

The Rev. Donald Ha.
St. Paul's Vicarage
32 Wilton Place
London, S.W.1.

PA 11/13/2/91

Harro



P.O. Box 278, Hillcrest
Natal.

Dear Donald,

Thank you very much for your letter about Geoffrey ^{May 1st 1973} I have accepted your advice to describe Bishop Clayton's new position as "lesser" rather than "lower". I was sorry to hear that Claud Handford had died, and that he will not see the book with which he helped me a great deal. I also notice your observation that Figgis never held a position in Peterhouse, but that will not be difficult to correct. In regard to Geoffrey's position as Chaplain and Fellow of Peterhouse, according to his obituaries, including one published in the Anglican newspaper GOOD HOPE of March 1957, Geoffrey was both Chaplain and Fellow. Unfortunately I cannot now remember the source of the story that the Master did not invite him to sit at the high table, and that the Master of Pembroke did. It does not sound like the kind of story someone would make up, so at the moment I am a bit baffled.

In regard to Michael Scott, he had left South Africa by 1949 so I think that Clayton was speaking retrospectively. Also thank you for telling me that Cyril Tomkinson was not a curate at Chesterfield. I shall make the necessary correction.

Now Now in regard to your general comments. I think it is almost certain that the title of the book will be APARTHEID AND THE ARCH-BISHOP. I think this will go some way to meet the objection that Geoffrey disappears from time to time. It is possible that some other biographer might have treated the subject differently, but I would be incapable of doing it. To me Geoffrey's great contribution was that of a churchman observing the life of his society, criticising its customs and conventions, subjecting the policies of the state to christian criticism, and praying for the state, the country and its peoples. From 1948 onwards this became his great role and I would guess that his concern for the church was inseparable from his concern for his society. In another country his life might have been very different. In any case I do not think of your remarks as being critical except in a helpful sense.

In regard to the typescript, please do not do anything at the moment. A manuscript of course is much more valuable than a typescript, and unless your typescript is needed it really has no purpose. I would suggest you keep it for a year and then destroy it if you have not heard from me.

I was very struck by your sentence "always the head prefect and sometimes the headmaster, he never quite transcended paternalism which one saw at its touching best in his invariable kindness to black and coloured people, but which brooked no competition with white people almost, if not quite, as intelligent as himself." I regard that as a very good summing up. Sometimes a biographer is tempted to wish that he had summed it up himself, but very often on reflection he realises that it is more important that one of his

readers should make such a summing up and that this in itself is a compliment to his biography. You then went on to say "How much more could be said!" I am not quite sure what this means; do you mean that not much more could be said or that much more could be said?

You may seem next month, but I shall not close without thanking you again for the help you have given me.

Yours sincerely

Alan Paton

In regard to Michael Scott, he had left South Africa by 1848 so I think that Clayton was speaking retrospectively. Also thank you for telling me that Cyril Tomkinson was not a curate at Chesterfield. I shall make the necessary correction.

Now in regard to your general comments. I think it is almost certain that the title of the book will be APARTHEID AND THE ARCH-BISHOP. I think this will go some way to meet the objection that Geoffrey disappears from time to time. It is possible that some other biographer might have treated the subject differently, but I would be incapable of doing it. To me Geoffrey's great contribution was that of a churchman observing the life of his society, criticizing its customs and conventions, and praying for the state, the country and its Christian peoples. From 1848 onwards this became his great role and I would guess that his concern for the church was inseparable from his concern for his society. In another country his life might have been very different. In any case I do not think of your remarks as being critical except in a helpful sense.

In regard to the typescript, please do not do anything at the moment. A manuscript of course is much more valuable than a typescript, and unless your typescript is needed it really has no purpose. I would suggest you keep it for a year and then destroy it if you have not heard from me.

I was very struck by your sentence "always the head prefect and sometimes the headmaster, he never quite transcended paternalism which one saw at its coaching best in his invincible kindness to black and coloured people, but which provoked no competition with white people almost, if not quite, as intelligent as himself." I regard that as a very good summing up. Sometimes a biographer is tempted to wish that he had summed it up himself, but very often on reflection he realizes that it is more important that one of his