The study of leadership has captivated humanity for centuries, for understanding this elusive concept is crucial to understanding the human condition. In the preface to *The Leader’s Companion*, J. Thomas Wren writes, “If leadership is viewed as a process by which groups, organizations, and societies attempt to achieve common goals, it encompasses one of the fundamental currents of the human experience.” Leadership relentlessly influences and shapes our lives. Whether or not we are consciously searching for it, we come into contact with leadership on a daily basis. We are influenced by our role models, inspired by new ideas, affected by the decisions of our country’s leaders, and even struggling in our own leadership positions. For this reason, we unceasingly strive to characterize, cultivate, and critique leadership. It is, therefore, the aim of the *Compass* to foster an academic discussion on the nature of leadership and its purpose in our world.

In our attempts to cultivate a valuable discussion on the multifarious nature of leadership and service, the *Compass* seeks to engage students from every academic discipline. This year’s edition includes papers that examine leadership and service through a wide variety of lenses. Molly Bynum Cook’s paper *An Outsider’s Perspective: José Martí on the United States* analyzes the life and writings of a Cuban author in the 1800s struggling to lead his beloved country. Channing Kennedy investigates the role of communication in leadership through her paper *Bob Dylan, Woody Guthrie, and Folk Protest Music: Cultural Heroism or Movement Leadership*. Charlsie Wigley uses personal experience and Daniel Goleman’s “Leadership that Gets Results” to examine the process of assessing leadership in her paper *Sinking the Putt, but Missing the Lessons of the Shot: Re-examining Goleman’s Results-Based Leadership*. In her paper *The Unifying Power of Black Student Activism in the 1960s*, Laura Chaires explores the establishment and expansion of formal black student groups and details numerous examples of the citizen leadership that emerged. Using historical analysis to address the modern-day crises facing leadership today, Natalie Ausborn studies South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the potential for translating the model of forgiveness and reconciliation to the Middle East through her paper *An Assessment of South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission and Implications for Peace in Israel-Palestine*. Our discussion is completed with a personal and important reflection on leadership from Dr. Ed LaMonte.
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I. Introduction

José Martí recorded his observations and analysis of the United States in a series of articles and essays published between 1881 and 1895. While Martí’s earlier writings appear to venerate U.S. ideals and encourage the growth of a mutually beneficial relationship between the U.S. and Cuba, his later writings emphasize the importance of forming distinctly Cuban ideals and establishing Cuba as a country absolutely independent from U.S. influence. Because Martí’s observations have been quoted by modern day Latin American leaders, most notably Fidel Castro, to justify anti-U.S. sentiment, proper and thorough examination of Martí’s ideology is critical. Examining the whole body of Martí’s work is the only way to truly understand his opinion of the United States.

José Julián Martí y Peréz was born in Havana, Cuba, on January 28, 1853, to Spanish parents. In 1868, the Ten Years War began, a conflict that marked the first major attempt by the Cuban people to overthrow Spanish rule. Growing up in this climate of violence and controversy, Martí, at a very young age, started to develop deeply patriotic feelings for what he hoped would become an independent Cuban nation. When he was just sixteen years old, Martí published some of his writings in a student-run magazine called La Patria Libre. These articles evidenced the young Martí’s early intentions to help bring about the liberation of colonial Cuba from Spain. Martí’s plans, however, were drastically thwarted when Spanish government officials became aware that he had criticized a fellow student for remaining loyal to the Spanish Crown during the Ten Years War. Consequently, Martí was thrown into a Cuban jail and sentenced to six years of hard labor for his crime. Martí’s parents, determined to ease their son’s sentence, were able to convince the Spanish officials to let José serve his time in exile. So, Martí was deported to Spain in 1871 where he began studying at the University of Madrid.

Although Martí lived in the U.S. for almost fifteen years, he remained emotionally connected to Cuba. Jacqueline Kaye describes Martí’s plight in “Martí in the United States: The Flight from Disorder”:

Martí was organically connected [to] the nationalist movement against Spanish rule [in Cuba]. … [And] during [the] long period of exile which … constitutes most of his adult life Martí wandered like Odysseus, finding at best some temporary refuge which served only to underline that he was not at home.

While Martí never considered the United States to be his home, he understood the importance of getting to know the country through travel and observation. Martí described the nature of the United States in his Escenas norteamericanas, which were published in La Nación newspaper of Buenos Aires, Argentina. Through this series of articles, Martí hoped to introduce the rest of Latin America to the positive
attributes and “progressive” nature of U.S. society, as well as the true character of its people. Martí strongly believed that “in order to know a country,” one must examine “all its aspects and expressions, its elements, its tendencies, its apostles, its poets, and its bandits.” Accordingly, Martí thoroughly explored both the positive and negative attributes of the U.S. for fifteen years and incorporated what he learned into his personal philosophy of nation building.

II. Historiography

Historians have sought to understand Martí’s view of U.S. society by both exploring his early writings that advocate ties between the U.S. and Cuba and his later writings that extol the benefits of a Cuba free from U.S. influence. Historians have explored this discrepancy in order to understand more fully Martí’s evolving perspective on U.S. society. Many historians, like Carlos Ripoll, who wrote the introduction to Martí’s Thoughts: On Liberty, Social Justice, Government, Art, and Morality, highlight the dichotomy evident in Martí’s writings. Ripoll notes that Martí “roundly censured” certain values he witnessed during his fifteen years as a resident of the U.S., such as “materialism, prejudice, expansionist arrogance, and political corruption, [but] enthusiastically applauded [the] love of liberty, tolerance, egalitarianism, and the practice of democracy” that he observed during his residency. Jacqueline Kaye, author of “Martí in the United States: The Flight from Disorder,” also notes that Martí’s writings point “both to and away from a country which must serve simultaneously as example and warning” for a developing Latin America.

Jaime Suchlicki’s analysis of Martí’s writings seems to bridge the gap between those historians who focus on Martí’s veneration of the United States and those who focus on his criticism of it. In his book, Cuba, Suchlicki exercises considerable effort in his portrayal of both perspectives. He writes:

Much has been written regarding Martí’s attitude toward the United States. His writings have been taken out of context to show him as being strongly anti-Yankee, or to portray him as the advocate of a Latin America in the image of the United States. The truth lies, perhaps, somewhere between the two extremes. Martí admired the accomplishments of the United States, but at the same time he saw it as a society in which, according to him, man placed too much emphasis on material wealth and on his selfish interest.

I have also noted the same well-rounded, but conflicting, perspective in my exploration of Martí’s writings on the United States.

Roberto Fernández Retamar, author of “The Modernity of Martí,” postulates that these contradictions evident in Martí’s writings can be attributed to self-censorship imposed during his earlier years. According to Retamar, Martí modified his critical approach and suppressed many of his controversial concerns about the country because Bartolomé Mitre, the editor of La Nacion newspaper of Buenos Aires, Argentina, refused to publish articles containing direct criticism of the United States. Mitre wrote that such criticism, “could lead... readers into the error of believing that [the newspaper was] opening a campaign of denunciation against the United States as a body politic, as a social entity, as an economic centre.” Retamar suggests that because of this censorship, Martí resolved to make his future commentary on the United States more indirect, thus masking his true perspective on U.S. society.

III. 1880-1884

During his time in the United States, José Martí remained passionately committed to the fight for Cuban independence. However, it is important to note that Martí’s “love for Cuba did not blind him to greatness of other countries, particularly the United States.” In one of his first commentaries on the United States, Martí applauded the work ethic of the U.S. citizens he encountered. The article, written soon after Martí’s arrival in New York City, describes the joy of living in a society in which self-motivated citizens choose to work and learn:

I find myself at last in a country where everybody appears to be master of himself. You can breathe freely, possess freedom, the basis, the emblem and the essence of life. Here you can feel proud of your species. Everyone works, everybody reads.
Martí hoped that the self-determination he observed in the U.S. citizenry would be instilled in the citizenry of the yet to be realized Cuban nation. In his essay, “Wandering Teachers,” which was published in La América in May 1884, Martí confirmed his belief that personal growth and learning were essential to human development. Men grow, Martí said, and “they grow physically and visibly when they learn something … and when they have done some good.”

Martí’s earlier writings evidenced his admiration for U.S. citizens who had done something good with what they had learned. His commentary on the funeral service of President James A. Garfield in 1881, for example, revealed the Cuban author’s admiration for “the grandeur of the American soul … [and the] nobility of the American spirit.” In his essay “Indians in the United States,” Martí referenced the good works of several other influential Americans, such as Harriet Beecher Stowe, whom he described as a woman passionately devoted to justice and therefore not afraid to sully her reputation, and Helen Hunt Jackson, a “strong-minded” woman with a “loving heart.” Although this essay also brought light to the failures of earlier U.S. presidents regarding the treatment of Native Americans, Martí insisted that the then current President Grover Cleveland deserved “high praise” for trying to understand the ostracized Indian population “with neither fanatical vanity nor prudery.” Cleveland, Martí believed, had shouldered the blame for turning the Indians into “drunkards and thieves” due to exploitation of their lands and livelihood. Martí admired Cleveland for acknowledging the humanity of the Native American population and his country’s role in destroying it.

“Indians in the United States,” in particular, is a prime example of Martí’s earlier writings, which tended to categorize the U.S. citizenry as a “benevolent” and “good” people. According to John M. Kirk, Martí was initially “very impressed by the many basic freedoms” the people of the United States had been afforded. He considered the U.S. to be “the most progressive country in the world … an example for all liberals to follow.” During his first few years as a U.S. resident, Martí admired the United States’ institutions and fervently defended Pan-Americanism, the idea that all of the countries of the Americas should work together for the greater good of the American people. He became the chief representative of Latin American countries in the United States and acted as their “spokesman” during inter-American conferences.

IV. 1885-1887

Wanting to observe the United States objectively, Martí kept up with both positive and negative commentary about the emerging superpower. His work as a delegate to inter-American conferences put him in contact with different political and ideological perspectives. Christopher Abel notes that Martí contemplated the new perspectives he encountered and “reinterpreted [them] through the lens of a Latin American refugee.” He also began to reinterpret the perspective of Simón Bolívar, the great Latin American liberator, through the lens of his time period. In his essay “Martí, Latin America and Spain,” Abel compares the evolving perspective of Martí on the United States in the 1880s to the perspective of Simón Bolívar on the United States in the 1820s:

Martí and Bolívar saw the United States differently. . . . For Bolívar the nascent United States posed no immediate threat to Spanish America … because the possibility of a British reconquest remained. . . . By the 1830s the international context had changed decisively. A restructuring of capitalism. . . . the consolidation of frontier settlements. . . . and the emergence. . . . of the United States as an expansionist force [made it] a world power co-equal in status with Britain, Germany, France, and Russia.

During the 1820s, the United States posed little threat to Latin America. By the 1830s, the United States was becoming a world power to be feared.

During his first few years as a resident of New York City, Martí admired the government and society of the United States, lauding the democratic system as the “solution to all problems,” and its representatives as highly moral, upward citizens of society. By 1887, however, Martí had decided “that such a system was fraud.” He became increasingly aware of the emergence of a new type of society in the
United States, one in which the principles of economy, not liberty, dominated the focus of the governing assembly. In his article “Dedication to the Statue of Liberty,” which was published in La Nación on January 1, 1887, Martí insinuated that although United States citizens professed both verbally and emblematically to uphold the principles of liberty, they had forgotten the true meaning of the word. According to Martí, the only people who had retained the essence of liberty were the “old men” who were children when Washington held the country’s highest post. While Martí did not completely vilify the people of the United States in “Dedication to the Statue of Liberty,” he questioned their resolve to uphold the principles of liberty above all else.

Hatred and disparity among races and classes concerned Martí most of all, and, throughout the middle part of the 1880s, he became increasingly aware of such problems in the United States. A trip to Coney Island in 1886 particularly disturbed Martí. On this trip, he noticed that “negro heads [still furnished] targets in the fairground.” In his famous essay entitled “Our America,” which was first published in La Revista Ilustrada of New York on January 1, 1891, Martí proclaimed that in the independent republic of Cuba, there would be “no racial animosity.” Instead, Martí purported that the soul of the country should “emanate from equal bodies of different shapes and colors.” Martí was critical of the enmity among classes in the United States. In an 1883 commentary, he contrasted “the gaiety of Coney Island with the poverty and squalor of New York slums.” He then broadened his analysis to different parts of the country, noting the difference between the “clean and concerned people of the North … [and] the choleric, poverty stricken, broken … loaﬁng Southern shopkeepers” enduring the hardships of Reconstruction. In the new Cuba, Martí insisted, hatred must not exist among different classes. He envisioned a society in which all members would work to form “a class alliance.”

In light of the “contrasting opulence and poverty” he observed in New York, Martí soon became convinced that “the U.S. Congress and U.S. executive represented the interests of large landowners, railway magnates, mining bosses and industrial tycoons rather than those of the people.” Because of this belief, he modiﬁed the focus of his criticism from the people of the United States to the government of the United States and the way in which it interacted with the people. “It is necessary,” Martí believed, “to study the way this nation sins … so as not to founder as it does.” After several years of close analysis, Martí determined that the United States had been “a great nation … but as a result of conceit over its prosperity … it [was] falling into … a reprehensible adoration of all success.” The government’s inability to harness unbridled corporate success, Martí postulated, affected the livelihood of the small industrialist, who had “few resources beyond [his] own energy and scant capital.” With the emergence of “vast corporations formed by the concentration of unemployed capital,” or monopolies, the small industrialist, Martí determined, had little to no hope.

Martí “saw two evils in the United States’ capitalistic society: monopoly … and protectionism.” He “deplored materialism, expansionist appetite … and reverence for wealth.” However, Martí considered the injustices of capitalism to be only temporary defects, not irreparable evils. Unlike many future Latin American leaders, Martí did not ascribe to the radical ideology of Karl Marx. After attending Marx’s funeral service, Martí wrote:

[Marx]…deserves to be honored for declaring himself on the side of the weak, but the virtuous man is not the one who points out the damage and burns with generous anxiety to put it right; he is the one who teaches a gentle amendment of the injury.

Martí “did not advocate the suppression of free enterprise”; he simply promoted a more “humanitarian approach to economics” which derived from the “desire for justice for the poor and the working class.” For him, the capitalist attributes of United States society conﬂicted with the “more modest humanistic virtues” of Spanish-speaking America. Martí did not aspire to eliminate capitalism but, rather, apply it the appropriate context.

Eventually, Martí determined that the disparity between rich and poor, black and white, that he had observed in the United States derived essentially from materialism and greed in society. So, in order to minimize materialistic temptation in Cuba, he proposed that each member of Cuban society be afforded equal opportunity for “work and enterprise.” He believed that the fair distribution of national resources was crucial for maintaining balance in society.
Martí had dreamed of forming in Cuba a nation of “small landowners … where everyone possesses a little of the wealth.” After observing the unequal distribution of wealth in the United States for thirteen years, he became even more convinced that Cuba must make unclaimed land “available to anyone desiring to work it.”

In Martí’s view, the chief responsibility of government was to maintain stability in society. Moreover, the ultimate goal of government, Martí believed, was to go one step further by “putting an end to the injustices of society.” Martí’s philosophy concerning the responsibility of a government to its people initially seemed to agree with the type of governmental involvement he witnessed in the United States until the Chicago Haymarket Riot. This incident marked the key turning point in Martí’s opinion of the United States. On May 4, 1886, a bomb, set by an unknown suspect, exploded in Chicago’s Haymarket Square. The bomber had intended to draw attention to the plight of a crowd protesting police brutality. Because government investigators could not identify the person who had planted the bomb, eight local men who had exhibited anarchistic tendencies were accused of the crime. The U.S. government hoped to instill in the American people a fear of dissention. In his essay “The Funeral of the Haymarket Martyrs: A Terrible Drama,” Martí condemned the U.S. government’s decision to “use a crime born of its own transgressions as much as the fanaticism of the criminals in order to strike terror by holding them up as an example.” Martí firmly believed that the crime had resulted more from the government’s failure to correct the issues of social stratification emerging in U.S. society than the crazed plot of anarchistic fanatics determined to wreak havoc in a stable society.

According to Christopher Abel, the Chicago Haymarket Riot “awakened Martí to the growing profundity and complexity of social stratification in the United States.” Although Martí initially condemned the anarchist action, he eventually decided that the incident had occurred because capitalism, rather than liberty, was beginning to dominate the focus of U.S. society. In his essay “Martí, Latin America and Spain,” Abel notes:

[Martí] came round to holding income-concentrating and profit-maximizing businessmen responsible for both aborting a liberal vision of a harmonious society in which all social groups shared in prosperity and disrupting a previous confidence in the goodwill of a virtuous political leadership.

By November 1887, Martí had declared “that it was unforgivable to pass judgment on social offences without knowing and weighing up the causes that gave rise to them.” He believed that the fulfillment of both individual and group needs was critical to the stability of society and “disapproved of all governmental forms that proposed suppressing either.” Over the next ten years, Martí became increasingly critical of the structure of the U.S. government.

V. 1887–1895

After the Chicago Haymarket Riot, Martí became more concerned that unbridled U.S. capitalism, which could be evidenced by the stratification of U.S. society, would pose a threat to the establishment of a free and independent Cuba. According to Retamar, during the years in which Martí lived in the United States, the country “underwent the transition from the competitive capitalism of the self-made man … to monopoly and imperialist capitalism.” Martí believed that monopolies began to take root in the United States while he was living in New York. Martí began to warn that a monopolistic institution not only “sits like an implacable giant at the door of the poor” of one nation, but also threatens the economic stability of other nations. Martí cited the growth of U.S. monopolies in Hawaii and Samoa as examples of the dangers of export capitalism, claiming the U.S. government’s failure to regulate the fruits of its economy had created the need for businesses to export capital elsewhere.

Before arriving in the United States, Martí had observed the expansionist tendencies of both Great Britain and France firsthand. And, by the late 1880s, he had come to think of the United States as “the lawful heir of [European] piracy.” Martí was appalled that the United States had permitted, and even encouraged, the growth of monopolies in Hawaii and Samoa. He was also aware that the U.S. had managed to devour more than half of Mexico’s territory through conquest and subversion. Therefore, Martí had no delusions about the United States’ professed interest in Cuba’s well-being, lamenting in a letter to Ricardo Rodriguez:
Never, except as an idea hidden away in the depths of some generous souls, was Cuba anything more to the United States than a desirable possession, whose only inconvenience is its population, which it considers to be unruly, lazy, and worthy of scorn.77

Martí held great affection for the Cuban population and strove to ensure that Cuba would not become a U.S. asset. During his last ten years of life, Martí devoted his energy toward fostering the establishment of a Cuban society that would interact amicably with, but stand apart from, the United States.78

Martí’s later writings relayed his “conviction that the freedom of the Caribbean [was] crucial to Latin American security and to the balance of power in the world.” 79 In 1891, Martí wrote that “the hands of every nation must remain free for the untrammeled development of the country, in accordance with its distinctive nature and with its individual elements.”80 Some of Martí’s last and most famous words emphasized his concern about the nature of Cuba’s relationship with the United States. In a letter to Manuel Mercado on May 13, 1895, Martí proclaimed, “I have lived in the monster and I know its entrails; my sling is David’s.”81 Martí used his sling precisely to inspire the Cuban people to stand their ground against all imperialist forces, including the United States.

Martí understood that imperialism could be imposed through means other than force. Increased economic and political strength, the results of the Industrial Revolution of the early 1800s, had allowed a few countries to dominate many. Accordingly, Martí explored in his writings the ways in which Cuba could respond to the economic and political forces of superpower nations, namely the United States. Martí proposed that the new, independent Cuba avoid linking itself too closely with the United States, or any other single country, by creating ties with many nations.82 Martí believed that “whoever says economic union, says political union; the people who buy command; the people who sell obey.”83 In his view, Cuba should not become too dependent on exporting its resources to the United States in order to prevent sacrificing its integrity as an independent nation.

However, Martí was aware that achieving his goal of breaking free from Spain without the “sympathy” of the United States would be close to impossible.84 So, despite his beliefs about the United States’ possible economic and political objectives in Cuba, Martí remained “firmly resolved to request and obtain” the United States’ verbal support of the revolutionary effort.85 Martí believed the only way Cuba could achieve independence from Spain and foster a friendly, but non-intrusive, relationship with the United States would be through a “quick and successful war [that would] forestall U.S. intervention.”86 Martí proved prophetic when he warned that “a protracted war would provide the North Americans with the pretext to intervene.”87 After three years of stalemate military conflict between imperial Spain and the Cuban people, the United States did intervene.88

VI. The Spanish-American War and José Martí’s Legacy

The war for Cuban independence, according to Jaime Suchlicki, “was not the fast and decisive struggle Martí had sought.”89 In January 1895, Martí left New York City to take a more active role in the pre-war movement.90 He traveled to the Dominican Republic and met with leaders of the revolution to draw up the guidelines of war.91 However, even as Martí focused on the fight for a free and independent Cuba, he carried with him the convictions he had acquired during his years in the United States, specifically his concerns on the separation of races and classes. For example, Martí insisted that “blacks would be invited to participate” in battle.92 A victory for Cuba would be a victory for all, regardless of race. A victory, let alone a victory without U.S. involvement, was a triumph Marti never witnessed. He was killed at the age of forty-two at the Battle of Dos Rios on May 19, 1895.93 Then, four years later, in 1899, U.S. forces joined the war for Cuban independence, a move that eliminated Martí’s hopes for the emergence of a Cuba established without the assistance of the U.S.94 The United States’ involvement contributed greatly to the defeat of Spanish forces in Cuba. And, with the passage of the Platt Amendment in 1902, the U.S. established itself as an often resented guardian of the Cuban people.95
VII. Conclusion

Through close reading of Martí’s most important critical works, several conclusions regarding Martí’s aspirations for both Cuban and U.S. society can be made. Martí believed that good government is a body that ensures “the balance of the country’s natural elements.” Over the course of fifteen years, Martí became increasingly critical of the U.S. government because he witnessed its inability to adjust imbalanced elements of society, such as race and class. These elements, according to Martí, would prevent U.S. society from maintaining stability in the coming years, thus making the United States a less desirable country for its people to inhabit. On the other hand, Martí’s writings also relay his admiration for the principles of liberty and good will, which he still believed existed in the fibers of U.S. society.

Despite the positive nature of much of Martí’s analysis of the United States, Cuba’s neighbor to the North has rarely been perceived positively by the Cuban people. Most notably, Fidel Castro has openly and harshly criticized the United States countless times during his tenure as leader of Cuba. Many members of the Cuban Communist Party, including Castro, point to Martí as the original critic of the United States, hoping to “complete Martí’s work” in modern day Cuba. Néstor Carbonell discusses the development of Martí’s legacy in his book, And the Russians Stayed: The Sovietization of Cuba:

The Cuban Communists, eager to exploit Martí’s prestige and influence, often point to his caustic remarks on the unbridled materialism and lust for territory and power that he observed in certain American quarters. They conveniently ignore, however, Martí’s genuine admiration for the United States’ unsurpassed qualities as an entrepreneurial and democratic nation, and ignore the sound advice he gave to Latin Americans on how to deal with the ‘Colossus of the North’: There is the America that is not ours, whose enmity is neither wise nor practical to instigate. But with a firm sense of decorum and independence, it is not impossible, and it is useful, to be its friend.

Clearly, Martí did not advocate the total rejection of U.S. society as future Cuban leaders would suggest. This misinterpretation of Martí’s philosophy has allowed his continued veneration in communist Cuba.

Neither the United States nor Cuba has been much of a “friend” to the other over the past fifty years. What would Martí think about the current state of affairs between the United States and Cuba? Certainly the animosity that now exists between the two countries would not have been Martí’s desire. It is evident, from Martí’s writings, that he would have made a few different choices for Cuba along the way. Martí would not have suggested that Cuba limit trade contact to the Soviet Union during the Cold War, a move that isolated Cuba from all but a few countries. Martí would not have suggested that the Cuban communist officials centralize sugar plantations, thus creating a monoculture type of economy and “a landless agrarian proletariat of poor whites and mulattoes.” If Martí could speak to the Cuban people today, perhaps he would point to, rather than castigate, the United States as an example of both what works and what does not work in society.

Martí was not averse to appreciating U.S. culture, as some modern day Latin American leaders would suggest. He lauded many aspects of U.S. society, such as “science, technical advances, and [a] vast wealth of art and literature which Martí shared copiously among his Latin American readers.” He only hoped that the U.S. would allow the new Cuban nation to create its own culture as well, one which could also be appreciated and enjoyed. Martí’s Cuba “was to be hased on the close collaboration of all social classes. . . . It would be the fatherland where everyone could live in peace with freedom and justice, ‘a nation based on law order, and the hard work of its inhabitants.’” Unfortunately, the principles Martí revered in U.S. society, such as freedom and justice, have not been adopted by Cuba’s leaders, namely Fidel Castro. The introduction to Martí’s Thoughts by Carlos Ripoll aptly expresses the conflict between the ideology of Martí and Castro:

Insofar as Martí made freedom and justice cornerstones and could never accept curtailment of the natural expansiveness of the human spirit, insofar as he believed, on the contrary, that man’s redemption would come through love and unfettered reason, his doctrine is, and must be, at odds with the totalitarian dogma that has been implanted in Cuba.
Although Martí might agree with the intention of communism, his writings indicate that he would most likely disagree with its implementation thus far. Along with his support of diversified agriculture, Martí believed that every citizen should “possess and cultivate a piece of land,” a vision much more akin to that of the United States than that of Cuba with its sugar cane monoculture. He also believed that “animals move in herds; men, guided by free thought,” a philosophy much more in line with the principles of democracy than dictatorship. A government for the people is something Martí would support, but a government that dominates the people is something Martí would oppose.

In the words of Roberto Fernández Retamar, Martí did not reject U.S. society “en masse,” rather he sought to “[underline] the negative aspects” that made it a danger both to itself and Cuba.”

According to Jaime Suchlicki:

Much has been written regarding Martí’s attitude toward the United States. His writings have been taken out of context to show him as being strongly anti-Yankee, or to portray him as the advocate of a Latin America in the image of the United States. The truth lies, perhaps, somewhere between the two extremes. Martí admired the accomplishments of the United States, but at the same time he saw it as a society in which, according to him, man placed too much emphasis on material wealth and on his selfish interest.

Martí states in his essay, “Our America,” written in New York in 1891, that “nations should live in an atmosphere of self-criticism because it is healthy, but always with one heart and one mind.”

Attempting to lead his country to independence and a better way of life, Martí adopted a critical approach to his analysis of both the United States and Cuba, not because he sought to demean them, but because he sought to improve them. During the years in which Martí studied the United States, hoping to grow in his understanding of liberty and sacrifice, he witnessed a society becoming increasingly enslaved by its own economic and social constructions. Martí relied on careful and objective observation of this transformation to construct what he considered to be a viable plan for freeing and improving Cuba. Through his writings, his lifestyle, and his ultimate sacrifice, Martí struggled to lead his beloved nation to a better and independent future.
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Bob Dylan, Woody Guthrie, and Folk Protest Music: Cultural Heroism or Movement Leadership

Channing Kennedy

“This Machine Kills Fascists.” The machine referenced in this catchy slogan was not a gun, a tank, or an instrument of war; it was not even a political machine. “This Machine Kills Fascists” was the text inscribed on Woody Guthrie’s guitar. In the battle for justice and social revolution, the guitar was the chosen weapon employed by Guthrie, Bob Dylan, and other folk protest musicians.

Musicians are typically seen as anything but leaders. They are entertainers, maybe even idols, but they certainly are not perceived as engaging in anything as socially relevant as leadership. One scholar called folk protest musicians like Guthrie and Dylan cultural heroes, as these singer-songwriters were admired for their personal integrity, especially by youth who felt that Guthrie and Dylan lived up the high-minded ideals they sang about (Rodnitzky xvi). Another author described a type of heroism characterized by the “cult of the singer-songwriter” surrounding musicians like Dylan and Guthrie (Hampton xii). This heroism is characterized by power, but it also involves a special genius, talent, charisma, and magnetic personality. More importantly, the hero fits into a larger mythology created by the cult following (Hampton 5-6).

Music, folk music included, is essentially a form of communication. Musicians might communicate directly through their words or lyrics or symbolically express themselves through the chords or notes they play. In lyrical songs, the addition of words makes a powerful statement, as it contributes to the message conveyed by the instrumental music alone (Seeger 57). Either way, music is communication. Similarly, communication is central to leadership. Indeed, no matter how stirring a leader’s vision may be, nothing can be accomplished if the vision is not effectively communicated to others. Thus, if music is essentially communication, and if communication is central to leadership, can music be a tool for leadership? Can musicians be understood as more than just cultural heroes?

The music and actions of Woody Guthrie and Bob Dylan, and thus folk music in general, are ripe for this type of leadership analysis. Whether defined by its unknown origin, subject matter, or musical style (Rodnitzky xiii), folk music, sometimes called folk protest music or propaganda music, is designed to communicate social, political, economic, or ideological concepts to listeners. Moreover, these songs of persuasion are designed to achieve several goals that go beyond just providing entertainment. The active nature of folk protest music in general, including its desire to point out problems, develop and maintain support, and offer solutions to reach a goal, makes folk protest musicians like Guthrie and Dylan suitable prospects for the study of leadership. Unlike other musicians who may simply provide a pleasant recreational experience for listeners, both Guthrie and Dylan offered a social commentary with the intent of engaging individuals in their cause. Music can be seen as an opiate, a weapon, or even a harbinger of social change.

Channing Kennedy

“Bob Dylan and Woody Guthrie are widely recognized for their musical legacy, but much of their work is too socially relevant to see them only in that light. Too often we think about leadership in really traditional ways. I chose this topic for a paper in Jeanne Jackson’s Capstone Senior Leadership Seminar because it gave me a chance to explore an atypical instance of leadership and the potential of music, an art form that touches so many people, to serve as an agent for social change.”

Channing is a senior history-political science major from Athens, Alabama. In addition to participating in the Leadership Studies Program and the Harrison Honors Program, Channing has served on the Panhellenic Executive Board and as editor of the Compass. She is a house director in Residence Life and a member of the BSC Jazz Band, Pi Beta Phi, and several honor societies, including Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Alpha Theta, Pi Sigma Alpha, and Order of Omega. In summer 2008, she was a Hess Fellow with Bread for the World in Washington, DC.
Therefore, it is only logical to conclude that the one making the music may assume a more active role in shaping society than is suggested by the term heroism alone.

Although the concept of heroism certainly may be a fair description of the protest singer, it alone may not accurately characterize the nature of this type of musician. In some instances, it may be more correct to describe this phenomenon as leadership. By employing a communication-based definition of leadership, contrasts emerge between the music of Guthrie and Dylan; these contrasts allow an analysis based on the extent to which these musicians employed the skills essential for effective communication and therefore exhibited the potential for leadership. In the end, Guthrie employed more of the skills necessary for communication providing a stronger basis for leadership, primarily because of the direct social relevance of his music, his focus on the union and cohesion, and his connection to and credibility among the folk-music community. Dylan, on the other hand, offered a more ambiguous picture of leadership because of his music’s abstract connections to society, his individualistic rather than communal focus, and his eventual loss of credibility among the core of the folk-music community.

This analysis of Guthrie and Dylan is somewhat limited in scope. Rather than analyzing their leadership as a whole or their relationship with followers, this paper centers on their communication skills; such skills provide the basis for leadership, according to leadership theorists Michael Hackman and Craig Johnson (Wren 428). Furthermore, the analysis of Dylan presented here focuses on his early career as a folk musician, primarily those years before his appearance at the 1965 Newport Folk Festival where he began his transformation from folk singer to rock and roll star. By contrast, this paper covers Guthrie’s career in its entirety.

Before beginning a discussion of the leadership skills Dylan and Guthrie demonstrated, a quick examination of their backgrounds is necessary to provide some context for this analysis. Guthrie was a singer-songwriter and folk musician who grew up in the early years of the twentieth century in Oklahoma. During his early career, he traveled around the Midwest with migrant workers and spent time in New York and the Pacific Northwest as well. Guthrie also served a short stint as a merchant marine during World War II. Most importantly, Guthrie became known for his militant pro-union beliefs and his attachment to communist and socialist ideologies.

Bob Dylan was born in 1941 into a Jewish family in Minnesota. He took an early interest in music, teaching himself to play guitar and piano. In the fall of 1959, Dylan enrolled at the University of Minnesota. While his academic work was largely a failure, it was at this university where he was first exposed to the music of Woody Guthrie, a man he would later consider an idol and an important musical influence. Dylan soon moved to New York and began playing folk music in several prominent clubs in Greenwich Village. Shortly thereafter, he recorded his first album.

The communicative basis of folk protest music – and music in general – leads to a communication-based definition of leadership, such as that proposed by Michael Hackman of the University of Colorado and Craig Johnson of George Fox College, both professors of communication. In Leadership: A Communication Perspective, Hackman and Johnson offer the following communication-based definition of leadership: Leadership is human or symbolic communication which modifies the attitudes and behaviors of others in order to meet group goals and needs. With this definition as a basis, the following examination of the lives of Guthrie and Dylan focuses on three clusters of skills that Hackman and Johnson believe are critical for leadership: linking, envisioning, and regulating. The first skill, linking, includes monitoring the environment and creating a trusting climate. The second skill, envisioning, essentially entails the act of creating an agenda or vision. The third skill, regulating, is the most complex. It involves a number of components, such as using effective verbal and nonverbal communication, creating positive expectations, managing change, and, perhaps most importantly, developing a perception of credibility (Wren 429, 431).

These three skills, however, are not exclusive to Hackman and Johnson’s communication-based theory. Other leadership theorists, including Lee G. Bolham and Terrence E. Deal of the National Center for Educational Leadership, discuss behaviors similar to linking in their application of theories of group interactions to formulate appropriate leadership responses. Other leadership theorists have examined the skill of envisioning; for example, Marshall Sashkin, a professor of human and organizational studies at George Washington University, discusses envisioning in his renowned theory of visionary leadership (Wren 390,402). In addition, James Kouzes and Barry Posner, authors of The Leadership Challenge, focus specifically on the importance of credibility in influence relationships.
Just as I will show through a focus on the careers of Guthrie and Dylan that credibility is key to regulating activity, Kouzes and Posner state, “If you don’t believe in the messenger, you won’t believe the message” (32–33). Quite simply, credibility is essential to influence people.

Linking is a communication skill necessary for leadership. According to Hackman and Johnson, successful leaders use their linking skills to process cues from the environment. Leaders apply these skills when they are attentive to current events and the activities of other groups. Not only do leaders connect with the environment, they also create a trusting, cooperative work environment and engage in team building (Wren 429). Essentially, linking occurs when a leader has an awareness of the outside world and creates a feeling of unity among followers by linking them to each other and to the broader society.

Both Guthrie and Dylan exemplified the first characteristic of linking by showing an awareness of their environment through their music. Each, however, did this according to their own styles and particular motivations. Guthrie employed his awareness of the world to make connections with his listeners in a personal manner; Dylan, however, emphasized broader social issues in more abstract terms. Songs such as Guthrie’s Dust Bowl Ballads recorded in 1940 linked listeners to the environment by offering descriptions of the drought, dust storms, farm failures, and western migrations. He connected people to their environment by singing songs about reality and the problems facing the working class.

Songs such as Guthrie’s Dust Bowl Ballads recorded in 1940 linked listeners to the environment by offering descriptions of the drought, dust storms, farm failures, and western migrations. He connected people to their environment by singing songs about reality and the problems facing the working class.

Lyrics from the song “Pastures of Plenty” show the connection Guthrie made to current events in society:

I worked in your orchards of peaches and prunes
I slept on the ground in the light of the moon
On the edge of the city you’ll see us and then
We come with the dust and we go with the wind (Guthrie, “Pastures of Plenty”)

In this song, Guthrie explained the economic realities of migrant workers during the Great Depression. Through such songs, Guthrie showed awareness of problems in society and connected listeners to larger issues.

Dylan displayed this linking skill in similar, yet more abstract ways. He exposed the racial injustice of the early 1960s in songs like “Oxford Town,” “The Death of Emmett Till,” and “Only a Pawn in Their Game.” His songs included lyrics that connected listeners to current events of the day and reflected his awareness of his environment. Other Dylan songs had anti-war themes. In the lyrics of “With God on Our Side,” Dylan made strong criticisms against war:

But now we got weapons
Of the chemical dust
If fire them we’re forced to
Then fire them we must
One push of the button
And a shot the world wide
And you never ask questions
When God’s on your side (Dylan, “With God on Our Side”)

His allusions to the dangers of chemical warfare and the growing threat of the Cold War showed an attentiveness to current events demonstrating a critical component of the linking skill necessary for leadership.

As Hackman and Johnson describe, the communication skill of linking has another important part that complements the connections that leaders make to the broader society. This second component of linking connects followers to each other. In Guthrie’s case, this element meant the creation of worker solidarity. For Guthrie, the only real hope for workers was the union, which he characterized in a positive light in order to encourage membership growth. He expressed this belief through songs such as “Union Maid,” “Union’s My Religion,” and “Good Old Union Feeling.” These organizing songs, which glorified achievements of unions, were intended to generate listener participation (Hampton 120,126). They also acted as a call to workers to join unions, thus connecting these individuals to each other.

Dylan, on the other hand, seemed to be less interested in connecting his listeners to one another.
One critic claimed that Dylan’s primary goal was aesthetic. The cult of originality and fame that developed around Dylan challenged the utopian sensibility of unity espoused by Guthrie and earlier folk musicians. Dylan replaced this “communal ideal” and the ideology of collective action with a sense of mystery and a focus on individual feelings. Furthermore, Dylan’s music essentially communicated an ethic of political apathy (Hampton 214). This lack of unity generated by Dylan’s music was emblematic of rhetorical protest songs of the 1960s that expressed individual feelings of discontent with particular issues, rather than collective feelings of unity (Dunlap 550). Songs like Dylan’s “Masters of War,” written from a first person point of view, were condemnations of social conditions (Denisoff, Sing a Song 10). In his music, Dylan urged his listeners to examine their own consciences to advance solutions, rather than mobilize to solve problems as Guthrie urged (Dunlap 559). Dylan may have offered some direction, but he believed that ultimately individuals must come to terms with themselves (Klier 345). Although listeners may feel connected with others because of their common feelings of discontent, Dylan’s music did not actively attempt to create unity and remained essentially individualistic. Unlike Guthrie who provided concrete links to the broader society and communicated an ethic of unity, Dylan connected his listeners to society in more abstract ways and did not use his music to link listeners to others. Thus, Guthrie demonstrated the first communication skills necessary for leadership, linking, while Dylan did so only in abstract ways or not at all.

According to Hackman and Johnson, another communication skill necessary for leadership is envisioning. Commonly known as articulating a vision, envisioning is simply the act of constructing an agenda or a plan for the future. Hackman and Johnson write, “Leaders must be able to take the inputs they receive from linking with others and the environment and convert them into an agenda or vision for the future” (Wren 429). For both Guthrie and Dylan, the vision was communicated through song. In a passage in the liner notes of one of Guthrie’s early recordings, John Steinbeck described the vision Guthrie presented in his music:

> Harsh voiced and nasal, his guitar hanging like a tire on a rusty rim, there is nothing sweet about Woody, and there is nothing sweet about the songs he sings. But there is something more important for those who will listen. There is the will of a people to endure and fight against oppression. (qtd. in Hampton 94)

As Steinbeck observed, Guthrie’s vision was found in his music. Guthrie’s main agenda was to create a society in which people recognized injustice and spoke out against oppression. Ultimately, he hoped that people would come together for the common good. The idea of unity as an aspect of Guthrie’s vision was expressed in songs like “Tom Joad,” based on Steinbeck’s novel The Grapes of Wrath:

> Ever’body might be just one big soul,  
> Well it looks that a-way to me.  
> Everywhere that you look, in the day or night,  
> That’s where I’m a-gonna be, Ma,  
> That’s where I’m a-gonna be.  
> Wherever little children are hungry and cry,  
> Wherever people ain’t free,  
> Wherever men are fightin’ for their rights,  
> That’s where I’m a-gonna be, Ma.  
> That’s where I’m a-gonna be. (Guthrie, “Tom Joad”)

In these lyrics, Guthrie expressed his solidarity with those who were disadvantaged and issued a call for them to join together.

Bob Dylan expressed his vision in a similar way. Whether singing in favor of civil rights or speaking out against the Vietnam War, Dylan presented what sociologists Ron Eyerman and Andrew Jamison call “a poetic cry of critique, a diatribe against pomp and power and pretense, and a renewed...call for justice and compassion...” (126). Although Guthrie and Dylan came from different times, the call for justice in the face of power was present in each man’s vision. In this sense, both Guthrie and Dylan used the skills of envisioning, an important basis of leadership.
The final communication skill necessary for leadership, regulating, specifically involves regulating the behavior of others. Regulating is the influence component of communication-based leadership. Hackman and Johnson list seven characteristics that leaders must demonstrate in order to influence others successfully (Wren 429). However, the analysis here will be limited to one of these elements necessary for influence: a perception of credibility.

In order to communicate effectively, potential leaders must be seen as credible. For Guthrie, this credibility was evident in his acceptance by left-wing intellectuals. In addition to his role as a folk singer, he was seen as a spokesman for the communist movement during the Great Depression and for radical labor groups that developed after the rise of the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO). Guthrie, who performed at a number of left-wing political rallies, was seen by progressive intellectuals as the “living incarnation of social issues they had grappled with” (Reuss 278). Guthrie’s credibility within left-wing circles was further reinforced by his position as a writer for two radical newspapers, the People’s World and the Daily Worker (Hampton 107). Before Guthrie encountered the political left, he held no special status within society other than that of another “good” hillbilly songwriter. However, after publicity in radical newspapers brought him to the attention of urban intellectuals, he became a symbol of the turmoil experienced by millions during the Great Depression (Reuss 282).

Guthrie’s credibility was reinforced by the authenticity of his image as a folk singer. Guthrie’s music was reflective of his own economic struggles growing up (Rodnitzky 7). Moreover, he expressed his ideology in a folksy language, partly from habit, but also in a conscious attempt to identify with the common man that his philosophy was intended to represent (Hampton 146). Critic Richard Reuss wrote in The Journal of American Folklore that Guthrie is especially worthy of our attention because of his use of terms, concepts, and modes of expression of his people, rather than those of elite American society. In addition to Guthrie’s folksy speaking style, his folk repertoire included a number of anecdotes, jokes, toasts, proverbial phrases, and witty sayings from the folk tradition (Reuss 282). Through his authentic speaking style and his acceptance by left-wing movements, Guthrie possessed the necessary credibility to regulate the behavior of others.

Dylan gained similar credibility through his acceptance by the protest community. His credibility, however, was soon undermined by his decision to renounce his folk roots in favor of the electric sounds of rock and roll. During the civil rights era, the urban protest public in the North emphasized the music of successful folk entrepreneurs, especially the songs of Bob Dylan (Denisoff, Sing a Song 73). Dylan’s acceptance by the folk protest community and thus his credibility was established by his performance at a Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) rally in Mississippi with Pete Seeger and the Freedom Singers (Sounes 133-35). While these early performances helped validate Dylan as a credible figure in the folk protest movement, his performance at the July 25, 1965, Newport Folk Festival seemed to destroy his credibility, at least among folk music traditionalists (Denisoff, Great Day Coming 190-91). This performance, which featured him playing electric guitar only, strengthened the perception that he had moved away from political material and reinforced the notion held by many on the left that Dylan was a sellout. Whatever credibility Dylan originally had, at least among the folk music community, seemed to dissolve when he traded in his acoustic guitar and “went electric.”

All in all, we see that both Woody Guthrie and Bob Dylan demonstrated many of the communication skills necessary to fulfill a communication-based definition of leadership. However, because of the limits of this analysis, specifically the omission of a focus on the relationship with followers, we cannot definitively conclude that Guthrie was a leader and Dylan was not. Both musicians exhibited the skills of linking, envisioning, and regulating as described in communication-based leadership theory, but they demonstrated these skills to different extents throughout their careers. Guthrie linked others to the environment through his words and connected followers to each other by his general appeal for solidarity and unionism. Dylan recognized similar societal factors, but he expressed personal dissatisfaction with an event rather than creating and mobilizing a group; thus, he failed to engage fully in linking behaviors. Both Guthrie and Dylan engaged in envisioning through their music by offering alternative visions of a more just society through their lyrics. Guthrie and Dylan demonstrated skill in effectively regulating others. However, primarily based on the differences in their credibility, they exemplified the ability to regulate others to different extents. Guthrie was widely accepted by intellectuals and core supporters of the left wing. Dylan, on the other hand, was not overtly political enough to gain their
acceptance, especially after his turn to rock and roll. Thus, while Guthrie had the credibility to engage in regulating, Dylan, over time, lost this credibility. Overall, Guthrie exhibited the three skills necessary for communication-based leadership. Dylan, however, did not.

Although Guthrie may have been Dylan’s hero, the characterization of Guthrie as a mythic hero, however accurate, is not sufficient to describe the reality of his actions and music. Dylan may be the greater musical talent of the two. Indeed, rock music might not be the same today without Dylan’s influence. However, in terms of leadership, not lasting popularity or superstar status, Guthrie certainly has the greater legacy. While perhaps Dylan’s iconic legacy will endure, the ideas of change and unity Guthrie expressed are certainly relevant to social struggles today. As Guthrie wrote, “I don’t know. I may go down or up or anywhere, But I feel like this scribbling might stay” (Guthrie, “Another Man’s Done Gone”).
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The Unifying Power of Black Student Activism in the 1960s

Laura Chaires

Since the Great Migration, when African Americans flocked to cities en masse in search of economic opportunities, tight-knit groups have developed within the black community, beginning with the often matriarchal family and percolating up to larger, more formally organized groups. August Meier and Elliot Rudwick, in their book *From Plantation to Ghetto*, state that Blacks, “[m]otivated by pride and habit, and the need for mutual protection from rejection […] found a refuge within their own community” (237). While the church was active in carving out a niche for African Americans in urban areas, helping them “adjust to the dismal realities of urban life” (Meier and Rudwick 249), more free-standing groups developed as well. In the era of segregation, there was a need for these types of groups, and “organizations, overall, were needed to meet the growing health, education, and social problems of Blacks in the urban environment” (Yearwood 427). The specific institutions that developed for these purposes varied, but their existence was fairly common in every city that was home to a significant black population. These groups precipitated tangible benefits for their members. As Lennox Yearwood observes, “[F]ormal [b]lack organizations and agencies contributed to acceleration of economic, political, and educational advancement of Blacks in American urban communities” (424).

On college campuses nearly forty years after the peak of the Great Migration, the trend of community building continued with the introduction of black fraternities and sororities, more formally known as black Greek-lettered organizations. In an article in the *New York Times*, Isabel Wilkerson states that “[t]he groups, an outgrowth of segregation days when [B]lacks could not join white fraternal organizations, are among the most influential and best-endowed of all black organizations,” adding that their members “commit themselves to service long after their college days are over” (1). She goes on to describe these groups as “survival networks” for black college students (Wilkerson 3). These student groups later became instrumental in precipitating cycles of student activism, providing a rallying point for disillusioned black students. Activism, in turn, served to tighten the bonds among group members and to help shape a generation of leaders among the African American community.

These Greek organizations evolved on predominantly black college campuses from literary societies, and they were typically highly exclusive. Involvement in such student groups “provided a haven for individual students to express their concerns as well as a collective voice for articulating group issues and negotiating resolutions with college and university administration” (Miller 128). As Stephanie Y. Evans notes, black Greek-lettered organizations were founded on worthy ideals. She writes, “Black Greek-lettered organizations,” in particular, “along with [b]lack churches, often have provided a foundation for the fight to correct social injustices. Member organizations of the National Pan-Hellenic Council—the ‘Divine Nine’—were all founded on principles of [b]lack pride, service, and justice” (Evans 1).

Laura Chaires

“I wrote this paper for *Plural America II* with Drs. Nicholas and Sprayberry. For this particular assignment, we were to focus on a person, event, or subject relevant to the Civil Rights struggle of the 1960s. I have long been aware of the social aspects that fraternities and sororities provide for students, but I was very curious as to the impact they might have had in a more political sense during the 1960s. It was really interesting talking to people who had experienced that era and coming to understand the ways it shaped them. I realized how it continues to inform their lives and personalities and how alive it still is to them.”

Laura is a junior majoring in English and minoring in French from Louisville, Kentucky. A participant in the Harrison Honors Program, Laura is also active in the Reformed University Fellowship. In addition, she serves as a ‘Southern Ambassador, writes for the Hilltop News, and holds membership in Omicron Delta Kappa and Sigma Tau Delta. Laura has enjoyed Interim projects in Seattle and the Galapagos Islands.
To cite a specific example, Ms. Vanteal Jones, a 1969 graduate of Alabama State University and member of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, says that “membership in Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority is a commitment to lifelong community service, scholarship, education, and leadership” (Jones). Emphasizing the tightly knit community these groups often created, she further explains that “unlike predominantly white sororities that are mostly social in nature and whose members usually cease to function after graduating from college, AKA members are encouraged to transfer their membership to a graduate chapter in the community where they will live after graduating from college so that they can continue to provide service” (Jones). Furthermore, Ms. Jones, who was personally involved in the civil rights movement, states that “sororities and fraternities were at the forefront of the civil rights movement in Montgomery in the 60’s” (Jones). She recounts an event that took place during her senior year of high school in which “students from Alabama State, led by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and sorority and fraternity members wearing their organizations’ emblems and colors, led several marches to the capital to protest laws that kept Blacks from voting” (Jones). Later, when she herself was involved in the sorority, Alpha Kappa Alpha held numerous voter registration drives in the black community.

However, student activism did not begin in the 1960s. Decades of earlier protests and demonstrations laid the groundwork for the explosion in student activism that became an integral part of the civil rights movement. In fact, “social and political activism was an important aspect of student life and culture in the United States” throughout the twentieth century (Franklin, “Introduction” 105). Before this activism could begin, black students had to find a sense of self-identity at historically black colleges and universities and on predominantly white campuses, in particular. As Karen Miller notes in her essay “Negroes No More,” “[c]ollective black student activism usually evolved out of smaller struggles to carve out space to be oneself, free from perceived and actual pressures to conform to ‘white’ cultural and social modalities” (126). In part, black student groups were so important because they provided a place where students could become comfortable enough with themselves to speak out about larger issues.

Often, student activism was an outgrowth of activism in the larger community. Scholar V. P. Franklin says that “[s]tudents attending colleges and universities in cities and towns where the local black community had launched protest movements participated in these civil rights campaigns” (“Patterns” 205-06). Franklin also acknowledges that the larger group of a college campus and its student body community were important in the movement as well. He goes on to substantiate this view, explaining how “[...] college campuses spawned hundreds of activists willing to put their lives on the line in the cause of social justice. The student sit-ins and the formation of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) represented a turning point and historical marker in the evolution of the Civil Rights Movement in the United States” (Franklin, “Patterns” 204). While students initially protested against segregation and other less-than-ideal realities on their campuses, their interest grew to include “the larger black freedom struggles whose aims were an end to racial inequalities and legalized segregation in both societies—on and off campus” (Franklin, “Patterns” 215).

Student groups felt tremendous responsibility to address racial issues. As a result, “[g]roups like the Black Student Union” at San Francisco State University, for example, “felt they had to strike in order to preserve their credibility and use their leverage within and outside the university community. Otherwise, institutions could ignore their issues without fear of serious consequences” (Miller 139). In order to gain and maintain the respect of the larger community, student groups could not make empty claims. Their actions had to live up to the philosophies they espoused. Therefore, student groups worked diligently in their struggle for freedom and thus emerged as an indispensable part of the entire pursuit. In fact, “it has been the youth who have been the chief dynamic force in revamping the strategy of the established civil rights organization—who in turn felt it necessary to do something in order to retain leadership in the movement” (Meier 442). Students were not mere sidekicks in the era of widespread African American activism.

Through this singular purpose, these groups provided an outlet for students who were dissatisfied with their treatment both within “the academy” and within the larger American society. One young man who participated in the first sit-in in North Carolina reported, “At the end of that first sit-in, I didn’t feel nearly as guilty as I had prior to it…. Before the sit-ins, I felt kinda lousy, like I was useless” (qtd. in Rosenthal 122). The protest movement finally gave this young man a place to do something
in response to his and other students’ complaints. This action spurred others into motion, including a
group at Miles College in Birmingham, Alabama, led, in part, by non-traditional student Frank Dukes,
who said, “Some of the students like in North Carolina were protesting and demonstrating and a group
of us [students at Miles] felt that we should do the same thing because we were so hamstrung by segre-
gation, discrimination, and all those other ills and wrongs. So we just got a committee together” (6).
Furthermore, he said that they “felt that [they] could not just sit idly by and not protest here [in
Alabama] because the conditions in Alabama were so much worse than those in North Carolina”
(Dukes 6). After leading a boycott, formally known as a Selective Buying Campaign, of downtown
businesses in Birmingham, Dukes said that “what [they] really got out of the Selective Buying
Campaign was unification of the [b]lack community psychologically and philosophically and in terms
of like the desegregation of stores and all this kind of stuff” (11). The group united over a common
cause.

Students were inspired by the actions of other students to take part in groups on their own campus-
es; this participation allowed them to express feelings and concerns that had previously been repressed.
One student, Catherine Burks Brooks, said that “what [she] remember[s] about SNCC was just being
so excited to see all of the students from look like around the world, I guess it might have been just
around the south […] and the changes that we were going to make” (19). In an article on black fra-
ternal organizations, Theda Skocpol and Jennifer Lyn Oser say that “[t]he modern civil rights move-
ment, it is well to remember, expressed remarkable solidarity among African Americans across lines of
class, gender, and residential location, enabling [B]lacks to fashion broad appeals to fellow Americans
while taking on the repressive segregationist order, pressing until the overt legal supports of that regime
gave way” (424). Blacks, especially students, came from various cities and towns, diverse family and
economic backgrounds, and differing religious schools of thoughts, but they were able to unite on the
front of activism for racial equality.

Out of these student groups that were involved in the civil rights movement came men and women
who were well prepared to become leaders and prominent personages in the black community. One
author posits that “[b]lack student activism on campus […] served as the training ground for partici-
pation in the larger freedom struggles” (Franklin, “Patterns” 214). Another student activist, Miriam
McClendon, said:

My years in the Movement taught me to evaluate and analyze. They sowed the seeds or
laid the groundwork for everything that came after. It allowed me to give expression to
my thoughts and it provided an outlet for me to put those expressions into some type of
practical practice. When I was out marching, picketing, and demonstrating and going
door to door, registering people to vote, that was something that I could actually do.
That was something concrete and I felt that I was making a difference and that was
important to me. I don’t know what direction my life would have taken had I not been
involved in the Movement. I can’t even imagine it, because I’m so much of a doer. It’s
so important for me to attack injustice wherever I see it, that I guess I would have been a
different kind of person to not have been involved in the Movement (17).

For McClendon, then, being involved in activism as a student not only provided her a means of partici-
paring in change and expressing her thoughts and opinions, but it also built a life-long passion for
“doing” and for being involved in her community. She also says that “the struggle continues”
(McClendon 19). Therefore, although many participants faded from the limelight after the tumult of
the 1960s, they have continued to be important players in the black community, serving important,
though perhaps less high-profile, roles. Catherine Burks Brooks said of herself and her fellow activists
that “we don’t drop out [of the movement], we move on” (23). Despite all the strides made by the
movement, work remains to be done, and people like McClendon, Brooks, and those who have learned
about their struggles are well prepared to do it.

The story of Mrs. Angenetta Scott, a 1968 graduate of Alabama State University in Montgomery, is
the embodiment of countless stories from students involved in the civil rights movement. Mrs. Scott
says that her “personal involvement [in the movement] was not as active as some because of [her] par-
ents’ fear for [her] safety” (Scott). In fact, Mrs. Scott was offered a full scholarship to Huntingdon
College, a small, Methodist, liberal arts college also located in Montgomery, but, because she would have been one of the first to integrate there, her family decided not to put her in that risky position. However, being involved in a student group, in this case the sorority Delta Sigma Theta, Inc., provided Mrs. Scott with a way to use her abilities to provide aid to the movement. Furthermore, being in Montgomery, Alabama, which was a crucial city in the civil rights movement, gave her “a unique passion and perspective on the necessary relationship between [her] sorority and the movement” (Scott). Though she may not have been able to be as vocal or active as some students, she “did march on campus and through the downtown of Montgomery, attended Bus Boycott Mass Meetings, worked on several committees within the Sorority making telephone calls, passing out leaflets, help raise money, etc.” (Scott). There was a role for everyone to play.

By attending school in Montgomery and being involved in her student group, Mrs. Scott was able to continue trying to make a difference and become more involved after her student days. She claims that “[t]he excellent education, encouragement, exposure to exemplary characters and expertise [she] received at Alabama State allowed [her] to be one of the first Negroes to integrate many places right after the end of the Movement” (Scott). She also says that “[h]aving member of a legal student group can be a positive avenue for social and personal growth. It can also be the avenue to be involved in political justice causes” (Scott). Mrs. Scott went on to hold various jobs throughout her post-college years—she served as court secretary for a federal judge, worked in hospital administration at the University of Alabama at Birmingham, and taught at both Robert E. Lee High School and Homewood High School. Her involvement in the movement and interaction with her sorority sisters helped to shape her into a woman of action and integrity. She explains that, for her, being part of a sorority was “an honor and something to be looked upon with great civic and social responsibility and great humility and pride” (Scott).

For the members of black student groups, their involvement in the civil rights movement and beyond offered not only opportunity but also inspiration and solidarity. Mrs. Scott says that the mindset of community involvement was inherent in the goals of her sorority, and that during the 1960s that mindset became one of hope—“Hope that doors and avenues would be opened to us as females that were closed to us because we were both females and at that time Negroes. Hope that would and could inspire dreams and aspirations to become something other than housewives, teachers, secretaries, or nurses. Hope for the future!” (Scott). Another sorority member, Ms. Vanteal Jones, puts it this way: “As college-educated African-American women, we realize that we are privileged, but we also believe that we must uplift those in our communities who are disadvantaged” (Jones). Members used their involvement in Greek organizations to become involved in projects geared toward this purpose and have extended that passion and those ideals into a lifelong commitment.

There are countless untold stories behind the personalities of each member of the civil rights movement. These stories, like those told by Frank Dukes, Catherine Burks Brooks, Miriam McClendon, Vanteal Jones, and Angenetta Scott, are stories of involvement leading to personal growth and empowerment. These stories tell of the true sentiment behind the movement itself, a sentiment of hard work, hope, and unity. A generation was shaped by this movement, aided by their membership in groups and influenced by other members of these groups. The events of the 1960s have left a lasting mark on the nature of black student groups and their members by helping them to create their own identities, by focusing their energy, and by providing a common purpose around which students from across the country could rally.
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Sinking the Putt, but Missing the Lessons of the Shot: Re-examining Goleman’s Results-Based Leadership

Charlsie Wigley

The first hole was a par-four. As I looked in the direction of the distant pin, I told myself that I could get the ball in the cup by the sixth stroke. My dad was standing next to me, slowly explaining pin placement, elevation changes, and sand trap locations. He also told me to use a particular club, that rarely worked well or me. I complied because I perceived that he had more knowledge of the situation. I hit the drive well. Nevertheless, it was shorter than it could have been due to the club that my father led me to choose. With each unhelpful suggestion from my father, I became less and less inclined to listen to him, but I eventually achieved my goal of getting the ball in the hole by the sixth stroke.

I never thought that I would learn about leadership while playing golf with my dad. Still, while listening to his advice, I observed the complexities and limitations of a results-based assessment of leadership, an evaluation that regards progress toward a stated goal as the best method of appraising leadership. Although I viewed the result of getting the ball in the hole by the sixth stroke as a success, I am now perhaps less likely to take his advice, at least on golf clubs.

A common dilemma in competition, such as a round of golf, is that leadership is too often measured by the results, by winning or losing. This method, however, leaves the means employed by leaders, whether victors or not, to be frequently overlooked or ignored. While it is generally accepted that leadership should have an end product, Daniel Goleman in “Leadership that Gets Results” argues for a systematic way for leaders within an organizational context to achieve positive results by learning and applying six different styles of leadership. Goleman’s six styles of leadership are based on an individual’s emotional intelligence, which he describes as “the ability to manage ourselves and our relationships effectively” (Goleman 80). Goleman suggests that the emotional intelligence of leaders may grow when these individuals recognize their shortcomings and commit to being coached by an expert. With this approach, positive results within an organization can occur due to the ability of leaders to apply a particular leadership style that best fits a situation or group of followers. For Goleman, results are the yardstick of leadership and can be controlled by the ability of leaders to be flexible with their leadership styles and to recognize the potential for the growth of their emotional intelligence.

While it is important to consider results, as Goleman does, it is problematic to focus exclusively on results as the yardstick of a leader. In other words, Goleman overly emphasizes the results of leadership and does not consider problems inherent in defining leaders based on their ability to motivate or influence followers to accomplish a stated goal. By focusing on the end results of a leader’s appli-
cation of a particular style, Goleman overlooks the deeper problems of analyzing unforeseen consequences or outcomes, assessing the extent to which a particular leadership style caused the intended results, and determining the perspective from which results are evaluated.

Just as Keith Grint contends in *Leadership: Limits and Possibilities* that leaders and leadership are “cooked” or come from particular perspectives (97), I argue that it is difficult to evaluate leadership based on results because results are judged or viewed on an individual basis and come from different perspectives. Goleman emphasizes that his leadership findings are applicable to an organization, yet he ignores the results of companies such as Enron that can be viewed as favorable or unfavorable depending on an individual’s perspective. As Grint points out, shareholders who stood to gain financially tended to view Enron’s results in a positive light, whereas other followers might have viewed these results as unsuccessful due to the unethical nature of the company’s business practices (Grint 70). Goleman, however, assumes that each leadership style is used for favorable results. Since he does not consider the issue of who determines the perspective, questions of the favorability of the results remain unanswered.

While Goleman states that the job of a leader is rooted in getting results, he seems to ignore the concept of unplanned or immeasurable consequences, results I consider to be outcomes. Goleman’s discussion of Sister Mary and the democratic style of leadership reveals this shortcoming. According to Goleman, democratic leaders “build consensus through participation” (80). He casts Sister Mary as a leader who was able to incorporate the community in an open discourse when faced with shutting down a private school. One of her primary goals involved ensuring that the community could cope with the situation if the school was closed. As a result of her leadership, no backlash from the community occurred when the school closed. Goleman, however, does not consider an important potential outcome – the expectations of the community to be involved in future decisions. Goleman assumes that followers will respond to the use of differing leadership styles, but he does not consider unforeseen outcomes, including situations that demand different styles of leadership when followers favor one leadership approach.

In contrast, Grint stresses the significance of outcomes of leadership. He uses the slave rebellion led by Spartacus as an example. While Spartacus failed to achieve his desired goal of leading a successful rebellion against the Romans, he defeated contingents of Roman troops despite being outmatched in strength, numbers, and resources (Grint 85). Goleman, on the other hand, implies that leadership styles lead to results, but he does not examine potential outcomes that could have a significant impact on the way leadership should be viewed.

The difficulty of determining the effect of a leadership style on the results adds to the complexity of using a results-based assessment of leadership. Goleman believes that leaders can recognize the best leadership style to apply in a particular situation and that successful results can point to one of the six leadership styles he outlines. He argues that results come from different styles of leadership or from different individual leaders (Goleman 84). These views are seen in Goleman’s example of Joe Torre with regard to the affiliative style of leadership. Affiliative leaders are able to “create emotional bonds and harmony” (Goleman 80). Goleman assumes in this example that the New York Yankees’ win in the 1999 World Series was a result of Joe Torre’s use of the affiliative style, which boosted the team’s morale and created a climate of loyalty and commitment. In reality, however, the success of the New York Yankees was perhaps more a testament to the fact that the team members had greater talent and received more pay than the average professional baseball player. In his conceptualization of leadership based strictly on results, it can be inferred that Goleman largely ignores the process of leadership, which involves the acts of leaders using various appropriate styles of leadership. Furthermore, he fails to consider the dynamics behind the emergence of leaders in particular situations.

Goleman directs the attention of leadership scholars and those concerned with the study of leadership toward a definition that is concerned exclusively with the results of a leader’s task. I agree with Goleman that results are an important consideration, but, due to problems that arise with varying perspectives and unforeseen outcomes, I cannot accept Goleman’s overall conclusion that leadership is defined on the basis of a leader’s result. In my view, Goleman’s findings on leadership inhibit us from considering leadership in its full scope. All individuals concerned with leadership, be it in the study of the theories or in the application of the methods, on a battlefield or during a round of golf, should be wary of results as the sole yardstick of leadership and must be willing to consider other areas of focus.
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An Assessment of South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission and Implications for Peace in Israel–Palestine

Natalie Ausborn

The signing of a treaty, cease in a cross-fire, or birth of a new regime are often not the final solution to conflicts involving acts of oppression, violence, and violations of human rights. Rather, after such conflicts, the spiritual, emotional, psychological, and even physical needs of people need to be addressed. While these efforts for lasting peace and closure may range from the Nuremberg trials to the granting of blanket amnesty, South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) has received much attention throughout the world. Though the South African TRC was not the first truth commission, it was unique in its accomplishments and quest for reconciliation. One may assess further how the TRC’s goals and recommendations have been realized since the commission published its final report in 1998, when the individuals and government of South African society were charged to contribute to the development of a national unity. South Africa’s TRC set a precedent for future commissions and can serve as a model for promoting reconciliation in other regions torn by conflict, such as the Middle East. By taking into account historical, cultural, and present-day societal contexts of both South Africa and the Middle East, one can explore both the accomplishments of the South African TRC and applications to the quest for truth and reconciliation in the Middle East.

An appreciation of the history of South Africa’s struggle with Apartheid is essential in understanding the basis of South Africa’s TRC. The Apartheid Era in South Africa lasted from 1948 to 1994, and during this time, the government strived to separate different races both socially and geographically. The Apartheid system divided the people of South Africa into the four racial classes of White, Colored, Indian, and Black, and it deemed the White minority as deserving of complete control. The White race was grouped into one nation. Blacks were placed into ten smaller nations in rural territories known as “homelands” (Thompson 190). The Surplus People Project estimated that an overwhelming 3.5 million Blacks were relocated from 1960 to 1983 (Thompson 194). Blacks who lived in the homelands were refused the same rights as other citizens of South Africa, and, in 1971, the Bantu Homelands Constitution Act allowed the government to declare any homeland to be independent (Thompson 191). However, other countries did not recognize the independence of such homelands. The conditions of these homelands became increasingly poor due to high population densities and the absence of help from outside countries and the South African government (Thompson 193).

In addition to geographical divisions, laws and regulations enacted under the Apartheid system led to deteriorating conditions for the Black race. A few examples of these measures demonstrate the diminished power of the Black race in South African society during Apartheid. The Reservation of Separate Amenities Act permitted separate and unequal public facilities among the different races (Thompson 190). The Bantu Education Act of 1953 allowed the government to control the Black
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public education system and ensured that Black children were taught according to Apartheid ideals, at a cost ten times below the amount spent on the education of Whites (Thompson 196). In addition, Blacks experienced high levels of poverty and disease as unemployment rates doubled among Black South Africans from 1960 to 1977, leaving over twenty percent of Blacks unemployed (Thompson 195). Indeed, South Africa possessed the widest gap in the distribution of income among ninety countries that were reviewed by the World Bank in 1980 (Thompson 202). As a result of the government’s oppression, many young Blacks left South Africa to receive military training elsewhere with the goal of returning to South Africa to “ultimately, launch a guerilla war” (Thompson 213).

South Africa eventually reached a point of political uncertainty where it could no longer ignore the harsh inequalities of Apartheid. By 1967, the General Assembly of the United Nations had created a Special Committee on Apartheid that denounced South Africa’s policies and later declared Apartheid to be “a crime against humanity” (qtd. in Thompson 214). In 1977, the Security Council issued an arms embargo against South Africa (Thompson 214). However, Britain, West Germany, France, and Switzerland abstained from the embargo in order to protect their trade and investments in South Africa; in particular, these countries depended on South Africa as a source of gold, platinum, chromium, manganese, and vanadium (Thompson 217-18). As conditions in the homelands continued to deteriorate, the growing Black population could no longer be sustained. One Black worker commented, “The countryside is pushing you into the cities to survive; the cities are pushing you into the countryside to die” (qtd. in Thompson 226). The time had come for a change.

The Apartheid Era was ended when South African President F.W. de Klerk lifted the ban on anti-Apartheid organizations, which freed the African National Congress leader Nelson Mandela. On April 27, 1994, people of South Africa, Black and White alike, were given the opportunity to vote, and Nelson Mandela was elected as the new president of South Africa. Though negotiations between government officials had been peaceful, violent struggles had taken place from 1990 until 1994, resulting in over sixteen thousand killings (Thompson 248). Mandela, who had been imprisoned for some twenty-seven years, advocated the need for reconciliation among the races in order to establish a new South Africa. The TRC was created to accomplish this purpose, and Mandela appointed the former Archbishop of Cape Town, Desmond Tutu, to serve as the chair of this commission. Tutu, a theologian and religious leader, recognized the need for truth and reconciliation in South Africa as well and viewed the formation of the TRC as the best way to allow the people of South Africa to move forward without ignoring the victims of the past. Though some criticize the effect of the TRC on racial reconciliation in South Africa, the liberating truths and spirit of forgiveness that this commission revealed cannot be ignored.

South Africa’s TRC included three committees: the Committee on Human Rights Violations, the Committee on Reparation and Rehabilitation, and the Committee on Amnesty. Tutu served as the chair of the Human Rights Violations Committee, whose purpose was to address the victims and perpetrators of gross human rights violations; these acts included killing, torture, and extreme ill treatment (Tutu 76). No exemptions were made for violators. As Tutu stated, “A gross violation is a gross violation whoever commits it and for whatever motive” because “a just cause must be fought by just means; otherwise it may be badly vitiated” (107). The basic goal of the Reparation and Rehabilitation Committee was to provide reparations to victims of political violence (Thompson 275). As an additional means of reconciliation, the commission suggested that public facilities and amenities should be named after the “fallen heroes” of South Africa’s liberation (Tutu 64). In regard to the perpetrators of human rights violations, the Committee on Amnesty sought to adhere to the following principle: “amnesty is granted only to those who plead guilty, who accept responsibility, for what they have done. Amnesty is not given to innocent people or to those who claim to be innocent” (Tutu 54). By confessing the truth, individuals could then request amnesty for their crimes and human rights violations. According to Tutu, “The solution arrived at was not perfect but it was the best that could be had in the circumstances - the truth in exchange for the freedom of the perpetrators” (58).

The commission’s published report was presented to President Nelson Mandela on October 29, 1998, after over two years of conducting public hearings, deciding upon reparations, and granting amnesties. More than twenty thousand people submitted statements during the eighteen months of hearings by the Human Rights Violations Committee (Tutu 108). The Reparation and Rehabilitation Committee issued urgent relief to twenty thousand victims in an amount totaling the equivalent of approximately three hundred United States dollars per victim. The committee recommended that the
government pay individual reparation grants in the amount of almost four thousand dollars a year, payable for six years, which would cost the government over four hundred million dollars in total (Tutu 62). The Committee on Amnesty received over seven thousand individual requests for amnesty; it granted over one thousand amnesties before the commission's report was published, leaving two thousand applications to be processed afterwards (Thompson 275).

The question remains as to whether or not the goals and recommendations set out in the TRC 1998 final report were accomplished. Specifically in terms of the Reparation and Rehabilitation Committee, Section 1(1)(xiv) of the TRC states that “any form of compensation, restitution, rehabilitation or recognition” constitutes reparation, and the South African government allocated twenty million dollars in 1999 and thirty million dollars in 2000 and 2001 for such reparations (du Plessis 185-86). However, a 2000 newspaper article by Brandon Hamber entitled “Official Silence on Reparations Cheats the Victims of Past Conflicts of Their Rights” points to frustrations with the extent of reparations not yet paid to victims. Five years after the commission's final report, the South African government reduced the reparations recommended by the TRC to approximately three thousand dollars for each victim (Villa-Vicencio and du Toit 165). To help address this situation, the South African Khulumani Support Group (KSG) speaks for victims whose voices were not heard by the TRC. As the Swahili word khulumani literally means to “speak out,” the KSG was originally formed in 1995 by victims of Apartheid in response to those who felt that the forthcoming TRC should be used to “speak out” to ensure that the past did not repeat itself. The KSG, which currently represents over sixty thousand individuals with claims for reparations, plans to hold a series of hearings in communities that were not reached by the TRC. One KSG member, Brian Mphahlele, stated that although he received his reparation payment, he does not understand why the eighty-five million dollars left in the President’s fund has not been granted to some two thousand people still awaiting payment as of 2008, ten years after the TRC’s final report (“TRC’s Unanswered Questions”).

The Institute for Justice and Reconciliation, an organization established to help bring about reconciliation, justice, and democratic nation-building in Africa, held a conference during April 2006, ten years after the creation of the TRC, entitled “Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa: 10 Years On.”

The conference provided an opportunity for open dialogue with former TRC chairman Desmond Tutu, former TRC commissioner Yasmin Sooka, and two South Africans who testified as victims at the TRC human rights hearings, Nohle Mohapi and Thembi Simelane-Nkadimeng. Simelane-Nkadimeng’s sister had disappeared some twenty-three years earlier during Apartheid, and Simelane-Nkadimeng professed his desire to speak with his sister’s victimizer, William Coetzee, who did not testify during the TRC hearings. After having waited more than five years to hear news of prosecutions, Simelane-Nkadimeng remarked at the conference:

I want to speak to William Coetzee and ask him what the hell he did with my sister and then I can get on with my life…there is only one key: he must tell me what he did with my sister so I can rest. I am following prosecutions now because it is the only option I have, but if I had an option to sit down and talk, I would choose that. (Villa-Vicencio and du Toit 12)

Along with the 1998 final report, the TRC submitted a list of over three hundred names to the National Prosecuting Authority (NPA) of those who did not testify at the TRC hearings and thus did not exchange the truth for amnesty. From 1998 to 2004, families of victims requested prosecution until they realized that the NPA's draft of prosecution guidelines contained a policy on partial amnesty rather than full prosecution (Villa-Vicencio and du Toit 17). According to Yasmin Sooka, “This focus on the perpetrators diminishes the goals of the TRC and ultimately the constitution…Are victims being offered another opportunity to become part of the TRC process and to qualify for reparations?” (Villa-Vicencio and du Toit 22). Concerned that politicians of the former Apartheid state who did not apply for amnesty might escape prosecution, Sooka also asked if “only foot soldiers” would be brought to trial (Villa-Vicencio and du Toit 22).

The conference held by the Institute for Justice and Reconciliation included an update on the imprisonment of key players in the Apartheid regime. Ferdi Barnard, a former hitman for the Apartheid regime’s Civil Cooperation Bureau (CCB) who did not testify at a TRC hearing, was imprisoned in South Africa for the murder of Witwatersrand University academic David Webster (Villa-Vicencio and du Toit 159). A fellow CCB operative who did choose to testify and admitted to bombing
the Early Learning Center in Athlone and attempting to kill United Democratic Front leader Dullah Omar was granted full amnesty and is now a sugar farmer in KwaZulu-Natal (Villa-Vicencio and Du Toit 159). Eugene de Kock, more commonly known as “Prime Evil” for his role as the commander of Vlakplaas, a unit responsible for capturing and killing political opponents of Apartheid, did testify at the TRC hearings, but he was not granted amnesty and is currently serving a 212-year sentence for crimes against humanity in Pretoria’s maximum-security prison. Today, de Kock exposes the crimes of superiors in Apartheid atrocities, with the hope of a future presidential pardon (Villa-Vicencio and Du Toit 159). Out of over seven thousand amnesty applications to the TRC, only 1,154 individuals were granted full amnesty and 150 were granted partial amnesty. Fewer than three hundred applicants were members of South African security forces, such as the police, and there is ongoing speculation that police generals will soon be prosecuted (Villa-Vicencio and Du Toit 160).

While some accomplishments and shortcomings of the TRC are easily characterized as facts, other outcomes, which are less easily evaluated, have been the subject of diverse opinions of South Africans and scholars. When considering opinions on the accomplishments of the TRC in regard to reconciliation, it is important to note the different evaluations. For example, Valli Moosa, a founding member of South Africa’s United Democratic Front, stated that reconciliation, truth, and justice were incomplete following the TRC. On the other hand, Rajeev Bhargava, a former professor at Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi who has written on the moral justifications of reconciliation commissions, noted that the TRC was necessary but not sufficient, as “reconciliation requires profound change in people.” (qtd. in du Plessis 194). In light of the comments by Moosa and Bhargava, Willemein du Plessis, Professor of Law at South Africa’s North-West University, noted: “The Commission contributed towards creating conditions for reconciliation – it was not an end of itself. It was an important moment on the transitional process where human forces took precedence over state politics” (194).

In addition to reconciliation, the needs of South African society can be considered on the basis of economical and psychological perspectives. The TRC recommended that the government create provisions to close the gap between the beneficiaries and victims of Apartheid with education, shelter, water, health services, and employment (du Plessis 184). The TRC also suggested the adoption of a wealth tax so that people who benefited from Apartheid could help alleviate poverty. However, as of 2002, this tax was still being debated by the South African government (du Plessis 184). The failure to implement the wealth tax, coupled with the evidence of post-traumatic stress syndrome in victims who testified at TRC hearings, led Tom Winslow, assistant director of the Trauma Center for Survivors of Violence and Torture in Capetown, to claim that the TRC “opened the patient up and then walked away” (qtd. in Graybill 83). South African journalist Brandon Hamber reported that victims were not provided with long-term mental health follow-up by the TRC. The need for psychological support persists today. As of 2002 in the Northern Province, for instance, there were no clinical psychologists in the public health services and only three psychologists in private practice to serve a population of 5.3 million people (Graybill 84). Du Plessis stated: “The Commission was a necessary start in the healing process, but if socio-economic and juridical reform does not form part of the process the good effect of the healing process might soon be lost again” (196-97).

One South African theologian and citizen of note, Edwin Arrison, has stressed the importance of addressing socio-economic disparities and has voiced his opinion on the work of the TRC. Arrison has expressed his frustrations that White businesses continue to profit over Black businesses after Apartheid. In his opinion, those who presently own the economy should, “preferably voluntarily,” transfer the economy to the majority of people in South Africa. When asked if the TRC was the best solution for reconciliation in South Africa following Apartheid, Arrison stated that the TRC was the “first building block” upon which other pursuits such as economic justice were placed. Arrison commented: “If [reconciliation] is to create a relative peace, then the TRC was perfect as one of the vehicles that contributed to that. But there were many other supplementary vehicles – writing and adopting the constitution. . . .” Arrison also noted that although the TRC was a good tactic, the truth about inequality within the economy was excluded, and more people should have been compensated sooner (Arrison). Even though Arrison felt that the TRC failed to address the economic needs of the South African majority, he gives the TRC credit for the major accomplishment of allowing the history of South Africa under Apartheid to be publicized. Similarly, the TRC allowed South Africans to reflect upon their own
humanity. Arrison refers to South African psychologist Pumla Gobodo-Madikizela’s book *A Human Being Died That Night* in which the author recounts her interviews with the imprisoned Eugene de Kock, or “Prime Evil.” De Kock first appeared in front of the TRC to disclose his role in killing three black policemen by planting a car bomb (Gobodo-Madikizela 13). After testifying, de Kock requested to meet with the widows of the men he killed, and afterwards one of the widows remarked: “I would like to hold him by the hand, and show him that there is a future, and that he can still change” (qtd. in Gobodo-Madikizela 14). At one memorable point in her book, Gobodo-Madikizela recounts how she spontaneously reached out to touch de Kock’s hand after he expressed remorse and anguish following his conversations with the widows (33). During their next encounter, de Kock informs her that she had touched his “trigger hand” (39). Throughout the remainder of her book, Gobodo-Madikizela struggles whether to hold de Kock accountable for his crimes or to forgive him. Arrison noted that throughout the history of the TRC, some individuals, like Gobodo-Madikizela, practiced the principle of *ubuntu* by actively seeking to uncover a level of humanity. Tutu uses the word *ubuntu* to express the depth of humanity he desires and describes *ubuntu* as a way to say, “My humanity is caught up, is inextricably bound up, in yours” (Tutu 31). *Ubuntu* is about the interconnectedness between all persons, as opposed to individualism (Arrison). Arrison stated that the TRC continues to influence South African society like this by allowing “South Africans to face each other with a level of honesty.”

In order to gain a better understanding of how ordinary South Africans view reconciliation, the Institute for Justice and Reconciliation conducted a national survey in 2002. A total of 3491 people over the age of sixteen, comprising a sample representative of the racial composition of South Africa, were asked the open-ended question, “What, if anything, do you understand by the word ‘reconciliation?’” Almost thirty percent of these individuals were unable to provide any answer, and the remaining expressed the following answers in these percentages: 23% forgiveness, 16% unity, 13% peace, 10% racial integration, 9% forget past, 5% cooperation, 5% dealing with past, 4% socio-economic development, 3% values, 2% ending racism, and 2% human rights. Interestingly, the concepts of forgiveness, peace, and unity trumped the small percentage of material issues, such as financial and socio-economic development (Villa-Vicencio and du Toit 78).

In Tutu’s view, the most important accomplishments of the TRC were the closure that was awarded to the victims of Apartheid and the forgiveness that followed. However, Tutu stated: “For me, one of the greatest weaknesses in the commission was the fact that we failed to attract the bulk of the white community to participate enthusiastically in the process” (231). Some argue that the TRC did not contribute to racial reconciliation, but instead contributed to racial divisions while also failing to bring justice to the victims of Apartheid and human rights violations (Thompson 278). Tutu found, however, that many victims did in fact find comfort and healing as a result of publicly voicing their struggles and victimization because “the acceptance, the affirmation, the acknowledgement that they had indeed suffered was cathartic for them.” Tutu remarked that “if this had happened to only one person, then we would have said that the commission had more than justified its existence. The fact that many people said the same made us wish we could have afforded many more the opportunity of unburdening themselves of the heavy weight of their anguish” (Tutu 165). Therefore, it is important to keep in mind that the TRC was “meant to promote not to achieve…worthwhile objectives” (Tutu 165). In the words of Tutu:

Reconciliation…has to be a national project to which all earnestly strive to make their particular contribution – by learning the language and culture of others; by being willing to make amends; by refusing to deal in stereotypes by making racial or other jokes that ridicule a particular group; by contributing to a culture of respect for human rights, and seeking to enhance tolerance – with zero tolerance for intolerance; by working for a more inclusive society where most, if not all, can feel they belong – that they are insiders and not aliens and strangers on the outside, relegated to the edges of society. (274)

Given that the purpose of the TRC was to “promote” worthwhile objectives, it is important to note the accepted limitations and realistic goals of such commissions. In order to obtain international legitimacy, a TRC must fulfill a number of objectives: provide convincing evidence that the majority of citizens endorse the commission; disclose as much truth as possible about gross human rights violations; incorporate accountability of those responsible for committing gross violations of human rights; grant
reparations to victims whose rights are encroached upon by any amnesty provision; and provide a forum where victims can tell their stories and question perpetrators. Also, prosecutions should remain open for perpetrators who did not adequately participate in the process (Villa-Vicencio and du Toit 4-5). The accepted limitations of a TRC include the inability to achieve the following tasks: impose punishment for crimes committed; ensure remorse from all perpetrators; ensure that victims will forgive perpetrators; address all aspects of past oppression; uncover the whole truth; allow all victims to tell their stories; provide adequate forms of reconstruction and reparation; and correct the imbalance between benefactors and those exploited by the former regime (Villa-Vicencio and du Toit 5). A TRC, however, can provide the means to accomplish quite a few realistic goals: break the silence on past gross human rights violations; counter the denial of such violations and provide official knowledge of the extent of human suffering; provide the basis for the emergence of a common, representative memory; create a culture of accountability; provide a safe place for victims to express their emotions; bring communities and institutions under moral scrutiny; contribute to the disclosure of the motives, causes, and perspectives of perpetrators of past atrocities; provide symbolic memorials; and initiate and support a process for reconciliation, while recognizing that it will take time and political will to realize (Villa-Vicencio and du Toit 6).

It is important to consider these realistic goals and limitations when assessing what the TRC has accomplished and how the commission has influenced or changed South African society. After providing a foundation for reconciliation, the TRC charged the South African government to follow its recommendations for paying reparations and to provide mechanisms for achieving racial and socio-economic justice. Similarly, the people of South Africa were encouraged to pursue the levels of reconciliation that the TRC could not accomplish alone. According to Tutu, “The TRC was flawed in many ways, but the world thinks the South African TRC has set a benchmark against which every other TRC is to be measured” (10).

If the South African TRC is indeed a benchmark by which other commissions should be measured, then perhaps South Africa’s quest for truth and reconciliation through the TRC can be a model for other countries or regions with human rights conflicts. According to John de Gruchy, “Reconciliation is something that is pertinent in every community where alienated and estranged people cry out for healing and a reason for hope” (12). For example, there has been a resounding call for peace in the Middle East through the reconciliation of Israel and Palestine. Both Desmond Tutu and former US President Jimmy Carter have equated the Israeli occupation of Palestine with Apartheid. The history of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict reveals evidence of oppression and violence that cannot be ignored, and current policies warrant a quest for truth and reconciliation. Though Israel and Palestine have not yet reached an agreement to cease violence or end Israeli occupation in order to pursue the creation of either unified or separate states, South Africa’s TRC could potentially serve as a model for the reconciliation of Israel and Palestine.

An awareness of the history of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is crucial to an understanding of the call for peace in the Middle East. The Balfour Declaration of 1917 stated that the British government supported “the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people” in “sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations” (qtd. in Harms and Ferry 69). According to the World Zionist Organization, the aim of Zionism was to create a national home for Jewish people in Palestine (Harms and Ferry 55). In 1922, Great Britain’s government reigned over Palestine, following the end of the Ottoman Empire (Harms and Ferry 75). At the culmination of the British mandate in November of 1947, the fate of Palestine was left to the United Nations, which then established a plan to partition Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab states and formally recognize the independence of Israel as a nation. With this partition, Israel was awarded fifty-six percent of Palestine, a land with 1.3 million Arabs and 600,000 Jews in 1946 (Harms and Ferry 92). This resolution, however, was rejected by the Palestinian community, and, in 1948, the same year that Apartheid formally came into existence in South Africa, the first Israeli-Arab war began (Rabinovich 35). More than 700,000 Palestinian refugees fled their homes during this war, marking the beginning of a refugee problem that still exists today (Harms and Ferry 99-101). By the end of the war in 1949, Israel had gained seventy-seven percent of Palestine, with Egypt occupying Gaza, and Jordan controlling the west bank of the Jordan River (Carter 4).

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict can also be viewed in terms of an Israeli-Arab conflict which not
only extends to the surrounding Arab states but demonstrates a greater international breadth to include some Western states. In the 1948-1949 war, Palestinians received military support from Egypt, Jordan, Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon (Rabinovich 35), and Israel received indirect assistance from the Soviet Union (Rabinovich 38). In the Suez Canal Crisis of 1956, a British-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt concluded with the Israeli capture of the Sinai Peninsula, resulting in the Arab view of Israel as an “agent of Western imperialism” (Harms and Ferry 107). In the Six-Day War of 1967, Israel attacked Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and Jordan and occupied the Golan Heights, Gaza, Sinai, and the West Bank, effectively tripling the size of the Israeli state within a mere six days (Harms and Ferry 111). In 1982, Israeli troops attacked Lebanon, where the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) had established its headquarters, and did not withdraw forces until 1985 (Harms and Ferry 136-37). From 1987 to 1993, an uprising known as the first intifada began through a series of strikes and boycotts by the Palestinians (Carter 7). A second intifada erupted in 2000 and included more violence and Palestinian suicide bombers. Within the next six years, approximately four thousand Palestinians and one thousand Israelis were killed (Carter 206).

Within the history of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict emerges evidence of human rights violations. In his book Palestine Peace Not Apartheid, Jimmy Carter paraphrases former Syrian President Hafez al-Assad, who asserted that even though Israel views the Jews as one people, Palestinians are not afforded a national identity despite the fact that they share a single language, culture, and history. Thus, an inferior view of Palestinian Arabs consistent with racism has resulted (Carter 77). According to the Israeli human rights organization B’Tselem, for every Palestinian accused of a violent act against Israel, even stone throwing, an average of twelve innocent Palestinian families’ homes are demolished (Carter 116). B’Tselem concluded: “Israel’s policy of punitive demolitions constitutes a grave breach of international humanitarian law, and therefore a war crime” (Carter 116). Furthermore, in the Gaza Strip, with a population of 1.3 million Palestinians in 2004, eight thousand Israeli settlers and twelve thousand Israeli troops controlled forty percent of the useable land and more than half of the water supply (Carter 168). The United Nations, European Union, and International Court of Justice have deemed the Israeli settlements illegal (Finkel 67).

A wall currently divides Israel from the West Bank region of Palestine. Although Israel claims that the wall was built for security, many Palestinians use the term “Apartheid Wall” to describe the structure, because it deprives Palestinians of human rights and freedom. Just as the wall dividing Israel and Palestine has been called the “Apartheid Wall,” the Israeli occupation of Palestine has been described as an “apartheid system.” The UN International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid listed “inhuman acts” supported by the apartheid system that were inflicted on victims: the establishment and maintenance of a subordinate racial group; denial of the “right to life and liberty”: infliction of “serious bodily or mental harm, by the infringement of their freedom or dignity, or by subjecting them to torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment”; “arbitrary arrest and illegal punishment”; and “living conditions calculated to cause . . . their physical destruction in whole or in part” (qtd. in Bennis 46-47). Similar to South African Apartheid, the Israeli-Palestinian dispute centers around land. The UN International Convention, therefore, also denounced measures “designed to divide the population . . . by the creation of separate reserves and ghettos for the members of a racial group or groups . . . [and] the expropriation of landed property” (qtd. in Bennis 47). Just as South Africa isolated the Black majority from the White minority through the formation of homelands, the wall, in the Palestinians’ view, “suffocates an entire population for the actions of a small minority” (Finkel 80).

Key similarities and differences can be noted between the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and South African Apartheid. In South Africa, Blacks were sentenced to life in homelands and denied the citizenship which Whites were afforded. Likewise, Palestinians are trapped in refugee camps in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank and are not recognized as citizens in their own land. In South Africa, laws prevented Blacks from working in White areas without a pass, isolating the majority of Blacks in overpopulated, impoverished homelands (Thompson 193). Similarly, numerous checkpoints exist between Israel and Palestine to monitor which Palestinians are allowed to enter Israel, and most of the roads, sewage systems, and electricity lines built in the Israeli territories are for the exclusive use of the Israeli people (Carter 141, 151). Another major similarity between the struggles in the Middle East and South Africa is the battle over land, although the values inherent in each land are different. While
South Africa is rich in diamonds and precious metals, the value of land in Israel and Palestine is fundamentally immaterial. In the words of Rabbi Menachem Froman: “This is not just land. This is the Holy Land. There’s no oil, no gold, no diamonds. It’s a dessert! But this is God’s palace” (qtd. in Finkel 66). This focus on the Holy Land emphasizes another difference in the two struggles. Though South Africa’s Apartheid regime separated people solely on the basis of race, Israelis and Palestinians are separated according to the designations of Jew and non-Jew. Despite these differences, a similarity is perhaps the most important result of such a comparison: the calls for peace and reconciliation in both South Africa and Israel-Palestine insisting that the injustices in each country cannot be ignored. In the words of Desmond Tutu: “Unless we look the beast in the eye we find it has an uncanny habit of returning to hold us hostage” (28).

It is important to note past efforts of peace-making before discussing a means to achieve reconciliation in Israel-Palestine. According to former US President Jimmy Carter, two main obstacles prevent the achievement of peace in the Middle East: first, the belief by some Israelis that they have the right to persecute the Palestinians and confiscate their land and, second, the mindset of some Palestinians that violence such as that inflicted by suicide bombers should be honored (Carter 205-06). In 1993, Israel and the PLO agreed in the Oslo Accords to settle key issues, including the release of prisoners, economic cooperation, refugee rights, and the establishment of borders of Palestine within a five-year period, which was eventually extended to seven years. However, most of these issues were never resolved, and violence and injustice continued (Bennis 134). In 2000, peace talks at Camp David unsuccessfully attempted to salvage the failing Oslo agreement. And in 2003, the International Quartet, comprised of the United States, Russia, the European Union, and the United Nations, developed a Roadmap for Peace which calls for three main principles. First, the security of Israel must be guaranteed, and Arabs must recognize Israel’s rights as a nation. Second, the international debate on Israel must be resolved in order to define Israel’s permanent legal boundary and return to pre-1967 borders. Finally, the sovereignty of all Middle East nations and the sanctity of international borders must be honored (Carter 206-08).

The peoples of Israel and Palestine have also engaged in some efforts to achieve reconciliation, as evidenced by a dialogue between an Israeli and a Palestinian. In The Lemon Tree, writer Sandy Tolan recounts the open, honest dialogue between an Israeli woman named Dalia Eshkenazi Landau and a Palestinian man named Bashir Al-Khayri. Bashir is the son of an Arab Muslim family who fled his childhood home in Ramla in 1948, and Dalia is the daughter of Jewish refugees from Bulgaria who inhabited Bashir’s family home later that year. Following the 1967 war, Bashir returns to visit his childhood home in Ramla, which has become part of Israel. For the next thirty-five years, Dalia and Bashir share their stories, revealing the propaganda of both Israelis and Palestinians. Dalia learns that her home was not simply deserted before her family’s arrival, but that Bashir’s family had fled from the terror. Although Dalia voices her desire for a compromise between the Jews and Arabs, Bashir explains that he wants the Jews to give the land back to the Palestinians (Tolan 199).

After the death of her parents, Dalia inherits the house and discusses with Bashir what she should do with the home. In the end, they use the home to house an organization known as Open House, a group that promotes the educational development of Arab children and contact between Arabs and Jews in Israel. Open House was officially founded in 1991 by Dalia and Yehezkel Landau, the Al-Khayri family, and the Fansos family. These three families represent the three groups in a quest for peace in the Middle East - Jews, Arab Muslims, and Arab Christians, respectively. They operate in Ramla, one of the few cities in Israel with both Arab and Jewish inhabitants. Yehezkel Landau, Dalia’s former husband, is a religious leader and a dual citizen of the United States and Israel. As co-founder and co-director of Open House, Landau recognizes the organization’s accomplishments towards the pursuit of truth and reconciliation. According to Landau, Open House is unique in that a Jewish family has acknowledged an Arab home. While efforts for peace at the macro level, such as the Oslo process, have failed, Open House is able to provide some success at the grassroots level. Landau feels that such efforts on the micro level can either trickle up to effect political change at the top or produce spiritual and emotional transformations in people that can augment political changes (Landau, Interview).

Although undertakings such as Open House are able to promote truth and reconciliation on the micro level, macro efforts could provide the means to achieve liberation for both Jews and Arabs in
Israel and Palestine on a larger scale. The first step in accomplishing this is to achieve peace at the political level. There are two main schools of thought for the achievement of peaceful borders in Israel-Palestine: a one-state or two-state solution. The one-state solution would entail the creation of a single state where Jews and non-Jews, Israelis and Palestinians, would live together in the absence of borders and walls. Palestinian refugees would then be able to return to their homeland and would no longer be in exile; in addition, Jerusalem would be accessible to Christians, Muslims, and Jews (Karmi 230). However, the one-state solution would not allow the full recognition of Zionism, and it would turn Israel into a secular rather than a Jewish state (Karmi 232). Conversely, a two-state solution would result in the creation of two separate states – Israel and Palestine. This creation of two states is the most internationally accepted solution, as Israel would remain a Jewish state (Karmi 219). Noting that neither proposition will provide a perfect solution, Dalia speaks to the needs of both peoples by stating that Palestinian rights have to be balanced against Jewish needs for survival, so in a peace plan “everybody will have to do with less than they deserve” (qtd. in Tolan 212).

After achieving peace and liberation at the political level, whether through a one-state or two-state solution, there will still be a need for reconciliation and healing at the macro level due to the years of violence and oppression inflicted by both Israelis and Palestinians. In South Africa, the most appropriate means to achieve reconciliation was through the TRC. Other methods of addressing grievances have included such strategies as the Nuremberg trials and the granting of blanket amnesty. Tutu’s reasoning for rejecting a strategy in South Africa based on the Nuremberg trials can also be applied to the Middle East. As Tutu observed, the Allies who accused the perpetrators at the Nuremberg trials could go back home following the tribunal, but the people of South Africa were going to have to stay and “live with one another” (21). Indeed, the people of Israel and Palestine both have a right to the Holy Land, and, even if a two-state solution does not allow Palestinians to return to their actual homes, a need will still exist for the two peoples to live as peaceful neighbors. In contrast with a blanket amnesty that would have simply ignored the past, amnesty was granted in South Africa to some individuals who had committed crimes, a method that simultaneously liberated victims with the truth in the form of public hearings. In South Africa, it was the revelation of such truths that freed the victims from their anguish and allowed them to look to someone to forgive. When explaining the need to address the past, Tutu has referred to the words of philosopher George Santayana that are found at the entrance of the museum of the Dachau concentration camp: “Those who forget the past are doomed to repeat it” (qtd. in Tutu 29).

A model similar to South Africa’s TRC could be adjusted to provide appropriate means to achieve truth and reconciliation in Israel-Palestine at the macro level. Dalia has mentioned a need to find “a means to transform…tragedy into a shared blessing” (qtd. in Tolan 203). One of the accomplishments of the TRC in South Africa that could apply to Israel and Palestine is the ability to create a shared memory and a more accurate history of the conflict while recognizing victims’ suffering through the use of a Committee on Human Rights Violations and a Committee on Amnesty. Just as Tutu’s concept of ubuntu and a shared humanity or community was essential to the South African TRC, the realization of humanity in one’s enemies would be an important and feasible aim of a TRC in Israel-Palestine. Just as Pumla Gobodo-Madikizela impulsively reached out to touch the “trigger hand” of the enemy “Prime Evil” in a South African prison in an act of human compassion, Dalia came to recognize the humanity of the Al-Khayri family who lived in her home before her, as she noted how the “walls evoked other people’s memories and tears” (Qtd. in Tolan 201). Also, a Committee on Reparation and Rehabilitation would be able to provide reparations for refugees who are unemployed and compensation for those Palestinians who lost their homes and land. Although the logistics of these committees may need to be adjusted to best meet to the needs of Israel and Palestine, this quest for a reconciled community is perhaps the most important activity of a TRC.

Such open dialogue between Israelis and Palestinians prompted by a TRC will also allow the two communities’ greater sharing of land and resources. St. John’s College Fellow Robin C. Ostle describes this community in the foreword of a historical novel entitled On the Hills of God by Palestinian-American academic Ibrahim Fawal: “The Palestine that was destroyed in 1948 was a rich and delicate human fabric which has been built up over many generations. Muslim, Christian, and Jew shared a common language – Arabic – and a common culture, and they shared the land” (3). A TRC would also allow Israelis the opportunity to publicly voice their suffering and fears as well as their yearning...
for Zion as a national homeland after almost two thousand years of existence as scattered minorities. This recognition of humanity in one another between Israelis and Palestinians would promote a shared humanity, and hopefully one day lead to the restoration of the “rich and delicate human fabric” among Muslims, Christians, and Jews in the Holy Land (Ostle 8).

Though South Africa’s TRC can be applicable to the peoples of Israel and Palestine, adjustments may need to be made to account for the uniqueness of each struggle and society. According to Edwin Arrison, “I definitely think all countries should consider the model we adopted and the ‘internal logic’ of the model, but should not try and implement it without taking the internal logic and the context of their own societies into account” (Arrison). Some scholars have hypothesized that the TRC was effective in South Africa due to the large Christian population and have argued that the religious differences in the Middle East would not be conducive to the same level of reconciliation. Donald W. Shriver asserted: “It is quite possible that such an event could only happen in a country like South Africa, whose people are so deeply imbued with certain religious convictions that they turn more ‘naturally’ toward reconciliation than do peoples of different cultures” (36). Indeed, Tutu’s Christian ideals and ubuntu theology shaped his view of reconciliation in South Africa. In his book No Future Without Forgiveness, Tutu described the South African elections as a “spiritual experience” versus a “secular political event,” noting how people waiting in long lines to vote interacted with one another as “they shared a common humanity” (7). Former TRC commissioner Patrick Lekota regarded both reconciliation and forgiveness of his opponents very highly, and he openly attributed his forgiving attitude to the influence of Christian churches (Tutu +3). Furthermore, many spiritual and church leaders opposed Apartheid throughout its existence and came to promote truth and reconciliation as important aspects of forgiveness. However, the Christians, Muslims, and Jews in the Holy Land are also deeply rooted in their religious convictions; and, although a TRC in the Middle East would have to deal with the complications of involving more than one religion, each of these religions has foundations in eschatological hope and reconciliation that would most likely aid, rather than hinder, the quest for forgiveness and reconciliation.

Though a TRC in the Middle East would provide a means for reconciliation at the macro level, attempts for reconciliation at the local and community level, such as the Open House, are still vital. Hugo van der Merwe, in his work “National and Community Reconciliation: Competing Agendas in the South African TRC,” described South Africa’s TRC as a “top-down” rather than a “bottom-up” approach by “viewing local reconciliation as a product of party-political interaction” (107). National provisions were first made at the macro level with the hopes of filtering down to the community level. Such national intervention is often necessary when the will of the majority is hindered by prejudices and is therefore in need of profound change. However, the need for ongoing reconciliation at the community level cannot be ignored. One South African TRC staff member noted that a more “delicate link” is provided at the community level, where local leaders in the government and church can “convince people to talk rather than fight” (qtd. in van der Merwe 109).

Just as the Open House and other grassroots efforts work for reconciliation between Jews and Arabs, programs have been implemented to spread the seeds of nonviolence through the work of people such as Sis and Jerry Levin. In 1984, Jerry Levin, then a CNN correspondent stationed in Beruit, was kidnapped and held hostage for eleven months in solitary confinement. His wife, Dr. Lucille “Sis” Levin, became passionately involved in the negotiations for Jerry’s release and has since then implemented a systematic, pedagogical program that educates teachers or “Peacebuilders” on methods to develop curricula that foster nonviolence for Palestinian children and youth. According to Dr. Levin, the options of “fight or flight” are not the only choices in response to conflict. The third option of nonviolence is simply not taught enough. A “principle of shared need” that allows nonviolent communities to develop can emerge. Dr. Levin stresses that by teaching children nonviolence, young people can provide hope for a more peaceful future in the Middle East and even educate their parents and elders on nonviolent conflict resolution (L. Levin). Jerry Levin also works for peace in the Middle East through his efforts with the Christian Peacemaker Teams to promote “nonviolent bridgekeeping,” which connects nonviolent Palestinian Arabs with their nonviolent Israeli counterparts (Levin). The efforts of the Levins and the Landau and Al-Khayri families provide prime examples of how psychological and educational needs can be met at the community level through the engagement of civic leaders who are committed to nonviolent conflict resolution and forgiveness.
When assessing the effectiveness of South Africa’s TRC and evaluating whether such a TRC could be applicable to similar conflict situations, such as the quest for peace in Israel and Palestine, the realistic goals of a TRC must be taken into account. A TRC cannot legitimately address all weaknesses in society that hinder full reconciliation among its members. However, a TRC can promote methods of healing by publicizing an accurate and diverse history of past and present conflict, by allowing perpetrators to seek forgiveness and request amnesty, by providing victims with a voice and someone to forgive, and, most important, by allowing victims and perpetrators to reflect upon their own humanity and the humanity of their enemies. After the close of its report, a TRC also charges the government and the people to further implement reconciliation through the payment of reparations, the prosecutions of perpetrators, the lessening of economic disparities, and the creation of a culture of respect for human rights.

Although the South African government and people still have a long way to go before achieving full reconciliation and accomplishing all the goals set forth by the TRC, the South African TRC planted a spirit of forgiveness and reconciliation within society – an accomplishment of paramount merit that has set a standard for future commissions. A top-down approach to reconciliation in Israel and Palestine through a TRC analogous to the one in South Africa would similarly promote forgiveness and reconciliation in the Middle East. Reconciliation at the government level is imperative in order for the Israeli and Palestinian leaders to be held accountable for a commitment to the affirmation and value of human rights, freedom, and nonviolence. While merely leaving such efforts of reconciliation to the people themselves and the will of the majority is often not enough, bottom-up approaches to reconciliation are also necessary to address the complex spiritual and psychological needs of people in a comprehensive manner. According to van der Merwe, “Healthy (reconciled) nations are seen as arising from the restoration of the psychological health of the individual members of society and a healthy network of interpersonal relations” (107). Such efforts at the community level are clearly crucial in supplementing the efforts of a TRC and addressing the ongoing needs of society. A TRC, in conjunction with additional government and community efforts, can thus promote the achievement of a fuller truth and reconciliation in Israel and Palestine, as the TRC did in South Africa, encourage an increased recognition of humanity, facilitate widespread forgiveness, and build a peaceful, unified, and reconciled society.
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Reflections on Leadership

Dr. Ed LaMonte

Let me begin my commentary by stating emphatically how greatly I have come to admire our Leadership Studies Program at Birmingham-Southern and how great a contribution the program makes to our campus community, most notably to those students who complete the Distinction in Leadership Studies Program. I have taught the LS 200 course, have mentored senior projects, have discussed the topic of leadership with students and faculty, and have read at least a portion of the increasingly large literature dealing with the subject. My concluding thoughts about leadership as I move into my retirement years are neither profound nor original, and I offer them realizing that there are others on campus capable of reflecting in a far more sophisticated way on this important subject.

My wife, Ruth, and I spend as much time as we possibly can in Fairhope, Alabama. During one of our visits several years ago, we ventured into Hiley’s Lapidary, an establishment owned by Mr. Hiley, who made absolutely beautiful jewelry. While Ruth carefully examined several pieces of his wonderful work, I, rather nervously, scanned the walls, relishing his interesting array of displays. The following message was framed and on his wall:

We have not succeeded in answering all your problems (questions). The answers we have found only serve to raise a whole set of new questions. In some ways we feel we are as confused as ever, but we believe we are confused on a higher level and about more important things.

My immediate reaction upon reading this message was to think of the Introduction to Leadership Studies course and some of the questions which we wrestled with in it, often without arriving at consensus or satisfactory conclusions. What exactly do we mean by leadership? Are leaders identifiable by virtue of possessing a set of specific traits? Can leadership be taught? Was Hitler a leader? And you can easily provide many more probing questions. While I in many ways remain as confused as ever, I do believe I am confused on a higher level and about more important things. Below is a summary statement of my present thinking.

Dr. Ed LaMonte

“I was delighted when the editors of the Compass invited me to write briefly about my current thoughts regarding leadership. My experience with the Leadership Studies Program has convinced me that it is one of the most valuable opportunities offered by the College not only to think rigorously about leadership but also to explore leadership possibilities and develop leadership skills. I have had the great pleasure of teaching Leadership Studies: Theory and Practice and have come to appreciate both the importance and ambiguity of academic research and writing on the topic. Students who pursue the Distinction in Leadership Studies Program are academically strong and highly motivated. Typically they are civically engaged at the time of their studies; I have always been impressed by the variety of leadership activities in which they are currently involved or plan to become involved. Perhaps most rewarding to me as a faculty member have been the numerous occasions when, during the course of the term, students have had ‘appointments with themselves’ to assess their leadership interests, strengths, and sometimes weaknesses (Cronin 31). My brief article represents one way in which I can express my admiration for and thanks to the students in Leadership Studies who have significantly contributed to my extremely rewarding academic career at Birmingham-Southern.”

38
Leadership is emphatically not to be confused with holding offices of great authority or prestige. Examples from the very recent past can surely evoke in each of us the names of both public and private officeholders whose conduct does not merit the distinction of being termed leadership. Further, leadership in my view, is not the same as management or administration. To me, these terms suggest guiding an organization through the fairly routine and predictable activities that involve the accomplishment of its particular goal(s) or purpose(s). I believe that leadership involves the ability to mobilize people to accomplish positive results in a non-routine setting. I think of excellent administrators and managers as having a high degree of professional competence. I think of leaders as being able to offer vision, provide inspiration, and display the energy and skills necessary to move an organization forward during challenging times.

Leadership can be offered by individuals at all levels of an organization; occupancy of high office is neither necessary nor sufficient. I would argue that leadership can be displayed even if an individual acts on his or her own by setting a personal example that motivates others to emulate admirable conduct. And such exemplary behavior does not even require that the leader be part of an organization or have an identifiable group of followers. In my Civil Rights and Justice seminar, students are introduced to a significant number of men and women who demonstrated leadership, some of it widely acknowledged and acclaimed, some of it less remarkable and less remembered. But one figure is always identified by students as a leader: Mose Wright, an illiterate tenant farmer in Mississippi whose nephew, Emmett Till, was brutally murdered by two white men outside the town of Money, Mississippi. Boldly breaking the segregationist customs of the time, Mose Wright agreed to appear in court to identify the two murderers. A moment of high drama occurred when Wright stood in the courtroom, pointed to one of the defendants, and said in his simple manner, “Dar he” (Williams 48). Mose Wright was not a member of any organization, nor did he have a following at the time of the trial. However, his simple example of profound courage inspired many other African Americans in the Deep South to reassess their own potential roles in what became the Civil Rights Movement.

I reach five other conclusions. One, to quote Martin M. Chemers, “No single style of leadership is universally best across all situations and environments” (85). Moments when leadership is needed arise, often unpredictably, and the characteristics required to provide effective leadership vary dramatically from situation to situation.
Two, leadership cannot be defined fully by listing necessary or highly desirable traits such as effective communication skills, physical attributes, or personality characteristics. Possession of particular traits is no assurance of the exercise of leadership. Three, leadership includes the capacity to understand the specific needs of an organization and its environment at a particular moment in time. I would label this type of knowledge “exterior knowledge.”

Four, a leader must have significant “interior knowledge” of him-or herself in order to judge when and how he or she might be able to offer leadership, if indeed leadership can be offered at all by that individual. I very much like Thomas E. Cronin’s notion that individuals should have “appointments with themselves” to carry out introspective assessments of who they truly are, rather than who they wish they were, and what they are truly skilled/gifted in performing, rather than what they wish they were skilled in performing (31).

Finally, and perhaps most important, I believe that every person can be a leader in some arena at some particular moment. The possible arenas include corporations, non-profit agencies, public agencies, faith communities, and families. Simple acts such as not responding to racial, ethnic, or gender jokes and setting an example of disapproval can have great impact on others who observe this behavior, regardless of the status of the individual within the organization.

Those of us who have had the significant privilege of being part of our Birmingham-Southern College community have not only the opportunity, but arguably the obligation, to have appointments with ourselves and determine how each of us can best be a leader.
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