“The most improbable Diocese of the Anglican Communion”: Mission, Church and Revolution in Lebombo, Mozambique, 1961-76

Abstract

The Anglican presence in Mozambique dates from the late nineteenth century. This article provides a historical overview, with reference to mission, church and diocese. It also examines ecclesiastical and other religious connections between Mozambique and the United Kingdom, South Africa and Portugal. Through focus on the career and writings of the English missionary-priest John Paul and on the episcopacy of the Portuguese-born bishop of Lebombo Daniel de Pina Cabral, the article furthermore examines Anglican affairs in Mozambique during the African struggle for liberation from Portuguese rule.
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In June 1961, not for the first or last time, events in Portuguese Africa became a cause célèbre in Britain. Having debated unrest and violence in Angola, the UN Security Council twice failed to pass resolutions critical of Portugal. In both votes the UK abstained. The Conservative government in London came under strong criticism from political opponents and also from unofficial agencies, among them Protestant churches and missionary societies. Baptists, with a longstanding mission presence in Angola, took the lead. Clergy convened meetings and instigated a petition, which drew support from other mission, church and ecumenical organisations.¹ According to the Baptist Missionary Society the

Portuguese military in Angola were engaged in ‘wholesale slaughter’ of local people.²

Protestant church representatives met with the secretary of state at the Foreign Office to voice their displeasure at government inaction. Not since the Suez crisis of 1956, reported The Guardian, had churches in Britain been so agitated about foreign affairs.³ In Parliament Opposition MPs cited missionary reports to back up their assertion that Portugal was guilty of repression, extermination and ‘nothing less than genocide’.⁴ A member of the shadow cabinet likened Portuguese actions in Angola to those of Adolf Eichmann, at that moment on trial in Jerusalem.⁵ The government rode out the protests; Portugal was an old ally, particularly valued in a time of Cold War. But Portuguese colonial violence aroused strong feelings in Britain.⁶

In the Hampshire village of Liphook some 50 miles southwest of London an Anglican missionary on furlough from Mozambique read with unease news of the controversy. The attitude of the Baptists disturbed him as also did the outspokenness of certain English diocesan bishops: criticism of the government in Lisbon and its leader, Antonio Salazar, the missionary believed, might have repercussions for the church in Portuguese overseas territories. In a letter to a colleague he confided that his own diocese might find itself ‘in a very awkward situation’. Recently he had discerned improvement in official attitudes in Mozambique, not only towards Anglican missions and churches but also in terms of ‘native

---

³ “Church leaders’ request to see Lord Home about Angola”, The Guardian, 21 June 1961, p. 1.
policy’.\(^7\) Were improvements in church-state relations in Mozambique to be jeopardised now by controversy about Angola?

The missionary was John Paul, and he served in the diocese of Lebombo. In June 1961 Paul was 32 years old and a member of the Anglo-Catholic Universities’ Mission to Central Africa (UMCA). For the previous two and a half years he had been priest-in-charge at Messumba in north-western Mozambique, close to the border with Nyasaland (Malawi) and to the great lake then named Nyasa. The mission was an anomaly: an Anglican outpost in a Portuguese overseas territory. Until 1959 it had been part of the diocese of Nyasaland, a late-nineteenth century creation of the UMCA. In June of that year diocesan restructuring took place, for financial and administrative reasons: the archdeaconry in which Messumba was located became part of Lebombo diocese, in the province of South Africa. Anglican mission in the diocese was the responsibility not of the UMCA but of another High Church organisation, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG).\(^8\) Notwithstanding these changes, the mission’s finances – and future – were far from secure; the Portuguese provided aid for Catholic education, but not Protestant. And given the historically complicated nature of relations between Portuguese authority and Protestants, controversy of any kind was to missionaries unwelcome, and troubling. Paul’s confidant, the UMCA general secretary, wrote that ‘it is extraordinarily difficult to know what to do about it’.\(^9\)

---

\(^7\) Fr. J.D. Paul to Canon G.W. Broomfield, confidential, 20 June 1961, Universities’ Mission to Central Africa papers at Rhodes House Library, Oxford (hereafter UMCA), SF19A.


the event, he communicated Paul’s concerns to the ecumenical British Council of Churches, to help brief its representatives for a meeting with UK foreign secretary Alec Douglas-Home.

Distaste for politics was a UMCA characteristic. Strongly aware of and dedicated to its history and traditions, the mission placed special emphasis on continuity, on episcopal authority and on adherence to Anglo-Catholic ecclesiastical and liturgical practice. It was neither well prepared nor well equipped for the changes that would sweep Africa in the 1960s. In January 1965 it would cease to exist as an autonomous body, amalgamating with the SPG to form the United Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (USPG). That change took more than two years to accomplish. In 1961, no missionary either within the UMCA or outside it could know that the revolt then underway in Angola was the beginning of a protracted struggle against Portuguese rule in Africa. In Mozambique that struggle would eventually culminate in the country’s independence, declared on 25 June 1975. At almost the same time Penguin Books in London published the final volume in Ronald Segal’s renowned Penguin African Library series. Its title was *Mozambique: Memoirs of a Revolution*, and its author was none other than John Paul. He had left Messumba in 1969, for reasons of health. He subsequently became rector of a Scottish Episcopal church near Kirkcudbright.

In the memoir Paul recounted his reasons for becoming a missionary and his experiences at Messumba during the revolutionary period. Much of the book is concerned with the impact of war on the mission and its environs. Its author’s view of Portuguese rule in Mozambique had altered from the time of the Angola crisis; now it was openly critical. In the preface Paul noted his approval of the White Fathers’ decision to withdraw in protest from Mozambique in 1971, and of Father Adrian Hastings’ exposure, two years later, of
atrocities at Wiriyamu. Those revelations stimulated Paul to write his book. He had felt unable to do so earlier, he acknowledged, for fear of jeopardising the safety of those still at Messumba. Written several years after the events it describes, Memoirs of a Revolution has often been cited by historians. As they acknowledge, religious affairs before, during and after the Mozambican revolution were nothing if not complicated.10 Notwithstanding the valuable work of Alda Romão Saúte on converts, catechists, teachers and others in the Maciene area, however, there is relatively little focus on Anglicans and Anglicanism.11 And detailed, wide-ranging research on Anglican mission in Mozambique during the 1960s is rare. John Paul’s memoir offers one view of that period. It is a partial and in some ways problematic view. The book was successful on publication, selling several thousand copies.12 However, it gave undue prominence to Messumba, whereas most Anglicans were and are located in southern Mozambique. It is not even the only personal account of life at Messumba; Paul’s colleague Joan Antcliff published reminiscences in 2004, which include reference to her work at other Anglican missions such as Maxixe, in the province of Inhambane.13 His memoir ranges more widely than hers, and is more critical in its observations. In its focus on Anglo-Portuguese relations and church leadership and on


12 M.G. Dover to Paul, 2 Sept. 1976, Penguin Archive, University of Bristol, DM1852/AP46.

diocesan as well as mission affairs it reveals much about the high politics of church
decolonisation in Africa from a particular perspective. Read in conjunction with mission and
church correspondence of the period, *Memoirs of a Revolution* helps show the ambiguity of
Anglican encounters with Portuguese authority and Mozambican nationalism.

**Anglican mission and the Diocese of Lebombo**

In his tercentennial history of the USPG Daniel O’ Connor notes the extent to which lingering
colonial attitudes after 1945 influenced the devolution of western ecclesiastical authority to
indigenous churches. ¹⁴ Theological reappraisal of mission went hand-in-hand with the need
to forge new relationships in ecumenical as well as denominational and geographical
terms. ¹⁵ Progress was slow, especially in the development of indigenous church leadership.
All the while theology also influenced nationalism, and nationalists such as Eduardo
Mondlane. ¹⁶ Like other missions in Mozambique, Messumba was a source of Frelimo
support and recruitment. Mission facilities (which, as well as a church, included a school, a
teacher-training institution and a hospital) fostered nationalist sentiment. In no greatly
significant sense, however, was Messumba a ‘hotbed’ of nationalism. As Didier Péclard has
noted in relation to Angola, the influence of Protestant mission on nationalism in
Portuguese Africa varied according to denomination and even locale. ¹⁷ In Mozambique, as
Helgesson and Cruz e Silva have shown, Methodist and Presbyterian churches and personnel

---

¹⁴ Daniel O’Connor and others, *Three Centuries of Mission: The United Society for the Propagation of the

¹⁵ O’Connor and others, *Three Centuries of Mission*, pp. 177-85.


¹⁷ Didier Péclard, “Religion and Politics in Angola: The Church, the Colonial State and the Emergence of Angolan
– located especially in Inhambane – were most influential in that respect, as they were also in the development of indigenous church leadership.\(^{18}\) Anglican missionary attitudes were characterised by uncertainty. That was also the case at mission headquarters in London. Overt support for Frelimo, it was feared, would incur the wrath of government in Lisbon as well as in Lourenço Marques (Maputo). Being perceived as too close to Portuguese authority risked African accusations of “Anglican neo-colonialism” potentially damaging to the Society and the church.\(^{19}\) What was to be done? In the circumstances neutrality seemed advisable while the bishop of Lebombo worked to devise a longer-term local strategy, as bishops (rather than the SPG) had been empowered to do since the origins of the diocese. The impact of revolution on Messumba was unquestionably a problem for the mission; but it was also a problem for the diocese and for the Anglican Communion in southern Africa.

Formed in 1893 as part of the Anglican province of South Africa, the diocese of Lebombo relied from the start on support – in the form of priests and funds – from English sources, especially the SPG. It was notable for its cohort of African evangelists and priests, among them the former slave James Chala Salfey. In terms of fundraising and publicity the Lebombo Home Organisation (together with the SPG) provided a vital link between the diocese and its supporters in England, as also did the quarterly magazine *Lebombo Leaves*. It was the bishop, however, who most notably embodied the diocese and represented it in its dealings with other churches and with secular authority, whether chartered company or


\(^{19}\) Canon J.S. Kingsnorth to Canon E.A. Maycock, 11 June 1964, UMCA, SF19A.
colonial. Bishops corresponded and consulted with local British consuls-general, typically on the subject of religious education in schools and on official Portuguese language requirements. English Protestants in a notionally Catholic territory, they invariably couched their arguments against state interference in terms of ‘religious freedom’. Interested for the most part to maintain good relations with other Protestant churches and missions, bishops had no wish to be drawn into controversy of the kind provoked by Henry Nevinson in his indictment of Portugal, *A Modern Slavery* (1906). Their preference was for diplomacy.

In March 1911 Bishop Edmund Smyth, with Foreign Office assistance, even journeyed to Lisbon, to negotiate (ultimately to little effect) with representatives of the provisional republican government there. Historians have noted the extent to which missionaries, among others, subjected Portuguese practices, especially forced labour, to scrutiny and criticism. That criticism was not always to missionaries’ advantage; sometimes it could redound to their detriment. In 1925 the New York office of the Protestant ecumenical International Missionary Council covertly supported an investigation of Portuguese Africa by the American sociologist Edward Alsworth Ross. His highly critical report inflamed opinion in Lisbon, with disastrous consequences for missions. Then, as the power and legitimacy of the republican regime waned and gave way to the Estado Novo under Salazar, the Catholic Church in Portugal asserted itself anew – for the state and against Protestant missions. In


August 1939 bishop of Lebombo Dennis Victor lamented ‘a policy of stranglehold’, with the Catholic bishop of Mozambique wielding ‘power behind the Throne’. The Portugal-Vatican concordat of May 1940 confirmed what had been apparent for some time: the relationship between state and church was deepening and growing stronger.

From the early 1930s Protestants with mission work in Portuguese overseas territories began to set up representative bodies, the better to make their case to the authorities. The Lisbon-based evangelical pastor (and poet) Eduardo Moreira initially took a leading role. In 1948 Protestants in Mozambique formed an ostensibly representative Christian Council. However, the organisers’ hopes that Anglicans might actively participate would not be realised for some time. Being of the High Church tradition missionaries and bishops of the UMCA were wary of too close association with what they perceived as evangelically-minded organisations. On that point the mission’s general secretary was forthright: it was to Anglicans’ advantage not to ‘allow themselves to be identified with a ‘pan-Protestant bloc”. ‘It has to be borne in mind’, he informed Archbishop of Canterbury Geoffrey Fisher in January 1951 with reference to similarities between High Church Anglicanism and Roman Catholicism, ‘that the Anglican Missions in Portuguese East Africa are regarded much more favourably by the Portuguese than the other non-Roman missions’. Whether or not that was indeed the case, bishops continued to make use of personal and institutional networks built up over time, in southern Africa, in Portugal and in the UK. As Portuguese pressure on Protestant missions and schools increased in the early

25 Spencer, Towards an African Church, pp. 79-82.
27 Broomfield to Fisher, 31 Jan. 1951, LPL, Fisher Papers, Box 90.
1950s they made their concerns known, as before, through Lambeth Palace (official residence of the archbishop of Canterbury), the UK embassy at Lisbon and other familiar, trusted points of contact. Though he chafed at Portuguese edicts against teaching in the vernacular, Bishop Humphry Beevor had little patience with ecumenical responses. He described his feelings in February 1956: ‘I am not happy in co-operation with other non-Roman missions, because they do not always seem to play fair with the civil authorities’. In the tradition of his predecessors, he would make the case for the diocese and the missions as best he could. He would make little headway. Portuguese civil authorities and Catholic Church alike were convinced by the mid-1950s that Protestant missions irrespective of denomination or nationality were breeding grounds for Communism. Developments in Angola further fuelled their suspicions. Bakongo nationalists formed the União das Populações do Norte de Angola in 1957. The uprising of 1961 – and the ferocity of the Portuguese response – brought Angola to world attention. In Mozambique events were about to develop a momentum of their own.

**The Mission at Messumba and the liberation struggle**

John Paul had taken charge of the Messumba mission in October 1958. The demands of the job gave him little opportunity to reflect on events beyond his purview. News of the crisis in Angola made him aware, probably for the first time, of the extent to which violence remained an inherent aspect of Portuguese colonialism. It was not like that at Messumba.

---


30 Sir C.N. Stirling to Foreign Office, 30 June 1956: TNA: FO371/119595.
He had been struck, almost from the moment of his arrival there, by its ostensibly unchanged – and unchanging – nature. He felt an affinity with the place and its people. His pastoral duties frequently took him beyond Messumba, on *ulendo* (or tour), to the various out-stations of the mission. Assisting him were eight African priests and deacons. Though the early 1960s saw a numerical increase in the African priesthood, there was as yet little or no African involvement in church leadership. Paul’s encounters with Portuguese officialdom were business-like, and his relations with Catholic clergy cordial. He spent most of 1961 on furlough in England. On his return to the mission the atmosphere, as he subsequently noted in his memoir, had changed, because of events in Angola. Now all Protestant missions were subject to suspicion. That suspicion fell initially not on missionaries but on Africans sympathetic to the aims of Frelimo, which formed in Tanzania in June 1962. Arrests followed. Tension grew. War – and violent death – came to the Messumba area in late 1964, and by the following year its effects had greatly intensified. The Portuguese armed forces’ declaration of an exclusion zone – intended to deny support and supplies to Frelimo – transformed innocent people into refugees. Thousands fled to Malawi, and encamped in the vicinity of the Anglican cathedral on Likoma Island. Others came to the Messumba mission for assistance. Ecumenical agencies cooperated to help as also did the governments of Malawi and Tanzania. Joan Antcliff helped ensure continuity of the mission’s important education work. Nurse Irene Wheeler despatched circular letters, to keep the hospital’s overseas patrons and supporters apprised of the situation. The crisis generated coverage in the British press, and brought Messumba briefly to national attention in the UK. Evading official restrictions on reporting, the journalist (and Irish peer) John


Kilbracken found his way to the mission and subsequently wrote an assessment of its situation for the London *Evening Standard*.33 The Anglican newspaper *Church Times* published a dramatic account, highlighting the implications of conflict for the mission; according to the bishop of Lebombo its future was in jeopardy.34

Stanley Pickard, the bishop, was in a quandary. He was also out of touch. Based in Lourenço Marques, more than 2,000 kilometres from Messumba, he had no regular contact with the mission. Pessimistic by nature, lack of information caused Pickard to fear the worst: that Frelimo had Paul marked down for assassination; and that the mission would be overrun if not by the army then by the rebels.35 A UMCA veteran, Pickard had spent nine years in charge at Messumba prior to becoming bishop in 1958. A reluctant appointee, he accepted the bishopric out of a strong sense of duty. Not a delegator, he felt keenly the responsibilities and pressures of office. He had a tendency to brood on past errors and misjudgements and on the chronically ‘hopeless’ state of diocesan finances. The Mozambican liberation struggle exacerbated his problems. With the USPG and the archbishop of Cape Town (primate of the Church of the Province of South Africa: CPSA) he explored the possibility of a successor.

The USPG was committed to Pickard and the diocese; but its officials had little faith in his leadership abilities or his financial acumen.36 The matter of succession was a challenge on a number of fronts. There had been no contemplation of, much less preparation for,
indigenous leadership of the diocese. But the fraught political situation in Mozambique and throughout colonial Africa seemed to make leadership by yet another English-born bishop (Pickard was the eighth) inadvisable. The unusual, even anomalous location of the diocese and its links with the CPSA and the USPG were further, complicating factors. Lebombo was a tricky case, and for that reason discussion of its future widened to include officials of the Anglican Communion. In the aftermath of the 1958 Lambeth Conference, Anglicans debated world affairs, missiology and the increasing heterogeneity of Anglicanism: how might worldwide cooperation and communion be strengthened given differences among Anglican mission agencies and among churches in newly independent states? 37 Quite separately, the Episcopal Anglican Church of Brazil had become an autonomous province in 1965; it was keen to forge links with other parts of the Communion, and Lebombo seemed appropriate. 38 During reorganisation of the Lebombo diocese in the 1950s meanwhile, involvement by the Lusitanian Church in Portugal had been mooted, but nothing came of it. 39 Now contact was revived. Formed in 1880, the Lusitanian Church developed out of nineteenth century dissatisfaction with Roman Catholic dogmas. Catholic-influenced, members of the new church committed to adopt and uphold Anglican liturgy and leadership. The church relied for episcopal stewardship on churches in the US and Ireland until 1958 and the consecration of the first bishop of Portuguese origin. In early 1966, the possibility of a Lusitanian Church link with Lebombo was the object of extensive correspondence and discussion. Among those involved were Pickard, officials of the USPG,


39 Fisher to Beevor, 29 Sept. 1955, LPL, Fisher Papers, Box 160.
archbishop of Cape Town Robert Selby Taylor, Bishop Luis Pereira of the Lusitanian Church and also Bishop Ralph Dean, executive officer of the Anglican Communion. There were tentative hopes that, in an unprecedented step, the Lusitanian Church could take over Lebombo from the CPSA.\textsuperscript{40} That was not possible. The Church was small and relatively impoverished (its priests earned their livings in secular occupations). A more practical proposition was the creation of an assistant or suffragan bishopric of the diocese, to be filled by a suitable Lusitanian candidate, who would in time succeed Pickard.\textsuperscript{41} It so happened that a suitable candidate existed, who was interested in the post. He was 42 years old, married with four children. He had been a priest and archdeacon in Oporto. He was a lawyer by profession. His name was Daniel de Pina Cabral.

Cabral’s professional and theological credentials were impressive. He had undertaken study in England, at the London College of Divinity under the auspices of Donald Coggan, now Archbishop of York. Coggan held him in high regard. The USPG secretaries with whom Cabral met in London in March 1966 were impressed by him. His High Church background and instincts fitted well with those of the Society and the diocese. Cabral had not previously intended to become a missionary, much less a bishop. But believing that God now called him to Mozambique, and that the diocese presented an opportunity for him, for mission and for the church, he felt compelled to take on the new role: ‘It is something worthy of the life of a man’, he told Dean, following an initial visit to the diocese.\textsuperscript{42} Cabral’s stipend would be a fraction of his salary as a lawyer, but the administrative and financial

\textsuperscript{40} Most Rev. R.S. Taylor to Trapp, 7 March 1966, USPG, TF3078.

\textsuperscript{41} Pickard to Rt. Rev. R.S. Dean, 27 Feb. 1966, USPG, TF3078.

arrangements were tortuous and protracted. In December 1966 negotiations finally ended; on 25 May 1967 at St Paul’s Cathedral, Lisbon, in a ceremony without precedent in the history of the Anglican Communion, Cabral, not Anglican, became assistant bishop of an Anglican diocese.\(^4\) He was subsequently enthroned at St. Augustine’s, Maciene, in south-central Mozambique. Pickard’s authority had for some time been little more than nominal. No real progress in diocesan affairs would be possible until his departure from office. He resigned in April 1968, and was succeeded by Cabral.

The episcopacy of Daniel de Pina Cabral and the Wiriyamu controversy

Cabral’s appointment marked a step into the unknown. From the outset he felt keenly the weight of history, and of the historic relationship between diocese and mission. It was a relationship of necessity, not altogether healthy for the church in Africa. Reflecting in July 1968 on what he described as “the most improbable Diocese of the Anglican Communion”, Cabral noted its continuing dependency on the generosity of England. ‘Our Christians’, Cabral believed, ‘do not feel that their Church is their own, but rather that they belong to and are the beneficiaries of the “rich” Anglican mission. They show no signs of realising that they have to support the work of the Diocese’.\(^4\) No less than other recently appointed bishops in the non-western world, Cabral found problematic the equation of Anglicanism with England and Englishness. He worked to strengthen links with the CPSA and with other Episcopal churches in the Portuguese-speaking world. He paid special attention to Brazil, visiting there in 1971 and securing the services of two Brazilian priests, Clovis Erly Rodrigues

\(^4\) The episcopacy in Jerusalem of Samuel Gobat, a Swiss Lutheran, began 21 years before the first Lambeth Conference of 1867.

and Hans Krolow. Money was a constant preoccupation. But he was energetic and resourceful in financial as in other aspects of his work. From the UK, Portugal and other countries including, later, the US, he solicited and obtained funds for church and clergy projects.

Throughout all of this the spectre of war was ever present. Since 1964 the activities of the army and of the secret police, the PIDE, had expanded greatly. In their determination to deny support to the revolutionaries, the authorities clamped down ever more firmly, and brutally. Within Catholic missions a crisis ensued. In May 1971, protesting against injustice (and against the silence of local Catholic bishops), the White Fathers withdrew from Mozambique. To remain, they stated, would implicate them in the actions of the regime. The decision provoked debate among Protestants about their role in Mozambique. Their churches now became increasingly subject to repression, with members arrested, detained and tortured. Among the many victims were pastors of the Presbyterian Church, including Zedequias Manganhela. Efforts to secure his release, made by Cabral and others, were unsuccessful, and Manganhela died in custody, in suspicious circumstances. Yet the impact and awareness of Frelimo (and anti-Frelimo measures) varied throughout Mozambique. As Cabral informed the USPG in December 1972, the situation at many missions, including Messumba, appeared relatively calm.

---


46 Cabral to Trapp, 22 July 1969, USPG, TF3078.


visiting Lourenço Marques that year, the ‘guerrilla war going on the north’ seemed much less prominent than the ‘relaxed gaiety and cheerful warmth’ evident in the capital city.\(^{50}\)

On 10 July 1973 *The Times* of London punctured such complacency about Mozambique with its publication of Adrian Hastings’ report on Wiriyamu, based on information from priests of the Burgos Fathers. Hastings would subsequently write that the massacres there were unusual only in their scale; they typified ‘a system of government whose whole character is brutal and destructive’.\(^{51}\) Published on the eve of an official visit to Britain by Salazar’s successor as prime minister of Portugal Marcelo Caetano, the report generated huge controversy, with implications for Anglo-Portuguese relations.\(^{52}\) No longer could Portugal be trusted, *The Times* editorialised; its rule in Africa was ‘both hateful and hopeless’.\(^{53}\) To a greater extent than any other event during the revolution, Wiriyamu continues to be the subject of debate.\(^{54}\)

What was the impact of the initial controversy on Anglican mission and church? The USPG contacted Cabral immediately, to ask his opinion and if he wished to make a statement. His response was unequivocal: he did not believe Hastings’ report; it contained ‘serious contradictions’. Cabral went on: ‘the military strategy required for the “Wiriyamu massacre” would be a decision completely alien to the army strategy’. If a massacre had indeed taken place he would surely have heard of it, as would

---

\(^{50}\) Rt. Rev. I.W.A. Shevill, notes on visit to east, central and southern Africa, 1972, USPG, TF1275.


the local Roman Catholic bishop, who he knew to be saintly and courageous. Cabral believed that the report had been published ‘to excite public opinion’ in the UK on the eve of Caetano’s visit. ‘I cannot accept, and I repudiate from a Christian point of view’, he concluded, ‘a moral accusation which is done not to serve justice but to serve a concrete political purpose’.55 He stated his view publicly, though in less explicit terms, a week later.56

Of interest to archbishop of Canterbury Michael Ramsey, Cabral’s statement attracted relatively little attention otherwise.57 It was of great interest to John Paul, in Scotland, upon whom the Hastings article had had an electrifying effect. He wrote to The Times, criticising Portugal for its violence and also for its hypocrisy.58 He decided that he must also write at greater length and in greater detail an account based on his own experiences in Mozambique. While at Messumba he had asserted the mission’s neutrality. Since leaving he had remained silent, for the sake of those who had remained and were still there. Now various people, and the press, were contacting him to ask his opinion of what Hastings had written. He had no doubt, he informed USPG secretary George Braund, that what Hastings had written was ‘horribly true’ and had brought the world to ‘the moment of truth’ in respect of Portuguese rule in Africa. Paul wished to perform, as best he could, a similar task, from an Anglican mission and church perspective. Cabral could hardly do so, because of his position as bishop. ‘I have the greatest respect and admiration for the present Bishop of Lebombo and would do nothing to harm his diocese’, Paul told Braund; but ‘Bishop Daniel couldn’t possibly be in a position to confirm or deny Fr. Hastings’

55 Cabral to Shevill, 14 July 1973, USPG, TF3077.
allegations – even if he could, it would be ‘curtains’ for him in more ways than one’. No such restrictions applied to Paul. ‘If I was still in Mozambique’, he continued, ‘or even if I was on furlough in this country, I would never dare say and print (let alone publish) the things I can do now... and I intend to do so!’ 59 The Wiriyamu controversy was the genesis of Paul’s memoir.

Wiriyamu was a symptom rather than a cause of Portugal’s inability to retain authority over Mozambique. Massive counter-attacks against Frelimo, and assistance to Portugal provided by the governments of South Africa and Rhodesia, could not offset a crumbling of the colonial structure during the early 1970s. Africa was in any case now of declining value to Portugal, which increasingly looked towards Europe instead.60 In September 1974, with the military situation at stalemate, the Lisbon administration and Frelimo finally agreed on the ending of hostilities and the granting of independence to Mozambique. Six months earlier an army-led coup in Lisbon had overthrown Caetano and ended the Estado Novo. Caetano’s reforms – in which liberal-minded Portuguese (including Cabral) and some army officers had put their trust – had not been sustained.61 And Cabral anticipated that independence for Mozambique might indeed depend upon revolution in Portugal. As to the prospects for the church, he was for the moment optimistic: ‘I do not believe that we have reason to fear’, he assured Braund, in London.62 Administrative and financial affairs remained a constant burden, but he was planning for the future; one project

62 Cabral to Braund, 13 May 1974, USPG, TF192.
was for the division of the diocese into two parts (accomplished in 1978). As the date of independence neared Cabral was uneasy but also hopeful, as he explained to his old friend Coggan, archbishop of Canterbury since 1974: ‘Mozambique gives me the feeling of a country that is in suspense. Everything appears to be waiting for the miraculous 25th of June in order to start again with new vigour’. Independence brought first uncertainty and confusion and then great difficulties, the result of Frelimo’s ideological and political reaction against churches and their personnel. From August 1975 educational and health facilities, largely the preserve of religious institutions, were nationalised. Their staff became, in effect, employees of the state. Bank accounts were frozen. Money from abroad was allowed for one purpose only: priests’ stipends. As one of Cabral’s contacts in the CPSA reported, ‘Frelimo suspect that monies are being used to achieve some form of ‘imperialism”. No church was favoured, and certainly not the Anglican Church.

**Mozambican independence and the publication of John Paul’s memoir**

Joan Antcliff noted in her memoir, that bishops of Lebombo in times past had often given up hope. It was a thankless job, she thought, and immensely difficult even in time of peace. By June 1975 Cabral had been a bishop for eight tumultuous years. He was only 51, but work had taken a toll on his health. It was also disruptive of family life. Soon he would report that diocesan finances were at the point of collapse. The cautious optimism that had

---


64 Cabral to Rt. Rev. F.D. Coggan, 29 April 1975, LPL, Coggan Papers, Box 7.


sustained him through to Mozambican independence was waning. He decided in late 1975 that he had done all he could. He would resign, hand over responsibility for the diocese in 1976 and return to Oporto in the hope of continuing his vocation. He explained his reasons in a letter to Coggan: ‘When in 1967 I came to Africa I had with me the clear conviction of being called by God for this specific mission... Now I see with equal clarity that I must leave’. He took pride in his achievements but gave a sombre assessment of independent Mozambique and the church under a Frelimo-led government. ‘The present social situation and the human relations which are developing in it have no likeness to that to which we were called to serve. This causes me to ask myself whether our Mozambican “kairos”, the historical period in which our mission was justified in Africa, has not reached its end’. The church in Mozambique was still not yet, as he had hoped in 1967, truly self-sufficient, or as fully African as it needed, and had the potential, to be. And the state’s new rulers were hostile to religion.

Adversity brought churches in Mozambique closer together. The Christian Council assumed a more important representative role. In that context, Christian cooperation increased. For Cabral cooperation had been a necessity from the beginning of his episcopacy. Diocesan business not only with secular authority in Mozambique but also with the USPG and the CPSA entailed constant negotiation. Involving as it did a succession of mission secretaries in London and Cabral in Lourenço Marques, the process resembled a kind of Anglo-Portuguese ecclesiastical diplomacy. Under financial pressures of its own, the USPG struggled to meet Cabral’s sometimes demanding expectations. Throughout his

---


69 Sulston to Shevill, 14 April 1972, USPG, TF3077.
period as bishop Cabral remained ambivalent, uneasy and possibly resentful about his
diocese’s inability to support itself and about its reliance on external funds, especially from
England. That unease, which coloured his relationship with USPG officials, increased as
Mozambique’s political landscape shifted during 1975. Inevitably, church leaders in
Mozambique such as Cabral were also influenced by developments in neighbouring South
Africa. Years before, Eduardo Mondlane had praised the Anglican Church there for its
leadership on racial discrimination.\textsuperscript{70} In 1969, stimulated by events in South Africa, the
World Council of Churches launched its programme to combat racism. Churchmen such as
Alphaeus Zulu and Desmond Tutu provided inspiration at home and abroad, and nationalism
and race in South Africa influenced theology in new ways.\textsuperscript{71}

Cabral confronted the necessity of greater African involvement in church leadership.
He was able to facilitate that need, in part by increasing opportunities for theological
training (in Tanzania as well as in Mozambique), in part by obtaining approval for the
appointment of two new assistant bishops, Paulo Litumbe and Dinis Sengulane. Given the
pressures upon him, Cabral had little reason to be interested in John Paul’s memoir,
publication of which was timed to coincide with Mozambican independence. Prior to its
release, \textit{Church Times} publicised it by reproducing excerpts, the focus of which was neither
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mission nor revolution but Cabral: his background, his personality and his character. The
tone of the excerpts was measured, though in parts almost palpably hostile towards Cabral.

Paul acknowledged Cabral’s anti-Salazar credentials, for which he had been
imprisoned as a young man. More troubling, it seemed, was the bishop’s friendship with
Caetano, a law professor during Cabral’s student days at the University of Lisbon. According
to Paul, the presence of Caetano (not then prime minister) and other Portuguese
government ministers and dignitaries at Cabral’s consecration indicated recognition by
Portugal of the Anglican Church in Mozambique. Cabral’s first visit as bishop to Messumba
three months later seemed to Paul to confirm recognition: civil and military representatives
were almost fawningly deferential towards Cabral. He was accorded ‘almost the same
privileges as a Roman Catholic bishop’. Their behaviour raised questions about Cabral’s
capacity for independent-mindedness; how critical was he likely to be of the regime? He
was critical indeed, Paul reported, of corruption, and of the PIDE. But for allegations of
torture against the army he had no time. ‘He seemed to think’, Paul wrote, ‘that my stories
of brutality by the troops issued not from my own knowledge but from my susceptibility to
pro-Frelimo propaganda... I found it almost impossible to convince Bishop Daniel that his
own countrymen were so brutal to the Africans’. The implications of all this for the church
were worrying, according to Paul: ‘I feared that before long, instead of fulfilling our
traditional role, we, like the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Mozambique, would be seen by
the very people we had come to serve as little more than an instrument for their deliberate
Portugalisation’.  

---

In the book Paul also recorded his liking and respect for Cabral, describing him ‘as the saviour of Anglican work in the country’.\textsuperscript{73} But for all his qualities Cabral, as a bishop in Mozambique, was disadvantaged according to Paul; he was Portuguese, and therefore ‘he was isolated, as were most Portuguese people, from what was really going on... The Bishop naturally saw the whole situation from a Portuguese standpoint, and had little insight into that of the Nyasas. Since he had never worked among them, and had lived always in a country with strict Press censorship, this was hardly surprising’.\textsuperscript{74} Some implications of Paul’s assessment seem clear. Because of his nationality, Cabral was too close to those in power. And with no experience of Africa, he lacked what Paul believed English missionaries at Messumba to possess: empathy and understanding born of first-hand knowledge, long experience and lives lived among the people. The memoir presented what seemed ample evidence of that knowledge, experience and empathy.

For Paul, the timing of the memoir’s publication was propitious; Mozambique was once again newsworthy not only in Africa, the UK and Europe but across the world. His experienced voice appeared to carry authority. The newspaper \textit{Church Times} continued to emphasise the problematic nature of Cabral’s friendship with Caetano.\textsuperscript{75} Irene Wheeler, a former colleague at Messumba, was dismayed by Paul’s comments: ‘I think that the criticism of Bishop Cabral is unjust, unnecessary and unkind’, she informed Braund.\textsuperscript{76} Cabral initially dismissed the criticism as irrelevant. He had many other more important things to worry
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about in 1975; Paul’s opinions were ‘just foolishness’. He subsequently revised his view, concluding that the assertions constituted an attack on his integrity. Had his position become compromised, as Paul alleged, he would have offered his resignation to synod. But he would make no direct response to Paul; he requested instead that the USPG exert what influence it could to counteract the criticism. As Cabral knew more fully than Paul, there was a greater threat to the church after 25 June 1975: ‘The fact is that Mozambique is being government by a group of men whose minds are rigidly and principally fixed on the communist doctrine’, he wrote. Campaigns were already under way, Cabral also noted, against Jehovah’s Witnesses, Seventh Day Adventists and other ‘sects’. The churches’ turn, he predicted, would soon come. He would try to ensure that the Anglican Church was prepared. Sengulane was already building a network of personal and institutional contacts within and beyond Mozambique: with other churches, with the USPG and also with Frelimo. Sengulane, already a suffragan, would succeed Cabral in 1976, as Lebombo’s first Mozambican-born diocesan bishop.

**Anglican mission and church, and Mozambican liberation**

Ending only in 2014, Sengulane’s period as bishop of Lebombo was successful as well as lengthy. It awaits full assessment. In Paul’s memoir, the mission aspect of Anglican affairs in Mozambique has always seemed most prominent, as may be seen in the book’s historiographical influence. According to Alf Helgesson, the only Protestants truly facing the horror of the war situation were ‘the Anglicans along the Eastern shore of Lake Malawi’, and
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specifically at Messumba.\textsuperscript{80} There were of course other Anglicans and other Anglican missions and churches elsewhere in Mozambique – at Maciene, Maxixe, Lourenço Marques and other places. British press reports on the mission in the mid-1960s together with Paul’s retrospective account were instrumental in bringing Messumba to wider and arguably undeserved attention relative to other more notable Anglican missions. Long before any of that, however, the UMCA had regarded Messumba, because of its isolated situation, as a ‘stronghold of Anglicanism’.\textsuperscript{81} Its unusual, and to English minds almost perilous, location in Portuguese territory made it seem deserving of attention and support. Its status as a “Cinderella diocese” was part of its attraction to some priests and bishops.\textsuperscript{82} (The Anglican presence in Angola was unofficial and little known before the 1980s.)\textsuperscript{83} Its remoteness should not obscure Messumba’s importance within a diocese, first of Nyasaland then of Lebombo. The diocesan aspect is integral to the history of the mission.

Notwithstanding the vicissitudes of church, mission and missionary society, by 1967 Lebombo’s history extended back over three quarters of a century. Cabral’s appointment as suffragan that year might have marked a break in the tradition. George Braund thought so. Visiting the diocese in 1970 he rather patronisingly noted how puzzled the African clergy were, by Cabral’s ‘Portuguese’ way of doing things – so different, it seemed, from the ‘English’ approach to which they had long been accustomed.\textsuperscript{84} Yet Stanley Pickard had strongly supported Cabral’s candidacy on grounds of nationality; the problem for Anglicans
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in Mozambique, he argued, was ‘not so much that we are ‘protestants’ but that we are not Portuguese’. Though it may have seemed ‘Portuguese’ to some English eyes Cabral’s way of doing things, it transpired, was remarkably similar to that of his English-born predecessors. He was unhesitant in asserting the historical importance of Anglicanism. To the Superior of the Community of the Resurrection at Mirfield, Yorkshire, Cabral wrote: ‘the churchmanship of Lebombo is entirely of the Anglo-Catholic tradition, which facilitates enormously our very good relations with the Roman Church.’ Those relations had improved greatly since Vatican II, but Cabral’s methods were in keeping with those of the USPG and of the now defunct UMCA. They did not imply allegiance to Portuguese secular authority. Of course, ‘good relations’ between the Anglican Church and the Church of Rome historically came at the cost of inter-Protestant cooperation; when it came to lobbying government about injustices, ecumenically-minded Protestants of other denominations typically regarded uncooperative Anglican bishops as ‘deluded’. That situation altered during Cabral’s period as bishop, as ecumenism strengthened bonds among Protestants, as well as between Protestants and Roman Catholics. It should be noted that Cabral refrained from overt criticism of the authorities not because he was Portuguese but because he was bishop of Lebombo. His public reticence about Wiriyamu in 1973 is explicable, to some extent, in that light. It also helps explain his irritation with Paul two years later. Cabral aimed
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to facilitate change through negotiation rather than through confrontation, in the way of previous bishops.  

During the 1960s and 1970s Anglican Church leaders publicly protested against injustice and racism in Africa. One of those leaders visited Messumba: Joost de Blank, archbishop of Cape Town, 1957-63. To him, the differences between Mozambique and South Africa could not mask an underlying similarity: both states were racist. In June 1965 Trevor Huddleston, famed for his work in Johannesburg, was bishop of Masasi in southern Tanzania. From there, and in response to the refugee crisis in Mozambique, he condemned ‘colonialism of the Portuguese variety’ and ‘Britain’s apparent contempt for African concern’. Committed at that time to the continuity of Messumba’s work and to its people, John Paul engaged in separate negotiations on its behalf with Frelimo and with the authorities during 1965-67. He refrained from public criticism of Portugal, confining his comments to correspondence. His approach differed from that of fellow High Church Anglicans de Blank and Huddleston, as theirs differed from that of Cabral. In his memoir Paul wrote: ‘I sometimes think that I should have spoken out more forcefully than I did about the gross injustices in Mozambique. But I am certain that if I had done so, I would have been expelled... I decided that my role was to consolidate our position and continue our historic role as the guardians of the Nyasa people against all who would seek to oppress them’.  

---
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Paul’s assertion of his role as ‘guardian’ overlooked the extent to which (as Romão Saúte has noted in relation to Maciene) the church in Mozambique relied for the most part not on missionaries but on African priests and many catechists and other lay activists, often unnamed in missionary accounts. For Paul, Messumba was his vocation. He was committed, as Pickard had been before him, to ‘substituting many Portuguese ways for English ones’. (Paul’s own departure from Messumba in 1969, however, would leave the mission in some difficulty; the only experienced African priest available to take over ecclesiastical duties was the elderly Canon Swithin Juma.) Until June 1975 Messumba, being part of Mozambique, was in any case ‘Portuguese’. By dint of the UMCA presence, which had begun in 1918, it was Anglican and also in a sense ‘English’, being for so long part of the diocese of Nyasaland, which had originated during a period of Anglo-Portuguese imperial rivalry. As bishop, Pickard no longer exerted influence on life and work at Messumba. After the outbreak of hostilities in 1964 he was unable to provide effective diocesan leadership. Paul provided leadership at Messumba, in his own way (he was made archdeacon in 1965). For him, Cabral’s arrival in 1967 was problematic: the new bishop’s Portuguese background and sympathies threatened to upset the delicate neutrality worked out between Paul, Frelimo and the local Chefe do Posto, Soares de Cruz. Cabral could have had no understanding of that arrangement. Paul did not altogether trust Cabral; thence his antipathy towards him.

For Anglicans in Mozambique, the liberation struggle was not, ultimately, a completely destructive force; but it was certainly a complicating one in terms of mission,
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church and diocese. It precipitated a crisis for Pickard as bishop, the ultimate outcome of which was Cabral’s unexpected and remarkable elevation to the episcopacy. There should have been no doubt about a priest’s loyalty to his bishop. But Paul’s feelings about and attitude towards Cabral were, to say the least, ambivalent not because Cabral was bishop but because he was Portuguese. Paul had imbibed from his father (who had visited Mozambique before Paul’s time there), from lengthy stays in Lisbon for language instruction, from Pickard and from life at Messumba strong distaste for things (and certain people) Portuguese. That distaste influenced his view of Cabral and the tone of his memoir. Braund thought the book displayed the English tendency ‘to think that no good thing can come from outside these islands. It is strange how we seem to despise the Portuguese’.95 Others took a different, if still critical view. Reviewing the book, Basil Davidson praised it as moving and illuminating and commended its author’s honesty and courage. He noted that its condemnation of Portugal came a little late.96 The most timely, most outspoken and undoubtedly most effective Christian criticism of Portugal in Mozambique in the early 1970s came from the White Fathers, the Burgos Fathers and Adrian Hastings. It did not come at that time from Cabral, or from John Paul. They sought to bear witness differently, each in his own not entirely dissimilar way.

**Conclusion**

In 2009 Mozambicans marked the fortieth anniversary of Eduardo Mondlane’s assassination. By then 80 years old, Paul had kept in touch with people and events in Africa, personally and also through agencies such as the Mozambique and Angola Anglican

---


Association, a late twentieth century successor to the Lebombo Home Organisation. An ecumenical news agency interviewed him, a few months before his death. He reflected on the difficulties experienced by churches in Mozambique before and after independence. He also reflected, obliquely, on his own situation, saying that ‘If I had been a young African in the 1960s, I would have joined Frelimo and supported it throughout the struggle for freedom’.  

Being a missionary offered no such certainty, it seemed. Instead, as Paul recounted in his memoir, his situation was one of dilemma. Overt criticism of the authorities, he reasoned, was not compatible with the mediatory role central to his vocation as priest. Faced with that very dilemma, the White Fathers had chosen to withdraw. They had acted not only rightly but influentially. Had Anglican missionaries done the same, Paul believed, the impact would have been nugatory, even counter-productive, for mission and church; it would have confirmed Portuguese suspicion that non-Roman Catholic equalled anti-Portuguese.

Such dilemmas were not unique either to Anglicans or to Mozambique. In British colonial Africa some missionaries spoke out against injustice. Church of Scotland missionaries criticised colonialism and supported African national movements. In Malawi their activism did them little good; after independence in 1964 they were ‘foreigners’ and objects of the new state’s suspicion.  

Cabral’s career after Lebombo offered a variation on that theme of mistrust; perceived in post-revolution Portugal as ‘too right-wing’ because of
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his association with Caetano, he failed to find a post in the Lusitanian Church. (With Coggan’s help he became assistant bishop of Gibraltar.) The situation in Malawi was replicated on a broader, deeper and more complicated scale in Mozambique in 1975 following Frelimo’s accession to power. The new government’s anti-church (and anti-religion) threat was real enough; yet it helped stimulate interdenominational, ecumenical dialogue and action and also, much later, new forms of church-state negotiation and peace-brokering. Sengulane, with other church leaders, played an important role. In 2009 Paul described the transformation in church-state relations during Sengulane’s episcopacy as ‘wonderful’. The length of Sengulane’s tenure as bishop – almost 38 years – was unprecedented in the history of Lebombo. It bespoke continuity in Anglican affairs during a period of turmoil in Mozambique. Paradoxically and of course unintentionally, that longevity and continuity may obscure our view of Anglican mission, church and diocese during the decade and a half preceding independence. In *Mozambique: Memoirs of a Revolution*, John Paul provided us with a partial view of much of that period. Forty years after its publication it still raises questions that should stimulate us to consider anew not only the history of Anglicanism in Mozambique but also the role in that history of, among others, an English-born missionary and a Portuguese-born bishop.
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