The relevance of 2 Corinthians 5:18-21 and Romans 5:1-11 for reconciliation between victims and offenders, for serious crime, especially rape, for bringing about healing via mediation.

By
Leslie Jonathan Chetty

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the academic requirements for the degree of Master of Theology in the School of Theology at the University of Natal.

Pietermaritzburg, December 2001.

ABSTRACT

This thesis looks at how relevant 2 Corinthians 5:18-21 and Romans 5:1-11 is for bringing about reconciliation between victims and offenders in serious crime. Their relevance is discussed in the light of a psychological model of rape trauma and recovery and the real experiences of rape victims and rape offenders. The crime of rape is used and examined paradigmatically for serious crime as a whole. I contend in this thesis that reconciliation between victims and offenders, in serious crime, can promote healing, especially if it is done through careful mediation.

DECLARATION

This thesis is original work by Leslie Jonathan Chetty and has not been submitted to any other university. Where use was made of the work of others it has been acknowledged in the text.

ACKNOWLEGDEMENTS

To the One Whose unseen hand led me, guided me and made all of this possible, JESUS CHRIST.

To my parents Johnny and Savvy Chetty who unstintingly supported me during the last seven years of my theological studies. Without their prayer, emotional and financial support, I would not have come this far.

To my best friend and loving wife, Sandra, whose prayer has been unceasing over my studying. She patiently endured my long hours of study and always gave me the strength, to take just one more step, when I did not have any strength of my own.

To those precious people who bravely shared their deepest and most intimate hurts with me.

Last but not least Professor Jonathan Draper, my supervisor, who was so reassuring whenever my confidence waned. I will always remember him for the patience and kindness with which he supervised me.

The financial assistance of National Research Foundation (NRF) towards this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed and conclusions arrived at, are those of the author and are not necessarily to be attributed to the National Research Foundation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NUMBER	CONTENTS	PAGE NUMBER
	CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION.	1
1.1	*AIMS AND MOTIVATION*	*1*
1.2	*METHODOLOGY*	*4*
	CHAPTER TWO KEY DEFINITIONS AND THE NEED FOR RECONCILIATION.	11
2.1	*INTRODUCTION.*	*11*
2.2	*KEY DEFINITIONS.*	*13*
2.2.1	MEDIATION.	13
2.2.2	RECONCILIATION.	15
2.2.3	HEALING.	17
2.2.4	FORGIVENESS.	20
2.2.5	RESTITUTION, REPARATION AND COMPENSATION.	24
2.2.6	VICTIM AND OFFENDER.	27
2.3	*THE NEED FOR A VICTIM-OFFENDER RECONCILIATION PROGRAM THROUGH MEDIATION.*	*28*
2.3.1	THE SPIRITUAL NEED FOR RECONCILIATION THROUGH MEDIATION FOR HEALING.	28
2.3.2	PSYCHOLOGICAL AND JUDICIAL ADVANTAGES FOR THE NEED FOR RECONCILIATION THROUGH MEDIATION FOR HEALING.	30
	CHAPTER THREE A PSYCHOLOGICAL MODEL OF RAPE FOR VICTIM AND OFFENDER.	35
3.1	*INTRODUCTION.*	*35*
3.2	*A PSYCHOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE TRAUMA OF RAPE.*	*36*

3.2.1	STAGES OF RECOVERY FROM TRAUMA.	38
3.3	*THE RAPIST : PSYCHOLOGICAL DYNAMICS AND CAUSES OF RAPE.*	*43*
3.3.1	FOUR THEORIES OF RAPE.	43
3.3.1.1	GENDER EQUALITY.	43
3.3.1.2	PORNOGRAPHY.	44
3.3.1.3	SOCIAL DISINTEGRATION.	44
3.3.1.4	CULTURAL FACTORS.	45
3.4	*THE RAPE.*	*46*
3.4.1	EVENTS PRECEDING THE RAPE.	46
3.4.2	LOCATION.	46
3.4.3	THE RAPIST'S EXPERIENCE.	46
3.4.4	THE VICTIMS BEHAVIOUR AND THE RAPIST'S RESPONSE.	47
3.4.5	THE RAPIST'S SPEECH.	47
3.4.6	THE RAPIST'S SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR DURING RAPE.	47
3.4.7	THE AFTERMATH OF RAPE.	48
3.5	*RECIDIVISM AMONGST RAPISTS.*	*49*
	CHAPTER FOUR	51
	BIBLICAL ASPECTS OF RECONCILIATION.	
4.1	*INTRODUCTION.*	*51*
4.2	*AN OUTLINE OF RELEVANT ASPECTS OF PAUL'S THEOLOGY.*	*52*
4.2.1	THE LIFE OF SIN.	52
4.2.1.1	THE CONSEQUENCES OF SIN.	54
4.2.1.2	SIN AND THE LAW.	54
4.2.2	THE REVELATION OF THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD.	55
4.2.3	THE ESCHATOLOGICAL CHARACTER OF JUSTIFICATION.	56
4.2.4	RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD IN CHRIST	57
4.2.5	RECONCILIATION.	58
4.2.6	CHRIST'S DEATH AS ATONEMENT.	60
4.3	*AUTHORSHIP OF 2 CORINTHIANS 5:18-21 AND ROMANS 5:1-11.*	*62*
4.4	*PUTTING 2 CORINTHIANS 5 :18- 21 AND ROMANS 5 : 1- 11. INTO HISTORICAL AND LITERARY CONTEXT.*	*63*
4.4.1	2 CORINTHIANS.	64
4.4.2	ROMANS.	65

4.5	*AN EXEGESIS OF 2 CORINTHIANS 5:18-21 AND ROMANS 5: 1-11.*	*67*
4.5.1	2 CORINTHIANS 5: 18-21.	69
4.5.2	ROMANS 5: 1-11.	73
4.6	*DEBATE FOR THE SOCIO- POLITICAL CONTEXTUALIZATION OF PAUL.*	*76*
	CHAPTER FIVE THE RELEVANCE OF PAUL'S THEOLOGICAL UNDERSTANDING OF RECONCILIATION, WITH A PSYCHOLOGICAL MODEL AND THE ACTUAL EXPERIENCES OF RAPE SURVIVORS AND OFFENDERS.	83
5.1	*INTRODUCTION.*	*83*
5.2	*RELEVANCE OF THE PSYCHO-SPIRITUAL MODEL*	*83*
	CHAPTER SIX CONCLUSION.	103
6.1	*INTRODUCTION.*	*103*
6.2	*THE CHALLENGES, DIFFICULTIES AND SHORTCOMINGS OF THIS THESIS.*	*103*
6.3	*WHAT I MANAGED TO ACCOMPLISH.*	*107*
6.4	*MY CONCLUSION ON THE "RELEVANCE" OF 2 CORINTHIANS 5:18-21 AND ROMANS 5: 1-11, FOR RECONCILIATION FOR HEALING VIA MEDIATION.*	*107*
6.5	*THE WAY FORWARD : POSSIBILITIES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.*	*108*
	APPENDIX.	110
	INTERVIEWS.	
	"SURVIVOR A"	111
	"OFFENDER "B"	124
	"SURVIVOR "C"	135
	"SURVIVOR "D"	147

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 AIMS AND MOTIVATION.

The aim of this dissertation, is to see how certain texts in the New Testament in particular, can be used to promote healing via reconciliation, forgiveness and reparation between victims of crime and the perpetrators of those crimes. I will examine Paul's understanding of reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5:18 - 21 and Romans 5:1-11 with the aim of seeing how useful and relevant it can be in serious crime. I will however make oblique references to other Biblical texts which I find connected to the essence of this dissertation, where necessary.

The attendant issues of forgiveness, reparation, vengeance, justice, hope, despair etc. cannot, in my opinion, be divorced from the concept of reconciliation. However, I do realize that I will have to critically assess any link between forgiveness, reparation, vengeance etc. with the idea of reconciliation for Paul in 2 Corinthians 5:18 - 21 and Romans 5:1- 11. I will argue for a Pauline "model of reconciliation", in a religious sense. I will then attempt to contextualize Paul's religious understanding of reconciliation with regard to the victim– offender relationship, so that the texts become a useful tool for bringing about healing between victim and offender. I leave myself open to the possibility, that in the final analysis, Paul's understanding of reconciliation may not be relevant partially or in it's entirety, to the victim – offender relationship in serious crime.

The model of reconciliation will be tested by a sample of interviewees, who have been involved in a crime encounter. Their critical assessment of the model as well as their engagement with it will determine the relevancy of the chosen texts for the purpose of promoting reconciliation between victims and offender. My aim here is to incorporate creative ways that victims and offenders may engage the texts as they appropriate it for healing. I intend to provide more critical definitions of key words like "healing", "reconciliation", "forgiveness", "reparation", "victim", "offender", etc., in Chapter Two. I will also argue in Chapter Two why I think that healing is brought about by reconciliation, forgiveness, reparation etc, between victim and offender. My argument here will stand in its own right, apart from what Paul may be saying in this regard in 2 Corinthians 5:18- 21 and Romans 5:1-11.

The desire for such healing stems out of my own Pastoral counseling experiences over the last six years. In my Honours thesis I came to see that spiritual and psychological closure, for victims of crime especially, cannot always be attained because victims and offenders normally do not have the opportunity to meet and resolve the complex set of issues around the trauma. This could exist for any of the following three reasons : Firstly, the victim and offender do not have the necessary expertise and courage to initiate the reconciliation themselves. Secondly, one or both of the parties may not be interested in reconciliation or may not be available. The offender may evade arrest and not be available for any form of reconciliation or dialogue. Thirdly, victims and offenders may not reach full closure because of oppressive, non-liberating interpretations of scripture irrespective of their religious persuasion. Clergy may sometimes propagate "cheap grace" for forgiveness and so leave the victim with unresolved emotions. Clergy may do this to "promote reconciliation at all costs". My intention in this dissertation is to examine if such reconciliation has any basis, in Paul's understanding at least. Such findings would be invaluable from a Pastoral counseling point of view. What we will have here is an exegetical basis for Pastoral counseling in this regard.

My preliminary survey of a victim-offender mediation program being an ideal forum for healing through reconciliation, has led me to the understanding that such a program, has many inherent complexities. Previous to my initial survey, I had quite a romantic notion of what a victim offender mediation program (V.O.M.P.) required. This dissertation, I thought at that time, would be able to cover the spiritual, psychological, social, law and order, political and financial aspects of such a program. Not only are there philosophical concerns from each of the above angles but one is also confronted with concrete logistical hurdles for such a program. The Correctional Services Department, for example, would be concerned with an actual venue, as well as the actual security of transporting convicted criminals to such venues. And where would the finances come from to put such a program in place?

Furthermore, there are serious judicial issues which will be vigorously debated from a philosophical point of view. Do we want criminals to be convicted first, before we attempt reconciliation or do we bring about reconciliation and forgiveness, "pre-trial", negating the need for conviction via the state? These issues challenge our very basic ideas of what justice means to us – in the context of reconciliation and forgiveness.

One can immediately see that political concerns will eventually be raised because these issues

inevitably involve some basic human rights. Can the victim demand a "face to face" meeting with the offender to vent his / her feelings and make other demands? I am afraid that the complexity of such issues is hardly being addressed by law-makers and politicians in South Africa presently, judging from my survey of information in this regard. I will not be able to go into questions of this nature in any depth in this dissertation.

One advantage, which I hope to pick up on in chapter two, though, is that our country's cultural milieu has place for reconciliation outside of our Western - style legal system. Here the mechanisms for dispute resolution also exists. However, these mechanisms need to be critically examined and put to use in a modern world.

To come back to my earlier point, then, the complexity of a V.O.M.P. means that I have had to narrow down my research to a more specific area. In this dissertation, I have focused on the spiritual and religious aspects of the victim offender mediation (V.O.M.) process. However, it is not possible, to examine the "spirituality" of the process, without an awareness of the psychological dynamics between victim and offender. I would think that the spiritual and psychological issues form the bedrock of V.O.M. This would apply especially to the spiritual and psychological preparation of victims and offenders who will go through a V.O..M.P. In some of my preliminary interviews with certain individuals and organizations who are attempting, or who see the need for V.O.M. in K.Z.N., I came to the conclusion that the biggest hurdle at present, facing such a program, was the lack of expertise and research, in the spiritual and psychological areas, in dealing with victims and offenders for reconciliation through mediation. I refer here to organizations like N.I.C.R.O., Rape Crisis, The Center for Criminal Justice at the University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg, as well as certain psychologists involved closely with victims of crime and perpetrators of violence. Thus an aim of this dissertation, is to shed some light on the way forward in this regard.

While I place emphasis on the spiritual - psychological dynamics for reconciliation, oblique references may be made to certain judicial, economic, social factors etc. The main aim of the dissertation though is to develop some paradigm with which all types of crime can be addressed as we attempt reconciliation between victim and offender.

While much attention is generally focused on the victim and offender in the V.O.M. process, we should also acknowledge the mediator and the spiritual-psychological challenges s/he goes

through as s/he mediates. It seems to me that not much has been written in direct reference to the mediator. I hope to show that Paul's theology on reconciliation covers in some way a "spirituality" of mediation. How can a mediator for reconciliation be empowered for the task, using 2 Corinthians 5:18 - 21 and Romans 5:1- 11?

1.2 **METHODOLOGY.**

I would first like to comment on what I mean by a "spiritual model" of reconciliation– which I endeavor to build in this dissertation.

In dealing with the issue of reconciliation, at a socio- political level, Schreiter (1992) and Haye (1998) argue for a "spirituality of reconciliation". Due to the complexity of reconciliation and forgiveness, the process itself cannot be reduced to a reproducible set of techniques in situations where reconciliation is desired and negotiated. Rather a whole ethos is required, i.e. a spiritual ethos, which underpins and super-imposes itself on the process. So the "spiritual ethos" provides a guiding light to reconciliation, while the context determines particular techniques of facilitating reconciliation. Schreiter (1992) and Haye (1998) use Biblical texts for developing their spirituality. In a similar vein, I will use 2 Corinthians 5:18 - 21 and Romans 5:1- 11 to develop a spirituality of reconciliation in the crime encounter. It may very well be, though, that someone of another faith could develop a spirituality of reconciliation using their own religious texts.

When I say a "spiritual model of reconciliation", I refer to a subscription in the reconciliation process to some higher ideal i.e. to some higher moral standard and symbolic world. At this level we draw on transcendental symbols, through which the meaning of the universe is obtained. In reference to this, Berger and Luckmann (1966:97-102), describe in their model of the social construction of reality, how the creation of "symbolic universes" gives "legitimation" to meaning. They say that "the symbolic universe provides order for the subjective apprehension of biographical experience" (:97). Through further argument, which I will not go into here, they go on to argue how an individual's "symbolic universe" produces security, belonging and identity for him/herself (:100).

These symbols are appropriated via faith and then govern the reconciliation process. Since these spiritual symbols help in making sense of the unknown, a victim may be able to find

hope and understanding in his/her predicament where there is no rational meaning to his / her plight. A victim may validly ask the question, "Why did I have to be the victim? Why me?". At this point a victim may find strength by locating him / herself within such a spiritual framework. In the course of this dissertation, I will refer to a psychological model of victims and offenders in rape. My reference here will be in terms of the mental and emotional processes that victim and offender go through in the rape encounter, the recovery phase and the reconciliation phase. This includes emotions like anger, hopelessness, loss, grief, revenge, etc. A psychological model then refers to a typical range of mental and emotional experiences that victims and offenders go through in their trauma and recovery from the crime act.

Note that while my interest lies in serious crime as a whole, I will use rape as one example of serious crime. I believe that rape affects its victims and offenders at the deepest levels of human existence, more than other crimes except perhaps for murder. I believe the expertise developed in handling the crime of rape should put one in good stead to handle other lesser crimes.

When I refer to a "spiritual- psychological model", I then mean, an integration of both the spiritual and psychological dynamics flowing through victim and offender during their initial crime contact and reconciliation. I will take it that there is an interplay between both these fields of experience in victims and offenders. [1]

I will use Judith Lewis Hermann's (1994) work, *Trauma and Recovery* as a model and benchmark for the victim's and to a lesser extent the offender's psychological experiences in trauma. This will provide me with an empirical framework within which to then approach victim and offender. However it will also provide an empirical psychological model that I can use to interact with whatever religious model of reconciliation I extract from Paul's theology in 2 Corinthians 5 :18 - 21 and Rom 5 :1 - 11. By mapping Hermann's model of trauma and recovery for victims and offenders on to Paul's models of reconciliation, I will be able to see if any definite contour of a model develops in Paul's theology, which I can then adjudge as empirically relevant in the first place. I leave myself open to the possibility that

---

[1] For the relationship between psychology and religion see Ulanov & Ulanov (1993:7-26) and Shafranske (1993:102-123).

Paul's understanding of reconciliation may not be congruent at all, or at some points with Hermann's model.

I will not go into any criticism leveled against Hermann's work because I consider that beyond the scope of this dissertation.[1] I will rather treat her work as a platform from which to understand victims of rape. My initial survey of literature, brought me to the conclusion though, that Hermann is considered an authority on the subject and in no small measure because of her work in *Trauma and Recovery*. I will, however, also access other authors in the field of Pastoral counseling, when necessary, especially in the area of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder.

Hermann employs a useful methodology in dealing with trauma which I will adapt for my own purposes here. My interpretation of Lewis Hermann is that she uses "rape" as a paradigm for all causes of trauma for women. She does not talk of the rape of men. For trauma experienced by men she then looks at the combat experiences of war veterans. These are mostly Vietnam war veterans. She only refers to male combat war veterans. The psychological experiences of war- veterans are used by her as a psychological paradigm of trauma experienced by men. Typically war veterans experience flashbacks and Post - Traumatic Stress Disorder, which relate to savage and violent acts that they committed during the war, and these symptoms of trauma are very similar to the symptoms of trauma that women experience in rape.

The other benefit of Lewis Hermann's work, is that she develops a methodology and psychological model for "recovery" from trauma. I will use this as my model of recovery from trauma, for both victim and offender in serious crime. In practice I used this model to develop a "pre-thesis" spiritual- psychological model of reconciliation with which I approached victims and offenders, to share their views on the relevancy of 2 Corinthians 5:18 - 21 and Romans 5:1- 11. Please note again that the primary aim of the dissertation is to develop a spiritual model of reconciliation and not necessarily to test Hermann's psychological model of trauma and recovery. Lewis Hermann's psychological model is merely a scientific foundation, from which I ask valid and relevant questions concerning reconciliation, forgiveness, vengeance etc.

---

[1]For a critique of Lewis Hermann's work rather see Rosik (1993:375-376) and / or Fortune (1993:435-436).

For a psychological model of rapists, I will refer mostly to the work of Lloyd Vogelman (1990) in his work *The Sexual Face of Violence : Rapists on Rape.* His work is primarily a qualitative study of South African sex offenders in the "coloured" community of Riverlea.

After drawing a concise psychological model of victim and offender in chapter three I will examine Paul's understanding of reconciliation in chapter four. I will then build up an argument for contextualizing Paul's religious understanding of reconciliation in the victim-offender relationship of reconciliation.

Thereafter in chapter five I will develop a "psycho- spiritual" model of reconciliation in the crime encounter, by critically engaging Paul's religious use of reconciliation with the psychological model of chapter three.

I will show that, by contextualizing Paul in a way that was critically valid in a psychological sense, I was able to come up with a model of reconciliation of Paul, which I could then qualitatively test. Testing the model took the "form" of a questionnaire. However this was not a questionnaire in the classic sense. Each questionnaire varied slightly between respondents depending on their unique circumstances. I also allowed answers to take on the form of a conversation. But it was not an interview in the classic sense either, where the conversation flowed freely. I still kept control of the flow of the conversation by keeping to a more or less fixed set of questions. The form in which I wrote out the "interviews"(see Appendix) is therefore not in the form of a verbatim with every word recorded. At times answers had to be clarified and made more concise so that the data could be put into a final manageable form. The interviews presented in this thesis then, are edited accounts of my dialogues with the subjects. However to a large extent I have kept the actual words and expressions of the subjects. The interviews consisted in explaining my aims, reassuring the subjects, listening sympathetically even when I needed brevity, as well as putting the text into critical perspective. Thus the interviews lasted on average up to about five hours each. All the interviews were done in at least two, sessions if not more, with breaks for refreshments. Interviews "A" and "B" were carried out over two days. Many of the questions needed clarification before some intelligible answer could be obtained. These are some of the reasons why it was not practically possible to provide a five hour transcript as an interview.

It must also be understood that my aim was not to counsel these respondents for their past

trauma and so I did not concentrate on asking questions in a manner that would be considered necessary for good counseling, though the process was carried out in an appropriately sensitive manner.

From the responses of the interviewees I was then able to ascertain the relevance of Paul's model of reconciliation for my sample. My sample was a narrow focus centered in an Indian-South African Pentecostal/Charismatic Christian tradition. This is in fact the race and Christian tradition that I myself come from. This had two advantages : Firstly from a practical point of view, I had easy access to this cultural group. Secondly, I was able to narrow down the psycho-socio- spiritual variables, amongst others, that are an input into the subject's experience. This allows me to make a stronger case for the significance of the results that I have obtained. This is important because cultural and social factors do play a part in influencing the perpetration of rape and the way victims respond to rape.[1]

I initially set out to interview five pairs of related victims and offenders. However the "availability" of these victims/survivors and offenders for interviewing proved difficult. I then realized that I was not going to obtain these related pairs because of a number of problems. So I settled on a total of ten unrelated victims and offenders in total. However I soon realized that it was still extremely difficult to get offenders to speak up. It seemed that once they had been healed and their lives had taken a new turn for the better, they preferred not to visit the incident again. Again one can easily imagine any number of reasons for this. In one refusal it was a family member who prevented me gaining access to the ex-offender. So it was a complex problem, because talking up just did not affect the offenders but it was perceived that it would also affect the rest of their families. When I finally did get an offender to agree to talk to me, he came to my home with his wife. They asked many questions about who had informed me of his past and other related details. They were visibly upset but nevertheless they agreed to the interview, largely I think because they respect me as a pastor in our community. However, even in this case there seemed to be a possible rationalizing away of his guilt because throughout the interview he painted himself as the "victim" (See Offender B; b56 -57). But this

[1] I discuss this in more detail in chp. 3 pg. 44-46.

accords well with Lewis Hermann [1] and Vogelman's [2] psychological models for victims and offenders respectively. Furthermore the lack of offenders to talk to is not an unusual problem. Vogelman (1990:9) also laments this problem when he says that "sample sizes are often small" in rape research because of the difficulties in obtaining subjects to talk to.

Secondly I interviewed victims and offenders who have already reached a large measure of healing from the trauma of rape. While quantifying "healing" may elude me in some measure, I must say that I interviewed victims and offenders who could "revisit" the crime encounter, without disintegrating spiritually and psychologically to a level where they felt overwhelmed all over again. Such a sample meant that I did not have to deal with victims and offenders becoming re - traumatized all over again. In fact I did abandon one "interview" after I realized that the victim was going to be re-traumatized by talking about the rape. [3] Also, by "interviewing" offenders and victims who had been through the process of recovery, I was able to obtain a more holistic understanding of the trauma and recovery process. Anyway, interviewing victims and offenders immediately after their involvement in rape could have been construed as opportunistic on my part, hence the preference for having interviewed victims and offenders who have been through a large measure of healing.

All of this meant that I ended up with a small sample of only four subjects in the end. This sample consisted of three "survivors" and one offender.

I will reference the interviews in the following way : When referencing, I will say, " a1, a2...etc." when referring to comments by "Survivor A" and "b1, b2...etc." when referring to comments by "Offender B" for example. If I want to refer to a question in the interview of "Survivor A" then I will say, " Question i1, i2...etc. in " "Survivor A" asked...", for example. When I refer to "i1;c1" for example, then it would mean I am referring to my question labeled

---

[1] See pg. 49 of this thesis as well as footnote 1 of pg. 38 which refers to denial in offenders.

[2] See pg. 48 of this thesis where Vogelman describes "No guilt and indifferent feelings" as one category of response by sex offenders to their victims.

[3] I attempted to console her and asked her to see me again but I have not seen her since. I have not had the time to visit her either because of the time constraints of this thesis but I hope once this thesis has been completed I will be able to spend time with her to counsel her. Counseling her will be a long term commitment as I have as discovered in my other interviews.

"i1" in the interview of "Survivor C" and "c1" will refer to her answer that I labeled "c1" in her interview.

I will use the "Harvard Reference System" as outlined by Kilian (1985) for reference to my sources and quote from the Revised Standard Version unless stated otherwise.

My approach to the texts, depended very much on me being a "trained" Biblical Studies student. However while I read the texts "critically", I was aware of how the text is usually read in my own Christian community and was sensitive enough to allow space for this. In this sample of subjects, that I chose, people tended to read "on" or "in front" of the text.[1] They tend to "spiritualize" the meaning of Biblical texts. I did however, point out to them certain critical approaches to the texts. This was not to impose a specific reading but rather to raise a critical awareness of the texts. In this way I hoped the texts could be a richer resource for them.

In this thesis I will also refer to offenders in the masculine and victims and survivors in the feminine. I do this merely to write in a manner that is more concise and easily readable. Furthermore the majority of victims of rape tend to be female and the converse is true of offenders. My use of the feminine and masculine for victims and offenders of rape respectively will then reflect reality on the ground. It will also be easier to work with Lewis Hermann's work since she also uses this method of reference.

---

[1] See West (1993:27) where he describes reading the text with an emphasis on the literary and narrative aspects as a reading "on the text" and reading "in front of the text " as placing an emphasis "on the thematic and symbolic context of the Bible as a whole".

CHAPTER TWO

Key definitions and the need for reconciliation.

2.1 INTRODUCTION.

The essence of this thesis is encapsulated by the following key terms : "Mediation", "Reconciliation", "Healing", "Victim / Survivor", "Offender / Perpetrator", "Reparation" and "Restitution". The need for definition and clarity is two- fold. Firstly from a methodological point of view, definitions of key terms at an early stage of the thesis are necessary for a logical sequence of thought.

However in this thesis, the nature of the topic makes the meanings of these words, much more complex, than what one understands in everyday, normal usage. The above key terms become fairly subjective in the context of the title of this thesis.

I will now show briefly how subjective just one term like healing can be. The word "healing" for example, means various things, depending on which field of expertise one decides to use the term in.[1] "In a medical model all health and illness phenomena are understood to be biomedical or physical and the mind as an activity of the nervous system" (Marks, Murray, Evans & Willig 2000: 5- 6). The bio-psycho-social model on the other hand sees health and illness as "a consequence of physical, psychological and cultural variables" (: 6). Thus in the biomedical model "healing" will be viewed as purely as an absence of physical injury or illness. By contrast a "bio-psycho-social " model views disease an organism-wide phenomenon.

Then in some cultures healing would be related to a complex set of socio-cultural factors, as well as in terms of definition. But apart from the biological, psychological and social dimensions of the word "healing", a priest, shaman, sangoma etc., may see the root cause as "demonic", or an affliction from "the ancestors". While they may concede that what is wrong

---

[1] This is supported by Gilbert, Selikow & Walker (1996:7) when they say, "The 'definitions' of health [and therefore healing] are determined to a great extent by 'where they come from' or 'who was asked to provide them'. They differ along professional lines by culture, gender as well as age characteristics."

at a spiritual level manifests at a biological, psychological and social level, their starting point for definition and healing would be grounded in the spiritual. Furthermore, what constitutes "being healed" for one person, does not necessarily constitute "being healed" for another. The above discussion gives us an idea that the key terms in this thesis are not definitions that can be viewed from one discipline only. This arises as a matter of necessity. I have also discovered that certain key terms like "forgiveness", "victim" and "perpetrator", cannot be accessed in psychology reference dictionaries. The reason is that there are no clear - cut, single- sentence definitions of "forgiveness"etc. One has got to understand that in the discipline of psychology, "forgiveness", "reconciliation", "healing",etc. are viewed as long term dynamic processes. And even these processes consist of complex sub-processes, that both the victims and offenders will go through.

I propose, then, that it is futile to define the key terms in this thesis with simple, concise definitions. While there may be some short dictionary definitions that I will use, one will immediately see that the words within a definition, are themselves subjective which need further explanation. So if a dictionary defines the word "reconciliation" with a phrase like, "to become amenable", one is still left with a subjective definition: "What exactly does it mean for victim and offender to "become amenable" after the crime encounter, at a spiritual, psychological and social level ? (Please note that I will comment on such nuances of meaning, in more detail later as I describe each key term individually.)

So my conclusion is that I should not just attempt to "define", but rather to also "describe" each key term. I will then give critical descriptions for the various key terms. These definitions and descriptions, will be drawn from various perspectives, viz :- the theological, psychological, social and judicial perspectives. Some words may tend to have more of a judicial-criminological description than other words for example because these words tend to be used in certain disciplines more than in others. The word "restitution"for example is more likely to have a stronger, theological description or sense than the word "reparation". The use of "reparation" on the other hand has a stronger judicial sense. In summary then, I am arguing that the key terms in this thesis cannot have an equal, critical level of definition across each discipline, be it psychological, theological, judicial, sociological etc.

I will also have to "create" or "define" the key words, as I see myself understanding them and using them in this thesis. I accept as inevitable, the criticism that these words are likely to

reflect my own subjective agenda concerning what I prefer to prove in this thesis.

Because the terms can be so subjective, I suggest that the definitions have to also find themselves grounded in some reality of experience. It is the victim and the offender themselves who ought to have a hand in the definition of what it means for them to be "healed", "reconciled", etc. The interviews, then, were valuable in not only gauging "how relevant" the given texts for reconciliation are but they also helped to gauge how victims and offenders bring definition and use to these terms.

I will now go on to describe the key words in this thesis, viz :- "Mediation", " Reconciliation", "Healing", "Forgiveness", "Restitution", "Reparation", "Survivor/Victim" and "Offender / Perpetrator". I will provide a theological description of the Biblical word for "Reconciliation" in Chapter 4, with regard to its actual Greek meanings in the texts 2 Cor 5:18 - 21 and Rom 5:1 - 11, as well as other ancient usage of the word. This will give greater clarity for the exegesis of the texts in chapter four.

2.2 KEY DEFINITIONS.

2.2.1 MEDIATION.

According to the *Oxford Complete Wordfinder* (1996:948), the word "mediate" means to "intervene; and to produce agreement or reconciliation". It also means," to form a connecting link between". The word "mediator" refers to one who is an, "arbitrator; referee; umpire; judge; negotiator; moderator; intercessor; interceder; conciliator; appeaser [and] peacemaker". "Mediation" then is the process of "mediating" involving a mediator.

In this thesis, I express much interest in the "mediator" because I believe the mediator should not just know certain techniques of mediation but that s/he needs to be in tune spiritually with the whole process too, as well as have a genuine concern for both parties to enhance the success of the mediation. In other words, I believe that there is a whole spirituality pertaining to the mediator as well.

While there may be other subtle nuances to the term "mediator", for the purposes of this thesis, I think the above description is sufficient.

One can see that inherent in the concept of "mediation", is the aim for "reconciliation". I will define the term "reconciliation" further in chapter four. In this thesis I will also propose, that there is a need for mediation to bring about reconciliation in serious crime, between victim and offender. However it will not be reconciliation at any cost ie:- my description of mediation is not a process aimed at "promoting cheap grace", in a similar sense to how Bonhoeffer (1948:37- 49) sees it. Bonhoeffer refers to grace offered in Christ for salvation as "costly". This grace exacts responsibility from the ones receiving it. I propose the same analogous demand of "grace", offered by victims to offenders. But this will be discussed further after examining Paul's theology on reconciliation and Lewis Hermann's psychological understanding of victim and offender.

The next thing that I need to point out is that apart from the term "mediator", referring to "arbitrator, judge, umpire, negotiator, referee, etc", it also refers to "intercessor, interceder, conciliator, appeaser, and peacemaker". For me this latter half of the definition, carries with it a more spiritual notion. I believe that these descriptions take a mediator beyond technique and into some "spiritual" level of mediation. It refers to an ability to intercede on behalf of another" (or each other in the victim - offender coupling).

The words "appeaser" and "peacemaker" indicate that the mediator, is not a passive third party. Rather s/he is one who helps drive the mediation to a point of reconciliation. This "half" of the definition provides a certain unique quality of human existence ie:- pleading on behalf of another to make peace. One can see then that by definition, mediation can subscribe to a higher, moral characteristic within our humanity. I have commented on this, because it was my stated aim in chapter one, page four, to look for a "spirituality of reconciliation" in this thesis.

In the victim - offender equation, the variables can go beyond the human dimension and into the divine as well. An offender for example, may want reconciliation between God and himself, if he is religious. If the mediator is a priest or is in some other similar capacity, then s/he should preferably be able to offer this mediation between God and victim. I say victim because I will show later (in chapter three) that victims can feel estranged from God once they have been subjected to crime. Perhaps offenders also feel guilty and estranged from God after committing a crime.

The definition of "mediator" then, that I have described above, supports well, what I intend to

argue for in chapter four, regarding Paul's model for reconciliation. Here (2 Cor 5:18 - 21), the Son of God is portrayed as mediator [1].

The website www.voma.org/abtvom.shtm provides an essay entitled, "What is Mediation?" ("VOMA" Is an acronym for Victim Offender Mediation Association. This website was accessed on the 27/3/2001.) In this essay "mediation" is described in a number of ways. I prefer to call them "contexts of mediation." These are some of the descriptions of mediation provided :

> Mediation can take place as interventions in schools where it can be supervised by school teachers. It can also take place as interventions in family crises where it may be handled by family counselors or therapists. Mediation can take place in labour conflicts. It can also take place in communities through state intervention.

These are just some of the descriptions of where mediation can take place. However, for the purpose of this thesis, the following contexts of mediation are more significant. This essay goes on to make the following comments : "Mediation is part of the juvenile criminal system. For non-violent offenders, victim- offender mediation is a process where community volunteers, under supervision of the criminal justice system, help both sides "humanize" and rehabilitate each other." This is my aim, i.e. for a "rehabilitation" and "humanization" of victim and offender in the crime encounter.

2.2.2 RECONCILIATION.

In my exegesis of the chosen texts in chapter four, I will examine the word "reconciliation" critically, as used in the Greek New Testament. This will situate the word in its context, as used by Paul. I will however continue now with a description of the word, and those words close to it, as described in the *Oxford Complete Word-finder*. The word will also be described as the interviewees see the word. Reference will be made to this in chapter five, when I analyze the interviews in more detail.

---

[1] However see point "12" in chp. 5 where I eventually come to the conclusion that the analogy of the Son of God as mediator is not totally congruent to that of the mediator/therapist in the crime encounter.

The word "reconciliation" can be broken down into the prefix, "re" and the word "conciliation". According to the *Oxford Complete Word-finder* (1996:295,1280), "conciliation" means, "the use of conciliating measures". "Conciliate" in turn means "to make calm and amenable; pacify; gain esteem and goodwill; [and] make compatible". "Reconciliation" means "conciliation; appeasement; propitiation; reconcilement; understanding; detente; reunion; compromise; settlement [and] agreement". My desire in this thesis is the above definition. That is, to promote or create "conciliation; appeasement and propitiation..." between victim and offender. However, the meanings of such phrases as "make amenable; gain goodwill; [and] make compatible" in the definition of conciliation and "detente; reunion; appeasement..." in the definition of "reconciliation" are subjective phrases, especially between criminals and their victims.

According to the *Oxford Complete Wordfinder* (1996:1280), "to make amenable" refers to a "responsiveness", an "easy-goingness", "submission" and a "docility" - amongst other things. I would say that such qualities characterize relationships of love. For me a meaningful relationship, underpinned by goodwill is characterized by mutual submissiveness, responsiveness, and amenability at some level, depending on the depth and seriousness that the relationship is desired to function at.

At this point, I am challenged then by what I mean and what I am aiming for, at a spiritual-psycho- social level, when pursuing reconciliation between victim and offender. The question is a humbling one, especially when considering serious acts of crime.

At this level, the question becomes more interesting. What is Paul proposing when he speaks of reconciliation? While the first challenge confronting me when approaching Paul's use of reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5 and Romans 5, is the question of how validly we can contextualize his theology in the victim - offender relationship, perhaps an even more daunting task would then be to ascertain, how Paul understands reconciliation and forgiveness at a psycho-social level? Since I could not directly fathom Paul in this regard in 2 Corinthians 5 and Romans 5, I had to access other texts of Paul, which I think helps to shed light in this regard.

Since the meanings of "reconciliation" and "forgiveness" are subjective, I consider very important what the interviewees have said. Greater comment and definition can only be taken

in the light of human experience, in the crime act.[1]

Out of necessity then, I will have to propose my own definition of what I think "reconciliation" and "forgiveness" entail. I would propose that reconciliation and forgiveness at a minimum must encompass "a change of heart" towards one's offender or victim. That is, at a minimum one's attitude should change at a spiritual, psychological and social level. Feelings of hatred, revenge, maliciousness, bitterness etc., must be replaced by a level of goodwill, respect, tolerance, love etc. At a minimum this must exist in "seed form". My proposal in this thesis is that a turn at this level signifies reconciliation and forgiveness, and I will comment more on this in chapter 2. 2,[2] as necessary for healing.

The level of outward experience or manifestation, of this new internal attitude, should be allowed to operate at one's own subjective level in a continuing dynamic process. This subjective level of goodwill and responsiveness in relationship, in my opinion, seems to depend on one's level of healing and is likely to be dependant on one's faith and religious experience.

2.2.3 HEALING.

In chapter two, page eleven, I described two models of health, when I described how subjective the term healing (and therefore health) can be. I mentioned the "biomedical" and "the bio-psycho-social" model of health. Added to these models however, is the "psycho-social-environmental" model of health, according to Gilbert, Selikow and Walker (1996:5). They add that this model focuses on the "promotion and maintenance of health through socio-environmental and behavioral changes".

The subjectivity of the term "health", is further emphasized by a sociological description of health provided by Gilbert, Selikow and Walker (1996:7). They say : "Sociologists view health as socially constructed: what people call health is a result of the interaction between them and their social context ... What is experienced as health represents a complex social content, not a fixed set of physiological and biochemical facts".

---

[1] I examine reconciliation at a psycho- social level in the light of human experience in points "8" and "16" of chp. 5.

[2] Chapter 2.3, pg. 28 of this thesis deals with "The need for a V.O.R.P through mediation."

In the victim-offender equation, this perspective is one of the important elements to be considered when talking of healing. It is often the case that victims may be looked upon with shame, resentment and isolation by the rest of the community when a woman for instance has been raped. This would possibly be more pronounced depending on which culture one comes from. The offender in a crime may also be left isolated and despised from his community. It is essential to consider that this sense of "ill-health", needs to addressed too, in the process of healing. Reconciliation and forgiveness, between victim and community as well as offender and community also needs to be pursued.

According to Gilbert, Selikow and Walker (1996:7) the World Health Organization's definition of health in their constitution (1948), states that "Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being, and not merely the absence of disease and infirmity".

In this vein, I will now continue to describe "health" and "healing" as found in the *Oxford Complete Wordfinder*, and thereafter build a definition or description, as I use it in this thesis.

In the title of this thesis, the word "healing" can be interpreted both as a noun and as a verb. According to the *Oxford Complete Wordfinder* (1990:690) "heal" means "to make sound or healthy again". And being "healthy" refers to being "well, fit, whole, strong, thriving , [and in] good health ...[etc]". Heal also means to "alleviate [sorrow etc.]". It can also mean "mending, curing, restoring [to health]...[etc]". A pertinent definition for this thesis, is to "reconcile, settle, patch-up, put or set right." The word healing as a noun, can be inferred then as that condition arising out of the verb, "heal". It would then be "a mending, a restoration, an alleviation [of sorrow, pain, etc.] ". It would be "a restoration of soundness or being healthy again."

Practically my findings yielded two significant factors with regard to healing. Firstly it seems that it takes a number of years from the time of the rape up until the time that the survivor or offender can say that they have reached an appreciable level of healing. Survivor A only came to a "point of healing" eighteen years after she stopped being abused (a104). Offender B says he came to a "point of healing" five years after the incident he was involved in (b72-73). Judging from my sample, it would seem that it takes years for victims and offenders to come to a "point of healing", i.e. a point where they can talk of the rape and not break down emotionally. Survivor C has not come to a "point of healing" yet (i12 / c57). She is twenty-two

years old now and has been raped on an ongoing basis from age eight up until last year (c2). Survivor D (now nineteen years old) was last raped at age twelve (d47). This is seven years after she was last raped and she says she has still not come to "a point of healing" yet (d75). The time taken for a person to reach an appreciable level of healing is an important one as it will guide us in any attempt for reconciliation. A more quantitative sample and the factors affecting this will be a useful study in this regard.

Secondly with regard to an actual definition of healing it is interesting that Survivor A and Offender B who claimed to have come to a functional level of healing, were the only ones who could articulate any form of a definition for healing (a71-74). Offender B felt he was healed because he could function "normally now, emotionally and physically" (b12). Survivors C and D who felt that they were not healed, could not articulate any clear definition of healing (i13/c61; i9/d81). Survivor D felt she would only be healed when she "saw Jesus" (i9/d81).

All referred to not just emotional damage but also physical scars/injuries which in my estimation indicates an acute awareness of the damages to physical health as well, in rape (a71-74; b10; c95-96; d75-76).

I would view "healing" from the crime act then, as "a dynamic process leading to increasing wholeness and restoration, to a spiritual-psychological and social level, as that experienced prior to the crime encounter." The aim of reconciliation and forgiveness, then, is to bring victims and criminals to a meaningful level of functioning as a human-being. If a process of disintegration takes place, at a spiritual-psychological-social level once the crime-encounter takes place, then the healing I envision would be a process of increasing integration of experience, spiritually, psychologically and socially.

When I said a "meaningful level of functioning as a human-being", above, I meant functioning in a "constructive way" towards one's self, others and towards God, for victims and offenders who believe in God. In the process of healing, the victim and offender must begin to gain a mastery over his/her life and begin to manage his/her emotions constructively.

While I have not emphasized the physical, biological aspects of healing above, I do not negate its importance. It is just that, the emphasis for this thesis, lies more in the spiritual and psychological aspects of healing.

2.2.4 FORGIVENESS

The term "forgiveness" is also subjective at a psycho- social level. I will however define the word from the *Oxford Complete Word finder* and any other attendant words. I will then go on to comment on the term as I see it and use it in this thesis. I would say that the average person thinks of forgiveness as "letting someone off the hook", "letting bygones be bygones" or even "forgetting the injury". According to the *Oxford Complete Wordfinder* (1990:690), the verb "forgive", means to cease to feel angry or resentful towards [another], pardon [an offender or offence], [or] remit or let off [a debt or debtor]". The noun "forgiveness", " is the act of forgiving, the state of being forgiven, pardon, absolution, acquittal, reprieve, remission, compassion, grace, leniency, clemency [and] indulgence" (1996:586). While there are other subtle nuances to the meaning of forgiveness, I think the list of descriptions above, is sufficient for what I am aiming for in this these.

I would say that "forgiveness" in a general sense is to "grant free pardon" to the offender for the crime perpetrated by him or her. The phrase "free pardon" in the above description needs to be unpacked further. "Free pardon" may provide an impression that the offender walks away without any obligations whatsoever to the victim after being forgiven. Words like "absolution, acquittal" etc. that appear in the dictionary definitions of "forgiveness", may further strengthen an indication of a lack of obligation to the victim. It is not my intention in this thesis, as I mentioned earlier [pg. 14], to promote "cheap grace".[1] I will argue later in chapter four, when I describe a "spiritual model of reconciliation", that forgiveness can still include punishment of the offender and some means of reparation. In fact I will argue in chapter three that this can be helpful for the victim's recovery from her trauma. It may be argued that it is debatable whether this is "true" forgiveness. My stance for this thesis though, as I will also interpret Paul's theology in chapter four , is that forgiveness does not negate the need for punishment and reparation .

The basic evidence for forgiveness for me, is that there must be a psychological change in attitude towards the offender. Feelings of hatred, animosity, maliciousness, vengeance, aggression etc. , must be transformed into feelings of love, compassion, grace and mercy.

---

[1] I am in agreement with Fortune and Poling (1993:491-492) when they discount "cheap grace" as being counterproductive. They say here that "Cheap grace short circuits the process that the abuser needs in order to repent."

This new attitude encapsulated by forgiveness, must start with a conscious act of the will. Having a conscious will to forgive, is not necessarily made when emotions of bitterness, anger, hatred etc. are absent. It can be made in spite of these emotions. Joan Mueller (1996:125-126) alludes to this in her book, *Why Can't I Forgive ?*, when she says that forgiveness is a decision. For her, it is primarily an act of the will and I am in agreement with her.

When I used the word "transform" I meant a change of emotions from bitterness, resentment, malice etc., to love, grace, mercy etc. The purpose was to show that I do not negate the need there may be for a victim especially, to feel these emotions of bitterness, resentment etc.- immediate to the crime encounter. In fact this may be a psychological necessity on the way to recovery. I propose that the victim be allowed space for these feelings. However on the way to recovery, I would argue for a transformation of these emotions into more "constructive" feelings towards the offender. I would think that if the victim maintains emotions of bitterness, malice etc., then the offender would still be dominating the psychological and spiritual well-being of the victim and this could go on for years on end.[1] I would say from my Pastoral experience that people who forgive and emotionally release their enemies, recover and heal from their traumas more quickly than people who do not.[2]

My sample indicated, as I expected, that the victim's initial reaction to the rapist is not forgiveness but rather hatred and anger (a111-112; i18/b81; i30/c85-86; i37/c97; c118; d117). Survivor A even thought of inflicting physical harm on her rapist (a111-112). My analysis is that as time evolved for these subjects, forgiveness also seems to have evolved (a105; b93; c85; d115), strengthening my conclusion that forgiveness is a dynamic process, which exists at a level subjectively determined by the survivor or victim. The level at which the survivor operates psychologically and spiritually, once forgiveness has set in, cannot in my opinion be quantified objectively. As I described in my understanding of "reconciliation" earlier, forgiveness operates at a level and pace dependent on an individual's life experience. Factors such as one's psycho-social and religious experience play a role in the evolution of the

---

[1] Note that all the subjects interviewed agreed that by taking the initiative to forgive and reconcile the survivor would not be dominated psychologically and spiritually by the offender anymore. See a196-197; a141; i44-b118; c146; c122; d137; d177

[2] See Cheston (1993:483) where I would agree with Sanford (1988) and others, as opposed to Lew (1990) and Bass and Davis (1988), who believe that forgiveness is necessary for health. Mueller (1996:48) also links forgiveness to healing but looks at it from a Christian theological point of view with reference to Lk 5:17-28.

forgiveness experience (a60; a105; c118-119; d110- 111).

I go further and say that "forgiveness" is essential for "reconciliation" and I intend to show that this is at least implicitly expressed in 2 Corinthians 5 and Romans 5. Smedes (1986:169) echoes this when he says, "Forgiveness offers a chance at reconciliation; it is an opportunity of life together... Forgiveness moves away the heavy hindrance to fellowship..."
Meditation and reconciliation also serve to impact forgiveness at another level. It is sometimes the case, as I mentioned earlier, that the offender will refuse to acknowledge his wrongdoing. Can the victim forgive some-one who does not ask for forgiveness? Alternatively, the offender may "rationalize away" the action that he has committed. The offender then does not obtain forgiveness at any level, be it psychological, spiritual or social. At least this is my own ethical stance, Luke 17:3- 4 takes the same stance when it says, "...Take heed to yourselves; if your brother sins, rebuke him, and if he repents, forgive him; and if he sins against you seven times in the day, and turns to you seven times, and says, I repent, you must forgive him." [1]

A truly repentant heart will show remorse and humility, and then seek forgiveness. It is in this context that Luke encourages forgiveness.

However apart from this theological perspective, psychologically it is very difficult for the victim to forgive, if the offender does not request it. It is difficult to have psychological closure, by just forgiving in an "abstract" sense. The advantage of mediation, and hence the need for mediation, is that it offers the possibility of bringing together the victim and offender, so that the offender can see his wrongdoing and ask for forgiveness. Since I have already presented this argument for the need for reconciliation, via mediation for healing, I will not mention it again until chapter 2.2, where I tackle this in more depth.

So if the offender does not ask for forgiveness, does this mean that the offender continues to dominate the victim in this way because she cannot have closure? This should not necessarily

---

[1] Note that I quote Luke without critical concerns here because it seems to reflect the way the subjects in my sample, who were all Christians, related to Biblical texts ie. a mode of reading not conciously occupied with critical concerns. See a129-130; b105-106; c65; c118; c100-101; d110-111; d134.

be the case [1]. The victim should then, even though it may be fairly difficult, "forgive", in the sense of "letting go". The victim must attempt to let go of feelings of bitterness, resentment, hate, etc. The victim does this for her own sake. The offender, however, still does not enjoy a "release" or pardon in his own mind. For the victim though, the spiritual and psychological energy used for bitterness and hate, becomes redirected at reconstructing one's own identity and well-being. After all, it takes much energy to hate and to fantasize out revenge. I do take into cognizance what the results of "unconditional forgiveness" are in this thesis but I will not pursue this line of argument any further.

To round up, though, on when and how we forgive, I will quote from a web- page, *When Forgiveness Seems Impossible!* [2] Looking at the issue from a Christian theological point, it says that "Christ-like love dictates how forgiveness happens." It says that sometimes it's "Father forgive them, for they do not know what they do (Lk. 23:24). Sometimes love requires us to forgive over and over (Mt. 18:21 - 22). Sometimes love requires us to withhold forgiveness for the sake of the one who has harmed us." (Note the subjects often quoted these texts amongst other New Testament texts. However I would refocus them on the 2 Corinthians 5:18-21 and Romans 5:1-11 texts because these were the subject of this thesis. They would relate to these texts without any concious critical considerations, similar to the way it is used here above.)

According to an article in this web-page, entitled *Forgiveness - A Definition* [3] , "Throughout the Bible, 'forgiveness' carries the idea of 'release', 'sending away' or 'letting go' ". According to this article, the Greek word often translated "forgiveness" , was used to indicate a "release from office, marriage, obligation, debt or punishment". In Biblical terms, therefore, "forgiveness is the loving, voluntary cancellation of a debt". I agree with this definition provided it is acknowledged that this is only one half of the equation. The other is the necessity for justice. "Forgiveness", as described above, is a process, with the one receiving it , not ruling out the possibility that s/he may have to pay reparation or meet the demands of justice.

---

[1] Note that all the subjects interviewed agreed that by taking the initiative to forgive and reconcile the survivor would not be dominated psychologically and spiritually by the offender anymore. See a196-197; a141; i44- b118; c122; c146; d137; d177.

[2] See pg. 1 of www.gospelcom.net/rbc/ds/cb941/intro.html as at 8/7/2000.

[3] See pg. 1 of www.gospelcom.net/rbc/ds/cb941/page1.html as at 8/7/2000.

The word usually translated into "forgiveness" is ἄφεσις. According to Louw and others (1988:503a) ἀφίημι (forgive) means: " To remove the guilt resulting from the wrong doing- to pardon, to forgive, forgiveness". They add that forgiveness is aimed at removing the guilt rather than the wrongdoing itself (:503b). They say, "The event of wrongdoing is not undone, but the guilt resulting from such an event is pardoned."

2.2.5 RESTITUTION, REPARATION AND COMPENSATION.

I will continue to provide a working definition of the above three terms and then go on to describe my use for them and how I see the concept of restitution in the context of this thesis. I say "three terms" instead of "three words" because "terms" carries with it a connotation of a richer set of descriptions and definitions.

I have grouped the three terms together because their meanings are practically interchangeable. It would seem that preference for each term depends on the discipline within which it is being used. It would seem that "restitution", is preferred as more of a theological term and "reparation" has a preference in a judicial context. Restitution then would be used in this thesis to describe compensation more at a spiritual- psychological level, and "reparation" would be used to describe compensation more in a legal, economic sense.

The *Oxford Complete Wordfinder* (1990:289) describes the term "compensation" as "the act of compensating". And "compensate" amongst other nuances, means "making amends [and] counter balancing." In psychology it is used to refer to "offsetting a disability or frustration by development in another direction". The significant description for the thesis here is, "offset", "atone" and "make up for ..." It also means to "make restitution or reparation". "Reparation" is described as "the act of making amends" (1990:1300). It is "an act or instance of repairing or being repaired". "Reparation" is also defined as "compensation". "Restitution" also means, amongst other nuances, "amends, compensation, reparation for an injury...etc." My working definition of the three terms will simply be, "making amends", ie.- the offender attempts to "make amends" to the victim, for injury that he has inflicted on that victim.

However the idea of "making amends" should be understood, as being far from simple. Who exactly is it that determines what is a just measure of restitution, so that the offender can make

amends?

While financial estimates for the loss or damage of property can be made fairly accurately, the attendant spiritual- psychological losses, mean that restitution overall, is a complex issue. Restitution is an ancient practice that we even see in the Old Testament.[1] Here the practice of returning four sheep as restitution, for one stolen, indicates that it was not just material value that was taken into account when restitution was made then.

In the case of rape, I agree that financial restitution cannot be measured equivalently to the injury suffered. A woman's bodily or sexual integrity, may be regarded by her as priceless because it could be argued by her to be irreplaceable, both physically and psychologically. However as I mentioned earlier, healing is a dynamic process and restitution can be used to spur on the process. In fact it may even be the case that the possibility of restitution, may be the key that kick- starts the reconciliation process for some victims. They may feel (and justly so) that this is the only valid indication of true repentance on the side of the offender. My stance is that victims should be offered restitution in all crimes and that the victim should have a say in what this restitution should be. It is a pity that modern legal systems, particularly in the West, have generally done away with restitution but encouragingly, restitution for victims is beginning to be revisited. Dicanio (1993:228) in the *Encyclopedia of Violence, Origins, Attitudes and Consequences,* supports this claim when she says, "Historically, restitution in kind or cash prevented ancient societies from having unending cycles of violence. The practice disappeared in about AD 1400... In 1972 England passed the criminal Justice Act, which provided for restitution".

South Africa now has legislation in place, which allows the state, to seize property acquired through crime.[2] The assets seized are used to help combat crime. This is an encouraging sign, which could move in the direction of a restitution fund. Dicanio (1993:228) says that in the state of Massachusetts in 1987, victims collected R10,3 million in court- ordered restitution. Hopefully this is the direction in which we will move in, in South Africa. In South Africa

---

[1] See Exodus 22:1 "If a man steals an ox or a sheep, and kills it or sells it, he shall pay five oxen for an ox, and four sheep for a sheep. He shall make restitution; if he has nothing, then he shall be sold for his theft." (RSV). Also look at Ex 22:2- 22:15.

[2] This is the "Prevention of Organized Crime Act, No. 121 of 1998".One of its aims is an "Assets Recovery Account" which will use money seized from crime, to fight crime.

victims presently will have to make a delictual claim for "restitution". Burchell (1993:2) says, "Presently in South Africa the victim would have to pursue a delictual claim. Here the plaintiff seeks damages as compensation from the defendant for infringement of his rights. This comes under Private Law rather than Criminal Law." The Truth and Reconciliation Commission which attempted reconciliation between elements who fought against each other during Apartheid, promoted reparation, but this it seems, was hardly realized in practice.[1]

However, it is necessary that a skilled mediator, facilitate the "bargaining" process, lest the victim and offender reach intractable positions or make futile demands. I put forward that forgiveness in no way nullifies the need for restitution, nor is it a "free" pardon. By obtaining the option of reparation, victims regain some form of power as well as some level of dignity and autonomy over themselves, in front of the offender. However, from my sample it would seem that the survivors do not expect anything material in terms of restitution (a187-188; i87-b170; i129/c165; d129-131). But the option must still be wielded by the victim to exercise as she wills. The power that the criminal exercised over the victim is now given back to the victim and she exercises the power, but in a non- destructive way. She does not lose her humanity, dignity and compassion in exercising this power in the way that the offender did. This will be a force for rehabilitation for the offender too because that violent unholy power, is constructively transformed before him.

An opportunity is provided, via reparation for the offender to pay his dues, and regain his sense of human dignity. I believe it is an opportunity that also helps break the criminal desire or lust for power over his victims. Through restitution the offender realizes the extent (perhaps not fully though) of his assault on the victim by having to pay an "equivalent price" for the crime. This will prevent the offender from repeating the crime, because he knows a "free" pardon is not inevitable. Restitution will be costly and so deters a habitual pattern of crime.

While we may never be able to put an accurate assessment on the actual amount of restitution needed to "balance out" the criminal deeds in general, for me the most important thing is that the victim has a say in 'how much' it should be. This empowers the victim and indirectly the offender, to recovery.

---

[1] See *The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa Report* (1998:312-313), for the aim of granting "reparation and rehabilitation" and their "value to the truth seeking phase".

If the offender cannot make financial restitution, then he can make restitution in other creative ways. Physical labor and other skills can be used to provide "payment", depending on the crime.

2.2.6 VICTIM AND OFFENDER. [1]

I will again provide brief working definitions of "victim" and "offender'. *The Oxford Complete Word finder* (1993:1751) defines victim as "a person or thing injured or destroyed in pursuit of an object or in gratification of a passion etc." While there are other variations in description of this term, I think the above definition is sufficient for this thesis.

It must be noted that the term survivor is more likely to be used and preferred in the therapy of rape victims. The idea is to empower the one suffering as a result of the crime. The term "survivor" is loaded with powerful inferences. My opinion is that "victim" on the one hand, denotes a passivity, while the "offender" on the other hand, exercises control not only in the crime but also in the post- crime phase. I feel "survivor" indicates an "overtness". Cheston (1993:450) says that "survivor" has a "more upbeat positive ring to it than "victim" ". I tend to think that the word "survivor" implies that the "victim" takes her recovery into her own hands and actively makes her recovery happen. She does not seem to have such a positive view of "survivor" though, because she says, "Survivor would be too limiting because victims do not want to survive, they want to thrive"(:450). In terms of a definition, Lew (1990) says, "...A victim is a victim during the abuse but a survivor after the abuse ceases" (quoted in Cheston 1993:450). I would disagree with such a definition because it seems to relate only to the actual crime incident and not the complex psychological after- effects.

I have used and will continue to use the term "victim" or "survivor" as is necessary in the context of its use. The term "victim" though is a more "objective" term for me, in describing the one against whom the crime is perpetrated. "Survivor" has an element of objective hope, especially when examining the crime encounter on its own. I have therefore used the term "survivor" especially when talking to the interviewees. A significant point which seemed paradoxical to me in the interviews was that Survivor C saw herself as a "survivor" rather than a "victim" in spite of the fact that she said that she was not healed (i12/c57; i14/c63).

---

[1] For a discussion of some views on the definitions of "victim", "survivor", "abuser" and "perpetrator" see Cheston (1993:450-451).

The "offender" is the one who causes the offence in the crime encounter, he causes the injury and is the one guilty of causing the wrongdoing. *The Oxford Complete Wordfinder* (1993:1054) defines the "offender" as a "criminal malefactor, lawbreaker... ,etc." Other words are also given to describe the term offender, but the above list is sufficient for this thesis. Whenever I use the term "perpetrator" it will just be to emphasize the "protagonist nature" of the offender.

2.3 THE NEED FOR A VICTIM-OFFENDER RECONCILIATION PROGRAM THROUGH MEDIATION.

The need for reconciliation through mediation for healing, is rooted in spiritual, psychological and judicial reasons. I will discuss the need from a spiritual angle first and then go on to describe psychological and judicial reasons for the advantages of reconciliation through mediation. I will then discuss the advantages of reconciliation through mediation. I will then discuss the psychological and judicial advantages, simultaneously. There-after, I will discuss some disadvantages of mediation for reconciliation- especially in serious crime. I must also point out that whilst I am an advocate for reconciliation through mediation, I do not advocate it for every crime encounter. However, it would still be helpful if some "indirect" means of contact is encouraged when face to face reconciliation is not possible. Perhaps contact through correspondence, via a mediator or even having unrelated victims and offenders meet, can be used to bring about reconciliation and healing.

2.3.1 THE SPIRITUAL NEED FOR RECONCILIATION THROUGH MEDIATION FOR HEALING.

I would think that the need for reconciliation and forgiveness between foes is generally motivated by most of the world's religions. However I will comment here from a Christian theological point of view because of my own religious and Pastoral background.

Umbreit (1989:100) quotes Zehr and Sears in this regard, as they connect spirituality, reconciliation and healing when he comments :

> Zehr and Sears (1980), point out the strong religious value base premised upon a Biblical perspective that views crime as a rupture or wound in the health of the community which needs to be healed. They state that from this perspective,

> emphasis is upon establishing right relations through reparation rather than retribution. This must involve addressing the underlying feelings of frustration and anger caused by crime.

The synoptic gospels in my estimation also provide spiritual direction for reconciliation, for healing. It is important for me to mention this because the vast majority of the people of the world are religiously minded. I quote the gospels here as an example of one religion which promotes the need for reconciliation through mediation for healing, while there may be evidence for mediation in the gospels, I cannot say that it is emphasized directly. However there is no evidence in the gospels which seems to discourage mediation for reconciliation either. From my Pastoral perspective, I would say that these texts are widely used by Christians to find spiritual direction, in times of stressful crises and interpersonal conflict. I conciously use the gospel texts uncritically here, as the interviewees tended to be use.

Matthew 5:23- 24 says, "So if you are offering your gift at the altar, and there remember that your brother has something against you, leave your gift there before the altar and go; first be reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift." Reconciliation is made a necessity here. The text indicates an active "going off" or pursuance of reconciliation. The idea is to "then come and offer your gift". Reconciliation then is not an abstract notion, merely occurring in the mind of the "offended" party. It is an open question whether the person "going" to reconcile is the offended party or the offender. It is not necessary for me to examine this any further though.

Matthew 18: 23-25, Mark 11: 25-26 and Luke 17:3-4, seem to be more applicable to what a victim of crime could go through. Here "unforgiveness" on the part of the offended will bring the following results to the offended:

1. Unforgiveness holds the unforgiving person in "bondage".
2. The unforgiving person is released to the "tormentors".
3. Unforgiveneness "blocks" the forgiveness of God, towards the offended.

Note I have already argued on page 22 that forgiveness necessitates reconciliation at some level. Therefore I take it that these text on forgiveness are an indirect commentary on reconciliation.

Matthew 5:9 also says, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God." This indicates that mediation is a desirable means of creating peace and therefore

reconciliation. In fact the text indicates that "children of God are blessed" because of their "peace- making". My interpretation is that the word "peace- making" refers to mediation between others - rather than simply living peaceably amongst others.

Luke 17: 3 talks about "rebuking" one's brother, when "he sins against you". Obviously it means a face to face encounter, to make one's offender fully aware of the of the anger and pain etc., that the victim has experienced. In my estimation, the text leaves open the possibilty of a forum for reconciliation and healing. My argument would be that mediation would be helpful in this context, to help provide support to both parties in this experience.

I have explained very briefly then, the justification in a spiritual sense for the need for reconciliation, via mediation, from a Christian theological basis, with reference to the synoptic gospels alone. Those texts do indicate healing in a religious sense because it shows "God's approval" for reconciliation and forgiveness". I would say that for a religious person "God's approval" means a healthier psychological outflow as well.

For a more in-depth treatment of the "spirituality of reconciliation" and how the church can play a mediating role, one should look at Mark Haye's (1998) work, *Ukubuyisana : Reconciliation in South Africa* and Robert Schreiter's (1992) book *Reconciliation : Mission and ministry in a changing social order*. While these books look at reconciliation at a socio-political level, I think that they can be useful in the victim-offender relationship in crime because they deal with common issues like forgiveness, reconciliation, etc.

For the purpose of this thesis, I will not go into greater depth for a spiritual basis for "The need for reconciliation through mediation for healing."

2.3.2 PSYCHOLOGICAL AND JUDICIAL ADVANTAGES FOR THE NEED FOR RECONCILIATION THROUGH MEDIATION FOR HEALING.

Mark Umbreit (1989:100) makes clear concise statements on the need for reconciliation via mediation. He says, "V.O.R.P (Victim Offender Reconciliation Program) offers the courts an alternative conflict resolution process involving a restorative rather than a punitive sanction. It humanizes the justice process to strengthen offender accountability, to provide assistance to victims and to divert some convicted offenders..."

He comments :

> Despite many important sub-goals (eg. Offender rehabilitation and victim restitution being an alternative to incarceration), the primary goal of reconciliation remains. Attitudes, feelings and needs of both victim and offender must be taken seriously. Restitution is important but should not be the only purpose of the victim-offender meeting (Zehr, 1983).
>
> (Umbreit 1989:100)

Another major argument for victim offender mediation is that in the usual legal procedure, the conflict and its resolution is taken away from the victim and put into the hands of the state. The victim then loses power, over her self-determination in some sense. However the purpose is to take away responsibility for retribution from the victim. This in turn also helps to prevent any further victimization of the victim. The possibility of the victim later feeling guilt for wanting retribution is also prevented. In relation to this Umbreit (1989:100) says, "Crime should be viewed as relational, emphasis is on the conflict among people rather than primarily an offence against the state."

Note that while Umbreit is connecting the advantages, that I have quoted and discussed above, of V.O.R.P in non-violent crimes, he does attempt to take these concepts and apply them, correctly I think, to violent crimes. In fact he says, "While the early development of the victim-offender reconciliation concept and it's replication in a growing number of communities has continued to focus upon non-violent property crimes, there is certainly nothing inherent in the model to suggest it must be limited to property offences" (1989:100).

Umbreit (1989:102) goes on to say that "a number of victims of violent crime have pointed out themselves, that mediation can have a significant impact in facilitating the healing process and moving beyond one's sense of vulnerability". He cites a number of case-studies of victims of violent crime, who testify to how meaningful they felt mediation to be.[1] One of these case-studies is about the sexual assault of a five year old but the mediation does not take place between the five year old victim and her assailant. Rather it takes place between the victim's mother, who needed emotional healing and the perpetrator (:104).

---

[1] See Umbreit (1989:104-108) for case studies of how mediation in face to face victim-offender meetings proved helpful.

According to Umbreit (1989:101), another reason for reconciliation through mediation, is that it provides a response to crime which addresses "the needs of both victim and offenders, allowing for the expression of feelings and opportunities for healing of emotional wounds". The idea here is that the victim and offender both have an opportunity to "tell their story". By revisiting the "break in the narrative of their lives", the victim starts to smooth out the "break" and the trauma starts to integrate itself into the psyche gradually. In echoing this idea, Villa-Vicencio (in Haye 1989:28) says that Ellen Kuzwayo once said, "We need more stories, never mind how painful the exercise might be. This is how we learn to love one another, to see things through someone else's eyes." Lewis Hermann (1992:173) also agrees because she says that the work of reconstructing the memory in recovery actually occurs when the "survivor tells [the story] completely, in depth and in detail."

Perhaps more clinical evidence that victim-offender mediation for reconciliation can help heal offenders, is found in an article written by Dünkel and Rössner (1989) entitled, "Victim-related therapy for sexual offenders in Hameln prison." [1] In this program offenders were given an opportunity to relate to the woman as "sex-objects", a major aspect here was that "victims" confronted the offender. This happened either "through tape recordings, lay-help... or in exceptional cases offenders met their actual victims"(Dünkel and Rössner 1989:167). The claim was made that in a period of three and a half years "so far", "there had been no recidivism among participants in the program"(:167)

Another advantage of V.O.M. P.'s is that they offer victims and offenders other information, like contact numbers of other social agencies etc. that could help them further.

Cheston (1993:476) lends support for reconciliation in reference to adult survivors from childhood sexual abuse. She refers to six stages of healing, the sixth of which she refers to as "Resolution and Reconciliation". Here the victim decides if she will confront the abuser. She says this stage is "akin to acceptance and rapprochement". In this stage the survivor must also learn to reconcile to herself and love herself (:476-477).

She also mentions positive as well as negative results of confrontation which takes place in this stage. She says, "The positive outcomes of disclosing or confronting may include confirmation

---

[1] See Dünkel and Rössner (1989:164-169) for numerous examples of V.O.M.P's in the then West Germany and Switzerland.

that the abuse did occur from another sibling, stopping a perpetrator from hurting another child, support from others... , an apology from the perpetrator and gaining strength for the victim because she has finally said 'Stop it.' " (Cheston 1993:476). She says, "The negative outcomes of confrontation may be revenge, loss of family support, being called crazy or a liar and denial"(:479).

Some proponents may think that another advantage or need for reconciliation through mediation is that if it is successful then it could help to ease the overcrowding of prisons. However such an argument assumes that the V.O.M.P bypasses the courts. The assumption is that if the offender shows that he has been involved in a V.O.M.P, the sentence will be lessened or negated. This brings us to the important question of when does mediation take place with regard to the normal legal process and at what level should it interact with it ? I prefer V.O.M.P to work alongside the normal legal process so as to complement it.

My field research strengthens the above theoretical arguments for mediation in reconciliation even further. In my survey Survivors A and D as well as Offender B saw a need for a mediator in their reconciliation attempts. In fact Survivor A made an unsuccessful attempt at reconciliation on her own (a59-70). She says that she would have preferred it if there was someone "like a psychologist present there that day" (a69). She says that she couldn't get the courage to tell "him I forgive him"(a64 - a65). She then left feeling "embarrassed" (a68). Offender B found the possibility of a mediator "quite appealing" (b113). He commented that the mediator whom he saw as the magistrate had to be "impartial" (b113-114). Survivor D was ambivalent on the need for a mediator. She felt it would be necessary to have the mediator for counseling before victim and offender met "face to face" (d138-139). However she felt that if they could handle themselves in a "dignified way" then "...It won't be necessary for someone else to be present."(d139-140). Survivor C also felt it was necessary to have a mediator for psychological preparation of victim and offender as well as to "control the situation" (c122-c123). I think that there is a strong indication, in my sample, for the desire for mediation by the victims and offenders for their reconciliation attempts.

Other valid concerns for the disadvantages of the V.O.M.P process also exists. Firstly there is the complexity of preparing the victims and offenders for reconciliation. How does one sift out a psychopathic serial rapist, who has no will to change but merely wants to take part in the process for some pathogenic psychological pleasure ? If the preparation is not done carefully

this could be counterproductive and cause more injury to the victim.

All of this points to the next hurdle. It is obvious that highly trained experts need to be involved in mediation for reconciliation, in serious crime. I am not convinced that we generally have the human-power or the finances in South Africa to hire these people. In my opinion there would be financial and logistical shortcomings with V.O.M.P's.

However in spite of the dangers and concerns, I believe that the advantages and the potential of V.O.M for healing, far outweigh the difficulties of such a program. We should rather aim to increase our knowledge of the dynamics of V.O.M. I could have cited evidence from other V.O.M's which show positive results emerging for V.O.M , but I will not write along this line further. I believe for the purpose of this thesis, I have put forward some strong arguments for investigating the effectiveness of reconciliation via mediation for healing.

I will touch on the psychological benefits of V.O.M in the next chapter, when I look at a psychological model of victims and offenders in serious crime- notably rape.

CHAPTER THREE

A psychological model of rape for victim and offender.

3.1 INTRODUCTION.

In this chapter, I will describe the psychological trauma of rape.[1] I will give a brief description of the psychological trauma experienced at the moment of rape as well as the psychological aspects during recovery. I will draw largely from Lewis Hermann's work. I will also describe the rapist from a psychological perspective, making reference to various authors. The purpose of understanding the victim and perpetrator in this way is three- fold. Firstly, it makes me, as a researcher, familiar with what is going on psychologically in the whole process. This helps me to be more precise in my interviews. Secondly, it helps to see how relevant Paul is, in terms of an empiric model of victims and offenders in crime. Thirdly, this psychological model will also help us to realistically gauge how likely reconciliation is in the crime encounter.

In this chapter I will discuss key concepts of this thesis like healing, recovery, forgiveness, reconciliation, mediation and reparation, from a psychological perspective. While Lewis Hermann writes extensively, I will have to make concise commentary on each of the above. The intention is to have a solid working description of each aspect from which I not only test Paul but also interview victims and offenders. I will cover these keywords within two broad categories viz :- 1.) The psychological trauma of rape and 2.) The stages of recovery.

This psychological model of victims and offenders in rape will then be critically interfaced with

---

[1] My definition of rape is the one preferred by feminists such as Brownmiller (1975), Burgess and Holstroom (1975), Medea and Thompson (1974). They define rape as "any sexual intimacy forced on one person by another" (quoted in Vogelman 1990:4). See Vogelman (1990:2-4) for a legal definition of rape in South African and American law. Also see Ludski (2001). In this newspaper-article he describes "a comprehensive revision of the Sexual Offences Act" by the South African Law commission at the time. Radical proposals were being put forward "to broaden the definition of rape to include the unlawful penetration for sexual purpose of any other orifice, apart from the vagina".

Also see Cheston (1993:449-450) for a useful definition of "sexual abuse". She says, "Sexual abuse can involve overt and covert activities which an adult or older child can enforce on a child. Some of these activities include : Being touched; being shown sexual movies...[etc.] "

Paul's religious/ spiritual understanding of reconciliation. The "spiritual-psychological model" that develops in this way will then be tested critically with the real experiences of victims and offenders.

I will not only draw up a model of adult rape victims but also comment on psychological aspects of adult survivors of childhood sex-abuse. This is becoming a serious problem in South Africa. In fact all three of the survivors that I interviewed are adult survivors of child sex-abuse.

3.2 A PSYCHOLOGICAL DESCRIPTION OF THE TRAUMA OF RAPE.

For Lewis Hermann (1992:32, 64) the syndrome from which victims of rape, domestic battery and incest suffer, is similar to that experienced by combat veterans. She says that the rape of woman and the combat experiences of men are the paradigmatic forms of trauma for woman and men respectively. She argues then that woman are on the "receiving end of a war" of some kind, because of the abuse that they experience at the hands of men. It is a kind of "war" between the sexes.

A pattern of emotional responses can be gauged in victims of rape. Lewis Hermann (1992:31) talks of a "Pattern of psychological reactions", that Burgess , a psychiatric nurse, and Holstrom, a sociologist, observed in 1972. They called it "rape trauma syndrome". She says, "They noted that women experienced rape as a life- threatening event, having generally feared mutilation and death during the assault".

In describing psychological trauma, Lewis Hermann (1992:33) refers to it as an "affliction of the powerless.. [this] traumatic event overwhelms the ordinary systems of care that give people a sense of control, connection and meaning". When a rape victim, for example is under threat of attack, it evokes intense feelings of fear and anger. She says, "These changes in arousal, attention and emotion are normal adaptive reactions. They mobilise the threatened person for strenuous action, either in battle or in flight. Traumatic reactions occur when action is of no avail" (:34).

She describes how this happens in the following way :

> ...Each component of the ordinary response to danger having lost its utility, tends to persist in an altered and exaggerated state long after the actual danger is over... The traumatised person may experienced intense emotion but without

> clear memory of the event or may remember everything in detail but without emotion. She may find herself in a constant state of vigilance and irritability without knowing why.
>
> (Lewis Hermann 1992:34)

Lewis Hermann (1992:35) then goes on to describe the symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder which she divides into three main categories. These are not necessarily, fixed linear stages. They are : "Hyper Arousal", "Intrusion" and "Constriction". In reference to the state of "Hyper Arousal" that victims go through, she says that "after a traumatic experience, the human system of self- preservation, seems to go on to permanent alert, as if danger might return at any moment". In this state of hyper arousal, which is "the first cardinal symptom" of post-traumatic stress disorder, the traumatised person startles easily, reacts irritably to small provocations and sleeps poorly.

She makes the following comments about the stage of "Intrusion":

> ...Long after the danger is past, traumatised people re- live the event as though it were continually recurring in the present... it is as if time stops at the moment of trauma. The traumatic moment becomes encoded in an abnormal form of memory, which breaks spontaneously into consciousness, both as flashbacks, during waking states and as nightmares during sleep".
>
> (Lewis Hermann 1992:37)

Lewis Hermann (1992:42-47) describes the next state as "Constriction'. Normally at the moment of attack, the victim goes into a complete mode of surrender. An altered state occurs whereby the actual attack becomes dissociated from normal consciousness for the victim.[1] The victim's "perceptions may be numbed or distorted, with partial anaesthesia or loss of particular sensations" (:42). The victim may feel as if the rape is not actually happening to her. This is actually a useful protective capacity of the human consciousness. Sadly, "...Traumatised people who cannot spontaneously dissociate may attempt to produce similar numbing effects by using alcohol or narcotics" (:44).

Lewis Hermann then describes a "dialectic trauma". According to her :

---

[1] For a moving first hand account of this state of "Constriction", see Thamm. (1998:1-27). This a shocking and brutal story of a rape and attempted murder that rocked South Africa, but Port Elizabeth in particular in 1994.

> In the aftermath of rape... The two contradictory responses of intrusion and constriction, establish an oscillating rhythm... Since neither the intrusive nor the numbing symptoms allow for the integration of the traumatic event. The alternation of these two extreme states might be understood as an attempt to find a satisfactory balance between the two... She finds herself caught between the extremes of amnesia or re- living the trauma, between floods of intense, overwhelming feeling and arid states of no feeling at all...
>
> (Lewis Hermann 1992: 47)

She then describes how :

> Traumatic events [like rape] call into question basic human relationships. They breach the attachments of family, friendships, love and community. They shatter the construction of the self that is formed and sustained in relationships to others. They undermine the belief - systems that give meaning to human experience. They violate the victim's faith in a natural or divine order and cast the victim into a state of existential crisis.
>
> (Lewis Herman 1992:51)

According to Lewis Hermann (1992:52), victims cry out to their mothers or God when they are being traumatized. When this cry is not answered, they feel "abandoned by human and divine systems of care."

One of the significant emotions that a victim feels is guilt. She says, "No matter how brave and resourceful the victim may have been her actions were insufficient to ward off disaster... feelings of guilt and inferiority [by the victim] are practically universal...it is the victims, not the perpetrators,[1] who feel guilty" (1992:53).

3.2.1 STAGES OF RECOVERY FROM TRAUMA.

Lewis Hermann (1992 : vi - vii, 155) describes the stages of "recovery" from trauma [2]- with rape being her paradigmatic example. She describes the following "stages" :

---

[1] See Pettigrow (1998:61-90) for denial in its various modes with these juvenile offenders. We see in the verbatims especially, how the offenders lack guilt through varying forms of denial.

[2] Cheston (1993:462- 477), on the other hand describes six "Stages of Healing". She does not describe them identically to Lewis Hermann but significantly she refers to the last stage as "Resolution and Reconciliation".

1.) "The healing relationships."
2) "Safety". This is the establishment of a physically secure environment, so that the victim can receive unhindered help.
3) "Remembrance and mourning".
4) "Reconnection" i.e. with other people in ordinary life.
5) "Commonality". Commonality here refers to sharing in the common moral values of humanity.

These are not necessarily, fixed, distinct stages but, in the course of successful recovery, it should be possible to have "Safety" and go "from dissociated trauma to acknowledged memory" and "from stigmatised isolation to restored social connection."

According to Lewis Hermann (1992:155), recovery is based upon the empowerment of the survivor and "The creation of new connections because the inverse had occurred in the time of the crime encounter" ie :- dis-empowerment and disconnection from others. She says, "...Recovery can only take place within the context of relationships, it cannot occur in isolation." By renewing one's connection to other people, the victim begins to build that which was destroyed in her rape viz :- trust and autonomy. The survivor must be allowed to dictate this process and initiate it. She says that a significant necessity for therapists (who would also be mediators for the purpose of this thesis [1]) would be that they help validate the survivor's experience rather than attempt to control the survivor.

She argues that while the therapist is technically neutral, "there should be a committed moral stance" (Lewis Herman 1992:135). She says, "[The therapist] must affirm a position of moral solidarity with the victim. This does not mean a simplistic notion that the victim can do no wrong either..." I think Lewis Hermann's comments here about the therapist, give us a glimpse of how the mediator should operate psychologically in victim- offender mediation and hence is useful in any spiritual- psychological model of reconciliation through mediation. Cheston (1993:477-478) agrees as well because she says that the relationship between the therapist and victim should be characterised by "believing in the survivor", developing trust and identifying and affirming the survivor's health.

---

[1] I proposed this argument in chapter 2.

Lewis Hermann (1992:136-140) also describes how "transference" occurs in the victim - therapist relationship. Since the victim's emotional make-up has been deformed by the traumatic experience, she will have an affected relationship with her therapist. Lewis Hermann says, "For this reason traumatic transference reactions have an intense life- or- death quality unparalleled in ordinary therapeutic experience" (:136). It is necessary for me to make comments on the relationship between victim and therapist, as I will argue in chapter four that the mediating role of Christ in 2 Corinthians 5:18 - 21 is analogous to the role that the therapist plays as mediator in the victim- offender relationship.

The therapist too, can be overwhelmed by the victim's emotional experience and "may begin to experience symptoms of post traumatic stress disorder too" (Lewis Hermann 1992:140). Hearing the patient's trauma story is bound to revive any personal traumatic experiences that the therapist suffered in the past." Lewis Hermann refers to this as "counter- transference." I mention the issues of transference and counter transference to point out the dangers and difficulties for the mediator who must act as therapist when preparing the victim and offender for reconciliation.

The second stage of recovery Lewis Hermann (1992:175-181) calls "Remembrance and mourning." Here the survivor "tells the story of trauma." This work of reconstruction actually transforms the traumatic memory, so that it can be integrated into the survivor's life story." While normal memory is the "action of story- telling", traumatic memory is "wordless and static" (:175). "...The way is paved ... for a reconciliation with the repressed material which is coming to expression in his symptoms ..." Note the idea here is for the victim to reconcile and integrate his traumatic memories into his whole life experience and see how " things of value" can come out of this experience in the future. The need to be reconciled with oneself is vitally important then. In therapy Lewis Hermann says, "The recitation of facts without the accompanying emotions is a sterile exercise, without therapeutic effect" (:177).

The survivor has two basic questions, "Why?" and "Why me?" (Lewis Hermann 1992:178). The patient challenges the therapist to share her own struggles with these immense philosophical questions." The victim also undergoes a revenge fantasy (:189). The victim hopes to undergo a catharsis by retaliating. The revenge fantasy has the same "grotesque, frozen and wordless quality as the traumatic memory itself." She says :

> Though the traumatized person imagines that revenge will bring relief, repetitive revenge fantasies actually increases her torment...[Feelings of revenge] are highly frustrating, since revenge can never change or compensate for the harm that was done. People that actually commit acts of revenge, such as combat victims..., do not succeed in getting rid of post- traumatic-disorder. Rather, they seem to suffer the most severe and intractable disturbances.
>
> (Lewis Hermann 1992:189)

One can infer then the psychological necessity for forgiveness. Lewis Hermann (1992:189) says, "During the process of mourning, the survivor must come to terms with the impossibility of getting even." One can see the potential in reconciliation. Apart from extreme revenge fantasy, the victim may also have fantasies of forgiveness, so that they can "by- pass their outrage altogether". For her this is an "attempt at empowerment." She says, "Giving up the fantasy of revenge does not mean giving up the quest for justice; on the contrary, it begins the process of joining with others to hold the perpetrators accountable for their crimes."

For Lewis Hermann (1992:189) mourning is necessary for healing. But resistance to mourning can sometimes stagnate recovery. This resistance can take in the form of compensation, forgiveness or revenge fantasies. Seeking compensation then, would just be a disguise to escape the mourning.

She goes on to say that healing of the victim "depends on the discovery of restorative love in her own life [1] ; it does not require that this love be extended to the perpetrator" (Lewis Hermann (1992:190). I think the reason Lewis Hermann says this, is so that the initiative for healing can be taken away from the perpetrator because she feels that "genuine contrition in a perpetrator is a rare miracle" (:192). I find Lewis Hermann's statement a bit problematic, when she says, "...It does not require that this love be extended to the perpetrator"(:192). I would accept that statement if it means that the perpetrator cannot be found or does not ask for forgiveness. Otherwise, I think it is more a matter of "...it does not require that this love be *accepted* [italics mine] by the perpetrator"(:192). I commented on the subjectivity around such issues in chapter two, in the definitions of the key concepts of "forgiveness" and "reconciliation." I will comment on this in chapter five where I further analyse the interviews.

---

[1] See Thamm (1998:127). In this biography *I have a life: Alison's journey* , Alison (triumphantly) also mentions how she had to stop focussing on the perpetrators but rather focus on herself and her own recovery.

In the process of healing, the survivor, according to (Lewis Hermann 1990:190) eventually comes to a point when she will be surprised at "how uninteresting the perpetrator has become, once mourning is over...She may even feel compassion and sorrow for him." However we are warned that a "disengaged feeling" is not the same as forgiveness (:190). Coming back to the point of Compensation", she says it can be an impediment to mourning because of the "very legitimacy of the desire for compensation"(:190). Lewis Hermann argues that "prolonged fruitless struggles to wrest compensation from the perpetrator ... may represent a defence against the full reality of what was lost. Mourning is the only way to give honour to loss ..." "Paradoxically, the patient may liberate herself from the perpetrator when she renounces the hope of getting any compensation from him"(:190). Note Lewis Hermann is not against compensation, per se at any point. However, if it becomes a fantasy - something that the victim is looking alone to for her recovery, then Lewis Hermann sees this as counter- productive. She says that "as grieving progresses, the patient comes to envision a more social, general and abstract process of restitution..."(:190). I would say that this is necessary especially if the perpetrator is never to be found again after the rape.

Another critical fact of recovery is that the survivor "will never forget the trauma... But the time [will come] when the trauma no longer commands the central place in her life." (Lewis Hermann 1992:195). This is significant because it means that in forgiving we need not place the unrealistic demand on the survivor to forget. "Resolution of the trauma continues to reverberate throughout the survivor's life- cycle"(:211).

For Lewis Hermann (1992:196 -213), the third stage of recovery is a "re- connection" to others. Having mourned the "old self" she must now develop a "new self" (:196). In re- connecting to others the survivor creates new relationships.

The fourth stage of recovery is referred to by Lewis Hermann (1992:214 -236) as "Commonality." By creating new relationships, the survivor gains a "solidarity" with a group. (:214) "Trauma isolates, the group re- creates a sense of belonging." This commonality arouses a sense of "common altruism." Things like faith, decency and courage that the victim believed to be irretrievably destroyed in the rape, are re - awakened in this common altruism.

Lewis Hermann (1992:218) mentions the value of "Groups for Safety" i.e. : the survivor joins a

group of other survivors that can validate her experience.[1] The time for joining these groups can be a matter of weeks or months, after the trauma. In fact the Boston Area Rape Centre, advises survivors "to wait six months to a year before considering joining a group." I have mentioned this just to provide some idea of what it could take for involving survivors in reconciliation - whether it's groups of unrelated survivors meeting perpetrators or individuals meeting for reconciliation.

3.3 THE RAPIST : PSYCHOLOGICAL DYNAMICS AND THE CAUSES OF RAPE.

I will briefly describe four theories of the causes of rape. I will then describe the psychological dynamics leading up to the rape, then the rape itself and finally the aftermath of rape.

While the aim of this thesis is to bring healing at a micro- level to victim and offender, it must be understood that certain theories see the cause of rape as social, cultural and economic. Rape is a manifestation of violence through sex. It is proposed by many that the problem has to be addressed at a social level, apart from dealing with it at the level of the individual.

Studying the rapist in this way, helps us to understand what the possibilities are for reconciliation, repentance and restitution. It gives us an idea of how "deep" the rapist has to "dig" psychologically, in order to come to a state of repentance.

3.3.1 FOUR THEORIES OF RAPE. [2]

3.3.1.1 GENDER EQUALITY.

According to Brownmillar (1975) and Rigen and Gordan (1981) in Baron and Straus (1989:61),

---

[1] For the advantages of group therapy for adult survivors of child sex-abuse see Mcdonogh.(1993:79- 81).

[2] There are other theories as well, such as : "Age structure of population", "Economic Inequality" and " The Sex Ratio"(Baron & Straus 1989:5). One can also examine the causes within a "medical model" too. In this model the rapist is situated in an a-cultural, a- contextual and an a- political "medical model." I will not comment further along this line though.

a major theme in feminist theories of rape, is that "...Rape functions as a mechanism in social control in patriarchal societies." The idea here is that rape and the fear it engenders enables men to "assert their power over women and maintain the existing system of gender stratification" (:61). Clark and Lewis (1977) (in Baron and Straus 1989:61) argue that rape would be more prevalent in societies where women are treated as "the sexual and reproductive possessions of men." However, Baron and Straus (1989:61) also point out that Russell (1975) argues that once men see the prospect of women gaining equality, they "retaliate" by using rape as a balancing mechanism to "put women back in their place." Another theme in feminist scholarship, is that "traditional gender - role attitudes encourage rape." Here :

> ... Norms associated with masculinity such as dominance and aggression encourage men to sexually exploit women. Because of gender role identities (Gagnon and Simon 1973), it seems likely that male sexual behaviour is infused with the traditional masculine traits of dominance and aggression."
>
> (Baron and Straus 1989:61)

3.3.1.2 PORNOGRAPHY.

According to Baron and Straus (1989: 95-96), anti- pornography feminists theorise that pornography causes rape. They describe this in three inter- related points. They are that,

1.) Pornography both reflects and promotes male dominance in society.

2.) Pornography sexually objectifies women.

3.) Pornography depicts assaults against women that serve as behavioural models i.e it presents violence against women in a positive light.

3. 3.1.3 SOCIAL DISORGANISATION.

According to Baron and Straus (1989:125), "this term generally refers to conditions that undermine the ability of traditional institutions (such as family, church and neighbourhood) to govern behaviour."

So certain factors which affect social organization inevitably cause crime and deviance. Baron and Straus (1989:131-133) mention the following factors that cause social disorganization. We may consider rape in this context :

1. *A percent of the population moving between geographic areas.* The theory here is that,

"change in the residential population diminishes the sense of attachments to community norms and reduces the ability of established institutions to regulate social behaviour."

2. *Ratio of tourists to residents in an area.* Cohen and Taylor (1978) in Baron and Straus (1989:135), put forward the theory that when tourists are away from their own communities, "they have the opportunity to escape from scripted roles and routine of everyday life." This may reduce restraints in conforming behaviour and hence result in deviance.

3. *Percent of divorce in population.* Baron and Straus (1989:133) put forward that divorce leads to the loosening of "social control and the increase of non - conforming behaviour because of the emotional distress and disruptive consequences of divorce." They even claim, " ...Research on the connection between marital dissolution and crime provides support for this conjecture" (:133). Note Baron and Straus (1989:145) claim that they have empiric evidence that "a high level of social disorganization increases the risk of rape."

3.3.1.4 CULTURAL FACTORS.

According to Baron and Straus (1989:15) one feminist theory put forward, is that certain cultural values encourage rape. Here, "covert or implicit cultural norms... encourage some men to rape." Hare- Mustin (1991) in Pettigrow (1998:16) gives an example of this when they state that "men's sexual urges are assumed to be natural and compelling; thus the male is expected to be pushy and aggressive in seeking to satisfy them." Note how certain cultural stereo- types can encourage rape.

In addition, according to Baron and Straus (1989:146), "The presence of norms which legitimate non- sexual violence could be implicated in rape." The theory is that a positive view of violence or physical force in one aspect of life, can be transferred by part of the population to relationships between the sexes. Baron and Straus do sound a note of caution when they say that "cultural theories of criminal violence have attained a moderate degree of influence in the social sciences" but "have not been adequately tested."

For Darke (1990:59) rape is now generally accepted, as not just a crime stemming out of sexual desire, but also as an act seeking "power and humiliation." Darke says, "It is proposed

here that men sexually assault in order to control, dominate and humiliate their victims... Humiliation is accomplished from a position of power, with forced sex providing the vehicle for domination." This is helpful insight, as it provides us with an idea of exactly what the rapist should be forgiven for, by the victim.

3.4 THE RAPE.

I will now go on to describe the rapist's behaviour, leading up to the crime, during the crime and in the aftermath of the crime. I will use Lloyd Vogelman's (1990) work, *The Sexual Face of Violence : Rapists on Rape*, primarily here.

3.4.1 EVENTS PRECEDING THE RAPE.

According to Vogelman (1990:144), rapists tend to "exploit situations in which women are vulnerable to attack." Thus woman that are economically powerless, physically disabled, mentally retarded, sleeping, very young or very old , are most likely to be their victims.

3.4.2. LOCATION.

Vogelman (1990:144,145) says that "the majority of rapes are perpetrated in relatively safe environments where the victim is alone and the rapist will not be seen or interrupted." A "relatively safe environment" could be a woman's home; where she is normally safe and so the victim is unlikely to be seen or interrupted .

3.4.3 THE RAPIST'S EXPERIENCE.

Tedeschi, Schlenker and Bonoma (1973) in Vogelman (1990:146), describe two ways in which one attempts to gain power over another person in a two- person encounter. In Vogelman's study, the rapist did use these ways. The first is to coerce woman into submission. The next is to manipulate them. They are coerced by using physical force or threats to the victim's social or physical well- being (:147). The exhibition and use of violent weapons serve another purpose - that of validating masculinity and power. Amir (1971) in Vogelman (1990:149) says that "eighty five percent of victims endure physical violence in reported cases of rape." All three rape survivors that I interviewed reported being subjected to violence and

ongoing physical abuse (a25-28; a36-37; i2-c2; c11-c13; i2-d3;d18-19).

In one of Vogelman's (1990:149) case-studies, he describes how even though "the women had initially, physically demonstrated her liking for the man", he still found it necessary to use physical force. He says, "It appears that violence was used in order to guarantee completion of the sex act. This may be because the rapist, perhaps on the basis of previous experience, feared rejection."

3.4.4 THE VICTIM'S BEHAVIOUR AND THE RAPIST'S RESPONSE.

The victim may respond in various ways, she may try "attention seeking tactics" by screaming for help, or she may try non- cooperation tactics, by not undressing voluntarily, for example (Vogelmann 1990:154). She may even use psychological tactics, by playing for sympathy (:155). However, it is very seldom that this works and can evoke even more aggression in the rapist. Fifty five percent of the rapists in Vogelman's study say that "they became more excited when their victims resisted" (:157). Vogelman says, "The fact that the rapists' find resistance titillating, again illustrates that pleasure of raping lies in the assertion of power. Not merely in the achievement of sexual orgasm."

The rapist's use of violence in response to female sexual rejection does not only serve to rid him of anger but it is also a declaration to his victim that no matter what she may do, he is still a man", still sexually and physically dominant (Vogelman :1990:151). According to Vogelman, "The rapist's impatience of not receiving sexual gratification, further stimulates his violent behaviour."

3.4.5 THE RAPIST'S SPEECH.

Verbal abuse adds to the physical abuse, by adding emotional abuse. According to Vogelman (1990:161), "The rapist often alternates between physical aggression and verbal reassurance to control his victim's emotional protestations."

3.4.6 THE RAPIST'S SEXUAL BEHAVIOUR DURING RAPE.

Vogelman (1990:162) says the majority of rapists " did not give any detailed account of their

behaviour during the rape." The use of aggression and physical force often inhibits the rapist's sexual enjoyment." In Vogelman's study, none of the rapists made any mention of erections and orgasms (:163). All of this may leave the rapist feeling cheated and unsatisfied. According to Clarke and Lewis (1977) in Vogelman (1990:163), in twenty three percent of reported cases, the rapist had problems with orgasm. According to Paske (1982), "Generally in psychiatric literature sexual dysfunction as a whole is correlated with psychological mood, states of anxiety, depression, negative, dirty, dangerous etc. These same factors are prominent characteristics of rapists" (quoted in Vogelman 1990:163).

Unfortunately, because of this lack of orgasm, this prolongs the ordeal of rape (Vogelman 1990:164). The rapist may want to further humiliate the victim to prove, "his masculinity" in the absence of an erection. "Feelings of sexual enjoyment, sexual exasperation, power , control and insecurity all emerge during the rape as primary emotions of the rapist during rape (:165).

4.7 THE AFTERMATH OF RAPE.

In Vogelman's (1990:167) study most of the rapists' were "very calm" immediately after the rape. I would think this is a good measure of their perception of entitlement. "They gave no indication of nervousness or panic and made no attempt to flee the scene of the crime. In fact in some cases the rapists "escort[ed] their victims to a place of safety." Vogelman (1990 :168) says, "Rapists' behaviour immediately after the rape suggests that they are unaware of their victims' feelings toward them. Most of them do not acknowledge the brutality of their crime". " Most... don't believe their behaviour is a violation of another human being. They tend to perceive their actions as being beyond reproach or perhaps a slight misdemeanour " (:168).

For Vogelman (1990:169) the rapists' feelings after the rape, can be divided into roughly three responses viz :

1. " No guilt and indifferent feelings."
2. " Slight regret" feelings and,
3. " Remorseful" feelings.

According to Vogelman (1990:169), the man who repeatedly rapes "does not necessarily feel the same way after each rape." For him rapists either fall into "the no guilt and indifferent"

category or the " slight regret but indifferent" category. These responses are a result of a "lack of respect for the women" which "invariably results in a lack of caring for them" (:168). These responses are an extension of the rapist's sexist attitudes and behaviour.

Rapists that have "no guilt and/or indifferent feelings" are normally the rapists that "objectify woman excessively" (Vogelman 1990:169). For such a rapist, the concept of rape is inconceivable because women are not self- determining individuals with the right and ability to choose.

Men that see the victim as sexually promiscuous are likely to "objectify" her more than other women (Vogelman 1990:170). "It is extremely difficult for the "whore" to evoke the rapist's sense of pity, regardless of the amount of physical torture she endures."Another category of rapists with "no guilt" consists of rapists that attempt "to absolve themselves consciously or unconsciously, from their rape by calling it seduction." "Rapists therefore believe their victim is playing "hard to get" or is enjoying the rape experience."

3.5 RECIDIVISM AMONGST RAPISTS.

The issue of recidivism is an important indicator with regard to the aim of this thesis because it gives us a measure of how sincere rapists are at repenting and seeking forgiveness.

One discouraging sign, noted by Groth, Longo and Mcfardin (1982) in Vogelman (1990:189-190) is that rapists have a tendency to rape more than once. He says, "Groth and his colleagues, as well as the present study, reveal a high degree of recidivism among rapists"(:189). In Vogelman's study, seventy seven percent of rapists, had raped more than once (:190). Vogelman says that the failure of rehabilitation is checked out by the fact that forty three percent of the seventy seven percent of rapists that raped more than once, had done time in prison for rape but continued to rape after their release.

According to Vogelman (1990:191) the failure of rehabilitation could rest on a number of factors. He says, "... It is hypothesised that psychotherapy alone could never successfully treat those that rape and are generally insensitive to their victims after the crime." He believes it would take "a great deal of time before the offender would relinquish some of his psychological defences (denial or rationalization) to become aware of the brutality of his

crime and finally resolve the particular psychological issues that lead him to rape." Apart from this there is a powerful prevailing rape culture to deal with, within which the rapist finds himself. He feels that rehabilitation, imprisonment etc., are necessary but insufficient. He believes that the social root of sexual violence must be unearthed and explored. I am also aware, that when this book was published in 1990, reconciliation for major crimes was hardly an issue in South Africa.

Judging from the literature available during this period, perhaps Vogelman would not have been so pessimistic had programs of this nature been attempted then.

CHAPTER FOUR

Biblical aspects of reconciliation.

4.1 INTRODUCTION.

Before I attempt an exegesis of the chosen texts, I will provide a concise description of Paul's theology of reconciliation. It is only out of this that one can provide a critical exegesis and then contextualization of these texts that comment on the concept of reconciliation. However to understand Paul's theology of reconciliation, I believe it necessary to describe theologically, Paul's use of such connected terms as "sin", "law", "justification" and "the righteousness of God in Christ". While one could provide a description of Paul's theology that is much wider, I will confine myself to the above areas because they serve well to put Paul's theology of reconciliation into context.

I will not comment on the various schools of Pauline interpretation here and the ongoing developments in this regard.[1] I will also not comment in depth, on the search for "coherence" in Paul's theology because this will take me away from the main aim of this thesis [2]. But I will make use of the ideas of "coherence" and "contingency" in Paul's theology later on, to argue for my method of contextualizing Paul in the crime encounter.

I will provide an outline of Hermann Ridderbos' understanding of Paul's theology, with regard to the key concepts that I have mentioned above. I have chosen Ridderbos in this regard, not only because of his comprehensive treatment of Paul's theology but because he also subscribes to a more "middle of the road" Christian theological approach which is representative of my own theological approach. He also sets out Paul's theology under an extensive scheme of sub-headings which made it easier for me to choose only those aspects of Paul's theology that were pertinent to this thesis, for discussion. I will cross- reference his work with that of other writers where I think it necessary, for further elaboration.

---

[1] For a discussion on this see Ridderbos (1977:13- 43) in the "The Main Lines of Pauline Interpretation".

[2] For a discussion on this see Beker.(1980:135- 347), in a discussion on "The Coherence of the Gospel in Paul's theology". Also see Achtemeier (1996: 132- 145), in "The continuing quest for coherence in St. Paul : An experiment in thought".

I have found the following three chapters useful, for the task at hand. They are:

1.) The Life in Sin.

2.) The Revelation of the Righteousness of God.

3.) Reconciliation.

4.2 AN OUTLINE OF RELEVANT ASPECTS OF PAUL'S THEOLOGY.

4.2.1 THE LIFE IN SIN.

According to Ridderbos (1977: 92), Paul's theology of sin, focusses on the "redemptive - historical and collective points of view, rather than focussing on the individual and personal". Paul sets this up by repeatedly referring to the life - context "before and outside of Christ". He describes human existence in that context. According to Ridderbos, Paul's idea of "world" (κόσμος) and "this present aeon" corresponds' to this life. Life in this cosmos and aeon is dominated by sin and is outside of Christ. In Ephesians 2:2, Paul talks of the "world- aeon" as "following the course of the power of the air, the spirit that now works in the sons of disobedience". Rom 8:38, 1 Corinthians 15:24 etc., indicate that Paul sees the "world" totally dominated by demonic powers whom he refers to as "the world rulers of this darkness".

Although κόσμος for Paul can be used to describe "the created world" (Rom 1:20) and "as human living- space" (Rom 4:13, 1Cor 14:10), it is now "the world turned away from God, rebellious and hostile towards Him", (Rom 3:16, 19; 2 Cor 5: 19) (Ridderbos: 1977:92). He says, Paul shows that the world "does not acknowledge God" (1 Cor1:21). It withstands God in its wisdom and "is without prospect" (2 Cor 7:10). Believers on the other hand are considered as no longer living in the cosmos" (Col 2:20) [1].

Ridderbos (1977:93) goes on to interpret Paul in the following way : he says that for Paul sin is not primarily about individual acts of sin "but rather about the supra-individual mode of existence in which one shares in the human-life context".

---

[1] Note Ridderbos does not comment on the validity of Pauline authorship of Col 2:20, but takes Paul's authorship as a given. Further comment on authorship can be seen in Bornkamm (1975:241- 243), "Authentic and Inauthentic letters of Paul."

His interpretation of Paul is that the conception of the "world" connects to a "universality" of human sin (Ridderbos 1977:93). For Paul, "...There is no distinction, for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God" (Rom 3:22, 23). The universality of sin in humankind is made more striking by Paul's use of the word "flesh" when he uses it to refer to "human weakness" and "perishableness". For Ridderbos, Paul also uses it to describe "man in his sin".

In various references, (Rom 8:6, Gal 5:19, Eph 2:3 etc.), "sin" and "flesh" are identified with each other (Ridderbos 1977:95). For Ridderbos, this is an indication of the universality of sin, "in that flesh on the one hand is a description of all that is man and on the other of the sinful in man". The idea of the universality of sin is crystallized by Paul in Romans 5:12, when he says, " Therefore as sin came into the world through one man and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all men sinned..."

Ridderbos (1977:97 - 98) is at pains to explain that Paul repeatedly points out that "the one transgression" committed by the one Adam, turns out to be "the sin of all". The sentence passed for Adam's sin is now shared by all his descendants. Out of this domination of sin over the "world", sin is able "to manifest in all its force" (Rom 7:13). The sin of Adam thus becomes personal sin. For Ridderbos this universal dominion of sin for Paul, cannot be used as an excuse for personal sins though, since "...Everyone will have to give an account of himself to God (Rom 14:12) and each man will bear his own load" (Gal 6:5). According to Bornkamm (1975:122), the universality of law and the fact that all men are guilty in God's sight is the radical and revolutionary aspect of Paul's gospel, which distinguishes Paul from the theologies of his time.

Ridderbos (1977:105) says that Paul sees sin in its essence as "rebellion against God" and "enmity against God" (Rom 5:10, Rom 8:7 etc). Romans 8:6 refers to "the flesh" as being in enmity against God. (I will comment further on this "enmity between God and man" in my exegesis of the texts.)

This enmity is expressed in man's transgressions of God's Law. Ridderbos (1977:106) explains that "the Law is the norm appointed by God and for true manhood." He says when Paul refers to the "Law" he uses it "in the wider sense of norm, binding and so forth..." or in reference to certain parts of the Pentateuch and Old Testament. He says Paul's use in general refers to the Law of Moses (1 Cor 9:9, Rom 10:5). While Israel is privileged to have received

the Law, "it is not confined to Israel". The Gentiles may not have received the Law in the form that the Israelites received it but they do "by nature (φύσει)" what is required by the Law. Their "knowledge of the Law cannot be denied" (Rom 2:14 ff). So all men have a sense of responsibility to God (Rom 1:20 - 21) even though they suppress it. Sin then "in essence" is "transgression of the Law appointed by God for man". Its strength then is the Law (1 Cor 15:56).

4.2.1.1 THE CONSEQUENCES OF SIN.

Ridderbos (1977:108) interprets Paul in the following way : since man takes part in sin voluntarily, his destruction is not merely a natural consequence but rather "punishment decreed on him by God". According to Ridderbos there are various terms to describe God's judgement but "the wrath of God" is the most frequent expression. This term carries the idea of "punishment" as well as a "personal expression of God". This "wrath" predominates above that of other emotions. God's wrath is determined by his righteousness and his holiness. Frequently Paul puts both in the same context, when he says for example, "God's wrath" and "righteous judgement"(δικαιοκρισία) or when he uses "God's wrath" and "righteousness" (δικαιοσύνη) as synonyms (Rom 2:5, cf vv. 2,11 ; 3:5) (:109).

For Ridderbos (1977:112) the consequences of God's wrath can be viewed both from a theological and an anthropological point of view. From a theological point of view God's wrath consists of a disturbance in the relationship in which God has placed man to himself. This breakdown in relationship consists in "alienation" (Col 1:21; Eph 2:12 etc.) and "enmity". This enmity is in the sense that human enmity raises itself against God but also that for man God has become an enemy (Rom 5:10, 11:28). In the anthropological sense, it means the destruction of human existence because to be truly human, means to be in communion with God. The punishment of sin is two-fold. Firstly, according to Ridderbos, it brings death (Rom 6:23), "in the most inclusive sense of the word". Secondly it brings about moral impotence because of the "inner discord", created by the "bondage of sin".

4.2.1.2 SIN AND THE LAW.

For Ridderbos (1977:134), Paul sees the Law as offering no relief from death which has come

from Adam's sin. In fact it makes the man who would be saved by the Law, sink down still more deeply into sin and its corruption. While Jewish doctrine held the belief that "in the Law it has received life" and it poses the Torah as "a protective and saving resource against the power of the evil impulse", Paul rejects the Law as a means of salvation. For Paul though, "the Law is holy and the commandment (Rom 7:12) is holy, just and good ", if one could in fact keep the Law one would in fact live (Rom 10:5 , Gal 3:12). According to Ridderbos, "Paul sees in the light of Christ's death and resurrection, the absolute inadequacy of the Law as a means of salvation"(:135).

Ridderbos (1977:143) understands Paul's seeking to be righteous on the basis of the Law, as essentially a display of "proud and carnal character". The law is also insufficient in the following sense : it is impotent in breaking the power of sin and conquering "the flesh", so that sin no longer reigns in the material body (Rom 6:12). The strength to overcome sin, does not lie in the Law but rather in the Spirit (Rom 7:6 ; 8:2). For Paul the Law goes further and even provokes sin! In Romans 5:20 he refers to the Law as increasing sin because sinful passions want to assert themselves when "they encounter the resistances of the Law"(:149).

One is tempted to ask then, "What is the purpose of the law for Paul?". Ridderbos' (1977:149) interpretation is that in a negative way it serves to "ban" man's way to salvation and "vindicate in a negative way the indispensability of the way of faith". Bultmann (1952-1955, 1:267) agrees with Ridderbos but expresses it in another way. He says, "...The ultimate purpose of the Law is to lead man to death..."

4.2.2 THE REVELATION OF THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD.

Ridderbos (1977:159) sees Paul's understanding of (God's) redemption as entering "into the lostness of man and the world in all its dimensions and levels". The death and resurrection of Christ brings about more than a mere "restoration from the misery brought about by sin". It refers to man's "inner discord", man's guilt and punishability in the divine judgement", "the world that is alienated and turned away from God", "the whole of the groaning creation", etc. Everything is placed in the redeeming light of Christ's death and resurrection (Eph 3:18-19 cf Rom 8:38-39).

Ridderbos (1977:161) views Paul's doctrine of redemption as God in Christ, placing man to

himself, "rather than an anthropological understanding", which focusses on the individual in his/er relationship to God". The new relationship entails two significant concepts viz :- "justification" and "reconciliation". He puts forward that justification in Paul is restricted to man's relationship to God, while reconciliation embraces "the whole of creation".

An interesting observation that Bornkamm (1975:138-139) makes in relating "Law" and "Righteousness of God", is that Paul shows that "God does not require to put out his righteousness in the sight of the Law". That is, God is not servant to the Law. God imputes righteousness at his own initiative. God is not subject "to an unchangeable norm greater than himself and inevitably determining his verdict". Bornkamm adds that this understanding of righteousness is not based on Greek thought but rather on the Old Testament and Judaism. Ofcourse Paul adapted Judaic thought on the Law and salvation though. J. Christiaan Beker (1980:257) echoes Bornkamm in a similar vein, when he too in reference to the Law and God's righteousness, says that "God sets forth the "right","apart from the Law"...(his) covenantal faithfulness transcends the impersonal justice of the Law" (Rom 3:24-25).

In the light of Beker and Bornkamm's arguments above, perhaps another question is then triggered : "Why did God have to seemingly be so vindictive so as to demand the death of his Son ? In my estimation, Barth (1956- 1969) with whom I am in agreement, goes some way in answering directly or indirectly. He sees in the judgement and sentence of Jesus Christ, both a positive and negative perspective. He says,

> We can ... say that [judgement and sentence] have a negative sense [and] in so far [as in] that judgement and sentence God remains, and therefore confesses Himself to be, true to Himself...and [in] a positive sense in so far as in the same judgement and sentence...He remains, and pronounces Himself to be true to man.
>
> (Barth 1956-1969, 4:514-515)

4.2.3 THE ESCHATOLOGICAL CHARACTER OF JUSTIFICATION.

Ridderbos (1977:164) understands Paul's concept of "the righteousness of God" in two senses. It does not only have a future dimension but has already been revealed with the advent of Christianity. Bultmann (1952-1955, 1:276) also agrees with this assessment, that Paul sees righteousness as present reality and also in a forensic- eschatological sense. To understand the

concept of "the righteousness of God" in Paul better, one has got to understand the difference in Jewish and Greek thinking with regard to this term. In Judaism it applied to a future-eschatological and judicial sense. Paul uses it though, as a "present reality already realized in Christ"(Ridderbos 1977:164). According to Ridderbos, the Jewish understanding "to justify", was lost once the term "righteousness of God" came into the hands of Greek interpreters. For them the forensic meaning was lost and "an exclusively ethical significance" became attached to it. For Paul righteousness was no longer an uncertainty in the future, but he spoke of it as a matter that had been accomplished and in faith (Rom 5:1; 8:3-34,38) (Ridderbos :1990:165).

According to Ridderbos (1977:163), there are different schools of thought, regarding the meaning of "the righteousness of God". Some understand it to be "as an activity or attribute of God...that the righteousness of God is now (or has been revealed) and that God has now revealed himself in the Righteous One, or in his (saving) righteousness". Others see in "the righteousness of God", the denotation of that which man must have in order to be able to stand in the divine judgement. In commenting on this type of righteousness, Bultmann (1952-1955, 1:285) says it is called "God's righteousness", simply because it has its origin in God's grace. He supports this by quoting Romans 10:3 which says, "For being ignorant of the righteousness that comes from God and [in contrast] seeking their own righteousness they (the Jews) did not submit to God's righteousness".

4.2.4 RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD IN CHRIST.

In 2 Corinthians 5:18, Paul refers to God in Christ, reconciling the world to himself. According to Ridderbos (1977 :167), the righteousness of God " in Christ", is related to the death and resurrection of Christ, "in all sorts of ways". In Romans 3:21- 31 we read that God has made Christ a "means of propitiation through faith in his blood". The understanding here is that God vindicates himself before the world because he has passed judgement in Christ on behalf of the world. But in another sense, God has also "revealed the righteousness that is necessary in order that those who have faith in Jesus might stand in the judgement of God". "God made Christ to be sin" (2 Cor 5:21). In Rom 8:3 we read that "God has condemned sin in the flesh". Thus those who identify themselves with that which is acquitted in Christ, become righteous in a forensic sense.

The idea of "Christ for us" and "we in Him" (2 Cor 5:14,21) together with the motif that Christ is the second Adam (Rom 5:18,19) reveals that the doctrine of justification "lies in the corporate unity of Christ and his own"(Ridderbos 1977:169). His interpretation of Paul is that "the justifying power of his death and resurrection...[ranks him] as the anti-type of the first Adam (Rom 5:18,19)". Thus through the one act of Christ, all become justified in him.

4.2.5 RECONCILIATION.

For Ridderbos (1977:182), "reconciliation" appears in more than one place as a parallel to "justification". An example is "we are justified by his (Christ's) blood" (Rom 5:9) parallelled by "we are reconciled by his death" (Rom 5:10). 2 Corinthians 3:9 also parallels 2 Corinthians 5:18, where "ministration of righteousness is parallelled by "ministration of reconciliation".

Ridderbos (1977 :182) does not see justification as subordinate to reconciliation or vice-versa. Rather he sees reconciliation as "peace with God", as a result of justification (Rom 5:1). For him "justify" is used by Paul more as a "religious-forensic-concept" and the meaning of "reconciliation" (in the sense of καταλλαγή "originates from the social-societal sphere (cf. 1 Cor 7:11) and speaks in general of the restoration of the right relationship between two parties". According to Ridderbos (1977:182), "it has a less qualified meaning in theological parlance" and "Reconciliation is often used positively in conjunction with "peace" " (cf. Rom 5:1,10; Eph 2:15 ff ; Col 1:20 ff).

In the reconciliation pericope of 2 Corinthians 5:18 - 21, God is the Author and Initiator of reconciliation (Ridderbos 1977:182). This reconciliation is not only made on an individual, personal basis but mention is also made of the church being reconciled (Rom 5:10) (:183). According to Ridderbos, "...The apostles [have] been entrusted the ministry [dispensation; distribution] of reconciliation (διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς). In Eph 2:16 and Col 1:20, 22, Christ in God reconciled both Gentiles and Jews to each other. Paul uses reconciliation in pronouncements over against "enmity" and "alienation" (cf Rom 5:10 ; Eph 2:14 ff. and Col 1:22).

The eschatological nature of Paul's understanding of reconciliation is also prominent (Ridderbos 1977:183). While "reconciliation", does have reference to the "disposition" of

man, it is used primarily to indicate reconciliation between God and the "world". "World" is here referred to in its fullest, most comprehensive sense as I have described earlier. Reconciliation then refers to the eschatological restoration of all things. Colossians 1:20 crystallizes this clearly, when it says, "...And through him to reconcile to himself all things, whether *on earth or in heaven* [italics mine], making peace by the blood of his cross". My interpretation of Käsemann (1971:43) is that he holds a converse view. He says that although reconciliation originally meant the end of enmity with the world "...Paul crystallizes the message, relating it more strictly to the church and the individual Christian..." I disagree with Käsemann's strict view but I think this view of Käsemann does lend support to my case for contextualizing reconciliation in Paul to a personal level between victim and survivor.

For Ridderbos (1977:184), when Paul refers to "all things", he does not refer to the "right disposition"of apostate spirits for example, but rather "of the div ine government over all". This happens in a measure because powers have been stripped of their authority by God, through Christ. For Ridderbos, Paul repeatedly denotes "peace" as a condition for reconciliation. This peace is meant by the condition of "shalom" ie. "an all embracing gift of salvation". This shalom refers to "the pacification of the powers hostile to God as well as the restoration of peace between Jews and gentiles". These are but two examples and this "shalom" stands in direct contrast to the wrath, indignation, tribulation and anguish of the eschatological divine judgement (Rom 2:9,10).

It is in this broad context of reconciliation, that we ought to look at reconciliation between God and human- kind at a personal level. Reconciliation refers to the removal of enmity of "the mind of flesh against God" (Rom 8:8) (Ridderbos 1977:184). Paul also, in Colossians 1: 21, 22 says, "And you, who once were estranged and hostile in mind, [toward him]...he has now reconciled...". But for Ridderbos, this reconciliation must not only be looked at from a sense of human disposition. It refers to more than this. It refers to "an enmity" of God - not only in the active but also in the passive sense of the word. Bultmann (1952-1955, 1:286), agrees with the idea of the enmity being "active" and "passive". He refers to the active sense as meaning "hostile" (Rom 8:7) and passive as being "hated" (Rom 5:10; 11:28). His view is that there is a connection between the two as indicated by Romans 8:7 ff. He argues that "the latter is the consequence of the former" ie. passive enmity consequent to active enmity. (I will comment on this enmity further, in my exegesis of the Rom 5:1- 11 text.)

Is there any further connection between "reconciliation" and "justification" ? For Ridderbos (1977:186) reconciliation "can be understood as starting from justification" while Bultmann (1952-1955, 1:286) sees reconciliation as " a consequence of righteousness". In this state man's relationship of guilt before God, is first of all abrogated "since his sin is not imputed to him". (2 Cor 5:19). Man ought to respond to God's "word of reconciliation" which has gone out to them. They ought to let "themselves be reconciled to God" (2 Cor 5:20), rather than remain enemies under God's wrath. This "peace" (the condition of reconciliation) brings about "an inner peace of the heart that pervades the whole man in all his doings (Rom 15:13). It "restrains the hearts and minds of believers (Phil 4:7) and...gives judgement in their hearts when they find themselves in uncertainty or inner discord" (Col 3:15 ; cf. 2 Thes 3:16)

Beker (1980:257) relates "justification" and "reconciliation" in the following way [1] : For him, Paul uses the oriental image of legal relations in dealing with justification and the law. One of the significances of this image is that here, " legal justice is...a manifestation of the benevolence of the person in power".

For Beker (1980:257- 258), reconciliation stresses the contrast between enmity and peace, hate and love (cf. Rom 5:1-12 ; 8:31-39 ; 2 Cor 5:14 -21). The basic metaphors used with reconciliation (καταλλαγή)are "peace" and "love" (ie. εἰρήνη ; ἀγάπη) (:258). Bultmann (1952-1955, 1:287), agrees. He says, "God's "reconciling is His restoration of peace" by no longer letting his "wrath" prevail." Beker (1980:258) describes justification as taking place "vertically" eg :- judge and sinner are placed on two different levels" while "reconciliation operates horizontally". He refers to reconciliation as the "language of "appeal" (2 Cor 5:20). He feels that Paul's understanding is that "powers" are hostile because they separate rather than oppress" (Rom 8:35- 39).

4.2.6 CHRIST'S DEATH AS ATONEMENT. (καταλλαγή and ἱλασμός)

I will round off this discussion of Paul's theology, by commenting on the atonement provided by Christ's death. Apart from Christ's death having a general forensic meaning, Paul also

---

[1] The relationship between justification and reconciliation is a complex one. For (Barth 1956-1969, 4:523), the issue of "justification" relates only to one aspect of the Christian message of reconciliation. For comprehensive treatment of "The problem of the Doctrine of Justification" see (Barth 1956-1969, 4:514 - 527).

speaks of God having made Christ openly "to be a means of propitiation in his blood (Rom 3:25), as well as being "justified by his blood" (Rom 5:9) (Ridderbos 1977:186). A significant question then is what is the connection between God's reconciliation to the world and the death of Christ.

For Ridderbos (1977:187), "justified by his blood" and "reconciled by the death of his Son" is best explained by connecting it to Romans 3:25 which says that God "made (Christ) openly to be a means of propitiation in his blood". Ridderbos prefers to translate ἱλαστήριον as "means of propitiation" although in a footnote [1], he refers to others "who wish to translate" by using "mercy seat" [2]. For Ridderbos, while καταλλαγή originates in the social-societal sphere, ἱλαστήριον is derived from the cultus, particularly from the propitiatory sacrifice that took place there. Thus Ridderbos reasons that Christ's blood is "propitiatory blood". Romans 5:9 goes on to say that justification has been accomplished by his "propitiatory death". Other texts also point to Christ's death as a sacrificial death. An example of this is "our paschal lamb" referred to in 1 Corinthians 5:7.

Ridderbos (1977:188-189) also discusses the view of some theological thinkers who propose that the propitiatory sacrifice enters substitutionally between God and man. Here "the life given up in the sacrifice through the attendant shedding of blood covers sin before the face of God and in this way atones" (:188). On the other hand it is posited that Paul spoke of the death of Christ in a figurative way and that there is no cultic significance to Christ's death (:189). Ridderbos vehemently argues against this and I tend to concur with him. Käsemann (1971:42-43) for one takes "the middle of the road approach". He says, "The idea of the sacrificial death has often been unduly stressed" (:42). But he does not eradicate, totally, the idea of sacrifice. He feels however that Paul "never definitely called Jesus' death a sacrifice, particularly since it was in general accounted as God's action and God cannot very well sacrifice to himself" (:42). My interpretation of Hengel (1981:45 - 46) is that the cultic and substitutionary notions are not mutually exclusive. He sees both themes in the death of Jesus.

I differ from the above comment of Käsemann in my contextualization of Paul in point "11",

---

[1]Ridderbos, pg. 187, footnote 15.

[2] For further debate on this, see Dunn (1974:131) for his argument as opposed to Käsemann's about the translation to "mercy seat".

Chapter Five [pg. 94]. There I argue that this sense of self sacrifice on God's part is what provides a powerful motif for survivors if they can analogously identify with the character of God in the texts.

4.3 AUTHORSHIP OF 2 CORINTHIANS 5: 18-21 AND ROMANS 5: 1-11.

Before, I can use these texts to contextualize them in the crime encounter, I will provide a brief but critical evaluation of the authorship of these texts. I will comment on the authorship and the socio- historical context of the texts, before I go through with an exegesis of the texts.

The question of authorship can be an important one, in determining whether the author in fact had crime in mind when writing the texts . Not only is the actual text in its present available form important for determining its purpose and the writer's intention but the socio- historical context of the author can also shed light on how the author may have thought. A grasp of his/er theology, as can be grasped from all of his/er writings, can also help shed light on the theology of any given text under evaluation at any time.

I will now comment on the authorship of the texts under consideration. If I can convincingly show Paul to be the writer of Romans 5:1-11 and 2 Corinthians 5:18-21, then I put forward that I can better understand what the texts are saying by situating them in Paul's general theological thought and methodology.

From a survey of authors on Paul and his theology, it seems to be generally accepted that Roman 5:1-11 and 2 Corinthians 18-21 were written by Paul. Writers like Bornkamm (1975), Munck (1954), Gundry (1970), Ridderbos (1977) and Furnish (1968) treat the texts as written by Paul. Nowhere in their examination of Paul's theology, do they question in particular, Paul's genuine authorship of these texts. Bultmann (1985:19) regards Timothy as a co-writer of 2 Corinthians and Marrow (1986:51) refers to "Romans, 1 Corinthians, [and] 2 Corinthians..." as "genuinely Pauline epistles" .

However there are some complexities involved in each epistle as a whole. Bornkamm (1975:244), for example, says that 2 Corinthians is a compilation of fragments of different letters of Paul sent to the Corinthians. He says, "...Several fragments of letters written at

various times and to meet very different external and internal situations are set alongside one another, in an order not corresponding to the course of events." Marrow (1986:170-172) also takes a similar stance because he speaks of someone being "responsible for gathering epistolary fragments into one letter...[in 2 Corinthians]."

Gundry (1970:286) also demonstrates such a fragmentation of 2 Corinthians. Both Gundry (1970:286) and Marrow (1986:170-172) critically discuss the thematic breaks in the form of 2 Corinthians. However for the purposes of this thesis, I will not venture further into this argument.[1] All of the authors I have mentioned above, never question the authenticity of 2 Corinthians 5:18-21 as being written by Paul and neither will I. In this thesis I will not go into any critical internal or external arguments, for the authorship of 2 Corinthians 5:18-21 by Paul.

All of the above authors also treat Paul as the writer of Romans 5: 1-11. However even here, according to Bornkamm (1975:247), "Many critics regard the long list of Romans 16 as misplaced at the end of Romans and originally a fragment of a letter to Ephesus." Again I will not venture further into such arguments, except to say that Romans 5:1-11 as such, is not argued by any of the above authors that I have mentioned, to be written by any one else except Paul.

4.4 PUTTING 2 CORINTHIANS 5:18-21 AND ROMANS 5 :1-11 INTO HISTORICAL AND LITERARY CONTEXT.

I will now comment on the following with regard to 2 Corinthians and Romans:
1) The events leading up to the writing of the epistles and the purposes for writing them,
2) The themes of the epistles,
3) A description of the audience that the epistles went to and a brief literary and thematic outline of the epistles,
4) Any links with the chosen texts (viz. 2 Cor 5:18-21 and Rom 5:1-11) to the rest of their respective epistles.

---

[1] For further argument along this line see Bornkamm (1975:244 - 246).

4.4.1 2 CORINTHIANS.

According to Gundry (1970:285), 2 Corinthians gives us a glimpse into Paul's inner feelings about himself and his apostolic ministry- more than any other epistle. For Gundry the epistle is "autobiographical in tone although not in framework or total content." This epistle is arguably the third epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. Gundry for one argues for a "second epistle." Part of his argument is that the description of the epistle described in 2 Corinthians 2:4; 7:8 "hardly fits" that of 1 Corinthians. According to Gundry, Titus carried this epistle to the Corinthians. Paul's impatience for news of the results, led Paul to Macedonia to meet with Titus. After hearing that the Corinthians had reacted favourably to Paul by repenting for their rebellion (2 Cor 2:12,13; 7:4-16) and disciplining the leader thereof, Paul writes 2 Corinthians.

According to Gundry (1970:284-286) Paul writes 2 Corinthians with the following aims in mind :

1). "To express joy and relief at the favourable response of the majority in the Corinthian church and in doing so describes his ministry in vividly personal terms (Chp. 1-7)."

2). "To stress the collection he wants to gather from them for the Jerusalem Christians (Chp. 8,9)" and

3). "To defend his apostolic authority to the still recalcitrant minority (Chp.10-13)."

For Gundry (1970:286) the theme of 2 Corinthians revolves around "Paul's inner feelings about himself, his apostolic ministry, and his relationship to the churches he had founded and nurtured." I will not discuss in detail, arguments for the literary integrity of 2 Corinthians, [1] except to say that the primary argument in this regard seems to revolve around the question of whether 2 Corinthians 10-13 is part of a "lost second epistle." The argument for this seems to revolve around the "change in tone" in chapters ten to thirteen compared to the "congenial tone" (I would say) of the rest of the epistle.

Gundry (1970:288), provides the following broad outline of 2 Corinthians into which we can place the 2 Corinthians 5:18-21 pericope, on reconciliation :

1.) "Introduction: Greeting (1:1,2)"

2.) " The relationship between Paul and the Corinthian Church with special reference to the

---

[1] For a more in-depth argument on this see Gundry (1970:286) in "The Integrity of 2 Corinthians."

now agreeable majority (1:3-7:16)"

3.) "Exhortation to contribute to the church in Jerusalem (8:1-9:15)"

4.) " The relationship between Paul and the Corinthian church with special reference to the still recalcitrant minority (10:1-13:10) "

5.) "Conclusion: farewell, exhortations, greetings and benediction (13:11-14)"

Within (2) ie: " The Relationship between Paul and the Corinthian Church with special reference to the now agreeable majority (1:3-7:16)," we find 4:1- 6:10, which Gundry summarises as, "The determination of Paul to carry out his ministry." It is in this context that we find the 2 Corinthian 5:18-21 pericope. My observation, is that the theme of reconciliation between Paul and the Corinthian Church is thematically linked to the reconciliation pericope. We see that the church had not only reconciled to Paul, but they had also disciplined the leader of the rebellion (2 Cor 2:5-11). Paul advises the Corinthians to forgive him and restore him into their fellowship again and he also offers his own forgiveness (2 Cor 2:7,10). Paul wants the Corinthian Church and his opponents to close ranks with him then, lest they (the Corinthians) be "outwitted by Satan's schemes" (2 Cor 2:11).

Thus the theme of reconciliation and forgiveness which I observe in the epistle, is crystallized in 2 Corinthians 5:8-21 but especially in vs 19(b) where Paul says, "...And entrusting to us the message of reconciliation."

The argument for reconciliation could also not have hurt Paul's hope of winning a collection from the Gentile Christians for the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem- if tensions were in fact existing between them.

4.4.2 ROMANS.

For Gundry (1970:290), the theme of Romans is "Justification by divine grace, through faith in Jesus Christ." According to him, Paul wrote the epistle to the Romans from Corinth, after just completing the collection for Jerusalem during his third missionary journey (:291). Paul's purpose for writing the epistle, was to prepare the church in Rome for his future, intended visit to them (:292). He hoped to strengthen the Roman Christians in their faith (1:11,15) and obtain financial support for an intended visit to Spain (15:24,28).

As far as the debate about the actual genre of Romans is concerned, I will not go into it except

to say that for Gundry (1970:292), "Romans is a treatise on the gospel designed to prepare the readers for Paul's coming oral ministry amongst them." [1]

I will also not enter into the debate on textual problems in Romans in detail, except to say that the primary problem discussed by both Gundry (1970:292) and Beker (1980:59) revolves around variations in ancient manuscripts on the position of the doxology of 16:25-27 and on the position of the benediction in 16:20.

I will also not go into a debate, as to whether the audience of Paul was Jewish or Gentile. Gundry (1970:291) though argues for a Gentile audience for which he offers textual evidence.[2]

I will now provide a broad outline of Romans , merely to put into literary and thematic context, Romans 5:1-11. Gundry (1970:298-299) provides the following outline:

1.) " Introduction (1:1-17)"
2.) " The Sinfulness of all men (1:18-3:20)"
3.) " The Justification of sinners who believe in Jesus Christ (3:21-5:21)"
4.) " The Sanctification of Sinners Justified by faith in Jesus (6:1-8:39)"
5.) " The unbelief of Israel (9:1-11:36)"
6.) "Practical Exhortations (12:1-15:13)"
7.) "Conclusion (15:14-16:27)"

Within this outline, which captions 3:21-5:21 as "The Justification of sinners who believe in Jesus Christ", Gundry (1970:298-299) captions Romans 5:1-11 as "The many blessings of justification." "Reconciliation" is portrayed as a consequence of justification- as I showed earlier in Ridderbos' outline of Paul's theology. Thus for me, Romans 5:1-11 fits into the main theme of Romans (i.e. justification through faith in Jesus Christ.) because it merely extends this theme, into the consequences of justification. Out of justification flows peace (5:1), access to God (5:2), rejoicing (5:2(b)), hope (5:5), love of God (5:5) and reconciliation

---

[1] For more on the question of whether Romans is "epistolary" or a "systematic treatise"- see Beker (1980:59-64). For Beker (1980:91), "...Romans is not a systematic treatise or compendium of Christian doctrine but rather a theology in process, one that was evoked by the concrete demands of the Roman church."

[2] For another argument i.e. that there was a Jewish element in the Roman church, even though it was largely Gentile, see Munck (1959:204- 209). Here Munck (1959:205) says that Baur, Mangold (1884), Sanday and Headlam hold this view too.

(vss 10,11). In this way Romans 5:1-11 is enmeshed into the greater epistle. The idea of reconciliation in Romans 5:10,11 is also connected to Romans 6:1-14 where Paul describes a union with Christ in his death and resurrection (Rom 6:5). Reconciliation and union here are connected because they convey a sense of "oneness" and "togetherness."

In my estimation, Romans 3:29,30 is also linked to the concept of reconciliation in Romans 5:10,11. In Romans 3:29,30, God is portrayed as God of both Jews and Gentiles, merely through faith apart from the law. We see unity and reconciliation at work here too.

4.5 AN EXEGESIS OF 2 CORINTHIANS 5:18- 21 AND ROMANS 5:1-11.

I will now provide a more critical examination of the word "reconciliation" in the texts that I have chosen as well as other sources in which the word is found. I will then go on to exegete the texts and then see if it is really valid to contextualize Paul's use of reconciliation in the crime encounter. To examine this I will show how people like Mosala, Domeris and Breytenbach argued their understanding of reconciliation in Paul in terms of contextualizing it for social transformation, in the late nineteen eighties in South Africa. This will enable us to get a better grasp of Paul's understanding of reconciliation, both semantically and exegetically and make us aware of the complexities involved. I will use this socio- political attempt of contextualization to enable me apply to Paul in a more personal victim-offender context.

I will use their arguments for social contextualization to validate my own method of contextualization. I will also comment briefly on Paul's theological methodology, which I hope will also validate my own theological method, which will enable me to argue my method of contextualization in the victim-offender encounter.

According to Büchsel (1964, 1:258), the meaning of καταλλαγή is " 'exchange' and then 'reconciliation' ". He says it is used only by Paul in the New Testament and denotes a "disposition ...of God." There are three words which help shed light on our understanding of reconciliation as used in the New Testament and/or by Paul.

1. ' Αλλάσσω : Büchsel (1964, 1:251), says "the basic meaning is 'to make otherwise'[and]

in the NT we find only the trans. act. and pass., not med." In Acts 6:14 for example, it is used in the sense of "to alter or change." In Romans 1:23 it is used in the sense of "to exchange".

2. Διαλλάσσω : For Büchsel (1964, 1:253) it has varied meanings of use, like, "to alter or exchange", "to distinguish oneself" and "to reconcile". In the New Testament it only occurs in Matthew 5:24 in the sense of "to reconcile", ie. "in the sense of seeing to it that the angry brother ...renounces his anger."

3. Καταλλάσσω : For Büchsel (1964, 1:254) it tends to have "the thought of change predominating". This word can be put to use to mean "to change", "to exchange" and "to reconcile" or "reconcile oneself".

For the purpose of this thesis, I will not go into the use of καταλλάσσω and its derivatives, outside of the New Testament [1] , except to mention this if it is incidental to the arguments of Mosala (1987), Domeris (1989) and Breytenbach (1990) later on.

Breytenbach (in Zuern 1998:3) says that the Greek terms δι- and καταλλάσσειν are "mostly in the writings of Greek historians". The words are used to indicate " establishment of a new relationship between two formerly hostile parties" (:3). One party sends a representative to the other asking for reconciliation. Reconciliation then brings about an end to the enmity with a new peaceful relationship. Via this process, the past evils are forgotten and amnesty is granted which results in past deeds having no present legal consequences (:3).

For Breytenbach (1990:67) [2] , Paul transfers this new relationship of καταλλαγή between formerly hostile parties (nations, cities etc.) into the new relationship between God and the world. Breytenbach (in Zuern 1998:4) says that apart from Greek literature, other texts also

---

[1] See Büchsel (1964, 1:254) for use outside the New Testament.

[2] See Breytenbach (1990:67), for part of his understanding of δι- and καταλλάσσω and καταλλαγή. He says, "...In the Corpus Hellenisticum both di- and kattallasō ktl. are mainly used to refer to the making of a peace treaty or to the reconciliation of individuals, kings, cities and nations which waged war against one another." And Hengel (1981:46) says that Paul knew that in addition to καταλλάσσεσθαι and καταλλαγή "deriving from the sphere of interpersonal relationships, [these were] a group of words which could also be interpreted in a cultic sense."

indicate this transfer of relationship between gods and people. Yet in these instances it is always the gods that change to bring about a new relationship with their subjects, as opposed to Paul's use of καταλλαγή where the world in a passive sense has its position changed and not God. Bultmann (1952-1955, 1:287) also says that all pagan notions of reconciliation saw that humans had to do something, to reconcile to God. For him this is "far from Paul's thought", who believed that "God conferred this reconciliation on men". With the above consideration of reconciliation in mind I will now exegete 2 Corinthians 5:18-21 and Romans 5:1-11.

4.5.1 2 CORINTHIANS 5:18-21.

Vs 18: τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ διὰ Χριστοῦ καὶ δόντος ἡμῖν τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς

In Paul's understanding, it is God who takes the initiative to reconcile Paul (ἡμᾶς would personally include Paul too, along with the world (vs.19)) and overcome enmity between them. Διὰ Χριστοῦ indicates that Christ was the mediator or broker between God and Paul. Τὰ δὲ πάντα stresses that the attitudes of vv. 16 -17 are a result of God's effort. He is the initiator or subject of this reconciliation and its many consequences - like peace and fellowship with God for example. Not only has Paul reconciled but he has received the "ministry of reconciliation" (διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς). Even this ministry of reconciliation is from God because he says τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. This ministry of reconciliation is given to Paul to point others to God, so that they too can be reconciled to God. Paul does not elaborate on his use of "ministry of reconciliation". Domeris (1987:78) points out that it is not shown in the text that this reconciliation is between one person and another. He says that "we are obliged to discover this for ourselves", even though "there are some pointers" in this regard. For me while the context implies reconciliation between people and God, there still remains an implicit possibility that it can also refer to reconciliation between people. Surely if humans are reconciled to God, then an inevitable offshoot would be reconciliation between people too - if they are in enmity towards each other. And this would still support Paul's theology that "all things are from God".

Note that while we can only infer a religious or spiritual theological understanding of

reconciliation from the text here,[1] we cannot in my estimation tell for certain what reconciliation would entail in its totality at a psychological level between God and humankind. I make this observation because it has significant bearing on any attempt to contextualize Paul's assessment of this reconciliation at a psychological level between victim and offender. I think we will have to consult other texts of Paul to ascertain what he could have had in mind in understanding this new relationship at a psychological level. However in continuing with the exegesis, we see that Paul has now become "an apostle of reconciliation". Paul is primarily reconciled to God and it may be argued secondarily to Christ.

Vs. 19 ὡς ὅτι θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ, μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς.

A slight variation occurs here compared to vs.18. Vs. 18 says διὰ Χριστοῦ while vs.19 says ἐν Χριστῷ. Here we have God "in" Christ reconciling the world. This combination builds up and points out that not only did God act through the medium of Christ but he was also in some qualitative sense "in" Christ, the mediator. So "all things" being of God (vs.18), even includes the mediator being from God. We also see that God not only reconciled Paul to himself but that he was also reconciling the world (κόσμον)[2] to himself ἐν Χριστῷ.

We must see that through one act[3] ie. God's Son dying, he effected the *condition necessary for reconciliation.* If we cannot see this then we would think that Paul contradicts himself in vs. 20 where he says "..Be reconciled to God " (καταλλάγητε τῷ θεῷ) when God was already, *previously* reconciling the world to himself -in Christ. We can only logically conclude that God was merely setting a condition and thereby vindicating himself for the impending

---

[1] This is why I stressed that Paul's understanding of reconciliation must be understood in the light of his more general theological understanding. It is for this purpose that I presented an outline of Ridderbos' understanding of Paul at the beginning of this chapter.

[2] See pg. 52 where I commented on Paul's use of κόσμος.

[3] This one act has its converse in the one act of Adam that led to the initial estrangement between God and humans. See pg. 53, where I explained Ridderbos' understanding of Paul's theology.

"completed acts of reconciliation" between himself and human-beings [1] . I would put forward that through his Son he initiated reconciliation only insofar that he created space for dialogue within which the complete transaction of reconciliation can take place with the world and Corinthians. No precondition is set by Paul for drawing the world into dialogue with him.

Μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, indicates that at that point, the sins of those who allowed themselves to be reconciled, stopped being counted against them. They received amnesty. Note again we see the point that "all things are from God" is emphasised (vs. 18) because Paul implies God has given them the gift of ministry in καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν.... τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς, is not exactly the same as διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς in vs. 18. Διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς in vs. 18 indicates an active demand on Paul it would seem to me, while τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς, implies an understanding of reconciliation ie. knowing in an abstract sense, what the logic of reconciliation really is.

5.20 ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ οὖν πρεσβεύομεν ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δι' ἡμῶν: δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, καταλλάγητε τῷ θεῷ.

Paul uses the language of being an ambassador (πρεσβεύομεν) on behalf of Christ (ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ). The image of reconciliation between nations is conjured up. Paul was sent here on behalf of Christ to ask the people of Corinth to become reconciled to God. Note the passive tone of the response (τῷ θεῷ) expected from them - again indicating that God has done everything and it is merely a matter of accepting consciously what has already been done for them by God, through Christ. Note this conscious appropriation of reconciliation must be taken up by the Corinthians otherwise the process of reconciliation is incomplete and to no avail. So both parties must in the final analysis have the will for reconciliation and commit to it. Having said this, we see that for Paul, God has already made his intentions clear and he himself initiates and also does all of the active work to set up a process that climaxes in reconciliation. We cannot suppose an equality of power in the new state of reconciliation nor in the previous state. On the contrary since "all this is from God" (vs 18) it is implicit that it is God who puts in all

---

[1] See pg. 56 where I quoted Barth as saying that through Christ's sentence and judgement , "He [God], remains, and pronounces himself true to man." Also see pages 57- 58 for the arguments presented around "The righteousness of God", in this regard.

of the effort short of human acceptance and therefore it is he who has all the power and benevolence in the equation of reconciliation. The image of benevolence, portrays God as "big-hearted"and righteous. We can infer then that he does not give his Son out of guilt but rather magnanimity. I draw on an expiatory perspective here but I also see a propitiatory perspective too, as I later point out [Rm 5:9 in reference to God's wrath on pg.87].

Note also that Paul is at pains to point out that he is merely an instrument of God and Christ in this reconciliation process to the Corinthians. He says, "...It is as though God is making the appeal through us..." and again he says, "...We beseech you on behalf of Christ." Again he shows it is God propelling the reconciliation process forward.

Vs. 21 τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ.

Here we see that the one through whom God does this work of reconciliation had to become sin for us (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν). Christ who knew no sin became sin. This implies someone had to pay the costly price for this reconciliation. "Christ was made sin" on our behalf, indicates a transference of *the sin* [1] onto Christ from those reconciled because he uses "for us". Note Christ is not merely made a sinner but he becomes "sin personified", since God made him to be sin (ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν).

The intriguing question left open and not directly commented on by Paul here is, "What effect did this have on the relationship between God and Christ? " God "made him (Christ) to be sin", again highlights the fact that God actively drove the process forward. Γενώμεθα... ἐν αὐτῷ indicates the transformative process of the work in Christ. In my estimation the actual meaning of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ cannot be determined exactly. The exact meaning of "the righteousness of God" must be examined and understood in the light of an overall theology of Paul in the New Testament. [2]

---

[1] Note sin here is in the singular (μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν) indicating a reference to the original, universal sin Paul had because of Adam. While I accept this cannot be gauged from the 2 Cor 5:18-21 pericope alone, I take the liberty here of interpreting in the light of Paul's general theology as I outlined from Ridderbos at the start of this chapter.

[2] See pg. 57- 58 where I outline Ridderbos' understanding of "The righteousness of God" in Paul's theology.

Because Christ suffers through the cross, we can say that space was left open for God's wrath and anger in the reconciliation process.[1] (Note that the texts under consideration do not mention the word "cross" but I conclude this from Paul in Romans 6:6 which says, "We know that our old self was crucified with him..." In relation to this point, I am in agreement with Domeris (1987:78) when he states that it is Jesus "who effects restitution by absorbing into his body the dark cloud of sinful humanity."

4.5.2 ROMANS 5: 1-11.

I will now go on to draw briefly from Romans 5:1-11. Here Paul in a general sense deals with justification and a consequence : reconciliation.

Vss. 1 and 9 refer to justification. The intervening vss. (2-8), in a general sense speak of faith, grace and Christ's death. Vss. 10 and 11 speak about reconciliation as an outflow of justification. Wilkens in Zuern (1998:6) says that Paul opens up a new facet by linking reconciliation to the complex issue of justification. For Wilkens the context for reconciliation in both the 2 Corinthians 5:18-21 and Romans 5:1-11 texts is "very similar".

Vs.10 εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες κατηλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, πολλῷ μᾶλλον καταλλαγέντες σωθησόμεθα ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ·
Vs.11 οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι ἐν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δι᾽ οὗ νῦν τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλά

Romans 5:10 speaks more strongly than 2 Corinthians 5:18-21, of what reconciliation has replaced, ie. enmity between God and humans. This initiative is also taken by God "while we were enemies" (ἐχθροὶ ὄντες). God took it upon himself unconditionally to reach out to humans while they were in fact hostile to him. In regard to this state of enmity, Ridderbos makes the following comment: "Man in his sin is an "enemy of God" not only in the active but also in the passive sense of the word." [See pg. 59 of this thesis.]

---

[1] (Barth 1956-1969, 4:514) agrees with my argument. He sees the judgement of God executed in Christ in a two- fold sense. Here he sees the "*burning, the consuming fire, the blinding light of His wrath*" [italics mine] as compared to a positive sense in which he sees "the God who has turned to man in goodness, mercy and grace".

Again as in 2 Corinthians 5:18-21, we see that someone still had to pay the price for this universal sin of humans and this was Christ. At the same time this reconciliation cost God something too because it was his Son that had to die. Romans 5:10 makes more vivid the cost to God for reconciliation, then, than 2 Corinthians 5:19, which merely says, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself." Implicit, then, is the love of God for the world because he gave his Son to die for his enemies.

Paul then describes two consequences. In essence he says, if God did so much for humans while they were sinners, in the death of Christ, how much more (πολλῷ μᾶλλον) will he do for them now that are reconciled in the life of Christ. Secondly, he says, "We boast (καυχώμενοι) in God through our Lord Jesus Christ." [1] Thus the medium whom the punishment fell on, ie. Christ, is now also not to be left out of the reconciliation climax. Also out of the reconciliation comes "boasting". There is no room for sorrowing over the death of the Son or regret over the past. Rather there is a healthy boasting or "self assertiveness". Rejoicing takes place in God but through the Son. From the context I can infer that καυχώμενοι has a positive connotation in the culture that Paul is addressing here. This self assertiveness is a mark of overcoming the past estrangement.

While both texts indicate reconciliation as an initiative of God whereas humans take the passive role, the questions left open in these texts for me are, "What new attitude is required on behalf of both parties? ". "How do they conduct themselves once reconciliation is mutually agreed upon? Ethically how do humans behave once they have allowed themselves to be reconciled? " Furthermore if "all things are from God" i.e. initiation, propitiation, etc. then is it valid to assume that God provides the power for those human- beings who allow themselves to be reconciled, to be ethically transformed ? I believe that from the text we could keep the theme and flow of Paul's thought "that all this is from God"and say that the power or enablement for humans to change their disposition, comes from God too - through Christ. I

---

[1] Note most English translations like the NIV and RSV, euphemistically translate (καυχώμενοι) as "we rejoice", perhaps because of a cultural sensitivity to "boasting". This does not seem to be a problem in the culture of the Corinthians. Soica (1994:295) says, "The etymology of καυχώμαι is disputed but the meaning of the verb which is usually intransitive is clear. [It means] "boast, glory in, put ones human confidence in" ". Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich (1957:426- 427) say that intransitively it means "boast, glory, pride oneself"and transitively it means "boast about, mention in order to boast about".

would pursue this as a natural conclusion to Paul's theology in 2 Corinthians 5:18-21.

However I think it necessary and valid to examine Paul's theology as a whole to answer this question. The debate of the "indicative and imperative" with regard to justification in Paul's thought is pertinent here.[1] "What does this mean? " Ridderbos (1977:253) describes the "indicative and imperative" with regard to justification in the following way: By the "indicative" is meant :"The new life in its moral manifestation [which is] at one time proclaimed and posited as the fruit of redemptive work of God in Christ through the Holy Spirit... elsewhere however it [moral manifestation] is put...as a categorical demand - the imperative." I am in agreement with Bultmann (1952-1955, 1:38) when he says that there is no contradiction between the imperative and the indicative of justification. "Rather," he says, "...the imperative results from it." He says in a certain sense then [it means], "Become what thou art!"

Once reconciliation has taken place, there is a "confluence of indicatives and imperatives" - as Ridderbos (1977:253) puts it. So while God gives new life freely which finds its origin in the death and resurrection of Christ, which leads to regeneration and moral fruitfulness, one's response is also important to this reconciliation. God's bestowing of life and the human's response to this initiative can be thought of as dialectical.

In my estimation, an example of this which makes us understand reconciliation more clearly, is Romans 6:2. Here those who are in Christ have "died to sin" by virtue of identifying with Christ's death and resurrection. Justification as imputation is "indicative". Ridderbos (1977:254) notes however that "this whole pronouncement [of the indicative], however, is directed towards stimulating responsibility and arousing to activity" because it also says, "Let not therefore sin reign in your mortal bodies...and do not present your members any longer as weapons of unrighteousness in the service of sin..." (vss. 12,13). The redemptive indicative of dying and rising with Christ is not to be separated from the imperative of struggle against sin." For Ridderbos, Colossians 3:13ff, is another "striking example" of the indicative making imperative demands.

My conclusion then is that reconciliation is a two-way process, not merely in God making the

---

[1] See Ridderbos (1977:253-258; 270-271) for a further discussion of this.

overture and fallen human- kind responding- but that a responsibility must go hand in hand with accepting this reconciliation. This responsibility means it is imperative to act "as one who is reconciled ." One's moral disposition must change too .Thus being reconciled to God is not merely a matter of lip- service but rather one of new life and disposition towards God because one has been transformed at an indicative level. If this new ethical disposition is not in view, then in my estimation, the overture of reconciliation by God was not genuinely appropriated in the first place. Alternatively it was appropriated but the human- being concerned has decided to turn his/er back on God and prefers the "un-reconciled" state again. Colossians 3:1 supports this view too. Here we read "if you were then raised together with Christ , seek the things from above." Ridderbos (1977:254) argues that the "if" is certainly not merely hypothetical ." He argues as follows: "It is a supposition from which the imperative goes as an accepted fact . But at the same time it emphasises that if what is demanded in the imperative does not take place, that which is supposed in the first clause would no longer be admissible (cf eg. Rom 8.9; Col 2:20; Gal 5:25)."

Domeris (1989:78) also makes a point which is connected to my argument above, when he says that reconciliation is costly for both sides. Here Christ suffers and dies and the one who allows him/herself to be reconciled must allow his/her life to be transformed . My understanding of reconciliation from Paul then, would be that it cannot exist in a continued state [1], if a change of moral disposition does not take place on the side of humans.

4.6 A DEBATE FOR THE SOCIO-POLITICAL CONTEXTUALIZATION OF RECONCILIATION OF PAUL.

The attempt at social contextualization of the reconciliation texts of Paul, must no doubt have been attempted throughout the centuries, especially when the church found itself in social turmoil. In South Africa, during apartheid, in the nineteen eighties, such a debate seemed to have raged amongst theologians, especially around the Kairos Document [2] . Whilst most would

---

[1] See my definition of "reconciliation" in Chp. 2.2.2, pg. 17, where I described it as a process.

[2] See De Gruchy (1985).The article makes the following comments : The Kairos Document was a working document that came into existence in opposition to Apartheid as a "result of pastors and theologians sharing together in trying to develop theological perspectives for ministry in the midst of a national crisis and state of emergency." It was

have no problem using the texts to assist a peaceful transition to social reconciliation, the problem rather revolved around exactly how the text ought to have been used .Though what seemed to have happened then was that people with different agendas (depending on such factors, as which side of the racial and political divide one came from) interpreted and contextualized Paul differently, to support their socio- political vision of reconciliation for a new South Africa. I do acknowledge though, that there must have many theologians, who intended well in "extracting exactly " what Paul could have had in mind if he envisioned his theology as providing a model of reconciliation for South Africa in the twentieth century.

I will describe how three writers wrote about Paul's theology of reconciliation and how they

---

initially initiated by the Institute for Contextual Theology in Johannesburg and reflected the thinking of more than fifty black pastors in and around Johannesburg. While initially there was no intention of publishing it, it eventually took on enough importance as a confessional statement addressing the churches as well as the state (:3).

It was first published on the 13th of September 1985 and tended to evolve as a document, as criticisms and suggestions were offered. The name "Kairos" evolved out of Lk 19:44, where Jesus wept over the impending destruction of Jerusalem and announced , "...And all because you did not recognize your opportunity (kairos) when God offered it." Theologians were drawing a parallel here to South Africa which was perceived as heading for a plunge into chaos and destruction because of the political and social turmoil in the country (De Gruchy 1985:62).

Section 3.1 entitled, "Reconciliation" examined what it meant theologically. The document critiqued the then "Church Theology" i.e. the theology of the ruling elite. It felt that in the conflict then, it was not a matter of a "right" side having to deal with a "wrong" side. It claimed that the "wrong" side had no right for negotiation. It felt that the situation reflected good and evil in an absolute sense and therefore it was a mistake to attempt to reconcile both sides. In fact its stance was that the evil had to be gotten rid of (De Gruchy 1985:62).

Out of this theological stance the idea of reconciliation and peace between both sides of the conflict was seen to be unChristian, before the then injustices were removed. Such reconciliation before the injustices could be removed was seen as sin because it meant embracing the oppressor. The stance was then taken that there could be no reconciliation , forgiveness or negotiations without repentance of sins to be extended to the unrepentant. The stance taken was that Biblical teaching did not expect forgiveness of sins to be extended to the unrepentant. A stance was taken to "confront our oppressors and sow dissension" as seen in Lk 12:51. The document went on to say, "To be truly Biblical our Church leaders must adopt a theology that millions of Christians have already adopted- a Biblical theology of direct confrontation with the forces of evil rather than a theology of reconciliation with sin and the devil"(De Gruchy 1985:69).

To summarize then, reconciliation could not take place with the unrepentant. In fact to extend forgiveness in this state was considered a sin.

contributed to a contextualization for social reformation in South Africa. Once we see if they had in fact made a successful and valid contextualization of Paul for social reconciliation, then contextualizing Paul for the crime encounter will follow a similar methodology with some modifications.

But apart from this, I think that a key for contextualizing Paul, lies in the very nature of how Paul theologised . If we can determine this, we could have a stronger or weaker argument for whether or not we can also contextualize Paul for social reconciliation and then reconciliation in the crime encounter.

I will now examine what Mosala (1987), Domeris (1987) and Breytenbach (1990) contributed to the debate in the late nineteen eighties.

Mosala (1987:19) at the time, argued that whites and blacks saw reconciliation differently. Blacks for him saw "no contradiction between liberation and reconciliation", while whites saw "reconciliation as a substitute for revolution."

Mosala (1987:22) looked at reconciliation from a materialistic point of view. For him there could be no reconciliation between blacks and whites - until blacks had received political and economic liberation . He made the following statement : "Our reconciliation with white people will follow from our reconciliation with our fundamental means of livelihood." For him then restitution was necessary before reconciliation.

Mosala's (1987:23) desire for economic restitution seems to have led him to the Old Testament and LXX, because he could not find evidence in the New Testament to support his claims for καταλλαγή. This lead him to "earth in historical reality", Paul's understanding of καταλλαγή. He attempted to show how καταλλαγή in the Old Testament and LXX meant "restoration" or "restitution", via some semantic and exegetical working of Isaiah 9:5 (LXX) and Heb. Jer 31:39. Mosala comes to the following claim: He says, "It (reconciliation) is primarily a socio-economic term which conjures up a process of socio-economic and political reconciliation."

Mosala (1987:23-25) goes on to make his claim about Paul's understanding of reconciliation by saying that "Paul's theological metaphor of reconciliation between God and humans, and

God and the world has its historical and cultural roots in this socio- economic meaning"(:25a). So Paul, in the new Testament, gets God to be representative of "the peasant producer whose property has been alienated." " Humans represent the lost property of God. Christ the mediator is the New Testament Goel He again roots this in the Old Testament by referring to Lev.25:25. So through Christ (the N. T. Goel), "God, the peasant producer restores/reconciles his alienated property , humans / the world." [1]

While I believe (and will comment on later), that Breytenbach convincingly critiques Mosala's understanding of Paul's theological rooting for καταλλαγή, I think Mosala's attempt is still significant, in that it challenges the spiritual understanding of reconciliation found in Paul. One sees the need in a desperate situation to contextualize Paul for meaning, in a concrete situation. His approach at least forces us to challenge the text, for social empowerment and transformation. I believe this same desire of Mosala, and the school of thought he represented back then, is also found in the voices crying out for victim- offender reconciliation in South Africa today.

Domeris' (1987) primary contribution to the argument was his separation of reconciliation as it occurs between God and humans and between humans themselves. My understanding of him is that valid contextualization of reconciliation from the New Testament meant that different words , referring to reconciliation, were necessary for different situations.[2] He argued for example that διαλλάσσω was useful for reconciliation between one person and another. Συναλλάσσω on the other hand was a "good description for Christian activity in South Africa", ie. better than καταλλάσσω for example.

While I maintain that Breytenbach sufficiently refutes Domeris' arguments, Domeris is still useful, I think, because he shows validly that we must take into consideration that reconciliation is operating at two levels, ie. between God and humankind as well as between

---

[1] I will not go into the technical details of his arguments in terms of semantics and exegesis. Rather see Mosala (1987:23- 25) for this.

[2] See Domeris (1989:79-80), for discussion of Domeris' understanding of αποκαταλλάσσω, διαλλάσσω, συναλλάσσω and καταλλάσσω and how he attempts to make these words useful in social and theological reconciliation.

human beings themselves. I think this is useful because it restrains us from making simple analogies between what Paul says is going on spiritually between God and humans and what he and other New Testament writers may be saying is going on socially when we talk of reconciliation.

I will pick up one of Breytenbach's criticisms of Domeris, which I think is significant for any understanding of contextualizing Paul on the victim-offender interaction.[1] Breytenbach (1990:66) says that he disagrees with Domeris, that "change" is a precondition for reconciliation. According to Breytenbach in Romans 5:10, God reconciled his enemies into his friends. He says, "To maintain that "reconciliation requires a complete change in the basic nature of the person involved" would imply changing the meaning of Rm 5:8-10 and 11 Corinthians 5:14-21."

So while I agree that God does not make an explicit requirement of "change first ", before he makes contact with humans, I believe that, in the light of Paul's general theology of the "indicatives" and the "imperatives" of justification, there will have to be change on the side of humans. I am in agreement with Domeris (1987:78) when he says that, "reconciliation requires a complete change in the basic nature of the person involved" but I accept that this is not *before* reconciliation.

The process of reconciliation is mirrored in the "indicative" and the "imperative" demands of justification. This is a crucial point to make because it has significant repercussions on any model for reconciliation between victim and offender. If we use Paul's portrayal of God, humans and Christ in reconciliation, as a metaphor between victims and offenders, (i.e. God is representative of the victim, Christ of the mediator and the world for the offender), then the initiative that God takes to reconcile, will be symbolic of the initiative that the victim will take to bring about reconciliation. In my opinion, this initiative merely creates space for dialogue, in which forgiveness, repentance and restitution to take place.

One of the reasons that I am more inclined to accept Breytenbach's analysis of καταλλαγή and associated words, is that apart from his logical arguments, he represents a more thorough source - base in his set of foot notes than Mosala and Domeris put together. I accept

---

[1]See Breytenbach (1990:64-68), for his semantic, exegetical and traditio-historical critique of both Domeris and Mosala.

Breytenbach's arguments for καταλλαγή ie. : "apart from denoting the peace between enemies, ...it also denotes the reconciliation between alienated couples"in 1 Corinthians 7:11 but not in the passages exegeted, as well as "the reconciliation of people living in animosity toward one another", like διαλλάσσω in Matthew 5:24 (1990:67). For me, these descriptions fit perfectly in the context of the crime encounter. In the light of my earlier psychological analysis of the victim and offender (chapter 3), I would say that καταλλαγή is validly useful in any reconciliation attempt if we subscribe to Paul's theology.

Furthermore, by "looking behind the text" [1] , as Breytenbach, Mosala and Domeris have done for us, it is a valid claim to make that Paul contextualized a word with primarily a "social-societal" meaning into a religious context. A logical conclusion for me then is that καταλλαγή can consequently be validly used, to contextualize into the crime encounter between victim and offender. It could be argued that I am reading "in front of the text"[2] , when I contextualize in this way. I believe by doing this I would be merely adopting Paul's methodology of theology.

The question of Paul's theological methodology is of a major concern for theologians of Paul. I will not get to detail into the arguments around this, except to provide brief significant comments of Beker.[3] Beker makes the following statements in regards to Paul's theological method, which I believe lends support to my argument, that I can validly contextualize Paul's use of καταλλαγή in the victim- offender interaction. He comments :

> We can say then that the hermeneutical interaction between the coherent centre of the gospel and its contingency - that is, the manner in which the one gospel of "Christ crucified and risen" in its apocalyptic setting achieves incarnational depth and relevance in every particularity and variety of the human situation- constitutes Paul's particular contribution to theology. His way of doing theology and the versatility

---

[1] This is the terminology I borrow from West (1993:26-29). For him this mode of reading refers to a critical approach of reading the text which looks at the text in its historical and social context. See especially, a description of three modes of reading the texts. They are: Reading "behind the text", reading "on the text", and reading "in front of the text".

[2] I explained this mode of reading on pg. 10, footnote 1.

[3] See Beker (1980:23 -41) for a discussion of "contingency and coherence" in the letters of Paul in describing his theological method.

> of his language in interpretation are the marks of his genius... His ability to focus in the midst of the early churches' variety of theological expressions on the one central core of "Christ crucified and risen", together with his ability to allow that focus to light up and interact with every conceivable variety and particularity of human life, is a feat that ... no other apostle or theologian, has achieved.
>
> (Beker 1980:35)

So not only am I arguing for contextualization of καταλλαγή on the basis of semantic, exegetical and traditio- historical arguments, but I think the arguments for Paul's methodology by Beker also strengthens my argument that Paul's use of καταλλαγή can be effectively contextualized in the victim- offender interaction.

CHAPTER FIVE

The relevance of Paul's theological understanding of reconciliation, with a psychological model and the actual experiences of rape survivors and offenders.

5.1 INTRODUCTION.

I will now go on to describe the relevancy of 2 Corinthians 5:18-20 and Romans 5:1-11, for reconciliation between survivors and offenders of crime with rape in particular. I will use the reconciliation attempt of God to the world as portrayed by Paul, as an analogy of the reconciliation attempt between survivors and offenders, in the crime encounter. I have already argued my justification in the latter half of Chapter Four, for using the text in this way. I do concede, however, that the analogy between God's reconciliation attempt with that of a survivor's reconciliation attempt, is not congruent at all points. In this chapter I will engage Paul's model of reconciliation with the psychological model of survivors and offenders that I drew up in Chapter Three. I will reference the models that I described in chapters three and four by page number so that you, the reader, can keep track exactly, from where the information was gleaned of the models. I will simultaneously show how relevant the subjects found this "psycho-spiritual" model.

5.2 RELEVANCE OF THE PSYCHO-SPIRITUAL MODEL

1.In the reconciliation attempt of God, as depicted by Paul, God who is wronged takes the initiative to reach out to his enemy (the world) to be reconciled [pg. 69 of this thesis]. The world did not earn this on any merit nor did it put up any effort to set up this reconciliation. The parallel can be seen on page forty-one of this thesis, where Hermann Lewis says that "genuine contrition in the perpetrator is a rare miracle", and in pages forty-nine to fifty, I quoted Vogelman as saying that recidivism amongst perpetrators was high and rehabilitation amongst them tends to be unsuccessful. I think that it would be fair to say then that the perpetrators will generally not reach out to the victim to ask for reconciliation and forgiveness.

However it is necessary for the survivor to control her own process of healing and not rely on the goodwill of the perpetrator. Similarly, like God, she could take the initiative and reach out for reconciliation with the perpetrator. I would say that if the victim does not take the initiative to forgive and reconcile but rather leaves this possibility in the hands of the offender, then that offender will still dominate the psychological well-being of the survivor.

In my interviews Survivor A felt that it was a realistic analogy to expect her to initiate reconciliation (i44/a141). Offender B felt that it was "realistic" for him to initiate reconciliation (i42/b118) bearing in mind that he considered himself to be a "victim". Survivor C felt that it was realistic for her to initiate reconciliation too (c123). Survivor D felt that it was not realistic in all cases. In response to whether this was realistic for her to initiate reconciliation she said "...Not all the time. Some survivors won't. They'll pull back. They will have something in their way." (i32-d137). However personally for herself she felt it was realistic for her to initiate reconciliation (d136). I find it remarkable that in spite of the severe abuse that these survivors went through, they were still open to offering reconciliation to their rapists at their own initiation. I would say then that Paul's model of reconciliation at this point is complementary with Hermann's psychological model of victims as well as in the practical experience of my subjects.

2. Lewis Hermann also mentioned that the survivor needs to give up the fantasy of revenge [pg 41] and the fantasy of compensation [pg 42], if she thinks this will bring about her healing. In such cases these fantasies become counter-productive. I believe this strengthens the argument that survivors should approach reconciliation without any preconditions- just as I see it portrayed in Paul [pg.71]. I have argued already that this still does not negate the imperative of transformation on the side of the world/perpetrator. However, Lewis Hermann says, "Giving up the fantasy of revenge does not mean giving up the quest for justice; on the contrary it begins the process of joining with others in holding the perpetrator accountable for his crimes" [pg 41]. We see that even in the reconciliation process of Paul , God reconciles but does not do away with his quest for justice. His Son pays the price (on the cross) for human- kind's sin. I also believe that reconciliation offered to the offender does not negate justice, in one form or another. I believe in this regard there is congruence in Paul's understanding of reconciliation and the psychological process of healing, that I drew up in chapter three.

This found correlation with the feelings of the subjects. All felt that forgiveness and reconciliation did not negate the need for justice.[1] This justice was understood in a judicial sense. Survivor A felt that in spite of reconciliation "...It would only be fair that he showed how sorry he is by serving a prison sentence." (a146). Survivor D also felt that the offender should go to jail (i44-d148). Survivor C was ambivalent. She felt restitution and justice should be met (c110-c111) but she felt that personally for herself if she forgave and reconciled then "they shouldn't go to jail" unless "they carried on raping her" (c111-113). Offender B in reference to the "lies" that his accuser spoke about him, was ambivalent about "justice being applied to her". He felt that there should not be a jail sentence as such but that "she should obey the law of the land too. If the courts carry out the sentence it would be their prerogative." (b122-124). Interestingly all three personally did not want to execute this justice or take responsibility for it (i56/a147; b123-124; d143-144). This adds weight to my stance that the reconciliation that I envision in this thesis does not negate the need for involvement of the judicial system.[2]

My conclusion for the pursuit of justice incorporated into the reconciliation process seems consistent to me with Paul's model, Lewis Hermann's model and the expectations of the subjects in my sample.

3. The death of God's Son on the cross indicates divine order and justice in spite of God's love for his Son [pg.73]. For God, reconciliation does not negate divine order and justice in the universe. Lewis Hermann says that when a victim is raped, her faith in a natural order fails and casts the victim into a state of existential crisis [pg 38]. I believe Paul's model of reconciliation is still congruent here, in that pursuing justice in the context of reconciliation, rebuilds the survivor's faith in the natural order of society with a built-in system of justice. For Survivor's A and D justice applied by the courts would build their trust for society and in the justice system (a149-150; i47-d149). Offender B felt justice applied through the courts would not matter to him personally (i51/b126). Since two out of four subjects felt that pursuing justice for reconciliation would build up their sense of social order, I would say that

---

[1] I will not go into the personal motivations that they have for still seeking justice through the courts but this can be examined from i59-a153; i61-a157; c111-113; i46-d149

[2] See pg. 31 of this thesis where I mentioned Umbreit's argument in contrast, that modern justice takes away the restitution of conflict from the hands of the victim and offender.

there is a fair measure of practical relevance at this point of the analogy with Paul and some complementation with Lewis Hermann.

4. We also noticed that Paul indicates that the offer of reconciliation is made but it can also be refused by those in the world [pg. 72]. In spite of this God still pays the costly price in his Son and leaves the opportunity open for reconciliation. The offer stands irrespective of its acceptance or rejection. Anyway Lewis Hermann does say that genuine contrition in the perpetrator is a rare miracle [pg 41]. But just as God is vindicated and justified, as one who has done everything that he could do to reconcile his estranged creation, so too does the victim acquire this high moral ground. By showing this love (that God showed), she refuses to allow her sense of humanity to be destroyed by the perpetrator. The victim rises up against the domination of hatred , bitterness and unforgiveness. In this regard, I think Paul's religious understanding of reconciliation complements Lewis Hermann's model of victim and offender.

In my practical findings I noticed that the survivors and offender would react negatively to any refusal of their overture for reconciliation but that they would feel better for making the offer anyway. Survivor A said she would be angry because she would feel she was being "made a liar once again" (i74-a195). However knowing that she took the first step towards reconciliation would make her feel "spiritually stronger"(a196-197). Offender B felt that he would be disappointed if his overture was refused and that it would "confuse him" (b146) but he would still feel that he possessed "some higher moral ground for at least offering" (i60-b149). Survivor D said she would feel "depressed" if this offer of reconciliation were to be refused (d176). But she says that she would feel better for trying and that she knows this would be the best thing for her to do (i62-d177).

My conclusion is that the analogy with Paul at this point is very relevant to the actual feelings of the subjects in my sample and that my interpretation of Paul complements Lewis Hermann's model of victim and offender.

5. My interpretation of Paul is that God made the overture of reconciliation, so that space could be created, within which he could dialogue with those wanting to reconcile [pg 71]. In a similar way the survivor can create space within which dialogue with the offender can take place. God did not make any demands up- front because this could have immediately raised

up a defensive position by humans. Analogously my interpretation is that differences between victim and offender should be addressed within a dialogical space. Within this context of dialogue, confession, forgiveness, reparation etc., is addressed. This was the thrust of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission after apartheid was dismantled ie. to hear the truth around atrocities committed during apartheid, which would then bring about closure to victims and even offenders who wanted to repent of their wrong- doings.

Lewis Hermann [pg 40], says that the survivor has two basic questions: "Why?" and "Why me?". The survivor can now ask the offender these questions which help for her psychological closure. I believe that the converse is also true. The offender in answering these questions also begins to examine his actions, which is a way forward for his own rehabilitation. In Romans 5: 9, Paul talks about being saved from God's wrath through Christ. This implies that God did vent his wrath on Christ, in the reconciliation process. Similarly, the survivor should vent her anger and pain to the offender in the space created for dialogue.

All of the survivors went on at length to describe what they would like to ask or say to their offender in the reconciliation dialogue. (Offender B was asked the same question.) Asking them what they would like to ask their offender, elicited more response (i68-a180; i56-b139; i58-b145; i54-d170) than any other question for each subject, apart from their descriptions of the circumstances around their rape and offence. To me this explicitly demonstrated how much was weighing on the subjects emotionally. This showed a great need to want to "get off their chests" their anger and hurt. I think three subjects out of four wanting to show their anger, shows the relevance to an analogous application of Paul. Survivor C said she would not want to show her anger because "it might scar the person" (c139-140). However she would want to "tell him of the pain and suffering he caused me." (c141-142). She also said he could ask about "...Anything he feels like." (c144). She also wanted him to ask her for forgiveness and that he would "never do it again and say how sorry he is." (c144-145). All subjects wanted to ask, "Why?" and "Why me?" showing agreement with Lewis Hermann's claim. I think again there is a strong measure of relevance with Paul's model, Lewis Hermann's model and the practical experience of my subjects.

6. In the model of Paul, my interpretation is that we do not see a God who is portrayed as guilty [72]. Although he provides his Son as propitiation, this is no admittance to guilt on his part, for the estrangement of his creation. 2 Corinthians 5: 20 b, says, "...Be reconciled to

God." Semantically, we see that God was always in the position he ought to have been in, for unity. His creation has erred because Paul says "be reconciled" in reference to the Corinthians. Lewis Hermann [pg 38] says, "...No matter how brave and resourceful the victim may have been, her actions were insufficient to ward off disaster. Feelings of guilt and inferiority (by the victim) are practically universal.." Survivor A actually felt this guilt because she says she fought back but it "could have been more" (a200).

One can see that the analogy between Paul on the one hand and Lewis Hermann and Survivor A's experience on the other hand breaks down here. God, who I said is representative of the victim, does not feel guilty whereas the victim undergoes feelings of guilt. This, however, should not be seen as an obstacle but rather as a resource that can be put to good use. If the survivor can identify herself with God in the model of Paul then my opinion is that this can be very empowering to the survivor.

In practice Survivor's A, D and C agreed that they also cannot see guilt in God in the texts chosen (i79/a199; c150; i66-d187). Survivor C, however, did not feel guilty in any way because she felt "like she was in a similar position to God", ie. not guilty (c150-151). Offender B says he feels that God is "a bit guilty because he made man and man wronged him and he had to do something to get it right." (b151). Offender B however did feel guilty at the time of the rape (b154). This is evidence, I think, that there are some sex offenders who actually do feel guilty for their offences. Offender B did not feel that the point of "God not being guilty", was relevant or empowering to him in any way (i66/b157).

I think that the space created for dialogue must be used in such a way that the survivors' burden of guilt will be removed. The mediator/therapist and the offender must help the survivor through with this. Although the analogy may break down here, as I have explained, my estimation is that these texts can still be empowering to survivors if used creatively.

7. The second stage of healing for the survivor, is the establishment of a physically secure environment, so that the victim can receive unhindered help [pg 38]. This is the "Safety Stage". In the description of Paul we see that God is all powerful not only because of our instinctive understanding of who God is but also because it is implicitly shown. He is portrayed as the power driving forward the process of reconciliation all the time [pg 69,72]. God then does not have a problem with personal safety. He cannot be under threat of any kind

by the world. However the analogy breaks down here because the victim is not as powerful as God. Her sense of safety cannot always be guaranteed in the rehabilitation process.

Survivors A, C and D as well as Offender B all felt that the analogy did in fact break down at this point (i82-a210; i67-b160; i106-c153; i68-d190). Their understanding is that it is much easier for God to reconcile with the world than it is for victims and offenders to reconcile. While B and D felt that the analogy was not relevant, D still felt that she did not feel any personal threat but conceded that it may be different for other victims (d188-189). Offender B did not fear physical threat but felt there could be an emotional threat (b160). I think it can be safely said that the reason D does not fear for her security from her rapist is because he is very sick, perhaps even presently dying (d122).

I think Paul's model at this point is not applicable or empowering in an analogous sense here and neither did the subjects of my sample think so. I cannot see how it can be complementary to Lewis Hermann's model either.

8. My view of 2 Corinthians 5: 8-21 and Romans 5: 1-11, is that we cannot get a clear picture of how this reconciliation operates at a psycho- social level [pg. 70]. However if we delve into the texts of Paul, we could have an idea of what Paul envisaged. In Romans 8:14 -15, Paul says, "Because those who are led by the Spirit of God are the sons of God. For you did not receive a spirit that makes you a slave again to fear, but you received a spirit of sonship. And by him we cry Abba Father." Similarly Paul says in 2 Corinthians 6:18. "And I will be a Father to you and you shall be My sons and daughters, says the Lord Almighty." Galatians 4:5-6 also conveys the understanding by Paul,[1] of adoption and sonship. I would say then that in Paul's mind, this new sense of reconciliation meant a relationship at the highest levels of social and psychological intimacy. The image of a family conjures up closeness and intimacy at a literal level too. However, I do not think that this relationship between God and those that are reconciled to him, can be analogous to what the survivor- offender relationship should be like when they are reconciled. There can be no guarantee that the offender will not threaten the survivor physically and psychologically. The reconciliation dialogue could take place in an environment that guarantees physical security to the survivor but this may still not prevent psychological intimidation. In the same vein Paul says in Romans 5:10, "For if while we were

[1] Support for Paul's authorship of Galatians can be found in Marrow (1986:51), Munck (1959:86-87) and Beker (1980:37).

enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, now that we are reconciled, shall we be saved by his life." Again we see that a close relationship, with virtually no limit of intimacy at any level is portrayed by Paul, in this new state of reconciliation. Again I have to say that while it is theoretically possible for an incest victim for example to be reconciled to her father and develop a very close father- daughter relationship, I cannot imagine this being a necessary demand on the survivor, as I mentioned earlier [pg. 22] that reconciliation is a process to me, the level at any time being what the survivor decides at that moment.

In my analysis, Survivor A said that she did not want any close, socially intimate ties with with her offender in the reconciled state (i85-a212). Offender B felt that a close psycho-social relationship could not be possible (i72-b161). Survivor C said she could develop a "family relationship" with the men that raped her (c154) and Survivor D felt that this analogy was "relevant in trying to achieve." (d191-193). In my opinion I would think that Survivor D hoped to develop a close psycho-social relationship with her rapist because her rapist was her father and it would seem to me, that she wanted to recreate what she missed out on in a healthy father- daughter relationship over the years and perhaps also influenced by her knowledge that he is dying.

From my sample I cannot claim a strong argument for relevance of the model with the practical experience of these subjects.

9. Paul refers to being given the ministry of reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5:18 and also that God has committed to him the word (λόγον) of reconciliation (vs 19b) [pg 71]. What Paul has received he now gives to others. Not only is he pointing the way forward to others, but he also has the "word" of reconciliation which means that he knows and understands it as an existential reality. Kim Seyoon in Volf (1989:239) argues that Paul's ministry of reconciliation "grew out of his own theological reflections on his Damascus Road conversion experience". Paul had persecuted Christ by persecuting his church. Out of this was born Paul's understanding and ministry of reconciliation. I would say that Paul has a "testimony of reconciliation" to share.

Lewis Hermann talks about survivors getting involved in programmes against rape or in programmes supporting survivors, as a key element of receiving healing and recovering from

the trauma. In helping others one empowers him/herself. In the analogy with God and the world, we see that it is God (representative of the victim) who starts up a reconciliation program, but it is Paul who actively carries it out, by pointing others to be reconciled to God . The analogy is significant and useful because Paul, (representative of a perpetrator) receives the ministry of reconciliation and embarks on a program of reconciliation, geared to point others to God. Διακονίαν, indicates a service (ministry) of reconciliation. This is an indication of coming alongside in service, rather than from a superior position of one who is already reconciled. It is not uncommon for rehabilitated convicts to come out of prison and to start programmes for other convicts, with the hope of them also becoming rehabilitated . This seems to mirror the experience of Paul.

All the subjects in my sample tended to agree and want to get involved in such programs. Survivor A said she "definitely" wanted to get involved in such a program (i91/a220). She said that such involvement would make her feel "better knowing that I helped people survive rape" and that it would make her "feel powerful" that she could "get back at rape by helping others survive it" (a221-222). Survivor D also felt she would "absolutely!" want to get involved in such a program (d197). She felt it would enable her "to show others that the world never comes to an end" and that it would give her "self- esteem" and " some responsibility" (d199-200). Survivor C would also like to get involved in a program to help woman heal from rape (i120-c160). She felt it would help "relieve her pain" (c161). She said she would also be encouraged to reconcile to her rapists if they joined a rehabilitation program (i118-c159). Offender B said that if he were pointed to a rehabilitation program by his "victim" as a prerequisite for reconciliation, then he would not mind joining (i78-b164). He also said that he would like to get involved in a program in which he could help other offenders (i80-b167).

My analysis is that firstly the willingness of these subjects and the reasons that they provide for wanting to get involved in a program of healing and reconciliation for other survivors finds agreement with Lewis Hermann's model. Analogous to Paul, Offender B wanted to get involved with other offenders and help them (i80-b165). I am sure that offenders who get involved with programs to help other offenders also experience healing out of this. Rehabilitated offenders can spread the message of reconciliation to other offenders, which I believe finds reflection in Paul's ministry of reconciliation. I mentioned some of the causes of rape in Chapter Three, with one of them being that men hold fallacious sexual attitudes about themselves and towards women [pg 44, 45-46]. Rehabilitated offenders can make a

contribution however, in bridging the "divide between the sexes", with their own experience of reconciliation.

I believe the priceless contribution that survivors and offenders can make to counselling programs is embodied in their traumatic experiences. I think Schucter (1986:305) makes a profound comment in relation to this when he says, "Therapists must realise that unless they have experienced the same kind of loss, their empathy will be incomplete." Switzer (1986:48) makes a related point when he says, "In order to work in the alleviation of pain and grief... they [Pastoral counsellors] must come to terms with their own feelings concerning death and dying- more precisely their own death." While they are commenting on loss through bereavement I think this can apply to rape victims as well because they are also undergoing mourning because of their loss.

My point is that, while ministers who have not been raped may not be able to feel the exact pain as the rape victims, the survivors of rape possess the experience with which they can effectively console, empathise and counsel other victims/survivors with. Survivors can have not only the "ministry" towards victims but also the "word" (λόγον) of reconciliation in a similar sense to what Paul says he had.

My conclusion from the above evidence is that the immediate analogy that I have made above between Paul's model and the experience of the subjects in my sample, is quite relevant and that the analogy also serves to complement Lewis Hermann's model too.

10. In Paul's theology of reconciliation, we see that it was only one act on the part of humans which caused the estrangement between God and the world (Rom 5:12) [pg.71]. Human-beings then stood legally guilty before God, in spite of any protestations and rationalisations that they could have made on their part. They were held accountable for this one deed. This represented the serious gravity of just the one trespass against God. The penalty was heavy and required the life of the Son of God- in spite of how much good may have followed them thereafter. I believe this immediate inexcusable nature of the universal sin of humankind, portrayed in Paul should be mirrored in the victim- offender relationship i.e. if the offender is in fact guilty, no amount of rationalization and finger-pointing is going to render him innocent. Hopefully offenders who subscribe to these texts analogously will be able to see their actions clearly for what they are. However, practically this does not seem to be

understood by offenders in general. [See Vogelman on pg. 48 of this thesis]. Vogelman says, "They [perpetrators] tend to perceive their actions as being "beyond reproach" or perhaps a slight misdemeanour." I put forward that the above analogy could be used as a resource in Bible- studies with offenders, when using the text to motivate rehabilitation.

The model of Paul in relation to this estrangement and disconnection of God from humans because of the one sin of Adam finds congruence in Lewis Hermann's model. She says that "dis-empowerment and disconnection" from others occurs because of the rape [pg. 39]. That is why she says recovery is based upon "the creation of new connections because the inverse occurred in the time of the crime encounter." This disconnection of God from human- kind because of the action of one man finds a direct reflection in a victim's disconnection from all men because of her rapist.

In the estrangement between God and humans, we noted that through the action of one man Adam (Rom 5:12), God became estranged from all human-beings. Woman that are raped not only isolate themselves and withdraw from society [1] but from my pastoral experience with rape victims, I have noticed that they tend to withdraw from all men generally because collectively men are seen as a threat. It seems that total disengagement with men is seen as a useful preventative measure against similar attacks. While immediately after the rape attempt, such an uncritical stereotypical view may serve as a normal reaction and defence mechanism, I argue that recuperation from the trauma, would necessitate a view of men that is not stereotypical.[1]

Evidence from my sample shows that only one of the survivors had this general fear, distrust and disconnection from all men because of the actions of their rapists. Survivor A felt she did begin to fear all men after the rape (a224) and that she still feels "uncomfortable" with men (a225). Survivor C on the other hand said she "did not fear all men" neither did she hold (negative) stereotypes of other men (c163-c164). Survivor D says that she does not fear all men (d202-203) but she does stereotype them all as "cowards and selfish" (d205-206).

---

[1] See Cheston (1993 : 484-485), for a suggestion of how one can counsel in regard to this alienation from men and the negative stereotyping of them. She says here that the victim should be made to see that it is not "maleness" that is bad but rather "abusive maleness".

Offender B did not feel that the "false accusation" of his "victim" created a stereotyped view of all woman in his mind (b168).

I find it remarkable that my analogy of Paul's model in this regard does not find as much practical agreement or relevance as I had expected. This is in spite of the fact that I think my interpretation of Paul has congruence in Lewis Hermann.

11. In Paul's understanding of reconciliation, we see that God provided Christ in whom he was (2 Cor 5:19). However, at the same time we know that the Son is human too. We can say that the human race provided a body, i.e. something material that they could afford to give- as part of the whole propitiation. God on the other hand, being in "Christ" (ie. in the propitiation) [pg. 70] provides what human beings could not contribute to this propitiation. God provides the purity, holiness, innocence, etc., i.e. - the highest qualities of what it means to be truly God and human.

My standpoint in this thesis is that restitution is necessary as part of the reconciliation process. Note that when I say that restitution is "necessary" I mean only as a right that the victim can choose to exercise. (On pg. 95, I show that in my sample, the victims/survivors do not in reality seem to want any material restitution).

I have argued on page seventy-three, that Christ's death provides the restitution. However, in Chapter Two, when I attempted definitions / descriptions of restitution, I argued [pg.25] that one could not put a price on certain abstract qualities that the perpetrator would have taken away or destroyed in the victim. Faith in God, a positive outlook on fellow human- beings, violation of intimacy and privacy, sexual innocence etc., are irreplaceable as far as restitution goes. A rehabilitated rapist on the other hand could possibly make accurate restitution for material things to the survivor : he could pay her medical bills resulting from the rape or replace any material possessions stolen during the rape. This is the dilemma of restitution in rape.

However, if we look at the cross, we see a useful metaphor in Christ. Here God sacrifices innocence, openness, privacy, etc. This is the price and contribution that God pays in the propitiation. The world could not provide this. We infer that God did this not only because he had no other way, except to destroy humans, but he did it because he loved them too.But we

can also infer that God did it because he loved himself. In order to re- present his estranged creation to himself, he had to sacrifice himself in a sense, through his Son. We can say that he loved himself enough, to sacrifice himself for himself. I put forward that the analogy of the above arguments can be related to the victim- offender relationship in reconciliation. To resolve the dilemma of an unpayable restitution, the victim will have to look within herself if she accepts that her healing lies with forgiveness and reconciliation[1]. My suggestion is that the survivor consider what she lost i.e. privacy, trust, innocence, etc., as a sacrifice she must make in order to be healed. She should not hold this loss against the offender for restitution, in a similar way to how God sacrificed these qualities in Christ, and did not expect any further restitution for it from the world. I would say that Lewis Hermann strengthens my argument because she says that the survivor must come to terms with the impossibility of getting even [pg. 41]. Again she says, "...As grieving progresses, the patient comes to envision a more social, general and abstract process of restitution..." [see pg. 42]. I think the survivor must consider loving herself enough to be able to sacrifice this part of her- self, on behalf of herself, so that she can receive her healing. By sacrificing in this way she takes the moral high ground and reconnects with her humanity because she opened up the possibility for reconciliation. It is my opinion that the above analogy is not only strong, but it also has much potential for healing, when we use Paul's understanding metaphorically for the crime context. I put forward that if a perpetrator is genuinely repentant , his restitution for this can be covered by the survivor's "sacrifice", which he will receive as an act of grace- just as God provided it to the world.

From my sample it would seem that the survivors do not expect anything material in terms of restitution (a187-188; i87-b170; i129/c165; d129-131). I asked them how they dealt with the fact that they could never be fully recompensed for what occurred to them. Survivor A said, "I've accepted that it's done, it's done!" (a230). Survivor C said, "I can't say..."(c166). She said that "Love and attention must be the restitution." (c165). This must be seen in the context that her step-father with whom she is still living was one of her rapists. Survivor D said, "I'll just let it pass." (i89-d207). Offender B said that his "accuser" could never pay full restitution and that he deals with it by "still living in the hope that one day she will tell the truth" (b170-171).

---

[1] See pg. 35 chapter 2.2 in *The Need for Reconciliation through Mediation for Healing,* where I argue for the necessity for forgiveness and reconciliation for healing.

As far as the relevance of the analogy was concerned, Survivor A said that the analogy was a "good comparison" and relevant (a231-232). Offender B said that the analogy was "relevant and helpful" and that he agreed (with the analogy) that the "healing process will start once the victim let's go of these things" (See i91-b174). Survivor C said that she "accepted" the analogy.

12. In Christ we see a mediator [pg. 69] who experiences the pain that it must take for reconciliation to be a reality. I put forward that Christ symbolises the mediator/ therapist who brings both parties together for mediation and reconciliation. In some senses the analogy of Christ's involvement in mediation would be analogous to the therapist/ mediator. I put forward that in a measure, mediators would have to be emotionally involved with the parties concerned . However such self sacrifice by the mediator, moving towards a similar level to that of Christ's, would not be useful and advisable. The mediator would have to steer the process forward, without destroying him or herself for the cause of the survivor and offender or even for the cause of reconciliation. The analogy between Christ in Paul's model and that of a psychological model for a mediator is not totally congruent in my opinion[1].

13. In Paul's model of reconciliation we see a God who does not live in a state of denial to the schism between him and his creation. He does not avoid the fact that it will cost him much pain to hand over his Son to die. He does not wish the problem away either, nor does he find an easier alternative. Furthermore, he goes the more painful route: He hands over his Son to die rather than he himself, even though in a paradoxical sense, he is " in" his Son. Lewis Hermann makes the point [pg. 42], that the " "fantasy for compensation" could represent a defence against the full reality of what was lost..." Any form of denial then on the part of the survivor will not aid in healing. On the contrary this could be counter- productive [pg. 42]. Analogous to God, the victim must go through the pain of confrontation with what has happened in reality. Hermann Lewis further says, "Mourning is the only way to give honour to loss." [pg. 53]. In other words the loss has got to be acknowledged and mourned over.

Survivor A felt that this analogy was quite empowering to her. She felt that if God did not

---

[1] I relate this to the dangers of transference and counter- transference between survivor and the therapist. This can be detrimental not only to the survivor but also to the therapist. See pg. 39 of this thesis where I discuss Lewis Hermann's comments on tranference and counter- transference.

deny the existence of his crisis and "we have his ability in us, why should we deny it ?" (a237) She felt that other survivors do live in a state of denial (a237). She did not totally agree with Lewis Hermann that "mourning was the *only way* to give honour to loss"(i118-a238). She also mentioned that she did prevent herself from mourning for "the first couple of years" (a239-241). Survivor C said that she did pretend that "it was not happening" and "denied it" so that she felt that the analogy about denial was relevant (c169-170). She agreed that victims "do prevent themselves from mourning" (i145/c171) and at the same admitted that she also did the same (c171). Survivor D said that some survivors do live in a state of denial and in some measure "pretend that it never happened" (d212). They also do not deal with it by revisiting it or talking about it (d212-213). In fact she also denied dealing with her rape and "tried to forget that it ever happened". She was also in agreement with Lewis Hermann that mourning was the only way to give honour to loss (i103-d215). Offender B refused to accept that he could be living in a state of denial for what he was accused of (i97-b176). He agreed though that this analogy was relevant and that one had "to take your losses and go on" ie. do not deny them (i100-b177). He agreed with Lewis Hermann that "mourning was the only way to give honour to loss" (b178).

The above analogy breaks down here between my interpretation of Paul and the reality of experience with the subjects. While God does not project denial, in reality the victims do live in a state of denial for awhile (or sometimes indefinitely) judging from the interviews. The analogy in my opinion though, does complement Lewis Hermann's approach to denial as I have discussed above.

However, even if the analogy breaks down, this is precisely why it can be such a powerful resource for victims going through denial. If the victims can identify with the character of God in the texts, then they will perhaps want to emulate him by throwing off their state of denial and this will be a major step in the direction of healing. Survivor A echoed this when she said, "...We have his ability in us, why should we deny it ?" (a237)

14. If we accept that God was in Christ, then we see a strong analogy of Christ's (God's) humiliation on the cross with that of the rape victim's. On page forty-nine, I quoted Vogelman with regard to brutality and debasement. The violation of God in Christ at so many levels is akin to the violation of the rape victim. Just one example of this is that of a semi-clad Son of God suffering humiliation which is analogous to a naked or semi- clad rape victim

also undergoing humiliation. I think the motif of the dying Son on the cross can be an empowering resource for healing in rape survivors. God and his Son can be seen to be in solidarity with her if she identifies with them analogously.

Survivor A found the analogy to be "a very good comparison" (a242). In fact she felt the humiliation to be "exactly the same" (a242). Survivor C felt in this analogy she saw God "in solidarity" with her "because he was there before [her] " (c172-173). Survivor D felt that she could identify with God in this way (i106-d223).

I think that the analogy of the dying Son is analogous and relevant in practice within my sample and I would think even for the purpose of bringing about healing in survivors generally.

15. We can reasonably infer that when Christ took on the sins of those who were going to be reconciled, the relationship between God and his son was momentarily one of estrangement [pg. 73, footnote 2]. An inference that lends support to this is Romans 3:25 because it says that God made Christ "openly" to be a means of propitiation. I get the impression of a "public humiliation". The memory of this estrangement will be forever etched in the mind of God. The memory of the pain the world caused him in the estrangement and the death of his Son will always be with him - simply because God is all- knowing by definition.

On page forty-two, I quoted Hermann Lewis saying that "there will come a time when the trauma does not take central place in the life of the survivor". She also says here that one should not place the unrealistic demand on the survivor to forget. This is important because many people still have the un-liberating notion that in order to forgive one must forget the injury committed against one.

Survivor A said that she will never be able to forget the rape (i124/a243) but she can still stay reconciled in spite of remembering the rape. Survivors C and D also said that they could never forget (i149/c174; i109/d224). Offender B also said that he would "not forget" even though he "wants to forget" (i103/b180). He says that he can handle remembering and still stay reconciled (i181/b182). Survivors C and D say that they can accept remembering the past and still stay reconciled too (c175-176; i110-d225).

I think the analogy of remembering and still being in a state of reconciliation is relevant both with Lewis Hermann's model and in practice as far as my sample goes.

16. But beyond the cross and this estrangement lies "boasting" (Rom 5:11) [pg. 74]. In spite of the memory and the painful events of the past, boasting for God and Christ is still possible. Paul says in Romans 5:11, "We boast in God through our Lord Jesus Christ..." "Boasting in God" and "through our Lord Jesus Christ", indicates a unity between God, his Son and the reconciled. This attitude of the ones reconciled, also touches God and Christ then. So all "boast" in spite of the memory of the past estrangement. In fact this ability to "boast" (perhaps even rejoice) in spite of the memory of the past estrangement shows genuine healing in both parties, as well as the Son. The past is not merely ignored, it has been worked through in all of it's pain.

I believe that healing entails a level of "boasting" (and rejoicing) for surviving the rape trauma. The survivor can "boast" (and rejoice) at conquering evil. She can "boast" that evil, ironically spurred her on to a higher possibility of love and forgiveness, a kind which she would not have known outside of her rape ordeal. She can also boast, that her overture of reconciliation has been accepted and has led to the rehabilitation of the offender, who would otherwise remain in his state of inhumanity. She can boast because through her initiative, the rehabilitated offender has most likely been prevented from raping other victims. However if the rapist does not accept her overture of reconciliation then she can could still "boast" that she at least had the courage to reach out to the rapist and held the moral high-ground.

In Paul "boasting in God", also indicates that those who are reconciled need not live under the domination of guilt because of the past. I believe in a similar way, this provides an excellent model to the rehabilitated offender. He cannot go back to undo the past. There will always be regret but he need not live in a state of guilt. He should constantly boast in the grace that he has received from the survivor, in a similar way to those reconciled "in God".

In practice Survivor A felt "boasting" or being "happy" together with the offender in a reconciled state cannot be analogous socially and psychologically to her experience (i131-a250). She says she cannot have a close psycho-social relationship with him similar (not the same) to that of a father-daughter relationship (a211). She forgives but "does not want any social relationship with him" (a211-212). She would "rejoice" with him in a "spiritual way"-

"if he were to give his heart to Christ" but she "could not sit with him and "boast" or have fun (with him) " (a250-251). She also says she will not be bothered if he goes on to live a life free from guilt (i133-a256). Offender B said, "Most definitely, she can rejoice and even boast."(b187). He also feels that it "does not matter" to him if she were "guilt free"- in fact he would "like it" (b189). Survivor C was most surprising in her response since, to me she seemed to be the most forgiving of all the survivors, judging from her previous responses. Yet she said that she would not want the rapists to be "happy, boast or rejoice" (c179). She felt that she "would not be able to handle it" and that the rapist could "be happy now and again but not with what he did to me" (c180). However when I told her that from the texts it seems like humans no more feel guilty before God and asked her if she would not accept this analogously , she became ambivalent. She then replied that he "should not be guilty...But should be sombre and serious"(c181). Survivor D says that the analogy of "boasting" and "rejoicing" is "applicable" to her (d229). She can accept "boasting" or "rejoicing" with her rapist in the reconciled state (d229). She also says that she would not want the rapist to feel guilty in the reconciled state. She says, "It would not bother me if he does not feel guilty." (d232).

I think that the practical findings in my sample strongly matches, analogously, God's memory of the cost of reconciliation in the reconciled state. The memory of the past injury and pain within the reconciled state is a monument to the grace and mercy bestowed by God and the survivor by analogy. I have not found any way to relate this point of my analogy with Lewis Hermann.

17. For God it was not a resolution by simply letting "bygones be bygones". None of the parties can ever be the same again. All have therefore been transformed by the experience. The Son of God for one will forever be the one who "died for sinners" (Romans 5 :8), i.e. he will be forever known as the one who was the propitiation for sin and accept all of the connotations with that. The above understanding of Paul has much congruence with the survivor- offender relationship. Firstly the survivor and offender cannot pretend that the rape(s) have never occurred. What they must realise is that their identities have been transformed forever. One is now a "former rape victim" whilst the other is a "rehabilitated criminal". All the subjects accepted their "identity transformation" (See i127-a245; b183; c177; d218-219). This means that they will always carry the status of having been raped at some time. Offender B also understands that he must accept that he can never go back to

being an "unconvicted person" for indecent assault (b183). Gherkin (1979:145) refers to this and how it can be used positively, when he says, "The one that suffered loss must be aware [that] her new individuality reveals a new set of strengths." He refers to the one undergoing loss (i.e. through bereavement) as one undergoing "identity reformation". While Gherkin (1979) refers to loss through bereavement, I think that the rape survivor also undergoes bereavement and mourning over the loss of certain abstract qualities that I described earlier, like trust, faith in humanity, privacy, etc. This "transformed identity" must be gradually accepted. Both survivor and rehabilitated rapist should not only accept the identity transformation, but also learn to "co- operate" with it. They should examine themselves to see what new strengths they have developed through the experience. One instinctively feels that if a women can survive rape, then she probably has enormous emotional strength, which could put her in good stead to overcome other traumas that she may experience in life.

Practically my sample revealed that all subjects saw new strengths emerging out of their negative experiences, except for Survivor C. Survivor A said, "...I believe I can forgive anybody anything, now that I've forgiven the rapist. Surviving the rape brought me closer to God and this strengthened me spiritually." (See a246-249). Offender B said, "I've got stronger..." (b184-185). Survivor D said, "...I feel strong...I feel I can take on any obstacle that comes my way now." (d226-228). Survivor C said she saw nothing positive emanating out of her sexual abuse and rape (i154/c178).

I think that my analogous use of Paul in the above way finds strong practical relevance *in my sample*. My analogy also strongly complements Gherkin's model of bereavement if used creatively in the way that I have.

18. In Romans 5: 10 Paul argues, "For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, now that we are reconciled, shall we be saved by his life." [pg. 74]. Paul indicates that a living Christ will be able to save much more than a dead Christ. This indicates a very close relationship in reconciliation, one in which much help can be expected from God through Christ. Not only is there a new passive state of reconciliation and goodwill from God but God will actively help the reconciled in times of trouble. All the subjects agreed with this interpretation (i88-a213; i75-b162; i110-c155; i76-d194). It is now a "win- win" situation for all parties involved. God wins back his creation. Christ wins because he sees the joy of his Father and that of his reconciled creatures. And the reconciled

human- beings have now overcome sin and become truly human. We now get the picture of a human- divine family, in which there is Fatherly help, intimacy and happiness.

The survivor- perpetrator reconciliation relationship has certain elements of congruence, though it is not congruent at all points with what I have described in the above paragraph. I described earlier that God is all- powerful and has no fear for closeness of any kind to those reconciled. The survivor cannot take a lack of threat for granted in the reconciled state. However the idea of rejoicing is an appealing one when transferred to the survivor-rehabilitated relationship because it shows healing has taken place in the survivor to a level where psychological integration has occurred , which results in a meaningful and healthy engagement with the world and the rehabilitated perpetrator. Lewis Hermann [pg.41] says that the survivor eventually comes to the point when she will be surprised at "how uninteresting" the perpetrator becomes, once the mourning is over. She says, "She might even feel compassion and sorrow for him". However she warns that a "disengaged feeling is not the same as forgiveness". This portion of Hermann Lewis fits the Pauline description of reconciliation very well. God does not take on a disengaged attitude to the reconciled after he forgives them. He is entirely involved in the lives of the reconciled.

Practically all subjects were prepared to help their rapists or "accuser" except for Survivor A. Survivor A agreed with the interpretation that God was actively involved in the life of the reconciled but analogously she felt that she would not be able to "get involved in his life and help him" (a214).However she feels she would help "out of fear" because of the "Day of Judgement". But she feels if it were possible for others to help him then she "won't help." Helping him would be more out of "obedience to God than any emotional goodwill". (See i90-a219). When Offender B was asked if he would help his "accuser" in "any way" in the reconciled state he replied, " Yes, if she requires it." (I77/b163). In response to the same question Survivor C said, " Yes, I will help him." (i112-c156). Survivor D even said, " I will want to get involved in his life, to help him." (d195).

I think my interpretation of Romans 5:10 was highly relevant in its interpretation and its analogous application to my sample of subjects. The immediate analogy above also complemented Lewis Hermann's model.

CHAPTER SIX

Conclusion.

6.1. INTRODUCTION.

In this chapter I will discuss the following :

6.2. The challenges, difficulties and shortcomings of this thesis.

6.3. What I managed to accomplish.

6.4 My conclusion on the "relevancy" of 2 Corinthians 5:18 -21 and Romans 5: 1-11, for reconciliation for healing via mediation.

6.5. The way forward : Possibilities for future research.

6.2. THE CHALLENGES, DIFFICULTIES AND SHORTCOMINGS OF THIS THESIS.

Firstly, I can say, that the production of this thesis had a transforming effect on me. Transforming not only to my personal knowledge and emotions but also transformative of the aims that I initially held for this thesis. After starting off with this thesis, I came to realize the enormity of what I first aimed to achieve. Firstly I expected to look into and come up with one integrated exploration and response to the question of reconciliation through V.O.M. I thought I would look at the judicial, financial, social, law and order, psychological and spiritual aspects of reconciliation in V.O.M.P.'s. I even thought at that time that I would be able to come up with a list of scriptures that I could use in the form of a manual, with which I could practically help empower and counsel victims and offenders. I soon discovered that even the legal aspect of reparation in crime involved complex arguments.

I soon realised that I needed to narrow down my focus to the psychological and spiritual aspects of V.O.M. for reconciliation. But even then I realised that the psychological aspect would be quite extensive in dealing with victims and offenders, especially with regard to rape. So even here, I had to narrow down my aims with regard to the psychological aspects, for this thesis.

I discovered that the psychological information and concerns at my disposal were not only

extensive but also in many cases fairly technical, couched in terms and methodologies of psychology, which I could not get to grips with, because of my lack of formal training in psychology. I realized then that I could not make a claim to speak with much authority for the psychological aspects of victims and offenders in rape, nor for the psychological transformation that they would undergo in V.O.M. for reconciliation. This turned out to be disappointing, especially because I saw the lack of ability to apply empirically sound techniques of research and methodologies as limiting. Thus the psychological aspects could have been empirically more thorough had I undergone some formal training in psychology.

This led me to further realize that the strength of my contribution to the debate in reconciliation between victims and offenders, could really only lie in the spiritual aspects and in regard to an examination of the New Testament texts in particular.

If I can claim any particular substantial input into the debate, then I can only say that this contribution is in the area of contextualizing certain New Testament texts, for the problem at hand. This conclusion may seem obvious perhaps to the reader but for me it was not a conclusion mentally deduced. Rather it was one of practical discovery, in the process of my research.

Part of my initial optimism for a wide study, though, I think was borne out by my practical Pastoral work. This involves Pastoral counselling, exegesis of scripture for teaching and preaching, "social work", "legal advice", etc. Thus the practical need for an integrated approach to the challenge of reconciliation via mediation, addressing the problem from all of the above angles, looked appealing to me. However, a gradual whittling away of areas of research for this thesis was not a humiliating or dis-empowering one. Rather, it was a positively humbling experience, that my theoretical research and practical ministry must go on!

The next challenge that I found myself facing, was that of finding willing and available subjects to be interviewed. In fact I came to regard it as a difficulty eventually. I have, however, already mentioned the practical difficulties of obtaining subjects to talk to [pg. 7].

One big disappointment that I had as far as the interviews were concerned, is that the one offender who did agree to talk to me, painted himself as a "victim" throughout the interview.

This proved frustrating to me because I wanted "first - hand" data from a rapist, who could be open to divulging his rape experience. I mentioned earlier, though, that Volgelman (1990:9) also laments that sample sizes for research with rapists are usually "small". He also mentioned, as I partially discovered, that "complex methodological problems" have to be also overcome.

This small size of my sample challenged me further. My initial aim was to provide a fair reflection of the problem with a narrow socio - cultural profile. While I in fact did manage to keep to the profile, the number of subjects interviewed was too small, I think, for me to speak with authority on behalf of such a socio - cultural profile, based on the findings of my thesis.

Thus I conclude and readily admit at the end of this thesis that my sample merely provided a means for practically testing "*what the answers may be*" for this socio- cultural group to the questions I raised in this thesis. For this reason, I constantly mentioned in Chapter Five, that my conclusions for the relevancy of the texts, were only for "*my sample*" or I would say "*this sample of subjects*".

I mentioned in Chapter One [pg. 7] that I had to provide an edited form of transcript of the interviews and I explained the reasons for this. I touched on how I had to clarify questions and answers a number of times in some instances, so that I could come up with an intelligible response to my questions. I came to the conclusion then that the questions that I was wanting to examine in this thesis, meant that the subjects themselves had to have a certain level of understanding, literacy or even education - if I may say so. Sometimes my questions could not be understood even the third time around! In some instances I sensed frustration and irritation on the part of the subjects, when I pressed them for a "proper" (not "correct"!) answer. I came across this for example when I challenged the reader that their response could not actually be gauged on the basis of the texts alone, as it appeared before them. This was a new way for the subjects to look at the texts because they brought a general symbolic and thematic understanding "from across the Bible" to bear on the texts under consideration. It was not unusual to sense a growing irritation, at my persistence and attempts at clarification. I sometimes postponed the question or abandoned it altogether.

The problems associated with this kind of participatory research became increasingly obvious to me. Since I have presented " edited interviews", for reasons I explained in Chapter One and

the above paragraph, I realize that I am open to criticism of my data and the method of collation. I too would agree that in some measure, by editing and clarifying the subjects' answers, I have altered the results from an ideal verbatim. However I will counter by saying that I aimed throughout the process of acquiring and collating the data, to keep the integrity thereof. Furthermore the advantages of the way in which I finally acquired and collated the data, far outweigh the disadvantages. I have already explained the daunting task of transcription of these interviews [pg. 7]. I will add here that such transcripts would be even more daunting for a reader!

As I mentioned earlier, I eventually came to the understanding that my research would have to be centred on an actual critical examination of Paul's texts for reconciliation. This explains why I never went into great detail to critically analyse and develop comparatively, a psychological model of victim and offender in rape and recovery. This lack of comparative research for my psychological model in Chapter Three, must be seen in the light of what I eventually had to concentrate on : a creative contextualization of Paul and its practical relevancy as opposed to an in-depth, critical psychological model of victim and offender in rape and recovery. Besides, as I discussed earlier in this chapter, I am very aware of my shortcomings in the field of psychology. Chapter Three then at times takes the form of a series of abstracts from Lewis Hermann and Vogelman. But this is simply because I wanted to use authoritative work already produced, from which to launch my Biblical work. And it is in the area of Biblical work that my expertise lies.

To a certain measure, I also used Ridderbos in this way in the first half of Chapter Four. The idea was merely to create some formal theological framework of Paul's thought, which would then illuminate my exegesis and contexualization of the texts. Once this psychological and theological framework was set up, my own creativity of exegesis and contextualization started to flow. Most of my exegesis and all of my contextualization thereafter, was my own original work. It was the area of my thesis that I most enjoyed.

It may be argued that the flow of this thesis in Chapter Two seems to get "bogged down", with the definition of the key words. I found the construction and descriptions of these definitions laborious. In fact this section was the section that I least enjoyed putting together for this thesis. Nevertheless, I believe that it was crucial to clarify the understanding of the key terms on which this thesis is based. There also seemed little point in me getting into an etymological

discussion of the key words in their English usage. The challenge rather, for me, arose in how people applied them to reconciliation in serious crime.

6.3 WHAT I MANAGED TO ACCOMPLISH.

I believe that if I have accomplished anything in this thesis, then it would be that I have at least shown how we may contextualize Paul critically for reconciliation between victim and offender. My work can at least be used in a contextual Bible- Study, to empower victims and offenders towards healing. I am sure that others can look at these texts and exegete and contextualize them even further, as a resource for Bible- Study. Not only have I opened up the question of using these texts for reconciliation between victim and offender, but I think I may have provided a handy set of questions and issues to be brought into a Bible- Study, which I think can then be used to engage the texts. So I do not think it is just useful for victims and offenders of serious crime only but I also think that it can be used as a resource or tool by anyone touched by the issue of rape and crime.

In my survey of literature on reconciliation, when I was building up a bibliography for use in this thesis, I never came across any written work in which an attempt was made to apply 2 Corinthians 5: 18-21 and Romans 5:1-11 to reconciliation in serious crime. From the evidence available at my disposable, then, this was a pioneering probe into a problem wracking South Africa presently i.e. the rape and healing of victims and the rehabilitation of offenders. Our country is presently at a crossroads with how they are going to handle the overcrowding of our prisons. The department of Correctional Services has just released its latest plan on how it wants to change its whole ethos to the rehabilitation of criminals rather than their punishability.[1]

I stress again that I am not over- estimating the importance of my results, especially because of my small sample and narrow socio- cultural profile. It is rather a hope that I express.

6.4 MY CONCLUSION ON THE "RELEVANCE" OF 2 CORINTHIANS 5:18 -21 AND ROMANS 5: 1-11, IN RECONCILIATION FOR HEALING

---

[1] See the article, "Restorative Justice" by The Department of Correctional Services in *The Sunday Times* (9 Dec 2001), which outlines the reasons for this ethos of rehabilitation.

VIA MEDIATION.

I conclude that the texts are in fact largely congruent in an analogous application to the experience of victims and offenders, when reflecting on reconciliation. It is largely congruent or complementary to the psychological model that I outlined in Chapter Three. There are points of the analogy that break down in the analogous use of Paul and the psychological model that was outlined. The analogous use of Paul was also largely seen as relevant by my subjects. Yet there were points of analogy which the subjects saw as contradictory in their experience of rape. Of the eighteen points of analogy that I drew up in Chapter Five, I found twelve points "fairly" to "strongly" analogous and practically relevant to the life experience of the survivors and offender and/or complementary to the psychological outline of a model that I drew up in Chapter Three. Two points of contradiction in the analogy to the actual psychological model and real life experience of the subjects were in fact actually empowering, in my opinion. They were "guilt"["6", pg.87] and "denial" ["13", pg. 96]. In the psychological model that I drew up (which tended to match the experiences within my sample) both victims and offenders tended to go through feelings of "guilt" and "denial" which inhibits recovery and healing if they become states of fixation. I felt that if victims and offenders could identify with God metaphorically (whom I argued did not show "guilt" and "denial"), then they could be empowered so as not to stay in a state of guilt or denial over their own rape experiences. The rest of the four points of analogy broke down either with the psychological model that I outlined in Chapter Three or with the practical experiences of the subjects. I think I could conclude then that the texts that I chose were "largely" relevant to reconciliation for healing via mediation for victims and offenders in serious crime - notably rape.

6.5 THE WAY FORWARD : POSSIBILITIES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.

I believe it would be useful to start a V.O.M.P. and monitor it over a longer period of two to three years. A team consisting of at least a Pastoral counsellor, psychologist and social worker could then do qualitative or quantitative research depending on how the actual program runs in practice. Face- to face reconciliation attempts could be attempted especially with the help of other professionals. In this pilot project information can be gleaned as to how viable it is to set up such a program. One could see just how committed the relevant role- players are in practice, whom I mentioned in Chapter One [pg.s 2-3]. The logistical concerns should be

monitored and a model of how such a program can be set up in a local community could be drawn up with the openness to replicating the program if successful.

The psychological and spiritual aspects should be monitored from the time that the victim and offender are prepared for reconciliation, right up through the eventual face- to- face reconciliation. The post reconciliation meeting phase should also be monitored to see how victim and offender are then coping. The alternatives to face- to- face meetings can also be investigated, monitored and implemented.

If we are to attempt healing for victims and offenders immediately after the rape, such a program could then take years to monitor because as I explained before in Chapter Two [pg. 18], from my sample it seems to take years for victims and offenders to come to a point where they want to reconcile. I hope to be involved in such a program in the future. The respect I gained for the complexities involved, through this thesis, will no doubt make me tread cautiously but optimistically.

APPENDIX
INTERVIEWS

Interview with "survivor A".
Age : 29 Sex : Female Race : Indian-South African
Religion : Christian Denomination : Pentecostal/Charismatic
Interview conducted over 2 days : 31/8/01 and 5/09/01 in Pietermaritzburg

i1 Are you comfortable talking about the rape and abuse now?

a1 Yes. It is not traumatic now and I will not have a relapse.

i2 When did the rape occur?

a2 About twenty years ago, the first time. It continued for about five more years thereafter.

i3 Were you a Christian then?

a3 Yes, I was born into a Christian home.

i4 Did you know the rapist?

a4 Yes, quite well. He was my uncle.

i5 Did you seek professional help at that time?

a5 No it was my mums brother. The family did not want it to get out.

i6 Can you describe the events around the rape, as well as events leading up to it, thereafter

a7 It was an ongoing thing from the age of fourteen years. It was sexual abuse. He did not
a8 fully penetrate me until age eleven. That's when he raped me. My parents were divorced
a9 when I was very young. So together with my five brothers and sisters, went to live with
a10 my grand mum and uncle. My mum worked during the day. My uncle first started
a11 fondling me. He was about 25 yrs old. I would have thought he was a father figure. At
a13 age six I started to feel insecure. It was no more hugging but intimate fondling of my
a14 breasts. He was always getting me alone. I knew something was wrong. I would often
a15 say I am going to tell mummy, and he would say. "What are you going to tell mummy?
a16 No one would believe you anyway." He always waited for opportunities to be alone
a17 with me and come onto me. Then my brothers noticed that I was uncomfortable with
a18 him around. They wondered why he'd always close the door behind us and cornered me,
a19 but they could not fully understand why. It went on for five years like this. When I was
a20 11yrs old I menstruated for the first time. I think I menstruated early because of the
a21 fondling over the years. None of the women in the family started menstruating so
a22 early. He must of heard that I started menstruating. A week later my mum and granny
a23 went to a birthday party. While menstruating I went to change. He came into the house
a24 having watched me. He locked all the doors and took me into a room and tore all my

clothes off. That's when he penetrated me for the first time. He was aggressive and
brutal and bit me all over my
breasts. He raped me repeatedly for about two hours. Someone knocked, he got
frightened. I picked up all the blood soiled clothes and ran into the bathroom. I was so
ashamed. He calmly cleaned himself and went to his car and sat there. I was terrified
and went to the neighbour pretending I came to visit. When my granny got home she
sjambokked me, saying that I was disobedient for leaving the house. My anger welled
up and I blurted out that it was safer to be outside the home. My mother insisted I tell
her why. I gradually explained to her. They were shocked. When he was confronted he
denied everything. They took me to the pastor. He said that my uncle (who was also his
nephew) would go to jail if we reported him to the police and they should n't charge him.
He said that I was a naughty girl- implying that I was to blame in some way. Whenever
he was alone with me he still continued to rape me and threaten me. I ran away from
home many times and also tried committing suicide many times- not with the intention
to kill myself. I even drank hydrogen peroxide. I started getting rebellious. I cut the
ugliest fringe for my hair, dyed it weirdly and would take a thorn and pierce my earlobes
right the way up. That pain made the inner pain more bearable in a way. I had earrings
running up to the top of my ears.
At about fourteen I confided in an older man. About twenty years old . I confided in him
about my repeated rapes, hoping that he would take revenge for me. Eventually we did
have sex. I then thought that if I fell pregnant, I would be able to leave the house. My
family didn't want this. I did fall pregnant and ran away. Another uncle, a policeman
found me and severely beat me up - while I was pregnant! He broke my arm and
disfigured my face. He probably wanted me to miscarry. The family put pressure on me
not to lay charges against my uncle, because he was a high ranked policeman and would
lose his job. I did this and in exchange they let me get married - as a pay - off. My
husband and I had our reasons to get married. He was wanting to avoid conscriptions
to join the army because he was considered Coloured. I wanted to get married cause I
wanted to get out of the house. We were married and my daughter was born three months
pre-mature.
My husband would become possessive, when my uncle was around me. Eventually he

a56 became possessive as a whole. When I used to go to work he used to sit in a tree, with
a57 binoculars, wearing brown and green clothes. Eventually we got divorced, after our
a58 second child. I eventually re- married. I can say
a59 that I was healed only last year. If I had mentioned this previously, I would cry. But I
a60 felt God was telling me I needed to let go of this one thing and to forgive. I prayed and
a61 eventually went to his house. My uncle had married a divorcee with a ten year old
a62 daughter. Rumour has it that he is sexually abusing his step - daughter now.
a63 My husband waited outside in the car, while I went inside. I knocked on the door and he
a64 opened it. I was scared because his wife wasn't in the home. I couldn't get the courage
a65 to tell him I forgive him. I acted like I came to see his wife. I thought that he may have
a66 thought that "I came to get more or something."Still I couldn't get myself to forgive him.
a67 after all that was what I went there for. I started to speak about trivial things because it
a68 was more a case of embarrassment. Then I left. I broke down crying. I felt very foolish.
a69 I thought someone should have been present there that day - like a psychologist. I went
a70 there hoping and wanting him to ask me for forgiveness.
i7 How would you describe " healing" for a " survivor"?
a71 Physically I have healed. Being healed means it's still in my memory, however I don't
a72 breakdown when I think about it now. I don't get hysterical...I don't cry or have
a73 nightmares and I can see the rapist and don't have some kind of relapse. But I still carry
a74 the scars.... this is in my memory and also physical.
i8 Do you see yourself as a victim or survivor?
a75 I see myself as a survivor.
i9 What would you say your level of healing is like now?
a76 I'd say about 95 %.
i10 When and how was there a switch - over from victim to survivor?
a77 About a year ago [the year 2000] I felt in order to carry on with my spiritual growth, I
a78 had to forgive because unforgiveness comes with seven evil spirits. I felt that was what I
a79 was living with.... resentment, ill - will, grudge, retaliation, bitterness, hatred .

i11 I hope you don't mind, but some of the questions may sound or be repetitious. Did you
i12 know the rapist before the rape?

a80 Yes.

i13 Where is he now?

a81 He lives in Pietermaritzburg and is married, with two children.

i14 Was he punished by the courts or family members in any way ?

a82 No.

i15 How do you feel about that?

a83 Not happy.

i16 Do you feel safe from him now?

a84 No.

i17 Do you have any fear that he may come back and do the same to you again?

a85 Yes he has the strength to come back and do it again. I wouldn't put it past him to try

a86 again. We are family members and at some point we do meet up at family gatherings.

a87 But its not an overriding fear that I live with. I used to live like that. I scare he could

a88 come back for my children.

i18 Can you describe your emotions immanently leading up to the rape, during the rape and

i19 immediately thereafter.

a89 Devastated! I thought I was going to die. A sick feeling. Scared. Paralysing fear. During

a90 the rape I fought back. I clawed him. That's the time he started to become more violent.

a91 Every time I clawed him, he'd hurt me more. After it was finished I felt dirty and soiled.

a92 I wanted to commit suicide. I felt partly guilty, like I deserved this for some reason or the

a93 other. From that time, up to the point of healing, I got divorced first and had many

a94 relationships. I felt all these men were going to do the same thing to me. Every time I

a95 got frigid, thinking it was that time again. [Subject uses facial expressions and body

a96 language indicating a bit of shyness.]

a97 I still feel soiled . I felt disgraced. What was so abnormal about me? Why couldn't I be

a98 like other women? I felt people labelled me.

i20 Did you have recurrent nightmares and would you say there were phases of healing?

a99 Yes I did have nightmares and there were stages of healing.

i21 Where you socially disengaged as a result of the rape?

a100 Yes, I always wanted to be alone and not to go to social functions. I preferred my own

a101 company because I was pre - occupied about my own healing and was afraid of what

a102 people thought of me. I didn't trust anybody male or female because my family didn't
a103 believe me. Mother, grandmother ...
i22 How long was it from the time of the rape, to the time, when you could say you reached a
i23 point of healing?
a104 Eighteen years.
i24 What was your understanding and feeling about forgiveness- before you read the texts?
a105 I knew in my heart that I had to forgive in order to go on. I thought I had to say verbally,
a106 "I forgive you for what you've done and I don't hate you anymore."
i25 Did your feelings change after you read the text- about forgiveness?
a107 Yes my understanding did change. I felt the texts were saying, "I have the God-given
a108 ability to forgive." Romans 5 : 11 says, "Through whom we have..." It's like Christ died
a109 for our sins and if God could forgive the whole universe for sin - why couldn't I
a110 forgive this one person . I felt I had the power to forgive.
i26 How did you view reconciliation, up until the time you felt healed?
a111 I hated him too much to even look at him. I actually contemplated harming him. I
a112 I thought of things I could do. I hated him enough to murder him.
i27 How would you describe reconciliation, psychologically and socially?
a113 I would describe it as letting by-gones be by-gones - but don't let it happen again,
a114 because then I am going to do something drastic about it. At a psychological level it
a115 means no more hatred, vengeance and ill - feelings between us. At a social level
a116 though, it means you keep your distance and I will keep my distance from you. If I can
a117 comment about it spiritually, then if he was a Christian believer, then he would
a118 understand spiritually what he did and then deal with it. It is through being spiritually
a119 empowered that I had the ability to reconcile. The same applies to the rapist. He needs
a120 spiritual power to acknowledge and ask for forgiveness.
i28 What are you feelings on restitution by rapists?
i29 How could restitution be made?
a121 They would need to serve a prison sentence. *They should serve a prison sentence.*
a122 [She emphasises the latter sentence.]
i30 Does forgiveness and reconciliation negate the need for restitution?
a123 No he must still go to prison, because what is he going to pay you back with? Because
a124 he damaged your emotions and soul. This could be a threat to other men in society that

a125 wanted to rape. It would build my belief in justice. And I wasn't a liar.

i31 How has your feelings about restitution changed, from before your healing to after your

i32 healing?

a126 No it hasn't changed in any way.

i33 Did it change after you read the texts?

a127 No, there was no change after I read the texts.

i34 After having read the texts, how has your attitude changed toward the rapist?

a128 I still want him to ask me for forgiveness. He owes me that right to ask me for

a129 forgiveness. Romans 5: 10 shows me, that if God went through so much pain, to put His

a130 Son through death, then I could forgive. Obviously reconcile. But I still want him to

a131 serve that sentence.

i35 I've mentioned already that Paul was talking of reconciliation in a religious sense and not

i36 of rape. Do you feel then that you still have an obligation to forgive and reconcile,

i37 because of what Paul says?

a132 Yes, because if God can forgive so can I. I do feel a conviction to forgive and

a133 reconcile to the offender.

i38 At what psycho-level do you think God would want you to reconcile to? "Let bygones

i39 be bygones? " Give the person "100% trust in your dealings with him?..."

a134 Not trust the person 100%! I don't think we need to build a social relationship now. "I

a135 forgive you but you go your way and I go mine." But God expects me not to grudge and

a136 hate - just release him.

i40 Do you think then that these texts of Paul, can be used analogously to the victim-offender

i41 experience? Or do you think it is irrelevant to you as a victim and survivor?

a137 Yes, I think it can be used analogously because he says, "... We can rejoice in our

a138 suffering." [Rom 5 : 2-3]. This gives me hope. It is relevant. I can use Paul

a139 metaphorically to meet my need at that time.

i42 [I explain to the survivor, that we will now use the texts analogously. God will be

i43 representative of her, Christ of the therapist / mediator and the world with the rapist.].

i44 In the texts God takes the initiative to reconcile to His enemy, even though He is the

i45 innocent party. If we use this as an analogy, it would mean that a survivor would need to

i46 take the initiative to reconcile to the offender. Is this realistic?

a140 It will be a realistic expectation for me to initiate reconciliation.

i47 Would you say this initiative on the part of the survivor prevents the offender from still
i48 dominating the psychological well- being and the healing of the survivor?
a141 Yes. By me taking the initiative, he would not be dominating me still.
i49 You will notice that God deals with the estranged world through a mediator. Do you think
i50 this will be useful or necessary in your reconciliation attempt with the offender? Why?
a142 Yes I will feel more confident that there is someone there. Now I have a witness and he
a143 will not think that, "I came back for more." I'll have protection and security. The
a144 mediator would have prepared me for what I'm about to undergo.
i51 You would have noticed that reconciliation on God's part does not mean that he does
i52 away with the need for justice. He gives up his son, to die on the cross, as a price for
i53 reconciliation. If you relate this to victim-offender reconciliation, would you say that
i54 justice must still be pursued for reconciliation.
a145 Yes!
i55 As a survivor what would you expect?
a146 It would only be fair that he showed how sorry he is by serving a prison sentence.
i56 How long should this be?
a147 I don't know, but that can be decided by the courts.
i57 What would justice do for you as a person?
a148 It would satisfy me. Hopefully it would be a deterrent from doing it again and for other
a149 would-be rapists. It will build up my confidence that someone believed me. My trust
a150 for society and justice would be re- built.
i58 When this happened to you, did you feel abandoned by God, your parents or society?
a151 Yes!
i59 Would justice build up your trust in society and even God?
a152 Yes! Knowing the person went to prison and served the sentence proves that there
a153 was justice. At one stage I thought of castration and physical harm as revenge, but not
a154 now. I wouldn't want him to be deformed. Just emotional punishment.
i60 Did you lose your trust, openness for people. Particularly men?
a155 Yes! I feared men in general - even my own brothers. I even stopped bathing my son
a156 after a few months, because I felt uncomfortable with him.
i61 Would the punishment of the perpetrator by the courts have helped your ability to trust
i62 men and society again?

a157 Yes! Knowing that the person was punished, would heal my ability to trust men again.
a158 But up until now, I still scare to be with a male, alone. I'm cynical of men. But 80% of
a159 the time I'm proved right. They will make a pass at me for example.
i63 Would you say that in the texts, God takes the initiative for reconciliation, without any
i64 preconditions for dialogue?
a160 I don't think there are any preconditions for dialogue.
i65 Do you think that God expects anything in return for reconciliation, like repentance,
i66 change of lifestyle, ethical change toward him?
a161 Yes, because God suffered a lot, through the death of his Son. We should
a162 out of gratefulness, return the favour by being kind to him and repent. 2 Cor 5:18
a163 says we are "therefore Christ's ambassadors..." Therefore this means that we are to be
a164 in a state of goodwill and repentance toward Him. Vs 19 says, "Christ not counting our
a165 sins against us." This means that there are no preconditions asked for, when the offer of
a166 reconciliation is made. Obviously, if I were the rapist, I wouldn't want to talk if there
a167 were preconditions. I'd run for it, if I had a family after all these years. But once
a168 dialogue starts, hopefully it would lead to restitution and repentance.
i67 How would you relate this to reconciliation between survivor and offender?
a169 There should be a change in the disposition between humans and God, so there must be
a170 a change in the attitude of the rapist toward me, - if I offer reconciliation.
i68 My interpretation of the texts, is that God forgives and reconciles, but he also shows his
i69 wrath by sending his son to the cross. Do you think that in a process of dialogue, as a
i70 survivor, you would want to show your anger?
a171 Yes! I would want to show my emotions. I would ask him, "Can you see what you've
a172 done to my life? " " Can you see how I had to leave school? " He needs to see the pain
a173 on my face and the hurt. I want to show him all the damage he has done to me....he has
a174 totally robbed me of my future. If we had to have a one on one conversation before I
a175 reached the point of healing, I'd be in a rage. I may be violent. But now that I have
a176 healed, I'd actually be calm and speak in a sincere and calm way. But by talking, I will
a177 pour out everything inside of me.
i71 What questions would you like to ask? "Why? " " Why me? "
a178 Yes! Why did he do it and why me. "Did I do something to you?" " Did you take
a179 advantage over me because of my circumstances, that we did not have a father and had

a180 to live under your roof?"

i72 How would you expect him to behave during the dialogue?

a181 He shouldn't mock or taunt or intimidate me. He shouldn't have a piercing look, like

a182 he's undressing me all over again with his eyes.

i73 What would you like him to say to you or ask you for?

a183 I have at least the right to expect him to answer all my questions. I would want him to

a184 ask for forgiveness. Obviously, his word that he has repented , would not be good

a185 enough because in all those years that he did it, he would point blank deny it. I will

a186 need proof or evidence that he has changed. I would want him to go into a rehabilitation

a187 program. Most importantly he must acknowledge guilt. Nothing he could do for me,

a188 in terms of paying restitution, would do anything for my healing. But I expect evidence

a189 in change of lifestyle. If he doesn't have a change in attitude to me, then I'd threaten

a190 with legal action against the rape, to show him how serious my intentions are, and to

a191 show him power now lies in my hands.

i74 If you made this offer of reconciliation and it was refused, how would you react?

a192 I'd feel that once again no one is believing me and once again everything is being

a193 swept underneath the carpet. He is now making me out to be a liar again. He'd be

a194 stirring up anger in me. It will make me feel dis-empowered because I'll feel cheated

a195 and a liar once again.

i75 Would you feel though that you would possess a higher moral ground than if you did not

i76 offer reconciliation ?

a196 Yes it would make me feel better, knowing for a fact that I'd made the first step. Yes I

a197 would feel spiritually stronger.

i77 If you made the overture of reconciliation what exactly would be the factors stimulating

i78 this ? (a) Obedience to God. (b) Your own psychological closure ?

a198 Yes, obedience to God and my own psychological closure.

i79 My interpretation of the texts is, God did not feel self-blame or guilt. What do you feel ?

a199 I agree. God is not guilty and does not show this.

i80 Did you feel guilty in any way about the rape ?

a200 I felt guilty after the rape but didn't feel self-blame. I could have fought more while

a201 he was raping me. I felt I could have told my family about his behaviour towards me,

a202 before it happened.

i81 How does the text help you ?

a203 Romans 5:2 helps me because it talks about suffering and hope. "And we rejoice in

a204 hope..." In a sense God and I have solidarity because of our similar experiences. But I

a205 question why he had to let me go through this experience. God had the power to

a206 stop this but he didn't. But then when Jesus was going to the cross God could have

a207 stopped it but he didn't.

i82 In the reconciliation attempt of God we can infer that God is all-powerful and under no

i83 personal threat from humans. Do you think it is easier for God to reconcile with the

i84 world than it is for survivors to reconcile with rapists?

*a208*Yes God is all-powerful. I think it is easier for God to reconcile than it is for survivors.

a209 Would you say that the analogy is irrelevant then, at this point ?

a210 Yes, I don't think the analogy is relevant.

i85 In Paul, I liken the psycho-social level at which reconciliation takes place to that of a

i86 father's relationship to his children. Do you think analogously such a similar close

i87 relationship is possible if you reconcile with the rapist ?

a211 No. This is not relevant. I forgive but don't want any social intimacy or ties with him

a212 because of distrust and fear for my loved-ones.

i88 My interpretation of Rom 5:10 is that God is now "Actively involved in the life of the

i89 reconciled because he is "saving them everyday "." Is this your interpretation ?

a213 Yes, I agree with your interpretation.

i90 Analogously are you prepared to help your rapist in any way once you are reconciled ?

a214 Analogously no. I won't want to be involved in his life and help him. But I used to say

a215 that if he were dying and needed a glass of water, I'd always say no. But now that I'm

a216 spiritually stronger - if he were dying and I did not help him, I'd be answerable on the

a217 Day of Judgement. Out of this fear I'd help him. But if it were possible for others to

a218 help him I won't help. It would be more out of obedience to God than any emotional

a219 goodwill.

i91 Would you like to get involved in a program to help to help woman recover from rape ?

a220 Yes definitely.

i92 What would this do for you as a person ?

a221 It would make me feel better knowing that I helped people survive rape. It would make

a222 me feel powerful that I am happy to get back at rape by helping others to survive it.

i93 Would you say that your unique experience could add a dimension to counselling which
i94 counsellors would otherwise not have - if they were not raped ?
a223 Yes.
i95 In Paul we see that " sin by one man" estranged God from the world. See Romans 5:12.
i96 Was your experience analogous in a way? Did you fear all men as a result of the rape?
a224 Yes I think I began to fear all men after the rape.
i97 Has your attitude changed now that you are healed?
a225 Yes and no...because I still feel uncomfortable with men.
i98 My interpretation is that restitution was paid to God through the death of his Son. Is that
i99 your understanding?
a226 Yes.
i100 What kind of restitution did you expect before you were healed and now that you are
i101 healed ?
a227 I would have wanted him dead- not even serving a prison sentence. No other restitution.
a228 Now that I'm healed and have Christ within me, I wouldn't want him dead. I still want
a229 him to go to prison. I'm not sure of the years. I don't care. They must decide.
i102 How do you deal with the fact that he could never fully pay restitution for what he did to
i103 you ?
a230 I've accepted that. It's done, it's done!
i104 On the cross we see God sacrificing the innocence and holiness of Christ. In a way he is
i105 sacrificing the thing most holy to him. Would you consider your privacy, trust and
i106 openness to people as a sacrifice on an altar, that you must leave behind in order to go
i107 forward with life and be healed ?
a231 Yes, that's a good comparison.
i108 So this is a valid, relevant analogy ?
a232 Yes.
i109 My interpretation of Paul is that God loved himself enough to die for himself in Christ.
i110 In this way he could be healed of the estrangement between himself and the world. Do
i111 you think you can use that analogously for your own healing ?
a233 Yes.
i112 Do you think that a nice way to look at it is that you must love yourself enough, to
i113 release that which was lost, in order to be healed ?

a234 Yes in order to gain back, I am willing to make that sacrifice.

i114 Would you say that God did that ?

a235 Yes.

i114 I would say that God does not live in a state of denial but had to confront the pain of

i115 handing over his Son to die. Do you think that you and other survivors live in a state of

i116 denial to some measure and pretend that it never happened ?

a236 Other survivors live in a state of denial ? Yes.

i117 Is this analogy of denial empowering in way ?

a237 Yes because if God can do it and we have his ability in us why should we deny it.

i118 The psychiatrist Judith Hermann Lewis says," Mourning is the only way to give honour

i119 to loss." Do you agree ?

a238 No. I don't like the word "only".

i120 Do you think victims prevent themselves from mourning ?

a239 I did, for the first couple of years. I put the rape at the back of my mind. It was too

a240 painful to go back there. I didn't want to mourn it. And yes there are victims who do

a241 this.

i121 I see the Son on the cross perhaps semi-naked and being humiliated and tortured. If we

i122 say that God felt this too because God was "in" his Son, do you think this provides

i123 encouragement to you - if you identify with God in this way ?

a242 Yes it's a very good comparison. The humiliation is exactly the same.

i124 Do you think you will ever be able to forget the rape ?

a243 No.

i124 I would infer from the texts that in the reconciled state, God still remembers the pain of

i125 estrangement and what reconciliation cost him. Would you in a similar way be able to

i126 remember the past and still stay reconciled ?

a244 Yes.

i127 Do you accept the fact that you never go back to being an "unraped" person again ? Do

i128 you accept or deny this transformation of your identity from "unraped" to "raped" ?

a245 Yes, I accept it.

i129 What strengths do you see emanating out of your survival ?

a246 Emotionally I'm strong. I've learnt to deal with it. I feel I can deal with any trauma.

a247 Nothing's worse than rape, which I won't be able to endure now. I believe I can forgive

a248 anybody anything, now that I've forgiven the rapist. Surviving the rape brought me
a249 closer to God and this strengthened me spiritually.
i130 In the text we see humans "boasting" "in God through Christ", in the reconciled state.
i131 How analogous could this be ? That is "boasting" or being happy together with the
i132 offender in a reconciled state ?
a250 Socially and psychologically it cannot be analogous. I could not sit with him and boast
a251 or have fun. I wouldn't do anything of the that sort. But if he were to give his heart to
a252 Christ and repented we could have a connection spiritually and for this rejoice in a
a253 spiritual way.
i133 If we use the above analogy, it implies that the rapist can live guilt-free in the reconciled
i134 state. Do you think for yourself that this is what the text implies ?
a254 Yes, I think he should go on with his life and not be burdened by guilt - if he really
a255 repents.
i135 Would that bother you ?
a256 No.
i136 How has this interview affected you?
a 257 It has really helped me! Initially, especially on the first night when I went home it was
a258 painful and I didn't sleep much. But I managed to get so much off my chest that I kept
a259 inside all this time. You asked questions in such fine detail. I have been to other
a260 agencies for help but all they say is that "It'll be alright." They do not go into such
a261 depth as you did. I really feel better now...And also because someone believed me.

Interview with "Offender B".
Age: 31 Sex : Male Race : Indian- South African
Religion: Christian Denomination: Charismatic/ Pentecostal
Interview conducted over 2 days : 11/9/01 and 14/9/01 in Pietermaritzburg

i1. Are you comfortable talking about your experience, in which you were convicted for
i2 indecent assault?
b1 No, I am not exactly comfortable. It brings back all those thoughts. There's an uneasiness
b2 going back there. I get upset. But I don't get upset in a sense of getting traumatically
b3 upset. It is just not a pleasant thought, thinking about what happened.
i3 How long ago did the incident happen?
b4 In 1991.
i4 Were you a Christian at that time and how would you describe healing?
b5 I was born into a Catholic home, but I wouldn't say I was committed, practising Christian
b6 then.
b7 I think it's complete amnesia [He sounds both serious and wishful]. But besides amnesia
b8 healing would be that a similar incident would not happen again to me. About me
b9 being healed now... I would say in terms of my memory, it's still there, so in that sense I
b10 may not be healed. I still have the scars. I have emotion scars and physical scars, because
b11 when the police arrested me, they broke my nose. [his nose can be visibly seen as having
b12 been broken.] But I function normally now, emotionally and physically- so in that sense,
b13 I'm healed.
i5 You said being healed "would be"that a similar incident would not happen to me." What
i6 do you mean by that?
b14 I mean, that I won't be involved in a similar incident and that I won't be accused
b15 innocently and jailed again.
i7 Did you know the victim or the accused, before the incident?
b16 No, I didn't.
i8 Do you know where she is now or anything else about her present circumstances?
b17 No.
i9 Can you relate the circumstances around the incident and your conviction?
b18 Yes, it was a Sunday. I went to the shebeen and my friends were there. My "so-called

b19 friends!" We had a few beers. We went to volley-ball social not far from there, with a
b20 case of quarts. Some of the guys took part in the volley-ball. When the beers were
b21 finished- we sent for two bottles of brandy. Then the eleven guys or so, started to break-
b22 up. We sent for a third bottle [of liquor]. We where down to about seven guys. After that
b23 bottle was finished my friends and I went down to another shebeen and bought half a
b24 bottle of brandy for just two of us. We decided to go to his house to have it. On our way
b25 there we saw some of our friends at the bus stop; at about 7:30pm.[The bus stop was
b26 near where the volley-ball social was.] As we came closer we saw two of them talking
b27 to a girl. They said she wanted to join us for a drink. So we went to park with her. These
b28 guys took her a bit further, and were talking with her, while we were drinking. Then a
b29 fifth guy came who was a black boy, looking for one of us.
b30 He was 14years old. He saw that it was a black girl and got excited. He took her a bit
b31 further from us. He got excited because he must have thought it was two of a kind. Then
b32 the other guys joined him and I also joined them. The black boy was telling her that he
b33 wanted to marry her. The other guys started fondling her. I didn't stop them. While this
b34 carried on, we were there for awhile. One of the guys shouted "the police are coming!"
b35 Five of us ran in different directions. According to the police they apparently fired shots
b36 at us, but I don't think so. The police caught us and severely beat us up. They hit the
b37 other guys with their gun butts. My nose was broken. My ribs were all sore. They brought
b38 the girl to us and said, "see what you'll have done," but I only saw that her shirt buttons
b39 were open. They took us to the police station and charged us there. We weren't
b40 allowed any phone calls at all. We were placed in different cells. after two days we
b41 appeared in jail and we were officially charged with rape in court. Bail was set at R1000
b42 each. Three of us came out. The case started and proceeded up until 1994 [ie. 3years].
b43 It was always remanded because something or the other was not clear.
b44 To shorten the case the lawyer said we should confess to a lesser charge of "indecent
b45 assault."We were all sentenced to up to six years. The black guy was under age and
b46 sentenced to six months. That was Thursday. Our lawyer started an appeal on Monday.
b47 He engaged an advocate. He found five things not clear in this trial. Our lawyer not only
b48 wanted money, but he wasn't interested in our case. Even the doctor who attended to
b49 the girl said that the girl was bruised and emotional but her hymen wasn't broken. They

b50 appealed on those five things a year later. We didn't have to appear in court. He (the
b51 advocate) brought five things forward. because we pleaded on the lesser charge. They
b52 convicted us on the lesser charge and sentenced us to two years in jail. I spent ten
b53 months and two weeks because before we went in there, there was a six month
b54 amnesty announced. While we were serving, there was another general amnesty of six
b55 months announced by Nelson Mandela.
b56 So you can say the state owes us some months! I was then released. After a week of my
b57 release, I started work. I am the victim...I was the one wrongfully accused.
i10 What were your emotions like leading up to the incident and thereafter?
b58 Before the incident I was troubled. I was going through a divorce and really drinking. I
b59 was more drunk than anything else. In the incident I was more inquisitive. I wanted to
b60 see what was going on. After the incident I was shocked. I couldn't believe it happened
b61 to me, that I was part of it. It was like a dream.
i11 Do you have any form of fear for the "girl"? [I asked this question because he insists on
i12 seeing himself as a victim of this "girl."]
b62 No . I have Jesus . I'd love this trial to come up again. Then if I get a lawyer I will
b63 instruct him. If I didn't have a lawyer then I would have done a better job of my
b64 defence.
i13 I take it that you were not happy with the way the courts handled your case?
b65 Yes. I think the courts were very biassed. From day one the magistrate had already found
b66 us guilty. They were very biassed.
i14 How would you say your family treated you?
b67 They were torn and devastated. They always supported me and even put the house on
b68 bond to support me. Even my football club supported me.
i15 When would you say that you came to a point of healing?
b69 While I was in prison. I decided I was going to make a success of my life and cover for
b70 the years that I lost. But that would have been about four years after the incident. But
b71 would say at least a year after I was released, once I was free from the house arrest and
b72 reporting to the police, then I came to the point of healing. That would have been about
b73 five years after the incident. Just knowing that the sentence was over, made me feel that
b74 I could go for it.

i16 Emotionally how were you feeling up until this "point of healing"?

b75 I felt ashamed. I was scared to go to peoples' homes. I didn't know how people would

b76 react with their children towards me. There was always a sense of insecurity that I had

b77 because of the next person. I was scared of rejection. I withdrew from people, but not

b78 entirely. I was scared of knocking on peoples' doors but not necessarily scared of going

b79 out.

i17 Would you say there were stages in your healing?

b80 I didn't think about it that way. But it was gradual.

i18 Did you harbour emotions of revenge for this "girl"?

b81 Yes , constantly. But not to kill. But just to catch her and take her in front of the

b82 magistrate to tell the truth. I also wanted to get the witness back to court. I wanted to

b83 get him. As for the lawyer, I hate him. I know he wasn't handling the case very well. I

b84 did fantasise revenge. I thought my police friends would get her. I imagined a court

b85 scene. I imagined stopping the court and getting the magistrate to hear the truth.

i19 Did you fantasise about forgiveness?

b86 I felt sorry for her. It's traumatic to put anyone in the witness stand. It was a woman. It

b87 was just a person. I don't think I had a grudge against her. It wasn't "she" that I saw. It

b88 was just the figure of a person. I don't think I fantasised about forgiveness.

i20 What were your feelings about forgiveness?

b89 I wanted her to ask me for forgiveness.

i21 If you could get restitution, what would it be?

b90 I wanted her to tell the truth. During our appeal it did come up. But I didn't expect

b91 anything from her. As for my charge against the police [for being assaulted by them]-

b92 the docket went missing.

i22 Would you say your attitude towards her and restitution changed after reading the texts?

b93 I actually forgave her a long time ago even before reading the texts. I wouldn't

b94 really say my attitude towards her changed.

i23 If you had the opportunity to meet her and perhaps reconcile with her, would you take

i24 the opportunity?

b95 Yeah, I would want to meet her.

i25 How would you describe this reconciliation and forgiveness in a social and psychological

i26 sense?

b96 I don't think we can ever be friends, even if we do think about being friends, I would

b97 like her to see the love of Christ and her being saved. I would like to work on that

b98 aspect [being saved], because she lied so much- she must be going through hell! [Not

b99 put in a totally serious way.] It would be contact in a religious way and not so much

b100 social.

i27 Do you think forgiveness negates the need for justice or punishment. For example if it

i28 could be proven that she lied against you , would you like her to be punished for perjury

i29 by the courts for example?

b101 I wouldn't want her to spend time in jail for perjury for example. As long as she tells

b102 the truth.

i30 When you read the texts, did you feel it made a demand on you to forgive?

b103 I forgave along time ago. But I do think the text makes a demand for reconciliation and

b104 forgiveness.

i31 But you realised that Paul talks about reconciliation in a religious sense, as I've

i32 explained to you earlier?

b105 Yes, I realise that Paul used it in a different context, I think it still makes a demand on

b106 me to forgive and reconcile. I still have anger though but no bitterness.

i33 What do you think reconciliation means at a psycho- social level?

b107 Reconciliation would be no bitterness, malice etc... but no social engagement. I will

b108 still be angry until she admits.

i34 At what psycho-social level do you think that God would want you to reconcile and

i35 forgive?

b109 I think that God can see our hearts. I don't think we need a face to face meeting- as

b110 long as God can see there is no malice etc. in my heart. But don't get me wrong "face to

b111 face " is good [ie a face to face meeting to reconcile]

i36 Having read the texts, do you think that they are relevant for healing and helping to bring

i37 about reconciliation between you and the woman in question?

b112 Yes. It is relevant.

i38 Do you think it is necessary for a mediator, in this reconciliation attempt?

b113 Yes. The mediator analogy is especially quite appealing to me. The mediator should be

b114 with both parties (on the side of both parties). When I think of reconciliation, I always
b115 think of a mediator - but he is the magistrate. I always think of this.
i39 We'll now go on to questions about the text. I explained earlier the way I will use the
i40 texts analogously. Bearing that in mind you will notice that God takes the initiative in
i41 reconciling to the world, even though he was the offended party. You see yourself as the
i42 victim. If you would this point analogously, would you say it is realistic and relevant to
i43 expect you to initiate reconciliation?
b116 I can appropriate that as a Christian I think it is relevant. I think I should make the first
b117 step to reconcile. This is realistic. I don't think God makes unrealistic demands
i44 Would you say that the survivor's initiative is a way of preventing the offender from still
i45 dominating the psychological well being and healing of the survivor?
b118 Yes. I think that is so. It is a good way of looking at it.
i46 You will notice that God deals with the estranged human- beings through the mediator?
b119 Yes. By getting a neutral person involved we will try to go back to the incident and
b120 validate the facts. And the other reason is to control peoples emotions and create safety
b121 for both parties.
i47 You would have noted that the reconciliation on God's part doesn't mean that he does
i48 away with the need for justice. He gives us his Son to die on the cross as the price of
i49 reconciliation. If you relate this to victim- offender reconciliation, would you still expect
i50 justice to be pursued for reconciliation?
b122 If she is convicted of perjury I would be prepared to do her jail time for her, but
b123 personally I don't think there should be a jail sentence as such. But she should obey the
b124 law of the land too. If the courts carry out the sentence, it would be their prerogative.
b125 For me God is the final arbiter. She will have to deal with her conscience.
i51 What would this justice do for you as a person?
b126 It wouldn't really matter because I left it to God.
i52 When this happened to you, did you feel abandoned by God, your parents and society?
b127 I didn't have a personal relationship with God then. So I didn't feel abandoned
b128 because he wasn't part of my life. I don't think society let me down. I had lots of
b129 support. The church was also supportive. My family was very supportive. I mean they
b130 bonded the house for me.

i53 Did you lose your trust in people and woman in particular because of this one incident?

b131 I didn't think about this at the time ... No. I can't say I lost my trust in anyone.

i54 Would you say that God makes any preconditions for reconciliation?

b132 I think in the texts it's a command to reconcile. I can't see anywhere in the texts where

b133 he sets conditions. But I don't think this is analogous to my situation. I will make the

b134 precondition though, that she will have to tell the truth before she reconciles.

i55 Do you think by not setting preconditions, God is creating space for dialogue?

b135 I agree, that is a nice way to put it. I didn't see that before...I think sometimes we don't

b136 need to make preconditions.

i56 What would you like to ask your accuser, when you dialogue with her?

b137 I'll ask, "Why you lied?" and "What were you doing in that area at that time?" What

b138 were you going to get out of it? [ie lying] ... Financial gain?...Do you enjoy hurting

b139 people?"

i57 How would you expect her to behave during the dialogue?

b140 The atmosphere must be calm. It must be tolerant. She must be gentle ...totally non-

b141 aggressive.

i58 What would you like her to say or ask?

b142 I'd like her to even get to know my name. I'd like her to ask me about myself, my

b143 family and how I'm coping after the incident. I'd like her to ask, "How has it affected

b144 your life?" "Has your life changed significantly after the incident?...Where would you

b145 be if the incident didn't happen?

i59 If you made this offer of reconciliation and it was refused , how would you re-act?

b146 I would be disappointed...that would be my initial reaction but it would confuse me -

b147 why she didn't accept it.

i60 Would you still feel though, that you possess the higher moral ground for at least

i61 offering?

b148 Yeah... you could put it that way. In relation to myself, I would think I was the better

b149 person for offering reconciliation.

i62 If you made this offer of reconciliation, what exactly would be the motivating factors: (a)

i63 God (b) your own psychological closure?

b150 Both.

i64 Would you say from the texts, that God does not act guilty. What would you say?

b151 I think God does feel a bit guilty because he made man and man wronged him and he

b152 had to do something to get it right.

i65 Do you feel guilty in any way for your involvement in the incident? Did you feel self

b153 blame?

b154 I felt guilty then but now. I know that I was "in the world then" but not now. I think the

b155 situation I was in then caused it. I felt guilty for being there. I blame myself for getting

b156 into that situation.

i66 How does the text help you, or was it relevant to your experience?

b157 I don't think this part about God not feeling guilty relates to me.

i67 In the reconciliation attempt of God we can infer that God is all-powerful and under no

i68 personal threat from humans. Do you think it's easier for God to reconcile to the world

i69 then, than it is for one human- being to another?

b158 Yes, it is easier for God to reconcile. He is all powerful. He is not threatened

i70 So that analogy is not relevant?

b159 It's not relevant . I don't think so.

i71 Do you fear meeting your accuser in any way and reconciling?

b160 I don't fear any thing physically aggressive. Maybe emotional though.

i72 I think that Paul likens the new reconciled state of God to humans, as a father behaves

i73 towards his children, psychologically and socially. Do you think that analogously such a

i74 close relationship is possible or can be similar, with your experience?

b161 I don't think it can be even that close or similar.

i75 My interpretation of Paul in Rom 5:10 is that God is now actually involved in the life of

i76 the reconciled- " saving them everyday." Is that your interpretation?

b162 Yes.

i77 Analogously would you help your accuser in any way if reconciled?

b163 Yes, if she requires it.

i78 If you offered reconciliation to your accuser and she pointed you to a program of

i79 rehabilitation- would you join?

b164 Yes, if she requires it.

i80 Would you like to get involved in a program to help others in a similar situation, to that

i81 which you experienced?

b165 Yes, I've been to jail. I can give them some advice. I can give advice on going into jail

b166 and how to survive there. I can give them advice about what to do when they come out

b167 and I can be of help to them.

i82 In Paul we see one man commit one act, which estranged all of human- kind from God.

i83 Do you think, perhaps in a similar way, the act of this one woman, estranged you from all

i84 women? Did you stereotype them all?

b168 No, I didn't stereotype women.

i85 In Paul my interpretation is that the restitution was paid to God, by the death of God's

i86 Son. Is that your understanding?

b169 Yes.

i87 What type of restitution will you expect from your accuser, before you were healed and

i88 now that you are "healed"?

b170 She could never fully pay restitution.

i89 How do you deal with this?

b171 I deal with it by still living in the hope, that one day she will speak the truth.

i90 In Christ we see God sacrificing the innocence and holiness of Christ. In a way he is

i91 sacrificing the thing most dear to him. Would you consider the time of your life in jail,

i92 reputation, trust etc. as a sacrifice on an altar, that you must leave behind in order to go

i93 forward with your life and healing?

b172 I agree , that's the only way the healing process will start, once the victim let's go of

b173 these things.

i94 Is this a valid and relevant analogy for your healing?

b174 Yes it is relevant and helpful.

i95 Would you say God loved himself enough, to die for himself in Christ, so that he may be

i96 healed of estrangement, from the world?

b175 Yes I agree, God did that. It is a good analogy to use for my healing.

i97 You notice that God did not live in a state of denial but had to confront the pain of

i98 handing over his Son for the reconciliation with the world. Do you think others accused

i99 even yourself, live in a state of denial about what you all were accused of?

b176 No.

i100 Is the analogy relevant to healing?

b177 Yes, you've got to take your losses and go on.

i101 A psychiatrist Judith Hermann- Lewis says, " Mourning is the only way to give honour to

i102 loss?" Do you agree?

b178 You've got to mourn.

i103 Can you ever forget the rape?

b180 No, I won't forget but I want to forget the incident...

i181 Like God, can you remember and still stay reconciled?

b182 Yes, I can handle remembering and still being reconciled.

i105 Can you accept that your identity was forever changed after the incident?

i106 You can never go back to being an "unconvicted person", for indecent assault?

b183 Yes, I accept that.

i107 What new strengths do you see in yourself emanating out of your survival of the

i108 incident?

b184 I've got stronger. I have better character and I've matured a lot. I've become more bold.

b185 I've learnt to interact with different peoples and opinions and overcome my fears. [The

b186 need to survive in jail would have also been a factor in this regard.]

i109 In Paul we see humans "boasting" or showing self assertion in overcoming and being

i110 reconciled to God. God is also "boasting"because those reconciled, do it "in" him

i111 "through" Christ. Most English translators say rejoicing "in" God.

i112 Would this analogy be relevant and realistic to your reconciliation with accuser?

b187 Most definitely, she can rejoice and even boast. I want her to be happy. That's the way

b188 it should be. I will be prepared to be in a state like that with her.

i113 We take it humans are guilt- free in this new state. Would it bother you, if similarly, she

i114 is guilt free in this reconciled state?

b189 It doesn't matter to me , I'd like her to be guilt free.

i115 Did this interview help you in any way?

b190 Yeah. I brought up things, that I think I was suppressing or didn't want to think about.

b191 That was good. I was worried at first before I came but speaking about it made me feel

b192 better. I saw things in a new light. I never saw some of the things that way before....

b193 That was good .

Interview with "Survivor C".
Age: 22 yrs. Sex: Female Race : Indian-South African
Religion : Christian Denomination: Charismatic/ Pentecostal
Interview conducted on : 24 September 2001 in Pietermaritzburg

i1 Are you comfortable talking about the rape ?

c1 Yes, I am comfortable talking about the rape.

i2 How long ago did it happen?

c2 From age eight, up until last year. [2000]

i3 Did you seek any professional help about these rapes?

c3 I only went for counselling, when I was in school in Johannesburg.

i4 Why didn't you seek further help?

c4 My mother didn't want me to.

i5 Why didn't she want you to seek further help?

c5 Because it was my step-father and she didn't want him to get into trouble.

i6 So you knew the rapist quite well.

c6 Yes, the one was my step- dad and the other two times I was raped as a child and a

c7 teenager... I didn't know these men.

i7 Can you please relate the circumstances around the ongoing rapes by your step-father and

i8 the other two incidents, you have inferred about.

c8 At about eight years my step- father started to rape me. When I kept telling my mother,

c9 she didn't want to listen, so I went and told my neighbour, "Everytime he drinks , he does

c10 it."

c11 That used to make my mother chase me out of the house. Late [at night] because he [the

c12 step-father] used to say I'm interfering with him.

c13 He used to hit me and make my mother sjambok me.

i9 Why?

c14 Because he used to say I was back- chatting him. He used to force me [to have sex]. He

c15 used to make "love- bites"and all that but my mother never used to do anything because

c16 she was scared of him... because at that time he used to beat her up. He still swears me

c17 now and then because he can't get me anymore.

i10 How did he go about raping you?

c18 He used to do it after my mother was asleep and in the morning when my mother was at
c19 work.
c20 He used to enter the room and rape me while the other kids were sleeping. He actually
c21 threatened to kill me once, if I told my mother. He said if I make a noise while he was
c22 raping me, he would kill me.
i11 Did you believe that he would kill you?
c23 Yes. I never told my mother because she wouldn't believe me and I was scared.
c24 But last year my mother caught up. My mother saw him doing it. It was late... about
c25 twelve at night. He thought my mother was sleeping and he had me in the bathroom. She
c26 peeped through the key- hole but waited for us to come out. She called the police during
c27 this time. They took a statement. He went to his mother's house and gave them a whole
c28 different story. He told his mother I forced him to do it and that "I wanted it."
c29 I went to Durban to live with my aunty. After awhile my mother asked me to drop the
c30 charges because she was battling financially. My mother had left work because of what
c31 was happening to me. I was in Durban and it was difficult to do anything and attend to
c32 the case.
c33 After a few months he tried it again but I made a noise and my mother came and asked,
c34 "What is the problem?" I was washing my shoes in the bathroom during this time. Last
c35 year [2000] was the last time he tried it.
c36 Also when I was about ten years, this man from outside our flat called me . He just told
c37 me to buy something for him. When I got close, he pulled me and took me to his house
c38 across the road, behind the bottle- store. He raped me and made "love bites." He then
c39 gave me a whole lot of money: a packet of coins. I then went back to the flat but never
c40 went home. My mother and them were looking for me because it was getting late.
c41 Eventually I felt cold and went home. My mother asked me what had happened. I told
c42 her and she called the police. The police came and took me to his room and caught him.
c43 I had to keep running to court. They sent me to district surgeons. He was locked up.
i12 For how long was he locked up?
c44 I don't know.
c45 I was also raped again on another occasion. I took the taxi to Durban to go to my aunty's
c46 house. My aunty didn't pitch up at the taxi-rank to fetch me. It was getting late and the

c47 conductor of the kombi said he will take me to my aunty's house. Instead he took me to
c48 a "squatter" camp, where he kept me for three days. He held a gun to my head and
c49 raped me. He made "love bites" on me and made me stay there with a whole lot of
c50 people. I was scared to tell them because he had a gun. He took me to the main house
c51 to go eat and all that [shack on property of main house]. I kept saying I wanted to go
c52 but he wouldn't listen to me. He finally left me by the taxi- rank. When I got to my
c53 aunty's house, my mother was there. They asked me where I was and why I took so long.
c54 They phoned the police but the police never found the man because
c55 he "skipped the country." The police couldn't find where he stayed because he gave me
c56 his house keys and told me to come back.

i13 Would you say you are healed from all this?

c57 No.

i14 How do you feel now?

c58 I don't feel safe. I feel scared to sit alone with men. I get nervous...like when someone
c59 has to shout at me.

i15 What would you say healing is?

c60 I don't really know. I guess it is not being scared of men and getting nervous when
c61 people shout at me.

i16 Would you consider yourself a survivor or victim?

c62 I feel I'm a survivor . I'm surviving it . I was a victim...I felt helpless but actually from
c63 this year on [2001] , I feel I'm a survivor.

i17 What would you say helped you make this transition?

c64 I'm a survivor now because I read the Bible. I read the Bible when I'm down.

i18 Did you know the rapists before the rape?

c65 In the case of my step-father "yes" but I did not know the other two.

i19 Do you know where they are now?

c66 I am still living with my step-father and the other is working at the Northdale Hospital.
c67 When I used to see him at the hospital I used to just walk away. The other rapist [who
c68 took her to the "squatter" camp] I don't know about.

i20 Were the rapists punished by the courts or family members?

c69 My step-father actually stayed in jail for a month when we laid the charge.

i21 Do you feel safe from them now?

c70 No, I don't... Not from my step- father and the one working at the hospital.

i22 Were you happy with the way the courts and your family handled the incident?

c71 No, I wasn't happy. I was happy about the one that got locked up. But I wasn't happy

c72 with the way my family and the courts handled it.

i23 What were your emotions like leading up to the rapes?

c73 [Pauses for awhile] I don't know ... I can't really tell.

i24 Were you scared ?

c74 Yes, I was scared... there was no one to talk to. I was shaking with fear all the time. I

c75 never got used to it...

i25 What were your emotions like during the rape?

c76 I can't say because I can't think of the actual rape.

i26 What were they like after the rape?

c77 I felt ashamed, emotionally alone... I felt guilty because he used to keep on blaming it

c78 on me.

c79 I used to blame myself, but not now. I felt dirty and soiled.

i27 Did you have nightmares and flash-backs?

c80 I used to have nightmares of how he used to often abuse me before. At the moment I

c81 have them now and again.

i28 Did you feel you had to withdraw from people ?

i29 Did these rapes cause you to be socially disengaged?

c82 Yes, I used to want to walk away from people, when they wanted to talk to me.

i30 Anybody? ...Male or female?

c83 Yes.

i31 You say that you are not healed yet and that the abuse stopped last year.

i32 Did you have any thoughts of revenge before last year?

c84 Yes, I used to but not anymore. I think it stopped a couple months back... I can't think

c85 exactly when.

i33 Did you fantasise about forgiveness?

c86 Yes, I did fantasise. I used to think that he would come to me and say "sorry." Yes

c87 I imagined it quite a bit.

i34 Did you think at the times of the rapes that God was letting you down?

c88 No, I didn't think of God. He wasn't part of my life so I didn't think he was letting me

c89 down?

i35 Were you let down by anyone else?

c90 Yes, the police let me down because they didn't catch the rapist from Durban [the one

c91 that took her to the "squatter" camp] and lock him up. My mother let me down because

c92 she asked me to drop the charges.

i36 What were the questions most on your mind during the period of abuse?

c93 I did question, "Why was this happening to me?"

i37 You said earlier that you have not come to a "point of healing".

i38 Can you comment further?

c94 I am not healed. This is why I 'm still sick... physically sick. I take Serances for my

c95 nerves. If I don't take it I will die. Emotionally I'm a bit "shaky."

i39 Did you even think about forgiving him during the abuse?

c96 I didn't think of forgiveness. I thought I would never forgive them.

i40 Did this view change after you read the texts?

c97 Yes, it did change after reading the texts. I felt if God can forgive and die on the cross,"

c98 why couldn't I forgive?"

i41 But you understand as I explained repeatedly before that Paul is only talking of

i42 reconciliation in a "religious" sense between God and human- beings?

c99 Yes... that's how I use the texts. I feel I can still apply it to me, even though it talks of

c100 God and men.

i43 At a psycho-social level how would you describe forgiveness?

c101 "Let bygones be bygones". Socially they can interact with me but they must not

c102 interfere with me. Psychologically I will not harbour hatred, bitterness and so on.

i44 Did reading the texts, change your view in any way, about forgiveness?

c103 No. It is still the same.

i45 How did you view reconciliation until you read the texts?

c104 Until I read the texts I didn't want to reconcile , but now I want to reconcile.

i46 At a psycho- social level, how would you describe reconciliation?

c105 It would mean to be able to talk to the person and not hold grudges. Socially it would

c106 mean that we will be able to " join" each other [ie. Have a social friendship]. It will
c107 mean that we will be able to become friends.
i47 These are the people that raped you and you can still become friends with them?
c108 Yes.
i48 What are your feelings on restitution by rapists?
c109 Yes, there should be restitution. It's fair. Financial payment in some form can help but
c110 they can't really pay for what they did.
i49 Does reconciliation and forgiveness negate the need for restitution and justice?
c111 No there should still be restitution and justice. If I forgave and I reconciled then they
c112 shouldn't go to jail, but if they carry on raping, like me for example, then they must go
c113 to jail.
i50 If you are raped again by your step-father , how many years do you think he should go
i51 to jail for?
c114 five years.
i52 Did your views on restitution change by reading the texts?
c115 Before I read the texts , I didn't think about restitution. But now that we've went
c116 through the texts, I think there should be restitution.
i53 Did your attitude change towards the rapists after reading the texts?
c117 Yes. It did, I hated him [the step-father] before. I read the texts but now we can be
c118 friends. I feel if God forgave, therefore I feel it's right to forgive and reconcile.
c119 This feeling is also from "within myself", I must forgive and reconcile.
i54 So it is not just the texts that encourage you to forgive and reconcile but also your own
i55 internal feelings?
c120 Yes.
i56 At what psycho- social level do you think that God would want you to reconcile to?
c121 "Let bygones be bygones ." It must be 100% forgiveness. I think God wants us to have
c122 social contact... I think he wants to be good friends.
i57 After having read the texts, how relevant do you think the texts are to contextualize for
i58 victim- offender reconciliation?
i59 It is relevant at some points and not at others. For example human- beings would not
i60 die for another in the victim- offender relationship just like how Christ died for the

i61 world .

i62 I have already explained how we will contextualize Paul's religious understanding of

i63 reconciliation between God and the humans. God will be analogous to you the survivor.

i64 Christ to the mediator/counsellor and the world to the rapists. Let us see how relevant

i65 Paul's use of reconciliation is to the victim- offender reconciliation.

i66 In the texts God takes the initiative to reconcile to his enemy, even though he is the

i67 innocent party. If we use this analogously it would mean that as a survivor you must

i68 take the initiative to reconcile with the offenders.

i69 Is this a realistic opinion for you?

c123 Yes. I think it is realistic for me to take the initiative to reconcile.

i70 Do you think this initiative prevents the offender from continuing to psychologically

i71 dominate you?

c124 Yes.

i72 You'll notice that God deals with the world through a mediator. Do you think a mediator

i73 will be necessary in your reconciliation attempt with the offender?

c125 Yes. I do think it is necessary because he does need to go for counselling. I'd like

c126 someone to be there to control the situation.

i74 I make the inference from the texts that God does not do away with the need for justice

i75 in his reconciliation attempt. He gives us his son to die on the cross. If you relate this

i76 Victim- offender reconciliation, would you say justice must still be pursued by the

i77 victim- survivor?

c127 No, I don't think justice should be pursued. I think we should go on with life. I

c128 wouldn't expect anything from him. If there is a rehabilitation program, I would like

c129 him to go to for it. I feel sorry for him that's why I wouldn't want him to go to jail.

i78 What would this do for you as a person if he joined a rehabilitation program?

c130 It would make me feel happy.

i79 Did lose your trust and openness for people and particularly men?

i80 D id your personality change as a result of the abuse?

c131 Yes. I was hurt. I used to talk out of anger. I used to talk abruptly... I did lose my trust

c132 and openness...I used to end up arguing with people at home.

i81 Would punishment of the perpetrators help you to build your trust in men and society

i82 again?

c133 Punishment by the courts won't help me trust again. This justice won't do anything for

c134 me as a person.

i83 Looking at the texts, Would you say that God takes the initiative for reconciliation,

i84 without any preconditions?

c135 Yes, I don't see preconditions for dialogue.

i85 Do you think his aim is to create space for dialogue in the repentance and regret will be

i86 shown?

c136 Yes... I didn't really see it in the texts but I think he wants love and attention from those

c137 who reconcile to him.

i87 How would you relate this to reconciliation between victim and offender?

c138 I would expect the same thing... Love, attention, repentance and regret.

i88 My interpretation is that as much as God reconciles and forgives, space is created for him

i89 to show his anger by sending his Son to the cross. In a process of dialogue would you

i90 similarly want to show your anger and why ?

c139 No. I wouldn't want to show my anger.

c140 Because it might scar the person.

i91 What questions would you like to ask him?

c141 "Why?" ... " Why did he make me lose my virginity?"...I would like to tell him of the

c142 pain and suffering he caused me.

i92 How would you expect him to behave during the dialogue?

c143 I would like him to calm and understanding ... normal.

i93 What would like him to ask you?

c144 Anything he feels like. I'd like him to ask for my forgiveness... That he'll never do it

c145 again and say how sorry he is.

i94 If you made this offer of reconciliation and it was refused how would you react?

c146 I'll feel hurt if he rejected it because I'm going up to him as a Christian and he is

c147 refusing. I'd feel he doesn't care and that he's just ignoring me.

i95 Would you feel dis - empowered in some way?

c148 Yes, I will feel weak in some way. It will demoralise me.

i96 But would you feel that you possess a higher moral ground for offering reconciliation?

c149 Yes, I'd feel spiritually ...I'd possess the higher moral ground.

i97 What exactly would motivate you to reconcile?

i98 (a) Obedience to God or (b) Your own psychological closure as expected from the

i99 texts?

i100 Both "a" and "b"

i101 In my interpretation of the texts, I feel God does not show or admit guilt for being

i102 wronged. Do you feel guilty in a way about being raped and does an analogy in the text

i103 help you in any way?

c150 Yes, I agree God is not guilty and the texts do help me. I feel like I'm in a similar

c151 position to God.

i104 In the texts we infer that God is all powerful and under no threat in any reconciliation

i105 attempt. Do you think it's easier for God to reconcile than humans?

c152 Yes.

i106 Is the analogy irrelevant then?

c153 Yes.

i107 In Paul I liken the psycho- social level at which God reconciles to that of a father and

i108 his children. I obtain this metaphor from elsewhere in Pauls teachings.

i109 Do you think analogously a similar close relationship is possible with your rapist?

c154 Yes, I could develop a "family relationship"with them.

i110 My interpretation of Paul in Roman 5:10 is that God is now actively involved in the

i111 life of the reconciled, saving them everyday. Is that your interpretation?

c155 I think so.

i112 Analogously would you be prepared to help your rapist in any way if you are

i113 reconciled to him?

c156 Yes, I will help him.

i114 To what level would you be prepared to help him?

c157 100%.

i115 You are very open and forgiving. Is this perhaps because you are H.I.V positive and

i116 feel that if you should die, you do not want to pass away holding an un-forgiveness for

i117 anyone?

c158 [She laughs] No, I've always been open.

i118 Would you be encouraged to reconcile if the rapists indicated they would like to join a
i119 rehabilitation program?
c159 Yes.
i120 Would you like to get involved in a program to help woman heal from rape , through
i121 reconciliation?
c160 Yes.
i122 What would this do for you as a person?
c161 It would relieve the pain.
i123 Do you think your experience beneficial in counselling, especially if the counsellor
i124 does not have your rape experiences?
c162 Yes, I will have an advantage.
i125 In Paul " one sin by one man" estranged humans from God. Do you think that your
i126 rapes made you have a fear of all men?
c163 No, I didn't fear all men. I think that there are good men.
i127 Did you or do you still hold stereotypes of men?
c164 No, no stereotypes. Even though I'm not healed, I still don't have stereotypes.
i128 My interpretation of Paul is that restitution in a paradoxical way, was paid to God, by
i129 the death of his Son. Analogously what would you expect in terms of restitution?
c165 Love and attention must be the restitution.
i130 How do you deal with the fact that they can never really fully pay restitution for what
i131 they did to you?
c166 I can't say...
i132 In Jesus Christ we see God sacrificing the innocence and holiness of Christ. In a way
i133 he is sacrificing the thing most dear to him. Would you consider your privacy, trust,
i134 virginity etc. , as a sacrifice on an altar, that you must leave behind in order to go
i135 forward with life and be healed?
c167 Yes, I accept that analogy.
i136 My interpretation of Paul is that God loved himself enough to die in Christ for himself,
i137 so that he may be healed of estrangement from the world. Would you say that God did
i138 that?
i139 Analogously would you say it was a relevant way to look at your healing, that you need

i140 to love yourself enough to release that which was lost, in order to be healed?

c168 Yes, I think that. I think I can use it analogously.

i141 You notice that God did not live in a state of denial, but had to confront the pain of

i142 handing over his Son to die. Do you think that other survivors and yourself live in a

i143 state of denial and pretend that it never happened? Is the analogy is relevant?

c169 Yes, I pretended it wasn't happening. I denied it.

c170 Yes, it's relevant.

i144 A psychiatrist Judith Hermann Lewis says,.. "Mourning is the only way to give honour

i145 to loss." Do you think that victims prevent themselves from mourning?

c171 Yes . I did.

i146 We see God's Son on the cross, perhaps semi- naked and being taunted and

i147 humiliated. If we say that God felt this too (because he was "in" Christ) , do you think

i148 this provides encouragement to you as a Christian?

c172 Yes. The analogy is the same. it shows that God can be in solidarity with me because

c173 he was there before me.

i149 Do you think that you can ever forget the rape?

c174 No. I can't forget being raped.

i150 I infer that (God can stay reconciled) while God is in that reconciled state, he still

i151 remembers the past estrangement and the price of reconciliation. In a similar way will

i152 you be able to reconcile, but still remember what the rapists did to you?

i153 Even when I reconcile I won't forget. I think you can reconcile and forgive and still

i154 handle the remembering.

i155 Do you accept that your identity is forever transformed from "un-raped" to "raped"?

c175 Yes, I accept that... I won't deny that.

i156 Are there any strengths that you have developed because of the incident?

c176 No, I haven't got any new strengths, everything is negative about what happened to me.

i157 From the text we see human "boasting".Some translates say "rejoicing". Even God and

i158 Christ can be said to also "boast" or "rejoice" in this new state. Will you be able to

i159 accept the rapists rejoicing ,or boasting or simply being happy that they have overcome

i160 the past, are forgiven and now reconciled?

c177 No. I won't be able to handle it. I don't want them to be happy, boast or rejoice. He can

c178 be happy now and again but not with what he did to me.

i161 From the texts it seems like humans are no- more guilty about there past estrangement,

i162 in their reconciled state. Analogously can you accept this?

c179 He shouldn't be guilty... But he should be sombre and serious.

i163 If I could organise a meeting of reconciliation with the rapists would you want to go

i164 through with it?

c180 I will want the opportunity to meet with them and to reconcile.

i165 What has our discussion done for you?

c181 I feel different from now because I got it out of me. When I was telling my mother

c182 before...She wasn't believing me. I feel you believed me.

Interview with " Survivor D "
Age: 19 yrs. Sex : Female Race : Indian-South African
Religion : Christian Denomination: Pentecostal/ Charismatic
Interview conducted on : 27/9/01 in Pietermaritzburg

i1 Are you comfortable about talking of the rape and abuse now?

d1 Yes. I'm not embarrassed, it is happening every single day of our lives. I don't mind

d2 talking about it now.

i2 When did the rape occur?

d3 When I was eight years old (ie: 1990) and it continued till I was twelve years old .

d4 It stopped at twelve, and I moved out of the house at fifteen.

i3 Were you a Christian then?

d5 No, I wasn't.

i4 Did you know the rapist?

d6 Yes. It was my father.

i5 Did you seek professional help at that time?

d7 No. Not when it was happening. However, when I was at the Children's Homes they

d8 referred me to a social worker... I moved into the Children's Home at fifteen.

i6 Can you describe the events around the rape, as well as events leading up to it and

i7 thereafter?

d9 I always stayed with my step- mother and my father. My parents were divorced when

d10 I was a baby. My step- mother was always mean and jealous over my sister and I.

d11 She gossiped about us and even made my father hit us. It was disastrous. It was a

d12 Friday. As usual I always liked to clean the house because I knew my father would

d13 come at 4pm... That time he came at exactly 5 :25 pm. I was alone...in the bath.

d14 I heard the door slam when he came in and he left his lunch- box on the kitchen table.

d15 There was no key on the bathroom door and he stepped in. I asked , "Daddy don't

d16 you have respect, I'm taking a bath." He gave me a very ugly look. He asked me

d17 what I knew about respect. I wrapped myself with the towel and ran to another room.

d18 I tried shutting the door but he pushed his way in and assaulted me with his fists

d19 and he even kicked me. My nose was bust. After he raped me he told me, "I'll always

d20 get you..." and he did.

d21 When he stopped , I asked what was that white stuff [semen]. He said it was "pee." I

d22 think that he could not get it [sex] from my step- mother so he felt he could get it from
d23 me. Because I was alone I was his target. That day [day of first rape], I couldn't
d24 even scream because no one could have heard .
d25 Even when watching television alone, he did it - right by the "Prayer-place." I told
d26 him "Daddy you're hurting me." But he never cared. I was even bleeding once. He
d27 just carried on whether I liked it or not.
d28 On Fridays, when he received his wages, he should take us to the shop to buy chips
d29 and "drink" for himself. I never ate any of the stuff my father bought. I never ate
d30 when he was around me and the family. Even when he was not around, I never ate.
d31 I looked like "skin and bones." For Deepavali I never wore whatever he bought.
d32 I didn't even pray. I always ran away.
d33 Whenever my family and relatives visited , I hid myself away in the room. I'd
d34 pretend I was asleep or very busy. I couldn't get into the car with them. I used to get
d35 pains...cramps in my stomach. I could not walk anywhere, I was physically terrible.
d36 I couldn't look people in the eye. I'd slip away from the house without anyone
d37 noticing. I'd stay by the swings [communal playground] sometimes overnight.
d38 One night a lady found me and took me home. My father hit me and said , "You
d39 know what these children are like. They don't listen!" Meanwhile he knew what was
d40 wrong, and pretended to be innocent.
d41 At night I visited people I never knew! They inquired why I was walking out so late.
d42 If my uncle found me out so late, he'd beat me up. But my father was worse. One day
d43 my father beat me terribly, to actually kill me. I was lying in the gutter. My granny
d44 had to come and she hit him with her walking stick.... I don't know how many people
d45 came home that night to save me. I was always the target. Today I am so sensitive. If
d46 anybody tells me anything, I will just burst out crying.
d47 This continued till I was about twelve years old . It was my birthday that Sunday. We
d48 had visitors who would stay and leave the next day. This gave me the opportunity to
d49 stay with my aunt. It was the December holidays and I stayed there the whole time. This
d50 way I was able to make a break from my house. Thereafter I spent every weekend at
d51 my aunt's place. I'd go home during the week, late in the evening. This way my father
d52 couldn't get me cause there were others in the house.

d53 At times he'd lock the doors to "do it ". This made me sick. Whenever I went out I'd
d54 try to get back after five, so we weren't alone. As a result I never did any house work
d55 after school. Therefore my step- mother hated me so much.
d56 At about eleven years, I tried committing suicide...three times. First I took tablets.
d57 The second time, I ran in front of a moving car - but someone pushed me away. The
d58 third time I tried hanging myself. I used my fathers tie. I tied it to the light fitting but
d59 the tie cut. I even poured paraffin over myself. However, I did not light it.
d60 At age fifteen I ended up in the Children's Home. My sister was already there and I
d61 missed her, so I told the social worker, I wanted to stay with my sister.
d62 One night while I was crying, the house- mother asked me why I was crying. I told her
d63 about my abuse over the years. Naturally, she got very angry. She arranged a meeting
d64 at the Homes. She summoned my father, my cousin and aunties.
d65 When my father was confronted with what he did, he became very angry and aggressive.
d66 His own sisters started to hate him. Even my uncle who used to beat me was terribly
d67 shocked . To this day they hate my father. Even though he is very sick at the moment,
d68 and probably dying, they do not visit him.
d69 He denied everything to all present and used vulgar languages. He knew he was
d70 wrong. He rose to hit me but my sister pushed him down. Imagine my own father
d71 even threatened to kill me.
d72 The neighbours commented , "How could I speak against my own father like that."
d73 I was supposed to open a charge against him but my aunt said I must not because
d74 he was the only one working to support the house.
i8 Would you say you are healed?
d75 I'm not healed yet. That's why I say I am not ready to get married. I still have a lot of
d76 physical scars. I still fear when people come to my house. I still can't interact socially.
d77 I'm fussy about the way I dress. I fear a lot, even when I come to church. I relate all
d78 this to the rape. Also when I pray, I feel no one is listening or hearing to my cries. I
d79 feel abandoned and orphaned . Even my uncle who I'm staying with, tells me I'm a
d80 burden to him. I think I'm no use to this world .
i9 What would you say healing is?
d81 I wish I could answer... But the only time I think I'll be healed is when I see the

d82 Lord Jesus because I feel I will have him to protect me.

i10 You don't feel He can guide and protect you know?

d83 No. I don't feel anything now even when I come to church.

i11 Do you consider yourself a victim or a survivor?

d84 I'm still a victim. When other guys see me they say bad things to me. This builds up

d85 stress and depression. I know I haven't overcome yet.

i12 Where is your dad now?

d86 He stays in Pietermaritzburg with my step- mother and her sister. He is not working

d87 now. His house got repossessed due to his sickness and he couldn't work anymore. All

d88 of his hair fell off, maybe because of his worries. He is very weak and only drinks

d89 alcohol.

i13 Was he punished by the courts or family members in any way ?

d90 Not by the courts...I don't know about the family. Maybe they don't care for him like

d91 before.

i14 How do you feel about him not being punished by the courts ?

d92 I don't really know. The police don't really care about rape victims. They rape on

d93 duty. At that time I wanted him to go to jail but he was the only one working at that

d94 time. I would have loved to see that but I couldn't.

d95 I was happy with the way the family handled it. They thought he was a saint but were

d96 shocked when they heard about it. They never invited him for family functions

d97 thereafter.

i15 Do you feel safe from him now?

d98 Yes! I feel safe.

i16 Do you have any fear that he may come back and repeat these acts on you again?

d99 I doubt it. Given the rate of how sick he is right now... No!

i17 Can you describe your emotions, immanently leading up to the rape?

d100 I thought he was just going to hit me because we were very close. I was afraid. I felt

d101 something inside me wasn't right... but the actual words are not really coming to me

d102 right now. During the rape I only remember pain. ...He will do it and then forget...

d103 like nothing happened . My father was strong... I couldn't fight back. [She can't

d104 seem to remember actual detail.]

i18 Do you have nightmares about the rape?

d105 I have dreams but not of him raping me...He's doing other things, in which he does

d106 not want his secret to be revealed . Or he may stab me... This won't really be a big

d107 problem for me.

i19 Did you become socially disengaged because of the rape?

d108 Yes! I do disengage from people and I wouldn't want to get married and have children

d109 because I wouldn't want my children to become victims.

i20 What was your understanding and feelings about forgiveness before you read the

i21 texts?

d110 I know at the end of the day forgiveness is not a matter of how you feel, for the

d111 Bible says that at the end of the day you will be rewarded for it. At one time I never

d112 forgave people. I'd do to them what they did to me and keep grudges and so on. I

d113 did come to a point of forgiving people even before I read the texts. I think

d114 forgiveness puts one at ease. ...I don't have to worry about what happened...

i22 Did your feelings about forgiveness change after you read the texts ?

d115 No. I forgave my father about three years ago. I did it on my own. Nobody told me to

d116 do it. The texts only encouraged me to forgive even more.

i23 How did your emotions change before and after you forgave?

d117 My feelings changed from hate and grudging to relief. I felt I could manage anything.

d118 I believe in myself [after forgiving]. I felt I can and will do things that are right

d119 and not wrong.

i24 How did you view reconciliation, despite not being healed ?

d120 Even though I'm not healed. I have reconciled . I went to see him today. [A day

d121 after we did the first half of the interview.] We spoke very well and friendly. We

d122 are reconciled at the moment. I went to see him because he might be dying. I didn't

d123 want to go. It was different to what I expected. It was like a natural meeting between

d124 father and daughter.

i25 Before you forgave, what were your thoughts concerning reconciliation ?

d125 I wouldn't have reconciled.

i26 Taking into consideration your own sexual abuse, what do you feel about punishment

i27 and restitution for rapists?

d126 I think if they rape, they should go to jail for three to four years according to the judge
d127 that is. If they commit murder during the rape, then they can get the death penalty.
d128 In my own case, justifiably he should have went to jail.
i28 For how long should this have been?
d129 Five years is enough. About restitution, I wouldn't want anything from him,
d130 irrespective of what it might be. I wouldn't take anything from him. Nothing would
d131 help heal me. I feel it will be like bribery if he had to pay restitution.
i29 Does forgiveness and reconciliation negate the need for restitution?
d132 It's quite hard to answer.... But I think it's okay for others. What if a rape results in a
d133 child? Compensation will be necessary here. In my case I don't need anything.
i30 Do you think then that these texts of Paul could be used analogously to the victim-
i31 offender experience? In reference to you as a survivor, is it relevant?
d134 It can be used analogously because it gives me hope to go on. That's all I need .
i32 In the text God takes the initiative to reconcile with his enemy even though he is the
i33 innocent party. If we use this as an analogy, it would mean that a survivor would have
i34 to take the initiative to reconcile to the offender. Is this realistic for a survivor?
d135 Not all the time. Some survivors won't. They'll pull back. They will have something
d136 in their way. Personally, for myself, I will be able to do it.
i35 Would you say this initiative on the part of the survivor prevents the offender from
i36 still dominating the psychological well- being and healing of the survivor?
d137 Yes! This will prevent it. Otherwise it could go on for thirty to forty years.
i37 You notice that God deals with the estranged world through a mediator. Do you think
i38 this will be useful and/or necessary in your reconciliation attempt with the offender
i39 and why?
d138 I think it is useful. It would be necessary to have counselling before the two people
d139 coming face to face. If the rapist and victim can handle themselves in a dignified way
d140 in the meeting, I'm sure it won't be necessary for someone else to be present.
i40 Do you think they can handle themselves on their own, without the meeting becoming
i41 threatening in any way?
d141 I'm sure they'll have to clear out what's on their chests. "They can't behave like
d142 animals all the time."

i42 You will have noticed that reconciliation on God's part does not mean that he does
i43 away with the need for justice. He gives his Son to die, as a price for reconciliation.
i44 If you relate this to victim- offender reconciliation, would you say then that justice
i45 must still be pursued for reconciliation?
d143 Yes! I think justice should still be meted out. But this must be done by the courts.
d144 Personally, I will not want to injure or harm him in any way.
i46 By him going to jail, what would it do for you as a person?
d145 At least he'll learn and never want to do it again. He will be frightened . He'll
d146 know that next he might serve a longer sentence. This will serve as a warning to
d147 him: To control himself [sexually]. Personally, his prison sentence won't help me
d148 in any way.
i47 Will this sentence build your sense of trust in society?
d149 Yes it will.
i48 When the abuse was happening, did you feel abandoned by God?
d150 I thought that God was not watching. That's when I stopped going to religious
d151 services [ie. Hindu religious services]. I felt there was no purpose for going.
i49 How did your family and society react?
d152 I felt my mum and my family let me down big time. We children were supposed
d153 to be their responsibility... Not their victims. As for society- my neighbours, they
d154 ignored me. Yet, when my neighbours needed help, I was always available.
i50 Considering repentance, change of lifestyle or ethical change toward God, do you
i51 think he expects anything in return for reconciliation?
d155 The only thing he requires, is for people to be righteous, learning to keep their own
d156 hands to themselves and to respect and obey him.
i52 Do you see this in the texts?
d157 No, it's just from my heart to obey.
i53 How would you relate this analogously to your own experience?
d158 He must respect me as his child. He must show remorse and repentance. And he
d159 must be loyal as a father...and do other usual things.
i54 My interpretation of the texts, is that God forgives and reconciles. He also shows
i55 his wrath by sending his Son to the cross. Do you think that in a process of dialogue,

i56 as a survivor, you would want to show your anger?

d160 I'll show my frustration... a little bit of anger and hatred .

i57 What questions would you ask your father during your reconciliation dialogue?

d161 I'll ask him, "What made you do something like that?

d162 "What was he thinking?"

d163 "What were his reasons?"

d164 "What did he benefit from it? "

d165 "If I were someone else's child would he have done it?" I'd tell him, if he can't

d166 get it [sex], he should learn to live without sex and not go around hunting

d167 someone else. I will tell him what the consequences are: How will I be able to tell

d168 anyone who might get involved with me, in a relationship?... "You hurt me..."

d169 "You caused enough damages."... Also, I'll tell him, "Daddy, somewhere along

d170 the line, you might have benefited but I didn't get any advantages."

i58 How would you want him to behave during the dialogue?

d171 In a dignified manner. It's his crime, not mine. He must be attentive and listen

d172 and admit to his wrong doings. He must know where his faults lie and to never repeat

d173 those mistakes. He must be calm, non- aggressive and understanding.

i59 What would you like him to say or talk to you about?

d174 That he is sorry for what he did. The reason why he did it. Was he put up to do

d175 it [by the stepmother] or did he want to do it?

i60 If you made this overture of reconciliation and he refused, how would you feel?

d176 I'd feel depressed... I'm trying to clear "my side" and now he's refusing me.

i61 Would you feel better for at least trying?

d177 Yes! I would have to do it. I know that I'll do what is best for me.

i62 What would your motivation for reconciliation be? Obedience to God or

i63 psychological closure?

d178 Psychological closure, yes! I won't keep something that is going to worry me. If

d179 I allow it to continue worrying me, I'll be filled with anxiety. I will also do it in

d180 obedience to God .

i64 My interpretation of the texts, is that God felt no self- blame or guilt. What do you

i65 feel?

d181 I don't really know. I'm not sure about that.

i66 Did you feel guilty in any way about your own rape?

d182 I did . When I was little, I never used to join girls. Perhaps this led my father to think I

d183 was good for an experiment. I can't say why though. I can't give a reason but I

d184 intensely felt guilt.

i67 Do the texts help you in this regard and why?

d185 Yes it helps because if God can say to himself, "I'm not guilty for what has

d186 happened to me..." What about us? I can say the same thing. God is helpful

d187 in this.

i68 In the reconciliation attempt of God, we can infer that God is "All Powerful" and

i69 under no personal threat from humans. Do you think it is easier for God to

i70 reconcile with the world, than it is for you and other survivors to reconcile with

i71 rapists?

d188 In my case I don't feel personal threat. I am not fearful. But other survivors might

d189 be different.

i72 Would you say then, that the analogy is relevant at this point?

d190 Yes.

i73 In Paul, I liken the psycho- social level at which God reconciles to that of a Father

i74 to children. Do you think analogously, such a similar close relationship is possible

i75 with your rapist?

d191 I can try .... There is nothing better than trying. Maybe I'll succeed . I will have to

d192 succeed and develop that perfect father- daughter relationship. I think this point

d193 is relevant in trying to achieve.

i76 My interpretation of Rom 5 : 10 is that God is now "Actively involved in the life

i77 of the reconciled because he is saving them everyday." Is this your interpretation?

d194 Yes I think so.

i78 Analogously, would you be prepared to help your dad in any way

i79 if reconciled?

d195 Yes. I will get involved in his life to help him. I think this is relevant. However, I

d196 will keep my distance from him because of my step- mother.

i80 Would you like to get involved in a program to help woman recover from rape,

i81 and reconcile with rapists?

d197 Absolutely!

i82 What would this do for you as a person?

d198 This will enable me to show others that the world never comes to an end . It will

d199 give me self- esteem to know that I can still continue with life. It will give me some

d200 responsibility.

i83 Would you say that your unique experience could add a dimension to counselling,

i84 which counsellors would otherwise not have - if they were not raped?

d201 Yes!

i85 In Paul we see that "one sin by one man", estranged God from humans. See

i86 Rom. 5 : 12. Was your experience analogous in some way? Do you fear all men

i87 as a result of the rape?

d202 No, I don't fear all men as a result of the rape. I have made up my mind that no

d203 matter what, I will not be overwhelmed by men- irrespective of the situation.

d204 I'll fight back.

i88 So you don't stereotype men?

d205 I don't have to say. I see it all the time. Men are nothing compared to woman today.

d206 I don't pay respect to men. I stereotype them all as cowards and selfish.

i89 How do you deal with the fact that your dad can never fully pay restitution to you

i90 for all that he perpetrated against you?

d207 I'll just let it pass.

i91 In Christ we see God sacrificing the innocence and holiness of Christ. In a sense he is

i92 sacrificing the thing most holy to him. Would you consider your privacy, trust

i93 and openness to people as a sacrifice on an altar, that you must leave behind in order

i94 to go forward with life and be healed?

d208 I would... It is helpful to look at it that way.

i95 My interpretation of Paul, is that God loved himself to die in Christ for himself, so

i96 that he may be healed of the estrangement between himself and the world . Do you

i97 think you can use that analogously for your own healing?

d209 Yes.

i98 Do you think a good way to look at it is that you must love yourself enough, to release

i99 that which was lost, in order to be healed?

d210 If I can worry about others, why can't I worry about myself? I would rather do it for

D211 myself than others [love myself and release that which was lost].

i100 You notice that God did not live in a state of denial. He had to confront the pain of

i101 handing over his Son to die. Do you think that you and other survivors live in a state

i102 of denial to some measure and pretend that it never happened?

d212 Yes some live in a state of denial and pretence. They don't deal with it by revisiting

d213 it or talking about it.

i103 The psychiatrist Judith- Lewis Hermann says, "Mourning is the only way to give

i104 honour to loss." Do you agree?

d214 Yes I do....because all you wished for when you were little is gone. All that

d215 happiness and the good life... That being thrown around [as a person] and doing

d216 your own thing. It shouldn't go on as a habit surely.

i105 Do you think victims prevent themselves from mourning?

d217 Maybe. I did deny it and tried to forget that it ever happened . Only recently, at

d218 about eighteen [she is nineteen now], I started to accept that I was raped and I could

d219 go on as a survivor.

i106 We see the Son on the cross, perhaps semi- naked, being humiliated and tortured . If

i107 we say that God felt this too, because he was "in" Christ, do you think this provides

i108 encouragement to you, if you identify with God in this way?

d220 Yes...The same thing happened to me... Only thing, it happened in a different way.

d221 He suffered worse than me. He had nails through his body...Yes it does alleviate

d223 my pain to know that Jesus went through that.

i109 Do you think that you will ever be able to forget the rape?

d224 No!

i110 I would infer from the texts that in the reconciled state, God still remembers the pain

i111 of estrangement and what reconciliation cost him. Would you in a similar way be

i112 able to remember the past and still stay reconciled?

d225 Yes. I can accept it.

i113 What strengths do you see emanating from your survival?

d226 When I see people I don't try to act like a show- off. I feel I can be friendly but

d227 there is a limit. I feel strong ...If I don't, no one will do it for me. I feel I can take
d228 on any obstacle that comes my way now.
i114 In the texts we see human- beings "boasting in God through Christ" in this
i115 reconciled state. The N. I. V says, "Rejoicing" instead of boasting. How analogous
i116 could this be? That is "boasting" or being self assertive, or rejoicing with the
i117 rapist in a reconciled state?
d229 Applicable because I'll be able to accept "boasting" and "rejoicing."
i118 If we use the above analogy it implies that the rapist can live guilt- free in the
i119 "reconciled state." Do you think for yourself that this is what the texts imply?
d230 Yes because they are now one.
d231 Do you think analogously, this would be fair to you as a rape survivor?
d232 Yes...I wouldn't want him to be guilty. It will not bother me if he doesn't feel guilty.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Achtemeier, P J. 1996. The continuing quest for coherence in St. Paul : An experiment in thought, in Lovering, H E (Jr.) & Sumney, J L (eds), *Theology and Ethics in Paul and his interpreters.* Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Baron, L & Straus, M.1989. *Four theories of rape in American society.* New Haven :Yale University Press.

Barth, K.1956- 1969.*The Doctrine of Reconciliation : Church Dogmatics.* vol 4. Edinburgh : T& T Clarke.

Bauer, W, Arndt, W F & Gingrich, F W.1957. *A Greek- English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature.* Chicago : The University of Chicago.

Beker, J C .1980. *Paul the Apostle : The triumph of God in life and thought.* Philadelphia : Fortress Press.

Berger, P & Luckmann, T .1966. *The social construction of reality : A treatise in the sociology of knowledge.* New York : Doubleday.

Bonhoeffer, D. 1948. *The cost of discipleship.* London : The Camelot Press.

Bornkamm, G. 1975. *Paul.* London : Hodder and Stoughton.

Breytenbach, C. 1990. On Reconciliation : An exegetical response. *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 70, 64- 68.

Büchsel, F 1964. ἀλλάσσω , in G. Kittel (ed), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, vol 1, 251- 259. Grand Rapids : William Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Bultmann, R.1952-1955. *Theology of the New Testament.* vol 1. London : S.C.M Press

_____. 1985. *The Second Letter to the Corinthians.* Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.

Cheston, S E.1993. Counseling adult survivors of childhood sexual abuse, in Wicks, R J & Parsons, R D (eds), *Clinical handbook of Pastoral Counseling*, vol 2, 447- 489. New York : Paulist Press.

Darke, J L.1990. Sexual aggression : Achieving power through humiliation, in Marshall, W L, Lewis, D R & Banbaree, H E (eds). *Handbook of sexual assault: Issues, theories and treatment of the offender,* 55 -68. New York : Plenum Press.

De Gruchy, J W. 1985. Documentation. The Kairos Document : Challenge to the Church : A Theological Challenge on the Political Crisis in South Africa. *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 53 , 61- 81.

Dicanio, M. 1993. *Encyclopedia of Violence. Origins, Attitudes, Consequences.* New York : R.R Donelly.

Domeris, W R.1987. Biblical Perspectives on Reconciliation. *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 60, 77- 80.

Dünkel, F & Rössner, D. 1989. Law and practice of victim-offender agreements, in Wright, M & Galaway, B (eds), *Mediation and criminal justice : Victims, offenders and community*, 152-177. London : Sage Publications.

Dunn, D G. 1974. Paul's understanding of the death of Jesus, in Banks, R J (ed), *Reconciliation and Hope*, 125 - 141. Grand Rapids : William Eerdman's Publishing Company.

Fortune, M M 1993. Review : Trauma and Recovery. *Journal of Pastoral care* (47), 435 - 436.

Fortune, M M & Poling, J. 1993. Calling to accountability : The church's response to abusers, in Wicks and Parsons 1993: 489-505.

Furnish, V P.1968. *Theology and Ethics in Paul.* Nashville : Abingdon.

Gherkin, C V.1979. *Crisis experience in modern life.* Nashville : Abingdon.

Gilbert, L, Selikow, T & Walker, L.1996. *Society, Health and Disease. An Introductory Reader for Health Professionals.* Johannesburg : Ravan.

Gundry, R.1970. *A Survey of the New Testament* Grand Rapids : Zondervan Publishing House.

Haye, M.1998. *Ukubuyisana : Reconciliation through mediation for healing.* Cluster Publications : Pietermaritzburg.

Hengel, M.. 1981. *The atonement : A study of the origins of the doctrine in the New Testament.* London : SCM.

Käsemann, E.1971. *Perspectives on Paul.* London : SCM Press Ltd.

Kilian, J. 1985. *Form and style in Theological texts : A guide for the use of The Harvard Reference System.* Pretoria : University of South Africa.

Lewis Hermann, J.1992 . *Trauma and Recovery.* BasicBooks : New York.

Louw, J P, Nida, E A, Smith, R B, Munson, K A (eds). 1988. *Greek- English Lexicon of the New Testament based on semantic domains : Volume one.* New York : United Bible Societies.

Ludski, H 2001. New proposals broaden definition of rape. *Sunday Times* 1 July.

Marks, D F, Murray M, Evans B, & Willig C (eds). 2000. *Health psychology: Theory and practice.* London : Sage Publications.

Marrow, S B.1986. *Paul : His letters and theology: An introduction to Paul's epistles.* Mahwah : Paulist Press.

McDonogh, J.1993. An investigation into the effectiveness of a structured group therapy program for adult survivors of child sexual abuse. Masters thesis, University of Natal.

Meiselman, K C.1979. *Incest : A Psychological Study of Causes and Effects with Treatment Recommendations.* San Francisco : Jossey- Bass Inc. Publishers.

Mosala, I.1987. The meaning of reconciliation: A Black perspective. *J.T.S.A 59*, 19-25.

Mueller, J. 1996. *Forgiveness : A Christian Reflection.* Allen :Thomas More.

Munck, J.1959. *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind.* London : SCM Press and Sons.

Pettigrow, L. 1998. A discursive study of Male Adolescent Sexual Offenders in a Treatment Program for Children in Kwa-Zulu Natal. Masters thesis. University of Natal.

Ridderbos, H.1977. *Paul : An Outline of his Theology.* London : S.P.C.K.

Rosik, C H. 1993. Review : Trauma and Recovery. *Journal of psychology and Christianity* 12, 375 - 376.

Schreiter, R J. 1992. *Reconciliation: Mission and Ministry in a changing social order.* New York : Orbis Books.

Smedes, L B. 1986. *Forgive and Forget.* New York : Harper and Row Publications.

Soica, C. 1994. *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament.* Peabody : Hendricson Publishers.

Schucter, S R.1986. *Dimensions of grief : Adjusting to the death of a spouse.* San Francisco: Josse-Bass Inc.

Shafranski, E.P. 1993. The contribution of short- term dynamic psychotherapy to Pastoral psychotherapy, in Wicks & Parsons 1993 : 102-123.

Switzer, D. 1986. *The Minister as crisis counselor.* Nashville : Abingdon.

Thamm, M.1998. *I have a life : Alison's journey.* Parktown : Penguin Books

The Holy Bible: Revised Standard Version : Containing the Old and New Testaments. 1952. London : Oxford University Press.

The Sunday Times 9 December 2001. Restorative Justice, p13.

Tulloch, S (ed).1990. *Oxford Complete Wordfinder : A unique and powerful combination of Dictionary and Thesaurus.* London : Reader's Digest Association.

Ulanov, A B & Ulanov B. 1993. Reaching to the unknown religion and the psyche, in Wicks and Parsons 1993 : 7-26.

Umbreit, S M. 1989. Violent offenders and their victims, in Wright & Galaway 1989: 98-112.

Villa-Vicencio, C (ed).1998. *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa*, vol 5. Cape Town : Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

Vogelman, L. 1990. *The Sexual Face of Violence on Rape* Johannesburg : Raven Press.

West, G.1993. *Contextual Bible Study* Pietermaritzburg : Cluster Publications.

Wolf, M..1998. The core of the faith : Reconciliation. *Christian Century* 115, 239.

Zuern, H. 1998. The Significance of the New Testament Texts for Social Reconciliation. Honours thesis, University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg.