Article

The Church and Forced Migration/Removal: The Elandskloof Case

Eugene Fortein
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5592-5145
University of the Free State
ForteinEA@ufs.ac.za

Abstract

The article focuses on the forced removal of the Elandskloof mission station through the implementation of the Group Areas Act. The study delves into the ramifications of the Group Areas Act through the lens of whiteness. The main argument of the study is that the Group Areas Act permanently disintegrated societies. Primarily, attention is drawn to the fact that forced removals started with the Dutch's permanent settlement with the Khoi's removal. Additionally, the Group Areas Act and its consequences are discussed. Furthermore, the consequences of the Group Areas Act on the Elandskloof mission station are discussed.

Keywords: Elandskloof; Group Areas Act; Forced Migration

Introduction

Migration is not foreign to Africa, especially sub-Saharan Africa. In Southern Africa, the Khoi and San peacefully migrated while living in harmony with the land. Weather patterns, the availability of grazing lands, and food influenced migration patterns to the coastline or inland. The migration of the Khoi and San was voluntary and an essential feature of their existence. The settling of the Dutch, later the English, French and Germans, and the coming of colonialism later altered these migrations. Unfortunately, apartheid legislation would later cause forced migration or removal of many oppressed groups in South Africa. The study understands forced migration and forced removal to be the same. In both instances, people are forced to uproot their lives and vacate their homes and neighbourhoods against their will. Removal is perhaps a more apt description, as people were removed and thrust wherever the powers of the day decided. "Remove" also indicates the venom, intent, and disregard of the apartheid government towards the lives and existence of those it deemed inferior.

UNISA
Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae
Volume 50 | Number 3 | 2024 | #15892 | 13 pages
https://doi.org/10.25159/2412-4265/15892
ISSN 2412-4265 (Online), ISSN 1017-0499 (Print)

The tragic events of the forced removal of the Elandskloof community are significant for several reasons that will be explored in this paper. The disintegration of the Elandskloof community also meant the disintegration of Elandskloof as a congregation. The Elandskloof case was a historic watershed event in the land restitution process of South Africa. It was the first successful land restitution case in South Africa as the community regained land ownership in 1996. The paper's first focal point is a historical view of the forced removal of the Elandskloof community and congregation within the milieu of "grand apartheid," in which the Dutch Reformed Church (DRC) was apartheid's chief executioner. The second focal point is that the return of land does not instinctively warrant the sense of community and social cohesion that existed before the forced removals. Firstly, the paper will explore the Group Areas Act as the cornerstone of apartheid and a manifestation of "whiteness." Secondly, a historical account of the mission station of Elandskloof will be discussed. Thirdly, the focus will shift to the church's role in the demise of the mission station.

The Ghetto Act, Apartheid and Whiteness

The forced removal of the Elandskloof community and congregation was not the first of its kind. The phenomenon of forced removals goes back to after Jan van Riebeeck arrived at the Cape in 1652. The claims that Van Riebeeck "founded" the Cape are refuted by Patrick Tariq Mellet's (2020) book, *The Lie of 1652. A Decolonised History of Land*. Mellet (2020, 95) illustrates how a vibrant multicultural community has developed at the refreshment station at the proto-port city of the Cape. According to his records, the docking of ships at the Cape goes back at least 180 years before the coming of Van Riebeeck. Contrary to colonial history, the Watermans (Ammaqua) operated a functional refreshment station on the banks of the Camissa River at the time of Van Riebeeck's arrival (Mellet 2020,99).

The Camissa River would become the genesis of land theft in South Africa. Van Riebeeck soon recognised the prime location of the water source for supplying the passing ships with water. Soon after the completion of the fort, Van Riebeeck removed the Watermans (Ammaqua) from the banks of the Camissa River to behind Table Mountain and Lion's Head (Mellet 2020,133). Once there, the Ammaqua people were dispossessed of their usual trading operations and were forced to make a living by hunting and gathering. The release of the free burghers by the Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie (VOC) in 1657 to provide the refreshment station with fresh produce and cattle extended well into the interior, in the process taking land the Khoi had occupied for generations (Marks 1972,63). Shula Marks (1972) recollects the following entry from Van Riebeeck's journal on 4 April 1660:

> taking every day ... land which had belonged to them from all ages and on which they were accustomed to depasture their cattle. They also asked whether if they were to come to Holland they would be permitted to act in the same manner (Marks 1972, 64).

Land theft escalated from the banks of the Camissa River and was later enshrined into the legislation of the Glen Grey Act of 1894, called for by Cecil John Rhodes, the Native Land Act of 1913 and the Native Trust and Land Act of 1936. However, it was the coming of DF Malan's National Party in 1948 with its "church policy" of apartheid, as *Die Kerkbode* (1948) described it, that forced removals would no longer be done in half measures. In 1950 the infamous Group Areas Act and Population Registration Act were launched, which was fundamental to the apartheid project's success (Van Der Westhuizen 2007,180). Along with the Group Areas Act, the Population Registration Act of 1950 instituted a "compulsory racial classification on a national register" of white, black, Indian and "coloured" (SAHO 2014). Living areas were subsequently divided along these racial categories. Ultimately, the crux of apartheid was about more than mere political inclusion or exclusion but also about how different ethnic groups could participate in the economy (Van Der Westhuizen 2007,66). The Group Areas Act was the chief determining factor in the equation, blocking black businesses from operating in white areas.

The Group Areas Act could better be described as the "Ghetto Act," as it broke all the dynamics of communities forged for generations and thrust them into the underdeveloped ghetto areas, bringing about a myriad of socio-economic challenges. I have argued elsewhere that the creation of these ghettoes and the dire state of townships is no mere accident, but it came about by a deliberate design (Fortein 2022). Glen Mills (1989, 65–66) notes that the Bantustans and townships were designed for exclusion and control. The high levels of crime, poverty, and unemployment are by no means a coincidence, but it was part and parcel of the apartheid project. Many studies have linked the current poor socio-economic condition of the townships to the forced removals initiated by the Group Areas Act (Cooper 2009, 2; Daniels and Adams 2010, 46−47; Dixon and Johns 2001,3; Kinnes 1996). Nadine Bowers Du Toit (2014,2) notes that the extent and causes of crime on the Cape Flats can be traced back to how the Group Areas Act disintegrated the family network and dissolved the social glue that held communities together before the removals. Communities were uprooted and left to their own devices in these ghettoes that lacked essential services and communal amenities (Horrell 1963,12).

The Group Areas Act aimed to create white cities in prime areas and to rid these areas of blacks. The Stallard Commission, which investigated the issue of black labour in urban cities, stated the following:

> …the natives should only be allowed to enter urban areas which are essentially the white man's creation when he is willing to enter and minister to the needs of the white man and should depart there form when he ceases to so minister (Haarhoff 2011, 187).

Errol Haarhoff (2011,192) mentions that urban areas were designed for whites, with townships located far from the cities. In some instances, townships were created close to the cities to serve as the labour force for the cities. Blacks were only mere migrant labourers in these white cities, where the dreaded pass law monitored their migration. Hence, one cannot speak of migration without referring to the Group Areas Act.

Religious places of worship like churches, mosques, and temples lost property during the forced removals. The uprooting and removal of congregations is the story of many Uniting Reformed Church in Southern Africa (URCSA) congregations. Hence, the history of the URCSA would be incomplete without referring to the "gaps" in the history of her existence and her people. If truth be told, the URCSA's genesis lies in the forced removal of her Indigenous members from white congregations to separate buildings of worship in 1857.

The Group Areas Act, along with the rest of apartheid legislation, were implementations and representations of whiteness. Although whiteness may be challenging to define, some distinctive characteristics are identifiable. Willie James Jennings (2020,6) describes whiteness as "a white self-sufficient man, his self-sufficiency defined by possession, control and mastery." Elsewhere, Jennings (2013, 789) states that whiteness is challenging to define because it centres around a European subject with the power to classify, categorise, and direct reality. Privilege is always present when constructing whiteness (Lindner 2018, 44; Rasmussen et al., 2001,11–12). Hence, white dominance in South Africa produced institutions and structures that secured generational wealth for whites and generational trauma for other groups. The Group Areas Act secured white possession and privilege and was perhaps the epitome of white control and domination.

The power of whiteness and white supremacy is "unchecked and untrammelled authority to exert its will; the power to invent and change the rules and transgress them with impunity; and the power to define the 'Other,' and to kill him or her with impunity" (Garner 2007,14). The genocide of the Khoi and San, enslavement, and humiliation of blacks for centuries, tell of, what Steve Garner (2007,15) and Guess (2006, 649) call structures of domination. Bell Hooks (1992,172) mentions that terror always represented the power of whiteness in the black imagination. Rasmussen et al. (2001,12) mention that whiteness is primarily associated with elevated levels of violence and terror as a tool of subjugation and a display of privilege. The forced removals of oppressed groups were indeed acts of terror and power with impunity. Besides the loss of land, the human costs of the Group Areas Act are unmeasurable.

Whiteness, domination, and power have always been present since the start of the colonial period. Owing to its European-centredness and its ability to dominate and control, whiteness was used by Europeans to alter the lives of Indigenous people. Whiteness influenced both thought and space (Jennings 2013,784). They took land from the position of power and renamed and privatised it. The land became a commodity. In opposition, indigenous people were deeply connected to the land as it was considered

sacred and holy. The disparity in the perception of space and the use of force enabled European settlers to displace the Khoi from their land in the Elandskloof Area, where they resided for centuries (Anderson 1993,8–9,30). The Group Areas Act would later execute the forced removal of the Elandskloof community and congregation from their land.

The History of Elandskloof Mission Station

The mission station of Elandskloof consists of two farms that lie approximately 200 km northwest of Cape Town in the Cederberg mountains. The commission responsible for the Dutch Reformed Church (DRC)'s missionary work bought the Elandskloof farm in 1861 as a mission station. Interestingly, Rev. (later dr) Andrew Murray bought the farm on behalf of the DRC on 20 March 1861 to establish a "Zending Instituut" (Smit 1966,126). Establishing a mission station was met with fierce resistance from the surrounding farming community as mission stations "threatened the power of masters" (Anderson 1993,52). The interest of the DRC in the Cederberg area comes at the back of the establishment of a mission station by the Renish Mission Society in 1830 in Wuppertal (Barry 2011,142). Furthermore, the DRC sought to counter the liberal ideas of "work discipline" and "civilisation" advanced by the foreign mission societies (Anderson 1993,54).

The Elandskloof community originally encompassed remnants of the Indigenous Khoi communities who had lived in the Cederberg area before the coming of the settlers (Barry and Mayson 2000). The forced removal of the Khoi in the Cederberg area started in 1870 when the area was reserved for forestry purposes (Barry 2009,3). Along with the church, the community assisted in raising funds for the purchase and transport costs of additional land adjacent to Elandskloof (Barry and Mayson 2000). According to the minutes of the church council of Elandskloof in 1890, the community bore half the land's purchase price, which raised the notion of joint ownership among the Elandskloof community, although the land was registered in the name of the DRC (Anderson 1993,57; Barry 2011,142; Barry and Mayson 2000). Reverend Abraham Le Roux, the missionary who managed and lived on the mission station then, served the Elandskloof and the surrounding white farming community (Smit 1966,124). In 1863 Le Roux drew the regulations for those who wished to reside at the mission station, which stated that inhabitants should behave in a Christian manner and that the abuse of alcohol and immorality were strictly forbidden (Anderson 1993,66). The missionary's control over the mission station's inhabitants was interconnected with the DRC missionary committee's control of the land. Furthermore, it countered any liberal ideas that the inhabitants might have.

In a letter of 1878 to the missionary commission of the DRC, Rev. Le Roux mentions that a school was built on the mission station where the children of the surrounding white farmers were, in a sense, forced to attend school with the children of the Elandskloof community (Anderson 1993, 70,73). This occurrence was because there were no church and school alternatives for the white community in the vicinity. In 1893

the congregation of Elandskloof joined the separate racially established so-called "coloured" church of the Nederduitsche Gereformeerde Zendingkerk van Zuid-Afrika, later known as the Nederduitse Gereformeerde Sendingkerk (NG Sendingkerk). Although the congregation belonged to the NG Sendingkerk, the land remained that of the DRC, even though the DRC made provision in 1880 that property may be registered in the name of the local mission congregation (Plaatjies-Van Huffel 2020). Many farmers found belonging to a "Hottentot" congregation inadmissible, where no specific attention was given to their spiritual needs (Anderson 1993,73). This may be why the town of Citrusdal was established after a DRC congregation was established in 1916 to cater to the needs of the white farming community.

The close proximity of the newly established DRC congregation and the town of Citrusdal suggests two aspects. Firstly, it was testimony of the prevalent racial exclusivity of the DRC at the time. Secondly, it was established as an economic and spiritual opposition to the mission station of Elandskloof. The missionaries' new regulations of Elandskloof of the 1920s now included that "no shop, butchery, bakery, or any other profitable business could be started on the station without the consent of the missionary" (Anderson 1993, 75). The DRC's establishment of a new congregation and town of Citrusdal was an emphatic display of power and privilege. It simultaneously secured the economic growth of Citrusdal as the new centre and the demise of the mission station.

The Demise of Elandskloof

At a macro-level, the final demise of the mission station of Elandskloof came about from Afrikaner nationalism and the accompanying philosophy of white supremacy, which displayed power and domination through racially based laws like the Group Areas Act (Barry 2009,4). At the micro-level, the marginalisation of the mission station started once a DRC congregation formed in Citrusdal in 1916. In April 1916, the church council of the DRC Citrusdal congregation appointed a commission of seven members to initiate the town's layout (Smit 1966,44). In 1922, the church council designated a "coloured" location in town (Anderson 1993,75). Identifying a designated location would set off the fall of the mission station.

As early as 1909, calls went up from the farming community to sell Elandskloof (Anderson 1993, 77; Barry 2011, 142; Smit 1966,127). The DRC's commission for missionary work investigated the possibility but decided to retain the mission station. At the request of the missionary commission, the local DRC congregation was later included in the management of Elandskloof (Smit 1966,128). With direct access to the affairs of the mission station, the local DRC congregation was influential in the future of the mission station.

In 1924, calls came for establishing a separate mission congregation in Citrusdal (Anderson 1993,75). The church council of Elandskloof and the commission for missionary work were against the idea of a separate congregation. Perhaps the last

mentioned was considering the financial implications of selling the mission station. The expansion of the "coloured" location in town due to employment opportunities meant that their spiritual needs had to be catered to with the missionary still residing at Elandskloof. In 1930, the DRC's commission for missionary work and the presbytery of Elandskloof decided that the buildings belonged to the General Synod of the DRC and not to the community and that the mission station would be sold at some point in the future (Anderson 1993,81–82).

In 1942, the future of the Elandskloof congregation was dealt a severe blow as the presbytery of Elandskloof started separate financial books for the mission congregation of Elandskloof and the ward of Citrusdal, and a lay preacher was appointed for Citrusdal (Anderson 1993,76; Smit 1966,133). The ward of Citrusdal, with the strong influence of the local DRC congregation, emerged as the new centre of the mission congregation, although no formal decision was taken to establish a new congregation. The departure of the last missionary from Elandskloof in 1953 led to the decline of both the mission station and the interest in the DRC's commission or missionary work. The local DRC Citrusdal congregation, through their minister, Rev PSN Swart, worked tirelessly to form a separate mission congregation in Citrusdal by contributing to the salary of the new minister and a parsonage and church building. The presbytery of Elandskloof established the new mission congregation in Citrusdal on 10 October 1952 (Anderson 1993,76; Smit 1966,137). The establishment of an additional mission congregation in the neighbouring Koue Bokkeveld further contributed to the decline of the Elandskloof congregation (Vrey 1976,190). The new congregation of Citrusdal now formed the centre of the presbytery of Elandskloof, now known as the presbytery of Citrusdal-Elandskloof (Anderson 1993,77). On 11 June 1953, the presbytery commission of the NG Sendingkerk and the DRC congregation of Citrusdal decided that Elandskloof would cease to exist as a congregation (Vrey 1976). In 1961, the presbytery of Elandskloof changed its name to the presbytery of Citrusdal, which concluded the official ecclesiastical existence of the name "Elandskloof."

The events that would play out on 18 November 1958 demonstrated white prejudice and the power associated with whiteness. On that evening, the group of Prof AC van Wyk, Revs JD Conradie, PES Smith (members of the DRC's missionary work commission), their lawyer, and the Revs PSN Swart (local minister of the DRC congregation) and Aggenbach (local mission congregation minister) convened in the parsonage of the DRC Citrusdal (Barry 2011,142; Wiese 2009, 177). Even though the sole reason for the meeting was the future of Elandskloof, no person from Elandskloof was present. According to Tobie Wiese (2009, 177), the tabled report resulted from a discussion between Revs Swart, Aggenbach and the lawyer of the missionary committee. The crux of the report was that Elandkloof should cease to exist.

Over the years, several roleplayers advanced reasons for selling the mission station. The local doctor, Dr Truter (also a member of the Citrusdal DRC congregation), mentioned the high levels of Tuberculosis in Elanadskloof that could lead to the death of several

people (Anderson 1993,86; Wiese 2009, 178). It is worth mentioning that the missionaries who resided at Elandskloof, in their regular report to the missionary commission, rarely mentioned cases of Tuberculosis. This was rather peculiar since the missionary reported on the minute detail of the mission station. Apart from racial prejudice, the report divulged the real reasons behind the call for Elandskloof's demise. The report stated that the white farmers of the district were 90 per cent in favour of the demise of Elandskloof since they had a labour shortage (Anderson 1993, 81,86; Wiese 2009,178). For the white farmers, the Elandskloof community could strengthen their labour force. The other reason behind the farmers' call was power and control. The report stated that the white farmers were flabbergasted that the politically powerless and economically poor Elandsklowers still had the independence to determine their own movement, how long and whom they wanted to work for and that they called themselves "farmers" (Wiese 2009,178). The white farmers had no control over the Elandskloof community in an area where farm workers entirely belonged to the farmer.

The Elandskloof community raised some resistance to the selling of the land. An Elandskloof leadership, headed by Adam Visser, headed to Cape Town in March of 1958 to address the Commissioner of Coloured Affairs (Wiese 2009,181). Their request was relatively uncomplicated. They applied for apartheid (Anderson 1993,85; Wiese 2009,180). Seeing that the community consisted of mainly "Coloured" members and one white family, the farm should be declared a "Coloured" area in terms of the Group Areas Act. Even the community's lawyer wrote a letter in this regard. The state answered through the office of the DRC's secretary for missionary work. He reminded the community that they were merely tenants on the land and that the whites in the area were against Coloureds gaining control of the farm (Wiese 2009,182). With this, Elandskloof remained white despite 600 "Coloureds" and one white family residing on the farm.

With the congregation of Elandskloof languishing, it was only a matter of time before the mission station would be sold. By 1958, the pressure from the local DRC congregation and farming community to sell Elandskloof and the implementation of apartheid mounted on the missionary committee to such an extent that the following options remained (Anderson 1993,86):

1) that Elandskloof be handed over to the Department of "Coloured" Affairs;

2) to sell Elandskloof to the NG Sendingkerk for a small amount;

3) to sell the farm to a private owner; or

4) to further rent out the farm.

After discussions with the NG Sendingkerk and against the community's wishes, the DRC's missionary committee decided to sell Elandskloof to the Sendingkerk for £6000, which the Sendingkerk accepted (Wiese 2009,187). The white farming community of

Citrusdal fiercely objected to this decision as placing Elandskloof in the hands of the NG Sendingkerk would not address the farming community's labour problem (Anderson 1993,87–88). Furthermore, the local DRC objected that if Elandskloof were to be sold to a "non-white church" (the Sendingkerk), they would be "stuck with the black spot" in a white farming community (Wiese 2009,189). They feared that Elandskloof would later develop as a "Coloured" neighbourhood under "Coloured" control if it were to be sold to the Sendingkerk (Anderson 1993,88). As expected, the pressure of the Citrusdal farming community was instrumental in the DRC's decision to withdraw its offer to the Sendingkerk.

The DRC approached the Department of Coloured Affairs, then under the leadership of PW Botha, on 11 May 1960, with a request to take over Elandskloof (Anderson 1993,88). The Department was mainly responsible for the creation of "Coloured" reserves. After scrutinising the objections of the Citrusdal farming community and consultation with the secretary of the DRC's missionary committee, Botha declined the offer (Anderson 1993,88; Wiese 2009,189). From 1960 to 1961, the government investigated the removal of mission stations from white areas in terms of the Group Areas Act. Hence, implementing the Group Areas Act and other state policies undoubtedly influenced the decisions of the DRC regarding Elandskloof (Anderson 1993,89).

Eventually, on 12 September 1960, the missionary committee informed the Elandskloof community that the farm would be sold to a private owner and that they had until 31 December 1961 to vacate the mission station (Anderson 1993,88–89). The community submitted a tender to buy the land from the church, but by then, Elandskloof was declared a white group area under the Group Areas Act (Barry 2011,143; Barry and Mayson, 2000). By then, the DRC successfully requested to remove the clause "for mission purposes only" from Elandskloof's title deed (Anderson 1993,89). This proves that a government adamant on forced removals would find no objections to asserting its power with impunity to scrap the clause if it meant eliminating the "black spot."

Elandskloof was eventually sold in October of 1961 to the neighbouring Smit brothers, who were church council members of the local DRC congregation (Anderson 1993,90; Barry 2011,143, Wiese 2009,210). When the Elandskloof community refused to move nor relinquish their land, the Smit brothers immediately implemented removal strategies to evict them from the land (Anderson 1993,91; Barry 2011,143). Barry (2011,143) describes the community's forced removal as "a brutal eviction," based on interviews with some community members. Anderson (1993,91) describes it as "acts of destruction." Smit's first action was to cordon off new smaller plots for living purposes, disregarding the community's previous plots and gardens (Anderson 1993,92; Wiese 2009,215). The community had their livestock (579 head of cattle) impounded and sold cheaply to the neighbouring farmers (Anderson 1993,91; Barry 2011,143; Wiese 2009,213). Several animals were burnt to death in fires the Smit brothers started, apparently to "clean" the veld. Smit went as far as to shoot some of the community's

animals (Wiese 2009,2018). Some community members also lost their homes in the fire (Anderson 1993,91; Barry 2011,143; Wiese 2009,220). Soon Smit used the church building to shave the wool of his sheep, and on rainy days he used it to dry the peaches (Wiese 2009,219). Neither the local DRC congregation, the missionary commission of the DRC, the surrounding farming community, nor the Sendingkerk spoke against or aided the community throughout their terrible ordeal. This was expected since all stakeholders finally got their way by eliminating the "black spot." The brutal events surrounding the forced removal signify the unchecked and untrammelled authority of white supremacy and whiteness to exert its will. In all this, the church was the chief executioner.

In resistance, the community protested through a walk from Elandskloof to the government's offices in Cape Town (Anderson 1993,93). Even the elderly joined in the walk with the hope of saving Elandskloof. Just outside the gates of Elandskloof, as it started to rain, the group camped along the road, with a pregnant woman giving birth (Wiese 2009,222). The police eventually stopped the march as PW Botha fiercely condemned the community's action (Anderson 1993,93). Upon their return, the DRC's secretary for missionary work and the chairperson of the Citrusdal Farmers' Association, Abraham van Zyl, told the community that the time had come for them to leave and that the local farmers were willing to employ them (Wiese 2009,228).

The following Sunday, the entire community attended the church service for the last time. John Januarie delivered the final sermon outside the church building since Smit held the keys to the building as he was already using the building to shave his sheep (Wiese 2009,228). The events of the following Monday morning resemble that of slaves being sold to whoever wanted them. Numerous farmers with trucks from Worcester, Tulbagh, Ceres, and De Doorns came for a "load" of Elandsklowers (Wiese 2009,229). Ironically, the local DRC congregation and farming community portrayed the Elandskloof community in a negative light. "Poor quality of work," "bad influence," and "dirty people" were some of the descriptions of the Elandsklowers. However, that Monday morning, the same white farmers were there to snatch up the lazy and dirty Elandsklowers, as they referred to them. Eventually, the community was removed from Elandskloof and scattered across the Western Cape. Using a "no-trespassing sign," Smit barred the Elandsklowers from entering the land their ancestors lived on for centuries (Anderson 1993,94). The community were not even allowed to visit the graves of their family members.

The Return

The Elandskloof community ceaselessly believed and worked for a return to their beloved land. The challenges never diminished the community's belief in justice. The passing of the Restitution of Land Rights Act of 1994 paved the way for the community to return. On 20 June 1996, a settlement was reached, and the legal ownership of the land was transferred to the Elandskloof community on 13 December 1996 (Barry and Mayson, 2000). On 16 December 1996, the Elandskloof community re-occupied their

land in a moving ceremony as the first land restitution case in South Africa (Barry 2011,143).

The return to Elandskloof is typified by various challenges, notably division and conflict. Internal conflict paralysed the development of the farm and led to the farm being placed under the administration of the Director-General of Rural Development and Land Reform in 2005 (Barry 2011,146). This was still the case when I left the congregation in 2020. This is a common phenomenon of community resettlement where the Group Areas Act uprooted communities. Notwithstanding that, the community exhibited great unity in resisting the sale and reoccupation of the farm, but that unity was destroyed when the community was forced to leave the farm. The fragmentation of the community across the Western Cape shattered the social glue that held the community together for so long.

Conclusion

This study aimed to demonstrate that the forced removal of the Elandskloof community was forced migration, as the community was forcefully evicted against their will. Implementing the Group Areas Act was described as a demonstration of whiteness and the destroyer of communities' social cohesion, which is almost impossible to regain. The study indicated how the church, particularly the DRC, served as an extension of demeaning government policies.

The impact and damage of the Group Areas Act on the communities it destroyed is boundless. The same holds true for the congregations affected by the Group Areas Act. The Elandskloof case is a testament that the return of the land does not automatically mean the return of the spirit and cohesion that existed before the forced removals. The forced removal of the Elandskloof community demonstrated white power through acts of violence and terror sanctioned by a theology that blessed land theft, wealth, and the privilege of a minority. It is regretful that the church (the DRC in general and the local DRC congregation of Citrusdal) played no meaningful part in the reconstruction of Elandskloof since the DRC was the sole executioner of the National Party's policies in the Elandskloof case. Perhaps, the unfinished business of the Elandskloof case lies in the belief that those responsible for the forced migration are yet to make restitution.

References

Anderson, M. 1993. "Elandskloof: Land, Labour and Dutch Reformed Mission Activity in the Southern Cedarberg, 1860–1963." BA (Hons.) Thesis, University of Cape Town.

Barry, M. 2009. "Dysfunctional Communal Property Associations in South Africa: The Elandskloof Case." Paper presented at The Annual Conference of the International Federation of Surveyors - the FIG Working Week 2009. Eilat, Israel.

Barry, M. 2011. “Land Restitution and Communal Property Associations: The Elandskloof Case.” *Land Use Policy* 28(1): 139–150. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2010.05.007

Barry, M and Mayson, D. 2000. “Informal Settlement Characteristics in a Rural Land Restitution Case: Elandskloof, South Africa.” *Sociological Research Online* 5(2). http://www.socresonline.org.uk/5/2/barry.html.

Bowers Du Toit, NF. 2014. “Gangsterism on the Cape Flats: A Challenge to ‘Engage the powers.’” *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 70(3). http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v70i3.2727.

Daniels, D. and Adams, Q. 2010. “Breaking with Township Gangsterism: The Struggle for Place and Voice.” *African Studies Quarterly* 11(4): 45−57.

Dixon, B. and Johns, CM. 2001. “Gangs, Pagad and the State: Vigilantism and Revenge Violence in the Western Cape. In: Violence and Transition Series.” Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation. http://scholar.google.co.za/scholar?q=Dixon+%26+Johns+2001&btnG=&hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5 (accessed 3 August 2023).

Cooper, A 2009. “Gevaarlike Transitions: Negotiating Hegemonic Masculinity and Rites of Passage amongst ‘Coloured’ Boys Awaiting Trial on the Cape Flats.” *PINS* 37: 1−17.

Die Kerkbode, 1948.

Fortein, EA. 2022. “Vulnerable By Design. Black Theology as Prophetic Theology.” *The Ecumenical Review* 74(4): 527–540.

Garner, S. 2007. *Whiteness. An Introduction*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203945599

Guess, TJ. 2006. “The Social Construction of Whiteness: Racism by Intent, Racism by Consequence.” *Critical Sociology* 32(4): 649–673. https://doi.org/10.1163/156916306779155199

Haarhof, E. 2011. “Appropriating Modernism: Apartheid and the South African Township.” *A|Z ITU Journal of Faculty of Architecture* 8 (1): 184–195.

Horrel, M. 1963. “The Group Areas Act.” *The Black Sash*, 8–13.

Jennings, WJ .2013. “Theology and Race.” In *The Routledge Companion to Modern Christian Thought*, edited by C. Meister and J. Beilby, 783–794. Abingdon: Routledge.

Jennings, WJ. 2020. *After Whiteness: An Education in Belonging*. Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Kinnes, I. 1996. “The Struggle for the Cape Flats.” In *Now That We Are Free: “Coloured” Communities in a Democratic South Africa*, edited by W. James, D. Caliguiere and K. Cullinan, 16–20. Rondebosch: IDASA. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781685858001-004

Linder, A. 2018. “Defining Whiteness: Perspectives on Privilege.” *Gnovis* 18(2): 43–58.

Marks, S. 1972. “Khoisan Resistance to the Dutch in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.” *The Journal of African History* 13 (1): 55–80. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021853700000268

Mellet, PT. 2020. *The Lie of 1652. A Decolonised History of Land.* Cape Town: Tafelberg.

Mills, G. 1989. “Space and Power in South Africa: The Township as a Mechanism of Control.” *Ekistics* 56 (334/335): 65–74.

Plaatjies-Van Huffel, M.A. 2020. “Whose Land Is it Anyway? A Historical Reflection on the Challenges URCSA Encountered with Land and Property Rights.” *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae* 46(2). https://doi.org/10.25159/2412-4265/7359

Rasmussen, B., Klinenberg, E., Nexica, I., and Wray, M (Eds). 2001. *The Making and Unmaking of Whiteness*. London: Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv11sn1gq

South African History Online (SAHO). 2014. “The Group Areas Act of 1950.” https://www.sahistory.org.za/article/group-areas-act-1950 (accessed 3 August 2014).

Smit, AP 1966. Ons kerk in die Bo-Olifantsrivier. NG Kerk Citrusdal 1916–1966. NG Kerk.

Van Der Westhuizen, C. 2007. *White Power and the Rise and Fall of the National Party*. Cape Town: Zebra Press.

Vrey, G. 1976. *Die Geskiedenis van die Ned. Geref. Sendinggemeente Elandskloof 1860–1925*. Licentiate Thesis, University of Stellenbosch.

Wiese, T. 2009. *Die Verhaal van Elandskloof*. Pretoria: Pretoria Boekhuis.