

Spring 1999 Monday Night Lecture Series
What Canst Thou Say?

From Calvinist Dissident to Quaker Mediator

April 17 and 18, 1999

by Hendrik Willem van der Merwe
Friend-in-Residence at Pendle Hill
Senior Fellow of the Centre for Conflict Resolution,
University of Cape Town

My response to the theme question: 'What canst thou say?' is quite literal and biographical. I will tell you the story of my life. That will tell you what I have to say. In fact, my story will tell you what I had to say, but more particularly how I said it. Should it be the language of the priest or the prophet? It starts with my gradual estrangement from the Dutch Reformed Church (DRC) in which I had been quite active, my discovery of Quakerism and how I found the beliefs, lives and actions of the Quakers to be consistent with my search for a new home. My beliefs were not any more at odds with my 'church'. What I had to say now, could be said with the backing of fellow Quakers.

I will also address the question: To whom do you say? In my particular case I was constantly faced with the problems of reform in apartheid society: how much can I reform my society from inside, and how much through forces from outside. Do I persuade or confront? Do I negotiate or coerce?

And now, in the New South Africa, how do we deal with the wrongs of the past: do we forgive or punish?

A long journey: From Afrikaner to African

Standing here before an audience of American Quakers almost on the opposite side of the globe from the rural Afrikaans community where I was brought up, where I seldom heard English outside the classroom, I am conscious of the many ways in which I have traveled besides geographic distance and religious orientation.

I was born on a farm near the small town of Bonnievale in a beautiful valley along the Breerivier, meaning Wide River, running parallel to the Langeberge, Long Mountains. My father was one of the first farmers towards the end of the previous century on the bank of this river. I was born when he was sixty and the big difference in age added to the huge gap between his generation and mine. Before the Anglo-Boer-War at the turn of the century, my father traveled on horseback accompanying ox wagons to the Transvaal Republic, a thousand miles to the north. This trip must have taken him about three months. Today, when I fly from Cape Town to Pretoria or Johannesburg, the flight takes less than two hours.

Our farm is 130 miles from Cape Town but though we had a car, my father would not undertake such a long journey. When he had to consult a specialist in the city, our family took the overnight train to Cape Town. So it came about that I saw the wonderful city lights for the first time when I was 16. When I went to university at the age of 22, I went by bicycle. The trip took me a day and a half. Today it is not unusual for my family to pay a day trip to Cape Town - two hours each way.

So, apart from the distance between the two generations, there was also a big distance between my childhood and my adult life. Less than 16 years after my first visit to Cape Town, our first child, Marieke, was born on

the prairies of Saskatchewan, a province that was as alien to me in my childhood as the people called Quakers.

I tended to be religious since my early childhood. I was active in the DRC, first in Sunday school, then the Student Christian Association, then as a missionary in Southern Rhodesia, and eventually as deacon and elder in my early forties. The DRC seems to me to represent the extreme opposite of the Quakers in the broad spectrum of religion.

The theological and ideological distance I have traveled from Calvinism to Quakerism resembles the great geographic jumps I have made across the globe. It is a fairly strict Calvinist church, to the extent that any deviation from the teachings of Calvin was seen as heresy. Concepts such as dogma, creed and sacraments were fundamental parts of our religious life. The Bible was seen as the only revelation of God. Failure to read the Bible and going on my knees in prayer twice a day in my childhood was a source of guilt and anxiety. The same for failure to attend church on Sunday. Emphasis on Calvin's concept of original sin tended to further promote a guilt-ridden atmosphere. One can ask how can one feel at home in two such different religions. Well, I was not at home in the DRC.

This biblical rigidity also applied to the ideology of apartheid, the separation of ethnic and race groups: whites, colored people, i.e. descendants of an early mixture of whites, Hottentots and slaves from the Malaysian archipelago, Indians, i.e. descendants of indentured sugar cane workers brought from India, and Africans, i.e. the vast majority of South Africans, known over the years as kaffirs, Bantu, natives, blacks. The custom of apartheid was not unique to South Africa, or for that matter to the colonies of the British empire, but in 1948 the Nationalist government of Dr D F Malan, turned custom into law. Dr Malan, a former minister of the DRC won the election on the apartheid slogan. His successor, Dr Hendrik French Verwoerd, a former Sociology professor, who studied in Nazi Germany, turned apartheid into an ideology, based on the Bible. Apartheid became part of our religion.

While apartheid was a racist policy, it had a fundamental ethnic component, that of the Afrikaner volk. Afrikaners were the Afrikaans-speaking descendants of the Dutch settlers. Just like the word American, Afrikaner is a misnomer. Literally, Afrikaner means African – a person from Africa. But in fact Afrikaner means a white European, quite distinct from a black African. Apartheid was meant to maintain that distinction.

I grew up in Afrikaans culture that felt threatened from many corners. In my childhood I was conscious of the three Groot Gevare, Great Dangers: the Engelse Gevaar (you know they conquered first the Dutch settlement in the Cape and subsequently the Boer Republics), the Roomse Gevaar (you remember the inquisition of the Roman Catholic Church), and the Swart Gevaar (the preponderance of the "uncivilized" black masses).

I grew up with the idea that I would become a farmer and this is what I did after finishing high school. But farming did not bring me fulfillment, and so I took off into "dark" Africa to seek adventure as a farmer on a mission station in Southern Rhodesia. I returned after two and a half years living among Africans and still refused to shake hands with a black man, believing that it was God's will.

But the seeds of dissent gradually started growing. Many years later, when the Quaker Esperanto Society in England asked me to single out the turning point in my life for an Esperanto pamphlet to distribute behind the iron curtain, I singled out one evening shortly after my return from the mission when my elder brother Jaco, who had just returned from a year study in Holland, referred to a colored woman as a woman, not using the normal derogatory term "meid" derived from maid. This was the first time I heard one of my family use such a form of respect for a colored person. I had heard the English government Inspector of Schools in Southern Rhodesia once refers to an African woman as a "lady", and I smiled because he was an Englishman, he did not know better. I corrected my brother twice: You mean meid?, but he persisted: Vrou.

There was no more discussion, but I believe that was my moment of truth. Gradually a new vision developed. The colored woman was a woman in the first place. An Afrikaner became an African. This new vision transcended apartheid.

Dissent

Other factors gradually stimulated critical thinking and growing estrangement from traditional beliefs. At age 22 I went to the University of Stellenbosch, a strong source of Afrikaner nationalism where I took a special Bachelors degree to allow me access to the DRC Theological Seminary. I became close friends of the two sons of Dr Malan and dated the daughter of Dr Verwoerd until I met my future wife, Marietjie, whose mother, incidentally, was the private secretary of her professor, Dr Verwoerd, while she was his student!

But not all Afrikaans professors were conservative. I was greatly encouraged and influenced by the ideas of the elderly Professor Ben Keet of the DRC Theological Seminary, a lonely dissident in the church who argued that apartheid could not be based on the Bible. He was a kind and lovely person who spoke Truth to Power with Love. I became actively involved in the Kontak-Studiegroep, the Contact Study Group, a revolutionary organization that invited black people to address a select group of students on campus. These meetings were quite unique in those days. Some of the people we invited became lifelong friends, like the famous poet, Peter Philander, who later emigrated to come and teach at Friends Academy in Long Island.

In later years I became active in liberal organizations like the South African Institute of Race Relations, a human rights organization with the explicit goal of promoting an integrated society. In the early sixties a former moderator of the DRC, Dr Beyers Naude, formed the Christian Institute of Southern Africa (CI) as a multi-racial ecumenical organization in open defiance of the apartheid policy, and of the apartheid theology of the DRC. I joined this organization as soon as I read about it and became active in it. It was not long before the DRC national synod declared the Christian Institute a heretical organization, defrocked Beyers Naude, and forbade members of the Church councils of congregations to belong to it. My style was more like that of Ben Keet and less confrontational than that of Beyers Naude, but I believed firmly in the principles of the CI and refused to resign. I was at that time a deacon on the church council of the congregation in Grahamstown, and subsequently an elder in Rondebosch, a suburb of Cape Town. In both congregations I informed the ministers that I wanted to retain membership in both the church and the CI, and wanted the matter discussed in the church council. In both cases they avoided discussion, admitting that the Synod decision was a political one that they could not defend on theological grounds. I remained a member of the CI until it was banned in about 1977. I remained a member of the church council until my period as elder ended in 1974. By that time I had become disillusioned with the DRC and have given up hope that it could be reformed from the inside. I personally had no influence in the church beyond my own congregation where I was constantly blocked in any efforts to remove traditional practices of racial discrimination and to promote racial integration.

Meeting the Quakers

At the University of Stellenbosch I discovered Sociology and gave up the idea of becoming a minister in the DRC. At the end of six years at university I married the daughter of a DRC minister and came to pursue further studies at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA). On arrival in New York in 1958 we met the first Quaker, Frank Loescher, who became a lifelong friend until his death in Cape Town. I remember telling a fellow South African student at UCLA that we had actually met a Quaker, and he was an ordinary, fine person! At UCLA my wife and I were appointed Resident Host and Hostess of the Westwood International Student Center, founded and run by a Quaker committee, with whom we became good friends. But they made no effort to recruit us to their church and we learned nothing about the Quakers. Back in South Africa I gave no thought that there might be Quakers around. It was only in the early 1970s, after we had moved to Cape Town, that I became involved in the Quaker Service Fund (QSF) and then got to know the handful of Quakers in Cape Town.

I became totally involved in and committed to the QSF and soon became chairman even though I had never been at a meeting for worship. I knew there was somewhere a source of spiritual strength that accounted for the admirable work of this small committed group. In 1974 I attended the World Congress of Sociology in Toronto where I joined a small group of Quaker sociologists and attended my first meeting for worship where I met Elise Boulding. On my way back I stopped to visit our good friends Harry and Jose Wright at Swarthmore College. Here I received an invitation to meet with senior AFSC people to discuss their proposals for a program on Southern Africa. My next stop was in London where I was invited to meet Walter Martin and John Harding of the Friends Service Council. When I got home and my wife heard all the praise I had for the Quakers I had met, she commented: This is where you belong. The day that my duties as elder ended in the DRC was the last day I attended church there. From then on I attended meeting for worship which was at the same time, Sunday mornings at ten.

The major things that attracted me in the Quakers were informal fellowship, the lack of dogma and creed, the silent meeting for worship, the liberal political orientation and racial harmony, and the emphasis on service. Even before I attended meeting for worship I became aware of a fundamental tenet of Quaker belief, the balance between the goals of justice and peace. In due course I would gain a reputation as political mediator and peacemaker. But early on I realized that it should never be peace at all costs. You cannot have peace without justice. And vice versa.

Justice and Peace

I want to emphasize three things about justice and peace. One is that they are ideals that can never be attained. We can strive towards them, pursue them. Second is that they are complementary, you cannot have one without the other. Third is that they stand in a relationship of tension to each other. Sometimes justice appears to be unattainable by peaceful means, and at times the achievement of peace seems to run counter to the demand for justice. This tension becomes more obvious in the interaction and contrast between two different means of pursuing these two goals, i.e. between the roles of prophets and priests.

The priest or peacemaker or mediator or conciliator must have credibility on all sides of a conflict. Building and maintaining good relations and credibility with all parties is not compatible with attacks on injustice or public confrontation with the perceived perpetrators of injustice. The roles, tasks and styles of peacemakers and prophets are different. And this difference can cause severe tension within any one person or group, and among persons and groups. The peacemaker who is trying to make peace at all costs, is likely to underplay injustice and overlook its manifestations. In South Africa, where injustice was seen as the major issue, peacemaking and mediation were highly suspect and often violently opposed. This was one of the reasons why the middle ground became eroded in South Africa. Peacemakers, mediators and conciliators were scarce. It took courage and wisdom to pursue a mediating role. I want to share with you some of the lessons I have learned from my experiences in this field over more than three decades.

In 1968 I was appointed Director of the Centre for Intergroup Studies, now known as the Centre for Conflict Resolution, at the University of Cape Town. I got the job partly because I did have a reputation of trying to bring together conflicting groups. But this became my major task for the rest of my career: to promote communication among conflicting groups. In the early 1970s I met the Quakers. This new religious home and new job tended to be mutually rewarding and also challenging. It was not without tension and conflict.

I would single out one major theme in my career in conflict resolution: the reconciliation of opposites, and more specifically the two goals of peace and justice. I explained above that they are complementary and in tension. That tension is present in each of us and in the Society. In the Society I found the kind of wisdom and support necessary to handle this tension in order to achieve a balance between justice and peace.

Conscientious affirmation

Many of you have heard the first lecture in this series in which Tom Farquhar pleaded for a responsible way of challenging authority by saying NO to unacceptable policies, while also affirming the positive, the good, the acceptable – what he called the deeper YES burning inside. I would like to interpret this NO as a protest against injustice. It is a means to achieve justice. I interpret the YES as an affirmation of the good in an adversary, i.e. the system, the government, the authority within which or under whose auspices a certain injustice is taking place. It is a positive step to achieve conciliation, peace.

About twenty years ago I wrote an article for *The Friend* titled "Conscientious Affirmation." In it I expressed my admiration for people, especially Friends, who support conscientious objection, especially in times of war. I deplored, however, the atmosphere of intolerance and animosity that often accompanied campaigns for conscientious objection and other related anti-apartheid activities. These campaigns contributed to further polarization in our society and eroded the middle ground. It made reconciliation more and more difficult.

While I was Clerk of South Africa General Meeting I represented the Quakers in the South African Council of Churches. At one annual national conference there was deadlock between conservatives and radicals about a motion calling for an illegal protest against an apartheid law. One reason why the conservatives felt unable to support the motion was the arrogant language of the motion. I then proposed that we formulate the proposal in the language of conscientious affirmation instead of objection. My proposal argued that we as Christians have an obligation to promote contact, fellowship and understanding among all population groups, especially among racial groups. It so happened that there were laws that prohibited certain kinds of contact between certain racial groups, for instance the law that required whites to get permits to visit black townships. Instead of making an emotional attack on this law, I proposed that we **affirm our commitment to interracial fellowship, regardless of the law**. We therefore declared that we continued in our resolve to develop fellowship across racial lines and that would inevitably mean visiting black townships. We found this law requiring permits so morally objectionable that we could not apply for these permits in good conscience. We would therefore proceed to visit our fellows in the townships without these permits. Should such action happen to be against the law, it would not deter us. This was a positive step, for something good, not against something bad.

This was called **conscientious affirmation**. We believed it would evoke a different response from our adversaries than the strategy of conscientious objection. This proposal was passed unanimously by the Council.

I want to suggest that these two approaches resemble in some ways the differences between the pursuit of justice and the pursuit of peace.

At about the same time I participated in a public meeting in the Cape Town city hall protesting against the destruction of squatter housing. Allen Boesak, who was that time moderator of the DRC Mission Church, made an impassioned plea for bringing down "this evil government." I felt the urge to put it in other words and got on the stage and made a plea "for a better government." I was becoming more and more conscious of how we said things, and not only what we said.

I got to know Bishop Desmond Tutu well in the Council of Churches and in other contexts. During the days of apartheid he was in my view the typical prophet, resembling those from the Old Testament. He was a typical political priest so much resented by conservative whites. He exposed the evils of apartheid and confronted the authorities in sermons and speeches. He cried for justice. He was not known as a peacemaker or mediator, but I was not surprised when he, and also Lech Walesa, the Polish Trade union leader, received the Nobel Peace Prize. They paved the way for peace by promoting justice in their respective societies. When apartheid was abandoned in the nineties, Tutu publicly stated that he was returning to his original calling, the priestly role. He ended his career as chairman of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

Conflict intervention

In the late 1980s we founded the South African Association for Conflict Intervention (SAACI). We argued that there were two forms of intervention: partisan and impartial. Both were needed in South Africa. Partisan intervention is taking sides and promoting the cause or power of one party. The Quakers are known for taking the side of the underdog, the deprived or the weaker party. Politicians usually have other motivations for taking sides. Partisan intervention can, in a good sense, be part of empowerment of the weaker party and coercion on the stronger party. Intervention is meant to increase the bargaining position of the weaker party. The conflict is not ended, but probably stepped up.

Impartial (or neutral) intervention means not taking sides in a conflict, but intervening as a mediator, peacemaker or conciliator. The purpose of impartial intervention is to make peace and to end the conflict. Quakers have a long history of peacemaking and conciliation. In fact, they also received the Nobel Peace Prize. As I understand it, their role was not very much unlike those of Tutu and Valesa. They were praised for their selfless dedication to humanitarian projects among the destitute, the deprived, and usually the underdog, the weaker party. By the way, it was in this same tradition that the Quakers opposed Britain's participation in the Anglo-Boer War, and assisted the Boer families in their efforts to recover on the scorched earth left behind by the British army.

The choice between partisan and impartial intervention is not always easy. It can be a source of intense anxiety in an individual and of intense conflict, even violent conflict, in a group. Tutu's choice of the prophetic role during the apartheid years was extremely controversial. The role of "political priest" was historically despised in Afrikaner circles and also disapproved in many conservative English churches. Likewise, his priestly role after the negotiated political settlement in South Africa, was seen as a sellout by black radicals who believed that forgiveness and conciliation deprived them of their right to justice.

The choice between the two roles is crucial in determining the outcome and success of intervention. In the case of South Africa, as it is now in Kosovo, there are numerous attempts to intervene, both partisan and impartial. In South Africa, as in Kosovo today, many people despaired because peacemaking was so unsuccessful. I want to argue that many failed because of the failure to acknowledge the complementarity between justice and peace, between coercion/empowerment and negotiation, but also the failure to acknowledge the tension between them.

I want to describe to you the insights I have gained, and the lessons we have learned in this respect.

In 1985 Archbishop Dennis Hurley, foremost human rights activist of the Roman Catholic Church asked me to intervene in the violent conflict in Natal between the predominantly Zulu organization, Inkatha, and the pro-ANC United Democratic Front (UDF). After acquiring the approval of the national leaders on both sides, I also obtained approval from the local leaders. I soon found out that while both sides agreed that I could intervene, the local UDF leaders wanted no peacemaking. They believed that at that stage they were at a distinct disadvantage in the violent struggle against Inkatha. They wanted to improve their bargaining position before entering into negotiations. For the first time in my career these people brought home to me this fundamental insight that peacemaking and the ending of the violent conflict could mean the institutionalization of existing inequality and the continuation of what they saw as an unjust situation. For them, it would mean peace without justice.

It is at this stage that interveners who want peace at all costs would pack their bags and go home. But intervention, as I emphasized earlier, has two sides. The need of the UDF at this stage was not for impartial intervention, but for empowerment. While I was in no position to give any services of the kind they had in mind, I am sure that my five visits to Natal over the next ten months made some contribution to a mental and psychological, and even intellectual, empowerment process, paving the way for peacemaking. It therefore did not come as a big surprise in mid 1986 when the UDF told me they were ready to meet with Inkatha leaders

to negotiate. And so the first meeting of top leaders of the two organizations took place in the palace of the Archbishop in June 1986.

The lesson I learned in Natal in South Africa was that the needs of the community, of the parties involved, have to be considered. I cited the example of the weaker party in need of some kind of empowerment. But what of the stronger party, very often the party guilty of, or at least accused of perpetrating the injustices. What are our attitudes, policies and strategies towards this party, knowing that we cannot annihilate or destroy it? At some stage we have to come to terms with it.

I remember so well the first meeting of the leaders of the UDF and Inkatha. They immediately started accusing each other of committing violence. As convenor of the meeting and as chairman I interrupted them with the following proposal: "Can we agree that there is guilt on both sides? And can we agree that there will therefore not be any accusations or mudslinging at this meeting?" There was a moment of silence and then both parties agreed. I did not deny that there was relatively more violence on one side in this particular conflict, but it was certainly not limited to one side.

The situation was different in the case of apartheid. While the ANC under the leadership of Mandela deliberately chose the armed struggle, they only did it when all democratic means were denied. Furthermore, the amount of violence committed by the ANC in their liberation struggle were comparatively little compared to similar struggles in other countries, and compared to the physical, structural and psychological violence of apartheid. I have always maintained this somewhat tenuous position that I could remain impartial toward the government and the ANC, but I could not be neutral on apartheid which I had to denounce. I have learned from the Quakers, and especially from Adam Curle, that I could denounce violence committed by a person, without attacking that person.

Impartial intervention therefore requires a meaningful relationship with the bad or evil party, an understanding of his position, and a place and role for him in the solution. As the Quakers would put it: acknowledge that of God in him, reach out to it and build on it. To retain good relations with the "guilty" party is not always easy, especially if one finds their actions morally objectionable. There is also the fear of guilt by association. Or of being used by the enemy.

This problem came up right at the beginning of the Natal incident when I hired a young student to collect information from the parties involved. The first night he struggled with a major problem. "How can I visit the Inkatha leaders without the UDF finding out about it?" I assured him that our tasks as mediators required that we have contact with both sides. It was therefore important that the UDF knew that we were meeting with Inkatha. This was different from his normal role as partisan student activist. I also experienced this problem in my dealings with the ANC-in-exile. Many of my colleagues expressed horror at my continued contacts with the government, and especially with the security police. I had to explain that my task was to promote communication between the two adversaries or enemies. My contacts with the ANC would serve no purpose unless I was able to take a message to the government.

Furthermore, the government and the police would not attach much importance to my message if they did not trust me. I could not gain that trust if they were not assured of a good measure of goodwill on my part towards them. It was in this respect that my path sometimes separated from my activist colleagues who just could not, in good conscience, be friendly with leaders in the apartheid regime. This confirms what I said earlier: each of us lean in a certain direction; we cannot do justice to both. But I have also indicated that what attracted me in the Quakers was the balance between the pursuits of the goals of justice and peace. There should be room for both. But that is not always easy. In Cape Western Monthly Meeting there was for decades tension between me and George Ellis, one of our country's top academics who is more comfortable in the role of prophet. One of our most frequent disagreements was whether the Meeting should make a

public statement in protest against some government action, or whether we should speak truth to power in private.

You may recall the well known tit-for-tat bombings in South Africa in 1983. After the ANC exploded a bomb in Church Street in Pretoria, killing several civilians, the South African Defense Force (SADF) launched two air raids in retaliation on Maseru in Lesotho and Maputo in Mozambique, also killing a number of civilians. There was outrage among Afrikaners and the Dutch Reformed Church after the Pretoria attack, and outrage among blacks, liberals and the English churches after the air raids. I felt sad that the churches, as so often before, contributed to the growing polarization. I informed Cape Western Monthly Meeting on Sunday that I intended to make financial contributions to the two funds set up for the victims, one by the government and one by anti-apartheid groups, and to issue a public statement to accompany it. The Meeting expressed the wish that such a statement should be issued by the Meeting. George Ellis and Julie Suberg were appointed to confer with me. My draft stated three things: I condemn the violence by both sides; I believe there is something good in both sides; and I am making a financial contribution to the victims on both sides. George and Julie could not agree with the second statement that there was something good in the government. They would go along if I said "potentially good". There was no time to go back to the meeting, so I proceeded to issue the statement in my own name. Another member of the meeting, David Muir, heard of it and joined me.

I decided to hand the financial contribution personally to a representative of the Lesotho Council of Churches. On my way there, I spent time with Winnie Mandela in Brandfort in the Orange Free State. This visit further strengthened my ties with the ANC. But this experience again showed how difficult it is for activists to retain links with their adversaries; a situation that calls for impartial mediators to step forward.

Retribution and forgiveness

While this is a problem during a conflict, it becomes quite acute at the time of cease-fire and peacemaking. An important principle of mediation is that the guilty party or parties must be allowed to save face. I have always argued, especially in my relations with the AFSC Southern Africa Program, that while I agree that there should be pressures on the government, these pressures should be constructive rather than negative and destructive; that they should drive the government towards a negotiating table and not into a corner.

It is at that peace table that we need an atmosphere favorable for face saving features. And this comes hardest for adversaries or enemies full of hatred and seeking revenge, to now allow the perpetrators of atrocities to escape punishment. This brings me back to what I said earlier: it is not only what we say, but especially how we say it. I am depressed when I read American papers making Milosevic the scapegoat and demonizing him. And with him his people who have rallied behind him against the American onslaught. Is there any chance that we will allow him and his people to save face? But when I think of how well South African leaders managed to heal the wrongs of the past and live together in relative peace and a fair measure of justice, I must still hope for Yugoslavia.

While I plead with the Kosovars, NATO and the Americans for the sake of peace to search for that of God in the Serbs and in Milosevic I do not want to deny the deep psychological need for punishment in all of us, including Christians and Quakers. One major criticism I have of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa is that it has failed to meet the deep needs of a large part of the population to see justice done towards the major policy makers and implementers of apartheid. I became especially conscious of this need through my friendship with Winnie Mandela, and the contrast with her ex-husband. Like Winnie, there are thousands, no, millions of black people who are not ready to forgive the whites, especially the Afrikaners, as Madiba has done. That deep-seated need for retribution has not been properly acknowledged in the Truth Commission, by our churches and by our political leaders.

To put it in popular terms: Mandela has leaned relatively more towards peace and reconciliation and less towards justice than I would have liked to see. While I pray that Winnie or somebody of her persuasion should never gain significant political influence in our country, I do believe their needs deserve sympathetic consideration. We cannot have peace without justice.