

The Politics of Naming: The Institution of the Religious Studies Department, University of Cape Town

Duane Jethro
University of Cape Town

Abstract

This article looks at the historical process of the institution of the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Cape Town from the later 1950s until 1970. Specifically, it pays attention to the negotiations the University of Cape Town entered into with both the state and religious organisations in its pursuit to establish a pluralist and liberal Department of Religious Studies. It argues three things. Firstly, that the drive for the Department of Religious Studies was pivotal for the kind of liberal, political resistance practised at the university in response to the apartheid state's racist political machinations during the 1960s. Secondly, that religious studies gained its apparently seditious character as a result of it being in stark opposition to the apartheid state's enforcing its religiously divisive and discriminatory Christian National Education policy upon South African citizens during this period. Finally, that the egalitarianism underwriting the plural study of religion is an ideal that is continuously struggled for as it is always situated within a complex of relations between various competing parties bargaining with both religious-philosophical and financial capital.

Introduction

The feature article on page eleven of the *Weekend Argus*, a Cape Town based newspaper, of July 9, 2006, is about Sunali Pillay a Durban Girls High School Matric learner.¹ The large photograph of her youthful face dominates the page

and is the centre of attention of the accompanying piece as it shows her in a close-up head and shoulders shot, which opens up to the background of her white school shirt and dark school blazer. At first glance the subject of the article is hardly visible, but upon closer inspection, the tiny nose-stud in the girl's left nostril becomes all the more apparent. The size of the accessory is ironic, given that it was at the centre of an enormous, drawn out legal battle which took place in both the South African Equality Court and the Pietermaritzburg High Court of Appeal between Sunali's parents and her school. Contravening her school's rules of apparel and accessories, Sunali chose to wear the nose-stud to school. Upon being asked to remove the ring, Sunali responded by claiming that wearing the stud was "a cultural and religious practice". This religious practice was wholly foreign to school authorities in the sense that, as Sunali's mother remarked, the school's religious ethos was "predominantly white, Christian".

Read within the context of the foundational document of the "New" South Africa, the Constitution, which guarantees the rights of all people within its boundaries, the legal contest regards the tension between Sunali's right to freely express her religious and cultural affiliation and her school's right to enforce its code of apparel. Possessing a clear understanding of these rights, other South Africans have put them into practice by challenging both the state and schools on a number of issues relating to religious and cultural expression. In recent times, a number of such cases have gained both media and legal attention.² A typical example would be hair and hairstyles, with learners wearing dreadlocks as a symbolic expression of their Rastafarian religion coming into conflict with school stipulations on hair. In Sunali's case, however, the South African judiciary found that her right to religious expression superseded the right of the school to enforce its code of apparel.

The school, as a nexus between the spheres of the public, the private and the state, is thus a highly charged political environment. And in the new democratic South Africa, nowhere has this volatility become more evident than in regards to religion and religion education. In trying to come to terms with this salient issue, considering that South Africa has a unique religious diversity, the state, through the National Education Department has implemented policy to democratically manage the rights and interests of all stakeholders involved in the school. To this end, and in line with the Constitution, the Department of Education has implemented policy in recent times to make religion education a compulsory part of primary and secondary educational instruction, as incorporated into the Learning Area of Life Orientation. Secondly, it has initiated Religion Studies as a formal subject which secondary school learners may pursue from grades 10-12. In terms of intervention, the state has thus sought to not only manage the rights and interests of the many stakeholders involved but also perpetuate Constitutional values through the implementation of a pluralist, open brand of religious education.

The kind of tensions which manifest within the institution of the school regarding the issue of religion education, it can be said, are prevalent in all educational institutions which attempt to democratically manage the religious rights and interests of all parties involved. The terms that make up the phrase "democratic religious education" are often difficult to keep together. The creation of the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Cape Town (UCT) during the 1960s stands out as a salient example of the ongoing struggles which take place around religion and education.³ Having been approached by a Christian organisation in the late 1950s about the possibility of instituting a Department of Divinity, over the course of the following decade UCT took measures to realise the new department. But from the outset, Senate felt that rather than having a department of divinity, as originally suggested, UCT would be better suited for a Department of Religious Studies. In this case, religious studies signified the open, plural and egalitarian study of religion. Opting for this brand of religious instruction was to significantly hamper the progress of instituting the new department as this had financial and religio-political implications which involved not only religious organisations, groups and communities but also the state. In spite of the various sensitivities, the tense socio-political environment strongly influenced by apartheid Christian National pedagogical indoctrination at the time, Senate and the principals who were involved in the process maintained their stance on the issue, a stance largely influenced by an overarching liberal political ethos swirling about UCT, to see the project to fruition.⁴

Thus, the primary focus of this article is the historical narrative of the institution of the Department of Religious Studies at UCT. It pays detailed attention to the dynamic struggles which the university's bureaucratic hierarchy navigated over the course of some eleven years to ensure that the particular brand of religious studies they pursued was eventually secured. In this regard, I hope to demonstrate that the phrase religious studies as referred to in the department's title "Department of Religious Studies" had a pleochroic significance for three distinct, yet tacitly connected political paradigms and the different types of political tussles which took place within these. Firstly, that it signified Senate's construction of UCT as liberal political space of resistance to the apartheid state's overt racist policies, and the construction of the department as a special space of resistance within these overarching political confines. Secondly, that it signified pedagogical struggles with the state in general and, specifically how religious studies functioned as a form of state political resistance in that it directly contravened its religiously oppressive Christian National Education policy. Finally, that it signified a religio-political contest, or "politics of the sacred", involving UCT, religious organisations and the state - a contest which brings to the fore the fragility and contextual nature of the egalitarian, open, plural study of religion.

Early Advances

On the 9th of December 1958 the Organizing Secretary of the Christian Education Movement (C.E.M.), Mrs Snell, sent correspondence to the then Principal of UCT, J.P. Duminy, regarding their organisation's motions towards establishing a Chair of Divinity at the university.⁵ In that rudimentary motion, Mrs. Snell conveyed the organisation's intentions of establishing a chair of divinity at UCT as they were in the process of doing at the University of the Witwatersrand (Wits). Having had the "the pleasure of calling on" the principal in October of that year regarding the matter, the December letter represented the second step in this phase of their grand mission. As such, attached to the letter for the principal's perusal, was a memorandum submitted to the heads of Wits neatly outlining their mission, its necessity and the path they recommended for its completion at the university. Aligned with "English-speaking Protestant Churches", the C.E.M., represented by their Organizing Secretary Ms Snell, posited its current mission as "the provision of full and adequate religious instruction in schools and colleges". And so, "unanimous[ly]" they considered "the establishment of a Department of Divinity in the Faculty of Arts at the University of Witwatersrand" a significant step in this overall process.⁶

In their memorandum to Wits, the C.E.M. argued that the need for such a department was two-fold. Firstly, that as universities are institutions designed for the broad study of knowledge, "students should have the opportunity of relating their religious beliefs to their intellectual development in other fields". Secondly, as "religious instruction" was compulsory in "provincial schools" and that "considerable time is devoted to the subject throughout the twelve year school course", it was essential that university-trained teachers be adequately equipped to enlighten their students about the truth of religion.⁷ Despite the suggestion that the new Department of Divinity should be inspired by its overtures, the C.E.M. proposed that the department's eventual inception should flow through the bureaucratic process as naturally as any other new university department, a move perhaps designed to cool the overtly Christocentric overtones woven into their suggested departmental title. Yet the advances by the C.E.M. were not merely empty demands, for the churches signed onto the project also proposed to make a firm financial commitment towards achieving their goal. As stated in the memorandum:

But in earnest of their good faith and as expressing their deep concern in this matter, the undermentioned Churches are prepared to subsidize the proposed Department to the extent of 500 pounds p.a. for an initial period of five years.⁸

Having conducted preliminary research into matter, the C.E.M. devised a financial strategy that, seemingly, would traverse the initial financial dilemma as well

as finance the department through its infancy until such time that it was financially self-sufficient. According to their financial reasoning, the funds made available from the churches in their stable combined with a subsidy available from the South African government would thus guarantee the fruition of their ideal. Overall, the Chair of Divinity as envisaged by the C.E.M. would be propped by the pedagogical needs and feelings of churches of the Transvaal area as well as their financial offerings towards this end, while at the same time be framed by the academic legitimacy of a well-established and prestigious South African tertiary institution.

However noble and well planned, the distance between theory and reality were still far removed. At this early stage, in the case of UCT, the C.E.M. was simply unable to make the same kind of concrete approach as they had to Wits. Mrs. Snell expressed exasperation in her initial letter at the fact that after approaching "Cape Churches" about committing themselves to a similar endeavor at UCT, she discovered that Rhodes University had already appealed to the "Churches to underwrite two new chairs under the Department of Divinity there". Nevertheless, if anything, these first forays were reconnaissance in orientation, meant to assess how arable UCT's institutional terrain was for such a department.

The principal's subsequent positive response to this initial letter most likely registered with the C.E.M. as the signal to proceed with organising a more concrete proposal. Many months later, on the 25th of September of 1959, Ms Snell delivered another letter to the principal, this time attaching a report on the establishment of "Departments of Divinity at other Universities" the University of Natal, Wits, as well as their proposal for UCT. To this he responded simply, assuring them merely that the matter was "receiving continued attention".⁹ Opening with a statement on their position on religion and education, the memorandum to UCT, on behalf of the C.E.M. and English-speaking churches within Cape Town backing them, follows on with a section on "The Need For a Chair of Divinity", then a section on the "Financial Provisions for a Department of Divinity" and closes with the signatures of the heads of four church bodies backing the proposal. These were namely, the Church of the Province (since 2006 known as the Anglican Church of Southern Africa), the Methodist Church of South Africa, the Presbyterian Church of South Africa, and the Congregational Union of South Africa. Despite slight adjustments to locale and churches, the memorandum is virtually the same as the one issued to Wits University. Despite the C.E.M.'s delay in preparations, the process was already well under way within UCT. By September 30th when the principal officially acknowledged receipt of the C.E.M.'s official proposal, a Senate and a special Sub-Committee meeting had already taken place, to firstly establish whether UCT had the need for such a department, and secondly in which faculty it would find its home. Summarily, in their attempts to fold UCT into their national project of disseminating a specific brand of religious education, these early advances by Ms Snell on behalf of the

C.E.M. marked the genesis of the current Department of Religious Studies at UCT.

Terms of Reference, Tactful Negotiations

From the outset the principal of UCT, J.P. Duminy, was both receptive to, and genuinely interested in the idea, clearly expressing his positive and encouraging feelings about the matter in his replies to Ms Snell's intimations about a Department of Divinity. For example, to their October meeting he expressed "interest in the possibility of a Chair and Department (or Faculty) of Divinity", and to her December 31st letter availed himself to any further information "as the situation develop[ed]" on her end.¹⁰ As mentioned, by the time the organisation had formulated and approached the university more concretely and officially, the matter had already weathered two high level debates within UCT, as a result of the principal's independent efforts. Initially, the proposal was put forward to the university Senate who subsequently commissioned a special sub-committee to consider the matter. On the 13th of May of 1959 a meeting was held to discuss the sub-committee's report. Attached to the report were the December 9th letter from Ms Snell, the memorandum issued to the heads of Wits University and the comments made by various boards of faculties at UCT. Looking at the information the sub-committee members had at hand, clearly, they factored the C.E.M.'s initial intimations seriously into their deliberations. In the final analysis, "the Sub-Committee was unanimous in its view that the university should have a teaching department of Religious Studies". But this came with a proviso which made it clear that "if and when a course were offered in this particular field it should not be linked either financially or doctrinally with any particular religious group or church".¹¹

Thus, in their success the C.E.M had also failed. They had succeeded in persuading UCT in instituting a department of religious studies but not with the style of religious study they would have preferred. This minor success, though, was long overdue since the 58/59 approaches were not the first time either Wits or UCT were approached by the organisation. The C.E.M had made similar motions to these tertiary institutions some ten years prior. Publishing its productivity over the period of 1947-8 in *Christian Education*, the C.E.M's official journal, in a section entitled "University Projects", the redactor clarifies the organisation's aims in this regard:

It is hoped that within the near future the possibility for Religious Education at a University level will be available in all academic centers and the way opened for adequate training of Scripture teachers and organizers of Religious Education.¹²

In practically effecting these measures, UCT was paid a visit in June of 1948 by the Organizing Secretary. She met with the then principal, Dr T.B. Davie and made the suggestion of the possibility of UCT having a "Lectureship in Biblical Studies". Unfortunately, "the idea [was] rejected by Senate". This setback, however, did not blunt their intentions since, they hoped the matter to be "proposed again" with the support of the Peninsula Church Council, and with the help of other high profile organisers of religious education within the region.¹³ This second proposal took some ten years to develop and resubmit. UCT was to have a department dedicated to the study of religion, but not the kind of department or religious instruction intended by the C.E.M. and churches that had backed it. It is not clear whether the C.E.M. was informed of the outcome of the sub-committee meeting or the final proviso, as there is no clear indication of it being communicated to them in the correspondence, yet in general, the continued attention UCT gave to the matter resonated well with their intentions.

Simply, the C.E.M focussed its work on the educational upliftment of South African scholars through trying to found the national scholastic education system, in whatever way possible, on sound religious principles. Religious in this case referred to a liberal brand of Protestant Christianity. Established in 1942 in Johannesburg, with Miss Snell as its first Organising Secretary, the C.E.M. effected its aims through improving religious instruction in the key focus areas' of the school, the home and church and penetrated these through availing itself as "a source of help for teachers, clergy, and lay church workers, parents and youth leaders of all Christian denominations and all races".¹⁴ Their advances to the South African universities in this formal manner thus represented but one of a range of practical strategies employed to religiously uplift the spiritually barren scholars across the country. For example, they organised and held courses for teachers and parents on a range of Christian issues, paid visits to schools within the Johannesburg area and other regions in the country, and developed a library stocked with the latest in Christian pedagogical material which members had free access to. In this religious drive *Christian Education* functioned not only as the organisation's mouthpiece but also a vital teaching aid. Thus, a common feature in the journal are practical Christian lessons directed at both adults and children, which readers could invoke at their leisure within their relevant institutions. The journal also published articles related to Christian education by prominent members of the English-speaking churches and high profile local and international academics and professionals, as well as publicised the organisation's current and upcoming activities across the country. Stretching their resources to all areas and corners of South African society, the C.E.M. thus missionised ardently to position its brand of religious values at the foundation for all forms of educational instruction within the nation.

At UCT, however, if we consider the May 13th meeting to be the institutional conception of the department, then it took 11 more years of gestation

before it was to be officially birthed. As such, the initial enthusiasm and speedy expedition of the special sub-committee was a moot indicator of the real tedium of the process. In some ways the bureaucratic wheels within UCT merely ground to a halt. Summarizing the situation in 1969, the finance officer informed the principal, that since the May 1959 meeting and roughly April of 1964, "nothing seems to have happened".¹⁵ In Christian terms, the Immaculate Conception, forms a central tenet of the faith as it narrates the divine transcendence of the biological fact of impregnation through sexual union: in the case of the new department, though, the financial plan calculated by the C.E.M. simply was not able to transcend financial reality. As the principal, J.P. Duminy, put it in a letter to the C.E.M.'s Organizing Secretary in 1964, "the establishment of the Chair depends very largely on whether financial arrangements can be made to endow it".¹⁶ Clearly, the blame for the bureaucratic stagnation has to be placed at UCT's feet since, as we recall, the sub-committee expressly divorced the university from any formal affiliation with the C.E.M., a move which at the same time inadvertently shifted the proposed department out of the neat financial scaffold the organisation had devised. It is this initial lack of calculation that had the most significant attenuative effect on the pace of the new department's inception.

To recap, the C.E.M.'s financial scheme was premised on funds from churches as well as from a government subsidy, which was based on what was called the Holloway formula. The Holloway formula, however, was calculated according to its provision of funds for courses and departments in the study of Divinity; Religious studies as conceived by UCT did not factor into this formula. As UCT's finance officer put it "the basic department should be called "Department of Divinity".¹⁷ As such, "the decisions of the Senate [would be] difficult to reconcile in their present form with the subsidy requirements set" down by Government at the time.¹⁸ Expressing its institutional prerogative from the outset, the sub-committee opposed the title of Divinity Studies, or Chair of Divinity because of its distinctive Christocentric overtones. As we recall, they opted rather for the more open title of "Religious Studies", aligning the new department, or course, with the broader, more inclusive ethos of the university. As Professor Erik Chisholm, one of the May 1959 sub-committee members, put it some years later:

In a university like ours, which prides itself on being multi-racial and hence multi-religious, with students and staff belonging to many religions and faiths, does a chair attached to one branch of faith really meet our requirements? Will it provide a fair survey of world religions to satisfy those who do not happen to belong to a reformed Christian church?¹⁹

At the outset, it seems the key criterion for members of the UCT sub-committee was not the availability of finance, funds or funding, but the ethos of the new

department. Whether funded by religious organisations or merely inspired by them, the new department had to be a free space, open for the broad study of the smorgasbord of world religions in an understanding, unbiased manner - traits the sub-committee members believed underwrote UCT as an educational institution. It is the tension within this complex which underwrites the principal's response to the C.E.M. in the mid 1960's, when he says that "procedures in academic affairs cannot be expedited beyond the limits imposed by our machinery of administration".²⁰ Clearly, the administrative "machinery" was being hampered by the lack of finance caused by Senate's pursuit of a pedagogical ideal.

Gradually, as the process dragged on during the early 1960's the C.E.M. and the various churches aligned and committed to the project started becoming "most anxious that this matter should be brought to some finality".²¹ And while always sympathetic to the tedium and complexity of the matter, they subtly started applying pressure in the hopes that things would sooner come to conclusion. Regularly appearing in the correspondence to the principal, and the university, during this drawn out liminal period from representatives of church bodies aligned with the C.E.M., and the C.E.M. are references to their financial stake in the matter. For example, in his letter to the Registrar in 1962, Reverend Eve, on behalf of the Cape Peninsula Church Council, which "represent[ed] the churches [that] agreed to *sponsor* [the] proposed Chair of Divinity", inquired about the "financial difficulties" they had heard the University had recently been plagued with and requested "what *increase of guarantees* would be involved in overcoming" them.²² In the following year, Ms E.W. Mathews' (the C.E.M's Organising Secretary at the time) writes to the principal saying:

We as a Committee feel that the need of this Chair is an urgent one; and we know that the representatives of the various Church Denominations who have promised to *contribute* towards it feel the same way.²³

Sharing little insight into the real dynamics of the matter unfolding on UCT's end, the C.E.M and their aligned churches probably felt that making their financial stake in the matter more explicit would see their desired outcomes sooner reached.

While the material, on the face of it, suggests the C.E.M and their aligned churches had seemingly assumed a "concerned outsider's" position - worried about the constitution of a university department that would have its interests within the scope of its pedagogical ambit - a more critical reading reveals this organisation to have adopted a "concerned stake-holder's" position, becoming increasingly "anxious" at an apparent deadlock in negotiations over its fundamental role, or claim, upon a university department that in theory and practice would advance its Christian interests. In this way, words like "contribute", "offer", "promised" and "support", come into focus as key terms of reference around which 'negotiations'

apparently revolved. Negotiations were thus about the dynamic interplay between the promise of finance and the issue of pedagogical guarantees. For example, as this 1964 quotation from a letter from Ms E.W. Mathews indicates:

I have been asked to write and ask you whether, in light of the fact that the courses and syllabuses are now receiving attention, you would be kind enough to receive a deputation from our committee. We should be very grateful if you would grant us this opportunity to *discuss* with you the aspects of the syllabus which are of particular interest to the Churches who have *promised* their *support* in this project.²⁴

The following day, the principal wrote in response:

Many thanks for your letter to hand yesterday morning...I shall be very glad indeed to make arrangements for a deputation from your committee to come and *discuss* the courses and syllabuses with us...[Although] this will not take place this term and possibly not before the end of September. I shall keep in touch with developments.²⁵

His response seems only to affirm the position the organisation appears to have adopted. This is a strange move, since, in light of the facts, the C.E.M. was certainly not a critical stakeholder. But the business of constituting new departments is always precarious, especially when it concerns those things that people hold ultimately sacred. In this way, then, despite the fact that the C.E.M. could make no hard claim over the way the process was to transpire, the material and courses that were being developed or who was to teach in the department, certainly their voice needed to be validated. Ethically, excluding them from the process would go against the very fundamentals upon which the new department was to be based. Pragmatically, any rash action on the part of the principal could potentially result in the organisation's total alienation from the university, which could have had devastating consequences on the department's actualisation. Impulsivity on UCT's part could have resulted elicited protest from the C.E.M., which would obviously and most significantly translate into an immediate rescinding of funds from churches within the region as well as across the country. Here we can only speculate, but at the time these sentiments, intricately written into the correspondence from the C.E.M., must have registered with the university hierarchy as a latent, yet significant concern. As such, the principal, on behalf of UCT, had to proceed with a subtlety and finesse that kept the C.E.M. at a careful proximity. A distance that tacitly marked their participation in the institution of the new department and validated their contributions towards that

end, but at the same time preserved the sanctity of UCT's ideals.

UCT maintained this inclusive strategy in relation to other religious organisations and communities as well making sure that the new department reflected the concerns and interests of a variety of religions. For example, towards the end of the 1960s when the process rapidly wound to conclusion, UCT not only opened its doors to approaches from religious communities, but also actively approached various religious communities within Cape Town about what they could contribute to the new department. Sir Richard Luyt (the then principal), for example, had a more hands-on style in this regard, taking it upon himself to consult relevant experts on religion in Cape Town, as well as personally receiving and corresponding with prominent members of some of the diverse religious communities in the region. Notably, in this religious reconnaissance Sir Richard Luyt sought the expertise of the previous head of the Department of Coloured Affairs, Dr I.D. Du Plessis. Dr Du Plessis was regarded as an authority on the "Cape Malays" by segments of the Cape Muslim community as well as academics. He apparently had conducted extensive research on the "Cape Malays", as he saw them, whilst studying at UCT during the early part of the twentieth century. As a result of this research (of which a central part was qualitative immersion in the authentic life of this apparently unique Muslim Community), Dr Du Plessis had developed significant authoritative contacts in the field (Jeppie, 1989). In light of his bureaucratic pedigree Sir Richard Luyt wrote to him in 1969 for information on members of the Cape Muslim community which might be of assistance to the project:

I have held an exploratory meeting with representatives of the Anglican, Baptist, Congregational, Dutch Reformed, Methodist Presbyterian and Roman Catholic Churches and gained support and valuable advice. However, in accordance with Senate's wish that the department should not be tied to one particular faith, I propose that meetings should also take place with Jewish and Islamic leaders. It is in regard to the latter that I am writing you to seek help.

With your intimate knowledge of the Cape Malay it occurred to me that you might be able to advise who would be regarded among members of the Moslem faith as a leader or leaders with whom the University could hold conversation in the confidence that he or they would carry the general support of the active Moslem community.²⁶

In a candid hand written letter, Du Plessis responded by suggesting a certain Sheikh A. Behardien and a Mr S. Dollie as good and reliable local "contacts".

Qualifying his choices du Plessis said of the Sheikh:

He is held in general esteem as the most senior priest in the local Malay hierarchy: a very willing helper, a gentle personality and serious scholar, well versed in Arabic and other oriental languages, as well as in the intricacies of his own religion (and there are many!).

While of Mr Dollie he said:

[He was] the first Cape Malay (and non-white) to qualify as chemist (in London). As a member of the City Council he represented this body on the UCT Council in his day.²⁷

Significantly, while his religious credentials cannot be remarked upon here, Mr S. Dollie held a status amongst the Muslim community as a result of his extensive experience in local and national politics, a status which certainly justified Du Plessis's recommendation (Lewis, 1987). Nevertheless, the Sheikh and Mr Dollie were invited to what seems a standardised meeting at the time. Here, simply, the principal would make explicit the university's vision of the new department, explain the university's needs in this regard, and extend an invitation for contributions from the attendant parties. Contribution in this case had a dual significance. In the first instance, it referred most importantly to the "short-fall of some R2, 500 per annum for a period of years from 1971", while at the same time it meant building up "courses to be offered in Religious Studies...by calling upon specialists to lecture in different fields of religion", referring to the pedagogical assistance parties could bring to the department.²⁸ In these final days of openness, approaches and inclusion it's not hard to notice how the process ironically echoed the vision of the original memorandum sent by the C.E.M. to UCT some ten years earlier, one which sought to make the future department a locally owned religious institution.

Curricular Calculations

While the problem of securing finance was critical, its ominous presence did not seem to blunt the university's vision. As is evident from Ms E.W. Mathews' 1964 letter regarding courses and syllabi, it seems the finer dynamics of the institutional process were already being attended to despite financial hindrances. Having started rudimentary discussions on courses and syllabi in 1964, by the following year Senate had approved an "outline for a syllabus for two qualifying courses" that effectively would constitute the two-year undergraduate experience of religious studies.²⁹ Here it should be noted that throughout the early 1960s, and the

institutional process in general, postgraduates and postgraduate study received sparse mention in Senate discussions on the department.

Paying closer attention to that initial "syllabus", in what was most probably then considered to be the introductory course for first-year students, the university's aim seems to have been to school prospective students in the concepts and language of religion from a broad perspective. This untitled preliminary course is described as placing emphasis on "the socio-cultural background" of religion, which entailed studying "the place of religion in primitive societies; the notion of the sacred; concepts of life and death; priests prophets and mysticism". The second course offered in the first year was a little more advanced and specific as it placed an emphasis on the "development of religious ideas (a) in Biblical times; the archaeology and geography of Bible lands; Old and New Testament Studies; (b) in later and recent times".³⁰ Interestingly, despite its very narrow focus, the above mentioned course resonates well with a current first-year course in the Department of Religious Studies which looks at the Ancient Near East, with its rich religious history, and which places special emphasis on the intertwining beliefs of the Abrahamic faiths.

In the second year of study the syllabus was designed to usher students into the deeper history of the Christian faith as well as sharpen their analytical vocabularies of religion studies. Course I for the year is described as the study of the "development of Judaic and Christian religious concepts; contacts with Hellenistic culture; patristic and medieval theology; Church schisms; modern Biblical criticisms". Course II of the second year focused on the philosophy of religion which was "an objective analysis of the phenomena of religion, illustrated by studies of the world religions (e.g., Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam)".³¹ Providing a glimpse into Senate's thinking at the time, the memorandum reveals its certain commitment to the project, on the whole, sticking to their original mandate of the open study of religion at the university by tempering the Christocentric aspects of the course with a more pluralist and objective study of the "socio-cultural" and "philosophical" aspects of religion.

Nevertheless, Judeo-Christianity still received the lion's share of the syllabus. While UCT may have had noble intentions about the way it hoped to approach the study of religion, the reality of the national educational climate, as well as the socially accepted norms about religion at the time, still managed to creep into their plans. Yet, that is not to say that this curricular skeleton was the "revelations" of the future syllabus, since there is a definite lack of clarity on how these courses would make up or operate in the stream, or streams, of religious studies. Recalling the opening remark to the memorandum, it stated that it represented an "outline for a syllabus for two qualifying courses". In that case we are forced to assume these were whole year courses and that students had the option of studying religion as either a Judeo-Christian subject, or religion as an objective, "socio-cultural" and "philosophical" phenomenon. Any further un-

corroborated speculation on the matter would be false conjecture. As such, we have to see the 1965 mapping of the undergraduate study of religion as comprised of four courses, making up two streams, running over two years.

In the wake of the subtle pressure exerted by the C.E.M., after some six years of debate and discussion the university managed to produce a rudimentary curricular skeleton of the undergraduate study of religion which represented the institution's long standing vision. But the business of teaching religious studies is complex and serious. While it had the authority to critically position one religious organisation's resolute advances in relation to its teaching aims, and others like it, it would be a mistake to assume that UCT as represented by Senate had complete sovereignty over the brand of pedagogy they hoped the department would disseminate. Critically, the final form of the course outline under scrutiny here would represent the interests of a party that had a more defining influence over its content: the South African government.

At the same time that it made provision for funds for the inception of new departments focussing on religion studies, the state also took an interest in (and financially supported) various, similar courses being taught in other departments. "Various" in this case should be understood conservatively since state specification stipulated that only courses in the fields of "Old Testament Exegesis, New Testament Exegesis, Philosophy of Religion", and "History of Religion" were accorded funding at tertiary institutions. More precisely, as the finance officer put it, "it is necessary that the courses given should have the names mentioned above to qualify for the subsidy with any certainty".³² Clearly, the 1964 courses, which by 1967 had already been named "Religious Studies I and II" respectively, only vaguely matched state funding requirements. A perusal of the wealth of information the finance officer drew on in his analysis and report on the matter in 1967 indicates that the matter had gone thorough consideration at various levels of the university:

Decisions of the Senate recorded in Principal's Circulars 96, 120 and 123 are attached.

The report of the Co-ordinating Committee was noted by the Senate and commended to the Arts Faculty.

The Arts Faculty referred the matter to a Sub-Committee which reported on certain stated problems. The report was accompanied by reports from the Faculties of Education and Social Science, and was referred by the Committee of Deans to the Faculty of Arts, where it is to be considered at the Faculty meeting in March 1967.³³

At every stage of discussion the conceptual and institutional form of the department was more and more richly developed, yet consistently the responsibility of funding was postponed or passed on to the next link in what was an intricate but open bureaucratic web. For example, the minutes of a meeting of the sub-committee appointed by the Board of the Faculty of Arts note that "the questions of the cost and of the availability of money had not been taken into consideration by the Faculty Board, only the academic desirability of instituting such a Department".³⁴ Charged with the responsibility of calculating a scheme for securing the valuable resource, the finance officer reported, the final request made by the university and the funding system established by government for this express purpose were difficult to "reconcile". This seemed to be a perennial problem for the finance officer as in 1965 to virtually the same mandate put before him by Senate he said, "the alternative of seeking special recognition of the course "Religious Studies" is a protracted matter with doubtful chances of success".³⁵ The finance officer's report of 1967, however, was less pessimistic yet it maintained that since the university remained adamant about its desire in specific terms, special permission was required from the Minister of Education for approval of both subsidies. Adamant that it would not disseminate religious study based on the brand of Christianity propping the state's racist political apparatus at the time, UCT was nevertheless vitally dependent on state funding.

At the heart of these negotiations with the state was an interesting irony. While Senate always demanded the independence of their Department of Religious Studies and distanced itself from coercion on the part of various religious bodies, organisations and communities, the state's funds were essential to ensuring its inception. And so, if tacitly buying into the state's education policy meant fulfilling that aim then it was a justified move. This signals a significant change in UCT's bargaining style. While it was not about to accept funding from religious organisations, institutions and communities on the terms that they could lay some kind of claim to the department, they were willing to accept funds from the South African state, thus tacitly agreeing to operate within its overarching educational mandate. In one sense, it could be argued that the shift revolved around the issue of sovereignty over the new department. UCT could not accept the fact that if things had flowed, for example, according to the C.E.M.'s terms, the C.E.M. would most certainly have asserted their authority using their financial resource as a bargaining chip. Considered more critically, as is evident by the trend throughout the inception of the teaching unit, the issue revolved not so much around sovereignty, but around the sovereign issue of money; more specifically, to the premium UCT placed on the ethos of the new department.

Simply, the deal with the state seemed a better exchange in securing their aims than having to submit to the zealous close scrutiny of a religious community, or communities. Securing the department's free spirit always meant trading off some of the idealism Senate so vigorously guarded. Funding matters plagued

the project from the outset, yet throughout the process, reading into the apparent silence, postponement and procrastination around the matter suggests a confidence, or faith, that the matter was to see a fruitful conclusion. In some ways, it was a sort of faith as trust (Pelikan, 1987) premised on the pursuit of an ideal in the face of sheer and seemingly impossible adversity. In other ways it was a faith premised on the power of careful calculation and tactful negotiations using the right terms of reference in securing the best deal possible.

Finishing Touches

From about the beginning of 1969 the stakes in the Department of Religious Studies became less and less vigorously contested. Significantly, this was as a result of UCT's administrative "machinery" eventually finalising its institutional desires and taking effective action to secure it. A critical aspect of this action was the procurement of funding from the state as well as securing a reliable flow of capital from some of the religious communities approached, which included churches affiliated with the C.E.M. A very healthy financial blessing from Mr C.S. Corder donated in early 1969, significantly aided the university's cause.³⁶

Once these final strings were tied, an advertisement was developed for the position of Professor and head of the new department. The candidate would have the responsibility of instituting the new department, as well as be qualified in Theology, Comparative Religion, and the History of Religion. As was common with all the matters pertaining to the department, the advertisement was hammered into finality through debate and discussion which included contributions from members of the Cape religious community. While the new head of department "need not necessarily be Christian", after receiving more than thirty Curriculum Vitae's from hopeful candidates, three were short listed for interview, and Professor J.S. Cumpsty, an ordained Christian minister, was chosen for the position.

Impatient to announce its prized newborn, UCT officially unveiled the Department of Religious Studies to the public in the Faculty of Arts and Science's Handbook of 1970. The outline to the stream of study offered in the department read:

It is hoped that the Department of Religious Studies will offer a first qualifying course for the B.A. degree from 1970 onwards and a second qualifying course beginning in 1971.

The syllabus will include study of the phenomenon of religion in broad perspective as well as of particular areas of religious thought and history, including biblical studies.³⁷

It was a fledgling but marked appearance which displayed its ethos as well as its only official representative, Professor J. S Cumpsty. As can be seen, the stream of study also markedly represented the syllabus approved by Senate five years earlier.

Religious Studies: A Local and Global Picture

While riddled with unique twists and turns, the trajectory of the founding narrative of the Department of Religious Studies at UCT veers very little from the historical trend of the field internationally. In the first instance if religious studies is understood to mean the plural, open investigation of religion as a human phenomenon, then, since its inception it has had complex relations with the state and religious organisations, particularly the hegemony of Christianity. As Arie Molendijk (1998:70) has remarked, “the history of the field is conceived as a gradual emancipation from the patronizing power of theology”. For example, one of the pivotal moments in the history of the study of religion is considered to be the institutionalisation of the study of religion in the Dutch University system in 1877. It meant that “for the first time in Western history, there were established two, parallel possibilities for the study of religion: a humanistic mode within the secular academy and a theological course of study within the denominational seminary” (Smith, 1978: 103). Smith’s synopsis of this shift is a bit narrow, since the shift concerned the reshaping of the theological faculties and the practice of theology within the university system, and was motivated by liberal beliefs about the state’s complicity with national religion. The study of religion can thus be understood to be “a child of the Enlightenment” (Smith, 1978:104).

While the transformation of the Dutch university system stands out as a significant moment in the history of religious studies, it cannot however be noted as the pivotal moment at which the contemporary discipline was born. Religious studies, or the science of religion as it was phrased during that time, took a form that was shaped by broader conservative beliefs about religion, education and the power of the state. The drive to transform the Dutch university system arose out of the conflict between the secular values in the new Dutch Constitution and the state’s connections with the Dutch Reformed Church (DRC); the main point of contention being the role of the state in the education of ministers, a liaison which was increasingly being perceived as undermining the fundamental separation between Church and State. Yet as Molendijk (1995:73) has pointed out, while the Dutch government and parliament always sought to advance the liberal, democratic values of the Constitution, its relationship with the DRC could not simply be severed. Essentially, at the time, “the religious identity of the Netherlands was framed in non-denominational, broadly Protestant terms, it could not be denied that the DRC had a major contribution to make towards that identity”(ibid). In working

out the limits of the separation between these spheres, it was concluded “that notwithstanding the separation between Church and state, there would always be a close link between religion and the state”, which therefore meant, according to one participant in the debate, “that only a genuinely scholarly theology embedded within the university system could be an antidote against religious separatism on the one hand, and atheism, on the other” (ibid). In the case of the Netherlands, emphasis should be placed on the word theology, since the kind of “science of religion” advanced as a remedy was concerned with the “(Christian) religion”, rather than the panoply of the world’s religions. At this time, then, the science of religion certainly did not embody the connotations it does today since it was firmly “centered on the transformation of the traditional faculty of theology” and the practice of that discipline (ibid).

From about the middle of the 19th century we find the liberal study of religion increasingly being investigated and implemented in higher educational institutions across Europe. A fledgling and obscure field at this time, with the progression of the century, the work of eminent scholars in the field subsequently opened up the phenomenon of religion to the masses. In so doing, contributed to raising the field out of misty obscurity, adding validity and credibility to the belief in understanding religion in secular terms. The works of these authors were to have a significant bearing on the style and face of religious studies within Britain from about 1850-1914.

Peter Byrne (1998: 51) argues that religious studies flourished in Britain during this period primarily for three reasons, namely, because of the healthy book publishing industry, “the role of the Victorian reviews and the endowment of public lectureships”. As a result of a vibrant intellectual climate characterised by a largely well-educated, wealthy and inquisitive book buying public and the availability of funds for the public dissemination of knowledge in the field of religion, in the form of the Hibbert and Gifford lectures, British and British-based scholars (Muller, Frazer, Tylor and Lang, for example) could etch their names into the history of the field. The public at this time was voracious for knowledge on the subject of religion, purchasing the pedantic works of these authors with a zest comparable to the popularity of the romance novel today, and flocked to lecture halls to hear them speak on the subject matter. The roots of this popularity lie in the gradual emancipation of knowledge from the orthodox grip of the Anglican Church and the increasing public enthusiasm and faith in science as the true path to veracity, conditions which were optimal for the advancement and greater acceptance of the pioneering works of these scholars. The state’s increasing liberalism in the sphere of higher education starting with reforms in the two bastions of British intellectualism, Oxford and Cambridge, in the 1830s, was another significant move in the eventual proliferation of religious studies in that nation. This is not to say that the field exploded upon the scene and immediately flourished, certainly not, since as practiced in Britain,

theology still cast a large shadow over the growth of the discipline at the time. Yet, as the century moved forward and took the turn into the next, the acceptance of the study of religion as a phenomenon at higher institutions was certainly popularly and institutionally gaining strength in Britain as well as across Europe. More and more universities saw it as important to have some department or sector of their university dedicated to the secular investigation of the phenomenon of religion.

However much “the new way” became increasingly entrenched within the public and authoritative mind, today the study of religion worldwide fails to bare the hallmarks of its popularity during its years of genesis. If departments of religious study - entitled clearly as such, and embodying the title’s suggestion of approaching religion from the secular philosophical perspective of egalitarian respect for all religions as human phenomena, in both ethos and practice – are taken as indicators of the state of the field at present, then the field is in a dismal state. For example, despite the flourishing of public interest in religion and religious study during the late 19th and early 20th centuries in Britain, today only a few of the 32 departments cited in the Association of University Departments of Theology and Religious Studies handbook are specializing in the study of religion. The picture in South Africa is not much different, this despite the unique religious diversity of the nation. Michel Clasquin (2005) has pointed out that, at present, there are but three higher institutions with departments dedicated to the open exploration of the study of religion, with two other institutions busy increasing their curricular emphasis on the study of religion, and a few others with some courses with religion as their focus. However, in the main, theology still dominates in South Africa as it does globally.

Religious Studies, as a discipline practiced in tertiary institutions, comes to the fore as a uniquely modern phenomenon, one that remains in complex relationship to the institutions and religious values from which it emerged. As is the case here, the discipline flourishes in the context of the democratic state, where Christianity and Christocentric values are well entrenched. Framing the field in this way begs the assumption that these predominantly Western, Eurocentric values are in place. In this regard, this analysis is narrow-minded and requires that research on the shape and face of religious studies in non-western regions and countries be taken up. Nevertheless, religious studies as a modern phenomenon represents the fundamental internal struggle of the nation-state to at once uphold its humanistic mandate of the respect for difference, as well as maintain its coercive control over the many, through religious or other means.

Political Religion; The Politics of Religion

From its early origins the Department of Religious Studies has eventually developed into a flourishing teaching, learning and research institution. Today, as part

of the Humanities Faculty (previously known as the Faculty of Arts), it boasts three separate research institutions, five journals, and flourishing undergraduate and postgraduate programmes which have produced graduates that have gone on to do great things in South Africa and the world.³⁸ Yet during the period of its inception, certainly, Senate could not have foreseen that their intended department would go on to reach such relative successes. Why then did they persist with the project in the face of numerous seemingly insurmountable obstacles? Why did they remain adamant about the department's name, as well as the brand of religious study?

One way of answering these questions is to look at the national political situation during the 1960s and the national policy on education in general, as well as its considerations for religion specifically. As is common knowledge, at about the time Senate was implementing measures to institute the new Department of Religious Studies the apartheid government was implementing radical segregatory measures across the country to separate different races and oppress people of colour. These measures were effected in all spheres of society and had a significant bearing on educational institutions in the form of racial segregation and academic freedom in terms of a religiously discriminatory Christian National Education policy first suggested in 1948. Against this background of educational restrictions and racist political and religious oppression, UCT was renowned as a liberal university that opposed the state's racist policies. UCT vociferously lamented and protested against the apartheid state's restrictions on academic freedom through the implementation of legislation such as the Extension of the University Education Act, which demanded the establishment of separate tertiary institutions for different race groups. Resistance was mobilised by both students and the academic hierarchy. In the case of students, they marshalled protests as well as establishing the TB Davie Memorial lecture, in 1959, "in honour of the previous vice-chancellor's tireless campaigning for the university's academic freedom."³⁹ While in the same year, the university hierarchy dedicated itself and the institution to academic freedom by stating that:

We dedicate ourselves to the tasks that lie ahead: to maintain our established rights to determine who shall teach, what shall be taught, and how it shall be taught in this university, and to strive to regain the right to determine who shall be taught, without regard to any criterion except academic merit.⁴⁰

In some cases these resistance strategies had real religious overtones. For example,

[a]fter the TB Davie Memorial Lecture on 26 July [1960], a torch symbolising academic freedom is quenched and Hon

Chief Justice Albert van der Sandt Centlivres unveils a plaque with a Latin inscription that translates: "This bronze memorial dedicated by the Chancellor, records the taking away of Academic Freedom which departed in the year 1960 and returned in the year ..."⁴¹

Thus, as a result of this "sustained opposition to apartheid, particularly in higher education" during the 1960s, 70s and 80s, and its geographical position, overlooking the majestic city of Cape Town from the slopes of Devils peak, "the University of Cape Town earned itself the nickname Moscow on the Hill".⁴²

In its political tussles with the state, often, it was the principal whom not only formulated, but also set the tone for the university's strategy of resistance. In some cases this meant taking a conservative and cautious approach, while in others it meant being at the front line of campus political struggles. Commenting on J.P. Duminy's approach to the political situation during his reign as principal from 1959 to 1968, the UCT official website states that:

During this time [Duminy] was often criticised for being too idealistic and conservative in the conflict with the government over academic freedom: while many urged that the university should seek confrontation with the government, Duminy was aware that the institution was dependent on government financing.⁴³

In contrast, Sir Richard Luyt, taking up the reigns of principal after Duminy, seems to have been more proactive and more hands-on in his style of dealing with the political situation on campus:

Sir Richard Luyt led UCT through difficult years in South Africa's political history, fighting for academic freedom with quiet dignity and vigorously objecting against the banning and detention-without-trial of students and staff who protested against apartheid. At times, he even placed himself between riot police and students demonstrating on campus.⁴⁴

During the apartheid era then, Senate and other members of the upper echelons of UCT management actively constructed the university as a space of state resistance. But it was a space characterised not by the radical type of resistance that its nickname of the time may suggest, but was rather more liberal in tone (Erbmann, 2005). In some sense, traces of this liberal thinking can be identified in the thought processes behind the institution of the Department of Religious Studies. Keeping in mind that this sentiment might not have been universal, these liberal

egalitarian feelings must have had an influence on the special Senate committee's original stipulations on the type of religious instruction they felt the university needed since it contrasted markedly with the kind of legislative stipulations made by the state on education in general. The apartheid educational system was geared towards the assertion of difference, discrimination and denigration whereas the new department would perpetuate the university's sentiments of egalitarianism, openness, freedom and equality. Within UCT, as a cityscape of resistance, consecrated by a ritual marking the death of academic freedom, the title of the new department probably signified the birth of a unique pedagogical zone of resistance, one which, in character would epitomise the egalitarian political and social values generated and perpetuated by the populous on campus.

In the "New" South Africa, as mentioned, the National Education Department implemented new policies on religion education, working within a functionalist frame of analysis, by recognising the unifying and civilising impact religion education could have on the nation's learners. This functionalist characteristic of religious study was also recognised more than fifty years ago by the apartheid state when it set about dividing the country along racial lines. A critical part of the maintenance of these social divisions was to school South African scholars into an educational system based on a brand of religion instruction that was religiously divisive, hierarchical and denigrating. In this scheme of religion education, entitled Christian National Education, a specific brand of Christianity was touted as the universal standard of religion, and that the process of learning about other religions required a confession of faith and belief. It was a system of religious instruction that "[indoctrinated] Christian children and [denigrated] adherents of other religions" (Chidester, 2003: 265). Against this background of religious indoctrination, to Senate, the type of religious studies they pursued thus probably also signified an "empathetic understanding and critical reflection on religious identity and difference" (Chidester, 2003: 264). As envisioned by Senate, the study of religion thus held out the opportunity to, at least in theory, subvert the state's oppressive pedagogical policies by opening a space for the equal affirmation of religious difference. As such, practising this brand of religious instruction, signified by the new department's title, also signified an active, yet distinctively liberal form of state resistance. Located at "Moscow on the Hill", the Department of Religious Studies could thus be seen as the centrepiece and epitome of liberal political resistance at UCT.

As a narrative on its own, the new department was at the centre of another political struggle, a kind of politics of the sacred, as it emerged out of debate discussion and negotiations with various parties tussling for a stake in the new department. Looking at the narrative from this religio-political perspective seems to bring to the fore some of the basic assumptions that underwrite the conventional understandings of what may be called the phenomenological approach to religious studies. Prozesky (1989) mentions that the phenomenological approach

to the study of religion requires that the enquirer suspends their personal judgement about a religious phenomenon, and secondly, that they should adopt a deep sense of empathy and openness to the religious phenomenon under investigation. These basic principles indicate that religion is a human phenomenon, one central to human existence, and engaging in religious studies is about analysing and affirming human difference in an egalitarian manner. It is this egalitarian element, this kernel of freedom at the heart of the study of religion which is so precious. In the unfolding narrative of the Department of Religious Studies this element has emerged not as a given, or a taken for granted aspect of religious study, but as an ideal which was ardently struggled and sacrificed for by Senate. As the above example demonstrates, this egalitarian spirit at the heart of religious studies, I would confidently venture, is always encased within broader socio-political complexes surrounding the institutions and practitioners of religious study. These complexes significantly, seek to undermine it as well as keep its philosophical boundlessness in check. This struggle emerging out of a complex seems to be the uniquely modern characteristic of the contemporary study of religion. It is this type of egalitarian spirit, or freedom, which opened the space for the affirmation and acceptance of difference at UCT in the face of religio-political tensions during the apartheid era's reign of religious and racist oppression.

A departmental title can thus have meaning beyond the kind of instruction it apparently embodies. It is not a small thing. Many pages ago, this article began with a discussion of the meaning of a nose-stud in contemporary South Africa. That small, uncanny thing was revealed to have potent significance within South our vibrant religious environment. The Department of Religious Studies at UCT, while successful and flourishing, in the context of other departments within the Humanities Faculty, is small. Despite its relative size the department has emerged as having a significance beyond merely being another academic department, characterised by its history of being firmly positioned at the cross-roads of power dynamics between the university, the interests of religious communities, the hegemony of Christianity, and the apartheid state apparatus; as well as its religion education policy. The distinctive brand of religious studies it practises, while lacking the direct implication of employment post-graduation, in some ways, continues to radiate an egalitarian power that cloaks the university in the aura of academic liberty struggled for during apartheid. It is the struggle for this kind of freedom which paved the way for Sunnali Pillay being able to express and assert her religious and cultural uniqueness, by wearing her nose-stud, in a way that at the same time affirmed her membership to South African society with its vibrant religious and cultural life.

Notes

- 1 The pedagogical term “learner” has been officially adopted and accepted in South Africa to replace the term “pupil”.
- 2 See <http://www.concourt.gov.za/site/judgments/judgments.htm>.
- 3 As Michel Clasquin (2005: 20) notes, “many universities in South Africa are known and referred to by acronym or nickname. ‘UCT’ would generally be understood by South Africans as referring to the University of Cape Town”. Similarly, the University of Witwatersrand is commonly referred to as Wits, while “Unisa” is universally recognised by South Africans as meaning the University of South Africa.
- 4 I am deeply indebted to Mr Lionel Smidt, the University of Cape Town’s archivist, for finding and availing me the official documentation relating to the institution of the Department of Religious Studies.
- 5 This is the acronym the organisation itself adopted and used in its publications and official documentation. At the same time, while the C.E.M. receives extensive coverage in this article, I in no way intend to denigrate this organisation or their representatives, but merely utilise the dominance of their correspondence with UCT in the interests of my overall argument.
- 6 UCT Senate minutes of 10 September, 1959.
- 7 *Ibid.*
- 8 *Ibid.*
- 9 Principal of UCT, J.P. Duminy, to Ms Snell Organizing Secretary of the C.E.M., 5 January 1959.
- 10 Ms Snell on behalf of the C.E.M., 31 December 1958; Principal of UCT, J.P. Duminy, to Ms Snell Organizing Secretary of the C.E.M., 5 January 1959.
- 11 Sub-committee report of May 13th 1959.
- 12 *Christian Education*, Dec 1948, no 26.
- 13 *Christian Education*, Dec 1948, no 26: 15.
- 14 The C.E.M membership subscription form, 1953.
- 15 Internal memorandum from D.W. Webb to the principal of UCT, Sir Richard Luyt, 21 May 1969.
- 16 Letter from J.P. Duminy to Miss E Mathews, Organising Secretary of the C.E.M., 12 May 1964.
- 17 Finance officer’s report on the “Department of Divinity or Department of Religious Studies”, February 1967. Original emphasis.
- 18 *Ibid.*
- 19 Memorandum from Professor Erik Chisholm on the Chair of Divinity, 4th June, 1963.
- 20 Letter from the principal of UCT, J.P. Duminy to the Ms Snell, Organising Secretary of the C.E.M, 14 October, 1963.
- 21 Reverend Basil H.M. Brown, organising secretary of the Christian Council of South Africa, to the principal of UCT, J.P. Duminy, 16 May 1963. Emphasis added.

- 22 Letter to the Registrar of UCT, 20th September 1962, from Reverend I.H. Eve on behalf of the Cape Peninsula Church Council.
- 23 Letter from Ms E.W. Mathews on behalf of the C.E.M. to the principal of UCT J.P.Duminy, 7 October 1963. Emphasis added.
- 24 Letter from Ms E.W. Mathews on behalf of the C.E.M. to the principal of UCT, 16 June 1964. Emphasis added.
- 25 Letter from the principal of UCT to the Organising Secretary of the C.E.M., 17 June 1964. Emphasis added.
- 26 Letter from the principal of UCT, Sir Richard Luyt to Dr I.D. du Plessis, 27 May 1969.
- 27 Letter from Dr I.D. du Plessis to the principal of UCT, Sir Richard Luyt, 31 May 1969.
- 28 Letter from the principal of UCT, Sir Richard Luyt to Mr S. Dollie, 18 June 1969. A very similar letter was sent to Rabbis in the Cape Jewish community, who also attended a meeting with the principal.
- 29 Unmarked letter of 21 May 1969.
- 30 Ibid.
- 31 Ibid.
- 32 Finance officers' report on the "Department of Divinity or Religious Studies", February 1967.
- 33 Ibid.
- 34 Minutes of the Sub-Committee, appointed by the Board of the Faculty of Arts, meeting of 13 April, 1967.
- 35 Finance officers report on the Chair of Divinity, 27 August, 1965.
- 36 See *Cape Times*, 3 March 1970.
- 37 Faculty of Arts and Sciences Handbook of the University of Cape Town, 1970. pg. 181.
- 38 See the Religious Studies Departmental website, <http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/religion/IE/index.html>.
- 39 http://www.175.uct.ac.za/history/uct_struggle/?f=1&s=0
- 40 Ibid.
- 41 Ibid.
- 42 Ibid.
- 43 Ibid.
- 44 Ibid.

Works Cited

- Byrne, Peter. 1998. "The Foundations of the Study of Religion in the British Context". In *Religion in the Making: The Emergence of the Sciences of Religion*, 45-65. Edited by Arie Molendijk and Peter Pels. Leiden: Brill.
- Chidester, David. 2003. "Religion Education in South Africa: Teaching and Learning about Religion, Religions and Religious Diversity". *British Journal of Religious Education*, 25, 4, pp. 261-278.
- Clasquin, Michel. 2005. "Religious Studies in South(ern) Africa- An Overview". *Journal for the Study of Religion*, 18 ,2, pp.5-22.
- Erbmann, Richard. 2005. *Conservative Revolutionaries: Anti-Apartheid Activism at the University of Cape Town*. B.A. Hons. Thesis. Oxford University.
- Jeppie, Shamiel. 1989. *Historical Process and the Constitution of Subjects: I.D. du Plessis and the Reinvention of the "Malay"*. B.A. Hons. Thesis. University of Cape Town.
- Lewis, Gavin. 1987. *Between the Wire and the Wall: A History of South African "Coloured " Politics*. Cape Town: David Phillip.
- Molendijk, Arie. 1998. "Transforming Theology: The Institutionalisation of the Science of Religion in the Netherlands". In *Religion in the Making: The Emergence of the Sciences of Religion*, 67-95. Edited by Arie Molendijk and Peter Pels. Leiden: Brill.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. 1987. "Faith". In *The Encyclopaedia of Religion* (2nd ed), pp. 2954-2959. Edited by Lindsay Jones. New York: McMillan.
- Prozesky, Martin. 1989. "Introduction". In *A Southern African Guide to World Religions*, 1-12. Edited by John de Gruchy and Martin Prozesky. Cape Town: David Phillip.
- Smith, Jonathan. Z. 1982. *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.