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Abstract

Most research tends to approach questions of ‘healing’ in post-authoritarian, or post-conflict transitions, from a psychological perspective. This study seeks to reconnect such therapeutic approaches to healing with wider questions of social change. Through exploring the conceptual framework and practices of healing and reconciliation work from the vantage point of one civil society initiative in South Africa, the Institute for Healing of Memories, this research aims to better understand such local reconciliation methods and logics. The main focus was to examine the organization’s conceptual frameworks, methodology and practices, and to relate these to theorizations in broader fields of study concerned with transitional justice. A key finding was that practitioners and theorists of transitional justice consider ‘destructive memories’ or emotions to be the carriers of past wrongs transgenerationally. The role of knowledge and acknowledgment at national, communal and individual levels is seen as an essential part of any attempt to foster reconciliation. Identifying successful methods and tools that support individual and communal capacities to transform the effects of legacies of violence remains a challenge across the fields of transitional justice and peace-building. This research explores how legacies of violence in post-Apartheid South Africa are being addressed in relation to notions of reconciliation and forgiveness in transitional justice.
Relevance to Development

Transitional justice aims to provide tools to address legacies of violence, most often those that have arisen from authoritarian regimes and violent conflict. But transitional justice mechanisms are also being used to address enduring legacies of colonialism. Considering that, as Pumla Gobodo-Madikizela asserts, the rubric of development is often used to veil the insidious influence of colonialism, this reason alone makes a study of transitional justice relevant to development studies (2006: 6).
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Chapter 1 Introduction

1.0 The Topic of Research

National, local and international actors aiming to support nations transitioning toward democracy from violent authoritarian states, such as was the policy under Apartheid (Das and Kleinman 2000: 7; Adonis 2008: 8) in South Africa, have increasingly turned to the field of transitional justice (TJ) for solutions. Within TJ’s toolbox exists a set of mechanisms1 aimed at addressing ‘questions about how to heal an entire society and incorporate diverse rule-of-law values, such as peace and reconciliation’ (Teitel 2003: 77). Transitional justice mechanisms are applied in societies that are struggling to recover from enduring periods of dehumanization, where the everyday had become an institutionalized ‘state of war’. ‘In such contexts, the devastating fragmentation of social ties and individual conscience contributes to the paralysis of any socio-political rehabilitation and fair justice process’ (Pouligny 2005: 7). Such a condition requires ‘the recovery of the everyday’ (Das & Kleinman 2001: 4). Such a recovery in the form of re-construction may not even be possible. ‘[R]esuming the task of living (and not only surviving), asks for a renewed capacity to address the future’. One question that arises when trying to address such realities is: ‘[A]t the level of interpersonal relations, how does one contain and seal off the violence that might poison the life of future generations?’ (Ibid.). Perhaps ‘containing and sealing’ are not the most productive methods, and rather we should consider how the residues of violence could be transformed. The field of TJ’s hallmark mechanism, the ‘truth commission,’ first established in 1983 in Argentina, is designed to address the complexity of these challenges. Commissions, and other TJ mechanisms, are employed to provide a path to recovery. Commissions are usually official truth-telling bodies that aim to recover truth about these ‘states of war’ and establish a collective narrative and memory in the target society. ‘How these goals are secured is complicated, for it asks for the simultaneous engagement of political and judicial institutions, as well as families and local communities’ (Ibid.).

At this stage in the development of the field of TJ, scholars and practitioners have arrived at near-unanimity that in order to address violent pasts, societies must ‘examine, acknowledge and account for violence committed by various groups…in order to move forward’ (Borer 2006: 3). The field of transitional justice, by developing and advocating the use of reconciliation tools to respond to legacies of violence, has made a vital link between recovery of societal and personal wounding and securing conflict transformation.

1 Transitional justice mechanisms have come to include, ‘truth commissions, criminal trials, international tribunals, reparation programs, memorials, amnesties, lustration programs’ et cetera (Baxter 2006: 7).
This study concerns itself with a South African civil society-based healing and reconciliation intervention operating at the level of individuals and communities. In contrast with research that approaches questions of ‘healing’ and reconciliation during post-conflict transitions from a psychological perspective, this study seeks to connect therapeutic approaches to healing with questions of wider social change. In other words, the case study presented here is considered within a context of transitional justice, which is understood to be an example of one approach to ‘conflict transformation’. Conflict transformation refers to actions and processes seeking to alter the various characteristics and manifestations of violent conflict by addressing the root causes of a particular conflict over the long term (emphasis added). It deals with the structural, behavioural and attitudinal features of conflict, and pertains to both the process of transformation and its conclusion. Further, its objective is to transform negative destructive conflict into positive constructive conflict (Berghof: 2010).²

Healing, reconciliation and forgiveness are age-old concepts, historically conceptualized as theological, and not largely studied outside of this field. Healing perhaps being the exception, as it is also associated with medicine. As dealing with violent pasts became the primary focus of transitional justice, the field has adopted these historically theological concepts to help provide theoretical and practical solutions to protracted issues, caused by legacies of violence, which are often institutionalized. In speaking about these contexts Rouland highlights, ‘mass violence comes to profoundly disturb and reshape all the moral categories and frames of reference that make social life possible’ (Rouland cited in Pouligny 2005: 21). TJ’s application of these concepts beyond the spiritual and personal realms has become a key part of its’ method to address violence and the destructive fragmentation that has transformed societies at the individual, communal and national levels.

This research explores the philosophy and practice of one reconciliation and healing intervention, pioneered by the Institute for Healing of Memories (IHOM), a South African-based non-governmental organization (NGO) operating in more than ten, often different, countries annually. The methodology looks at how IHOM’s reconciliation and healing practices are articulated and implemented through an exploration of their conceptual framework and practices, operating at the individual level to address intrapsychic (internal-psychological) wounding, and at the relational level to address interpersonal and communal wounding. The study focuses on how their discursive construction relates to their theoretical conceptions of reconciliation. Of particular interest is the relationship between the organization’s framework and practices, and how these relate to theories in fields concerned with and working to ad-

² This reference lacks a page number as it refers to the Berghof Foundation’s website.
address legacies of violence. Through this case study-based method (Yin 2009: 17), my intention is to illuminate and analyze how IHOM practitioners are interpreting realities and applying concepts of healing, reconciliation, truth and forgiveness to facilitate healing and reconciliation. Where possible I also explore how theorists of transitional justice approach conflict transformation. The study also discusses the challenges and opportunities of healing and reconciliation work within the contexts of enduring structural violence. As will become clear, I find it important to evaluate to what extent these practitioners and theorists account for structural and cyclical violence in their logics and practice, and additionally, I am particularly focused on the way the ‘victim’ category is constructed and operationalized in these interventions.

Furthermore, this study is focused on how IHOM’s intervention model is applied in the context of post-Apartheid South Africa, which remains a setting of extremes due, at least in part, to the legacy of Apartheid, which Greedy characterizes as structural violence consisting of ‘poverty and inequality, social and criminal violence, an HIV/AIDS pandemic, and xenophobia’ (2010: 1). Prior to the Apartheid era the exploitative systems of slavery and colonialism infused South African society with a complex framework of consistent dehumanization, and experiences and beliefs about superiority, humiliation, and privilege.

This study is situated in the context of transitional justice and how it was applied in South Africa. The South African TRC is considered to be the first commission to significantly contribute to understanding the concepts of truth, justice and reconciliation within transitional justice (Greedy 2010: 2). This, along with South Africa’s complex terrain of injustice and abuse, and the parallel development of IHOM’s methodology, namely, the healing of memories (HOM) to the TRC, make this case study a relevant contribution to knowledge of the conceptual framework and practices of civil society healing and reconciliation interventions.

The research was conducted through a mix of participant-observation (in both New York and the Western Cape), in-depth interviewing, and detailed analysis of documentary evidence. Theoretically, this study is informed by approaches to transitional justice, and social suffering, as well as theories of forgiveness, reconciliation and transgenerational transference of trauma.

---

3 Extreme here refers to ‘high aggregate level of income inequality increase between 1993 and 2008. The same is true of inequality within each of South Africa’s four major racial groups. Income poverty has fallen slightly in the aggregate but it persists at acute levels for the African and Coloured racial groups. Poverty in urban areas has increased’ (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development 2010: 4).
1.1 The Research Objective

The primary objective of this investigation is to illuminate and analyze how the Institute for Healing of Memories conceptualizes internalized violence and its healing, specifically within post-Apartheid South Africa. The central assumptions informing this objective are:

(1) individuals and communities internalize beliefs, emotions and attitudes from the structures (social, economic and political systems) they are surrounded by;
(2) when these structures are systemically violent, they produce negative harmful beliefs, emotions and attitudes, and directly target marginalized peoples;
(3) the effects of violence, to some degree, become internalized by individuals and communities, in turn producing internalized violence;
(4) internalized violence is an on-going process, not determinate or stagnant, where people and communities have opportunity for action and negotiation, even when wounded by beliefs and emotions;
(5) internalized violence at the levels of individual, communal and society can be healed and transformed.

1.2 The Research Problem

Providing mechanisms and support to enable societal reconstruction from institutionalized violence at points of conflict transformation is a complex undertaking. The major challenges transitional justice faces are: firstly, lack of clarity, under-theorization, and inadequate understanding of its three foundational concepts, truth, reconciliation, and justice (Borer 2006: 3; Gready 2010: 2-3). Secondly, transitional justice mechanisms themselves are often broad and holistically defined (Gready 2010: 6). Lastly, ‘models of how truth-telling mechanisms work [have mostly been] overly vague and aspirational’ (Borer 2006: 3). Given these problems, this research explores the following questions concerning one truth-telling model, which developed parallel to the application of transitional justice mechanisms in South Africa.

1.3 Research Questions

Central question:
What does the case study of IHOM reveal about the transitional justice concepts e.g. truth, reconciliation and how they can be successfully applied?

Sub-questions:
1. How is the process of healing and reconciliation discursively mapped by IHOM?
2. What methods are conceptualized and practiced by IHOM to contribute to healing and reconciliation?

1.4 South African Legacies of Violence Towards Healing?

Nelson Mandela was elected President by South Africa’s first ever non-racial democratic elections on 2 May 1994. The election ended forty-five years of Apartheid rule and over three-hundred years of segregated rule (Borer 1998: 1). That incredible moment, both long awaited for and feared, had arrived. The Apartheid state policy of institutionalized racism, also known as ‘separate development,’ from 1948-1994 continues to have enormous impact. During the regime’s tenure it affected South Africans and Namibians, the entire region of southern Africa, and galvanized countries and people around the world.

The National Party’s ‘grand scheme of Apartheid…was aimed at entrenching white supremacy and ensuring racial purification.’ (Lotter as cited in Adonis 2008: 6-7). …Apartheid was based on the total commitment of securing rights, benefits and privileges for Whites at the expense of Black people through many forms of domination, exploitation and oppression (Adonis 2008 6-7). Gibson [cited in Adonis], ‘describes Apartheid as a codification of racism not seen in the world before. Racism was facilitated by the classification of all South Africans into racial groups on the basis of which, rights and responsibilities were determined’ (Ibid.).

To provide the reader a greater sense of the brutality and authoritarianism of the system and implementation of Apartheid, I refer to a factual description by Fiona Ross.

[During one year]–1985-1986, ten thousand children were detained. …Fourteen hundred Black people were killed at the hands of security forces (International Defence Aid Fund 1991: 69). The period under review by the Commission (1960-1994) also saw enforced racial classification and segregation; mandatory military conscription for young White men; unacknowledged “destabilization” by the state against neighbouring states; and assassinations of political activists. Legislation, States of Emergency, and draconian Emergency Regulations eventually provided for detention without trial for up to 180 days. Torture and harassment were frequent (cited in Das 2001: 274 Note 3).

After majority rule was passed, the South African nation sought a pathway to overcome its divisive, bloody and unequal history. The TRC was a product of the parties’ negotiated compromise and, as the mechanism to guide the nation through transition, was enacted to cover a significant but narrow investigation, encompassing only gross violations of human rights.

---

4 Here Adonis uses ‘Black’ inclusively to refer to Indigenous Africans, Coloureds (people of mixed race), and people of Indian descent.
The system of Apartheid has been understood in many ways. This study adopts a historical view of Apartheid, which argues that Apartheid arose from post-colonial policies of racial segregation, enacted after South Africa’s independence from Britain in 1910, and begot from settler colonial rule in southern Africa. Apartheid amplified these policies through its systematization of legalized racism (South Africa Truth 1: 30; Adonis 2008: 7).

The enduring structural legacies of Apartheid include persistent geographic inaccessibility according to racial divisions. This reality was born from the design of racist urban planners who planned the country in the vision of ‘separate development’ (Kayser-Whande 2005: 7). Today, the legacies of these urban designs confine indigenous Africans and Coloured peoples to impoverished, under-developed townships, and enclose mostly White South Africans in suburbs policed by ‘armed response’ security patrols. This entrenched separation continues to cause ignorance, fear, and suspicion of the ‘other’. Another stark legacy is the contrast between incredible wealth and incredible poverty, visible to anyone who travels across the territorial boundaries created by Apartheid.

Other damaging histories from the South African past cannot be subsumed under Apartheid, but were legacies of earlier forms of colonial rule. These include the enslavement of indigenous peoples, most notably the Khoi and San. In addition, residual complexities left by slavery and colonialism influence the present and demand negotiation on a daily basis, whether one or one’s ancestors were extraordinarily privileged, or extraordinarily oppressed during the tenure of any of these systems of structural violence.

Today, post-Apartheid South Africa is often described as beset with problems of corruption, gang and township and community violence; police and army brutality; and continuing sharp economic inequalities, with mass poverty among Black and Coloured South Africans in particular. This remains part of an inherited, and thus neo-colonial, pattern of social and racial inequality.

Nineteen months after Mandela took office, in December 1995, the government commenced the TRC. The TRC space was ‘both framed in a discourse of forgiveness, catharsis and healing, and linked to a broader nation-building project’ (Gready 2010: 30). Ultimately the TRC’s mandate was to establish and document the truth about the Apartheid period, afford victims and perpetrators the opportunity to testify publicly, and grant amnesty to perpetrators found to have acted out of political motivation who fully disclosed their actions (Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act 34, 1995). Archbishop Desmond Tutu’s words in his opening speech set the Commission’s inclusive position: that all South Africans had suffered during Apartheid. ‘We are meant to be a part of the process of the healing of our nation, of our people, all of us, since every South African has to some extent or other been traumatized. We are a wounded people because of the conflict of the past, no matter on which side we stood’ (Tutu 1995: 2).
While the TRC has become the most lauded and studied Truth Commission it is not without critique. The TRC was tasked with defining ‘victims’ and ‘perpetrators’ of Apartheid for the nation. According to Mamdani, this ‘was the single most important decision that determined the scope and depth of the Commission’s work’ (2002: 33). In the end decisions about the categories victim and perpetrator resulted in a contradiction between the mandated discourse and practice. Taking the TRC away from its mandate to foster ‘social reconciliation’ to delivering a ‘political reconciliation’ between state agents and political activists. Mamdani highlights this contradiction, showing that in its final report (1998) the TRC acknowledges the system of Apartheid itself, as a ‘crime against humanity’ (2002: 34) while, in practice, the TRC defined ‘victims’ individually. Thus, ‘the Commission’s analysis reduced Apartheid from a relationship between the state and entire communities to one between the state and individuals’ (Ibid. 33-34). ‘If the crime against humanity involved a targeting of entire communities for racial and ethnic cleansing and policing, individualizing the victim obliterated this particular—many would argue central—characteristic of apartheid’. Moreover, Mamdani continues, ‘[t]o the extent that the TRC did not acknowledge the full truth, the amnesty intended to be individual turned into a group amnesty’ (2002: 34).

1.5 The Ethics, Scope and Limitations of the Study

Ethical Concerns

While designing and implementing this research I was concerned with the politics and ethics of my position as a foreign and privileged researcher aiming to produce knowledge about a context and history that are not my own. Furthermore, I considered, as an ethical question, whether, given the possibilities and risks of misrepresentation, resulting from my being an outsider if my investigation was even warranted. I eventually reconciled these concerns after receiving support from my interviewees and IHOM, who told me that an empirical endeavour such as this, genuinely carried out with the interest of contributing positively to societal reconstruction, was worthwhile. Further, it is also important to note that I entered this research with the standpoint that all social reality is subjectively constructed, and that my own worldview is derived from my locations: socially, politically, economically and geographically. Therefore, regardless of ones indigeneity there is a relative standpoint to negotiate, and no matter the geographic location of my research I would have faced similar challenges. Having said this, even as this project of study concludes, I consider these ethical questions and the problems and opportunities that arise from them.

Scope

As a result of limited time, resources, and methodological feasibility, this study did not aim to measure the impact of IHOM’s conceptual logics, methodology, and practices, but rather posed them, their conception, design and execution as objects of analysis. The study was chosen to be undertaken in
Western Cape, South Africa, which is the root of the methodology and practice, but also included preliminary research in the United States, where IHOM is most well established outside of South Africa. My sensitivity to respecting guidelines proscribed by IHOM and the space of HOM and its participants as one of confidentiality and intimacy limited my ability to take direct notes during workshops and activities. Rather, I relied on my memory and emotional recollections, and took notes during breaks. Lastly, the theoretical and discursive scope of this study has been located within the field of transitional justice.

Limitations

Limits were owed to the academic period allotted for fieldwork (May to September 2010), narrowing my access to IHOM board members and former participants. Board members were often unavailable due to the heavy demands of their work; while former participants were often unreachable because of unstable contact information, lack of transportation, or at times, my need for accompaniment for reasons of security. Despite these restraints, I was able to interview thirty-four relevant people. However, the analysis of the total interview data could not be included in this study due to the restricted period for writing and the emphasis on discourse analysis as the primary method.

1.6 Methodology

I chose to use a case-study method as it allowed me to perform a deep and specific exploration of how one local-level reconciliation and healing intervention conceives of its work and operates. The literature review revealed the lack of clarity and empirical research about the implementation of truth-telling models. This awareness, along with my interests in conflict and the ways in which interventions at personal and communal levels relate to societal changes, moved me to seriously consider IHOM as a case study. Finally, once I learned of IHOM’s historical connection with the TRC in South Africa, thereby situating its origins within the transition from Apartheid to democratization and the application of transitional justice I felt this case would provide an informative exploration of how reconciliation and healing are conceived and applied in a context of legacies of violence.

Fieldwork was conducted in both New York and the Western Cape. Data collection was anchored in personal and focus group interviews (both semi-structured and in-depth life histories), with people relevant to IHOM at four levels: (1) staff, board, and facilitator leadership; (2) staff of partner organizations; (3) past participants of IHOM activities; and (4) staff of organizations in the field. I intentionally organized my interviews based on the different levels at which people interact with the organization in order to provide a lens into the different levels and strategies of intervention IHOM employs. Further data collection included my active participation and observation in IHOM organizational activities, including three workshops. (See Appendix 1 for a complete overview of data and sources.) Lastly, my analysis is focused on a thorough review of organizational materials, including: the IHOM website, speeches, in-
house and independent research of their activities and method, annual reports, funding proposals and other internal reports, their facilitators guidelines manual, press and publicity material, and one short video presenting their HOM methodology. One of the main goals of this project has been to analytically track IHOMs’ conceptual framework in its own context and relate it to larger debates about similar constructs and methods. In analyzing this varied media and data, I drew on Wodak’s explanations of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and in particular her understanding that texts once ‘isolated from any context, would not give insights into social processes’ (Wodak 2004: 197). Along these lines, CDA became relevant as this case is about discourses employed in a social process–reconciliation. The practical mechanics of my discourse analysis involved two of the steps Wodak outlines, namely establishing specific topics within the discourse and identifying discursive arguments (2004: 206). These were implemented by identifying repetition and contradictions. As well, CDA was drawn upon to illuminate the historical and intellectual fields that IHOM, and to some extent transitional justice’s concepts are situated within. Lastly, close readings with attention to word-choice and juxtaposition of terms assisted to identify the construction of power-relations within texts. Finally, the CDA method encourages researchers to reflect on their experiences, and where I felt useful, and space permitting I have added my own reflections.

1.7 Structure of the Paper

This first chapter has elaborated on the research focus, outlined key questions and research problems, as well as methods used, and has given a brief idea of histories of institutionalized violence and their resulting legacies in South Africa. Chapter 2 now introduces and contextualizes the Case Study of the Institute for Healing of Memories (IHOM). Chapter 3 first analyses the central conceptual logics of IHOM in relation to a broad range of literature relevant to transitional justice. The main elements of IHOM’s approach to healing and their practices are then critically examined in Chapter 4. Chapters 3 and 4 move from conceptual framing to practical applications, integrating transitional justice concepts with a close analysis of the selected case study. Throughout Chapters 3-4, the concern is to relate IHOM’s approaches to wider notions of addressing legacies of institutionalized violence, associated cycles of violence, reconciliation and social reconstruction. Finally, Chapter 5 presents and synthesizes the main conclusions and findings of this study, returning to the central questions.
Chapter 2 The Case Study

2.0 Introduction: Institute for Healing of Memories

In Chapter 2 the case study is presented. The focus will be on the developmental history of Healing of Memories (HOM), a distinct methodology which came about prior to the creation of the Institute for Healing of Memories (IHOM). HOM will be connected to the ending of Apartheid and the commencement of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The chapter then looks at the work of IHOM, whose core aim has been to spread the HOM methodology more widely, both within and beyond South Africa. The rest of this chapter provides details of current and past programming, recipient populations, leadership and strategies of IHOM in the Western Cape, South Africa and beyond. The organisations main form of intervention for healing and reconciliation is this three-day workshop. Appendices 2 and 3 detail the daily ‘elements’ that make up the three-day working practice of HOM. Specifically, appendix 2 provides examples of the questions given to participants at the workshops.

2.1 The Birth of HOM as a Methodology

In the late 90s, South Africa prepared to implement the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, which was proposed during the political negotiations (1994-1997) between the African National Congress (ANC) coalition and the National Party (NP) as the key to dealing with gross human rights violations committed during the Apartheid era. Meanwhile, civil society, in the form of NGO-led regional networks, began forming around the country to address concerns over the TRC (van der Merwe 1999: 58). Religious networks were especially involved, and in the Western Cape, one year prior to the commencement of the TRC, civil society groups had formed The Religious Response to the Truth Commission (RR) a volunteer campaign to advocate for local concerns (Ibid.; Kayser-Whande 2000: 2-3). One key figure in this civil society initiative was Father Michael Lapsley, originally from New Zealand and a former ANC chaplain. While in exile in Zimbabwe, he was the target of a parcel bomb attack, widely accepted to have been sent to him by the Apartheid government, causing the loss of both of his hands, sight in one eye, and permanent injury to his eardrums (Lapsley cited in Worsnip 1996: 32). In 1993 he took the position of chaplain, to counsel other survivors, at the newly formed Trauma Centre for Victims of Violence and Torture known simply as ‘Trauma Centre’. From the outset, both the RR and the Trauma Centre Chaplaincy saw

5 “The meeting was held under the auspices of the Western Cape Province Council of Churches (WCPCC), the World Conference on Religion and Peace (WCRP) and other organizations” (Kayser-Whande 2000: Note 2).
themselves as parallel processes to the TRC, working to support, monitor and critique the Commission.

Then, as today, Father Michael’s thinking and leadership about reconciliation and healing is informed by his own experience.

‘When I was bombed I became the focus of evil… Through the response of people all over the world, I became the focus of all that is beautiful in the human family, our ability to be tender, loving, generous, kind, and compassionate. That was the context that enabled me to walk the journey from victim, to survivor, to victor, because I realized that if I spent the rest of my life filled with hatred, bitterness, anger, self pity, and a desire for revenge, then they would have failed to kill the body and they would have killed the soul. I would be their permanent prisoner’ (Lapsley 1998: 757).

It was through his personal experiences of living in exile, recovering from a violent political attack, and counselling other survivors at the Trauma Centre, that Lapsley developed the epistemology that has since informed his subsequent healing work –that healing journeys must provide people with spaces where they can tell their personal stories and be genuinely heard and acknowledged, because this exchange enables emotional healing and the exorcising of painful feelings (Karakashain & Niyodusenga 2007: 9). Scott (1991) warns against such taking of personal experience as epistemology, raising experience to the level of truth because experience itself denotes interpretation. She ads when it is taken as the origin of knowledge, it makes experience the ‘bedrock of evidence on which explanation is built’ (1991: 777). Scott argues further that rather experience should be recognized as contingent and contextual and be given the opportunity to be contested, and not taken as fact. She goes further that it is only when experience is scrutinized in such a way that then it can be accepted as evidence (1991: 796). I agree with Scott that taking personal experience as fact should be approached with caution. I also recognize the need to base reconciliation methodologies on the direct experience of those who have been through violence so that methods are contextualized. This said, it is clear that reconciliation is not a process that can be formulaically applied across person-to-person and community-to-community. While the same HOM methodological components are applied across culture and context IHOM does acknowledge that it is only one method, applied ideally among many, and is not a one-stop solution for conflict or an individual.

Upon his return to South Africa, Lapsley concluded that all South Africans were ‘messed up’ by Apartheid, no matter whether they were victims, perpetrators, beneficiaries, or just bystanders (Lapsley 1997: 1). Gready explains that Archbishop Desmond Tutu, the Chair of the TRC, repeatedly articulated a similar view that all South Africans were victims of Apartheid, mar-
shalling *ubuntu* as his creed and arguing that dehumanizing relationships affect all partners to the relationship (TRC 1998; Tutu 1999 cited in Gready 2010: 167). Lapsley borrows from Karl Jasper’s notion of ‘four kinds of guilt: criminal, political, moral, and metaphysical’ (Lapsley 2000). Jasper’s ‘metaphysical guilt’, explained by Lapsley, refers to ‘the guilt that we share as part of the human family’. Therefore, for Lapsley, the collective ‘messed up’ arises in part from ‘all [South Africans] shar[ing] in a degree of complicity with Apartheid’. He goes further citing the worldwide anti-Apartheid movement as being called to action not only for victims’ sake but also for the sake of global humanity (Lapsley 1998: 755). While Lapsley, Tutu, and the TRC may be correct in this argument, it is essential to note that all South Africans have not been wounded or complicit in the same ways. Gready critiques this notion because of the long-term implications it has for both reconciliation and social change. He explains, ‘[i]nclusion on such terms embraces a moral relativism or balance in pursuit of short-term transitional accommodation, which undermines the prospects for longer-term structural or identity transformation’ (2010: 167).

With these convictions, and the awareness that the Truth Commission would offer a ‘story-telling’ space to people who had suffered or perpetrated severe human rights violations, Lapsley concluded that the majority of South Africans would be left out. Additionally, in disagreement with the opinion of the NP regime, namely that South Africans needed to forgive and forget, he believed South Africans needed to remember and speak their stories; he thus became a catalyst for the creation of healing opportunities for all South Africans, inspired by the opportunity to heal he had received by the generosity of those who helped him recover from the attack on his life (Lapsley 1997: 1). Through his work at the Trauma Centre and in the RR, Lapsley and his colleagues began to develop and advocate the methodology now known as ‘Healing of Memories’ (HOM), with the intention that it could be offered more widely than the rare opportunity to testify at the Truth Commission.

The first HOM workshops were held in 1995. Those who participated were members of the RR or were affiliated with the Trauma Centre (Ibid.). The workshops aimed to ‘facilitate reconciliation between racial groups and heal psychological wounds, making it possible for individuals to contribute effectively towards the reconstruction of South Africa’ (IHOM 2010a). The

---

6 Ubuntu is a philosophy of life originating from a Zulu antinomy, ‘A person is human being through other people’. ‘[T]hat is, my humanity is dependent on your humanity, I cannot be a human being alone’. From ‘Africa Is Not a Proverb’, (Ngũgĩ 2009: 48).

7 Of the 21,000 people who submitted statements to the TRC, only 2,000 were recognized as victims of gross violations of civil and political human rights violations and selected to testify (Gready 2010: 160). In relation to these decisions Mamdani asks the important question, ‘Could a “crime against humanity” that involved a racial and ethnic cleansing of the bulk of its population have only 20,000+ victims?’ (2002: 35).

8 This citation and others in similarly noted throughout refer to different sections of the IHOM website, a complete reference can be found in the final list.
methodology was grounded in two-day discussion forums, and small group personal narrative story-telling sessions. ‘Elements of autobiography workshops and creative art therapy methodologies were incorporated’ (Kayser-Whande 2000: 3). In 1996 and 1997 the TRC, through its Human Rights Violations Hearings, collaborated with the RR and Trauma Centre to offer HOM workshops (in the Western Cape) to support those who had testified and had been deemed to suffer from gross violations of human rights (Ibid.).

In 1998 as the TRC was moving toward closure, Lapsley founded, as a non-profit organization, the Institute for Healing of Memories (IHOM). The only major change to their mission was to work internationally. To date there mission is ‘[f]acilitating the healing process of individuals and communities in South Africa and internationally. Remembering the Apartheid years and healing the wounds. Redeeming the past by celebrating that which is life giving and laying to rest that which is destructive. Working in partnership with others who share our vision’ (IHOM 2010a). Their vision remains to be ‘to contribute to the healing journey of individuals, communities and nations’ (IHOM 2010e). The only major distinction in the new mission of IHOM was a commitment to offer its resources internationally, as well as within South Africa. Beginning in April 1998, IHOM offered its first workshop outside of the Western Cape, in New York City, largely for veterans of the American Civil Rights movement.

The HOM methodology is a healing and reconciliation intervention, designed to address legacies of violence. Their interventions are described as ‘a response to the emotional, psychological and spiritual wounds that are inflicted on nations, communities and individuals by wars, repressive regimes, human rights abuses and other traumatic events or circumstances’ (IHOM 2010b). To date the populations utilizing IHOM programs are as assorted as the geographical locations where they operate from Sweden to Haiti, averaging some form of activity in ten countries annually. They coordinate on-going programs in South Africa⁹ and the United States, and are developing on-going programs in Zimbabwe. They have also been offering programs for the last two consecutive years in Malawi and Zambia (IHOM 2007: 13).

2.2 IHOM Programs

Since expanding its geographical base, IHOM evaluates its program focuses every few years asking: ‘What is happening in our society? What are the challenges around healing and reconciliation?’ (M.L. personal interview 29 June 2010). In recent years this has led them, to focus on what Lapsley calls ‘contemporary realities’, including: working in prisons; HIV/AIDS; refugees; and xenophobia. As noted earlier Gready pronounces these same issues to be partly the result of ‘enduring structural legacies’ of Apartheid (2010: 1). Thus the

---

⁹ IHOM has offices in Cape Town (since 1998), and KwaZulu-Natal (since 2007), and operates programs in both provinces.
South African current program target populations include: those affected by HIV/AIDS, those affected by xenophobia, female refugees, prisoners and prison wardens (Interview M.L., June 29, 2010), anti-Apartheid struggle veterans and ex-combatants, township women, seminary students (who are predominantly White) and youth (in prisons and at schools) (IHOM 2007: 6-7; IHOM 2008: 14-16; IHOM 2009a: 7, 13). Their U.S. programs aim to work with indigenous peoples, military veterans, religious communities and prisoners10. Internationally they focus on survivors of war, terrorism and genocide, combatants and church members (IHOM 2009a 36-39).

2.3 Current South Africa Programs

Focus Meetings

Focus meetings occur several times a year to address current issues faced by specific communities. They are convened in a variety of locations (townships, Cape Town and in suburbs) to encourage diverse participation. While IHOM coordinates these meetings they are convened through their partnerships with NGOs who also work on the issue of focus. The meetings format includes an evening of public talk, usually by a local researcher or intellectual, facilitated small group discussions, and a plenary space for discussion and Q&A. Focus meetings purposes are broadly to develop collective knowledge, facilitate discussion and debates, and foster constructive problem-solving with communities. Focus meetings have covered issues of community violence (centring on youth and the vulnerability of women and children) and xenophobia.

The main objectives have been to (1) highlight and build trust between foreigners and South Africans, (2) contribute to community reconciliation by changing the attitudes of individual community members, (3) develop integrated strategies to address xenophobia (4) to initiate processes whereby local civil society organizations, community structures, migrant communities, local police stations and government can engage in ongoing dialogue, (5) reflect on the dynamics and issues that lead to community violence and (6) contribute to the understanding of the high levels of violent behaviour exhibited by the new generation (IHOM, Trauma Centre 2009; IHOM 2008). The strategies employed have included bringing foreigners and South Africans to HOM workshops, facilitating focus meetings and participating in community conversations11.

10 They also work with graduate students completing advanced degrees in Psychology, a shelter supporting disabled survivors of domestic violence, families affected by the 9/11 terrorist attacks, and those working in the NGO sector on a variety of social causes.

11 “Community Conversations” is another xenophobia intervention initiated by the Nelson Mandela Foundation.
Youth Development Program (YDP)

The YDP centres on human rights and peace education for young people, and is grounded in lessons about South Africa’s history of gross abuse of human rights. The program is carried out with the belief that although the South African youth of today are not old enough to have experienced Apartheid directly, it is important for them to understand its history and impact. The program teaches history and life skills in high schools and at youth camps; it also co-ordinates a youth peace academy mobilizing youth to contribute to transforming adverse social conditions. The program utilizes creative (theatre, song, multi-media, narrative story-telling) methods, reaching over 2,000 youth annually, (Karakashain & Niyodusenga 2007: 9) and trains dozens of youth facilitators.

The objectives of the YDP are to ‘raise the awareness of young South Africans about their country’s past of social and political segregation and oppression, and sensitize them to the impact that this has had on people. (To) improve the knowledge and understanding of young South Africans of the human rights abuses that occurred in the Apartheid years and the heroism of those who opposed it in order to bring about a democratic and peaceful society. (And lastly, to) motivate young South Africans to actively participate in shaping a society that upholds human rights, justice and equality for all, irrespective of race, culture, ethnic group, or religion’ (IHOM 2010d). The main participants in the youth program are recruited through high school engagements. The program teaches in schools serving all communities, so as to reach youth representative of South African society. They have continuously faced difficulty in gaining the attendance of white youth in their camps, but continue to work with them through in-school day programs. Most recently they have begun to pilot an adapted HOM workshop in youth prisons.

My findings show that IHOM’s current focus in South Africa is to provide programs that offer individuals and communities tools to address historical and current divisions in society (e.g. rooted in race and citizenship), and internalized and collective wounds resulting from legacies of violence. Their activities worldwide include the following five programmes:

(1) HOM three-day workshops are the core of IHOM activities. They provide safe, collective spaces for the telling and listening of life histories with an emphasis on exploring national and ancestral pasts. These workshops aim to allow participants to come to greater awareness of their histories, providing them with an increased emotional capacity to contribute positively to the health of themselves, as well as their families, communities, and nations. In KwaZulu-
Natal\textsuperscript{12} these programmes additionally include IHOM’s two year-old Healing Support Network;\textsuperscript{13}

(2) Facilitator trainings where peers are coached in offering the HOM model;

(3) Conferences, public events and religious sermons with the aims of influencing public discourse and contributing to knowledge-creation on issues related to their work, e.g. reconciliation, restorative justice, reparations, healing and legacies of violence;

In South Africa only: (4) Focus meetings, which are issue-driven, public community gatherings that bring together leading local intellectuals and various other community leaders to discuss challenges they face and brainstorm solutions.

And: (5) Youth Development Programs (YDP), offering human rights education for youth with a focus on learning from South Africa’s Apartheid past.

2.4 Conclusion

This chapter has shown that, from its early association with the TRC, and the days of South Africa’s transition from Apartheid to a multi-racial democracy, IHOM as an organization and its methods of intervention have expanded beyond their original remit to explore new dilemmas and conflicts emerging in post-Apartheid South African society and elsewhere. IHOM’s main healing and reconciliation intervention tool is its interdisciplinary Healing of Memories three-day workshops, which are facilitated by staff and trained facilitators in an increasing collection of countries. This intervention concentrates on supporting individuals, and at times communities, in facing their life histories in a holistic manner, by addressing their emotional pain and current life obstacles. Furthermore, it aims to assist participants to make connections between their historical life experiences (e.g. personal, generational and political) and their current life situations, and to equip participants with internalized emotional, communication and psychological tools to confront their challenges. This intervention is, however, usually offered as a one-time intervention\textsuperscript{14}.

\textsuperscript{12} KwaZulu Natal is a province in South Africa, which has the highest rates of HIV/AIDS and endured intense political violence during the transition from Apartheid.

\textsuperscript{13} Developed to provide long-term community healing support, the Network operates as a supplementary process to the workshops. It functions by providing past participants, who are leaders and involved in caring for others in their communities, with the opportunity to gain emotional and psychological resilience. In this way, the Network is meant to strategically extend healing resources into the larger community (IHOM 2009a: 30).

\textsuperscript{14} Participants are allowed to attend more than one workshop if they consider it to be helpful. But workshops are, in large part, offered to individuals on a one-time basis, even when IHOM
My on-going participation in IHOM activities during the duration of this project, and the testimonies I have gathered from past participants, lead me to conclude that HOM interventions produce durable, positive and deep impact for individuals. Resulting from my own participation, I have noticed enriched self-reflexivity and consciousness about how my past informs my present. I am therefore of the opinion that a geographically focused long-term HOM intervention strategy, perhaps similar to the newly launched Support Network in KwaZulu-Natal, could have a significantly more successful cohesive and strategic systemic impact at least on the communal level, than the standard short-term model is able to affect.

is providing workshops for one community (through an organization, township partnership, etc.) over the course of several years.
Chapter 3 Mapping Transformation and Conceptual Logics

3.0 Introduction to IHOM Concepts

The chapter illuminates and analyzes the language and conceptual frameworks that IHOM has developed to convey its beliefs and their corresponding meanings in order to fulfill their ultimate goal of ‘contributing to the healing journey of individuals, communities and nations’ (IHOM 2010e). Some of these concepts are clearly illustrated in the ‘Facilitators’ Guidelines: Healing of Memories Workshops’ (2005), while others are more present in their annual reports or Fr. Lapsley’s sermons, or have become apparent through my observation of IHOM programs. This IHOM discourse provides the foundation for understanding their methodology and practices.

I provide an overview of the conceptual frames and beliefs informing IHOM practitioners and situate IHOM’s discursive choices in larger debates about shared humanity and responsibility in relationship to violence. I aim to identify the problems and constraints of their discourse, as well as some of its strengths and weaknesses.

3.1 Sharing Humanity, Wounds & Responsibility

A key element in the journey of healing happens when we meet the full humanity of the other – discovering that in the deepest sense there is only “us” - we do share a common humanity (ML 2007: 32).

This can be read in contrast to the foundational concept of Apartheid—that human value derives not from being human but from the colour of one’s skin. The notion that the ‘human family’ by nature of being human is connected through a shared humanity is foundational to IHOM’s conceptual framework and underpins all of their further beliefs and practices. This notion is similar to that of ubuntu, a Zulu concept used widely in post Apartheid South Africa to promote reconciliation. The basic premise is that ‘my humanity is dependent on your humanity, I cannot be a human being alone’ (Ngugi 2009: 48), and that ‘individuals gain their humanity through their deep rootedness in community (Adonis 2008: 18).

Moreover, shared humanity is described by IHOM as having spiritual and moral character. Therefore, when humanity is violated, for example by enacting violence toward a group, there are spiritual and moral costs (IHOM 2008: 25). These costs and benefits are understood to be shared by all. Arising from this idea is the IHOM principal that ‘all people share responsibility for the past and therefore are responsible for dealing with it’ (IHOM 2010). By extension, successful methods to restore humanity will therefore be collective in nature and practice (IHOM 2005: 13).
Concepts of shared humanity are a part of established debates in fields such as philosophy and theology. For instance, that there are costs to one’s own humanity when taking one-sided violent action is a notion discussed by Hegel in the Lordship and Bondage section of his *Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807). Arendt, in conversation with Sartre, comments on this:

Sartre himself, in his *Critique of Dialectical Reason*, gives a kind of Hegelian explanation for his espousal of violence. ‘Aggression is the consequence of need in a world where “there is not enough for all.” Under such circumstances, violence is no longer a marginal phenomenon. Violence and counter-violence are perhaps contingencies, but they are contingent necessities, and the imperative consequence of any attempt to destroy this inhumanity is that in destroying in the adversary the inhumanity of the contraman, I can only destroy in him the humanity of man, and realize in me his inhumanity. Whether I kill, torture, enslave...my aim is to suppress his freedom—it is an alien force...’ (Arendt 1969: 90 Note 17).

Here Sartre argues that the motivation to victimize arises in people living in material scarcity. Violence, following this, is committed against others who are perceived as a threat. Thus, violence is seen by its executor as counter-violence against an anti-human other. By destroying the inhumanity in the other, the executor reaffirms the other’s humanity, and at the same time takes over the inhumanity that the other represented. This self-defeating aspect of violence is what IHOM takes up as its spiritual and moral costs.

Lastly, Fr. Michael and IHOM build on their notion of shared humanity to establish their ontology of shared responsibility. This connection is best shown in a speech Lapsley gave for Amnesty International where he once again illustrates Karl Jasper’s thinking on guilt.

Somebody made and sent me a letter bomb. They are criminally guilty together with the chain of command. South Africa’s political leaders passed unjust laws and created the environment in which torture, murder and mayhem flourished. They are politically guilty. The majority of white people voted for apartheid. They are morally guilty. All white people, even those who fought against it, benefited from it. Jaspers speaks also of metaphysical guilt, which we all share because we are part of the same human family. The last night that it was possible to get amnesty under the Truth Commission process, a small group of [Black] young people approached the Commission. They asked that they should be given amnesty for apathy. They made the point that all Black people suffered under Apartheid and struggled to endure it. It was left to a minority to fight against it. All people share responsibility for the past of their countries and all people have a responsibility for creating a different kind of future (Lapsley 2000).

This passage makes clear Lapsley’s position that the way to be accountable to the responsibility for shared humanity is to become active citizens, using his own personal experience as a victim of political violence. The application of metaphysical guilt is used to allocate guilt to all South Africans, in this case via apathy, which allowed abuse to continue. Lapsley distributes different types of guilt for different groups of citizens. Within this distribution, the responsibility
for Apartheid is allocated to all citizens – without any discussion of how the power location of each group may differentiate the level of guilt and responsibility.

3.2 Identity Positions

As mentioned in chapter two, operating within discourses of ‘victim’ and ‘perpetrator’ has significant political, social and reconciliatory consequences, not to mention legal ones. The application of this categorization and word choice bears consequences on intra and interpersonal relations, and often fails to capture the multiplicity of subjectivities flexibility for agency the user may intend. Therefore, discursively framing subjects of violations and victimization is always a difficulty. Michel Foucault explained how discourse is a constructed power-knowledge regime that determines the rules and conventions the subject is produced within. In turn, this ‘produced subject’ is applied to the discourse itself. Subjects are produced to personify the specific forms of knowledge the discourse creates, according to particular historical contexts (Hall 1997: 55-56). So, not only is language or word choice itself a constraint to our ability to acknowledge and convey complexity, and actualize intended outcomes, but these choices operate within us; they produce and are themselves produced by established, regulatory discourses, which further determine the limits of both the production of knowledge and meaning.

IHOM’s core work, as stated earlier, is to contribute to healing within the context of legacies of violence for individuals, communities and nations throughout the world. To this end, their work centres in the realm of victimization and its discourses. Lapsley outlines how he perceives this realm in a speech at Stellenbosch University, where he recalls another speech he gave there in 1994:

‘I was taken to task for talking about the period between 1948 and 1994. I was reminded that from 1899 to 1902, we [Afrikaner] were the victims and now we [Afrikaner] are the victims once more...In my experience, many of us [humans] are very clear about the ways in which we are victims but very hazy about the ways in which we are perpetrators. Whenever I have to face myself as a perpetrator, then I have to deal with guilt and shame – Denial becomes a tempting option. …Some have asked the question, would South Africa’s history have been different if there had been a TRC at the end of the South African war of 1899 – 1902 – if we had been able to face the truth not just of what was done to the Afrikaner people but also to countless Black people. Of course that is not far enough back. Have we truly faced what slavery did to us? Some are beginning to look at how communities in the Western Cape have experienced gratuitous violence without interruption down through the centuries. What would it mean for Stellenbosch to truly face that it is a town and an economy built by slaves?’ (Lapsley: 2009)

The term victim denotes the occurrence of harm, lack of agency and an inability to defend. The juxtaposing terms, victimizer/perpetrator, imply aggressor, possessing agency and power. As these three quotations demonstrate,
IHOM often discusses these subjects, but rarely does so providing explicit context and analysis as to who these subjects are. In this way these subjects are not confined to a deterministic category (e.g. Black, poor, female victim), but it is also left to the listener to envision the particularities of the context, which poses the dangerous risk of stereotyping and simplifying reality to the realm of the individual.

In South Africa it is clear that persistent poverty and the fragmentation of kinship and family relations found today is the direct result of a system of institutionalized racism (Ramphela 2000: 103; Adonis 2008: 8). So while IHOM’s discourse does mention enduring legacies of Apartheid (poverty and family neglect), the structures of power responsible for this reality are disregarded. Speaking at Stellenbosch, Father Michael makes the case for the need for clarifying and confronting the perpetrator position. I agree with him that it is key to provide the listener the opportunity to confront his own subject position, and history, but I would add that the reader could better consider their own subject position if the discourse were less ambiguous about who victims and perpetrators are. Lapsley’s use of ‘we’ and ‘us’ lends ambiguity to the identity of the subject. Clarity could be added to the victim/perpetrator categories by the naming of concrete characteristics and actions, both inhumane and humane.

Lapsley uses the terms victim, survivor and victor to refer to the arc of the journey that the HOM participants should encounter. The term victor, which Lapsley uses in referring to himself, is meant to convey the triumph of surviving and re-gaining agency as a subject– an actor in the world again, victorious. This story arc is often told through Fr. Michael’s personal journey (IHOM 2007: 33). The use of the term victor inevitably reaffirms the discourse of victim and perpetrator, as it cannot exist without those categorizations.

IHOM’s ontological notion that ‘everyone has the capacity to become victim and/or perpetrator’ is explained to have emerged through their work of listening to the pain of the human family. This ontological position that we are all ‘capable of being both victim and victimizer’ is expanded on by the recognition that no location is fixed, a notion that allows for multiple subject positions to exist simultaneously within an individual. Lapsley illustrates this concept through an anecdote of a freedom fighter’s (someone who struggled against Apartheid) experience at a workshop.

He told us that he did not want to speak about the heroism but rather about that of which he was ashamed. The stereotype of just being a hero had not allowed him to be the complex human being that we all are – living with contradiction and ambivalence– capable of being a fighter for justice, bystander, perpetrator and victim to varying degrees – sometimes all at the same time (IHOM 2007: 31).

Also commenting on the flexibility of subject positions, Madoda Gcwadi, a long-time HOM facilitator, about recent work in the United States, remarks, ‘We all need healing, big time. Young and old, rich and poor, slaves and masters, we all need healing of memories. We all have issues. The U.S. trip taught
me that there is a great need for healing of memories worldwide’ (IHOM 2009a: 33).

In my opinion reconciliation intervention methodologies need to adequately address the complexities and challenges of the politics of location: a subject’s location within the hierarchies of structured power\(^\text{15}^\). This is important, as the location where one is situated by power in part defines the space within which one can negotiate wellbeing, in terms of access to education, health care, adequate housing, etc. Madoda’s reflection points to IHOM’s universalist and equalizing belief that ‘all are wounded’ and ‘all share some level of guilt’, a notion that, in disregarding the actor’s position within the hierarchies of structured power, risks assigning the same levels of guilt, victimhood and therefore, responsibility to divergent subjects.

To be clear, what I am arguing here is that a focus on participants’ locations will further assist them to enter a process of reconciliation. This explicit space of acknowledgement would allow participants to genuinely represent themselves and reflect on their subject positions in relation to the conflict they face. Further providing opportunities for participants to confront their own roles and responsibilities in relation to their differing locations relative to power. Successful framing and implementation of such an acknowledgement would further support all participants to move deeply toward understanding themselves and those they are to reconcile with. Ideally it will also inform participants’ further actions, where ‘a broadening of the reconciling lens [moves from] ‘me and my future’ to ‘we and our future’ (O’Connor cited in Villa-Vicencio 2006: 75), thereby creating the space for actors to address obstacles to reconciliation (e.g. issues of restitution) at multiple levels in their lives. Unsuccessful attempts risk disregarding and denying the experience and positions of some participants, favoring others and perhaps even leading to re-victimization.

Lastly, referring to IHOM’s work with survivors of post-Apartheid political violence living with HIV/AIDS in KwaZulu-Natal, Lapsley states, ‘We also came to see very clearly that for many people there was multiple woundedness. That you could frame a workshop in a particular way, but what people brought may be much wider and have many levels and layers to it’ (Lapsley personal interview 29 June 2010).

The IHOM views of ‘multiple wounding’ and the presence of multiple subject positions simultaneously are in agreement with Avery Gordon’s (1997) argument about ‘complex personhood’:

\[E\]ven those who live in the most dire circumstances possess a complex and often times contradictory humanity and subjectivity that is never adequately

\(^{15}\) Among the characteristics that situate ones correlation to hierarchies of power are: race, ethnicity, class, gender and religion etc.
glimpsed by viewing them as victims or, on the other hand, as superhuman agents. …Complex personhood means that all people...remember and forget, are beset by contradiction, and recognize and misrecognize themselves and others. Complex personhood means people suffer graciously and selfishly too, get stuck in the symptoms of their troubles, and also transform themselves. Complex personhood means that even those called “Other” are never that (Gordon 1997: 4-5).

Navigating the minefield of discourse is never a simple path, especially when meaning and representation are open to interpretation. Similarly, constructing frameworks that motivate multiple conflicting parties to participate, while also establishing safe spaces inviting deep sharing, is a hugely challenging task. This thorough analysis of IHOM’s foundational discourse uncovered how reconciliation is conceptualized, and allowed for a critical review of its challenges and strengths. The review found that IHOM’s approach rests on the assumptions that the human family has a universal, shared humanity that can be harmed, which implicates a shared responsibility for abuses of humanity.

3.3 Cycles of Violence

Intergenerational trauma is what confronts many countries after years of conflict with generations of youth holding onto the experiences of their parents. In South Africa [today] you find some youth that are angry with other groups because of what was experienced by their parents. It is an experience that we should acknowledge but also not allow it to imprison us and cloud the way we view other people (IHOM 2009a: 23).

The above excerpt is from a report by IHOM’s Youth Development Program manager, Themba Lonzi, describing how he sees the transference of trauma generationally. In speaking about how to address legacies and cycles of violence, Father Lapsley often discusses a notion of cycles of victims becoming victimizers, and the role that the retention and passing on of ‘destructive memory’ from generation to generation plays in sustaining this cycle. What is meant by destructive memory is stories that carry negative emotions such as bitterness and desires for revenge. Lapsley highlights that the releasing of emotional harm is key to breaking cycles of victimization: ‘[o]ften the community of victims holds on to the memory of what happened whilst those who benefited and even more, their descendants, remain blissfully ignorant of what happened’ (Lapsley 200916). In my view, these challenges of responsibility have to do with official, social and personal truth silencing. Pouligny adds that communities of victims ‘are long afterwards burdened by the scars of violence, leaving them even more vulnerable to manipulation on the part of the perpetrators of violence’ (2005: 15).

---

16 There is no page number on this citation or others like it as they refer to speeches with unclear page numbers. A full reference is included in the reference list.
Similarly, Lapsley warns, when people with power carry these harms there is a greater likelihood of mass victimization (Lapsley 2000). When discussing cycles of violence, differing variations of the quotation below are often to be found in IHOM documentation:

One of our wise and great leaders [referring to South African, Chief Albert Lutuli] once said, “Those who think of themselves as victims eventually become the victimizers of others.” Often someone who has been badly treated is not able to get at the perpetrator. Instead they take it out on those who are close to them and weaker than them whether in the form of emotional, physical or sexual abuse (Lapsley 2000). In conflicts, often both sides assert that they are the real victims (IHOM 2006: 25).

This passage explicitly talks about the belief that victims often go on to become victimizers, referring to a causal relationship between the two, much as Lapsley said when he alluded to Afrikaner attitudes toward the British in his speech at Stellenbosch. This idea of intergenerational transmission of abuse emerged in psychology in the 1970s, and according to Falshaw rests on ‘Social Learning Theory’ (citing Bandura, 1973, 1977) as a basis. Social Learning Theory suggests that behavior is learnt through observation and experience. The premise is that one will repeat, react or work through experiences of violence. Parallel to the idea of transfer of violence is the idea of transgenerational transfer of trauma. The theories argue along similar lines to IHOM’s notion of destructive memory wounding subsequent generations. Theories of transfer of transgenerational trauma have (Adonis 2008) been introduced within the context of transitional justice in South Africa. The references to Afrikaner history of marginalization is again a case in point: ‘In South Africa, a conversation with an Afrikaner does not have to continue for very long before there is reference to the concentration camps invented by the British during the South African war of 1899 to 1902’ (Lapsley 2006: 25).

I found several authors who agree that the presence of destructive emotions carried in memory or knowledge assist in transmitting trauma. Das (2000: 221) makes a distinction between ‘traumatic memory’ referring to one’s memory of experiencing a horror, and ‘poisonous knowledge’ arising from witnessing horror. Furthermore Pouligny explains how denial or suppression of a process of truth recovery and official acknowledgement displace the narrative(s) of abuse, not only in the public realm but also the in the private. If such a healing process is denied, she says, ‘the story fails to find a permanent space in society, thus remaining absent from the individual stories as well as from the collective history. …[And] the process of transmission to the next generation is then handicapped (2005: 10).

To conclude, IHOM’s position that trauma resulting from violent experiences is passed on through destructive emotions retained through memory is, at least, a broadly purported theory. The notion that victims often become victimizers has been widely studied in the context of domestic and adolescent violence, but has been unable to establish clear determining factors that facilitate such a repetitious cycle. An important concern noted is that to purport that victims tend to become victimizers is an essentializing and deterministic
position, which severely limits the victim-subject’s agency, at least through the power of discourse.

3.5 Concluding Conceptual Reflections

In conclusion, it was found that IHOM’s healing and reconciliation interventions rest on the ontological position and conceptual framework originating from their unifying notion that the entire ‘human family’ is connected through a shared humanity. This ‘shared humanity’ is not explicitly discussed, but remains in the abstract. It rests on the assumption that all people are responsible for humanity and thus carry the moral and spiritual costs and benefits resulting from their actions. Further, IHOM believes that everyone has the capacity to become a victim or victimizer, and regardless of which of these position(s) one holds, wounding occurs.

What was found to be most problematic about IHOM’s use of this unifying notion is their failure to situate this ethos within the context in which they are applying it. More specifically, IHOM does not concretely attribute humanity’s woundedness to the institutionalized, racialized hierarchy, which has determined peoples’ access to power and the degree to which violence would be wielded upon them. IHOM’s conception of all South Africans as wounded, and all capable of being victim or victimizer, implies that all hold the same responsibility toward humanity, and pay the same costs and receive the same benefits from them. This understanding put into practice risks universalizing experiences of victimhood and perpetration, and at worse creates obstacles for participants to gain awareness and take responsibility for example, for offering reparations and for calling for them.

Finally, IHOM believes that cycles of violence are maintained intergenerationally through the retention and passing on of ‘destructive emotions,’ through memory and narrative story. Literature reviewed was largely in agreement with IHOM’s views, especially in terms of destructive emotions being a key point of action, and the acknowledgement of ‘multiple woundedness’. Weaknesses were found in the interpretation of the framing of cycles of violence as victims becoming victimizers, which can be seen as determining subject positions. Also limitations were found concerning a lack of clear presentation of the politics of location, which leaves out an analysis of how the location in relation to power differentiates guilt and responsibility. This ambiguity has the potential to marginalize participants and lose the opportunity to adequately challenge participants’ subject positions, attitudes, and assumptions. Lastly, attention was brought to the role of the transmission of destructive emotions and the un-silencing of narratives, and how these processes need more widespread attention in order to sustainably address trauma, healing and reconciliation.
Chapter 4 IHOM: Linking Methodology and Practices?

4.0 How to Heal

Now that I have analyzed IHOM’s central conceptual logics, this chapter will critically reflect on their thinking about how reconciliation and healing can take place. Each section of this chapter engages with a different methodological moment IHOM outlines as a step along a healing of memories journey: collective process, memory work, acknowledgement, truth, forgiveness and nation-building. Where possible their methodology is illustrated with an example of their practice and is juxtaposed with broad theoretical fields addressing transitional justice. This supports the examination of IHOM’s practices in relationship to their methodology, and further explores the relationship between this local methodology and the needs of larger projects of societal reconstruction.

4.1 The Collective Process & Challenges of Framing

[Reconciliation] is about the complex business of real people engaging one another in the quest of life (Villa-Vicencio 2006: 68).

This section examines the ‘Introduction’ to the Facilitators Guidelines HOM manual, which explains IHOM’s reasons for employing a relational-based methodology. Additionally, the obstacles to reconciliation expressed in this passage are critically analyzed.

The introduction first posits the IHOM and TRC belief that, ‘every person has been hurt and damaged by Apartheid’, and because of this hurt, ‘[f]or healing, South Africans need to remember their hurts, tell their stories, and be accepted/ respected/ listened to’. The manual argues that the process of deep telling and listening helps to further ‘our journey towards peace and reconciliation’, asserting that there is a ‘need to establish the truth about our history’ and to ‘help people to become reconciled’. This is underscored by saying that a healthy society cannot be founded on lies and rather ‘requires mutual trust and understanding’ (IHOM 2005b: 6).

As noted in earlier chapters, it is a widely-held opinion in the field of transitional justice that societal reconstruction necessitates truth-telling and acknowledgement. Moreover, the TRC proclaimed that each South African has a responsibility to help reconcile society and the nation (Villa-Vicencio & Du Toit 2006: ii).

The introduction mentions specific obstacles to reconciliation. These include: ‘fright’, ‘lies’, lack of forensic and narrative truth, not listening, lack of sharing of one’s story, ignorance of one another, and ‘prejudice’. It is import-
ant to note that the majority of items on this list suggest that the obstacles to reconciliation are located at the individual level, inferring firstly, that structural obstacles no longer exist and secondly, that individuals not only have the responsibility but also the power to reconcile society. According to this logic, South Africans participating in reconciliation interventions such as HOM will transform their own prejudices and help more people to do the same, thereby enabling individuals, communities, and society to overcome the barriers to reconciliation.

While I agree that individual obstacles do exist in post-Apartheid South Africa, are significant, and need to be confronted as a part of any reconciliation intervention, I believe that IHOM’s methods would benefit from additionally applying a deeper focus on the entrenched structural legacies of Apartheid (enduring gross social and economic inequality, geographic segregation, violent crime, to name a few) and the longstanding unresolved issues of the TRC (most notably community reparations and prosecutions).

Structural obstacles continue to shape the everyday experiences of South Africans, framing their relations, experiences of the past and present, and imaginaries of the future. An analysis of these existing barriers, and acknowledgement of where any particular healing and reconciliation intervention is situated in relation to them, is necessary for a successful reconciliation effort. The need to address these issues became apparent during my participation in a three-day HOM workshop with ‘struggle veterans’ of the anti-Apartheid movement. Before the group of fifty was able to move forward with the program, the lead facilitator had to respond to the participants’ exhaustive questions about outstanding reparations. This material issue proved as meriting of attention as the participants’ psychological needs.

4.2 Destructive and Redemptive Memory

At the centre of the HOM methodology is a focus on the intra-psychic locations of interlocked memory and emotion, as IHOM determines this to be where the experience of wounding is retained, and therefore where the greatest potential and need for transformation lies.

This internal process is expressed by IHOM as ‘deep positive vomiting’ (IHOM 2006: 23), and it is this intra-psychic release that is understood will assist in breaking cycles of transgenerational transference of trauma. This quotation from Antjie Krog speaks to the power that can arise from vocalizing paralyzing pain. A ‘particular memory at last captured in words can no longer haunt you, push you around, bewilder you, because you have taken control of it’ (Krog cited in Villa-Vicencio 2006: 70). Successfully bringing people to this location, and providing them with tools to transform emotions and re-view them through a different lens, is the aim of the HOM methodology and prac-
The methodology distinguishes between two kinds of memory: destructive and redemptive.

Destructive memory – memory that fuels conflict from one generation to another – memory that has poison connected to it. Grandparents teach their grandchildren how to hate – they tell the stories, they remember and there is poison connected to the memory (IHOM 2007: 30).

Redemptive memories are those that have been ‘redeemed’ of harmful emotions. The notion of redeeming memory is distinct from ideas of forgetting: ‘It is not a matter of forgetting, since the mere act of forgetting one’s pain is impossible. It is a matter of remembering, but with other eyes’ (IHOM 2007: 21). IHOM believes that memories of pain and suffering from legacies of violence are not only difficult to forget, but also important to remember and learn from (IHOMe; IHOM 2005b: 6). This is confirmed in transitional justice literature, as ‘reconciliation is a new beginning that often reconfigures the past in quest for the future’ (Villa-Vicencio 2006: 68).

One of the first techniques that HOM employs during its workshops is an emotionally-triggering drama. Recalling the first time she was a participant seven years ago, M.T. explains:

It was an awakening for me. At the end of the drama I was shedding tears more than all the participants because it particularly spoke to my story, my situation, my feelings. Everything that had happened to me as an individual. I said to myself God how did I find myself here. …I made myself the number one participant. And I said to myself this is what I have needed all along in my life (Interview August 31, 2010).

Thus the methodology for releasing deeply embedded suffering is to consciously allow the emotion and memory to gain tangible form in the present, where it can be exorcised through the process of it being expressed, witnessed and released through a re-visioning.

4.3 The Roles of Knowledge and Acknowledgement

Knowledge and acknowledgement are understood to play important roles in post-conflict transitions relating to the relief of victims and in terms of political stability. Both are widely discussed in relation to how truth operates in TJ literature. Knowledge is described as forensic or factual truth (Borer 2006: 22; Gready 2010: 20), which is argued to have a monopoly on producing the past. Narrative truth is seen to contrast this by having the aim of ‘healing or affirming the dignity of victims and survivors’, and in this way is found to resemble acknowledgement (Wilson cited in Borer 2006: 22). Gready expounds on this distinction, attributing it to Thomas Nagel (Aspen Institute 1989) and pointing out that some widely known truths are forced into ‘private memory’ by their official denial. Once officially acknowledged, painful experiences are affirmed, converting such private knowledge into ‘social memory’ and factual,
sanctioned truth. He continues that this kind of acknowledgement reorganizes unequal relations of power, healing the breaches in memory and truth (Gready 2010: 20).

According to IHOM, general knowledge (described as collective memory above) of an issue or problem is of reciprocal importance. For example, if there has been an official acknowledgment of fault and a commitment to advancing reconciliation, but yet there is a lack of general awareness of a problem, particular truth-telling obstacles arise (IHOM 2007: 31). In these situations, there is a risk that the very group whose truth has been suppressed could feel this acknowledgement is unwarranted. Or another option might be that acknowledgement could be interpreted as political favouritism. Either scenario increases the need for further interventions to secure political forgiveness.

HOM foremost provides opportunities for participants to break through a lack of acknowledgement and challenge themselves with this fresh knowledge. This quotation from an interview with a facilitator expresses one experience of this break-through:

When I first told my story – I hadn’t gone so deep, and hadn’t realized how painful it was for me. I couldn’t talk about it. The way my family was destroyed, and we lost everything. The first time you go... you cry, and you can’t talk. …The more I went I can now talk. I am not going to be a prisoner of past experience. I can’t change it (Interview A. N. August 2010).

Knowledge and acknowledgement are understood by both IHOM and transitional justice as central components to transformations, whether at the personal, communal, or at a more macro scale. These processes are not linear or prescriptive, although it is usually accepted that knowledge and acknowledgement begin the process.

4.4 Truth/Expression

"Those who say “forget the past, it’s time to move on” do not appreciate that the past continues to be a companion on the journey until it is faced and brought to consciousness and given expression in one way or another – then people can begin to lay it to rest' (IHOM Tutu 2006: 2).

Central to the conceptual framework and methodology of HOM is the idea that the past can never be simply forgotten, erased, and that it shouldn’t be. Rather, in order to begin a process of healing destructive parts of lived-experiences, there need to be opportunities afforded for confrontation, witnessing and expression. Central to the HOM method is the creation of safe and confidential ‘sacred space’ (Kayser-Whande 2005: 28) at three-day retreats. It is at HOM retreats that a narrative truth-telling method is employed. One aspect of this method is a daylong small group session, aimed to provide a caring space and create a sense of community, by allowing participants to recount their lives for forty-five minutes while the group listens. This space, pro-
vided to everyone, including facilitators, affords an opportunity to reflect and share deeply, perhaps as never before. For many whose daily life is consumed with the entrenched structural legacies of Apartheid, this in itself has a profound impact (personal interview M.T. 2010; L. 2010).

Both IHOM and TJ emphasize the importance of truth-telling in processes of societal reconstruction.

There is a saying that justice cannot be founded on lies and the same is true for human society, which requires mutual trust and understanding. Once we know the truth, we can begin to put the past behind us and move with hope towards a peaceful future (IHOM 2005b: 5 emphasis added).

What is questionable here is the assertion of ‘the truth’, inferring one truth. The notion of a singular truth challenges the existence of subjectivity and complex personhood, which I understand IHOM to embrace in its practice. Explicit assertions of the existence of multiple truths, especially in relation to narrative truth, can also be found in IHOM literature. For instance, ‘everyone has a story – a truth – to tell’ (IHOM 2010f). From my observation of IHOM workshops, they appear to embrace multiple viewpoints rather than pushing any singular one.

4.5 Forgiveness?

This section explores the role forgiveness is given in healing journeys by IHOM and more broadly points to roles it is seen to take in approaches to transitional justice. The act of forgiving is commonly associated with both healing and reconciliation. IHOM associates processes of forgiveness with reconciliation in general, and with the journey of healing of memories itself.

The TRC was criticized for emphasizing the Christian model of confession, repentance and forgiveness (Adonis 2008: 24). From within the Commission, critiques have included that this approach facilitated a ‘dogmatic and absolutist’ lens, in effect de-historicizing the roles of actors in the conflict (TRC, Malan 5: 442). One outside view has been that this approach risks ‘mistakenly equating forgiveness of past enemies with reconciliation’ (Hamber & van der Merwe 1998: 1). As stated in earlier chapters, forgiveness is now being recognized as a political construct (Adonis 2008: 13). Adonis points to Daye’s assertion that reparations are essential to political forgiveness, along with his likening of ‘the process of political forgiveness to an unfolding drama’, whose constituent acts include: ‘truth-telling; apology and claiming of responsibility; building a transitional justice framework; finding ways to heal; and finally embracing forgiveness’ (Adonis 2008: 17). Daye’s (2004) drama clearly demonstrates that the concept of forgiveness has now begun to be applied well beyond inter-personal forgiveness, where conceptions of the act were originally confined.
IHOM’s interventions are situated within this broad process but remain focused on how forgiveness operates on the personal level. IHOM’s literature and my observation show that they are sensitive to promoting forgiveness as prescriptive, or necessary for healing or reconciliation. They do not recognize healing and reconciliation to be dependent on acts of forgiving, and at the same time acknowledge that, for some, forgiving can be a way to healing. Within the method of HOM it is emphasized that, when initiating healing processes, participants must lead, and facilitators are not to push any advice or one path to healing (such as a necessity of forgiveness), especially when participants’ deepest need is for their pain to be heard and acknowledged (IHOM 2009a: 38).

IHOM agrees with Daye’s (2004) view that justice, restitution and reparation are an important part of journeys of forgiveness. Lapsley clarified his view of the role of these restorative acts in a sermon at St. Paul’s Cathedral, in London, by associating the freedom of individuals, communities and nations with acts of reparation and restitution. This shows a universalizing position that an individual is not free if they have not restored balances with those they have harmed, including themselves (IHOM 2007: 33). This moral argument demonstrates that within the ethos of IHOM, freedom is seen as dependant on justice and reconciling. In this ethos, forgiveness, although not a temporal requirement, when acted on is viewed as an empowering act of taking responsibility for how the past relates to the present and future one desires. In this way we see that while IHOM’s approach to forgiveness relates to broader projects of political forgiveness, as described by Daye (2004), IHOM’s role is centred on the individual’s healing journeys.

4.6 ‘Nation-Building’

In IHOM’s discourse, the ultimate ambition of successful healing and reconciliation is referred to as becoming whole, and as ‘nation-building’: ‘becoming a participant in the life of the nation,’ (IHOM 2005: 20); no longer being ‘an object of history but a subject once more’ (IHOM 2007: 33); ‘building a reconciled society’ (IHOM 2009a: 18) and finally ‘shaping a country that upholds human rights, justice and equality’ (IHOM 2009a: 22). These descriptions of nation-building pose it as a concept, which centres on repairing society and the nation. Furthermore, IHOM’s logic denotes that individuals and communities who are not reconciled but are, rather, divided within themselves or are in conflict with others cannot (fully) participate in the project of national repair. In fact, people in this position could be a danger to nation-building.

Here we see the link between nation-building and IHOM’s foundational concepts of shared humanity and responsibility. It is inferred that the journey of healing and reconciliation is, ultimately, an act of nation-building, moving from the individual level outward to the societal and national.
4.7 Conclusion

This chapter examined key concepts in HOM methodology and practices of healing and reconciliation. Many of these concepts are central to the broader field of transitional justice, including encounters of the Other as necessary parts of reconciliation interventions; knowledge and acknowledgement as central components to conflict transformation; and lastly, the value of ‘memory work’ and narrative truth.

Amongst all of these similarities and shared conceptions we can find a significant silence in terms of future vision, meaning and what kind of societal transformation is needed. This lack strikes me as a missing element in transitional justice discourse and practice.

Furthermore, I believe that if any of these processes are undertaken without confronting the presence and operation of structured, ordered, power, and the institutions which sustain it, only limited transformation can occur. To share suffering or fault, and be caringly witnessed, can provide important but limited relief. Without analysis and vision about what needs to be cleansed beyond individually-held emotions, embedded structural factors will continue to perform, enabling more violence and the transference of transgenerational suffering.

These critiques could be addressed by providing participants with opportunities to confront the ways they understand, internalize, and perform society’s ordered hierarchies. Additionally, IHOM, and transitional justice interventions could strive to articulate visions for post-reconstruction societies. If we are going to be so idealistic as to talk about ending a cycle of violence that spans generations, then we need to think and talk seriously about what it will take for societies to be constructed in such ways that tools are embedded and distributed within it to help confront dehumanizing elements.
Chapter 5 To Conclude

This research was involved in illuminating the Institute for Healing of Memories logics, methods and practices as they relate to their healing and reconciliation work and transitional justice concepts. It situated this case in the broader field of transitional justice. The study found that at the heart of the Institute’s work is an interdisciplinary workshop utilizing a narrative-truth telling method focused on addressing the destructive emotional residues people carry from experiences of violence. The methodology aims to assist participants to make connections between their historical life experiences (e.g. personal, generational and political) and their current life situations. In the hope of instilling participants with internalized emotional, communication and psychological tools to confront their challenges. While their stated aim is to impact individuals along with scales of community and nation, IHOM was found to largely operate at the individual level. Here their focus is to address intrapsychic wounding, and at the relational level to address interpersonal and communal wounding. A remarkable focus of the methodology is its emphasis on the heart and not the mind. In the HOM workshops the focus is on triggering, being with, and expressing emotion through a diversity of methods. The objective is to become present to emotions and memory that may be driving much of ones everyday but are normally hidden from awareness. In South Africa this work has been situated around racial reconciliation, developing parallel to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. My participation in IHOM activities, and my interviews with facilitators and past participants proved to me that this methodology can have a lasting and deep impact. Personally it has left me with months of reflexive thinking and feeling. As a result of their emphasis on encouraging participants to bring their whole selves to the process, my participation has given me insight into more of my past than I normally consider relevant to my present.

While IHOM’s interventions are largely focused at the individual level and in some ways strategically impact communities, by their selection of participants and consistent work with some community leaders. The intervention is mainly a one-time interaction. This limitation brings into question the Healing of Memories methodology’s ability to impact structural violence and reach their goals of strongly influencing communal and national reconciliation. An investigation of what impact HOM has, and how HOM could better support participants to successfully address the structural obstacles (i.e. entrenched racial segregation, community violence, extreme poverty etc.) to healing and reconciliation will be important in making IHOM’s ambitions a tangible reality.

It was found that IHOM believes that cycles of violence are maintained intergenerationally through the retention and passing on of ‘destructive emotions,’ through memory and narrative story. Literature reviewed about transgenerational transmissions and social suffering tended to agree with this assessment, and also locates harmful emotions in memory. The current successes
of the methodology in the face of the stacked obstacles it provides relief from, pushes me to wonder if HOM could be implemented as part of an on-going intervention would it be able to impart intra-psychic reflective and organizing skills to participants in ways that more dramatically affect social change? Although this was not the aim of this research, these considerations have been present. Further, I was able to conclude from this study that while my experience has made me deeply aware of the value in the HOM method, it has also made clear these challenges. In order to more thoroughly address the cycles of wounding HOM is concerned with, I conclude, a strategic implementation of on-going interventions, perhaps such as the newly attempted Support Network in KwaZulu-Natal would create a better container for the maximum benefit and ambition of the Healing of Memories method to be realized.

The focus of this research has been the conceptualization of the largely illusory concepts of healing and reconciliation. This illusiveness and the varied ways these processes are interpreted, are, in many ways part of the struggle of IHOM and this study. IHOM’s conceptual logic was found to rest on the universalizing idea that the ‘human family shares a common humanity,’ a position that finds resonance in a wide variety of cultures and literature from ubuntu, to Sartre. It is from this notion of ‘oneness’ that all of their further thinking and method derives. Namely, that everyone has the capacity to become a victim or victimizer. Further, that regardless of which of these positions (or both) one holds, wounding occurs and I infer from this, conversely, benefits occur. What I find to arise as most problematic from my discursive analysis of the ways in which this logic is articulated in IHOM texts is how a denial of difference and power can occur by applying this unifying notion. Such an inference lends itself to encouraging a thought process that denies responsibility. This application can become particularly challenging, as IHOM does not explicitly attribute humanity’s ‘woundedness’ to the institutionalized hierarchies, which determine peoples’ access to power and the degree to which violence is wielded upon them. Their ontology was found to be similar to the discourse of the TRC, namely that all South Africans are wounded, and all are capable of being victim or victimizer, what is inferred from this universalizing view is that all hold the same responsibility toward humanity, and pay the same costs, therefore receiving the same benefits from them as well. These conceptual operations, while helping to facilitate an open terrain for participants in HOM to engage with one another, also risks denying the extreme differences in South African’s experiences and blurring awareness, and thus ability to transform the prolonged structural elements reinforcing violence.

Additionally, a lack of clear presentation was found concerning the politics of location. This lack of explicit acknowledgement leaves out an analysis of how ones location in relation to power differentiates guilt and responsibility. This ambiguity, similar to the universalization of the notion of shared humanity, creates the potential to marginalize participants and minimizes their opportunity to adequately challenge their subject positions, attitudes, and assumptions about themselves and ‘others’. In my opinion this can create barri-
ers to reconciliation, especially when one considers, as IHOM does, for example that any process of forgiveness involves restitution.

The focus of HOM’s methodology is to make participants viscerally aware of the emotions held in memory that inform their personal view of their lives, so that participants can take control of these emotions and choose to re-vision their past, present and future. This attention to narrative-truth clearly situates the HOM method within the practices of transitional justice. Their approach emphasizes the necessity for the exploration of narrative when re-constructing societies, as noted in transitional justice literature. The success IHOM has in articulating and facilitating these kinds of explorations was found to be the strength of their healing logics and practices.

The heart of this intervention is the practice of supporting individuals, and at times communities in facing their life histories in a holistic manner, by addressing their emotional pain and current life obstacles. Ideally the effect of these one-time interventions is to seed deeply wounded communities with individuals more capable of breaking out of the chain of violence and oppression by having participated in healing of memories. Perhaps this occurs when the challenges in discourse that I have highlighted above are not found to be obstacles for individuals or participant groups. What is left to be understood is how well one-time participants can help others to shift and develop their emotions and lives in a manner that can cause themselves and their society and community to care for it-self, unify and heal.
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Appendices

Appendix 1 Field Work Interview Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of interviewee</th>
<th>Profession /Function</th>
<th>Gender identity (self-identified)</th>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Ethnicity /Nationality</th>
<th>Additional comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mongezi Mngese</td>
<td>Workshop Manager Western Cape, Institute for Healing of Memories</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>Xhosa, South Africa</td>
<td>2 in-depth interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphonese Niyodusen-ga</td>
<td>Program Researcher, Institute for Healing of Memories</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>Rwandan/South Africa</td>
<td>1 in-depth interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themba Lonzi</td>
<td>Youth Program Manager, Institute for Healing of Memories</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>Xhosa, South Africa</td>
<td>2 in-depth interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyllis Rodriguez</td>
<td>American Coordinator, Institute for Healing of Memories</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>American, U.S.</td>
<td>1 in-depth interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. Michael Lapsely</td>
<td>Director, Institute for Healing of Memories</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>New Zealand/ South Africa</td>
<td>2 in-depth interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan Vesley-Flad</td>
<td>Board Member, Institute for Healing of Memories</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>American, U.S.</td>
<td>1 personal interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Profiles of all fieldwork interviews conducted, May – September 2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity/Country</th>
<th>Interview Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maongi Ndwendwe</td>
<td>Facilitator, Institute for Healing of Memories</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>Zulu, South Africa</td>
<td>1 in-depth interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Tal</td>
<td>Facilitator, Institute for Healing of Memories/ Acting Director, Whole World Women Association</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>Cameroonian/South Africa</td>
<td>1 in-depth interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boncele Mngese</td>
<td>Facilitator, Institute for Healing of Memories</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>Xhosa, South Africa</td>
<td>1 in-depth interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stehen Karakashain</td>
<td>Board Member (U.S.); Facilitator, Institute for Healing of Memories</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>American, U.S.</td>
<td>2 in-depth interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo van der Merwe</td>
<td>Director of Transitional Justice Program, Center for Study of Violence and Reconciliation</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1 personal interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noukhanya Mncwabe</td>
<td>Manager, Center for Study of Violence and Reconciliation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Xhosa, South Africa</td>
<td>1 consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoard Varney</td>
<td>Truth Seeking Consultant International Center for Transitional Justice- SA office</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>British, South Africa</td>
<td>1 semi-structured interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vali van Reenen – Le Roux</td>
<td>Head of Programme, Reconciliation and Reconstruction Institute for Justice and Reconciliation</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>Coloured, South Africa</td>
<td>1 semi-structured interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Jobson</td>
<td>Director, Khulumani (victims rights movement for social justice and human rights)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>British, South Africa</td>
<td>1 in-depth interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. D.</td>
<td>Past participant, Healing of Memories workshop</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>Xhosa, South Africa</td>
<td>1 personal interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of participants</td>
<td>Organization/Community</td>
<td>Gender identity (self-identified)</td>
<td>Age range</td>
<td>Ethnicity/Nationality</td>
<td>Additional comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 participants</td>
<td>Stars of Today (Orphan community – based organization) Kosovo, Phillipi West, South Africa</td>
<td>2 Female 4 Males</td>
<td>14 - 45</td>
<td>Xhosa, South Africa</td>
<td>All past participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 participants</td>
<td>Struggle Veterans Association, Claremont, Western Cape, South Africa</td>
<td>3 Female 4 Male</td>
<td>40-65</td>
<td>4 Coloured 1 White 3 Black (all South African)</td>
<td>All past participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 participants</td>
<td>Masiphumelele township community leaders, engaged in anti-Xenophobia focus meetings with IHOM</td>
<td>2 Female 2 Male</td>
<td>30-60</td>
<td>4 Black (1 migrant); 3 South African</td>
<td>Community leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop’s name</td>
<td>Total # of participants</td>
<td>Organization/Community</td>
<td>Gender identity (self-identified)</td>
<td>Age range</td>
<td>Ethnicity /Nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healing of Memories Workshop</td>
<td>46 struggle veterans from the</td>
<td>Struggle Veterans Association, Claremont, South Africa</td>
<td>42 Female 4 Male</td>
<td>50-70</td>
<td>Xhosa and coloured, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Prison Healing of Memories’ Workshop</td>
<td>20 youth prisoners</td>
<td>Bonnytoun Place of Safety, Claremont, South Africa</td>
<td>20 Males</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>Xhosa, Sotho and Coloured, South Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 Healing of Memories Questionnaire

A. (Used in New York, U.S. June 2010)
Questions for Personal Reflections on the Past

- What effect has your country’s past had on you?
- How has what happened to your parents and grandparents affected your life?
- What were the most painful and the most wonderful experiences of your life?
- How have your experiences affected your faith/beliefs?
- How has your past changed you?
- What resources enabled you to survive?
- When you remember the past, what feelings/emotions do you experience?
- What of the past still has an effect on you?
- What are your feelings today about your country, your community, and where you live?

What did you do?
What was done to you?
What did you fail to do?

B. (Used in Western Cape, South Africa for an adapted HOM workshop: Youth in Prison pilot program August 2010)
Questions for Reflection on Personal Experience

- What effect do you think your personal experience had on you?
- How did you experience it?
- How did it affect your faith?
- What were the most painful and the most wonderful experiences for you?
- What resources enabled you to survive?
- How did your personal experience shape and change you?
- When you think about your personal experience, what emotions/feelings do you have?
- What from your past still has an effect on you?
- How do you feel about your own community and South Africa today?
  1. What did I do?
  2. What was done to me?
  3. What did I fail to do?
Appendix 3 Healing of Memories Workshop

Friday: Opening Drama

On the opening evening, participants arrive and are greeted by facilitators. After dinner everyone gathers in a large group where chairs are set in one large circle, filling the room. The group is then led by the lead facilitator who will run every large group session. The group is welcomed and an introductions exercise begins. The facilitator then takes the opportunity to explain that the practice of HOM is a ‘listening with the heart,’ an opportunity to reflect on one’s life, that the process is one of listening and speaking, rather than discussion, and that this is the kind of exercise that the more one puts into it the more one gets out. Then participants write down three expectations they have for the workshop and post them on a wall, and then the group brainstorms commitments and agrees on them. This time is also used to dispel any confusion participants may have about what HOM is and what IHOM offers. In one case during my fieldwork a group of ‘struggle veterans’ attended, assuming the process would include support and advocacy about their pending monetary reparations. The lead facilitator was careful to be completely transparent clarifying what could be expected and what could not, exhausting all questions and frustrations around the communities’ need for support, before continuing the program.

Once the group is settled and seems ready to move, Fr. Michael, if he is leading, often explains with a metaphor that the ‘HOM train is now leaving the station for the journey, and will not pull in until Sunday’. After this opening the Mina Nawe theatre group performs a twenty-minute drama, ‘That Spirit’, weaving drama and song, about the Apartheid period. The placement of the drama (or in some cases another creative tool, a film, poem, story, etc.) on the first evening, and its content, are designed to trigger emotions opening the participants to their own experiences. After this activity participants are usually noticeably moved; some may be crying. At this stage the facilitator opens the floor for anyone to share what has come to them. After a few people speak, the facilitator affirms the feelings and stories heard. This collective process creates a shared and individual, emotionally palpable and rich atmosphere. Before

17 A formal performance troupe made up of young women many of whom were born after or at the end of Apartheid. The play was written by Themba Lonzi, a multi-talented artist and long-time facilitator and manager of the Western Cape youth program.

18 ‘That Spirit’ is a twenty minute dramatic enactment of scenes from the Apartheid years, a powerfully moving combination of interactive drama and song. The scenes that are enacted by the young performance team include a mother who has lost her son, a shoot-out in a township, the story of a young white soldier who is sent into the townships to kill school-children, a husband who witnessed the rape of his own wife by the security police, and others. A number of the songs are well-known struggle and working songs (Kayser 2000: 10)
the close of the evening participants are given a sheet with a list of twelve questions (found in Appendix 1) to be answered before the following day session. Questions range from reflections about the effects of your nation’s history on you, personal experiences, how these affect your faith, emotions, and feelings about your community and what you have done\textsuperscript{19}. Often participants are not clear about what the workshop entails when they first take their seats, but by the closure of the first session they have a much greater idea of the depth that the HOM process is trying to journey.

\textbf{Saturday: Life-Story Pictures, Storytelling}

The morning session begins in the large group with a check-in from the previous night and an overview of the day’s agenda. Transparency about the program and what participants can expect is taken very seriously, with the intention to be gentle with participants and not surprise anyone with the agenda along the journey. The first activity is a 45-minute individual silent drawing exercise where each participant (including facilitators) has the opportunity to draw, using crayons, their life-stories in the forms of pictures, symbols and colours on a large newsprint paper. Participants often spread out across the venue’s grounds for this exercise. Facilitators encourage participants by playing music during the session and letting them know this is not a drawing competition but an exercise to allow them to get into their feelings and express themselves. The life-story pictures are used to aid in the narrative storytelling that takes place in small groups during the next session, which begins before lunch, breaks and then continues again after lunch. Small groups are divided with four to six participants and one facilitator. Each group is created with the intention of balancing age, gender, life experience and language.

Small groups are held in private rooms, prepared with a circle of chairs, tissues, sweets and water. First the facilitator leads a consensus agreement with the group members about confidentiality, creating a safe space, and the narrative storytelling process. It is agreed that the small groups are not about discussion but about speaking and listening, where each person will have 45 minutes to tell their story (with an emphasis on the Apartheid period, and any other issues the participant wants to raise) and while they do so others listen. Only after the speaker is finished can individuals ask questions and offer support—which is made clear to be different from advice, facilitators explain. The ‘safe space’ agreed to be created is in terms of allowing all participants to speak the truth of their experience, free from attacks or criticism, allowing each person to feel comfortable to fully share (Kayser 2000: 11). Facilitators encourage speakers to draw from the answers they thought of to the questionnaire from the first eve-

\textsuperscript{19} It is inferred that the final three questions: What did you do? What was done to you? And, What did you fail to do, are in reference to the particular legacy of violence, in this case Apartheid, but this is left to the interpretation of the participant, who could answer in terms of their life history, or a particularly challenging experience.
ning and to use their pictures to help them tell their story and allow others to understand it. In this way the participants determine the process, as they decide the extent to which they share. The facilitator is usually the last to share their story. ‘The range of life stories is as varied as the participants’ background’ (Ibid). During the speaking section after each teller, or if a speaker has a long pause, the facilitator encourages them to express how they felt about their experience. Sometimes an intimate closeness develops among the small group members, as stories are often deeply personal, and sometimes have never been spoken before. At the close of the session, participants are often visibly tired and sometimes the group closes with a group hug.

After a break, the large group reconvenes. Often after such an intense series of narratives and attentive listening this is a welcomed change. At this stage ‘many of the tensions seen on Friday night have dissipated. There is a sense of having shared a difficult day’ (Kayser 2000: 12). The lead facilitator guides the group through a listing exercise of feelings, themes and questions that were found during the small groups. Feelings range from sadness tojoy, anger to love, and themes extend for instance to family, abuse, Apartheid, and support. Questions raised deal with issues participants are still struggling with, such as if it is necessary to forgive in order to heal, how to cope with unemployment and poverty, and how to support youth caught up in violence. Next the facilitator guides a discussion about what has been raised, as well as a brainstorming of thoughts about the questions people have. ‘Here, as in the small group sessions, the diversity of the group plays a role as people may question each other’s choices and motives across historical boundaries. This forum demands highly skilled facilitation if it is to induce dialogue on the issues rather than promote a particular opinion or model of forgiveness’ (Ibid).

Next the group comes to agreement on one theme raised that guides their design of a ‘liturgical celebration’ that will close out the workshop the following day. Themes focus on the positive that has come out of the day, for instance, ‘humanity and victory,’ ‘resilience and strength.’ Four to six volunteers are secured to plan the program, including one person who takes the lead in organizing it. It is agreed that each small group will contribute one performance or poem or song that captures something from their experience together for the program. The large session then breaks for dinner. Afterwards everyone comes together for a short party that IHOM has organized with music, opportunities for performance, drinks and snacks. The theme of the party is the ‘celebration of life’, and is meant to offer a voluntary space for socializing and release of the intense energies experienced during the day. When the group is diverse it is a chance for some, for the first time, to socialize across the divisions of Apartheid.

**Sunday: Clay Symbol, Liturgical Celebration**

The day begins with an individual creative exercise that emphasizes hopefulness. Each participant is given a block of clay and a candle and is asked to sculpt it into a peace symbol, anything representing their journey. The partici-
pants go off inside or outside the venue, for 25 minutes, often using natural found objects in their symbol.

There is a tea break, giving the celebration planning committee a time to meet. Following that, the full group assembles to discuss the liturgical celebration. The facilitators usually suggest a procession for the opening of the celebration where participants walk outside on the grounds to a drum holding a fire where each participant offers to the fire something negative they wish to leave behind written on a piece of paper. There is a break for lunch and at reconvening the celebration begins with the procession to the fire, the group often sings, and on returning to the large group room individuals and small group performances of poems, group sketches and songs begins. At the end of the program each person has the chance to present their peace symbol, explaining what it is and why it is important to them. Then they light their candle and place it in the centre of the circle. This closing activity is intended to bring a cohesive atmosphere of reflection.

Once everyone has presented their symbol and breaks for tea there is a final coming back together where participants are given the opportunity to discuss ways forward and offer feedback and evaluation to the process. The final step is setting a meeting date for a follow-up one-day gathering. With this the ‘HOM train has completed its journey, and returns to the station,’ and participants and facilitators begin their farewells readying for their transport home.