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Abstract

This paper examines the role the Universities’ Mission to Central Africa (UMCA) played in the move towards independence in Tanganyika. It sees a paradox at the heart of the Society’s work and mission in its apparent affirmation of African experience but its seeming failure to promote African leadership. However, the lack of ecclesiastical preferment, due in part to circumstances beyond the control of the Society, could not quench its support for the value of African experience. Indeed, Christians formed in the UMCA tradition would go on to take key roles in government before and after independence, and eventually help to build a national church, the Church of the Province of Tanganyika (now the Anglican Church of Tanzania), which would embrace the African philosophy of Ujamaa (Unity) over narrow Anglo-Catholicism.
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2015 saw the fiftieth anniversary of the union of the Universities’ Mission to Central Africa (UMCA) with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG) on 1 January 1965 (O’Connor 2000:160). It has sometimes been suggested, tongue in cheek, that UMCA is the U in USPG (The United Society for the Propagation of the Gospel). As the society was considering such changes in its own life and constitution, UMCA missionaries in what was then Tanganyika were facing a very different political situation: the move for autonomy and independence had grown strong in the region. In Tanganyika, the Tanganyika African Association (TAA) had become the Tanganyika African Union (TANU). Independence would come to Tanganyika in 1961, making it the first independent national state in the region. After the 1964 revolution in Zanzibar, the United Republic of Tanzania would be formed by the consolidation of Tanganyika and Zanzibar.

This paper seeks to assess the contribution made by UMCA in the movement to independence and beyond. This has merited a brief mention in John Stuart’s wider analysis of missionary responses to nationalist movements (2003:186), but even that focuses on what was taking place in Nyasaland, with no mention of Tanganyika. This omission deserves attention. There is more in Porter (2003), in a sustained reflection on the mission, who starts with a critique of the broad view adopted by Sachs that Anglican structures and schools assisted the process of change from colonial to independent government (Sachs 1993:319–20). Porter suggests that UMCA, in coming to terms with the changes from a colonial to post-colonial society, had to overcome an “angularity of Anglo-Catholic traditions” (2003:83). Such a description stems, in part, from the perception of UMCA as an Anglo-Catholic society, which is true in many respects, but is not entirely accurate. Certainly, in its earliest manifestations, the society seems to have embraced a variety of ecclesial traditions (Ransford 1978:179–80), even if its later ethos was more conspicuously Anglo-Catholic. Any response to Porter lies within the UMCA’s own “DNA” and needs to address not only ecclesiology, but its views of culture and society. These, it will be seen, threw up conflicting attitudes which demanded resolution. That resolution would be revealed, at least in Tanganyika, in the processes which led to independence.

While exploration of the Society’s history and practice reveals that it embraced a variety of opinions and responses to the demand for independence
and that there was never a univocal policy, it is possible to see threads which run through the history of UMCA in Tanganyika: ecclesial and social concerns appeared to clash, and, as will be seen, there was a palpable wrestling with their conflicting claims. Some of these elements, it will be suggested, pre-date UMCA itself, and may originate with David Livingstone, who inspired its foundation, and remained an important symbol for the society.

The Origins of the UMCA

Popular mythology has long linked David Livingstone to the foundation of the UMCA. His speech on the 4 December 1857 in the Cambridge Senate House described Batoka and the Zambezi in glowing terms, outlined the need for trade and mission work, and finished with a stunning and famous peroration:

I beg to direct your attention to Africa; I know that in a few years I shall be cut off in that country, which is now open; do not let it be shut again! I go back to Africa to try to make an open path for commerce and Christianity; do you carry out the work which I have begun. I leave it with you (Ransford 1978:128; Ross 2002:121).

In reality, this was but one of several incidents which inspired the foundation of the new mission society, Bishop Selwyn's lectures had also been significant (Tengatenga 2010:31–32).

The assessment of Livingstone is complex: often the man has to be separated from the myth (MacKenzie 2013:277). Recent analyses have covered a gamut of views. For some he is the embodiment of colonialism (Jeal 2013:189; Mackenzie 2013:280; Northcott 1973:74), for others a corrective (Nkomazana 1998; Ross 2002). Certainly, even if he is finally judged to be a colonizer, he was deeply unhappy with aspects of colonial practice. His own writing bears evidence to this: “From Commissioners who can play the fool for £600 per annum, with the Bible in one hand and the sjambok in the other, Good Lord deliver us” (NLS, MS 10778, Livingstone to Thompson, 6 September 1852, cited in Ross 2002:69).”

In some ways, this views are closer to post-independence Kenya, where Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o could write of colonialism in Devil on the Cross that: “The white man came to this country with the Bible in his left hand and a gun in his right. He stole the people’s cattle and goats under the cover of fines and taxes. He robbed people of the labour of their hands.” (1987:102). The two quotations are similar in content, but need not mean that the two writers would have
agreed completely. A further quote from Ngũgĩ makes this clear by associating a missionary with the colonial enterprise, an enterprise characterized by Livingstone’s 3 Cs: “He carried the Bible; the soldier carried the gun; the administrator and the settler carried the coin. Christianity, Commerce, Civilization: the Bible, the Coin, the Gun: Holy Trinity.” (1993:88). Notwithstanding, there remains a shared critique of colonial practice.

Another statement implies that Livingstone saw colonialism as a temporary measure:

We are not advocates for war but we would prefer perpetual war to perpetual slavery. No nation ever secured its liberty without fighting for it. And every nation on earth worthy of freedom is ready to shed its blood in its defence. In sympathising with the Caffres we side with the weak against the strong. Savages they are but surely deserving of independence seeing they have fought gallantly for it for upwards of twenty months. (National Archives of Zimbabwe, L1/1/1, cited in Ross 2002:75)

Ross notes that this is a passage which was refused publication in the British Quarterly, which presumably would have had no issues with freedom from Transvaalers, but would have sat more uncomfortably as a cry for freedom from British dominion, and wryly concludes: “His ideas would have been seen as subversive in Nairobi, Johannesburg or London in 1952, let alone 1852.” (2002:75). However, there is a flipside, as Sanneh notes: “The classic representative of the modern missionary was busy with a stalwart defence of the virtues of primitive tribes while, according to a school of history, he justified colonial rule on the grounds of native inadequacy.” (2009:146). Nevertheless, it does not seem excessive to claim that the legend of Livingstone might have left behind a model which combined a love for Africa and its peoples whilst it stymied their political independence with a paternalistic attitude.

Livingstone’s associations with the embryonic UMCA continued in Africa. Journeys to the Shire Highlands with the first Bishop, Charles Mackenzie, were undertaken, but the association soon unravelled (Ransford 1978:178–89; Tengatenga 2010:38–54). MacKenzie’s death in 1862 and replacement by Bishop Tozer, who would tactically move UMCA’s centre of operations first to Morumbala and then to Zanzibar, were the final nail in the coffin (Ransford 1978:216–17; Ross 2002:182–84; Tengatenga 2010:54–59).

Even if the association between Livingstone and the UMCA was effectively severed, he most likely remained a strong symbol in UMCA’s identity, not least because of the mythology which had grown up around him and persisted well into the twentieth century (Pettitt 2007). Later UMCA missionaries
might even claim to be executors of his hopes. A recorded sermon of Weston’s shows this:

And has not God’s power descended upon us? Has He not been with us? Where is the Africa of Livingstone’s time? In spite of all failure and disappointment and defeat, the power of God has driven Satan from many a stronghold. To-day, in many places where once he ruled, African clergy are ministering to African congregations, African priests are celebrating the Holy Sacraments. In Zanzibar, a Cathedral covers the slave market on the mainland, churches and schools mark the track of the slave-raiders. Brethren, this is the Lord’s doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes. (Weston 1905 in Smith 1926:57)

The stress on sacerdotalism is alien to Livingstone, perhaps, but Weston exploits to the maximum the symbolic role of UMCA as those who made Livingstone’s dream a reality. This somewhat rhetorical summary, however, fails to admit a problem within UMCA practice: that of preferment. If there were African priests ministering the sacraments, the same could not be said of African bishops – and it would not be said for another sixty or so years.

The Problem of Preferment

UMCA’s record on promoting indigenous leadership is a mixed bag. On the one hand, significant efforts were made from an early stage to ordain local men for the diaconate and the priesthood. Bishop Tozer had set in place both training schools for men and women on Zanzibar by 1865: St Andrew’s, Kiungani (Zanzibar) was given “college” status in 1866 (Moriyama 2000:331). Bishop Steere continued this work: Kiswahili became the principal language of instruction, with advanced English studies for the best students alone (Moriyama 2000:332). Kiswahili translations of Scripture and liturgy were completed by 1 May 1879 (Moriyama 2000:332). When Kiswahili emerged as an unfamiliar language in mainland contexts, training in the vernacular was undertaken as society policy (Moriyama 2000:335). Locals like Cecil Majaliwa and Peter Limo were also sent to England for further training (Moriyama 2000:335–38). Reports from expatriate missionaries show that there were great hopes and expectations for generating local leadership: “An African Church must be founded, spread and worked by Africans themselves. The business of its European members is to do their best to start them on this career, help as they may, and then pass out of sight” (quoted in Moriyama 2000:338) and:
“I hope in four or five years’ time we may see four or five native priests from the district. Then it will be the time to talk about making Cecil [Majaliwa] a Bishop for which I think in many ways he would be admirable (Smythies 1893, cited in Moriyama 2000:338). Here can be seen hopes and expectations which anticipated an African church with African leaders, not a colonial church.

These hopes did not come to pass: Majaliwa never received preferment. Within the UMCA dioceses, there would be no African bishops until after Tanganyika was independent, both politically and ecclesiastically. As Moriyama notes (2000:341), and we both recognise with great personal gratitude and respect, it was Cecil Majaliwa’s grandson, John Acland Ramadhani who would become bishop of Zanzibar (1979) and then Archbishop of the then Church of the Province of Tanzania (1990).

Why was the promotion of African priests such a thorny problem? A number of factors seem to lie behind this. Porter suggests that the ecclesiology of UMCA with its high view of the episcopate was crucial (2010:89–93). But it cannot be the only one. After all, there is nothing in in a high view of the episcopate which necessarily demands such outcomes. It is worth noting Lesslie Newbigin’s description of Roland Allen as both “nurtured in the Catholic understanding of churchmanship” and “a High Churchman” (Allen 1999:ii): yet there is little resistance to the contextualisation of leadership to be found within his Missionary Methods: St Paul’s or Ours?. We might also note in passing that Allen’s proposals also met with resistance from within mission agencies: it would not be until much later that his work became influential (O’Connor 2000:101–02). Nor did the UMCA’s own experience in the late nineteenth century necessarily demand a rejection of indigenous leadership (thus Madan and Smythies).

What might the other factors be? Firstly, language would be an issue for the episcopal role, given that it demanded considerable interaction with the Church of England. Language is not neutral, and the choice of language has consequences. One of these is linguistic “hegemony” (Neke 2003): issues of language and power, specifically of the relative “power” of English and Kiswahili. The problem of power in relation to language is not just theoretical: it would have, and still has to this day, very real consequences, not least in debates about the respective merits and disadvantages prompted by English and Kiswahili in contemporary Tanzanian education.

The privileging of Kiswahili and other vernacular languages meant a concomitant reduced role for English in the formation of local personnel: as Neke states, “Language is a means that facilitates or hampers people’s participation in politics” (2003:21) – to which we might add, “and the Anglican church"
We might paraphrase this for the situation we are describing: the choice of Kiswahili and the vernacular both hampered and facilitated the development of a Tanganyikan church. The restriction of English formation to the best alone necessarily reduced the numbers who would be able to function at the “international” level, and would have restricted the pool of potential leaders. So, the privileging of Kiswahili, for all sorts of positive reasons, might well have had a counter-productive influence on the promotion of indigenous clergy into leadership positions, notably the episcopate. A second factor again is related to numbers: much was invested in a very few. So, when a key candidate like Majaliwa withdrew from full time ministry eleven years after his ordination as a deacon, the potential for indigenous advancement was again restricted.

Personalities also intrude. After a negative experience, Bishop Hine of Zanzibar resolved in 1903 to ordain no native priests for ten years (Moriyama 2000:340). He seems, however, to still have had confidence in African clergy especially after Daudi Machina’s management of affairs in Ruvuma during the evacuation of expatriate personnel that followed the Maji-Maji uprising of 1905 (Moriyama 2000:340). Frank Weston, to whom we shall return below, was also chary of what he perceived to be a lack of adequate discipline for priests, as well as a shortage of vocations: this led him to pursue increased recruitment of expatriate personnel (Porter 2003:92–93).

A third factor which needs to be considered is the method by which UMCA bishops were appointed. All such appointments followed the practice of the Church of England in the period. This historically dated back to the time of the Reformation, but the role of the monarchy had decreased, and advice from the prime minister was paramount for appointments within England (Archbishops’ 1990:222; Simon 1961:63). Appointments to colonial bishoprics, prior to 1866, were often made by Letters Patent, but these were not used after 1866 in provinces with independent legislatures (Archbishops’ 1990:210). In a process similar to that used in England, episcopal appointments were made on the recommendation of the Colonial Office and the trustees of the Colonial Bishoprics Fund (Smith 2012:310). It must be noted that the UMCA dioceses do not appear in the list of Colonial bishoprics (Carey 2013:110–11). As provinces became independent, appointment processes emerged in which bishops were appointed independently, but with the affirmation of being in communion with Canterbury. However, in the UMCA provinces which remained under the jurisdiction of the Church of England, appointments continued to be made from England. This pattern emerges repeatedly in the history of UMCA, but details are sketchy in the official histories. With the exception of

How effectively this process might function obviously also depended on those involved in the appointments process in England. The prevailing ethos at the Colonial Office could also have been a factor: attitudes to particular territories might well have influenced decisions about appointments, just like other policies. Consider the following overview of British colonial policies which reveal differences in the handling of affairs in the different East African territories before the Second World War:

In Uganda we seem to be committed to work towards black supremacy: in Kenya we have declared that native interests are paramount and scared the whites into consolidating a position which is strong politically but precariously supported by a weak economic structure: in Tanganyika the whites are so few and the TTP1A-F blacks so backward it is difficult to see how relations between the races will develop; but the mandate seems to commit us to an ultimate future of black self-government. (cited in Pearce 2005:61)

It is not difficult to see how such attitudes might have an impact on the business of selecting bishops in an established church like the Church of England. Indeed, it may persist right up to the present day, long after the sun has set on the British empire: Church of England appointments today are still criticized as “male, pale and stale” (Bingham 2015), never mind the imperial and colonial contexts of the twentieth century.

More idiosyncratic factors, such as the interest of the Archbishop, might also intrude. As Edward Carpenter notes in his summation of Archbishop Frederick Temple:

His energy up to the end of his days was remarkable, but certain aspects of the passing of the years manifested themselves too clearly, particularly in his relations with the Colonial Churches. It had long been the custom for overseas bishops and missionaries to seek the Archbishop’s advice. He in turn would consult the various societies and individual bishops before replying with his opinion. This, however, seems to have ceased when Archbishop Temple took over … (1988:404).
Whilst, no doubt, UMCA was able to inform decisions being made, these would ultimately have come under the purview of the English bishops, not the society in isolation, especially given its high regard for the episcopacy.

The nub of the matter is this: it is unlikely that UMCA had a completely free hand in the appointment of bishops, and that appointments were subject to factors beyond the society. It is unlikely that strong advocates for the appointment of indigenous bishops might have held sway in the appointments process of the Church of England. This was a process, simply beyond UMCA’s control, even if they participated in it. This appears to be confirmed by events in other provinces, churches and communions which were not primarily associated with UMCA.

There was not much of a lapse in time between the appointments of Anglican African bishops across East Africa. Aberi Balya was the first Ugandan to be consecrated as an assistant bishop in 1947; Erica Sabiti the first bishop (of Toro-Bunya-Mboga, later Rwenzori) in 1960 (Byaruhanga 2008:69, 174). The first indigenous Kenyan assistant bishops in the Diocese of Mombasa (Festo Olang’ and Obadiah Kariuki) were appointed in 1955: Kariuki became bishop of Fort Hall in 1961 (Keyas 2005a) and Olang’ bishop of Maseno (Keyas 2005b).

Delays in appointing indigenous hierarchies appear to have transcended churchmanship, not to be restricted to just Anglicanism. Within the Lutheran tradition, Stefano Mosi became the first Church president (1958) then Bishop (1960) in Northern Tanganyika, and Josiah Kibira the first bishop in the Lutheran North Western region in 1964 (Ludwig 1999:43). The Roman Catholic Church was marginally ahead, with the appointment of Lauren Rugambwa as Bishop of Lower Kagera (1952), then Rutabo (1953), and election as a cardinal (1960). Joseph Kilasara (in Moshi) and Jacob Komba (in Songea) were also diocesans in the Roman Catholic church by the early 1960s (Ludwig 1999:44).

However, at lower levels, UMCA was more complicit in the failure to promote. It would seem that such reticence was occasioned sometimes by disappointment. This has been seen already in the case of Hine (above), but it also appears in the writings of Bishop Frank Weston (Porter 2003:92–93). Later on, issues of churchmanship may well have intruded, in the fear of the Anglo-Catholic vision of the church being swamped by Church Missionary Society (CMS) ecclesiology in the creation of the new Church of the Province of East Africa (Porter 2003:101).

Here we see evidence for the kind of paternalism similar to Livingstone’s: the paralysis which followed from not thinking indigenous personnel had developed to a stage to exercise authority, and the concomitant need for expatriates. Yet, a high view of African culture was also present, suggesting that perhaps UMCA shared the paradox which Sanneh has identified within Livingstone’s
missiology. Even if appointments to archdeaconries and the episcopacy did not take place, other events indicate that leadership, to the extent of shaping policy, was based on trust of local knowledge and experience. This high view of African experience appears in two significant UMCA bishops who served in Tanganyika: Frank Weston and Vincent Lucas, and marks a departure from much Anglican practice across East Africa (Heaney 2015:31–61).

**Affirming African Experience: The Theology of Bishop Frank Weston**

Bishop Frank Weston (1871–1924) may appear an unlikely inclusion in this list. He became bishop of Zanzibar in 1907 – a post he held until his death in 1925. He is often considered a champion of Anglo-Catholicism; a conservative notorious for his attempt to excommunicate Bishop Hensley Henson of Hereford for heresy in 1915 after he had made B.H. Streeter (an advocate of histori cal criticism in the German style) a canon of his cathedral (Brown 2011:145). Here, again, the lenses through which history is assessed may come into play: this may make him appear an arch conservative or recidivist, held back, on occasion, by personal flaws (Porter 2003:93; Smith 1926:168; White 1992). Even Brown’s summation that “while radical in politics, he was intensely conservative in theology” (2011:145) may introduce a false dichotomy between his politics and his theology.

Weston’s conservatism was to the fore in matters of his ecclesiology, notably in his resistance to the ecumenical aspirations for East Africa: he was a staunch opponent of such moves in what is termed the Kikuyu controversy (1913–1914).1 Here, too, he attempted the excommunication of bishops whose theology he rejected (Gathogo 2010:9). Weston’s rejection of such plans echoed contemporary Anglo-Catholic concerns about the “coherence of the

---

1 The Kikuyu Controversy of 1913–14 centred on efforts to rationalize relations between Protestant churches and reduce competition between the different missions. Resolution of these issues raised the issue of “interdenominational celebration” (Mombo 2006:277). Weston, as a staunch advocate of the validity of episcopal orders, considered that any compromise which might recognise celebrations by ministers of non-episcopal churches would be at the expense of episcopal orthodoxy. Whilst he is sometimes identified as an ecumenist (Yates 1999:725), Weston’s ecumenical concerns primarily addressed the re-unification of churches which had maintained episcopal orders, notably the Roman Catholic Church. For more on the Kikuyu Controversy, see Gathogo 2010, Heaney 2015:46–47, and White 1992.
Church of England” (Porter 2003:87). But there was more to Weston than a conservative ecclesiology. To categorise him simply as a conservative further does an injustice to his theology: Donald Mackinnon, another unsung theologian (McDowell 2011:vii), described Weston’s *The One Christ*, written during his time at St Andrews, Kiungani (Zanzibar) as a “truly great book” which explored kenotic Christology “delicately and subtly” (MacKinnon 1968:112).

Part of the problem appears to be a readiness to identify Anglo-Catholicism wholesale with conservatism. Yet Anglo-Catholicism of the late nineteenth century was not necessarily a reactionary or conservative movement. Its social dimensions were significant. Within the United Kingdom (UK), Anglo-Catholic parishes were founded in the industrial cities and deprived areas which were neglected by traditional parish demarcations and church hierarchies. The Anglo-Catholic clergy of late nineteenth century were determined to make a qualitative difference to the society of their times. This may even have manifested itself in a rejection of, and even flight from, the industrialisation of British society: some UMCA missionaries apparently hoped to reduce a process of urbanization and the continuation of rural patterns of life (Porter 2003:96–97). However, for Weston at least, this was not a simple escapism, or some vain attempt to retain a pastoral idyll. A long quotation from *Our Present Duty* delivered to the Anglo-Catholic conference of 1923, stripped of much of its original power by being presented as a bowdlerised slogan on church doors, reveals this:

But I say to you, and I say it to you with all the earnestness that I have, that if you are prepared to fight for the right of adoring Jesus in his Blessed Sacrament, then you have got to come out from before your Tabernacle and walk, with Christ mystically present in you, out into the streets of this country, and find the same Jesus in the people of your cities and your villages. You cannot claim to worship Jesus in the Tabernacle, if you do not pity Jesus in the slum.

Now mark that — this is the Gospel truth. If you are prepared to say that the Anglo-Catholic is at perfect liberty to rake in all the money he can get no matter what the wages are that are paid, no matter what the conditions are under which people work; if you say that the Anglo-Catholic has a right to hold his peace while his fellow citizens are living in hovels below the levels of the streets, this I say to you, that you do not yet know the Lord Jesus in his Sacrament. . . . If you listen. I am not talking economics, I do not understand them. I am not talking politics, I do not understand them. I am talking the Gospel . . . And it is folly — it is madness — to suppose that you can worship Jesus in the Sacraments and Jesus on the
Throne of glory, when you are sweating him in the souls and bodies of his children. It cannot be done. (1923:30)

Any notion of escape to a pre-industrial or pastoral idyll is absent – what is recognised is a need for justice in the midst of modern society. Nor is this an isolated sentiment, but part of a longer line of thinking, unlikely, given Weston’s experience, to be concerned solely with social conditions in Britain. That such thinking is shaped by an African context is apparent from his earlier writing. It first emerges in his critique of German colonial practice, which bore the less than subtle title, *The Black Slaves of Prussia* (1918). The sentiments found in that volume were not simply a result of wartime circumstances (Porter 2003:88; Schnee 2013[1926]). Weston, showing himself an “equal opportunities” critic of colonial practice, followed it with *The Serfs of Great Britain* (1920a) in which he blasted British policy: “We regard forced labour as in itself immoral: and we hold that forcing Africans to work in the interests of European civilisation is a betrayal of the weaker to the financial interests of the stronger race” (Weston 1920, cited in Porter 2003:88). If not a critique of the “what” of colonialism, it certainly marked a broadside, with both barrels, directed against the “how” that was not simply a mark of wartime politics. Such an attack surely suggests that the labelling of Weston as radical in this respect is not without substance. Weston’s contribution was part of an impressive lobby which was able to bring reform in the face of powerful opposition (Tengatenga 2010:227).

Elsewhere, Weston’s other writing shows that his supposed conservatism involved a rejection of liberal theology, but, again, this was not simply antiquarianism. Significantly, his critique of liberal theology demanded a rejection of its foundational principles, which he seems to have recognised as built on a post-Enlightenment agenda. Consider the reasons for his rejection of liberal theology in the two following quotes:

We appear to forget that our essential relation with eternal love is through the Response of Love incarnate, Jesus, the coloured man of Nazareth. Moreover we ignore our relation with the poor Man of Galilee, the naked

---

2 Schnee’s strident response to criticism of German colonial practice accuses Weston of undertaking an exercise in propaganda, despite citing his equally strong objections to British colonial practice. Schnee’s final analysis dismisses Weston for “the irresponsible personal and private view as opposed to the responsible official, the purely humanitarian and democratic view as opposed to the administrative and economic. The difference is explained by the fact that the humanitarian is free to advocate ideal theories, while the administrator has to pay regard to the actual facts and conditions of practical life as he finds them” (2013[1926]:135).
Christ of Calvary. And we allow ourselves to be, almost entirely, dominated by standards of wealth and caste the world about us approves. . . . Eternal love, when He takes flesh, comes as a poor, coloured Man, whereas we dislike poverty and despise colour! How then can we preach love incarnate? (Weston 1920b:157)

This makes the supposed conservative the radical. Such criticism of liberal theology points out its weaknesses in addressing racism, most clearly manifested in the anti-Semitism so prevalent in the Europe of the period (Lazier 2008:45), and political injustice: a criticism found in the second edition of Barth's Epistle to the Romans (Busch 2014:n.p.).

A second quote reveals further his rejection of any liberal agenda which demanded that Christian theology necessarily be predicated on the philosophical presuppositions of the Enlightenment:

You will bear me out that Gethsemane and Calvary are most real in Africa; that Christ is brutally crucified here, crucified in the persons of Africans, by his professing followers . . . God in manhood, God on the Cross, God of the empty tomb.

Now into the glory of our Calvary breaks the voice of prelatical and priestly liberalism. And its message, what is it?

It is that Africans cannot possibly understand the Gospels, Church or sacraments until they re-interpret them in the light of modern European thought! Poor Africans: not yet among the wise of European thought. (Weston 1919:68–69)

Weston objects to liberalism’s inability and unwillingness to engage with, or recognise, the difference and value of African experience: he rejects any demand that African Christians need to be versed in the worldviews of Europe. Again, his writing indicates an approach far more radical than the liberal theology of the period, which is built on these very foundations. Weston’s remarks here are deeply critical of Western scholarship of the time, and its implicit “progressive” pattern of history, exemplified by comparative religious studies like Frazer’s Golden Bough, in which science trumped religion or magic (Frazer 2003 *passim*; Tambiah 1990:42–64). Weston, the supposed conservative, is closer to Frazer’s critic, Ludwig Wittgenstein (1993), in rejecting the uncritical prioritizing of Western science and metaphysics. Both, no doubt for very different reasons, were prepared to argue that the experience and practice of non-Europeans could not simply be dismissed from a supposedly superior analytical viewpoint. Such a radical way of approaching
religion and theology should counter simplistic attempts to label Weston a "conservative".

**Affirming African Experience: Vincent Lucas and *Jando***

Vincent Lucas served in Tanganyika from 1909, and was bishop of Masasi from 1926 until 1944. His development of a Christianised form of *jando* was intended to provide a version of the initiation rites of the Makua and Yao people which would satisfy the cultural expectations in a manner acceptable to the mission. *Jando* had become significant within Islamic communities, and had contributed to the spread of Islam (Stoner-Eby 2008:176). His thinking was motivated by the recognition that such rites of passage gave a sense of identity which needed to be provided in an acceptable Christian form; its absence left Christians isolated from a wider community. The Christianizing of the male rites was often considered more successful than that of the female (O’Connor 2000:112–13; Ranger 1972:239, 247; contra Stoner-Eby 2008:189). It was long assumed that Lucas was the chief architect of such initiatives, not least because of the publication of his *Christianity and Native Rites* (1950) and his reputation as a key exponent of “adaptation” (Stoner-Eby 2008:172–73). Terence Ranger’s re-evaluation of Lucas’ work served to stress the important role which was taken by African Christians in the development of *jando* (1972).

However, it is important to note that this contribution needs a stronger emphasis, not least because the process of making a Christianized form of *jando* was underway by 1907, well before Lucas would even arrive in Masasi (Stoner-Eby 2008:183). African clergy, recently increased in numbers because of the reputation that they had gained in the Maji-Maji uprisings,³ successfully argued for the modification of, rather than the abolition of, traditional rituals (Stoner-Eby 2008:177–78). The process was founded on Weston’s open-ness, when at St Andrew’s College, Kiungani, to learn from his African clergy and students. Kolumba Msigala recorded Weston’s practice:

> Every month he found opportunity to ask about the homes of these students, their customs and the state of the Christians where they lived, the best way to bring them up, and the state of advance of the Church at that time. There was indeed a period every month for students of each

---

³ The Maji-Maji uprisings of 1905–07 were a mass resistance to German colonialism by twenty different tribal groups across 100,000 square miles of southern Tanganyika (Gwassa 1972:202. For a comprehensive study, see Giblin and Monson, 2010).
tribe and in this way he got at the heart of Africans, by being taught by his charges, the students who explained to him the act of shepherding the inhabitants of their different parts. (Msigala (n.d.): 27, cited in Stoner-Eby 2008:179)

Later, indigenous clergy exercised significant roles in the implementation of the protocols agreed in 1907, with a key role taken by deacon Namalowe: Lucas was only involved in the final decisions (Stoner-Eby 2008:181–83).

Nevertheless, Lucas, as bishop of Masasi, continued to permit the rituals to be practised. In so doing, significant authority was delegated to priests who therefore not only gained stature in their own communities (Stoner-Eby 2008:174), but also kept the value of African experience at the heart of UMCA’s mission activity in Tanganyika.

UMCA in Colonial Tanganyika: Tentative Conclusions

The affirmation of the value of African experience by UMCA personnel but its apparent paralysis in promoting African clergy into positions of authority shows a tension between theory and practice. It may have its roots in ecclesiology. It may be, in part, due to decisions being made in London, rather than locally based. To these potential causes, a third may be added: the tension between affirming African experience and offering preferment to Africans. Both Weston and Lucas reveal a mission praxis in which respect for African experience, and recognition of its significance in developing vibrant local Christian expressions, did not lead naturally into shifts in ecclesial power and authority. They did, however, have other consequences.

The Move Towards Uhuru (Independence)

The increasing speed of the move to independence would see changes advocated by some within the society. Andrew Porter’s assessment of UMCA’s attitudes to the coming independence provides a bleak picture. As he notes, the reticence of the society was remarked upon by one of its sympathisers: “Bluntly it [UMCA] is falling behind its environment… In practical terms, U.M.C.A. is still working on the assumption that Africans are unable to take over their own affairs for a long time yet, and still need a very permanent hand on top (e.g., Bishop)…” (UMCA Papers SF 15/XV, cited in Porter 2003:102). This gives a picture of UMCA as going against the flow, or simply failing to keep up.
In the Tanganyikan context, the picture needs more focus. It is possible to record more progressive elements at work in terms of the mission’s place within Tanganyika, just as it is possible to note more negative events, such as the breakdown in relationship between Bishop Mark Way of Masasi and his African clergy (Ludwig 1999:45–46).

Simple economics and status may have lain behind the preference for indigenous Christians to opt for teaching and politics rather than the priesthood. Thus, Bishop Trevor Huddleston’s remarks from 1963 would have been apposite also in the years leading up to independence: “The younger generation has the world at its feet – any member of it might become a cabinet minister – and it is not going to be attracted to a priesthood which seems to them to be identified with a low academic level and an indifferent academic training and, of course, a very low salary.” (cited in O’Connor 2000:130).

In the run-up to independence, some UMCA personnel felt they were involved in a movement which was right and proper. Others did not, and would leave at independence. However, as the groundswell for independence rose in the late 1950s with the increased prominence of TANU, Bishop Leslie Stradling of South West Tanganyika (DSWT) was obliged to defend his diocese’s support of the pro-independence movement to the society in the UK:

> There is always an element in the church which says that “religion is religion and politics is politics” and that the two have nothing to do with each other. No doubt it is this which has led some of the young men at Makerere [University] to abandon religion altogether in favour of politics, as being more relevant to the world in which they live. It is a matter for thanksgiving that we were able to be unanimous…in our belief that our Christ is Lord of all life. Secondly, some of the older clergy and others have lived all their lives under European rule, both in church and in state…The day of paternalism is over…(1961:10, cited in Mndolwa 2012:93).

He was not alone. The (then) Fr Neil Russell did not win universal support for his remarks that:

> There would seem to be three possible approaches for the Europeans to this nationalism: to ignore it which is unrealistic, rude and asking for trouble; to stamp it out which might appear successful for a time, so responsible to the territory; and to transform it from an exclusive movement to an inclusive one giving fair opportunity to all races to bring their skills and insights to the service of the common good and the glory of God,
while acknowledging, the overwhelming preponderances of Africans. (Russell n.d.; cited in Mndolwa 2012:90).

It would also be a major error to assume that UMCA’s contribution to African advancement was measured solely by evidence of clerical preferment. In the run-up to independence, families from within the UMCA dioceses saw their children going overseas for education and taking up significant positions within the colonial administration: Dunstan Omari as the first African District Officer in Tanganyika, and Yustino Mponda as the Liwali (resident magistrate) of Chitangari (Blood 1962:356). The educational opportunities offered by UMCA had also prepared local Christians to be key members of TANU and the post-independence government. Well-educated Anglicans like Oscar Kambona, son of Fr Daudi Kambona of DSWT, and John Rupia became TANU’s secretary and treasurer respectively. UMCA Anglicans who worked in the colonial administration were conduits of information to TANU. Eight out of fourteen TANU-held seats in the Lower chambers were filled by Anglicans from both the CMS and UMCA traditions. In the post-independence government, Kambona became Minister of Education.

**Uhuru and Beyond**

Shortly after independence, Bishop Trevor Huddleston, the then Bishop of Masasi (consecrated in 1960 after Way’s resignation) would be able to write:

Africanisation; it is an ugly word and has been so much used lately that many are getting tired of it. But it is useful shorthand for the double process of handing over authority to the Africans and for the stripping from our faith of its purely European accidentals and making it homely for Africans... [This has been] the aim of all UMCA missionaries for the past hundred years [:] to plant and nourish a church that should be both catholic and African, not an overseas branch of the Church of England. (Huddleston 1964:10)

Previously, in times of both German and British political oversight, UMCA missionaries in Tanzania had reckoned that Tanzanian priests were ready to take authoritative roles in the church, even if these had not translated into episcopal appointments (above). The newly-independent provinces, first in the Province of East Africa (1960) and subsequently in the Church of the Province of Tanzania (CPT; 1970) would quickly appoint indigenous bishops. Within
Tanganyika, there was little difference in timing between the CMS and UMCA areas. For CMS, Yohana Omari would become assistant bishop in Central Tanganyika in 1961; Gresford Chitemo was ordained bishop of Morogoro (1965) and Musa Kahurananga for Western Tanganyika (1966). In the UMCA areas, John Sepeku and Douglas Soseleje would be appointed assistant bishops of Zanzibar (1961) and Masasi respectively (1963): Sepeku would become the first diocesan in the new Diocese of Dar es Salaam in 1965 (Ludwig 1999:44). Huddleston himself would be followed by the Tanzanian Hilary Chisonga, a former teacher and priest who became bishop of Masasi in 1968 (Wilson 1969:152). In the Diocese of Zanzibar and Tanga, Yohana Jumaa would also be consecrated Bishop in 1968. In DSWT, Bishop Stradling was followed by an expatriate, John Poole-Hughes (1962) who would be followed by Joseph Mlele in 1974. Was Poole-Hughes’ election a retrograde step in terms of African preferment? Perhaps it might be considered so but the shape of national politics, too, is significant here. As Mwakikagile notes: “Still, among all the East African countries, Africanization was slowest in Tanganyika, and deliberately so, under the leadership of Julius Nyerere. And his definition of Africanization included people of all races who were citizens of Tanganyika, therefore African, just like the rest of us with a black skin.” (2010:6). Even leadership positions in TANU were open to all, regardless of racial background – if they were citizens (Mwakikagile 2010:16). This pattern of “colour-blindness” would emerge again in the CPT, when Richard Norgate would follow Chisonga as bishop of Masasi.

This was not the only way in which the UMCA tradition would mirror the political landscape in Tanzania. Bishops of both the UMCA and CMS traditions were generally supportive of the ujumaa (African Socialism) policy of the Chama cha Mapinduzi government (Mombo 2006:280) which would be formally unveiled later in the Arusha Declaration (1967) and was developed in post-independence Tanganyika in a series of writings and political statements authored by Julius Nyerere (1962; 1967; 1997). An example from within the UMCA tradition was Bishop Huddleston’s development of the Mahiwa Agricultural Training College, designed to reflect government policies with the Ministry of Agriculture (Jennings 2008:88). He also endorsed the Ruvuma Development Association, which started as an attempt to implement ujamaa, fell foul of local TANU leaders, and was eventually banned by decree (Black 1992:145; Ludwig 1999:125–26).

Support for the national programme even over-ruled UMCA’s long-held Anglo-Catholic practice.  

Note, however, that the Zanzibar (UMCA) rite which was championed by Weston has not fallen into complete disuse.
The use of three distinct liturgies within a single province was somewhat of a scandal, and worked against the witness of the Anglican church in a country that espoused the philosophy of Julius Nyerere—ujamaa ni watu, “Community is humanity”. Diocese from both missionary traditions saw the need for one liturgy, and efforts to unite them resulted in the Common Liturgy of Tanzania. (Mombo 2006:280)

This common rite also marked the triumph of vernacular—“a liturgy for all people: unlike liturgies translated from the original English, it was developed in the local language throughout” (Mombo 2006:280).

Such developments were not restricted to liturgy. The Provincial Diploma Syllabus for Theology, used in the formation of priests from both traditions, would be developed in common between the two traditions (CPT 1986). The same pattern held for a revision which took place ten years later (CPT 1997) and served further to contextualise the diploma, reducing the significance of some topics more suited to European theological discourse. A conference held at IDM-Mzumbe in 2001 brought together all the serving clergy from both traditions to foster further unity. The provincial university, St John’s University of Tanzania, Dodoma, also has a campus at St Mark’s Center, Dar es Salaam—providing a structural link between the leading educational establishments of both CMS and UMCA traditions. The heirs of UMCA and of CMS in Tanzania thus overcame obstacles erected by the different church traditions which had previously divided the mission agencies (Porter 2003:100–101). Furthermore, USPG, the “heir” of UMCA in society terms, would, after a bilateral consultation between CPT and the Society in 1995 (O’Connor 2000:151), agree funding protocols which built a relationship with the whole province rather than only with those dioceses which were historically linked with UMCA.

Concluding Remarks

UMCA lived with a paradox: the affirmation of African experience combined with a paralysis to give preferment to African clergy. A strong affirmation of African experience and potential was perhaps thwarted, but never extinguished, by factors both within and beyond the control of the society itself. Yet those who held African experience in high regard were able to equip

5 Whilst Kiswahili was firstly a vernacular language on the coast of East Africa, it became a lingua franca during the colonial period. In Tanzania, where it was adopted both as the national and official language after independence, Kiswahili has come to function as a vernacular in many parts of the country (King 2001:361).
African Christians for leadership roles both within the church and government of independent Tanganyika, and, later, Tanzania. In so doing, the local heirs of the UMCA, in their engagement with a new political reality, were also able to overcome the insular ecclesiological dimensions of their forebears and help to shape a more ecumenical or broader Anglican church for the whole nation, one which resonated with the political moves to build national unity rather than sectarianism, regionalism or tribalism.
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摘要

本篇文章检验‘中非大学宣教’(UMCA)在推动坦噶尼克独立过程中的角色。本文发现此机构的工作与宣教核心中的矛盾，就是它一方面肯定非洲人的经验，另一方面它的失败却好像在于没能提拔非洲领袖。教会里的升迁，一部分原因是超出了机构的控制范围。但是，这也不能熄灭机构对非洲经
In Two Minds?

验价值的支持。的确，从UMCA传统里出来的基督徒，独立前后在政府部门担当重职，而且最终帮助建立了一个本地教会，即坦噶尼克省教会（现为坦桑尼亚圣公会）。它包容了Ujamaa（合一）的非洲哲学，而不是狭隘的圣公会高派教。

Resumen

Este artículo examina el papel que la Misión de las Universidades al África Central (UMCA) jugó en el movimiento hacia la independencia de Tanganica. Puntualiza la paradoja existente entre el centro del trabajo y la misión de la Sociedad en su aparente afirmación de la experiencia africana, y lo que parece ser un fracaso en la promoción de líderes africanos. Sin embargo, la falta de puestos eclesiásticos, debido en parte a circunstancias fuera de su control, no apagó su apoyo a la experiencia africana. De hecho, los cristianos formados en la tradición UMCA tendrían papeles clave en el gobierno, antes y después de la independencia. Finalmente, ayudarían a la formación de una iglesia nacional, la Iglesia de la provincia de Tanganica (ahora la Iglesia Anglicana de Tanzania), que adoptaría la filosofía africana de la Ujamaa (Unidad) en lugar de un anglo-catolicismo con mentalidad estrecha.