



Book of Abstracts

ETHICS OF RECONCILIATION – EUROPEAN PERSPECTIVES

Societas Ethica’s 59th Annual Conference 2023
August 24–27, 2023, Sarajevo (Bosnia and Herzegovina)

The abstracts included here are ordered in alphabetical order by family name.

Table of Contents

“Facing the other” as a reconciling, just and truthful approach <i>Judith Bollongino, Germany</i>	3
“Victims can be persuaded with justice” Contextualizing Reconciliation in Turkey’s Kurdish Conflict <i>Güneş Daşlı, Germany</i>	5
State-building and Reconciliation – Ethical perspectives on an uneasy relationship <i>Sarah Delere, Germany</i>	7
Reconciliation Memorial Site: Remembrance and Commitment <i>Prof. Roman Globokar & Robert Dolinar</i>	10
Ministry of Reconciliation (2 Cor. 5) - an Eschatological View on Reconciliation <i>Dr. Hubertus Flohr, Neatherlands</i>	12
Sports as Reconciliation <i>Matteo Frey, Switzerland</i>	18
Limitations of reconciliation – the problem of the superiority of forgiveness and the significance of having a choice <i>Dr. Ulrica Fritzon, Sweden</i>	20
Memory, History and Reconciliation Three Narratives and Their Capacity to Further Peace <i>Prof. Ingeborg G. Gabriel, Austria</i>	22
“Dealing with the past beneficiaries and responsibility in the reconciliation process between Church of Sweden and the Sami people” <i>Dr. Johanna Gustafsson Lundberg</i>	24
Reconciliation for Foxes: Between Conflict, Pluralism and Compromise <i>Dr. Frank Handelmann, Switzerland</i>	26
Adaptiveness and evaluative standpoints: A shared human nature as a resource for reconciliation. <i>Emma Jakobsson, Sweden</i>	28
Our Home on Native Land(s): Canada as Benevolent Good Samaritan or Global Environmental Racist and Robber? <i>Dr. Sheryl Johnson, USA</i>	30
Equality as a conceptual opportunity and a practical challenge in reconciliation <i>Dr. Heidi Jokinen & Prof. Björn Vikström, Finland</i>	32
Conflict Resolution and Reconciliation: Lessons from the Gandhian Thought <i>Prof. George Kodimattam Joseph, India</i>	34

Subjectivity, Forgiveness, and Reconciliation <i>Martin Langby, Sweden</i>	36
The Use of Testimony in Truth Commissions: A Radical Critique <i>Dr. Alexandra Lebedeva, Sweden</i>	39
Versöhnung unter den Bedingungen des Justizvollzugs – eine Frage der „Restorative Justice“? <i>Katharina Leniger, Germany</i>	42
Fortschritt des Menschen als anthropologische Grundlage einer Ethik der Versöhnung? <i>Prof. Arne Manzeschke, Germany</i>	44
The Ethical and Moral Dimensions of Reconciliation Resources and Documents <i>Dr. Attila Nagy, Germany</i>	46
Reconciliation in Workplace Bullying Contexts: Renarration. Responsibility. Grace? <i>Mikael Nilsson, Finland</i>	48
The conditions for reconciliation: forms, timing and normative potential <i>Dr. Johanna Ohlsson, Sweden</i>	51
Klaus von Stoschs Komparative Theologie und die interreligiöse Versöhnungsarbeit <i>Dr. Michael Pfenninger, Switzerland</i>	53
Reconciliation Across Religious and Political Borders: Lessons from Early-Modern Westphalia <i>Dr. Gary Slater, Germany</i>	55
Telling stories across borders: narrative hospitality in Central Europé <i>Luca Welzenbach</i>	58
“the body they may kill: God’s truth abideth still” Theological and Ethical Expressions of Reconciliation in Swedish Hymns <i>Prof. Susanne Wigorts Yngvesson, Sweden</i>	60

“Facing the other” as a reconciling, just and truthful approach

Judith Bollongino, Germany

Reconciliation, justice, and truth in a post-conflict situation match idealistically with each other. But different perspectives on the same situation often challenge this holistic transformation. This paper tries to explore, if Emmanuel Lévinas’ concept of “facing the other” (visage (French), Antlitz (German)) enables us to look at the situation from the same point of view and thus to achieve justice and truth and even reconciliation in a post-conflict situation.

What “facing the other” means For Lévinas life performs in social relations in form of facing each other (“von Angesicht zu Angesicht”) (cf. Lévinas 2014, 418). The other’s face is the limit and call of one’s action (cf. Lévinas 2014, 420). Facing the other means also to discover infinity and the presence of God as well as to establish one’s own truth (cf. Lévinas 2014, 446). Therefor every intentional act is limited and enabled by facing the other. Every ethical approach is to be measured by facing the other. There is no formal rule or total order which gives general advice for the right action. It is the unformal, singular face of the other which can’t be generalized at all (cf. Lévinas 2014, 336). One and the other, both together determine each other and accomplish full life. The social relation itself is ultimate existence (cf. Lévinas 2014, 320).

How justice and truth can be found by “facing the other” Justice is not possible without the singularity, without the specific subjective perspective (cf. Lévinas 2014, 362). It is the subjective perspective of the victim, but it refers also to the perspective of the judged person. This is Lévinas’ conclusion dealing with formal judgements – judgements of court, judgements of history. The invisible status of the subjective position to the formal judgement may show a benevolent truth of the judged one (cf. Lévinas 2014, 358). So “facing the other” means do seek for the other’s understanding of what is considered just. It is about seeking the invisible offense (cf. Lévinas 2014, 359) in a subjective position to a formal judgement. It means to find the offense in facing the other (cf. Lévinas 2014, 363f.). Facing the other calls one to find the truth.

“Facing the other” to enable reconciliation Reconciliation can ethically be understood as the process of restoring a culpably broken interpersonal relationship through mutual internal turnaround (penitence; forgiveness) (cf. Schlenke, 1998-2007, VII. Ethics). Lévinas expects that one becomes more oneself by finding the truth in the face of the other (cf. Lévinas 2014, 364). As one and another determine each other, seek justice in facing the other to fully exist, reconciling can mean to exist abundantly. It can be understood as a process of finding one’s guilt by truly facing the other and seeking the other’s pain. This calls oneself to restore the relationship by seeking what the other needs and wants. It can only be understood in a mutual process by both trying to face the other one.

A holistic transformation by “facing the other” “Facing the other” can be understood as a mutual process which takes different steps. It is about facing the other to

- 1.) be called into a reconciling process, because one sees the pain in the other’s face;
- 2.) find out what is to be just in the perspective of the other;

3.) seek the truth understanding that the invisible position of the other might differ from a formal judgement;

4.) live a more abundant own life by reconciling through acting due to the other's need. "Facing the other" is an ethical approach calling for changing the perspective. Because Emmanuel Lévinas considers this facing of the other to be the only way of performing life abundantly it offers a holistic transformation for culpably broken relationships. "Facing the other" is an approach to reconciliation by finding justice and truth out of the other's perspective and acting accordingly. For post-conflict situations this means to identify who the other is, 1.) facing the other to understand the other's pain and thus 2-3.) trying to find out what the other truly understands to be just and 4.) lastly to act accordingly to live more abundantly. These steps may enable conflicting parties to find shared perspectives on their situation and find solutions in which all, justice, truth and reconciliation, are considered to be shared values.

Bibliography:

Hock, Klaus et al. (1998-2007): Versöhnung. I. Religionsgeschichtlich, English Version: Reconciliation/Atonement. I. Religious Studies, in: RGG4 , Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Lévinas, Emmanuel (20145): Totalität und Unendlichkeit. Versuch über die Exteriorität, Freiburg/München: Alber.

Schlenke, Dorothee (1998-2007): Versöhnung. VII. Ethisch, English Version: Reconciliation/Atonement. VII. Ethics, in: RGG4 , Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

“Victims can be persuaded with justice” Contextualizing Reconciliation in Turkey’s Kurdish Conflict

Güneş Daşlı, Germany

The uneasy relationship between justice and reconciliation complicates whether transitional justice and reconciliation can be achieved together in post-conflict settings. Reconciliation is often contextualised as one dimension of transitional justice, resulting in a normative outcome of it. This paper differentiates its standpoint from the literature upon two aspects. First, it uses a critical perspective of the Hölderlin Perspective, which calls for reconciliation in the midst of strife rather than utilising it in a post-conflict setting (JCRS, 2022). Secondly, the paper endorses Leiner (2018), who underlines the interdependency of reconciliation and transitional justice with having different principles and temporalities. Altogether, the study resituates reconciliation as a long-term project in which transitional justice autonomously settles with particular foci on victims and victimhood.

The findings discussed in this paper are based on the PhD project’s fieldwork from July to October 2021 in Turkey. The twenty-one interviews were conducted in person and online. The participants consisted of the local actors, including the families of enforced disappearances whose work and activism are relevant to measures and principles of transitional justice. The research used a mixed method by benefiting from grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006) and applying the critical content analysis (Mayring, 2022) in order to contextualise reconciliation in relation to justice in the context of the Kurdish conflict.

The paper’s main argument is that a ticker understanding of justice (Llewellyn & Philpott, 2014) distancing from the narrow legalistic justice perspective bridges transitional justice to reconciliation. The research particularly focuses on the relatives of enforced disappearances; the crime was systematically and widely committed by the state security forces in the Kurdish region during the 1990s. The phenomenon of enforced disappearance is categorised as a continuing crime which violates multiple human rights in international law (International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, 2010). In terms of the crime’s components of continuity and complexity, the families of missing persons are generally seen as the most challenging group to persuade for reconciliation. However, Kovras (2012) proposes that the issue of missing can be a driving force in reconciliation.

The exact number of missing persons is still unknown. In the IHD's (Human Rights Association) archive, 1.388 cases were recorded. However, the estimated number of missing persons cases is much higher. There are still 303 unexhumated mass graves in the Kurdish Region. In parallel with Kovras’ proposal; this research finds out that the families of the disappeared perceive reconciliation as a process that can be tackled without jeopardising their justice agenda in the Kurdish conflict. The paper discusses that restorative justice in the forms of truth-recovery, memorialisation and apology are framed as bridging reconciliation and transitional justice, the (de)linking which can prepare the relatives to sacrifice for the sake of reconciliation. As Stauffer (2014) addresses, restorative justice potentially fosters remedying harm rather than overfocusing on punishment and isolation, which often happens in the criminal justice system. The paper concludes that a thicker and richer justice content is desired in pursuit of just-peace.

Bibliography

Jena Center for Reconciliation, Hölderlin Perspective to Reconciliation, accessed on November 15, 2022, <https://www.jcrs.uni-jena.de/what-is-reconciliation-about>

Kovras, I. (2012). De-linkage processes and grassroots movements in transitional justice. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 47(1), 88-105.

Leiner, M. (2018). Conclusion: From conflict resolution to reconciliation. In *Alternative approaches in conflict resolution* (pp. 175-185). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Llewellyn, J. J., & Philpott, D. (2014). Restorative justice, reconciliation, and peacebuilding. *Studies in Strategic Peacebuilding*.

Mayring, P. (2021). *Qualitative content analysis: a step-by-step guide*. Sage.

Stauffer, C. S. (2014) *Justice in Transition: Deviance, Mass Atrocities and Post-war Reconstruction*, Springer Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice.

United Nations International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, December 13, 2010, <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instrumentsmechanisms/instruments/international-convention-protection-all-persons-enforced>

State-building and Reconciliation – Ethical perspectives on an uneasy relationship

Sarah Delere, Germany

Suggested thematic field/sections: the concept of reconciliation as related to different contexts/ moral dimensions of reconciliation, conflict resolution, and transitional justice/ reconciliation and social justice / critical approaches to the paradigm of transition /open channel

The need for a thorough investigation of the topic of reconciliation in post-conflict situations is evident and hence the need for ethical perspectives. After all, reconciliation touches upon highly ethical matters such as justice and truth. My paper starts with a puzzling observation: Why is there an elaborated field of literature on reconciliation and peacebuilding but hardly any work on state-building and reconciliation or even systematic ethical reviews? And secondly – what does this say about our perception of conflict (resolution) and reconciliation? Could it be the case that state-building is simply inconceivably hindering reconciliation or is this an issue of a theoretical blank spot?

In my paper, I want to examine this gap and investigate the conceptual reasons for it, which seem to be grounded in the dominant conceptions of state-building. Debates about state- and peacebuilding are especially prominent in the discussion of the so-called failure of liberal peace (Visoka, 2016) and include the question of where an exact definitory line can be drawn between state-building and peacebuilding. Still, there seems basic consensus that state-building can be separated from peacebuilding and described as a set of practices in post-conflict situations that aim to ensure the functioning of core elements of the so-defined modern state: effective and legitim monopoly of force over the territory and the capacity to enforce political decisions authoritatively (Kipping, 2011, pp. 19–20).

To approach this conundrum, I am intending a three-step approach. First, the exact gap needs clarification. How are the key concepts defined, what exactly is missing and where are the relevant gaps for an ethical perspective? The gap between state-building and reconciliation will be demonstrated by a survey of key literature (among others Chandler & Sisk, 2015; Paris, 2007; Richmond & Visoka, 2021). Reconciliation can be defined as a type of amelioration of a relationship, individual or collective, with different elements and forms such as individual or representative apologies, forgetting, truth-telling and commissions, reparations and restorative justice or punishment. For this investigation, reconciliation will be seen as both a process and an ideal outcome and its scope will be limited to collective post-conflict situations e.g., war or violent regime change (Radzik & Murphy, 2021).

In the second step, I analyse the conceptual reasons for this gap. Based on Kelly, I try to substantiate the hypothesis that this is due to the nature of reconciliation as a process that includes or is grounded in deliberative processes and the nature of state-building as an “early” political process with a limited scope. In most cases, state-building is a process dominated by international donors, multilateral organisations providing humanitarian assistance and a steady presence of military forces. Often institutions need to be rebuilt or reinstated and as Kelly claims thick/thin concepts of reconciliation need to be supplemented by vertical/horizontal concepts of reconciliation, whereby she defines vertical reconciliation of individuals or groups with institutions (Kelly, 2021, p. 507). Deliberative processes of reconciliation require

1 institutions to facilitate and enforce reconciliation, whether it is at the local, regional, or national level. The combination of these two natures hints at a practically uneasy relationship.

In the third step, I will merge the previous arguments in an ethical discussion. Here I will discuss critically the question if state-building should not be conceptualised in general without elements/processes of reconciliation. Radzik & Murphy point to the balance of interest between reconciliation and stability required in this regard: Is reconciliation burdening victims with an unjustifiable demand and asking them to sacrifice for peace? (Radzik & Murphy, 2021) If one stresses factors like individual and collective participation in decision-making or the individual right to choose when and how to search for reconciliation, this prioritization should be regarded critically.

This gains further weight as such a path is often supported by international interveners, donor regimes or multilateral organisations. While it is empirically established that international support is a positive factor in these operations (Autesserre, 2017), post-colonially sensible ethics should point out the right to self-determination and the danger of asymmetric power constellations. Reconciliation cannot be decided upon from the outside and neither should the decision of its postponement in favour of other goods.

Other questions I will address concern the concepts of reconciliation used in the existing discourse which one-sidedly emphasize emotions but seem to underestimate the role of rationality, public memory, or institutions (Hutchinson & Bleiker, 2015). Furthermore, taking up post-colonial criticism, the question of the perspective from which the necessity of reconciliation, as well as its conception, is defined will be included. Here I will draw on LemayHébert's analysis of the fragile states discourses, a field very close to state-building (LemayHébert, 2021).

Going these three steps should allow to shed a light on why there is little substantial ethical work on the matter of reconciliation and state-building and which ethical challenges the topic might have to offer.

2 Bibliography

Autesserre, S. (2017). International Peacebuilding and Local Success: Assumptions and Effectiveness. *International Studies Review*, 19(1), 114–132.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viw054>

Chandler, D., & Sisk, T. D. (Eds.). (2015). *Routledge handbook of international statebuilding* (First issued in paperback). Routledge.

Hutchinson, E., & Bleiker, R. (2015). Reconciliation. In R. Mac Ginty (Ed.), *Routledge handbooks. Routledge handbook of peacebuilding* (pp. 81–90). Routledge.

Kelly, G. (2021). Reconciliation and Peacebuilding. In O. P. Richmond & G. Visoka (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of peacebuilding, statebuilding, and peace formation* (pp. 505–519). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190904418.013.37>

Kipping, M. (2011). *State-Building: Erfolg und Scheitern in Afghanistan*. Schriften zur

Governance-Forschung: Vol. 24. Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG.
<http://nbnresolving.org/urn:nbn:de:bsz:31-epflcht-1196120>

Lemay-Hébert, N. (2021). Peace, Intervention, and State Fragility. In O. P. Richmond & G.

Visoka (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of peacebuilding, statebuilding, and peace formation* (pp. 353–367). Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190904418.013.24>

Paris, R. (2007). *At war's end: Building peace after civil conflict*. Cambridge Univ. Press.
Radzik, L., & Murphy, C. (2021). Reconciliation. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford*

Encyclopedia of Philosophy (2021 st ed.). Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2021/entries/reconciliation>

Richmond, O. P., & Visoka, G. (Eds.). (2021). *The Oxford handbook of peacebuilding, statebuilding, and peace formation*. Oxford University Press.

Visoka, G. (2016). *Peace figuration after international intervention: Intentions, events and consequences of liberal peacebuilding*. Routledge studies in intervention and statebuilding. Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9781315675633>
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315675633>

Reconciliation Memorial Site: Remembrance and Commitment

Prof. Roman Globokar & Robert Dolinar

This article, a joint reflection by a theologian and an architect, stresses the importance of monuments in the process of confronting a community with its painful past and creating conditions for reconciliation. Memorials remind us of the victims of conflicts and at the same time enjoin the present generation to prevent tragedies from happening again. In the past, numerous memorials to war heroes often deepened divisions between warring parties. Monuments to reconciliation, therefore, have a special significant role in the reconciliation process, not glorifying heroes of the individual sides involved in a conflict, but pointing to shared common humanity and the importance of transcending divisions. Memorials can wield a special power when they appeal to the totality of the human senses. Many nations have included the installation of reconciliation monuments in their reconciliation processes (e.g. Northern Ireland, Greece, USA, Rwanda). Such monuments usually intend to re-establish relations between warring parties and build trust between them. However, they often serve the political and ideological interests of those who commissioned the particular memorial or monument.

We first delve into the hermeneutics of erecting memorials. An analysis of the meaning and message of a monument takes place on three levels. At the first level we examine the initial intention of the commissioning parties. On the second level, we explore ideas and meanings given to the monument by the artist. The third level of analysis considers how the monument speaks to a wider public and what meaningful messages it conveys.

We claim that successful memorials share three elements in common: purity of idea, strong narrative, and deep poetry. In the first section we present some well-known reconciliation monuments from different parts of the world. Then we focus on a memorial site in Slovenia dedicated to reconciliation, co-created in 2015 by the authors of this text. This memorial, installed at the St Stanislaus Institution in Ljubljana in memory of the victims of the First and Second World Wars, especially commemorates the prisoners of war at the end of WWII. With around 1 500 pupils and students currently attending the St Stanislaus Institution, it was particularly important that the memorial reach out to the younger demographic. The memorial's prime intention seeks to make them aware that violence and war do not ever solve people's mutual disagreements.

The composition of the memorial employs seven stone pieces, which, like thousands of prisoners at the end of WWII, are spread throughout the entire area of the Institution. The stone slabs, scattered around the interior, the squares and the parks, perhaps resemble some ancient ruins or even graves of the war victims. Yet, no names appear inscribed on them. Instead, we find only the biblical phrase, "Peace be with you" (3 John 1:15). The inscription repeats in the languages of those imprisoned here and then taken to the killing fields (Croatian, German, Serbian, Slovenian). The message imparts simultaneous reflection and comfort. The words might arise in the voices of the fallen, coming out of their graves. Or, the words could carry our message, addressed to our betrayed dead brothers.

In practice, young and old alike stop at the memorial. They meet at the stone slabs and talk to one another. They touch the stones, sit on them and read books. Visitors, staff and students themselves become part of the monument, marking the memory and inviting reflection of those who lived, of us who are here, and of those who will come after us. Therefore, this work

of architecture is no longer a place of grief only; despite its initial memorial intention, it becomes a place of hope. This memorial, principally intended to mourn tragic events of history, finds a new language and becomes a carrier of joy within people's ordinary everyday lives.

References

Bailey, Spencer. 2020. In Memory Of: Designing Contemporary Memorials. London: Phaidon.

Clark, Janine I. 2013. Reconciliation through Remembrance? War Memorials and the Victims of Vukovar. *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 7 (1): 116–135.

Eltringham, Nigel. 2021. *The Anthropology of Peace and Reconciliation. Critical Topics in Contemporary Anthropology*. New York: Routledge.

Ibreck, Rachel. 2013. International Constructions of National Memories: The Aims and Effects of Foreign Donors' Support for Genocide Remembrance in Rwanda. *Journal of intervention and statebuilding* 7 (2): 149–169.

Lischer, Sarah Kenyon. 2019. Narrating atrocity: Genocide memorials, dark tourism, and the politics of memory. *Review of international studies* 45 (5): 805–827.

Ricoeur, Paul. 2004. *Memory, History and Forgetting*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ministry of Reconciliation (2 Cor. 5)- an Eschatological View on Reconciliation

Dr. Hubertus Flohr, Neatherlands

Ministry of Reconciliation (2 Cor. 5) - an Eschatological View on Reconciliation

(0) Introduction

If reconciliation is to be considered a fundamental condition of Christian faith and dogmatic doctrine as well as a fundamental ground of Christian acting (1) we should reflect about what can be the specific contribution of Christian theology to an ethic of reconciliation (2), how this contribution has been implemented among Christians themselves (3) and which results it shows for reconciliation in the vast field of conflicts in society (4).

(1) Reconciliation as fundamental notion of Christian faith and acting

As Wilhelm Dantine in his 1978 published booklet ‘Versöhnung – ein Grundmotiv christlichen Glaubens und Handelns’ clearly points out reconciliation is to be considered a fundamental condition of Christian faith and dogmatic doctrine as well as a fundamental ground of Christian moral acting.¹ From the point of protestant view reconciliation is the word for the certainty that God and world have been reconciled in the way of universal peace (shalom) which includes the relation to his creation as well as to humanity. That means that reconciliation between God and the world also affects the relation of humanity to the cosmos as well as the relation between humans. In his rereading the history of Christian ideas Dantine stresses the importance of widening the to just the individual relation to God limited idea of reconciliation towards its cosmic dimension which includes both the relation to the whole creation as well as humanity as a whole. The history of salvation started by God’s self-revelation is nothing else than a history of reconciliation started by God and completed in the death and resurrection of Jesus who in his lifetime presented himself in solidarity with the unreconciled. In and through Christ’s solidarity with the unreconciled God reconciles². That means also the rejection of the theological idea of God to be reconciled by the sacrifice of Christ for the sin of humans. God guarantees the reconciliation as the horizon of expectations in terms of the Kingdom of God encouraging Christ’s followers to continue his work of reconciliation of the unreconciled. In terms of theological anthropology Christians take their responsibility for the wellbeing of the world as eschatological beings, rooted in the certainty of the hope Gods kingdom to being realized.

Here reconciliation becomes a fundamental ground of Christian moral acting. What already in faith is a reality is realized by working on reconciliation. The reconciliation of future and world by death and resurrection of Christ becomes necessary condition for the possibility of Christian moral acting reaching out to humanity as a whole and the totality of creation. In this rereading Dantine is approaching the way catholic theology is giving base to moral responsibility of Christians for the world summarized in *Gaudium et spes* of the Second Vatican Council.³ As sacrament of the world the Church’s self-understanding intrinsically is

¹ S. Wilhelm Dantine, *Versöhnung. Ein Grundmotiv christlichen Glaubens und Handelns*, Gütersloh 1978.

² “So hat die Urgemeinde die Versetzung Jesu in den ‘Stand der Erhöhung’ durch Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt als eine göttliche Solidaritätshandlung mit diesem Menschen und mit diesem Weg gelebter Versöhnung durch diesen Menschen Jesus primär gedeutet und verstanden. Das heisst mit anderen Worten, dass für die Urgemeinde in allererster Linie der Glaube an die Auferstehung und an die Himmelfahrt Jesu den Sinn gehabt hat, dass Gott sich bestätigend mit diesen Menschen solidarisiert, der sich seinerzeit mit den Unversöhnten der Gesellschaft versöhnt hat.” Ibid. 75.

³ For Catholic approaches: Gerhard Bauer, *Christliche Hoffnung und menschlicher Fortschritt*, Mainz 1976, 180-188.

bound to the wellbeing of the world. Involving in the world's secular needs the Church is realizing her work of sanctification of the world. And the lack of wellbeing of the world is mainly her being divided in herself. The lack of unity and harmony in an ongoing process of conflicts makes reconciliation the main issue of salvation of the world. It is this history of conflicts to be converted into a history of salvation by way of the ethical work of reconciliation. That doesn't mean however that the immanent future of this world culminates in the reconciliation as content of the Kingdom of God. While the eschatological destiny of humanity, the universal peace, cannot be completed without the active contribution to a reconciled world of the free human response to God's offering the reconciliation, a reconciled world by human effort is not identical to the eschatological fulfilment of the history of salvation.⁴ God's Kingdom of peace and reconciliation remains an eschatological reality offered by God by way of the death and resurrection of Christ, while the future of a reconciled world is fruit of the human effort inspired by the grace given by the risen and sending Christ, which can be called a pneumatological gift. Which is given for certain in faith has to be obtained by active contributing to world immanent reconciliation in hope⁵.

(2) Specific contribution to an ethic of reconciliation

The specific contribution of Christian theology lies in lining out the way in which Christians should carry out this so called ministry of reconciliation. This expression found in 2 Corinthians 5,18 cannot be limited to the ministers of the church but means the task of witnessing to reconciliation entrusted by the risen Christ to every member of the church. Pope John Paul II in this regards talks about the fourfold reconciliation: with God, with one himself, with neighbor and with the whole of creation. "The originality of this proclamation", he says, "is in the fact that for the church reconciliation is closely linked with conversion of heart: This is the necessary path to understanding among human beings."⁶ Conversion of heart is a religious expression for a specific aspect of reconciliation that is not covered by the other notion that is related to reconciliation: justice. Reconciliation and justice both deal with the good and the evil. But while justice is part of a legal system that objectively claims what is good to be done or evil to be condemned at any time, reconciliation supposes an inner consent in reciprocity and at a time one is ready for it. Without this inner consent at appropriate time there can't be reconciliation. Moreover: the evil in question is like a tissue that spins between people and suffocates them. Reconciliation is a work of unbundling from within.⁷ The biblical parable of the prodigal son (Luke 15, 11-32) shows how reconciliation first of all is a gift of God who is always willing to forgive waiting patiently for the appropriate time a human person is ready for the conversion of heart. As long as a person lives his independency, exploiting the creation for his own sake he will not be open to the love of God, who created him in his likeness, entrusting him all the creation to take care for it as shows the decision of the younger son. Moreover he will abhor himself and consider himself worthless the moment he comes to realize his loneliness. As long as one prevents himself to be touched by the infinite mercifulness of God towards his unjust brother he will stick to his selfishness,

⁴ "Die Christen können ihre Hoffnung auf den endgültigen Frieden und die Versöhnung aller vor Gott, vor den anderen Menschen und vor sich selbst nur verantworten und verständlich machen, wenn sie sich jetzt für eine Vorwegverwirklichung nach dem Masse des Möglichen einsetzen, denn das erhoffte Heil ist schon seit Christus in der Welt und will durch die Christen seinen Ausdruck, seine Wirksamkeit finden. Deswegen "darf die Erwartung der neuen Erde die Sorge für die Umgestaltung dieser Erde nicht abschwächen, auf der uns der wachsende Leib der neuen Menschenfamilie eine umrisshaftige Vorstellung von der zukünftigen Welt geben kann, sondern muss die im Gegenteil ermutigen." ", Ferdinand Kerstiens, die Hoffungsstruktur des Glaubens, Mainz 1969, 207, with reference to Gaudium et spes, no. 39.

⁵ S. from the point of view of hope: Benedict XVI, Spe salvi, nos. 35-36.

⁶ John Paul II, Reconciliatio et paenitentia, no. 8.

⁷ S. Gerard Visser, Verzoening. Een zaak van verwerking of van zuivering?, in: Edith Brugmans (red.) e.a., Rechtvaardigheid en verzoening, n.p. 2000, 90.

arrogance or jealousy which divides people among themselves, as shows the attitude of the older son.⁸ It is this what the religious notion of sin means: as long as a human person is not reconciled with God by conversion of heart he will not be reconciled with himself, the neighbor and the creation. On the other hand: only by living in peace with himself, the fellow human person and the creation he seriously shows himself open to God's merciful gift of reconciliation.⁹

The ministry of reconciliation is the core business of a reconciling church but this ministry starts with being herself reconciled. As part of the world Christians also deal in the history of conflicts and need themselves to get reconciled as a community of believers. As sacrament of reconciliation for the world the church needs to become herself first a reconciled reality. Generally this need is expressed in matters of faith in which different views cause tensions and sometimes divisions between Christians. But, as *Gaudium et spes* stresses, the Church as community share all conflicts in human interaction and in caring for creation as people do in daily life. Especially here the contribution to an ethic of reconciliation should become clear. How Christians deal with armed conflict between Christian nations as there are the Russians and the Ukrainians in this very moment of our history? How Christians estimate the growing gap between the poor masses and the rich few in the Catholic Philippines? How Christians cope with the threatening of the natural environment of Christianized indigenous people in the Amazon by Christians working in the mining? And how church authorities deal with abuse of power against those who are dependent of pastoral care? In all these conflicts Christians have to be reconciled among each other, and how do they do? Can they by resolving such conflicts become useful instruments of reconciliation elsewhere in this world of conflicts, and thus sacrament of unity?

(3) Implementation: reconciliation in matters of sexual abuse

One of the most widespread issues on the field of reconciliation is nowadays the question of sexual abuse in unequal relationships. This question appears on various fields of interaction in society, in sports associations, media companies, political movements, cultural organizations, leisure accommodations, in the workplace and so on up to educational centers such as schools and within families. But never we will forget how this became a huge media issue: it was the sexual abuse of minors by clergy and religious in the Roman Catholic Church that shocked the modern world. This reaction not only has been due to the fact in itself, the scandal of sexual abuse, but for the most part that it happened in such a large scale by the clergy and religious which authority is based on personal trust in their ministry. If a conflict of violence between human persons was deeply wounding the self-respect of human persons, it happened in these cases. How the Church found a way towards reconciliation between perpetrator and victim and how this way opens perspectives for analogous situations?

Looking at the facts the Church authorities originally caring for the prestige of her ministers tried to hide away these shameful events by keeping silent about it. Massive criticism in the media caused this attitude to turn around in favor of the victim up to an attitude of zero tolerance with harsh juridical consequences for the perpetrator. Such is the reform of the Catholic Church' canon criminal law, initiated by John Paul II, continued by Benedict XVI and completed by Francis.¹⁰ As to the purpose of reconciliation however on the highest level of measuring nothing has been organized unless the already given reconciliation with God in the

⁸ Cfr. *Reconciliatio et paenitentia*, nos. 5 and 6.

⁹ For the notion of sin in this context: "However disturbing these divisions may seem at first sight, it is only by a careful examination that one can detect their root: It is to be found in a wound in man's inmost self. In the light of faith we call it sin: beginning with original sin, which all of us bear from birth as an inheritance from our first parents, to the sin which each one of us commits when we abuse our own freedom." *Reconciliatio et paenitentia*, no. 2.

¹⁰ Cfr. Francis, *Apostolic Constitution Pascite gregem Dei Reforming Book VI of the Code of Canon Law*, 23 May 2021.

sacramental area of penance and forgiveness. For reconciliation between perpetrator and victim we depend on measures taken by the various national bishop's conferences in the world. Such measures are found for example in the report of the Dutch Bishop's Conference and the Conference of the Heads of religious orders and congregations on 23 October 2015¹¹. This 54 page report giving a survey on 5 years working with a new procedure only touches this issue but in a significant way. Both the Bishops and the Superiors of the Religious Orders report about meetings with victims which have been very helpful in feeling themselves taken seriously. But there are significant differences in these reports. While the Bishops talk about meetings with victims and representatives of the dioceses the report of the religious orders shows that beside their representatives there also have been dialogues with the accused. As a result the meetings with diocesan representatives in general helped victims to handle what has happened to them without talking about reconciliation¹². In case of victims of accused belonging to religious orders the report talks directly about reconciliation as purpose of mediation – reconciliation with the accused perpetrator or with the religious order which often victims used to be member of¹³. Unfortunately the reports don't specify the way in which this process of handling or reconciliation took place, but it is clear that the word reconciliation in this context primarily concerns the relation between victim and perpetrator and secondarily the institute (diocese or religious order) which perpetrator and sometimes victim belonged to. The fact that most accused already passed away since the event took place many years before reconciliation in this primarily sense cannot any more be the case unless by way of their representatives. Generally diocesan officials and superiors of religious orders representing the institute only can ask for forgiveness in a derivative sense. That seems to be the reason why the Bishop's report mentions the word regret instead of plead guilty or apologize. The real institutional guilt however has been the protection of the accused/perpetrator and the lack of of the plaintiff/victim by the church authorities.

In this approach two facts are relevant for evaluating its value for reconciliation. First of all the cancellation of the statute of limitations of cases of sexual abuse of minors. This has been one of the first measures taken by the Catholic Church in reforming the criminal law. Cases of sexual abuse of minors do not expire. This matches to the insight that reconciliation as has been said needs an appropriate time. In juridical sense the passing away of plaintiff and/or accused ends the case, but not the moral need of reconciliation. The second fact is the acknowledged responsibility of the institute as contextual factor of sexual abuse. This acknowledgement appears where the institute by protecting the accused is guilty of neglecting her obligation towards plaintiff and is regretting it. Where the accused or even the perpetrator isn't able anymore to plead guilty, the institute by her officials sign guilty by substitution. In terms of sin neglection or substitution can't be sin in the proper sense of personal sin but only

¹¹ Nederlandse bisschoppenconferentie en Konferentie Nederlandse Religieuzen, Preventie van seksueel misbruik en grensoverschrijdend gedrag binnen de Rooms-Katholieke Kerk en aanpak herstel, erkenning en genoegdoening 2010-2015, september 2015.

¹² "De algemene indruk is dat de zittingen van de Klachtencommissie, hoewel emotioneel erg belastend voor de slachtoffers, een positieve bijdrage leveren in het verwerkingsproces van de slachtoffers. Waar een bisschop aanwezig was bij de zittingen, gaven meerdere slachtoffers na afloop aan dat ze in eerste instantie opzagen tegen zijn aanwezigheid. Die werd echter alsmede spijtbetuinging ('Dit doet me heel veel goed,' aldus een slachtoffer) bleken vaak belangrijker dan de mogelijkheid van een financiële compensatie." Ibid. 25.

¹³ "Een achttal religieuze instituten geeft aan tegen de 200 klachten behandeld te hebben in een mediationprocedure van het drieluik herstellbemiddeling (...). In het algemeen zijn de oversten bijzonder tevreden over deze procedure. In een eerste oriënterende fase worden de klacht, de feiten en de contouren van het mediationtraject vastgesteld, in een tweede luik (het hart van de mediation) worden aangeklaagde en klager met elkaar in gesprek gebracht om erkenning, herstel en verzoening te bewerkstelligen. Deze fase wordt afgesloten met een vaststellingsovereenkomst die grondslag is voor de derde fase, de arbitrage, waarin een compensatiebedrag wordt vastgesteld. In het mediationtraject wordt niet aan waarheidsvinding gedaan. (...) Wanneer de aangeklaagde is overleden en de overste diens plaats inneemt, is vaak niet duidelijk waar de mediation in de zin van verzoeningsbemiddeling op gericht is: op verzoening met het instituut of verzoening met de daad van de overledene." Ibid. 30.

as social sin in a derivative sense.¹⁴ That doesn't mean that reconciliation with the institute has no value. If the evil in the case of sexual abuse invades all kinds of relations like a tissue reconciliation can't stop with the mere relation of victim and perpetrator even if this is the core relation in the sense of personal responsibility and therefore personal sin. It pervades also the institutes that made possible this transboundary behavior of members including violence suffered by victims that made them perpetrators at their turn. This the complex reality of what is called the social sin in theological terms. Here the commitment for reconciliation even exceeds the juridical and existential framework defined by still living and conscious subjects of this history of conflict. How a victim can reconcile him or herself if there is no one responsible for the wounds inflicted left? Here reconciliation remains an eschatological reality that allow the unfulfillable attempt to work on it. The reconciliation of victim or perpetrator with God is the only certain ground for the meaningfulness of reconciling with the other in this conflict, who can't respond anymore, and with the social network of relations involved.

(4) Results for working on the field of reconciliation

What does this practical example on a sensitive field of conflicts between Christians contribute to ethics on the vast field of reconciliation? Four lines can be drawn.

Firstly: Reconciliation transcend by far any commitment within the legal field of justice. Reconciliation only can take place by the inner consent of both parties which implies a conversion of the heart as theological notion. It will take time until the victim comes to put his or her claim and the perpetrator recognize the truth of it. Far beyond any gesture of material reparation it needs this moment of inner consent and remorse to find peace within this wounded relation. That counts for all kind of damaged relationships between individuals as well as social groups. That's why still nowadays countries like Poland and South-Corea still claim Second World War reparations from Germany and Japan. Obviously the conversion of the heart has not been completed within the still ongoing process of reconciliation.

Secondly: Reconciliation is part of a history of conflicts rooted in a complex structure of conflicts that makes victims to become perpetrators. Here the theological notion of original sin matches with the social interconnectedness of various processes, reaching back into history. It takes time to deepen the real conflict that needs reconciliation. This seems to happen still within the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians: Those who once have been persecuted up to the holocaust nowadays tend to use violence to expel fellow countrymen.

Thirdly: Reconciliation only can be meaningful if considered a reality that never can be reached unless it is understood and accepted as an eschatological reality. The simple reason is the fact that in many situations the subjects in a conflict don't survive. Furthermore the historical complexity of a conflict is often that way that one never come to work it through. If the desire to reconcile the history of conflicts is essential for the future of humanity and the world we need the certainty of the fulfilment that only can be given from beyond human possibilities. If there is not such a hope, every commitment to reconciliation is meaningless.

On the fourth place: Reconciliation is needed only as far as it opens new perspectives for conflictual relationships. That is what the eschatological approach makes possible. The

¹⁴ "Whenever the church speaks of situations of sin or when she condemns as social sins certain situations or the collective behavior of certain social groups, big or small, or even of whole nations and blocs of nations, she knows and she proclaims that such cases of social sin are the result of the accumulation and concentration of many personal sins. It is a case of the very personal sins of those who cause or support evil or who exploit it; of those who are in a position to avoid, eliminate or at least limit certain social evils but who fail to do so out of laziness, fear or the conspiracy of silence, through secret complicity or indifference; of those who take refuge in the supposed impossibility of changing the world and also of those who sidestep the effort and sacrifice required, producing specious reasons of higher order. The real responsibility, then, lies with individuals." *Reconciliatio et paenitentia*, no. 16.

limitation to just the point to understand each other and be willing to settle from the heart can be enough to find a new base of mutual trust and change the antagonism into a cooperation what happened in the European Union. And even if the victim or the perpetrator isn't there anymore to be reconciled from the theological point of view the prayer for the sake of the missing subject can be enough to leave the painful situation in peace and to be committed to a world without conflicts ¹⁵.

Bibliography

Bauer, Gerhard, *Christliche Hoffnung und menschlicher Fortschritt*, Mainz 1976

Benedict XVI, *Encyclical Letter Spe salvi*, 30 November 2007

Dantine, Wilhelm, *Versöhnung. Ein Grundmotiv christlichen Glaubens und Handelns*, Gütersloh 1978

Francis, *Apostolic Constitution Pascite gregem Dei Reforming Book VI of the Code of Canon Law*, 23 May 2021

John Paul II, *Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation Reconciliatio et paenitentia*, 2 December 1984

Kerstiens, Ferdinand, *Die Hoffnungsstruktur des Glaubens*, Mainz 1969

Nederlandse bisschoppenconferentie en Konferentie Nederlandse Religieuzen, *Rapportage Preventie van seksueel misbruik en grensoverschrijdend gedrag binnen de Rooms-Katholieke Kerk en aanpak herstel, erkenning en genoegdoening 2010-2015*, n.p. september 2015

Visser, Gerard, *Verzoening. Een zaak van verwerking of van zuivering?* In: Edith Brugman (red.) e.a., *Rechtvaardigheid en verzoening*, n.p. 2000

¹⁵ “Our lives are involved with one another, through innumerable interactions they are linked together. No one lives alone. No one sins alone. No one is saved alone. The lives of others continually spill over into mine: in what I think, say, do and achieve. And conversely, my life spills over into that of others: for better and for worse. So my prayer for another is not something extraneous to that person, something external, not even after death. In the interconnectedness of Being, my gratitude to the other—my prayer for him—can play a small part in his purification. And for that there is no need to convert earthly time into God's time: in the communion of souls simple terrestrial time is superseded. It is never too late to touch the heart of another, nor is it ever in vain. In this way we further clarify an important element of the Christian concept of hope. Our hope is always essentially also hope for others; only thus is it truly hope for me too [.]. As Christians we should never limit ourselves to asking: how can I save myself? We should also ask: what can I do in order that others may be saved and that for them too the star of hope may rise? Then I will have done my utmost for my own personal salvation as well.” *Spe salvi*, no. 48.

Sports as Reconciliation

Matteo Frey, Switzerland

When speaking of values in sport one might initially think about qualities that help in the pursuit of victory in competition, such as ambition, endurance, discipline, self-control, strength in one or another form, etc. But could victory in sports truly be considered a triumph if not achieved with fair play? Hence, also qualities that do not necessarily lead to success, or might even hinder it, like fairness and sportspersonship are considered fundamental values in sports. When taking a look at one of the most significant sport institutions, the Olympic Movement, one finds a definition of three specific values of Olympism: excellence, friendship and respect. ¹ Within them, all the initially listed values can be allocated. Qualities that aim towards victory could be defined as notions attributed to excellence and the values of fairness and sportspersonship find their place within the values of respect and friendship. And yet again, one cannot just draw a clear line between these aspects. But what do aforementioned values of sport have to do with the Ethics of Reconciliation?

In the following paper, I propose that: First, excellence, friendship and respect, ² are fundamental values not only for sport but also for reconciliation; second, as "[t]hey constitute the foundation on which the Olympic Movement builds its activities to promote sport, culture and education with a view to building a better world" ³, that

IOC. Olympic values. International Olympic Committee. 2021. URL: <https://olympics.com/ioc/olympic-values>. (Stand: 15.12.2022) ² "The original values of Olympism as expressed in the Olympic Charter were to 'encourage effort', 'preserve human dignity' and 'develop harmony'"(ibid.)

³ IOC, Olympic values. in peace, being understood as the ideal state of this better world, ⁴ the Olympic Sports and reconciliation share a common greater good; and third, that reconciliation is at the very heart of Pierre de Coubertin's ⁵ idea of what sport can teach humanity, which transcends in one of his last public speeches:

"[...] Men are not angels, and I do not believe that humanity would profit from having most men become angels. But the truly strong man is one whose will is powerful enough to make himself and his group stop pursuing its desire or passion for domination and possession, regardless of how legitimate such pursuits may be. [...]" ⁶

Coubertin's call that humans might "stop pursuing [their] desires or passions for domination and possession, regardless of how legitimate such pursuits may be", addresses a virtuous approach to Philpott's suggestion of "six practices that give reconciliation political expression: building just institutions, acknowledgement, reparations, accountability, apology, and forgiveness". ⁷ Philpott's definition of reconciliation in peacebuilding considers the virtue of mercy ⁸ central to reconciliation. The suggested parallels between the Olympic Sports and

see Olympic Charter, Fundamental Principles Art. 2, 4, 6; Composition and general organisation of the Olympic Movement Art. 1; Mission and role of the IOC Art. 1, 4, 6, 8, 11; etc. in IOC. Olympic Charter. International Olympic Committee. 2021 ⁵ Founding Father of the Olympic Movement ⁶ English translation by Georg Hirthler in: Coubertin Quote for May, 01. 2022), original in French in by Pierre de Coubertin, in: Les Assises philosophiques de l'Olympisme moderne: Message radiodifusé de Berlin le 4 août 1935. Genève: Le Sport

Suisse, 1935 7 Daniel Philpott. “Reconciliation: An Ethic for Peacebuilding”. In: *Strategies of Peace*. Ed. by John Paul Lederach and Appleby R. Scott. Oxford Academic. *Studies in Strategic Peacebuilding*. New York, 2010. Chap. 4, pp. 91–118, p. 93.

8 Ibid, p. 92. Reconciliation will at the least suggest that values are fundamental to Reconciliation that can be promoted and taught as virtues through the exercise of sport. Hence, sport would be considered a school of reconciliation. As in the Olympic spirit, every game well played and every competition well performed becomes in its ideal a very act of reconciliation.

Bibliography

Coubertin, Pierre de. *Les Assises philosophiques de l’Olympisme moderne*:

Message radiodifusé de Berlin le 4 août 1935. Genève: Le Sport Suisse, 1935.

Hirthler, Georg. Coubertin Quote for May, 01. 2022.

IOC. Olympic Charter. International Olympic Committee. 2021.

IOC. Olympic values. International Olympic Committee. 2021. url:

<https://olympics.com/ioc/olympic-values>. (Stand: 15.12.2022).

Philpott, Daniel. “Reconciliation: An Ethic for Peacebuilding”. In: *Strategies of Peace*. Ed. by John Paul Lederach and Appleby R. Scott. Oxford Academic. *Studies in Strategic Peacebuilding*. New York, 2010. Chap. 4, pp. 91–118.

Limitations of reconciliation – the problem of the superiority of forgiveness and the significance of having a choice

Dr. Ulrica Fritzon, Sweden

In most conversations about reconciliation, forgiveness is included either as the final step in the process or as a step that enables liberation and new life opportunities, usually for both parties. It's not strange with that. Forgiveness holds great potential for both healing and reconciliation. However, when forgiveness is used as a condition for concluding the reconciling process, it risks, on the one hand, being trivialized and, on the other, creating limitations to victims' opportunities for existence and liberation. It also limits the reconciliation process to either end with forgiveness or not end at all, or even being destroyed or inadequate.

The problem of the superiority of forgiveness in reconciliation processes

It is not uncommon for forgiveness to be highlighted as the final and conciliatory step in a reconciliation process and thus serve as proof that the process has been completed (Tutu, 1999, Johnsen, 2017). The steps preceding the reconciling end form a conditional structure for the forgiveness that can then be issued if these steps are carried out (Griswold, 2007). In this way forgiveness depends on whether the steps are carried out and thus become, as the American philosopher Martha C. Nussbaum puts it, transactional. In her book *Anger and Forgiveness. Resentment, Generosity, Justice* (2016), she questions this almost unchallenged capacity of forgiveness in the context of reconciliation and justice.

When forgiveness is used as a requirement for victims and as the only alternative for reconciliation, it also risks losing its unique capacity, simply, when forgiveness is either used as a condition of reconciliation or as a transaction. The French philosopher Jacques Derrida believes that forgiveness can only retain its uniqueness and capacity if it is preserved unconditionally and unlimitedly. "If one is only prepared to forgive what is forgivable...//then the very idea of forgiveness would disappear." (Derrida, 2001)

So, what are we actually doing when we condition forgiveness as the final step in a reconciliation process? These are important questions for example in the ongoing reconciling process between the Sami community and the Church of Sweden (2017). What will be the meaning of forgiving if there is no alternative but to either forgive or risk destroying the reconciliation process? I will argue that when we condition forgiveness as the final step in a reconciling process, we risk losing the uniqueness of forgiveness as Derrida warns or trivializing it as Nussbaum states when forgiveness is used as a transaction. We also risk placing too great a burden on the shoulders of the victims when forgiveness is made a "receipt" of reconciliation completed. Furthermore, we deprive victims of the existential possibility of transcendence (Cashwell 2023) when they have no means of choice, other than to forgive or destroy a process of reconciliation.

Mercy and the significance of having a choice

The philosopher Karl Jaspers is one of the existential philosophers who emphasizes the importance of choice in what he refers to as boundary situations. From these situations, one must act, and transcend those boundaries (Jaspers, 2003). For Jaspers, the question of existence is not a question of what human existence is, but of how we can live with what is.

Being deprived of the opportunities of choice in these crucial life situations can risk contributing to the loss of existence. The process of dissolution and reconstitution is necessary, as ‘without resolution there would be torpor, without encasement, annihilation’ (Casewell, 2023).

I therefore highlight mercy as an alternative to forgiveness in the reconciliation process. Mercy holds opportunities for respect and inclusion in a way that supports reconciliation (Fischer, 2003). The outcome of mercy is almost the same as forgiveness, (Fazlhashemi, 2012, Kierkegaard 200) except for relating to the act performed. Inserting mercy as an alternative in the reconciliation process means making choice a reality in an existentially challenging life situation. The victims may choose to forgive or to meet the other with mercy without destroying or limiting the reconciliation process.

Bibliography

Casewell, Deborah, Karl Jaspers. *The Forgotten Father of Existentialism*, 2023

Derrida, Jacques, *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*, Routledge, 2001

Fazlhashemi, Mohammed, *Barmhärtighet – respekt för människans person*, i Österberg, Eva, Lindstedt Cronberg, Marie, Stenqvist, Catharina red., *Dygdernas renässans*, Bokförlaget Atlantis 2012.

Fischer, Simon, *Working with Conflict*, Zed Books, 2003

Griswold, Charles, *Forgiveness: A Philosophical Exploration*, Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Jaspers, Karl, *Way to Wisdom. An Introduction to Philosophy*, Yale University Press, 2003.

Johnsen, Tore, *Erkänd historia och förnyade relationer: Perspektiv på försoningsarbetet mellan kyrkan och samerna* i Lindmark, Daniel & Sundmark, Olle m.f. (red.) *Samerna och Svenska kyrkan. Underlag för kyrkligt försoningsarbete*, Gidlunds förlag, 2017

Nussbaum, Martha C., *Anger and Forgiveness. Resentment, Generosity, Justice*, Oxford University Press, 2019

Tutu, Desmond, *Mpilo No future without forgiveness*, 1999.

Memory, History and Reconciliation Three Narratives and Their Capacity to Further Peace

Prof. Ingeborg G. Gabriel, Austria

The well-known dictum of the American philosopher George Santayana “Who does not remember history is doomed to repeat it.” describes a widely held conviction regarding the relationship between reconciliation and historical memory. The paper will question this assumption and design a map of coordinates so as to show the complex relationship between remembrance and reconciliation in dominant Western narratives, presenting three ideal types. In the end this hypothesis will be used for showing how in the legitimization of the war in Ukraine all three are intertwined and have to be taken into account so as to reach peaceful solutions.

First: the Enlightenment narrative is (particularly in the first phased) based on a linear understanding of history as a movement of progress, originally guided by divine providence later becoming secular or secularist. Even if questioned by romanticism and its glorification of national characters, and later fundamentally by Nietzsche as well as by postmodern philosophers, this progressivism inherent to modernity continues to be a potent factor for the self-understanding of Western societies. Marx did not question it, though the realisation of progress in history comes now is subjected to a dialectical process. At present different forms of evolutionism continue on this path, theories of historical decline being the other side of the medal. The relationship of all progressist world views to historical remembrance, guilt and reconciliation is that history being a movement towards the better, the past can be but a demonstration of errors to be corrected. Reconciliation takes place through the process of history itself, but is not an ethical notion and therefore cannot be promoted through human action.

Second: For the nationalist (or culturalist) narrative on the rise the relationship between memory and reconciliation takes forms directly opposed to the dictum of Santayana. They do not aim at reconciliation, but at revenge. This narrative is in diverse forms culturally widespread and can be found in biblical texts, e. g. of the psalms, as well as secular writings. At present, nationalisms stress the principle of revenge which is one of the most frightening aspects of present European (and indeed world) politics. As Ernest Renan already showed in his famous lecture of 1882 historical memory (and fictive kin relations) here serve as a tool to further political and military ends. The essay of the president of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin (August 2020) may be taken as a current example. The historical constructions may be more or less farfetched. They aim to legitimize imperial claims stressing the victimhood of one’s own people. Any form of reconciliation is rejected because, the wrongs committed cannot be undone by any “anamnetic justice”.

These narratives show that a positive relationship between memory and reconciliation has ethical preconditions in a certain view of history. In the European context it is prominently held by biblical ethics, particularly of the Second Testament: It is here and only here that history must be remembered so as to come to reconciliation, e. g. together in a concilium. Though often narrowed down, this biblical message constitutes according to Hannah Arendt a Christian proprium, which as Jacques Derrida has shown, however remains open for universalization and integration into other cultural and religious contexts. The prayers for reconciliation and forgiveness for past evils of Pope John Paul II (2000) are an application. During the past decades a global promotion of the notion of reconciliation in politics has

taken place. This development is ebbing because of a surge of identity and nationalist politics not aiming at reconciliation but stressing the need for revenge of evils committed by the Other. This shows the political importance of the concept of reconciliation. In a last part I will therefore apply the three narratives as ideal types to the conflict between Russia and Ukraine.

Bibliography:

Arendt, Hannah: *Vita activa oder vom tätigen Leben*, Piper: München 4. Aufl. 1985

Assmann, Aleida: *Der europäische Traum. Vier Lehren aus der Geschichte* (München 2018)

Gabriel, Ingeborg: *Ethik des Politischen. Grundlagen – Prinzipien – Konkretionen* (Würzburg 2021), 98-112; 188-201.

Gerl-Falkovitz, Hanna Barbara: *Verzeihung des Unverzeihlichen. Ausflüge in die Landschaften der Schuld und der Vergebung* (Dresden 2013)

Moses, Stephane: *L'Ange de l'Histoire* (Paris 1992).

Ricoeur, Paul: *Gedächtnis, Geschichte, Vergessen* (München 2004).

Transit. *Europäische Revue: Das Gedächtnis des Jahrhunderts* (Winter 2001/2002).

Ingeborg G. Gabriel, i.gabriel@univie.ac.at, professor emerita, Institute of Systematic Theology and Ethics, University of Vienna, Schenkenstrasse 8-10, 1010 Wien, private address: Steinbüchlweg 1/17, 1190 Wien.

“Dealing with the past beneficiaries and responsibility in the reconciliation process between Church of Sweden and the Sami people”

Dr. Johanna Gustafsson Lundberg

In October 2022 the second step in the reconciliation process between the Church of Sweden and the Sami community was taken. This complex and sometimes vulnerable process displays the importance of long term commitment when trying to repair relations that were violated in the past. An important aspect of the reconciliation process relates to responsibility and guilt: of who should be held accountable and for how long. In the reconciliation process with the Sami people these questions involve processes of decolonialization. The violations, unjust decisions, and actions committed in the past, which still have consequences now, call for closer analysis about extended moral responsibility over time. This is particularly so in relation to the beneficiaries of past injustices—those who today benefit from what happened in the past but who were not part of the original violations. An insight connected to reparative justice and reconciliation processes is the challenge for the beneficiaries to realize/recognize not only their privileged position but also their embeddedness in a colonial heritage which still influences their mindset. Norwegian theologian Tore Johnsen claims that this is one of the biggest challenges to the Nordic churches in their reconciliation processes with the Sami people. According to Johnsen, the idea of being a colonizer is not part of the self image of the Nordic countries whose national identities rest predominantly on success stories of having built up some of the most developed welfare states in the world (Johnsen 2017 and 2022).

Against this background, the aim of this paper is to analyze parts of the reconciliation process between Church of Sweden and the Sami community with specific attention to the position of the beneficiaries. Gaining from the insights made in the field of restorative and reparative justice (Collste 2018, Fritzon 2017, Eriksson 2001), this paper investigates the position of the beneficiaries with a particular focus on a) the meaning of decolonialization and b) the meaning of an extended moral responsibility.

South African psychologist and former commissioner in the truth and reconciliation process, Pumla Gobodo-Madikizela argues that just as a position of being vulnerable can be inherited, so can a position of a beneficiary. The position of beneficiary involves a person who benefits from what happened in the past but who is not guilty of having actually acted and, as a result, cannot be held personally accountable. According to Gobodo-Madikizela, it is not enough to recognize the guilt generated through the behaviour and actions of previous generations. We must also recognize and take responsibility for the consequences of these historical actions “to break the cycles of transgenerational repetition” (Gobodo-Madikizela). To do this GobodoMadikizela means that we need to achieve 1. a revision of the past i.e. narrate the past in new and conscious ways in which the positions of beneficiaries are deconstructed. Acknowledging that you are a beneficiary is part of such a revision 2. actively making amends for the historical violations. Thus, an important point is that you need to “remember it in order to transcend it”. In this sense the act of remembering conditions the possibilities of transcendence i.e. the possibility of transformative processes to emerge (Gobodo-Madikizela 2009). The Swedish former bishop Karl-Johan Tyrberg expressed this ambition of creating new transformative narratives in a proposition to the national church meeting of The Church of Sweden in year 2000: "Through a joint search for truth, new history is created with healing and reparation and a contribution to common faith in the future".

In ethics there are several approaches to responsibility ethics and history, not the least in the field of restorative justice. British philosopher Saul Smiliansky argues that we have moral duties to history. He states that in addition to those obligations we currently recognize in response to the present and the future, there also exist special obligations in response to the past. Accordingly, this means that our lives ought to be guided, in part, not only by our obligations to the living but by our duties to history (Smiliansky 2020). A similar but still a different argument can be found in the foundations of the democratic mission in Nordic educational settings. Post-war insights made some democratic core values universal and a compulsory part of the school curricula. In both examples ethical responsibility is based on historical experiences, relations and knowledge. In this paper I look more closely at the specific power aspects connected to the positions of the beneficiaries of colonial heritage. How can an equivalent to the concept of living reconciliation (Gobodo-Madikizela 2009) – a concept of living responsibility – be developed with the help of theories on moral responsibility and the concept of decolonization (Collste 2018)?

References

- Collste, Göran, *Historisk rättvisa: gottgörelse i en postkolonial tid*. (2018) Daidalos:Göteborg
- Eriksson, Maria *Reconciliation and the Search for a shared Moral Landscape – An exploration based upon a study of Northern Ireland and South Africa*. (2001)
- Fritzon, Ulrica, *Jag kunde åtminstone berätta hur jag dödade henne. Om transformerande och försonande möjligheter för en skyldig människa*. (2017)
- Gobodo-Madikizela, Pumla with van der Merwe, Chris (eds.) *Memory, Narrative and Forgiveness: Perspectives on the Unfinished Journeys of the Past* (2009)
- Jonhnsen, Tore, *Sámi Nature-centered Christianity in the European Arctic. Indigenous Hierarchical Worldmaking*. (2022) Lexington Books:Lanham
- Johnsen, Tore, *Erkänd historia och förnyade relationer: Perspektiv på försoningsarbetet mellan kyrkan och samerna i Lindmark, Daniel & Sundmark, Olle m.f. (red.) Samerna och Svenska kyrkan. Underlag för kyrkligt försoningsarbete*, Gidlunds förlag, 2017
- Smiliansky, Saul “The Idea of Moral Duties to History”, in: *Philosophy* ,

Reconciliation for Foxes: Between Conflict, Pluralism and Compromise *Dr. Frank Handelman, Switzerland*

There is a memorable line by ancient Greek poet Archilochus: ‘The fox knows many things, but the hedgehog knows one big thing.’ Drawing on this metaphor made popular by Isaiah Berlin (Berlin, 1953/1998), this paper sets out to ‘think like a fox’ about reconciliation and its place in transitional justice processes. In developing its argument, the paper takes issue with and criticizes what it refers to as ‘monistic’ conceptions of reconciliation – conceptions driven by the assumption that all conflicts (of values and interests) are only apparent and can be resolved, ironed out, by appeal to a coherent moral system. On this view, symbolised by the ‘hedgehog’, reconciliation holds the promise of harmonious unity and final settlement of conflict.

The ‘fox-like’ account of reconciliation defended here stands in stark contrast to this sort of monism. At its heart is the idea of value pluralism – the thought that human values are irreducibly plural, potentially conflicting and sometimes ‘incommensurable’ such that there is no common measure in terms of which they can be compared and ranked (Berlin 1988/1998). On this pluralist view, there is no neat formula for resolving all conflicts, nor can these conflicts be translated into the terms of some overarching system. The ‘fox’ leaves us with hard, perhaps tragic, choices to make. Thus, far from suggesting happy and harmonious unity, reconciliation for foxes places the inevitability of conflict and the need for compromise and negotiation at the centre of thinking about, reimagining and practicing reconciliation in transitional justice processes.

Reconciliation, so understood, aims at the incorporation (not elimination!) of tensions – between beliefs, values, interpretations of events – that inevitably arise in times of transition. In arguing for such a pluralistic notion of reconciliation, the paper draws on and engages with a number of attempts in the literature to incorporate tensions and disagreement in our thinking about reconciliation – including Susan Dwyer’s idea of ‘narrative incorporation’ (Dwyer, 2003, 88) and Catherine Lu’s notion of ‘structural reconciliation’ (Lu, 2017, 183). Another important reference point for the paper’s argument is Jean Améry’s reflections on post-Nazi Germany. While categorically ruling out any reconciliation with the past, Améry could imagine a kind of reconciliation with the German people based on the acceptance of historical collective responsibility and the willingness to integrate, rather than neutralize, the victims’ resentments as constant reminders of ‘Auschwitz’ as an indelible part of Germany’s national history (Améry, 1980, 77–78; see also Brudholm, 2008).

Inspired by Améry’s thinking, the proposed paper maintains deep scepticism about the widespread use of a therapeutic language of ‘healing’ that dismisses negative emotions as mere pathologies to be cured and celebrates a conflict-denying form of social harmony as the greatest good. Rejecting what has been referred to as ‘boosterism of uncritical forgiveness’ (Murphy, 2008), this paper argues for a complex (never smooth, never complacent) notion of political reconciliation that takes as its task to genuinely engage with and speak to dissonant, unforgiving voices, rather than silence or suppress or diminish or disqualify them. This is a daunting, open-ended task. Engaging in genuine communication with rightfully angry, unreconciled voices is not a comfortable exercise, but it is an essential one for a lively pluralist practice of reconciliation.

Pluralist reconciliation, as here conceived, is as an inherently political practice. An important part of this practice involves, I argue, clearing space for a politics of compromise (see Rostbøll, and Scavenius, 2018). In a field strongly shaped by the human rights cause, there is an understandable distrust of compromising ‘deals’ that may betray the cause and those on the receiving end of human rights abuse. But more often than we would like to admit compromise is the only viable alternative to continuing war and oppression, and hence a precondition of the very possibility of reconciliation.

However, while stressing the crucial role of compromise in enabling a process of reconciliation, the paper insists that political compromise is a deeply ambivalent practice, thoroughly entangled with the question of limits. Rather than closing off the debate once and for all, a truly pluralist politics of compromise must enable an ongoing social conversation about the limits of compromises reached. Compromise, on this view, is always momentary, never final, and is part of an ongoing negotiation about who and what ‘we’, as a society, are and aspire to be. And this opens the way for reconciliation as a dynamic, open-ended and revisable political project rather than a final, conflict-transcending form of unity (see also Bell, 2017).

References

Améry, Jean (1980), *At the Mind’s Limits: Contemplations by a Survivor on Auschwitz and its Realities*, Sidney Rosenfeld and Stella P. Rosenfeld (trans.) (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

Bell, Christine (2017), ‘Contending with the Past: Transitional Justice and Political Settlement Processes’ in Roger Duthie and Paul Seils (eds.), *Justice Mosaics: How Context Shapes Transitional Justice in Fractured Societies* (New York: International Center for Transitional Justice) 84–119.

Berlin, Isaiah (1953/1998) ‘The Hedgehog and the Fox: An Essay on Tolstoy’s View of History’ in Henry Hardy and Roger Hausheer (eds.), *The Proper Study of Mankind: An Anthology of Essays* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux) 436–498.

Berlin, Isaiah (1988/1998) ‘The Pursuit of the Ideal’ in Henry Hardy and Roger Hausheer (eds.), *The Proper Study of Mankind: An Anthology of Essays* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux) 1–16. Brudholm Thomas (2008), *Resentment’s Virtue: Jean Améry and the Refusal to Forgive* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press).

Dwyer, Susan (2003) ‘Reconciliation for Realists’ in Carol A. L. Prager and Trudy Govier (eds.), *Dilemmas of Reconciliation: Cases and Concepts* (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfried Laurier University Press) 91–110.

Lu, Catherine (2017) *Justice and Reconciliation in World Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Murphy, Jeffrie (2008), ‘Foreword’ in Thomas Brudholm, *Resentment’s Virtue: Jean Améry and the Refusal to Forgive* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press).

Rostbøll, Christian F., and Scavenius, Theresa (2018) *Compromise and Disagreement in Contemporary Political Theory* (New York: Routledge).

Adaptiveness and evaluative standpoints: A shared human nature as a resource for reconciliation.

Emma Jakobsson, Sweden

This paper seeks to present and critically discuss Sharon Street's concern for moral agency that puts our ability to evaluate as the core concern for a shared human nature. It seeks to critically engage in a discussion about whether or not we can talk about a shared human nature as the basis for moral matters when it is founded upon the idea that we are adaptive. This paper also seeks to critically discuss to what extent we can find some resources for the conceptual analysis of reconciliation from the idea of a shared human nature.

Street holds that that we can, to some extent, account for what we can call the "evaluative standpoint of every living creature".¹ That is, no matter the contingent nature of how we came into existence, we do share some trait or feature that constitute us into human beings. This means that the evaluative standpoint of any person holds that the person occupying that standpoint is aware of the fact that things are valuable. That person, considers, at a minimal level, at least something to be good or bad, worthy or worthless. It is a person who judges, who feels a need to provide reasons for their beliefs.²

The awareness of the fact that I can judge and find, at a minimal level, something to be valuable seem to correlate with the ability to be adaptive.³ Street holds that "[...] we face an ineliminable gap between how things are and how we would like them to be. Is there a way to live in full awareness of this fact without falling into anxiety or depression, or resorting to one form or another of forgetfulness, denial or numbing out?".⁴ How does the ability to be adaptive correlate with a person who strive to live in full awareness? If the contingent evaluative standpoint holds, which it seems, that the common feature we all share is the ability to be adaptive, then the "awareness" of things being valuable to us can be the basis for a shared human nature.

Thus, if we experience, this gap between how things are and how we want them to be, the normative force that this adaptiveness seems to hold is to avoid feeling pain, loss, anxiety. Any feeling that would be emotionally distressful for us. The question we want to ask then is how this can be a resource for how we ought to understand the concept of reconciliation? It can be resourceful in the sense that since we are adaptive we want to avoid the things that are in anyway

Street, A. Sharon: "What is Constructivism in Ethics and Metaethics": in, *Philosophy Compass*, 5(5), pp. 363-384, 2010: p. 366. ² Street: "What is Constructivism in Ethics and Metaethics": p. 366. ³ Street, Sharon: "A Darwinian Dilemma for Realist Theories of Value", in, *Philosophical Studies*, pp. 109-166. (127), 2006: p. 141. ⁴ Street, Sharon: "Constructivism in Ethics and The Problem of Attachment and Loss", in, *The Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volume XC*, pp. 161-187, 2016: p.163.

¹(2) painful to us. The space for a conceptual analysis of reconciliation then becomes apparent with what Street initially refers to as "the maximally thin point of view of the "one who is aware". If we are this person then there is no difference between the "self" and the "other". This is phrased by Street as the fact that "[...] "I" am everywhere, in "you" as much as "me".⁵

References

Street, A. Sharon: *Evolution and the Nature of Reasons*, ProQuest information and Learning Company, Ann Arbor 2004.

Street, Sharon: "A Darwinian Dilemma for Realist Theories of Value", in, *Philosophical Studies*, pp. 109-166. (127), 2006.

Street, A. Sharon: "What is Constructivism in Ethics and Metaethics": in, *Philosophy Compass*, 5(5), pp. 363-384, 2010.

Street, A. Sharon: "Coming to Terms with Contingency: Humean Constructivism about Practical Reason", pp. 40-60, in, Lenman, James and Shemmer, Yonatan: *Constructivism in Practical Philosophy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2012.

Street, Sharon: "Constructivism in Ethics and The Problem of Attachment and Loss", in, *The Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volume XC*, pp. 161-187, 2016.

Street, Sharon: "Constructivism in Ethics and The Problem of Attachment and Loss", in, *The Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volume XC*, pp. 161-187, 2016: p. 187.

Our Home on Native Land(s): Canada as Benevolent Good Samaritan or Global Environmental Racist and Robber?

Dr. Sheryl Johnson, USA

Canada's national anthem refers to the country as "our home *and* native land." Activists often change this line to "our home *on* native land" to underscore Canada's (and Britain/France's) colonial history of land theft, broken treaties, abusive and oppressive relations, and the ongoing marginalization of Indigenous communities, cultures, spiritualities, and lands. These realities are slowly coming to the fore particularly due to Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2008-15), established to address the horrific legacies of Indigenous Residential Schools. Catholic and Mainline Protestant churches, comprised in large part of members of European heritage, have been active in this effort, in part due to their direct culpability in this matter.

At the same time, Canada's self-image is deeply tied to a narrative that depicts it as a welcoming cultural mosaic where refugees and migrants are warmly greeted and respectfully integrated. This narrative denies the racism and marginalization that many experience, in addition to masking the fact that many are denied entry or status. Still, churches have been active in the process of welcoming refugees specifically. Through an arrangement with the federal government, churches and other community groups sponsor refugees and support them directly in their first years in Canada. Differing from the churches' engagement with Indigenous reconciliation, this relationship with refugees is often depicted as one of selfless benevolence on the part of Canada and churches specifically. Connections are not generally made to the roles that Canada, Christians, or churches might play in the reasons why refugees must leave their homelands.

Yet such connections can and must be made. Although one cannot detail every aspect of the varied political, social, and economic factors that entwine the nation-states of Canada and those from which refugees and other migrants originate, one important linkage is the issue of mining. 75% of the world's mining companies are headquartered in Canada¹⁶ and about 80% of the global equity trades related to mining stocks occur on the Toronto Stock Exchange.¹⁷ Canadian mining companies are culpable for atrocities all around the world including environmental degradation and social and economic destruction that directly lead to the displacement of marginalized populations and situations of migration.¹⁸ Many of the peoples and much of the land that is impacted around the world is Indigenous - perhaps bringing an additional level of meaning to the notion of "our home" occupying "native land."

To frame this issue ethically, understanding our (as Canadians and Euro-Canadians specifically) culpability in environmental colonialism and racism through industries such as mining in various parts of the world magnifies the urgency and necessity of our response to the situations that we contribute to, such as displacement and environmental injustice. As Canadian churches, rather than viewing ourselves as neutral Good Samaritans who simply strive to aid the refugees who "appear" at "our" door, we might imagine ourselves instead as the robbers and thieves who are attacking and causing injury in the first place. The work that we have begun with the Truth and Reconciliation Commission may help to guide us in new relationships and true reconciliation with all the world's sacred peoples,

¹⁶ Niko Block, "Toronto's buried history: the dark story of how mining built a city," *The Guardian*, March 3, 2017, accessed February 17, 2021, <https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2017/mar/03/toronto-hidden-history-how-city-built-mining>.

¹⁷ José Carlos Marques, "Private Regulatory Fragmentation as Public Policy: Governing Canada's Mining Industry," *Journal of Business Ethics* 135, no. 4 (2016): 617–630. doi:10.1007/s10551-014-2377-3

¹⁸ Meera Karunanathan, "UN must challenge Canada's complicity in mining's human rights abuses," *The Guardian*, April 24, 2013, accessed February 17, 2021, <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/poverty-matters/2013/apr/24/un-canada-mining-human-rights>.

homes, and lands. It is also critical that Indigenous (rather than Euro-Canadian) understandings of reconciliation, shape and guide this process.

Bibliography:

Andraos, Michael. *The Church and Indigenous Peoples in the Americas: In Between Reconciliation and Decolonization*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2019.

Augustine, Sarah. *The Land Is Not Empty: Following Jesus in Dismantling the Doctrine of Discovery*. Nashville: APG Sales and Distribution, 2021.

Bannerji, Himani. *The Dark Side of the Nation: Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism, and Gender*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press, 2000.

Cannon, Martin and Lina Sunseri, editors. *Racism, Colonialism, and Indigeneity in Canada: A Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Schweitzer, Don and Paul Gareau, eds. *Honouring the Declaration: Church Commitments to Reconciliation and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. Regina: University of Regina Press, 2021.

Stark, Heidi, et al. *Indigenous Resurgence in an Age of Reconciliation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2023.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. *A Knock on the Door: The Essential History of Residential Schools from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2015.

Wilson, Shawn, et al. *Research and Reconciliation: Unsettling Ways of Knowing through Indigenous Relationships*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc., 2019.

Woodley, Randy. *Shalom and the Community of Creation: An Indigenous Vision*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012.

Equality as a conceptual opportunity and a practical challenge in reconciliation

Dr. Heidi Jokinen & Prof. Björn Vikström, Finland

Different reconciliation practices have been rocketing in the past decades, both after large scale atrocities and in small. Reconciliation has been used to address the genocide in Rwanda, school bullying in the US and domestic violence in Finland. All these different processes witness of the coming together of parties who are very differently positioned.

Reconciliation very seldom occurs between parties that are on an equal position. It's not only that the parties might concretely represent a ruling institution and a marginalized minority like in the reconciliation processes between the Nordic churches and the indigenous Sámi people. The inequality is also of a deeper nature. The relationship that needs addressing is marked by injustices of many sort between the two. One or both parties have offended the other, taking from them a right that they had. In such a skewed relationship it is not clear whether it is possible to encounter each other on equal terms, even though such encounter is claimed to be a core element in all reconciliatory practices. This is the fundamental point of departure for this paper.

In virtually all literature on reconciliation practices it is claimed that the neutral third party in the meeting, be it a facilitator or a mediator, is the one who balances the meeting for the two so that they can participate on equal footing. However, as the parties were not equal at the start, is it a wishful claim to assume that they would be that during the encounter? The stronger part may be the one setting the rules and formulating the desired outcomes. The weaker part takes a risk when participating in a reconciliation process. Moreover, it's not clear what a reconciliation after the process can even entail. We argue that equality seems to be a conceptual opportunity but a practical challenge in reconciliation.

A common role model for many reconciliation practices globally has been their spiritual roots, including Christian faith practices. In Christian theology, the basic pattern for reconciliation is the reconciliation between humankind and God – two parts, with very different status and power. Even though God is considered the active part in this reconciliation, a mediator is still needed. In the classical debates concerning Christology, one could, harshly simplifying, state that there was a perceived need to find a balance: Christ need to be “enough God” in order to achieve a lasting redemption and reconciliation, but, on the other hand, Christ need to be “human enough” to be able to truly represent humanity. As a mediator, Christ is not “a neutral third part”, but heavily engaged in the reconciliation by bridging the gap between the two parts.

Our aim is to analyze the relationship between the two parties in a reconciliation process. We ask if and if so, why, reconciliation can be motivated between two parties, taking into account the fundamentally unequal relationship both before, during and perhaps even after the reconciliation practice. Further, we discuss the possibilities and pitfalls of applying the Christian conception of reconciliation between humankind and God to reconciliation processes between actors such as states, churches, groups and individuals.

This is done by seeking inspiration from the theological resources concerning reconciliation and looking at the concrete practice of reconciliation between the Lutheran Churches in Finland, Sweden and Norway and the Sámi people, and how the concept of equality comes to

the fore and is understood. These reconciliation processes have brought to the fore several material elements of reconciliation processes, such as compensation and restoration of natural resources.

The question of equality during and after reconciliation processes is vital, as it not only exhibits an important point of criticism towards reconciliation practices, but the relationship also entails the critical success factor in reconciliation. An enhanced understanding of the concept of equality between the two parties will help to better shape also future reconciliation practices, and to make them safer and more meaningful to the parties.

Bibliography:

Ahluwalia, D. P. S.(ed) *Reconciliation and Pedagogy*. Abingdon [England] ; New York: Routledge, 2012.

De Gruchy, John W. *Reconciliation: Restoring Justice*. London: SCM Press, 2002.

Hadley, Michael L. *The Spiritual Roots of Restorative Justice*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001.

Lindmark, Daniel, and Olle Sundström. *Samerna Och Svenska Kyrkan: Underlag För Kyrkligt Försoningsarbete*. Möklinta: Gidlunds förlag, 2017. Kearney, Richard. "Forgiveness at the Liit. Impossible or Possible?", in O'Rourke, Fran (ed), *What Happened in and to Moral Philosophy in the Twentieth Century?: Philosophical Essays in Honor of Alasdair Macintyre*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2013, 304 – 320.

Kärkkäinen, Veli-Matti. *Christ and Reconciliation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2013.

Seurujärvi-Kari , Irja and Virtanen, Pirjo Kristiina, "Sámi Reconciliation in Practice : Long and Ongoing Process", in R Datta (ed.) , *Reconciliation in Practice : A Cross-Cultural perspective*. Fernwood Publishing , Winnipeg, 2019.

Vainio, Olli-Pekka. "Frälsning och längtan efter en kosmisk rättvisa" in Huttunen, Niko; Anna-Kaisa Inkala, Kari kopperi, Marko Marttila, Terhi Törma (red), *Frälsning synodalavhandling 2022*. Helsingfors: Kyrkostyrelsen, 2022, 227 – 248.

Conflict Resolution and Reconciliation: Lessons from the Gandhian Thought

Prof. George Kodimattam Joseph, India

The present paper introduces the Gandhian thought as a promising conceptual framework to draw measures to reduce tensions among communities and nations, resolve wars and conflicts, regain social harmony, repair damages, and reconcile broken relations. The Gandhian approach to international peace had been gathering great attention since the second half of the twentieth century and Gandhian views on human nature, political values, and social dynamics bring deeper insights into several issues in political thought and moral philosophy. The Gandhian approach establishes a perfect alchemy between the Jain tradition of the east and the Biblical tradition from the west and an undeniable correlation between virtues of persons and values of social systems. For instance, the Gandhian position manifests an impeccable commitment to the five great virtues (mahāvratas), such as nonviolence (ahimsa), truthfulness (satya), nonstealing (asteya), nonattachment (aparigraha), and chastity (brahmacharya), that are upheld in the east and makes these concepts compatible with the western intellectual traditions. Among other things, the paper analyses three major Gandhian concepts such as nonviolence (ahimsa), civil disobedience (satyagraha), and uplift of the last (antodaya) that are borrowed from the western tradition, that is to say, from Tolstoy, Thoreau, and Ruskin respectively, and proposes promising strategies for conflict management and reconciliation.

Gandhian thought suggests 'nonviolence' as the law of the civilized society, and furthermore, recommends it as the only enduring framework to assure prevalence of justice and reconciliation of social bonds. The apparent passive implication of the term nonviolence is deceptive. The implication is not confined to the avoidance of violence, which is denoted by the popular normative concept of 'nonmaleficence', but it signifies 'beneficence' which is positively contributing to the welfare of everyone. Furthermore, nonviolence is the weapon of the strongest and not of cowards, and it signifies virtuous disposition of individuals to denounce evil while keeping no hatred towards evildoers. Therefore Gandhi prefers to call it 'soul force'. Peace, according to Gandhi, is not the absence of war but the synergy in social life and harmonious coexistence of humankind and nonhumankind as well. The rule of the virtuous disposition of nonviolence would reverse the destructive forces and resolve conflicts that might damage relations. Additionally, nonviolence has a long history of success, which is much higher than alarmingly costly violent solutions to social problems, and the solutions drawn on nonviolent grounds manifest additional virtues of endurance and perceived fairness. However, both the moral power to practice unconditional love for the evildoer and the ability to maintain unblemished disposition of nonviolence look impossible to achieve.

The second strategy suggested for reconciliation and conflict resolution is 'nonviolent noncooperation'. Gandhi calls it satyagraha, which in the literal sense, implies steadfastness to truth. The idea of 'truth' occupies a central position in the Gandhian moral philosophy and political thought as well. While the early Gandhian thought preferred to hold the view that 'God is truth', later deliberations chose a modified concept which is 'Truth is God'. It is admitted that all reactions and wars are not equally wrong and we do have an obligation to offer moral support to the one whose cause is just. To stay away from committing the same mistake, we need to ensure that the support is nonviolent and both means and ends are clean enough. Noncooperation, furthermore, implies civil disobedience which is disobedience with civility. Stated otherwise, it is denouncing unjust acts and policies of the evildoer.

Additionally, collective effort of all civilized minds is suggested to motivate the evildoer rectifying the mistakes committed and turning to the path of truth. Thirdly, the Gandhian thought advises us to be on the side of the last in the social structure and the victims of aggressions and transgressions. Historical accounts witness to the alarming fact that innocent civilians are major victims of violence, for wrong targets are always being chosen as a combat strategy. Additionally, violence should not be calculated merely on the basis of material damages; rather due consideration is to be given to other impacts on individuals, society, and nature at large. Here, Gandhi's view on peace is radically different from western pacifism. While pacifism recommends avoidance of aggression, Gandhian thought suggests positive measures of social action that nurtures justice, peace, and reconciliation. Among other things, the paper examines the major constraints of Gandhian framework in responding to sudden and unanticipated crises, excessive demandingness and impossibility attributed to the Gandhian method, ultimate possibility and unparalleled endurance claimed by the Gandhian way of conflict resolution and reconciliation, and the need of the hour to turn to nonviolent strategies, social actions, inclusive restorative practices, and peaceful coexistence.

Bibliography:

Chandra, S. (2018). *Gandhi: An Impossible Possibility*. New Delhi: Routledge.

Gandhi, M.K. (1968). *Ethical Religion*. Ahmedabad: Navjivan Trust.

Gandhi, M.K. (no date). *The Story of My Experiments with Truth*. Ahmedabad: Navjivan Trust.

Kripalani, J.B. (1971). *Gandhi: His Life and Thought*. New Delhi: Publications Divisions, Government of India.

Ruskin, J. (2021). *Unto This Last*. New Delhi: Digireads.

Thoreau, H.D. (2016). *Civil Disobedience*. New Delhi: Ingram.

Tolstoy, L. (2006). *The Kingdom of God is Within You*. New York: Dover Publications.

Subjectivity, Forgiveness, and Reconciliation

Martin Langby, Sweden

This paper provides a critical account of the debate on restorative justice (RJ) by highlighting the lack of focus on subjectivity in the discussion. My perspective draws upon the works of Judith Butler and Denise Ackermann to actively engage with a particular interpretation of RJ offered by Yutaka Osakabe. By adding a critical debate on subjectivity and its role in reconciliation, the discussion is furthered to provide new insights on conceptualizing reconciliation's meaning.

As Osakabe shows in the article 'Restoring Restorative Justice,'¹⁹ the concept easily provides the ground for sentimentalization. The term sentimentalization refers to attributing emotional or sentimental value to a principle, idea, or concept inappropriately. Osakabe argues that the principles of reconciliation and forgiveness in RJ can be sentimentalized, meaning they are oversimplified or romanticized. This can lead to problems in the implementation and understanding of RJ. Osakabe provides examples where there was suspicion that the RJ process was more beneficial for offenders than victims due to the sentimentalization of principles such as forgiveness and reconciliation.

Osakabe advocates Howard Zehr's understanding to challenge this, mainly by using *Changing Lenses*²⁰ to refocus the discussion on how to de-sentimentalize RJ. In *Changing Lenses*, Zehr argues that the traditional criminal justice system, based on punishment and retribution, is ineffective at addressing the root causes of crime and promoting long-term healing and reconciliation. Instead, he advocates for a shift towards a restorative justice approach, which seeks to repair harm, hold offenders accountable for their actions, and involve all stakeholders in resolving conflicts and restoring relationships. Zehr, in turn, relies heavily on Perry Yoder and his book *Shalom*.²¹ Yoder explores the concept of shalom in the Bible. Shalom, is a Hebrew word often translated as "peace," but it has a broader meaning that includes salvation, justice, and well-being.

Osakabe focuses primarily on the critical notion of Zehr that challenges individual and societal norms of what justice can and should entail.²² This critique is important, but the lack of focus on subjectivity makes the debate less than ideal. Osakabe argues that there is inherent importance in de-sentimentalizing the discussion of RJ. Focusing on changing perspectives and norms in play is crucial. The theological resources provided by Zehr and Yoder are sound here since they show how the vision of God can instill hope in the complex process of reconciliation.

To enhance the discussion, we should look to Butler and her work on subjectivity, mainly drawn from *Giving an Account of Oneself*.²³ She argues that subjectivity is not a fixed or inherent quality that individuals possess but rather a social construct shaped and performed through language and cultural practices. The subject is a product of cultural norms and expectations, not a natural or universal phenomenon. She asserts that the individual self is not

¹⁹ Yutaka Osakabe, "Restoring Restorative Justice: Beyond the Theology of Reconciliation and Forgiveness," *International Journal of Public Theology* 10, no. 2 (June 4, 2016): 247–71, <https://doi.org/10.1163/15697320-12341445>.

²⁰ Howard Zehr, *Changing Lenses: A New Focus for Crime and Justice*, 3rd ed (Scottsdale, Pa: Herald Press, 2005).

²¹ Perry B. Yoder, *Shalom: The Bible's Word for Salvation, Justice, and Peace* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2017).

²² Osakabe, "Restoring Restorative Justice," 269, 271.

²³ Judith Butler, *Giving an Account of Oneself*, 1st ed (New York: Fordham University Press, 2005).

a pre-existing entity but is constituted through social and cultural interactions. Subjectivity is mediated between the subject and the context, and since language is a prerequisite for it, it is not confined to the subject alone; instead shared through relationality.

When combining Butler's concept with the one of Ackermann, we see a new venue for forgiveness and reconciliation. Ackermann does not take the idea of forgiveness lightly, and "forgiveness is an active, willed change of heart that succeeds in overcoming naturally felt feelings of anger, resentment, vengeance, and hatred."²⁴ Further, Ackermann claims, "whereas forgiveness can happen without reconciliation taking place, reconciliation cannot happen without forgiveness."²⁵ By acknowledging that forgiveness is part of the context that forms subjectivity, the subject can be encouraged to change and work toward reconciliation. The subject formation is a mutual act since both victim and offender are continuously constituted through the relational process. There is a difference between individual and societal reconciliation, but they are closely related.²⁶ Thus, forgiveness and reconciliation for the subject are part of a larger context. If a state of unforgiveness is part of the subject, there can be no true peace with the self or others.

The discussion on RJ can be furthered by focusing on forgiveness and subjectivity. As Jesus says in Matthew 5:44, to love your enemies,²⁷ we should make a willed change of the heart, to use Ackermann's terminology. Osakabe problematizes the expectations of the RJ process, and there is credence to this critique. But if there are no expectations, why even engage in a process that focuses on healing relationships? For subjectivity to be enacted in a manner that does not promote anger, resentment, vengeance, and hatred, we all need to forgive the other – not through cheap forgiveness, but rather mutual understanding. Here the RJ process can provide guidance, if it is enacted mutually. As a Christian, one should try to move beyond a state of unforgiveness, and by focusing on subjectivity, one key aspect can be viewed in a new light to further reconciliation.

²⁴ Denise Ackermann, *After the Locusts: Letters From a Landscape of Faith* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Glosderry, Republic of South Africa: W.B. Eerdmans ; D. Philip Publishers, 2003), 119.

²⁵ Ackermann, 119.

²⁶ Denise Ackermann, "Reconciliation as Embodied Change: A South African Perspective," *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America*, no. 59 (2004): 55.

²⁷ Thomas Nelson, *The Holy Bible, New King James Version* (Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1982), 851.

Bibliography

- Ackermann, Denise. *After the Locusts: Letters From a Landscape of Faith*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Glosderry, Republic of South Africa: W.B. Eerdmans ; D. Philip Publishers, 2003.
- . “Reconciliation as Embodied Change: A South African Perspective.” *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America*, no. 59 (2004): 50–67.
- Butler, Judith. *Giving an Account of Oneself*. 1st ed. New York: Fordham University Press, 2005.
- Nelson, Thomas. *The Holy Bible, New King James Version*. Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1982.
- Osakabe, Yutaka. “Restoring Restorative Justice: Beyond the Theology of Reconciliation and Forgiveness.” *International Journal of Public Theology* 10, no. 2 (June 4, 2016): 247–71. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15697320-12341445>.
- Yoder, Perry B. *Shalom: The Bible’s Word for Salvation, Justice, and Peace*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2017.
- Zehr, Howard. *Changing Lenses: A New Focus for Crime and Justice*. 3rd ed. Scottdale, Pa: Herald Press, 2005.

The Use of Testimony in Truth Commissions: A Radical Critique

Dr. Alexandra Lebedeva, Sweden

The concept of testimony is a multifaceted concept, characterized by different forms, dimensions and uses. Since the experiences of South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission it has been acknowledged that testimony and public hearings are considered to lie at the heart of truth commissions and their potential contribution. ¹ However, as Franka Winter rightly notes, despite the growing popularity of public hearings and testimony, these practices have provoked surprisingly little criticism. Critics have addressed problems of procedural fairness, security issues, and the problem of selection. ² In this paper, I will address and critically analyze some other problems concerning different uses of testimony in truth commissions and the presumed positive effects of public witnessing.

In order to define the use of testimony in truth commissions, I draw on Shoshana Felman's distinction between testimony's judicial use in courts of law, and its historical use as a mode of representation of past events. The case of truth commissions blurs the boundaries between judicial and historical uses. On the one hand, testimony represents a supporting element of evidence, and on the other hand, it aims at revealing the past in a broader context informing the public about the past human rights atrocities. Apart from the judicial and historical use, Felman also discusses testimony's clinical dimension, arguing that testimony is a medium of healing for the traumatic experience to which testimony bears witness. ³ Based on Felman's distinction and in relation to truth commissions' context, I suggest that three uses of testimony can be identified: testimony as working through the past (the clinical dimension), testimony as a ground for the right to economic reparation (the legal use) and testimony as a mode of political representation (the historical use). In the paper, I will present these different uses and critically discuss them.

Firstly, I will challenge the use of testimony as working through the past and the assumption about the healing effects of testimony from a human rights perspective. Martha Minow asserts that the idea of restorative power of narrative has played a central role in the establishment of truth and reconciliation commissions. ⁴ Testimony is thus considered to have healing effects for the witnessing subject and is used for dealing with psychological trauma. Meanwhile, the positive impacts of testimony and public witnessing have been questioned from a psychological perspective, ⁵ whereas I seek to challenge the impact of healing discourse for the understanding of human rights atrocities. I will argue that the presumed healing effect of testimony indicates an understanding of human rights violation as trauma. It results in diminishing responsibility for the violations to psychological treatment and presenting human rights violations as passive suffering without a wrongdoer. Without taking a stance on the psychological effects of

See for example Gready, Paul: "Culture, Testimony, and the Toolbox of Transitional Justice", in *A Journal of Social Justice*, Vol. 20, No. 1, 2008; Minow, Martha: *Between Vengeance and Forgiveness: Facing History after Genocide and Mass Violence*. Beacon Press, Boston 1998. ² Winter, Franka: "Giving Voice to the Voiceless? Second Thoughts on Testimony in Transitional Justice", in *A Journal on Social History and Literature in Latin America*, Vol.6, No. 3, 2009, 91. ³ Felman, Shoshana and Dori, Laub: *Testimony: The Crisis of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis and History*, Routledge, London 1992, 9, 12. ⁴ Minow, Martha: *Between Vengeance and Forgiveness: Facing History after Genocide and Mass Violence*, 66. ⁵ See, for example, Brounéus, Karen: "The Trauma of Truth Telling: Effects of Witnessing in

the Rwandan Gacaca Courts on Psychological Health”, in *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 54, No.3, 2010, 408-437. testimony, I argue that the shift from the question of justice to the question of mental health of survivors is problematic from a moral perspective.

Secondly, testimony’s legal use is demonstrated through the link between witnessing and the right to reparations. The imposition of legal paradigm, more specifically, the model of tort, entails individualization of human rights atrocities, abstracting them from the political and social contexts. As Pablo de Greiff argues, the imposition of massive reparations programs disregards the specific circumstances of human rights atrocities, including their systematic character and normalization of violence. ⁶ Furthermore, linking together testimony with economic reparation may contribute to the commodification of stories about past events. Drawing on Arjun Appadurai definition of “the commodity situation” ⁷ and Michael Walzer’s concept of commodity, ⁸ I argue that stories about past events become commodities that can be exchanged for economic reparation when exchangeability becomes their defining feature. As a result of such commodification, testimony’s critical potential is significantly reduced, and imposition of moral and political responsibility is obstructed.

Against the backdrop of clinical and legal uses, historical use of testimony aims to bring to the fore political aspect of human rights atrocities. Scholars within subaltern studies, as for example John Beverly, has argued for a “subaltern” dimension of testimony. ⁹ This dimension entails political representation of collective experiences of human rights violations through personal stories. I will problematize this use of testimony by drawing on Jacques Derrida’s deconstruction of testimony, where “built-in uncertainty” and its “instant” moment constitute the essence of testimony. ¹⁰ It will allow me to challenge not only the reductionist and instrumental legal use of testimony, but also the use of testimony as representation and the formation of collective testimonial subject.

Bibliography:

Appadurai, Arjun: "Definitions: Commodity and Commodification," in Martha Ertman, Joan C. Williams (eds.), *Rethinking Commodification: Cases and Readings in Law and Culture*. New York University Press, New York 2005.

Beverly, John: *Testimonio: On the Politics of Truth*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis 2004.

De Greiff, Pablo. “Justice and Reparations”, in Pablo de Greiff (ed.). *The Handbook of Reparations*. Oxford University Press, New York 2006.

Derrida, Jacques: “Poetics and Politics of Witnessing” in *Sovereignities in Question: the Poetics of Paul Celan*. Fordham University Press, New York 2005.

De Greiff, Pablo. “Justice and Reparations”, in Pablo de Greiff (ed.). *The Handbook of Reparations*. Oxford University Press, New York 2006, 454-55. ⁷ Appadurai, Arjun: "Definitions: Commodity and Commodification," in Martha Ertman, Joan C. Williams (eds.), *Rethinking Commodification: Cases and Readings in Law and Culture*. New York University Press, New York 2005, 37. ⁸ Walzer, Michael: *Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality*. Basic Books, New York 1983, 97. ⁹ Beverly, John: *Testimonio: On the Politics of Truth*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis 2004, 27. ¹⁰ Derrida, Jacques: “Poetics and Politics of Witnessing” in *Sovereignities in Question: the Poetics of Paul Celan*. Fordham

University Press, New York 2005; Derrida, Jacques: *Demeure: Fiction and Testimony*. Stanford University Press, Stanford. Derrida, Jacques: *Demeure: Fiction and Testimony*. Stanford University Press, Stanford. Felman, Shoshana and Dori, Laub: *Testimony: The Crisis of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis and History*, Routledge, London 1992.

Gready, Paul: "Culture, Testimony, and the Toolbox of Transitional Justice", in *A Journal of Social Justice*, Vol. 20, No. 1, 2008.

Minow, Martha: *Between Vengeance and Forgiveness: Facing History after Genocide and Mass Violence*. Beacon Press, Boston 1998.

Walzer, Michael: *Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality*. Basic Books, New York 1983
Winter, Franka: "Giving Voice to the Voiceless? Second Thoughts on Testimony in Transitional Justice", in *A Journal on Social History and Literature in Latin America*, Vol.6, No. 3, 2009.

Versöhnung unter den Bedingungen des Justizvollzugs – eine Frage der „Restorative Justice“?

Katharina Leniger, Germany

In Justizvollzugsanstalten wird die durch Gerichte verhängte Freiheitsstrafe zur Aufarbeitung von Straftaten vollzogen, um die Tatverantwortlichen zu resozialisieren. Dies entspricht in deutschen Strafvollzugsgesetzen dem so genannten Vollzugsziel gemäß § 2 StVollzG des Bundes. Daneben wird die Sicherheit für die Gesellschaft als weitere Aufgabe des Justizvollzugs betrachtet. Resozialisierung wird dann als geglückt bezeichnet, wenn ein:e Inhaftierte:r nach der Haft ein Leben ohne weitere Straftaten und in „sozialer Verantwortung“ führt. Angesichts hoher Rückfallquoten und einer zur Kenntnis zu nehmenden Frustration der Menschen, die in der Justiz allgemein, aber auch im Justizvollzug im Speziellen beschäftigt sind, ist festzuhalten, dass diese „Behandlung“ der Inhaftierten offenbar nicht reicht, um eine langfristige Wendung der Lebensumstände zu erreichen, die zur Inhaftierung geführt haben. Eine These lautet deshalb, dass es womöglich daneben eine ‚andere‘ Form der Gerechtigkeit bräuchte, um das Unrecht zu transformieren, das durch interpersonale Gewalttaten entstanden ist und den fokussierten Blick auf die Inhaftierten weitet. Es wird in wissenschaftlichen Diskursen verschiedener Fachrichtung seit Jahren diskutiert, dass eine kommunikative Annäherung und daran anschließende Wiedergutmachung zwischen den Beteiligten dazu führen können, dass Betroffene – also Verantwortliche und Geschädigte – ihr Leben selbstbestimmter und letztlich ‚versöhnter‘ gestalten können. Dies hat in der Folge auch positive Effekte auf die Gesellschaft und den so genannten ‚sozialen Frieden‘. Konzepte der so genannten Restorative Justice (RJ) stellen dabei Möglichkeiten und Erfahrungen bereit, wie diese ‚andere‘ Gerechtigkeit aussehen und operationalisiert werden kann. Diese Erkenntnisse können auch für den Justizvollzug fruchtbar gemacht werden und werden bereits durch den sogenannten Täter-Opfer-Ausgleich (TOA) umgesetzt. Auch internationale Institutionen beschäftigen sich seit einiger Zeit mit RJ und stellen Informations- und Weiterbildungsmöglichkeiten für die Umsetzung restorativer Belange zur Verfügung. Angesichts dieser skizzierten Lage stellt sich die zentrale Frage des Vortrags, inwiefern Ansätze der RJ für den Justizvollzug ein „Mehr“ an Gerechtigkeit bereitstellen können, die den einzelnen Betroffenen – Geschädigten wie Tatverantwortlichen einer Gewalttat – in ihren Bedürfnissen und gleichzeitig der Gesellschaft hinsichtlich ihres Sicherheitsbedürfnisses gerecht werden. Dazu gehört auch eine Untersuchung, inwiefern RJ und versöhnende Prozesse für eine erfolgreiche Resozialisierung bedeutsam werden können.

An den genannten Thesen und der Grundfrage wird deutlich, dass eine weitestgehend ausschließlich juristische, kriminologische oder psychologische Auseinandersetzung in Bezug auf das Thema RJ im Kontext des Justizvollzugs zu kurz greift. Insbesondere die ethisch zu reflektierende Frage, ob und inwiefern Gerechtigkeitsfragen durch RJ tangiert werden, ist deshalb zu beantworten. Eine systematische ethische Reflexion der Gerechtigkeitsvorstellungen der RJ ist jedoch bislang nicht vorgenommen worden, was zur Folge hat, dass nicht geklärt ist, unter welchen Vorstellungen von Gerechtigkeit restorative Verfahren durchgeführt werden. Diesem Desiderat will dieser Beitrag begegnen: So sollen zunächst die gerechtigkeits-theoretischen und moralischen Grundlagen des Konzepts der RJ skizziert werden. Entscheidend ist dafür die Unterscheidung, dass Gerechtigkeit in restorativen Prozessen nicht durch Bestrafung des Rechtsbruchs, sondern durch die Aufarbeitung der interpersonalen Verletzungen durch Dialog und Wiedergutmachung ‚wiederhergestellt‘ werden soll. In diesem Zusammenhang wird aufgezeigt, dass einige Annahmen und Prinzipien der RJ – z.B. Empowerment, soziale Verantwortung und dialogische Konfliktaufarbeitung – an gängige sozialetische Konzepte anschlussfähig sind,

insbesondere die der vulnerable agency (Haker) und an narrative Ethiken im Kontext von Konzepten narrativer Identität (Ricoeur).

Diese Erkenntnisse sollen in einem zweiten Schritt auf den Justizvollzug übertragen werden. Die grundsätzlichen Chancen und Grenzen der RJ in außerjustiziellen Kontexten werden dazu auf die besondere Situation in Haft hin zugespielt. Denn insbesondere die Vereinnahmung durch das Justizsystem, wie sie etwa in Formen des Täter-Opfer-Ausgleichs in Deutschland geschieht, verändert restorative Prozesse von Grund auf. In der Analyse wird deutlich, dass die Logiken des Justizvollzugs (womöglich der Justiz generell) und der RJ so unterschiedlich sind, dass eine Implementierung der RJ in den Vollzug bislang zu Lasten des Anliegens und der Grundsätze der RJ gehen muss. Restorative Verfahren stellen mit ihren lediglich schwach normativen Vorstellungen gegenüber den starken normativen Vorgaben des Justizvollzugs eine ‚fremde Welt‘ dar, mit der der deutsche Justizvollzug bislang überfordert scheint – und es bleibt fraglich, ob sich beide Systeme je irgendwann ergänzen können, wie von Praktiker:innen der RJ seit Beginn gefordert.

In einer abschließenden Synthese soll eine Krieteriologie vorgestellt werden, wie die Zielvorstellungen des Justizvollzugs und die der RJ zu verknüpfen sind, d.h. die Resozialisierung einerseits und die Idee einer ‚versöhnten‘ Zukunft für alle Beteiligten andererseits, einschließlich einer sozial befriedeteren Gesellschaft. In Bezug auf das Tagungsthema soll mit dem Beitrag ein Baustein zu einer Ethik des Justizvollzugs geliefert werden, der das Anliegen der Versöhnung mit denen einer gerechten Gesellschaft verbindet und auf den spezifischen Kontext der Haft eingeführt.

Bibliographie:

Becka, Michelle, Strafe und Resozialisierung. Hinführung zu einer Ethik des Justizvollzugs (= Forum Sozialethik 16), Münster 2016.

Dies. (Hg.), Ethik im Justizvollzug. Aufgaben, Chancen, Grenzen, Stuttgart 2015.

Cornel, Heinz u.a. (Hg.), Resozialisierung. Handbuch, Baden-Baden 2018.

Hagemann, Otmar, Restorative Justice und Resozialisierung - Abgrenzung und Gemeinsamkeiten, in: Maelicke, B. / Wein, C. (Hg.), Resozialisierung und Systemischer Wandel, Baden-Baden 2020, 151-179.

Haker, Hille, Towards a Critical Political Ethics. Catholic Ethics and Social Challenges, Basel/Würzburg 2020.

Dies., Narrative und moralische Identität, in: Mieth, D. (Hg.), Erzählen und Moral. Narrativität im Spannungsfeld von Ethik und Ästhetik, Tübingen 2000, 37-65.

Johnstone, Gerry, Towards a 'justice agenda' for restorative justice, in: Restorative Justice: An international Journal (RJIJ) 2 (2014), 115-123.

Kilchling, Michael, Täter-Opfer-Ausgleich im Strafvollzug. Wissenschaftliche Begleitung des Modellprojekts Täter-Opfer-Ausgleich im baden-württembergischen Justizvollzug, Berlin 2017.

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Handbook on Restorative Justice Programms. Second Edition 2020, https://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/20-01146_Handbook_on_Restorative_Justice_Programmes.pdf.

Zehr, Howard / Toews, Barb (Hg.), Critical issues in restorative justice, Monsey/New York 2004.

Fortschritt des Menschen als anthropologische Grundlage einer Ethik der Versöhnung?

Prof. Arne Manzeschke, Germany

Problemskizze

»Der Mensch ist das der Versöhnung mit seinem Dasein bedürftige Wesen« (Blumenberg 1989, S. 356). Dies zu konstatieren, erfordert, mit den politischen, moralischen und pädagogischen Implikationen der Diagnose ernst zu machen. Dass Moral und Ethik stets auf anthropologischen Grundlagen aufsetzen, wird häufig stillschweigend in Kauf genommen. Es lohnt jedoch ein genauerer Blick auf die häufig unter »Menschenbild« subsummierten Aspekte, die in Konzepte einer Ethik – auch der der Versöhnung – aufgenommen werden.

Hans Blumenberg hat in seiner »Beschreibung des Menschen« (2006) die Sichtbarkeit des Menschen, verbunden mit der Aufrichtung zur Bipedie zu seinem kardinalen Risiko erklärt, das über das mit allen Lebewesen geteilte Existenzrisiko hinausgeht. Der Mensch wird in der Aufrichtung sichtbar für andere, und damit werden Fragen nach seinem Ansehen und seiner Würde relevant. Biologisch betrachtet mögen das ›Luxusprobleme‹ sein, die sich für andere Lebewesen offenbar so nicht stellen. Für den Menschen, der »am Ertrag der Evolution als einer Optimierung der Anpassung und Reduzierung des physischen Existenzrisikos nicht mehr teilnimmt«, bedeutet es, »daß er sich dies nur leisten kann, wenn er auf der Flucht vor dem Zugriff der natürlichen Selektion fortschreitet« (Blumenberg 2006, S. 551)

Fortschritt bedeutet in diesem Sinne ein Fortschreiten von ›natürlichen‹ Ausstattungsmerkmalen zu kulturell überformten Lebensformen und einer kulturell überformten »Lebenswelt« (Husserl). Diese Lebenswelt, die man auch in ethischer Hinsicht als ein Anthropozän bezeichnen kann (vgl. Antweiler 2022), liefert zunehmend den Hintergrund (mit Gadamer ließe sich auch von einem »Horizont« sprechen) und Aufsatzzpunkt für ethische Konzepte. Eine Ethik der Versöhnung verliert zusehends den Boden von Letztbegründungen eine Tatsache, die in der Ethik weitgehend akzeptiert erscheint. Sie basiert damit allerdings zunehmend auf selbstgeschaffenen Gründen, die sich aus der immer weiter ausgreifenden Gestaltung der Lebenswelt und der darin eingewobenen Lebensformen ergibt. Wenn, wie Blumenberg diagnostiziert, der Mensch mit seinem Dasein versöhnt werden muss, so zielt das nicht mehr, wie noch von Kant gefordert auf eine ›allgemeine Vernunft‹, die Gründe für dieses Dasein liefern muss. Vielmehr macht der Verzicht auf diese Letztbegründungen den Blick frei für den modus vivendi unter den Bedingungen einer fortschreitenden Distanzierung von der Natur und einer Etablierung selbst-gemachter Daseinsbedingungen. Unter diesen Bedingungen fragt es sich zunehmend, ob der sogenannte naturalistische Fehlschluss, von den Dingen, wie sie sind, dürfe nicht darauf geschlossen werden, wie sie sein sollen, nicht modifiziert werden müsste. Und zwar dahingehend, dass die Dinge wie sie sind, von Menschen im Rahmen ihrer kulturellen Produktion und Naturdistanzierung so gemacht worden sind und deshalb ihrerseits einer ethischen Reflexion unterzogen werden müssen. Eine Ethik der Versöhnung wird deshalb zunehmend das Fundament ihrer eigenen Konzipierung in den Blick nehmen müssen.

1 Durchführung

In einer Blumenberg-Exegese wird das skizzierte Problem exponiert und auf die Frage zugespitzt, inwiefern diese Analyse zu einer anthropologischen Fundierung einer Ethik der Versöhnung beitragen kann.

Literatur

Antweiler, Christoph. Anthropologie im Anthropozän. Theoriebausteine für das 21.

Jahrhundert. 1. Aufl. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2022. Blumenberg, Hans. Höhlenausgänge. 1. Aufl. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1989. Blumenberg, Hans. Beschreibung des Menschen. 1. Aufl. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2006.

The Ethical and Moral Dimensions of Reconciliation Resources and Documents

Dr. Attila Nagy, Germany

Keeping in mind the success story of Croatia and its 2013 EU accession following with the 2023 joining of Schengen and Euro zone we will aim to see how and why different regions of ex-Yugoslavia once belonging to a same system have developed so differently. Whereas all people from ex-Yugoslavia have the same ideas, share the same values and support the EU integration of their respective countries it is necessary to approach this phenomena from different perspectives where we will do it primarily from the Ethical, Moral and Legal perspectives. Behind the ideas of Reconciliation, conflict Resolution and Transitional Justice we can find many new, innovative and successful ideas and case studies of countries once post-conflict societies and now developing countries or even EU member states.

In this research our aim will be to research and compare the recent agreement in the EU neighborhoods namely the ones made almost three decades ago for Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, Dayton Peace Accords¹. Additionally we will research the very recent agreements related to the Serbia-Kosovo relationship and the EU supported Brussels Agreement 2013² and the USA supported Washington Agreement from 2020³. While both agreements have certain economic dimensions and advancements they both go very deeply into the Sovereignty of both Serbia and Kosovo whereas both EU and USA primarily support their independence, democracy and transitional procedures overall. The Moral and Ethical dimensions of these agreements is even more supported by the fact that even the EU and USA standpoints regarding some issues are divided and while all the parties try to incorporate their priorities they tend to ignore the real and actual needs of local populations and their needs, wishes and demands. Also the moral and ethical dimensions of EU and USA made agreements are different, whereas USA supports the move of the Israeli capital to Jerusalem, as seen in Washington Agreement, this idea goes completely against the peace talks with Muslim communities and also against EU standpoints.

Parallely in the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina process of post-conflict development we can also outline some shortcomings where an independent and democratic country does not posses the

Dayton Peace Accords '<https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/e/0/126173.pdf>' accessed 6 February 2023
First Agreement of Principles Governing the Normalization of Relations '<https://www.srbija.gov.rs/cinjenice/en/120394>' accessed 6 February 2023
3 Economic Normalization '<https://www.new-perspektiva.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/WashingtonAgreement-Kosova-Serbia.pdf>' accessed 6 February 2023

2 mechanisms for its constitutional changes, keeping in mind that the Annex 4 of the Dayton Peace Agreement 4 is a legitimate means to make a constitution it certainly needs and has different and various development needs. Although the experience of making Bosnia and Herzegovina an independent country 5 and the efforts invested were tremendous we are coming back to the beginning and the problems from decades ago are coming back as a boomerang of who is responsible for what. The inability of the society, although deeply divided, can not be deemed to consist a democratic society and especially the moral dimension of an independent state such as Bosnia is Recognized and trying to act today.

Therefore the international recognition and especially partial recognition is hiding many dilemmas and moral shortcomings which are taking more and more precedents in post-conflict and divided societies and in fact do not bring any closer to a possible system of resolution. Overall a very bad economic situation and the inability of the country to repeatedly conform to EU standards and get closer to joining the EU brings Bosnia not closer to its possible future EU perspective.

Regarding Croatia from the other hand side we will approach its recent problems and again the inability and impossibility to find a just, moral and ethical solution to its two most burning problems. One of these problems is the inability of Croatia together with the whole EU to find the labor force which is necessary for its development, in other words, who should be given working permits and who should be treated as terrorists and persona non-grata on the Croatian soil. While in the previous sentence we have not mentioned Serbs in the description of the following problem we certainly will. Namely the recent EU level statistical research has showed that in fact e.g. in Vukovar there are less than 30% Serbians which according to the local assembly means that there is no more need to put out signs in Cyrillic script and have the official use of Serbian language in Vukovar city⁶. Therefore it is hard to achieve economic and political advance and also protect all the necessary human and minority rights and this phenomena is very typical for all post-conflict societies but obviously has its counterpart deeply rooted in many EU member countries as well and in this case without an actually viable resolution mechanism present today.

Annex 4 '<http://www.ohr.int/dayton-peace-agreement/annex4/#:~:text=Neither%20Entity%20shall%20threaten%20or,Presidency%20of%20Bosnia%20and%20Herzegovina.>' accessed 6 February 2023 5 Carina Pistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina: The Constitutional Court Protects the Rule of Law Against Illiberal Memory Politics '<https://blog-iacl-aidc.org/new-blog-3/2022/11/8/bosnia-and-herzegovina-the-constitutional-courtprotects-the-rule-of-law-against-illiberal-memory-politics>' accessed 6 February 2023 6 Official Use of Serbian, Cyrillic Ended in Croatia's Vukovar '<https://balkaninsight.com/2022/12/30/official-use-ofserbian-cyrillic-ended-in-croatias-vukovar/>' accessed 6 February 2023

Reconciliation in Workplace Bullying Contexts: Renarration. Responsibility. Grace? *Mikael Nilsson, Finland*

Introduction

Reconciliation is a contextual and dynamic social process. One context in which it has become a controversial issue is in cases of workplace bullying. Bullying is a complex and sometimes subtle phenomenon that appears in ordinary workplaces, yet still associated with devastating health effects on victims.²⁸ In this context, reconciliatory processes need to regard e.g., the complexities of power imbalances and structural and cultural factors.

The complexity of bullying

According to previous research, bullying refers to (1) negative and unwanted behaviours, that are (2) repeated over time, and (3) presupposes or produces an imbalance of power which makes the victim unable to defend him/herself. Bullying is usually not a permanent state, but rather an intensified process from subtle offences to serious violations. What started as a conflict between equal combatants may subtly escalate into serious bullying where the imbalance of power leaves the victim in a powerless position.²⁹ The changing state of the situation and the different experiences of victims, perpetrators and bystanders make it possible to interpret behaviours and narrate situations differently.

Moreover, bullying evolves in a multi-layered working life context. On a particular workplace level, it develops out of specific structures, organizational cultures, roles and leadership styles. In addition to that, the workplace is situated in a sociocultural context which provides the normative backdrop from which bullying is identified as a deviation. Beyond that, the contemporary workplace is for the most part driven by neoliberal economy and thus conditioned by virtues like competitiveness, efficiency and adaptability.³⁰ Thus, the bullying process can be stimulated and “covered” by interests beyond the interpersonal level, and still cause serious harm to individuals and interpersonal relationships. What does reconciliation mean in such a context?

Reconciliation?

In light of the contextual complexity and changing state of bullying, reconciliation has become a controversial and debated issue. Is reconciliation a possible or even desirable solution? In early conflict stages of bullying, different kinds of dialogical conflict resolution methods have been recommended.³¹ However, in serious and long-running bullying cases, investigation of filed complaints, separation of the parties and sanctions against the perpetrators is usually preferred.³² From the perspective of a theological anthropology, I argue that this is an understandable but limited conclusion. If human beings are assumed to be ontologically connected in social bodies of interdependent relationships, the healing of

²⁸ Mikkelsen m.fl. 2020.

²⁹ Einarsen m.fl. 2020, 10-26; 33-35. See also Zapf & Gross 2001.

³⁰ D’Cruz 2021.

³¹ Keashly m.fl. 2020, 347-352.

³² Zapf & Vartia 2020, 471-473.

individual bodies cannot easily be thought of independent of the healing of social bodies i.e., repaired relationships.³³

However, that does not make reconciliation an easy or self-evident ideal. Some presuppositions need to back up the restorative process in order for reconciliation to be meaningful to even speak about.³⁴ (1) A reconciliatory process cannot be reduced to pure ‘conflict resolution’, but needs to take the complexity of bullying and the imbalance of power as a prerequisite. Thus, the process requires a moral sensibility and a critical investigation of possibilities to bring about a just distribution of responsibility. (2) Reconciliation must be based on a shared renarration, beyond the interpretative prerogative of the perpetrators, in which the experiences of the victim are emotionally expressed and recognized. It includes repentance and practical reparation³⁵ by the perpetrators as a kind of ‘embodied renarration’. (3) Reconciliation needs to involve a critical review of the structures, culture and interests that stimulated the bullying process to evolve. What *kind* of relationship is desired to be repaired? What changes of the particular workplace are called for by the renarration? If truth is exposed and narrated, and if responsibilities are acknowledged and distributed justly, a restorative process still remains open-ended. Every attempt to control or force the process toward reconciliation runs the risk of new violations. The process should rather prepare for a variety of possible outcomes. Separation and compensation may be one. Forgiveness and transformed relationships may be another. Reconciliation appears from within the social process, not as a prescription, but as a non-mandatory, undeserved grace that no-one involved could predict, a gift that *may* be given and received in due time.

Conclusion

Workplace bullying is a highly complex phenomenon that causes serious damage to victims. Still, unlike what some previous research has suggested, a door to reconciliation – the healing of individual and social bodies – should be kept open, even in serious bullying cases. Not for everyone to enter, but because the workings of unpredictable grace are beyond human control.

Bibliography

D’Cruz, Premilla

2021 *Back to the Drawing Board: Revisiting the Bases of the Field of Workplace Bullying*. Keynote lecture, International Association on Workplace Bullying and Harassment, Virtual Conference, 2021-04-12.

Einarsen, Ståle Valvatne & Hoel, Helge & Zapf, Dieter et. al.

2020 The Concept of Bullying and Harassment at work: The European Tradition, 3-54, in: Ståle Valvatne Einarsen, Helge Hoel, Dieter Zapf & Cary L. Cooper (eds.): *Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace – Theory, Research, and Practice*. 3. ed. CRC Press, Boca Raton.

Keashly, Loreleigh & Mindkowitz, Honey & Nowell, Branda L.

2020 Conflict, Conflict Resolution and Workplace Bullying, 331-362, in: Ståle Valvatne Einarsen, Helge Hoel, Dieter Zapf & Cary L. Cooper (eds.): *Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace – Theory, Research, and Practice*. 3. ed. CRC Press, Boca Raton.

Leer-Salvesen, Paul.

³³ The assumption is based on a Pauline understanding of the social body, e.g., 1 Cor 12:12-27; Eph 1:22. See also Sigurdsson 2006, 367-369; 373.

³⁴ The suggested presuppositions are partly inspired by Zehr 2015, chap. 2.

³⁵ See Leer-Salvesen 2009, 204-207.

- 2009 *Forsoning etter krenkelser*. Fagboksforlaget, Bergen.
- Mikkelsen, Eva Gemzøe & Persson, Roger & Hansen, Åse Marie et. al.
- 2020 Individual Consequences of Being Exposed to Workplace Bullying 163-208, in: Ståle Valvatne Einarsen, Helge Hoel, Dieter Zapf & Cary L. Cooper (eds.): *Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace – Theory, Research, and Practice*. 3. ed. CRC Press, Boca Raton.
- Sigurdsson, Ola
- 2006 *Himmelska kroppar: Inkarnation, blick, kroppslighet*. Logos Pathos nr 6. Glänta produktion, Göteborg.
- Zapf, Dieter & Gross, Claudia
- 2001 Conflict escalation and coping with workplace bullying: A replication and extension, 497-522, in: *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 10.
- Zapf, Dieter & Vartia, Maarit
- 2020 Prevention and Treatment of Workplace Bullying: An Overview, 457-496, in: Ståle Valvatne Einarsen, Helge Hoel, Dieter Zapf & Cary L. Cooper (eds.): *Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace – Theory, Research, and Practice*. 3. ed. CRC Press, Boca Raton.
- Zehr, Howard
- 2015 *The Little Book of Restorative Justice*. Good books, New York.
- Bible
- 2001 *Bibeln*. Bibel 2000. Verbum förlag, Stockholm.

The conditions for reconciliation: forms, timing and normative potential

Dr. Johanna Ohlsson, Sweden

Reconciliation is often conceptualised and understood in the aftermath of systematic armed violence, large-scale human rights violations or endings of authoritarian rule. It is commonly seen as a political process connected to other notions such as peace, truth and forgiveness, within the framework of transitional justice (Lebedeva 2022, Nordquist 2017, Porter 2015). Previous research seems to primarily focus on political reconciliation, and while the understanding of reconciliation has empirical as well as normative implications, there seems to often be a rift between the theoretical and normative understandings of what political reconciliation means and what it can offer versus what people expect to happen in post-conflict scenarios (Rettberg & Ugarriza 2016). I interpret this as suggesting that the empirical aspects primarily speak towards *when* and *how* reconciliation is seen as a possible way forward, while the normative aspects primarily address *if* and *why* reconciliation is possible – both theoretically and normatively. However, it seems relevant to also consider other aspects of reconciliation, such as social (O’Neill 2002), interpersonal (Emerick 2017) and ontological reconciliation (Lister & Sterling 2001), and in particular to address if these forms might offer other avenues not captured in political reconciliation.

In this paper, I start by setting out an exploration of the differences between various forms of reconciliation (political, social, interpersonal, ontological). I am arguing that political reconciliation is the dominant form, and that this also potentially affects the other forms of reconciliation. I then continue to address the conditions for reconciliation by exploring which circumstances seem necessary for the various forms of reconciliation to be possible. I am relating this to the ripeness and timing of reconciliation, arguing that there must be a political and some extent social willingness from the affected parties to reconcile. By drawing on yet reconceptualising I.W. Zartman’s (2001) theory of a mutually hurting stalemate (MHS) as developed in mediation theory, I argue that the various forms of reconciliation is possible in a specific ripe moment in time - when violations are ceasing or after violations have stopped. What is fascinating is that this ripeness moment for reconciliation seem to be deeply contextual. In circumstances following armed conflict and war, reconciliation seems to most often be possible after efforts of mediation and negotiations, yet not all reconciliation processes are initiated after or in relation to negotiations or agreements. This indicate an interesting empirical as well as theoretical puzzle about the conditions for reconciliation. In addition, reconciliation is not always structurally implemented after gross human rights violations, but seems more common in post-conflict settings.

Based on previous research as well as the above reasoning and argumentation, I develop a model where the most central steps for an assessment of the possibility for reconciliation are structured based on an analysis of three steps: 1) what the core incompatibilities are, plus prospects for if and how they can be resolved, 2) who the main and secondary actors are and what they want and need, and 3) the political and social willingness to change the current situation. Embedded in this, the normative conditions for reconciliation seem to be 1) political and 2) social willingness to change current situation but also 3) some level of intergroup contact (Allport 1954), and 4) some level of democracy and mutual respect for each other. I finalise the paper by elaborating on how and why the different steps in this model are central for the various forms of reconciliation, and what the normative implications and potential are.

References:

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books
- Emerick, B. (2017). Forgiveness and reconciliation. *The moral psychology of forgiveness*, 117-34.
- Lebedeva, A. (2022). *Justice and Politics : On the Depoliticization of Justice Claims in the Work of Truth Commissions* Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Meierhenrich, J. (2008). Varieties of Reconciliation. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 33(1), 195–231. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20108753>
- Nordquist, K-Å. (2017). *Reconciliation as politics: a concept and its practice* Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publications.
- O’Neill, W. (2002). Imagining Otherwise: The Ethics of Social Reconciliation. *Journal of the Society of Christian Ethics*, 22, 183–199. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23561577>
- Porter, E. (2015). *Connecting Peace, Justice and Reconciliation* Boulder, CO and London, UK: Lynne Rienner.
- Rettberg, A., & Ugarriza, J. E. (2016). Reconciliation: A comprehensive framework for empirical analysis. *Security Dialogue*, 47(6), 517-540. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010616671858>.
- Zartman, I. W. (2001). The timing of peace initiatives: Hurting stalemates and ripe moments. *The Global Review of Ethnopolitics*, 1(1), 8-18.
- Lister, K., & Sterling, L. (2001). Agents in a multi-cultural world: towards ontological reconciliation. In *AI 2001: Advances in Artificial Intelligence: 14th Australian Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence* Adelaide, Australia, December 10–14, 2001 Proceedings 14 (pp. 321-332). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Klaus von Stoschs Komparative Theologie und die interreligiöse Versöhnungsarbeit

Dr. Michael Pfenninger, Switzerland

An das Projekt einer *Komparativen Theologie* werden in jüngeren religionstheologischen Publikationen weitreichende Hoffnungen geknüpft. Die Komparative Theologie, wie sie etwa der katholische Systematische Theologe KLAUS VON STOSCH vertritt, versteht sich als Versuch, durch interreligiösen Dialog «die Bedeutung und Wahrheit der eigenen Tradition tiefer zu verstehen»,³⁶ zielt darüber hinaus auf die eine «adäquate Wahrnehmung und Wertschätzung des religiös anderen»³⁷ und legt Wert darauf, nicht nur interreligiöse *Toleranz*, sondern «Freundschaft» zwischen Angehörigen verschiedener religiöser Traditionen anzustreben.³⁸ Charakteristisch ist ihr Anspruch, über die bisherigen religionstheologischen Paradigmen pluralistischer, inklusivistischer und exklusivistischer Prägung hinausführen zu wollen. Wer echte Begegnung zwischen Angehörigen verschiedener Religionsgemeinschaften ermöglichen möchte, so lautet die (wenn auch oft implizit bleibende) ethische Grundierung ihrer Programmatik, der sollte sich zum Paradigma der Komparativen Theologie bekennen. Mit ihrer Methodologie lasse sich der – nach der Komparativen Theologie nicht aufzugebende – eigene religiöse Wahrheitsanspruch mit dem echten Anerkennen der Wahrheitsansprüche und der Andersheit anderer Traditionen verbinden.

Der geplante Tagungsbeitrag unterzieht dieses Projekt der Komparativen Theologie einer kritischen Prüfung hinsichtlich der konkreten Frage, inwiefern es geeignete Mittel zur *Versöhnung* der Angehöriger verschiedener Religionsgemeinschaften in Konfliktsituationen bereitstellt. Er fragt: Kann die Komparative Theologie auch in religiös konfliktreichen Diskursituationen in pazifizierender Weise auf Versöhnung hinwirken? Wann bedeutet in solchen Situationen das bessere Verstehen des religiös anderen einen Schritt zur Versöhnung mit ihm – und wann nicht? Und: Verträgt sich die Überzeugung der Komparativen Theologie, über die Forderung nach Toleranz hinauszuführen zu wollen,³⁹ mit der Tatsache, dass schon der Toleranzbegriff in vielen diskursiven Situationen erst erarbeitet werden muss (und keinesfalls bereits den kleinsten gemeinsamen Nenner bietet, der vorausgesetzt werden könnte)?

Zur Behandlung dieses Fragenkomplexes werden zentrale Aspekte Komparativer Theologie dargestellt und auf konkrete, versöhnungsbedürftige Dialogsituationen hin angewandt. Zu diskutieren ist die versöhnungsethische Tragfähigkeit folgender Grundgedanken der Komparativen Theologie:

- VON STOSCH vertritt die These einer notwendigen konfessionellen Positionalität des interreligiösen Diskurses. In ihm soll keine allgemeinreligiöse Metaperspektive eingenommen, sondern ein Dialog jeweils distinkter religiöser Positionen angestrebt werden, die potenziell voneinander lernen, sich aber auch in ihrer Unterschiedlichkeit wahrnehmen. Lässt sich diese Grundentscheidung hin zu einer konfessionell grundierten – und nicht überkonfessionellen – Theologie der Religionen auch auf die Thematik der Versöhnung anwenden? Was bedeutet es, die Notwendigkeit von Versöhnung nicht metareligiös zu postulieren, sondern im Anschluss an interne Prämissen einzelner Religionen zu begründen?
- Die Komparative Theologie ist u.a. darin dezidiert theologisch, dass sie davon ausgeht, dass die «Andersheit des anderen eine Spur für die Andersheit Gottes sein könne»⁴⁰. Sie zielt darauf, aus der Begegnung auch neue Impulse für die eigene religiöse Tradition und die in ihr enthaltene

³⁶ Von Stosch, *Komparative Theologie als Wegweiser in der Welt der Religionen*, S. 154.

³⁷ A.a.O., S. 150f.

³⁸ A.a.O., S. 150.

³⁹ Vgl. ebd.

⁴⁰ A.a.O., S. 149.

Gottesrede zu finden. Was trägt ein solcher theologischer Anspruch in konkreten versöhnungsbedürftigen Dialogsituationen aus, was nicht? Inwiefern behindert eine solche theologische Aufladung des Dialogs seine Eröffnung in Situationen mit Konfliktcharakter?

- In Abgrenzung von religionstheologisch pluralistischen Ansätzen betont die Komparative Theologie, dass es ihr nicht um eine apriorische *Wahrheitsunterstellung* gehe, die bereits vor der Dialogsituation Wahrheitsgehalte in anderen religiösen Traditionen behauptete – und in Abweisung eines traditionell-theologischen Exklusivismus lehnt sie es ab, Religionen und deren Lehrinhalte für prinzipiell inkommensurabel zu halten. Die gemeinsame Pointe beider Abweisungen besteht darin, dass sich erst *in* der konkreten Dialogsituation zeigen könne, ob an der im Dialog behandelten Thematik eine theologische Lernerfahrung möglich sei, ob sich mir also in der Beschäftigung mit einer mir fremden religiösen Tradition Wahrheit erschliesse oder nicht. Insofern lässt die Komparative Theologie das Resultat jeder konkreten Dialogsituation grundsätzlich offen. Was bedeutet diese Grundentscheidung interreligiöser Hermeneutik für die gegenseitige Wahrnehmung religiöser Gruppen im Kontext religiöser (oder religiös grundierter politischer) Konfliktkonstellationen? Ist es für gelingende interreligiöse Versöhnung ratsam – allenfalls sogar notwendig –, für Wahrheitsmomente im Denken des religiös anderen offen zu sein? Oder überfordert man mit diesem Anspruch die konkrete Dialogsituation?

So wird im Vortrag anhand der gewählten versöhnungsethischen Fragestellung das besondere Profil der (aus je unterschiedlichen Perspektiven konfessionell gebundenen) Komparativen Theologie insbesondere gegenüber einer pluralistischen Religionstheologie herausgearbeitet. Dabei wird deutlich, dass das versöhnungstiftende Potential des Dialogs tendenziell unterminiert wird, wo das Aufgeben eigener Wahrheitsansprüche zu einer Bedingung gelingenden Dialogs erhoben wird, wie es im religionstheologischen Pluralismus der Tendenz nach geschieht. Versöhnung, Dialog und freundschaftliche Begegnung müssen vielmehr auch da möglich sein, wo beidseitig an solchen Wahrheitsansprüchen festgehalten wird. Eine durch die Dialogethik der Komparativen Theologie geprägte interreligiöse Grundhaltung erscheint daher – wenn auch mit im Beitrag zu benennenden relativierenden Elementen – als tragfähiger Ausgangspunkt auch für interreligiöse Versöhnungsprozesse.

Literatur

Clooney, Francis X: *Comparative Theology. Deep Learning across Religious Borders*, Malden (MA) / Oxford 2010.

Cornille, Catherine: *The Im-Possibility of Interreligious Dialogue*, New York 2008.

Tietz, Christiane: *Dialogkonzepte in der komparativen Theologie*, in: Bernhardt, Reinhold / von Stosch, Klaus: *Komparative Theologie. Interreligiöse Vergleiche als Weg der Religionstheologie* (Beiträge zu einer Theologie der Religionen, Bd. 7), Zürich 2009, S. 315–338.

von Stosch, Klaus: *Komparative Theologie als Wegweiser in der Welt der Religionen* (Beiträge zur Komparativen Theologie Bd. 6), Paderborn 2012.

von Stosch, Klaus: *Methoden der Komparativen Theologie*, in: *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* 2019 (103), H. 3/4, S. 234–246.

von Stosch, Klaus: *Komparative Theologie als Strategie zur Pazifizierung religiöser Geltungsansprüche? Ein Rückblick*, in: Webrick, Jürgen (Hg.): *Sühne, Martyrium und Erlösung? Opfergedanke und Glaubensgewissheit in Judentum, Christentum und Islam* (Beiträge zur Komparativen Theologie, Bd. 9), Paderborn 2013, S. 183–187.

Webrick, Jürgen / Kalisch, Muhammad Sven / von Stosch, Klaus (Hg.): *Verwundete Gewissheit. Strategien zum Umgang mit Verunsicherung in Islam und Christentum*, Paderborn 2010 (Beiträge zur Komparativen Theologie, Bd. 1).

Reconciliation Across Religious and Political Borders: Lessons from Early-Modern Westphalia

Dr. Gary Slater, Germany

Abstract

The proposed paper examines relationships between religious and political borders as a resource for reconciliation. Drawing lessons from early-modern Westphalia, the paper poses two questions. First, how are religious and political borders related? Second, how can probing this relationship serve the ethical task of promoting reconciliation? The key claim is that reflection on religious borders discloses practices that promote reconciliation across political borders, with Westphalian violence, peace, and border-making as instructive. Conceived as a work of Christian Social Ethics, the paper follows the Society of Christian Social Ethics in understanding its discipline as “an interdisciplinary ‘bridging subject’ between church and society or social, human and environmental sciences” (2018). Along with reconciliation, the two borders types are defined as follows:

- Religious borders: Points at which the contrasts between religious traditions become explicit and self-conscious to the members of the cultures in question or third parties, giving rise to narratives that reinforce said contrasts.
- Political borders: Demarcations between neighboring sovereign territories, in which sovereignty is understood in adherence to the norms of mutual recognition, mutual exclusion, and uniform distribution across each territory in question.
- Reconciliation: Restoration of trust and repair of a damaged bilateral or communal relationship following a rupture or conflict.

It is helpful to be clear about how these respective forms of bordering differ, as well as how each intersects with the notion of reconciliation. There are three key points.

First, political borders, however successful they may be for maintaining order, exist in the shadow of the violence that characterizes the origins of political sovereignty. Religious borders, however likely to generate acts of violence, lack such a categorical connection to violence. Second, religious borders, as signs of a diversity of religious traditions, warrant normative claims in their defense (e.g., Thatamanil 2020: 35) that political borders do not; even if the existence of foreigners per se warrants such claims (e.g., O’Donovan 1999: 268), these warrants do not extend to the diversity of states upon which the maintenance and enforcement of borders depend. Third, the characteristic of ambivalence has been convincingly applied both to political borders (Heimbach-Steins 2016: 241) and religious ones (Volf 2019: 2), a pivotal connection within the broader ambivalence of religion in relation to politics (Appleby 1999). Taken together, these points suggest, in political borders, the need for reconciliation, in religious borders, the capacity for reconciliation, and, in the mutual ambivalence of both borders types, a connective point by which reconciliation in one category of bordering can be applied in the other. Westphalia and its history provide a fertile opportunity for grounding and drawing lessons from these relationships. Westphalia and its neighboring regions were in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries highly bordered among both churches and states; they were also characterized by high rates of violence—including religious violence, which, contrary to William Cavanaugh, was not simply a “myth” (2019).

This was evident, respectively, in the principle of *cuius regio, eius religio* from the Peace of Augsburg of 1555, and it was operative in the territorial dimension of the Anabaptist Rebellion in Münster of 1534-35. The Westphalian Peace of 1648 sought to decouple the link between denominational identity and political membership, yet it did so without addressing the tendency of bordered groups to assume antagonistic identities or express differences in violence. One can thus claim that (a) despite the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, the modern state, and also modern borders, arose in violence; (b) religion was bound up with this process; (c) even in sublimated form, religion continued to be a factor in modern bordering, albeit in a latent way that is re-emerging now amidst contemporary transformations in national sovereignty (Brown 2010).

When one reflects on the parallels between the seventeenth century and the present, it is not just that, as Miroslav Volf has put it, Europe has become more like Yugoslavia in the 1990s (2019: 1-2); it has also become more like early-modern Westphalia. To recognize this is an interpretative guide to Thomas Brady, Jr.'s point that "the keys to possible global community in the future lie in the history not of states but of religions" (Brady 2006: 151). Saskia Sassen makes a point similar to Brady's, albeit with more nuance. According to Sassen, "out of the partial unbundling of what had been dominant and centripetal normative orders," i.e., the nation-state at the heart of the Westphalian System, "normative orders such as religion reassume great importance where they had been confined to distinct specialized spheres arising into multiple particularized segmentations" (Sassen 2006: 423). It is not that religions should dictate political borders and control political spaces. Rather, the normative claim here is that, in examining relationships across borders, Christian social ethicists can serve an interdisciplinary and public conversation in which a variety of coalition partners can work together and build relationships.

References

Anselm, R. (2018): *Who Are The People? Toward a Theological Ethics of Citizenship and Community*. In: Schmiedel, U., Smith, G. (Ed.): *Religion in the European Refugee Crisis*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 227-242.

Appleby, R.S. (2000): *The Ambivalence of the Sacred. Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Brady, T.A., Jr. (2006): *Limits of Religious Violence in Early Modern Europe*. In: Von Greyerz, K. and Siebenhuener, K.: *Religion und Gewalt. Konflikte, Rituale, Deutungen (1500-1800)*, 125-151. Brown, W. (2010): *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cavanaugh, W. (2009): *The Myth of Religious Violence. Secular Ideology and the Roots of Modern Conflict*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heimbach-Steins, M. (2016): *The Ambivalence of Borders and the Challenge of an Ethics of Liminality*. In: Brazal, A.M. and Dávila, M.T (Eds.): *Living With(out) Borders. Catholic Theological Ethics on the Migrations of Peoples*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.

O'Donovan, O. (1999): *The Desire of the Nations. Rediscovering the Roots of Political Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sassen, S. (2006): *Territory, Authority, Rights. From Medieval to Global Assemblages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Society of Christian Social Ethics (2018): *The Importance of Christian Social Ethics for Society, University, Theology and Church. A Position Paper of the Society of Christian Social Ethics*. In: *General Assembly of the Association of Christian Social Ethics (Arbeitsgemeinschaft Christliche Sozialethik)*, 23 March 2018.

Thatamanil, J. (2020): *Circling the Elephant. A Comparative Theology of Religious Diversity*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Volf, M. (2019): *Exclusion and Embrace, Revised and Updated. A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation*. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press.

Telling stories across borders: narrative hospitality in Central Europe

Luca Welczenbach

Recent decades saw the rising interest in academy and society concerning social, cultural and individual memories. This often cited ‘memory boom’ (Simine:2013), found the region of Central and Eastern Europe at a pivotal moment of transition. After decades of silenced or falsified remembrance, post-Soviet societies were facing a remarkable eruption of memories, which in the short term, lead to more confusion and conflict within and between nations. The process of coming to terms with totalitarian pasts and building up a national memory in a democratic present, often created fruitful debates, but not without problematic developments. The last three decades saw the emergence of a specific culture of remembrance in some countries of the region. Unlike many Western nations, the newly independent states of the region were born out of narratives of „trauma, victimhood, and suffering”, which defined the mode and tone of remembering. (Assmann:2021) Although such wounded histories can carry within themselves a therapeutic potential, which enables the remembering community, to stand in solidarity with the suffering of others, it carries the danger of an exclusionary way of remembering as well. Some of the narratives of victimhood and suffering tend to elevate historic wounds by connecting them to national self-understanding (Máté-Tóth:2018), this process of elevation can go hand in hand with the creation of taboos around specific memories. National narratives of suffering are often appointed to an undisputable and unreachable status, to secure and solidify national identities. Such a turn towards national victimization contributed to a hegemonic struggle to remember in a certain way while competing narratives of remembrance are often side-lined or even excluded from the national narratives. Moreover, many historic wounds are shared by neighbouring countries, and the emerging national frameworks often fail to encompass diverging experiences of the same trauma. In this paper, we argue, that some of the current narratives, born out of a wounded self-understanding, can not only hinder further reconciliation but often deepens the already existing hostilities among and within nations. Unwillingness to respond to questions of historic responsibilities and criticism of an exclusionary national memory point towards the vulnerability of the newly constructed national identities as well. Moreover, such narratives did not only build historic wounds into national identities but the possibility of conflicts as well. To explore the presence and possible effects of such narratives we will look at some examples of conflicting memories in the Central European context, using the example of Hungary. To offer an alternative way forward in the region we would like to propose insights from the Irish philosopher Richard Kearney. His hermeneutical approach to wounds (Kearney:2018) and the notion of narrative hospitality (Kearney:2021) inspired by Paul Ricoeur (Ricoeur:1995), can offer a deeper understanding of wounded narrative identities and possible routes for reconciliation. Since some historic wounds of Central and Eastern Europe exist across nations, crossing the fastchanging borders of the last century, narrative hospitality can open up a new horizon in which the multitude of overlapping stories can be heard, exchanged and retold.

Bibliography

Assmann, Aleida. ‘Cultural Memory’. In *Social Trauma – An Interdisciplinary Textbook*, edited by Andreas Hamburger, Camellia Hancheva, and Vamık D. Volkan, 25–36. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-47817-9_3.

Kearney, Richard. '2 Narrative Hospitality Three Pedagogical Experiments'. In *Radical Hospitality*, by Richard Kearney and Melissa Fitzpatrick, 24–42. Fordham University Press, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780823294442-003>.

Kearney, Richard. 'The Hermeneutics of Wounds'. In *Unconscious Incarnations*, edited by Brian W. Becker, John Panteleimon Manoussakis, and David M. Goodman, 1st ed., 21–42. Routledge, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351180191-1>.

Máté-Tóth, András. *Freiheit und Populismus: Verwundete Identitäten in Ostmitteleuropa*.

Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-254858>.

Ricoeur, Paul. 'Reflections on a New Ethos for Europe'. *Philosophy & Social Criticism* 21, no. 5–6 (September 1995): 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0191453795021005-602>.

Simine, Silke Arnold-de. 'The Hermeneutics of Wounds'. In *Unconscious Incarnations*, edited by Brian W. Becker, John Panteleimon Manoussakis, and David M. Goodman, 1st ed., 21–42. Routledge, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351180191-1>.

“the body they may kill: God’s truth abideth still” Theological and Ethical Expressions of Reconciliation in Swedish Hymns
Prof. Susanne Wigorts Yngvesson, Sweden

For centuries hymns have been poetic expressions of people’s images of God and human relations. They have shaped people’s theological, political, and ethical ideas and ideals. In this paper there are particular focus on expressions of reconciliation between, first, God and human and, second, between humans. Further, focus and selection will be on Swedish 17th and 20th century hymnody, since the hymnbook from 1695, the oldest official Swedish hymnbook, contains several hymns related to war in a political and spiritual sense which are not as frequent in the Swedish hymnbook from 1986. Rather, modern hymns pinpoint the human relations of reconciliation in this world more clearly than older hymns. A comparison may show a significant difference in the understanding of theology, ethics, and reconciliation.

A hypothetical idea for the paper is that moral, ethical, and theological expressions of reconciliation is related to a stronger cosmological worldview in the older hymns, and to a higher degree an anthropological worldview in a secular and modern age. If so, what does this indicate on the understanding of morals and ethics? Are there particular imperatives to human or divine action? Are there any special explanations when it comes to acts and ideas of reconciliation, for example connections between sin and reconciliation or the battle between good and evil? In the analysis I will not assume a particular definition of reconciliation, rather I will do the comparison deductively and interpret the concept in a broad sense, from the chosen material of about ten hymns from each hymnbook. The result will be discussed in relation to their contextual setting described below.

Alongside the textual analyses there will also be a discussion about the contexts towards which the chosen hymns relate. In the end of the 17th century Sweden was one of Europe’s political superpowers. The Hymnbook 1695 became one of King Karl XI’s nationalistic tools to control the kingdom and to influence people’s minds on matters of values, politics, ethics, beliefs, and ideas. The hymnbook became, among other things, a tool for propaganda, a century after the constitutional meeting in Uppsala 1593, when Sweden officially was declared as Lutheran. After decades of war, it is interesting to analyse the hymns on war and reconciliation from the questions raised in the earlier paragraph.

The hymnbook from 1986 was shaped in a much different context, after decades of peace (more or less) in Europe but after experiences of the Holocaust and the historically most violent century in history. 1986’s hymnbook is, until then, the first ecumenical and broadest international Swedish version after decades of influences from for example The Lutheran World Federation, Second Vatican Council, and a domestic ecumenical movement between the churches in Sweden. The contexts in which it is shaped is naturally different from the hymnbook from 1695, a context one can describe with broad concepts as a secular, individualistic, and modern era. Due to this context the theological poetry is expressed by other symbols and ethical framing, regarding the expressions of divine and human reconciliation. There are also other ethical and moral concerns regarding reconciliation in the later hymnody, which will be further explored in the paper, and by this exploration also an elaborated discussion on relations between theology and ethics when it comes to the sung hymns about reconciliation.

References

Den svenska psalm-boken. Stockholm, [1695] 1818.

Den svenska psalmboken. Stockholm: Verbum, 1986.

Jones, Serene, Trauma and Grace: Theology in a Ruptured World, 2019.

Mjaaland, Marius Timman, The Hidden God. Luther, Philosophy, and Political Theology. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2016.

Möller, Håkan, Psalmernas värld: tre studier i 1695 års psalmbok. Skellefteå: Artos, 2019.
Niebuhr, Reinhold, The Nature and Destiny of Man. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941.
Taylor, Charles, A Secular Age. Harvard University Press, 2007.

Ytterberg, Claes-Bertil, Olov Hartman och det kosmiska dramat. En studie av några centrala motiv i ett teologiskt författarskap. Stockholm: Libris, 1986.