

RELIGION, POLITICS AND SYMBOLIC PERFORMANCE :

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE WORK OF
ARCHBISHOP DESMOND TUTU FROM JULY 1989 TO FEBRUARY 1990**

BY

DAVID W TAYLOR

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE
DEPARTMENT OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN
CAPE TOWN, SOUTH AFRICA
NOVEMBER 15, 1990**

**UCT LIBRARIES
C000052949X**



The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
AKCNOLWEDGEMENTS	i
ABSTRACT	ii
CHAPTER ONE - SYMBOLIC DEFINITIONS : AN OVERVIEW OF TOPIC AND ANALYSIS	1
CHAPTER TWO - SYMBOLIC POSITION AND POPULARITY	17
CHAPTER THREE - SYMBOLIC ACTS TOWARDS SOCIAL CHANGE	33
CHAPTER FOUR - SYMBOLIC TRANSFERENCE AND RELATIONSHIP	50
CHAPTER FIVE - SYMBOLIC CORRECTION; TUTU, SANCTIONS AND MONETARY SYMBOLISM	69
CHAPTER SIX - SYMBOLIC TRANSITION AND RESOLUTION	84
FOOTNOTES	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to acknowledge the assistance of the Rotary Foundation which provided the opportunity to live, study and experience South African history from July 1989 to December 1990. Special appreciation is also extended to Ley and Vicki Kempthorne who opened their home and lives to a vagabond American student and made my stay much richer by their generosity.

I am also extremely grateful to Terry Crawford-Browne for his insight and interest in the development of this project.

I am greatly indebted to the entire staff of the Archbishop's office at Bishops court. Thank you for accepting my presence during my research of countless newspaper articles and for the warmth in which I was received. Special thanks are given to John Allen and to the people who made my research so much easier, Estelle Marinus, Nonzame Sodladla, Rosemary Swartz and Lavinia Crawford-Browne.

Dr David Chidester should be commended for his fine support and direction as he supervised, edited and encouraged this work. Shannon Marsh should also be rewarded for her patience and assistance. Dawn and Mark Silbert were invaluable in the typing and proofreading of an often messy and incoherent first draft. Thank you for all your work.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the unending support of Harvey and Juanita Taylor, whose reprimands, love, encouragement, and giving of themselves have provided an excellent foundation and example of how to live in a rapidly changing world.

ABSTRACT

TITLE: RELIGION, POLITICS AND SYMBOLIC PERFORMANCE : AN
ANALYSIS OF THE WORK OF ARCHBISHOP DESMOND TUTU FROM
JULY 1989 TO FEBRUARY 1990.

AUTHOR: TAYLOR, DAVID WAYNE

THESIS SUBMITTED: NOVEMBER 15, 1990 TO THE UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

SUBJECT: RELIGIOUS STUDIES

This document follows the performances of Desmond Tutu, the Archbishop of Cape Town, from the international release of The Road to Damascus theological statement until the release of South African political prisoner, Nelson Mandela. The leadership of the Archbishop is analysed using the broad methodological framework of "Dramatism" as established by literary critic, Kenneth Burke. Burke's work is then expanded to incorporate performance theory as well as post-Burkian criticism to examine the range of impact of the leader of an oppositional culture in an established time period of social change.

The dynamics of cultural conflict and social action are defined in terms of symbolic performance. Burke's "Dramatist" methodology is based upon a "comic" attitude of history due to the mistaken nature of the ruling class. Within this attitude, historical interpretation and symbolic direction are controlled and focused through a "comedic master". Tutu fulfills this role by being the central "performer" that articulates the South African oppositional struggle through the world media network. As

the focus of international press coverage, the Archbishop serves as the lens by which criticism of the dominant ruling culture is expressed. This criticism is based upon his personal theology of liberation set against the oppressive nature of the apartheid legal system that oppresses the black South African population.

After the foundations of symbolic performance and leadership are established, special attention is placed upon a chronology of historical action that serves as a catalyst towards social reform in South Africa. Once this is shown, transference of these symbolic actions is established as a form a validation and publicity for similar cultural struggles internationally. Acts of symbolic correction are expressed through the Archbishop's involvement with the campaign for economic sanctions against the oppressive government. Finally, the transition of symbolic leadership is manifested with the release of a greater cultural symbol, found in the character of Nelson Mandela.

This paper stresses the symbiotic nature of religious motivation and political action through symbolic drama. Using performance theory it is possible to examine the effects of the Archbishop's actions as the "comedic master" of the oppressed culture and the flux of symbolic relationships on the international level.

CHAPTER ONE : SYMBOLIC DEFINITIONS : AN OVERVIEW OF TOPIC AND ANALYSIS

Desmond Tutu. The mention of the name brings a wide variety of responses. Since he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1984, the most reverend Desmond Mpilo Tutu, the Anglican Archbishop of Cape Town, has become an international figure, associated with the struggle against the system of racial separation known as apartheid in his native country of South Africa. For many of his country's inhabitants he is a figure of hope and of promise of a new land of racial equality. For others he is a source of evil that has stolen food from the hungry and crippled the South African economy through his advocacy of economic sanctions by the international community. In a land where he does not have the right to vote, the Archbishop has become a public figure that is either adored or despised. While his popularity on the world scene is incredibly strong, his image within his own country is mixed. He has been greeted by applause as well as tear gas, he has been exalted as well as jeered. Regardless of the opinions expressed in the public arena, whether positive or negative, the work of Desmond Tutu has made an impact upon the lives and thoughts of his South African peers as well as the international community. His words, actions, reactions and political participation have become symbolic of a struggle for social change. At one point, his appearance at a meeting was almost a guarantee of world press coverage. His message is either instinctively recognised as a voice of common sense and hope for oppressed and privileged people alike¹, or he is criticised in newspaper editorials as inanely running around like a character from an American Comic Book.² In South Africa, few are neutral regarding this controversial Archbishop. Raise his name in a conversation and immediately tension rises dividing the company into Tutu haters and Tutu lovers.³

Without a doubt the legal, social, and political implications of apartheid

are extremely complex and not as simplistic as a white minority ruling a black nation. The struggle to overturn this policy formalised by the National Party of South Africa in 1948 is closely linked to the organisation of the African National Congress and the imprisonment of its leaders such as the twenty six year internment of Nelson Mandela, the current ANC deputy President. Education, conscription, voting rights, health care, legal action, social services, labour issues and domestic living are all at the crux of the struggle. Intricately interwoven in this complex network is the character of Desmond Tutu. It can be argued that not since the civil rights activist the Rev. Martin Luther King jr. has there been a Church leader who has had so much of an impact on the political aspects of the life of a nation. While Tutu has claimed to be "just a simple pastor"⁴, he is much more. It is the purpose of this work to attempt to determine the overall impact of the Archbishop's actions in a struggle for social change by examining the methods and media through which those acts occurred. In so doing, it will be possible to isolate certain examples in which Tutu's role as a churchman and politician work in symbiosis towards a greater goal of liberation for all South Africans as well as others who suffer under the burden of oppression. Because of the struggle against apartheid, the Archbishop has used his influence to speak out for marginalised groups in other political situations world wide.

In the interest of space, it is impossible to analyse the entire life work of Desmond Tutu. As a result, the time frame of this study will be from July 19, 1989 to February 11, 1990. These dates are extremely significant. The first is the announcement by the Archbishop of his signed support for the Road to Damascus, a theological document that identified "Right Wing Christianity" in seven third world nations as a heresy and says that when right wing Christian groups target churches for direct attack, they abandon the Christian faith and become guilty of apostasy.⁵ The new document, based

upon the previous Kairos document, was signed by Christians in South Africa, Namibia, the Phillipines, South Korea, El Salvador, Nicuragua and Guatemala.⁶ This event is of vital importance for it set the stage for the Archbishop's involvement in the Mass Democratic Movement and specific protests designed to create worldwide attention to the social implications of apartheid and the election of a white State President in a September election without black involvement in the political process.

The closing date is also vital for it marks the release of the famed political prisoner, Nelson Mandela, after twenty six years of incarceration. This is the end of the period in which the leadership of Tutu was needed. He has often said that he is a "leader by default", saying that he did no more than fill a vacant leadership position because the true leaders were in prison or in exile.⁷ From this point of closure the amount of press coverage the Archbishop received is drastically reduced and the focus is shifted upon a new symbol internationally.

The use of the word 'symbol' is not meant to dehumanise the individual in this study. The word is to be treated as a term of representation and association in the social struggle against laws that are considered unjust. Thus 'symbolic performance' in the title is meant to serve as a broad category of events in which there is an act of communication that involves an audience, participants, and a set purpose or agenda within a given culture. In this case the culture is defined as the establishment of dialectical relationships working against South African in origin of geography but also as an ideological issue of oppression and marginalisation. For the purpose of this work symbolic performances will be seen as the establishment of a dialectical relationship attempting to work against given oppressive structures.

For purposes of definition, it is necessary to limit the word 'performance' in a cultural context. In this regard the work of Milton Singer is particularly useful. Cultural performances, according to Singer are "the ways in which the cultural content of a tradition is organised and transmitted on particular occasions through specific media". A given performance is a "particularisation of the structure of a tradition complementary to its social organisation".⁸ Singer provides the examples of weddings, festivals, plays, dances and concerts. He theorises that "perhaps all peoples think of their culture as encapsulated in such discrete performances, which they can exhibit to outsiders as well as themselves".⁹ He continues to state that performances are taken as the most concrete observable units of the cultural structure, for each performance has a definitely limited time span, a beginning and end, an organised programme of activity, a set of performers, an audience, and a place and occasion of performance.¹⁰

By working with this definition of performance it is possible to accomplish several important tasks. To begin, numerous events that occur between the previously mentioned dates can be categorised as performances. These will include several protest marches, acts of civil disobedience and press conferences. The latter is extremely crucial since it is in the performance of the press conference or media event that Desmond Tutu is the lens by which the international community views the South African situation. Also building off of this definition it is possible to argue that any news conference or appearance of the Archbishop at a public or private function becomes a performance given the criteria in Singer's definition that such events are "transmitted on particular occasions through specific media". For our purposes the specific media will be the press. Specific attention will be placed upon articles that have appeared in South African newspapers and periodicals. Through the use of these articles, it is possible to

develop an accurate chronology of the wide range of scenarios in which the Archbishop was involved. It is also possible to gauge public opinion in regard to his activities through the numerous letters to the editor in which Desmond Tutu was the subject. Thus the press in the media of transmission, Desmond Tutu is the principle performer, the audience is on the microcosmic level, South African citizens but on the macrocosmic level the world news gatherer. Each organised programme activity that falls within a temporal boundary is a performance that is an encapsulation of the South African culture for South Africa as well as outside spectators.

Since it has been established that Desmond Tutu will be the lens by which these performances are seen, there must be a method of analysis that can serve as a filter, breaking down the experience into specialised areas by which greater understanding of the symbols involved can be obtained as well as the direction or goal that is desired. For this, it is necessary to turn to the work of Kenneth Burke. While the corpus of Burke's work is expansive, he has devoted considerable time and energy to the philosophical concept of dramatism. For Burke dramatism is the reductional motivational vehicle for all symbolic and linguistic action. In the progressive form of the title essay in The Philosophy of Literary Form, he states that symbolic action is drama and ritual drama is the essence of all linguistic action. He then defines man as "the essentially symbol using animal" and makes linguistic action the essence of man. As a result, the central generating principle of the numerous texts Burke has written since 1945 is the proposition that man is the specifically language using or symbol using animal, and that somehow the essence of man, human relations and ultimate reality are to be derived from the dramatic study of communication and language and the various functions they perform.¹¹ Burke's dramatic umbrella will serve as a methodological framework to analyse the dramatic performances of Desmond Tutu. The dramatist principle is based on a motion

towards social change, especially towards socialism. This movement is congruent to the direction of the ANC and the South African Communist Party for the future of South Africa.

Since the bulk of Burke's work deals with dramatism in some way, shape or form, it will be necessary to isolate several key principles that will have specific relevance to the subject matter. Furthermore, from the field of communication studies, Burkian commentators will be used in order to enhance the application of dramatism to the struggle of the oppressed for social change. The whole dramatistic system is laid out on a moral ethical bias and is presented in such a way that is designed to save humanity in this world.¹² Therefore the terminology that is used is religious in nature and will thus mesh quite easily into the religious motivation and rhetoric of Desmond Tutu. An attempt will be made to utilise the system that Burke established rather than to use the opinions of Kenneth Burke towards the direction social change should take. The direction will be established through the work of the Archbishop during the given time frame and his symbolic performance.

Given this background it is possible to construct an outline of the events that shall be concentrated upon. The remainder of this chapter will set the stage in terms of appropriate background concerning Tutu, Burke and communication theory, and cultural performance. Chapter two, Symbolic Popularity and position will deal with the image of the Archbishop and how that image is depicted through the media. Chapter three, Symbolic initiative for social change will specifically concentrate upon performances and organised activities that were associated with the Mass Democratic Movement's protest leading up to the September election. Tutu's voice and leadership will be discussed. In Chapter four the emphasis will be taken outside of the South African context and set in Israel. Symbolic

transference and relationship, will centre on the Archbishop's trip to Israel in December of 1989 and with his identification of the marginalised Palestinians. This will be shown alongside the relationship between the South African and Israeli governments and the Jewish response to the rhetoric of Desmond Tutu. Economic sanctions and its effect upon the South African Government will be the focus of Chapter five, *Symbolic Correction : Tutu, Sanctions and Monetary Symbolism*. Tutu has been at the forefront of the sanctions campaign on the international scale. The pressure that sanctions has created as a motivator for social change will be discussed. Finally, *Symbolic Transition and Resolution*, Chapter six, will examine the shift of symbolic power from Tutu to Mandela and provide a point of departure to develop conclusions concerning the effectiveness of the Archbishop's performance. Throughout the course of the analysis, the events will continually be placed within the methodological framework of dramatism and explained by performance theory.

While the work of Kenneth Burke is fairly well know and utilised in a broad range of academic disciplines, Performance Theory is still in its infancy stages of development and application in the academic study of religion. Even though the method is embryonic, its pragmatic nature is a key to understanding the direction of movement in a society towards social change. In terms of academic background, Igor Kopytoff attributes the origin of performance theory to Arnold Von Gennep's "classic formulation" that people celebrate their passage from one state of being into another with symbolic performance.¹³ The aspect of transition and mass cultural movement is vital to the contextual struggle towards a new South Africa, free of apartheid. Jonathan Culler argues that the true origins of the analysis of symbolic action "lie in the work of Marx" who showed that individual experience is more possible by the symbolic action systems of collectives.¹⁴ The link to Marx is deeply rooted in the writings of Burke as well as the political

ideology of the African National Congress and the South African Communist Party. It is a given academic presupposition that performance theory is an evolution from various sources which includes the dramatism of Kenneth Burke. Performance resides in a series of cross fertilising questions posed by scholars in some disciplines to investigators in others.¹⁵ These include linguistic, sociology, performing arts, social psychology, political theory and religious studies.

It is possible to make several common claims about the nature of performance. For instance, all performances contain "a commonly acknowledged procedure" that orders their actions "a sense of collective or communal enactment that is purpose" and a communal "awareness" that the performed acts "are different from ordinary everyday events".¹⁶ Perhaps most important is the view of Lawrence Sullivan who argues that theories of performance are attempts to group the quiddity of symbolic action; they seek to understand what sets performance of the human condition apart from brute behaviour. He continues to state that all successful theories of performance "are attempts to delineate, analyse or interpret the specific quality of knowledge that underlies human action during cultural performances".¹⁷

The expression "quality of knowledge" is from Dell Hyme's 1981 "Essay in Native American Ethnopoetics", Hyme distinguishes between "performance" and "behaviour" because performance emerges from a context of a specific quality of knowledge. He characterises this quality of knowledge as a concern with "something creative, realised, achieved, even transcendent of the ordinary course of events".¹⁸ It should be noted that the term "knowledge" is not restricted to epistemological or cognitive operations. Sullivan uses Hyme's term "quality of knowledge" because it is open to other kinds of concern with dimensions or values that might be termed psychological, aesthetic,

political, existential, accoustical and so on.¹⁹

For the work of Archbishop Tutu, the "quality of knowledge" that underlies his performance in the larger community is centered upon the Christian theological concept of the Kingdom of God and how that Kingdom is manifested in the dialectical relationship between the Church and the State in which it dwells. In his book Hope and Suffering, Tutu maintains that the church in South Africa must be a prophetic church which cries out "this saith the Lord" speaking up against injustice and violence, against oppression and exploitation, against all that dehumanises God's children and rules them less than what God intended to be.²⁰ Crucial to the "quality of knowledge" is the underlying principles of a theology of liberation that is rooted in an eschalogical image of the Kingdom of God that is seen as a historical fact in process of fruition. He declares "Freedom is coming, we will be free whatever anybody does or does not do about it. We are concerned only about how and when. It should be soon and we want it to be reasonably peaceful".²¹ The promise is for the liberation of all people from oppression.

At the opening date of this analysis, July 19, 1989, the Archbishop firmly cemented the struggle in South Africa with liberation theology at a news conference in Johannesburg to launch the Road to Damascus document. He declared:

Yes, it is liberation theology, for we are involved in a liberation struggle, which is God's struggle, for Jesus Christ came to ransom ... , when you ransom you are setting free someone who has been kidnapped. When you redeem it, it is buying back something that has been taken wrongfully, usurped wrongfully we are making no bones about it.²²

Thus, inherent within the "quality of knowledge" in this specific performance situation is the dynamic of values in which the state is conducting evil practices and it is the responsibility of the Church, as

God's representative acting in creation, to declare the word of God against evil. In the Church-state relationship, its impetus must be upon the eradication of evil rather than conflict with the state. Tutu elaborates upon this relationship in an interview in November 1989:

We are not interested in a conflict with the state. We would like to talk amicably with everybody, including the state, and it is incumbent on Christians, all things being equal, to be good citizens and good citizens are people who try to uphold the law. The onus is entirely upon the government: it has the opportunity to avoid conflict. The church has no political axe to grind; it is concerned only with the Kingdom of God, and the Kingdom of God is concerned about everything. As long as the government is God's servant for the good of all people, and responsive to the aspirations, hopes and longings of most of them there will be no conflict. The church can have no quarrel with the government so long as it works out a just and equitable dispensation in which all the people participate in the decision making process in the country. The church speaks out against evil because evil is there. So the responsibility [for the absence of evil] lies with the state, the government.²³

In this statement, the Archbishop establishes many of the parameters for the knowledge that serves as a motivation for his performance. Since God is concerned about everything, he can be concerned and act accordingly for his vision of the Kingdom of God against the personification of injustice found in the character of the government. All aspects of life are of cultural importance. Also intrinsically a part of the framework is the conviction that evil will ultimately be removed. The proclamation of the Kingdom of God and all that it entails, serves as the support for a broad range of symbolic action and events that will be concentrated upon later in this work.

The continual emphasis that every action and performance of the Archbishop is based on a "quality of knowledge" is vital in the establishment of the transference of this knowledge to a given culture which is defined in the masses of Black South Africans who have no political voice in the state that is propagating evil influences upon them. This situation sets up an ideological conflict of "ruling knowledge" versus the knowledge of the

oppositional critic in a social struggle. At this point a definition of culture is needed. It is useful to turn to the work of Frank Lentricchia for an analysis of culture that is suited to the work of social conflict and change. Lentricchia defines culture as "knowledge precisely at the point at which knowledge becomes power, or is on the way to power".²⁴ This definition is based upon Marxist theory in which cultural weapons are deployed in a social conflict of cultural domination in which power is the ultimate goal. The Archbishop is basing his knowledge and power on a divine principle set in opposition to the state. He is a critic pointing towards a new culture, based upon a new power that is outside of validation of the state. God is the source of validation as well as the instigation of the spreading of the cultural. This culture must inhabit and spread until the neglected have been recovered in a new sense of unity of power. In terms of political action, culture becomes a process whose goal is the saturation of the social.²⁵

A criticism for social change can only occur if a space for resistance is left open, only if a dominant "culture" cannot completely cover the social.²⁶ Thus the ruling culture inevitably leaves an open space for the oppositional critic to work. Desmond Tutu is therefore, as a leader by default, speaking while true leaders of the struggle were not tolerated and were either placed in prison or forced into exile by the ruling culture. He states "I always think I haven't suffered as much as many other people. I have not been detained and I haven't been burned, although I have "lost" my passport now and again".²⁷ Oppositional criticism is therefore always an active possibility within capitalist society, such as South Africa, because ruling ideas are not situated everywhere. Lentricchia states "Ruling culture does not define the whole culture, though it tries to, and it is the task of the oppositional critic to re-read culture so as to amplify and strategically position the marginalised voices of the ruled, exploited,

oppressed and excluded".²⁸ Tutu is an oppositional critic working within a structure of white cultural and political domination.

It should be noted that cultural domination, or hegemony, is not a static or finished item. It is a process that has continually to be renewed, recreated, defended and modified because it is continually being resisted, limited, altered and challenged by pressures not at all its own. That is to say that hegemony is never either total or exclusive and according to Raymond Williams best understood dramatically.²⁹

This leads back to the concept of performance theory. Sullivan dictates that the idea or quality of knowledge that underlie each performance is categorised by several different characteristics. For our purposes the most important of these is synethisa. Synethisa is usually defined as a phenomenon in which one type of stimulation evokes the sensation of another.³⁰ He writes that:

The point is that performance displays the symbolic expressions of synethisa as it is imagined in a culture. In so doing it renders perceptible a symbolism of the unity of senses. The symbolic experience of the unity of the senses enables a culture to entertain itself with the idea of the unity of meaning.³¹

Sullivan goes on to write:

Cultural knowledge is obtained piecemeal from the separate senses of the individual bodies in action. But it is the performance that provides a culture the occasion to reflect on the unity of that body of cultural knowledge.³²

Given this structural framework the public appearances of the Archbishop's will serve to show the attempt to establish a specific 'local theology' designed for the social struggle against apartheid, in the over reaching context of liberation theology. Again, the July 19th press conference and the Road to Damascus document are important. The document serves as an abstract principle of commonality for the seven nations involved in the

struggle of liberation theology.

What we (the signatories in seven nations) have in common is not only a situation of violent political conflict, but also the phenomenon of Christians on both sides of the conflict. This is accompanied by the development of a Christian theology that sides with the poor and the oppressed and the development of a Christian theology that sides with the oppressor. This is both a scandal and a crisis that challenges the Christian people of our countries.³³

Here the previously mentioned struggle between the ruling class and the masses is highlighted. The conflict of culture is specifically focussed between a conflict of theologies. The document is an attempt to re-interpret culture into a power formation in which the oppressed have a symbolic unity of voice. The dynamic of conflict is in flux. The document is meant to increase the dynamic of change and force alignment.

We have wished to make it quite clear that we believe that those Christians who side with the imperialist, the oppressors and the exploiters of people are siding with the idolators who worship money, power, privilege, and pleasure. To misuse Christianity to defend oppression is heretical. And to persecute Christians who are oppressed or who side with the oppressed is apostasy - the abandonment of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.³³

Given this abstract theological document, it is necessary to further focus the conflict far beyond the vague aspects of "oppression" and "oppressor" in its respective praxis. It must be brought down to a lower more concrete level of location and performance. Robert Schreier develops this idea by addressing the performances involved in constructing local theologies. Opposed to what Schreier calls "the sure knowledge" underlying *scientia*, or the theology that bases itself on an invariant text, he depicts a theology of praxis founded upon faith, a term by which he designates a species of reflection on how God performs in human history. This performed reflection underlies the transformative action on the part of the community of believers.³⁵ In order for this transformation to occur, the theological principles must be drawn down to the most common level of application in a given area. The general abstract principle of liberation theology must be

made specific and localised in terms of individual responsibility and accountability.

At the press conference on July 19th, Desmond Tutu localised the application of the Road to Damascus document to the South African context for the individual Christians of that country. He states,

I hope that all Christians in South Africa will recognise that when the Kingdom of God is proclaimed, you are always called on to make a decision: either for or against God... We are glad to be able to say God has enlisted us to be fellow workers with Him in seeking to transform this country and all of God's world so it can become the kind of thing God longs for... That is liberation, for the God we worship in Exodus, God, the great liberator, God who leads us out of all kinds of bondage, not just political bondage... That goes for the oppressor (as well as the oppressed), for we are fully aware that nobody will ever be free in a situation of injustice until all are free.³⁶

As an oppositional critic, the Archbishop uses the performance of this press conference to further perpetuate the "quality of knowledge" that is found in the context of liberation theology and the Kingdom of God to counter the hegemony of the South African government. In so doing, he builds a system in which the symbolic expression of unity is given to a culture that is against the government's policy of apartheid, by meaning and purpose of God working through the oppressed. In turn, cultural knowledge is further defined by this performance. Lines are culturally drawn in terms of a power relationship. You are either for God or for the government. There is no middle ground in the struggle for social change in local terms. Here symbolism in the performance further unifies the culture in the dialectical relationship against "ruling knowledge" in context.

Yet it continues. Tutu does not only localise on the mass theological and political levels. He brings the local theology down to individual responsibility and response to the issue of apartheid. At the "Damascus" press conference a questioner suggested that the document implied that

supporters of apartheid could not be accepted as members of the Christian Church. The response of the Archbishop further draws lines of division over the issues. He stated,

It is actually a very, very serious question. Five or so years ago our church together with other churches denounced apartheid as heresy ... according to my understanding it means in fact you cannot be a Christian and support apartheid. You cannot be an Anglican and support apartheid.³⁷

This step is a very significant one. The process of thought that is established is that individual belief systems are deemed false if the proper political decision is not made. While starting out with a battle of cultures over power, the focus has been isolated from political movements of collective persons, to the particular responsibility to respond to the call of the proclamation Kingdom of God or be judged in opposition to God. Desmond Tutu, through his rhetoric, has set the terms that the people of the opposition identify with on a regular basis.

The press conference in Johannesburg launching The Road to Damascus document is just the first of many vital performances in which the work of Desmond Tutu sets the scene for the continued struggle against the ruling culture in South Africa. This initial performance is of special significance for it is the foundation by which the rest of his work during this time frame is built upon. These many performances provide the world with a view of the political tensions of South Africa as interpreted through the words and actions of the Archbishop. Each performance is an encapsulation of the culture of the oppressed transmitted through world wide news gathering services for the international community to view the action of the human drama of social criticism towards cultural change.

As established in this brief overview of certain aspects of performance theory, performance is shown as a manner in which societal transitions are

made and, according to Marxist theory, the manner by which individual experience is made possible through collective symbolic action systems. "Quality of knowledge" is the vital component that separates performance from behaviour. It has been established that for the Archbishop, this knowledge is engraved in the concept of the Kingdom of God specifically shown in praxis through the tenants of liberation theology which in turn leads directly into a struggle against cultural domination and evil that is enforced by the state, which serves as the motivation for specific acts of performance in the dynamic reformulation of culture.

As an oppositional critic of the ruling culture, Desmond Tutu is allowed to speak because of gaps provided by the ruling culture's inability to completely control the social sphere and because of the elimination of other leaders who were living in exile or in prison. It is from the position of oppositional critic that symbolism and symbolic experience leads to unity of meaning that is a facilitator for cultural knowledge. This knowledge is then localised in order to achieve concrete praxis on the corporate and individual levels.

Now that these broad strokes are drawn, it is possible to narrow the focus to the characteristics of specific acts of performance by the Archbishop. Kenneth Burke's dramatism, along with performance theory, will provide an excellent methodology by which these acts of performance can be further developed. The primary postulate of Burke's dramaturgical theory is that "Man is the essential symbol using animal". Our focus will now turn to Burke's understanding of symbolic expression and its effects upon the symbolic performances of Desmond Tutu.

CHAPTER TWO : SYMBOLIC POSITION AND POPULARITY

While the previous chapter dealt primarily with performance, the focus of attention of this chapter will turn to the concept of the performance. By doing so, it will be possible to understand the influence of the oppositional critic within the arena of public domination. Also within this context the dynamics of change can be emphasised as the performer continues to localise the quality of knowledge in a progression of performance. As the actions of the performer change, the actions of his or her culture follow suit. The drama unfolds accordingly and is transmitted to the audience through a specific form of media.

Burke stresses the importance of the examination of this drama for an understanding of human interaction. In this examination leadership plays a significant role. Burke wrote:

Human relations should be analysed with respect to the leads discovered by the study of drama. Men enact roles. They change roles. They participate. Even a 'star' is but a function of the total cast. Politics above all is drama. People are neither animals or machines but actors and actors.¹

Desmond Tutu is no stranger to dramatic terms. Theatrical analogies are often used to describe his interaction with crowds. Press clippings refer to his "showmanship", his ability to entertain. Reporters have called him an "old trouper". A Johannesburg photographer manoeuvred the Archbishop into a position next to a poster of the cartoon character Garfield the Cat. The photo showed the Archbishop next to a caption that read "It is not easy to be a superstar, but someone has to do it".² By the amount of newspaper and media coverage he has received it is easy to see that he is often in the spotlight of the world stage.

To show the depth and growth of coverage that emphasised not only the

Archbishop but also the rise of the coverage of issues of racism, it is useful to examine the results of a study prepared by Mead Data Incorporated, a United States company that conducted an analysis of issues and individuals of importance to black Americans. The report results were published and released on the United press international wire on January 26, 1989, before the beginning of February, which is black history month in the States. Using the Nexis Information Service, the nation's largest information source, the study scouted the nations leading daily newspapers, wire services and magazines. No information was gathered from broadcast journalism. A comparison was made between the years of 1984 and 1989 concerning the subject of racism, black issues and black leaders. The general results are indeed significant. In the sampling data taken during the five year time span, articles dealing with the subject of racism rose a staggering 315% from 590 in 1984 to 2241 in 1989. Coverage of issues of concern to black Americans rose 135% from 2607 articles to 6133 articles in 1989. Perhaps the most important find was the media identification of black leaders. Desmond Tutu was ranked fourth in position behind Nelson Mandela, Jesse Jackson and Martin Luther King jr. It should be noted that an American study placed two South Africans at the top of the black leadership list. The Archbishop was the subject of 183 articles.³ Why? One reporter stated:

Americans love the Archbishop ... and tend to treat him rather as they do their movie stars. Which in practice means that literally every word, every action the Archbishop has uttered or taken ... has been printed, broadcasted or video taped in virtually every newspaper and on every radio station or television network throughout the continent.⁴

This particular report dealt with a proclaimed Archbishop Desmond Tutu week in the United States.

While this study is representative of only a certain region of the globe, it does serve as an example of the international popularity of Desmond Tutu.

The American media conglomerate is the largest in the world. For the American people in 1989, Desmond Tutu was the lens by which South Africa was viewed. He was not only perceived as a South African leader but also as a black leader who encompassed a broader constituency. The popularity and position of the Archbishop since worldwide attention was brought to him with the Nobel Peace Prize in 1984 has made him a symbol.

The word "symbol" is not used in a derogatory manner and should not be prefaced by modifiers such as "merely" or "just". A point of importance in the work of Kenneth Burke is the value of symbols in human relation. Burke's primary definition of humanity is that "man is the symbol using animal". Every aspect of non-verbal, socio-political and extra verbal reality is viewed by human being through a fog of symbols.⁵ Burke has written that:

overwhelmingly much of what we mean by "reality" has been built up for us through nothing but our symbol system ... our reality for today (is) ... this clutter of symbols from the past combined with whatever things we know through maps, magazines, newspapers and the like.⁶

In turn new symbols continue to be formulated through the course of current events.

Central to the nature of any symbol system is a view of the past. For Burke history must be viewed in a "comedic" vein. He wrote:

Comedy works against the changes of pride, but its emphasis shifts from crime to stupidity... The progress of humane enlightenment can go no further than in picturing people not as vicious, but as mistaken, and that all people are exposed to situations in which they must act as fools.⁷

Through the comic attitude Burke has argued, people should be directed towards maximum consciousness in which one would transcend oneself by noting his own foibles. The comic attitude provides a structure for locating the irrational.⁸ Burke has named this attitude towards history "comic" for it

postulates foolishness and embarrassing exposure for the human agent.

Anyone working within this structural format can be called a "comedic master". The comedic master is an individual who represents full consciousness within the twist or turns of the human drama. The position also includes a confident and complete knowledge of how the game began and how it will eventually end. History is shown in the mode of dramatic irony, with a privileged place given to a person of comedic knowledge. This person must be a foolish actor, is somehow a wise spectator and an achiever of maximum consciousness.⁹ The comedic master has always known that in the end all human differences make no difference at all.¹⁰ From this presupposition of knowledge, Burke develops a "comic" methodology which has its final realisation in dramatism. The comic master is the catalyst for a "methodology of exposure" which attempts to demystify situations by systematically trying to show that nothing is what it appears to be on the surface.¹¹

It should be evident that in this study Desmond Tutu is placed in the role of the comedic master. The quality of knowledge that is found in his theological view of the just society of the Kingdom of God has provided the springboard that can be linked to the Burkian idea of "maximum consciousness". His popularity identification as a leader has allowed him to interpret and expose evil in the South African context and redefine the role of the oppositional culture against the dominate ruling class. The ruling class is mistaken. Their ignorance can be shown to them through the proper channel of symbolic performance which exposes the clouding of the scenario and offers insight towards a direction of resolution.

In order to analyse the Archbishop as a performer or more precisely, as the comedic master in Burke's view of human relations, several steps will need

to be taken. To begin, the 'comic' attitude of Desmond Tutu will be elaborated upon with special attention placed upon his humour and exposure in the media. After this has been accomplished two performances will be analysed to show the conflict between the opposed cultures focussed directly upon the character of the Archbishop and the attempt to control the interpretation of events by antagonist in the drama. The two situations examined will be the debate over the teargassing of the Archbishop on August 23, 1989 and the debate over the number of dead bodies that resulted from the violence following the national election on September 5 and 6, 1989. Finally the ability of Desmond Tutu as the comic master to refocus oppositional action against oppression will be shown.

Burke states that "comedy works against the dangers of pride". The Archbishop has often worked against a prideful image by what has been noted as a "charmingly self-deprecating sense of humour".¹² He often smilingly apologises for being late because "I was working according to African time". He tells a story about a church in which he ministered where the nave was so dark that all that was visible of him was a row of white teeth.¹³ Here is a man, a Nobel Prize winner who has toured foreign countries and appeared at social protests sporting a T-shirt bearing the words "Just call me Arch". An important element of the Archbishop's humour and character is his humility. He is far from the "simple pastor" he has claimed to be. In Burkian terms it is the comedic master that teaches the audience lessons of humility through performance and interaction. The comic is an exemplary humble person who points others in the same direction; to transcend to maximum consciousness by noting one's own foibles.¹⁴ Humour that is self directed is an important part of security of knowledge necessary to see past the struggle. Comedy is also valuable at points of conflict within the struggle in order to show situations as they really are by exposing ironies involved between the opposing cultures. Consider the following remarks by

the Archbishop that were recorded on occasions of struggle. The comic attitude is quite apparent in each context.

"Our God is not a neutral God, the Bible is the most subversive book around. The government should have banned it long ago" - August 5, 1989 at a church service.¹⁵

"They say apartheid is dead. It is one of the most extraordinary corpses around"¹⁶ - August 20, 1989 at a church service following a protest on a whites beach only in Cape Town

"We don't give two hoots whether white South Africans become more right wing"¹⁷ - September 7, 1989 following the election held during the previous two days

"If that was low profile police pressure ... then I'm Bing Crosby"¹⁸ - comment following beach protest held on September 30, 1989.

These examples are representative of the numerous comic responses given by Tutu in a variety of situations. His humour is not limited to one-liners in sermons or press conferences. The comic attitude is shown in many interviews, and public appearances. Journalist John Scott recorded the humour of the Archbishop at a gathering that followed the enormous peace march that took place on September 13, 1989. It was the largest march in the country since 1959. An estimated 35 000 people participated. The Archbishop organised and led the procession. Scott's article deals with the assembly in the old City Hall of Cape Town. He writes:

Meanwhile in the hall, the Archbishop was entertaining his audience like an old trouper. "We say to Mr De Klerk ... 'Hello'", raising his voice to telephone pitch. It brought the house down. "Mr De Klerk" he said addressing the invisible state president "If you know ... if you know ... if you know what is really good for you ... join us". Bellows of delight. "Let us keep quiet", he suggested, pulling a new one out of his repertoire. A hush fell over everybody. Then he broke the silence himself. "Mr De Klerk?" He asked, returning to his favourite character. "Did you hear a pin drop?".¹⁹

Scott recorded another instance in his column entitled IV Tutu's repartee as blinding as his pate. The title referred to the Archbishop's clean shaven head. The event was a debate on October 22, 1989 on South African television. It was the first time the South African network allowed the Archbishop to be persona grata. The debate was between Tutu and the Bishop

of the Church of England in South Africa, Frank Retief. In response to the Bishop's question on whether or not economic sanctions against South Africa was "fighting evil with evil" Scott writes "The Archbishop then went into chuckling mode. He chuckled and chuckled". Tutu laughed for so long that the moderator of the programme stated "If you want to respond verbally please do so".²⁰

Not all of the Archbishop's press coverage has been so positive, as can be seen in Richard McNeill's review of the same programme Tutu makes out a poor case in the Sunday Times. McNeill began by stating that Tutu's appearance on South African television was due to the fact that "the virtual godfather of economic warfare against this country isn't fond of talking to less than a three network international news conference".²¹ McNeill concluded his review by insisting that "only a fool, a cynic, or a unreconstructed socialist could pretend that the poor are helped by impoverishing everybody else ... perhaps the Archbishop of Cape Town is a bit of all three".²²

In response to McNeill, however, it is important to remember Burke's statements about the comedic master being a "foolish actor". The comedic master is inevitably a victim of judgement because of the amount of exposure and risk involved in the dramatic struggle. Tutu receives negative reactions because of the broad range of implications of his actions, the subjects that he addresses, as well as his personal characteristics. Cape Town writer, Adam Small, expands on this issue. "Archbishop Tutu has again been castigated for naive talkativeness. Worse even, he has yet again been bluntly billed as a fool". Why? Because "The Archbishop risked himself on the thinnest of ice".²³ Small's statement implies that calling the Archbishop a fool is not a rare occurrence in print. This judgement is directed from the ruling class in an attempt to usurp the power of a performer. Yet in the schema of Burke's dramatic methodology it is this

judgement that aids the comedic master by lending humour a transcendent significance and power.

Perhaps the most noteworthy example of comic attitude, symbolic action, and public ridicule in the time period of this study is the appearance of the shaved head of Desmond Tutu. On September 27, 1989, Desmond Tutu appeared on a panel to support the young men who refused to serve in the South African Defence Force on conscientious grounds. It was a press conference, thus a performance. This event marked the first public appearance of Tutu's new hairless style. The next day it made the front page of the Cape Times with the headline "Newlook ... Archbishop" and the quote "I am the poor man's Kojak" underneath the before and after photos.²⁴ The conscientious objectors did not make the front page.

The hair cut became the subject of numerous editorial cartoons during the course of the next week. However, media coverage moved in a new direction at a press conference following a beach protest on October 2, 1989. At the end of the performance Tutu asked the reporters "Why didn't anyone ask about my haircut?" A reporter asked "Why?" The response "Really, I didn't have any reason until people kept asking. Maybe we should keep it this way until the state of emergency is lifted and people are unrestricted. Then we might just let it grow".²⁵ The press quickly broadcasted the news. The next day the Natal Mercury contained a front page article with the headline "Tutu's close shave now a Dome of Symbolism. The Cape Times ran an article entitled "Tutu talks about his new haircut". While most of the coverage was devoted to the beach protest, the symbolism of the close shave received widespread coverage and special attention.

Attention to the comic significance of Tutu's haircut was especially evident in political cartoons. The editorial page of the Cape Times showed an

illustration of the Archbishop with reporters and the caption "It reflects my views of the Nationalist Government. Hair today, gone tomorrow".²⁶ The noted liberal paper, The Weekly Mail, saw a feature with reference to haircuts as well. It was found in the comic strip, Comrade Joe. The character of Comrade Joe is a dog with left-wing political views. The crux of the strip was Joe's owner saying "I don't think the Desmond Tutu hairstyle was intended for dogs" and a reflective dog with a shaved head and sporting glasses, admiring himself in the mirror thinking "Just call me Arch".²⁷

In the end, the Archbishop did not keep his head shaved, which then provided the press the opportunity to tell the world that his hair was growing back. The comic nature of these episodes is obvious. The performance is lighthearted and the joking attitude of the main character is evident. The point that should be made, however, is that in the struggle against apartheid in South Africa, even a hair style became symbolic action that received public attention and made Desmond Tutu the brunt of jokes rather than the initiator of them. For many, this added to his foolish image in the political arena.

A reminder is needed to point out that the comic attitude is not only to serve as a manner by which the comedic master can be labeled as foolish by the ruling class, but it is a manner of correction against domination. According to Burke, the role of the comic is to show the mistaken interpretation of events by those who are in control of the dominant culture. Thus the interpretation of any event can serve as a microcosm for the overall struggle. The interpretation of the comedic master is vital for the overall demystification of the situation in order to show the general audience the truth of the actual event through the method of exposure. The concept of exposure is crucial in the relationship between the Archbishop

and the South African Police. On several occasions the media became the field of battle for the war of the words that directed public attention to police action.

The first episode that will be examined occurred on August 23, 1989 in the black township of Guguletu outside of Cape Town. The Archbishop went into Holy Cross Church in order to persuade hundreds of children against staging a protest march in defiance of the police. A factor that should be considered is that a large number of heavily armed police were lined up seventy five yards away from the church entrance. According to reports at the scene, "The police fired teargas as soon as Tutu and the school children emerged from the building. Tutu walked through the gas and told a policeman "You can't teargas them. They haven't done anything. The policeman responded "I don't care".²⁸

A photograph taken of the Archbishop walking through clouds of teargas was distributed internationally. Wire stories began with the headline "Tutu teargassed". The world press heard the Archbishop's interpretation of the events at a press conference later that day. The focus of the message was an appeal to western leaders to be aware that South Africa might be on the brink of a "very serious catastrophe". He stated "I want the world to know that ... it is likely that our children are going to be killed by people who have become reckless". Archbishop Tutu said he would send messages to US President George Bush, and other western leaders so that the world "can not say I didn't know".²⁹ He concluded "Today (the police) showed such incredible, incredible impatience and eagerness to use the wide range of their armoury. It's going to be a miracle if we do not have several people killed".³⁰ He also stated that the police fired into the crowd of several hundred children without warning.

It is important to note that the Archbishop is complaining about the SAP's firing of teargas into the crowd. The next day the public relations department of the police denied teargassing the Archbishop. According to the official police statement, the children did not disperse after a warning. Since it was an illegal gathering, police fired teargas into the crowd. "The Archbishop "was inside (the church) when tear smoke was used against them".³¹ Subsequently, however, the police admitted teargassing the Archbishop, "backing down from the original assertion that the tear smoke was never aimed at the Bishop and if he did appear while the last of it was being fired the officer in command was not aware of it".³² But this new version reinforced the conclusion that the teargas was aimed at the hundreds of school children, which was exactly the point the Archbishop was making at his press conference five days earlier. The struggle was not over the event, but rather the interpretation of the event. By pressing the conflict in the media the police were forced to change their position. Thus, the comedic master was able to expose the situation as it truly occurred.

Public outcry focused on the fact that Tutu had been teargassed, rather than on the police action against children. The police did not respect the role of the main performer during the drama, but emphasised the importance of the performer in later statements. Therefore, the treatment of the comedic master/oppositional critic stands out from the rest of the cast. The comedic role brings a certain degree of protection within the exposure it provides. Tutu reinforced this position and the responsibility to protect the masses from some aspects of the risk involved in the methodology of exposure.

I am very conscious of the fact that I am a protected species. And that is a dilemma. Then when I say perhaps we ought to take a particular action ... this protected species will be treated differently from others of you. And that worries me. I can say, let us march, and the chances are that I would march for a few yards and they (the police)

would pick me ... and then deal brutally with the other people, and I need to be careful of how I involve you, my sisters and brothers.³³

This language is very important especially the last sentence "I need to be careful how I involve you". Tutu does not want others to be dangerously exposed. He is protected from violent forms of action because of his position, yet it is also that position that makes him responsible for the exposure of others that are following his example in the struggle against the ruling class.

Perhaps the most horrific and morbid example of the struggle over the interpretation of events was the public argument that followed the violence that surrounded the racist election of September 5, 1989, in which 73% of the South African population could not participate. The Archbishop called the violence in the Cape Flats a "massacre" in which the police had acted brutally. Tutu addressed a news conference on September 7. At that stage the casualty count was twenty three dead and hundreds injured.³⁴ The response was swift from the police. Law and Order minister Adriaan Vlok stated that only fifteen people were killed and the police were not involved. According to Vlok, death and injury resulted from "black on black violence". However, a strange statement was issued from Vlok's office: "If they came up with that figure, they must produce the bodies".³⁵ Vlok further attacked the Archbishop by saying that Tutu was "deliberately misleading the world" acting in "complete disregard of the law of South Africa". He concluded by attempting to shift blame to Tutu and Boesak. Vlok expressed his "deepest condemnation about the manner in which the two church leaders have attempted to make political gains from the unrest".³⁶ The battle of the number of dead moved into the ridiculous when Dr Allan Boesak invited the Minister of Law and Order to visit mortuaries with him to count the bodies. On September 8, Cape Town lawyer Essa Moosa said that

twenty nine had died.³⁷ The police's final body count was given on September 19, the day of State President De Klerk's inauguration, as nineteen. In the midst of the two week numerical argument, Desmond Tutu, as oppositional critic tried to expose a truth beyond qualification. He told a memorial service, "It doesn't really matter whether few, or twenty or thirty people have been killed, The point is that people have died as a result of the unbelievable behaviour of the police".³⁸

Once again the Archbishop was exposed to public ridicule, in this case from a senior government official. But that exposure was necessary in order to show a media audience the nature of the harm that had occurred. Here the comic master pointed to the mistaken knowledge of the dominating ruling class. It was not a question of how many people died. The issue was that people did die. Counting corpses was not pivotal to the struggle. The acknowledgement that the corpses were produced because of police action was the goal. The fight over numbers kept the issue in the minds of the public for a longer period of time. It maintained a quality of public attention that resulted in the Peace March on September 12.

In terms of symbolic action, one of the most significant events involving Desmond Tutu occurred on the eve of the Election on September 4. The Archbishop released a statement from his office the next morning.

The South African police sank to new depths last night when they desecrated my cathedral. During the course of the evening they had: marched into the cathedral carrying fire arms and quirts, their hats on, with the intention of removing anyone they could find in the building; denied the Dean access to his own cathedral, and prohibited anyone else from entering the cathedral. Police relented after some time ... but the Dean, wholly justifiably in my view, decided that since the police had desecrated the cathedral, he would not allow it to reopen until it had been reconsecrated.³⁹

That evening had been a busy one for the Archbishop. After he left the scene at the cathedral, he went to another service, was arrested and held

for ninety minutes, he held a press conference at midnight to report on the events. The reconsecration service was held at 7.15 a.m. the next morning. Tutu's press release was issued shortly thereafter, charging the police with "profane disregard for the sanctity of our churches".⁴⁰ To counter these charges, the police issued a statement on September 6, denying that they had entered the cathedral wearing caps and carrying guns.⁴¹

This incident had several important ramifications. Firstly, the Archbishop seemed to take the police action as not merely a personal affront. It was an act of desecration. After the police entered the church, it was defiled. Their presence, clothing, and purpose was offensive to God and thus made the building unusable. The cultural knowledge of the church or this particular church, is in direct opposition to the cultural power evoked by the police. The key point that should be stressed is that it was the performance of the police, with or without hats, that was offensive to the cultural knowledge and direction of the Archbishop. Thus the only manner by which this evil could be corrected was by another performance. In this specific case, the performance was a service of reconsecration that returned the cathedral to its previously undefiled state so that it could be reopened. Here the performance was a redemptive act to deal with the violent exposure of a sacred space.

Within the structural framework, another emphasis of the comedic master can be seen. The comic can serve as the focal point by which the cultural struggle is examined and interpreted to an outside audience. For Burke, the role of comedic master is of vital importance because, "You can't see the class struggle. It is an interpretation of events".⁴² The comedic master is the chief interpreter. In South Africa, Desmond Tutu has the power to interpret performances to an international media audience, as well as to modify the parameters of actions within the South African context. By means

of performance, the Archbishop continues to localise his theology, in terms of the struggle against the government towards his knowledge of the Kingdom of God.

Theological localisation through performance is also exemplified in an event that occurred at a Johannesburg press conference on August 4, 1989. This event was roughly two weeks after the launch of the Road to Damascus document, which the Archbishop localised to mean that one could not be a Christian and support Apartheid. At this performance, the heads of churches of the South African Council of Churches, including Desmond Tutu, took the issue a step further. They stated,

One cannot be a Christian and not resist apartheid. Resistance to this evil system is both the duty of the church ... for these reasons we believe they must be in support of, and may even have to give leadership to, non-violent forms of protest.⁴³

The Archbishop was among those who were directing the human drama. It was not enough to fail to give support to the evil in the ruling culture, This evil must be openly resisted. The implication of this dramatic message will be explored in the next chapter through an examination of the Defiance Campaign.

In this chapter it has been established that Desmond Tutu fits into the methodological character of the Burkian comedic master. Often referred to in theatrical terms, the Archbishop is a well established black leader on the international level which provides opportunity of media access as well as exposure. As a symbol using animals, human beings use figures from current events to formulate a sense of reality. Kenneth Burke takes these symbols to formulate a "comic" view of history which emphasises the role of the comedic master who sets the example for an oppositional culture. The master comic corrects the ruling class by pointing out its mistaken knowledge and power and sets an example to reach maximum consciousness by risking foolish

exposure. It is through the comic attitude that events are demystified and the truth is able to be seen by observers.

As the comedic master, Desmond Tutu is compatible to his form of personal humour as well as in his personal activities. He uses humour, performance and the public stage not only to interpret events but also to redirect the struggle. This places Tutu in an exposed position in which he can be subjected to ridicule. It also discloses his followers to the risk of physical harm through following the methodology of exposure. Burke points out that the struggle is based on the interpretation of the events. This places a great responsibility upon the comedic master and the quality of knowledge by which he or she directs by interpretation of movement. Again as mentioned in Chapter One, Tutu's quality of knowledge is rooted in his theological concept of the Kingdom of God. This is key to maximum consciousness that allows Tutu to interpret conflicting situations to show the mistaken nature of the dominant culture.

In order to further highlight the evil in the system, the Archbishop maintained that it was the responsibility of the Christian to resist apartheid. The result was church leadership in protest situations of performance. These acts of performance, and the interpretation of them by the comedic master, will be analysed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER THREE : SYMBOLIC ACTS TOWARDS SOCIAL CHANGE

With the endorsement of the South African Council of Churches (SACC), the defiance campaign launched by the Mass Democratic Movement officially began on August 2, 1989. The campaign took its name from the similar action led by the African National Congress in 1952. The group which spearheaded the campaign in 1989, the Mass Democratic Movement (MDM), was forced to adopt an amorphous label coined to get around the political restrictions placed on anti-apartheid groups.¹ The MDM had no official structure or acknowledged leader. The purpose of defiance was to draw attention to the injustice of the election on September 6. The Archbishop stated, "The most important thing for us is to try to take away attention from what is a charade and to deal with the real issue of our country. We don't vote and we are actually the most important item on their agenda".² The Church was ready to take the lead. They stated that during the campaign "some actions will be initiated by the Church, others will be supported by the Church".³

The key word in this chapter is "Actions". This section will deal with the specific performances that, while symbolic in nature, were instrumental in social change on the concrete level. While the first two chapters dealt with general performance and the role of the performer as comedic master, Chapter Three will illustrate specific acts of performance that will flush out the structure that has previously been established. In order to analyse these acts it will first be necessary to define them in terms of Kenneth Burke's theory of Dramatism. Once this has been accomplished, it will be possible to springboard into the plethora of activities found in the Defiance Campaign. The time frame of the performances will be limited between the dates of July 31, 1989 and October 11, 1989. The first date is the previously mentioned press conference of SACC leaders which included

Desmond Tutu, SACC General Secretary, Dr Frank Chikane, and the President of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, Dr Allan Boesak. The latter is a meeting of these three men with South African President F W De Klerk. The religious leaders acted as facilitators for the negotiation. Significant political change did occur between these dates. The symbolic acts show that Desmond Tutu was an instigator and performing catalyst for change. Attention will also be directed to the theological content of the Archbishop's motivations. But, the emphasis in this chapter will be on the action rather than the theology of Desmond Tutu.

In the Grammar of Motives, Burke has drawn upon the resources of Aristotle and Aquinas to provide structure for a definition of Act. According to Aristotle "Things are more or less real according as they are more or less energetic (from the Greek acty, from which the English word "actual" is derived).⁴ Etienne Gilson takes the same mode thought a step further. She stated that existence is "an act ... not a thing. To be is the act of Acts".⁵ Aquinas brings a similar emphasis in his Summa Contra Gentiles, "It is of the nature of action that a like agent should produce a like action, since everything acts according as it is an act".⁶

Action is therefore central to human existence. But in this framework, action is also central to theology. For Aristotle God, the "universal mover", not only serves as the origin of all motion but also as the end to all action. God is therefore conceived in terms of action.⁷ As agents humans relate to God in terms of Act. Burke noted that dramatism fits directly into this view of God and human action. "All human happiness or misery takes the form of action; the end for which we live is a certain kind of activity".⁸ Burke then focused upon drama as action.

Burke went on to stress the distinctive characteristics between symbolic

drama and the reality of the drama of human interaction and relationship.

In Philosophy of Literary Form, he wrote

The difference between the symbolic drama and the drama of the living is the difference between imaginary obstacles and real obstacles. But the imaginary obstacles of symbolic drama must, to have the relevance necessary for the producing of effects upon audiences, reflect the real obstacles of living drama.⁹

Within this scenario, "persons of moral and imaginative depth acquire great enterprise and fitness in such purely 'symbolic' solutions to conflict. Hence at times they try to solve symbolically kinds of conflict that can and should be solved by material means".¹⁰

For the purpose of this chapter, as well as the context of the struggle in South Africa, Burke's work is important. But it is problematic in that it is lacking at a crucial point. It is vital to consider the question, can symbolic drama be related to a real obstacle? Would it not be possible for symbolic action to attack a microcosm of a larger reality? Burke states that the symbolic must have relevance to reflect the real, yet is not real itself. Using Burke's writing as a foundation, symbolic drama and living drama must be synthesised in order to formulate a separate category in which the symbolic is not only a reflection of the real but incorporated within the living drama as a part of a greater reality based upon real obstacles. These obstacles are set up by the dominant culture. In the case of South Africa, these barriers take the form of laws and restrictions. Desmond Tutu as comedic master is one of the persons of "moral and imaginative depths" Burke cited. But the solution to the conflicts was not "purely symbolic" because by definition of context, any type of oppositional protest or gathering was deemed illegal by South African laws imposed by the State of Emergency. The definition of symbolic drama must be expanded as a collective action against the dominate culture against both symbolic and material obstacles. In this chapter, Tutu moved away from the purely

symbolic by bringing in material means of protest to confront the obstacles (laws) which he determined unjust based upon his quality of knowledge found in theological views. His religious motivations serve to work in dramatic conflict against political forces of oppression. This was done through symbolic performances. Through these acts, individual existence is verified within a cultural framework. Consistent with the Archbishop's liberation theology, God is revealed in terms of Action.

Given this appreciation of acts as symbolic performance, it is now possible to examine the series of performance instigated by or featuring the Archbishop during the mentioned time period. Again Singer's definition of performance is vital in terms of the temporal nature and organisation of all of these events. These performances did not spontaneously occur. They were produced. For Desmond Tutu the performances were outward expressions of political opposition rooted in a religious base. Continual emphasis will be placed upon his interpretation of the role of God in the actions of the defiance campaign.

The SACC press conference marked the beginning of the time in which church leaders united with the defiance and began to take non-violent action to expose the political "charade" that was taking place. University of Cape Town religious studies professor Charles Villa-Vincencio stressed the importance of this action. "For the first time in South Africa, high profile church leaders are participating and lead to the campaign. This is significantly different from the resistance of the 1950's or 1985."¹¹ This view was elaborated upon by the Rev. John Freeth who linked Tutu to the moral symbolic leader in Burckian thought. "Archbishop Tutu's leadership has made it possible to act in a significant way. His moral courage and clarity of understanding of the situation have locally made the difference".¹²

The first symbolic performance in which the Archbishop took part occurred on August 5. It was a funeral for two youths that were killed in an attempt to place a bomb in a public rest room. They were both African National Congress guerrillas. According to reporter Pippa Green, "The funeral was a watershed in South Africa. It not only marked the re-emergence of open anti-government activity after nearly four years of enforced silence, but also heralded a well planned campaign to defy apartheid laws".¹³ All of the mourners present were breaking the government's laws of funeral restrictions. To further emphasise the nature of the symbolic performance, the African National Congress tri-colour flag with an AK-47 assault rifle imposed on the image of Christ hung from the tower of St Mary of the Angels Catholic Church. The flag was also illegal. At the service, the Archbishop slammed the restrictions saying "when are they going to learn NOT to tell us how to mourn. They say don't cry today, cry tomorrow ... is this not our land?".¹⁴ Also in his funeral address, Tutu thanked both of the Umkhonto we Sizwe members as well as thanking especially "you young people in your dedication to justice, peace and humanity".¹⁵ The Archbishop was then instrumental in protecting mourners from the police and defusing a tense situation. It is important to recognise that the Archbishop of Cape Town was speaking at an illegal gathering, held under the flag of an outlawed political organisation, for two individuals that the South African Government considered terrorists. In opposition, the Archbishop thanked them for what they were attempting to do to bring about social change in an unjust society.

The next day the Archbishop was involved in another illegal gathering. This symbolic performance occurred on the evening of August 6 at the African Methodist Episcopal Church in Hazendal, Cape Town. At the church twenty leading activists appeared and spoke at an ecumenical service attended by about 2000 people in open defiance of restrictions imposed on them under

South Africa's State of Emergency regulations. Their restriction orders confined them to their homes from early evening and prohibited them from addressing or attending large gatherings.¹⁶ The crowd led by Tutu gave them a standing ovation as they entered the church. They were under house arrest from either 6pm or 8pm till dawn. The church service lasted until 9pm. The Archbishop placed the performance in religious terms.

It is a religious duty to oppose injustice and oppression. We stand here to say that our freedom does not only come from any human. It comes from God. Nobody ... not even the state ... has the right to restrict people's freedom. When these rulers give you unjust laws you are duty bound to disobey them. When the people decide to be free nothing can stop them.¹⁷

He went on to elaborate upon his support of the restrictions.

The Book says you are created in the image of God. However you may be, you are a viceroy of God, you stand in the place of God. To treat one person as less than this is not just wrong. It is blasphemous. It is to spit in the face of God.¹⁸

Finally he stated "I commit myself to supporting you to the fullest possible extent ... God has put me here to ensure that this country is not destroyed. I will obey God".¹⁹

Church leaders, led by the Archbishop, vowed that they would hold a protest march after the service if the police acted against the restrictees. When the restrictees returned home they were met by security police, who warned them they were under investigation on charges of breaking their restriction orders.²⁰

It shall be recognised that the underlying message in the statements by the Archbishop centred around action and the unjust nature of restrictions on action. One must oppose injustice by action. Freedom of action comes from God. Restriction is blasphemous for it negates God's freedom exemplified in God's people. Tutu is very direct in his imagery. The state is spitting in

the face of God by restricting individuals, since God is revealed in terms of action. Perhaps it is most important to notice where the Archbishop places himself in the conflict. He is working under a Divine appointment in a political realm. Through symbolic performance he commits himself to those who defy the state's orders and act in a manner that is directed towards liberation against injustice. If the police punished them for exercising their divinely given freedom, another symbolic performance was in order in which Tutu would take the lead. As comedic master Tutu centres the struggle upon the ability to "Act" which is vital to existence. The Act of performance at the church service provided an opportunity for another performance.

Two days later, on August 8, the Archbishop led a demonstration in defiance of laws prohibiting open-air protest and in support of the political activists ignoring restrictions. The protest was fifteen minutes long. The Archbishop and about fifty clerics and academics held the illegal gathering on the steps of St Georges Cathedral in Cape Town, it was a placard protest.²¹ Tutu took the lead bearing a placard saying "God's truth cannot be restricted". The Archbishop stood quietly as police filmed him with others. The film could be used as evidence if charges were filed. An outside demonstration of protest was illegal under the terms of the State of Emergency.²² The protest also included a placard that stated "to hell with restrictions". It was also on this day the the MDM gave notice of a symbolic performance that would take place on "whites only" beaches on August 19. No-one was arrested during the placard protest.

In the fifteen minute silent demonstration, the Archbishop's performance symbolised a number of points. To begin, he gave support to those who were restricted by placing himself in an obviously illegal situation. Secondly, the dramatic messages upon the placards placed political restrictions in

direct opposition to God. God cannot be contained by a system of laws. In response to the police visit to the restrictees, another symbolic performance occurred and achieved international attention because of the leadership of the Archbishop.

Perhaps the most unusual symbolic performance occurred the next week on August 17. Two days earlier, the Archbishop announced an illegal demonstration that would help defy the segregation of public facilities such as "whites only" beaches.²³ The announcement of the performance guaranteed press attention as well as a police response. The demonstration was to be part of the church leaders "standing for the truth" campaign. But it would fall under the contextual timetable of the MDM.

Desmond Tutu led the illegal march towards Parliament of about 150 Christians. The march was stopped less than two hundred metres from its origin, St Georges Cathedral, by what one reporter called "a gaggle of gently starched police women, clutching handbags and wearing dreadful hats".²⁴ A young officer, her hands shaking, read out a statement declaring the march illegal and urging the crowd to disperse. Tutu refused and the crowd of protestors sang quietly as they knelt or stood on the pavement in a stand off that lasted most of the hour.²⁵ According to the report of the Cape Times the ugliest moment of the confrontation was when a camera man knocked off a police woman's hat. "Oh ... my hat!" She exclaimed.²⁶ After this tense moment, police escorted the marchers back to the Cathedral.

The use of policewomen, who were not visibly armed, and their reluctance to arrest the marches, was in sharp contrast to the frequent use of teargas and whips by heavily armed riot police in the black townships.²⁷ Journalists who witnessed the march devoted considerable attention to the comparatively low-key response of the police. The previous illegal march by church

leaders on the streets of Cape Town resulted in the protestors being bombarded with a police water cannon and then arrested.²⁸ The Archbishop declared that "we have notched up a victory for non-violence". He also stated that "we don't want victory over the police, they are not our enemies. Apartheid laws are the enemies".²⁹ This attitude is very important for statements of inclusion in other symbolic performances that occurred at later dates.

The police response to the next symbolic performance was quite different. On August 8, an announcement was made that "whites only" beaches were to be the targets of symbolic action by the MDM. Select beaches around Cape Town, Strand and Blouberg were to be the sites of picnics by the protestors on August 19. The day before the beach protest, heavily armed police sealed off all beaches of the Strand a town east of Cape Town, using barbed wire at some places. Apartheid signs at the Strand normally said that the beach and sea were for whites only, but they were covered with notices saying "Danger - No Entry - SAP Dog Training".³⁰ On the Saturday of the protest, buses bringing protestors were turned away at road blocks manned by police and soldiers. The Archbishop passed through three road blocks before reaching the Strand.³¹ The presence of Tutu made a difference in the police response. Before the Archbishop arrived at the Strand, riot police chased protestors with whips. But the security forces stood back when Desmond Tutu was carried shoulder high in defiance of an earlier police order to disperse.³²

Another news report stressed the different treatment of the Archbishop:

Earlier in the day Archbishop Desmond Tutu strode through the police blockade and walked along the beach at the Strand, as scores of police and troops looked on. He walked along the beaches as police barred supporters from joining him.³³ Policemen with dogs stood between the protestors and the sea. Dogs were set on the crowd after the Archbishop left.³⁴

At Bloubergstrand, north of Cape Town, police used whips to drive fifteen or more busloads of protestors from the "whites only" beach as the Archbishop arrived. In a press release to explain the events at Blouberg:

At Bloubergstrand, it was the police who brought violence into the situation when they beat people off the beach. When I arrived on the scene, the crowd had been chased from the beach... was grouped ... along the beach front with policemen lined up along the beach. Some of the crowd wanted to return to the beach. However, I was afraid that police violence against them might lead to a dangerous confrontation and I and others urged the people to get back on their buses and return home.³⁵

The following is a transcript of the message of the Archbishop to the protestors at Blouberg:

Today we have won a victory, not only for ourselves, but for all of South Africa's people, black and white together. Today we have shown that we are a peaceful people and that this is a noble struggle and that our methods are noble and peaceful. But now is the time for a strategic withdrawal. We are not going against our principles, but strategy is very important and we do not want violence or conflict. I am going to ask you now ... to get back on your bus and go home now. Let us thank God for this wonderful day. We have made these our beaches.³⁶

Tutu interpreted the retreat in terms of a greater act of performance that has claimed the beaches for the people of the counter culture. The brutality by the police is shown in contrast to the noble actions of the protestors. The obstacles presented the police exposed the mistaken nature of the dominant culture. It was a culture that allowed dogs on the beach, but not blacks. For Tutu it was a culture against the laws of God.

On Saturday, September 2, the police used teargas, and a water cannon with purple dye to disperse a large demonstration by the MDM and church leaders in the centre of Cape Town. Some protestors were badly beaten by the police outside St Georges Cathedral. The Archbishop protested this police action and was arrested. His arrest was front-page news. The election occurred four days later. The aftermath was the violence in the townships

which resulted in the conflict over corpses discussed in Chapter Two. These acts of police brutality serve as the backdrop for the Peace March on September 13.

The origins of the peace march were found in the person of the Archbishop. He in turn gave the credit for the idea to God. One published report of the motivation came from his personal chaplain, Chris Ahrends. Ahrends gave an interpretation of the events in a South African magazine:

In the early morning of Friday, September 8, the Archbishop was found by his chaplain. Tutu was in his study working on his sermon for the memorial service for the dead which was announced the previous day. He had obviously had a restless night. "I am going to call for a march next week", he said to Ahrends. "I'm going to call on all Capetonians to show their outrage at what has happened". Ahrends later said it was as if God had spoken with a prophetic voice. Tutu had consulted no-one, there had been no strategy meeting. Out of his anguish, depression and prayer ... this thing had come. A march to show outrage. In the midst of all this ugliness, this thing just ... fell out of heaven.³⁷ The Archbishop further elaborated upon the origin of the idea for the march.

I was sitting there (in my office) preparing my address for ... the memorial service in the Cathedral. I was sitting there writing when ... well you assume that you are trying to be in touch with God ..., and that God was saying 'that is what you should do'.³⁸

The significance of this statement was not to question whether or not God actually spoke to Desmond Tutu. The important point was that the motivations of the march were attributed to religious motives with specific emphasis placed upon an "Act". Since Burke established that God could be conceived in terms of action, God therefore could perpetuate action through symbolic performances against a political force. Tutu rested the motivation of the march upon the Divine. In so doing, the symbolic performance illustrated his understanding of the role of God in the struggle towards social changes.

On September 8, the Archbishop announced the protest at the end of the memorial service. The newly-installed Mayor of Cape Town, Gordon Oliver,

who represented the white City Council, told journalists after the service that he would join the march.³⁹ On Sunday, September 10, the proposed march received wide publicity. The Mayor's decision to join is the main subject of attention in the white oriented press. It is important to keep in mind that the proposed action on the following Wednesday was illegal. It was proposed a little over a week after marchers were beaten and painted purple by the police. Hence, the Mayor of the city endorsed the illegal action initiated by the Archbishop. The performance was to be monitored by diplomatic envoys from twelve countries, including the United States, Britain, Canada, Portugal, Spain, Australia, France, West Germany, Italy, The Netherlands, Norway and Sweden.⁴⁰

On the day before the march, an "open letter to the people of Cape Town" was issued declaring the theme for the march to be "peace in our city". The Archbishop conveyed the peaceful intention of the march in a telephone conversation with the Minister of Law and Order, Adriaan Vlok. The Archbishop refused to ask for government approval or to allow restrictions to be placed on the march. Late that evening the Minister of Justice, Kobie Coetzee telephoned the Archbishop to ask for details. It appeared that the Government was intending to issue permission formally despite the lack of a request for such permission.⁴¹ This was shown the following day as headlines read "FW: It's okay to march". The State President gave his permission for the act to take place. He stated "the door to a new South Africa is open there is no need to batter it down".⁴²

The act of the peace march was the first legal South African protest since the State of Emergency was imposed in 1986. Therefore, since the legal obstacle was removed, this act became the first symbolic drama that was able to occur "legally" during a three year period. Its symbolic theme was peace against the background of police violence. In this act, the police

were urged to stay away. The symbolic drama, recognised in terms of act, was open to all who wished to participate in a march of 1.5 kilometres from St Georges Cathedral to the City Hall. The results were staggering.

Acknowledged as the biggest march in South Africa in thirty years, Archbishop Desmond Tutu led a conservative estimate of 30,000 people singing and dancing through the streets of Cape Town.⁴³ Other estimates ranged upwards to a total of 60,000 or 70,000 including those who were spectators. The act was hailed as a turning point in the struggle for it was the first time the National Party Government had taken the attitude that people were entitled to express their political views this way.⁴⁴ The Tutu-inspired Cape Town march also proved to those who opposed the march, that such an act could be accomplished without problems. According to one newspaper report "It went off like a march of doves". Symbolically, the marchers claimed "Today we have freed Cape Town."⁴⁵ Because of the success of this march, similar acts of symbolic drama were led in other major cities throughout the country, all led by church leaders protesting election night violence. In Grahamstown about 2000 protestors marched to the local police station on September 19. In Johannesburg, on September 15, a march to the police headquarters was reported by secular newspapers to have involved over 25,000 marchers. Durban was the site of a march of over 20,000 protestors on September 22.⁴⁶ Other marches took place in Pretoria, Port Elizabeth, East London and King Williams Town.

It is crucial to realise that through the course of these actions social change did occur. The plan of the oppositional critic/comedic master against the dominant culture resulted in the removal of enforcement that previously would have been an obstacle in symbolic performance. Thus, symbolic drama then became a viable form of political expression for thousands of people. This opportunity was promptly exercised. Each act was

totally peaceful in nature and occurred without incident. The marches were symbolic acts of synthesis between the religious and the political, directed against the ruling culture. In response the parameters of performance were changed. This was noticed and articulated in media reports world wide. Tutu's march was a tremendous success.

On the date of September 20, a meeting of the Standing for the Truth campaign held a press conference which the Archbishop attended. At this performance it was announced that there would be a second beach protest at the Strand on September 30. Before the protest, demonstrators would be able to take courses in non-violent response. Setting this action in context, the Archbishop stated, "We are not facing enemies, but potential friends and everyone should realise that".⁴⁷ It is here that a principle of inclusion was again emphasised. The police were not the enemy. Once they had seen their mistakes they would recognise their errors. Through symbolic action, the conversion of the dominant culture was presented as possible.

The final performance in the defiance campaign that will be focused upon is the second beach protest. Roughly a thousand people showed up at the Strand for the event. A police spokesman stated "We are not interested in upholding beach apartheid."⁴⁸ But significant police presence was, nevertheless, in attendance. Some officers wore bathing suits and Hawaiian shirts. Before the Archbishop arrived a police officer warned that in terms of the Internal Security Act the crowd should disperse or "force and firearms would be used". Tutu then arrived wearing a sailor's cap and his "Just call me Arch" T-shirt. When the Archbishop spoke to the police, an unidentified man, dressed in civilian clothes told him to "enjoy himself" and then gave the police standing by a thumbs up signal. The police tactics immediately changed. They still monitored the picnic and marched up and down the beach. They did not, however, take action.⁴⁹ The police did not

attempt to stop black people from walking on the beaches and there was no repetition of the violence at the last protest of August 19.⁵⁰ The protest lasted for approximately three hours.

At 1pm Archbishop Tutu and Dr Allan Boesak held a service of thanksgiving on the pier at the main parking lot. At the service, they interpreted the protest in religious terms of inclusivity. "A few weeks ago", Tutu declared, the police "would have been chasing us, today we want them to come and join us". He continued to pronounce the protest action a success. "We have claimed this beach, this sea for all God's people".⁵¹ The next day at the World Conference on Religion and Peace held in Durban, he placed a further interpretation on the actions. "We have no doubt, no matter what anyone may want to say, whatever they are going to do, that we are going to be free. All of us, black and white in this lovely, lovely South Africa".⁵² Again the Archbishop made reference to the quality of knowledge that motivated him.

It can be argued that the involvement of Tutu made the difference in this symbolic performance. At the point of his arrival the attitude of the police changed and no other threats of force were made. The headlines read that "Tutu claims "God's Beaches", which again stressed the role of God in symbolic acts against laws that the oppositional critic has deemed unjust according to his quality of knowledge. This knowledge was exemplified by others in individual acts. In these acts it was also possible to invite the dominant culture to join to expose evil.

The performances of the defiance campaign in the months of August and September led to a land mark meeting between the State President, F W De Klerk and the Archbishop, joined by other religious leaders. In this case, the defiance campaign was the first step towards negotiations, as it was

preparing the ground for genuine negotiations by trying to secure the necessary conditions.⁵³ On October 6, the Archbishop issued a statement asking for an urgent meeting with the president. Tutu announced:

I have asked for the meeting so that we can spell out to Mr De Klerk the steps he needs to take to create a climate that is conducive to genuine and productive negotiations to resolve the crisis facing South Africa.⁵⁴

President De Klerk responded positively to the request within hours, signalling his willingness to talk to the leaders of the MDM⁵⁵. The State President met with the Archbishop, Allan Boesak, and Frank Chikane in Pretoria for two and a half hours on October 11. The meeting lasted much longer than expected.

Before the meeting the Archbishop explained his position to journalists. In one interview it was indicated that he was one of the leading figures of the MDM. Tutu responded:

No, I am not. I am a church leader. I am not really a part of the MDM in that sense. I am carrying out in many ways the mandate of our church which has accepted the Standing for the Truth Campaign. That initiative is locked into the initiative of the MDM.

Tutu further defined his role:

We are not claiming to be negotiators, but people who were seeking to be facilitators in the process of negotiations ... because if our political leaders would have been released, then they are the people who by rights must represent us. While the churches have taken a leading role, that has in part been due to the fact that many of the organisations have been banned or restricted and the churches have therefore stepped into that particular vacuum.⁵⁶

At the meeting with the President, the church leaders presented a list that they believed the government had to take immediately. The list included six steps: the lifting of the State of Emergency, the lifting of restrictions on all people, releasing all people detained without trial, lifting restrictions and unbanning political organisations, releasing all political

CHAPTER FOUR : SYMBOLIC TRANSFERENCE AND RELATIONSHIP

After the meeting with the State President, the Archbishop's involvement in protests and marches dropped drastically. The oppositional critic had placed terms of negotiation and action into the hands of the leader of the dominant culture. It was up to President F W De Klerk to respond to the given agenda of the church leaders.

The week after the historic meeting, Desmond Tutu contributed an editorial piece to the New York Times. It ran in the Times on October 20 and was printed in the International Herald Tribune's following weekend edition. The article's title was "Now is not the time to Ease the Pressure on De Klerk". The emphasis of the article should be apparent. The Archbishop was calling for a continued international pressure upon the South African government through financial sanctions and banning direct air links. In this article Tutu sets the tone for a majority of the remaining time period in this study. The final paragraphs stated:

If we are to judge Mr De Klerk by his actions, he needs a little time to plan and implement action. Let us see what he achieves in his first 100 days. Then we should evaluate carefully what he tells the opening session of parliament next year and give him say, three months after that to make the necessary legislative changes.¹

While the State President was not given a time table, the oppositional critic of the oppressive culture gave a fairly specific framework to the international community. Not only in South Africa, but also internationally, Desmond Tutu was a symbol.

The given 100 days marked time before the opening of Parliament. Again, the central focus was upon "action". Since the critic is allowing a given amount of time for the President to act, it should be important to concentrate upon the actions and performances of the oppositional critic

during the same time period. In the case of Desmond Tutu, these actions seemed to be dominated by a symbolic transference of the political struggle of blacks in South Africa to the plight of Palestinians in the nation of Israel. This comparison provided a backdrop for the Archbishop's conflicts with Jewish leaders in Israel, as well as in South Africa and the United States.

In order to better understand the nature of the impact of symbolic transference and relationships to other political struggles, several points need to be made. To begin, it will be necessary to establish the relationship between the Israeli and South African governments and the broader context of the marginalised cultures and organisations that operate in each country. Once this has been accomplished, a chronology of the Archbishop's actions will be given to show his involvement in conflicts with Jewish leaders in South Africa which set the stage for confrontation with Jews in Israel and the United States. Specific attention will be placed upon the Archbishop's Christmas visit to Jerusalem and the international uproar that resulted in the Jewish community of faith. Finally conclusions will be developed regarding the importance of the transferring of symbols from one culture to another, and the role of the media in that relationship. This chapter will show how an oppositional critic from one oppressed culture transfers the symbols of his particular struggle into another context and it will examine the results of that dynamic relationship.

In an article published within the 100 day time period from October 20 to February 2, Lawrence Freedman commented upon the similarities between the relationship between Israel and South Africa. According to Freedman, South Africa was far above Israel in reforming injustices in the political systems. The title of the article was "No longer Sin Twins". Its final paragraphs set the dynamics of the relationship between the two countries

and the intense nature of their interaction with an oppositional culture. Symbolic evil such as racial superiority and the horrors of the Holocaust do not deter the relationship in spite of obvious similarities. The countries share the same world perception of their internal conflicts.

Few comparisons are as odious to Israel as that with South Africa. Apartheid represents a direct link with doctrines of racial superiority which sent millions of Jews to their deaths and made the demand for a Jewish homeland almost irresistible ... None the less, the comparison is frequently made. The two countries share uprisings regional isolation and pariah status in the international community. When their representatives stand to speak at the United Nations they trigger mass walk outs while other regimes of oppression and brutality linked to their names are listened to politely. In the rhetoric of the worldisms, 'Zionism' and 'racism' are coupled and are a notorious UN resolution described as synonymous ... Such conditions forge a shared embattled outlook in Pretoria and Tel Aviv and have even lead to collaboration, especially in study areas of international affairs.²

A particularly sensitive area of collaboration was found in the purchase of military weapons and technology. Significant breakthrough occurred in mid-July 1989. An American television network broadcast news reports linking the two countries with the production of nuclear tipped missiles. Newsweek magazine chronicled the story.

For years now it has been a more or less open secret in defense circles that Israel is engaged in military collaboration with the apartheid government of South Africa. Israel is thought to be South Africa's largest arms supplier ... (The American news) "network charged that: Jerusalem was involved in a full blown partnership with Pretoria to produce a nuclear tipped missile for South Africa:. It said South Africa's testing range was built to Israeli specifications ... the first missile flight of the Jerusalem-Pretoria alliance on July 5th ... In exchange for technology Israel gets the use of test facilities there and continuous supply of enriched uranium for its nuclear warheads.³

The timing of this event was very important. It was released at the beginning of the time period of this study, thus it falls into the realm of criticism of the comedic master of oppositional culture. It was therefore a question of timing in terms of response to the situation The Archbishop's response to this topic has been previously shown in his analogy between South Africa's oppression of blacks and Israel's oppression of Palestinians.

According to the Archbishop's spokesman, John Allen,

It is not the first time the issues have got coverage ... I mean his views on the Palestinians. His views on two things have got coverage before. In fact these are two issues. One is his view on the Palestinians, just as the legitimacy of their cause and the justice of their cause. The other is the Israeli Government's collaboration with South Africa. Nuclear collaboration, military collaboration. The former issue has got more attention than the latter. The issue of the Israeli Government's military collaboration with South Africa can not be a new issue to people in tune with public issues.⁴

The comparison of Palestinians to South African blacks was made on a number of levels. Just as blacks in South Africa had no political rights, Palestinians, in the occupied territories, did not have rights. The only way they were likely to obtain them was from the Israeli Government.⁵ Both marginalised groups had a representative organisation of illegal political support found in the African National Congress and the Palestinian Liberation Organisation. Each Organisation combined popular support with regional backing, but has embraced violent action because of disbelief in the possibility of constitutional change. Governments claimed that this recourse to violence disqualified both organisations from a representative role.⁶

Given this background for the relationship between the governments of the two countries and the similarities between the two groups that are oppressed by them, it will be possible to move to the acts and performances of the Archbishop and his transference of South African symbols into the Middle-East conflict. Crucial to this symbolic transference was the quality of knowledge of liberation, as previously discussed. Religious terminology, as well as classification, is also vital for this time period. It is very difficult, if not impossible, to separate the Nation of Israel from the Jewish religion and experience. Therefore, the train of thought that can develop is that since the Archbishop has spoken out for the Palestinians that places him in direct opposition with Israel and therefore the Jewish

people. This has resulted in the Archbishop being labelled anti-semitic, anti-Israel or confused as to the events of Jewish history. By looking at the chronology of events, it will be possible to understand these allegations in the context of symbolic transference.

One theme that was constant in the dialogue between each relationship was the negative association of the label "Nazi". Whenever any culture group wished to criticise another, immediate reference was made to the Nazis or the Nazi instigation of the Holocaust. These two symbols, the Nazis and the Holocaust, are also transferred throughout the course of the relationship.

Before the election in September, Archbishop Tutu made a comment that linked the date of the election to the fiftieth anniversary of the Nazi invasion of Poland and the beginning of the Second World War. In essence that was the beginning of the end for the Nazi party. Tutu then went on to transfer the role of the Nazis to the Nationalist Party Government of South Africa and how the election would mark the beginning of the destruction of apartheid rule. This comment received little attention in light of the protests that were occurring at the time. However, a response was made by the Archbishop on his televised debate with Bishop Frank Retief on October 22, received much broader reaction. While discussing the morality of sanctions Bishop Retief asked Tutu: "Must not a Christian cast himself upon sovereign God when all else fails. The Archbishop responded: "Did you throw yourself on Sovereign God when Nazis killed six million Jews ... No of course not ... You said this evil must be stopped ... The nations of the world went to war over the death of six million Jews".⁷ This response was crucial. It provided the opportunity to argue over this interpretation of history by the comedic master by South African Jewish Leaders. The argument however, did not begin until over three weeks after the broadcast. In order to better understand the dynamics of this conflict of interpretation and symbolic

transference, a chronology of the Archbishop's action needs to be established.

The days after the television interview, on October 23, the Archbishop met with Palestinian Liberation Organisation Leaders Yasser Arafat in Cairo, Egypt to discuss Egypt's effort to promote Israeli-Palestinian dialogue. Among the issues discussed by Tutu and Arafat were the situation of Palestinians in Israeli occupied territories, the similarities between the plight of Palestinians and that of black South Africans, and the recognition of Arafat and his organisation of Israel's right to exist.⁸ In an interview following the meeting, the Archbishop commented upon collaboration between the Israeli and South African Governments as well as the treatment of Palestinians in the occupied territories. The Archbishop stated:

One of the awful things really is having to find that people who have the kind of history and tradition as the Jews should be ready to collaborate with the South African Government, many of whom had supported the Nazis. The Israeli's seem ... to be seeking to deny the Palestinians their right to self-determination, and are quite determined to put down the people's protest for justice violently. It is almost a replica of what is taking place in South Africa.⁹

The following week it was announced in South African and Israeli papers that the Archbishop would be travelling to Israel for a four day "spiritual pilgrimage" during the Christmas holidays as the guest of an East Jerusalem Anglican Bishop. The Jerusalem Post noted that two years earlier the Archbishop had turned down an invitation from an official of the Foreign Ministry of the Israeli Government. No meetings with Government leaders was scheduled.¹⁰

On November 3, The Jerusalem Post ran another article that dealt with the visit. The article quoted an unnamed Government official who was "apprehensive" about the Christmas visit because Tutu "would use the occasion to draw a parallel between the plight of the blacks in South

Africa and that of the Arabs under Israeli rule".¹¹ The article also quoted Eliahu Lankin who was ambassador to South Africa from 1981 to 1985. He stated that Tutu was antagonistic to Israel and unsympathetic to the Jews. Lankin went on to describe his first meeting with the Archbishop. Tutu had asked how it was possible that the Jews, who had suffered so much persecution, could oppress other people. In reply Lankin invited Tutu to come and see for himself.

I promised him that he would be free to go wherever he wished and meet with whomever he pleased and he agreed to come. But two days later he was already backing down, apparently on the advice of his PLO advisors. Now evidently, his PLO advisors say he should come.¹²

One can determine that the stage of conflict was already set. The Archbishop met with the chief figure of opposition to the Israeli Government, Yasser Arafat, and linked the similarities of the two struggles. Tutu then announced a trip to Israel which would further broadcast parallels of the struggles. A constant attitude was the negative relationship of oppression between the Nazis and the Jews in World War Two. Six weeks prior to the visit, it was depicted as a time of confrontation and of symbolic transference. The Israeli Government did not want to be seen in the same manner as the South African Government. The visit by the Archbishop would transfer the struggle of oppression as well as promote new articulation through his various performances and actions while in the area.

The Archbishop's views of history were questioned by two Cape Town Rabbis in a letter to the editor of the Cape Towns. The article, which appeared on November 14, was in response to the comments made by the Archbishop three weeks earlier in his debate with Bishop Frank Retief on October 22. The letter was in opposition to the Archbishop's interpretation of the historic events of the Holocaust. This would be an attempt of symbolic correction against the comic master's interpretation of events in the dramatic

struggle against oppression. The thrust of the Rabbi's statement was that World War Two was not fought to save Jews. The article was published in several other papers nation wide. It stated

It is most distressing that the Archbishop of the Anglican Church has revealed his lack of understanding of the events which led to the outbreak of World War Two in terms that have been associated with the cruellest of anti-Semitic canards specifically, the assertion that World War Two, and the sacrifice it brought to millions was fought to save the Jews from Nazi Holocaust ... No Reverend Archbishop, the nations went to war to save themselves from slavery to Nazi tyranny ... World War Two was not fought to save the Jews, nor was saving the Jews the primary goal of the Allies in their war against Hitler ... The memory of the dead must be honoured. It is unacceptable to misuse their eternal memory for momentary political gain.¹³

This claim of anti-Semitism and misrepresentation of facts resulted in broad coverage of the charges and a highly publicised conflict over Holocaust between Tutu and the Rabbis. In an article in The Sunday Tribune of November 18, titled "Tutu, Rabbis in major row" a counter-statement was given by Tutu's press spokesman, John Allen:

We find it difficult to follow their accusation. It makes sense only if the Rabbis assume that the Archbishop would have been opposed to going to war to save Jews from the Holocaust. If that is their assumption, then they are quite wrong. The Holocaust is always the one supreme example the Archbishop uses in talking about massive atrocities and evil things that governments do to people.¹⁴

Historically, the views of the Rabbis are well grounded. The response of the Archbishop was based upon the nature of evil that was intrinsically associated with the event and its application to the South African struggle. The important point was not whether or not the Archbishop response was historically accurate. It was not. The critical focus of these statements was the conflict over the use of a sacred symbol, in this case the atrocities of the Holocaust. Specifically, it was relating the Nazi's activities to the South African Government by association. Tutu placed the actions of the Israelies in relation to their treatment of the Palestinians as being Nazi-like in application of suffering. This spiral of symbolic

transference turned a sacred symbol against those who hold it sacred. Tutu was accused of being Anti-semitic - because he held a position that was against the Israeli government. This position was drawn from collaboration and by symbolic transference into the situation. The argument is over the historical interpretation of a comedic master in a different context of struggle.

The first weeks of December held a few performances that should be recognised. On December 4, it was reannounced that the Archbishop would be visiting Israel over Christmas. Several newspapers nationwide saw a statement identical to the one that had been released on November 2. The major quoted source was the Good Hope magazine, an Anglican periodical. The articles gave no new information about the "peace pilgrimage". The previous day Desmond Tutu was in Washington DC paying tribute to Harry Belafonte. An article that was published in December 6, stated"

Archbishop Desmond Tutu, America's favourite South African, was given a standing ovation when he made a surprise appearance at the Kennedy Centre to pay tribute to singer-actor Harry Belafonte ... Bishop Tutu told the audience of entertainers and politicians that it was an age of miracles because he had flown thousands of miles to make a two-minute speech.¹⁵

On December 18, the American appreciation of the Archbishop continued as it was announced that he would participate in the inauguration of New York City Mayor David Dinkins,

Archbishop Desmond Tutu who long ago attained celebrity status in the United States and has become a frequent visitor, will join Harry Belafonte, the actor-singer at the inaugural ceremony for New York's First black Mayor on New Year's Day.¹⁶

The Archbishop would go to New York after his trip to Israel.

The days prior to the Archbishop's arrival in Jerusalem, were being prepared for as a media event with international ramifications. The Executive

Director of the committee for Accuracy in Middle East reporting in America (CAMERA) wrote a strong letter to the editor of The Jerusalem Post concerning Archbishop Tutu's visit to Israel. He wrote:

Many of Tutu's remarks about Jews deserve to be characterised as nothing less than anti-Semitic ... The Tutu visit has all the ingredients for yet another spectacular anti-Israel blitz in the world media. Headlines will tell of Tutu, the Christian clergyman scolding the Jews for their misbehaviour' and Tutu, the South African black activist comparing Israeli treatment of Arabs to blacks under apartheid.¹⁷

The next day CAMERA placed a quarter page advertisement in The Jerusalem Post with the banner "Is Desmond Tutu's visit to Israel a peace mission or a Partisan tactic?" It went on to state:

A genuine peace mission to Israel by Archbishop Desmond Tutu would be most welcome. But in light of his extensive record of making derogatory remarks about Israel and Jews. Tutu's Christmas visit to Israel cannot be considered a true mission of peace, but rather a partisan tactic designed to publicly distort the view of the Arab-Israeli conflict.¹⁸

The Israeli Government was already making preparations for the large media contingent. That same day The Jerusalem Post reported that the Minister of Religious Affairs had requested that the bishop postpone his visit to the Western Wall for a few hours. The minister said that "worshippers would be offended by the presence of large numbers of journalists and cameramen, and it would be better for Tutu to go in the evening".¹⁹ The next day an item stated that the Ministry of Religious Affairs was pushing Chief Rabbis to meet with the Archbishop. The article read:

Officials, ... who are also unhappy about the visit which they fear will be exploited to mount a public relations campaign on behalf of the Palestinians, are pressing the chief Rabbis to meet with Tutu. Both because they hope the Rabbis can influence the Archbishop and because the failure of the Rabbis to receive him could contribute to an even more extreme anti-Israel stand.²⁰

The day before he left for Israel, the Israeli newspaper Ha'aretz published an interview in which the Archbishop criticised Israeli policies in the

occupied territories in carefully worded comments. The Archbishop stated:

I find worrismatic parallels between the way the governments of Israel and South Africa react to unrest ... I must say that I find it extremely hard to understand Israel's policy in this area ... I am a black South African and if I were to change the names, a description of what is happening in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank could describe the events in South Africa.²¹

These statements in the telephone interview upset Israeli government officials. Jewish leaders reacted sharply accusing Archbishop Tutu of harbouring "anti-Israeli sentiments which appear to border on anti-Semitic". The country's two chief Rabbis ultimately rejected his request to meet with him. The spokesman for the Rabbis said, "If they like someone they meet with him, if not, not".²² Israeli security officers said that they fear Archbishop Tutu, who is sure to be followed by an army of television cameras, could provide a boost to the Palestinian uprising.²³ All of this was happening before the Archbishop set foot upon Israeli soil on December 22.

The following four day visit held few surprises. The first public service was held on Christmas Eve. Tutu arrived to a tumultuous welcome by hundreds of townspeople who shouted "ANC-PLO". Tutu made his way through a crush of cameramen and townspeople.²⁴ He told the joyful Palestinian crowd, "Victory in your struggle for sovereign nationhood is assured because God is on your side".²⁵ "God sides with those whom the world despises ... God is with those whom it oppresses".²⁶ The Archbishop also spoke of the right of Israel to exist as a nation.

Speaking at a carol service, Tutu described the condition of blacks in South Africa, implicitly comparing them to Palestinians in the territories. South African blacks are deprived of political rights, employed in menial occupations, imprisoned, exiled, teargassed, shot and killed. "Our people

know in their hearts that victory is assured. They know that their struggle is not in vain... If it can happen in South Africa with its apartheid policy, it must be able to happen anywhere. It will happen here".²⁷ He further told the crowd to refer to the struggle of blacks in his country as a source of inspiration. A bomb threat disrupted a Christmas Eve midnight mass at St Georges Cathedral where the Archbishop was preaching. In his Christmas service at St Georges Tutu hinted that Israel should talk to the PLO and urged the government to recognise Palestinian rights to self-determination.²⁸ In a press conference later on Christmas day at the Cathedral, Tutu reacted to the cool reception he received in Israel. He stated:

I have absolutely nothing against Jews. It would be contrary to the basis of my faith. I believe that they are a tremendous people from the basis of their faith, but I think many of them have deflected from that faith ... The Bible says that Israel will be the light of the nations. It speaks about Israel being an agent of God for establishing justice and peace. There is no way I am going to say that treating the Palestinians the way they do is just. And if they revile me for that, tough luck, they do so with quite a number of their own prophets ... When I say I believe something is wrong, then I do not care who perpetrates that wrong. I will criticise them for doing so.²⁹

On this final day in Israel, the day after Christmas, the Archbishop's major plans were to visit the Yad Vashem Holocaust memorial and to meet with Israeli Religious Affairs Minister Zevulun Hammer. Overnight vandals wrote "Tutu is a black Nazi pig" on the wall of St Georges Anglican Church in East Jerusalem where he celebrated Christmas Mass.³⁰

The visit to the Holocaust memorial proved to be especially controversial. After a tour of the movement commemorating the six million Jews who died under Hitler, journalists asked what he would say to the children of Holocaust victims. Tutu responded:

As our Lord would say in the end, the positive thing that can come ... is the spirit of forgiving, not forgetting. Saying; God, this has happened to us ... we pray for those who made it happen, forgive them

and help us to forgive them, and help us so that we in our turn will not make others suffer.³¹

Tutu also mentioned that seeing the pictures of starving Jewish children in European ghettos reminded him of black experiences in South Africa, and that he himself was a "victim of injustice living in a ghetto".³²

The Archbishop arrived at the ministry of religious affairs to find that vandals had written "Tutu is a Nazi" in black marker on the wall of the ministry building.³³ After his meeting with Minister Hammer, both of the men held an informal press conference. The Archbishop repeated earlier statements about the Jews forcing others to suffer and the comparison with blacks in South Africa. Mr Hammer replied that such a view of the Middle East showed a lack of understanding. He urged the Archbishop to recognise the Israeli view. "It is to my sorrow a simple lack of understanding and it is worthwhile to clarify because the situation is completely different ... we (Israel) are the ones who were persecuted".³⁴

As Tutu left Israel, negative press coverage was appearing on three continents. Back in South Africa the Chief Rabbi of Johannesburg, Cyril Harris, announced publicly that Tutu's statement that "God was on the side of the Palestinians" was a distortion of the Bible which gives "the children of Israel the right to the Holy Land".³⁵ In the United States, Jewish leaders criticised the Archbishop's suggestion to forgive and pray for the Nazi perpetrators of the Holocaust. The National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council, the American Jewish Congress, the New York Jewish Community Relations Council and the B'nai B'rith Anti deformation League issued statements criticising Tutu.³⁶ In New York City the role of the Archbishop in the inauguration for Mayor David Dinkins was questioned in terms of black-Jewish relations. One Jewish leader, Rabbi Abraham Weiss asked Dinkins to drop Tutu from the programme. Dinkins refused. Weiss then

planned to organise a public protest against Tutu for his statements and against Dinkins for a refusal to rescind the invitation.³⁷

Meanwhile in Israel The Jerusalem Post published an editorial titled "A dissonant pilgrimage". It read:

Archbishop Tutu ... has come and gone ... his visit was billed as a pilgrimage ... It was not supposed to have any political significance. But Desmond Tutu is a very political Archbishop. Capturing media attention wherever he goes, he could not refrain from using his visit to broadcast his views on the Palestinians, the Jews and Israel ... in his visit to Yad Vashem. Evidently he could summons no deeper understanding than to compare the Holocaust to the sufferings of his people in South Africa ... Ironically that piece of obtusiveness made the Archbishop only the second famous visitor to emerge from Yad Vashem with nothing more than an awkward observation. The first was his late countryman, John Vorster, who while visiting here as Prime Minister, could only compare the Nazi murder centres to the British concentration camps of the Boer War ... But Desmond Tutu also had advice, that Jewish people should forgive those responsible for the Holocaust ... yet the Archbishop has not been know to ask forgiveness of his own tormentors at home ... Desmond Tutu (is) a political cleric fastened to the single issue of his own people's aspirations through which he filters and distorts all else, with neither the spiritual or historical imagination that his title and celebrated international reputation would signify.³⁸

At the ceremony for David Dinkins in New York City, Rabbi Weiss did stage a protest but Tutu received a standing ovation. The Archbishop was also the intended reciprocant of a balloon filled with water, delivered while he was addressing the crowd. The water balloon burst on the head of a nearby city councillor.³⁹ In his speech the Archbishop hailed Dinkins victory in New York as a sign that one day soon South African blacks will be celebrating freedom. "We must walk together into the future, nothing will stop us for the people are unstoppable. Thank you for your victory, we shall overcome, we shall be free".⁴⁰

That week, after the Archbishop left, New York's outgoing mayor, Ed Koch, a powerful figure among American Jews, castigated the Archbishop in the most savage public attack made by an American public figure.⁴¹ Koch made

reference that Tutu said "Jews in South Africa will pay unless Israel supports the black cause, the Archbishop went to Jerusalem to indulge in pro-Arab" politics and that he found it particularly objectionable that Archbishop Tutu compared the Israeli government to the government of South Africa and for implying a similarity between Israel's policies on the West Bank to the conduct of Nazi Germany.⁴² From South Africa the Archbishop denied the charges on January 7. He stated "It is very strange. I saw Koch in New York a few days ago and we spoke very warmly. Why does he wait until I have left New York? I am shocked that he has descended to this level"⁴³

The rest of the month of January held a rehash of the trip. David Hoffman, one of the Rabbis who criticised the Archbishop's response on the killing of Jews in the Television debate, wrote an article accusing that Tutu was "bearing false witness" on the Holocaust. It was published on January 14. Again two weeks after the performance took place, newspapers carried numerous letters to the editor dealing with the Archbishop and the Middle East. In Cape Town, Mr A Parker ran a count of positions of letters to the editor of the Cape Times. In the five week period ending in January, there were seventeen letters about the Archbishop. Three were for, fourteen were against. The total of positive published words were 150 against 1200 negative⁴⁴. In a letter to the editor of the Sunday Star, a writer labelled Tutu an "actor without a stage". Chief Rabbi Cyril Harris of Johannesburg, who called Tutu's stand on Palestine a distortion of the Bible was publicly challenged to a debate at the largest hall in South Africa by the president of the Islamic Propagation Centre, Achmed Deedat. The subject of discussion would be over the statement by the Archbishop "God is on the side of the Palestinians".⁴⁵ The rabbi refused to participate. Letters and articles continued until the end of the month of January, ranging from defending the Archbishop to congratulating Ed Koch of New York. The issue finally faded from the presses with President De Klerk's Parliament speech

delivered on February 2. Until that performance, the majority of the previous one hundred days press coverage of the Archbishop dealt with his relationship and interaction with the Palestinian situation in Israel.

The dynamics of the symbolic transference that occurred between the four parties in this quadrangle was very intense. In developing conclusions several points need to be stressed. First of all the opinions of the Archbishop concerning Israel and the Palestinians that caused the uproar were not new. That was established in the interview performance of the Archbishop following his meeting with Yasser Arafat on October 23. In retrospect the Archbishop's media spokesman John Allen stated:

The issues he raised were not new ... (the trip to Jerusalem) ... created more publicity and more attacks on him (Tutu) publically than he had been exposed to before ... The fact that it was Archbishop Tutu speaking may have been faintly new or got more publicity than it had before.⁴⁶

The Archbishop only restated or expanded upon opinions already stated. The events of the Jerusalem pilgrimage were not a revelation to anyone who had monitored his statements about Israel.

Secondly, the concept of negative labelling of symbols is high amongst all groups in the dynamic relationship. The Archbishop drew parallels between the South African Government and the Nazis. This, by association placed the Israeli government in a symbolically similar form of behaviour in dealing with the Palestinians. The sacred symbol of the Holocaust is vied over in terms of historical interpretation and application. In turn, Israeli and Jewish leaders labelled Tutu as being anti-semitic and linked his views to the instigators of apartheid. The Jerusalem Post even compared the Archbishop to the former South African Prime Minister, John Vorster. Vandals labelled Tutu as a Nazi in Jerusalem while he was there. That negative symbol was then transferred to the United States where Jewish

leaders attacked and elaborated upon the Archbishop and his remarks. The negative symbol once used by the Archbishop was then reversed and used against him in the public arena. Ed Koch stated that attacking the Archbishop in the United States was "a lot like attacking Mother Theresa".⁴⁷ Yet it occurred.

Third, Israeli Government and public responses to the visit of the Archbishop were significant. The major focus of the argument against Tutu is not the issue that the Palestinians were being mistreated. Public outrage was over the association of the plight of the Arab in the occupied territories with blacks in South Africa. The negative response was against the symbolic transference. The minister of Religious Affairs made the point of saying Tutu was confused. The situations were different. Also the fear of the Archbishop's visit was articulated always in terms of press coverage. The fear was that anti-Israel views would be broadcast world wide. Desmond Tutu, the lens through which the world viewed South Africa, was coming to Israel. On arrival he then stated that he felt like he was at home. The performance of the oppositional critic of one oppressed culture provided a great deal of coverage for a situation he deemed "similar" in nature.

This entire performance period can seem to show the difficulties, as well as range, of an established symbolic performer. It is true that Desmond Tutu related most political situations to his own political context. That should be expected since he was rooted so deeply in the struggle against apartheid. It was this context that had brought him international acclaim. It is because of this acclaim that he was invited to Israel and the United States. This chronology should show that it is not possible for a symbolic performer, oppositional critic or comedic master to separate himself from the quality of knowledge or culture that he represents. That culture is vital to his symbolic identity and application. When symbolic transference

does occur it does not hold as much value outside of the original cultural context and can more easily be refuted by others who are an opposition to the critic. The Archbishop is an established authority figure in South Africa because of his history with the struggle. When he transfers that struggle to another context (in this case Israel) although he may or may not be accurate, he can be easily disregarded by the oppressors by saying he doesn't know the situation in his full form. This does not mean that the performance does not make an impact. The amount of press coverage should indicate that the Archbishop made international news and had a large audience listening to his views. He also was eagerly accepted by the Palestinian people. The critic however does not have the same power of authority that he would in the context when symbolic transference is placed into the relationship.

The role of the media is noteworthy. In the given chronology of events it was the print media that serves as the battle ground for the Archbishop. Attacks are made in print. It is fair to say that the media did control the controversy to some extent if only in lengthening it. Announcements were made, then re-issued. Rebuttals were run two or three weeks after an event originally took place. In the age of broadcast and print journalism that brings up to the minute reporting this delay would seem to make an issue old news. In the case of the Archbishop's trip to Israel this is not the case. The longer the issue was in the public eye the more it became news because of the reactions of others. The Archbishop's opinion was consistent. The audience was in flux.

Overall, the relationship between Tutu, Israel and the Jews remained in the media because no other performance was given with an intensity to take its place on the international stage. This changed on February 2 with the march to parliament, FW De Klerk's landmark speech and the broad range of

reactions to that performance. The media then had something else to report upon.

The hundred days that Tutu gave the world to judge the actions of the State President were filled with symbolic conflict and transference. These events, acts and performances were very significant because for the first time Desmond Tutu was publically attacked, refuted and protested against internationally. For the first time negative pronouncements were advanced internationally against the Nobel Peace Prize winner because of his pro-Palestinian stance. This attitude is extremely important because through this understanding it will be possible to better analyse the negative attitudes held against the Archbishop in his own country, For the most part, in South Africa, the issue that breeds the greatest amount of negative feeling towards Archbishop Tutu was not his stance on apartheid, but his firm stance on economic sanctions against his country.

CHAPTER FIVE : SYMBOLIC CORRECTION; TUTU, SANCTIONS AND MONETARY SYMBOLISM

The trip to Israel created the first large scale negative reactions towards the Archbishop on the international level. However, the people of South Africa had long been exposed to anti-Tutu rhetoric. The Archbishop had become the subject of protest editorials, articles and bumper stickers for automobiles. The issue of economic sanctions against the South African Government was of the forefront of Tutu's symbolic character within his home country since his installment to the position of Bishop of Johannesburg in 1985. Since that time Tutu's name has been invoked more than any other in calling for all out, preferably mandatory United Nations sanctions against South Africa, a cause he has promoted sedulously and with great vigour over many years.¹ The main effect of his outspoken support of sanctions, according to Tutu's media spokesman, John Allen, is that it "arouses very strong negative feelings in a majority of the white community (of South Africa). That has got him hated and villified in the past and does still now".²

The issue of sanctions, and the Archbishop's support of them, is rooted far beyond the time limitations of this study. It is however the major point of continued negative criticism of Tutu during the given timeframe in spite of his involvement in the Defiance Campaign, the Israel trip, or any performance dealing with the liberation of oppressed peoples in South Africa and the world. By examining the role of money in the context of the South African struggle it will be possible to understand the negative responses towards Tutu by the white dominant culture. It is this issue that created the most tension, thus it reinforced his role as the principle oppositional critic against domination.

Burke provided an excellent methodological definition of the role of money

within the dramatist framework in his book The Grammar of Motives. Money was linked to both religious and political symbolism and praxis. Once Burke's insight has been established it will be possible to look at the role of the Archbishop's involvement with financial sanctions. Special attention will be placed upon the history of involvement, the role of his financial advisor, Terry Crawford-Browne, and intense negative reactions. Finally, a sampling of Tutu's activities in the established time period, dealing with sanctions, will be shown. In so doing, understanding of the financial role in cultural conflict can be achieved.

A significant part of Burke's work in The Grammar of Motives was linking money to the symbolism of liberation and as an expression of freedom. Money develops into a high form of motivation in the capitalist/Western economic process. Burke elaborated upon this foundational relationship of motivation:

The increased use of monetary symbolism as an integral part of the economic process, led nations to develop their productive and distributive systems in accordance with the money motive as a rational test. This necessarily meant a 'transubstantiation' of money, from its function as an agency of economic action into a function as the ground or purpose of economic action.³

Within this framework, monetary motivation becomes a "second nature" to modern humanity. Freedom was developed in this situation not only through the liberties that are available to persons of wealth but upon workers who would freely volunteer to do work. That was unpleasant and includes a high degree of risk. Burke showed that in a capitalist market all that is needed to acquire labourers for an unwanted task was to say "who will do this for five dollars?" People then came forward of their own free will to enlist for the work.⁴ They did it for the motivation of money, not for other forms of satisfaction. The capitalist system therefore presented "opportunity". It was up to the individual to accept or refuse the oppressive conditions.

This view point is extremely relevant to the situation in South African history. In the apartheid system Blacks were given the "opportunity" to work in the gold and diamond mines. Workers were forced to leave the restricted black homeland areas in order to live in mining areas. Thus, they sacrificed family relationships in order to solely work for wages under white supervision. Supposedly the black person had a choice. In the history of apartheid that choice was narrowly defined by the legislation adopted by the ruling white minority. The economic reality was that blacks were needed to do labour that no white man would risk doing. The result was vast exploitation of persons who chose to do the work rather than starve in a homeland with their families. The motivation was to obtain money.

Burke developed money as the common rationale of motivation and reduction. All is reduced to monetary symbolism. "Monetary symbolism is the 'simple', the 'god-term' of which all complexity (is reduced) and attains a unity transcending distinctions of climate, class, nation cultural tradition etc".⁵ He defined the phrase "god-term" as a designation of ultimate motivation, or substance of a given framework.⁶ Thus there was a notion that "the monetary motive can be a technical substitute for God" in that "God" represents the unit substance in which all human diversity of motives are grounded.⁷ Thus, money and religion were parts of the conflict. Burke showed that money was seen as a point of active temptation against God. Religion then speaks against money as being the "root of all evil" and against the divine order of creation and freedom, in that it becomes the united ground of all action as a substitute for God.

Burke did however indicate a point where monetary symbolism works with religious symbolism "as a lowest common denominator for mediating among many motives". He stated that when this does occur the focus would have to be placed in a role outside the point of public mediation⁸. The role is

centered in a religious doctrine of communication directly with God. This role was fulfilled by Desmond Tutu. Using Burke, it is possible to construct the dynamics of the role of monetary symbolism in the struggle against apartheid. Historically the white ruling class, through colonialisation and capitalism, changed the structure of motives within the majority of the population to a motive guided by money. This placed the burden of the gold and diamond mining industries upon blacks. These individuals did not have any political rights but were manipulated into "freely" accepting economic freedoms. Capitalism was stressed through the missionaries of the white church and the goods brought by such individuals as Livingstone and Moffot were more readily accepted than the religious principles they attempted to promote. The result was that black workers have long been the basic brunt of the labour burden in the South African economy. In this scenario they have had little social advancement because of competition and the restrictions placed upon them by the government. This view of monetary symbolism served as a substitute for God for the whites who benefited from black exploitation. Money was more important than treating others as the image of God in humanity.

For the purpose of this study monetary symbolism in the form of sanctions does the work of religious symbolism and performance. This, according to Burke, is a lowest common denominator. Money is central to the moral support for a Government built upon racist classification. Sanctions state the moral wrongness of the situation. This was a point continually activated by the Archbishop. Sanctions must serve as a form of international pressure to bring about change in South Africa's government. For the Archbishop, sanctions work as both a foundation and facilitator for his world-wide symbolic character. This point is elaborated upon by his spokesman John Allen.

If you look at (Tutu as) the international symbol ... sanctions are

inevitably an international issue. The main thing people say when they look at a foreign situation is 'what can we do to make things better in that country?' Sanctions, boycotts and isolation have been the main things western countries have been urged to do in response to oppression in South Africa. And since he is a major figure in promoting sanctions that obviously increases his presence as a symbol internationally.⁹

Tutu was then conversely seen in negative terms in his own country by the white community and that according to Allen, "makes him a more powerful symbol to the black community. If the white community hates and villifies him, this guy must be doing something good".¹⁰

Sanctions have become the symbolic performance of correction against the South African government. They are based on the lowest common denominator of monetary and religious symbolism. This can be seen in the statements of Congressman Joseph Kennedy. He said "If the United States cannot take a resolute and principled stand against the practices of the racist Government of South Africa, then our nation's moral compass has lost its bearings".¹¹ The stand of sanctions was then seen as an extension of support for the quality of knowledge held by the oppositional critic, Desmond Tutu.

Historically the Archbishop and the subject of the sanctions were linked in only generalised terms until 1986. Tutu stated "We had to be cagey because we had been warned about the fact that you could be had up on charges of economic sabotage". In response to a specific question about promoting sanctions, he said: "My friend, if I said yes, that would cost me five years and I would much rather got to jail for something slightly more exciting"¹² (the comic attitude should be noticed). The major starting point of involvement was over the rescheduling of South African loans on the world market in 1985. The Archbishop asked banks not to reschedule South Africa's loans until Regime had handed over to a transitional government. The loans were rescheduled until June of 1990 which provides a vital link to

the time frame of this study.

Tutu stressed that the purpose of sanctions was to provide sufficient leverage to negotiate. He stated that:

To a very large extent my own crusade has been moral. One was saying to people 'We are giving you the opportunity of taking sides, of making a moral decision'. It was important for the South African Government and their supporters to be given an urgent signal that the world was opposed to them, and that the victims of apartheid were made aware that the world dared to take action.¹³

Another factor that must be considered in this background was the introduction of the Archbishop to Terry Crawford-Browne. Crawford-Browne is a member of the Western Province Council of Churches. He is a former foreign exchange official for Nedbank in South Africa, and he became the financial advisor for Tutu in the mid 1980's. Crawford-Browne has also stated that the involvement of the Archbishop has been pivotal in international recognition of sanctions. "It has been the Archbishop's standing that has mad people sit up and notice. People have been talking sanctions for twenty years, but it was only in the mid-1980's that they really began to make an impact".¹⁴ The relationship between the Archbishop and Terry Crawford-Browne is an important one for Crawford-Browne became a major voice of the opposition culture during the time period of this study in regard to sanctions. Because of this he shared negative responses in the white community as well. As financial advisor to Tutu he becomes an object of ridicule.

A common response to sanctions by the white community is that they hurt the blacks of South Africa tremendously. Business leaders reactions have always been strongly against the Archbishop. In an interview he stated:

These chaps have responded by exalting my status to that of an ogre. Whenever my name is mentioned it is synonymous with sanctions. They are trying to get our people to turn against me. All of that was the surest indication that we had exposed a raw nerve ... With all the

efforts that they have put into proving, or seeking to prove, that sanctions don't work, you might ask: 'Why worry about something that doesn't work? Its lack of success should surely indicate the futility of it?' And all of this wonderful attruism - they are suddenly worried about all these black people who are going to suffer as a result of sanctions. They distort statistics. They attribute unemployment that has come out of the mechanisation of agriculture to sanctions for instance.¹⁵

The attempt to draw popular support against Tutu has been attempted on several levels, directed towards black audiences. One such attempt was the mass produced leaflet The South African Trade Union Monthly Titbits distributed in September 1989. The message sent to the worker is obvious: The heading of "The Flying Bishop" was placed over a drawing depicting the Archbishop with the following commentary:

Did you know Desmond Tutu spent 73 of the 151 days during the first half of this year overseas campaigning for sanctions against South Africa instead of praying for his congregation ... Tutu is calling for sanctions, disinvestment ... boycotts of South African goods ... for you the worker it means that you will lose your job ... starve together with your family ... if you lose your job, Tutu remains employed, if you lose, Tutu loses nothing. Think of your job security ... reject sanctions! Think of your future. Stop enriching people who don't care for you as workers.¹⁶

Around the same time period, bumper stickers were placed upon automobiles with the image of Tutu and the following messages: "Tutu cater for the jobless"; "Tutu pray for the poor don't starve them"; "Tutu help build South Africa, don't destroy our future" and "Tutu is wrong, condemn sanctions".

It is highly likely that this campaign was instigated by white business leaders. While this specific case can not be proven, often anti-sanctions measures have been found to have white roots. One of the most popular black anti-sanctions campaigners, Archbishop Mzilikazi Fanie Maslya of the United Apostolic Ministers Council in Africa (UAMCA), admitted his anti-sanctions effort was started by a white businessmen. "The One Million Anti-sanctions Signatures Campaign" was launched in 1989 with much publicity. Maslya was

brought in by the white businessman "to make it seem like a black initiative".¹⁷ He stated that he was brought in "after they realised they couldn't get anywhere overseas on their own without blacks".¹⁸ Maslya was later forced to leave his church for making unauthorised statements on behalf of UAMCA and attacking leaders like Desmond Tutu.¹⁹ These examples show the money/god-term relationship and the attempts of the Archbishop to use money as a moral standard of symbolic correction to be used for the oppressed people of South Africa. The Archbishop was the symbol by which the situation was affirmed or rejected. This background in both Burke's writing and historical position are extremely important in establishing the performances used to promote sanctions in the period of this study.

The major issue of performance concerns the rescheduling of the South African debt in June of 1990. In 1985 the Archbishop moved towards financial sanctions of this time table as a way to force the South African government into a process of negotiation. The sum of the loans was figured at nine billion dollars. While it was almost certain that the debt would be rescheduled the question for South Africa's financial authorities would be the terms of the agreement.²⁰

The issue prompted a meeting of Tutu with other influential Anglican leaders in Johannesburg during the end of July 1989. The Archbishop called for a 15% repayment in June 1990. According to a group of economic researchers this would cause tremendous economic hardship in South Africa. A 15% repayment would mean a lump sum figure of 1.3 billion dollars rather than a scheduled 170 million. Economist stated that such a large obligation could only be met by killing off domestic demand which would cause a recession.²¹

On August 8, eight Foreign Ministers of the Commonwealth accepted a similar

version of Tutu's plan. They agreed to put pressure on foreign banks to impose stringent repayment terms on the money they are owed by South Africa. The officials urged the banks to charge the highest interest rates to South Africa and reject any attempt for extended repayment.²²

During that same week the Archbishop's financial advisor, Terry Crawford-Browne was in Washington D.C. testifying for the complete repayment of United States loans before the House of Representatives banking subcommittee. He advised Congress that United States banks should be forced to make any debt rescheduling conditional on certain political actions by the South African government, which included: the lifting of the state of emergency; releasing of all political prisoners and detainees; unbanning all political organisations and negotiation with real black leaders.²³ Crawford-Browne also appeared before the United Nations dealing with the issue of debt rescheduling.

In September the only major news item dealing with sanctions concerned a representative of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Bishop Simon Barrington-Ward expressed solidarity with Tutu and warned that South Africa could expect major pressure when trying to reschedule its foreign debts. The Bishop was also speaking as Chairman of the South African Coalition in the United Kingdom. The coalition represented seventy different anti-apartheid organisations. At his meeting with Tutu he stated: "We intend to give a concentrated push to match the ground swell in our country to the ground swell here. We will press our government to exert pressure on your government".²⁴

This coalition was only a small part of an international movement. This was shown on October 7, when groups of church members, anti apartheid, labour and community action activists picketed banks in New York, London, Paris,

Bonn and Zurich. In the United States 29 people were arrested at Manufacturers Hanover Bank in New York City.²⁵ Hanover played a pivotal role in renegotiating the loan's terms. According to one of the leading U.S. Activists, John Lind: "For the first time, there is a coordinated international effort to pressure bank negotiations with South Africa".²⁶ The centre of this international pressure was Desmond Tutu.

October 1989 was a month where sanctions against South African were recommended and supported by a variety of different sources. Perhaps the most interesting motivation for sanctions came from the United Nations. In a study by the Economic Commission for Africa, recommendations were made to strengthen "international economic sanctions against South Africa, particularly sales of petroleum products".²⁷ The reason behind this call was the study's finding that military conflicts between South Africa and its neighbours claimed at least 1.5 million lives and cost the region more than 60 billion dollars in damages and lost production in the 1980's. It said the economic output of the region would have been 40% higher had it not been for South African inspired conflicts. It also added that half of the human lives lost were children under the age of five.²⁸ The ultimate goal of the conflicts was economic destabilisation.

This was the only call for sanctions that did not show specific instigation by the Archbishop. Secondly, it showed the impact of South African based economic sabotage upon bordering nations. These military expeditions also had a severely negative impact upon the South African economy. This in turn forced President De Klerk to meet with black leaders on economic reasons. If this was the case, the debt rescheduling could have been an issue that would have forced the economy into a state of ruin. Thus negotiations with the Archbishop were urgently needed.

The South African debt was rescheduled in October. Pretoria and the bankers clinched a new three and a half year agreement. The agreement disappointed and angered Crawford-Browne. When he challenged two major banks in the United States on the terms of the arrangement their response was "We got a good deal".²⁹ The failure of this attempt did not halt other sanction's oriented performances.

On October 22, the Archbishop argued for sanctions in his televised debate with Frank Retief. He stated that Black South Africans had little option, if they rejected violence. The only other choice was to lobby for sanctions to bring about political change, "We don't want to use violence, we do not have the vote so we look for a non violent strategy to bring about change".³⁰ He continued to urge Western leaders not to ease pressure upon the government until reform was significantly implemented. This message was also stressed in the performances of his trip to Egypt.

On October 25 Desmond Tutu flew to Egypt to meet with President Mubarak over the issues of conflict in Africa. At this meeting the Archbishop expressed appreciation for Egypt's support for the struggle for freedom in South Africa. When asked by a journalist about the South African situation, the Archbishop said "present sanctions and pressures should be maintained until it is clear that we have entered an irreversable process in the dismantling of apartheid".³¹ He further stated at the performance that the world should consider new sanctions if South African President De Klerk "does not deliver the goods".³²

The attitude and response of the Egyptian Government was strongly in favour of the Archbishop. The Egyptian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Dr Boutros Ghali, stated "The Egyptian Government will support him (Tutu) in his struggle to end apartheid in South Africa".³³ The Archbishop was again

internationally reinforced as the symbol of opposition to the ruling government of South Africa. The performance dealing with sanctions, provides outsiders to participate in the moral correction of the Government through monetary symbolism. The Archbishop was the catalyst of correction.

Since monetary symbolism is the lowest symbolic common denominator, financial figures can be used as moral arguments for or against the position of the oppositional critic. During the first week of November, a study was released by Dr Chris Van Wyk, the Chief Executive of Bankorp in South Africa. The recorded impact of the "Tutu inspired" sanctions included:

Besides the loss of half a million jobs, another 1 000 000 people will be without work if the campaign goes on. A cumulative R40 billion in foreign exchange has been lost, because of this there have been production losses of about R80 billion and total 'standard of living' losses of R100 billion. Real consumer spending has been cut by 15%. Spending on Education and Health has been slashed.³⁴

Countering this document dealing with the evil effects of sanctions impact is a study from the University of Stellenbosch Economics Department which estimated the direct and indirect cost of apartheid as R80 billion a year. This is to be added to the gross mismanagement of State owned corporations such as the SA Transport Services, the Post Officers and Wool Board.³⁵ Overall each side claims moral wrong articulated in financial or national economic terms.

The final performance of the Archbishop that will be examined occurred directly after President De Klerk's landmark speech opening parliament on February 2, 1990. The impact of the speech will be dealt with in the next chapter. After the speech Tutu made hints that sanctions could be lifted on American news programmes. One day later he was calling for disinvestment. The Archbishop arrived in Boston for a meeting of the Board

of Overseers of Harvard University. He said at the airport: "Having pinched myself, I realised it wasn't a dream, it was real. But we shouldn't be euphoric."³⁶ The next day he told reporters that he had asked the Board of Overseers to sell of \$139 million in investments in companies that do business in South Africa. The money could be reinvested once it became clear that reforms promised by President De Klerk would take place.³⁷ According to Crawford-Browne one possible reason for this hasty-international performance was a telephone conversation between Tutu and De Klerk the day of the speech. Crawford-Browne stated that "The Archbishop telephoned the State President to congratulate him and to say he was over the moon about his speech. De Klerk's final comment was, rather rudely, 'Now tell the Americans to call off their sanctions'".³⁸ The opposite effect took place when Tutu went to America.

In the final analysis, the role of sanctions has been an intense topic of discussion in the South African economic community. What is vital to this study is that it was within the established time frame that sanctions were shown to have a definitive impact upon the nation. On July 18, 1989, Minister of Law and Order, Adriaan Vlok, conceded that sanctions were working and that they "are forcing the government to negotiate with the African National Congress".³⁹ Crawford-Browne has elaborated "It is quite apparent now that sanctions do work. It is the pressure of sanctions that were the cause of De Klerk's major announcements in his speech on February 2".⁴⁰ A goal for both the Archbishop and his financial advisor has been to create leverage to force the government into negotiation. On February 2 the negotiation process began.

Both men have publically stated that they were attempting to find a way of correction that would least damage the national economy. Crawford-Browne insisted that "We do not relish sanctions anymore than a cancer patient

looks forward to surgery. But only when apartheid is behind us can South Africa begin to contribute positively to the development of Southern Africa".⁴¹ For the Archbishop, sanctions have been an issue of symbolic performance. Sanctions provided the opportunity to make moral corrections using a monetary symbol reduced to its lowest common denominator.

The Archbishop's support of sanctions against the South African government also called for investment in the morally correct culture in the conflict and struggle of liberation. This involves fund raising. When the Archbishop was the head of the South African Council of Churches, brief meetings with the European donors often resulted in seven figure sums being routed to SACC accounts.⁴² His financial advisor elaborated upon this role and his status as a symbol internationally:

The recognition he has had overseas has meant that people are that much more prepared to fund the churches that have been seen as the frontline of highlighting the iniquities of the apartheid system. Whenever he goes overseas collections have been given. Because of his status in the States, the church has done a lot of funding of projects due to the recognition he has received.⁴³

The work of the Archbishop can not be isolated from his financial influence. His actions show a direct economic impact linked to his articulation and interpretation of the actions in the struggle of liberation. Within this structural system, three conclusions can be made regarding sanctions, symbolism and Desmond Tutu.

Firstly, the Archbishop's popularity as an international symbol linked his religious performance to acts of monetary symbolic correction through sanctions. He was the pivotal figure that stood beyond the point of public mediation. He was placed in the role of being in direct communication with God, the oppositional critic and the comedic master that interprets the morally correct use of money.

Secondly, the subject of sanctions has made Desmond Tutu a hated man to certain segments of the South African population. This negative attitude has also been seen in print reports concerning his financial advisor, Terry Crawford-Browne. Yet, the issue of sanctions has increased his image as a symbolic performer on the international level, and made him a more powerful figure amongst members of the black community in his own country. His involvement has had definite financial ramifications.

Finally, through Burke, money was established as the source of motivation in the capitalist system. Money can serve as the symbol that cuts across any cultural context. When seen as a 'god term' it becomes a substitute for god, and in conflict with religion. However, monetary symbolism can perform the same function as religious symbolism, through an outside public mediator who represents direct communication with God. This role has been fulfilled by Desmond Tutu who used sanctions as a monetary symbol for religious performance.

The continued depth of influence by the oppositional critic in a cultural conflict has been linked to symbolic financial correction. The performances of the comedic master provide an economic interpretation of a struggle in history and financial praxis. Archbishop Tutu's character was inevitably tied to the issue of sanctions. This served as a positive factor by supporting his international status as the primary symbol of the oppressed South African culture.

CHAPTER 6 : SYMBOLIC TRANSITION AND RESOLUTION

The final eleven days of the time frame of this study were crucial in the history of South Africa. The country became the spotlight of international attention focused upon the release of Nelson Mandela. Mandela had been jailed since 1962 and was serving a life sentence for helping plan the start of the African National Congress' guerilla campaign. Many South African blacks consider him their permanent leader. He would be a favourite to win the presidency if blacks could vote.¹ Mandela was released from Victor Verster prison on February 11, 1990. The event signalled the symbolic transition of oppositional leadership. From that moment, the symbolic role of Desmond Tutu immediately became secondary to Nelson Mandela. The shift of attention was also documented by the focused press coverage of Mandela's actions.

The performances leading up to the end of this work were built around an established anticipation of this event. In order to trace the formation of this moment of symbolic change and its results, special attention must be directed towards three events. these actions are: the oppositional march to parliament on February 2 and the implications of reform given in President F W De Klerk's speech, the announcement of the release of Nelson Mandela, and the first public performance given by the famous political prisoner. In the analysis of these events, emphasis will also be placed upon the response of the oppositional culture and the redefinition of role of Desmond Tutu in the struggle for liberation. After this has been accomplished, resolutions will be developed concerning the role of the Archbishop in the future of South Africa as well as several conclusions evaluating to his role of his symbolic performances since July 1989.

The opening speech of the State President to the South African Parliament

was heralded as a significant event by the oppositional critic. It was the end of the one hundred days established by Tutu in international press statements to allow for the State President to establish reforms as well as creating a climate of negotiation with the Government. The stage was set. Governments of other countries paid strict observance due to the issue of punitive economical sanctions. For the oppositional culture, this event marked the possible release of their major symbol of resistance and the hope of continued sets leading to the dismantling of apartheid laws. The oppositional critic had given the State President necessary steps needed for negotiations in October of the previous year. Future criticism rested upon the response. Overall, there was a general air of expectancy over the contents of President F W De Klerk's parliamentary speech.²

A performance was organised before the opening of parliament by the Mass Democratic Movement. A march was planned from Green Market Square (an area of earlier police brutality) to the Parliament building via Tutu's St Georges Cathedral. The Archbishop and Winnie Mandela, the wife of the famed prisoner, led a crowd of about four thousand without incident.³

Before the march began, the Archbishop made a strong appeal for discipline amongst the protestors. As he addressed the crowd he related recent revolutionary events in Eastern Europe as the direct result of corporate symbolic action. He said that in Germany people had marched and the Berlin wall had fallen. Tutu also stated that these actions were effective as a form of public protest based upon international recognition of the peace march in Cape Town during September 1989.⁴ He added: "We are not anybody's doormat. We are marching as part of our struggle for justice and for peace".⁵ Mrs Mandela also addressed the crowd.

The leading of the march by these two individuals was of symbolic

significance. This was the first performance that both Winnie Mandela and the Archbishop took part. Mrs Mandela had not played a vital role in any previous M.D.M. performance nor had she been publicly seen with Tutu. Her participation marks a foreshadowing of the transition of oppositional leadership between Tutu and her husband. At the rally prior to the march, she said jokingly: "I'm hoping to speak to you all later after President De Klerk has spoken of the transfer of power".⁶ While she was no doubt referring to a hopeful transfer of political power from the Nationalist Government to the ANC, President De Klerk's speech did transfer power in the leadership of the oppositional culture. The role of the Archbishop was greatly altered.

The speech was hailed internationally as a tremendous step towards reform and negotiation with the marginalised people of South Africa. As De Klerk was addressing parliament, news of the reforms filtered to the protestors four blocks away. A leader interrupted the protest to "deliver a very important message". The crowd fell silent as she announced "The ANC has been unbanned". The crowd seemed stunned at the news, then erupted into celebration.⁷ The ANC had been outlawed since 1960. It could become a legal participant in the political arena and in the fight against apartheid.

The most important announcement concerned the release of Mandela. De Klerk stated: "I want to put it plainly that the government has decided to release Nelson Mandela unconditionally ... Unfortunately for personal circumstances and safety, a further short passage of time is unavoidable".⁸

Other reforms included: the legalisation of more than sixty other opposition groups, a relaxation in the National State of Emergency, and the suspension of all executions resting upon a revision of capital punishment laws.⁹ The forty minute speech met many of the conditions set by the

oppositional critic in October for negotiations on a new constitution.

The Archbishop responded to the President's speech a few hours later at a press conference. A "comic" nature radiated in his attitude. One wire report stated: "What he has said certainly has taken my breath away" an excited Tutu told the audience. "It's incredible", he said, giggling and squirming in his seat. "He (De Klerk) has not met all of those conditions but he has gone a very long way along the road."¹⁰ The Archbishop continued to praise the reform initiatives but stated that international pressure must be maintained until apartheid is dismantled.

The major question was when Mandela would be free. This was seen as the most significant obstacle to negotiations. Once Mandela was free, there would be no credible excuse for either the ANC or the Nationalist Party Government to avoid exploratory meetings.¹¹ The unbanned status of the ANC did nothing to break down apartheid legislation. De Klerk's move opened the door to negotiation, leaving the logistics of apartheid for future talks. One journalist indicated that the President's motives were "clearly meant to throw the ANC off balance ... to exploit any differences in age, personality and ideas within the black leadership".¹² The leader of the dominant culture placed the burden of negotiation back upon the oppositional group. In addition to Mandela, the State President ended restrictions placed upon the movements and political activities of 374 opposition supporters. He also stated political exiles could return to South Africa.¹³

In light of these dramatic steps, Archbishop Tutu admitted a need for change in his role in the country's political stage. The day of De Klerk's speech, the Archbishop stated that he was going to downgrade his high-profile political role in the cultural struggle. He said:

I have said I am really an interim leader. But now there is not going

to be as much of a need for people such as me to be speaking out and saying things which others could not say because they were restricted, in jail or in exile. In the past I've had to step into a kind of vacuum. I am not saying the Church has no role in the political arena. It still has a role to speak the word of God on a socio-political dispensation.¹⁴

Oppositional criticism, as stated in Chapter One, can only work within the framework that the dominant culture allows. In this case the leadership of Tutu was no longer needed, because of the promised release of a more powerful symbolic leader.

Eight days later President De Klerk announced that Nelson Mandela would be liberated on February 11 at 3 p.m. De Klerk said he was convinced that the black leader was committed to a peaceful resolution in the South African conflict. He also promised further reforms, such as the complete lifting of the three and a half year state of emergency. In his announcement the President declared:

There can no longer be any doubt about the Government's sincerity in seeking to create a just dispensation based on negotiation. The eyes of the world are presently focused on all South Africans. All of us now have an opportunity and a responsibility to prove that we are capable of a peaceful process of creating a new South Africa.¹⁵

The emphasis upon negotiation and international concern were high priorities.

The response of the Archbishop was picked up by the world media. Tutu was at his home in the Orlando West section of Soweto when the announcement was made. Most South Africans heard the announcement on the 6 p.m. television news. The statement had been made public one hour earlier and broadcast live to other parts of the world. In South Africa the local broadcast was delayed due to a cricket match.¹⁶ The Archbishop went to join an impromptu celebration at the Mandela residence several blocks from his home. A crowd

of about 500, many of which were too young to have known a free Mandela, waved banners and chanted songs in the glare of television lights.¹⁷ The press was quick to pick up the comic nature of the celebrating Archbishop. He visited Mrs Mandela at the time of the broadcast. After which he could not contain his happiness and shouted "Hallelujah, Hallelujah" to reporters.¹⁸ A press performance was organised outside his home. He came out laughing, proclaimed "It is a happy day" and began to dance. Commenting that he had never before given the popular "Viva" black freedom salute, Tutu decided that this was the time and he shouted "Viva".¹⁹ The almost incoherent Archbishop kept breaking into song. "When I was asked what my New Year resolution was, I said it was to take off some time to improve my dancing. I knew that I would have reason to dance".²⁰ As he was driven away in a car, Tutu looked out the window and yelled "Yaaaayyyyyyyyy!" waving to a few people gathered around.²¹ Press reports the next day began with lines "Tutu beside himself with Joy" and "Tutu dances in the street".

The day of the release, hundreds waited and cheered as Mandela left prison outside of Cape Town. The celebrations degenerated into chaos when police clashed with looters at the Grand Parade area outside of Cape Town's old City Hall. Police pumped shotgun pellets and rubber bullets into the crowd. Two people were killed and over 200 injured in the action.²² After marshalls managed to restore order, Mandela emerged upon an outside balcony of the City Hall and delivered his first speech he had made since his trial in 1964. Political analysts said Mandela's address was a carefully crafted balance between the demands of the ANC's militant youth and the requirements of the government that freed him.²³ After the rally, Mandela went to spend his first night of freedom at Bishopscourt, the official Cape Town residence of Desmond Tutu.

The next morning a press conference was organised but had to be postponed

because of the number of reporters attempting to enter Tutu's residence. The Archbishop lead the way for Nelson and Winnie Mandela when they appeared in the gardens where the press conference was held. The press conference was hailed as a "masterful performance".²⁴ The Archbishop reportedly left the group and began to dance in a nearby flower bed.

In the speech at City Hall, Mandela stated a renewed commitment to the armed struggle which in 1964 earned him a life jail term for plotting against white rule. He said "Our resort to the armed struggle in 1960 ... was a purely defensive action against the violence of apartheid. We have no option but to continue".²⁵ He countered this at his press conference by sympathising with white fears at the prospect of black domination. Mandela added "Whites are fellow South Africans and we want them to feel safe".²⁶ In terms of his future he stated "Now that I am released, it is for the ANC to determine what role I will play".²⁷

Several comparisons should be made between the messages and distinctions of the two symbolic leaders of the oppositional culture. The first area is the subject of violence. Archbishop Tutu has categorically rejected violence all through the Defiance Campaign. In the first public performance of Nelson Mandela, a commitment to the armed struggle was renewed. Secondly, the source of the quality of knowledge for the Archbishop is found in his concept of the Kingdom of God. References were continually made to God's role in the struggle of liberation. Nelson Mandela's quality of knowledge is directly linked to the leadership of the African National Congress. He stated that the political group would control his actions. This would provide a more direct and established line of accountability. Third, while the message of liberation is similar, the personification of the struggle is radically different. Tutu was a leader by default, Mandela was a leader due to the status he had achieved as a political prisoner. A significant

percentage of the South African population was too young to remember the role Mandela played in the organisation of the armed wing of the ANC. Tutu was a symbolic leader of action. Mandela's position was created because of a forced period of inaction. The Archbishop served in the preparation of the public attitude that reinforced the symbolic power of Mandela. The world was focused upon the release of one man who had been forced into a position of isolation due to his personal history. In the survey of black leaders given in Chapter one, Mandela was the most recognised and international symbol of black issues. He has not had the opportunity to obtain any negative criticism because of his incarceration. He did not share the vulnerability of the comedic master, Desmond Tutu in the South African struggle. At the moment of his release Mandela seemed to be invincible in the symbolic arena.

After the symbolic transition of leadership, Desmond Tutu was not mentioned in another major story in a South African newspaper until the month of March. The emphasis was placed totally upon the new symbolic leadership of Mandela. His criticism was no longer sought after by the world press as the primary valve of the oppositional culture.

The Archbishop did however make two important points of resolution before he left the public spotlight of performance. Neither action received the amount of coverage that was needed to work against the intensity that had previously been established. However, performances were made that corresponded to the turbulent issues of sanctions against South African and the relationship of the Archbishop with the South African Jewish community.

A delegation including the Chief Jewish critic of Tutu, Chief Rabbi Cyril Harris, requested a meeting with the Archbishop. He readily agreed. A report of the February meeting was published in the March edition of the

Cape Jewish Chronicle. The tone of the article was centered around resolution and the open exchange of ideas. The article contained a photograph of a smiling delegation with the equally exuberant Archbishop of Cape Town. In the dialogue the group conveyed to the Archbishop the resentment and distress of the Jewish community. Tutu, in turn, went to great lengths to deny that he had made any remarks threatening to the Jewish community, a community which, he said he held in high regard.²⁸ The article concluded with the statements:

It is important for Jews to know that Archbishop Tutu is not a rabid anti-Semite. It is equally important for the Archbishop to understand that unconsidered and hurtful comments on the Holocaust are not welcome, whilst liberation theology, South African style is inaccurate and inappropriate in the Israel:Palestinian conflict.²⁹

While the symbolic transference was still rejected, the symbolic critic of the South African struggle was reinforced.

On February 10, the Archbishop made a strong statement regarding his role on continued sanctions following Mandela's release. He displayed an attitude of reconciliation to resolve the impact economic sanctions amongst South Africans. He stated "Sanctions are necessary, but calls can be stopped as soon as negotiations are irreversible for the lifting of apartheid. I will then go around the world and do whatever I can to promote and get investment for South Africa".³⁰

Publically the Archbishop's promotion of sanctions dropped drastically and was assumed by the new leader of the oppositional culture, Nelson Mandela. The negotiation process, which had been Tutu's benchmark concern all along, transformed the Archbishop into a potential economic catalyst for a new nation. He defined his role in a post apartheid South Africa.

These two performances serve as acts of resolution on the part of the

comedic master. Since he previously stated that he would set down from his high profile position, it was necessary to provide points of symbolic clarification that concerned issues that may have been considered open ended by other members of the struggle for social change.

In the final analysis several observations and conclusions can be drawn concerning the work of Desmond Tutu from July 1989 to February 1990. The observations critique his performance and pay specific attention to the character of the Archbishop and his effectiveness as an oppositional critic. The conclusions will concentrate upon outside historical factors that were beyond the control of the comedic master and therefore limited the future participation of the symbolic leadership towards a situation of social change. The use of Burke's methodological framework of dramatism and performance will also be evaluated in terms of historical application to South Africa.

First, Desmond Tutu, by his own admission, was an interim leader of the oppositional culture. This status provided him with an extremely expedient transition out of symbolic leadership. He has continually stated that the Churches role at the forefront of the struggle was due to the outlawed status of other organisations such as the African National Congress. By being placed in a position of temporary leadership it was possible for the Archbishop to prepare the oppressed culture for a new symbolic dispensation. His performance served as a constant reminder that he was a leader by default. As he stated at his October meeting with F W De Klerk, his role was to serve as a facilitator of negotiation until the true leaders of the people could represent themselves. A strength in the Archbishop's overall performance was that he established an exit route from the public spotlight, yet, did not relinquish his role until the appropriate moment. Good leadership, like good drama, heavily centres upon the impeccable use of

timing. Tutu's rise to symbolic prominence as well as his exit from it were focused upon the larger context of liberation for the oppressed in the country. His timing reflected a concentration of the larger issue of social change and what would be most beneficial to achieve that goal. While it cannot be denied that Tutu was a leader, he must be considered as a figure that was only in that position until such a time that he could be replaced by a more powerful symbol. In this case the symbol was Nelson Mandela. Second, a significant amount of the symbolic power given to the Archbishop is from an outside source of validation, in this instance the international community. Tutu was constantly defined as the "winner of the 1984 Nobel Peace Prize for his opposition to apartheid".³¹ In news reports internationally, the Nobel Prize provided the catalyst for world attention that has continually been reinforced through the Archbishop's actions. This created a dynamic relationship as the Archbishop used the international struggle to continue to support the cause that brought him acclaim. No other Nobel laureate has been as continually in the world spotlight. The international recognition of the performance led to greater attention of the cause represented. In this case the sanctions campaign was a tangible result of the appeal and effective use of the quality of knowledge demonstrated by the Archbishop. This gave the world an opportunity to participate in the struggle for liberation in South Africa. The international community validated the symbolic leadership of Tutu and supported his work in his environmental context.

Thirdly, this was not the case when it was attempted to transfer the symbols of South Africa in the conflict between Israel and Palestine. The events of December 1989 illustrate that media coverage and symbolic transference broadens the gap of criticism on the international level. Although the Archbishop spoke of the similarities of the situation, the world noted the differences. Desmond Tutu was not recognised as the oppositional critic for

the cause of Palestinian liberation. As a result, the rhetoric of the Archbishop was not given the same amount of credibility. The actions of Tutu were consequential, but the impact was less significant in terms of praxis. The visit to Jerusalem was noted more for the irritation of the international Jewish community than the plight of the oppressed Palestinians. Transference loses contextual symbolic power.

Symbol transference does however provided validation to a given cause. The Archbishop provided international support for the struggle of Palestinians in Israel. He was providing reciprocal justification for the cause of the Arabs in the occupied territories much in the same manner that the world has supported the cause of South African blacks. The problem rested in the dominant culture. However, because Tutu spoke against the actions of the Israeli government, he was accused of being against the Jewish people. This was not the case. A division must be made between the predominant religion in a country and the actions of that country's government.

Finally, the humorous nature of the Archbishop served as an invaluable asset in the promotion of his message. Tutu said interesting things. His actions were newsworthy. He told jokes. The Archbishop's personality made him an entertaining performer in an often intense dramatic situation. The media followed the Archbishop primarily for the cause he represented, but also for the manner in which he presented that cause. The Burkian role of comedic master does not have to be forced upon Desmond Tutu. Humour was a part of his public personality to aid in communication. His humour points to his own foibles and increases his power to interpret events. His timing emphasised the dramatic nature of the struggle on international issues through the press.

These observations centre around the action of the comedic master and the

power of that individual to control and interpret events within the struggle. However, the total historical picture must not be limited to the comedic master's frame of reference or quality of knowledge. Acknowledgement of other vantage points are needed in order to have a balanced perspective of the struggle and to allow the criticism of the symbolic leader of the oppositional culture. By examining these views several conclusions can be drawn.

The first conclusion relates to the prescribed concept in Burke's thought that limits the power of the oppositional culture. The opposition was forced to work within the parameters of the structure given by the dominant ruling group. The relationships are continually in a state of flux and redefinition. The Archbishop continually made a call for whites to join the struggle. At the beach protest in September, Tutu spoke for the inclusion of the police. From the October meeting between President De Klerk and the clerics, the State President made a tremendous impact in reshaping the stage that set the drama. In October political prisoners were released. In February significant steps were made towards the process of negotiation and the release of the most important symbol of opposition against his own government. De Klerk was continually forcing the opposition to react to positive measures that he instigated. By doing this the State President was praised by the oppositional critic on several occasions. In his February speech, De Klerk placed the burden of negotiation back upon the oppressed culture. He made the major group of political opposition legal. He made several aggressive steps that increased communication between the two cultures as well as placed responsibility upon the opposition to add to the process of negotiation for peaceful social change. The role of the dominant culture's leader, F W De Klerk, must be stressed as a factor in limiting the pressure of the oppositional critic, Desmond Tutu. Tutu gave De Klerk a three month time period to prove himself. De Klerk then made his opposition

respond to positive action which he had taken. He established the setting in which the comedic master performed.

Secondly, the role of the African National Congress was crucial to Desmond Tutu's symbolic leadership. The ANC was an opposition in exile until February 2, 1990. There were several areas of redefinition which occurred once the ANC was allowed to resume its status as the primary organisation of the opposition rather than the Church. The Church and its leaders had been used to articulate the struggle from the ANC's perspective. This could have led to the confused idea that to join the struggle one must join the Church. The Church could not be seen as the leader of the revolution from an ANC perspective. These are three points of critique that the ANC provided concerning the relationship between Christian Churches and liberation. A primary concern was the contested nature of Christian theology. Any exclusive theology was not seen to provide a basis to derive a political movement. This was further elaborated upon in the second point of which dealt with the concept of religious pluralism. Christian groups are only one part of a mosaic of religious constituencies in South Africa. No single religious tradition should be seen as privileged. Finally, the people should establish the terms of liberation and not the Church. The struggle can be supported by the Church but not confined to its organisation³¹. The ANC must articulate the political agenda.

In light of two conclusions the role of the Archbishop in the leadership of the struggle was greatly changed when the ANC became unbanned. The Archbishop, as a leader of a Church, could not continue as oppositional critic because of the source of his quality of knowledge. Tutu was motivated by his view of the Kingdom of God articulated through liberation theology. This was far different from the quality of knowledge of the ANC. The continued high profile status of the Archbishop would not have been

positive for the political struggle. Tutu stated that the Church still had a role to play in the socio-political arena. After February 2, that role became further distanced from political action against the dominant culture. His role was further diminished by the transition of symbolic power to Nelson Mandela's leadership.

The use of Kenneth Burke's concept of dramatism is extremely valuable in the analysis of the work of Desmond Tutu in this time period. New insights of the dynamics of social change are established when emphasis is placed upon specific actions of performance orchestrated by a comedic master. As a secularised view of religion, dramatism provided an excellent framework in which sacred symbols can be expressed in a cultural conflict. Performance theory then can be used to show how that conflict is presented to the audience through the media. Humans, as symbol using agents, relate to the action and respond. That response can be through negative or positive reaction and participation in the struggle.

Burke's insights are vital to capture the symbolic performance of the Archbishop in both religious and political terms. In the established time period these two arenas are totally inter-woven. Religious position must be shown in political action according to the comedic master. Desmond Tutu was the lens through which the world witnessed the South African struggle. His performance interpreted the historical events for the international audience. A religious figure became a vital link in the political process. Tutu has had a far reaching impact upon the social, economic, and political aspects of South African life. His work brought the struggle of the oppressed culture international support and recognition.

In the history of South Africa, Desmond Tutu will obviously receive considerable credit in forcing the dismantling of apartheid. The religious

motivation of his political influence must be formulated on the symbolic level in order to fully understand the broad scope of its impact internationally. Dramatism and performance theory provided this structure.

It is impossible to separate the religious action from the political action of the Archbishop from July 1989 to February 1990. The work in symbiosis towards liberation through symbolic performance. The action was rooted in his theology. The action received world-wide attention and was effective in the facilitation of the negotiation process of the ANC and the National Party Government. Special emphasis has been placed upon establishing the definition of symbolic performance in cultural conflict; the role of the comedic master; the historical acts of symbolic drama and the use of symbols in transference, correction and transition of leadership.

In the academic study of religion, the historical impact of Desmond Tutu must be recognised as a process in which religious thought instigated socio-political reform through internationally observed performance. In this dialectic, the oppositional critic became a powerful symbol. He performed in terms of dramatic action and then interpreted historical events from his perspective to an audience. The time period of study is a final season of many years of previous dramatic performances and symbolic actions by Desmond Tutu.

With the release of Mandela, Archbishop Tutu shifted from his role as the principle actor in the symbolic spotlight. With this transition, the negative reviews and the controversy of his actions subsided from the public arena as well as being the subject of constant media attention. The historical analysis of the work of Desmond Tutu has revealed a complex case study of the relationship between religion, politics and symbolic performance and its role in the process of social change toward liberation.

FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER ONE

1. Charles Villa Vicenio, Parables of Resistance: The Church and Defiance in South Africa, University of Cape Town, 1989, p.4.
2. The Citizen, Editorial "Call me Arch", October 2, 1989.
3. Albert Du Toit, "Controversial figure in sympathetic light". The Eastern Province Herald. August 2, 1989.
4. Press conference response, August 15, 1989.
5. "Third World Christians take a stand against the Right". Bishopscourt Update, August 2, 1989, p.1.
6. Ibid
7. "Arch is up in Alms: But its not always easy being a superstar." Living, February 1990, p.44.
8. Milton Singer, Traditional India: structure and change (Philadelphia. American Folklore Society, 1959), p xii - xiii.
9. Lawrence E Sullivan, "Sound and Senses: Toward a Hermeneutics of performance". Journal of the American Academy of Religion, August 1986, vol. 26 #1 p.1.
10. John J. Mac Aloon ed. Rite, Drama, Festival Spectacle: Rehearsals toward a Theory of Cultural Performance (Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1984), p.7.
11. William H. Rueckert, Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1963), p.129
12. Ibid, p 133-134
13. Igor Kopytoff, "Revitalisation and the Genesis of Cults in Pragmatic Religion" in African Systems of Thought, ed Ivan Karp and Charles S Bird (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1980) p.184-185.
14. Jonathan Culler, The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature and Deconstruction (Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell. University Press, 1981) p.26-27.
15. Sullivan p.5.
16. Stanley J Tambiah, "A Performative Approach to Ritual" Radcliffe-Brown Lecturarian Social Anthropology, Proceedings of the British Academy 65 (1979) p.116-117.
17. Sullivan p.5
18. Dell Hymes, "In Vain I Tried to Tell You": Essay in Native American Ethnopoetics (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981), p.81.

19. Sullivan, p.6.
20. Desmond Tutu, Hope and Suffering: Sermons and Speeches. (Johannesburg Skotaville Publishers, 1983) back jacket.
21. Ibid
22. "Third World Christians take a stand against the Right", Bishops court Update. August 2, 1989, p.1.
23. Hannes Siebert and Dumisani Daniel, "Negotiation Outside Apartheid" Cross Times, October - November 1989.
24. Frank Lentricchia, Criticism and Social Change (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983), p.14.
25. Edward W. Said, the World, the Text and the Critic (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1983) p. 8-12.
26. Lentricchia, p.14.
27. Siebert and Daniel, "Negotiations".
28. Lentricchia, p.15.
29. Raymond Williams, Marxism and Literature (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977) p. 112-113.
30. Sullivan, p.6.
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid.
33. "For the Record", Extracts from The Road to Damascus: Kairos and Conversion, found in Bishops court Update, August 2, 1989.
34. Ibid
35. Robert J Schreiter, Constructing Local Theologies (New York, Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1985), p.91.
36. "To Support Oppression is Heresy", Bishops court Update, August 2, 1989, p.2.
37. "Anglicans cannot support Apartheid", Bishops court Update, August 2, 1989, p.2.

CHAPTER TWO

1. Kenneth Burke, The Philosophy Form: Studies in Symbolic Action (Los Angeles, University of California Press, Third Edition, 1973), p.311.
2. "Arch is up in Alms: But it's not easy being a superstar", Living, February 1990, p.46.
3. "News coverage of issues of concern to black Americans climb 135% in past five years" United Press International Wire Service, January 26, 1990.

4. Ramsey Milne "In America, it's been Tutu's week", The Weekend Argus, September 9, 1990.
5. William Rueckert, Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations (Berkley: University of California Press, Second edition, 1982) p.130-131.
6. Kenneth Burke, Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature and Method (Berkley: University of California Press, 1968), p.5.
7. Kenneth Burke, Attitudes towards History (Berkley: Beacon Press, 1961) p.41-42.
8. Ibid p.171.
9. Frank Lentricchia, Criticism and Social Change (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983) p.62.
10. Ibid p.63.
11. Ibid p.62.
12. "Archbishop is up in Alms", Living, p.45.
13. Ibid
14. Lentricchia, p.62.
15. "Keeping the Peace", Bishopscourt Update, August 16, 1989
16. "A comment to reporters at Beach Press Conference", August 20, 1989.
17. Comment made in an interview on Cable News Network, September 7, 1989.
18. "Beach Race Demo's end Peacefully", The Sunday Iimes, October 1, 1989.
19. John Scott, "Zaccheaeus might have given up - not a vacant tree in sight", The Cape Iimes, September 14, 1989.
20. John Scott, "TV Tutu's repartee as blinding as his pate", The Cape Iimes, October 25, 1989.
21. Richard McNeill, "Tutu makes out poor case", The Sunday Iimes Extra, October 29, 1989.
22. Ibid
23. Adam Small, "Tutu has been castigated again", The Weekend Argus, January 20, 1990.
24. "Newlook ... Archbishop", The Cape Iimes, September 28, 1989.
25. "Tutu talks about his new hair cut", The Cape Iimes, October 2, 1989.
26. "Grogans Week", The Cape Iimes. September 30, 1989.
27. "Comrade Joe", The Weekly Mail, October 6-12, 1989.

28. Brendon Boyle, "SAP teargas Tutu and Hundreds of Children, Reuter's Wire Service, August 23, 1989.
29. "A warning to the World", Bishopscourt Update, August 30, 1989.
30. Ibid
31. "Tutu demands government apology", The Eastern Province Herald, August 26, 1989.
32. "Tutu in teargas drama", The Sowetan, August 28, 1989.
33. "The Archbishop dilemma", Bishopscourt Update, September 11, 1989.
34. "De Klerk should start by saying sorry" Bishopscourt Update, September 11, 1989.
35. "Twenty three killed in night of violence claims Tutu", The Argus, September 7, 1989.
36. "Vlok slams Tutu over lies", The Citizen, September 9, 1989.
37. "Take Action: a plea to the west after the Cape Flats Massacre", Bishopscourt Update, September 11, 1989.
38. Ibid.
39. "For the Record: Persecution and desecration", Bishopscourt Update, September 11, 1989.
40. Ibid.
41. "Police issue statement on Tutu teargassing", Pretoria News, August 27, 1989.
42. Alan Burke, Attitudes towards History, pg 41.
43. "Resistance is a Christian duty", Bishopscourt Update, August 16, 1989.

CHAPTER THREE

1. Pippa Green, "New Wave of Defiance in South Africa", The Nation, September 18, 1989, p.1.
2. Greg Myre, "Churches endorse Defiance Campaign", Associated Press Wire Service, August 1, 1989.
3. "The Church backs the Defiance", Bishopscourt Update, August 16, 1989, p.1.
4. Kenneth Burke, The Grammar of Motives (New York; Prentice Hall, 1945), p.227.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid, p.230.
8. Ibid.
9. Kenneth Burke, The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action (Los Angeles; University of California Press, 3rd edition, 1973), p.312.
10. Ibid.
11. Cross Times, October 1989, p.8.
12. Ibid.
13. Green, "New Wave.
14. "Peace Talks", Bishopscourt Update, August 16, 1989, p.4
15. Sahm Venter, "Police fire teargas to break up Activist Funeral", Associate Press Wire Service, August 5, 1989.
16. "Keeping the Peace", Bishopscourt Update, August 16, 1989, p.3.
17. Mike Hutchings, "Political activist defy government orders", Associated Press Wire Service, August 6, 1989.
18. "Peace Talks", Bishopscourt Update.
19. Brendon Boyles, "Police weigh charges against Defiant Former Deliverance", Reuter Press Service, August 6, 1989.
20. "Clerics protest the restrictions", Bishopscourt Update, August 16, 1989, p.3.
21. Ibid, p.1.
22. "Tutu leads placard protest", Bishopscourt Update, August 16, 1989, p.3.
23. "Clerics to hold public demo's", The Star, August 16, 1989.

24. Paul Bell, "The Grand Parade", Leadership, October 1989.
25. "... with one exception", Bishopscourt Update, August 30, 1989, p.2.
26. Paul Bell, "The Grand Parade", Leadership, October 1989.
27. "... with one exception", Bishopscourt Update, August 30, 1989, p.2.
28. Ibid.
29. "Protest a victory for non-violence/Tutu", Pretoria News, August 16, 1989.
30. "Walking on God's beaches", Bishopscourt Update, August 30, 1989, p.3.
31. Ibid.
32. Carolyn McGibbon and Bronwyn Adams, "Police Acts on Defiance Wave", The Durban Iribune, August 20, 1989.
33. Bert Van Hees, "Demos thwarted - Tutu walks alone", The Citizen, August 21, 1989.
34. Ibid
35. "For the Record", Bishopscourt Update, August 30, 1989, p.2.
36. Paul Bell, "The Grand Parade", Leadership, October 1989.
37. Ibid.
38. "For the Record", Bishopscourt Update, September 27, 1989, p.3.
39. "Step by step", Bishopscourt Update, September 27, 1989, p.3.
40. "March divides council", The Cape Iimes, September 12, 1989.
41. "Step by step", Bishopscourt Update, September 27, 1989, p.3.
42. "FW. Its okay to march", The Cape Iimes, September 12, 1989.
43. Rach Mkhondo, "Tutu leads first legal South African protest since 1986", Reuters Press Service, September 12, 1989.
44. "March for peace - Tutu, mayor lead 30 000 in massive protest", The Cape Iimes, September 14, 1989.
45. "Securocrats proved wrong", The Star, September 19, 1989.
46. "Step by step", Bishopscourt Update.
47. "Demo's to get course in beach protest", The Citizen, September 20, 1989.
48. "All set for protest at the Strand", The Cape Iimes, September 30, 1989.
49. Liz Clarke and David Breir, "Mystery man cools beach friction"Sunday Iribune, October 1, 1989.

50. "Back to the Beaches", Bishops court Update, October 9, 1989, p.4.
51. David Breir, "Tutu Claims God's Beach", The Sunday Star, October 1, 1989, p.1.
52. "Freedom Ours, says Tutu", The Leader, October 6, 1989.
53. "Church must be an ally in the struggle", The South, September 28 - October 4, 1989.
54. Micheal Morris, "Tutu asks for urgent meeting with President", The Argus, October 6, 1989.
55. "De Klerk to hold talks with clergy", The Weekend Mercury, October 7, 1989.
56. "Negotiations: Churches role", Bishops court Update, October 9, 1989, p.2.
57. Edyth Bulspring, "FW will address Clergy's obstacles", Business Day, October 12, 1989.

CHAPTER FOUR

1. Desmond Tutu, "Now is no time to ease the pressure on De Klerk", The International Herald Tribune, October 21-22, 1989.
2. Lawrence Freedman, "No longer sin twins", The Sunday Star, November 26, 1989, p.1.
3. Russell Watson, "Israel's Deal with the Devil?", Newsweek, July 1989, p.23.
4. John Allen, media secretary for Desmond Tutu, taped interview record, October 12, 1990.
5. Freedman, "Sin Twins".
6. Ibid, p.2.
7. David Hoffman and Arthur Seltzer, "WWII not fought to save Jews", The Cape Times, November 14, 1989.
8. Mandy Jean Woods, "Tutu meets Arafat in Cairo", Business Day, October 24, 1989.
9. "The Palestinian question", Bishopscourt Update, November 13, 1998, p.4.
10. David Horowitz, "South Africa's Tutu coming in December", The Jerusalem Post, November 2, 1989.
11. Haim Shapiro "Jerusalem officials 'apprehensive about Tutu visit'", The Jerusalem Post, November 3, 1989.
12. Ibid.
13. Hoffman and Seltzer, "WWII not fought to ...".
14. John MacLennan, "Tutu, rabbis in major row", The Sunday Tribune, November 19, 1989.
15. "Tutu pays tribute to isolator Belefonte", The Argus, December 6, 1989.
16. "NY new mayor honours Tutu", The Argus, December 18, 1989.
17. Betram Korn Jr., "Archbishop Tutu's visit to Israel", The Jerusalem Post, December 18, 1989.
18. Advertisement, The Jerusalem Post, December 19, 1989.
19. "Tutu at the Wall", The Jerusalem Post, December 19, 1989.
20. Haim Shapiro, "Chief Rabbis still reluctant to meet Archbishop Tutu", The Jerusalem Post, December 20, 1989, p.1.
21. Joel Greenberg, "Archbishop tutu arriving today", The Jerusalem Post, December 22, 1989, p.3.

22. "Tutu's comparisons make Israel see red", The Star, December 22, 1989.
23. "Tutu hits at Israel", The Citizen, December 22, 1989, p.2.
24. Joel Greenberg, "Struggle in South Africa an inspiration, Tutu tells Palestinians", The Jerusalem Post, December 25, 1989, p.2.
25. "Tutu tells Palestinians: God is on your side", The Argus, December 27, 1989.
26. "The Middle Eastern question", Bishopscourt Update, February 5, 1990, p.2.
27. Greenberg, "Struggle in South Africa".
28. Joel Greenberg, "Bomb threat disrupts Tutu's Christmas Eve Mass", The Jerusalem Post, December 26, 1989, p.12.
29. Joel Greenberg and Robert Rees, "Tutu rebuffs Israeli criticism", The Jerusalem Post, December 26, 1989, p.12.
30. "Tutu urges Israelis to forgive Nazis for killings", The Natal Mercury, December 27, 1989, p.1.
31. Joel Greenberg, "Forgive the Nazis", The Jerusalem Post, December 27, 1989.
32. Ibid.
33. "Tutu's remarks arouse Israeli passions", The Citizen, December 27, 1989, p.2.
34. "Tutu defends attacks on Israel", The Citizen, December 27, 1989, p.2.
35. "Tutu under fire", The Daily Dispatch, December 29, 1989.
36. "Tutu's remarks cast shadow over inauguration of New York's mayor", The Jerusalem Post, December 31, 1989, p.2.
37. Ibid.
38. Erwin Frenkel, "A dissonant pilgrimage", The Jerusalem Post, December 31, 1989.
39. "Water bomb misses Tutu in US", The Daily News, January 3, 1990.
40. "Stone hurled at Tutu NY speech", The Cape Times, January 3, 1990.
41. Ramsay Milne, "New York's ex mayor savagely attacks Tutu", The Sunday Star, January 7, 1990.
42. Ibid.
43. "Tutu denies threatening SA Jews", The Cape Times, January 8, 1990.
44. Aida Parker, "Letter to the Editor", The Cape Times, January 17, 1990.
45. G H Agjee, "Chief Rabbi invited to public debate", The Star, January 19, 1990.

46. John Allen - interview.

47. Milne, "New York's ex mayor ...".

CHAPTER FIVE

1. Aida Parker, "Street theatre in a cassock", The Aida Parker Newsletter, September, 1989, p.4.
2. John Allen, media secretary for Archbishop Tutu. taped interview at Bishopscourt, October 12, 1990.
3. Kenneth Burke, A grammar of motives (New York, Prentice Hill, 1945), p.92.
4. Ibid, p.43.
5. Ibid, p.110
6. Ibid, p.355
7. Ibid, p.111
8. Ibid, p. 112.
9. John Allen, interview.
10. Ibid.
11. Ismail Lagordien, "Paying off the debt of apartheid", The Sowetan, September 22, 1989.
12. Alan Hirsch. "Hit them in the pocketbooks" an interview. Upfront, November, 1989.
13. Ibid.
14. Terry Crawford-Browne, financial advisor to Desmond Tutu, taped interview, recorded August 15, 1990.
15. Hirsch, "Pocketbooks".
16. The newsletter is a part of the Archbishop's abuse file at Bishopscourt. Such documents are saved in order to monitor negative publicity and threats.
17. Elias Maluleke, "The odd history of sanction busting bishop", The Weekly Mail, July 21-27, 1989, p. 1 and 2.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid.
20. Hilary Joffe, "Stamping hard on our Achilles heel", The Weekly Mail, July 21-27, 1989.
21. Greta Steyn, "Church briefed on foreign debt", Business Day, July 29, 1989, p. 1 and 2.
22. "Tu much" - the Citizen comment, The Citizen, August 9, 1989.
23. David Brown, "US activist plan their next step on SA", The Argus,

August 9, 1989.

24. "UK churchman warns SA of debt pressure", The Cape Times, September 7, 1989.
25. David E Anderson, "Churches challenge banks on South African Debt.", United Press International Wire Service, October 13, 1989.
26. Ibid.
27. "UN Says wars and South Africa cost 1.5 million lives", United Press International Wire Service, October 13, 1989.
28. Ibid.
29. David Brown, "The man who would bring SA to her financial knees". United International Wire Service, November 8, 1989.
30. "Tutu backs sanctions in debate", The Star, October 25, 1989.
31. "Tutu meets Mubarak over conflicts in Africa", The Egyptian Gazette, October 25, 1989.
32. "Tutu stresses need to step up SA sanctions". The Egyptian Gazette, October 24, 1989.
33. "Egypt to support Tutu's anti-apartheid campaign", The Egyptian Gazette, October 25, 1989.
35. "Amazing Grace", editorial, The Natal Mercury, November 4, 1989.
35. Lagordien, "Paying off debt ...".
36. "Tutu says anti-apartheid pressure must continue", United Press International Wire Service, February 4, 1990.
37. "Tutu: Harvard should divest until South African changes are made.", Associated Press Wire Service, February 5, 1990.
38. Crawford-Browne - interview.
39. Lagordien, "Paying off debt ...".
40. Crawford-Browne - interview.
41. Braun, "The man who would ...".
42. Wessel Ebersohn, "Archbishop up in Alms", Living, February 1990, p.45.
43. Crawford-Browne - interview.

CHAPTER SIX

1. Sahm Venter, "Mandela to be freed tomorrow, President says", Associate Press Wire Service, February 10, 1990.
2. "Winner, in big Cape march", Evening Post, February 2, 1990.
3. Ibid.
4. Personal diary transcript entered after the author attended the rally on February 2, 1990. Tutu related all of the historic events in Eastern Europe to the Cape Town peace march.
5. "Winner, Tutu ...", Evening Post.
6. Ibid.
7. Bruce W Nelan, "At least half a loaf", Time, February 12, 1990.
8. "ANC legal, Mandela to be free", Associated Press Wire Service, February 2, 1990.
9. Nelan, "... half a loaf".
10. "Tutu heaps praise on De Klerk", United Press International Wire Service, February 3, 1990.
11. Tom Matthews, "The prisoner, the President", Newsweek, February 12, 1990, p.13.
12. Ibid, p.9.
13. Ibid, p.10.
14. "Interim leader Tutu steps aside for unbanned leaders", The Argus, February 2, 1990.
15. Venter, "Mandela to be freed".
16. Rohan Minoque, "Soweto celebrates Mandela announcement", United Press International Wire Service, February 10, 1990.
17. Ibid.
18. Andrew Steele, "Mandela leaves jail to face daunting political challenge", Reuter Press Wire Service, February 10, 1990.
19. Dennis Farrell, "Mandela, neighbours dance and sing", Associated Press Wire Service, February 10, 1990.
20. Comme Molusi, "Tutu beside himself with joy over release", City Press, February 11, 1990.
21. Farrell, "Mandela, neighbours ...".
22. Jack Reed "Mandela believe obstacles to negotiations to be removed soon", United Press International Wire Service, February 12, 1990.

23. Andrew Steele, "Mandela awakes to freedom at Tutu's Cape mansion", Reuter Press Wire Service, February 12, 1990.
24. Patti Waldemere and Micheal Holman, "Mandela gives the press a masterful performance", Financial Times, February 14, 1990.
25. Steel, "Mandela awakes ...".
26. Waldemere and Holman, "Mandela ... masterful performance".
27. Reed, "mandela believes".
28. Mervyn Smith, "De Klerk, Mandela, the AWB and Tutu", The Jewish Chronicle, March 1990.
29. Ibid.
30. "The world welcomes Mandela", Sunday Star, February 11, 1990.
31. "ANC legal, Mandela to be free", Associated Press Wire Service, February 2, 1990.
32. David Chidester, Shots in the streets (unpublished manuscript, 1990) p. 26-27.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Advertisement, The Jerusalem Post, December 19, 1989.
- Agjee, G. H., "Chief Rabbi invited to public debate, The Star, January 19, 1990.
- Allen, John, media secretary for Desmond Tutu, taped interview record, October 12, 1990.
- Anderson, David, E., "Churches challenge banks on South African Debt, United Press International Wire Service, October 13, 1989.
- Argus. Ihe, "Twenty three killed in night of violence claims Tutu", September 7, 1989.
- Argus. Ihe, "NY new mayor honours Tutu", December 18, 1989.
- Argus. Ihe, "Tutu tells Palestinians: God is on your side", December
- Argus. Ihe, "Interim leader Tutu steps aside for unbanned leaders", February 2, 1990.
- Associated Press Wire Service, "ANC legal, Mandela to be free", February 2, 1990.
- Associated Press Wire Service, "Tutu: Harvard should divest until South African changes are made, February 5, 1990.
- Bell, Paul, "The Grand Parad", Leadership, October 1989.
- Bishopscourt Update, "Third World Christians take a stand against the Right". August 2, 1989, p.1.
- Bishopscourt Update, "For the Record", Extracts from The Road to Damascus: Kairos and Conversion, found in August 2, 1989.
- Bishopscourt Update, "Anglicans cannot support Apartheid". August 2, 1989, p.2.
- Bishopscourt Update, "The Church backs the Defiance", August 16, 1989, p.1.
- Bishopscourt Update, "Tutu leads placard protest", August 16, 1989, p.3.
- Bishopscourt Update, "Keeping the Peace", August 16, 1989
- Bishopscourt Update, "Resistance is a Christian duty", August 16, 1989.
- Bishopscourt Update, "Peace Talks", August 16, 1989, p.4
- Bishopscourt Update, "Clerics protest the restrictions", August 16, 1989, p.3.
- Bishopscourt Update, "For the Record", August 30, 1989, p.2.
- Bishopscourt Update, "Walking on God's beaches", August 30, 1989, p.3.
- Bishopscourt Update, "A warning to the World", August 30, 1989.

Bishopscourt Update, "The Archbishop dilemma", September 11, 1989.

Bishopscourt Update, "De Klerk should start by saying sorry" September 11, 1989.

Bishopscourt Update, "Take Action: a plea to the west after the Cape Flats Massacre", September 11, 1989.

Bishopscourt Update, "For the Record: Persecution and desecration", September 11, 1989.

Bishopscourt Update, "For the Record", September 27, 1989, p.3.

Bishopscourt Update, "Step by step", September 27, 1989, p.3.

Bishopscourt Update, "Back to the Beaches", October 9, 1989, p.4.

Bishopscourt Update, "Negotiations: Churches role", October 9, 1989, p.2.

Bishopscourt Update, "The Palestinian question", November 13, 1988, p.4.

Bishopscourt Update, "The Middle Eastern question", February 5, 1990, p.2.

Boyles, Brendon, "Police weigh charges against Defiant Former Deliverance", Reuter Press Service, August 6, 1989.

Boyles, Brendon, "SAP teargas Tutu and Hundreds of Children, Router's Wire Service, August 23, 1989.

Breir, David, "Tutu Claims God's Beach", The Sunday Star, October 1, 1989, p.1.

Brown, David, "US activist plan their next step on SA", The Argus, August 9, 1989.

Brown, David, "The man who would bring SA to her financial knees", United International Wire Service, November 8, 1989.

Bulspring, Edyth, "FW will address Clergy's obstacles", Business Day, October 12, 1989.

Burke, Kenneth, The Philosophy Form: Studies in Symbolic Action (Los Angeles, University of California Press, Third Edition, 1973), p.311.

Burke, Kenneth, Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature and Method (Berkley: University of California Press, 1968), p.5.

Burke, Kenneth, Attitudes towards History (Berkley: Beacon Press, 1961) p.41-42.

Burke, Kenneth, The Grammer of Motives (New York; Prentice Hall, 1945), p.227.

Burke, Kenneth, The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action (Los Angeles; University of California Press, 3rd edition, 1973), p.312.

Burke, Kenneth, A grammer of motives (New York, Prentice Hill, 1945), p.92.

Cape Times. The, "UK churchman warns SA of debt pressure", September 7, 1989.

Cape Times. The, "March divides council", September 12, 1989.

Cape Times. The, "FW. Its okay to march", September 12, 1989.

Cape Times. The, "March for peace - Tutu, mayor lead 30 000 in massive protest", September 14, 1989.

Cape Times. The, "Newlook ... Archbishop", September 28, 1989.

Cape Times. The, "Grogans Week", September 30, 1989.

Cape Times. The, "All set for protest at the Strand", September 30, 1989.

Cape Times. The, "Tutu talks about his new hair cut", October 2, 1989.

Cape Times. The, "Stone hurled at Tutu NY speech", January 3, 1990.

Cape Times. The, "Tutu denies threatening SA Jews", January 8, 1990.

Chichester, David, Shots in the streets (unpublished manuscript, 1990) p. 26-27.

Citizen. The, "Tu much" - the Citizen comment, August 9, 1989.

Citizen. The, "Vlok slams Tutu over lies", September 9, 1989.

Citizen. The, "Demo's to get course in beach protest, September 20, 1989.

Citizen. The, Editorial "Call me Arch", October 2, 1989.

Citizen. The "Tutu hits at Israel", December 22, 1989, p.2.

Citizen. The, "Tutu's remarks arouse Israeli passions", December 27, 1989, p.2.

Citizen. The, "Tutu defends attacks on Israel", December 27, 1989, p2.

Clarke, Liz, and David Breir, "Mystery man cools beach friction"Sunday Tribune, October 1, 1989.

Crawford-Browne, Terry, financial advisor to Desmond Tutu, taped interview, recorded August 15, 1990.

Cross Times, October 1989, p.8.

Culler, Jonathan, The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature and Deconstruction (Ithaca, N.Y: Conett. University Press, 1981) p.26-27.

Daily Dispatch. The, "Tutu under fire", December 29, 1989.

Daily News. The, "Water bomb misses Tutu in US", January 3, 1990.

Du Toit, Albert, "Controversial figure in sympathetic light". The Eastern Province Herald. August 2, 1989.

Ebersohn, Wessel, "Archbishop up in Alms", Living, February 1990, p.45.

Eastern Province Herald. The "Tutu demands government apology", August 26, 1989.

Egyptian Gazette. The, "Tutu meets Mubarak over conflicts in Africa", October 25, 1989.

Egyptian Gazette. The, "Tutu stresses need to step up SA sanctions", October 24, 1989.

Egyptian Gazette. The, "Egypt to support Tutu's anti-apartheid campaign", October 25, 1989.

Evening Post. The, "Winner, in big Cape march", February 2, 1990.

Farrell, Dennis, "Mandela, neighbours dance and sing", Associated Press Wire Service, February 10, 1990.

Freedman, Lawrence, "No longer sin twins", The Sunday Star, November 26, 1989, p.1.

Frenkel, Erwin, "A dissonant pilgrimage", The Jerusalem Post, December 31, 1989.

Green, Pippa, "New Wave of Defiance in South Africa", The Nation, September 18, 1989, p.1.

Greenberg, Joel, "Archbishop tutu arriving today", The Jerusalem Post, December 22, 1989, p.3.

Greenberg, Joel, "Struggle in South Africa an inspiration, Tutu tells Palestinians", The Jerusalem Post, December 25, 1989, p.2.

Greenberg, Joel, "Bomb threat disrupts Tutu's Christmas Eve Mass", The Jerusalem Post, December 26, 1989, p.12.

Greenberg, Joel, and Robert Rees, "Tutu rebuffs Israeli criticism", The Jerusalem Post, December 26, 1989, p.12.

Greenberg, Joel, "Forgive the Nazis", The Jerusalem Post, December 27, 1989.

Hirsch, Alan, "Hit them in the pocketbooks" an interview, Upfront, November, 1989.

Hoffman, David and Arthur Seltzer, "WWII not fought to save Jews", The Cape Times, November 14, 1989.

Horovitz, David, "South Africa's Tutu coming in December", he Jerusalem Post, November 2, 1989.

Hutchings, Mike, "Political activist defy government orders", Associated Press Wire Service, August 6, 1989.

Hymes, Dell, "In Vain I Tried to Tell You": Essay in Native American Ethnopoetics (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981),

Jerusalem Post, Ihe, "Tutu at the Wall", December 19, 1989.

Jerusalem Post, Ihe, "Tutu's remarks cast shadow over inauguration of New York's mayor", December 31, 1989, p.2.

Joffe, Hilary, "Stamping hard on our Achilles heel", The Weekly Mail, July 21-27, 1989.

Korn Betram, Jr., "Archbishop Tutu's visit to Israel", The Jerusalem Post, December 18, 1989.

Kopytoff, Igor, "Revitalisation and the Genesis of Cults in Pragmatic Religion" in African Systems of Thought, ed Ivan Karp and Charles S Bird (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1980) p.184-185.

Lagordien, Ismael, "Paying off the debt of apartheid", The Sowetan, September 22, 1989.

Leader, Ihe, "Freedom Ours, says Tutu", October 6, 1989.

Lentricchia, Frank, Criticism and Social Change (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983), p.14.

Living, "Arch is up in Alms: But its not always easy being a superstar." February 1990, p.44.

Mac Aloon John, ed. Rite. Drama. Festival Spectacle: Rehearsals toward a Theory of Cultural Performance (Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1984), p.7.

MacLennan, John, "Tutu, rabbis in major row", The Sunday Iribune, November 19, 1989.

Maluleke. Elias, "The odd history of sanction busting bishop", The Weekly Mail, July 21-27, 1989, p. 1 and 2.

Matthews, Tom, "The prisoner, the President", Newsweek, February 12, 1990, p.13.

McGibbon, Carolyn and Bronwyn Adams, "Police Acts on Defiance Wave", The Durban Iribune, August 20, 1989.

McNeill, Richard, "Tutu makes out poor case", The Sunday Times Extra, October 29, 1989.

Milne, Ramsey, "In America, it's been Tutu's week", The Weekend Argus, September 9, 1990.

Milne, Ramsey, "New York's ex mayor savagely attacks Tutu", The Sunday Star, January 7, 1990.

Mkhondo, Rach, "Tutu leads first legal South African protest since 1986", Reuters Press Service, September 12, 1989.

Molusi, Comme, "Tutu beside himself with joy over release", City Press, February 11, 1990.

Morris, Michael, "Tutu asks for urgent meeting with President", The Argus, October 6, 1989.

Myre, Greg, "Churches endorse Defiance Campaign", Associated Press Wire Service, August 1, 1989.

Minoque, Rohan, "Soweto celebrates Mandela announcement", United Press International Wire Service, February 10, 1990.

The newsletter is a part of the Archbishop's abuse file at Bishopscourt. Such documents are saved in order to monitor negative publicity and threats.

Natal Mercury, Ihe, "Amazing Grace", editorial, November 4, 1989.

Natal Mercury, Ihe, "Tutu urges Israelis to forgive Nazis for killings", December 27, 1989, p.1.

Nelan, Bruce, "At least half a loaf", Iime, February 12, 1990.

Parker, Aida, "Street theatre in a cassock", The Aida Parker Newsletter, September, 1989, p.4.

Parker, Aida, "Letter to the Editor", The Cape Times, January 17, 1990.

Personal diary transcript entered after the author attended the rally on February 2, 1990. Tutu related all of the historic events in Eastern Europe to the Cape Town peace march.

Pretoria News, "Protest a victory for non-violence/Tutu", August 16, 1989.

Pretoria News, "Police issue statement on Tutu teargassing", August 27, 1989.

Reed Jack, "Mandela believe obstacles to negotiations to be removed soon", United Press International Wire Service, February 12, 1990.

Rueckert, William, H, Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations (Berkley, University of California Press, 1963), p.129

Said, Edward, W. The World, the Text and the Critic (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1983) p. 8-12.

Schreier, Robert, J, Constructing Local Theologies (New York, Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1985), p.91.

Scott, John, "Zaccheaeus might have given up - not a vacant tree in sight", The Cape Times, September 14, 1989.

Scott, John, "TV Tutu's repartee as blinding as his pate", The Cape Times, October 25, 1989.

Shapiro Haim, "Jerusalem officials 'apprehensive about Tutu visit'", The Jerusalem Post, November 3, 1989.

Shapiro, Haim, "Chief Rabbis still reluctant to meet Archbishop Tutu", The Jerusalem Post, December 20, 1989, p.1.

Siebert, Hannes, and Dumisani Daniel, "Negotiation Outside Apartheid"

Cross Times, October - November 1989.

Singer, Milton, Irtraditional India: structure and change (Philadelphia, American Folklore Society, 1959), p xii - xiii.

Small, Adam, "Tutu has been castigated again", The Weekend Argus, January 20, 1990.

Smith, Mervyn, "De Klerk, Mandela, the AWB and Tutu", The Jewish Chronicle, March 1990.

Sowetan. The, "Tutu in teargas drama", August 28, 1989.

South. The, "Church must be an ally in the struggle", September 28 - October 4, 1989.

Star. The, "Clerics to hold public demo's", August 16, 1989.

Star. The, "Securocrats proved wrong", September 19, 1989.

Star. The, "Tutu backs sanctions in debate", October 25, 1989.

Star. The, "Tutu's comparisons make Israel see red", December 22, 1989.

Steele, Andrew, "Mandela leaves jail to face daunting political challenge", Reuter Press Wire Service, February 10, 1990.

Steele, Andrew, "Mandela awakes to freedom at Tutu's Cape mansion", Reuter Press Wire Service, February 12, 1990.

Steyn, Greta, "Church briefed on foreign debt", Business Day, July 29, 1989, p. 1 and 2.

Sullivan, Lawrence, "Sound and Senses: Toward a Heremeutics of performance". Journal of the American Academy of Religion, August 1986, vol. 26 #1 p.1.

Sunday Star. The, "The world welcomes Mandela", February 11, 1990.

Sunday Times. The, "Beach Race Demo's end Peacefully", October 1, 1989.

Tambah, Stanley, "A Performative Approach to Ritual" Radcliffe-Brown Lecturian Social Anthropology, Proceedings of the British Academy 65 (1979) p.116-117.

Tutu, Desmond, Hope and Suffering: Sermons and Speeches. (Johannesburg Skotaville Publishers, 1983) back jacket.

United Press International Wire Service, "UN Says wars and South Africa cost 1.5 million lives", October 13, 1989.

United Press International Wire Service, "News coverage of issues of concern to black Americans climb 135% in past five years" January 26, 1990.

United Press International Wire Service, "Tutu heaps praise on De Klerk", February 3, 1990.

United Press International Wire Service, "Tutu says anti-apartheid pressure must continue", February 4, 1990.

Van Hees, Bert, "Demos thwarted - Tutu walks alone", The Citizen, August 21, 1989.

Venter, Sahm, "Police fire teargas to break up Activist Funeral", Associate Press Wire Service, August 5, 1989.

Venter, Sahm, "Mandela to be freed tomorrow, President says", Associate Press Wire Service, February 10, 1990.

Villa Vicenio, Charles, Parables of Resistance: The Church and Defiance in South Africa, University of Cape Town, 1989, p.4.

Waldemere, Patti, and Micheal Holman, "Mandela gives the press a masterful performance", Financial Times, February 14, 1990.

Watson, Russel, "Israel's Deal with the Devil?", Newsweek, July 1989, p.23.

Weekend Mercury. The, "De Klerk to hold talks with clergy", October 7, 1989.

Weekly Mail, Citizen Joe

Williams, Raymond, Marxism and Literature (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977) p. 112-113.

Woods, Mandy Jean, "Tutu meets Arafat in Cairo", Business Day, October 24, 1989.