how much I've struggled to put something together, and now I have to cut it! One of the first things that I was going to say was that the work that I've done so far lacks particularly – it's focused very much on the Church of England and the Church of England establishment, particularly in the 1950s, so I'm very glad that there are so many Methodists here because that's the next big area of research to look at. I'll just skim through this very quickly. I think, clearly when we're looking at British Christian anti-apartheid campaigners, the first person we have to think of is Michael Scott, who had studied theology in Grahamstown in the 1920s, then in the 1930s was a priest in the East End of London as well as a chaplain in India, before he returned to South Africa after being discharged from the Royal Airforce at the start of the second World War. He arrived in South Africa in early 1943, and began work at St Albans mission in Sophiatown. Whilst in South Africa he almost immediately threw himself in to South African political life and worked for a left liberal movement called the Campaign for Rights and Justice, which sought to address several questions of universal political representation, questions about discriminatory legislation and land ownership, all in the context of post-war reconstruction. And there was a particular focus on the needs of recently demobilised African servicemen. Scott, over the next few years, after resigning from the campaign, following a controversy over a pamphlet that was about to be circulated on the Broederbond, which never was circulated. He resigned over this controversy and because of moves towards making this movement an actual political party in South Africa.

Over the next few years he embarked on a series of campaigns against racial and social injustice in South Africa, most famously in 1946, being arrested and spending time in Durban jail, after participating in protests against Smuts Asiatic Land Tenure and Indian Representation Act. After spending time in jail, he then moved to Tobruk shantytown on the

outskirts of the city, and was arrested again for living in a so-called ‘native’ area. He then – by which point he became extremely famous in South Africa, and was called upon to investigate a series of issues and causes in South Africa, particularly the most notorious in Bethal in the Eastern Transvaal, where he published his findings on the conditions of farm workers in the Rand Daily Mail. But soon after, he was asked to take up the cause of the Herero people who live in present day Namibia and to petition the British government and the United Nations on their behalf, and travel to New York in late 1947 for that purpose. Unable to gain a hearing of the UN in that session, Scott returned to South Africa and made preparations to present his case to the 1948 session.

Coming back to England after the 1948 South African general election on his way to the next United Nations session in New York, Scott spent some months in London, where he attempted to cultivate support in Britain for his campaign on behalf of the Herero people. He helped organise, or took part in organising, a deputation to the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations organised by the Anti-Slavery and Aboriginals Protection Society, which included George Bell, Bishop of Chichester amongst its members. Bell was reported as being the leader of that delegation in the Observer, and was then contacted by the chair of the Royal Commission of Churches on International Affairs noting the reservations that had been expressed about Scott by a number of individuals in South Africa. Friends in South Africa were very cagey about him, remarked Bell, who nonetheless stressed that he admired a man who suffered for his convictions. Scott, meanwhile, continued to publicise his campaign widely, writing in early February to King George VI, recalling the Hereros’ petition to Queen Victoria in 1876, and calling upon the king to persuade South Africa not to proceed with its measure of bad faith towards this sacred trust. Bell wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury, George Fisher, informing him officially of the planned deputation, and stressing that he would not in fact be its head, and noting the reservations that had been expressed about Scott. On the other hand, Bell continues, ‘I gather his good will and self-sacrificing spirit are appreciated’. At the same time, Fisher was contacted by Basil Roberts of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel’s Africa subcommittee. Roberts noted that there was undoubtedly a feeling that the Church of England ‘has given too little official evidence of its sympathy and concern with the province on this vital issue’. Prompted by this correspondence with Bell and Roberts, Fisher wrote to Geoffrey Clayton, the newly installed Archbishop of Cape Town, requesting his views and possible demonstrations of support from Britain. George Bell had also written to Clayton to judge his feelings on Scott. Soon after Fisher had written, George Bell received a response from Clayton outlining his position. Clayton repudiated Scott absolutely, stating that ‘he no more represents the diocese of the Church of the province than any other stray clergyman who happens to hold a license to officiate in the diocese of Chichester would represent that diocese if he paid a visit to South Africa’, and that representations to the British government would have little positive effect, stating with authority that ‘we have got to fight our own battles in South Africa’. Clayton repeated this message a few weeks later when he replied to Fisher, adding that extracts of church debates were being reported in South Africa, illustrating apparent interference in the part of England, that would only result in resentment. This essentially becomes the basis of the establishment line of the Church of England, certainly until the mid 1950s, that no move

would be made, no comment would be made from establishment figures in the Church of England without following the lead of Clayton in Cape Town.

Christian opposition to apartheid in this country therefore became focused on the small number of outspoken priests with whom we're all now familiar. Michael Scott, having achieved his aim of speaking at the United Nations in 1949, returned to Britain as somewhat of a celebrity. He was profiled in the Observer and compared to David Livingstone. At the end of December 1949, he was introduced to Canon Collins of St Paul's by Victor Gollancz, who suggested the possibility that Collins' organisation, Christian Action, might be able to provide support for Scott's activities where official Church bodies had not been active. Soon after this meeting, in fact on New Year's Day 1950, Collins preached a sermon in St Paul's, talking of how Christian Action could indeed provide support for those who campaigned on racial justice in South Africa, more than British church leaders, who, as Collins said, are responsible for the running of a machine, and their hands are therefore tied when it comes to being prophetic. The Natal Witness duly reported extracts of this speech, alleging that he had quoted the Archbishop of Canterbury saying that his hands were tied in relation to South Africa. Fisher immediately wrote admonishing comments, complaining that: 'Anything I have said on this topic was said confidentially and personally'. And this exchange sets the tone for the relationship between Collins and the archbishop over the next few years. But he was not dissuaded, and when Scott returned from New York in the following spring, it was Christian Action that provided the platform for him at a meeting in the Central Hall in Westminster. By 1952 Scott, who was by that point prohibited from residing in or visiting South Africa, and had taken an interest in African causes across the Southern African region, helped form a new organisation based in London, the Africa Bureau, which was supported by eminent figures such as Margery Perham, Arthur Creech-Jones and Arthur Lewis, and of course by the administrative skills of Mary Benson.

Soon after the establishment of the Africa Bureau and the launching of the African and Indian National Congresses' Defiance Campaign, attention was again focused on South Africa. Michael Scott wrote a letter in the New Statesman calling for 'something practical to be done to assist the wives and families of the protesters'. Unable to persuade the Africa Bureau's somewhat respectable executive to support such a thing, Scott again approached Collins, who agreed to support a fund through Christian Action. Collins announced the plan to provide material support for the Defiance Campaign from the pulpit of St Paul's in early September 1952 in a sermon in which he describes the South African Prime Minister Malan as 'a poor wretched man hag-ridden with fear'. It was just as difficult, Collins carried on, 'to expect a man with delirium tremens to discover in his heart the love to destroy his illusion of pink elephants, as to hope that the Nationalists, whose hearts are full of fear, can rid themselves the illusion of white supremacy'. In his autobiographical account of that time, published over a decade later, Collins remarked that 'in spite of my wife's frequent explanations, I find it difficult to understand why this passage aroused such a stream of criticism'.

The passive resistance campaign in South Africa, of course, brought the activities of another Anglican priest to the attention of observers outside South Africa. Trevor Huddleston had arrived, like Michael Scott, in South Africa in 1943, and had immediately thrown himself into his work in the Community of the Resurrection's schools and churches, and amongst the people of Sophiatown. Although he had not engaged in national politics until the early 1950s, Huddleston had quickly become involved in philanthropic activities in Johannesburg, establishing the African Children's Feeding Scheme for school children and attempting to set up local bodies to tackle crime and housing in Johannesburg's African townships.

These activities led Huddleston into increasing criticism of the social and cultural system that was creating such hardships for his parishioners. Huddleston came into closer and closer contact with leading congressmen, and by 1952, he too was playing an active part in Congress activities, by acting as the South African contact for Christian Action's Defiance Campaign support fund. Early in the following year, he publicly allied himself with Congress, addressing Indian and African National Congress delegates at the Trades Hall, Johannesburg. Huddleston wrote to John Collins soon after this event, stressing that his presence gave a lie to the claims that the Defiance Campaign was anti-European, and urged Collins to give as much possible publicity as he could. He noted that the proposed Criminal Law Amendment Act would make it virtually impossible to publicly criticise the government, making outside help crucial. 'I believe the only thing which might shake our government is determined hostility from the rest of the world', said Huddleston in his letter, 'with the rest no longer a distant possibility'. Huddleston argued that Collins help in raising the International profile of his own activities was of the utmost importance. Impressed by Huddleston's plea, Collins sent a copy of the letter to Geoffrey Fisher. The archbishop noted the undesirability of any strong comments from Britain during the election campaign in South Africa, and with Collins permission, forwarded a copy of the letter to Clayton in Cape Town. With Clayton's belief in the sanctity of law, it is hardly surprising that he responded by saying: 'If Father Huddleston or anyone else exhorts people to break the law, he must expect the government to retaliate by punishing him'.

A few weeks later, in a letter to Ambrose Reeves, Fisher commented that although clearly passionate in his views, Collins was a person of very poor judgement, and efforts to restrain him would achieve little success. But Fisher actually was very soon to join Collins as a target for criticism in South Africa, following a review of the world situation, a speech he gave at the meeting of the British Council of Churches in Birmingham that year. He turned to South Africa and pointed out that apartheid did not actually produce any kind of true separation, but instead a system which kept Africans socially and politically not apart, but under. This, according to Fisher, amounted to a sort of slavery. That statement coming from the Archbishop of Canterbury was enough to prompt a storm of criticism from the South African government. The South African High Commissioner called on the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations with a very strong protest from Malan, who suggested that Fisher's comments had made it harder to argue for his own strong wish for South Africa to remain in the Commonwealth, not to mention to argue for his own presence at the coronation. Although we shouldn't overstretch the comparisons between Fisher and Collins at this point, the

Archbishop of Canterbury's speech, although probably not intentionally controversial, did represent a small shift in the official stance towards apartheid.

The following year, 1954, would see further significant developments. Collins would travel to South Africa, invited by a Durban paint manufacturer who wanted to show Collins South Africa as it really was, and convince him to change his opinion. Collins visited South Africa in June and July of 1954, staying for a month with the Shave family. Jack Shave was a paint manufacturer in Durban, and Collins was taken on a pre-arranged whistlestop tour of townships, hospitals, schools and government offices, and introduced to a series of dignitaries. Instead of being convinced by the error of his criticism of South Africa, he saw instead a 'beautiful madhouse' in which relations between black and white were 'bedevilled by fear and rooted in unreality and ignorance'. It was enough to prompt his host to repudiate his guest as 'a man with a mental fixation who sees every non-European as right, and every white man as wrong'. Collins returned to England in a storm of controversy, a series of correspondence in The Times ranged from condemnation of public pronouncements by uninformed tourists, unnecessarily chafing the bonds of the British Commonwealth; letters of support for Collins from Victor Gollancz, Christopher Gell and Trevor Huddleston were also published. And the Daily Herald published a series of three articles by Collins himself reflecting on the visit.

In early October of that year, Huddleston wrote an important article in the Observer entitled 'The Church Sleeps On', condemning the lack of action on the part of South African churches, particularly in relation to the Bantu Education Act, which had recently become the law in South Africa. 'The Church sleeps on', wrote Huddleston, 'while sixty-thousand people are moved from their homes in pursuit of fantastic racial theory, while a dictatorship is swiftly being created over all native affairs in the union, though occasionally it talks in its sleep, and expects the government to listen'. The article's most significant passage is that which calls for a cultural boycott of South Africa. Huddleston called on Christians everywhere 'to show their distress in practical ways by isolating South Africa from contact with all civilised communities, until she realises her position and feels some pain in it'. By 1954, apartheid legislation had begun to encroach on social institutions traditionally controlled by South African churches, the African schools. The Bantu Education Act of 1953, seeking to establish a system of mass education in line with separate development, placed church leaders in a position of having to choose between acquiescence or opposition. Shortly after Huddleston's attack, Collin Legum wrote in the Observer how Bantu education was threatening a serious crisis in church stabilisation in South Africa. A week later he reported how Basil Roberts of the SPG was calling for a day of prayer for South Africa. And Roberts had also written to Geoffrey Fisher suggesting launching an appeal to fund Anglican schools. Fisher had already received a similar suggestion from Canon Collins, while the Bantu Education Act had been condemned at a meeting of the British Council of Churches. In response to all this pressure, Fisher actually organised a committee of church leaders to discus possible action to strengthen the churches in South Africa in their resistance to the state. And the committee's first meeting resolved to send a delegation to South Africa to investigate the needs of the churches.

Clayton and Raymond Raynes had both pointed out to the Archbishop of Canterbury that any attempts to keep Anglican schools running as private institutions, as the Roman Catholic Church was already planning to do, was likely to founder on a provision that made it necessary for private schools to be licensed by the Minister for Native Affairs. Events then proceeded apace in South Africa, which overtook these discussions and debates in Britain. The Church's Provincial Episcopal Synod decided to lease the Anglican school buildings to the government, which was followed rapidly by Ambrose Reeves' own decision to the contrary, that actually all Anglican schools in the dioceses of Johannesburg would in fact be closed. So the discussions in Britain over appeals became somewhat academic. Yet the impetus towards some kind of practical action continued. George Bell announced to Geoffrey Fisher that he was drafting an appeal on behalf of the Africa Bureau and Christian Action, while both the SPG and British Council planned similar announcements. The SPG, prompted by this development, then went ahead independently and launched an appeal to 'come to the help of the church in South Africa'. The Africa Bureau and Christian Action then quietly backed down from setting up a rival appeal. Fuming at the SPG, Fisher felt that he'd been left with the miserable job of saying that, 'I could not control them', and picking up the broken fragments of this piece of interchurch co-operation. It was not until the middle of January 1955, that Fisher and Cyril Garbett, the Archbishop of York, made a joint announcement of an appeal to maintain and develop its pastoral responsibilities to the European, the Coloured and the Asian peoples of South Africa, as well as for the Africans.

I think this is perhaps an unfortunate moment to bring a halt to this narrative, but I think it represents in some ways a kind of watershed in the Church of England's response to apartheid. For the first time, the most senior figures in the church were standing, if not side by side, then at least in the same room, as the church's more vociferous opponents of apartheid. And the next three years, of course, would see an intensification of the opposition from the church. Huddleston's continued campaign ensured more and more worldwide publicity for Congress, and he was famously honoured at the Congress of the People in 1955, before if was announced that he was to be recalled to Mirfield. Collins continued to spar with the Archbishop of Canterbury over South Africa, while his earlier efforts to organise material support for the Defiance Campaign protesters was to be rekindled following the arrest of over a 150 anti-apartheid activists on charges of treason in December 1956. Collins, recalling the delays of 1954, acted swiftly, setting up the Treason Trial Defence Fund that was to provide £170,000 over the four-year trial and to expand into one of the major sources of financial support for the victims of apartheid. By 1957, when the Native Laws Amendment Act threatened to make multiracial church services conditional on the permission of the Minister of Native Affairs, Geoffrey Clayton finally found himself in a position where he could contemplate breaking the law and indeed advising others to do so, despite the fact that he came to this decision almost at the same moment as he took his last breath. And with the replacement of Clayton with Joost de Blank as the Archbishop of Cape Town, I think there is a true watershed in terms of the church of the province's relationship with the government. From that point on, the attitude towards the South African government was much more emphatically oppositional. And that's where I stop.

Shula Marks: Thank you very much indeed.

Kevin Ward: This is also about an Anglican figure, but I think it can carry on the story a bit from where Rob has left it off. But I'd like to begin by – I don't know if any of you read the novel by Marlene van Niekerk called *Triomf* published in Afrikaans in '94 and last year in English, about the Afrikaner community threatened with eviction from the ironically named Vrededorp in Johannesburg, finding its salvation in moving into Sophiatown, from which the 'kaffirs' have only just been evicted. But this is how Marlene van Niekerk describes this community, this Afrikaner community, beginning its life there:

> That little Priest was there too, in his little black dress, walking through the piles of smoking rubbish, the burst pipes and the pools of dirty water. All the dogs were traipsing after him as usual. Every now and again, he'd stop, and then he'd write down something in a little notebook. I bet he's taking notes so he can go and complain to the Queen of England, Trepi said, cos if he understood correctly, the Queen was in charge of all the Churches. But he couldn't understand what was bothering the Priest, cos there his church still stood, no-one had even touched it.

I suppose the little priest is supposed to be Huddleston, not many of you would regard him as a little priest. Perhaps Reeves would have been a more appropriate person to answer to that description. But it's very interesting on the kind of Afrikaans perspective on Anglican opposition to apartheid in the '50s, that the Anglican church is a church of outsiders, that they have imperial connections, that they're snooty, that they've long had a hate and disdain for Afrikaners, and that this is taking on new dimensions in the 1950s. And the expectation that the church, at least the Anglicans, always have been concerned with their own affairs, rather than with everyone else's, and let them keep that way, let them preserve their church and don't worry about the collapse of the rest of Sophiatown. Well Ambrose Reeves personifies the response to those perceptions. He'd never been to South Africa when he was appointed Bishop of Johannesburg in 1948. Bishop Bell, I think, and this would certainly be born out from what Rob has just said, was very instrumental in his appointment, and told him at a meeting of the World Council in Amsterdam, 'You are going to the second most important see in the whole Anglican communion'. Bell had obviously influenced Fisher sufficiently to accept that this was an appropriate person, because of his strong record of social work in Liverpool. And in writing to Reeves when he went, Fisher said, 'One of the bishop's first duties is to lead effectively a crusade against the evil side of the colour problem' – a typical way of Fisher's ambiguity in all these things. And he then went on, 'Have you read Cry the Beloved Country?' Reeves was an unusual bishop, I think, for South Africa, in the extent of his concerns not with sanctuary, but with the public life of South Africa generally and its church. Rob has talked about the opposition to the Bantu Education Act of 1953, which Reeves saw as morally indefensible. 'In conscience', he said, 'I am bound to oppose it'. And of course it was the fact that he absolutely refused to have anything to do with it which put him at odds with his fellow bishops in the church of the province of South Africa. One of his big problems was that he was just unable to get the finances to provide an adequate

alternative system. He did toy with the idea of establishing what he called church family centres, which African kids, having come out of the schools which were now only often operating on a half-day basis, would be able to go and get some more tuition, but that never really worked.

Reeves was also very interested later on in the '50s in opposing the so-called Extension of University Education Act, which was to have such a devastating effect on African participation at university level. But perhaps the most distinctive thing about Reeves was his concern with industrial relations, his perception of the economic effects of apartheid, of all the plethora of legislation which went around that, forcing people, he said, into a convenient labour pool, preventing them from operating effective trades unions, squeezing Africans out of every form of work except the lowest. Such legislation, he said, is a crime against humanity. And one of his most imaginative ventures was the channelling of funds, from Canon Collins to some extent, for the establishment of, or the continuation of, a radical socialist trade union magazine in Afrikaans, called Saamtrek, which had been established by Solly Sachs of the Garment Workers Union. And I think this is one of the important ways in which not simply the churches, but trade unions and political organisations in Britain became aware of the need to establish a viable anti-apartheid movement.

It was perhaps because of that work that in 1953 Reeves was subject to an arson attack in his house, and it was rather mysterious who was responsible. Was it Communists who were genuinely disturbed by the wooing of African workers into a church-related organisation, or was it right-wing people who didn't like the Englishman interfering in South African affairs. And then at the end of the '50s, he became very much involved in being a conduit for the Defence and Aid Fund for the various treason trials which were coming up at that time, helping people like Luthuli and Oliver Tambo, whom Reeves had even interviewed as a possible ordinand in the mid-'50s. Reeves also was very, very disquieted at the World Council of Churches attitude to the Dutch Reformed Churches in the 1950s. He felt that Visser 't Hooft was much too sympathetic to their needs, and this began to be very important in the Anglican understanding of the Afrikaans churches. And in a fairly blanket condemnation of them, Reeves said of the Dutch Reformed Church in the '50s, 'Frankly, it's more a political party than a church. It infiltrates everything, manages to squeeze out the other churches, and claims increasing privileges for itself.' I think that was to the point. Less to the point was this blanket condemnation of Calvinism as a cause for apartheid. I think that was typical Anglican insensitivity on those matters. I won't say much about Reeves' participation in the aftermath of the Sharpeville massacres, but of course it was because of that that he had to flee the country, and arrived back in 1960 as a big embarrassment to the Church of England. Fisher, who had been trying to get him to retire from Johannesburg, because he called him 'a very nervy man, and he was always likely to erupt' had wanted him out, but now he had politically controversial figure, he didn't know what to do with him. It was made worse by the fact that Macmillan absolutely ruled out the question of giving Reeves a diocese in England. He said, 'This is likely to injure Commonwealth relations with South Africa'. This was exactly the time when, I don't know precisely the date, but South Africa withdrew from the Commonwealth, in the last months, I think, of 1960.

[Someone calls out]

It was in '61. Obviously it was on the cards at that time and Macmillan said, 'No, we're not going to appoint Reeves to a diocese'. Of course at that time, Reeves was saying, 'Well I'm going to go back', and he wasn't making himself available in any case. Fisher tried to appoint him to another important job in the Church of England – the recently created Board of Social Responsibility, and I think its lay head was Sir John Wolfenden, later to be, or already, famous for his report on homosexuality. But Wolfenden was adamant that 'We don't want Reeves to be the Secretary of the Board of Social Responsibility'. 'Members of the Board', he lectured Fisher, 'felt that in the view of the circumstances attending his leaving South Africa, a good many people might feel that he would not be universally acceptable to those people whose interests in the Board we are most anxious to enlist', i.e. big business, 'and it would be detrimental to the work of the Board of Social Responsibility in the world in which we operate'. The Bishop of Peterborough, I'm not sure who he was, but he wrote to Fisher saying, 'I don't see why he shouldn't be appointed to this, I can't believe that there are so many supporters of apartheid in this country that his appointment would be unacceptable'. And it was the sense that Reeves was an embarrassment that was percolating back to South Africa, and provoked Alan Paton to write to Geoffrey Fisher, 'Now, whatever one may think about the bishop and about his activities, there is one thing in which he is pre-eminent, in that he wanted the Christian church to enter deeply into the life of the people of South Africa, to champion their just causes, and to suffer with them the humiliations and deprivations of apartheid. It would come as a great shock to many of them if they were to think that the Church of England had cold-shouldered the man who had represented to them the righteousness of Christ.' Fisher, the diplomat ever, I think would have liked to be able to appoint Reeves to some significant position, but he recognised the tremendous constraints under which he was operating, not least the constitution of the Church of England, with its, as he put it 'multiplicity of competing authorities'. And it is always difficult, he said, to place anybody quickly, 'who has become in any sense a problem'.

It was the sense of Reeves as a problem that dominated all those discussions. It's true, even today I think, that the Church of England does not know how to use people who have worked abroad. Well, of course, then Reeves did go back, and was deported and then South Africa did leave the Commonwealth, but Macmillan remained adamant that he should not become a bishop in England. As Macmillan's secretary reported, Macmillan had actually gone to hear him preach in St Paul's or somewhere, and Macmillan was not impressed. 'His mind seems so preoccupied with South Africa that he could not bring it around to think about anything else', said Macmillan. And so that became a common perception, which stymied any attempt to appoint Reeves to any significant position in England. And eventually, he was by this time pretty desperate financially, he was nearly 60, he was nearly coming up to retirement in that sense, but he didn't have enough to retire on without a pension, and eventually he became one of the secretaries of the Student Christian Movement, with whom he'd worked in the 1930s. I don't think that was very successful, and eventually he got a parish on the south coast, and then retired and died in 1980. The last time when he was suggested for a

bishopric, it was Liverpool, which he had worked in very effectively before going to South Africa. That was in 1965, but again, by that time he was considered too old, quite apart from any other problems. So that's the rather unhappy story of Reeves in his final relations with the Church of England.

Paul Oestreicher: My own education in this area began when I was editor of the university student newspaper in New Zealand. I did my academic work, training in New Zealand student politics. And it was there that I read Scott for the first time, and published the writings of Michael Scott in New Zealand. That was really my entry into this whole subject. I came to England, studied theology in Lincoln, and Oliver Tomkins, who was probably the closest person to George Bell in this country and a great ecumenist, so my theological college already was a place where South Africa was constantly on the agenda, and Bell's attempts to educate the Church of England, particularly to educate the archbishop. But Oliver Tomkins, quieter in his way, behind the scenes, was very much part of that. And when I became a curate in the east end of London, the priest of my parish was very active already in anti-apartheid politics, Stanley Evans, whom some of you will remember. And it was at that period that Sharpeville happened. And I immediately, after Sharpeville, founded a fund of money to go to the archbishop – this was now Joost de Blank – to support the victims of apartheid. And a group of us young Anglican clergy committed a proportion of our salary, which was small enough, if you look at it now, so it was very much a symbolic act, it was not a great deal of money going, but it was very much a matter of personal commitment. It was during that period that I began to get to know Trevor Huddleston well, Trevor Huddleston, in some of his anger at not being in South Africa, but of course an anger that was channelled so creatively. And soon after that, I worked as a staff member of the British Council of Churches, alongside the work that Canon Collins had started. So the things that we have already being hearing intermeshed very much with my life, and the constant attempt of really a small group of us, and some of us are sitting round this table, to use what means we had, in terms of publicity. The first four years of the '60s, I was on the staff of the religious broadcasting department of the BBC, and I made several feature programmes about apartheid. So it was really as a writer and broadcaster that I put most of my efforts over the years, and I was not alone. There was a whole network of us working in that context, always against the background of people like Trevor, and of course then also, the equally controversial exiled Bishop of Namibia, Colin Winter. Colin Winter has not so far been mentioned, but he was of course a part of the exile scene, and a very important part of the exile scene.

But it was during the '70s that my involvement became direct, and included several visits to South Africa. The first visit to South Africa was really educating myself, informing myself. But it was plain to me that after that visit I would be persona non grata and wouldn't get back in legally. My next visit was really at the height of the worst of the violence in Soweto, when children were being killed on the streets, and when the situation was dire. And by this time, I'd become chairman of Amnesty International, and my concern was really for people who'd been tortured, people who were being killed, and to see that at the place where it was bitter and terrible. I was determined to try to get in. I won't bore you now with the most interesting story of my getting in to South Africa, against the will of the South African government – but

Beyers Naude, whose name too has not been mentioned so far, and one of the great Afrikaans prophets, received me when I arrived and contrary to his expectations I got in. But he immediately said we must now activate the machinery to keep you here, so that you can take the affidavits, you can go and see the townships, you can meet the people who've been tortured, but they'll pick up on your presence within 48 hours, and expel you, unless we take action quickly. And he took me straight to the British embassy in Pretoria, and the request that he made to the ambassador was to put my presence in South Africa on an official level, and to write to the South African government, that the chairman of Amnesty International was in South Africa, and wanted to find out the truth of South African propaganda. Of course, it was always – come and see for yourself, come and see all the lies that are told about us. He is here to find out the truth, he is willing to meet you at any time, and of course my judgement was, no British ambassador would do that, and commit himself to that degree. It would not be in the British diplomatic interest. But I was proved wrong. The ambassador did not write to the Minister of Justice, as he was asked to, to put my presence on record, he wrote to the Prime Minister and that of course put my presence in a very official way. Then I remembered, and now another personality that ought to be on the record, that before I went, one of the persons who briefed me was Robert Birley, a great liberal, whose commitment after he'd worked as Professor of Education at Wits was a very important factor in the whole story. Robert Birley said to me, 'Don't forget the ambassador in Pretoria is one of my boys'. He [Birley] used to be headmaster of Eton. Says something about the British establishment and how it works. 'Don't forget, the ambassador is one of my boys.' So it's, you know, the strange way English society works, sometimes can be a blessing. Sometimes it's the other way round. And so I was officially there, and that is where I first met my colleague Brian Brown, who's sitting across the table, who was at the Christian Institute, which Beyers was head of. And on that visit, where I also got to Namibia, I took affidavits, I took as much evidence of what was happening as I could. And used this link to the South African government by, on my last day in South Africa, accepting a meeting with the Chief Secretary for Foreign Affairs, that was what was offered by the South African government, and Brian Brown came with me. And it was a hard, tough, two hours talking, throwing the book at him, as it were. I said, really its your Department of Justice I ought to be talking to and not the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but that's your business, to convey what I have discovered to them.

And when I had done that, I went to the airport the next day and had an airport press conference to present what I had discovered to the press, because one of the things about South Africa was that even in the worst days, there were still journalists able to write, and they did. So, obviously that was going to be my last visit until the much later stage when everything was unravelling. When then Desmond Tutu, who was by now part of the picture, remembered that way back 16 years earlier, when I was a vicar in south London and ran the conference house of the Southwark diocese, I got a telephone call one day, I can't even remember from whom, saying could you put up a young South African who wants to form a Zulu newspaper, and be his host for a couple of weeks? And I'd never heard of this man called Buthelezi! But I was Buthelezi's host in London for two weeks, when he had come to lobby, to find some money to publish a Zulu newspaper. I met this young man, I remember him well, knew nothing about his background, was quite naïve about him, simply hosted him,

and that was that. But I had told this to Desmond, and Desmond said, 'You must now use what influence you've got with Buthelezi to bring him in from the cold, and try to stop a civil war from breaking out. You will be one of many trying, because you won't do it, but at least you'll be one more little factor.' So, a sort of shuttle diplomacy to Buthelezi, to try to stop him from doing the things he was doing, and particularly to stop him being under the influence of a number of people whom I certainly regarded as very evil, much more evil than …

Interjection: What year was this, sorry?

Paul Oestreicher: This was, by now we were in the late '80s. I mean, the whole thing rolls on and then people like …

Interjection: The affidavits were in '76, '77?

Paul Oestreicher: Yes, '76. People like Walter Felgate, the name will be known to some of you, and to mitigate the damage of a group of very destructive people influencing Mangosuthu Buthelezi. But he did remember that he'd been my guest, and so he hosted me very lavishly in his little fiefdom, flew me there in his private plane several times, and at least listened. I didn't kid myself that that was enough to move him from a very hardline position into eventually becoming a member of Mandela's government. That was a long and very complex process, but it no doubt saved lives. And that's really the span of my involvement, and I suppose it ended with my sitting in Desmond Tutu's study in South Africa, on my last visit before apartheid really totally collapsed, watching the Berlin wall come down, in Cape Town.

There was only one more thing, because again, it stresses the importance of artistic and other things of that kind in the struggle. One of the things during one of my visits to South Africa that I smuggled out of the country, were negatives of the pictures of Peter Magubane, that I sent to New York and which then were published as one of the most influentual volumes educating the world on South Africa. I smuggled those pictures out of South Africa.

Shula Marks: Thank you very much indeed for that. I wonder if anybody wants at this stage to come forward.

Jim Wilkie: Well, I think there's very little I can add to what Paul and the others have said [inaudible] I got to know Trevor a bit better later when I was at Mirfield for a time. Ambrose Reeves had been the rector of the parish in Scotland where I lived for many years. He finished up on the south coast, in the parish where I now live. … I think the history of the Church of England … it's sort of littered with the waste of giants, certainly in this area and in others, and the church is just incapable of coping and dealing with and realising that they [inaudible] I just want to finish by saying something that may be … I think that nothing has changed! This week the Church of England came up with, it wasn't a report, it was a briefing of a consultation about the role of the Archbishop of Canterbury [inaudible]

Dorothy Robinson: I got involved in Anti-Apartheid in the [inaudible] as the Administrative Secretary as it were, and when it was set up, there were 20 organisations which had representatives on it, and I haven't actually got the list now – but a lot of them were church bodies. I know there was the Friends, Society of Friends, and Chris Holmes was then the secretary of the Student Christian Movement, and he wrote South Africa A Time to Choose, which was in the early '60s, about '65 I think, which had a foreword by Bishop Reeves. And I was struck myself by the amount of Christian involvement in Anti-Apartheid, because my background had been in the trade unions - working for trade unions for several years, and then in an international trade body. And I was aware, I mean I knew of course the role of Canon Collins and Bishop Huddleston, and of course of Michael Scott. And we always had a church person on our platform as a speaker. I remember John Robinson, the Bishop of Woolwich, and I think Mervyn Stockwood, who was Bishop of Southwark at the time. At that time there were no black bishops around. And there was Huddleston, but then he went back, he went to … Tanzania, so he wasn't around then. And the other was Bishop Reeves. But the other person that I remember being around one time here was Joost de Blank, who handed in a petition from the Rivonia campaign, and it was a worldwide petition to save them from the death penalty, and he was the person who handed that in to the South African embassy, it would have been in 1964.

The other thing I remember is that I think was in '60, was a conference going on for the World Council of Churches, that was a complete rejection of apartheid, and I think that included the Dutch Reformed Church, which I thought was terribly important, because we had this kind of philosophy that we didn't just want to be a political or working class movement, it was kind of an all-party thing, to make it very broad. And so the participation, and what the church was doing, was very important, because you were countering a very fierce onslaught from South Africa, who were writing letters to the press at the time, about how much the boycott was going to damage Africans and their livings and everything, and employment, and this whole barrage of South African government propaganda against us. So that it became very much a moral issue. So I think the support of the church was very important to us. It wasn't just the Church of England, but the Methodists and the Quakers, as I said. There was also a Baptist minister, who I think has now died, who was very active on what I called the 'unholy alliance'. He went to Angola a lot and spoke at some of our meetings. He was a very strong figure, I can't remember his name offhand. Anyway, I have it at home somewhere, so I can fill in the gap. And there was Lord Soper, Donald Soper, another person who spoke at rallies, Elliott Kendall, who was on delegations, and the other person is David Sheppard, who played quite a role in the sports campaign. And the Church of Scotland, someone called George MacLeod, moderator of the Church of Scotland, and he was very good at making pronouncements against apartheid. So that whole thing, we really valued that kind of support from the church, and it made me realise how important that was.

Ethel de Keyser: I just wanted to say something about the Catholics. They're the absent ones here. And first of all I should have said at the beginning, Mildred Neville asked me to apologise. She didn't hear about this meeting until a few days ago, and unfortunately couldn't come. But I know that in my time, after Dorothy left in '66, that I went to work there [in the

Anti-Apartheid Movement] in '65, until I left, I worked very closely with a number of church bodies, and this included the Catholic Institute for international Relations, and in particular at the time with Tim Sheehy. But Mildred Neville was very prominent and active in all the work, and we worked particularly together on the campaign against UDI. We formed this committee which was NIBMAR – No Independence Before Majority Rule, and worked with the Catholic Institute at different levels. We worked at one level with Lord Woolston and the Lords cricket grounds; we worked with Bishop David Sheppard at the time on the campaigns outside the grounds; and we worked to some extent, unofficially, with Peter Hain on the Stop the Seventy Tour – who's not a representative of the church. But the Catholics were very active and very prominent at the time, together of course with the Anglicans and the Methodists. I don't think I'll go on.

Unidentified participant: Exactly so, I intended to make that point myself. I happen to be a Catholic and I was hoping to come and make the Catholic point. I brought with me this today, as a reminder of Denis Hurley, who was, as you say, very central as far as Catholics were concerned, perhaps almost on his own as well, in South Africa, and who lived through all that period.

Ethel de Keyser: Sorry, I just want to mention somebody else, since we're doing a lot in relation to individuals, who seem to be standing up against the mass of the formal church organisations in most cases, until we come to the World Council of Churches. But Bishop Winter, who came over here and who really wasn't welcomed with open arms in my recollection, and who had quite a remarkable impact on the campaign at the time.

Unidentified participant: Yes, I was going to add also that Bishop Winter, after he wrote this book on the story of his efforts to secure justice for [inaudible] in 1977, wrote to my wife, and he said, 'The agony of Namibia, and the sufferings of its people cry out for redress and support, but their courage and determination to be free challenge and inspire us to hew out of the valley of despair a rock of hope'. And that to me is the life that Colin Winter lived. He lived both in Namibia and afterwards in this country, a very short life, and he lived that life – hewing out of the valley of despair a rock of hope.

Unidentified participant: I think there are not just, if you like, personality conflicts, but there were some policy issues, and I think it would be useful, maybe after tea, to begin to touch on those policy issues, because I think they affected relationships between the different sort of partners. On the one hand, there were different approaches within the different denominations in this country, over sanctions, over Zimbabwe, over attitudes towards liberation, I mean there's a whole range of things, and I think those reflected differences within the denominations in Southern Africa, they reflected relations with Anti-Apartheid. And I think it would be worthwhile pointing out some of those things, because although on the one hand there was a great deal of co-operation, there were also issues where there was potential for conflict or differences, and I think it would be valuable to talk through some of those things because they're part of the history and I think we've got to be true to that history.

Kevin Ward: If I can start with the personality thing, and I think it's important we look at policy divergences, but the perception from within, say, the white Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa, in regard to these figures whom we have spoken of, like Clayton and Reeves, and de Blank and Winter, their prophetic stance on one level is of course highly commendable, and is recorded as such, but they did have so much baggage that they brought with them, that for the constituency they sought to address, namely the white Dutch Reformed Church leadership, I would argue it was almost impossible to hear them. They brought with them the baggage of imperialism.

And Dr Phillip – let's remember that in the lifetime of somebody like the first apartheid Prime Minister Malan, there was known the Anglo-Boer war, there was known the concentration camps, there was known all the inexcusable things, to use a weak word, done by British imperialism to the Boers or the Afrikaners. And who were these people other than representatives of the imperialistic church? Not only did they carry all this baggage with them, but they were seen to be who they were, birds of passage, people who were moving through society, and who were ultimately destined to go home. In their estimate, of course, in the DRC's, the sooner the better, and they ensured it happened. Also, how representative were they? Where were the black colleagues of whom they spoke, on whose behalf they purported to be representative? In the hierarchical structure of the church, in those pre-Tutu days, were they heir apparents or would it be just another import to succeed the deport? And what about the lifestyle of these people, with their commendable commitment to the poor, from the environment of Bishop's Court and its palace? And so, given that they were also seen to be of liberal ecclesiastical persuasion, and of a learned anti-Calvinistic disposition, it was inevitable that there was this resistance to their persons. And the last thing I say, I have rubbished on many occasions a man called Landman, a Dutch Reformed Church minister's book called A Plea for Understanding, but I just, as the traitor in the midst, intrude this little plea for understanding as to why when Collins did in St Paul's, make a judgement about Malan, there would be an irate response within Afrikanerdom, by virtue of some of the factors I have sought to enumerate from their perspective.

Unidentified participant: May I also just make a very small point about Bishop Reeves. Most of us who were at his memorial service at St Paul's in 1980 will remember that however feeble the churches response may have beenm by the time he died, this was a tremendous celebration of his life's achievements.

Unidentified participant:2000 No, I really don't take it as being… it was recognition, perhaps coming too late…

Shula Marks: [indistinct – introduces Baldwin Sjollema]

Baldwin Sjollema: Well, first of all, thanks for inviting me. I'm glad to be here and to learn a lot. Also, I'm a bit nervous because I do have a feeling that some of those that are present here know the story just as well as I do and could be even better than I. I'm thinking about Pauline, Pauline Webb, and also of course, of Sandy Kirby, who was my colleague for

several years. However, I'll try to answer the question that you, Shula Marks, raised with me – where does the WCC [World Council of Churches] come in? And so I would like to say something about the WCC, but also about its relationship with the anti-apartheid movement. And when I say the anti-apartheid movement, I do mean the broader, not simply the UK, because we had to do with many different anti-apartheid movements, in different parts of the world. Of course, I wanted particularly to say something about the PCR – the Programme to Combat Racism, but it is not, I think, historically unfit to start with the fact that the WCC was created in 1948, which was exactly the same year that the National Party came to power, and that the state of Israel was established. And it is not out of context to say that both of these events had profound consequences for the life and the witness of the WCC.

In 1950 the law constituting the foundation of apartheid was enacted, and soon afterwards, Christians the world over began to realise that a strong international Christian response was needed. And the WCC at that point asked the member churches, the seven or eight member churches, in South Africa whether they would receive a multiracial ecumenical delegation, and the reaction came fairly soon when they said that this was not possible, because it would cause problems, as they said. And it was then in 1954 at the Evanston assembly of the World Council of Churches that the WCC made its first, not its last, but one of its first major statements about racism and apartheid, saying that any form, and I quote here: 'Any form of segregation based on race, colour and ethnic origin is contrary to the gospel, and incompatible with the Christian doctrine of man, and the nature of the church of Christ'. Now this was the beginning of a long series of many statements on apartheid and racism over the years. And within South Africa itself, of course, the Sharpville massacre in 1960 caused a very strong conflict between the English speaking and the Afrikaans speaking churches. And it was in this context that the WCC, after intensive discussions, was finally able to convene its week-long historic multiracial consultation in Cottesloe, 1960, between its eight member churches in South Africa and representatives of WCC itself. And then of course, Verwoerd reacted furiously afterwards when he saw the results of this, and when you reread Cottesloe today, you would say, 'Well, what was there really to be anxious and concerned about?', because it was as mild as one could say at that point.

Visser 't Hooft has been mentioned, and perhaps rightly so. I have to be careful here, but when I reread – Visser 't Hooft went [to South Africa] on his own when the delegation was refused in the '40s and beginning of the '50s, he went on his own and he wrote a report, and in that report he does still try to explain what separate development means. But not much later, well ten years later, and that is the next point I would like to make, the World Council held another consultation on Southern Africa, this time in Kitwe, the ecumenical centre in Kitwe, in what was then still Rhodesia – no Zambia, I'm sorry. He said there that in certain situations of oppression, one of the good works of Christians, and here he was basing himself on Calvin and John Knox, could be to eliminate the tyrant. And such resistance had also been seen as necessary by some Christians, and he singled out of course Dietrich Bonhoeffer in Germany during the Nazi period. Armed resistance, he said, could thus not be ruled out, and that was quite strong for him. Besides one of the participants in that consultation, I think it is significant to mention him today, was Eduardo Mondlane. And

Eduardo Mondlane had been a youth participant at the Evanston Assembly in '54, but now, ten years later, he came as the leader of FRELIMO, the liberation movement of Mozambique, and as a committed Christian. And he explained how in his country FRELIMO had had to decide to involve itself in violent resistance against the Portuguese colonial rulers, but he said that he did not only come to explain his position, but also to discuss the moral and spiritual problems with which he and his organisation, that is FRELIMO, had come to be confronted. And I should also add here that the Mondlane meeting was co-chaired by the well-known South African lawyer Z K Matthews. Z K Matthews, who was a professor at Fort Hare and later on became the chairman of the ANC, and later on still, when his position became untenable in South Africa, he became the first Africa Secretary of the WCC. And his presence, I would like to underline, considerably sharpened the WCC's understanding of the African people's struggle for liberation.

But the demand for very clear and unambiguous action came only at the Uppsala Assembly of the World Council in 1968. There, many delegates reported local and national racial tensions, and advocated a strong and leading role for the WCC itself in the struggle for justice and reconciliation. And it was the time when Martin Luther King, who was to have been the preacher at the opening worship, was assassinated. The Assembly then decided that the WCC should undertake a crash programme in the urgent matter of racism. But the details of that crash programme were discussed only one year later, at a consultation in Notting Hill, year '69. And after lengthy and heated debates, that consultation was approved – the results of that consultation were approved by a WCC subcommittee in Canterbury. It came to be known as the Programme to Combat Racism. It was only after very lengthy and very heated debates that they approved that programme. Perhaps Pauline could say something about what happened there. I will confine myself to the historic development since then. But since white racism was to be the main focus of the PCR's attention, it was clear that Southern Africa, and South Africa in particular, would be the object of many projects in the future because of its economic and military power, and also because a majority was being ruled by a minority. The South African government however had made itself special by claiming that the Republic of South Africa was founded on the word of God, and that it was defending western Christian civilisation. And the way in which it made this claim was a challenge to Christian faith and theology and a threat to the unity of the church and the ecumenical movement itself. The PCR then quickly became identified with Southern Africa, and was seen by some of us, people around, as a kind of church Anti-Apartheid Movement. It decided that it should, we should, have high visibility because we were convinced that the only way that we could get our constituency – and don't forget that the Programme to Combat Racism was in the first instance addressed to its own constituency – that high visibility would be taken seriously because it would for the first time be possible to really get a discussion going on what was needed. The debate concentrated almost exclusively on support to so-called illegal Southern African liberation movements, and the churches so-called involvement in violence. And Vorster then accused the WCC very quickly, we were hardly prepared to react to that in the beginning, he accused the WCC of being Communist infiltrated and providing terrorist organisations with funds for buying arms. Programmes and projects with racially oppressed groups in Australia and New Zealand, North and South

America, were ignored by its critics, both inside and outside the church. This was, as I said already, mainly because of the high visibility of the grants to the liberation movements, via the Special Fund. These grants were also condemned by most churches in South Africa itself, they did criticise the WCC for support of liberation movements committed to overthrowing the South African regime. But the South African Council of Churches, in a public statement, made it clear that in spite of the Prime Minister's warning against maintaining ties with the WCC, all the churches affiliated with the SACC had decided to retain their membership. Member churches in South Africa asked for consultation with the WCC, so we see here the reverse, that they were prompted now to say, 'We want to see you', but this was made impossible by Mr Vorster, by laying down conditions that were unacceptable to the WCC. The abortive proposal for the 1971 visit to South Africa showed the problem of communication between the WCC and its member churches there. Continuous misunderstandings arose on both sides because of the lack of information and interpretation, which resulted in some angry reactions and exchanges of correspondence. And although the Vorster government did not succeed in making any of the member churches leave the WCC, relationships were clearly strained. By the way, for the first time really, a meeting was possible between the South African member churches and the WCC, came only in 1973, during the Central Committee meeting in Geneva. But the WCC was also receiving many messages of support, notably from the All Africa Conference of Churches, the AACC, and from President Kaunda of Zambia, and as importantly, through informal signs of support from black people in South Africa itself. However, invariably they did not want to be co-opted for fear of reprisals.

What was the goal of the PCR, when the member churches realised that everything they had said and done thus far had been too little and too late, and that they themselves had participated in racial discrimination, and this amounted, and I want to underline this, effectively to a confession of guilt, they decided that it was time for the WCC to urgently start a programme of action. The underlying concept of the Special Fund was to make a contribution, not more than that, towards redistribution of power. And even if the amounts dispersed were sometimes symbolic, they did have the desired effect, namely to put the liberation movement in general on the map for many Christians the world over. We had learned that if we put money where our mouth is, people really begin to hear what we were trying to say. And the liberation movements, on the other hand, saw that the grants were not only for them a question of monetary terms, but also a way to dramatise and internationalise their struggle.

And then the next move was for the PCR to start working on disinvestment, and not only itself, but also its member churches, and this was another source of considerable friction between the WCC and its constituency. It decided that no resources should be invested in concerns which were wholly or primarily engaged in producing or handling armaments or activities in or trade with South Africa or Rhodesia. The PCR's conviction was that Christians must not abdicate ethical responsibility for the outcome of economic policies. And the WCC's portfolio was scrutinised to discover any direct or indirect involvement in investment in companies or banks operating in Southern Africa, as well as any investment in the subsidiary

companies operating in that region. It asked its member churches to do likewise, but since we had little experience in this field, PCR had to turn to the US churches, which had much more experience, and also to the Anti-Apartheid Movement, in different countries, but mainly in Britain. It asked for their help, and since I mention now the Anti-Aparthied Movement, I'm really wondering – this is thinking aloud while I was listening to you around the table – whether some of our church leaders who have been revered and spoken of very highly here, did not find in the end, refuge in the Anti-Apartheid Movement, at a point – refuge in the Anti-Apartheid Movement because their own churches would not allow them to accept the point of view they had. And I think that that is an important aspect of, perhaps, the relationship between the WCC and its member churches, on the one hand, and the Anti-Apartheid Movement. Why was Trevor Huddleston the president of the Anti-Apartheid Movement in this country? Why were there so many church people of one kind or another involved in different anti-apartheid movements around the world? It is a question I would like to raise, and I think it is important for the history.

So we asked for the assistance, to come back to the point of disinvestment, and in our situation of considerable help was the outstanding book study by Ruth First on Western investment in apartheid, *The South African Connection: Western Investment in Apartheid,* published here in London by Temple Smith in 1972. 1972 was also the moment for the WCC to sell forthwith any existing holdings and to make no further investment in corporations involved or trading with South Africa, Namibia, Rhodesia, Mozambique and Guinea Bissau. Christian agencies and individual Christians outside Southern Africa were urged to use their influence, including stockholder action, disinvestment, and to press corporations to withdraw from these countries. And the PCR published several lists of corporations that were highly criticised by the companies themselves, but very useful for its constituency to understand where they had to look for the companies that they would have to go and see. And here again the Anti-Apartheid Movement was of great help to discuss with the PCR different strategies to be used, and to exchange information, on experience they had already gained. This was especially important because of the criticism which soon came after the decision was taken, notably from churches in Britain, West Germany and Switzerland, citing remarks by Buthelezi and other Bantustan leaders as evidence that black workers were opposed to disinvestment because it would lead to massive unemployment. And the WCC, they said, was in fact advocating pauperisation of black people, in order to drive them to revolution. But the WCC saw its policy as a last attempt to bring non-violent change about. And they turned, to SACC church leaders like Desmond Tutu and Allan Boesak, and the liberation movements to make their point.

Now, in the process of the boycott campaign, it became clear that action with specific and well-defined focus usually stands a much better chance of achieving its aim than responses which are general. And this was why in 1974, WCC decided to concentrate largely, though not exclusively, on the European American Banking Corporation. Because the EABC had a unique connection with South Africa, by making substantial credit arrangements and a concerted effort to assist the South African government in overcoming its economic and financial problems. And this focus meant consultation with many anti-apartheid and other

action groups about co-ordinated action and strategy. After extended correspondence with these banks, WCC decided in 1981 to break off all relations with three main banks: the Grazer Bank, the Swiss Bank Corporation (SBS) and the Union Bank of Switzerland (the UBS), after it had developed a careful list of defined criteria. Like the grants to liberation movements by the Special Fund, the WCC decision to disinvest provoked an intense discussion, and here again these were often stimulated and forced on the agenda of the church synods by ecumenical groups and the Anti-Apartheid Movement. But in this case of investments, more basic and wider questions were at stake. It was a further move on the part of the WCC as a whole towards its involvement in the struggle for racial justice, and in many ways, the decision on withdrawal of investment was of much more fundamental importance than the preceding ones on grants because it questioned, fundamentally, the social, economic and political structures of both the West and Southern Africa itself. For the churches it raised the whole question of the roots and consequences of the capitalist system in their own countries and their links with that system, and this discussion then provoked within the churches was of immediate importance for the whole question of ethics and stewardship of investment far beyond the apartheid debate only.

I could add here white migration, we supported the campaign, the international campaign, to stop white migration. We discussed also with the Anti-Apartheid Movement the whole question of the role of the media and the fact that many extreme right-wing connections, organisations, had been funded by the South African government, which tried to influence member churches of the WCC to quit the WCC. They had little effect, but they were quite considerable. The Club of Ten and others were very hard-working behind the scenes. And then in 1988 we joined the international sanctions campaign to boycott Shell oil company. But in its correspondence with the banks and also with Shell, it was made clear that Shell and the banks were not our enemies, much less its personnel. We underlined that the common element of humanity was apartheid itself. And then there were the campaigns against the death penalty, the World Council itself was for the abolishment of the death penalty in general, and supported action in South Africa itself.

In conclusion, it can be said that in many of its activities, the PCR and the Anti-Apartheid Movement, not only in Britain, but in many parts of the world, worked closely together. In fact the churches in many instances depended on their experience and support. This did not mean that the PCR blindly followed each and every move of the AAM. Each one had its own priorities, and above all its own constituency. And when I say constituency, in the case of the WCC, it is perhaps most important to underline that the PCR, and I say this again, was a programme to conscientise Christians and churches about racism and apartheid, and to make them reflect and act locally, nationally, regionally. The PCR was a kind of locomotive, if you want, to get them out of their inactivity. Now, one aspect that I did not touch on was that the PCR found it very important as part of its co-operation to make available some financial assistance through its Special Fund to anti-apartheid movements. And if I single out here the Anti-Apartheid Movement in Britain, it probably received the largest amount of grants from the Special Fund in this category of support groups, and between 1970 and 1980 I counted that $51,000, and more in the years to follow, was made available to the Anti-Apartheid

Movement. Well, what I tried to say is not exhaustive, fortunately not, it is intended as a contribution to, I think, what is here an important discussion about a very dramatic and exciting years which have marked us all for the rest of our lives. Thank you.

Shula Marks: [inaudible]

Pauline Webb: I will be very brief and anecdotal really. My position was trying to interpret what was happening in the World Council and its Programme to Combat Racism to the British churches here. And that was really quite a traumatic experience, because I went to Uppsala in 1968, the World Council Assembly fairly innocent really. I had been involved in Anti-Apartheid, having of course been influenced by Trevor Huddleston, like so many other people, and I was an editor at the Methodist Missionary Society at that time. We had covered quite extensively the situation in Southern Africa in our journal, I mean I remember the debate about the Bantu Education Act. Our Africa Secretary at that time had been very helpful in providing material, and so I was reasonably aware of the Southern Africa situation, but it was certainly the Uppsala Assembly that mobilised me into the Programme to Combat Racism. And I soon discovered that this meant that I had quite a job of explaining to do when I got back to Britain.

In fact, the very first time I really realised this was I think after we'd made our first grants in 1971, and I was asked to explain to Archbishop Ramsey what was actually going on. Now I had thought of Archbishop Ramsey as reasonably radical, because if you remember he was one of the people who had made this extraordinary public statement during the time of UDI in Rhodesia about the need for the British to be prepared to use force. I don't know who actually prompted him on that, but it was quite a remarkable statement, so I had thought of him as fairly enlightened church leader. But I didn't find him quite so enlightened when it came to expressing to him what we were about with the Programme to Combat Racism. I had been the first chairperson of the Programme until I was immediately dislodged by Andy Young, who refused to be chaired, as he said, by Queen Victoria! And insisted on there being a black Chair, which I quite understood, but that was an interesting educational experience for me as well. But I came back to Britain and had this job, as I say, of trying to interpret what was going on, and I can't really exaggerate the effect on the British churches of what was going on in the Programme to Combat Racism.

I just found in a file at home some extracts from the correspondence that I got at the time. And I thought you might be interested to hear one or two of – these are letters from fine church people, often signed 'Yours in Christ' and that kind of thing! And I won't read you them all, but I'll just read one or two to show you the sort of temperature of the time: 'As a practising Christian, I'm appalled by the support afforded to the murderous Marxist revolutionaries in Southern Africa by the World Council of Churches, of which the British Council of Churches is a member. I'm afraid that this and numerous other instances of the current trend towards socialism in the church can do nothing but harm, and accelerate the decline of the church in attendance of services, and in prestige. I can guarantee my face for one will be seen less frequently, with certainly no financial support in church and at church

functions as a result.' Well that was fairly typical of quite a few. 'We are utterly disgusted at the way the British Council of Churches supports terrorist movements in South Africa, and while you continue with your present politics, the so-called Christian church will not receive one single penny from me. No excuses please.' And so it goes on, all these, with just occasionally you've got a little letter like 'I have pleasure in enclosing a cheque for £100, as a donation from the Iona community'. And I must say, that kind of letter really, you know – I mean that's out of 20 letters here, that one comes.

Question: Did you try to reply?

Pauline Webb: Oh, I used to have to reply, yes. But it was quite a job, and so trying to interpret … Now in 1971, when this attempt was being made for the World Council of Churches to have a meeting with the South African churches, I did in fact go down to South Africa on a personal visit, but was immediately turned back from the airport, where poor old Brian Brown had to wait over four hours to receive me after having checked on the guard for a while. And I was dismissed from South Africa. So that was an indication. But fortunately the BBC news featured this on the television, and so I was able to make the case, and then was constantly being regarded as a spokesperson for the World Council in Britain. So we became involved in all these other programmes about which, of course, David can say much more about when we began to tackle the disinvestment question, and ending loans to South Africa, and there were many anecdotes that we could tell about that. For instance, the horror in the Methodist Church when at Westminster Central Hall, David and another accomplice climbed up over to the roof of the Midland Bank next door, and put up a huge poster over the Midland Bank – 'End Loans to South Africa', and I had the job of trying to explain to the trustees at Westminster Central Hall why we were doing this. Do you remember that, David? We got it on the front page of *The Times* as a result, an advert for which we would have had to pay many thousands!

David Haslam: We didn't climb up the Central Hall …

Pauline Webb: Well, you went up inside and you put the banner over. It was only up for five minutes, but it got all the publicity we needed. And then I was involved in a big debate on Radio Four, on the BBC, when there was a programme called 'Trial by Jury', which some of you may remember, when a proposition was put forward. And the proposition was that the World Council of Churches was supporting terrorism and so on. And I remember appealing to you, Michael [Mike Terry], at one point as to what I was to do. George Austin, the renowned Archdeacon of York as he was, was the opponent of this, and he had Lord Chalfont as his main witness. Lord Chalfont was a very respected member of the nobility. And I had to find some churchman who would speak on our behalf. And I had quite a job until I got the Reverend Ernest Payne, a Baptist Minister, who was extremely courageous in that debate. But I remember going to Albie Sachs, you sent me to Albie Sachs for advice on how you present a case in court and how you cross-examine a witness. And he was so helpful, because he – I always remember – I said, 'George Austin will be so calm and collected and logical, and Lord Chalfont is so honoured and respected a member of the nobility, you know,

how am I going to face them?' He said, 'Just get angry!' He said, 'Just remember, you're talking about life and death issues, you haven't time for reasoned argument'. And also I said, 'I'm at another disadvantage because George Austin has been to South Africa, he was there subsidised by the South African government. I've been thrown out of South Africa, I've no experience of the country.' 'Well', he said, 'Just save that delicious fact up until the last sentence of your speech, and then just say, "Of course, Mr Austin has been to South Africa subsidised by the South African government", and that will completely discredit him.' But the other thing that happened was that you sent another whole batch of anti-apartheid people along to the place where we were having the debate, so they all swung the vote considerably in my favour, and we won the vote.

It also gave me a certain reputation at the BBC, where in fact, a year later, I was appointed the religious broadcaster at the BBC. I don't think those two things were connected, but through being at the BBC, of course, I was able then, in the output of the religious department, to include people like Michael Lapsley, who was a tremendously strong witness, the man who eventually had both hands blown off, but he was a New Zealand Anglican priest, who was a very good broadcaster, and I also was able to invite Trevor Huddleston frequently to broadcast and Colin Winter. And just to show that the BBC of course always keeps a balance, I even invited George Austin to speak.

But as I say, this is all just anecdotal, but it was a very interesting experience to be trying to interpret this, and I think probably two crucial things had happened: one was, I remember going to a meeting of church leaders at Cumberland Lodge, when we looked at the church's response to racism in this country. And I think that that was one of the big things that the PCR did. It did raise people's awareness here. And this was really, I think, quite an important consultation, which led to another consultation on racism in Britain and in the world church. And I think it did a tremendous amount really to raise the question with people in this country. And apart from the activists like David, the two Davids here, who were of course great leaders in this country, I think eventually we did begin to affect the whole church population in this country in their awareness of racism.

Paul Oestreicher: [inaudible] … church leaders on the anti-apartheid side as it were have to take refuge in the Anti-Apartheid Movement. In one sense of course it was a very important instrument, but the British Council of Churches, and Brian can speak on this with even more authority than I can, stood in this interesting halfway house between the official church denominations and had a great deal of freedom of action, and was identified in the public mind, as you have just illustrated, with the World Council of Churches. In fact the British Council of Churches is not a member of the World Council of Churches. The British Council of Churches represented the British churches, which were its members. But the public image was different and the British churches never denounced or renounced the position of the British Council of Churches, which was so close to the World Council of Churches. It was a way for the churches, as it were, to have an alibi. They didn't have the courage to be where the British Council of Churches was, but they knew the British Council of Churches in a sense spoke for them, and they could use it, and it was very much an instrument in Britain of

the Programme to Combat Racism, and many other issues. But it is telling that this period of prophetic ministry from the British Council of Churches was so disturbing that it's been stopped. That the structures of the British Council of Churches were dissolved, and a new body formed, which doesn't have the same clout. And that was quite deliberate.

Pauline Webb: [Inaudible – reads document] '… we've been compelled to face issues of obedience and commitment to the Gospel that we prefer to avoid. We acknowledge that there are feelings of racial superiority still alive in many of us, and we are entangled with white populations in Southern Africa.' And then it goes on, and then it says 'in particular, we feel the British situation will become both more confused and tense in the 1980s, and that the contribution of the British Churches to the PCR will be chiefly in the way that they handle their responsibilities here in Britain.' And I think that that was very important.

Question: What year was that?

Pauline Webb: This was 1979.

Unidentified participant: … which out of its central funds made a contribution to the special fund of the PCR.

Unidentified participant: … and then got stopped again.

Unidentified participant: Yes, for a number of reasons … which is an interesting little side light on the investment issue. Richard Harries [Bishop of Oxford] on that issue felt very passionately, and was one Anglican, as it were, episcopal contribution to that debate.

Brian Brown: This discussion illustrates the truth that when you ask what did the church say vis a vis justice issues at a particular time, you can get at least two very distinct, in fact differing, answers. If by church you mean the assembly, conference, synodical statements emanating from the hierarchical structure of the denominations, you will get a voice. And that voice will usually be rather conservative, and decidedly cautious, because it is a voice seeking not to alienate its constituency there in the pews, and to maintain membership, and I now speak as somebody who's into that game, is a priority for church. Whereas if you have a para-church party, or a body that can be perceived as almost para-church, in the strange way that the British Council of Churches had a capacity to speak without necessarily getting the endorsement for its pronouncement of its constituent parts, when you have that situation, then the prophetic stance is far more possible. So when in South Africa the WCC's grants were made, the denominations, the churches per se, found that they could not with readiness pronounce, they hid behind the committee structures, and certainly deferred pronouncements in many instances. Whereas in the body that I represented, called the Christian Institute, if you like a para-church body, I happened to be, I think, the first unfortunate to arrive in Europe after the pronouncement of the grants. And that was my moment of international glory. It was brief, but there it was. And I was being asked, in Zurich, to pronounce on those grants. I had my own resentment – with a small 'r' – towards the

WCC's structures at that time, because some of us who felt we were more entitled to be briefed than perhaps we were, hadn't been briefed. In fairness to the WCC, their response could well be, we were only protecting you against what would come if you were excessively informed. But in that moment, I had to declare, because I knew I was going home, what the Christian Institute saw about these grants. So I immediately became an avowed pacifist, a stance which was then adopted by the Christian Institute in a rather strange way. We were all avowed pacifists, which gave us the right to continue and not to be deemed treasonable, but I also suggested, of course, that there was a silent majority, which in the democratic lack of South Africa had not voiced an insight which might be endorsing of the grants, could it not. And then also to say that these were just humanitarian grants, were they not. And you know the argument that can flow from that. But what I'm trying to say is that the para-church body can assume a prophetic stance if it is of that disposition, which the denominational body cannot. And I think it is very difficult for people who analyse this weird and wonderful thing called 'church' to make that subtle distinction, because methinks church talks with forked voice, and of course it does, given where it emanates from in this analysis.

Jim Wilkie: [inaudible] … people who ought to be picked up into this. One is Harry Morton, who actually had a very important role as the General Secretary of the BCC, and who was a Methodist of course, but he also came out of the missionary tradition of the church which certainly in the BCC days, I think, also helped to radicalise what was going on in the BCC headquarters. And the other question, and this goes back to our earlier conversation about the Anglicans, is really how people read Archbishop Runcie's position in all this, because we found him very supportive from the BCC, and I think there was a real change at hand when Runcie came in. But these were just a couple of things that I wondered …

I think in defence of his predecessor, Archbishop Ramsey, once he saw the point, he was a real passionate opponent of apartheid and went to confront the South African government in South Africa, one of the most frosty and non- … He was not willing to inter-dialogue with people, it was straight confrontation, and he was very angry. He was a person slow to anger, but once he'd formed a view, it was pretty passionate, so he, you know, he was not …

Unidentified participant: I was just wondering if I could say quite briefly … the dilemmas of how one responds to apartheid. Because I imagine that in the grassroots, there were a lot of workers who have relatives, white people in South Africa, who would be fairly illiberal in terms of … and yet perhaps trade unions officials wanting their union to be outspoken, but I suspect there were dilemmas. I don't know if that was the case.

Christabel Gurney: Just on that, the TUC of course for many years was verbally opposed to apartheid, but because it had such strong links with the Trade Union Council of South Africa wasn't very outspoken at all – in some ways in the same way that the establishment of the British church …

Pauline Webb: I think the interesting thing too is how the whole thing became focused when it became a matter of finance. I mean it was extraordinary how the whole – because the PCR

was actually giving money, although they were not really comparatively large amounts of money, that seemed to be the thing that … and then the other side of that was when we started attacking the banks. And I think the most heated debate we ever had in the Methodist Conference, I don't know if David would agree with this, was when we attacked our Finance Department, and even got their report referred back, which was unheard of, wasn't it, until we did that, over investments? Yes, it really struck me that this sort of so-called spiritual body of the church is as affected by these financial considerations as any other.

Ethel de Keyser: [inaudible] … Methodists. And it seems a good link into the End Loans to South Africa, the general financial side of the story …

David Haslam: Yes, I mean Pauline is of course a Methodist, and I think I was just passing round one of the cuttings of her counterposed with Kingsley Lloyd, who was one of the secretaries of the Methodist Finance Board, from 1973. She looks a bit different then than she does now, like the rest of us! And yes, that's right, that was one of the debates that went on. Just to comment on the individuals against institution kind of debate, yes, there were outstanding individuals, and some of them have been mentioned, but it was much more difficult when you started trying to deal with the institutions, as a lot of people here are aware. I mean being, I suppose, I think the only active Christian on the AAM Executive, or certainly as a clergy-person, I don't know, Ethel and Mike would probably have some comments on that as well, but trying to interpret the Anti-Apartheid Movement to the churches and vice versa was quite difficult, because they, the churches, just couldn't deal with the quite radical policy issues that were being demanded of them, and Baldwin's outlined some of those.

And as Pauline said, it came to a crunch, really, in the matter of money, the grants of the PCR which we've spoken about, but also investment issues, and trying to challenge what the banks were doing and what large British companies were doing. And the church finance people, and of course it's the most conservative of the church sectors, did seem to be unable to actually make the connection for quite a long time. I mean it took 10 or 15 years to actually get through why there was this real problem about lending to the South African government and investment in British companies who themselves were heavily involved in South Africa. We tried constantly both in the denominational churches and through the BCC to say, you know, we need to be much more critical of the financial involvement, and that did seem to create the difficulties. On the other hand, we have to say that with the Midland Bank, which was a member of the EABC, which Baldwin spoke about earlier, and with the discovery of EABC's loans both to Zimbabwe, or to Rhodesia as it was then, and to South African government owned organisations, that did become … it was the birth of ELTSA in '73. But by '76 when we brought the first, I think, the first resolution to a British company or bank on a social issue, about loans to South Africa, we did actually as well as the Methodist Church, subsequently discover that the Church Commissioners had supported that resolution, and we got about 6 per cent of the vote, which was a pretty substantial support from a standing sart against the policies of the bank. We just couldn't get the Church Commissioners to do these things publicly, I mean that was one of the problems, we never knew what they were doing or what position they'd taken up, or whether they were having dialogue or debate with the

companies. All through the ’70s and the ’80s we never really knew, and there was this whole area of – this is private, church finance is private, it’s not your business. And I mean it was our money! And you couldn’t actually get through their heads that we were entitled to know what they were doing, what they were saying. And there was that approach to finance. I think gradually you got a development through the ’70s and the ’80s where this diocese here, and that parish there, and you know, the Methodist district somewhere else or the Methodist conference gradually began to take up more progressive positions on the financial issues. I remember there was a Father Mahoney, he was a Catholic priest in South Africa [inaudible].

And to get over the fact that yes, these British companies, like Barclays, like ICI, Consolidated Goldfields and some of the others, GEC and so on, Rio Tinto Zinc, yes, they may not be South African companies, they may not have a major part of their business in South Africa, but in South African terms, they’re a major part of the economy, a very important part of the economy. For example, ICI having 42 per cent of African Explosives and Chemical Industries, which was producing explosives and military equipment for the South African military. To get through that kind of barrier, and get it into people’s heads that something should be done about this, either the British company should stop their South African subsidiaries doing these things, or they should pull out, one or the other. The other big argument was over wages and conditions, you know, the constructive engagement thing went on for a long time – that you can actually improve the situation. And again, that was a continual debate in the churches, and gradually we won it, and it was illuminating that by the end of the ’80s when apartheid was crumbling, of course almost the whole church had become anti-apartheid!

And all those people that we’d had head-banging arguments with for the previous 20 years suddenly were on the bandwagon. I think perhaps just the last point I’ll make is the thing about the British Council of Churches and as Paul said earlier, that structure has been undermined and in fact destroyed, and as part of that, and having worked for the Council of Churches through the change, now looking back I think it has been a retrograde step. You have no dialectic in the churches any more in the way that you had between the BCC and the churches, and in a way the BCC was the church and visa versa, but in another way, there was enough space between them, as Paul said, for more radical positions to be taken by the BCC. And we don’t have that any more, and it’s a serious loss. The other issue is about the institutions and their leaders being unwilling to take up more radical positions, and that’s a problem for the churches in that, you know, where is the Christian teaching of our congregations, in that they do not understand what the gospel is really about, and we’ve got the same problem today as we had then. The other side of that is there are also some remarkable people and remarkable things done in the churches, and Jubilee 2000 is probably the counterpart of that these days, so the battle continues. But the ’70s were, I think, a very revealing time for many people in the churches, and those of us involved in that learnt a great deal. The churches I don’t think come out of it very well, but I’d be interested to hear from those who are here not of a church background how it seemed to them.

Shula Marks: Before we move on to that, Elizabeth, you wanted to come in.

Elizabeth Williams: Yes. This is from the chairman of the Standing Committee on Home Affairs in South Africa, in front of the House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee. The question was put to him: 'Do you agree, or do you think that the South African Council of Churches or the South African Conference of Catholic Bishops are responsible bodies?' And he replied:

'One would like to say that the churches are always responsible, but unfortunately it cannot be said of all church leaders, it cannot be said of all church groupings. I think that they are very, very radical in their political opinions. To my view on occasions, a stretch they've used much too far, and they say things that are really not in the interests of peace in South Africa, that are really not in the interests of the new South Africa that we're trying to build.' This was in 1987. 'Take for example a person like Reverend Boesak, and a person like Reverend Tutu. I know them personally and I like them. I can understand their feelings about injustices that they have suffered in their lifetime. I can understand many things. However, I certainly cannot agree with many of the very extreme views that they express, such as that we are going into civil war. The same thing applies to the South African Council of Churches. I think they are taking things too far. Often I wonder whether they're busy with church work or whether they are so much into politics that they never get back to their church work. There are many people who are really making it virtually impossible. The South African Council of Churches is very much in support of the ANC, the UDF is the same sort of grouping. One of the things they say is that they say to black people who've suffered long enough, just a little bit won't matter. I ask any members of this committee – is there any possibility whatsoever for you to say to people in Britain anywhere who've suffered long enough "just a little longer won't matter"? I cannot see how people can go to these lengths. I think that the South African Council of Churches has overstepped, to my view, the democratic political realities on so many occasions that I have to disagree with them.'

So I think from these statements, we can't really – well we can see quite clearly the effect of the South African Council of Churches, and the church as a whole had on these members of the National Party and how they were viewed.

Question: What date was that?

Elizabeth Williams: This was 21st January 1987, at the House of Commons.

Jim Wilkie: I'm really not the best person to speak about the Church of Scotland, because although I was in fact paid by them all my life, pretty well, for the first 15 years I was in Zambia, then I worked in [inaudible], and then I came straight back into the BCC. It's been more the other way round, actually, that the education that I got from the people who are sitting round this table has stood me in a certain amount of good stead since, in the case of working with the Church of Scotland. And I think that I would just say that I came back from Zambia, having been a member of UNEP in Zambia, in the north, where Dr Kaunda came from of course originally. At one stage we were threatened by an invasion from somebody

called Michael Scott, and we were really rather glad that he didn't come because the locals had the thing pretty well under control already, and knew where they were going and we were in touch with them, and we really thought there'd be awful chaos if he arrived. So there is a problem between the sort of campaigning at the international level, and what's actually happening on the ground. And this would be true in certain areas in South Africa as well, I think.

In my work with the BCC, I was first involved with Rhodesia, and that we're not really talking about today, and the man who really made the big step there was Paul Oestreicher who's just departed, so that's alright. But I had to go in and out of Rhodesia several times, following up work which the BCC had been doing for years in relationship to Bishop Muzowara and others before him, and came back in the end really very fired up from the last visit, because I was quite clear that the whole show was crumbling and the British press and the British government were telling people something else. And I reported this to the BCC Rhodesia Group, who knew more about Rhodesia than anybody else in this country at the time, and they said go away and write it up. So I wrote it up, and I came in the next day, and who should I meet in the office but Paul Oestreicher. And I said to Paul, 'Look, I really want to get this out, but I don't know how to do it'. 'Oh', he said, 'Gve it to me, I'm going down to *The Times*. So he met somebody in the corridor and said, 'This is a piece that's come from a chap that's just come back from Zimbabwe, what about it?' And the next we discovered was it was right across the front page of *The Times*. I actually think what happened was that the British government knew by that time that they had to change tack and they needed somebody else to blame for doing it, so they hung it on this thing. But it does show you how the churches at certain points can really get into things, and if you want to know my few minutes of fame, Brian, these were the few minutes. But it really was very important and there was a certain MP, a Conservative MP, whose name I have forgotten, who wrote to *The Times* immediately and said, 'How dare you publish that rubbish on your front page, and not say who wrote it till page five? I would not have read it if I had known it was written by some missionary from far away'. So, interesting. It also tells you what they read and what they don't read.

The only other thing I would say is that on the South African thing, the Christian Fellowship Trust was an enormously important aspect of this, which had its effect on me. I was never a grantee, I went to South Africa for the first time being educated by the church and the BCC, who wanted the Africa Secretary at least to know a little of what was going on. I had gone through the previous year in '76 bringing my family out from Zambia in a motor caravan, beautiful holiday, driving on the broad roads from campsite to campsite, meeting nobody but whites. It was wonderful, lovely country. Go back the next year as the guest of the South African Council of Churches, with a few contacts set up by, I think, the Christian Institute that I didn't really know about. A lot of stories, I won't go into them all, but I was sent down to Cape Town, and I spent three nights in Cape Town: the first night with the chaplain to the University of the Western Cape, and his wife and children, this was Alan Boesak, who I'd never met before; the second night with a Methodist minister called Charles [indistinct], and so it went on. And it was these guys, it was all set by Cedric Mason, and it was these people

who taught me what South Africa was really like, and I came back quite different in my understanding of what it was all about. So I think they've got a very important role in this whole thing. And of course Beyers Naude was the mastermind of all that, and I had to see him when I came back from the tour to make sure that I'd got the right story to carry home to London. That's enough I think.

Shula Marks: Thank you very much.

Unidentified participant: One of the most impressive things about the Church of Scotland is the way it campaigns on [inaudible] and Biafra and then on anti-apartheid, in a sense had a very [inaudible] profile in Scottish society, and I think a much more unified stance, or at least the appearance of it, it may not have been there down in the nitty-gritty … but very important. I don't know how important, a colleague of mine at Edinburgh University, John Nelson …

Jim Wilkie: Oh, absolutely, he was secretary of Anti-Apartheid in Scotland. Yes, I only came back into that after I came back to Scotland, and discovered the same thing there as I'd discovered in London actually, that it's really – the relationships between the different organisations depend on personal relationships very much. It was a friendship with Mike Terry that helped me to work with Anti-Apartheid, and so many more. I mean there were three or four people, there was Sydney Bailey from the Quakers, that I could phone up at any time and ask for help, and Paul Oestreicher, and so on, and Mildred Neville. So it was a group like that. Now that has also been true in Scotland, but where all this experience, for me, paid off enormously, was in the latest trouble when we were trying to get rid of Banda, because the techniques I had learned in London with the British Council of Churches were the techniques we were able to use when actually we had a very high profile in helping the United Democratic Front [inaudible]. But as for Nelson, John Nelson, he's still going strong. And what we did in Scotland was set up a committee on Southern Africa which involved all the churches, including the Roman Catholics, and John was on that from the beginning, and really we didn't move without telling each other what we were up to.

Mike Terry: It was partly prompted by what David said in that it might be valuable to have some input from those of us who feel more of the anti-apartheid community than of the churches. Given the time, I think it's actually quite difficult to do justice to that relationship, because in many ways it was quite a complex relationship, and if I highlight the sort of issues which were problematic, it's only simply to bring those out, because things where we were in agreement are in a sense not so controversial. And I just wanted to say something about … the comments I make obviously are bound to be subjective and influenced by my own experiences. I mean I was very privileged working with the Movement in that two of the most, if you like, prophetic Christians involved in the anti-apartheid struggle, Ambrose Reeves and Trevor Huddleston, were the presidents of the Movement when I was the executive secretary. And as we've discussed already, they made very unique contributions both to the Movement and to the whole anti-apartheid cause, although they had their own problematic relationships with the Anglican hierarchy, especially Ambrose.

Before I worked for the Movement, I worked under John Collins' leadership at IDAF for two years, so also knew some of his, how can I say – he wasn't near the mainstream of the Anglican church either. And there are other things which influenced, I suppose, my approach as well. Being kind of anecdotal, because I studied science, we were obliged to do Scripture O level, at school, we were the only people that had to do it, because we were doing science. So we had *Cry My Beloved Country* as a set book to read, and Ambrose Reeves came and talked to us at school. So I ended up as a volunteer at a London Missionary Society school in what's now Zimbabwe, before I went to university. I was young, very naive, and surprised, and in that sense I hope this is understood, because I just read a fascinating book about the Congo and the role during the end of the last century, sorry the end of the century before last and the beginning of this century, about the whole opposition to King Leopold's rule – Hochschild's book. But I suppose I was still surprised at the extent to which some in the missionary community were still very isolated from the African community. And I think if you were to judge by standards that we'd accept in this country now, had views of racial superiority and so on, whilst they were outspoken against injustices, and this was at the time of UDI, just after UDI, and at the same time they didn't identify themselves with, if you like, the whole cause of African liberation. So that had shaped my views.

And then when I became involved in the Movement nationally, when Ethel was Executive Secretary of the Movement, there were a number of issues where there was the potential for divisions. I mean the WCC made a call for disinvestment, and one of the responses in the church here was the setting up of the CCSA [Christian Concern for Southern Africa], which subsequently played a very important role in winning the churches for disinvestment, but initially was advocating the kind of code of practice, constructive engagement role, and I know for very different reasons, I mean we had ten years later, Thatcher and Reagan using much the same arguments to justify constructive engagement, for different reasons, and for very different motives. And even at the time of the settlement, or the attempt by Heath's administration, to negotiate a settlement for Zimbabwe – this is what, 1971 – there were tensions, because by and large people associated with the Movement identified with the Rhodesians, people had their own preferences between ZANU and ZAPU, but in general that's where people's sympathies were. Whereas precisely for the reasons that we've been talking about, that Pauline talked about previously, the churches were very very reluctant to be associated with an organisation that was seen to be supporting those engaged in armed resistance, in a way more so in Zimbabwe than in the rest of Southern Africa, but I suppose for kith and kin and other historical reasons.

And the other area at this stage, this was when I was first getting involved in the Movement, was what was happening in the Portuguese territories, Portuguese colonies, because there, on the one hand you had outspoken – I'm trying to remember, there was the report that came from Wiriamu – and on the other hand, the Catholic hierarchy in both Angola and Mozambique was very close to the Portuguese administration. And so there was a situation where, as we've talked about previously, there was a kind of ambiguity. And I thought it was worthwhile trying to just look at some of those factors, what they were, which meant that sometimes there were the potential for tensions between, on the one hand, the Anti-

Apartheid Movement, and on the other hand, the church community in all sorts of different expressions. And I think there were first of all policy issues, and I suppose the ones which were most critical were questions of sanctions, disinvestment, the boycotts. But perhaps the one which was most emotive was the armed struggle. And I think that there were – I mean there were problems both ways, because there were those both in the liberation movements and those who supported the liberation movements, who would tend to glorify the armed struggle, and I think that that, if we're looking honestly at the situation, this needs to reflect why some of these tensions were existing. I think secondly, we've not really touched on it at all, there were, if you like, ideological issues. I think the Movement was perceived as being – and it was true that it was closely linked – aligned with the ANC and a broader community of movements in Southern Africa. There was this kind of alliance at this stage with ZANU and ZAPU, and FRELIMO and MPLA. And certainly the ANC was perceived in this country as very much under kind of communist domination, and linked to the Soviet Union, and so there were all sorts of issues with the cold war. It was also true that within the Anti-Apartheid Movement there were people in the Communist Party, parties on the left, and that affected people's attitudes.

I think there were those, some within the church, who because of those problems would look for ways of supporting alternatives to the ANC and alternatives to the AAM, and that was a source of tension. There was then, if you like, policies which people have touched on already of respective partners. On the one hand, the churches looked for leadership from the church within South Africa, Southern Africa, and I suppose some of us in the room felt on occasions that because people were effectively, or partially, silenced for all sorts of reasons, that that sometimes was used as a justification not to speak out. On the other hand, the Movement largely took its policy issues from the liberation movements, and therefore inevitably there was potential for tension. And then there was the respective role of our organisations. AAM's raison d'être was to promote the freedom of Southern Africa, and that was why we existed. And, you know, we would try and pursue campaigns, sometimes controversial ones, because those were the ones, rightly or wrongly, that we judged were going to be the most effective. Whereas that wasn't – I mean, Southern Africa was only one issue that the churches – and racism – were touching on. And they therefore also had to reflect their own internal decision-making structures. And I suppose I felt, maybe I'm wrong, that at least in some quarters, at least until the early or mid 1980s, there was a reluctance in the upper echelons of the church establishment to come into open conflict with the British government. There was a relationship with government that some, I'm not talking about people here, but I think some within the churches who I think didn't see its role as being openly in conflict with government. I may be wrong. And on our side, I mean we were very strident, very shrill, very demanding in our criticisms, which also I think made that relationship complex. And I think there's justifiable criticism in retrospect of the Movement, that we didn't always appreciate the impact that our activities had on other constituencies, including the churches, in terms of making their efforts to support the anti-apartheid cause more difficult. I think that there needs to be some self-criticism on our part. Overriding all that, I would say that I felt at least working in the Movement, there was a common appreciation that there was a shared objective of

ending apartheid, and that whatever the potential for differences, then everything should be done to minimise those, and to find areas of potential co-operation.

I think that it was extremely important that there were a whole number of key people, many of whom are here this afternoon, but many others who did a lot to support and explain what the Movement was about within a wider, you know within the church community. And that was very, very important for the Movement. Sorry, I've gone on a bit longer than I'd intended to, but just to say that I think my assessment of it was that the relationship between the Movement and the different churches, individual denominations, individuals in the churches, the BCC, or it then became the CCBI, sorry. I mean because of the dynamic of the struggle in Southern Africa, especially in South Africa, then the relationships became ever more closer, because there were significantly less policy differences, and there were a whole host of things that we worked together on. I mean, Jim was talking earlier, we had a sort of international anti-apartheid co-ordinating committee, which I think was a very valuable framework where people worked together, and that's just back in the late '70s. And Brian, when the first UDF people were able to come over, although we were kind of facilitating business, I mean these were people like [name indistinct], not to talk about that generation of church leaders. I mean often we'd be arranging something, but they would never appear to be involved. I think the first UDF press conference ever given in this country was hosted by Brian. So there were lots of ways in which we co-operated, and that found its strongest expression right at the end in the Southern African Coalition, which was I think a very important form of co-operation.

As I said at the beginning, I've raised some of these things partly to, if you like, be a little – provocative is not the right word, but just to get us to think about some of those issues, because otherwise there's a danger that we just ignore problems that existed. One has the impression these days that pretty much everybody in this country supported the ANC, were paid up members of a union. And I think sadly some of South Africa's leaders give this impression, they fail to appreciate just how hard, whether it was within in the church community, or within the anti-apartheid community, just how hard it was at some stages to mobilise support. And I'd just like to say that I really valued working in the Movement, the support that I got from people, many of whom are here today, who encouraged me, gave me help, gave me advice, their friendship was very deeply appreciated.

And if I've got time can I end with an anecdote, just to make some humour, because I think too often we think about the pain, and not enough about the sort of joy we got out of this. Some of you will have know – this is a Methodist story I'm afraid – some of you will have known Yusuf Dadoo, who was the chairman of the South African Indian Congress, he was I think vice-chair of the ANC's Revolutionary Council, and also chairman of the South African Communist Party, who died I think in 1982. Anyhow, the family, I assume, decided that he should be given a Muslim burial, there's a Muslim plot just opposite the plot where Karl Marx is in the cemetery [Highgate Cemetery], and so they wanted a venue near there where they could have, I don't know quite what you'd describe it as, a kind of combination of a Muslim come political event, to record his burial. And Ruth Mompati, who was the ANC

representative at the time had been trying desperately to find somewhere and couldn't, phoned me up. I didn't know anywhere, but my mother was quite active at the time in the URC [United Reformed Church] and suggested a number of places, and we ended up approaching the Central Hall at Archway. And I phoned up whoever the person is who runs Central Hall, the superintendent, and explained that was it possible to use the hall for this event, and explained that this was a prominent South African exile associated with ANC, which was sort of the first entry into this conversation. And the superintendent said, 'Well I'd need to discuss this with the trustees, because we don't normally allow this sort of thing'. And then I said, 'Well, if you're discussing it with the trustees, the idea is to have a sort of Muslim dimension to it'. And there was this very long pause, and he said, 'Well, I'll definitely need to discuss this'. And I said, 'Well, if you're discussing this with the trustees, there's just a third element, and that's that he was chairman of the South African Communist Party'. And I said that Oliver Tambo and Joe Slovo would be speaking at this event. Anyway, they got back and it was all agreed, and so on the Monday I phoned up because the ANC had agreed to write to thank the superintendent. I had my doubts that that would happen, and so I phoned up to thank the superintendent. And he said, 'No, no, I have to thank you, because I've just had this letter from our district and we'll be producing a new magazine which is called *Methodist Outreach* or something, and we've all been asked if we can produce evidence of reaching out to ethnic minorities, people of other faiths, and people of no faith, and I've done it in one'.

Brian Brown: I can't follow that. But we mustn't move into the realm of the self-congratulatory, but as one who from 1980 through into the era of the new South Africa, engaged with the Anti-Apartheid Movement, representing the British Council of Churches in its Africa desk, I was deeply appreciative that within the Anti-Apartheid Movement, there was a capacity to be a remarkably broad church, perhaps they've never been called that in their lives, but you know what I mean, a remarkably broad spectrum of opinion prevailed within it and a very high level of tolerance. And when I went to Holland, and when I went to Germany, to engage with my colleagues in churches there, they would often marvel at the fact that I seemed to have some constancy of engagement in an official church capacity with the Anti-Apartheid Movement, because they, and I can be corrected, from mainland Europe, but they at that time were far more into a Jew-Samaritan dichotomy. The demonising, if you like, of each other, invariably as you can guess, because of the pussy-footing stance of the churches, vis-à-vis the hard line stance of the Anti-Apartheid Movement. And I sensed that without this what I call high tolerance, very inclusive understanding within the AAM, this ultimate engagement within the Southern African Coalition would have been quite impossible.

The Southern African Coalition was, I think, a remarkable institution, bringing together as it did the driving force of the Anti-Apartheid Movement, who didn't seek to control it in office bearing, the churches, the political parties, with the exception of Thatcher's party, the campaigning bodies outside of the AAM per se, relating to Namibia and Angola and Mozambique, the development agencies and people of goodwill, who believed in democracy for South Africa. And that broad church did allow us to often work in parallel when we knew that there was not complete convergence with regard to policy. So if I was invited to dine and

wine – though I am teetotal, and therefore to abstain for two reasons, because they were South African wines – with the South African Ambassador Denis Worrall, there would be the moment of dining, this is the confessional penitential moment, of dining with the ambassador and coming out of the entrance to join the picket line, which I think is quite unprecedented in British opposition to apartheid. There was the capacity to cross an anti-apartheid picket line to debate in Oxford or Cambridge with the South African Ambassador of the time, [name indistinct], and wondering whether or not to mention the tobacco industry [inaudible]. And that kind of engagement was done with reasonable openness and awareness. We reached a stage when in the British churches virtually our entire denominational constituency embraced the British Council of Churches line of targeted sanctions. But targeted sanctions when you are marching down Pall Mall do not slip off the tongue as easily as comprehensive mandatory sanctions. And we realised that we were in two divergent groups, and we could have sought to demonise or to exclude. But there was again this capacity to see that the ultimate goal was the liberation of South Africa, and if the particular methodology was slightly at variance among the different perspectives and the different constituencies, we would be respectful of that. And ultimately, the churches, as a tribute to the Anti-Apartheid Movement, would catch up on, or catch up with the policies as declared by the Anti-Apartheid Movement, and so we did move into full economic sanctions, we did move into the call for civil disobedience, we did move into the totality of boycotts being imposed. But it is because as churches we were often given space at our own pace to get there, that we were able to get there and engage in the catching-up job, and I am deeply appreciative of that capacity for patience exercised within the Anti-Apartheid Movement.

The last thing I'd say is also in some measure, especially in the late '70s, early '80s, our constituencies as church and as Anti-Apartheid Movement engaging with South Africa's struggle was slightly different. As Mike has said, your historic commitment was with the ANC, and the PAC in some measure. We in South Africa in the '70s didn't know that an ANC existed. My colleagues like Mushwubada Myatula, who were leaders of the ANC, in seven years of intimate Christian fellowship and prayerfulness every day of the week except weekends, Mushwebada could never trust me to know that he was a leading card-carrying member of the African National Congress, because he didn't trust me enough, which is an indictment upon myself more that his own capacity for graciousness. Now in that situation, we dealt with the black consciousness movement, we dealt with the Aubrey Mokoapes, with the Barney Pityanas, with the Steve Bikos, with the – you name them, they were the black consciousness leaders. And so, this was a grouping very much at variance perhaps with the hardline voice that could be expressed in exile, because of course there's a freedom to express yourself in exile which has stultified, limited capacity when you're there in the heat of the day in the situation. So there was a different starting point of their pronouncements. There was also a different ideological starting point, and we were thus engaging with divergent constituencies, constituencies which ultimately, church and Anti-Apartheid Movement, came together and also within the black world, ANC and black consciousness came together.

Ethel de Keyser: Well, you know, I was at the third one of these sessions about [inaudible] and I find them endlessly fascinating, I could spend a day just listening. And everything that it makes me realise is how much history we're not actually talking about, and there is a tendency, which I think has been referred to, to look at the benign. You know, we want to gloss over. And maybe that's the best way, I don't know, but it's the broad brush strokes, it doesn't go into the detail of what actually took place. And there, certainly in my ten years in Anti-Apartheid, there were many differences between the position of the Movement and the churches at the time. I'm just doing a broad thing. And one does tend to talk of individuals because they were the ones who stood out. I mean I have, in 1970 I think it was, when we suggested a resolution to Constituency Labour Parties calling for support for the liberation struggle, and this got through to the Labour Party conference, to our amazement, we really thought this was – you know, the world would change the next day. And I remember going around to Stewart Weir, who was then on *The Times*, trying to seek publicity for this event, and trying to get Labour Party members, who were really quite strongly in favour of everything the Anti-Apartheid Movement stood for to speak to Stewart. And the only one who would do it, and I went to all the others, and he had a row I think in the Methodist church, was Alex Lyon. And he actually spoke to Stewart, but everybody else said no, because at that stage, in 1970, and subsequently even in 1972, when we had a major conference at the Roundhouse in support of the liberation struggle, we couldn't get church support of any kind. Now I appreciate what Brian has said about the patience and Mike's words about thanking everybody, but I remember being terribly angry at the time, and I wasn't really patient at all. I mean, we weren't talking about the same period of course. And it seemed to me there was an urgency which didn't seem to get through.

But the pace – I mean obviously I thought the Programme to Combat Racism of the World Council of Churches was the most dramatic move forward, and it was tremendous. I mean I did a little work not in the Anti-Apartheid Movement, and what was so successful was publishing a book on the Programme to Combat Racism. And it was quite remarkable the extent to which everybody that I spoke to at the time had identified so much with the struggle in South Africa and was making contacts with it, so of course there were always people and there were always positions that were very important, and were very significant as far as the movement in this country was concerned, but I don't remember it as a, you know, that we were all going along quite amiably.

Pauline Webb: I'd like to endorse what Ethel just said because I think it was very difficult indeed to get any kind of official support from the church. I mean, as I said, when we did that debate on the radio, I remember ringing up one church leader after another, asking someone if they would come to defend the Programme to Combat Racism, and everyone had excuses. Nobody said, 'Oh no, we don't believe in it', but they had excuses for not coming. Nobody was free and I mean the British Council of Churches and everybody else I'm talking about. And it was only Ernest Payne who, I remember, because it was just at the time when it was the Rhodesia thing, and you know, the plane of the missionaries had been shot down, and people were saying – I think it was the *Daily Mail* had a front page: 'WCC has blood on its hands'. And I remember Ernest Payne in this debate quoting the words of Graham Greene: 'I

would rather have blood on my hands than water like Pilate'. And I thought that was very courageous of him, and I remember thinking at the time, well yes, all these other people I phoned up were washing their hands, they really were, and he was the only one, the only church leader – I mean some of them may have had genuine reasons they couldn't be there, but I just felt people didn't want to stand up and be counted. And I agree with you, Ethel, I don't think there was a great deal of support from the British churches at all, not the official church.

Jim Wilkie: [name inaudible], when she was the Chair of the Woman's Guild did two things in our Assembly. The one was to use a prayer which talked about God as female, and the other was to call for the boycott of South African goods, and she suffered vitriol for it – it took about 15 years until that was put right. And they blamed her really for the motherhood of God thing, but actually the other was there as well, and the two together they went for.

Pauline Webb: [inaudlble] Irish, the northern Presbyterian church. On the same day, we had a delegation to the World Council facing the leaders of those two organisations. It was interesting because their arguments were almost the opposite. The Salvation Army was claiming that the reason why they couldn't support the World Council was because of its sacramental [inaudible], whereas we all knew it was because it was affecting their commercial interests, that's what we felt. And then Northern Ireland was saying it was because of our approach to – we were getting closer to the Roman Catholics and it – no, it was because of the liberation movement, and really it was because they didn't like the closeness to the Roman Catholics. It was very interesting, they each used the opposite argument. But there were whole church bodies that were refusing to give any support, and I don't think it was – it was minimal really.

Ethel de Keyser: I'd just like to mention a volunteer, because Baldwin referred to the 'Club of Ten'. When these adverts were appearing in the press, there was a volunteer in the Anti-Apartheid Movement who worked in publishing, and she came to me one day and said that she had discovered that the South African High Commission had put £1,500, not a small amount in those days, into the publication of a book by John Sparrow – I don't know if the name rings a bell with you – and what should she do about it? And because she'd been through the file, and obviously was not really allowed to do that, and I said, 'Well, I'd like you to do this, but it will jeopardise your job, what do you want to do?' She said, 'I don't like the job anyway'. And she went to the *Guardian* and they printed the story, and that actually killed the advertising in this country for a long time.

Pauline Webb: There's a reference, there's a story here, about a copy of the book called *The Fraudulent Gospel* by Bernard Smith. Do you remember that, that was circulated quite widely, and somebody here's saying that 'this had made a deep impression on me. It shows me what strange, twisted, perverted doctrine, what vicious inverted racialism can motivate so-called men of God into that. I will dedicate my time and work to expose the World Council for what it is, a perverted, neo-Marxist, subversive organisation motivated and inspired by inverted racial hatred.' Now that was because he'd read *The Fraudulent Gospel* by Bernard

Smith, which I think again was financed from the South African government. It was quite a vicious counter-attack …

Ethel de Keyser: I'd like also to just pay tribute to Colin Morris, who was very active in the campaign we had on UDI on No Independence Before Majority Rule. He was the chairman of the committee, and of course we were lumbered at the time with Bishop Muzorewa, because we'd been looking for a person who had been active with the liberation struggle, and had been liaising with [names indistinct]. And the only one who could leave the country and who had a passport and at that stage looked like opposition was Bishop Muzorewa. And when he came over – it was a big campaign at the time, but he turned out to be a real failure in terms of the … I think he was funded by South Africa probably at a very early stage, because he certainly was during the election campaign.

[Inaudible]

Mike Terry: Just very quickly, simply just a reaction to what Ethel and Pauline said, and that's that I would share their kind of comment about the overall contribution which the church has made, but at the same time, if you look at other groups we have worked with in the Movement, you could make exactly the same criticism. Yes, well I think – it was at the time of the Simonstown, no not Simonstown – before the Simonstown Agreement was broken, and there were two naval exercises, endorsed by a Labour government, with the Minister of the Navy sanctioning – and we couldn't get a single Labour MP to speak in a meeting against it – not a single Labour MP. And yet you can have Nelson Mandela going to the Labour Party conference and praising the Labour Party for its consistent support.

Ethel de Keyser: But I've got to add – at least you're going to finish it with Barbara Castle.

Mike Terry: No, I mean you could say the same thing about the trade unions. On occasions you'd have strong support, but when it came to delivering various things, there were real difficulties. And I think those are a reflection much more deeply about our society, about the extent to which, for a long period, attitudes of racism were not very far from the surface. And also, I mean all sorts of matters, so I think it's wrong just to perceive it as a problem of our relationship with the church community. I think there was – you're right, there were times when there was anger in the Movement because we couldn't deliver the kind of support that we wanted to, and expected it to come from people it didn't come from. But I think it would be wrong to see it simply as something that affected the church …

Ethel de Keyser: Sorry, can I just finish that, which perhaps is not relevant to this discussion. But on that occasion, in the House of Commons, we had a National Committee meeting, it was during my time that something happened, and Ronald Segal got up and made a very effective speech, swinging the whole Anti-Apartheid Movement, saying that all members of the Labour Party, this is opposition to the very point you're making, had to resign from the Anti-Apartheid Movement, who had actively supported the British navy exercises in Simonstown. And Barbara Castle, who'd been president of the Movement, had been told she

would have to resign. And this made headlines the next day. I hasten to say that Abdul Minty pulled us all together fairly soon afterwards …

Brian Brown: Can I just intrude the Namibian dimension, which I think is relevant to what we're talking about at the moment. I think that from a church perspective, here in Britain, we found it easier to interpret Namibia than South Africa. Because in Namibia, you had church leaders like [name indistinct], Kaluma, [name indistinct] and Dumeni, who were right in the forefront of the struggle, who were truly representative and who pronounced for SWAPO. And SWAPO happened to be engaged in a military activity against the occupying army of Pretoria. And so there was a clarity to that debate, because as a churchperson, the first thing you do if you are trying to be representative is be sensitive as to the repercussions occasioned by what you are saying, or particularly what you are attributing. And in South Africa, those waters were muddy. In Namibia, the waters were crystal clear, you could pronounce by and large, especially as this was an unlawful army of occupation, violating the territorial integrity of a neighbouring state, in violation of Resolution 435 and all that. Whereas in South Africa you had a kind of democratic government, don't shout at me, but a kind of democratic government, who you had to give some credence to. And so when it came to the violence debate, and that is where I think the church got hung up with regard to the PCR grants, a church which had glorified in Britain its heroic violent conquest of one called [indistinct] to liberate the world from the wrath of God, was now a church that had become almost pacifist in its persuasion. And that was the theological inconsistency of the church. When then I said earlier that I had to, wearing the Christian Institute hat, wear a pacifist hat as well, it was because unlike Namibia, there wasn't that clarity of voice which I could represent. So one said the primary violence, the institutionalised violence, is apartheid; the secondary violence, the response of violence, the revolutionary violence is the liberation movements. We cannot support either. But you had then illegitimatised the South African state as the instigator of primary violence against its people. And that was a dimension which the church in Britain was a long time coming to. And if it had got there earlier, it could have been more endorsing of good things.

David Haslam: Just a quick comment on Ethel's remarks about the real anger around, particularly in the '70s. I think it went through stages, but certainly in the '70s it was a hard time. And it was very difficult, for instance in the Methodist church, to get people to listen on this investment issue. So it's just an anecdote, and Pauline referred to it earlier, but there was a report by the Methodist Central Finance Board to the Methodist Conference, which was just not willing to do anything that we asked, and so we, a group of us, invaded the sound system, and turned off all the microphones, and then had another bunch down below going into the conference saying, 'Now you know how black South Africans feel – voiceless', because the Secretary of our Finance Board was left at the microphone with no voice, as it were. And there was that kind of conflict going on. Another anecdote is just about the Programme to Combat Racism, and I remember the then Director of Christian Aid, Kenneth Slack, because after some of the commitment of WCC funds and some of their reserves, actually, to the Special Fund, they then found themselves in some financial difficulties. And Kenneth Slack, as the Director of Christian Aid, observed more or less, 'Well, it serves them

right, doesn't it?' And some of us had to be very robust in responding to that situation, which just shows how unpolitical in those days the charitable field was, not just the church, but the wider charitable field. And thankfully things have moved on a great deal from there.

I did also just want to pick up, there were a couple of references to CCSA, which Mike made, and Elliott Kendall. And Elliott, if he'd still been alive, would have certainly been here, as he was a remarkable figure in the background. He was very much a behind closed doors, corridors of power, kind of person, and that's where he did a lot of his work. But he did help to set up CCSA with some of the rest of us, and took a leading role. And the reports that came out of CCSA on the companies like ICI and GEC, and the banks and Consolidated Goldfields and RTZ and so on, those detailed research reports I think were very important in changing a lot of people's minds on the financial side and the wider side. And it's the importance of detailed research in this kind of field, as well as the rhetoric, I think, which we shouldn't forget. That's an important discipline, that needed to be done in terms of ELTSA. I mean we did our Shadow Reports, which were slightly more glamorous versions of CCSA's more sober kind of presentations when we got the Shadow Board, which included trade unionists and church leaders and others together, even the occasional High Commissioner and so on, on that board. And again that was another effective tactic when the people in the churches made common cause with those outside.

I think those things also reveal the role and the logic of transnational corporations, which is of course continuing to grow in the world of today, and that's just another aside, that that whole thing needs to be monitored and challenged, perhaps even more now than it did then, and much more widely than just relating to South Africa. Cedric Mason's been mentioned as well, and I think we should just remind ourselves of his contribution, in terms of going round speaking to endless church meetings and preaching at endless churches on this whole issue, and himself in exile from South Africa. I mean Barney Pityana was also another figure. So those kind of individuals out of South Africa, along with Brian and others, also helped to change the climate gradually, and get it across to people. And I think the importance of those kind of meetings shouldn't be underestimated. Just a small story again from the beginnings of ELTSA, and ELTSA began because I visited New York in 1972, I think, and got from there these documents which showed that EABC [European-American Banking Corporation] and Midland Bank from Britain had been involved in these direct loans to the Rhodesian government and to South Africa. And they came about because a guy called Don Morton, who was also a Methodist minister, went to speak at a drab New York church, somewhere out in the Boondocks as he put it, on a damp winter's evening with about a dozen people there, spoke about the South African situation, wondering why on earth he was there. And afterwards a guy came up to him and said, and this is how he tells it, you know, said, 'Is it really like that in South Africa?' And he said, 'Well it certainly is', and persuaded the man. And so the man said, 'Can I have your address, I'd like to perhaps be in touch within a few days'. And anyway a few days later, he met up with Don and gave him a bunch of papers, and said, 'You know, forget all about me, you never heard or seen me before now or since'. And that was the documentation out of someone who worked in the EABC, who happened to

be a Christian, who was at that meeting. So never underestimate what you might get out of these very odd meetings out in the backwoods – or the boondocks.

Just lastly to pick up Mike's point, because none of us have taken that on, about the ideological questions and the ideological conflicts. I mean Mike's right, that a lot of the problems that the churches had with the AAM was because it was seen to be – and ANC – was because they were seen to be in hock to the Soviet Union, to the Communist societies. And as, again, someone who was with a foot on both sides, I felt that quite strongly. And I think it's always important on these occasions to remind ourselves how crucial what the eastern socialist countries did to support ANC and to support the anti-apartheid struggle, and without them it might have been a lot longer. I mean I was always amazed by the discipline, both the political and ideological discipline in the Anti-Apartheid Movement and the ANC. I thought sometimes it was a bit too heavy, but I later understood why it was like that and also, the practical and lifestyle discipline that members of the ANC had to espouse in order to actually to fight the struggle. Now, you could say that there were mixed motivations in the socialist countries for the kind of support they gave, but nevertheless it was quite crucial, and in these days when socialism's rather discredited, it's important to remember that. I mean capitalism was fully in support of the apartheid system for most of its life, and let's not underestimate that, now that capitalism is so rampant. I mean I just think we need to remember the ideological battle that socialism may well need to be rediscovered, largely because capitalism, as we know, is creating an increasingly unequal world and an increasingly polluted world. And unless perhaps we remember some of the values of socialism, and I would say allied with Christianity, both South Africa and the rest of us face a rather difficult future, shall we say.

Baldwin Sjollema: Well I simply want to say to David how grateful I am for what he's just said. And I also wanted to say to Pauline Webb that we were most anxious in Geneva to have some support from somewhere, and we had very little in the beginning, and Pauline has played an extremely important role. I will never forget the first thing that you did when you came back was to write, jointly with Ernest Payne, a letter to the editor of *The Times*, and that was the beginning of something, we got some support somewhere. The other thing I want to say is the Christian Institute, because Brian has mentioned this and his name has come up, and of course I don't think we should forget Theo Coetzee at this point. The Christian Institute, through a publication on 15th October, that was just a month after the first grants were made, came out with a very strong article. You are anxious to have David speak, so I won't quote it now, but the article was very clear in that it speaks about the white pharaohs who are violent and who are working on slavery and so on, and that the blacks are expecting a Moses from their own ranks, who at some time, God alone knows when, would speak the liberating word and perform the liberating deed. Talking is no longer enough, the time for pious words is passed. And I thought that that was – it was the first time that we got any positive response in South Africa itself.

David Craine: I'm still a newcomer to this, I was only around from the mid-80s, so I sort of have to bow to people who were involved a lot longer than me. There's a few things that

strike me. I mean there's a lot of anecdotes from ELTSA days that could be told, I don't think we've got time. But I think there still are a few issues which we haven't touched on. One is the Church Commissioners, which has been mentioned very briefly in terms of the court case, but there was a whole campaign there with vigils, and there was activity, trying to get people on board, and trying to move them, because of the enormous wealth in the Church Commissioners and the symbolic significance of that. That was a particular campaign, I think on the ethical investment thing, I mean we haven't heard from [name inaudible] coming and interviewing me before we closed CCSA or ELTSA down or something, wanting to write a book on shareholder action, which was eventually published. And a lot of the techniques used have been used by lots of other campaigning groups, and I think its important that that gets remembered, in terms of a lot of that work being pioneered on investment in South Africa. So I do think that it's a history that does need to be told. I think there are other issues. Lots of other groups that were involved, church-related groups, para-church groups if you like, that haven't been mentioned, like Church Action on Namibia, the Alliance of Radical Methodists, there were about a dozen or so, COSPEC [Christian Organisations for Social, Political and Economic Change], and a lot of groups that were members of COSPEC, all of which on the ground did a lot of work.

We probably haven't spoken enough about the Anti-Apartheid Multi-Faith Committee specifically, either, and the sort of multi-faith work, and the way in which being involved in the anti-apartheid struggle led to you being engaged with Muslims and other people, or Muslim church leaders, or Muslim activists coming over and speaking to us. And for me that's an important memory and reflection of the fact that the Movement chose to have a Multi-Faith Committee, rather than a specifically churches group. The Christian-Marxist dialogue has been touched on, but that for me really was worked out in the pubs after we'd had our meetings and organised all the work we'd done, and then we'd go to the pub and I'd learn about the difference between Straight Left and whatever, this that and the other, and I mean the sort of various ultra-leftist groups that used to wreck the Anti-Apartheid AGM that we'd have to work against. I mean for Christians to be involved in that kind of situation, I think, is quite unusual. And I think a lot of theory is written about the Christian-Marxist dialogue, and this sort of thing, but actually in many ways it's the sort of activeness of that work that's more important. There probably are one or two other issues, I scribbled a few things down, but I think SATIS hasn't been mentioned, and that was important as well.

I think the Methodist Conference, the sort of resolutions towards the end of the '80s when things were a lot clearer, as Brian was saying. And the resolutions to the Methodist Conference then were sort of support for the Shell month of action, and that led then to actually getting grassroots churches to be involved and going and picketing, sometimes in their own right, sometimes linking it with the local anti-apartheid group. And in addition, women's groups – I think Network once had a ribbon campaign, which was getting mainstream women involved, later on in the Movement, as a broadening of activity, and there was an enormous amount of action really happening. In terms of the ideological issues, I think we've touched on most of them, this moving from moral exultation to activism and involvement, really, I think is increasingly the sort of thing that became important. And that

was always wrapped up in money, you know, funding ELTSA. I was the treasurer for several years, and it was always very difficult. And the World Development Action Fund hasn't been mentioned, and the history of that, as to why that existed, to get round the charity commissioners, and the whole issue around the charity commissioners' work. I think that's probably enough, but I deliberately haven't mentioned any names at all because once you start mentioning names you never stop, is my fear. So I've tried to deal with organisations, and issues and themes.

*Unidentified participant:*What David has just said answered many of the questions I was beginning to have about what we've been talking about. We've talked a lot about the relationships with the churches, but it would be – I think there's a whole agenda about how the Movement itself operated, and the presumably internal conflicts and squabbles that were there. And particularly whether the Anti-Apartheid Movement was seen by many people as overly Christian, too dominated by religious themes, in the way that the Truth and Reconciliation Commission has been criticised in the new South Africa. Also whether – someone mentioned 'ultra-left', who obviously caused trouble in some of the AGMs and that kind of entryist Trotskyite, whether that was a serious issue for the Movement. Also, did the South African government try to have moles and other spies which affected the World Council of Churches?

[inaudible]

Pauline Webb: But on the whole, you see, the trouble is, I think somebody said before, it's like when you go to Germany, even five years after the war, you never found anybody in Germany who supported the Nazis. I don't think that you'd find anybody now who'd say that they were opposed to Anti-Apartheid. I mean, you know, it would be very difficult to find anybody who would come here and sit down – I mean I had a letter not so very long ago from Mrs Smith, the widow of Bernard Smith, you know, saying how sorry she was they'd written a letter to me … now she was writing, very graciously apologising. But I mean that's what happens. I don't think you find people, I can't think of any church leaders who would come now and sit round this – well in the Methodist churches I don't think you'd find a minister now in the Methodist church who'd admit …They might still think it, but they wouldn't say it.

Unidentified participant: on the other hand, you might still find people who think the Anti-Apartheid Movement is too dominated by clerics…

Unidentified participant: I doubt that

Ethel de Keyser: I just wanted to make one point about the different groups that we're talking about. And we're referring in particular to the City Anti-Apartheid Group, I would imagine. And I want to say that even at the time, but certainly in retrospect, they were enormously troublesome, but there's no doubt that they also made a serious contribution to the campaign and I don't think we should dismiss that. That was the one thing. Can I just ask a question

[inaudible] I just wanted to ask, I'm sorry I don't know your name – you were talking about the early period, about Canon Collins and Michael Scott, and the very friendly relationship they had. Do you know what happened? I mean I know but I don't think I know what you know. What happened to divide them, because I recall when I joined the Anti-Apartheid Movement, Michael Scott used to get up in our meetings, and attack the Defence and Aid Fund.

[inaudible]

Unidentified participant: … but I think it was earlier than that, wasn't it? It was also about the Movement for Colonial Freedom and [Fenner] Brockway. I mean there were lots of tensions there which were not specific to South Africa, they were more over the Central Africa Federation.

Ethel de Keyser: I just remember when I was very green in coming into Anti-Apartheid, going to a meeting where Scott got up and made an absolutely violent attack on Defence and Aid. He said that nobody should support it. I remember being somewhat surprised at the time!

Shula Marks: You wanted to come in?

Christabel Gurney: Well, I'm interested in the other side of the equation, how well the Anti-Apartheid Movement worked with the churches and with other groups – it touches on the things that Mike was raising. I think it's easy to forget that especially in the '70s, in the early '70s, the Anti-Apartheid Movement was very hardline in its policies, and its policies were very unpopular on supporting the armed struggle. But its remit was to mobilise the largest possible movement of public opinion against apartheid, which everybody – or a very wide spectrum – of the British public was opposed to. And so I was really fascinated by what Brian said about how he perceived the Anti-Apartheid Movement as intolerant. Because that wasn't how it seemed from the inside – because it was so deeply convinced that its policies were the only ones that could bring about change. And so I'm interested in knowing from people who worked mainly in the churches, apart from Brian and Baldwin, how they did perceive Anti-Apartheid, because at the same time, as I remember it, putting forward the correct policies, I now realise that in many ways, Anti-Apartheid did, as a public face, it did work with people. There is truth in what Brian was saying, and I think more on the trade union side, and the same thing happened in the trade union movement [inaudible].

Unidentified participant: Would it be helpful if anyone had a radically different viewpoint from Brian, if they would state it now, then it would be on record. If there isn't a radically different viewpoint, then we have a summation of the churches' point of view.

Christabel Gurney: I wondered also if it's to do with the period, the period that you're talking about, that you came here in the late '70s and are perhaps talking more about a greater kind of flexibility in the '80s, whereas maybe the beleaguered few was a more representative view of the late '60s and early '70s.

Unidentified participant: I think it was a spearhead view in terms of people who worked … those who worked in the office knew all about their subjects and they were spearheads for knowledge, information and [inaudible] in this country. And so what to them might seem strident and have a sense of urgency, which other people didn't respond to, was simply the question that they were right near the front, and everybody else was being drawn along behind.

Ethel de Keyser: I'd like to just come in, in response to what Christabel has just said. We had two people in the Anti-Apartheid Movement, and I'm referring here to Vella Pillay and Abdul Minty, who had – I mean they were there, I think Vella was there, from the very beginning, and Abdul if not from the very beginning, from around about that time – who were, and I don't know if Vella still is, but certainly Abdul, is a most astute politician, and what they said informed a lot of what we did, certainly in my time. And I'd gone to work in the Anti-Apartheid Movement as a South African coming to this country, and then I'd been deported from South Africa, but I'd gone there really to do my bit, and that was it. And I learnt a lot from both of them. But they were absolutely spot on and I illustrated that, I think, by the story about Barbara Castle and the arms thing, because what Ronald Segal said had a lot of sympathy from the management committee at that time, but Abdul came in and Vella came in and the whole thing was resolved in a way that was more acceptable to our continuing to get support from the Labour Party and to move on as an organisation. And I think these two sort of policies, because they are both most valuable people in their contribution to the anti-apartheid struggle, really huge. Both positions were parallel, we accommodated both, and I don't think that …

Unidentified participant: I think '70s and '80s and onwards, different periods, and I cannot speak for the '70s. I think you can always distinguish between the leadership and its graciousness and generosity and its support group, so if I found Terry the next morning in a pool of blood, after the executive meeting had ended at four o'clock, I would be aware that he had had his own distinctive infighting, but that didn't have to project upon the wider constituency and the wider goal. And I think finally, even if you are a very anti-church person in Britain in the 1980s, if you support Anti-Apartheid, damn it, you have to in some measure to go along with the church, because there are guys called Tutu and Chikane around, and they want to pray before they speak. And so, you know, in one sense, the Anti-Apartheid Movement was obliged to take the church seriously, even if some of your extremists, and I think of certain groups who would have not have liked that, but they had to bite the bullet, because those were the representative spokespersons, and they had been given an immunity beyond prosecution back home because they had been given by the churches and others an international platform which put them beyond attack.

Mike Terry: Can I do a plug as well? The Movement's archives are at Rhodes House library. A bit of irony! And they're in the process of being catalogued due to a donation from the South African Friends of the Bodleian. Until his death, the Chair of the South African Friends of the Bodleian was one Harry Oppenheimer. At the moment, there's access to some of the

most important documents, the executive minutes, national committee minutes, *Anti-Apartheid News* and things like that, but there's a restriction on access until the work has been completed, because otherwise the archivists would spend their time servicing people. But the main documents are available and that should be completed in about a year, year and a half. And if I could mention that also at Rhodes House Library are the archives of Trevor Huddleston, and the AAM Archives Committee is going to take on the responsibility to raise the money for those to be catalogued. In fact there's a sort of separate deal, I've got a leaflet about it, so if anybody is in a position to pass those on to people who are in a position to give a donation, they'll be more than welcome. So, there's a leaflet and everything about it.

Shula Marks: Well, thank you all very much indeed.