R E S T I T U T I O N   F O U N D A T I O N

RECONCILIATION TOOLKIT

CONTENT

FOREWORD - *Deon Snyman*

TRAUMA - *Sarah Crawford-Browne*

REMORSE - *Juliet Rogers*

ATONEMENT - *Richard Cogill*

APOLOGY - *Wilhelm Verwoerd*

TRANSFORMATION - *Ntozakhe Simon Cezula*

RESTITUTION - *Sharlene Swartz*

SUSTAINABLE PEACE - *Deon Snyman*

RECONCILIATION - *Fanie du Toit*

FORGIVENESS - *Sarah Hills*

APPENDIX

Restitution Foundation

PO Box 51722
West Beach
7449

Tel 0720804717

Email: deon.snyman@telkomsa.net

Website: www.restitution.org.za

Foreword

For the past six years the Restitution Foundation is involved in the facilitation of a community-led restitution initiative in the Western Cape town of Worcester. As is the case with all South African communities, the country's colonial and apartheid past negatively affected the psychological and socio-economic well being of the majority of Worcester residents. Sustainable peace in Worcester is only possible if the town develops and implements reparative strategies to actively address the psychological and socio-economic harm of our troubled past.

The Restitution Foundation used the narrative of the racially motivated 1996 Worcester bombing in which four people died and about seventy people were injured as a metaphor to highlight the psychological impact the policies of colonialism and apartheid had on the lives of all Worcesterians. While serving his jail sentence, one of the perpetrators of the bombing, Stefaans Coetzee had a change of heart and underwent a transformation process. He indicated that he would like to meet with the survivors of the bombing to offer an apology for his actions and to explain what motivated him to commit the crime.

Only one of the survivors of the bombing was interested to meet Stefaans Coetzee. This meeting took place in November 2009 at the Kgosi Mampuru Correctional Facility in Pretoria. In this meeting Stefaans Coetzee was able to convince Olga Macingwane that his remorse was sincere whereupon she decided to forgive him. When Macingwane informed the other survivors of the outcome of her meeting with Coetzee a large number of the survivors indicated that they were now also ready to meet with Coetzee.

For more than two years the Restitution Foundation unsuccessfully lobbied the Department of Correctional Services to transfer Coetzee to a correctional facility in Worcester to enable the survivors to meet with him. When it was clear that such a transfer was not to happen, the Restitution Foundation in partnership with the Worcester community arranged for 60 bomb survivors to travel by train to Pretoria in order to meet with Coetzee. This Victim Offender Dialogue (VOD) between Coetzee and the survivors of the bombing took place on the 31st of January 2013. Themes closely associated with the psychological trauma of colonialism and apartheid such as remorse, apology, atonement, transformation, restitution, peace and forgiveness formed an integral part of the VOD process.

The VOD experience highlighted that neither the survivors of the bombing nor the officials of the Department of Correctional Services nor the residents of Worcester fully appreciated the complexity associated with the meanings of the different VOD themes. It is against this background that the Restitution Foundation decided to compile a VOD toolkit which could serve as a resource to broaden the understanding of themes closely identified with VOD processes.

Over a very long period of time many academics have written much on each of the themes. To some of us just the thought of reading these books is quite overwhelming. Ordinary people just want somebody who has some knowledge about the different themes to share their knowledge in a very accessible way with them. And this is exactly

what the Restitution Foundation has tried to achieve with the development of this VOD toolkit. We identified experts on each of the different themes and asked them to explain in no more than 500 words their understanding of the different themes. We also provided the various authors with indicators of whom the target audience is (c.f. addendum at the end of the toolkit).

The reconciliation toolkit is still a work in progress and we believe that it would further evolve in time to come. It is our sincere hope that it would become a handy tool to support the both the survivors and perpetrators of the 1996 Worcester bombing but also staff members of the DCS and ordinary Worcesterians on their various journeys to consider reconciliation.

Dr Deon Snyman
Restitution Foundation

Cape Town

1 July 2014

Trauma

Moving through our collective "woundedness"

Sarah Crawford-Brown[1]

With freedom many call us to put aside the past – to forgive, reconcile and move into the future. Given the cumulative socio-economic damage and the emotional trauma, is this possible? South Africans have been trapped in traumatising cycles of violence, exploitation, brutality and dehumanisation over generations. Have these experiences left enduring scars on the victims, perpetrators and bystanders, and on us as a nation? Many South Africans have experienced military service, border warfare, detention, torture, racist bombings, forced removal and devastated family life. The daily indignities of pass laws, uncaring education and extensive exploitation were more mundane, but perhaps more hurtful, particularly when linked with the ugly arrogance or ignorance promoted by families, church, education and state. This short essay considers the impact of the violence of Colonialism and Apartheid on individuals and on our society as a whole, offering some ideas for how we can live together more caringly.

People who have experienced life-threatening violence may respond with "post-traumatic stress", a state where present-day experiences are polluted and irrationally taken over by the emotional memories and anxieties of what has happened. Despite trying to forget or avoid the past violence, small reminders trigger memories that seep into everyday life. Survivors may feel as if the danger is continuing, hence their bodies and minds remain on high alert exhaustingly ready to react to danger. With haunting historical wounds, survivors irrationally over-react to current situations that hold reminders. Not only does this damage relationships; but survivors may feel out of control and unsafe. These symptoms of remembering, forgetting and hyper-arousal usually ease as the shock passes, with most people recovering after three or four months. About 15% people exposed to violence are badly affected for years, not feeling themselves as they work to make sense of an unsafe world where people are not always good and life does not seem fair. Some people may become depressed, losing interest and energy for life. Trauma affects everyone differently with reactions saying little about strength or weakness, but rather the significance and meaning of the event in their lives which will be different for every person. Given the extreme violence of Apartheid we know that many survivors remain burdened by past experiences that keep creeping back to influence their current lives. Children who witnessed their parents being arrested, young men who quelled unrest in townships, people who participated in unrest may have memories that continue to feel real in the present; triggered by the sight of a police man, a person representing another group, or the noise of a crowd.

Trauma is usually thought of as an individual experience. Yet as I witness day-to-day life in South Africa I see the wounds of multiple humiliations and threats replay, affecting our present relationships with each other and with ourselves. We seem not to believe that the struggle is over. We seem to be unconsciously re-enacting the pain and anger

[1] Sarah Crawford-Browne lectures in the Primary Health Care Directorate within the Faculty of Health Sciences at the University of Cape Town.

that we experienced, within our politics, churches, media, schools, universities and communities – where-ever we have the courage to engage with each other. The reminders of Apartheid continue to shape our ways of being, relating and engaging even as we try to forget our past. Are we a multiply-wounded, traumatised nation? If so, where is the "trauma" situated if not within a person's psychological well-being? And what does this mean for us as people trying to find a different future? What will it mean for our great-grandchildren? Wrestling with these questions, I offer a few ideas followed by some suggestions of how we may find each other, to start healing.

The trauma of our South African past is embedded in our relationships with each other, just as the indignities and trauma of Apartheid legislation were structured within the relationships between groups of people. People were targeted with violence because of their identity and their association with a community. An event that initially involved a victim and a perpetrator was quickly understood as an injury to "us" perpetrated by "them". Traumatic stress rippled to those witnessing, for they knew that it could have happened to them. Added to this, Apartheid placed communities into the roles of victim, perpetrator and bystander with only a few people finding agency to move apart. Once placed in this inescapable relational triangle there is a human tendency to cycle between the positions. In order to regain the lost sense of power, victimised people often move to hurt others, becoming perpetrators. Those watching may rescue or blame, often causing more harm in their clumsiness. Perpetrators justify their actions in victimhood. These are human responses that we all share. But when played out at societal level with the power of a security state the consequences are enormous.

This raises a controversial question: are perpetrators traumatised by their actions? I believe that when a perpetrator has been forced to abuse, or is re-enacting the victimhood of their own history, post-traumatic stress may be very real. Stepping out of this violent triangle requires a real connection with our deeper selves connecting with our values, agency and emotions as full humans; separating out our response to current situations from the ghosts of the past. Traumatic events become linked in our memories and life narratives, bypassing normal structures of time and place. Survivors may start to talk about a current traumatic experience, and quickly time travel to all the previous times that they felt vulnerable, humiliated or out of control. Meanings are quickly drawn and offence easily taken. Stuck in the cast roles we are likely to re-enact and re-play the past violence in the present, continuing to cycle between victim, perpetrator and helpless bystander. Yes, it may not rational, yet these feelings are real. Just think of the time when your name was casually mispronounced, when you were overlooked in a queue or you walked into a situation with entitled power. And we are likely to pass the burdens of our past on to our children.

The psychological wounds of violence shatter our deepest and earliest needs for comfort, safety and trust. These are assurances gained as babies that enable us to relate to the world and to people. The shattering of safety and trust in other people and the world may be devastating, where trust in the goodness of other people, the justice of the world and in our own capacity to cope with challenges may have been eroded, requiring us to quickly rebuild ways of thinking that can keep our lives intact. One of the easiest approaches is to divide the world into us and them, and then to link all that is good and safe with us, and all that is dangerous and suspect with them. When forced to commit violence it is easier to avoid seeing the full wonder of God's presence in the other.

Similarly it may be difficult to see the full humanity of former perpetrators, with these realisations painfully taking us back to times of feeling less than human. Familiar patterns and stories about the others allow us to remain protected from the past hurts and future possible pain.

Freeing ourselves from our patterns is made all the more difficult by the fractured discussions of our past, reflecting the conflicting symptoms of post-traumatic stress. Speaking quickly of forgiveness and reconciliation some people seek to avoid, forget or move on from the past. Others are caught in the memories and bitterness, needing to hold on to the memories until this pain is acknowledged. A third group are scared it may happen all over again. Healing lies at the sacred place where these dividing forces meet, to integrate and bring wholeness where all three groups feel heard. Stepping out of the cycle of violence requires that we fully recognise the wonder and splendour of each person, made by God in God's image.

Are we a traumatised nation? Certainly I think we are multiply wounded[2], with this pain being held and reproduced in our relationships with each other. I suggest that we as individuals need to each reflect carefully on the pains and hurts of our personal histories; examining how our past experiences of being a victim, perpetrator or bystander affect us and our relationships today. Apartheid pain and anger is often mixed with our personal histories or childhood injuries. Telling our life stories allow us to work through our hurt, thereby making peace with our shadows. Deepening our understanding of our complex identities allows us to understand the meaning of these identities in our lives and our place in South Africa's complex inter-community relationships. As we relate to each other we need to be sufficiently self-aware to recognise the irrational moments when past pain enters the conversation from their side or ours, and to humbly and gently step away. And we need to find the scared meeting points where we can be fully human together.

Let us tell the stories about South Africa that we want our grandchildren to live as our love poem to each other; finding new inclusive narratives that hold our past, our present and our future within which we can all thrive.

---

[2] Cabrera, M. (2002). Living and surviving in a multiply wounded country. Envivo. No 257. http://www.envio.org.ni/articulo/1629

Remorse

The importance of an enduring gesture

Juliet Rogers[3]

Remorse is often regarded as a feeling associated with guilt, regret and it is usually accompanied by an action, an apology, reparations, tears or a gesture of acknowledgement of wrongdoing. The gesture is usually deemed to dictate the sincerity or what is described as the 'genuineness' of the feeling of remorse in a person who has done something they or others perceive as wrong.

Sincerity or genuineness of the feeling of remorse are measured in the depth of this gesture and the gesture can sometimes be seen on the face – through tears or an expression of pain. As many people say of remorse, 'I am not sure how to describe it, but I'll know it when I see it'.

However, the idea that we can *see* remorse is problematic because often the most violent of perpetrators are the best at *evidencing* a feeling which may or may not mean they experience that feeling. Further, once the remorse is *seen* it can dissipate, while the pain of the victims may not. Thus while apologies and tears at a meeting between perpetrators and victims may be sometimes cathartic or satisfying in a moment, that moment passes and victims are often left with nothing, while the perpetrator's tears dry and their lives go on without hindrance. Victims' satisfaction in the apology in the moment may then turn to bitterness as they watch the perpetrator live on and later see them enjoying their lives or even benefiting from their crimes of the past.

It is because of the fleeing nature of apologies, the possibility of disguising insincerity in the perpetrator and because the victims' may come to resent the disparity in what they live with and what the perpetrator does not, that victims often articulate a need to see something more than a single apology. In many instances of efforts toward post-conflict reconciliation worldwide it appears it may be more helpful for victims to evaluate the *depth of the gesture of remorse*, and consider the value of its depth in terms of two guiding questions – does it leave a mark on the perpetrator? And is this mark enduring?

The etymology of remorse comes from the Latin verb 'to bite' (morsus, mordere) and it is here that we get the idea of a morsel, and precisely a morsel of flesh. While many victims do not require the retributive justice that is implied in taking a morsel of flesh from the perpetrator – either as their life (as mortality or in the case of a life sentence), or as the infliction of corporal punishment – in most cases they require the perpetrator to *lose something of themselves* when they express remorse. A symbolic loss of flesh.

Gestures of remorse that are meaningful to victims must therefore often involve loss and a loss that is enduring. If this loss is money, as reparations, it needs to be seen as a loss *in the flesh*, and not simply a token. That is, it must be a loss of money that hurts, that impact on the perpetrator's resources and thus their lives as an impact on their

[3] Dr Juliet Rogers lectures at the School of Social and Political Sciences in the Faculty of Arts at the University of Melbourne.

flesh. If the gesture is apology it needs to be accompanied by what we might call atonement, as acts that involve a labour that can be felt and perhaps seen in the flesh, and this may be the flesh of the perpetrator, or the flesh of the community in which s/he lives. It needs to be seen as work that changes the body of the perpetrator and the body of the community.

In some societies these gestures of atonement are not expressed as such, but often involve working in the community in which the act was done. That is, if you kill someone in order to produce the community you want, then it may be important precisely to work for that community now. And the work must be hard, not necessarily physically, but it must alter the life or the body of the perpetrator for it to be perceived as a meaningful gesture of remorse, and thus for it to mean anything to the victims.

Letlapa Mphahlele offers this in respect to his authorization of the killing of Lyndi Fourie in the Heidelberg Tavern Attack in Cape Town, 1993. In conversation with Ginn Fourie, Lyndi's mother he says 'Ginn forgives me, but it is not enough to be forgiven. I must be worthy of that forgiveness every day for the rest of my life'. This does not mean he must apologise to Ginn everyday for the rest of his life, but, for him, he must work for a South Africa that is better than the one in which he killed, and he must work *in* a South Africa that he created, that is, a South Africa in which Lyndi Fourie no longer exists in the flesh. He must feel her loss in his flesh through the recognition of her loss in his community, everyday for the rest of his life.

Atonement

"That we might have life" – a brief reflection on the Theory of Atonement and its implications for Christian living

Richard Cogill[4]

To ***atone*** means to make amends, or reparation. Christian theologians believe that the crucifixion of Jesus atones for the Original Sin of Adam and Eve and restores the relationship between God and Man.

Anselm, in the 11th Century, wrote of the Satisfaction Theory, which came to dominate atonement Theology in the 2nd millennium. Jesus sacrificed his immortality, and accepted a death he did not owe God, because a sinless man need not have died. Thus, Christ filled the treasury upon which all the baptized would thereafter draw, to be made right with God.

If we believe Christ's death and resurrection were pre-ordained by God for the absolution of all people, then God the Father is implicated in the crime of Christ's torture and crucifixion. If we find this belief intolerable, we are obligated to formulate new explanations for the Death of Christ. Some 20th Century theologians have argued that if the Christian drama had ended with the cross, there would be no redemption. Jesus' death would then be comparable to that of Stephen Biko or Martin Luther King—men whose ministries were ended forever by violent assassinations, even though they themselves were exemplars of peace, nonviolence, and justice.

But that is not what happened to Jesus. His followers proclaimed the risen Christ. They asserted resurrection. J. Denny Weaver, in his "Narrative Christus Victor" theory, revived the idea that God achieves ultimate victory over Satan, death, and the power of evil, through resurrection—not abstractly, but through the real political evils we face on earth. Resurrection is God's "NO!" to the disasters we inflict on one another by our injustices. Evil—real, everyday, human evil—will not have the final say.

Theologians are increasingly looking to Africa for an understanding of *ubuntu,* to think through atonement restoratively, rather than retributively. For example, Kimberly Vrudny has written a restorative model of atonement drawing on South Africa's situation, specifically. She says that traditional models of atonement pit the Father against the Son and introduce conflict into the Trinity because they suggest that the Father must punish humankind for their sin, a fate that prompts Jesus to say, "take this cup from me." She wants Christianity to embrace a restorative model of justice rather than a retributive one, recognizing that God desires a restored relationship—that God desires reconciliation with humankind. Jesus is dying because human beings are rejecting the reconciliation he offers. She emphasizes that Christ forgives from the cross and does not seek vengeance. And when human beings eventually succeed in killing him, something the Father does not want--for the Father was advocating for Truth, Goodness, and Beauty to prevail—God resurrects him. As a community of faith, we live

[4] The Reverend Richard Cogill is an Episcopalian priest and currently serves as the *Precento*r at St. George's Anglican Cathedral in Cape Town

into the resurrection by living as he lived—peacefully--resisting injustice and advocating for the poor and vulnerable. His forgiveness offers the beginning of a new relationship—and, through a process of spiritual development, the human heart is reconciled as it becomes more like Christ's, desiring reconciliation with our neighbors through deliverance from the injustices that we inflict upon one another when we reject salvation in Christ.

Apology

Saying sorry, sincerely - on the promise and pitfalls of apologies

Wilhelm Verwoerd[5]

"I am so sorry…!" We all know from personal experience what a big difference these few words can make…IF we are convinced that the sorrow is coming from the heart of the person who hurt us. A friend recently put this promise of apology as follows:

"If you've done something to me and I'm angry with you and if you come and say, 'I'm sorry, Themba, for what I did...' For me it's like you have the key to my own liberation and I have the key to your liberation. So when it happens, we are unlocking the chains that are holding us as individuals."

Of course, for these "keys" to work we need to answer this rather tricky question: how do we really know that someone's sorry is sincere?

Let's use a relatively straightforward example to start with. Say I stole Themba's bicycle and now I want to apologize to him. What would it take for Themba to believe my apology?

I would have to start by **accepting personal responsibility**: "Themba, I am sorry, I stole your bicycle…"

I would then have to make it clear that **what I did was wrong** and that **I understand and acknowledge the hurt** my actions have caused: "Themba, I accept that I did not just borrow your bicycle, without asking, I STOLE it and I now understand that this meant you couldn't do your work and that you and your family have really struggled to survive since…"

I will also have to convince Themba that I **will not steal from him or hurt him again**. Shedding a few tears can be a sign of sincerity, but though important this body language is rarely enough. Also, if this is the first time I stole from him or deliberately hurt him, he would find it easier to accept my commitment. If not, the final step becomes even more important.

I will have to **do something practical to address the consequences** of what I did; Themba will need a **tangible token of my sincerity**: "Themba, I am very sorry, and I am currently saving to buy you a new bicycle. This will take a month or so, but in the mean time I will bring your family some food at least once a week."

Each one of these key parts of a sincere apology can become a pitfall – I can deny personal responsibility ("my friends forced me to do it"); I can deny wrongdoing and/or underestimate the hurt ("I only borrowed it for a while…why are you so upset?"); I can

[5] Dr Wilhelm Verwoerd, a former researcher at the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission works as a Peace Consultant.

keep on hurting someone; I can deny the need for practical amends ("But I told you I am sorry?!")

These pitfalls loom even larger as we move from the above interpersonal, ordinary life example to hurt and harm that was caused, say, during Apartheid. Let's take the example of someone who was badly treated by the security police.

Looking back at what he was involved in during the 1980s, one of these policemen – as we saw during the Truth and Reconciliation Commission hearings – might be inclined to deny personal responsibility, thus not meeting even the first requirement: "Yes, we treated people badly, but I was only following orders…"; or: "we had no choice, we needed the information…"

If this security police person really believed that he was fighting against "evil, communist inspired terrorists" he will also struggle to say sorry sincerely, to really acknowledge that what he did was wrong, even though he might not deny that he was personally involved and wanted to "defend my community".

For someone who was strongly politically motivated in his (wrongful) actions it would typically be quite a personal journey to come to a point where he (or she) actually accepts what he did was wrong and where he really sees and feels the hurt and pain caused by his actions.

For "I am truly sorry…" to spring from his heart he will need to begin to challenge not only his beliefs, but also his sense of loyalty to his community or group. He will need courage to sit with the pain of those he harmed, and deal with the feelings of shame and guilt that accompany this pain. He will most likely need to work through a sense of betrayal of himself and his community when he starts to move closer to former enemies. He will need to break through blinding boundaries of narrow group belonging. In other words, underlying any sincere apology is a journey towards authentic compassion. When someone's heart is truly touched by the human suffering that resulted from his actions, the next two requirements for a sincere apology tend to flow more freely. Once the former security policeman has been willing to meet and really listen to the human stories of those he treated badly, it is much more likely that he will be willing to do something practical to address these consequences.

What these tangible tokens will look like need ideally to be worked out in conversation with those who suffered – "What can I do to show you that I am really sorry? What would be the most important thing that will help you to deal with the pain from the past?" Writing a cheque and posting it, or anything that comes relatively easily and does not involve someone really engaging with those he harmed, are unlikely to be convincing signs of a sincere apology.

Transformation

Transforming past behaviour

Ntozakhe Simon Cezula[6]

One's behaviour is a choice made from different types of behaviour. For example, if one is unduly humiliated, one can choose not to respond, to respond verbally or to fight physically. However, it is not a choice free of external and unconscious influences. It is strongly influenced by one's values (What is right?). Values in turn are influenced by one's belief (What is true?). One's belief is influenced by one's worldview (What is real?). For an example, people might be convinced that ***reality*** (worldview) is that God created different and unequal nations. It is also ***true*** (belief) that they were elected as a superior nation. Thus, it is ***right*** (value) to dominate other nations. In the process dehumanising ***behaviour*** might be ***chosen vis-à-vis*** respectful ***behaviour*** (choice).

Under these circumstances, transforming past behaviour is more complex than some of us reckon. The above-mentioned is a collective/social dimension of behaviour. However, behaviour does also entail an individual dimension. This means an individual can reason about his/her worldview/belief and make individual conclusions. One therefore needs courage to question inherited worldviews and belief systems. By that s/he exposes him/herself to harsh criticism. Nevertheless, questioning is a characteristic of a sincere believer. It is through such believers that humanity is saved from unnecessary disasters. Each individual has a responsibility to take an initiative to better our living.

In reasoning about worldview/belief there are things to take into cognisance. One of them is identity. Identity is central in the formulation of a worldview. People have multiple identities, namely, racial/national/ethnic/gender/religious identities etc. They emphasise others and de-emphasise others. An emphasised identity is instrumental in formulating worldview/belief. If emphasised identity excludes many groups; worldview/belief/values/behaviour might carry discriminatory tendencies. If identity includes many groups the result might be opposite. Exclusive or inclusive identities highlight differences or similarities respectively. Such considerations might be helpful for a rigorous examination of a worldview/belief. An individual may choose which of his /her identities s/he wants to emphasise as a point of departure.

In order for transformation to materialise it should presuppose a living relationship with God. Hence, it is suggested in this brief discussion that believer-in-God as one's identity be given special importance. Although not all-inclusive, it is an identity that includes many groups. Such an identity is compatible with a worldview that recognises only one Almighty God Who created everything and to Whom alone obedience should be shown. Such a worldview in turn diminishes destructive differentiation of humanity. It also helps to embrace the belief that God made all human beings into His own image. Such a belief guarantees dignity to all humanity. It also creates conducive conditions for values based on treating people the same way we want them to treat us. Such values

[6] Dr Cezula lectures in the Old and New Testament Department in the Faculty of Theology at the University of Stellenbosch

actually, should be the guiding principles or standards for our behaviour. A rigorous analysis of identities, worldviews, beliefs and values can further improve the quality of a process of transforming past behaviour. Group discussions can add value to the process.

Restitution

A new and surprisingly positive agenda for transformation in South Africa

Sharlene Swartz[7]

Restitution is a difficult word. Historically and in legal language, the word 'restitution' has been defined as restoring matters to the state they were before an injustice occurred. Naturally, such an aim is not easily achieved: where people have been dishonored, dispossessed, enslaved and sometimes killed, and where racial superiority has become institutionalized and privilege engrained into the psyches of whole groups, what was lost is irretrievable.

However, if we take the word restitution to simple mean 'paying back' or 'making things right' for wrongs previously committed we find it's a very useful term to use when thinking about what can and should be done about the past. In addition, although we usually associate the term restitution with land claims - returning land unjustly taken - the term applies to more than just land. It is one of the ways in which we can truly heal the damage of the past, and extends beyond financial 'paying back' to include spiritual, material and other practical and symbolic actions to 'make things right'.

In my opinion, restitution has four main legs.

First, we need to **understand and recognise the way in which our past has damaged our humanity** – no matter which side of the divide we find or found ourselves on. Apartheid's damage to the human spirit has resulted in ongoing social ills such as violence, crime, addictions, joblessness, educational failure, poor physical and mental health and senses of social inferiority along with enduring economic deprivation. For those in positions of privilege, harm has also occurred. While it cannot be compared in scope and severity, aspects of these include indifference, the normalization of inequality, the numbing to and fatigue of need, along with the lack of ability to connect, listen and empathize. These effects of the past on the present need to be understood in order to serve as a catalyst for forward-looking action.

Second, and related to our understanding of the past, is **what roles each of us has played**, recognising how these roles become complicated over time. In the South African context, the conventional triangle of perpetrator-victim-bystander seems to be inadequate for engaging people across multiple generations and in the light of popular disavowal of (or at least amnesia about) past atrocities. Instead we need to locate ourselves within a set of more complex positions and locations of actors in order to achieve social transformation through material and symbolic restitution. Proposed labels that might help us to enrich the conversation include that of architect, implementer, dishonoured, beneficiary, and inheritor - categories described in relation to both injustice and resistance to injustice. Offering a wider range of positionalities serves to broaden the debate and defuse simple accusations of guilt and blame. In the context of a country such as South Africa, which is still deeply divided along racial lines

---

[7] Prof Swartz is a Research Director at the Human Sciences Research Council and lectures in the Sociology Department in the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Cape Town. She currently serves as Chairperson of the board of the Restitution Foundation.

corresponding to the legacy of Apartheid, this approach is able to present to individuals their accountability for the past without alienating them from a national process of healing through acts of restitution.

Third, **acts of restitution need to happen different levels** alongside government programmes and **in dialogue with all affected**, and will only be effective if everyone sees themselves as having a role to play. So while government and legal programmes such as penalty payments, land redistribution, and affirmative action (acts of restitution with which we are most familiar) are important in bringing about social transformation after conflict and injustice, the participation of civil society, communities and individuals is vital in fulfilling restitution's wider aims.

Fourth, restitution should have as its ultimate aim **restoring our sense of humanity** and should do so in solidarity with others for all our benefit. Strategies for restoring personhood comprises remembering past injustices, working towards human dignity, fostering active senses of belonging (including citizenship and equality) and implementing projects to foster physical and psychological flourishing. Such restitution-in-practice actions tied to individual and group actions might include building friendships across former lines of enmity, learning an indigenous language and asking for forgiveness and disrupting the perpetuation of inter-generational transfer of wealth through inheritances, for example.

These ideas of restitution offer a surprisingly refreshing opportunity for dialogue and a more relational interaction between those dishonoured by injustice and those complicit with it. In this way the issue of restitution should not leave us angry or jubilant (depending on where we are located with regards the past). Instead it has the potential to show how we all have a role to play in building the future we want for ourselves and our children across all of the divisions of the past.

Sustainable peace

Deon Snyman[8]

Johan Galtung, a well known theorist of peace and conflict studies introduced the concepts of negative peace and positive peace in his seminal *Editorial to the Journal of Peace Research*. The two concepts represent two different dimensions of peace:

- *Negative peace* describes the absence of violence and war, and is usually reached through the agreement to a ceasefire. It is considered negative peace because something undesirable such as violence and oppression has stopped happening.

- *Positive peace* or sustainable peace is based on solving the underlying causes of a conflict to ensure that the conflict does not recur in the future. It develops from the premise that the cessation of direct physical or structural violence (negative peace) is only the start of the process in ending a conflict situation. To reach conditions for sustainable peace the systems that led to the original disagreement have to be transformed in order to be fair to everyone and to allow for the repair of the harm caused. Sustainable peace is therefore peace that is able to last now and in the future.

Literature on peace building defines the concept of sustainable peace as a situation characterized by the absence of physical, psychological and structural violence within a society where the diverse communities strive together to meet the macro and micro level needs of all of its members through the promotion of social justice, the resolving of traumatic memories caused by the conflict, the addressing of the root causes of the past conflict and having conflict resolution mechanisms in place to ensure that new conflict situations are resolved in a peaceful manner.

For the purposes of this article, sustainable peace is broadly defined as the conditions that need to be in place for a community to peacefully co-exist next to each other - now and in the future.

Sustainable peace requires both a backward-looking and a forward-looking approach. The backward-looking approach assists in the identification of the underlying causes of a conflict while the forward-looking approach focuses on the development of strategies to ensure that the root causes for the violence are addressed.

The end of the Apartheid era and the establishment of a democratic South Africa led to the emergence of negative peace in the country. The current service delivery protests and strike actions are indications that South Africa has not yet moved beyond negative peace. It is particularly the huge socio-economic gap between the “haves” and the “have not’s” in the society that serves as fertile soil for the breeding of potential conflict situations. Sustainable peace in South Africa would only be possible if citizens feel that the resources in the country are equally shared amongst all the people living in the country.

---

[8] Dr Deon Snyman is the COO of the Restitution Foundation

Reconciliation

Fanie du Toit[9]

Reconciliation obviously means different things to different people. This flexibility can be viewed as both a strength and weakness. When it draws people with different points of view into conversation, it is a strength. It is a weakness when it tolerates injustice.

Reconciliation often starts when farsighted leaders take a long, hard look at their divided communities and discover that both sides in fact need one another to realise their own hopes and dreams, not only materially, but also morally. When societies pretend that individuals and groups can live in isolation, as during apartheid and colonialism – everyone's longer-term aspirations are undermined. This was true even for those who enjoyed unfair advantage during apartheid.

We are *in fact* interdependent, even if we remain unequal and divided. For a long time South Africans believed that they could live without one another, that they were better off "apart" than together. But this approach failed. Dismally. Today we ask how it was ever possible for apartheid beneficiaries to think they would somehow be able to lead peaceful and prosperous lives whilst simply ignoring the interests of those around them.

This idea – that we are interdependent with our enemies at every level of human existence – has radical implications. When taken seriously, it cannot help but change things dramatically. It propels us across divides and divisions that we never thought possible. It also motivates people to challenge the *status quo* with all its power structures and holy cows, as in fact South Africans began to do in the 1990's.
When we take our interdependence seriously, we are able to build truly inclusive and credible processes of change. We are *willing* to include enemies when we understand that, unless everyone is part of reconciliation, it cannot last. We are, in turn, *able* to include enemies when there is sufficient credibility built into the processes for all parties to feel respected. By acknowledging our interdependence we begin the hard work towards equality and long-term peace. Reconciliation processes last when they inclusively and fairly represent the interests of all, turning violent relationships into mutually-beneficial ones.

When interests clash head-on, as they almost always do at one point or another, the idea of interdependence reminds us there is no option but to press on, to remain focused and to keep talking. Others never go away. As President Mandela said to the mighty apartheid army's top general, Constant Viljoen: "We cannot beat your army, but you cannot shoot us all. Sooner or later we will have to talk". The result was a series of smart compromises that gave everyone *something*. If on the contrary, one is unwilling to compromise, it is a sure sign that one has *not* understood how profoundly entwined one's interests are with those one is competing with. The alternative to compromise, however difficult, may well be losing everything.

[9] Dr du Toit is the Executive Director of the Institute for Justice and Reconciliation

Reconciliation based on the acknowledgment of interdependence often does not begin directly by dealing with the bad things that happened between people or groups of people. Rather they tend to begin by generating a shared belief in an interdependent future. Once we can believe in a shared future, and understand that we are moving towards this future together, we are both more motivated and better able to turn to the past to deal with unfinished business.

Dealing with the past is part of realising the future. Glancing backwards is a way of moving forward, or at least, this is what it ought to be. Obviously details of how to deal with the past will differ between contexts. Perpetrators and the victims, together, need to work this out. There are no rules, except that the inclusivity and fairness that motivated enemies to embrace reconciliation in the first place eventually become the hallmarks of the society they build together.

Forgiveness

Sarah Hills[10]

Forgiveness is to do with all of us: there are times when we need to be forgiven, and times when we are asked to forgive. But forgiving and forgiveness are not straightforward, and are not easy to do. There are many questions that forgiveness raises. Sometimes it seems that we are told we **must** forgive - I have heard people say, 'It is your duty as a Christian to forgive the person who hurt you'. But no one should be forced to forgive. Sometimes it is even hard to accept that we ourselves are forgiven by God. And are personal and political forgiveness the same?

So what **is** forgiveness? It is helpful in answering these questions to look at forgiveness from two perspectives: what forgiveness is, and what it is not.

Forgiveness is

- **letting go**: the word often used in the New Testament for forgiveness is *apheimi*, meaning 'letting go'. Letting go of vengeance, of hatred, of resentment, can help us to be free.
- **a gift**: the other word in the New Testament used is *charizomai*, meaning grace or gift. Forgiveness means giving of ourselves, in grace-filled and generous ways. Crucially, the victim of wrongdoing has the choice to offer this gift of forgiveness, and the perpetrator does not have the right to expect it.
- **costly**: this giving of forgiveness can be hard, and can take a long time.
- **firstly from God**: we are forgiven through Jesus' death on the cross. The Lord's Prayer asks us to forgive others, as we have been forgiven by God. We are helped to become more forgiving of others if we first believe we are forgiven by God.
- **a journey**: becoming more forgiving takes time and energy. It is not usually a 'one off' moment.
- **about recognising that we are all human together**: today I am the victim, tomorrow I might be the perpetrator. We are connected through our being human together, and our need for restored relationships.
- **healing**: both being forgiven, and forgiving, help us to become more whole.

Forgiveness is not

- **forgetting**: we must re-member the past hurts, in order to move forwards in our journey of forgiveness. Forgiving does not mean having to forget; rather, it takes very seriously the wrongs done and seeks to address them.
- **easy**: it takes courage and soul searching.
- **instead of justice**: forgiveness and justice are inextricably linked, and together lead towards the possibility of restoration rather than vengeance.
- **always a response to repentance**: it is possible to forgive a perpetrator without their repentance. However, while this can help the victim to heal, it will not restore relationships or lead to reconciliation.

---

[10] The Rev Dr Sarah Hills is the Canon Reconciliation at Coventry Cathedral, Coventry and a qualified Psychiatrist

- **the same as reconciliation**: other factors are necessary in the reconciliation journey. For instance, in political reconciliation, peace and socioeconomic justice may play a larger role, while between individuals, forgiveness may be more crucial.

Appendix

Indicators of the target audience in Worcester

Mandla is a 65 year old Xhosa speaking black African man. He was born in Worcester and grew up South of Durban Street where his family lived amongst coloured people. With the implementation of the Group Areas Act Mandla was forced to move to Zwelethemba, the black African township on the outskirts of Worcester. Mandla was a member of Umkhonto weSizwe, the military wing of the ANC leader in the Worcester anti-Apartheid struggle. Mandla was detained a number of times without trial under section 29 of the Internal Security Act of the Apartheid government. He spent months at a time in solitary confinement and was tortured by the security police. After democratisation Mandla served as an ANC ward counsellor of the Breede Valley Municipality. He is currently unemployed and depends on the salary of his one employed son.

Zanele is a 60 year old Xhosa speaking black African women. She was born in Worcester and grew up South of Durban Street where her family lived amongst coloured people. With the implementation of the Group Areas Act Zanele was forced to move to Zwelethemba, the black African township on the outskirts of Worcester. During the 1980's Zanele's husband was on many occasions detained without trial under section 29 of the internal security act for his involvement in ANC activities. Zanele served a few terms as a local government councillor in the Breede Valley Municipality. During her last term she served as the first black Mayor of Worcester. She is currently not involved in politics and spends her time with church activities and community development initiatives.

Phumeza is a 45 year old Xhosa speaking black African women. She was born in Zwelethemba, Worcester. During the 1980's while still at school Phumeza became a member of the ANC and joined Umkhonto weSizwe, the military wing of the ANC. She became an active youth leader in the anti-Apartheid struggle in Zwelethemba. On two occasions Phumeza was detained for a number of months under section 29 of the Internal Security Act. She suffered torture while in detention. Black African people of her generation in Zwelethemba respect her as one of the key leaders in their struggle for liberation. Phumeza is married and have children. She currently works as an unskilled labourer at the Breede Valley Municipality.

Lindii-Jain is a 40 year old coloured woman who was born in Worcester. She grew up under very poor and difficult circumstances but early on in her life she made a decision that she would like to succeed as a person. After completion of her school training she pursued tertiary education and worked as the manager of a furniture shop. The shop had to close and Lindii-Jain then decided to start an own business. She is today the owner of a successful recycling business and employs twenty staff members of all the different racial groups in Worcester. Her success as business women received local, national and international press coverage. She has two children, is divorced and is currently engaged to a white man.

Cedrick is a 64 year old coloured man who was born in Worcester. He is married and has children. He is qualified teacher and is currently working for a Worcester based NGO. Cedrick received a lot of recognition for his music and poetry talents. He was the leader of a music band and made a number of records. He published several collections of poetry and received the Worcesterian of the year award for his contribution to the cultural life of Worcester. Cedrick serves on a number of boards and is currently serving as the chairperson of the Worcester Museum. He is an eager chess player and has a particular interest in teaching blind people to play the game.

Fransman is a 45 year old coloured man who was born in Worcester. He is married and does not have children. He grew up in a poor working class family and was an active ANC leader during the student uprisings in the 1980's. During this period he was detained without trial under section 29 of the state of emergency regulations. Fransman completed tertiary education at the university of the Western Cape and first serve as an ANC councillor of the Municipality before he started working for the Robben Island Museum. He then worked for local government in Zwelethemba and in George before accepting a senior managerial position in local government in Worcester. Fransman serve on the board of a number of NGO's and is an active member of his church.

Koos is a 63 year old white Afrikaans speaking male. Koos is married and has children. He is a minister in the Dutch Reformed Church. He started his ministry in a black African congregation in the Eastern Cape. He recently retired after 35 years as a minister of religion in the Dutch Reformed Church. He spent 24 of these years serving as a minister in a white congregation in Worcester. He is very involved in community projects that serve the interest of marginalised people in the black African and coloured communities. Koos is currently much involved with advocacy work on foetal alcohol syndrome within churches.

Hannelie is a 66 year old white Afrikaans speaking woman. Her father was a minister in the Dutch Reformed Church. Hannelie is married and has three children. She is a retired teacher. Her husband is a retired minister of the Dutch Reformed Church. For the first ten years of his ministry he served coloured congregations in rural areas. This exposure assisted Hannelie to develop an understanding of the challenges coloured people faced. Her husband then became a minister in a white Dutch Reformed Church congregation in Worcester. Hannelie and her husband are for the past ten years involved in multi racial faith-based reconciliation work.

Johan is a 60 year old white Afrikaans speaking male. He is married and has two children. Johan practised for many years as a lawyer in Worcester. He used to support the policies of right wing political parties such as the Conservative Party and the Freedom Front Plus. He was for many years sympathetic to the ideology of the AWB, a white supremacist organisation until he underwent a radical transformation in 2001 when he came to understand the perverse nature of his racist worldview. He is currently serving as a DA councillor in the local municipality and is actively promoting reconciliation amongst the different racial groups in Worcester.