

2011

Rhetoric of Reconciliation: Implications from Bonhoeffer's [Work] for a Communicative Praxis of Reconciliation Grounded in Christian Narrative

Charles E. Thomas

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Thomas, C. (2011). Rhetoric of Reconciliation: Implications from Bonhoeffer's [Work] for a Communicative Praxis of Reconciliation Grounded in Christian Narrative (Doctoral dissertation, Duquesne University). Retrieved from <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd/1277>

This Immediate Access is brought to you for free and open access by Duquesne Scholarship Collection. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Duquesne Scholarship Collection. For more information, please contact phillips@duq.edu.

RHETORIC OF RECONCILIATION: IMPLICATIONS FROM BONHOEFFER'S
[WORK] FOR A COMMUNICATIVE PRAXIS OF RECONCILIATION GROUNDED
IN CHRISTIAN NARRATIVE

A Dissertation

Submitted to the McAnulty College & Graduate School of Liberal Arts

Duquesne University

In partial fulfillment for the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

By

Charles E. Thomas Jr.

May 2011

RHETORIC OF RECONCILIATION: IMPLICATIONS FROM BONHOEFFER'S
[WORK] FOR A COMMUNICATIVE PRAXIS OF RECONCILIATION GROUNDED
IN CHRISTIAN NARRATIVE

By

Charles E. Thomas Jr.

Approved April 19, 2011

Ronald Arnett, Ph.D.
Professor, Chair
Communication & Rhetorical Studies
(Committee Chair)
(Department Chair)

Calvin Troup, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Communication & Rhetorical Studies
(Committee Member)

Janie Harden Fritz, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Communication & Rhetorical Studies
(Committee Member)

Christopher M. Duncan, Ph.D.
Dean
McAnulty College & Graduate School of
Liberal Arts

ABSTRACT

RHETORIC OF RECONCILIATION: IMPLICATIONS FROM BONHOEFFER'S [WORK] FOR A COMMUNICATIVE PRAXIS OF RECONCILIATION GROUNDED IN CHRISTIAN NARRATIVE

By

Charles E. Thomas Jr.

May 2011

Dissertation Supervised by Professor Ronald Arnett

Reconciliation may broadly be considered as the repairing, restoring, and mending of that which has been broken, namely relationships be they interpersonal, communal, or national due to some type of conflict between two parties. This project seeks to establish a Rhetoric of Reconciliation as a narratively constructed ethical communicative praxis. The first chapter will consist of an overview of reconciliation. In the second chapter the major theoretical frameworks and scholarship in the field of reconciliation will be considered to establish a working understanding of the particular communicative processes of reconciliation and how these processes are narratively grounded. The major theoretical frames will consist of Judicial, Social-Psychological, and Religious perspectives. The third chapter of this project will inquire how the narrative faith

perspective of Dietrich Bonhoeffer and Bonhoeffer's notion of reconciliation, which is grounded in his theological and philosophical construction of the self, other, church and community, may inform reconciliation. Furthermore, this project will take into consideration Bonhoeffer's ethic of responsibility as that step of faith or praxis in the reconciliation process that moves beyond the theoretical to engage a rhetoric of reconciliation in action. The fourth chapter will review South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission as a case study of the process of reconciliation grounded in a narratively situated religious and cultural perspective and a discussion of pragmatic implications and further research on a rhetoric of reconciliation.

DEDICATION

To my beautiful wife Chantel and our wonderful children Carra, Keirsten, Tierra, and Andrew. Thank you for your support, prayers, and love for without I could not have completed this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract.....	iv
Dedication.....	vi
Introduction to the Project	1
Introduction	1
What is Reconciliation?	3
Theoretical Approaches to Reconciliation	4
5 Essential Aspects of Reconciliation.....	14
Dietrich Bonhoeffer	22
South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission.....	26
Theoretical Frames of Reconciliation	31
Judicial Reconciliation Theory.....	33
Social-Psychological Reconciliation Theoretical Frame	47
The Christian Religious Theoretical Frame	62
Summary	80
Bonhoeffer’s Rhetoric of Reconciliation.....	87
Bonhoeffer’s Background	89
Bonhoeffer’s Theology	98
Humanity in Disunity with God, Self, and Other	103
Faithfulness in a Flawed Community	115
Ethics of Responsibility in a World Come of Age	126
Implications for a Rhetoric of Reconciliation	135
Truth & Reconciliation Commission: A Rhetoric of Reconciliation Praxis	140
Historical Background of Apartheid.....	142
TRC, Tutu, and Bonhoeffer.....	162
Summary of TRC, Tutu, and Bonhoeffer in Praxis.....	191
Communicative Praxis of Reconciliation grounded in Christian Narrative.....	194
Bibliography	203

Chapter 1

Introduction to the Project

Rhetoric of Reconciliation is proposed to be a communicative praxis narratively situated to bring about peace and stability in the aftermath of conflict. Reconciliation can be generally deemed as the repairing and/or establishing of relationships following conflict. Conflict resolution seeks to end the conflict, however reconciliation takes the next step to address cognitive and emotional issues connected to the conflict to establish peace and harmony (Biggar, 6). Rhetoric of Reconciliation arises out of a concern for the condition of the modern world being fraught with disassociation, individualism and cynicism, which contribute to the fragmentation of society which raises the question: what is needed in such a time of contention? The answer may lie in the foundational principle of the Christian Gospel message, reconciliation. What is reconciliation in consideration of the varied goals and aspects to achieving those goals? What theoretical ground exists for reconciliation considering that the scope of the scholarship on reconciliation encompasses at least judicial, ethical, psychological, scientific, and religious? How is reconciliation enacted and communicated in light of there being no universal acceptance of reconciliation? Is reconciliation a viable avenue for communal restoration? Can the Christian faith narrative provide a re-envisioned society through a rhetoric of reconciliation? These questions give rise to the following dissertation.

The following project will first review the major theoretical approaches and scholarship in the field of reconciliation from judicial, social-psychological, and religious perspectives. Second, this project will review the life and work of Dietrich Bonhoeffer to provide a perspective on reconciliation flowing from God's act through Christ and

extending to all of humanity as being, in Bonhoeffer's thought, the rudimentary hinge point necessary for reconciliation at any level. Bonhoeffer's theological disposition addresses the human condition, both before and after the fall; the relevance of evil in the world; and the function of the church proper with respect to broader society.

Additionally, Bonhoeffer's historical context provided a proving ground for faith in action through a rhetoric of responsibility that is achieved through making informed decisions based upon the ground under one's feet. Third, this project will review South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission implemented following the end of apartheid as a course of action toward national restoration after decades of civil, political and military unrest. This case study will be utilized to ascertain foundational principles of reconciliation that are grounded in a narratively situated religious and cultural perspective. Finally, this project will seek to discover what pragmatic implications there are for a rhetoric of reconciliation grounded in the Christian faith narrative.

A rhetoric of reconciliation can be a vital component in bringing peace and a sense of stability in an age of contention. Personal, communal, national and international accountability and responsibility facilitate an environment that fosters understanding, forgiveness and transformation, which is the essence of reconciliation. Reconciliation is by no means an easy process to navigate, but stands as a necessary challenge to take on in order to shape a more harmonious existence. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. well said, "unless we learn to live together as brothers [and sisters] we will die together as fools"(Loving Your Enemies, sermon by Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. quoted by Tutu, 8). This project frames a rhetoric of reconciliation within the Christian faith narrative and

focuses on the implication for the study of reconciliation from the field of rhetoric and communication.

What is Reconciliation?

Reconciliation may broadly be considered as the repairing, restoring, and mending of that which has been broken, namely relationships be they interpersonal, communal, national or international due to some type of conflict between two parties. Reconciliation in modern research has focused upon how individuals and communities can heal in the aftermath of such atrocities as rape, murder, genocide, terroristic acts, and war. Reconciliation in this light seeks to regain a sense of order and peaceful cohabitation of both perpetrator and victim. Ackerman et al suggest, “In its simplest form, reconciliation means restoring friendships and harmony between the rival sides after conflict resolution, or transforming relations of hostility and resentment to friendly and harmonious ones” (Ackerman, Keisberg, Phillips, Arthur, Gardner-Feldman, 16). Therefore, it is cautioned that reconciliation ought to be distinguished from conflict resolution in the sense that “real reconciliation is a process that takes place after conflict resolution and often takes longer than bringing the conflict to an end” (Whittaker, 11). Reconciliation goes beyond bringing closure to a conflict to address cognitive and emotional issues in route to establishing peace and harmony. The conclusion of a conflict does not necessitate the instantaneous transformation of perspective rivals have for one another. Furthermore, conflict resolution does not guarantee that conflict will not rise again. One has to look no further than the Israeli-Palestinian situation where cease-fires and peace talks have only been lip service to an underlying tension that reemerges in rage and war. Reconciliation seeks to go beyond ending conflict.

Reconciliation takes a step beyond formal conflict resolution to establish stable and lasting peace (Bar-Siman-Tov, 41). Stable and lasting peace includes a process toward transformative dispositions of groups toward one another. Bar-Tal and Bennink suggest that reconciliation addresses “changing the motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes, and emotions of the great majority of the society members regarding the conflict” (Bar-Tel & Bennink, 8). The changes take place through a process that promotes peace in interpersonal, inter- and intra-group relations as a foundation for communal stability. The process from conflict to reconciliation is approached and constructed in a variety of frameworks dependent upon the perspective from which reconciliation is viewed. While the end goal is reconciliation, there are theoretical perspectives that stand out from one another in their approach to how the process is achieved.

Theoretical Approaches to Reconciliation

A rhetoric of reconciliation can be constructed from a multiplicity of theoretical frameworks, for the process of reconciliation contains a fairly broad scope of opinion and perspective dependent upon the lens through which reconciliation is viewed. Brown and Poremski point out that reconciliation is a subject matter that requires the participation of researchers from a variety of fields (Brown & Poremski, iii). Biggar, Shriver, Elshtain, and Keating direct attention to the judicial and political implications of reconciliation. Biggar notes, “the tension of making peace and doing justice after civil conflict is of political importance” (Biggar, 2). Daly and Sarkin propose that while justice can be conceived in various forms, justice has a consistent constant of being that which balances society. When injustice occurs, the judicial system is responsible for correcting it and returning “the society to the status quo” (Daly & Sarkin, 17). However, Hugo van der

Merwe contends that addressing social conflict by judicial means has a limited extension and beyond the judicial reach, “localized conflict dynamics can take on a life of their own” (Merwe, 132). Dealing with the localized conflict residue is the emphasis of a social-psychological approach to reconciliation. To this Bar-Tal and Bennink add “we see reconciliation as a psychological process and outcome that takes place between rival groups” (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 4). Hence, the social and psychological are interrelated and approached as such for this work. Finally, many researchers agree that discussions of reconciliation have religious overtones that include “intimations of purification and cleansing as well as the restoration of an individual’s relationship to God” (Dwyer, 18). A diversity of case studies, in theory and practice, point to the religious understanding and often grounding of reconciliation (Helmick & Petersen, 32; Laderman, Smith, Krause, Martin, 25; Tutu, 12). In laying out a theology of forgiveness and reconciliation, Stanley Harakas illustrates how “the sacramental aspect of forgiveness provides the ontological ground for the possibility of the practice of forgiveness and meaningful reconciliation” (Harakas, 112).

Meaningful reconciliation is the end goal of all theoretical frameworks of reconciliation. However, there are varied opinions of the processes to arrive at such a destination. The vantage points of judicial, social-psychological, and religious, will be reviewed as the major theoretical frameworks of reconciliation. These theoretical frames were chosen as representative of the major views of inquiry across liberal and academic fields of study such as Philosophy, Theology, Sociology and Communication. Each theoretical framework proceeds from the perspective seen as most influential in the reconciliatory process. Judicial proceeds from a position of justice for the offended as

primary starting point for a reconciliation process. Social-Psychological grounds itself in the individual and communal cognitive transformation as essential for reconciliation and the Religious perspective begins with the relationship between the divine and humanity as a template for the interpersonal relationships between people.

Judicial

Justice theorists tend to view reconciliation through restorative justice as the antithesis to the predominant western notion of retributive justice. Nigel Biggar suggests criminal justice is often thought of in terms of the punishment of the perpetrator but “justice is primarily not about the punishment of the perpetrator, but about the vindication of the victim, then about the protection of potential victims, and then the reform of the perpetrator” (Biggar, 7). Theorist such as Biggar provide a perspective on the criminal justice system as a framework toward reconciling interpersonal conflict through a process that is focused on the victim rather than on the perpetrator. A process that is focused on the punishment of the judicial system for an infraction of the law actually can inhibit the process of restoration and ultimately reconciliation (Biggar, 8). Those working within a judicial theoretical framework seek to redefine the goals and objectives of the criminal justice system to the extent that the victim is of primary concern and focus is subsequently placed upon reconciliation with the perpetrator as well as reconciliation with the community. Theorist do caution that reconciliation is not always possible, especially in the cases of murder whereby the victim is deceased and the possibility of reconciliation is impossible.

In addressing issues of social or national atrocity, justice theorists tend to focus on a top-down model of reconciliation. A top-down model implies that political offices,

judicial court and lawmakers are primarily responsible for attending to the after conflict social restructuring (Mewre, 138). This view contends that the public wants its' leaders and elected officials to provide leadership to address the atrocity and provide the next steps toward regaining a stable living environment. Within the scope of this framework topics of peace talks, peace contracts, national security, and immigration legislature come to forefront of research and discussion. A prime example would be 9/11 and how government officials handled the days, months and now years after the atrocity.

President Bush's national address following the terrorist attacks dramatically increased his approval rating to nearly 90% (Schubert, Stewart & Curran, 2). President Bush called for national "unity"; bringing the terrorists "to justice"; and highlighting the responsibility of a collective nation to return to life as usual (Schubert, Stewart & Curran, 2). While this speech was not directly related to attempts of reconciliation, the immediate accepted response allowed for the steps of military force, Homeland security, and talks with foreign countries to establish relationships that will hopefully bring the eventual stability that is desired.

The rhetoric of judicial and political leaders aims to move a nation in a new direction following national atrocities. The goals at this level consist of infrastructure, organizational and institutional rebuilding, educational distributions and shaping the perspectives of the public to elicit majority favor of the decisions being made. The agendas consistent within this framework address the macro level issues of a nation while contending and upholding that individual responsibility is warranted for the betterment of the nation and restoration of peace. The judicial disposition is that a trickle down reciprocity will take place throughout society. Nevertheless, as Elshtain notes, it is a long

and sometimes multiple generation lifetimes for the process of reconciliation to take place through political means (Elshtain, 87). This work will review the extent of the success and noted shortcomings of a judicial framework of reconciliation.

The judicial stands in contrast to the other theoretical frames on the basis of justice being the primary impetus for the success of and process of reconciliation. The Social-Psychological begins from a different ontological ground of introspection and cognitive transitions.

Social-Psychological

According to the Social-Psychological approach “the reconciliation process should openly address painful questions of past conflict so as to build a foundation for normal peace relations” (Bar-Siman-Tov, 5). Sociology and Psychology theorists have some common perspectives and theoretical ground based on similar rhetorical entrances to reconciliation. Psychological theorists focus upon the traumatization of conflict and the difficulties associated with overcoming trauma to attain reconciliation. Psychological theorists are also concerned with the transformation and cognitive restitution that must be worked through by the victim and perpetrator. A theoretical ground of forgiveness emerges as one of, if not the most major area of focus (Worthington, 3). Research has developed to identify the character traits necessary for forgiveness to occur as well as the contributing biological and emotional dispositions of the victim and offender. Sociology theorists identify issues of assimilation versus discrimination; equality versus inequality; ethics and morality of societies and institutions. Researchers in this broad but closely similar situated framework primarily focus on reconciliation from the vantage point of transitions and transformations in social systems. They argue that differing social groups,

be they ethnically, politically or culturally different, must come to terms of agreement on the perspective each has for the other in order to begin a long and tedious process of social reconciliation. Both perspectives focus on the transformations that take place or need to take place for reconciliation to be achieved.

A social-psychological framework—at the interpersonal level—begins with the individual and moves through a progression toward reconciliation as a therapeutic-cognitive process. Researchers ascribe to a ‘bottom-up’ model whereby transformative measures are initiated at the micro or individual level within a society and then expand to broader society reaching up to political and judicial levels. At the individual level psychotherapy is engaged as a means to assist people overcome the trauma and seek reconciliation. Robert notes that one difficulty of the psychotherapeutic process is that of the ‘divided self’ (Robert, 67). Personal impulses and motives following tragic events are often antithetical to the person’s characteristics. People tend to privilege revenge, fear and even hatred toward the perpetrator (Robert, 68). The goal of therapy is to assist the person in constructing an acceptable narrative of the event to ground them in the present and move toward cultivating a reconciled future both within themselves and with the perpetrator(s).

The social/national level shares common features among theorist related to social-psychological dynamics of reconciliation. Kriesberg asserts that the necessary conditions for reconciliation include “forgiving, taking responsibility for harms done and making reparations for them and changing the allocation of resources to one that the involved parties will perceive as socially just” (Kriesberg, 98). The readiness for transitions to peace and reconciliation are predicated upon the identity perceptions that one group has

for another and whether or not the other group has satisfied the expectations of the other. People, groups and nations in conflict with one another maintain assumptions and preconceptions about their enemy (Moaz, 28). Negative image of the opponent and negative evaluation of behavior ascribed to an opponent are barriers to reconciliation (Silverstein, 107). These perception barriers must be eradicated for even a readiness for reconciliation to arise. In concert with the previous section, it is suggested that techniques such as mutual disclosure of the sides' views and mutual disclosure of beliefs about the other side's views can be enacted to minimize polar oppositions (Moaz, 28). Public debates, ambassadors, peace talks, and open forums provide a communicative arena for cognitive transitions in relation to the perceptions of the opponent. Stereotypes that are locally, nationally distributed and media reinforced fall into the scope of addressing perceptions.

The outcome of stability as an objective of reconciliation requires community members, groups and nations to vanquish harbored anger, resentment and desire of revenge to construct a collective narrative of peace. Daly and Sarkin agree when they suggest that social reconciliation needs to overcome deep-seated fears and resentments and establish a history that resonates to some extent with everyone (Daly & Sarkin, 72). The rhetoric of reconciliation has to establish of fusion of horizons within a given historical period to establish future stability. "Reconciliation refers to accommodative ways members of adversary entities have come to regard each other after having engaged in intense, and often destructive struggle" (Kreisberg, 18). Regard for one another is seen as a psychological transition from prior sentiments to new ones. On a social scale more broad sweeping rhetorical devices may be necessary, while on interpersonal levels more

intense direct approaches. The social-psychological views these approaches through cognitive processes necessary for social stability and peace.

The ontological ground from which both judicial and social-psychological take their start differ, there still remains the end goal of arriving a point of stability and peace following conflict. The Religious framework also attends to a varied starting agenda. From a biblical narrative construction, the religious framework seeks to address justice, mercy, peace, spiritual and mental transformation in concert with the reconciliatory act accomplished through Christianity. The examination of religious implications for reconciliation therefore begins with a particular religious view—Christianity. This trajectory is attentive to Dietrich Bonhoeffer’s work as well as the case study of South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

Religious/Christian

Religious Scholars, Christian specifically, have agreed regardless of the perspective that is sought, there remains a shared understanding that the reconciliation process “demands dialogue, self-reflection, and a commitment to the belief in the possibility of significant change” (Brown & Poremski, 201). Significant change can be ascertained as one of the primary attributes that emerge from the Christian Gospel. Significant change comes through the impetus of salvation toward an understanding of how humanity is to live in relation to God and in relation to one another in light of the death, burial, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus of Nazareth as the atoning sacrifice for the sins of creation. The sacrificial act of Jesus is considered an act of reconciliation. “At the cross a mighty flood of reconciling grace was released into the earth. At the cross we ourselves were recipients of such mercy that it changed the way we viewed those that

had sinned against us” (Dawson, 2). The Apostle Paul wrote, “All this is from God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ and gave us the ministry of reconciliation: that God was reconciling the world to himself in Christ, not counting men's sins against them. And he has committed to us the message of reconciliation” (2nd Corinthians 5:18-19, NIV).

In light of God’s act of reconciliation, the New Testament writers encourage humanity to be transformed in both thought and action. In his letter to the Romans Paul admonish new believers to “not conform any longer to the pattern of this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind” (Romans 12:2, NIV). In other words, Paul is making an appeal for people to change their perspective on how they view themselves and others. James adds that it is not enough to say you have a different perspective, but you must have actions that reinforce the talk. “Show me your faith without deeds, and I will show you my faith by what I do” (James 2:18, NIV). John Dawson suggests that the necessary transformation of people and societies has been hindered by people themselves who have not been able to get to reconciliation because of sectarian strife in and out of the body of believers (Dawson, 2). Peterson adds that this hindrance can be attributed to forgiveness in the church being “spiritualized” rather than enacted in everyday living (Peterson, 64). Nevertheless, the church is still considered the impetus for and foundational of reconciliation.

The social dimension of forgiveness takes root in the church community as physical representation of the reconciliation of man to God and subsequently man to man. The church therefore ought to be the foundational impetus for reconciliation to occur within humanity. L. Gregory Jones notes that a reconciled society is not “so much as a

word spoken, an action performed, or a feeling felt...the goal is to engage in an ever-deepening process of unlearning sin and learning to live in communion with the Triune God, with one another, and with the whole creation” (Jones, 55). The task of reconciliation does not end with the church but rather only begins with the church to provide a ripple effect of transformation of individuals and societies who learn and re-learn what it means to live in communion and peace with one’s neighbor.

Karl Barth proposed that one’s neighbor is central to the gospel and not an abstract spiritualized notion. “To love my neighbor means accepting the future that is shaped by the reality of my neighbor. We are in fact given to one another to benefit from one another, to find the restoration that is only possible because of each other...” (Barth, 197). The act of forgiveness is meant to bring people together reconciling relationships, communities and nations. The understanding of neighbor that goes beyond being defined by those who are in close proximity and extends to the entire human race that is deeply embedded in a Christian faith narrative. Girard suggests that, “since we have been forgiven, and thereby accepted at a most fundamental level, we can extend forgiveness to others” (Girard, 46). In this light the rhetoric of reconciliation is grounded in the Christian faith narrative derived from the teaching of Christ and brought to the culmination in the ultimate sacrifice on a cross. The gospel records of Jesus’ life provide the backdrop upon which Jesus taught by word and action, the physical and spiritual implications for reconciliation. This work seeks to draw a synthesis with biblical teaching, modern scholarship and application.

5 Essential Aspects of Reconciliation

A rhetoric of reconciliation may be constructed from various theoretical grounds with overlap in varying degrees of the steps in the process toward achieving reconciliation. The similarities among the theoretical frames provide recognition of several key aspects that must be taken into consideration throughout a process of reconciliation. These five issues are addressed in each theoretical framework and by scholarly contributors in the field as hinge points to the success or failure of reconciliation. The process of reconciliation must take into consideration the issues of trauma (Fivush, 18; Worthington, 5; Janoff-Bulman, 21), justice (May, Keating, 184; Biggar, Shriver, Elshtain, Hamber, 6), acknowledgment (Marrus, Crocker, Dwyer, Govier, 2) forgiveness (Worthington, 2006; Volf, 91; Tutu, 13; Auerbach, 5), and social assimilation (Kelman, 27; Daly & Sarkin, 18; Moaz, 3). The research has shown that these five points of contention are more than noteworthy issues that have to be addressed to move individuals and communities from conflict to reconciliation. The trauma associated with the conflict; the justice for the wronged; the acknowledgement that someone was violated; the forgiveness of the violation and the violator; and the social assimilation of all parties involved in order for stability and peace to occur.

Trauma

Theorists such as Fivush suggest that there are two commonly held beliefs about the memory of trauma. First, traumatic experiences are so devastating that people are unable to conceptualize or process the event with clarity and thus repressed from memory. Secondly, others are susceptible to have such vivid clarity of the event that it is as if the event has been “burned into the brain” and they are reliving the event over and

over (Fivush, 8). Interestingly enough, there are some people who contend with both extremes of having times of vivid recollection and poor or no memory at others, which is designated Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). The victims are emotionally and psychologically ‘stuck’ in the past event and are unable to reconcile the trauma with their lives both in the present and for the future. For a process of reconciliation, trauma must not only be addressed but also overcome in order move from instability to a stable personal and communal existence.

The process of reconciliation must take into account the real issues of trauma that are wrought in the lives of the victims. Reconciliation must seek to bring to the fore coherent narratives to provide the victim(s) with the opportunity of coping with the traumatic event as well as being able to place the event, psychologically, in its’ proper place with respect to the totality of one’s life. This project will investigate how trauma has the propensity to impede reconciliation as well as how trauma is dealt with in the process of reconciliation. However, addressing trauma with respect to reconciliation cannot be done without other factors considered. For an individual and/or a community to deal with the traumatic experience there is a need for justice to be served. A rhetoric of reconciliation must seek to identify a judicial perspective that is beneficial and satisfactory to all with the end goal of reconciliation in hand.

Justice

Theorists and researchers in the field of reconciliation ascribe to a restorative justice model rather than a retributive one. However, human tendency is slanted toward revenge, at least as an immediate response, for victimization. Hamlin suggests that revenge is a socially constructed phenomenon that is sustained or rejected by the

approval of the culture in which one functions (Hamlin, 374). Revenge is seen as a backward looking framework aligned with a retributive justice system. The focus is to punish the victimizer for the wrong that they have done, crime they have committed or atrocity that they have initiated. This follows an argument posed by Zaibert who suggests that there is very little if any difference between revenge and punishment (Zaibert, 81). Many use the Old Testament Biblical quote “an eye for an eye...” (Exodus 21:24, NIV) as a proof text to justify their own moral standpoint of revenge being an accepted and necessary action. While it will not be within the scope of this work to sufficiently address biblical interpretation or the multifaceted aspects of revenge, suffice it to say that revenge and punishment are dynamic contributors toward the distinctions adopted in a justice system.

Reconciliation, on the other hand, is a forward-looking framework. The atrocity that has been committed is not demeaned nor rejected, but the focus is on restoration of the victimizer and the victim(s). Restoration as part of the reconciliation process seeks to impose enough shame on the criminal to induce a desire to change (Braithwaite, 89; Tutu, 13) but not to the extent of producing hopelessness or bitterness. The approach is intended to move the perpetrator toward acknowledgment of the wrongdoing and subsequently seeking forgiveness and restoration with the victim(s) and society. Acknowledgement and forgiveness will be taken up below. This judicial standpoint does not negate or overlook the crime that was committed, for just punishment is included. However, the focus is on restoration, therefore the focus is to look forward rather than constantly revisiting the past traumatic experience. Justice served from this perspective allows the trauma to be dealt with, however so carefully. Furthermore, taking a

restorative justice approach, which calls for dialogue between parties, engages in the necessity of the acknowledgement of one having a legitimate perspective and different personality that is at odds with the other. The acknowledgement that one person, group or society has wronged another is an important milestone in the process of healing and reconciliation.

Acknowledgement

The unwillingness to acknowledge the Other, or in the scope of this work the victim(s), is one of the primary objections to the legal system's inefficiency of reconciling parties torn apart by horrific events. In a retributive justice, such as the United States often holds, questions are asked to ascertain who broke the law and what do they deserve. However, the restorative approach seeks to resolve who has been hurt, what are their needs and whose responsibility is it to meet those needs (Zehr, 63). Furthermore, in most instances the victim is not given the opportunity to voice their concerns, pain, and ask the questions that haunt them in relation to the travesty. The victim is a silent mute, only called upon if necessary as a witness on the stand to progress the argument. Govier considers this to be the "second wound of silence" for it is further pain infliction to insinuate, "the victim simply does not matter" (Govier, 13). For many, this avenue does not provide healing for the victim or the space for any level of reconciliation. Krause suggests, "as a society, we would do well if we took the time to listen to victims as a part of their healing" (Krause, 62). She goes on to write, "Trauma creates a need to tell the story again and again. It is telling their truth that others can be witnesses to their pain" (Krause, 62). It is an open acknowledgment of the Other—as victim—that allows for a discourse to ensue that has reconciliatory potentiality.

This acknowledgement in conjunction with addressing trauma and justice paves the road toward actual forgiveness of one party to the other. Without true forgiveness, that is actions that match statements, the process of reconciliation falls flat and progresses no further.

Forgiveness

The term forgiveness is often associated with a moral and/or religious principle of providing pardon to someone for some wrong that has been done. However, the scope of forgiveness is extremely broad and many construct parameters for what they can easily forgive, may forgive in time or never forgive at all. There is a distinction that can be ascertained between bumping into someone on the sidewalk and saying I am sorry and robbing someone on the same sidewalk and asking for forgiveness when caught by the police. Furthermore, there is an even greater distinction if in the same scenario above the robbed person is injured or possibly killed. The willingness of the victim and society in general to forgive fluctuates dependent upon social cultural norms as well as individual worldviews. However, for reconciliation to progress to its' completion of restoration and stability, forgiveness is necessary and at the same time one of the major hindrances to the process.

Forgiveness stands as the middle ground tension between justice and reconciliation and cannot be manipulated by either pole (Peterson, 87). Forgiveness entails an acknowledgment of the wrong, a shared narrative of the wrong and a decision to move toward reconciling relations. Hanna Arendt suggests that we [humanity] have the ability to remember the past but are powerless to change it and we have the ability to envision the future, but again do not have the power to control it. Therefore, having the

power to forgive is the only effective response to the past, which opens up a potential effective future (Petersen, 88). If an effective future is a desired reality, then forgiveness is a point of contention to be addressed by victim and perpetrator alike. The process of reconciliation cannot progress without forgiveness.

A judicial process that ensures justice is served in a restorative manner assists coming to terms with the traumatic experience. The acknowledgement of the other and providing the respect and dignity deserved moves the process toward reconciliation to a point of potential forgiveness of the atrocity committed. Forgiveness provides the doorway through which a community can mend and exist in peace with one another. The existing in peace can be attributed to social assimilation or the ability to provide space for the other to be themselves, even when worldviews differ, and maintain stability and peace.

Social Assimilation

Bar-Tal and Bennink suggest, “reconciliation is required when societies involved in conflict evolve widely shared beliefs, attitudes, motivations, and emotions that support the conflict and de-legitimize the opponent” (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 221). During a conflict the emergence of emotional orientations may arise that permeate throughout groups and institutions even if and when political leaders come to a peace agreement (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 221). Conflicting parties will tend to hold to their negative perceptions of the other party through ongoing communicative processes that are reinforced by societal accepted narrative structures (Ackermann, 103). Therefore, “mechanisms that foster integration” (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 222) are needed to reorient a society’s perceptions. These social perceptions may be adjusted through undergoing

“psychological change so as to form new motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes, and emotions”(Bar-Tal & Bennink, 222). Thus a community can move toward being reconciled after conflict.

Whitaker has defined a reconciled community as one that “assimilates rather than discriminates, promulgates humane and legal rights, does its best to dissolve alienation and fear, encourages people to share values and develop congenial relationships, and promotes a hope that material benefits will accrue as a product of peaceful transactions and independence” (Whitaker, xii). In communities and societies that are torn by atrocities the ability to reorganize, reorient and move forward in a collective manner requires social assimilation of the victim(s) and victimizer(s). Whitaker describes a community wherein discrimination, alienation and fear of retaliation for seeking justice is not accepted nor tolerated. A reconciled community is one that has acknowledged the past atrocity; addressed the atrocity to the extent of justice being satisfied and has made a concerted decision to pick up the broken pieces and use them to create a mosaic of their collective future.

Social assimilation is the action connected to forgiveness. Forgiveness, as noted above, remains abstract unless and until there is social action that provides evidence of the cognizant decision to forgive and be reconciled. This entails alleviating the tension and suspicion connected to the past atrocity as well as establishing trustworthiness among community members. A healthy society is one that contains psychologically healthy individuals with equally healthy interpersonal relationships with those in the community (Merwe, 272). These healthy relationships are predicated upon a willingness to accept community members as actual participants of the community rather than outsiders. This

notion can be seen as expressed in the aftermath of 9/11 whereby the majority of people understand and agree that all Muslims and middle easterners are not terrorists. However, not all those who agree with this sentiment act in accordance with their confession or would they be comfortable having a Muslim from Pakistan living next door (Salaita, 2). There is further evidence in news reports wrought with the injustice, racism and profiling that continues in spite of the education, cross talks, interviews and discussions that are provided through multiple modes of media.

A process of reconciliation must address the social assimilation of its' members with a dedication of action toward constructing and/or reconstructing a healthy, reconciled community. Considering that a community is the sum of its' members, then what happens to one community member affects a segment, if not the entire community. And the converse is true that a social or communal atrocity affects the individuals. Therefore, reconciliation has to address the micro and the macro. Mewre contends that there is only so much political or community leadership can do in the aftermath of atrocities till it becomes an individual matter of decision and action. Additionally, only so much can be done on an interpersonal level till it becomes a matter of community leadership to intervene (Mewre, 275).

Reconciliation is a process that goes beyond the end of a conflict to move individuals, communities, and nations to stability and long lasting peace. The process of reconciliation is a tedious and long road containing treacherous terrain that cannot be ignored but must be navigated with great sensitivity, openness and courage. The process of reconciliation must address issues of trauma, justice, acknowledgement, forgiveness and social assimilation. A rhetoric of reconciliation will seek to lie out the map to safely

navigate through the minefield of adversity toward restoration of broken relationships and broken societies.

Broken societies operate in chaos and dysfunction during and after societal atrocities occur. The spread of Nazism and the rise of Adolf Hitler to power lead to one of the greatest atrocities that mankind has experienced. Propaganda of anti-Semitism gave way to attempted genocide of the Jewish population in Germany. Those who would assist Jews in fleeing the country, hiding them or even speaking out against this extermination catastrophe could face imprisonment and death if caught. During this time of social upheaval, Dietrich Bonhoeffer was an advocate for reconciliation and social stability grounded in the narrative of Christian faith. Bonhoeffer became an opponent of Nazism by speaking truth to power based upon his faith convictions, which ultimately cost him his life. Bonhoeffer was convinced that genocide was not the answer to Germany's poor conditions and struggling economic situation after the First World War. Bonhoeffer could not stand by idle and mute while the innocent were murdered; therefore he was certain it was his responsibility as a man of faith to intervene. Bonhoeffer's historical context, philosophical background, and theological foreground provide substance to the conversation of reconciliation from the perspective of addressing the atrocity while it is in progress. Bonhoeffer provides a bridge from the theoretical to the pragmatic process of reconciliation.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer

Dietrich Bonhoeffer—pastor, theologian, and scholar—provides a perspective of reconciliation that is grounded in Christian narrative that privileges significant change through both thought and action. From Bonhoeffer's perspective, one cannot begin to

discuss morals, ethics, or even justice from a purely humanistic starting point, which is the case with sociological, scientific and political views, but rather one must first begin with God. Bonhoeffer directs our attention to the transcendent reality of a creator God from whom we derive a starting point of how we are to understand the human condition. Furthermore, we gain insight through the ongoing narrative of God's interaction with humanity to develop a sense of how we are supposed to live that is manifested in humanity's reconciliation with God and subsequently with one another.

Bonhoeffer's "rhetoric of responsibility" (Arnett) within the historical context of the Holocaust offers insight to how a process of reconciliation may be pursued from a Christian narrative ground. Bonhoeffer was the pastor of a German parish at London from 1934 until the end of his life on April 9, 1945 when he was hanged (Mengus, 19). "For Bonhoeffer, it all began with his deep empathy for a specific group of compatriots, church ministers with a Jewish origin. Their exclusion was for him simply intolerable. Once kindled in this context, his active compassion then extended itself to wider circles" (Mengus, 19).

Bonhoeffer's stand against the Third Reich amidst persecution and eventual death is in contrast to the modern increasing ineffectiveness of the church to affect social and personal change. Bonhoeffer contended with an attempt to rally the Confessing Church, to no avail, to go against the Nazi regime and the injustice propagated against Jews. Bonhoeffer establishes an ethic of responsibility whereby faith is actualized through love, love of neighbor who happened to be the Jewish counterparts. An ethic of responsibility is grounded in and only possible due to the reconciliation that is complete in Christ. Bonhoeffer moves from a faith position to a conviction of responsibility to do something.

Therefore, Bonhoeffer's rhetorical communication was that of a call to the church community—the community of love—to do something against the injustice.

Furthermore, it was a call to actualize the faith that church members proclaimed to have due to the reconciliation of man to God and man-to-man. Moyo offers collaborating sentiments when he writes, “The Church is that instrument through which God chooses to be reconciled with creation as a whole, but more so with people, and to reconcile people with one another regardless of race, color, or creed. In other words that message constitutes the core business of the Church and is not only to be proclaimed, but must also be lived out both in church and in society” (Moyo, 32).

Arnett suggests that “Bonhoeffer considered it important for a person of faith to meet the everyday, the present situation, with a guiding faith story” and that his [Bonhoeffer's] scholarship direct us “to a rhetorical religious charge—to meet and address the world before us, not the world we demand of God” (Arnett, 5). Bonhoeffer rejected the notion that one could stand outside of or above a given historical moment and engage in a “telling”(Arnett). However, Bonhoeffer “lived a rhetoric of phronesis, a practical wisdom emergent from the meeting of the concrete moment and the storyline of faith ever responsible for the Other” (Arnett, 7). The dialectic of the story of faith and the historical moment calls into conversation the injustice at hand and the interpretation of the injustice through the narrative lens of the faith story. This dialectic brings into conversation the immortal and the mortal, inviting differing views, however, not losing the central ground of the story of faith. “Bonhoeffer understood that interpretative action cannot deny reality but must offer a story that contends with evil, oppression of the

Other, and unearned privilege for oneself” (Arnett, 35). This is accomplished through the story of faith and relationship with God.

Disagreement, dis-unity and splintered was the condition of the church community of which Bonhoeffer was situated. Was it due to a multiplicity of opinions whereby unanimity was never reached? Was it due to a sense of mediocrity whereby it was safer to be non-resistant rather than swim against the current? Was it due to interpersonal conflict among and between church members that debilitated the church?

Bonhoeffer suggests the church rightly understood is the community of love rather than the community of faith. Why? He suggested that faith causes the church community to be realized, but it is love that causes it to be actualized (Bonhoeffer, 42). For Bonhoeffer *vis a vie* Luther, the church is not the church unless and until some manifestation of the faith that is claimed is put into practice. We look at the sentiments of James again in a fuller context, “What good is it, my brothers, if a man claims to have faith but has no deeds? Can such faith save him? Suppose a brother or sister is without clothes and daily food. If one of you says to him, "Go, I wish you well; keep warm and well fed," but does nothing about his physical needs, what good is it? In the same way, faith by itself, if it is not accompanied by action, is dead” (James 2:18-20, NIV). Faith in action is that of caring for the welfare of the human family, which is predicated upon a foundation of love that is given to the believer (Christian) through the Holy Spirit. It is argued by Bonhoeffer that the ability to love—agape love—is impossible for any human to do. Faith actualized in love for another is only accomplished through the work of the Holy Spirit.

Bonhoeffer provides a perspective of faith that is not just talked about, but actualized through action. His theology and philosophy of reconciliation, grace, and love grounds an overly spiritualized faith in praxis. Bonhoeffer contributes to a rhetoric of reconciliation a pragmatic narrative ground in a historical era of contention.

Bonhoeffer's philosophical and theological ground frames a rhetoric of reconciliation that begins and ends with God. Bonhoeffer's faith convictions lead him to live out the grand reciprocity of reconciling people as God reconciled people to himself. Reconciliation of people to people was also the goal of South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation

Commission. The work of the commission was grounded in the Christian faith narrative to bring about peace and social harmony in the wake of apartheid. South Africa's

apartheid was a government imposed dehumanization of a race of people indigenous to the country and contained heinous acts of violence often perpetrated by malicious bribed Black South Africans. Mass rape, murder, kidnapping, illegal imprisonment and

oppression are some of the ongoing issues lived through during apartheid. However, the end of apartheid did not automatically and instantaneously change society. A new

government, lead by the democratically elected Nelson Mandela had a long road toward creating a sustainable infrastructure for a stable society. The decision was made to enact

the Truth and Reconciliation Commission whereby a process of reconciling people and communities was instituted. South Africa's end of the long history of apartheid has been

and continues to be a widely studied application of a process of reconciliation due to the course of action the successive government administration chose to take following

apartheid's demise. South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission will be reviewed for its' potential of future application in various other contexts.

South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission

The theoretical and theological remain abstract unless and otherwise they incorporate praxis. A dialogue of a rhetoric of reconciliation remains mere rhetoric unless it can be grounded in some pragmatic application to prove its' efficiency or reject its' hypothesis. Therefore, this work will take into consideration South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission as such a pragmatic situation.

The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) was set up by the Government of National Unity to help deal with the horrific events that occurred during the decades of apartheid. The conflict during this period resulted in violence and human rights abuses. No section of society escaped these abuses. The TRC was based on the Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act, Number 34 of 1995 (www.justice.gov.za/trc). The task of TRC was to uncover the truth about the past atrocities, both local and national, and provide grounds for reconciliation between individuals and communities. The TRC sought to promote "both truth and reconciliation via three steps that constitute the foci of its three committees: amnesty, victim testimony, and reparation and rehabilitation" (Villa-Vicencio, 407). The process contained the platform for victims of human injustice to tell their stories that were followed by the possibility of the offenders to come forward, confess their crimes, ask for forgiveness and be granted amnesty rather than punishment. This process allowed the Commission to "get a complete picture as possible of the nature, causes and extent of the politically motivated gross human rights violations that occurred" (Verwoerd, 23).

The TRC gained notoriety because it was unlike any other previous process to bring about justice in the aftermath of chaos. The underpinning motivation of the TRC

was deeply connected to and driven by religious, namely Christian, beliefs. Chapman notes, “In contrast with other truth commissions, whose commissioners were generally lawyers and jurists, religious thinkers and clergy played major roles in the TRC” (Chapman, 20). The chair of the Commission was Archbishop Desmond Tutu who is often noted as framing the discourse of the Commission hearing in terms of “repentance and forgiveness” (Chapman, 20). Chapman also notes that many of the hearings resembled church services rather than judicial proceedings with liturgical overtones that could not be denied (Chapman, 20.). The general acceptance of a religious framework to bring about justice and reconciliation is associated with South African culture of liberation theology (Poewe, 44). Liberation theology views the restorative act of reconciliation as presented in the gospels from the perspective of the oppressed or a bottom-up view (Peters, 2). Such a theological position posits the act of making things right lies in the hands of those that have been oppressed rather than dictated by those you have political and socioeconomic power (Peters, 27).

A major portion of reconciliation, especially that of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, is that of story telling. However, in the telling of the story, a question arises that must be addressed, who’s story? In the retelling of historical narrative, be it a historian, biographer, or autobiographer, there are always differing perspectives on the story that elucidate difficulty in surmising legitimate accounts. Historical events can take on a variety of interpretations and meanings dependent upon the perspective of the interpreter; proximity to the event; as well as personal biases and filters through which a person views the event and is always projecting (Gadamer, 269). These factors have the propensity to create barriers to a rhetoric of reconciliation, especially when one group

views an act in a completely different light than another. Gadamer writes, “rival projects can emerge side by side until it becomes clearer what the unity of meaning is; interpretation beings with fore-conceptions that are replaced by more suitable ones” (Gadamer, 269). He suggests that there is the potential for differing views and narrative structures to exist simultaneously while a new narrative is being constructed. It becomes an ethical communicative aspect needed by all. Arnett and Arneson note, “We need to listen to the existential demand of a given historical moment in order to interpret situations within the present historical framework rather than one created by an earlier generation....” (Arnett & Arneson, 35). Transformation and progress that is forward looking rather than backward, allows for a rhetoric of reconciliation to emerge.

Nevertheless, it goes without saying that not everyone is convinced that reconciliation is possible or pragmatic. Proponents argue that sometimes it is better to let some things remain covered over rather than open old wounds. Furthermore, there are others who do not believe it is in the realm of possibilities for selfish, self-interested humanity. Dwyer states “any conception of reconciliation that makes reconciliation dependent on forgiveness, or that emphasizes interpersonal harmony or fellow-feeling, will fail to be a realistic model for most creatures like us” (Dwyer, 81). Nevertheless, it will be argued that humanity, created in the image of God, has the potential to rise above the banality of evil to live in a more peaceful cohabitation. It is a surety that has been well quoted that as humans we have more in common than we do uncommon, which reinforces the argument of reconciliation being a pragmatic reality. A rhetoric of reconciliation must embrace the narrative structures of reality present and past toward creating a unified future. Truth telling, openness, forgiveness and acknowledgement are

some of the ingredients necessary for achieving reconciliation. Additionally, a rhetoric of reconciliation must also take into consideration the construction of narratives from the various perspectives that emerge from a process of reconciliation.

The trajectory of this research is an attempt to construct a rhetoric of reconciliation that is grounded in a Christian faith narrative and perspective. This project will look at popular theorist in the field of reconciliation along side the theological disposition and historical context of Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Bonhoeffer's historical predicament provides a setting for reconciliation to be attempted in worse of conditions. This project will also look at how the processes of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission have played out and see if there are any connections to Bonhoeffer's view of reconciliation as pragmatic application of a rhetoric of reconciliation. Hans Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics will act as philosophical background for this project for interpretation becomes a primary foundational issue for reconciliation. One's perspective on the past and the present has far reaching implications of for the future. A rhetoric of reconciliation must be attentive to varying voices in an attempt at gaining a fusion of horizons. Thus the undertaking of a rhetoric of reconciliation, to discover more suitable narratives that guide societies, communities and individuals to live in peaceful and stable environments.

Chapter 2

Theoretical Frames of Reconciliation

Rhetoric of reconciliation is a communicative praxis narratively situated to cause peace and stability after conflict as terminated. Reconciliation seeks to restore justice and communal order, repair broken relationships, heal communities, and provide an atmosphere for stability and safety. However, reconciliation theorists differ on their approach to how reconciliation is to be achieved. Some theorists contend that a judicial process is the primary aspect of reconciliation and frame their theories based upon a restorative justice model (Biggar, 7; Mewre, 138; Elshtain, 87; Abu-Nimer, 5; Bar-Simantov, 12; etc). Judicial theorists place justice as the main issue of achieving reconciliation albeit there is disagreement among theorists on the defining of justice. Social-Psychological theorists take as their starting point and emphasis mainly upon the trauma and social disconnection that are incurred by the victim(s) (Worthington, 3; Bar-Tal, Bennink, Kelman & Kriesberg, 4; Robert, 67; Moaz, 28, etc). These theorists focus on the cognitive processes that must happen in the individual, victim and perpetrator, as well as the community in which the crime has occurred. On a national and global scale Social-Psychological theorists focus on the similar cognitive responses necessary for transition and transformation of entire social systems. Religious theorists, and for the purposes of this research, Christian theorists, respond to reconciliation from the divine and move toward the moral and ethical reciprocity that ought to occur among humanity in light of the template offered by the Biblical narrative. These three—Justice, Social-Psychological, and Christian—will be taken up in this chapter. Each theoretical frame will be reviewed and discussed for implications for a rhetoric of reconciliation.

At the heart of reconciliation lies a necessity of dialogue to facilitate the principle aspects of repair that are necessary to establish or reestablish relationships between conflicting parties. A rhetoric of reconciliation is an identification of those channels of communication; the moral and ethical ground from which dialogue can ensue; and the pragmatic reciprocity that enable the process of reconciliation to steady its course to the attainment of restoration of that which had been lost, namely community. Bar-Tal and Bennink suggest that reconciliation addresses “changing the motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes, and emotions of the great majority of the society members regarding the conflict” (Bar-Tel & Bennink, 8). To change motivations, goals, beliefs and attitudes requires a communicative process that merges previous narrative structures into a new narrative that undergirds the communal stability for the present and future. Montville recommends that in issues of conflict resolution and reconciliation involves a “transactional” dialogue wherein, “both sides must come to some agreement on the situation at hand; the historical event itself—including the details of the event and who was involved; the wounds; and the acceptance of moral responsibility” (Montville, 28). The transactional engagement of parties involved sets the parameters for ongoing dialogue to work out issues related to the conflict and sets the foundation for how the relationship(s) can emerge anew. However, what is communicated and subsequently enacted contains pragmatic stipulations that must be addressed. Theorists agree that trauma, justice, acknowledgement, forgiveness and social assimilation are issues of concern that can impede the progression of reconciliation if left unattended. The trauma of the experience; justice being served; the acknowledgement of the offense; a process of forgiveness of both victim(s) and perpetrator(s); and social assimilation of all parties

involved into the broader communal environment are necessary aspects of any reconciliatory process (Fivush, 18; Worthington, 5; Janoff-Bulman, 21, May, Keating, 184; Biggar, Shriver, Elshtain, Hamber, 6, Marrus, Crocker, Dwyer, Govier, 2, Worthington, 26; Volf, 91; Tutu, 13; Auerbach, 5, Kelman, 27; Daly & Sarkin, 18; Moaz, 3).

The actual events and constituents involved in conflict can range from interpersonal moral and criminal offenses to national and international infractions of human rights, genocide, and civil and national war. However, when the conflict has ended, what ought to occur? What direction does life take for those involved in the conflict? How is the potential for conflict to resurface curtailed? The answer to these questions for many theorists is reconciliation. “In its simplest form, reconciliation means restoring friendships and harmony between the rival sides after *conflict resolution*, or transforming relations of hostility and resentment to friendly and harmonious ones” (Ackerman, Keisberg, Phillips, Arthur, Gardner-Feldman, 16). The goal of reconciliation is not the end of conflict, for it is at the end of conflict when the process of reconciliation begins. The often long and tedious climb to recovering, rebuilding and reestablishing a sense of order is the murky process of reconciliation. This chapter will address the three major theoretical frames of reconciliation, the dialogical interaction that is present in each and the manner in which trauma, acknowledgement, justice, forgiveness, and social assimilation is achieved.

Judicial Reconciliation Theory

A rhetoric of reconciliation from a judicial disposition involves retributive and restorative justice models. Theorists further define retributive justice in terms of being

procedural, distributive and legalistic. These metaphors are based upon what theorists find to be the essence of the modern western society's approach to justice by virtue of the court system's crime/punishment paradigm (Biggar, 168). Restorative justice models on the other hand place emphasis upon rebuilding relationships and communities that have become distraught due to conflict and crime. Theorists point to Group Meetings such as Family Group Conferences and Victim-Offender programs for interpersonal issues and Tribunals, Truth Commissions and Mediation programs on communal and national/international scales as alternatives to retributive justice models and more productive than court procedures. Restorative justice theorists view the western philosophy and practice of retributive justice as being inconsistent with the goals of reconciliation and call for a revamping of the current judicial system, which privileges punishment over restoration and includes a more community-wide process of justice that in which the outcome is directly affected by the victim and the perpetrator. Though it must be noted that incarceration is not ruled completely out in a restorative justice model. A restorative model requires willing participation, but if the perpetrator(s) refuse to participate then alternatives must be sought to ensure justice is restored (Estrada-Hollenbeck, 67). Nevertheless, the goal is to restore broken relationships; reestablish community stability and peace, which restorative justice theorists suggest is accomplished through a restorative rather than retributive practice of justice.

Johan Galtung asserts that justice can be interpreted as "to each party his/her due" based upon concepts of "parity, equality and equity" (Galtung, 3). The court systems in most western cultures has been given the authority to carry out the goals of equality and equity to the end that society is just and safe environment. This aim constitutes both a

“procedural justice and distributive justice”(Estrada-Hollenbeck, 65). Procedural justice is achieved when parties involved perceive that justice is served through the appropriate judicial process or procedure. Distributive justice occurs when parties involved are satisfied that what is fair, equal and just has been accomplished through the judicial system. Such a system, which is predominant within the United States, is termed legalistic (Van Ness, 16) or retributive (Zehr, 68). A legalistic justice system views crime committed as a crime against the state rather than against a person (Hudson & Galaway, 2). The court system is thereby empowered to carry out the punishment of the perpetrator, inclusive of restitutions and incarceration. Judges and juries therefore settle conflicts between lawbreakers and the state thereby making “the administration of criminal justice the exclusive responsibility of the government” (Estrada-Hollenbeck, 67). A legalistic and retributive judicial system makes extremely problematic for a restorative justice model to exist, for a restorative model calls for the mending of interpersonal and communal relationships that have been damaged by conflict. For restoration to occur, all parties involved in the conflict must be a part of resolution, which a retributive perspective does not allow.

In post-modern society it is often uncommon for the victim to have a role in the court proceedings, unless prosecuting attorneys call upon them as a witness. Otherwise, the victim is not given the platform to share their experience of the trauma that was inflicted upon them nor the opportunity to have questions answered that will assist the victim in bringing closure to the event (Krause, 57). “The heart of reconciliation is to begin to heal the very thing that wounded us” (Krause, 55). The healing process for the victim, and perpetrator alike, becomes problematic in a retributive justice system where

there is not dialogue between victim and offender, which is paramount to reconciliation (Brown & Poremski, viii). However, rather than healing, emphasis is placed upon the crime and the appropriate punishment of the criminal for the infraction. Similar is the situation on national and international justice issues whereby a mediating representative, such as the United Nations, are sought to administer justice. Such counsels are relegated the authority to provide terms of conflict resolution as well as punishment of offenders, often without the participation of those most affected by the conflict being involved. Furthermore, in the aftermath of war punishment of those who are found guilty of human rights violations, such as the Nuremburg trials, complicates any process wherein reconciliation is the goal (Pankhurst, 242). Pankhurst goes on to suggest that punishment within a retributive model is focused upon “vengeance” not reconciliation and such a focus may address the atrocity at hand, but will inevitably lead to the issues that created the conflict to arise again (Pankhurst, 244).

The legal system has not always been grounded in a legalistic-retributive framework. According to Estrada-Hollenbeck legal systems prior to the rise of centralized government in Europe in the Middle Ages “viewed crime primarily as wrong done to victims and their families” (Estrada-Hollenbeck, 67). When a crime was committed, it was considered a breach in community peace and the perpetrator(s) were encouraged to “provide restitution and gestures of atonement in order to repair their injury to the victims and restore peace to their communities” (Estrada-Hollenbeck, 67). Wilkinson believes that a shift occurred following the Norman Invasion of Britain and to William the Conqueror who created a legal system that centralized power and observed any crime committed as being against the king rather than another person (Wilkinson, 6).

King Henry I continued in his father's stride and created laws that were considered offenses to the king's peace and in so doing allowed the king to take authority away from citizens, courts and the church (Wilkinson, 6). While the judicial system of the west does not operate under a dictatorship, the philosophy of crime being an offense against the state has persevered. It is the goal of the court system to ensure justice, which often is just punishment or retribution to reestablish equity that the offender has disrupted with their crime. Shriver suggests that this philosophy follows the principal "for your hurt [that you caused], we [the state] hurt [you] in return, but not necessarily in like kind" (Shriver, 31). To this end justice is considered served. The criminal is punished for their crime by an objective procedural distributive justice system whose undertaking is to ensure justice is enacted and laws obeyed. However, reformers of the present situation argue that a retributive process is not designed for reconciliation, even in the most abstract sense of the term. Minow asserts that the "reconstruction of a relationship, seeking to heal the accused, or indeed, healing the rest of the community, are not goals in any direct sense" (Minow, 26). Minow's comments are directed at both criminal court proceedings as well as national/international tribunals.

Opponents of retributive justice insist that unless and until the parties involved in a conflict acknowledge the wrong; agree upon the historical attributes of the event; and address the trauma that has been suffered, there is not justice nor can there be any conceivable level of reconciliation attained. "Reconciliation of a conflict demands dialogue, self-reflection, and a commitment to the belief in the possibility of significant change" (Brown & Poremski, viii). Judicial reformers and reconciliation theorists alike desire an existential model of justice that is driven by restoration rather than retribution.

“Restorative justice is a practitioner-led reform movement calling for changes in the criminal justice domain that place greater emphasis on communication and reconciliation between victim, offender, and community” (Dzur, 4). Such a model places more authority and decision-making in the hands of the laypersons, mediators, and those most affected by the atrocity and lessens the power of court system (Biggar, 167). Dzur asserts “All” [reformers] “want to make the criminal justice process less mediated by professionals following system imperatives; all are critical of traditional forms of punishment” (Dzur, 7). Punishment, in the modern sense of incarceration, mass deportation, and the like is recognized as unbeneficial to creating lasting peace and communal stability. Zehr suggests:

Punishment seeks to right the balance by lowering the offender to the level to which the victim has been reduced, while a non-punitive measure like restitution seeks to raise the victim to his or her previous level and acknowledges the role of the offender and possibilities for repentance. For punishment does not give victims a real experience of justice and it does not give offenders a chance at real accountability.

A restorative framework of justice hinges upon dialogue between victim(s) and offender(s) whereby, as Zehr articulates, acknowledgement, repentance, accountability and reintegration have the greatest potential to occur.

Communicative interaction between parties that are involved in conflict have the opportunity to air out their grievances, concerns, anger and other emotional issues surrounding the atrocity. Dialogue provides a substance mode of interaction aimed toward addressing the trauma; acknowledgement of the wrong done; apology and forgiveness; justice and social assimilation. Theorists utilize interactive restoration programs such as Family Group Conferences (Smith, 41), Victim-Offender Program (Zehr, 8), Problem-Solving Workshops (Estrada-Hollenbeck, 77), Tribunals (Pankhurst,

242), and Truth Commissions (Bar-On, 246) to support their argument of a restorative justice model. Family Group Conferences, Victim-Offender Programs and Problem-Solving Workshops function to bring together victim, offender, families and often, key community leaders to resolve conflicts and crimes on a community/interpersonal level. Tribunals and Truth Commissions have been utilized in providing similar, but often more complicated, conflicts that involve groups, communities, and countries.

A restorative mode of justice views conflicts of an interpersonal nature being able to be resolved through dialogically interactive programs that provides the space for the victim, offender and other key stakeholders to address the crime and come to terms on steps for restitution, reintegration and reconciliation. Zehr, who is a proponent of victim-offender mediation programs, writes, “The goal is to set up a face to face encounter between victim and offender that will focus on facts, feelings, and agreements” (Zehr, 8). In the face-to-face encounter the participants have the opportunity to speak openly about the incident that has occurred while expressing the trauma, humiliation, and anger that has been created due to the incident. The offender is given the opportunity to dialogue with the victim and in the best case scenario acknowledge the wrong that was done and plead for forgiveness (Dzur, 10). The mediator/facilitator’s role is to assist the participants to stay on track; prevent the encounter from becoming negative and/or violent; assist in interpreting and communicating the agreed upon outcomes of the entire process that are most often written in contractual terms and signed by the parties involved (Zehr, 12). Ideally, “parties assume responsibility for the wrongs they have done, apologize, and are willing to provide compensation or make reparation” (Estrada-Hollenbeck, 76). Additionally, those involved must be willing to accept remorse and

forgive the perpetrator. Forgiveness being instrumental factor in moving beyond the event(s) toward reconciliation (Minow, 41).

A rhetoric of reconciliation is inclusive of trauma, acknowledgement, justice, forgiveness, and social assimilation. Victim-Offender, family and community conferencing programs aim at addressing the trauma, having the perpetrator acknowledge the wrong they have done, ensure justice is served, promote forgiveness of and to all parties and reestablish a stable living environment where animosity is not carried by anyone (Hudson & Galaway, 12). It is noteworthy at this juncture to mention a program that has documented success in Australia and in the US, specifically Western Pennsylvania. Family Group Decision Making (www.americanhumane.org) is a conferencing program that this writer had the privilege of being a part of for several years. The main emphasis is assisting families, usually adolescent and teen offenders, address what they have done wrong; create a plan to correct the wrong and curtail repetition and reintegrate the perpetrator into the community. However, at least in Pennsylvania, there is enforced mediation as a part of the process. The majority of the cases are referred to Family Group Decision Making by the juvenile court system and a representative of Child and Youth Services over sees the bottom-line objectives. This aspect of the program makes it unique but the goals of reconciliation through an alternative to acts of retribution are the same. Nevertheless, no matter how theoretically sound victim-offender programs may be, there are a few problematic issues. To begin, the process in each program mentioned is completely voluntary, which can create potential hindrances to the program. The perpetrator may not want be involved and the offended may not want to face the offender (Strang, Sherman, Woods, Bennett,

Newbury-Birch & Inkpen, 281). Additionally, the conferencing programs tend to be utilized for criminal offenses, such as theft, verbal assault and minor physical assault, which would be considered misdemeanors by the traditional justice system. Crimes such as armed robbery, attempted homicide, and murder are not among offenses addressed. Also, conferencing programs most often involve minors who have committed crimes rather than adults.

National and international atrocities have a similar yet more complicated process to travel toward reconciliation. Political, cultural and religious distinctions between conflicting parties are obstacles that can have decades of entrenched ideology difficult to overcome. Luiz Carlos Susin writes, “Peoples have histories going back thousands of years, including the histories of their traumas and sorrows, their struggles and refusals” (Susin, 9). Bar-On writes of the complexities associated with mass reconciliation citing the German Christian attempts to begin a reconciliation process with Jews following the Holocaust (Bar-On, 239). Jews were not willing to accept German Christian attempts at reconciliation for many years. Differing perspectives, interpretations of the atrocity, and historical issues of anti-Semitism are some of the barriers that existed (Bar-On, 241). Nevertheless, there are documented successful reconciliation programs between groups following civil, ethnic, national and world wars.

Truth commissions (TCs) are one of the most cited and researched reconciliation models. Truth commissions have been utilized after civil conflict in countries such as South Africa, Botswana, Zimbabwe, Ireland, and the former Yugoslavia (Merwe, 187; McCandless, 209; Fitzduff, 255; Hart, 291; Lambourne, 311). The basic elements of TCs are similar to victim-offender and conferencing models previously discussed addressing

the issues of trauma, acknowledgement, justice, forgiveness, and social assimilation. Judicial theorists point the main emphasis of the process as being justice and how justice is defined, achieved, accepted, and enacted to curtail future problems (Biggar, 175; Shriver, 18). In short, TCs include a public telling of the atrocity by the victim(s); a public acknowledgement of the wrong done by perpetrators as a sign of remorse; a willingness to pay and accept restitution; forgiveness in the form of amnesty for the perpetrators and by the victim(s); and reestablishment of community interaction (Tutu, 47). The philosophical ground of TCs is most often associated with cultural and/or religious dispositions that emphasize repentance, forgiveness, and reconciliation. “Peace requires justice, justice requires truth, and truth requires the correct information” (Susin, 10).

Justice is conceived as being done through the process of perpetrators coming forward to confess what they have done and plead for forgiveness. Amnesty is to be granted by the committee and subsequently the community if it has been ascertained that the committer of the offense has come forward as truthful, convicted, remorseful and willing to change (Rasmussen, 113). Kelsen points out that this approach to community can be seen in Aristotelian thought. “It seems, therefore, that it is friendship that holds a polis [and so the state] together...the highest level of justice resides in the achievement of friendship” (Kelsen, 8). Kelsen asserts that for Aristotle friendship among community members was more important than justice in the sense of retribution. Therefore, truth, admittance, and forgiveness were necessary elements between community members to establish on-going peace and stability. Getting at the truth, no matter how ugly it is, and having offenders provide acknowledgement of guilt, remorse, change of heart/mind,

reparations and restitution as means of justice (Galtung, 12) and establishing stability and on-going peace within the community.

However, TCs have received their share of both praise and criticism, especially from judicial theorists. Critics of Truth Commissions question the validity of justice being met with the potential of offenders lying about their actions and/or not fully disclosing all the details that TCs set as the stipulations of granting amnesty (Asmal, 3). Furthermore, those appointed to the commissions are given the roles of amnesty grantors and mediators between the offended and the offenders. These assignments are perceived as potential inhibitors if and when those on the commission boards may have ulterior motives and grant amnesty in situations that do not warrant such. Additionally, it has been noted by Kriesberg, that there are some people within countries that have utilized Truth Commissions who express sentiments of being forced or coerced in forgiving when they are not ready or willing to forgive (Kriesberg, 106). Nevertheless, success has been found through the utilization of Truth Commissions to bring about peace and stability in the aftermath of conflict.

The establishment of mediation programs has been the focus of organizations as the United Nations and NATO. The appointment of mediators to war torn countries to establish peace-talks toward future stability and reconciliation is their primary goal. The mediators stand as the go-between for the groups in conflict and assist in creating stipulations, often in the form of treaties, which each side is able to accept and agree to. Additionally, they are to ensure the justice is carried to the satisfaction of those who are involved in the conflict. Justice being served is defined in terms of the political, cultural and if necessary international laws and regulations. According to Williams “the

traditional mediator has been an outsider, impartial and full of objectivity” (Williams, 24). A sense of objectivity is what provides acceptance among those involved, so as all parties agree upon the mediator and the mediation process. Estrada-Hollenbeck suggests that the mediation process typically requires dialogue between conflicting parties; non-coerced participation and provides “every parties subjective perspectives to contribute to the shape of the agreement” (Estrada-Hollenbeck, 79). Kelman adds that such a process allows parties with lengthy history of violence and intense conflict to establish incremental steps of trust leading toward reconciliation (Kelman, 68). The dialogue of the mediated process allows for conflicting parties to re-conceptualize their perception of the enemy’s image, goals, ideologies and symbols of legitimacy (Kelman, 68).

Therefore, the dialogic interaction or transaction should lead to a co-authored narrative structure (Fisher, 18) of the past, present and future of the relationship between the parties. The co-opted construction of the narrative can provide the ontological principles that set the parameters of peace and stability. Mediators assisting parties in conflict are challenged to assist in the acquiring of a mutual understanding of the other’s historical disposition, context, and perceptions in order to begin writing new combined narrative.

Issues of concern arise when mediators become imposing authorities upon the process rather than facilitating the parties to arrive at their own agreement (Holbrooke, 80). When imposing becomes the agenda of the mediation process, it mimics a retributive justice framework is that the mediating party takes on the role of judge and jury to hand down the terms by which justice is to be established and the particulars of how the relationship between parties will ensue. This is the usual situation when threats of military force and/or international sanctions are enforced to bring about a cease-fire.

Subsequently, the governing entities act as mediator between conflicting parties to establish contractual terms of peace. The Dayton Peace Accord (DPA) is a peace agreement drafted by third party mediators for Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian peoples (Estrada-Hollenbeck, 80). The agreement was created with independent input from all parties involved in the conflict prior to the coming together of representatives of each group. Estrada-Hollenbeck writes, “Holbrooke, as mediator, used both military threat, personal skill, and political pressure to gain the parties’ agreement. The third party could own the agreement, because it made sense to them” (Estrada-Hollenbeck, 80) even if the parties in conflict did not completely agree. The long term outcome is that Bosnia, though it was suppose to become a multinational democratic state, continues to have three distinct ethnic parties that have conflicting views of how the country should look (International Crisis Group, 1). Therefore, reconciliation has not been attained in Bosnia due to ongoing disunity among differing groups who have not yet begun to co-author an agreed upon new narrative. From this example it can be surmised that mediation by imposition may bring an end to the conflict, it does not necessarily provide ground for reconciliation to be accomplished. The dialectic of acknowledging the past and re-envisioning the future for the reframing of the present (Lederach, 27) cannot be accomplished through strong-arm mediation. For reconciliation to occur, parties in conflict must be in dialogue with one another—no matter how difficult and lengthy the process may take—in order to comes to terms of agreement upon what has been; what can be and therefore what must be done now.

Reconciliation is dependent on dialogue. Dialogue between parities in conflict, be they individuals or groups, has to arrive at consensus upon the historical elements of

the conflict as well as how justice will be attained. How justice is conceived and achieved becomes the main focus of judicial reconciliation theorists. “The world globalized by the dynamic of modernization...ignoring the originality of peoples, has also become a world of accumulated wounds, of disconnections and fragmentations, and of increased risks on all levels” (Susin, 9). The overcoming of deeply embedded wounds and past atrocities is the challenge of a reconciliation model framed by justice. While there is a consensus among theorist that a retributive approach to justice is not justice at all, there is not a consensus on exactly how justice is perceived. Some theorists suggest that justice is achieved through interpersonally through group or community conferences. There is documented success of group conferences, however they have not been used in cases beyond misdemeanors. On national and international levels, theorists cite peace talks, truth commission, and mediation groups as viable models to achieve justice in route to reconciliation. However, the problem still is maintained that willing participation must transpire for a restorative justice model to move beyond conflict to reconciliation. The unwillingness to participate can be attributed to worldviews that are socially constructed and psychologically embedded (Wilmer, 91).

Sociological and Psychological factors contributing not only to conflict, but also to the hindrance of reconciliation arise from viewing the conflict resolution and reconciliation from a different perspective. Socially constructed characteristics of cultural norms, religious beliefs, and ethical positions on issues of morality affect an individual’s worldview and the identity that is ascertained by communities as well as nations. At this juncture another theoretical frame emerges to identify how sociological and psychological factors contribute to reconciliation, or the lack thereof. Additionally,

how the social and psychological need to be addressed to overcome trauma and achieve reconciliation.

Social-Psychological Reconciliation Theoretical Frame

Sociology and Psychology are steeped together to form the social-psychological framework of reconciliation. It has been stated that a rhetoric of reconciliation is a communicative praxis that addresses trauma, acknowledgement, justice, forgiveness, and social assimilation. Social-Psychological Reconciliation theorists view each of these aspects of a process of reconciliation to be cognitive transitions (Fisher, 28) that produce outward or social changes. “The social psychological approach stresses the cognitive and emotional aspects of reconciliation” (Bar-Siman-Tov, 5). Accordingly, social psychological theorists view reconciliation as a process that addresses the “painful questions of past conflict so as to build a foundation for normal peace relations” (Bar-Siman-Tov, 5). This process requires a mutual willingness to apologize and provides forgiveness; offering of appropriate compensation based upon a mutual understanding of justice; respect and acknowledgment of each other’s identity; and the willingness to begin a new chapter in life (Tavuchis, 12; Scheff, 6; Shriver, 215; Bar-Tal and Bennink, 14). Social-Psychological theorists construct their model of reconciliation on the emphasis of psychological processes and social structural processes. While transformations in political regimes, such as Yugoslavia and South Africa, are structural changes, theorists attribute these changes to psychological transformations that give way to structural changes and not the other way around (Bar-Tal and Bennink, 15). Social scientists tend to observe the structural elements of cultures, states, and countries and then look for underlying principles to why the structure exists (Bar-Tal, 352). Political and economic

structures are observed as the most important infrastructures needing changed in the aftermath of conflict. However, Wilmer points out, “although structural factors may contribute to precipitating in a conflict or to constructing a framework for stable peace, structural factors alone neither cause nor resolve protracted and violent conflict” (Wilmer, 93). Therefore, what has emerged is a focus on the interrelationship of the psychological transformations that lead to the structural changes in route to stable and lasting peace. Social-Psychology Reconciliation theorist begin their assent toward reconciliation through dealing with the cognitive reality of the trauma associated with conflict. The process is followed by forgiveness on the part of the victim(s) and repentance of the perpetrator. Social Psychological Reconciliation theorists believe that through the interaction of the victim and the perpetrator a new perception of the other can and ought to occur that creates the groundwork for a collective narrative structure of peace and stability. Furthermore, structural changes, such as infrastructure, and economic trade, are seen as macro-level transitions in both perception and action that assist the reconciliation process.

Trauma

Getting society members to make a shift in their perceptions of others entails dealing with and addressing the trauma that has been experienced during the conflict. The issue of trauma and subsequently victimization becomes even more heightened in interpersonal conflicts (Fivush, 89). Janoff-Bulman suggests that one of the most enduring consequences of experiencing a traumatic event is “shattered assumptions” (Janoff-Bulman, 8). People have expectations of their daily routines and livelihood in general that consists of a certain level of security and safety. There are cultural and

societal predispositions about how a given community will function and the moral and ethical dimensions that are observed. When these primary assumptions are disrupted by a traumatic event, the psychological expectations are “shattered” (Janoff-Bulman, 8). The trauma associated with conflict has the propensity to become a deep-seated psychological phenomenon that does not subside when the traumatic experience has ended, but is relived in the mind of the victim(s) for an unidentifiable amount of time. A primary example of shattered assumptions occurred on 9/11 when terrorists ruined the major assumption of the security of the United States. In the aftermath of such civil as well as situations of individual traumatic experiences, predictions about the future and present dispositions have been drastically altered. Such altered perceptions may also cause changed self-perceptions, especially in atrocities such as mugging, rape, attempted murder, genocide and slavery.

A traumatic experience can be so devastating and life altering that the vivid images of the experience are “burned into the brain” (Fivush, 90). Some victims recall the event with such great clarity that it is as if they are reliving the event over and over again. However, on the other hand, due to the devastation of a traumatic experience, others do not have the cognitive ability to process the event and therefore the details of the event become confusing or cloudy at best (Fivush, 90). Fivush goes on to suggest that research has shown that victims can have both of the aforementioned dispositions where sometimes they recall the event with great clarity and at others cannot remember anything at all (Fivush, 91). People who suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) display these symptoms. The traumatic experience causes a disruption in one’s narrative coherence or the cognitive ability to place the events of one’s life in an

organized, historical, rational manner. Fivush argues, “coherent narratives provide us with a framework for understanding the traumatic event, which in turn allows us to integrate the trauma with self-understanding” (Fivush, 91). Foa, Molnar, and Cashman conducted research with women who were raped and those who were in narrative therapy, which entailed retelling of their rape over and over, after one year had overcome the PTSD symptoms of nightmares, insomnia, inability to focus and sweats (Foa, Molnar, and Cashman, 681). Why did this occur? The researchers suggest that our ability to narrate our lives and events in our lives with clarity provides a better copying mechanism to deal with past atrocities. This becomes essential in the aftermath of having life’s assumptions shattered for one to pick up the broken pieces and be able to move on.

Individual traumatic experiences need therapeutic intervention in order to overcome the trauma and construct a new coherent narrative of one’s life (Fivush, 94; Paul, 110; Worthington, 28). Paul points out that in psychotherapy with individuals who have suffered a traumatic event, the issue of revenge consistently arises (Paul, 109). Paul asserts that the theories of evolutionary psychology and sociological formulations agree that humanity shares one great maxim in some capacity: “do as you are (or would be) done by” (Paul, 109). In a positive light, the golden rule is seen as a guiding ethical standard that affords a society common grace, politeness, and expectation of good deeds among community members for one another. However, when an individual or group of individuals experience an event that destroys these common assumptions and brings about the potential for humiliation, shame and embarrassment, the negative aspect of the golden rule emerge...an eye for an eye...in the form of revenge (Paul, 110). Furthermore, Paul asserts that in psychotherapy narcissistic tendencies arise as

individuals attempt to develop a sense of coherence, but instead connect traumatic experience with other negative past experiences (Paul, 113). In such instances the therapist has to work at getting the individual to bracket each traumatic experience separately to develop an appropriate interpretation of the events (Paul, 116). Through reinterpretation of the events, it is implied, that the individual can then develop a coherent narrative about their past, present and future. Narrative coherence is the first step in the healing process and precedes forgiveness and ultimately reconciliation (Fivush, 96).

Repentance and Forgiveness

Healing the very thing that has caused wounding is at the heart of reconciliation (Krause, 55). Healing entails conceptualizing the traumatic event in such a way that one is able to have a proper perspective and overcome the sentiments of humiliation, shame, embarrassment and anger (Fivush, 94). Each day we have the opportunity to start anew and therefore “we should not be prisoners of our past. We don’t need to be tied to our fears, our hatreds, and our regrets” (Zimmerman, 62). This advice is provided for both the victim and the perpetrator and relates to the religious function of repentance.

Repentance involves admittance of wrong and the turning or moving toward doing what is right (Krause, 59). For the perpetrator it is to admit their guilt; apologize for the damage they have caused; take actions of reparations; and steps to dissuade any future repetition. If the perpetrator(s) are willing to do the above, then the victim has the ability to accept and begin the forgiving process, or reject and remain un-reconciled (Shriver, 133). Auerbach situates the process as a transaction between the victim and the offender (Auerbach, 154). Forgiveness is a deeply rooted Judeo-Christian concept presented in the Old Testament and New Testament and portrayed as one of the basic qualities of God

(Auerbach, 153). Forgiveness emanates from God to people due to God's love and mercy and is conceptualized through the repentance of people for their sin and then follows forgiveness from God (Auerbach, 153). This model of forgiveness is given as a standard by which humans are to deal with one another—forgiving one another's sins. However, some contend that forgiveness is an unrealistic expectation in the aftermath conflict and dangerous toward the prospect of building reconciliation (Simpson, 5). Gardner-Feldman asserts that asking for forgiveness in the context of “intractable and sometimes bloody conflicts may seem extreme and perhaps paralyzing” (Gardner-Feldman, 335). Nevertheless, adherents of forgiveness, such as Bishop Desmond Tutu argue, “the value of forgiveness for the victim is that it cleans the wound and allows it to heal” (Tutu, 271).

Forgiveness is a psychological and some suggest spiritual process that lays the foundation for dialogical interaction to create an atmosphere of stability and peace. Forgiveness is by no means easy (Tavuchis, 121) but it is possible as a part of human makeup (Arendt, 212). Everett L. Worthington, Jr., the Executive Director of A Campaign for Forgiveness Research, has stated “Forgiveness is both a decision and a real change in emotional experience. That change in emotion is related to better mental and physical health” (www.forgiving.org). Forgiveness begins with a cognitive decision to forgive, hence the difficulty associated with forgiveness for some, many even, are not willing to take the first step. The decision to forgive and subsequent activity of forgiving—shown through acts of solidarity between victim(s) and perpetrator(s)—provide healing for the victim and a passage toward continuing life in a healthy manner within a healthy society (www.forgiving.org).

Collective Narratives

A healthy society is one that contains psychologically healthy individuals with interpersonal relationships with those in the community (Merwe, 198). Healthy relationships are predicated upon a willingness to accept community members as actual participants of the community rather than outsiders. Kelman points to identity change or the “removal of the negation of the other as a central component of one’s own identity” (Kelman, 112). This suggests an accommodation of the other’s identity in the development of a new narrative along side a cultural narrative that need not be at odds. Such as narrative change allows the victim to overcome issues of guilt—rape victims often believe that they did something wrong to deserve being raped—and the perpetrator being a hindrance to moving beyond the incident. Furthermore, Kelman contends that a change in each person’s identity can develop a common, transcendent identity that can strengthen reconciliation (Kelman, 116). Kelman stops short of what others (Bar-Tov, 85; Govier, 268; Forget, 119) imply is a necessary component of reconciliation, that of collective memories and collective narratives.

Collective memories of the atrocity are presented as a justifiable goal for dealing with trauma and acknowledgment of the crime (Govier, 279). Collective narratives constructed moving forward are claimed to be the substance of stable and peaceful cohabitation is created. In a relationship that crosses state and national borders, social assimilation becomes the outgrowth of changed perceptions each group has for the other (Fisher, 34). Collective narratives are constructed by the opposing groups toward re-conceptualizing the views of the groups toward one another. This entails a fusion of

horizons whereby new interpretations of past events give way to constructive manors of envisioning the future.

Reconciliation encompasses a societal mutual understanding, recognition, and legitimization of the other party. Reconciliation “asks for a mutual change of conflicting ethos or conflicting societal beliefs and the emergence of new societal beliefs” (Bar-Simon-Tov, 73). Bar-Tal suggests that there are five themes of societal beliefs that are formed before and during conflict that have to be changed for reconciliation to occur: societal beliefs about the group’s goals, about the rival group, about one’s own group, about relations with the past opponent, and about peace (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 20). Societal beliefs about the group’s goals and perceptions about the rival group provide justification and rationale for conflict. Reconciliation requires the dismantling of stereotypes and negative perceptions of the rival group as well as revising and/or abolishing goals that undergird the conflict (Bar-Tal, 17). Reconciliation promotes the legitimization of rival groups and acknowledges their humanity that in many instances had been delegitimized during conflict. Furthermore, the new perceptions should encompass seeing the rival group as much of a victim of the conflict as one’s own group (Kelman, 187). This step requires a reinterpretation of guiding historical narrative of the group that has given justification to view the other group in a negative way. Taking into account the experiences of the other group assists in the endeavor.

Experience is an important topic of discussion for Gadamer. In his perspective one can never fully experience the same as another, however, language, and openness can lead to a cursory understanding of where the other is situated. The primary influence is the ability, the willingness of one to take the time to allow the other to provide an

articulation of their experience to gain insight rather than project to the other what their experience means. In other words, for lines of divisions within a society to be eradicated, a more textured comprehension must occur for groups and individuals to understand other's experiences as different regardless in they live in the same neighborhood or not. Gadamer suggests, "A person who is trying to understand a text is always projecting. He projects a meaning for the text as a whole as soon as some initial meaning emerges in the text" (Gadamer, 269). The projecting is closely tied to prejudices and pre-judgments. Prejudices in most instances provide an opening for what may be understood being closely related to situatedness culturally and historically whereby pre-judgments are obtained. As one is swept up into history, there is an ability to identify oneself in relation to history both past and present. Nevertheless, situatedness does not always equate the correct interpretation, only one of many perspectives of history.

To this end, one group may develop conclusions about another group in relation to how they view, interpret or perceive the group to be based upon presuppositions that may prove incorrect. Fisher notes that the most pervasive cognitive error among those in conflict is to make misattributions about the characteristics and motives of the other (Fisher, 32). Humans have the tendency to make personal attributions about others when they are the observers, but make situational attributions about their own behavior (Jones & Nesbett, 321). In other words one can perceive that another's actions are wrong and therefore categorize them as less than, while a similar or even identical action will be rationalized as acceptable based upon the situation. However, as the reading of the text [written and verbal narrative] progresses, the possibility remains that other projections may arise and give additional meanings (Gadamer, 270). The additional meanings that

can arise allows for a fusion of horizons or a common narrative to be constructed in light of the transformed beliefs of opposing groups. This becomes possible as the groups agree to an ethical dialogical exchange that provides ground for past misunderstanding to become present and future new understanding. The new understanding arises from gaining a historical perspective that differs in perception than one's own. As parties are given the larger framework and history acting on the other party in the past and present, "their initial attributional analysis begins to weaken as they encounter new explanations that are credible" (Fisher, 33). The old understanding and the new understanding create a cognitive dissonance, due to incongruence, that induces change of perception (Fisher, 33). A rhetoric of reconciliation includes the re-conceptualization of others from negative to positive through gaining clarity about their historical narrative. A cognitive or psychological shift has to take place within a society for new perceptions to overwrite old ones. Collective narratives are developed as society members become more aware and open to the perceptions, experiences and historical context from which they conceive the world and those within it. Thus, individuals and communities can begin to create new narratives of peace and stability. The collective narrative must also contain a pragmatic application, which comes about through structural changes within a society to solidify the reconciliation of warring parties.

Structural Changes

Psychological transitions are only part of the process toward reconciliation from the view of Social-Psychological theorists. Bar-Tal and Bennink note that reconciliation is a long process that "encompasses psychological changes of motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes, and emotions, which are reflected in structural changes; these, in turn, facilitate

the process of reconciliation” (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 23). Therefore, the practical aspect of the social-psychological model moves from cognition to actualization or outward manifestations of the psychological transformation. Without real signs or actions by all involved in conflict, the process remains but a conversation (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 27). As such, structural changes can be instituted through a top-down model, via policies, reparations, or through a bottom-up model, via acts of kindness, sharing, helping and developing interpersonal relationships that may have previously been nonexistent.

On a global, national, intra-national or group level successful cognitive transformation can be addressed from a top-down model and implemented through discourse and structural changes. Decision-makers, elites, and leaders must internalize the transformation and then communicate the new disposition through word and deed to the rest of the group (Bar-Siman-Tov, 71). This process of developing new beliefs, goals, perceptions, values and definitions of security are referred to as social learning (Bar-Siman-Tov, 71). Social learning is said to reciprocate through society as political and economic leaders and society elites communicate these new beliefs to develop a collective understanding and identity (Bar-Siman-Tov, 71). According to Rodden “the function of adjusting ideas to people and people to ideas” is the essence of rhetoric (Rodden, 151). The adjusting can range from total assimilation to diminutive movement. The speaker, in this case community leaders, fluctuates and adapts his/her rhetoric according to the listener’s responses thereby disclosing the narrative in such a way that it is not forced down the throat of the hearer but inclines the masses to change their perceptions to agree with the narrative that is presented. Additionally, word and deed have to be congruent with one another or societal transition does not take place (Bar-

Siman-Tov, 72) therefore, in addition to rhetorical discourse leaders must establish infrastructure changes that are upheld by officials as well as adhere to them personally. Structural changes that include policies, laws and infrastructure changes must be consistent with the rhetoric of new perceptions to avoid sentiments of cynicism.

In theory a Top-down seems rational, for leadership professionals agree that people will follow the direction of their leaders (Stanley, 8). However, on a micro level there may be pockets of individuals who are not so easily swayed to follow elected officials, even when policy and law changes stipulate otherwise. However, when the members of society do not share the sentiments of social reciprocity, the ties that bind become the cords of strangulation. These sentiments have caused some to suggest that structural changes are more strongly made due to the grassroots efforts within societies from a micro perspective or bottom-up model (www.equalinrights.org).

Bar-Tal and Bennink suggest that reconciliation has to take place through a top-down and bottom-up process simultaneously (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 27). “The psychological change among leaders greatly influences the society members, on the other hand, the evolvment of a mass movement that embraces the psychological change has an effect on the leaders” (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 27). They do not downplay the importance of leadership throughout the reconciliation process, however they are positing the importance of the grass roots initiatives of psychological change necessitating the buy in of the masses. Everett Staub concurs and writes, “effective reconciliation requires engaging with and changes in a whole range of actors in a society, from members of the population whose psychological orientation is the core to reconciliation, to national leaders who can shape policies, practices, and institutions” (Staub, 875). Staub was a

part of the mediation endeavors in Rwanda following the warring of the Tutsis and Hutus in which thousands of lives were lost and massive acts of inhuman terror occurred (Staub, 869). In the attempt to bring about reconciliation the group instituted small group processes that included sharing of traumatic incidences among Tutsis and Hutus to facilitate addressing the trauma as well as the potential to create new shared narratives based upon commonalities. Additionally, both Tutsi and Hutu representatives were trained to promote and facilitate healing as representatives of local organizations (Staub, 877). Their training was focused addressing trauma, seeking ways of healing and forgiveness, and communicating human basic needs (Staub, 877). At the other end of the spectrum, institutional and government leaders were brought together to work through social division and establish new norms, regulations, and laws for the collective society (Staub, 882). While there is still healing to be done, the ongoing strides of success toward reconciliation are attributed to implementing the reconciliatory process from the bottom up and from the top down simultaneously to bring about stability and lasting peace.

Stable and lasting peace are goals of reconciliation in the aftermath of conflict. The question arises of what the characteristics of stable and lasting peace. Many definitions have been proposed in relation to groups and countries such as the probability of war not being an option as the deliberate choice of those involved in a relationship (Boulding, 13). Stable peace can also be defined as a relationship between two sides in which neither will consider the use of military force and/or the absence of preparation for war (George, 7; Russett & Starr, 376). Bar-Simon-Tov summarizes that stable peace is an outcome of a relationship void of the use or threat of military force and implies that those

involved in the relationship “develop a common understanding and dependable and stable expectations regarding the continuation of peaceful relations” (Bar-Simon-Tov, 63). This does not mean that disagreement will not occur. Nevertheless, there is an understanding and agreement that disagreements and potential conflicts will be handled through peaceful negotiations. The deliberate decision to maintain the relationship and the stipulations thereof also suggests that the parties “share the same interests, norms, and values and mechanisms for management and regulation of their relations” (Bar-Simon-Tov, 63). That is to say that the parties in relationship have some foundational ideologies that they have come to agree upon and share in common with one another. Without common understanding and common interest, which is metaphysical, the relationship may not uphold stability and lasting peace. However, it must be noted that some theorists contend that stability and peace need not equate to reconciliation. The relationship between parties can be positive, warm and harmonious (Miller, 94) which is the common assumption of scholars (Adler & Barnett, 31). However, Boulder maintains that a relationship of stability and peace is not the same as having a common language, religion, culture or interests—interest meaning cultural or social interests such as professional sports (Boulder, 17). Reconciliation, on the other hand with respect to stability and peace, calls for not only intentional structural changes, but also changes in cognition or perceptions of the other party to create a harmonious relationship (Ackerman, 18).

As noted above, reconciliation is a voluntary process in which all parties have to agree to seek peace and stability. This entails the mass majority of a society developing a devotion to reconciling with the enemy. Reconciliation is “a psychological willingness for transition from conflictual interaction to a more cooperative relationship” (Moaz,

226). The social-psychological model of reconciliation begins with the cognitive transitions and transformations that need to occur within individuals and groups prior to outward changes. The transformations entail addressing the trauma that has been experienced and becoming healed through justice, apology, reparations, and forgiveness. The psychological changes are enacted through pragmatic changes in social norms, institutional policies and government laws. The social changes encompass the whole of society, from the top to the bottom and from the bottom to the top.

The Social Psychological frame of reconciliation enters the conversation at the individual psyche and the social influence on the psychological development. Theoretically the argument is made for transformations of the individual psyche contribute to societal transformations that bring about reconciliation. Furthermore, it is suggested that one cannot occur without the other. Unless and until trauma and the associated emotional and psychological issues are dealt with, there can be no reconciliation. However, when they are, stable and lasting peace can be the outcome that is the desired end of reconciliation. The Social-Psychological frame and the Judicial Theoretical frame both seek justice through restorative means, however the Social-Psychological sets at the forefront the psychological impediments that must be overcome. Furthermore, the Social-Psychological progressing to going beyond the Judicial agreement between parties to suggest the construction of a shared narrative based upon renewed perceptions of one toward another that are enacted in the daily living within a community.

The Social-Psychological begins with the individual and moves toward the communal, national and international while maintaining the dialectic of both micro and

macro contributions toward successful reconciliation. Similarly, the Christian Religious Theoretical frame addresses the individual situation and moves to the communal.

However, the point of departure varies in that the Christian Religious frame begins with the divine and then proceeds to delineate the relationships of divine-human and human-human.

The Christian Religious Theoretical Frame

Religious scholars in the field of reconciliation take a different hermeneutical entrance into the conversation of reconciliation. The religious and more specifically, Christian religious framework of reconciliation accentuate divine intervention and fundamental aspects of divine-human and human-human relationships as central to the reconciliatory process. The Christian framework of reconciliation follows a trajectory that is theologically grounded in the story of God that reaches an apex in the reconciliatory act of God to humanity through the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth (Rice & Katongole, 120). The Biblical narrative is viewed as the grand narrative, which depicts the divine's ongoing interaction with humanity with special care given to the divine-human relationship. The narrative presents a foundation for the development of a theology of reconciliation connected to major hermeneutical constructs. The theological framework provides a model for the Christian's responsibility of providing forgiveness; seeking justice; and embracing the other who is made in the image of God as reciprocating the relationship of the divine with humanity (De Gruchy, 16). The outgrowth of this perception is that the church is to be the witness to and embodiment of reconciliation in the world (Moyo, 294). Through the witness of the church political, economic, sociological and psychological transformations are possible

even in societies that are not Christian per say. Furthermore, the Christian Reconciliation model is eschatological or forward looking toward the “new heaven and new earth” (Revelation 21:1, NIV) where God’s eternal reign will be fully actualized (Rice & Katongole, 44). As such the Christian Reconciliation framework begins by addressing the broken relationship between God and humanity and lays out the ultimate example of reconciliation between them as the template for reconciliation between individuals and societies. Reconciliation is accomplished in this view not by denouncing the aspects of trauma, acknowledgement, justice, forgiveness, and social assimilation, but rather approaching these essential aspects of reconciliation grounded in and informed by the Biblical narrative.

A Theology of Reconciliation

Reconciliation from a Christian perspective is developed from the basis of three major presuppositions that give shape to the grand narrative of Christian tradition (De Gruchy, 48). The first presupposition is that humanity was created by God to be in a convental relationship with God and stewards of God’s creation. This is the Genesis or beginning of human history from Biblical narrative of creation. An extension or derivative of the relationship between God and man (man and woman) is the harmonious relationship between human beings. The second presupposition is that as a result of man and woman disobedience they, and subsequently all of humanity, become alienated from God. This second presupposition is often referred to as the fall and the doctrine of original sin (De Gruchy, 48). The deception of Adam and Eve by the serpent in the garden is the story that pinpoints original sin and the successive stories of their offspring highlight the generational inheritance of humanity to have a predisposition toward being

sinful (Berkhof, 39). The third presupposition is that “God, out of love and grace, freely chooses to overcome this alienation and redeem humanity from its bondage to sin and its consequences” (De Gruchy, 49). These presuppositions provide an interpretative framework for a Christian understanding of the mission of Jesus of Nazareth as Messiah or mediator of redemption in that those, through faith, who share in the renewal of the God’s covenant with mankind through the redemptive work of Christ, are reconciled to God (De Gruchy 49).

The term reconciliation within the realm of Christian doctrine as such has taken on various meanings throughout history. Some have suggested that reconciliation is the sum total of God’s saving work accomplished through Jesus Christ (De Gruchy, 45). In this light discussions of reconciliation pinpoint terms such as salvation, redemption and atonement which are theological terms to describe the process and outcome of the of Christ’s death, burial and resurrection (De Gruchy, 45). Another major view that has been observed is reconciliation as the controlling metaphor for expressing the gospel as found in the writings of Paul (Pannenburg, 400). In Paul’s writings reconciliation, redemption, deliverance and justification are metaphors utilized to convey God’s work of healing the broken relationship with humanity (De Gruchy, 46). To the church in Corinth Paul wrote, “All this is from God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ and gave us the ministry of reconciliation...” (2nd Corinthians 5:18, NIV). Paul wrote in his letter to the Romans

There is no difference, for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, and are *justified* freely by his grace through the *redemption* that came by Christ Jesus. God presented him as a sacrifice of *atonement*, through faith in his blood. He did this to demonstrate his *justice*, because in his forbearance he had left the sins committed beforehand unpunished—he did it to demonstrate his *justice* at the present time, so as

to be just and the one who *justifies* those who have faith in Jesus (Romans 3: 22-26, NIV, *Italics added*).

Pannenburg suggests that in Paul's writings the various metaphors employed create a unified whole that demonstrates reconciliation as being at the heart of the matter of the gospel (Pannenburg, 405). This becomes more evident when looking at the Greek term interpreted as reconciliation, reconcile, and reconciled that are utilized by Paul. In each use the term *allasso* or to exchange is a derivative of *allos*, which is most commonly interpreted the other (Kittel, 257). The term therefore contains "the sense of exchanging places with the other" (De Gruchy, 51). This understanding of reconciliation points to the vicarious representation of Christ as exchanging places with humanity thusly "He made Him who knew no sin to be sin on our behalf, so that we might become the righteousness of God in Him" (2nd Corinthians 5:21, NASB).

The vicarious representation of Christ becomes foundational to the understanding of reconciliation and the doctrinal theories of reconciliation. In the second century Irenaeus developed the doctrine of recapitulation that suggests "what was lost in Adam was retrieved in Christ through his obedient redemptive retracing of the human story" (De Gruchy, 58). For Irenaeus the life of Christ reestablished the human existence that was distorted through the sin in the garden. Christ not only stands as the sacrificial lamb as the exchange for humanity's sin, he is also the template for righteous human existence. "Every aspect of what it means to be human has been assumed and redeemed by Christ" (De Gruchy, 58). In the eleventh century, Saint Anselm of Canterbury built upon his fundamental understanding of Augustine's doctrine of original sin to stress the satisfying of God's justice through the atonement of the cross. Anselm proposed that the gravity of sin, guilt and human disobedience is as such that it is impossible for humanity to satisfy

such justice and therefore “Christ did so on our behalf by satisfying the demands of God’s justice and imputing God’s righteousness to us” (Anselm, 279). However rich Anselm’s contribution is considered, some theologians considered the forensic understanding of Christ’s sacrifice establishing a scapegoat mentality and encouraging justified violence. Timothy Gorringer suggested that there is a “strong connection between the theory of satisfaction and the sanctioning of violence against those whom the dominant in society need to exclude for the sake of maintaining order” (Gorringer, 2).

In contrast to Anselm’s forensic understanding of satisfaction, Abelard suggested that the gospel “saves through its power to influence and transform our lives rather than through the forensic satisfying of God’s wrath” (De Gruchy, 63). Abelard did not disagree with Anselm on the situation of the human condition and the inadequacy of humanity to redeem themselves. However, he sought to bring about a change of focus on reconciliation when he wrote:

Our redemption is that supreme love manifested in our case by the passion of Christ, which not only delivers us from the bondage of sin, but also acquires for us the liberty of the sons of God; so that we may fulfill all things from the love rather than fear of him (Abelard, 84).

The emphasis of God’s reconciliation is shifted from the wrath of God to reconciliation being predicated on the love of God. According to Marshall, God’s justice has much less to do with the law-court and much more to do with “healing relationships and social justice with a particular bias towards the poor and oppressed” (Marshall, 60). Therefore, a Christian framework of reconciliation must first be understood from a perspective God’s love toward humanity rather than a necessity to gratify a vengeance. Being reconciled to God is accomplished through an act of love and compassion whereby Christ

willingly presents himself, laying aside all personal desire, as the other in place of sinful humanity.

A stream of thought that has run concurrently to catholic and mainstream protestant conception of a theology of reconciliation is that of participation with Christ. Anabaptists, Baptists, Quakers and most recently Liberal theologians have offered an alternative reading of the message of the cross (De Gruchy, 78). By virtue of Jesus' servant-hood, non-violence, inclusiveness and willingness to suffer on the behalf of the other provides ground for believers to participate in the ongoing reconciliation process that was instituted and modeled by Jesus (De Gruchy, 78). The participation is viewed from a point of privilege and from a point of marginalization whereby it encompasses the whole of humanity. Miguel De La Torre argues:

God does not stand aloof from human experiences, but rather enfleshes Godself in the concrete events of human history. Not only do we learn from the gospel how to be Christ-like, but God, through the Christ event, "learns" how to be human-like. God understands the plight of today's crucified people, who hang on crosses dedicated to the idols of race, class, and gender superiority...Jesus' death on the cross should never be reduced to a sacrifice called for to pacify a God offended by human sin (De La Torre, 36).

De La Torre calls for a conception of reconciliation as a participatory process wherein God chose to participate in the plight of not only sinful but marginalized, oppressed humanity. This participatory aspect is outlined in the Sermon on the Mount (De Gruchy, 58) and explicitly by the writer of the book of Hebrews who wrote, "For we do not have a high priest who is unable to sympathize with our weaknesses, but we have one who has been tempted in every way, just as we are—yet was without sin" (Hebrews 4:15, NIV). The statement is set within the context of the writer arguing for the sufficiency of Christ being a perfect sacrifice and example. Christ fulfills the Old Testament understanding of

a sacrifice for human sin offered to God being perfect (Exodus 30; Leviticus 4, NIV) and the New Testament understanding of God's love being embodied in Christ (Romans 3:16, NIV). Following the trajectory of this understanding the reading of Paul's statement "All this is from God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ and gave us the ministry of reconciliation: that God was reconciling the world to himself in Christ, not counting men's sins against them. And he has committed to us the message of reconciliation" (2 Corinthians 5:18-19, NIV) as a call to participate in the process of reconciliation.

Christian Responsibility

The participatory aspect of reconciliation involves the believer being a witness of the renewed relationship that one has entered into with God through Christ. Barth suggests that Christians are "not to keep their knowledge of it to themselves, but by the witness of their existence and proclamation to make know to the world which is still blind and deaf to this verdict the alteration which has in fact taken place by it" (Barth, 317). Christians have a responsibility to share the gospel or good news with others about the atonement sacrifice of Christ. This aspect in no uncertain terms is a representation of evangelism or the declaring the good news of salvation to all. The act of sharing the gospel or good news was given as instruction to the twelve disciples that Jesus sends out (Matthew 10; Mark 6; and Luke 9) and is also commanded by Christ prior, often referred to as the Great Commission, to his ascension (Matthew 28:18-20). However, the participatory aspect of reconciliation does not end with the horizontal relationship established through the new covenant with God. Humanity is expected to live out a course of reconciliation by means of a process of reciprocity. Biblically reciprocity is articulated through Jesus' teaching in various aspects and settings. Jesus declares that the

two greatest commands are to “Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind. This is the first and greatest commandment. And the second is like it: Love your neighbor as yourself” (Matthew 22:37-38, NIV). In the parable of the Good Samaritan Jesus solidifies the definition of neighbor as everyone and anyone in need specifically (Luke 10: 25-37, NIV). Furthermore, when questioned about forgiveness by Peter, Jesus responded with the parable of the Unmerciful Servant who was forgiven by but refused to forgive another and was therefore punished (Matthew 18, NIV).

These major themes of Jesus’ teaching are later reinforced by Paul’s writings such as his letter to the Corinthians where Paul discusses the necessity to love (1 Corinthians 13) and in his letter to the church in Philippi he reinforces that a Christian’s duty is to imitate Christ who put the needs and concerns of others before his own (Philippians 2). Furthermore, James forcefully argues for the disposition of a Christian to be one of charity, love, kindness and forgiveness grounded pragmatically rather than being over spiritualized lip service (James 2). Reconciliation is therefore, a commitment to forgiveness, justice, and embracing the other as a part of the human family, which extends beyond just those of Christian faith. Barth declared “on the basis of accomplished reconciliation citizens are called to serve their neighbor, and live for others on the basis of mutual forgiveness” (Barth, 445). The mutual forgiveness that Barth speaks of is not a sweeping forgive and forget but rather a forgiveness that emanates from God to the individual and from the individual to others. It is the essence of John the Baptist’s message of repentance and baptism for the remission of sins in preparation of the coming of Christ (Matthew 3; Mark 1; Luke 3). The Greek term *metanoeo*, which is

interpreted as repentance, means to “change one’s mind and purpose, as the result of after knowledge...is used of true repentance, a change of mind and purpose and life, to which remission of sin is promised” (Easton’s Bible Dictionary, 2009). The Westminster Dictionary adds that *metanoeo* is change of life direction (Westminster Dictionary of Theological Terms, 1996). A change of understanding and a change of action is regarded as repentance that a Christian is bound by to provide to others because God has provided it them. Therefore, “Coexistence can happen in a new community that challenges our previous identities” (Katongole and Rice, 58). Nevertheless, the change does not come without struggle; strain and often pain for the road to reconciliation can be a long and tedious process.

Katongole and Rice contend that reconciliation is a journey that is taken with God and neighbor rather than a one-time act in which people have to be given the time and space to become new people (Katongole and Rice, 57). Reconciliation is a process that entered into by willing individuals. The process has to transcend formal meetings, conferences, and court-hearings to the everyday encounters of community members. “Grounded in God’s gift of the new creation, a Christian vision insists that reconciliation is ultimately about the transformation of the everyday—a quiet revolution that occurs over time in everyday people, everyday congregations, and everyday communities, amid the broken places on God’s earth” (Katongole & Rice, 46). This is to suggest that reconciliation begins at the grassroots level of interpersonal communication between individuals that make up organizations, communities, governments, and nations. The Christian Religious Theoretical Frame of Reconciliation identifies the church as the major social institution as the embodiment of reconciliation.

The Church as the Embodiment of Reconciliation

The Christian Religious Theoretical Frame of Reconciliation posits the responsibility of the church as the institution through which reconciliation is to enacted and embodied. Moyo suggests,

The Church is that instrument through which God chooses to be reconciled with creation as a whole, but more so with people, and to reconcile people with one another regardless of race, color, or creed. In other words that message constitutes the core business of the Church and is not only to be proclaimed, but must also be lived out both in church and in society” (Moyo, 189).

The Christian church’s mission is to be an institution where reconciliation is to be proclaimed as the primary ministry endeavor as well as embodied as a way of life by its’ members. Reconciliation “both names the church as and requires the church to be the agent of God’s reconciliation” (Katongole & Rice, 60). As agents or ambassadors (2 Corinthians 5) of reconciliation, Christians are to initiate reconciliation in the world. Mostert argues that, “If Christians are in any sense a reconciled people, reconciled with God and with others, they must become what they already are: a reconciled and reconciling community” (Mostert, 198). As a reconciled community the church has the obligation to enact a life of reconciliation that reflects the restored relationship that Christians have with God. Reconciliation in this sense is not limited to other believers or Christians, but to be extended to all humanity. The biblical notion of the extent of reconciliation knows no limits or bounds and therefore the church and its’ members do not have the authority to determine to whom reconciliation is to be offered. Rather, the church is to draw direction from the Biblical narrative that provides motivation to work for reconciliation as well as “reshapes the way the challenge is understood and provides

concrete alternatives to our usual versions of reconciliation” (Katongole & Rice, 62).

The conventional retributive judicial framework of reconciliation is rejected to embrace a restorative and pragmatic path inclusive of seeking justice, peace and providing forgiveness and grace.

De Gruchy contends that restorative justice and reconciliation are tied to relationships and lived out in a community of restored relationships. De Gruchy continues to suggest that, “this is the essence of the church; if it were not so, the church would simply be an association of religiously inclined people” (De Gruchy, 102). Pannenberg, drawing from Paul’s notion of Christians being “ambassadors for Christ” (2 Corinthians 5:20), echoes De Gruchy’s sentiment in arguing that reconciliation is grounded in the practice of diplomacy and not a religious cult (Pannenberg, 412). The church is to function as an institution that models reconciliation within the church community and extending throughout the world. However, as with all social institutions human characteristics often prevent the perfected ideology and vision from becoming a reality. While the Biblical call is one of unity and coexistence, historically the church had its’ share of contribution to separation and division within the church and broader society (Mostert, 199). The church in its’ present form is therefore considered the realized and not yet actualized church (Mostert, 199). The church functions within an eschatological tension between the now and the not yet in relation to the kingdom of God. On the one hand, because of the reconciliatory act of Christ the kingdom of God has come (Luke 10:9) but on the other hand the kingdom of God in its’ fullness is not yet (Hebrews 17; 1 Corinthians 7; Revelation 21). Therefore, a realization of the kingdom of God is represented by the church along with a constant struggle toward the actualization

of the kingdom of God, which ought be the church's goal. The actualization is not a utopian dream, but the reconciliation of all humanity to form a human society that God intended from the beginning (Pannenberg, 414). The church, with all of its imperfections due to being subjected to the conditions of this world, is to be a "fellowship that provisionally and symbolically represents the world-embracing fellowship of the kingdom of God that is the goal of reconciliation" (Pannenberg, 414).

The church is to constitute ambassadors for Christ and therefore reconciliation in the world. The church is to be the embodiment of reconciliation as the message that is communicated within the church through the sacraments of baptism, communion and proclamation of the gospel (Barth, 447). The message of reconciliation is to be communicated beyond the church congregation to the ends of the world the gift of grace and reconciliation with God through Christ. Furthermore, the church is to embody reconciliation within the world as a lived out pragmatic reality in a journey with God and neighbor to transform predispositions of difference to restored relationships (Katongole & Rice, 92). "The church lives in relationship with, and has obligations vis-à-vis, all sorts and conditions of people. Christians are to live exemplary and neighborly lives, and above all living in love as Christ has loved them" (Barth, 418). However, the argument thus far seems to suggest that for reconciliation to work, at least from the perspective of a Christian framework, one has to be Christian. While adherence to the Biblical call to proclaim the gospel and receive salvation do in fact suggest that reconciliation is foremost the individual's restoration with God, the church's work of reconciliation has far reaching implications for society.

The Christian Religious Frame Applied to Secular Institutions

The Western world has continued to uphold the separation of church and state and therefore the question rightly arises how can a Christian Religious Framework of Reconciliation have any impact outside of Christian institutions. John Yoder suggested that, “even people who do not share the faith or join the community can learn from them, for they can function as paradigms for ways in which other social groups might operate” (Yoder, 36). Hardy argues that since the church is a human social institution, it entails similar aspects of other social groups such as politics, ethics, and economics (Hardy, 37). The church’s embodiment of reconciliation constitutes a particular way in which politics, ethics, economics and relationships are addressed and therefore can be applicable to other social institutions and societies. Hardy continues his argument of connection by stating that,

The acceptance of the gospel of Christ crucified and risen gave rise to a new sociality, a redeemed sociality. Christ himself was the peace between Jew and Gentile in the new social ecology; and by implication he must be the peace between all Christians who find themselves in conflict, irrespective of religious or other formation. In other words, Christ reconstitutes our sociality, and we form communities that are or should be different in some significant respects (Hardy, 24).

Sociality can be understood as a complexity of categorical views of persons, communities, and social relations. For Hardy the implications of a Christian frame of reconciliation is not necessarily a separation but rather a continuation of the work of Christ in that his redemptive work was for the whole of creation regardless of acceptance. Considering that Christ redeemed all of creation, there ought to exist the potentiality for all societies to transform former predispositions to redeem or redefine sociality, a transcendental sociality (Hardy, 24). For Hardy, in light of God’s created order humanity

was created to be in social relationships that have been shaped by historical, ecological, economic and other social characteristics including religion (Scott, 153). In light of Christ's act of reconciliation sociality is reconstituted anew and regardless if one is a Christian, there still remains the God-given attributes of social beings (Scott, 156). Therefore the human condition is as such that all have the innate ability to be reconciled with their fellow man, if one chooses to do so.

De Gruchy suggests that in light of the human condition and the propensity to be reconciled under varying religious, philosophical, and ideological differences can be ascertained through a covenantal relationship (De Gruchy, 224). "Theologically speaking, the doctrine of reconciliation is located within the framework of God's covenant with creation, a covenant made new in Jesus Christ" (De Gruchy, 224). The Hebrew word *berith*, which means to cut, is utilized in the Old Testament of the Bible as the understanding of cutting an agreement or contract between individuals, tribes, or nations (Easton's Bible Dictionary). The cutting is related to the action of the two parties in the cutting in half sacrificial animals as a communicative means of solidifying the covenant or agreement. Additionally, God was called upon as the mediator of the covenant with the parties involved accepting punishment from God if they should break or fail to meet their stipulations of the covenant. Furthermore, the Bible provides accounts of covenants that were instituted by God with humanity whereby God made a promise and invitation to humanity to enter into a covenant with God through Noah, (Genesis 9), Abraham (Genesis 17), Moses and Israel (Exodus 34). However, the Biblical narrative also records humanity breaking the covenant with God through disobedience and sin. Therefore, God's resolution to the human inability to uphold their

end of the covenant, which was obedience to God, was to provide a means for a new covenant through Christ often referred to as the covenant of grace (Easton's Bible Dictionary, 2006). This covenant is an unconditional promise to the dedication of the restoration of the relationship between God and humanity through the mediation of Jesus Christ. It is a commitment to restoration and reconciliation that will continue in spite of humanity's acceptance or rejection. De Gruchy writes, "there is an analogous relationship, for covenant implies a new commitment to one another that transcends simply agreeing to co-exist" (De Gruchy, 226). While political entities, nations, and groups of diverse religious belief systems are obviously not accepting of such a covenant with God in the same manner as Christians, there arises a point of conversation to agree to enter into a similar relational agreement.

Developing covenant relationships points to respecting difference, such as religious, cultural, political worldviews, without allowing difference to create division and strife. William J. Everett suggests, "the idea of covenant points to the way in which new relationships, not rooted in the inevitability of repeating communally inherited habits of hatred and cycles of revenge, are forged through intentional acts of entrustment" (Everett, 165). A covenant in these terms constitutes parties agreeing to forge new relationships while maintaining difference with a common goal of bringing about ongoing peace and stability. However, a covenant relationship requires inclusivity of all; a willingness to see things from the other's perspective; acknowledgement of wrong; forgiveness and social assimilation. Volf suggests that, "a covenantal relationship requires a willingness to see things from the perspective of the 'other', a willingness for self-sacrifice in keeping the covenant, and an unconditional commitment to the

relationship” (Volf, 154). An unconditional commitment to the relationship is the hinge point of the covenant. It entails working through the issues that brought about division. It is people, from the micro to the macro, participating together to develop a common or shared narrative and vision for the future. Everett calls it a “shared vocation” that assists in overcoming “a fixation of the past, with its infinite complexity of sin and victimage” (Everett, 167). The past and the tragedy associated to it “must be approached from the standpoint of the miraculous opening up of a possible new order founded not on the consequences of the past and its compensations but on the new covenant forged in the midst of new hopes” (Everett, 167). Covenant implies a new beginning, a starting afresh with the capacity of and the dedication to eradicating division and overcoming tragedy. Hanna Arendt in her comments on the advent of Christ suggested that, “the miracle that saves the world is ‘natality’, that is, the birth of new people with the capacity of participating in new beginnings. Only the full experience of this capacity can bestow upon human affairs faith and hope” (Arendt, 247). Through a covenant relationship one must enter each new day with a faith in the propensity for change and a hope for stability and lasting peace—the common ground of reconciliation.

Reconciliation from a Christian framework begins with a theological disposition that is rooted in the Biblical narrative that provides a progressive continuum of divine-human and human-human interaction. The grand narrative depicts the sin of mankind as the historical milestone demarking the broken the relationship between man and God. Following Pauline thought reconciliation arises through a chronological and historically rich compilation of Jewish and Christian experience with God, one another and other nations (Martin, 81). The trajectory of the Old Testament points to the advent of Christ,

while the New Testament is seen as the fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecy; the reestablished covenant of God; and the eschatological vision (St. Athanasius, 95). The Biblical narrative displays the ongoing micro and macro encounters of humanity with God that build to the climax of the advent, death, burial and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth. The historical event changes the divine-human relationship forever. P.T. Forsyth argued “reconciliation meant the total result of Christ’s life-work in the fundamental, permanent, final changing of the relation between man and God, altering it from a relation of hostility to one of confidence and peace” (Forsyth, 54). Christ stands as the mediator between God and humanity in the renewal of the previously broken relationship with God, which is the new covenant with mankind from which reconciliation is to be understood. The new covenant is inclusive rather than selective. The offer to accept the covenantal relationship with God is extended to all humanity regardless of race or socioeconomic position. “A vision of reconciliation grounded in the story of God affirms diversity” (Kantogole & Rice, 24). Paul confirms that the covenant through Christ dissolves the barriers that once existed when he writes, “there is neither Jew nor Greek, slave or free, male or female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus” (Galatians 3:28; 1 Corinthians 12; Colossians 3, NIV).

From this theological ground the Christian frame moves to incorporate that the renewed relationship with God through Christ is the template by which a process of reciprocity is to occur between individuals, groups and nations. It is the responsibility of Christians, as ambassadors for Christ, to extend reconciliatory relationships to others. Christians are to be co-workers with Christ in the continuing work of reconciliation in the earth (2 Corinthians 5). Furthermore, the Christian responsibility encompasses devotion

to serving one's neighbor to the extent of seeking justice; ensuring needs are met; and providing grace (Matthew 22). Reconciliation from this vantage is not a one time act but an ongoing daily "dynamic journey" in which "not only justice and peace but also truth and mercy meet" (Katongole & Rice, 62). Therein lies the potential for a community of reconciled individuals to emerge.

The institutional and communal aspect comes into light through the assembly of Christians that comprises the church through which reconciliation is to be embodied and lived out. The church universal therefore becomes a social institution representative of a reconciled community—reconciled to God and reconciled to one another. Furthermore, the church's mission is not one of seclusion, but that of being mediators of reconciliation in the world through overcoming difference; seeking justice; providing and accepting forgiveness; and fighting against oppression on behalf of the least in society. The mission of the church is bound to a covenant with God and a covenant with the rest of mankind. This suggests that, "Christianity does not exist to motivate people for work within the prevailing visions of reconciliation. Rather, Christianity offers distinct gifts of seeing, speaking about, engaging and being transformed within the world and its brokenness" (Katongole & Rice, 41). Transformation takes place through an agreement or covenant to create a new narrative and aspire for a shared vision. The covenantal relationship is not an easy task to enter into or maintain due in part to the various worldviews prominent in society. Nevertheless, the Christian Reconciliation framework contributes an ontological and metaphysical position of a shared human condition (Moltmann, 89) steeped in sin. The acceptance of a shared human condition can be the

segue-way into covenantal relationships between peoples of disparate social, political, and religious views.

Summary

Disparities and unwillingness to accept people as they are have contributed to conflict ranging from interpersonal to international levels. Resorting to violence on any scale to achieve conquest, grasp power, advance a political ideology or prove dominance results in a gulf of division. The fallout consists of torn family relationships, divided communities and societies scarred physically and psychologically by the injustices committed by fallible people in a fallen fallible world. The need of restoration of such broken and dysfunctional relationships in the world calls for measures of reconciliation. However, just as disagreement and disunity has brought about division and injustice, conceiving of reconciliation in an agreed upon manner bears its' own significant issues. What is the goal of reconciliation? What are the determinants of the achievement of reconciliation? Who should be included? What issues are to be addressed? How is the past injustice dealt with? What stipulations are to be set and rules employed as the parameters for relationships? In this chapter, three different major theoretical frameworks of reconciliation have been presented in an attempt to provide elements of how reconciliation is and can be conceived. Additionally, the aim was to highlight their similarities as well as their differences theoretically and pragmatically.

At the outset of this chapter it was noted that Bar-Tal and Bennink suggest that reconciliation addresses “changing the motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes, and emotions of the great majority of the society members regarding the conflict” (Bar-Tel & Bennink, 8). A communicative process that merges previous narrative structures into a new

narrative that undergirds the communal stability for the present and future is needed to address issues of motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes and emotions. Montville recommends that in issues of conflict resolution and reconciliation involves a “transactional” dialogue wherein, “both sides must come to some agreement on the situation at hand; the historical event itself—including the details of the event and who was involved; the wounds; and the acceptance of moral responsibility” (Montville, 28). It is a transactional nature of ongoing dialogue to work out issues that relate to the conflict and sets the foundation for how the relationship(s) can emerge anew. However, what is communicated and subsequently enacted contains pragmatic stipulations that must be addressed. Theorists from each major approach discussed agree that the trauma of the experience; justice being served; the acknowledgement of the offense; a process of forgiveness of both victim(s) and perpetrator(s); and social assimilation of all parties involved into the broader communal environment are necessary aspects of any reconciliatory process (Fivush, 18; Worthington, 5; Janoff-Bulman, 21, May, Keating, 184; Biggar, Shriver, Elshtain, Hamber, 6, Marrus, Crocker, Dwyer, Govier, 2, Worthington, 26; Volf, 91; Tutu, 13; Auerbach, 5, Kelman, 27; Daly & Sarkin, 18; Moaz, 3). Nevertheless, beyond these commonalities, each theoretical frame uplifts to varying degree certain aspects as instrumental and foundational to reconciliation.

The Judicial Reconciliation frame is grounded in the necessity of justice as not just a part, but the primary aspect of reconciliation. However, the conception of justice from this vantage is developed from a theoretical model of restorative rather than retributive justice. Restorative justice theorists view the western philosophy and practice of retributive justice as being inconsistent with the goals of reconciliation and call for a

reorganizing of the current judicial system, which privileges punishment over restoration (Estrada-Hollenbeck, 67). The goal of reconciliation is to restore broken relationships; reestablish community stability and peace, which restorative justice theorists suggest is accomplished through a restorative rather than retributive practice of justice. A restorative approach opens the door for a diversity of participants to be involved in the judicial and reconciliatory process. Programs such Group Decision Making, Victim-Offender Program, Truth Commissions and Peace Councils come to the fore as spaces where cooperative and socially constructed meaning of trauma and injustice can lead to peace, justice, forgiveness, and social assimilation. Therefore, the accomplishment of reconciliation is predicated upon a restorative model of justice whereby the parties at odds develop new relationships dialogical engagement of acknowledgement and responsibility of wrong; providing restitution; giving and receiving forgiveness and forging a new stable social existence.

The construction of a new social existence is accomplished through the concept of collective narratives, which are developed by the opposing groups or individuals toward re-conceptualizing the views of the group toward one another. The Social-Psychological Reconciliation theorists raise collective narrative as an outgrowth of addressing the psychological and social dynamics of conflict. The social-psychological frame is situated in the crossroads of social constructed norms and psychological positions. Theorists operating from this frame do not discount the issue of justice, but believe that there is more deeply embedded psychological and social issues that need addressed for reconciliation to be accomplished. “The social psychological approach stresses the cognitive and emotional aspects of reconciliation” (Bar-Siman-Tov, 5). Accordingly,

social psychological theorists view reconciliation as a process that addresses the “painful questions of past conflict so as to build a foundation for normal peace relations” (Bar-Siman-Tov, 5). This process requires a mutual willingness to apologize and provide forgiveness; offering of appropriate compensation based upon a mutual understanding of justice; respect and acknowledgment of each other’s identity; and the willingness to begin a new chapter in life (Tavuchis, 12; Scheff, 6; Shriver, 215; Bar-Tal and Bennink, 14). In addition to the individual and communal psychological issues, the social-psychological frame addresses the structural and institutional transformations that are necessary for reconciliation.

Without real signs or actions by all involved in conflict, the process remains but a conversation (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 27). The conversation moves from language to cognitive transitions to social transformation as the practical progression of the social-psychological model. Social learning is said to reciprocate through society as political and economic leaders and society elites communicate these new beliefs to develop a collective understanding and identity (Bar-Siman-Tov, 71). Therefore, the social-psychological model suggests that social transformations must be articulated and actualized from the macro level of governments and institutions as well as lived out on the micro level of daily interpersonal interactions.

The Christiana Religious Frame of Reconciliation enters the conversation from a theological ground of viewing the relationship between God and humanity as the template to be followed for reconciling individuals, communities, and nations. The theological understanding is attributed to the overarching Biblical narrative and grand theme of God’s plan of redemption and restoration of creation through Jesus Christ.

God's reconciliation with humanity is predicated upon the work Jesus Christ through his death, burial, and resurrection (Barth, 68). "God, out of love and grace, freely chooses to overcome this alienation and redeem humanity from its bondage to sin and its consequences" (De Gruchy, 49). From this act of redemption, humanity has the opportunity to establish a relationship with God through accepting Christ's salvific act. Why the need for Christ? Anselm proposed that the human condition is as such that it was and is impossible for humanity to satisfy the justice of God and therefore "Christ did so on our behalf by satisfying the demands of God's justice and imputing God's righteousness to us" (Anselm, 279). The inputted righteousness provides a restoral of the estrangement of humanity from God due to sin. It is God's reconciliation of humanity to God's self.

The theological ground that is the foundation of Christian faith sets the stage for the development of reconciliation among human participants. The church becomes the assembly of reconciled people who have the mission of being ambassadors for Christ and agents of reconciliation in the world (Katongole & Rice, 60). The church as such is to embody the attributes of grace, forgiveness, acknowledgement, justice, and acceptance. Furthermore, these characteristics are not to be only provided to other Christians, but extended to all who are in world. This aspect becomes evident in Christ's parable of the Good Samaritan wherein Jesus was questioned about who should be considered one's neighbor and the implicit short answer is everyone (Luke 10:25-37, NIV). Therefore, the church and those within it are to live out reconciliation in their everyday encounters.

The obvious question arises of how the Christian Religious Frame can have any bearing in a world of various religious beliefs and worldviews? Yoder argues, "even

people who do not share the faith or join the community can learn from them, for they can function as paradigms for ways in which other social groups might operate” (Yoder, 36). The church as a social organization can be viewed as other social institutions. The church, like other social institutions, has struggles, problems, and disagreements (Hardy, 37). However, reconciliation is to undergird the assembly and provide a foundation for overcoming difference that is based upon a covenantal relationship. A covenant can be understood in terms of a social contract, but entails much more than just toleration. A covenant implies an unconditional commitment to the relationship. Individuals, communities, and social institutions can look to developing covenantal relationships that in Volf’s words suggests, “a willingness to see things from the perspective of the ‘other’, a willingness for self-sacrifice in keeping the covenant, and an unconditional commitment to the relationship” (Volf, 154). A covenantal relationship means being dedicated to the relationship through all the obstacles, disagreements, discouragements and strife. It is to take a stance of viewing other people as a part of the same human family who are to be extended the same courtesy, grace, mercy, forgiveness, and acceptance.

The three major theoretical frames converge at points of intersection to propose how reconciliation can be accomplished in a world of division. All the theories agree that the goal of reconciliation is to arrive at a point that there is stability and lasting peace between individuals and within communities as well as nations across the world. The theorists from the respective frameworks also agree that trauma, acknowledgement, justice, forgiveness, and social assimilation are areas that must be dealt with in order for reconciliation to ensue. Furthermore, the theorists point to undergirding narrative

structures as a dynamic influence of how people view one another and subsequently contributes to division as well as reconciliation. Each theoretical frame indicates that discourse among all parties involved is necessary throughout the process of reconciliation. Whether it is between individuals at a group decision-making meeting or between national leaders at peace summits. Discourse must take the shape of opposing sides being open and receptive of the stories from the other side as well as dedicated to wanting resolutions and reconciliation. Nevertheless, questions still remain unanswered with respect to all the frameworks discussed thus far. What if people do not agree on what justice is? What, if any, motivations can move people to forgive in the aftermath of horrendous acts? What mutual ground can be established for inner-national groups to move beyond tolerating to reconciling? What challenges arise and setbacks that can occur in a reconciliation process? How can rhetorical discourse be utilized to facilitate perception transformations and integrate social changes?

The next chapter shall review the work of Dietrich Bonhoeffer to address these questions and more. Bonhoeffer's historical context, theological, philosophical, and sociological understanding and ethical views will assist in texturing the conversation of reconciliation. The point of departure for Bonhoeffer is a Christian worldview that is informed by the Biblical narrative. However, Bonhoeffer represent one who was not narrow-mindedly traditional in the sense that there is nothing to be learned or accepted outside of the church. Rather, Bonhoeffer presented an understanding that historical context and situational calamities have to be regarded in light of scripture not just tradition. Bonhoeffer's work therefore has far reaching implications beyond the church and Christianity.

Chapter 3

Bonhoeffer's Rhetoric of Reconciliation

A rhetoric of reconciliation as conceived through the work and life Dietrich Bonhoeffer provides another lens to view reconciliation. Bonhoeffer's rhetoric of responsibility within the historical context of the Holocaust offers insight to how a process of reconciliation may be pursued from a Christian narrative ground. Bonhoeffer's theology was not purported as 'this world' versus 'other world' dichotomy, but rather he envisioned reconciliation between worlds whereby Christ's atonement was for all. Therefore the trajectory of his thought begins with an understanding of the human condition as that of being in a fallen state and centered upon oneself as representative of the falling away from God. The self-centered individual is at constant conflict within him or her self as well as with other individuals in the world. The solution is reconciliation with God through Christ that enables one to restore the relationship with God and thereby develop a different perspective of the other as made in the image of God. For Bonhoeffer, reconciled individuals are at the same time capable of community through reconciling with one another in spite of difference. Bonhoeffer explains the situations as "being-free-for" (*Creation and Fall*, 62) the other in the sense of sharing in the struggles and success of one's neighbor regardless of how different they may be. Bonhoeffer's work addresses the primary instigations of conflict—misunderstanding and desire. Bonhoeffer's work lays a Christological foundation of these instigations can be overcome and a united community develop. A rhetoric of reconciliation formulated and actualized by way of both word and deed.

The issue of reconciliation within the world is a major metaphor of Bonhoeffer's work. His concept of reconciliation begins with recognition of the work done through Jesus Christ of reconciling the world to God. Additionally, man is to be reconciled to man through this same process of grace. The juxtaposition is that man cannot move in the direction of reconciliation with his/her fellow person without acknowledgement of and acceptance of the grace of God. To make an attempt to mend ties previously broken without God is an attempt to be god and such will always fall short of success. Reconciliation is that mending of the broken relationship between creator and the created through the advent of sin and corruption of the will. In modeling the reconciliation of God and man, humanity is admonished to do the same with one another.

This chapter begins with an overview of Dietrich Bonhoeffer's biographical background and historical context to provide an understanding of the development of his work. Bonhoeffer's theological education and progression of thought will be reviewed to lay the foundation of his perspective of reconciliation. Bonhoeffer begins with the nature or essence of person in order to gain an understanding of the propensity to partake in injustice toward another to constructing a sociality of community, which justifies his notion of a call to faith in action. The chapter will conclude with an implication of Bonhoeffer's work within the present historical context for a rhetoric of reconciliation.

Bonhoeffer's first pastoral engagement was in a German parish at London in 1934. The course of his life was accentuated by a faith in practice until the end of his life on April 9, 1945 when he was hanged (Mengus, 92). "For Bonhoeffer, all began with his deep empathy for a specific group of compatriots, church ministers with a Jewish origin. Their exclusion was for him simply intolerable. Once kindled in this context, his active

compassion then extended itself to wider circles” (Mengus, 89). Bonhoeffer’s work and life became a synthesis of word and deed whereby his rhetorical preaching and writing were actualized in his willingness to suffer for others. He believed that through being reconciled to God through Christ that it was his and the church’s responsibility to be reconciled with others. His belief is fixed on the guiding Biblical narrative and the life of a disciple in relationship to God and humanity. Dietrich Bonhoeffer called and even many years after his death continues to call humanity to embrace an ethic of responsibility.

Bonhoeffer’s Background

Dietrich Bonhoeffer was one of eight children, the youngest of four boys and just ten minutes older than his twin sister Sabine born to Karl and Paula Bonhoeffer. Dietrich’s father, Karl, was the chair of psychiatry and neurology at the university of Breslau, and the director of the hospital for nervous diseases (Metaxas, 5). Karl would later become the Professor of Psychiatry and Nervous Diseases at the University of Berlin and the director of the psychiatric and neurological clinic at the Charite Hospital Complex (Nelson, 16). Dietrich’s mother, Paula, formally von Hase, was a teacher. Both of Dietrich’s parents are derived from a lineage of persons held in high regard and accomplishment. Dietrich’s maternal grandfather, Karl Alfred von Hase, was a military chaplain and chaplain to Kaiser Wilhelm II. His maternal grandmother, Clara von Hase, was a pianist whose love for music and singing had a profound impact on the Bonhoeffer family. Additionally, Dietrich’s maternal family included artists, sculptures, writers and historians (Metaxas, 6). Dietrich’s paternal family was no less impressive including doctors, pastors, judges, professors and lawyers. Dietrich’s grandfather, Friedrich Ernst

Philipp Tobias Bonhoeffer was “a high-ranking judiciary official throughout Wurttemberg, and he ended his career as president of the Provincial Court in Ulm” (Metaxas, 7). Dietrich’s paternal grandmother, Julie Bonhoeffer, was of the Swabian family that played a vital role in the liberal democratic movement of the nineteenth century. Julie Bonhoeffer lived to be ninety-three years old and had a very close relationship to Dietrich (Metaxas, 8). On February 4, 1906 Dietrich was born in Breslau, Germany. The family resided in a three story spacious house close to the clinic that Karl Bonhoeffer worked. Dietrich’s mother supervised the household including the staff of cooks and housemaids. Paula Bonhoeffer also taught all of her children until they were older, in the schoolroom located within their home (Metaxas, 8).

Käthe and Maria van Horn, who began working for the Bonhoeffer family when Dietrich and Sabine were six months old, religiously influenced the Bonhoeffer children. The sisters were devout Christians from the community of Herrnhut, which was founded by count Zinzendorf in the eighteenth century and advocated a personal pietistic lifestyle instead of formal church attendance (Metaxas, 8). The Herrnhut community was of the Moravian Brethren and focused upon personal encounters with God and therefore emphasized home devotions and Bible reading. Count Zinzendorf’s ideology had influence on John Wesley and his theology following the latter’s visit to Herrnhut and subsequent conversion experience in 1738 (Metaxas, 12). Interestingly enough, the Bonhoeffer family’s religious lifestyle was similar though not explicitly derived from the disposition of the van Horne sisters. The Bonhoeffers rarely attended church service except for baptisms and funerals. Rather, Paula Bonhoeffer read Bible stories directly from the Bible to her children as well as through the values and morals that were taught

to the children by Karl and Paula. When issues of Biblical questioning arose, they would consult Paula's father or brother. After the formation of the Confessing Church in 1934, Paula Bonhoeffer joined the parish of Martin Niemöller, which became the family's home church (Nelson, 17). Though they lacked consistent church attendance, Dietrich's mother insisted that her children were taught the stories of the Bible, learned hymns, participate in evening prayer, offered grace before meals and were taught the Christian traditions (Nelson, 17). These practices of faith helped shape the Bonhoeffer home life and Dietrich's future.

Dietrich's family spent vacations and holidays at their second home in Friedrichsbrunn in the Harz Mountains. The times of quiet, serenity and nature afforded the young Bonhoeffer the opportunities to hike, swim, ski, gather berries, read and spend family time singing folk songs (Nelson, 19). Dietrich obtained fond memories of the time in Friedrichsbrunn that he spoke of on a many occasion in his writings from prison (DeGruchy, 4). The Bonhoeffer's second home became a place of withdrawal following the tragic loss of Dietrich's older brother Walter who was killed while serving the German army during the First World War (Nelson, 19). Following Walter's death, Karl Bonhoeffer took a year off from the university and clinic and Paula often withdrew from family life for weeks at a time (Nelson, 20). The death of Walter would leave an impression on the entire Bonhoeffer family. In the years following Germany's loss of the war, they became skeptical of the leadership and direction the country was going, especially when Hitler began to rise in power in 1933. Nevertheless, a young Dietrich would soon turn his sights on a career as a pastor and theologian.

Theological Education and Pastoral Ministry

Two years after the death of his brother, at the age of fourteen Dietrich announced to his family that he had decided to pursue ministry and become a theologian. Dietrich's father and brothers tried to dissuade him to no avail. Dietrich had spent his adolescent years reading philosophical and religious writers such as Euripides, Schleiermacher, Goethe, Schiller, Tonnies and Max Weber (Nelson, 28). At the age of seventeen, following in the footsteps of his father and older brothers, Dietrich entered Tubingen University. After his graduation from Tubingen, Dietrich and his brother Klaus spent three months traveling throughout Rome, Sicily, Tripoli and Libya. This particular trip, according to Dietrich's former student and good friend Eberhard Bethge, is believed to have had a vital role in the formation of his attitude toward the church (DeGruchy, 12). A note in Dietrich's diary during Holy Week 1924 reads, "Palm Sunday...the first day on which something of the reality of Catholicism began to dawn on me: nothing romantic or the like. I think I'm beginning to understand the concept of the church" (Nelson, 32). After their travels, Dietrich studied theology at the University of Berlin and would write his doctoral dissertation, *Sanctorum Communio*. While at University of Berlin, Dietrich would study under church historians Adolf von Harnack and Hans Lietzmann, Lutheran scholar Karl Holl, and systematic theologian Reinhold Seeberg who would oversee Bonhoeffer's dissertation work (Nelson, 33). Dietrich's years in Berlin would provide the groundwork for his later theological and philosophical writings and perceptions of the church.

In 1928 Bonhoeffer began his first pastoral engagement as the curate for German speaking United Protestant congregation in Barcelona, Spain. After two years in

Barcelona, Bonhoeffer returned to Berlin and wrote *Act and Being* to afford him an appointment as a university lecturer (Nelson, 36). In 1930 Dietrich traveled to Union Theological Seminary in New York for post-doctoral studies as a Sloane Fellow. Bonhoeffer wrote of Union “the theological atmosphere of the Union Theological Seminary is accelerating the process of the secularization of Christianity in America” (DeGruchy, 28). Nevertheless, Bonhoeffer was challenged by Reinhold Niebuhr, one of Bonhoeffer’s mentors, to think “deeply about the church’s involvement the aches and pains of society” (Nelson, 36). Additionally, Jean Lasserre from France and Paul Lehmann and Frank Fisher, who were both Americans, befriended Bonhoeffer. Fisher was an African American assigned to the Abyssinian Baptist Church in Harlem. Bonhoeffer often joined Fisher to Abyssinian for Sunday service and during the spring of 1931 he assisted Fisher in teaching Sunday School (Nelson, 37). When Bonhoeffer returned to Berlin, he shared with his students the recordings of Black Spirituals and his experiences in Harlem. Zimmermann reported that Bonhoeffer told them [his students], “When I took leave of my black friend, he said to me: “Make our sufferings known in Germany, tell them what is happening to us and show them what we are like.” I wanted to fulfill this obligation tonight” (DeGruchy, 29). Additionally, Bonhoeffer traveled with Fisher to Washington D.C. on one occasion visiting Fisher’s alma mater Howard University. During their trip Bonhoeffer was exposed to African-American struggles of racism and segregation, which became an ongoing point of interest for Bonhoeffer.

The Church Situation

Bonhoeffer’s returned to Germany with a renewed focus of theological discourse. Bonhoeffer’s experiences in the United States, especially those within the African

American communities, contributed to his understanding of piety and power of the church residing not in theological institutions, but present in the reality of suffering (Metaxas, 89). The nature of the church continued to be one of Bonhoeffer's points of focus in addition to systematic theology, philosophy of protestant theology and Christology (Rumscheidt, 52). In 1932 the Nazi party begin to grow in influence and power. Bonhoeffer became increasingly concerned that the political and social climate would greatly affect the church, though he did not at the time fathom what was to come in a few short years when Hitler would become chancellor in two years followed by the ascent to dictatorship. Bonhoeffer wrote to his friend Sutz stating, "the outlook is really exceptionally grim and we are standing at a tremendous turning point in world history" (Metaxas, 92). To this, Bonhoeffer felt compelled to be a voice of warning to the German Lutheran church. His passion and concern was evident through his teaching at the university as well as his preaching. On Reformation Sunday in 1932, an annual celebration of Luther and the Reformation, Bonhoeffer was invited to preach at the Kaiser Wilhelm Memorial Church in Berlin. The expectation was that of a sermonic discourse of uplifting and celebratory content, however "the sermon that Bonhoeffer delivered must have seemed like a nasty sucker punch followed by a wheeling roundhouse kick to the chops" (Metaxas, 93). Bonhoeffer chose Revelation 2:4-5 as his Biblical passage, which states, "Nevertheless I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love. Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the works; or else I will come unto thee quickly..." (KJV). Bonhoeffer proceeded to draw the parallel between the church that is spoken of in the text and the German church of his day contending that the church was near death and they were actually attending a

funeral instead of a celebration (Metaxas, 93). Bonhoeffer believed that the church was failing to be the church that Luther and the Bible taught that it should be. He felt his duty was to warn everyone to stop pretending to be the church and return to being the church that God was calling for. This occasion was only one of many such sermons that Bonhoeffer would give through the remainder of his life.

In October of 1933 Bonhoeffer made a decision to leave Germany and accept a pastoral position at two German-speaking congregations in London. To this decision, Karl Barth would write Bonhoeffer stating, “You are a German and the house of your church is on fire...you must return to your post by the next ship” (DeGruchy quoting Barth, 31). Nevertheless, Bonhoeffer would stay in London for the next eighteen months and assisting in mobilizing German pastors in London to take a stand against Nazism (DeGruchy, 32). In 1934 Bonhoeffer would not be in attendance for the Synod of the Confessing Church, which at its’ advent was the organized objectors to a German national church or what would come to be known as the Reich church. However, Bonhoeffer saw their task [the Confessing Church] to be more than just an objection to a national-political church. When the Anti-Jewish legislation was passed in Germany, it was Dietrich Bonhoeffer who outspokenly denounced the oppressive measures and called for the Confessing Church and the Ecumenical Movement to come to the aid of their Jewish counterparts regardless if they were baptized believers or not (DeGruchy, 35). Bonhoeffer’s controversial address entitled *The Church and the Jewish Question* insisted that there were times when the church must take a stand and challenged the church to “come to the aid of the victims of injustice” (DeGruchy, 35). Heinz Eduard Tödt wrote, “Bonhoeffer was the only one who considered the solidarity with the Jews, especially

with the non-Christian Jews, to be a matter of such importance as to obligate the Christian churches to risk a massive conflict with the state—a risk that could threaten their very existence” (DeGruchy, 37). Bonhoeffer did not receive the support that he expected and believed the church was obligated to provide, which frustrated him all the more concerning the state of church. Nevertheless, he would not be swayed to think otherwise nor be silenced in his efforts against Nazism.

In January of 1933 as the Chancellor of the Parliamentary government of Germany, Hitler presented a plan to restore the German economy, which had been on a downward spiral since the end of World War I (Moses, 16). The plan called for the elimination of all political parties except the Nazi party and was followed by the Enabling Bill that gave the Chancellor unchallenged power to make decisions for the country. This was to be the beginning of Hitler’s reign. Hitler’s creation of the *Fuhrerstaat* or leader state has been suggested to be a return to a familiar government framework of old, namely the Prussia-Germany Bismarck (Moses, 18). Additionally, the promise of restoring economic prowess and dignity that was destroyed in the loss of the war propoganda provided massive numbers of supporters who welcomed National Socialism over against communism of the East and liberalism of the West (Moses, 18). Part of Hitler’s plan for economic restoration involved the extermination of Jewish businesses, which was swiftly followed by the attempted genocide of Jews altogether. Hitler surrounded himself with loyal individuals who without their loyal service and obedience to Hitler his rise to power and implementation of such legislature would not have been possible (Moses, 19). Consequently, the *fuehrer* demanded loyalty of the military, government officials and the general population including the church.

The history of the church in Germany was that of separation from political and governmental issues. The approach was that the government's task was to see to secular situations and the church spiritual. However, theologians of the Third Reich equated the Reich with the kingdom of God on earth (Moses, 20). Their predecessors had set the stage for the wide acceptance of the church's loyalty, designated by congregations and pastors taking a public oath of allegiance to Hitler (Moses, 20). There was a cultural heritage of history and theology that associated the state as an instrument in the hand of God to bring about his will for humankind (Moses, 21). Therefore, the monarchies of the Prussian-German empires were seen as instituted by "the grace of God, and its destiny in the world (imperialism), was mutually reinforcing" (Moses, 21). The German people saw Hitler in light of this history as the next great redeemer of German society potentially God sent. Nevertheless, Dietrich Bonhoeffer did not agree with such a theological hermeneutic and believed that the church had an obligation to take a stand against the overthrow of the church and the Nazi Jewish policy that forbade anyone of Jewish descent, even if previously baptized, from being a part of the church (Moses, 21). This point of contention was one of the chief motivators for Bonhoeffer to enter the conspiracy efforts against Hitler in 1944 as well as develop a "theology of resistance" and "ethics of responsibility" (Moses, 21). Bonhoeffer believed that the church was the presence of Christ in the world and therefore any other institution that propagated oppressive measures against another individual or group in society was considered to be against the will of God and its' influence must be resisted. The church had to maintain its distinction within the world and carry out its mission in a particular historical context.

The historical context in which the church was situated in during Dietrich Bonhoeffer's life entailed a country trying to recover from a war and reestablish its' identity, dignity and power. However, in the attempt to recover, Germany was led into a historical period of darkness with the rise of Adolf Hitler and the Third Reich. The attempted extermination of the Jewish people; the engulfing of the church into submission to the *fuhrer*; the invasion of Austria and war with Russia as well as the Second World War were the political, social, military, and ecclesial situations that Bonhoeffer contended with. This historical climate within which Bonhoeffer lived provided the landscape and background from which he would look the Holy Scriptures to develop a theology and philosophy that addressed the massive injustice and subjugation of the church.

Bonhoeffer's Theology

Bonhoeffer's discursive response to the injustice of his day is predicated upon his understanding and construction of a theological trajectory grounded in a Christological formation of the church as Christ in Community. Bonhoeffer's theological progression will be viewed through a tracing of his theological education and those who had significant impact on his development. Bonhoeffer's early writing will be reviewed in light of the interpretations of Bonhoeffer's work by DeGruchy, Green, and the English translation of Bonhoeffer's writings.

Central to Bonhoeffer's thought is his dissertation *Sanctorum Communio* in which Bonhoeffer investigates the "social intention of revelation" (Green, 1). In this inaugural work, Bonhoeffer explores such issues as the concept of person and the relation to the other; Christian freedom of being-free-for; vicarious representation; and the reciprocal

relationship of humanity in light of Christ and the divine-human encounter in history (Green, 2). Bonhoeffer develops his research of a Christological understanding of the church through employing social philosophy and sociology as tools of theology. In the preface of *Sanctorum Communio* Bonhoeffer wrote,

This work belongs not to the discipline of sociology of religion, but to theology. The issue of a Christian social philosophy and sociology is a genuinely theological one, because it can be answered only on the basis of an understanding of the church. The more this investigation has considered the significance of the sociological category for theology, the more clearly has emerged the social intention of all the basic Christian concepts. 'Person', 'primal state', 'sin', and 'revelation' can be fully comprehended only in reference to sociality.

A theological sociality is decisive for Bonhoeffer due to his positing of Christ be present within the church. For Bonhoeffer the church constituted the revelation of God through Christ where word and sacrament bind believers in love. "The reality of the church is the reality of revelation, a reality that essentially must be believed or denied. There is no relation to Christ in which the relation to the church is not necessarily established as well" (*Sanctorum Communio*, 120). The prescriptive role of the church in the world and the subsequent ethical regard one ought have toward another can consistently be found throughout Bonhoeffer's writing, teaching, and life. However, the development of Bonhoeffer's theological disposition was inspired by life experience, education, and historical situatedness.

Bonhoeffer's theological education began at the University of Tubingen where he encountered Adolf Schlatter, Karl Heim, and Adolf von Harnack. Schlatter was the professor of New Testament studies who implanted the notion that in "all decisions in matters of faith and church he was accountable to the Bible alone" (Rumscheidt, 52).

The *sola scriptura* of Martin Luther taught to the young Bonhoeffer that would impactful

on his epistemological and theological existence (Rumscheidt, 52). Karl Heim taught systematic theology and maintained a reputation for engaging and incorporating natural sciences in his approach. This was Heim's contribution to a Christian epistemology that attempted to "combine the proclamation of Jesus Christ as Lord of all reality and the necessity to confront modern thinking with experience of God's grace" (Rumscheidt, 59). Adolf von Harnack was the most impressionable of the three at this point in Bonhoeffer's educational endeavors. Interestingly, Bonhoeffer's parents were a part of a community circle that included the von Harnacks and therefore Dietrich had both personal and university connections to him. At the time Adolf von Harnack's theological position is often characterized as liberal theology (Rumscheidt, 59). However, it must be noted that liberal in 1923 is not the same as liberal theology of the 21st century. Liberal theology portrayed the confidence in humanity to develop competence in thinking and the ability to transcend their own subjectivity to reach objectivity (Rumscheidt, 61). Harnack's liberal theology placed emphasis upon the "relation between faith and what faith claims to be its subject or object" (Rumscheidt, 61). It was an approach to integrating cultural, historical, and the existential with human faculty of reasoning to transcend methodological approaches that constrain what can be known. From Bonhoeffer's position, Harnack work represented an approach that found good in the world grounded in the theology of the church.

Bonhoeffer focused upon the reconciliation of the individual and subsequently the church as the community of the reconciled where Christ exists. Bonhoeffer was drawn to a Biblical hermeneutic that relevant for the historical moment that embraces the whole of life rather than a compartmentalizing aspects of faith, family, and society. Systematic

theologian Reinhold Seeberg assisted Bonhoeffer in delving in this trajectory of inquiry (Rumscheidt, 63). Seeberg was Bonhoeffer's dissertation advisor who was known for rediscovering Luther. Seeberg engaged Hegel's thought through which Bonhoeffer grabbed hold of one major theme of "Christ existing in community" (Rumscheidt, 74). In particular, Bonhoeffer embraced Hegel's premise of denying Christ, as present in his community is a sin against the Holy Spirit. Seeberg contributed to Hegel's understanding in his *Dogmatics* suggesting that the word became flesh in the world and therefore the Holy Spirit becomes present in the community of Jesus Christ (Rumscheidt, 58). Bonhoeffer realized that to develop one's identity is connected to community and community, namely the church community, is where identity is discovered. Therefore, Bonhoeffer synthesizes epistemology and sociology as foundational for the communal and individual identity discovery. This is over and against the philosophical attempt to derive personal identity through self-discovery and consciousness. Bonhoeffer sought to frame a theology that addresses the questions of its day in light of the revelation of God through Christ, which, in Bonhoeffer's belief, is grounded in the community—church community. Bonhoeffer turned to dialectic between church and society revelation and history.

Bonhoeffer's student and good friend Eberhard Bethge has suggested that Bonhoeffer had a preoccupation with the dialectical theology of Karl Barth as well as his personal encounters with Barth who became a lifelong friend and confidant (Bethge, 132). Barth's dialectical theology was dedicated to making the revelation of God in Christ as the center of Christian proclamation rather than forms and practices of traditional pietism, orthodoxy, and historic relativism (Rumscheidt, 67). "Barth's move

was not one of correlating human questions with biblical answers...but of hearing what questions the Bible raises in its answers” (Rumscheidt, 68). Additionally, Barth wanted to take seriously that God is God and the revelation of God is found in the person of Christ and not in secular or humanistic empirical approaches. Barth wrote,

In those years I had to rid myself of the last remnants of a philosophical, i.e. anthropological (in America one says ‘humanistic’) foundation and exposition of Christian doctrine, if it is to merit its name and if it is to build up the Christian church in the world as she must needs be built up, has to be exclusively and conclusively the doctrine of Jesus Christ. (Green quoting Barth, 13)

In short, it was a focus that knowledge begins with God rather than beginning with the individual. The dialectic gave Bonhoeffer a platform to expand his own theological discourse with the exception of his critique of Barth’s starting point. Bonhoeffer believed that Barth “appeared to make God’s revelation his point of departure rather than the community to which God’s revelation is addressed, the church” (Rumscheidt, 70). Hence, Bonhoeffer’s dissertation work, *Sanctorum Communio—Communion of the Saints*, grounding revelation in the community arena in which Christ is present.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer’s theology is grounded in the revelation of God through Christ in history. It takes its start from the divine-human encounter and expands to the human-human encounter that is substantiated within community, a community—the church—as prescribed by the Biblical narrative that is hermeneutically attentive to the historical moment at hand. The divine-human relationship is only possible through the act of reconciliation that occurred through Christ’s sacrifice and sustained by God’s grace afforded to believers. The reconciliation becomes manifested in the community of believers wherein the responsibility of reciprocity is evidenced through Biblical dictum of go and does likewise. Bonhoeffer’s theology begins with the church, however the

implications of his thought go far beyond the traditional notions of religion to display a breadth and depth of epistemological, metaphysical, social, ethical, and interpersonal insight. Bonhoeffer's work contributes a theologically rich position on the human predicament that overflows to encompassing the sociological, institutional and eventually political realms wherein basis of conflict are sustained through seemingly polar opposites of unchangeable positions in need of reconciliation.

A rhetoric of reconciliation undergirds Bonhoeffer's theology that is built upon his educational encounters and historical experience. Driven by his passion for the church and a theology that is centered upon the revelation of God through Christ as evidenced in the community of believers, Bonhoeffer proceeded to invest his intellectual prowess and physical work toward living out the faith.

Humanity in Disunity with God, Self, and Other

A rhetoric of reconciliation is a mode of discourse to establish and/or re-establish relationships that have been torn apart through conflict. A rhetoric of reconciliation Christian framework begins with the divine-human relationship as mediated through the sacrificial reconciling act of Jesus Christ. The Christian framework then moves to model the divine-human relation as a basis for human-human relation founded on principles of understanding, acceptance, forgiveness, generosity, and love. Nevertheless, foundational is the perspective that one has to the other that permits reconciliation to ensue. A biased perception of the other arises from conclusions drawn from historical interpretation and experience for which a corrective lens is necessary. Bonhoeffer's theological and philosophical work provides such a lens to view one's fellow man in a world of division.

Bonhoeffer begins with a conversation of the human condition informed by the Biblical narrative and moves to construct a model of a reconciled community.

Bonhoeffer's initial scholarly work was *Sanctorum Communio*, Communion of the Saints, which provides insight to his theological and philosophical understandings he continued to build upon throughout his life. In *Sanctorum Communio* Bonhoeffer establishes the Christian Community as being "constituted by the presence of Christ in word and sacrament in the church" (Green, 16). Bonhoeffer's trajectory was to display that the human condition in relation to God and to other beings is constituted through the redemption of Jesus; therefore Biblical hermeneutics is to be grounded in a Christological approach. His Christological approach to Biblical exegesis becomes clear in *Creation and Fall*, a treatise that was originally delivered as a series of lectures as his exegesis of Genesis 1-3. Bonhoeffer wrote, "Indeed it is because we know of the resurrection that we know of God's creation in the beginning, of God's creating out of nothing" (*Creation and Fall*, 39). The resurrected Christ provides the lens through which the creation out of nothing can be realized for if Christ did not rise then creation by the divine is obscured. It is through the resurrection that new life is created, out of freedom and out of nothing, which gives credence to creation out of nothing and out of freedom—God's freedom (*Creation and Fall*, 39). Therefore, Bonhoeffer's metaphysics is grounded in understanding the human condition in the primal state through a Christological lens of the power of God to create as well as sustain creation.

Creation is the will of God to bring about what is out of nothing at all. "In the beginning—that is, out of freedom, out of nothing—God created heaven and earth" (*Creation and Fall*, 40). It is out of God's freedom that God chooses to create and create

out of nothing. For Bonhoeffer, one cannot go behind the beginning—that is the created beginning to surmise some form prior to God speaking (*Creation and Fall*, 35). God speaks and by speaking God creates through the word. The word of God—*logos*—is the command of God through which the will of God is carried out. “That God creates by the word means that creation is God’s order or command, and that this command is free” (*Creation and Fall*, 42). Because God creates out of freedom, God is not bound by or bound to what God creates. However, out of this same freedom God binds God to what God creates and through the word upholds creation. “Thus the world is upheld only by the one who is its Creator and only for the one who is the Creator. It is upheld not for its own sake but because of God’s look” (*Creation and Fall*, 48). God’s look is a gaze that God makes upon what God created and determined it was good. This look continues, according to Bonhoeffer, even in a fallen world hence the act of reconciliation by Christ. “And because of God’s look, with which God embraces God’s work and does not let it go, we live” (*Creation and Fall*, 47). God’s look and determination of “it is good” is what causes creation to be good and not what is created being good in and of itself. Furthermore, a Christological lens of creation causes Bonhoeffer to conclude that God’s look is not contained to creation in its pre-fallen state, but continues. The evidence is found in Christ through whom God was reconciling the world back to God’s self (2nd Corinthians 5:19, NIV). However, the reconciliatory act through Christ was necessary due to the change in the human condition in relation to the Creator.

The apex of God’s creation is humanity who is created in God’s image by virtue of God’s will. However, a distinctive turn takes place with the creation of humanity in that God becomes involved. According to the Genesis account, when God created man,

God “fashioned humankind out of the dust from the ground and blew into its nostrils the breath of life” (*Creation and Fall*, 72). To this fashioning, Bonhoeffer raises the notion that God expresses two complementary things. It expresses the physical nearness of the creator to humanity as well as the omnipotence of the creator (*Creation and Fall*, 72). While everything else that was created was done by the word of God wherefore let it be and so it was commands the existence of creation, but for humanity God gave of God’s self through the shaping, forming and breathing life into this new creature. Bonhoeffer wrote, “Human being do not live as human beings apart from God’s spirit. To live as a human being means to live as a body in the spirit” (*Creation and Fall*, 74). The human’s existence varies from all other living creatures in that it bears the spirit of God, which constitutes its *Geist* or essential being. Therefore, humanity bears within itself an essence that is directly from God and part of God, a likeness of God. Additionally, humanity created in the image of God to the extent that they are created in freedom. Freedom in a Biblical sense, Bonhoeffer notes, is not something that is tangible neither is it attainable in isolation or developed as an ability. “For in the language of the Bible freedom is not something that people have for themselves but something they have for others. No one is free in himself or herself [an sich]” (*Creation and Fall*, 62). Freedom is a relation between persons wherein one finds freedom in “being-free-for-the-other” (*Creation and Fall*, 62), bound intrinsically to the other and in relation with the other.

For Bonhoeffer this is a Christological understanding of the primal state of humanity. The primal state is prior to humanity’s encounter with the serpent through which the human condition forever changes. Prior to the fall Adam’s life was characteristic of “utterly unbroken and unified obedience, that is, Adam’s innocence and

ignorance of disobedience” (*Creation and Fall*, 78). Adam was given a prohibition, which points out Adam’s limit, a limit that is at the center of the garden. The prohibition involves what Adam cannot do or his limit; eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. On the other hand, according to Bonhoeffer, the prohibition also points out Adam’s freedom, that is “free for and free from” (*Creation and Fall*, 78). Adam is provided his limit and addressed as a creature that is bound to his creaturliness as well as existence. This creature, Adam, is free to eat of anything in the garden with one exception, the tree of knowledge of good and evil. To this Bonhoeffer asserts that “the human being’s limit is at the center of human existence, not on the margin; the limit or constraint that people look for on the margin of humankind is the limit of the human condition...the limit of what is possible for humanity. The boundary that is at the center is the limit of human reality” (*Creation and Fall*, 80). The limit or boundary is for the benefit of humanity through the grace of the creator for in the primal state humanity had no knowledge of good and evil and therefore the relationship between the created and creator was in perfect harmony. The harmony is attributed to the lack of comprehension of the two-sided dilemma and choice between good and evil. “Adam lives in the strictest sense beyond good and evil; that is, Adam lives out of the life that comes from God” (*Creation and Fall*, 81). This life that has been created by and sustained by God is lived in communion with the creator. The reciprocal situation occurs in the relationship between humans.

Adam was living free from and free for that constitutes living a harmonious relationship with Eve. Bonhoeffer suggests that the creator knows that this free creature that has been created with limits can bear the limit only if it is loved, therefore the creator

creates a suitable helper for Adam. “The helper who is a partner had to be at once the embodiment of Adam’s limit and the object of Adam’s love. Indeed love for the woman was now to be the human being’s very life in the deepest sense of the word” (*Creation and Fall*, 89). Bonhoeffer posits the relationship between Adam and Eve in the primal state as the foundation for understanding community in that they [Adam and Eve] constitute the first community. The relationship is also how the church is to be understood. “It is therefore the church [Kirche] in its original form. And because it is the church, it is a community bound with eternal bond” (*Creation and Fall*, 91). The community is constitutive of being free from and being free for one another to share in the limit.

The community is inclusive of belonging to one another in intimate relationship without shame. “The man and woman were both naked and the felt no shame” (Genesis 2:25, NIV). Shame arises only when the knowledge of good and evil, *tob* and *ra*, enter upon the scene. *Tob* and *Ra* are the ultimate split and are “concepts that express what is in every respect the deepest divide in human life” (*Creation and Fall*, 81). Shame comes out of humankind’s knowledge of dividedness and difference. After the fall, both Adam and Eve’s eyes were open and they saw that they were naked and attempted to cover themselves with fig leaves. Disobedience by humanity gave to way shame due to the knowledge of difference. Bonhoeffer wrote, “Shame arises only out of the knowledge of humankind’s dividedness, of the world’s dividedness in general, and thus also of one’s own dividedness. Shame expresses the fact that we no longer accept the other as God’s gift” (*Creation and Fall*, 91). Shame therefore becomes the rationale for covering and hiding of the self’s evil as well as questioning of the other’s motives. The dividedness

caused by disobedience created a disillusionment of the self no longer being free from and free for, but rather ashamed of oneself. Bonhoeffer suggests, "It [shame] also expresses the knowledge that goes along with this that the other person too is no longer content to belong to me but desires to get something from me" (*Creation and Fall*, 91). Therefore, the dividedness contributes to the other no longer being accepted and appreciated as helper, but now viewed as one who wants something for helping.

For Bonhoeffer the rhetorical exchange with the serpent and the subsequent act of sin in the Garden constitutes a seeking of the obscure in exchange for striving with God. "Adam knows neither what good nor what evil is and lives in the strictest sense beyond good and evil, that is, Adam lives out of the life that comes from God, before whom life lived in good, just like a life lived in evil, would mean an unthinkable falling away" (*Ethics*, 28). In the fall, evil is that disruption of the harmony between creator and the created with the introduction of the question posed by the serpent to Eve: "Did God really say, you shall not eat from the every kind of tree in the garden?" (Genesis 3:1, Bonhoeffer's translation in *Creation and Fall*). The rebuttal that is presented following Eve's response is becomes the questioning God's authority: "You will not die at all. Instead God knows that on the day you eat from it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God and know what good and evil is" (Genesis 3:4, Bonhoeffer's translation in *Creation and Fall*). "With the first pious question evil has come upon the scene" (*Ethics*, 26). In this sense evil is seen as an attempt to stand outside of God and critically view the role of God and His judgment (Mathewes, 382). Evil therefore is not something that stands outside of man that can be critically examined or inquired of, but evil is within and a part of the human condition in light of the Fall in the Garden. Bonhoeffer makes the

distinction of humankind before and after the fall as *Imago dei* and *sicut dues*. *Imago dei* represents humankind created in the image of God existing for God and for neighbor; this is the primal state of humanity. *Sicut dues* is the state of humankind like God in having knowledge of good and evil existing and acting outside the limit and against God and neighbor (*Creation and Fall*, 101). This distinction provides a sharp contrast to the relationships prior to the fall and after the fall. The primal state displays humankind bound to God and to one another, however after the fall humankind is bound to self as the creator of reality. Humankind thus replaces God with self as the center of their existence.

Shame is born due to the loss of the unity with God. “Their eyes were open” (Genesis 3:7, NIV) and they discovered that they were naked and felt “shame”. “Shame is man’s ineffaceable recollection of his estrangement from the origin; it is grief for this estrangement, and the powerless longing to return to unity with the origin” (*Ethics*, 25). Bonhoeffer makes a distinction between shame and remorse through suggesting that remorse arises when a person knows that they have been at fault for something. However, shame on the other hand is a result of knowing that he/she lacks something (*Ethics*, 25). Bonhoeffer states, “The peculiar fact that we lower our eyes when a stranger’s eye meets our gaze is not a sign of remorse for a fault, but a sign of that shame which, when it knows that it is seen, is reminded of something that it lacks, namely, the lost wholeness of life, its own nakedness” (*Ethics*, 26). Shame seeks to be covered and hidden, hence Adam and Eve’s action of making covering to hide their nakedness. Humanity attempts to conceal and cover themselves from one another and from God. Bonhoeffer asserts that the concealment is “a necessary sign of the actual situation of disunion” (*Ethics*, 28). However, the mask of concealment is not a disguise of deception,

but rather a covering of the longing for the restoration or reconciliation of the lost unity with the origin of life (*Ethics*, 28). The dialectic of concealment and exposure covering and revelation become the essence of a life of disunity from God and from men. “Self knowledge is now the measure and the goal of life” (*Ethics*, 30). Life for humanity becomes a continual conflict with others and even more profoundly with the self. The knowledge of good and evil creates a divided self from which reality and understanding emanates. The knowledge of self is no longer derived from the creator, but from the self and therefore it is from the self that God and others are understood.

The individual as the center of one’s own existence develops a conscious that is also not derived from God, though it is often mistaken as the voice of God. “Conscious is concerned not with man’s relation to God and to other men but with man’s relation to himself” (*Ethics*, 29). Man now is divided and in conflict with himself. The point of decision-making becomes the point of ethical examination and choice that is no longer derived from the relationship with God but from the relationship with the self—the divided self wherein conflict is constant. Humanity places the self to be the center of life and exist in disobedience to God by virtue of ignoring the word of God that calls to them. Therefore, even human piety, according to Bonhoeffer, is humankind’s attempt to be for God and to know of God from self as center rather than God as center.

Thus for their knowledge of God human beings renounce the word of God that approaches them again and again out of the inviolable center and boundary of life; they renounce the life that comes from this word and grab it for themselves. They themselves stand in the center. This is disobedience in the semblance of obedience, the desire to rule in the semblance of service, the will to be creator in the semblance of being a creature, being dead in the semblance of life (*Creation and Fall*, 103).

From the center man now lives out of self's knowledge and perceptions. Man becomes his own god living out of his own resources and seeking out his own self-interest. Man within himself, his own consciousness, that his actions of covering, fleeing and hiding from the word calling him are justified. As such, the conscious is man's defense against the voice of God. Therefore, man's relationship with self as center creates disunity with God that is reciprocated in the man's relationships with the other. The punishment of death for eating from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is manifested in not physical death, but in the death of the unity that man had with God and with one another.

The harmony with God and the other is traded for desire, power and competition characterized by the first offspring, Cain and Able (*Creation and Fall*, 129). Bonhoeffer asserts that Adam and Eve become the creators of new life and community that is "characterized by obsessive desire" (*Creation and Fall*, 129). In the slaying of his brother Able, Cain becomes the first murder. "The human who may not eat from the tree of life grasps all the more greedily at the fruit of death, the destruction of life" (*Creation and Fall*, 130). The division and disunity is perpetuated throughout humanity. Humanity as the center of life and operating from a position of self-sufficiency broadens the relational gap between God and others. The divided self no longer perceives the other as helper, but as competition and in competition for what is desired. When the desired is denied, Cain lashes out against whom he conceives to be the obstruction to the desired. The dysfunctional relationship that occurs between these brothers is symbolic of the perpetual disharmony in human relationships and communities.

The human predicament is that of humanity being in disunion with God and with others and as such all things are in disunion. Bonhoeffer asserts that due to humankind's

disunion with God that conflict arises in all things that are in opposition with one another. Bonhoeffer wrote, “what is and what should be, life and law, knowledge and action, idea and reality, reason and instinct, duty and inclination, conviction and advantage, necessity and freedom...truth, justice, beauty and love come into opposition with one another” (*Ethics*, 29). These constitute a plethora of oppositions that are a result of the knowledge of good and evil. While the sinful act in the garden and by Cain against his brother were individual acts, it is conceived that these acts of falling away constitute all of humanity. Augustine referred to this as the “sinful collective act” (Bonhoeffer quoting Augustine in *Sanctorum Communio*, 114). Bonhoeffer suggests that in the sinful act the individual rises up against God and the individual by virtue of being human is also a part of the human race. Therefore, “the deed committed is at that same time the deed of the human race in the individual person” (*Sanctorum Communio*, 114). Bonhoeffer’s theological disposition is that every individual is a part of the sinful solidarity of humanity and therefore “all humanity falls with each sin, and not one of us is in principle different from Adam; that is, every one is also the “first” sinner” (*Sanctorum Communio*, 115). The sinfulness is result of the knowledge of good and evil that created disunity with God and thus the loss of community. The striving of man against self and others is an ongoing attempt to overcome the disunity, however feeble the attempt may be. The attempt to overcome from a knowledge of self—divided self—as the center of knowledge falls short of rectifying the tragedy of sin.

The overcoming of the disunity is the reconciliation of man with himself, which is only possible through being reconciled to God. It is a rediscovery of the unity lost by virtue of the overcoming of evil on the cross that extends forgiveness of guilt and

reconciliation of a fallen creation with the creator. The divided self creates conflict within, which permeates outward within the community. When an ethical choice is at hand, conflict arises. When there is conflict, either within the individual or between individuals, a judgment must be made and “the judge is the knowledge of good and evil; he is man” (*Ethics*, 30). The judgment that is enacted is done from a self-righteousness that is credited from the self and the self’s knowledge. To this end, Bonhoeffer draws an analogy of the judgmental Pharisee attitude with that of fallen humanity attempting to honor God through stringent judgment upon oneself and one’s neighbor while thanking God for his knowledge (*Ethics*, 32). The Pharisee stands in disunity with God over and against Jesus, the second Adam, who is in unity and solidarity with God. “For man in the state of disunion good consists in passing judgment, and the ultimate criterion is man himself” (*Ethics*, 35). The Pharisee makes judgment upon himself and others based upon what is good. However, the judgment of self is situational and the judgment of the other is absolute. Therefore, a contradiction arises between action and word of the Pharisee. Bonhoeffer wrote, “the action of the Pharisee, that is to say, of the man who realized his knowledge of good and evil to the very extreme, is false action or hypocrisy” (*Ethics*, 37). Furthermore, the judgment of the Pharisee on others, with the intent to overcome the disunion of man, only aggravates the disunion further (*Ethics*, 37). Jesus’ response to the Pharisee to “judge not” is addressing the disunited man to the call of reconciliation (*Ethics*, 38). It is a call to reconciliation that overcomes the disunity caused by the knowledge of good and evil. It is a call to reconciliation of man to God man to himself and man to other humans.

Reconciliation is the overcoming of the disunity that was wrought by the fall of man in disobedience to the creator. “The new knowledge of the reconciliation which is accomplished in Jesus, the knowledge of voiding of the disunion, itself entirely voids man’s own knowledge of his own goodness” (*Ethics*, 38). Man’s own goodness is obliterated along with the judgment of others; therefore, man’s knowledge of self-goodness can impede unity for the disunity has been overcome. However, it is only through Jesus that the disunity can be overcome for any other way is a deceitful attempt to again stand in God’s place (*Ethics*, 42). Reconciliation is achieved through the death, burial, and resurrection of he who is reconciliation and the essence of God, namely Jesus. By virtue of Jesus’ act of reconciliation, humanity’s sinfulness and self-righteousness are covered over, even from themselves. A restoral of the harmony with God and with others is attainable through the new knowledge found only in Jesus (*Ethics*, 42). The overcoming is therefore accomplished through reconciliation and subsequently; those who are reconciled to God through Christ are into a ministry of reconciliation in their communities and the world.

Faithfulness in a Flawed Community

Community, for Bonhoeffer, can only be understood from the perspective of both the person and the community, for both are at the same time realized and actualized through ethical encounters (*Sanctorum Communio*, 62). Community does not exist without the individual and the individual does not exist without community. In the primal state, man was created by God and in the same community was created. “Community with God by definition establishes social community...neither exists without the other” (*Sanctorum Communio*, 63). Unmediated community was established

between man and woman whom were bare to one another in the primal state. In *being-for* one another, humanity constituted community that the individual was only realized in relation to the other. Their communicative interaction was not obstructed by barriers of desire nor curtailed by shame. However, disunity because of sin ruptured the unmediated community (*Sanctorum Communio*, 63). Community after the fall has attempted to overcome the disunity through ethical practices of social interaction and action from a self-centered knowledge rather than from a unity with God. Hence, Bonhoeffer's rejection of deriving social community from a purely epistemological framework (*Sanctorum Communio*, 45) and argues for an understanding of community in relation to a Christological hermeneutic of person and community in tandem.

A sociological perspective of community may be defined as a group of interacting people living in a common location and often organized around similar values, beliefs and a shared worldview. A psychological perspective of community abandons the necessity of common location to develop a "sense of community" whereby 'membership, influence, integration and fulfillment of needs, and shared emotional connection" (Bar-Tal, 332) create a community. These definitions ground community with the self as center and humanity as constituents that create community through achieving similarity based upon shared perceptions. Bonhoeffer argues that such a construction of community places the intellect of the individual as responsible for determining community (*Sanctorum Communio*, 45). Furthermore, such an idealist construction denotes the individual as having a spirit [geist] of *being-for-itself* through attribution of absolute value to humanity rather than to God (*Sanctorum Communio*, 49). Furthermore, it designates trying to understand oneself from oneself (*Act and Being*, 45). The

epistemological idealism of Kant that Bonhoeffer argues against suggests that community is achieved through a transcendence of the individual through knowledge of the universal. Nevertheless, Bonhoeffer insisted that there is no cognitive way to reach such a point in knowledge or to ever arrive at an understanding of real existence of the other (*Sanctorum Communio*, 45). Therefore, an attempt to construct community through intellectual endeavors leaves the task unaccomplished.

Church Community

The Christological approach to constructing community begins with a transcendence of the individual by God, rather than the universal. “The human person originates only in relation to the divine; the divine person transcends the human person, who both resists and is overwhelmed by the divine” (*Sanctorum Communio*, 49). However, the individual does not exist in isolation, but others must necessarily be present. The reality of the other is not brought into understanding unless and until there is an ethical encounter that places a demand on the self in a moment of responsibility. When the acknowledgement of the ethical barrier is made, the first step toward basic ethical relationships of persons is made (*Sanctorum Communio*, 51). The I-You basic social relation that Bonhoeffer here constructs only comes to fruition in relation to the divine. The I can only be understood in relation to God and the You can only be acknowledged through that same recognition of the divine. Nevertheless, the I is not an I until encountered by God as I (*Sanctorum Communio*, 52). Bonhoeffer is asserting that the I-You relation comes about only after God enters a person as an I. “God or the Holy Spirit joins the concrete You; only through God’s active working does the other become a You to me from whom my I arises” (*Sanctorum Communio*, 50). Therefore, every You is

the image of God and to acknowledge the You as the image of God, every social encounter places a unique ethical demand on the I to engage the You as such, rather than from any other perspective.

Community arises from the communicative interaction of the I and You. The Christian I-You is different from an empirical I-You relation in that the You is known as an alien You as an ethical barrier rather than known through the revelation of God (*Sanctorum Communio*, 66). The Christian perspective approaches the You as an individual with value and worth who like the I is made in the image of God. In an empirical sense, the You is perceived as an obstacle; as an ethical situation that a conscious decision must be made to reject, ignore or engage. Bonhoeffer argues that for the Christian to reject or ignore the You cannot be options for the understanding of the self is tied to the community of which the You is a part. The entire social interaction is the foundation for community substantiated upon the revelation of God. “God’s being is not in transcendent isolation and absence. God is free for humanity in our history; that is, in the light of Jesus Christ, God is revealed as present to us in the world—God’s being is being-in-relation-to-us. This is the meaning of incarnation: God with us, and God for us” (Green, 115). God being-in-relation-to-us is the restoration of the primal understanding of man being-free-for the other in community. The revelation of God through Christ is the word of God that calls the dis-united man to reconciliation with God and subsequently to humanity. The God-human relationship through Christ is the model relationship that directs the Christian’s interaction with and respect for the other. The God-human-human interaction becomes the basis for Bonhoeffer’s sociality. For Bonhoeffer, “the concepts of person, community and God are inseparable and essentially

interrelated” (Green, 113). The self’s identity is only actualized through a relationship with God and simultaneously with others. The horizontal and vertical dimensions of the interrelated relationships are the essence of community.

Community is a holistic construct derivative of communicative interactions. “Only in reciprocal interaction with other minds is self-conscious thinking and willing possible and meaningful” (*Sanctorum Communio*, 69). The phenomenon of language is the conduit for the combination of thought and emotion that creates the meaningful interaction between humans. Language is an overcoming of the ethical barrier that the meeting of the I and You creates. The linguistic exchange provides the transmission of meaning of thought to the other. The objectivity as well as subjectivity of communication comprising the human nature or human spirit that is only actualized in sociality (*Sanctorum Communio*, 66). Through the interactions of individuals constitutes the consciousness of the existence of the I and the ethical demand of the You. Wherever the interaction occurs community exists and due to human nature, at the point of the ethical demand conflict can arise (*Sanctorum Communio*, 72). Nevertheless, Bonhoeffer argues, “Only in strife with other wills, in subjecting these to one’s own will or being subjected, is strength and richness of will developed” (*Sanctorum Communio*, 72). The conflict that Bonhoeffer at this point is discussing is a healthy conflict that builds community and establishes societal bonds between individuals. The strength that comes as a result of interaction is established on the basis of perception of the other as being made in the image of God. As such, a community is the partaking of the reality of God in the world an in the other.

Bonhoeffer argues that the goal of sociology is to identify social structures and the actions that uphold them, not the identification of the essence of community. A sociological perspective presupposes that people of common backgrounds, interests, ideologies, etc. constitute a community. However, Bonhoeffer argues that “commonness” does not lead to community but rather sameness (Bonhoeffer’s take on Kant, *Sanctorum Communio* p.43). “Thus the essence of community is not commonality—although formally every community has this. Rather, reciprocal will constitutes community” (*Sanctorum Communio*, 83). Groups that are held together by virtue of agreements or commonality are not communities but should be categorized as mass or public (*Sanctorum Communio*, 83). Communities, according to Bonhoeffer, possess a unity of wills rather than commonality. He warns that this does not entail the eradication of potential conflict, but rather is a unity of intent that seeks to build upon the division of the I-You relationship (*Sanctorum Communio*, 85). The intent signifies the desire to know and do God’s will with the recognition that achieving such is only accomplished in community. Within community “Christ embodies and creates God’s new reality for the world: the Christian community is the new humanity—part of the world reconciled and being made new” (*Ethics*, 83). This is the reality of community or communion of saints participating in the body of Christ or the church.

The establishment of the church, Christ’s body, is the act of reconciliation of man back to God. “God established the reality of the church, of humanity pardoned in Jesus Christ—not religion, but revelation, not religious community, but church” (*Sanctorum Communio*, 153). The church is grounded in the work of reconciliation that was achieved on the cross and with the resurrection of Christ. The church is not constituted by a group

of people with similar interests or proximity, although denominations can be seen as having aspects of this sort. Nevertheless, the church is created from above and not from below. Membership within the church community is predicated upon faith not works or human arranged stipulations. To have a faith in the redeeming work of Christ is to be counted among others with the same faith disposition. Furthermore, to have this faith is to be counted from above as one of many in the community of faith. There can be no separation of the two. One cannot confess to have faith yet reject the church. To reject the church is to reject Christ who is the head of the body or the church (*Life Together*, Editor's Introduction). It is Christ existing as community.

The church community is the reconciliation of man to God and subsequently man to man. "Community with God exists only through Christ, but Christ is present only in his church-community, and therefore community with God exists only in the church" (*Sanctorum Communio*, 158). If community with God exists only in the church then it would suggest that community proper—as established by God prior to the fall of man—ought to be derived from the church. Bonhoeffer suggests the church rightly understood is the community of love rather than the community of faith. It is faith that causes the church community to be realized, but it is love that causes community to be actualized (*Sanctorum Communio*, 160). For Bonhoeffer *vis a vis* Luther, the church is not the church unless and until some manifestation of the faith that is claimed is put into practice.

The sentiments of James, who wrote:

What good is it, my brothers, if a man claims to have faith but has no deeds? Can such faith save him? Suppose a brother or sister is without clothes and daily food. If one of you says to him, "Go, I wish you well; keep warm and well fed," but does nothing about his physical needs, what good is it? In the same way, faith by itself, if it is not accompanied by action, is dead (James 2:18-20, NIV).

Faith in action is that of caring for the welfare of the human family, which is predicated upon a foundation of love that is given to the believer through the Holy Spirit. It is argued by Bonhoeffer that the ability to love—agape love—is impossible for any human to do (*Ethics*, 52). Faith actualized in love for another is only accomplished through the work of the Holy Spirit.

The community of faith is predicated upon the reconciliation of humanity to God through the work of Christ. It is a Christological perspective mediated by word and deed that is inclusive rather than exclusive. Furthermore, the community of faith is not to be lived in seclusion but in the presence of all peoples. Bonhoeffer wrote, “The Christian cannot simply take for granted the privilege of living among other Christians. Jesus lived in the midst of his enemies” (*Life Together*, 5). He argues that those who desire only to be among friends and common individuals do not desire to truly be a part of the life of Christ and paraphrases Luther by asserting, “If Christ had done what you are doing, who would ever have been saved?” (*Life Together*, 5). The visibility of the community of saints is the grace of God in the world. This community is only the church when it exists with and for others. Bonhoeffer is not naïve about the church-community for he recognizes that not everyone in the physical community is truly a part of the spiritual community. Bonhoeffer asserts that both villains and saints are at the same time in public view both having the ability to present themselves as good. The villain can do something that would appear to be good with the wrong intentions and the saint can do something good with good intentions. However, “if evil appears in the form of light, beneficence, loyalty and renewal, if it conforms with historical necessity and social injustice, then this, if it is understood straightforwardly, is a clear additional proof of its abysmal

wickedness” (*Ethics*, 67). He provides conclusion to the matter through writing, “There will never be a pure church, such as there has never been one” (*Sanctorum Communio*, 283). Nevertheless, the church’s calling is to be and exist in a broken world where the effectual essence of being-for-others may take root.

The church-community is the Christological example of being visible in community with and for one another. Bonhoeffer wrote,

A truth, a doctrine, or a religion needs no space of its own. Such entities are bodiless. They do not go beyond being heard, learned, and understood. But the incarnate Son of God needs not only ears or even hearts; he needs actual, living human beings who follow him (*Discipleship*, 218)

The community proper is modeled in the New Testament through Jesus’ being visibly present with and for his disciples. Jesus was the Word that was made flesh who called the disciples and created bodily community. The visible community embodied communicating the word and providing servanthood. Jesus and the disciples are the example of community in bodily form that Bonhoeffer points to in identification of what the church is to be. He progresses his argument through the Biblical examples presented in the Acts of the Apostles that highlights the teaching and communicating of the Word and the selfless acts of caring for others (Acts 2, 3). The communion of the saints or church-community is the visible manifestation of Christ being with and for humanity. Bonhoeffer understood the community of the church to be “God’s way of continuing to exist throughout history in the midst of human life-the very way God’s image continues to be manifest most authentically on earth” (Floyd, 16). However, the caution Bonhoeffer insisted is that people have had the tendency to worship the church as an idol rather than Christ who is the church (Floyd, 16). Nevertheless, the church community is

to embody the characteristics that were exemplified by Christ in both word and deed (*Discipleship*, 228). The church is to exist in a broken world as the beacon of light on the hill. Furthermore, the church is to communicate the good news of Christ as the reconciliation of God and actively live a life of reconciliation in the world.

The Human Community

Bonhoeffer's framing of sociality as the spirit of the human community in relationship with God through Christ and in relationship to fellow humans is his foundational understanding of the church. Christ existing in the church community was actualized on the day of Pentecost when the outpouring of the Holy Spirit occurred (*Sanctorum Communio*, 152). This act constituted the beginning of the church, which are the reconciled people in community with Christ and one another where the Holy Spirit in operation. "But if the Spirit is operative only within the church-community, then the genesis of the latter cannot be deduced from the spirits of individuals" (*Sanctorum Communio*, 152). By this Bonhoeffer is insisting that community is derived from the Spirit of God and not of the cooperation of individual spirits. Individual spirits, according to Bonhoeffer, can at some points constitute a form of community that Bonhoeffer suggests ought to be called mass or public, but the intention of that community is connected to a self-centered existence (*Sanctorum Communio*, 121). The human in the state of not being reconciliation with God maintains a living from the center of self rather than God as center. Such individuals are able to co-exist with others like willed individuals, but not in a sense of being for the other, but rather being for the self. When there is a disagreement or the individual no longer are in agreement, conflict erupts and division ensues (*Sanctorum Communio*, 123). The individuals with concern for self

an un-reconciled to God will continue in strife as such as been the state of humanity since the fall. The solution is reconciled individuals living in reconciled community with a reestablished self of being-free-from and being-free-for.

The individual and community are a simultaneous phenomenon. The individual is known only in community and community is only actualized among individuals.

Community proper for Bonhoeffer is the communion of the saints wherein Christ is present (*Life Together*, 2). Christ is the reconciliation of man to God and the model by which humanity is to embody in word and deed for the reconciliation among one another (*Discipleship*, 225). Bonhoeffer's Christological development of reconciliation hinges upon the acceptance of and participation in the church-community, which is the visible body of Christ in the earth. Furthermore, this visible body is to reciprocate and embody the attributes of the physical life of Christ as a model of true community in the world (*Discipleship*, 228). "The body of Christ, which was given for us, which suffered the punishment for our sins, frees us to exist "for Christ" in death and in suffering" (*Discipleship*, 226). Therefore, those reconciled to God through Christ are now free to extend to others the grace that has been provided by Christ. Furthermore, Bonhoeffer argues that even though Christ "accomplished all the vicarious suffering necessary for our redemption, his suffering in the world is not complete. In his grace, he has left something unfinished" (*Discipleship*, 226). This suggests that it is the church-community's responsibility to continue the work of reconciliation and to suffer vicariously for others. This is the mission of the church-community, which for Bonhoeffer is true community, community that is from above, instituted by God through Christ's act of reconciliation.

Bonhoeffer's Christological understanding of community provided a basis for his theological and pastoral engagements. Bonhoeffer sought out community that embodied the elements of true church-community wherein individuals were free-for one another. However, the church-community of Bonhoeffer's day became a primary point of contention. The rise of nationalism and the eventual power of Hitler and the Third Reich contributed to the unraveling of the strength of the ecumenical movement as well as the church of Germany to carry on its mission, as the church-community ought (*Clements*, 156). Bonhoeffer would eventually reduce his participation in the ecumenical peace work and focus his attention on the Confessing Church. However, the Confessing Church rapidly became a disappointment to Bonhoeffer as the pressure and violence of the Gestapo increased in Germany and the church was not living up to its' responsibility. Bonhoeffer addressed the issue as the church's responsibility to God and to the world in which the church was historically situated.

Ethics of Responsibility in a World Come of Age

Reconciliation with God through Christ is the primary starting point for Bonhoeffer's theological, philosophical and sociological framework. Bonhoeffer's Christological hermeneutic is foundational to his understanding of the history of God and God's relationship with humanity (*Sanctorum Communio*, 35). Bonhoeffer situates sociality as the co-existence of the individual and community functioning through and only through the presence of Christ. Community is maintained through the ongoing engagement of the self with the other mediated by discourse that ensues when an ethical demand is placed upon the other and the other determines the response (*Sanctorum Communio*, 68). The communicative exchange hinges upon the wiliness of the You to

view and accept the I—as different as the two may be—as being the image of God.

Bonhoeffer does not suggest that within community there will always be agreement, but he does contend that disagreement is a healthy and necessary way for the community to realize and actualize God's will in the world (*Sanctorum Communio*, 86). Community is only capable of continuing because of the reciprocity of reconciliation that those who have accepted the grace of God through Christ recognize as their responsibility as new citizens of the church community (*Discipleship*, 37). Thus, Bonhoeffer construction of community is the church community or the communion of saints whereby the renewed individual lives an existence of being-free-from and being-free-for others.

According to Bonhoeffer, the church community is recognized as the visible presence of Christ in the world and agents of grace and reconciliation to the world (Willmer, 175). “In Christ we are offered the possibility of partaking in the reality of God and in the reality of the world, but not in the one without the other. The reality of God discloses itself only by setting me entirely in the reality of the world, and when I encounter the reality of the world it is always already sustained, accepted and reconciled in the reality of God” (*Ethics*, 195). The church community is historically situated within the broader world community of which is all the reality of God. The church and the world are not isolated one from another, but co-exist by virtue of the sustainer of creation. Bonhoeffer's Christology views all of creation as already sustained, accepted and reconciled to God through Christ. Furthermore, the church-community as the visible body of Christ in the world is responsible for the world of which the church-community is a part. “Responsibility is the total and realistic response of man to the claim of God and of our neighbor” (*Ethics*, 245). Bonhoeffer is alluding to Jesus' parable of the Good

Samaritan that was told as a response to the question, who is my neighbor. The Biblical teaching suggests that anyone who is need, regardless of his or her ethnicity, social status, or religious disposition, is “my neighbor” (Luke 10: 25-37, NIV). Therefore, Bonhoeffer believed that the church-community has a responsibility to those in the world without exception.

The Christological understanding of the church-community that is informed by an ongoing faith narrative provided Bonhoeffer the ground to argue his disposition of the church-community’s responsibility in the world. Bonhoeffer did not believe it was the responsibility of the church to oversee the ordering of society in relation to state and the enactment of laws (Floyd, 118). However, he did believe that the church and the individuals of the church-community have a responsibility to ensure that the state acts in accordance with what is just (Floyd, 118). The church-community’s responsibility became a major theme of Bonhoeffer’s preaching in the mid 1930s as he saw the unwillingness of the church-community, both with Germany and ecumenically throughout Europe, to be the church as it was called to be (Mextaxas, 147). In an essay that Bonhoeffer presented to a group of German pastors, he addressed his position of the responsibility of the church. Mextaxas writes, “Bonhoeffer then famously enumerated “three possible ways in which the church can act towards the state.” (Mextaxas, 149). The first was for the church to question the state regarding its actions to assist the state to be the state ordained by God. The second was to aid those who were victims of state’s actions. Bonhoeffer stated, “the church has an unconditional obligation to the victims of any ordering of society even if they do not belong to the Christian community” (Metaxas quoting Bonhoeffer, 149). Those in attendance knew that Bonhoeffer was talking about

the Jews and some of the pastors walked out in anger when he made these assertions (Metaxas, 150). Additionally, Bonhoeffer quotes Galatians 6:10 “Let us do good to all men” to emphasize the responsibility of the church to help all people who suffer. The third was for the church to work against the state if necessary (Mextaxas, 152). The three-fold responsibility of the church-community laid out was Bonhoeffer’s formulation of an ethic of responsibility. An ethical responsibility that Bonhoeffer believed was necessary for the church to be the church. His conviction would lead him to participate in the attempted assassination of Hitler.

Bonhoeffer contended with an attempt to rally the Confessing church to no avail to go against the Nazi regime and the injustice propagated against Jews. Bonhoeffer establishes an ethic of responsibility whereby faith is actualized through love, love of neighbor who happened to be Jewish counterparts. Bonhoeffer’s ethic of responsibility is grounded in and only possible due to the reconciliation that is complete in Christ. Bonhoeffer moves from a Christological faith position to a conviction of responsible action. Whether his actions to participate in the coupe to assassinate Hitler were justified as right or wrong, Bonhoeffer admits that he can only make a decision based upon the faith narrative that guides his understanding of the particular historical context with wherein he found himself (*Ethics*, 121). Bonhoeffer’s rhetorical communication is that of a call to the church-community to do something against injustice and actualize the faith that the church-community proclaimed to have due to the reconciliation of man to God and man to man. Arnett suggests that “Bonhoeffer considered it important for a person of faith to meet the everyday, the present situation, with a guiding faith story” and that his [Bonhoeffer’s] scholarship direct us “to a rhetorical religious charge—to meet

and address the world before us, not the world we demand of God” (Arnett, 5).

Bonhoeffer “lived a rhetoric of *phronesis*, a practical wisdom emergent from the meeting of the concrete moment and the storyline of faith ever responsible for the other” (Arnett, 6). The dialectic of the story of faith and the historical moment calls into conversation the injustice at hand and the interpretation of the injustice through to narrative lens of the faith story. This dialectic brings into conversation the immortal and the mortal inviting differing views, however, not losing the central ground of the story of faith.

“Bonhoeffer understood that interpretative action cannot deny reality but must offer as story that contends with evil, oppression of the other, and unearned privilege for oneself” (Arnett, 9). This is accomplished through the story of faith and relation to God.

Bonhoeffer was convinced that the responsibility of the church-community was to suffer with and for those who were victims (Selby, 228). Bonhoeffer was not content on standing idle and mute when the Jewish people were being persecuted and the country lead to war and conquest. His consistent response to the question of the rightful action of the church-community to the Jewish issue was that of responsibility. From his jail cell Bonhoeffer writes,

Who stands fast? Only the person whose final standard is not his or her reason, principles, conscience, freedom, or virtue, but who is ready to sacrifice all this when called to obedient and responsible action in faith and in exclusive allegiance to God—the responsible person, who tries to make his or her whole life an answer to the question and call of God” (*Letters and Papers*, 4).

Bonhoeffer question is to those of the church to take an introspection of themselves to disseminate their motivations and ethical perspective or the lack thereof. The call of God on the Christian was a call to ethical responsibility in a world come of age. The ethical however, cannot be based upon personal or self-centered principles or reasons. The call

of the Christian and the church-community was to vicariously suffer in necessary as Christ suffered (*Discipleship*, 222). Furthermore, Bonhoeffer suggested that it is a privilege to suffer as participants with Christ. He wrote, "Such vicariously representative action and suffering, which is carried out by the members of the body of Christ, is itself the very life of Christ who seeks to take shape in his members" (*Discipleship*, 222). The suffering being spoken of is the retaliation of the Nazis against those who would stand with the Jews; the suffering that may, as such in Bonhoeffer's situation, lead to death. Bonhoeffer was in no means desirous of becoming a martyr or calling the church-community to martyrdom. However, his call was to embody the essence of being a Christian, which entailed responsible action even if the action were to lead to suffering and death.

The responsible action of the Christian communicates to the other an inclusive rather than exclusive perspective of humanity. Selby suggests that Bonhoeffer's notion of a world come of age is related to a regaining of "humanity's whole destiny, part of the Christian vision of what that destiny could be, precisely as Christ expresses it in his continued presence in the world without accommodation to the world" (Selby, 235). Bonhoeffer believed that his struggle against Hitler was a living out of the calling of God to responsibility in the world and to be a voice for the deprived and oppressed (Selby, 235). Furthermore, the call to responsibility is a call to discipleship through which the Christian is called out of a life of security into "complete insecurity (which in truth is absolute security and protection in community with Jesus), out of the foreseeable and calculable realm (which in truth is unreliable) into the completely unforeseeable" (*Discipleship*, 57). Bonhoeffer is here describing the life of faith wherein the individual

gives up the right to self, in the sense of self-centeredness and self-righteousness, on commitment to the relationship with Christ. The relinquishing of the right to self is to participate in the vision for humanity that is predicated upon the revelation of God in the personhood of Christ. Discipleship is therefore “a commitment solely to the person of Jesus Christ, a breaking through of all legalisms by the grace of him who calls” (*Discipleship*, 59). The life of a disciple is to follow the path of Christ regardless of where that path may lead and to live a life otherwise is to choose one’s own path that will inevitably lead to continued disunity and enmity with God and man. The responsible action is the embodiment of the call to being-free-for the other.

Ethics of responsibility is an all-encompassing orientation of the church and its mission in the world. Bonhoeffer wrote, “Responsibility is an overall life-orientation affecting all particular actions and responsibilities. Responsibility is concrete, part of an ethic that can be described as relational and contextual” (*Letters and Papers*, 12). Bonhoeffer was acutely aware that responsible action was a historical construction in that the person of faith must meet the present situation that is ever moving toward a final destiny. This is not to say that the gospel message changes or that God changes, rather it means that one has to interpret what is the ethical response necessary in light of the guiding faith narrative (Arnett, 11). Furthermore, the ethical response solidifies the relationship between individuals as modeled by Christ’s willingness to lay down his life for humanity for the forgiveness of sins. Therefore, an ethic of responsibility can only be actualized by those who are living in the world in a given historical moment keenly aware of the other and their suffering. Bonhoeffer proposed that a Christian should live a this-worldly life without focus on the self. He wrote, “In so doing we throw ourselves

completely into the arms of God, taking seriously not our own sufferings, but those of God in the world—watching with Christ in Gethsemane” (Letter by Bonhoeffer quoted by Willmer, 1993). Bonhoeffer is not proposing an over spiritualized life without concern for the every day activities of life. Rather, Bonhoeffer is asserting that one has to live with both feet on the ground with a concern for one’s neighbor. “The church is only the church when it exists for others” (*Letters and Papers*, 98). The concern for one’s neighbor may lead suffering on behalf of the neighbor as the ethical response to and for the other made in the image of God.

The ethical responsibility for others has to be understood from the perspective of the relationship with Christ who also suffers along with humanity (*Discipleship*, 60). Bonhoeffer suggests that theorists and ethicist can be blinded by the form of evil dressed in the caricature of good (*Ethics*, 67). Furthermore, humankind can become blinded to wickedness, as in the wickedness posed in the Holocaust, when it appears good. This was the deceptive psychology of the Nazis (Thurman, 70). Bonhoeffer further asserts, “If evil appears in the form of light, beneficence, loyalty and renewal, if it conforms with historical necessity and social justice, then this, if it is understood straightforwardly, is a clear additional proof of its abysmal wickedness” (*Ethics*, 68). It is a two-fold warning against toward those who attempt to disguise evil in the form of good and not to be fooled by the masquerade. Bonhoeffer insisted that the Christian has to base their life from the Bible (*Letters and Papers*, 6). Again, it is the Biblical narrative that guides the Christian toward an ethic of responsibility. For Bonhoeffer Christ is the end of evil when he writes, “the theological question is not a question about the origin of evil by one, but about the actual overcoming of evil on the cross; it seeks the real forgiveness of guilt and

the reconciliation of the fallen world” (*Ethics*, 120). From this perspective Bonhoeffer is suggesting, in connection to and grounded upon the Christian narrative, that an undertaking of responsible action that leads to reconciliation requires one to turn from evil and our attempts to understand evil and seek the path of following Christ who has overcome evil.

The overcoming of evil in the cross was costly for reconciliation of humanity to God was paid with the life of the incarnate Son of God—Christ. Bonhoeffer contended that in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ lies a costly grace that cannot be taken for granted (*Discipleship*, 46). Furthermore, Bonhoeffer differentiates between what he calls cheap grace and costly grace. Cheap grace is without cost, empty rhetoric that makes claim to the grace of God but has no manifestation of that grace (Floyd, 129). “Cheap grace is the enemy of the church” (*Discipleship*, 58). Bonhoeffer is suggesting that when the church functions within the sphere of cheap grace, the church does not embrace an ethic of responsibility. Cheap grace is that of a confession of faith without any manifestation of the living a life in faith and dependent upon Christ. On the other hand, costly grace embraces the call of God to follow Christ even in the midst of danger. It is to leave everything behind and follow Christ—it costs the Christian (*Discipleship*, 63). Bonhoeffer utilizes the calling of Levi by Christ to press his point. “As Jesus was walking along, he saw Levi, son of Alpheus, sitting at the tax booth, and he said to him, follow me. And he got up and followed him” (Mark 2: 13-14, NIV). Levi, also known as Matthew, left his life and his vocation to answer the call to follow Jesus—it cost him. Additionally, Levi’s occupation as a tax collector was frowned upon and considered unethical due to over taxing the Jewish people in order to make a personal profit.

Therefore, Levi, even after accepting the call, would have continue pay a price due to his past and due to his faith. Nevertheless, it was a price that he was willing pay. To live a life following the path that Christ calls to will inevitably be costly. To Bonhoeffer it was a price that he was willing to pay, even unto death.

Bonhoeffer was willing to pay the ultimate price of the living a life responsibility toward the other. On April 9, 1945 at the age of 39 Dietrich Bonhoeffer was hung in Flossenburg concentration camp for his participation in the attempted assassination of Hitler (Floyd, ii). Bonhoeffer was convinced that Hitler was an evil that had to be stopped. The genocide of the Jewish population and the terror that was rampant by the Gestapo under the direction of Hitler was the propagation of evil in the world. Bonhoeffer spent his adult life making a rhetorical proclamation for the church-community to embody an ethic of responsibility that if necessary will suffer with the disposed, who in his day was the Jewish people (Rasmussen, 207). Bonhoeffer life and work from the churches in London to the African American churches of Harlem to the secret seminary in Finklewald displayed an ethic of responsibility; a faith in both word and deed.

Implications for a Rhetoric of Reconciliation

Bonhoeffer's work and life provide significant implications for a rhetoric of reconciliation. Bonhoeffer's initial academic work, *Sanctorum Communio*, provides a foundation for Bonhoeffer Christological construction of person, community and reciprocity in a fallen world. In *Creation and Fall* Bonhoeffer suggests that no one is free in and of themselves, but freedom is something that they have for others. "No one is free "in herself" or "in himself" [an sich]—free as it were in a vacuum or free in the same

way that a person may be musical, intelligent, or blind in herself or in himself. Freedom is not a quality a human being has; it is not an ability, a capacity, an attribute of being that may be deeply hidden in a person but can some how be uncovered” (*Creation & Fall*, 62). He goes on to argue, “Freedom is a relation between two persons. Being free means ‘being-free-for-the-other’, because I am bound to the other. Only by being in relation with other am I free” (*Creation & Fall*, 62). This concretizes the notion of society being established upon a foundation of mutual respect, and concern for the other that is not predicated upon some hedonistic or self- serving principles. Society ought to be governed by the understanding of interdependence whereby ‘I’ need ‘You’ in order to not only survive but also be become a person of my fullest potential. Bonhoeffer suggested, “the I cannot exist without the You, nor can it exist without the human race” (*Sanctorum Communio*, p.117). However, when the members of the society do not share the sentiments of social reciprocity, the ties that bind become the cords of strangulation. Society becomes entangled within the plethora of a multiplicity of competing, often disgruntled voices that vie for attention and power. A fragmented and splintered society no longer functions an Aristotelian ‘we’ but a modern ‘I’. Unable to stand united on fronts of social injustice if the injustice does not have a direct affect. Neighbor is only a geographic location of a person or families living in close proximity rather than people who are worthy of interaction.

The reconciliation of man to God through Christ is given as the solution to a fallen self-centered world. The act of reconciliation on the cross by Christ reestablishes the relationship that was destroyed at the fall. The individual is no longer captive to internal and external conflict by virtue of personal disunity, but is now free-from and

free-to. Furthermore, the I no longer view You as an obstacle to be overcome, but views the other as made in the image of God. This perception of the other is foundational to a rhetoric of reconciliation. Bar-Tel and Bennink suggest that a framework of reconciliation has to deal with the “changing the motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes, and emotions of the great majority of the society members regarding the conflict” (Bar-Tel & Bennink, 8). Therefore, Bonhoeffer’s understanding of the human condition and the propensity to be reconciled to God and one another provides a groundwork from which a new perspective of the other can ensue. Though Bonhoeffer operates from a strictly Christological approach that is not to say that persons of other faiths and belief systems cannot institute his thought. However, Bonhoeffer must not be confused with arguing for a theory of utilitarianism, for he situates the good as only being conceivable in and through Christ. Furthermore, his ethical construct is developed and actualized within a particular historical context, which holds viable consideration for the ethical choices that are made.

Bonhoeffer’s rhetoric of reconciliation calls individuals to be responsible for and to their fellow man. In being-free-for, humanity is free to exist not just in co-habitation with one’s neighbor, but in relationship with and for them. Therein lies the essence of community, as being understood that the individual cannot exist with community and community cannot exist without the individual. Bonhoeffer asserts that community is actualized by virtue of being in community with Christ whereby the reciprocal relationship is one of sacrifice and service. Holding Jesus’ physical relationship with the disciples as the model, Bonhoeffer argues for the physical relationship of humanity to constitute the same care, sacrifice and service to ensure that the needs of others are placed

before one's own. Therefore, a rhetoric of reconciliation provides the acknowledgment that the other is important even if the other is different. The acknowledgement is not an attempt to win over or control the other, but a turning from a previous negative exclusive perception to an inclusive understanding of community. Bonhoeffer is not arguing for a utopian society, for he understands that individuals will not always agree or desire the same things and therefore conflict will inevitably arise. Nevertheless, conflict is viewed as healthy and necessary for the progression of society to continue (*Sanctorum Communio*, 64). Furthermore, conflict addressed dialogically is the answer ethical engagement of the I and You toward reconciliation grounded in the mutual respect that is given one to another.

Bonhoeffer's framework of reconciliation takes a further step in demanding that discourse not remain linguistic propaganda. For Bonhoeffer, again in line with a guiding Biblical narrative, the theoretical and theological have to be actualized in every day life and encounters. One has to be willing to provide acts of grace and compassion to others regardless of who the other is (*Discipleship*, 81). The motivation to do so cannot be predicated upon the expectation of something in return—that would constitute a self-centered life. Rather, the motivation to live out an ethic of responsibility is founded upon the grace that has been given in the reconciliatory act of Christ. Through his final days of life Bonhoeffer continued to call to the church-community to be the church that accepted the responsibility of providing for and suffering with those in need (*Selby*, 229). It was a call to take a stand in the face of adversity and lay down one's life in necessary for the "least of these" (Matthew 25: 45, NIV). Reconciliation from this vantage takes on the willingness to stand up for others who are suffering adversity. Furthermore, it is being

empathetic and sympathetic to the extent of taking the pragmatic step of doing for the other what the other is incapable of doing or oppressed for attempting.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer's convictions lead to his hanging in a concentration camp at the age of 39. His life and his work provide a rich complexity of thought, dedication, and faith that continues to reverberate more than fifty years after his murder. Dietrich Bonhoeffer contribution to the present day is a resounding call for man to be reconciled to God and to one another; for the church-community to be the community willing to not only talk about reconciliation, but to actualize Christian rhetorical discourse in ethical responsibility for those who suffer. Furthermore, it is call to the ends of the world to recognize that people are all a part of the human community, though different still responsible for one another in creating a world in which the response to the question: Am I my brother's keeper, is a resounding yes.

Chapter 4

Truth & Reconciliation Commission: A Rhetoric of Reconciliation Praxis

A Rhetoric of Reconciliation is proposed to be a communicative praxis narratively situated to bring about peace and stability in the aftermath of conflict. South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission was implemented following the end of apartheid as a course of action toward national restoration after decades of civil, political, and military unrest. South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission operated from an understanding of *Ubuntu*, a framework of Christian and African Religious interpretation of humanity, community, restoration, and hope for a better future. The South African notion of *Ubuntu* incorporates the guiding foundational principles of the process of reconciliation grounded in a narratively situated religious and cultural perspective as a holistic approach to living. The guiding principles of the TRC have direct colorations to the theological and philosophical ground of Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Therefore, the TRC stands as a pragmatic application of Bonhoeffer's work within a similar context of horrific inhumanity and social atrocity.

This chapter will review the South Africa Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) as a pragmatic application of a rhetoric of reconciliation from a Christian Religious framework. The TRC was the decided course of action following the upheaval of apartheid in South Africa in 1994 when Nelson Mandela was elected South Africa's president in the first democratic public vote. Following Mandela's election, a determination of how justice would be carried out in light of years of brutality and crimes averse to humanity at the hands of government officials, military and police forces of the apartheid regime. The decision was made what South Africa needed was not more death

or brutality, but for a country to heal from the past and move on in unity toward a new future. Thus, a pursuit of reconciliation between black and white South Africans was the decision. The chapter traces a history of Apartheid with an examination of the racial brutality that occurred for over sixty years followed by the rationale for the decision to deal with the injustices by means of a truth commission. Then the theoretic, theological, and philosophical underpinnings of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission are discussed through the work of the Commission's leader, Archbishop Desmond Tutu. Additionally, the points of intersection of Bonhoeffer and Tutu are identified to solidify the theoretical and pragmatic implications of a Christian framework of a rhetoric of reconciliation. Finally, the chapter concludes with a presentation of a framework of a Rhetoric of Reconciliation Communicative Praxis derived from this work.

South Africa Truth and Reconciliation Commission was the successful, by most accounts, to institute a national program of reconciliation in the aftermath of one of history's most inhumane era of fear and brutality accented by deep-seated racism. When apartheid ended, the new parliament determined that the best course of action for the future of South Africa was to establish the Truth and Reconciliation Commission to address the atrocities of apartheid. The TRC is of vital significance for a rhetoric of reconciliation from a Christian Religious framework due to the religious and cultural philosophical ground from which the TRC operated. The TRC functioned with distinct similarities to those proposed by Dietrich Bonhoeffer, such as the perception of humanity and community established on interdependence, reconciliation of humanity with God and neighbor, ethic of responsibility, the Church, and ecclesiology. Furthermore, the work of the TRC, headed by Archbishop Desmond Tutu, places the framework in praxis that

reveals the applicability of a rhetoric of reconciliation from a Christian Religious framework in other situations.

Historical Background of Apartheid

Nelson Mandela was in prison from 1964 until 1990 for being a traitor and conspirator against the government (Moyers, 12). Nearly four years after his release from prison, Mandela was elected the president of South Africa, officially ending apartheid. However, apartheid has left in its' wake a country still suffering from the scars, both physically and emotionally, that decades of brutality and inhumanity inflicted. "Our country has been through a long dark night of anguish, which we must now put behind us. I believe joining hands in that task is a central aim of reconciliation" (Mandela, 1995). President Mandela made this statement in 1995 after the decision was made to establish the Truth and Reconciliation Commission as a means to deal with the crimes of apartheid. It was 1652 when Europeans, followed by Dutch and British, settled in South Africa and eventually a unified South Africa emerged under white rule (Moyers, 11). In 1948, the National Party with the support of white Afrikaners took dominance of the parliament and instituted laws of separation or apartheid. Apartheid laws were intended to separate black and white South Africans geographically, economically, racially, and educationally. "Race classification boards sought to separate South Africa's inhabitants by race as if they were cattle" (Tutu, 14). Tutu asserts that often people that were of the same family were separated due to being of a lighter or darker complexion. Those who were of a darker hue were assigned to a lower and less privileged group. The categorization was used to enforce where a group was allowed to live, work, and worship. The penalty for disobedience of these laws was imprisonment.

The educational system was also designed not only for separation, but the content of the education that was received was based upon racial classification and projected place in society. Tutu quoted Dr. Hendrik Verwoerd, the Prime Minister of South Africa during apartheid as stating; “The school must equip the Bantu to meet the demands which economic life will impose on him. What is the use of teaching Bantu child mathematics when it cannot use it in practice? Education must train and teach people in accordance with their opportunities in life” (Tutu, 16). The system was set to ensure that those of lesser social classes were not enabled to rise above the government assigned position in South African society. When there was any attempt of protest, those in power instituted violence and gross abuse of human rights. Tutu recalls the 1960 Sharpeville massacre when a peaceful demonstration against pass laws turned violent when police opened fire on the demonstrators and sixty-nine people were killed (Tutu, 23). The pass laws were laws that forbade black South Africans from traveling outside of their assigned towns without proper documentation from the government. All males over the age of sixteen had to have a “pass card” on them when they traveled or they could face imprisonment. Tutu recalls as a child traveling with his father who was a schoolteacher and had an exemption due to his occupation, but was always stopped by the police who demanded to see his pass card. “He was a nonentity in the eyes of the laws with the minimum rights of a third-class citizen” (Tutu, 96). Such was the life of a black South African full of humiliation and subordination in a manner that was catastrophic to the humanity of generations of black South Africans. However, there would remain a people within a people who would continue to voice their disagreement and rejection of apartheid, sometimes with a retaliation of violence.

In 1912, the African National Congress (ANC) was founded as a black South African political party. It was not until 1961 that the ANC developed the military arm of the organization (Moyers, 11). The aim was to only target dismantling strategic military and detention centers without the loss of life. In 1964, Nelson Mandela and nine other ANC leaders were sentenced to life imprisonment on charges of sabotage and treason (Moyers, 11). Others would follow after Mandela while he was imprisoned, such as Steve Biko who in the 1970s encouraged black South Africans to be proud of who they were and to emancipate themselves from the psychological prison of being less than their white counterparts. “Merely by describing yourself as black, you have started on a road towards emancipation. You have committed yourself to fight against all forces that seek to use your blackness as a stamp that marks you out as a subservient being” (McKee, 4). Like many others, Steve Biko was silenced in September 1977 after dying from injuries that resulted during an interrogation. The police report suggested that Biko died from self-inflicted head trauma from banging his head against the wall. “People recalled that Steve had been driven naked in the bed of a police truck over 1500 kilometers to Pretoria, where it was reported he would have received medical treatment, except that he died soon after he arrived there” (Tutu, 98). Tutu goes on to recount that no one ever explained why Biko could not have received medical treatment in Port Elizabeth where he was detained or why he was transported naked. This is only one of the many stories of inhumane treatment that occurred during apartheid.

During the next thirty years South Africa would be torn apart by the oppressive forces of apartheid. Albie Sachs, a white activist who opposed apartheid defined it as “The total control of individual human beings and communities through the law. Your

whole fate was determined by the color of your skin and only whites had the vote” (Moyers, 5). The fate of black South Africans was perpetuated by a continual onslaught of propaganda that reinforced the political degradation of the black population. A segment taken from a pamphlet published by the National Party reads:

Churches and missions which frustrate the policy of apartheid will not be tolerated...Educational institutions and social services for blacks should be situated in the reserves, instead of the present practice of providing them in urban locations...Blacks in urban locations should be regarded as migratory citizens not entitled to political or social rights equal to those of Whites (Mandela, 31).

Second class citizenship within the country of their birth was the sum total of apartheid legislation. The fundamental ideology was that of supremacy by one race over another, such as the case with the Holocaust, and American slavery, with a subjection to the accepted ideology upon those viewed as lesser. Furthermore, the accepted ideology was justified with a religious ecclesiastical dogma. Hendrik Frensch Verwoerd, former Prime Minister of South Africa during apartheid stated,

We send this message to the outside world and say to them that there is but one way of saving the white races of the world. And that is for the White and non-White in Africa each to exercise his rights within his own areas. We have been planted here, we believe, with a destiny and the service of a nation to the Deity in which it believes (Mandela, 36).

Apartheid became entrenched in everyday life in South Africa wherein difference, and everything that it entailed, was the accepted norm of life. That by virtue of race the white population of South Africa perceived themselves as the superior race that was placed in this geographical location to fulfill a preordained destiny. Any South African, black or otherwise, that dared to go against the systematic injustice was considered a threat to the apartheid way of life and was dealt with severely.

The opposition to apartheid was met with violence even when the opposition was not violent. Tutu comments, “Peaceful resistance and protest are virtually impossible in South Africa. If you are an effective opponent of apartheid then you may be charged with high treason or you may be detained under the emergency regulations; you may be banned” (Moyers, 22). Tutu recalls examples of a three-year-old child that was killed by a rubber bullet and an eleven year old that were beaten to death by police. Apartheid law and regulation enforcement became a perpetual torrent of violence that would be met with violence from the oppressed at times as well. Terror was used by the government, military and police to keep the Black South Africans fearful of resistance. However, fear produces either a fight or flight mentality (Thurman, 18) and many chose to fight, even though lives were lost in the process. Such as the uprising and protests that took place throughout South Africa in Black Township that caused the government to declare a state of emergency (Moyers, 17). There were also covert operations by militant blacks that included car bombings, beating and abductions of whites that were considering instigators of apartheid (Moyers, 18). In his 1985 address to the United Nations, Bishop Tutu stated, “South Africa is a violent country and the primary violence is the violence of apartheid” (Moyers, 22). The fear of uprising and the loss of power and control contributed to the ongoing violence. Additionally, apartheid laws ensured that even individuals with high-ranking offices, national and international recognition, and influence were never exceptions.

In 1986, Desmond Tutu became the Archbishop of South Africa’s Anglican Church. The appointment gave Tutu and his family the ability to occupy the Bishops court located in Cape Town. Bishop Tutu had been awarded a Nobel Peace Prize

in 1984, yet he was unable to vote and should not have moved into the Bishops court until receiving special permission documentation from the local and national government because of the Group Areas Act (Tutu, 4). However, Tutu announced when he was elected to the office, “I will not be applying for such a permit. I am the Archbishop, and will be occupying the Archbishop’s residence, and the apartheid government could act as it saw fit” (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 5). The government never removed Tutu from the Bishops court, but they did keep watch on him and his family. Tutu also notes that even though he was well known, he and his family were often susceptible to maltreatment. “My wife and daughters have been stripped to be body searched at a roadblock. Your dignity is not just rubbed in the dust. It is trodden underfoot and spat on” (Moyers, 22). Apartheid created an underpinning philosophical understanding of the Black South Africans as being less than. Tutu makes a connection to Hannah Arendt’s work in writing, “The philosopher Hannah Arendt refers to the ‘banality of evil’—that those involved with evil are certainly outwardly not grotesque. They are for all intents and purposes normal people like you and me” (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 144). The cruelty and violent acts are enacted due to a perception of the Black population as being sub-human and more closely identified as animals. Leandra, a white South African of Dutch descent, stated, “When I was small I was told I had to stay away from black people because they were almost like animals: They were dangerous; they could kill you” (Moyer, 6). Hate imbedded in the narrative of social consciousness is a dangerous weapon that was utilized to ensure continued social structure, separation, and power. From the educational system to diner table conversations, the Blacks in South Africa were portrayed as people who were not really people.

The history of South Africa as taught in the classroom reinforced the apartheid mentality. The Battle of Blood River in 1838 is pointed out as a significant event in the history of South Africa in relation to the conquering nations that were the ancestors of the apartheid regime. The Battle of Blood River is where the Boers defeated the Zulu warriors. The name was given because of the color of the water in the Ncome River turning red from the blood. The Afrikaners celebrate December 16 as the triumph of the Afrikaner over the African and proof that God was their side (Moyers, 14). However, Africans mourn the day as a massacre of their people. The superiority and God given destiny of the Afrikaners was the consistent historical interpretation. The predestination and superiority were taught throughout the education of Afrikaners to reinforce and give rationale for apartheid. Nevertheless, when others would make an attempt to offer contrary views of history, they were silenced.

In 1979, the University of South Africa held a conference on the problems of interpretations of history where an Afrikaner professor was to give a lecture on the potential misunderstanding of the covenant made before the Battle of Blood River. The covenant theory suggested that there was a promise made to God by the Boers that if God gave them victory over the Zulu, that they would build a church and have an annual celebration. Because they did defeat the Zulu, the day of the Covenant was celebrated annually as a commemoration (Moyers, 17). This understanding the Blood River Covenant underscores the rationale for white rule in South Africa. Therefore, when the professor took the stage to speak at the conference, a group of young male Afrikaners ran into the room and proceeded to tar and feather the professor (Moyers, 18). Whatever the professor had to offer as a potential different interpretation of history was deemed as a

threat to the accepted history of how and why the Afrikaners were in power in South Africa. Interestingly enough, presently December 16 is no longer a celebration of victory for Afrikaners and the defeat of Africans, but is now the Day of Reconciliation, a national holiday of celebration for all of South Africa.

The Transition to a Democratic South Africa

History would take a different trajectory beginning in 1990 when anti-apartheid groups were legalized and subsequently apartheid outlawed. There were decisive steps that were taken before 1990 that caused the end of apartheid. In 1984, under the presidency of P.W. Botha, a new constitution was inaugurated that among other increased racism separated the single House of Parliament into three bodies: “A 178-member (all white) House of Assembly, an eighty-five-member (coloured) House of Representatives, and a forty-five-member (Indian) House of Delegates” (Byrnes, 18). Whites maintained the majority and Blacks were not admitted in any of the three divisions. This caused a major outbreak of protest across the country. Over the next six years peaceful protests lead by Bishop Desmond Tutu; strikes by Trade Unions; the removal of investments from international companies including the United States and international sanctions began to weaken the grips of apartheid on South Africa as their economy deteriorated (Byrnes, 21). In 1986 President Botha shocked the government by stating, “South Africa has outgrown the outdated concept of apartheid” (Byrnes, 21). Over the next three years, steps, ever so small, were taken to begin to give the impression that racial equality was on the horizon. Throughout the process, the concerns of conservative white elites and the impatience of the radical blacks caused the government to declare state of emergency on several occasions. The major shift came on the heels of President Botha resigning after

suffering from a stroke and other health related issues. Botha was resistant to the pressure to resign, nevertheless he eventually relinquished his presidential position (Byrnes, 23). In 1989, the former Minister of Education Frederik W. de Klerk succeeded Botha as president of South Africa.

Soon after becoming president, de Klerk had a series of secret meetings with Nelson Mandela while Mandela was still in prison. De Klerk recognized the urgency to give an ear to and allow the contribution of the Black majority in the political process (Byrnes, 25). One of the largest shifts in apartheid control came when de Klerk announced in early 1990 that Nelson Mandela would be released from prison; media restrictions were to be lifted; former liberation fighters were invited to become a part of the government negotiations and a promise for all human rights violations to be investigated (Byrnes, 25). “Widely held as historic, de Klerk’s speech was nonetheless attacked by anti-apartheid critics for what it lacked—it did not mention the two most despised legislative pillars of apartheid, the Population Registration Act and the Group Areas Act” (Byrnes, 26). These two acts kept White and Black South Africans separated geographically and socially. The acts ensured the minimal interaction of Blacks and Whites. Additionally, de Klerk did not address lifting security provisions that provided the military and police heightened authority during a state of emergency. Nevertheless, on February 11, 1990, after twenty-seven years of imprisonment, Nelson Mandela was a free man. At the age of seventy-one, Mandela’s first words to the crowds that awaited to greet him were that of reassurance that his release was not due to a deal made with the government and he intended on working toward reconciliation of Blacks and Whites in South Africa (Byrne, 26). Mandela said,

I have fought against white domination, and I have fought against black domination. I have cherished the idea of a democratic and free society in which all persons live together in harmony and with equal opportunities. It is an ideal, which I hope to live for and to achieve. But if needs be, it is an ideal for which I am prepared to die (Byrnes, 26).

Nelson Mandela held to his word and promise of working toward a more harmonious society in South Africa and the institution of a democratic society. The actions of de Klerk communicated to the rest of the world that a potential change in South Africa was under way. However, only time would be able to tell if apartheid would fall or if de Klerk's motives were to gain international support through deception.

In the later months of 1990, the de Klerk's conservative supporters called for his resignation due to de Klerk lifting a ban on nearly 40,000 exiles and granting immunity from prosecution to banned and exiled ANC members (Byrnes, 28). The ANC exiles were given immunity in order to participate in the government talks toward creating a peaceful South Africa. While de Klerk's actions were deemed gracious, he was still criticized by the ANC for attempting to ensure white control was preserved. There was further animosity at the negotiating table when the Harms Commission, government-appointed commission to investigate murders, concluded that there was evidence of clandestine death squads but not proof that they had operated as a part of security services in carrying out beatings and murders of blacks (Byrnes, 28). The tension drew international attention and therefore countries participating in the sanctions against South Africa were cautious and attentive. Both Mandela and de Klerk visited many of the sanction nations throughout 1990 and 1991 communicating the progress and still to be dealt with struggles of a new South Africa. "Several African countries, visited by Mandela within weeks of his release from prison, held to their pledge to await his signal

of progress toward ending apartheid before they began to lift sanctions” (Byrnes, 30). Such was also the case with the United States. “The US Comprehensive Antiapartheid Act of 1986 had specified that five conditions would have to be met before sanctions could be lifted” (Byrnes, 30). By the end of 1990 three of the five conditions were met, but the two remaining conditions included the freeing of political prisoners and the repealing of both the Group Areas Act and the Population Registration Act. It was not until 1991 that the latter were achieved (Byrnes, 31). South Africa was in the process of reorganizing a country that had been torn apart by apartheid for over sixty years and the process was not easy. Nelson Mandela had announced his commitment to the reconciliation of the South African people who have been divided by race and power.

The determining factors that would eventually lead to a democratic South Africa came in 1991. The movement toward democracy began in July of 1991 when the government repealed the Population Registration Act, Group Areas Act and the Lands Act. Following this decisive move, other nations began to lift their sanctions and trade bans against South Africa (Byrnes, 33). In December of 1991 the Convention for a Democratic South Africa that included delegation from nineteen governmental and political organizations was instituted with a primary goal to plan and prepare for the transition of South Africa to a democratic nation. There were five working groups established to “take the lead in creating a climate for free political activity; in determining basic constitutional principles; in setting and overseeing timetables for the transition; and in dealing with new problems that would arise during the transition itself” (Byrnes, 33). Moreover, there were problems that arose during the process and over the next two years, violent outbreaks across the country occur between right wing defenders of apartheid and

retaliation from militant groups. Negotiations would be halted and nearly completely ended on two occasions due in part to accusations of association to the conflicts by those in the delegation groups (Byrnes, 34). Nevertheless, through the tensions capable of dismantling South Africa into all out civil war, those dedicated to a new South Africa continued to persevere despite the odds. In November of 1993, “the two sides agreed on an interim constitution. In April of 1994, South Africans of all races went to the polls, many for the first time, to elect a new government. Nelson Mandela and the ANC won the election” (Moyers, 26). It was a time of elation and celebration as the world watched in awe at the site of South Africa electing its’ first democratic president.

Archbishop Desmond Tutu recounts April 27, 1994, the day of the first democratic vote in South Africa:

I had waited until I was sixty-two years old before I could vote. Nelson Mandela was seventy-six. The air was electric with excitement, anticipation, and anxiety with fear even. Yes, fear that those in the right wing who had promised to disrupt this day of days might in fact succeed in their nefarious schemes...The moment for which I had waited so long came and I folded my ballot paper and cast my vote. Wow! I shouted Yippee! It was giddy stuff. It was like falling in love. The sky looked blue and more beautiful. I saw people in a new light. They were beautiful, they were transfigured. I too was transfigured. It was dreamlike (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 4).

The outcome of the historic monumental occasion was the election of Nelson Mandela as South Africa’s president. The people of South Africa had long awaited a day when their voice could be heard. Tutu’s description of the day of voting describes a surreal moment shared by droves of people across South Africa. Tutu recalls that it was a media frenzy, with coverage of the voting being carried by news reports all over the world (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 6). It has been estimated that more than twenty-two million voters stood in line for hours at 9,000 voting location to exercise their right to vote (Byrnes, 34).

However, accusations of election fraud surfaced in the days following the voting and it would not be until May 6, 1994 that the final count was tallied with Mandela and the ANC receiving 62.6 percent of the vote (Byrnes, 34). Mandela was inaugurated on May 10 with over 140 represented countries in attendance for the occasion. In his inaugural address Mandela laid out the direction, that he envisioned that South Africa would take in creating a country that was void of racism and sexism. “We have, at last, achieved our political emancipation. We pledge ourselves to liberate all our people from the continuing bondage of poverty, deprivation, suffering, gender and other discrimination” (Brians et al, 88). Mandela, who was once prisoner now president set the stage for the transition of South Africa through setting lofty goals for his administration. Mandela would prove to be instrumental in the founding of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission as well as the commitment to reconciliation.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission Established

Rhetoric of Reconciliation is proposed to be a communicative praxis narratively situated to bring about peace and stability in the aftermath of conflict. Reconciliation can be generally deemed as the repairing and/or establishing of relationships following conflict. This was the goal of the new post-apartheid government led by President Nelson Mandela. Mandela became the embodiment of reconciliation and forgiveness as one who spent nearly three decades in prison and sought to reconcile his country rather than opt for revenge on those who upheld apartheid. Mandela embodied a communicative praxis of a rhetoric of reconciliation to do and not only talk. Mandela’s dedication to reconciliation against the criticism and obstacles earned him the 1993 Nobel Peace Prize. A world-influencing event occurred at Mandela’s inauguration wherein

Mandela invited his white prison jailer as an honored guest. Tutu proclaims that this action was, “the first of many gestures he [Mandela] would make in his spectacular way, showing his breathtaking magnanimity and willingness to forgive” (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 9). Nelson Mandela’s political rhetoric was not meant to capture audiences for voter approval or reelection, but connected to a deep-seated passion for his country and his people who had suffered through the darkness of apartheid. Mandela’s persistence in developing relationships built on forgiveness and reconciliation is related to the African notion of *Ubuntu* (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 29). *Ubuntu* is an African concept of interconnectedness of persons with an emphasis on generosity. Tutu writes, “*Ubuntu* speaks particularly about the fact that you can’t exist as a human being in isolation. It speaks about our interconnectedness. You can’t be human all by yourself, and when you have this quality—*Ubuntu*—you are known for your generosity” (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 68). Nelson Mandela tells a story of a traveler that has no money or food to eat and when he stops in a village he does not have to ask for food or water for the people provide him with it. Mandela concludes, “This is one aspect *Ubuntu*, but it will have various aspects. *Ubuntu* does not mean that people should not enrich themselves. The question therefore is: Are you going to do so in order to enable the community around you to be able to improve?” (Mandela, 12). To this end, *Ubuntu* as an underlying philosophical ground of community in the South African context implies the necessity to subvert self for the betterment of the community. Therefore, if punitive actions for the atrocities of apartheid would be detrimental to society, which is what was ultimately determined, then retribution should not be the course of action following the fall of apartheid. *Ubuntu* had a great affect on how the decision to create the Truth and

Reconciliation Commission rather than pursue judicial criminal court proceedings of those guilty of the crimes during apartheid.

One of the primary focuses of the Mandela administration was to ensure that there was not an outburst of violence from right-wing extremists and the transformation of the entire nation. “The liberation movement has always been very clear that its major aim was not to replace a white government by a predominantly black one, but to transform the whole society. South Africa, as the ANC's Freedom Charter states, 'belongs to all who live in it' and the talents of all its citizens must be enlisted in the fight to eliminate poverty” (Asmal, 10). This was the post-apartheid focus on transitioning from an older regime to embodying Bishop Tutu’s idea of the rainbow people of God (Bois, 17). The key themes of the transition was justice and reconciliation that repudiated a history of injustice and separation to embrace the possibility of a promised better future through challenging society to become what it is called to be (Bois, 18). The call is to be a community of people that are not designated by the color of the skin. The call, as believed by Mandela, was to be a country that able to move beyond the violence and separation of the past to become a unified people of South Africa that embody Ubuntu. The move toward such an actualized dream was more than motivational hype for the steps toward justice and reconciliation were written in the legislature of the governing rule of the country as the National Unity and Reconciliation Act of 1995.

The National Unity and Reconciliation Act 34 of 1995 was approved by the parliament of South Africa as the ruling legislative document to govern the continued process of transition from the old regime to the new government. The long title of the

Act provides insight to the legislative expectations of the goals of a truth commission to embody the measures of restoration of South Africa. The title of the act reads:

To provide for the investigation and the establishment of as complete a picture as possible of the nature, causes and extent of gross violations of human rights committed during the period from 1 March 1960 to the cut-off date contemplated in the Constitution, within or outside the Republic, emanating from the conflicts of the past, and the fate or whereabouts of the victims of such violations; the granting of amnesty to persons who make full disclosure of all the relevant facts relating to acts associated with a political objective committed in the course of the conflicts of the past during the said period; affording victims an opportunity to relate the violations they suffered; the taking of measures aimed at the granting of reparation to, and the rehabilitation and the restoration of the human and civil dignity of, victims of violations of human rights; reporting to the Nation about such violations and victims; the making of recommendations aimed at the prevention of the commission of gross violations of human rights; and for the said purposes to provide for the establishment of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission, comprising a Committee on Human Rights Violations, a Committee on Amnesty and a Committee on Reparation and Rehabilitation; and to confer certain powers on, assign certain functions to and impose certain duties upon that Commission and those Committees; and to provide for matters connected therewith.
(Promotion of National Unity Act 34)

The title provides a summary of the course of action that was determined to be the best way in which South Africa could become a unified country in the aftermath of apartheid. The decision to conduct a Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and the various sub-committees associated with the Commission lay within a belief that unity must be sought through a process of restoration of people rather than retribution and revenge (Moyers, 29). The mission of the TRC was to provide amnesty to individuals who willingly came forward to the Truth Hearing and acknowledged their wrong, provided truthful accounts of their wrong-doing publically, provided the identity of perpetrators and victims and asked for forgiveness (Moyers, 30). Under the provisions of the National Unity Act those requesting amnesty were only to be considered if their deeds gross

violations of human rights were done in connection to a political or military order.

Therefore, any crime of homicide, assault, theft, or the like not connected to political or military order was not allowed at the TRC hearings.

The transition from apartheid to a democratic South Africa the TRC was instituted with President Mandela spearheading the charge. Reconciliation was proposed as the way in which South Africa could become a unified country without regard for race. The task ahead would be no easy journey, nor would the process of the TRC. Nevertheless, the pragmatic reality of reconciliation was established. Judge Mohamed, who was the appointed to the commission stated, “For a successful negotiated transition, the terms of the transition required not only the agreement of those victimized by the abuse but also those threatened by the transition to a democratic society” (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 21). This implies the necessity of the nation to accept the process of the TRC and the other subsequent measures of the transition to a democratic nation as well as the government ensuring that the projected course is steadied regardless of how rough the going may get. The transition has to ensure that both the victims and victimizers of apartheid are free to give voice to the atrocities of the past and then move on to reconcile rather than revenge. Judge Mohamed’s statements were pointing to the necessity of government policy and laws ensure this end. The TRC could not become a ploy to provide a space for victimizers to come forward as a set up for revenge and retribution.

Bishop Tutu, who was appointed the chair of the TRC by President Mandela, suggested that the process of the hearings required the commission to “balance the requirements of justice, accountability, stability, peace, and reconciliation” (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 22). He goes on to suggest that they could have had retributive

justice, which would have left South Africa in ashes. They had to make a critical and careful decision on the best possible means of overcoming their past and moving forward to a new South Africa; this was reconciliation (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 38). “To ignore what happened to thousands of people who were victims of abuse under apartheid is to deny them their basic dignity. It is to condemn them to live as nameless victims with little or no chance to begin their lives over again” (Boraine, 29). Providing a voice and a place of safety for those who were so horrifically damaged from apartheid was given during the hearing in an attempt to restore the dignity of the effected. There would not be a blanket amnesty as some began to suggest about the TRC. The government would not just make a mass declaration that those who had killed, maimed, kidnapped, tortured and the like were absolved from what they had done. To do so, in Tutu’s perception would have been to take the route of amnesia rather than amnesty (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 51). The TRC’s approach included the acknowledgement of the wrong with full disclosure of the event(s) associated with the crime that was committed by both the perpetrator and the victims or their families if the victim was deceased.

Joyce Mtimkulu was one of many mothers who went to the TRC hearing to find out the truth and gain closure on the atrocity that she endured during apartheid. Joyce’s twenty year old son Siphiwo was abducted by the police in 1982 and she had no idea what happened to her son until 1990 when a newspaper interview with a former policeman revealed that her son had be assassinated for leading an anti-apartheid activity in Port Elizabeth (Moya, 6). Joyce did not find out where they had disposed of her son’s remains until 1997 at a TRC hearing. Joyce stated, “I won’t just forgive if you don’t come to me and ask forgiveness. They should come to me and ask forgiveness. To me,

and then to God” (Moya, 6). Joyce’s statements are in response to any amnesty without disclosure and the asking of forgiveness by those who were involved with the death of her son. Tandy Shezi is a survivor of months of imprisonment and brutality. In 1988, Tandy was detained without cause or hearing by four policemen who told her that after they were finished with her, she would hate herself. In the months that followed Tandy was repeatedly raped, beaten unconscious, suffocated with a plastic bag and left naked in a concrete cell with no bed, no bedding and not rest room facilities (Moya, 7). Tandy stated that the only way she could make it through the ordeal was to dissociate herself from her body and at the TRC hearing she said, “I wish I could go back to that prison and collect my soul, for the real Tandy is still there” (Moya, 7). Tandy told Moya in an interview that at the TRC hearings people got together and shared their stories, on and off the testimony stand. Tandy said, “For we understand that talking is healing. The more you talk about your pain, the more you get relieved” (Moya, 7). The TRC provided a space for the victims of apartheid to tell their stories and receive compassion for the trauma they experienced.

The narrative component of the TRC institute a space for the victims of atrocities to tell their story and for the perpetrators to confess their wrong and ask for forgiveness. The TRC was established to function as the main impetuses for the transition of a country torn by generations of apartheid to a democratic nation. The decision to pursue reconciliation inclusive of a restorative justice model was determined the best course of action rather than seek formal judicial proceedings in an attempt to bring to trial all those involved in acts of human violence. The trajectory of bringing about peace after conflict was inclusive of trauma, justice, acknowledgment, forgiveness, and social assimilation.

These five essential aspects of reconciliation were incorporated into the work of the TRC. The underlying principles that constituted the narrative ground from which the TRC operated was established on the African philosophical understanding of Ubuntu and theological implications of humanity being created in the image of God (Battle, 3). Furthermore, with Archbishop Desmond Tutu as the chair of the TRC, a Christological hermeneutic of forgiveness, restorative justice, and ecclesiology was contributed to the ongoing dedication to reconciliation (Moyo, 296). Tutu also provided a consistent and constant challenge to the church local and international to answer the call of being the church that God was calling for to stand against the apartheid regime on behalf of the oppressed (Battle, 6). Thus, the framework of the TRC can be defined as functioning as a Rhetorical Christian Narrative Approach.

The successes as well as shortcomings of the TRC represent a pragmatic application of the Christian framework of reconciliation with philosophical and theological connections to the work Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Particularly Bonhoeffer's notions of sociality and being-free-for in relation to Ubuntu; humanity as the *imago dei* in relation to the *imago dei* of South African liberation theology as *Ubuntu*; a Christological hermeneutic of what the human community can be. In addition, Bonhoeffer's ethic of responsibility of the individual and of the church is closely associated to Tutu's notion of responsibility of the person and the church. Most pointedly, connection is the guidance of the biblical narrative as a lens through which the historical moment at hand is to be understood and addressed. The connection of Bonhoeffer's philosophical and theological ground to Tutu and the TRC assists the further development of a rhetorical communicative praxis of reconciliation from a Christian narrative ground.

TRC, Tutu, and Bonhoeffer

The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission chaired by Archbishop Desmond Tutu is a pragmatic example of a rhetoric of reconciliation from a Christian Religious perspective. The theoretical underpinnings are guided by the notion of Ubuntu, the Christological hermeneutic of *imago dei*, forgiveness, restorative justice, and ethical responsibility (Battle, 6). These fundamental principles preempted the newly developed and elected democratic government of South Africa to institute the TRC as a means to restore the division, brokenness and inhumanity caused by decades of apartheid. Furthermore, the overlapping of the theoretical, philosophical, and theological framework from which the TRC functioned is correlated to the work of Dietrich Bonhoeffer.

Bonhoeffer's Christological hermeneutic of man in relation to God and in relation to humanity before and after the fall in the garden informs his notion of sociality (DeGruchy, 89). Bonhoeffer's sociality, as the essence of community where relationship of reciprocity occur, have similarities to Ubuntu, the African philosophy of community. Sociality and Ubuntu incorporate the relationship of humanity to God and humanity to one another. For Bonhoeffer it is the 'being-free-from' and 'being-free-for' that grounds reciprocal social relationships (Green, 2). Ubuntu stresses the interconnectedness of individuals within a community through whom the individual finds meaning of the self (Battle, 38). The relationships are possible, even when there is difference, because of the Christian understanding of humanity being the *imago dei* or created in the image of God. Bonhoeffer and Tutu emphasize this aspect of their theoretical frames. Moreover, the call of Bonhoeffer and the TRC, specifically Bishop Tutu, was for the church and nation to embody an ethic of social responsibility inclusive of seeking justice for the oppressed.

To this end, Bonhoeffer and Tutu each envisioned a reconciled community—reconciled with God and reconciled with the rest of humanity. This section provides points of intersection between Bonhoeffer and the TRC with particular focus given to Archbishop Desmond Tutu’s theological disposition as the chair and guiding voice of the TRC.

Ubuntu and Sociality

Reconciliation is understood as a communicative praxis narratively situated to bring about peace and stability in the aftermath of conflict. The conflict of Dietrich Bonhoeffer’s era was the dictatorship of Hitler and the atrocities of the Holocaust during which Bonhoeffer consistently proclaimed and embodied a Christological approach to reconciliation. South Africa’s apartheid divided an entire nation along racial lines for nearly six decades. Apartheid regulations and perceptions provided for thousands of lives lost and families destroyed. In both historical moments the incomprehensibility of the circumstances that people were enduring leaves one bewildered to how, if ever, any sense of normalcy could occur. Nevertheless, persons dedicated to their faith, their country, and their people endured the atrocities, but not silently. Dietrich Bonhoeffer opposed the Hitler and the Third Reich through his public proclamation, preaching, writing, and resistance, which led to his death by hanging. Archbishop Desmond Tutu grew up during apartheid and similar to Bonhoeffer denounced the atrocities through public proclamation, preaching, writing, and resistance. However, unlike Bonhoeffer, Tutu has lived to see the fall of apartheid and the inauguration of a democratic South Africa. Furthermore, Tutu played a critical role in the TRC as the chair of the commission. Bonhoeffer and Tutu share similarities in their theological and philosophical dispositions through which grounded the positions that each took. One of

the primary points of connection between them is associated to their understanding of community and the interconnectedness community members.

In South Africa, the essence of community is defined in terms of Ubuntu and for Bonhoeffer it was sociality. Both terms offer an understanding of community that is grounded in a Christological hermeneutic of God-human relationship and the human-human relationship. Furthermore, each understands person as being made in the image of God and therefore acceptable, approachable, and redeemable regardless of past wrong. Archbishop Tutu has said,

Ubuntu refers to the person who is welcoming, who is hospitable, who is warm and generous, who is affirming of others, who does not feel threatened that others are able and good for [this person] has a proper self-assurance that comes from knowing they belong in a greater whole, and know that they are diminished when another is humiliated, is diminished, is tortured, is oppressed, is treated as if they were less than who they are. What a wonderful world it can be, it will be, when we know that our destinies are locked inextricably in to tone another's. We are being forced if not by prosperity then by impending disaster to realize that we are one another's brothers and sisters (Battle, 35-36).

Foundational of Ubuntu is the notion that no person is an independent entity. Each is intrinsically connected to every other person in society through which his or her humanity is realized (Battle, 39). Ubuntu means humanity and conveys, "each individual's humanity is ideally expressed in relationship with others, and a person depends on other people to be a person" (Shutte, 5). The community is able to function through the interdependence of the community members. Interdependent community is established through relationships of vulnerability, which begins when human divisions are set aside. Tutu said, "the scripture says, people are made for togetherness, people are made for fellowship" (Battle, 41). Those committed to being in vulnerable relationships

are able to recognize that one's humanity is bound up in the humanity of others (Battle, 41). Vulnerability suggests a potential for participants to be hurt, disappointed, and harmed. Nevertheless, it is an aspect of human community, according to Tutu, that cannot be avoided except in complete isolation.

The interdependence and interconnectedness of Ubuntu resonates with Bonhoeffer's construction of being-free-for. Bonhoeffer wrote, "For in the language of the Bible freedom is not something that people have for themselves but something they have for others. No one is free in himself or herself [an sich]" (*Creation and Fall*, 62). Freedom, for Bonhoeffer, is found in the relationship between persons wherein one finds freedom in "being-free-for-the-other" (*Creation and Fall*, 62). Therein freedom of the self is bound intrinsically to the other and in relation with the other. Humanity is therefore interdependent and interconnected. Bonhoeffer finds the primal state of humanity as representative of the being-free-for-the-other relationship wherein Adam and Eve possessed freedom in connection to one another (*Creation and Fall*, 78). Adam and Eve's intimate relationship transcends difference to acknowledge and accept difference as good. "The man and woman were both naked and the felt no shame" (Genesis 2:25, NIV). Difference, before the fall, is embraced and accepted. However, after the fall the difference is recognized and other is viewed as someone to overcome. After the fall, both Adam and Eve's eyes were open and they saw that they were naked and attempted to cover themselves with fig leaves. Disobedience created knowledge of difference and subsequently shame. Bonhoeffer wrote, "Shame arises only out of the knowledge of humankind's dividedness, of the world's dividedness in general, and thus also of one's own dividedness. Shame expresses the fact that we no longer accept the other as God's

gift” (*Creation and Fall*, 91). Since the fall, the attempt of humanity at developing community has been from piestic self-centered and self-righteousness position (*Ethics*, 38). The position causes man to be judgmental which leads to conflict and disunity. “For man in the state of disunion consists in passing judgment, and the ultimate criterion is man himself” (*Ethics*, 35). The reconciling act of Christ is, according to Bonhoeffer, the overcoming of the disunity between humanity and God and between humanity and humanity (*Ethics*, 42). Through the act of the cross, community can be renewed and intended by the creator before the fall.

Tutu also interprets the creation story as a formative narrative to undergird the theological disposition of interdependence of humanity. The creation of Eve who was needed by Adam and she needed him illustrates the communal nature that God instituted when He created humanity. Tutu furthers his argument through suggesting the condition of need has not changed. “No real human being is absolutely self-sufficient. We belong therefore in a network of delicate relationships of interdependence. We do need other people and they help to form us in a profound way” (Battle, 42). To accept and embrace the responsibility of needing and being needed is Ubuntu. Furthermore, Ubuntu accepts difference and diversity within the community. Tutu posits diversity to the creation story wherein Eve was made different from Adam and they rejoiced not quarreled over their difference (Battle, 43). Tutu asserts, “It has always been God’s intention that we should live in friendship and harmony. That was the point of the Garden of Eden, where there was no bloodshed, not even for religious sacrifice” (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 263). Tutu agrees with Bonhoeffer that sin in the garden constitutes the fundamental brokenness of the human community that has infected every generation. Blaming one

another and being at one another's throats became common replacing harmonious friendship with enmity (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 264). The question for harmony, friendship, peace, and community constitute the striving of humanity throughout history (Battle, 64). Tutu believes,

Somewhere deep inside us we seem to know that we are destined to something better. Now and again, we catch a glimpse of the better thing for which we are meant—for example, when we work together to counter the effects of natural disasters and the world is galvanized by a spirit of compassion and an amazing outpouring of generosity (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 265).

Tutu suggests that the underlying resultant is the God-directed campaign to recover the primal harmony lost after the fall of humanity in the garden (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 265). Moreover, the recovery is essential to Ubuntu and essence of reconciliation by virtue of the grace of God through Christ's atoning sacrifice.

The Christological emphasis of Tutu continues the trajectory of interconnectedness of humanity by virtue of the humanity's relationship with God through Christ. Tutu explains, "the truth about persons is made known only through our relationship with Christ Jesus, who sets us free from deception and sin, thereby making it really possible to know the other (Battle, 71). The restoration of humanity with God and with one another is accomplished through Christ. Christ sets humanity free from deception and sin and at the same binds humanity to himself and to one another. "Tutu believes that God restores humanity in such a way that persons no longer own themselves. Instead, all persons have been made free to be a royal household, serving God as priests" (Battle, 72). Jesus' ministry in the world was to overcome the deception that was instituted in the garden that created separation and division. Jesus was reconciling man to God and with one another to restore their humanity. "Therefore, the

reality of Ubuntu is bound up in Jesus, who creates new relationships in the world” (Battle, 72). The new relationships are possible through viewing the other as important, needed, and bound to the self. The other is not an abstract, but real, personal, and accepted by Christ regardless of difference.

One of the underlying goals of the TRC was to expose the reality of the atrocities of apartheid and provide a space for people to regain their dignity and personhood. “True reconciliation exposes the awfulness, the abuse, the pain, the degradation, the truth...it is a risky undertaking but in the end it is worthwhile, because in the end dealing with the real situation helps bring about real healing” (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 270). Many of the victims and perpetrators reported telling their stories provided them relief and healing. Being acknowledged, accepted, and affirmed as humans of worth allowed the unburdening of the unfathomable weight of their anguish (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 165). “Reconciliation will only be possible when the dignity of black people has been restored and when whites become compassionate. The people are telling their stories—that’s the important thing” (Krog, 64). The commission hearings enabled people to tell their stories and affirm that others cared for their distress. The commission’s task is “to listen to the unknown victims—those who have never received any attention from the authorities or the media—and to provide a forum for the exposure of their experiences” (Krog, 39). Their humanity was acknowledged and their pain undertaken as a communal endeavor for healing. Ubuntu in this manner is a reflection of the ministry of Jesus who identified with the victims of oppression and exposed the reality of sin (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 73). The approach of the TRC was to ensure that victims and perpetrators alike understood that reconciliation was a communal

endeavor; therefore, every hearing, every story, and every submission for amnesty was open to the public.

Antjie Krog, a South African journalist, covered the amnesty hearing from inception to the conclusion. Krog comments that throughout reporting on the hearings, those involved are left physically exhausted and mentally frayed (Krog, 55). The vicariousness of story after story of inhumanity causes the near breakdown of several reporters as well as the commissioners themselves. Krog reports that one morning Tutu sent of the counselors of the commission to the journalists and stated, “You will experience the same symptoms as the victims. You will find your self powerless—without help, without words” (Krog, 56). This is a manifestation of Ubuntu wherein the interconnectedness of people causes one to hurt and mourn for another. The theological implication is derived from the words of Paul who wrote, “If one part suffers, every part suffers with it; if one part is honored, every part rejoices with it” (1 Corinthians 12:26, NIV). Paul’s words concerned the unity of believers in commune or community with one another emphasizing that no one is greater than another and therefore the functionality of the whole is contingent on the interdependence of the parts. Krog attests the feelings of anxiety, suffering, and pain as the details of the atrocities are told. Furthermore, she describes Tutu at points physically showing signs of distress and bordering on emotional bankruptcy (Krog, 78). The journalists are told to “exercise regularly, take photographs of loved ones with you and talk to one another, be one another’s therapists” (Krog, 55). Whether it is suffering with those who are telling their stories, or supporting one another to deal with the stories they are hearing, Ubuntu is exercised. A new community is formed in the halls of the hearings through an understanding that the only way through

the suffering is together.

Made in the Image of God

The suffering that was endured through apartheid is proclaimed to be evil for it declares separation, enmity, and alienation. Ubuntu on the other hand, “rests in the knowledge that human existence is inextricably bound up with God’s creation and that a solitary human being is a contradiction in terms” (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 65). Ubuntu purports that a person needs other persons in order to be human. Tutu asserts, “We say a person is a person through other persons. We do not come fully formed into the world. We learn how to think, how to walk, how to speak, how to behave, indeed how to be human from other humans” (Battle, 85). Ubuntu consists of caring, being compassionate, concerned, and conscious that everyone is to be revered. Ubuntu is accomplished through and understanding that all people are created in the image of God no matter where they come from or the color of their skin (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 68). Tutu addresses the overcoming of racism and apartheid from a theological disposition of *imago dei*. “Race is no the most distinctive attribute of a human being. Our distinction stems from the fact that we are created in the divine image and are therefore on infinite worth” (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 125). Ubuntu is, as observed by Maclain as “the African functional equivalent of the traditional Christian concept of the *imago dei*” (Maclain, 276). Ubuntu, whether translated from the Christian perspective of Tutu or the philosophical perspective of Maclain, views the other as made in the image of God. Bonhoeffer’s Christological construction of the I-You relationship hinges upon humanity viewing one another as made in the image of God as well.

Bonhoeffer’s Christological approach to constructing sociality or community

takes foundation in the transcendence of the individual by God. “The human person originates only in relation to the divine; the divine person transcends the human person, who both resists and is overwhelmed by the divine” (*Sanctorum Communio*, 49).

Community arises from the communicative interaction of the I and You. The Christian perspective approaches the You as an individual with value and worth who like the I is made in the image of God (*Sanctorum Communio*, 66). For Bonhoeffer, similar to Ubuntu, “the concepts of person, community and God are inseparable and essentially interrelated” (Green, 113). The self’s identity is only actualized through a relationship with God and simultaneously with others. Therefore, humans are only able to be human in relationship with other humans. The relationships within the human community are reciprocated through an understanding that all of humanity is created in the image of God. For Bonhoeffer *imago dei* represents humankind created in the image of God existing for God and for neighbor (*Creation and Fall*, 101). Bonhoeffer contends that evil, constituted as any act that is against the will of God, is an attempt to be in God’s place. Evil does not exist outside of humanity, but rather is within humanity as a distinction of deprivation due to the fall (*Creation and Fall*, 102). Therefore, the image of God in the other is distorted by the perception of functioning from the self as center and judge. The other’s worth, in a fallen state, is interpreted through a comparative lens with the self (*Ethics*, 30). Those who are like the self may be accepted and those who are not, are rejected as worthless or at best less than the self. This has given rise to the holocaust and apartheid. The cure to this self-centered ailment is the reconciliation of humanity to God through Christ.

Christ being in the world, reconciling the world to himself is the overcoming of

evil to restore the *imago dei* of humanity. Bonhoeffer asserts that due to humankind's disunion with God that conflict arises in all things that are in opposition with one another. Bonhoeffer wrote, "what is and what should be, life and law, knowledge and action, idea and reality, reason and instinct, duty and inclination, conviction and advantage, necessity and freedom...truth, justice, beauty and love come into opposition with one another" (*Ethics*, 29). Bonhoeffer contends that this state is *sicut duos* or having the knowledge of good and evil, yet operating outside of the will of God for self and others (*Creation and Fall*, 101). Man, therefore has a distorted view of self and of others. People are not viewed as made in the image of God, but rather are compared as not like the self wherein the self is held up as the model of acceptance. Nevertheless, "The new knowledge of the reconciliation which is accomplished in Jesus, the knowledge of voiding of the disunion, itself entirely voids man's own knowledge of his own goodness" (*Ethics*, 38). The restoration of the primal state of humanity comes through the reconciling act of Christ enabling humanity to view self and others as created in the image of God.

Humanity created in the image of God is taken up in Ubuntu and furthered through a theological understanding of kenosis. Kenotic theology is posited as the sacrificial and relational means by which God is present to the world. "God is present to the world through suffering for others" (Battle, 78). Bonhoeffer terms the suffering of Christ as vicarious representation (*Creation and Fall*, 119). It is an understanding that God in the person of Christ suffered death and grave for humanity. Christ emptied himself in order to intervene in the affairs of humanity. Ross asserts, "God willingly limits God's power in the self-emptying of Christ as seen in the Philippian hymn (Phil. 2:5-9) in which God takes the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of a human

being” (Ross, 79). The incarnate God, namely Jesus, is willing to be made an object by creation in order to overcome the disunity. Tutu explains:

This kenosis, this self-emptying, this self-giving is an abiding characteristic of our God. This utterly self-sufficient God created all there is because God loved it. God loves it now. And God will live it forever and ever...God created this world because God loves and when things went wrong, because of sin, God redeemed it. God, in Christ, emptied God’s being of divine glory and God paid the price for our sin (Sermon by Tutu: *The Spirit of the Lord is Upon Me*)

Kenosis becomes an expression of Ubuntu to reciprocate to others the self-emptying and self-giving as found in the ministry of Christ. It is a call to be responsible to and for the other in their suffering.

Ethic of Responsibility

The notion of kenosis enacted within the human community hinges upon the emptying of self for the suffering. Ubuntu therefore is not a theoretical abstraction, but rather a pragmatic reality to be embodied. God participates in creation and humanity is called to participate with God. “God is personally involved in creation in such a way that creation is not outside of relationship with God. God is thus simultaneously transcendent and immanent” (Battle, 57). God is described as being above and at the same time being with humanity, actively involved. Furthermore, God places responsibility on humanity to continue the ministry that was instituted by Christ. Paul wrote, “All this is from God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ and gave us the ministry of reconciliation: that God was reconciling the world to himself in Christ, not counting people’s sins against them. And he has committed to us the message of reconciliation” (2 Corinthians 5:17-19, NIV). God invites humanity into the process of being for others and reconciling with other in the world. Tutu believes that God

perceives each one as having the capacity to do extraordinary and therefore allows humanity active participation in God's purpose (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 168). Nevertheless, an active willfulness has to be embraced by humanity in order for such participation to ensue. There is much more to the process of reconciliation than merely discussing the theoretical implications.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer's ethic of responsibility articulates a faith in action by virtue of participation with God in the process of reconciliation. Bonhoeffer asserts, "Responsibility is the total and realistic response of man to the claim of God and of our neighbor" (*Ethics*, 245). The claim is the ethical barrier that is presented demanding a response. When the other is viewed as *imago dei*, then the self is understood as responsible for the needs of the other. Bonhoeffer expresses the process through pointing to the parable of the Good Samaritan who embodied being a neighbor through caring for another who was not like himself in terms of ethnicity. Bonhoeffer was convinced that the Jewish question was to be addressed the same responsible way. He wrote:

Who stands fast? Only the person whose final standard is not his or her reason, principles, conscience, freedom, or virtue, but who is ready to sacrifice all this when called to obedient and responsible action in faith and in exclusive allegiance to God—the responsible person, who tries to make his or her whole life an answer to the question and call of God (*Letters and Papers*, 4).

Bonhoeffer embodied an ethic of responsibility and until his death called out for others to live out the same vicarious suffering for those, the Jews, who were suffering at the hands of evil (*Discipleship*, 222). For Bonhoeffer, an ethic of responsibility entails giving up the right of self out of necessity for the deprived and oppressed (Selby, 235). An ethic of responsibility is an overarching, all-encompassing life orientation that affects every area of existence (*Letters and Papers*, 12). Bonhoeffer's call to embrace an ethic of

responsibility as the giving up of self for the other touches upon the concept of Ubuntu's kenosis or self emptying for the other.

Apartheid was a banality of evil that could only be overcome through a process of reconciliation grounded in Ubuntu (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 143). Ubuntu encompasses a responsibility of each person to empty themselves for others who are in need. Those who were affected by Apartheid legislation were in need of those enforcing and supporting apartheid to take the responsibility necessary to overcome the past and create a better present and future. Moyo writes:

The African philosophy of Ubuntu helps me as an African to understand faith not as something that is restricted or limited to an individualistic relationship to God, but necessarily includes the neighbor, and thus concern and responsibility for the social and indeed political dimensions of life (Moyo, 298).

The TRC, with this understanding at hand, conducted the amnesty hearing through which the victims' stories could be told and victimizers could ask for forgiveness. The aspect of receiving amnesty was and remains a point of contention. Many in South Africa believe that those who were responsible for crimes of inhumanity ought to be punished and even put to death (Krog, 48). Krog further asserts that many wanted to see P.W. Botha stripped of his dignity and placed inside the dark, cold, and damp cell where countless black South Africans were tortured (Krog, 48). However, a turning point arose for Krog that she relates while attending a peace conference where Jose Zalaquett, who served on the Chilean Truth Commission, discussed the aspect of amnesty and forgiveness. Zalaquett explained that in other places like Germany and Tokyo, the power elites were completely overthrown and therefore the punitive punishment had the propensity to work. However, in Chile and in South Africa, some of the same government officials remained

in the government (Krog, 40). Such a situation has to be handled with care due to the potential of an overturning or eruption of civil war.

Taking precaution in moving forward after conflict toward reconciliation does not equate to easy justice or a forgive and forget mentality. “A community should not wipe out a part of its past, because it leaves a vacuum that will be filled by lies and contradictory, confusing accounts of what happened” (Krog, 41). The emphasis of a truth commission is to bring the truth to light where the perpetrators must divulge all the wrong they had done and take responsibility for their actions. Why? Zalaquett stated, “It creates a communal starting point. To make a clean break from the past, a moral beacon needs to be established between the past and the future” (Krog, 41). In South Africa, President Mandela and government officials desired to make a break from the past in order to work together to create a better future, therefore the ask of the TRC was conduct the amnesty hearings to bring the horrific events of apartheid to light.

Amnesty in South Africa was only granted when the criteria of the confession by the perpetrator was met. “The act must have been politically motivated. The applicant had to make a full disclosure of all the relevant facts relating to the offense for which amnesty was being sought. The rubric of proportionality had to be observed—that the means were proportional to the objective” (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 49). The stipulations were for the perpetrators, both white and black South Africans, were to take responsibility for their actions during apartheid. If the conditions were not met, there amnesty was not granted. Additionally, victims had the right to oppose applications for amnesty through demonstrating the perpetrator’s act(s) did not qualify for amnesty (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 49). Furthermore, amnesty was not given to those who

claimed to be innocent of any wrongdoing. “It was precisely on this point that amnesty was refused to the police officers who applied for amnesty in their part in the death of Steve Biko” (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 53). The officers claimed to have done no crime and they were retaliating against Biko’s attempted assault on the officers. However, witnesses of the incident told a completely different story. Therefore, amnesty was not granted and criminal charges were brought against the officers.

The granting of amnesty to those who willfully confessed of their wrong and revealed the pertinent details of their crimes through meeting the established criteria had any criminal record associated with the crimes expunged. This aspect of the Amnesty Act forbids any victim or their family from filing civil lawsuits against the perpetrators (Tutu, 54). The process was intended to make public the entire episode, accepting responsibility and acknowledging the pain that was induced, and then moving on as a community. Tutu notes,

Here the central concern is not retribution or punishment. In the spirit of Ubuntu, the central concern is the healing of breaches, the redressing of imbalances, the restoration of broken relationships, a seeking to rehabilitate both the victim and the perpetrator, who should be given the opportunity to be reintegrated into the community he has injured by his offense (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 54).

The function of the TRC was an embodiment of responsibility to the victims and the perpetrators to restore communities within the nation that had been destroyed through apartheid. The healing and establishing of relationships necessary to achieve a communal environment where people no longer lived in fear of attack or retaliation; to live with Ubuntu. The goals of the post-apartheid government could not be accomplished without the participation of all those involved with apartheid, for the only way persons and communities can be free is together (Battle, 42). Freedom in this sense refers to

freedom from the past atrocities that enable the community to move forward with a re-envisioned future for the potential of peace and long-lasting stability. The objective of the TRC was to create a national atmosphere that lived up to the 1956 Freedom Charter that proclaimed South Africa “belonged to all who lived in it” (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 72). With such an overwhelming aspiration, the TRC had to model Ubuntu and encourage the identification of all South Africans with one another to discover commonalities that bound their diversity together, exalting one another, rather than denigrating. The process of reconciliation in South Africa would be accomplished by institutional laws and regulations or by TRC hearings, but by virtue of the dedication of all aspects of South African communal participants. One such grass roots institution was that of the church. Church in this sense is to be understood of not just a particular denomination, though Bishop Tutu is an Anglican priest, but all the people of Christian faith within South Africa.

The Church's Mission

The role of the church played a vital part in the development of reconciliation in South Africa and in Germany during the Holocaust. The church, not necessarily the institution of governing bodies and regaled edifices of worship, but the people of a Christian faith who were called upon to embody the essence of being the community of believers whose lives were identified with the earthly life of Jesus of Nazareth. Whether it is the Anglican Church in South Africa or the Confessing Church in Germany, the church is believed to be a community of believers who are responsible for restoration of the unity of people to God and to one another (Battle, 84; *Sanctorum Communio*, 83). Furthermore, the church as community was challenged to ensure the justice, peace, and

provision are provided to everyone regardless of cultural, economic, political, racial and religious orientation. Both Bonhoeffer and Tutu point to the words of Paul, “There is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus” (Galatians 3:28, NIV). For Bonhoeffer, Tutu, and the TRC, the church provides the foundational understanding of community that guided by the Christological hermeneutic of the Biblical narrative justifies the inclusivity of the community of humanity (Battle, 84; DeGruchy, 128). The call to the church to stand up and be the church was an overarching aspect of Bonhoeffer and continues to be poignant part of Tutu’s life.

The church for Dietrich Bonhoeffer was central to his understanding and construction of the community. The church, for Bonhoeffer, was the gathering of the community of believers where the presence of Christ was manifest in the world (*Sanctorum Communio*, 80). The relationship of the believer with God through Christ is reciprocated within the community of believers. Bonhoeffer wrote, “Thus the essence of community is not commonality—although formally every community has this. Rather, reciprocal will constitutes community” (*Sanctorum Communio*, 83). Reciprocal will establishes the trajectory of the work of the church as living out the will of God in the world, which may not constitute commonality of persons involved in the work. The church is the established reality of the reconciliation of humanity with God through Christ. “God established the reality of the church, of humanity pardoned in Jesus Christ—not religion, but revelation, not religious community, but church” (*Sanctorum Communio*, 153). The church is grounded in the work of reconciliation that was achieved on the cross and with the resurrection of Christ. It is Christ existing as community.

Within community “Christ embodies and creates God’s new reality for the world: the Christian community is the new humanity—part of the world reconciled and being made new” (*Ethics*, 83). This is the reality of community or communion of saints participating in the body of Christ or the church.

The participation in the body of Christ requires believers to be willing to move beyond their realms of comfort to embrace all of humanity who are created in the *imago dei*. Bonhoeffer wrote, “The Christian cannot simply take for granted the privilege of living among other Christians. Jesus lived in the midst of his enemies” (*Life Together*, 5). Bonhoeffer argued that those who desire only to be among friends and common individuals do not desire to truly be a part of the life of Christ and paraphrases Luther by asserting, “If Christ had done what you are doing, who would ever have been saved?” (*Life Together*, 5). As participants with Christ, believers are called to embrace those who are not like themselves as Christ did. Bonhoeffer suggested that to be the church was not to understand doctrine or only to participate in rituals, but Christ “needs actual, living human beings to follow him” (*Discipleship*, 218). The church-community is the visible manifestation of Christ being with and for humanity. Bonhoeffer believed the church to be “God’s way of continuing to exist throughout history in the midst of human life—the very way God’s image continues to be manifest most authentically on earth” (Floyd, 16). This community is only the church when it exists with and for others. The church is called to embrace and embody an ethic of responsibility to the neighbor of all in the human family (*Discipleship*, 228). Bonhoeffer believed the call of the church was to live vicariously for those who were oppressed, namely the Jews. Therefore, his rhetoric was a consistent call to the church to be the church in opposition to Hitler (Clements, 156). It

was not the task of the church to be political or involved with politics, but to hold elected officials accountable to ensuring that justice was provided for the people (Floyd, 118). Hence, Bonhoeffer's ongoing public and private communicative discourse and actions against nationalism. Bonhoeffer's understanding of the church was grounded in a Christological hermeneutic of the Biblical narrative and attentive to the historical moment. The attentiveness to the historical moment underlies the embodiment of reconciliation through relationship with Christ and the other rather than devotion to dogma.

Bishop Desmond Tutu also interprets the position and work of the church through a Christological hermeneutic that is attentive to the historical moment. Tutu deems the church as "the community of the new covenant, of which Christ is the head and its mission is to restore all people to unity with God and each other in Christ" (Battle, 84). For Tutu the church is a gathering of believers who pray and worship together, proclaim the gospel, and promote peace, justice and love (Battle, 84). The unity of the believer with Christ and with one another is emphasized in the observance of the Eucharist, which is central to Anglican worship. The Eucharist is held as a deeply personal and communal spiritual experience and part of the daily life Tutu in connection to mid-day prayer and meditation (Battle, 89). The Eucharist is a reminder of the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus as instrumental to the grace of God for the world. The ritual act of unity is to be transposed into the daily act in community wherein people work toward unity with one another (Battle, 89). The church is founded on the Christ and called to emulate Christ in the world as providers of grace. However, Tutu growing up during apartheid and being promoted through the ranks of the Anglican Church to the appointment of Archbishop of

Cape Town experienced a much different church.

The South African Church, be it Anglican or otherwise, upheld and participated in apartheid. Similar to other historical travesties, such as American slavery, the church used slanted Biblical interpretation to justify their position on separation and division (Battle, 98). The curse of Cush (Genesis 10), which denotes that Cush, who was dark-skinned, and all his descendants were cursed by his father to be slaves and servants provided a proof text for white South Africans to view black South Africans as subservient to them (Battle, 96). Moreover, there were institutionalized regulations that forbade multicultural church gatherings (Tutu, 82). Nevertheless, Tutu endeavored to grow the church in Cape Town to be representative of the unity required of the church and Ubuntu. Furthermore, Tutu spoke nationally and internationally about the apartheid calling the church to address the ills of South Africa.

The liturgy of the Anglican Church offered Tutu an understanding of the church community being inclusive through identification with Christ. “The miracle of the church is that everyone—the poor, the rich, the free, the slave, male, female, black, white—can find one identity in Christ” (Battle, 91). The identification with Christ transcends ethnicity to incorporate aspects of one’s existence common to the human experience. Again, the commonality of the human experience relates to the Ubuntu interconnectedness of persons. The church, in Tutu’s understanding, ought to be the place where an alternative reality may be experienced (Battle, 91). The church is a gathering of believers who through worship, adoration, praise, and prayer transcend difference to display the body of Christ in the earth (Tutu, 86) wherein there is “neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female, for you are all one

in Christ Jesus” (Galatians 3:28, NIV). The division between God and person and between persons is transcended by Christ to enable reconciliation with God and others.

The common worship brings together people from a broad spectrum of the world who are thus placed on an even plane with one another before God (Tutu, 81). Whatever has separated them from God is overcome in Christ, liberating the person from the past (Battle, 112). Furthermore, the breaking of bread, the sharing of the cup and the doxology of the Eucharist symbolically represents the unification of people of diversity identifying with the life of Christ, who are admonished to “go and do likewise” (Luke 10:37, NIV). Tutu recounts, “The final dismissal, ‘Go in peace, to love and serve the Lord’, means to go forth to make South Africa more compassionate, more caring, more living, more sharing. Go forth and recognize in someone of a different race your brother, your sister and treat them as such” (Tutu, St. George’s Cathedral, 1986). The church is to reciprocate the transformation of the world in participation with Christ as the individual has been transformed by God through Christ. The rituals of the church symbolize the liberating of believers from the past to be reconciled with God and with one another.

Tutu admonished the church during apartheid to become the church that liberates people from the past and sides with those who are being oppressed. Tutu proclaimed,

If the DRC (Dutch Reformed Church) were to stop giving spurious biblical support to the most vicious system—apartheid—since nazism, if it were to become truly prophetic, if it were to be identified with the poor, the disadvantaged, the oppressed, if it were to work for the liberation of all God’s children in this land, then, we would have the most wonderful country in the world (Battle, 113).

The Dutch Reformed Church was one of the largest denominations in South Africa that supported apartheid. Prior to the end of apartheid, Tutu proclaimed similar messages of across South Africa and the world, calling for the church, regardless of denomination or

affiliation, to be the church of its true vocation as the church of God. The vocation of the church included the liberation of the oppressed and the reconciliation of people with God and with one another (Battle, 92). Tutu protested that, “No secular authority, not even the government of the land, has any authority to sit in judgment on the churches about how to be church” (Battle, 113). Furthermore, Tutu argued that the work of the church is to “fulfill its God-given mandate, to work for the extension of God’s kingdom of justice, peace, reconciliation, compassion, laughter, joy and goodness” (Battle, 114). Tutu optimistically believed that some day apartheid would be overcome and the overcoming would begin in the church and with church members who were to reciprocate reconciliation in the world.

Reconciliation in South Africa is underscored by a deeply held spiritual conviction associated with the vocation of the church as a community of humanity. Tutu suggests an un-reconciled church cannot rightly proclaim a gospel of reconciliation. “The church is to be God’s agent of salvation to transfigure the world” (Battle, 100). Therefore, reconciliation has to begin in the church and move outward to broader society. The church has to foster repentance and reconciliation and that means they “must build a degree of mutual understanding and acceptance that will be entirely new to South Africa” (Battle, 100). Tutu called for a church praxis that would place their faith in action through reconciliation in South Africa. Tutu argues that the church proclaims the reception of God’s grace, love, mercy, and reconciliation with God through Christ and now needs to answer the call to reciprocate grace, love, mercy, and reconciliation in the world (Battle, 102). Reconciliation is also tied to the notion of liberation, or that of being set free from the past, namely apartheid (Battle, 100). Tutu clarifies that this liberation is

not just for blacks, but also for white South Africans for they have been affected through apartheid as well. Tutu exclaimed, “No one is a person in South Africa until blacks attain freedom to open their God-given personhood and humanity” (Battle, 100). Furthermore, Tutu argued, “True liberation must be understood holistically as the removal of all that keeps human identity in bondage. Anything that makes human identity less than what God intends is apartheid” (Battle, 141). This is the crossroads of church’s vocation and Ubuntu. For Tutu the church’s mission in the world is closely associated with the understanding of Ubuntu wherein people are interconnected to one another. Only through their interconnectedness does the individual derive their personhood. Therefore, according to Tutu, to suggest that no one in South Africa can be considered a person until apartheid has ended is a call to Ubuntu.

The connections of Tutu’s theology, Ubuntu and the TRC have seemingly blurred into one another, though there are differences. Other truth commission, such as Chile and Zimbabwe held the political, communal, and religious compartmentalized from one another (Chicuecue, 485). The distinctions are not as evident in South Africa due to the deeply intertwined spiritual nature of the South African population (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 89). The most prominent distinction is held between church and broader community is that of disagreement about the personhood of Christ as the Son of God and redeemer of creation (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 89). Nevertheless, in South Africa there remains a commonality across religious lines of the nature of God. “The most common description of God among African peoples is as Creator (Mbiti, 167). South Africans experience God through the natural world as God being creator of all that exists. The natural world is viewed as the spiritual manifestation of the creator God (Tutu, 90).

God is also the *telos* or end of creation and “in this way creatures can never lose their existence for God is eternal and death is a transition to eternity” (Mbiti, 171). Therefore, though there are denominational and religious beliefs systems in South Africa that do not agree on doctrine, their participation in Ubuntu destroys the barriers of religiosity (Battle, 110). Tutu writes, “Theology helped us in the TRC to recognize that we inhabit a moral universe, that good and evil are real and that they matter” (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 87). The Commission was tasked to a great undertaking that was profoundly spiritual and religious and therefore spiritual resources were utilized appropriately for the task (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 82). The spiritual orientation of South Africans allowed the theology of the church, as portrayed and embodied by Tutu, to play a prominent role in the framework of the TRC. Tutu’s Christological hermeneutic, which emphasized the liberation of people through reconciliation with God through Christ, was a foundational aspect incorporated into the TRC. The daily interaction during the hearing procedures was encased by Christian undertones.

The TRC was established as a vital aspect of the process of reconciliation in South Africa. The foundation that would guide the commission’s work was a shared understanding of Ubuntu that intrinsically incorporated Christian aspects of humanity being reconciled to one another as reciprocal of the reconciliation of man to God. The spiritual emphasis was revealed throughout the hearing from the opening prayer to the closing doxology. Antjie Krog recalls the first day of the first hearing,

After everyone was seated in the crowded room, Archbishop Tutu prays...we long to put behind us the pain and division of apartheid, together with all the violence, which ravaged our communities in its name. And so we ask you to bless this Truth and Reconciliation Commission with your wisdom and guidance as a body which seeks to redress the wounds in the minds and the bodies of those who suffered (Krog, 42).

As the hearings progressed the perception and humanity that was provided to victim and perpetrator was representative of the belief that no one is irredeemable. Tutu stresses that it would have been easy, after hearing some of the testimonies by those applying for amnesty, to consider them monstrous demons (*God has a Dream*, 16). However, Tutu reminds that on the cross, Jesus was crucified between two criminals and when one repented, Jesus promised him that he would be in paradise on that same day (*God has a Dream*, 17). “Even the most notorious sinner and evildoer at the eleventh hour may repent and be forgiven, because our God is preeminently a God of grace” (*God has a Dream*, 17). The provision of amnesty to perpetrators who met the conditions established by Reconciliation Act were being afforded grace and redemption as understood from a Christological hermeneutic. A rhetoric of reconciliation from a Christian Framework as implemented by the TRC incorporates theological principles of redemption, liberation, and restoration. These principles were and are subsumed in the communal and spiritual nature of Ubuntu, which purports the interconnectedness of the whole of humanity. Ubuntu therefore assumes the necessity of repentance and forgiveness as indispensable for the vitality of community.

The goal of the TRC was to be a conduit for the reconciliation of the people of South Africa. Their mission was to hear the testimony of those applying for amnesty, seen as the act of repentance, and provide amnesty, the act of forgiveness, so as long as the conditions established were met. Amnesty was a point of contention for those who did not agree with the reconciliation process (Krog, 39). The main argument that arose was if the perpetrators were sincere in their apologies or putting on a show in order to forego judicial punishment (Krog, 39). Krog notes one fellow journalist as suggesting,

“Now that people are able to tell their stories, the lid of the Pandora’s box is lifted... Where does the truth lie?” (Krog, 66). Neither Tutu nor the rest of the commission could guarantee that amnesty applicants were truly remorseful. Nevertheless, Tutu did comment that, “If the wrongdoer has come to the point of realizing his wrong, then one hopes there will be remorse, or at least some contrition or sorrow. This should lead him to confess the wrong he has done and ask for forgiveness” (*No Truth Without Forgiveness*, 270). Again, Ubuntu was vital to the position of the TRC who believed that amnesty applicants were coming forward because of remorse leading to repentance and reconciliation.

A rhetoric of reconciliation, as instituted by the TRC with an emphasis on South African Ubuntu, hinged upon the willingness of perpetrators of gross human rights to apply for amnesty. Amnesty applicants were to present the details of the atrocities that they were involved in at the TRC hearings. The hearing were open to the public, therefore the persons that an applicant may have done harm to or their family members of the deceased were able to be present. Unlike a judicial proceeding, the victims and family members of deceased victims were enabled to tell their stories of suffering (Moyo, 484). It was believed that to take this trajectory, rather than retributive judicial approach, after the fall of apartheid would bring about a new South Africa where communities of all races would live in Ubuntu (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 18). Tutu recalls,

It is quite incredible the capacity people have shown to be magnanimous—refusing to be consumed by bitterness and hatred, willing to meet with those who have violated their persons and their rights, willing to meet in a spirit of forgiveness and reconciliation, eager only to know the truth, to know the perpetrator so that they could forgive them (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 119).

The TRC hearings were a space of transformation whereby a discovery of the ability of a people to transcend the conflicts of the past toward becoming the rainbow nation of God (*God has a Dream*, 22). Nevertheless, when the amnesty hearings concluded, the process of reconciliation was not over. President Mandela proclaimed, “The policy of apartheid created a deep and lasting wound in my country and my people. All of us will spend many years, if not generations, recovering from that profound hurt” (Mandela, 28). The process of reconciliation shifted from the formal proceedings to the every day encounters of people of various races throughout South Africa.

The end of apartheid did not mean the instantaneous reversal of perceptions of Afrikaners for Africans. A Dutch South African interviewee commented,

I used to overhear my aunt telling my mother that blacks were going to take over our houses, kill the women and children and that the men were not allowed to leave their children and wives at home. My father had a .22 rifle, and he said, “Okay, my darling, if they come into our house, we’ll just kill them”. So, when I heard that apartheid was going away, I hated it. I thought, why must they move near us, why must they take our land over, why must they mix with us? (Moyer, 6).

The transformation of perceptions, as Mandela stated, may take generations to permeate the depth and breadth of South Africa. Moyer reported that ten years after the TRC, South Africa remains divided in many respects. The vast economic disparity, poor living conditions, poor health conditions and substandard education are prevalent issues rooted in apartheid that is still being contended with (Moyer, 28). Additionally, the recommendations of reparations by the TRC to the president have not yet been fulfilled due in part of the fact that the government of South Africa does not have the resources to provide monetary reparations (Moyer, 28). Tutu affirmed that in his analysis the failure to provide reparations as the Reconciliation Act called for has been one of the major

hindrances of the reconciliation process (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 172).

Nevertheless, Tutu also stands firm on the decision of choosing the path of reconciliation as they did for the restoral of South Africa (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 172). Tutu exclaims that he witnessed the activity of the gospel day after day in those hearing where proof was provided that people can truly change (*God has a Dream*, 14). In South Africa the reconciliation process will be an ongoing process in the lives of its people. The transformative nature of the TRC hearings has to become an ongoing aspect of everyday engagement.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa is a praxis of a rhetoric of reconciliation. The TRC was a rhetorical approach of reconciliation following South Africa's transition from apartheid to a democratic nation. Reconciliation was determined to be the best course of action to take toward restoring a country that had been desolated through nearly sixty years of division, distress, and violence (Mandela, 9). The framework of reconciliation that the TRC functioned from is that of Christian religious frame grounded in Ubuntu. Ubuntu as a life encompassing philosophy understands people to be interconnected and vital to one another for growth and development as the human community (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 72).

Furthermore, Ubuntu encompasses generosity, care, compassion, and serving others in the community regardless of their race, class, or socioeconomic status. Ubuntu overcomes difference and conflict through reconciliation through the viewing of others as created in the *imago dei*—the image of God (Battle, 26). The guiding principles of the TRC encounter the theological and philosophical work of Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Bonhoeffer viewed community as reconciled people, first to God and then to one another

(*Sanctorum Communio*, 118). He further viewed community as those who were interconnected to one another through being-free-for the other in the world (*Creation and Fall*, 93). Bonhoeffer contended that one's life is not their own, but each is connected to other by virtue of being in the human family (*Ethics*, 45). Furthermore, Bonhoeffer articulates and embodies an ethic of responsibility through being attentive to the other who is in need. This other may or may not be different, but created in the imago dei and therefore worthy of mutual respect, compassion, care, and love (*Creation and Fall*, 101). These constitute the major connections of Bonhoeffer's work and the TRC. They form a trajectory for the comprehension and projection of a rhetoric of reconciliation from a Christian framework.

Summary of Bonhoeffer and TRC in Praxis

A rhetoric of reconciliation communicative praxis is grounded in the Christian narrative. The Biblical narrative provides the guiding parameters through which reconciliation is perceived and achieved. Bonhoeffer situated his understanding of reconciliation in a Christological hermeneutic of the Bible (DeGruchy, 18). Through a Christological lens, Bonhoeffer interprets the creation narrative as the primal condition of humanity in community with God and with one another. The creation narrative provides an understanding of the original intent of God in creating humanity in community prior to sin entering the world through deception (*Creation and Fall*, 38). The trajectory of the Biblical narrative progresses to the apex of restoration of humanity through the second Adam, namely Christ who reconciled creation to God. A rhetoric of reconciliation envisions the reconciled community through attributes of the primordial community of humanity with God and humanity with one another. The creation story provides ground

from one can stand upon rather than abstract theoretical notions of what community ought be. A rhetoric of reconciliation grounded in the Biblical narrative provides point of navigation in relation to a variety of social conditions that arise throughout the continuum of Biblical history.

A rhetoric of reconciliation communicative praxis is attentive to the historical moment. With a guiding Christian narrative, reconciliation that is attentive to the historical moment is not a fixed set of stipulations, but rather an ongoing revelation of how one is to be in the world. Bonhoeffer's notion of "being-free-for" (*Creation and Fall*, 62) and Ubuntu's notion of interconnectedness (*Battle*, 37) highlight a way of being in the world. The actual manifestation of being is determined by the historical moment. For Bonhoeffer it was his stand against the Third Reich for the injustice and inhumanity against the Jews. For Tutu it was his stand against apartheid and racial injustice and violence. Each respectively acknowledged the necessity of reconciliation and the call to the church to be the church, however their pragmatic realities differed. Therefore, a rhetoric of reconciliation communicative praxis utilizes the Biblical narrative as an interpretative lens for understanding as best as possible the way of being in the world at a given historical moment.

A rhetoric of reconciliation communicative praxis grounded in the Christian narrative views others in the world as *imago dei*. Every frame of reconciliation discussed includes some aspect of changing one's perspective of the other. The Christian frame accentuates viewing the other as created in the image of God. It is to look in the eyes of the other and see love rather than hate (*God has a Dream*, 14). For Bonhoeffer it is a reaffirmation of the primal other who the believer has been set free from sin to be free for

(*Sanctorum Communio*, 113). Viewing the other as made in the image of God provides space for the other to be different but not less than the self. It is a perception embraced in Ubuntu that is a return to the sentiment of interconnectedness of humanity through which everyone needs everyone else to become fully himself or herself. Therefore, such a perception gives ground to reconciliation between individuals, communities, and nations based on relationships steeped in mutual respect, appreciation, and love.

A rhetoric of reconciliation communicative praxis is actualized in responsibility to and for the other. To accept the guiding Christian narrative to inform the establishment of community and that community is inclusive of the human family created in the image of God has to move one to action. This was the great struggle for Bonhoeffer and Tutu alike. They each wrestled with motivating and challenging the church to enact their faith. Bonhoeffer challenged the Confessing Church to take a stand against Hitler and side with the oppressed in light of believing the church's mission was to reciprocate the grace of God in Christ in the world (*Life Together*, 6). Tutu was the herald calling for the churches of South Africa to end their support of apartheid to realize that black South Africans were of equal value to God as white South Africans (Battle, 86). Each context constitutes an ethic of responsibility for the other. One's faith pragmatically orientated to those who are oppressed and in need in the world. A rhetoric of reconciliation communicative praxis goes beyond the theoretical to the actualization of embodying a life orientation predicated upon the guiding Biblical narrative attentive to the historical moment. The work of Bonhoeffer provided an enriching theoretical and pragmatic frame of conceiving reconciliation and the TRC, headed by Archbishop Tutu, situates

reconciliation in a recent context. Reconciliation cannot remain only doctrine, but become embodied.

Communicative Praxis of Reconciliation grounded in Christian Narrative

A rhetoric of reconciliation communicative praxis grounded in the Christian narrative seeks the repairing, restoring, and mending of that which has been broken, namely relationships be they interpersonal, communal, or national due to some type of conflict between two parties. Conflict arising from social disparities and unwillingness to accept people as they are has contributed to a gulf of division. Often, the desire to achieve conquest, grasp power, advance a political ideology, or prove dominance results in violence on both small and grand scales. The fallout of such violence consists of torn family relationships, divided communities and societies that are scarred physically and psychologically by the injustices committed by fallible people in a fallen fallible world. The need of restoration of such broken and dysfunctional relationships in the world calls for measures of reconciliation. However, just as disagreement and disunity has brought about division and injustice, conceiving of reconciliation in an agreed upon manner bears its' own significant issues. What is the goal of reconciliation? What are the determinants of the achievement of reconciliation? Who should be included? What issues are to be addressed? How is the past injustice dealt with? What stipulations are to be set and rules employed as the parameters for relationships? The response to these questions was sought through investigating the major theoretical frames of reconciliation with particular focus on a Christian framework attentive to the work of Dietrich Bonhoeffer and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa.

Interconnectedness of Humanity

A rhetoric of reconciliation communicative praxis grounded in the Christian narrative is attentive to the interconnectedness of humanity. The goal of reconciliation is to restore broken relationships and establish community stability and peace, which addresses “changing the motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes, and emotions of the great majority of the society members regarding the conflict” (Bar-Tel & Bennink, 8). A communicative process that merges previous narrative structures into a new narrative that undergirds the communal stability for the present and future is needed to address issues of motivations, goals, beliefs, attitudes and emotions. A rhetoric of reconciliation Christian framework begins with the guiding Biblical narrative for the understanding of and grounding of relationships based upon the primordial intentions of a Creator God. The progression from creation to the advent of sin to the redemption of creation is the major guiding narrative of the Bible. It calls to attention a Christological hermeneutic through which divine-human relationship as mediated through the sacrificial reconciling act of Jesus Christ and the reciprocal human-human relationship. Bonhoeffer wrote, “Indeed it is because we know of the resurrection that we know of God’s creation in the beginning, of God’s creating out of nothing” (*Creation and Fall*, 39). The primal state is prior to humanity’s encounter with the serpent through which the human condition forever changes. Prior to the fall Adam’s life was characteristic of “utterly unbroken and unified obedience, that is, Adam’s innocence and ignorance of disobedience” (*Creation and Fall*, 78). This primal state of existence provides an understanding of the parameters constituting successful relationships of reciprocity.

The Christological hermeneutic of the primal state of humanity, according to Bonhoeffer, supplies a basis for how one is to situate the self in the interconnectedness of relationships in the world. Creation is the will of God to bring about what is out of nothing at all. “In the beginning—that is, out of freedom, out of nothing—God created heaven and earth” (*Creation and Fall*, 40). It is out of God’s freedom that God chooses to create and create out of nothing. The apex of God’s creation is humanity who is created in God’s image by virtue of God’s will. The Genesis account of creation, according to Bonhoeffer, expresses the physical nearness of the creator (*Creation and Fall*, 72). When God created man, God, “fashioned humankind out of the dust from the ground and blew into its nostrils the breath of life” (*Creation and Fall*, 72). While everything else that was created was done by the word of God wherefore let it be and so it was commands the existence of creation, but for humanity God gave of God’s self through the shaping, forming and breathing life into this new creature. Therefore, as Bonhoeffer wrote, “Human being do not live as human beings apart from God’s spirit. To live as a human being means to live as a body in the spirit” (*Creation and Fall*, 74). The existence of body and spirit undergird the nature of humanity being in the likeness of God.

Humanity created in the *imago dei* or image of God produces a semblance of God in the human nature. The human is therefore, in the likeness of the Creator, created free in the world in which humanity is situated. *Imago dei* represents humankind created in the image of God existing for God and for neighbor; this is the primal state of humanity (*Creation and Fall*, 101). Bonhoeffer points out that created free is an interconnected freedom not a self-centered freedom. Persons are free from institutions and ideologies

that bind the human from the full potential of life (*No Future Without Forgiveness*, 212), however they are not free in the sense of living in any desired way without respect for or acknowledgement of the other. Bonhoeffer notes, “For in the language of the Bible freedom is not something that people have for themselves but something they have for others. No one is free in himself or herself [an sich]” (*Creation and Fall*, 62). Freedom is a relation between persons wherein one finds freedom in “being-free-for-the-other” (*Creation and Fall*, 62), bound intrinsically to the other and in relation with the other. The Christian understanding of Ubuntu agrees through Tutu asserting, “No real human being is absolutely self-sufficient. We belong therefore in a network of delicate relationships in interdependence. We do need other people and they help to form us in a profound way” (Battle, 42). To accept and embrace the responsibility of needing and being needed is Ubuntu. Nevertheless, the primal state of humanity was disrupted by sin. The advent of sin in the human community created enmity and disunion between humanity and God and humanity with one another. The disunity was overcome through the reconciliatory act of Jesus.

Reconciliation is the overcoming of the disunity that was wrought by the fall of man in disobedience to the creator. “The new knowledge of the reconciliation which is accomplished in Jesus, the knowledge of voiding of the disunion, itself entirely voids man’s own knowledge of his own goodness” (*Ethics*, 38). Reconciliation is a rediscovery of the unity lost by virtue of the overcoming of evil on the cross that extends forgiveness of guilt and reconciliation of a fallen creation with the creator. By virtue of Jesus’ act of reconciliation, humanity’s sinfulness and self-righteousness are covered over, even from themselves. A restoral of the harmony with God and with others is attainable through the

new knowledge found only in Jesus (*Ethics*, 42). The overcoming is therefore accomplished through reconciliation. Through a Christological understanding of reconciliation, humanity is set free from self indulgence to once again recognize that they are free-for others in the world (*Creation and Fall*, 64). Tutu explains, “the truth about persons is made known only through our relationship with Christ Jesus, who sets us free from deception and sin, thereby making it really possible to know the other (Battle, 71). The others in the world constitute all of humanity who are made in the image of God. The others in the world are intrinsically interconnected as part of the human community; bound to one another, for one another. Tutu asserts, “each individual’s humanity is ideally expressed in relationship with others, and a person depends on other people to be a person” (Shutte, 5). Through the web of interconnectedness, the necessity of reconciliation emerges to overcome the false perceptions developed between persons that have caused disunion and conflict. The desire for reconciliation arises out of an understanding that humanity is interdependent of one another for existence. The disconnection, disapproval, and separation keeps both the oppressor and the oppressed; the victim and perpetrator; and the strong and weak from actualizing their full human potential in the world.

Responsibility to the Other

A rhetoric of reconciliation communicative praxis grounded in the Christian narrative accentuates one’s responsibility to others in the world. Bonhoeffer’s rhetoric of reconciliation calls individuals to responsible for and to their fellow man. In being-free-for, humanity is free to exist not just in co-habitation with one’s neighbor, but in relationship with and for them. Therein lies the essence of community, as being

understood that the individual cannot exist with community and community cannot exist without the individual. Bonhoeffer asserts that community is actualized by virtue of being in community with Christ whereby the reciprocal relationship is one of sacrifice and service. Holding Jesus' physical relationship with the disciples as the model, Bonhoeffer argues for the physical relationship of humanity to constitute the same care, sacrifice and service to ensure that the needs of others are placed before one's own. Therefore, A rhetoric of reconciliation provides the acknowledgment that the other is important even if the other is different. The acknowledgement is not an attempt to win over or control the other, but a turning from a previous negative exclusive perception to an inclusive understanding of community. According to Bonhoeffer, the church community is recognized as the visible presence of Christ in the world and agents of grace and reconciliation to the world (Willmer, 175). "In Christ we are offered the possibility of partaking in the reality of God and in the reality of the world, but not in the one without the other. The reality of God discloses itself only by setting me entirely in the reality of the world, and when I encounter the reality of the world it is always already sustained, accepted and reconciled in the reality of God" (*Ethics*, 195). Through the navigating of life, one continually meets others in the human family who are made in the image of God. The person encountering the others in the world has a responsibility to and for the others that are encountered.

The call to responsibility is a call to discipleship through which the Christian is called out of a life of security into "complete insecurity (which in truth is absolute security and protection in community with Jesus), out of the foreseeable and calculable realm (which in truth is unreliable) into the completely unforeseeable" (*Discipleship*, 57).

Bonhoeffer's framework of reconciliation moves to demanding that discourse not remain linguistic propaganda. For Bonhoeffer, the theoretical and theological have to be actualized in every day life and encounters. One has to be willing to provide acts of grace and compassion to others regardless of who the other is (*Discipleship*, 81). A rhetoric of reconciliation has to include an embodiment of being responsible for the others in the world. The interconnectedness of humanity as understood through the guiding Biblical narrative situates the self as an ethical conduit for the provision, grace, and love from God to others in the world. Bonhoeffer suggests that it requires a vicarious suffering with and for the others, just as Christ vicariously suffered for humanity.

For Bonhoeffer, an ethic of responsibility entails giving up the right of self out of necessity for the deprived and oppressed (Selby, 235). An ethic of responsibility is an overarching, all-encompassing life orientation that affects every area of existence (*Letters and Papers*, 12). Ubuntu also encompasses an entire life-orientation with respect to responsibility to the other. Ubuntu encompasses generosity, care, compassion, and serving others in the community regardless of their race, class, or socioeconomic status. Ubuntu overcomes difference and conflict through reconciliation through the viewing of others as created in the *imago dei*—the image of God (Battle, 26). To this end, an rhetoric of reconciliation constitutes of necessity a responsibility to others in the world. Relationships have the propensity of restoration with those involved in conflict recognizing that each thy brother's and sister's keepers.

The Historical Moment

A rhetoric of reconciliation communicative praxis grounded in the Christian narrative is attentive to the historical moment at hand. Bonhoeffer was acutely aware

that responsible action was a historical construction in that the person of faith must meet the present situation that is ever moving toward a final destiny. Bonhoeffer “lived a rhetoric of *phronesis*, a practical wisdom emergent from the meeting of the concrete moment and the storyline of faith ever responsible for the other” (Arnett, 6). The dialectic of the story of faith and the historical moment calls into conversation the injustice at hand and the interpretation of the injustice through to narrative lens of the faith story. This dialectic brings into conversation the immortal and the mortal inviting differing views, however, not loosing the central ground of the story of faith.

“Bonhoeffer understood that interpretative action cannot deny reality but must offer as story that contends with evil, oppression of the other, and unearned privilege for oneself” (Arnett, 9). Selby suggests that Bonhoeffer’s notion of a world come of age is related to a regaining of “humanity’s whole destiny, part of the Christian vision of what that destiny could be, precisely as Christ expresses it in his continued presence in the world without accommodation to the world” (Selby, 235). Bonhoeffer believed that his struggle against Hitler was a living out of the calling of God to responsibility in the world and to be a voice for the deprived and oppressed (Selby, 235). Bonhoeffer had to contend with the historical moment before him and make ethical decisions based upon his Christological hermeneutic of the faith narrative.

The Holocaust and Apartheid represent two distinct historical moments that had to be dealt with in distinct manners. Dietrich Bonhoeffer and Archbishop Tutu each approached their historical moment with a guiding narrative of faith. However, each had to encounter different particularities in relation to a rhetoric of reconciliation. The historical moment could be the War in Iraq, present day Palestine and Israeli conflict, US

Healthcare, or the Abortion debate. Each issue set within the confines of a particular historical moment requires attention to the particulars of the time. Bonhoeffer was acutely aware that responsible action was a historical construction in that the person of faith must meet the present situation that is ever moving toward a final destiny.

A rhetoric of reconciliation communicative praxis grounded in the Christian narrative seeks the repairing, restoring, and mending of that which has been broken. To accomplish restoration the trauma of the experience; justice being served; the acknowledgement of the offense; a process of forgiveness of both victim(s) and perpetrator(s); and social assimilation of all parties involved into the broader communal environment are necessary to be achieved (Fivush, 18; Worthington, 5; Janoff-Bulman, 21, May, Keating, 184; Biggar, Shriver, Elshtain, Hamber, 6, Marrus, Crocker, Dwyer, Govier, 2, Worthington, 26; Volf, 91; Tutu, 13; Auerbach, 5, Kelman, 27; Daly & Sarkin, 18; Moaz, 3). A rhetoric of reconciliation must be attentive to the interconnectedness of humanity; the responsibility one has to others, and the historical moment. The communicative engagement of reconciliation proceeds from an embodiment of the above toward the discourse necessary to overcome the conditions, which have caused division. A rhetoric of reconciliation is not a systematic series of steps to achieve reconciled relationships. Rather a rhetoric of reconciliation is an all-encompassing orientation of being in the world.

Bibliography

- Allen, John. *Rabble-Rouser for Peace: The Authorized Biography of Desmond Tutu*. New York: Free Press, 2006.
- Anderson, Rob, Kenneth N. Cissna & Ronald C. Arnett, eds. *The Reach of Dialogue: Confirmation, Voice and Community*. Creskill: Hampton Press, 1994.
- Anselm, St. *Basic Writings*. S.N. Deane, trans. IL: LaSalle, 1968.
- Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*, 2nd. ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Arnett, Ronald C & Pat Arneson. *Dialogic Civility in a Cynical Age*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1999.
- Arnett, Ronald C. *Dialogic Confession: Bonhoeffer's Rhetoric of Responsibility*. Southern Illinois University, 2005.
- Arnett, Ronald C. *Communication and Community: Implication of Martin Buber's Dialogue*. Ill: Southern Illinois University, 1986.
- Asmal, Kader. "Truth, Reconciliation and Justice: The South African Experience in Perspective". *The Modern Law Review*, 63.1 (2000): 1-24. Blackwell Publishing on behalf of the Modern Law Review.
- Auerbach, Yehudith. "The Role of Forgiveness in Reconciliation". *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation*. Bar-Simoan-Tov, Yaacov, ed. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004.
- Bahktin, Mikhail. *Speech genres and Other Late Essays*. trans. Vern W. McGee. Austin: University of Texas, 1986.
- Bar-On, Dan. "Will the Parties Conciliate or Refuse? The Triangle of Jews, Germans, and Palestinians", *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation*. Bar-Simoan-Tov, Yaacov, ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Bar-Simon-Tov, Yaacov, ed. *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation*. Oxford Oxford: University Press, 2004.
- Bar-Tal, Daniel. "From Intractable Conflict through Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation: Psychological Analysis". *Political Psychology*, 21. 2 (2000): 351-365.

- Baranowski, Shelley. "Consent and Dissent: The Confessing Church and Conservative Opposition to National Socialism". *The Journal of Modern History*, 59. 1 (1987): 53-78.
- Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics: The Doctrine of Reconciliation*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1961.
- Barth, Karl. *Ethics*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1981.
- Battle, Michael. *Reconciliation: The Ubuntu Theology of Desmond Tutu*. OH: Pilgrim Press, 2009.
- Bethge, Eberhard. *Dietrich Bonhoeffer: Theological, Christian, Contemporary*. London: Harper Collins, 1970.
- Biggar, Nigel. "Making Peace or Doing Justice: Must We Choose?" *Burying the Past*, Nigel Biggar, ed. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2007.
- Biggar, Nigel. "Peace and Justice: A Limited Reconciliation." *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 5. 2 (2002): 167-179.
- Bois, Francois du and du Bois-Pedain, Antje. *Justice and Reconciliation in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. NY: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Act and Being: Transcendental Philosophy and Ontology in Systematic Theology*. Wayne Whitson Floyd, Jr., ed., H. Martin Rumscheidt, trans. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Creation and Fall: A Theological Exposition of Genesis 1-3*, trans. Douglas Stephen Bax. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Ethics*. Trans. Neville Horton Smith. NY: Macmillan Publishing, 1955.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Sanctorum Communio: A Theological Study of the Sociology of the Church*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *The Way to Freedom* trans. E.H. Robertson and John Bowden. London: Harper Collins, 1972.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *The Cost of Discipleship*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, Robert Coles, trans. NY: Orbis, 1998.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Letters and Papers from Prison*. NY: MacMillan Publishing, 1972.

- Boraine, Alex. *A Country Unmasked: Inside South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission*. NY: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Braithwaite, John. *Crime, Shame, and Reintegration*. NY: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Chicuecue, Noel Muchenga. "Reconciliation: The Role of Truth Commissions and Alternative Ways of Healing." *Development in Practice* 7.4 (1997): 483-486.
- Chapman, Audrey R. "Truth Commissions", *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: Religion, Public Policy, and Conflict Transformation*, Raymond G. Helmick, S.J. & Rodney L. Petersen, eds. Radnor: Templeton Foundation Press, 2002.
- Crooker, David. "Reckoning with Past Wrongs: A Normative Framework" in *Dilemmas of Reconciliation: Cases and Concepts*, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2003.
- Dilemmas of Reconciliation: Cases and Concepts*. Carol A.L Prager & Trudy Govier, eds. Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2003.
- Dwyer, Susan. "Reconciliation for Realists", *Dilemmas of Reconciliation: Cases and Concepts*, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2003.
- Dzur, Albert W. "Restorative Justice and Civic Accountability for Punishment." *Polity*, 36. 1 (2003): 3-22.
- Easton's Bible Dictionary for Kindle, 2009.
- Elshtain, Jean Bethke. "Politics and Forgiveness", *Burying the Past*, Nigel Biggar, ed. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2007.
- Epp, Roger. "We are All Treaty People: History, Reconciliation, and Settler Problems" in *Dilemmas of Reconciliation: Cases and Concepts*, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2003.
- Estrada-Hollenbeck, Mica. "The Attainment of Justice through Restoration, Not Litigation: The Subjective Road to Reconciliation." *Reconciliation, Justice, and Coexistence*. Abu-Nimar, ed. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2001.
- Floyd, Wayne Winston. *The Wisdom and Witness of Dietrich Bonhoeffer*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.
- Floyd, Wayne Winston. "Bonhoeffer's Literary Legacy" in *The Cambridge Companion to Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, ed. John W. DeGruchy. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1999.

- Fisher, Walter R. *Human Communication as Narration: Toward a Philosophy of Reason, Value and Action*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989.
- Fitzduff, Mari. "The Challenge to History: Justice, Coexistence, and Reconciliation Work in Northern Ireland." *Reconciliation, Justice, and Coexistence*. Abu-Nimar, ed. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2001.
- Fivush, Robyn. "Reconciling Trauma and the Self", *Roads to Reconciliation: Conflict and Dialogue in the Twenty-First Century*. Amy Benson Brown & Karen M. Poremski, eds. New York: M.E. Sharpe Inc., 2005.
- Foa, E.B., Molnar, C. and Cashman, L. "Change in Rape Narratives During Exposure Therapy for Posttraumatic Stress Disorder", *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 8 (1995): 675-690.
- Forget, Marc. "Crime as Interpersonal Conflict: Reconciliation between Victim and Offender." *Dilemmas of Reconciliation: Cases and Concepts*, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2003.
- Forsyth, P.T. *The Work of Christ*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. 2nd revised ed. New York: Continuum Books, 1975.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. "Rhetoric and Hermeneutics", *Rhetoric and Hermeneutics a Reader*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Galtung, Johan. "After Violence, Reconstruction, Reconciliation, and Resolution: Coping with Visible and Invisible Effects of War and Violence." *Reconciliation, Justice, and Coexistence*. Abu-Nimar, ed. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2001.
- Girard, Rene`. *The Scapegoat*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1986.
- Gopin, Marc. "Forgiveness as an Element of Conflict Resolution in Religious Cultures: Walking a Tightrope of Reconciliation and Justice", *Reconciliation, Justice, and Coexistence*. Abu-Nimar, ed. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2001.
- Gorringe, Timothy. *God's Just Vengeance: Crime, Violence, and the Rhetoric of Salvation*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Govier, Trudy. "What Is Acknowledgement and Why Is It Important?" *Dilemmas of Reconciliation: Cases and Concepts*, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2003.
- Gruchy, John W. de. *Reconciliation: Restoring Justice*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.

- Gruchy, John W. De. *The Cambridge Companion to Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, ed. John W. De Gruchy. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1999.
- Green, Clifford. *Karl Barth: Theologian of Freedom*. London: Harper Collins, 1989.
- Green, Clifford. "Human Sociality in Bonhoeffer's Theology" in *The Cambridge Companion to Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, ed. John W. DeGruchy. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1999.
- Gutierrez, Gustavo. *A Theology of Liberation*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell, revised ed. New York: Orbis, 1988.
- Hamlin, Alan P. "Rational Revenge" *Ethics*. University of Chicago Press. 101. 2 (1991): 374-381.
- Hardy, Daniel W. "Created and Redeemed Sociality", in Colin E. Gunton and Daniel W. Hardy (eds.), *On Being the Church: Essays on the Christian Community*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1989.
- Hart, Barry. "Refugee Return in Bosnia and Herzegovina: Coexistence before Reconciliation", *Reconciliation, Justice, and Coexistence*. Abu-Nimar, ed. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2001.
- Haynes, Stephen R. "Who Needs Enemies? Jews and Judaism in Anti-Nazi Religious Discourse". *Church History*, 71. 2 (2002): 341-367.
- Holbrooke, Richard. *To End a War*. New York: Modern Library, 1999.
- Hudson, J. and Galaway, B. "Restorative Justice and International Human Rights" in *Restorative Justice: International Perspectives*, J. Hudson & B. Galaway, eds. New York: Criminal Justice Press, 1996.
- INCORE. Recent Peace Agreements and Cease-fires. International Crisis Group, www.INCORE.ulst.ac.uk, 2010.
- Janoff-Bulman, R. *Shattered Assumptions*. New York: Free Press, 1992.
- Jones, L. Gregory. *Embodying Forgiveness: A Theological Analysis*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Katongole, Emmanuel & Rice, Chris. *Reconciling All Things: A Christian Vision for Justice, Peace, and Healing*. Ill: Intervarsity Press, 2008.
- Keating, Tom. "What Can Others Do? Foreign Governments and the Politics of Peacebuilding" in *Dilemmas of Reconciliation: Cases and Concepts*. Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2003.

- Kelman, Herbert C. "Reconciliation as Identity Change: A Social-Psychological Perspective." *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation*. Bar-Simoan-Tov, Yaacov, ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Krause, Tammy. "Murder, Mourning, and the Ideal of Reconciliation" *Roads to Reconciliation: Conflict and Dialogue in the Twenty-First Century*. Amy Benson Brown & Karen M. Poremski, eds. New York: M.E. Sharpe Inc., 2005.
- Kriesberg, Louis. "Coexistence and the Reconciliation of Communal Conflicts." *The Handbook of Interethnic Coexistence*, E. Weiner, ed., New York: Continuum, 1998.
- Kriesberg, Louis. *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change*. JAI publishing, 1984.
- Krog, Antjie. *Country of My Skull: Guilt, Sorrow, and the Limits of Forgiveness in the New South Africa*. New York: Three Rivers Press, 1999.
- Lederach, John Paul. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1997.
- McCandles, Erin. "The Case of Land in Zimbabwe: Cause of Conflict, Foundation for Sustained Peace." *Reconciliation, Justice, and Coexistence*. Abu-Nimar, ed. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2001.
- Maclain, Iain S. "Truth and Reconciliation: Irreconcilable Differences? An Ethical Evaluation of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission." *Religion and Theology* 6 (1999): 276.
- Mandela, Nelson. *A Long Walk to Freedom*. New York: Mandela, 1994.
- Mandela, Nelson. *Conversations with Myself*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2010.
- Malpas, Jeff. *Hans-Georg Gadamer* in Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Stanford: Stanford University, 2003.
- Mamdani, Mahmood. "Reconciliation Without Justice", *Southern African Review of Books*, December 1996.
- Marsh, Charles. "The Overabundant Self and the Transcendental Tradition: Dietrich Bonhoeffer on the Self- Reflective Subject." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 60. 4 (1992): 659- 672.

- Marshall, Donald G. "Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and the Interpretation of Scripture: Augustine to Robert of Basevorn." *Rhetoric and Hermeneutics a Reader*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Mathewes, Charles. "A Tale of Two Judgements: Bonhoeffer and Arendt on Evil, Understanding, and Limits, and the Limits of Understanding Evil." *The Journal of Religion*, 80.3 (2000): 112-138.
- Mbiti, John S. *Concepts of God in Africa*. New York: SPCK Publishing, 1996.
- McKee, Tim. *No More Strangers Now: Young Voices from a New South Africa*. DK Publishing, 1998.
- Mengus, Raymond. "Dietrich Bonhoeffer and the Decision to Resist." *The Journal of Modern History*, Supplement: Resistance Against the Third Reich, 64, 1992.
- Merwe, Hugo van der. "National and Community Reconciliation: Competing Agendas in South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission." *Burying the Past*, Nigel Biggar, ed. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2007.
- Metaxas, Eric. *Bonhoeffer: Pastor, Martyr, Prophet, Spy*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2010.
- Minow, M. *Between Vengeance and Forgiveness: Facing History after Genocide and Mass Violence*. New York: Beacon Press, 1998.
- Montville, Joseph V. "Justice and the Burden of History." *Reconciliation, Justice, and Coexistence*. Abu-Nimar, ed. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2001.
- Moltmann, Jurgen. *A Theology of Hope*. Lodon: SCM Press, 1967.
- Mostert, Christiaan. "Reconciliation and the Church." *Journal of the Melbourne College of Divinity*, 23. 2 (2010): 192-213.
- Moyo, Ambrose. "Reconciliation and Forgiveness in an Unjust Society." *Dialog: A Journal of Theology*, 41. 4 (2002): 294-301.
- Moses, John A. "Bonhoeffer's Germany: the Political Context." in *The Cambridge Companion to Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, John W. DeGruchy, ed. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1999.
- Moyers, Bill. *Facing the Truth*. NY: Thirteen/Wnet, 1999.
- Muller-Fahrenholz, Geiko. *The Art of Forgiveness: Theological Reflections of Healing and Reconciliation*. Geneva: WCC Publications, 1997.

- Nelson, F. Burton. "The life of Dietrich Bonhoeffer." *The Cambridge Companion to Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, John W. DeGruchy, ed. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1999.
- Pankhurst, Donna. "Issues of Justice and Reconciliation in Complex Political Emergencies: Conceptualizing Reconciliation, Justice and Peace." *Third World Quarterly*, 20.1 (1999): 239-256.
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. *Systematic Theology Volume IV*, English trans. New York: Eerdmans Publishing, 2004.
- Paul, Robert A. "Reconciliation and the Craving for Revenge." *Roads to Reconciliation: Conflict and Dialogue in the Twenty-First Century*. Amy Benson Brown & Karen M. Poremski, eds. New York: M.E. Sharpe Inc., 2005.
- Pawlikowski, John T. "Martin Luther and Judaism: Paths Towards Theological Reconciliation". *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 43. 4 (1975): 681-693.
- Petersen, Rodney L. "A Theology of Forgiveness." *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: Religion, Public Policy, and Conflict Transformation*, Raymond G. Helmick, S.J. & Rodney L. Petersen, eds. Radnor: Templeton Foundation Press, 2002.
- Peters, Ronald E. *Urban Ministry: An Introduction*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2007.
- Plato. "Protagoras." *The Dialogues of Plato*. B.A.F. Hubbard and E.S. Karmofsky, trans., New York: Bantam Books, 1986.
- Polkinghorne, D. *Narrative Knowing and the Human Sciences*. New York: Albany State University of New York Press, 1988.
- Poewe, Karla. "Theologies of Black South Africans and the Rhetoric of Peace versus Violence." *Canadian Journal of African Studies*, 43.1 (1993): p. 44-65.
- Rasmussen, Larry. "The Ethics of Responsible Action" in *The Cambridge Companion to Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, John W. DeGruchy, ed. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1999.
- Reading About the World*, vol. 1, 3rd ed. Paul Brians, Mary Gallwey, Douglas Hughes, Azfar Hussain, Richard Law, Michael Myers, Michael Neville, Roger Schlesinger, Alice Spitzer, and Susan Swan, eds. Washington: Harcourt Brace, 1999.
- Reconciliation, Justice, and Coexistence*. Abu-Nimar, ed. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2001.

- Richards, I.A. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Roberts, J. Deotis. *Bonhoeffer & King: Speaking Truth to Power*. Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005.
- Roberts, Julian V. "Public Opinion, Crime, and Criminal Justice." *Crime and Justice*, 16 (1992): 99-180.
- Roads to Reconciliation: Conflict and Dialogue in the Twenty-First Century*. Amy Benson Brown & Karen M. Poremski eds. New York: M.E. Sharp, 2005.
- Rodden, John. "How do Stories Convince Us? Notes Towards a Rhetoric of Narrative." *College Literature*, 35.1 (2008): 148-173.
- Ross, Maggie. *The Fountain and the Furnace: The Way of Tears and Fire*. New York: Paulist Press, 1987.
- Roy & W.J. Starosta. "Gadamer, Language and Intercultural Communication." *Human Communication Studies*, 1.1 (2001).
- Rumscheidt, Martin. "The Formation of Bonhoeffer's Theology" in *The Cambridge Companion to Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, John W. DeGruchy, ed. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1999.
- Salaita, Steven. "Ethnic identity and Imperative Patriotism: Arab Americans Before and After 9/11", *College Literature*, 32.2 (2005).
- Scheff, T. *Bloody Revenge: Emotions, Nationalism, and War*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994.
- Schubert, James N., Stewart, Patrick A. and Curran, Margaret Ann. "A Defining Presidential Moment: 9/11 and the Rally Effect", *Political Psychology*, 23.3 (2002): 559-583.
- Scott, Peter. *Theology, Ideology and Liberation: Towards a Liberative Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Selby, Peter. "Christianity in a World Come of Age" in *The Cambridge Companion to Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, John W. DeGruchy, ed. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1999.
- Shamir, Jacob and Khalil Shikaki. "Determinants of Reconciliation and Compromise among Israelis and Palestinians." *Journal of Peace Research*, 39. 2 (2002): 185-202.

- Shriver, Donald. "Where and When in Political Life is Justice Served by Forgiveness?" *Burying the Past*, Nigel Biggar, ed. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2007.
- Shutte, Augustine. *Philosophy for Africa*. South Africa: University of Cape Town, 1996.
- Silverstein, B. Enemy Images: "The Psychology of U.S. Attitudes and Cognitions Regarding the Soviet Union", *American Psychologist*, 44.2 (1989).
- Smith, Theophus. "Vengeance is Never Enough." *Roads to Reconciliation: Conflict and Dialogue in the Twenty-First Century*. Amy Benson Brown & Karen M. Poremski, eds. New York: M.E. Sharpe Inc., 2005.
- South Africa: A Country Study*. Rita M. Byrnes, ed. Washington: GPO Library of Congress, 1996.
- Stein, Dan. "Psychiatric Aspects of the TRC in South Africa." *British Journal of Psychology*, July (1998): 173.
- Strang, H., Sherman, L., Angel, C. M., Woods, D. J., Bennett, S., Newbury-Birch, D., & Inkpen, N. "Victim evaluations of face-to-face restorative justice experiences: A quasi-experimental analysis." *Journal of Social Issues*, 62 (2006): 281–306.
- Susin, Luiz Carlos. "Introduction", *Reconciliation in a World of Conflicts*, Luiz Carlos Susin and Maria Pilar Aquino eds. London: SMC Press, 2003.
- Tavuchis, N. *Mea Culpa: A Sociology of Apology and Reconciliation*. California: Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.
- Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Gerhard Kittel, ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Tutu, Desmond. Forward to *Reconciliation in Divided Societies*, ed. Erin Daly & Jeremy Sarkin. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- Tutu, Desmond. *No Future without Forgiveness*, New York: Random House, 1997.
- Tutu, Desmond. *God has a Dream: A Vision of Hope for Our Time*. New York: DoubleDay, 2004.
- Tutu, Desmond. Forward to *Reconciliation in Divided Societies*, ed. Erin Daly & Jeremy Sarkin. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- Van Ness, David. "Restorative Justice and International Human Rights". *Restorative Justice: International Perspectives*. B. Galaway & J.Hudson, eds. New York: Criminal Justice Press, Monsey, 1996.

- Verwoerd, Wilhelm. "Toward a Response to Criticisms of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission", *Dilemmas of Reconciliation: Cases and Concepts*, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2003.
- Villa-Vicencio, Charles. "Restorative Justice in Social Context: The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission." *Burying the Past*, Nigel Biggar, ed. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2007.
- Volf, Miroslav. *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996.
- Westminster Dictionary of Theological Terms. Nashville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006.
- Wilkinson, Robert. "Back to Basics: Modern Restorative Justice Principles Have Their Roots in Ancient Cultures." *Corrections Today*, 59.7 (1997): 6-8.
- Willmer, Haddon. "Bonhoeffer's Sanctity as a Problem for Bonhoeffer Studies." *Celebrating Critical Awareness: Bonhoeffer and Bradford 60 Years on*. London: International Bonhoeffer Society, 1993.
- Willmer, Hadden. "Costly Discipleship." *The Cambridge Companion to Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, John W. DeGruchy, ed. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1999.
- Whittaker, David. J. *Conflict and Reconciliation in the Contemporary World*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Yoder, John Howard. "Sacrament as Social Process: Christ the Transformer of Culture." *Theology Today*, 48.1 (1991): 33-41.
- Worthington, Everett L. *Forgiveness and Reconciliation*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group, 2006.
- Zaibert, Leo. "Punishment and Revenge." *Law and Philosophy*. 25 (2006): 81-118.
- Zehr, Howard. *The Little Book of Restorative Justice*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books, 2002.
- Zerner, Ruth. "Church, State and the Jewish Question." *The Cambridge Companion to Dietrich Bonhoeffer*, John W. DeGruchy, ed. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1999.
- Zimmerman, Earl. "The Beginning of the Beginning", sermon exert, Shalom Mennonite Church, Harrisonburg, VA, 2002. *Conflict Between People and Groups*, S. Worchel and J. Simpson, eds. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1993.

Zondervan. *The New International Translation of The Holy Bible*. Grand Rapids:
Zondervan Publishing, 2008.