Social Justice, Reconciliation and Non-racialism,

Shared complicities; Collective futures[1]
The Research Framework of the Institute
(2012-2016)

December 2011

The reference to the 'little perpetrator' in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission report takes the notion of shared complicity further by suggesting that the focus on the 'big' violators of human rights, deflected attention away from the 'little perpetrator' is each one of us. Following Arendt, the potential of evil in all of us, always already makes us complicit in the wrongdoing of others ... in the banality of evil. Complicity is thus an ethico-political response (responsibility) available to anyone (paraphrasing Sanders, 2002: 3-4).

Overarching and Constitutive Themes

1. The review of existing literature[2] suggests research trends and new-emerging interpretive schemes that support *shared complicities; collective futures*[3] as the overarching and guiding premise of the Institute's research project with the following constitutive themes[4]:

   a) *'Space', 'Race', 'Rights' and Class*: (inequality, restitution, redistribution, discrimination, whiteness, blackness, racism, ethnicity, indigeneity, identities, oppression, spatiality, environment, rights)

   b) *Justice, Jouissance*[5] *and Democracy:* (truth and commissions, restorative justice, human rights-based justice, peace studies, environmental justice, compassion-

---

[1] The double meaning, tautological slant and plural forms are deliberate. There are various movements within which I attempt to construct meaning around these concepts in this document. In relation to *shared complicities; collective futures,* I am foregrounding the concept of 'reconciliation' for intellectual and practical reasons. Concepts such as 'justice', 'non-racialism', 'democracy', 'peace' and many others have rich histories which cannot be pursued here.

[2] Apart from scholarly work and reports, this includes a massive compendium of documents on 'Reitz' and consultations that preceded the establishment of the Institute.

[3] I am particularly indebted to the Hatch-Wilson-Doxtader-Lawrence engagement as reflected in *The Hope of Reconciliation* (2006) and the challenges in thinking through integrating the moral, social, psychological and material dimensions of reconciliation.

[4] The themes are inevitably but productively broad and flexible.

[5] 'Jouissance', in French, means enjoyment and pleasure, [...] it is pleasure and pain together, a feeling of being at the edge. It can indicate a breaking of boundaries; a connection beyond the self; or the enjoyment of rights and privileges (see Macey, 2001: 210). I use the concept in close association with 'thinking on the verge', 'breaking boundaries', one's relationship with the other and 'democracy begins with two' (see Irigaray, 2004). The concept is also used by Lacan and Žižek, two thinkers who also feature in the literature review. I also use the concept in relation to eroticism, pleasure and the 'death drive'. In short, the concept is use within the Critical Theory framework (see Macey, 2001: 210).

based justice, deliberative democracy, participation, verge, breaking boundaries, humanity)

c) *Spectrality and Hauntology*: *Implications for reconciliation studies* (ghosts, spirits, haunting, ontology of presence, existence, appearance, disappearance, co-existence, culpability, guilt)

d) *Mourning, Forgiveness and Legacy*: (social psychology, psychoanalysis, historical memory, trauma, reconciliation, nostalgia, empathic repair[6])

e) *Cosmopolitanism*: (différance, difference, non-normativity, hybridity, otherness, social cohesion, identity, friendship, hospitality, love, mutual vulnerability, precariousness, conflict resolution, diversity management)

f) *Humanity, Science, Technology and Cyborg-Bio Techno-sciences:* (form, function, artificial intelligence, neurosciences, machines, androids, computerised automata, prosthetism, cybernetics, DNA research, the human genome project, bio-prospecting)

g) *Language, Culture, Literature and Representation*: (feminism, speaking, writing, narrative, time, discourse, signs, rhetoric, orientalism, art, drama, performativity, the body, post-colonialism, alterity).

The Main Questions

2) Is 'reconciliation' a permanent social demand? If so, how do we weave big and small 'moments of reconciliation'[7] into interpretive schemas that integrates the politics of redistribution, recognition and representation so that practices can be guided towards a legitimate and sustainable project of social justice and non-racialism? How will studying the moral, social, psychological and material dimensions of 'reconciliation' contribute to expanding communities' 'capabilities' for psycho-social and economic advancement? How, and why, should we integrate the politics of mourning, restoration, friendship, forgiveness, memory, legacy, love and 'a justice and democracy to come' to enrich our understanding of, and practices aimed at reconciliation? What are the psycho-social and political-material economies of hostility, hatred and disrespect amongst human beings?

3) This document has a straightforward purpose: It suggests a variety of conceptual frameworks and thematic areas from which a particular set of knowledge generation processes, social practices and agencies can follow. These interpretive schemes take its primary focus to be *the study of everyday violence[8], trauma and disrespect in human relations; its import from the past; and its projection into the future from where it rules the present, and what to do about it.* A disruptive-productive orientation to research in these areas is proposed. In a sense, this document presents a *conceptual cartography* onto which we can overlay various *coordinates*

---

[6] See Gobodo-Madikizela, (2008: 61) on 'Radical Forgiveness'.
[7] There are many examples across the world and in South Africa.
[8] Based on the 'banality of evil' as coined by Arendt, one can logically explore the 'everydayness' of present-day violence.

to locate and root research activities. As it is with cartography, *topography* is central in drawing research *contours.* But, since social landscapes are ever-changing, the coordinates are in flux, and the contours are continuously redrawn. Conceptual cartography simply provides a sense of location and an awareness of the intricate linkages with and between various conceptual frames.

4) The suggested themes should be thought of as forming webs of rich interrelatedness, binding-un-binding; sedimentation-de-sedimentation; and weaving-re-weaving. The various concepts, in different combinations, form an assortment of conceptual frames and the constitutive themes could have been constructed in a variety of ways. Though flexible, they do however suggest parameters to guide research related considerations; to identify appropriate partners and associates; and steer organizational and strategy design and operations. They are meant to give the Institute it's particular 'research' contours and coordinates, which, as I am proposing in this document, should be retraced around *Shared Complicities; Collective Futures*[9]. That is, the themes should crisscross and interface with each other in ways that build this particular social, political and intellectual project.

The 'Rupture of Reitz'

5) Following the 'rupture of Reitz' in February 2008, and an incubation period of consultations and discussions over a period of almost three years[10], the Institute was launched by Bishop Tutu on 27 January 2011. Emerging from the richness of these discussions was a clear and collective vision to set up the Institute primarily as a research outfit that will exemplify "the scholarship and the practice of reconciliation, forgiveness and social justice"[11]. Before and during 2011 both the interim director[12] and director[13] engaged in a range of discussions within and outside the borders of the university to give form, function and content to the vision of the Institute. This document, partially, serves such purpose.

---

[9] The National Development Plan of South Africa (November, 2011), though open to criticism as it should be, correctly elevates social cohesion and reconciliation as facilitative conditions to anchor development and the success of the nation. But, because the strategies to achieve this reads more like 'countermeasures' (see p26) in a 'war' context, it need to be rethought and re-crafted. A rights-based, narrowly conceived conception of social cohesion as proposed in the report is, to my mind, counter-productive. The shift to a 'capabilities' approach is welcomed.
The overall 'representation' of a collective future is of central interest here. Though the report lacks the pre-theoretical, empirical and theoretical resources to scaffold this image properly, work in various disciplines employing the concept of 'mutual vulnerability' in a cultural and environmental sense are under way. The writing of Judith Butler on new bodily ontologies and precariousness has also been instructional for 'thinking' the contours of these 'collective futures'. My main argument is that such 'contours' are impossible to imagine outside the concept of 'shared complicities'. 'Complicity' is a central concept in 'reconciliation' and social cohesion studies. However, except in a few of these, 'complicity' is in most instances conflated with 'guilt' and 'culpability'. This conflation is the exact pitfall I am trying to avoid on my road to an overarching, flexible and eclectic conceptual framework.
[10] A number of people were involved in these processes. These are well documented in various reports by Willem Ellis and JC van der Merwe. In addition, an archive on 'Reitz' is being set up which is readily accessible to scholars and researchers. History will measure their (Ellis and Van der Merwe) contributions and those of others (consultants, researchers, fellows, advisors, leaders, etc.) favourably.
[11] Jonathan Jansen: Speech at his inauguration as the new Vice-Chancellor and Rector of the UFS. (16 October 2009).
[12] John Samuels directed the Institute during the crucial setting-up phase till the end of June 2011. He remains a valuable and productive associate of the Institute.
[13] Andre Keet was appointed as director from 1 July 2011.

6) The 'rupture of Reitz' was not simply an incident. Rather, it was history's attempt at temporarily suspending itself, pausing ... giving us a 'still' impression of the complexities of the violence in everyday human relations ... inviting inquiry, education, pedagogy and resolution. Thus, by pausing, that 'undistracted state of being-present'[14] 'Reitz' became a much deeper intellectual and socio-political demand, institutionally, nationally and internationally. It would have been convenient, but catastrophic, to think of 'Reitz' as a hiccup, rather than a 'rupture'. 'Reitz and its aftermath' questioned our frames of meaning-making, analyses, social activism, politics and ethics...it questioned our very way of 'thinking' and 'doing'. 'Reitz', as a rupture which was strangely expected, demands the 'transformation of the theorizing space', as a prerequisite for the transformation of social practices. The 'rupture' suggests that 'thinking' about 'Reitz' through 'Reitz' would render 'Reitz' unknowable. The inclusion of the outsider and transgressive knowledges of 'those others' which represent the counterpoints of 'Reitz', constitute the very possibility of knowing 'Reitz'. 'Reitz', therefore, paradoxically demands an inclusivity of knowing. What counts as 'knowing' and valuable 'to know' and 'do' cannot remain the same. 'Shared complicities' can only take shape as a consequence of constructing 'the known' through inclusive knowledges. That is, the rational form of 'shared complicities" is dependent on epistemic justice[15].

7) 'Reitz' has since 2009 been a catalyst for widespread and profound changes at university. The Academic Turnaround Strategy launched in 2010 provided the foundation for the draft 2012-2015 strategic plan, which highlights several clusters of interventions. Of particular importance to this proposal are the clusters of interventions under (i) the 'Human Project', aimed at transforming the university to embrace a universal sense of common humanity and openness to the perspectives, experiences and cultures of others; (ii) the 'Academic Project', aimed at building a strong academic institution with distinctiveness and excellence in teaching, research and 'scholarship in public'; and (iii) 'Internationalisation', aimed at moving UFS from an inward to an outward looking university that seeks links with institutions across the world. These directions are also reflected in the university's research strategy[16].

8) Given the pragmatic demands of setting out a research framework, this document is a conversion of a much broader literature review and exploration of social theory[i]. It includes the critiques levelled against the 'field'. The starting point of the literature review is to question research. And research knows that this is a question of fidelity, of critique. This questioning yens to make sense of the "pathologies of the social"[17]...to find out where to start, so that the start is not 'the return to the beginning'.

---

[14] A. Keet, (2009) … paraphrasing Macho and Heidegger.
[15] See Yosso's (2005) landmark work on *Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth*.
[16] See SARChi proposal, 2011.
[17] A. Honneth, (2008).

Pausing as 'reflection-on-the verge'

9) *Pausing* denotes, even demands, displacement of thinking. *Pausing* is 'reflection-on-the-verge' and *verge* here has manifold meanings ranging from 'an extreme edge' and 'brink' to "a transitional interval beyond which some new action or a different state of affairs is likely to begin or occur"[18]. The 'rupture of Reitz' registered our position at an unacknowledged, 'extreme edge'. 'Reitz' gave us the coordinates of the place of 'the now', and all the possible options one can follow. It functioned as a geo-socio-political positioning system (GPS) … a call to be watchful and vigilant. 'Reitz' consciously became the signifier for the broad academic and human transformation project at the university, which has its precedents in many different periods of histories and forms of 'the now'. Accordingly, 'Reitz' declares that research has to expand those interpretive schemes that are "capable of thinking and speaking on the verge"[19]. If not, we will "return to the beginning, which, […] comes toward us from out of the future"[20]. Stated different, a good chunk of our research is locked into a type of 'reflection' that tends to return us to the same beginning. 'Pausing' suggests something entirely more disruptive…it envisions new conceptual architectures to guide social practices in bridging the 'abyss'.

Research Orientation

10) The nature of the practical challenges to be addressed in South Africa and elsewhere and the poverty of our logical abstraction are central concerns for the Institute. In particular, the Institute must provide a disclosing critique of the 'pathologies of the social' in all its complexities as the basis for multiple analyses. Though social justice demands a focus on challenging inequalities, 'reconciliation'[21] is irreducible to social justice. Like 'justice' and 'democracy', 'reconciliation[22]' is always becoming. This becoming naturally implies that

---

[18] *ibid*

[19] J. Sallis, (2009):p148.

[20] *ibid.* I am in accordance with Doxtader's (2007) sentiments expressed in *The Faith and Struggle of Beginning (with) Words: On the turn between reconciliation and recognition.*

[21] Therefore, we have to be careful in following this logic: In *varieties of reconciliation,* Meiherhenrich (2008: 201-202) suggest that according to the literature, restorative justice "has been the dominant model of criminal justice throughout most of human history for perhaps all the world's peoples. A decisive move away from it came with the Norman Conquest of much of Europe at the end of the Dark Ages"). This coincided with the formation of the early modern state. Restorative justice "fell away with the rise of the modern state, and was replaced by a retributive model of state-centered justice with outcomes focused on punishment of the offender, rather than reconciliation between the disputing parties and restoration of the victim's wellbeing" (Strang 2002, 43). Despite this interlude of retribution—and the concomitant rise of inquisitorial and adversarial legalism—interest in restorative justice for individual wrongdoers rekindled in the advanced industrialized countries. This led to the emergence of victim-offender reconciliation programs in the 1970s, especially in North America. The influence of restoration has been widespread ever since. "In the 1990s, restorative justice became a unifying banner, sweeping up various traditions of justice as 'making amends'; reconciliation; peacemaking; redress; relational justice; transformative justice; and republican justice" (Braithwaite 2002, 11). Revolving around four values—personalism, reparation, reintegration, and participation (Roche 2003, 26)—the rise of restorative justice paved the way for the emergence of a reconciliation discourse in the international system".

[22] Rangell, honorary president of the International Psychoanalytic Association, in a 2008 paper, criticizes the discipline for not living up, in its own practice, to the criterion of 'reparative regrouping' (p218)…that is 'reconciliation'. There are many definitions of 'reconciliations' (see Meierhenrich, 2008; Tang, 2011). After a rich conceptual analysis Meierhenrich (*ibid,* 206) proposes the following systematized concept of reconciliation: *reconciliation refers to the accommodation of former adversaries through mutually conciliatory means, requiring both forgiveness and mercy ,*

new languages, discourses, grammars and alchemies are constantly required. Contributing to this, is one is of the central objectives of the Institute. However, the concept of 'reconciliation' has, like human rights', become one of the "most abused words in recent history" (Hay, 1998: 13). Similarly, like 'human rights', it is in danger of becoming an empty signifier[23]. It may be rescued by 'reflection-on-the-verge'. If we explore the associated concepts of equilibrium, conciliation, resolution, restoration, forgiveness and mercy, then Meierhenrich's (2008: 213) conceptual diagram is a useful starting point.

11) Social theory, political philosophy and social psychology have opened up the trajectories for studies in 'race', non-racialism, reconciliation, memory, precariousness, mourning, mutual vulnerability and forgiveness in a multiplicity of directions. These productive schemes, configured appropriately, have the potential to present us with 'new tools to apply our trade'. The Institute is challenged to mine these[24] in service of social justice and reconciliation[25].

Thinking and doing

12) Importantly, the Institute regards thinking and reasoning as practices from which social action sources its form and function. Practical reason is not simply practical because it has an empirical image as its object of observation and a particular social action (intention) as its aim. It is practical because it is a form of reason or thinking that makes the practical unfold as practical and rational in the first place. Theoretical reasoning, the route by which we change our beliefs and conceptual frames, is a prerequisite for practical reasoning which is aimed at modifying intentions[26]. Importantly, both are 'reason' and it is through reason that agency is constituted. Being unaware of this is to start everywhere and nowhere at the same time...potent impotency. This issue continuously is also raised with regard to the relationship between theory and practice. We have to accept this as a settled issue. It is better to start from the exaggerated claim that theory and practise have collapsed ... and work one's way back, limitedly so. One may, in this working back process, come to understand that "practice is a set of relays from one theoretical point to another, and theory is a relay from one practice to another"[27].

---

where *forgiveness* connotes the forswearing of resentment, "the resolute overcoming of the anger and hatred that are naturally directed toward a person who has done one an unjustified and non-excused moral injury" (Murphy 1988a, 15), and *mercy* connotes the extension of an act of compassion to the undeserving person who has committed an unjustified and non-excused moral injury. Among other things, this conceptualization of reconciliation is intended as a response to the prevalence of conceptual stretching.

[23] See Baudrillard's (2007) work on the 'simulacrum', 'disappearance' and the 'vanishing point of communication'.

[24] Zembylas's work in this regard is a good example of the pursuit of new conceptual frames to make sense of and respond to real experiences. See for instance his work on mourning and pedagogy, (2009, 2011).

[25] The work of the Khulumani Support Group (formed in 1995 by survivors and families of victims of the political conflict of South Africa's apartheid past…it was set up in response to the pending Truth and Reconciliation Commission by victims who felt the Commission should be used to speak out about the past to ensure that such violations never occur again) is a good practical example of how this can be done.

[26] There is no need here to discuss Kant's *Critique of Practical Reason* (1788).

[27] J. Deleuze, (1977): p206.

Comparison and Interdisciplinarity

13) It is standard nowadays, with fanfare emptiness, to propose an interdisciplinary approach to the study of such deep and substantive issues. I have argued, in a different space and time,[28] that interdisciplinarity is a redemptive exercise[29] for fixing something that is broken. It is not an evolutionary progressive step, but an attempt at recovering what once was a conventional intellectual stance, practically and conceptually. The legitimization of knowledge and its constitution of and within power, so insightfully disclosed by Foucault (1974), explains how this stance became the rule rather than the exception. The research responsibility of the Institute is to be sufficiently redemptive as far as interdisciplinarity is concerned.

14) From a comparative research perspective, this document suggests that our inquiry entails studying the manifestations of race in higher education, linking such inquiry to the related matters of reconciliation and social justice in the South African context against the backdrop of racial, ethnic and tribal conflicts elsewhere in the world[30]. Such comparative endeavours can be enriched by meaning-making schemes that question the mode and function of 'comparison', which is itself an operating concept for these fields of study. The Institute regards the 'comparative' as both a research-methodological and intellectual-substantive concern. Oucho's (2002) work on conflict on the African continent is a useful initiating pointer for exploring violence and conflicts across the globe. Chabal's (2009) book titled *Africa: The Politics of Suffering and Smiling* is a great contribution to understanding 'agency' as 'striving', 'surviving' and 'overcoming'. It thus makes sense for the Institute's research programme to have a 'southern' orientation spiralling outwards to an inclusivity of conceptual frames and experiences.

15) It is intellectually appropriate and pragmatic to put 'non-racialism', 'social justice' and 'reconciliation' forward as organising concepts. They have multiple shifting meanings and are constitutive of broader understandings of 'justice' and 'democracy'. Indeed, the 'physiques' of these concepts are productively unstable and 'unfolding', so are the practices ensuing from them. Govier's (2006) *Taking Wrongs Seriously: Acknowledgement, Reconciliation and the Politics of Sustainable Peace* and the anthologies on 'race' edited by Back and Solomos (2000), Essed and Goldberg (2002), Dwyer and Bressey (2008) as well as Collins and Solomos (2010) demonstrate the 'shifting sands' characteristics of 'meaning' and 'research' in these areas. Similarly, the concept of 'social justice' relates to inequality in society and the way in which burdens and responsibilities are unequally distributed along structurally engineered faultlines that become ciphers or markers of exclusion and inclusion (Ayers, Quinn and Stoval, 2009). But, if we add to this Lister's (2010) analysis of 'social justice' as a momentum concept which is continuously unfolding, the meaning and practice complexities increase exponentially. This is to be expected. All these framing and organising concepts, their very nature and meaning, are the fabrics of 'research'. They are the basis for

---

[28] A. Keet, (2010a).
[29] A concept associated with Walter Benjamin.
[30] IISRRSJ, Mission Statement, 2010

these fields of study to become "theoretically robust and empirically rigorous field [s] of inquiry" (Collins & Solomos, 2010: 529).

Questioning Research?

16) One has to question, respectfully so, the 'social productivity' of research. That is, to question in this form: 'does our research clear pathways for the renewal of 'justice' and 'democracy' as ways of living ... as dispositions, as demanding and practically working towards politico-cultural and socio-economic reconfigurations?' To question further: 'in the light of a hegemonic imprisoning tribal discourse in South Africa; the entrenched ethnic socio-political arrangements on the continent; the migrantification (this term is used advisedly) and subsequent conservative politics of Europe; the different forms of ethnic, racial, religious and other conflicts of the Americas and the Asia-Pacific region; the morally and structurally anchored violence in everyday interpersonal and group relations, what are the psycho-social and political-material economies of hostility, hatred and disrespect amongst human beings?'

17) Do we have the resources, intellectual and otherwise, to inquire into the violence of modern ethnic war and its precursors? How can we account for violence without a political-moral conviction, violence without aim ... in the words of Enzensberger, an 'autistic violence'? (one can think of many South African examples) [31]. How do we deal with the critique of 'truth' and its 'commissions' and 'omissions' as 'false reconciliation' ... a challenge laid down by Adorno[32] in relation to post second world war Germany, and by Ignatieff[33] (1998: 172) in relation to truth commissions in Latin America and South Africa?' Or, how, as Fanon says of Césaire in *Black Skin, White Masks*[34] (1952: 14), are we "renouncing the present and the future in the name of a mystical past"? How, in this age of rights and morally uncurbed violence, should we imagine the contours and coordinates for a research project on non-racialism, social justice and reconciliation that can first make the phenomena and challenges emerge in its own complexity, and second, result in transformed social practices?

18) The primacy of the question remains. It is an expression of fidelity to inquiry.

The 'Empirical'[35], the 'Deductive' and 'Mutual Recognition'

19) Kirt (2004) asks: *'Is there interest in reconciliation?* How do we root our research in observable conditions that can empirically ground its gaze into social reality? In this case, can we observe an empirical desire for non racialism, social justice and reconciliation? Are there evident actions in the social reality of everyday life that can pre-theoretically ground a research project on race, reconciliation and social justice? That is, before abstraction, do

---

[31] A. Honneth, (2008): p 200.
[32] Adorno (2005: 89): *The meaning of working through the past.*
[33] M. Ignatieff, (1998): p172.
[34] F. Fanon, (1952): p14
[35] A. Honneth, (2008): chapter XX

people think of themselves as complicit actors with a critical sense of citizenry responsible for reconciled prospects and expectations?[36]

20) If we assume that human beings, on a mundane pragmatic level, desire 'reconciled, non-racialised lives', such desire must logically span from the consequences and aftermath of massive human rights violations and historical conflict, to the structural violence in everyday human relations (such as racism, discrimination, homophobia, xenophobia, sexism, and disrespect, to name a few). That is, the desire for reconciled and non-racialised lives cannot be limited to and associated with certain forms of conflicts, but rather extends to all forms of violence, inclusive of 'everyday fascisms'. Questioning the potency of the ideal of reconciliation in South Africa, - an ideal expressed as a demand- Christodoulidis and Veitch[37] argue for an interface between the "under-determination of responsibility" and the "over-determination of memory" and suggest that

> If reconciliation remains co-opted in the dual modalities of underdetermining responsibility for the violence that is inflicted through structures of the 'invisible hand' and over-determination of a past that calls South Africans to leave behind not just the traumas of the past but the very politics of the past – to remember them as forgotten – then the question arises what potency is left in the ideal of reconciliation. We have suggested that perhaps its disruptive potential can be retained only in the modality of the reflexive question: "Why reconcile?", when the question is posed as a political question rather than one already collapsed into the givens and the prioris of the institutions of capitalist democracies.

The focus on the political nature of the 'why reconcile' question is instructive and productive. Creating and maintaining the conditions that make asking the question possible and making the question questioning, is a worthwhile research trajectory to pursue.

21) We may be well-served to think of 'reconciliation', 'recognition' and 'non-racialism' as 'thought' pointers; a trajectory in consciousness. The history of philosophy highlights these pointers. Kant, Bergson, Fichte, Hegel, Levinas and others have all engaged with 'recognition'. Honneth, Fraser and Butler are presently the major social theorists on 'recognition'. It is, however, Ricoeur (2005) in *The Course of Recognition,* who drew a fertile conceptual landscape on which we can build the construction of *shared complicities; collective futures* via *mutual recognition*:

> Ultimately Ricoeur wants to question the importance of the idea of "struggle" that Hobbes, Hegel, Honneth, Thevenot & Boltanski all give central place. Ricoeur asks: "when, we may ask, does a subject deem him- or herself to be truly recognized?"(217). Ricoeur sees that this might be an insatiable quest. "Does not the claim for affective, juridical and social recognition, through its militant, conflictual style, end up as an indefinite demand, a kind of "bad infinity" (218)? Exchange of gifts illuminates two central aspects of mutual recognition. The first is "the irreplaceable character of each of the partners in the exchange. The one is not the other. We exchange gifts, but not places."(263). The second is the difference of mutual recognition from any form of fusional union, whether in love or friendship: "A just distance is maintained at the heart of mutuality, a just distance that integrates respect into intimacy."(263) The main claims of the last chapter are hard to resist: that we should not exaggerate possibilities of mutuality or

---

[36] See the example of the Worcester community in South Africa, day of Reconciliation (16 December, 2011) event [accessible at www. khulumani.net].
[37] 2008: p34.

forget the original asymmetry of the self and the other, or that we should not forget the role of vertical power relations in discussing the struggles for recognition, but at the same time, we should not deny that at least fleeting experiences of genuine mutual recognition are possible (even in an imperfect world) (Laitinen, undated: 234-235).

22) Ricoeur is now reshuffling the encyclopaedia. Despite asymmetrical power-relations, like 'reconciliation', there are fleeting 'experiences of genuine mutual recognition'. The presupposition of 'struggle' in 'recognition', gives it an 'unwanted' adversariality, which makes "mutual recognition" a much more productive option. Doxtader (2007: 140), argues that the TRC's "work suggests ultimately that a closer appreciation between reconciliation and recognition may be a way to open and underwrite an important critique of violence [...] to unravel (law's) precedent in a manner that does not negate the promise of (its) justice". The dominance of 'procedural justice' suggests that forms of human agreement that "exceed the logic of the contract" *(ibid:* 140) will be difficult to achieve. However, we are slowly building the conceptual architecture to do so, and we are spotting, more regularly, the fleeting moments as its empirical counterparts in support of the 'justice to come' of which Derrida speaks.

23) 'Mutual recognition' is central to 'mutual vulnerability' which, as I will argue later, drives the notions of *shared complicities; collective futures.*

24) In the "*Politics of Misrecognition*" Leeb (2009) argues that Hegel and other 'recognition' theorists got it wrong when they contend that a politics of recognition may be a source for a 'just' society'. Such theorization, based on the ego in the Hegelian Mirror Encounter' "leads to the creation of a politics of the ego, which violently suppresses difference", (*ibid:* 70) "because in the mirror, the ego is the other and the other is me" *(ibid:* 71). The subject and the other is thus in a struggle for recognition and as such *mutual recognition* does not lead to justice, but to a fundamental injustice, since it rejects that which does not fit into the wholeness it defends. According to Leeb (*ibid:* 72) Lacan, though initially in consonance with Hegel, shifted from the politics of mutual recognition to an "ethics crafted in the real", where the Other is a "subject-in-outline" as a fundamental uncertainty that cannot and should not be resolved. On the contrary, the ego, in its quest to "receive recognition from the Other, excludes everything different to itself" *(ibid:* 73) which produces thus the violent suppression of the 'other'.

25) Leeb's critique of 'mutual recognition' is instructive and rich. In the context of *shared complicities; collective futures* I use Deleuze's concept of 'immanence' to speak to this critique.

26) Let me return to the thought pointers. Since Hegel the dialectic driving the advancement towards *absolute spirit*, presupposes historical movements that should enable us to develop, progressively, forms of social practices that cultivate humanity. Temporary moments of reconciliation are inscribed in Hegel's dialectic of consciousness. Marx, as it is well known, inverted this dialectic via historical materialism which asserts that consciousness follows the material reproductions of people's daily lives. Marx's conception of dialectics drives towards

a socialist society as the materialist counterpart of Hegel's absolute spirit. Here, as well, reconciliation is juxtaposed with alienation. In this sense, 'reconciliation' is a proxy for emancipation, non-racialism and social justice that already has deductive-empirical form onto which it is able to anchor our conceptual frames. This, however, would require a complex argument worth pursuing. Empirical studies in, for instance, geography, are confirming the desire "for further social and spatial mixing" (see Phillips, 2008) amongst young people as the real-topographical image of the cognitive trajectory described above. Similar empirical patterns are described by Anderson (2011) in *The Cosmopolitan Canopy*. 'Space' is also central to Anderson's (2011) work. It is worthwhile to quote Force's (2011) review of Anderson's book at length on this theme.

> Anderson describes spaces in the city where people characterized by wide a range of social differences interact in a familiar way on neutral ground, opening the opportunity for an expansion and revision of how individuals view members of other social groups. In Chapters 2 and 4 he introduces readers respectively to the Reading Terminal and Rittenhouse Square—both of which exemplify this attitude of civility and racial cosmopolitanism. Anderson acknowledges, nonetheless, that Blacks under the canopy can be made to feel "provisional"—these are the moments wherein the "possibilities and limits of cosmopolitanism as an organizing theme of public life" are made most plain (157). In "The Color Line and The Canopy" (Chapter 5), Anderson relents from his optimistic view of social life to demonstrate how both latent and more overt forms of racial discrimination, especially at work, threaten the civility of the canopy[38].

27) The "Our Shared Futures' report of the British Commission on Integration and Cohesion (2007), suggests that the debate on 'integration' should flow from a set of four principles. "The first principle of shared futures valorises a sense of becoming that does not erase the imprint of history and memory over a sense of being. The second principle argues that we need to consider a framework of rights and responsibilities that recognises the incommensurabilities of the global, national and local senses of the citizen. The third principle argues for an 'ethos of hospitality' that acknowledges the moral place of the stranger in the rapidly changing landscape of today's Britain. And the fourth argues that these forms of recognition need to be geared with a sense of visible social justice that stems from principles of equality and institutional transparency" (Keith, 2008: 197).

Reconciliation as pre-cognitive, ontological

28) The logic in the 'Our Shared Futures' report (paragraph 22) has Heideggerian[39] affinities, especially in relation to the 'rescued' notion of 'dasein'[40]. Following Husserl's conception that phenomenology is concerned with consciousness and its object, and that we have to explore how the world as phenomenon is constituted in the consciousness, Heidegger explores the mode of being (of that being) in which the world constitutes itself. 'Dasein', for Heidegger, exists in the 'midst of beings' which are both dasein and not dasein. The encounter with those beings, 'being-alongside' or 'being-with' them, is made possible for

---

[38] Force, WR. (2011). Book Review. http://thesocietypages.org/sociologylens/2011/05/10/book-review% E2% 80%94the-cosmopolitan-canopy-race-and-civility-in-everyday-life-by-elijah-anderson/ [accessed on 6 Novem-ber 2011].
[39] I am acutely aware of Heidegger's Nazi-related politics which in not my interest in this paper.
[40] The notion of 'dasein' within this context was suggested by Lis Lange.

dasein by the presence of those beings "within-the-world"[41]. Here, already, following Heidegger, Gadamer's hermeneutics adopted "understanding" as our reconciled "way of being-in-the-world". 'Being-in-the-world' as constituted by 'being-alongside' or 'being-with' other beings, is prior to cognition, that is, it is pre-theoretical and thus intra-mundane. Perhaps, this is the ontological condition of reconciliation even before a desire for it is uttered. But, Heidegger's 'dasein' was a limited one which did not include the unknowable 'other', as Derrida later on argued. This, as many thinkers have suggested, was the root of the 'spiritual racism' which drove Heidegger's political support for Hitler. However, if Derrida's critique is taken into consideration, 'dasein' is still a useful conceptual tool.

29) 'Reconciliation' is now emerging as an ontological condition, prior to cognition … before thinking about it. Heidegger's 'dasein' suggests such a movement whilst Derrida's critique of Heidegger intimates that 'spirit' "calls our attention to the absent Other". It reminds us of an ethical responsibility prior to ontology. *There is thus cosmopolitanism before self-existence"*.

30) 'Reconciliation as an ontological condition" and the 'pre-ontological ethical responsibility' are further movements towards the conceptual architecture of *shared complicities; collective futures.*

The 'Seductive', the 'Religious' and the 'Secular'[42]

31) It is a given that the notions of 'reconciliation' within the context of religion or theology are important and much needed. But, both its successes and failures are explained *a priori,* that is, it is accounted for transcendentally. Therefore, we have to, rightfully so, ask: 'Are their secular sources in everyday-life that suggest a demand for 'non-racialism' and 'reconciliation'? This question does not suggest the displacement of the non-secular, but moves towards a more rationally inclusive form of conceptual mooring. The compilation of essays in *The Humanist Imperative in South Africa* (De Gruchy, 2011) oscillates between two main streams, I suggest. First, the flirtation to image 'the human' in the 'human rights mirror' is seductively inescapable, and with 'seduction', as Baudrillard (2007: 91) argues, we are in a catastrophic order. I have, on a few occasions (Keet, 2010b, 2011), already dealt with the inadequacy of this image. We can, critically but with fidelity, imagine the human rights framework as a 'simulacra' ... where it's signs "can no longer be exchanged for reality" (Baudrillard, 2007: 76). The recently concluded United Nations Conference of Parties on climate change in Durban (COP17, 2011) is a classic, but tragic example of how, in this case, the signs of rights cannot be exchanged for the scientific and social reality of the now and the future. Other political examples here and elsewhere float around as countless illustrations.

---

[41] See W. J. Korab-Karpowicz: http://www.iep.utm.edu/heidegge/ [accessed on 6 November 2011].

[42] See Dixon on Doxtader and the secular and non-secular: "To say that I am a fan of Erik Doxtader's work is an understatement. Along with John Hatch, Mark Lawrence McPhail, and Kirt Wilson (also targets of my admiration), his work has served to expand the conceptualization of reconciliation beyond morality and theology, to the consideration of rhetoric. Doxtader's willingness to bridge the secular and theological frameworks of reconciliation imbues his work with a hopeful realism that appears, at times to be absent in the work of the other scholars noted above. This level of comfort with the theological *and* rhetorical contexts of reconciliation is one of the primary reasons his scholarship is considered excellent grounding for theologians, like myself, grappling with the homiletic challenge of preaching peace to a contentious world".

This argument is developed in greater detail in my work on *The Perfect Crime* (2009). Second, a new dignity-injected ethics that struggles to shed its theological inscriptions appears to constitute the second stream. Pinker's (2008) argument on the *Stupidity of Dignity* has been creatively challenged by Beckwith (2010). At the centre of their debate was the logic of *scientific materialism.* Interestingly, the essay on *Neurobiological Foundations* (Solms, 2011: 41) in *The Humanist Imperative* is the only attempt to explore a secular, scientific materialist, and non-human rights pre-theoretical source for humanity. De Gruchy's (2002) reflections on the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission unapologetically marry the desire for reconciliation with the theology of Christianity, which is, conceptually, a fairly undemanding exercise. Forgetting to read Derrida on *a justice to come,* De Gruchy defines reconciliation as the 'restoration of justice' (*ibid*: 2). A 'restored justice' that was incapable of keeping the 'reconciliation pact' in the first place, seems to be a retrogressive step.

32) Govier (2006: 13) provides a useful 10-level definitional framework for reconciliation within the matrix of victims, perpetrators, bystanders, beneficiaries, and interveners (*ibid*: 22). Later on (*ibid:* 89-111) she also provides an analytical way for *revisiting forgiveness.* On this score, Gobodo-Madikizela (2008) also covered poststructuralist thinking related to the 'why' questions of reconciliation, forgiveness and non-racialism. Both the arguments of Govier and Gobodo-Madikizela suggests that somewhere between the secular and the non-secular and the metaphysical and the post-metaphysical we may be able to root our work on non-racialism and reconciliation. It may be, in relation to religion as a transcendent marker, productive to consider Habermas's (2002: 162) twin tendencies on *Religion and Rationality.* In the first, "religion is liquified and sublated in discourse ethics and the theory of communicative rationality"; in the second, "religion is given the function of preserving and even nurturing a particular type of 'semantic' content that remains indispensable for ethics and morality". If these streams return us to a permanent movement towards a post-metaphysical form of thinking on 'reconciliation' and 'non-racialism', we can retain transcendental views only to achieve 'immanence' as a form of thinking. 'Immanence' as thinking will also productively critique those forms of utopian thinking that assigns our dedication to the future, because it demands a "commitment without delay" (Derrida, 1999: 248).

33) The demand to think through secular interpretive schemes within which to assign meaning to 'reconciliation' elevates our conceptual challenges dramatically. For instance, Levinas' religiously-tuned work (1963, 1993) on the 'other', so crucial for conceptions of ethics and reconciliation, would require a rereading which would extend to Derrida's work (1993, 1996, 1999) on hospitality, friendship, mourning and forgiveness. This would be a tall order ... an ability to imagine a *messianic without a messiah.* Nonetheless, it is a path which we have to make for ourselves, one is which a secular ethics can provide us with the resources to build our project on *shared complicities; collective futures.* This future is not utopian, but the unfolding 'now'.

Immanence and Transcendence[43]: Reconciliation as Cognition

34) Although the 'transcendent' is inescapable within theoretical resources, Deleuze's (Due, 2007: 21) concept of 'immanence' as a form of thinking independent of a transcendent marker represents an instructional alternative. For him the mind unfolds as an activity, part of reality (*ibid*). Consequently, and this has to be argued via logic, if the mind unfolds as an activity in reality, and 'reconciliation' is engraved in its cognitive architecture, then this is one option for 'reconciliation' to claim a non-transcendent intra-mundane source in everyday existence. On this score, our research theories may be grounded in a 'cognitive design towards reconciliation and non-racialism' which can be logically justified. This point requires further deductive clarification. However, Deleuze (Žižek, 2004: 12) is even more central to the 'transcendental' leitmotif of theology through his distinction between the 'actual' and the 'reality of the virtual' and the notion of 'repetition'. Because the 'virtual' past has been "betrayed by its past actualization" (*ibid*: 12), by 'repeating' the past, it "retroactively changes the balance between actuality and virtuality" (*ibid:* 12) in the past ... thus the "New can ONLY emerge through repetition (*ibid:* 12)". From the distinction between the virtual and the actual, the difference between letter and spirit takes on a new meaning. To repeat a text, author or event, is to transform it. Betraying the letter is to remain faithful "to (and repeat) the 'spirit'" (*ibid:* 12). Conversely, to be faithful to the 'letter' is to betray the 'spirit'; this means betraying the "creative impulse" that authored the letter. Our constitutional court judgements' reference to the 'spirit' of the Constitution that overrides contested textual interpretations, underwrites this complex Deleuzian insight. The court is constantly changing the balance between the "actuality and virtuality of the past" (*ibid:* 12). From this position, the possibilities for theological textual re-readings as 'real' repetitions are infinitely transformative, so is the promise of reconceptualised (transformed-repeated) notions of 'forgiveness' and 'reconciliation'. Similarly, we have the option of repeating the past in order to transform the balance between its actuality and virtuality. 'Memory' and 'nostalgia' are thus political.

35) Walter Benjamin's (Caygill, 1998: 34) notion of 'immanent critique' is closely linked to the notion of 'immanence' in Deleuze. Critique is 'immanent' when it does not require external transcendental criteria for its operations. The criteria are invented in the process of criticism

---

[43]See Wilder's (2004: XX) take on Fanon's rejection of a 'transcendental' that wants to jump over social, economic and psychological challenges into a cosmological future. Doxtader's (2004) response to Hatch (2004) and Hatch's response to Doxtader (2006) is also productive in this regard: "Doxtader focuses attention on philosophical and theoretical questions regarding reconciliation's potential and practice. While generally affirming the value of my tragic-comic analysis, Doxtader detects in it a problematic tendency to synthesize the two frames in a way that privileges the comic call for peace and unity over the tragic cry for justice. At a deeper level, he warns that treating the tragic and comic as epistemological "frames" leaves unchallenged the problematic ontology of the self-certain, transcendent subject and the law of identity, which together enable societies to do violence to the Other in the name of law and claimed transcendence. Moreover, he fears that defining reconciliation in terms of such presumably transcendent actions as forgiveness and apology obscures the historical conditions that may (or may not) make for reconciliation, contingencies that rightly engender controversy over what specific actions would qualify as reconciliation (if it is warranted)". See for instance Halpern and Weinstein (2004) on *Rehumanizing the Other: Empathy and Reconciliation* for an interpretation with which Doxtader would take issue.

and no recourse to religion or a Kantian transcendental come into play ... criticism is called to "recognise and free the future from its distorted present" (*ibid: 35)*. But, Benjamin, like Levinas, has traversed the borders of religion in various forms. This is not to say that one cannot recover the secular from Benjamin's work. If the redemptive[44] suggests "to mend what is broken and to correct what is distorted" (*ibid: 9*), then the recovery of wholeness as a secular project is infinitely possible. As Callahan argues, (undated: 5), albeit for different reasons, Benjamin, "by reflecting upon discarded objects, old buildings, and items from the past, [...] hoped to redeem them by remembering them, unfolding their meanings and experiences and thereby recovering the wholeness of historical human experience [...] To be sure, only a redeemed mankind receives the fullness of its past—which is to say, only for a redeemed mankind has its past become citable in all its moments". These insights will most certainly resonate secularly in studies on non-racialism and reconciliation.

36) The 'immanent unfolding of the mind in reality', responds to Leeb's critique of Hegel, Butler's and others' politics of recognition in support of her 'politics of the subject-in-outline'. Combining an 'ethical responsibility' prior to ontology together with 'reconciliation as cognition' provides the notion of *shared complicities; collective futures* with infinite conceptual resources. *'Reconciliation' 'immanence', 'immanent critique' and 'repetition'* merge together into a productive interpretive scheme.

'Space', 'Race', 'Rights' and Class[45]

37) *A Race against Time* (Stevens, Franchi and Swart, 2006) is a sober assessment of the possibilities and impossibilities of a deracialised South African future. Shifting the discursive trajectory, Durrheim, Mtose and Brown (2011) suggest that *Race Trouble* may be a more productive analytical stance than 'racism' for studying inequalities and its social, interpersonal and structural expressions. Further, MacDonald (2006) argues that race categories are deliberately and consciously revamped for political and economic purposes in *Why Race Matters in South Africa.* Related work slanted towards 'project reconciliation' includes *Negotiating the past* edited by Nuttall and Coetzee (1998), *After the TRC* edited by James and Van de Vijver (2000), *Justice and Reconciliation in Post-Apartheid South Africa* edited by Du Bois and Du Bois-Pedain (2008) and *In the Balance (South Africans debate reconciliation)* (2010) edited by Du Toit and Doxtader (2010)[46].

---

[44] The idea of a secular 'redemptive' for the purposes of this document arose out of a discussion with Lis Lange.

[45] Infinite sources are available of this theme. I have listed the major ones right throughout the document. Therefore, I am limiting by analysis on this theme.

[46] Doxtader's (2009) book *With Faith in the Works of Words: The Beginnings of Reconciliation in South Africa: 1985–1995* traced the beginning of 'reconciliation' in South Africa. Dixon (2010) makes the following observation in the book review: "It is only in the Epilogue that Doxtader addresses the question that has long plagued his work, "Did reconciliation work?" (285). (Re)placing himself into the ontological debates that have occurred between Hatch, McPhail, and other scholars, Doxtader ambivalently declares that such questions can only be answered provisionally. Yet, it is here that Doxtader turns reflective, philosophical, and quite theological. He moves us away from defining reconciliation as an end place and toward defining it as a constant invitation to beginning. Invoking Foucault, he advises that the process rather than the meaning of reconciliation may be a richer concern for his readers. By shifting in this manner, Doxtader advances the mystery and miracle of reconciliation: "More than a plea for dialogue, calls for reconciliation interrupt history's words and open a time to speak . . . the advocacy of reconciliation involves reading the signs of the times and discerning a moment (and a need) for choice".

38) *A spectre is haunting these fields of inquiry'* ... to borrow from and paraphrase Marx. This spectre is the 'disturbing possibility', as Nancy Fraser (2009) argued in relation to the feminist movement, that the cultural-identity focus of research can simply offer a cultural-revolution, but not institutional and structural change. She argues that initially feminist critique integrated the economic, cultural and political dimensions of gender injustice. These dimensions, also designated as 'redistribution', 'recognition' and 'representation', became separated from one another over the past two decades and from the critique of capitalism and in the process became enlisted to legitimate neoliberal capitalism (see Fraser, 2009: 99-100). It is difficult to find a more 'haunting spectre' (double meaning intended), one which has already appeared-disappeared in 'race' studies. Similarly, Goldberg (2009), in 'A Political Theology of Race: articulating racial southafricanization, reminds us of Stuart Hall's seminal contributions to the field and alert us to the fact that "non-racialism [...] offers a conceptual partner for neo-liberal politics" (*ibid:* 532). Goldberg suggests that a new research project should focus on "the constitutive connections between neo-liberalism, the social modes of racial expression, and racist social structure" (2009*:* 535). In the field of 'whiteness', that "power-laden discursive formation that privileges, secures, and normalises the cultural space of the white Western subject"[47], research in South Africa has to engage with the work of Melissa Steyn, Christi van der Westhuizen and Mary West. Under this thematic area the guiding concepts include inequality, restitution, redistribution, discrimination, whiteness, blackness, racism, ethnicity, indigeneity, identities, oppression, spatiality, environment and human rights.

39) *Shared complicities; collective futures,* as operational frames, cannot be nominated in the absence of an invigorating emphasis on 'space', race', 'right' and 'class'. Under this theme, we have the most dominant moral language of our time; 'human rights'. But, I suspect this theme has entered a sterile order, a sentiment acknowledged by Essed and Goldberg (2002). In line with Torfing (1999), I argue that the analyses forwarded by Laclau, Mouffe and Žižek make a whole range of new political projects possible. Fraser and Butler's insights are also productive in this regard.

40) This theme, so much more than the others, demands an integration of the politics of redistribution, recognition and representation; or, the social, psychological, moral and material.

41) *Race, Whiteness and Education* by Leonardo (2009); *The Globalization of Racism* (Macedo and Gounari [eds], 2006); *The Cosmological Imagination* (Delanty: 2009) and *The New Sociological Imagination* (Fuller, 2006) are recent texts worth consulting.

---

[47] West, M. and Schmidt, J. (2010: 10).

Justice, 'Jouissance' and Democracy

42) What more can be said of 'justice' and 'democracy'[48]? That they are to come?

43) Alasdair MacIntyre has asked that the question remains the question in *After Virtue* (1981) and *Whose Justice, Which Rationality?* (1988). It remains the most open mystery of intellectual grandstanding that this question is still regarded as not being responded to. Social theory is littered with responses, none more as original as that of MacIntyre. MacIntyre did challenge the project of a 'universal morality' on which a common understanding of justice can be based. Before and since then, Nussbaum (2006), Sen (2009) and many others explored 'theories of justice'. Rawls, Dworkin and Hart stand out amongst these. Standard texts on jurisprudence and theories of law have carefully manufactured (uncritical) inventions on these. *Retributive, Restorative and Redistributive* justice emerged as referents to different orientations to fairness. Bell's (2002, 2007) focus on African moral philosophy and his interpretations of the work of Simone Weil (1909-1943) introduces the notion of *compassion-based justice.* At present, *procedural* justice seems to have replaced 'ethics', aided (this is my biggest gripe with Habermas's reconstructive theory of law) by Habermasian notions of 'discourse ethics'. These chronologies are well-trodden.

44) Gewirtz and Cribb's *Plural Conceptions of Social Justice* (2002) demonstrate that the notions of 'social justice' are plural and dependent on discursive relations. The concept of social justice has a long history that includes the social contract theories of Locke, Rosseau and Kant, which according to Rawls, (1971: 75) must be taken to a higher level of abstraction of 'justice as fairness'. The Rawlsian notions of "distributive justice" are generally described as 'liberal' (Engstrom, 2005: 1). Rawls (*ibid*: 73) argues that the "conception of social justice, then, is to be regarded as providing in the first instance a standard whereby the distributive aspects of the basic structure of society are to be assessed" – this should form the basis for "assigning rights and duties and defining the appropriate division of social advantages". Nozick (1996: 187) also adheres to a notion of "distributive justice" but argues for a minimalist state where the "free operation of the market system" provides for the optimization of opportunities for everyone! MacIntyre (1992), on the other hand, chides both the liberal notions of justice of Rawls and Nozick since it is premised on an impossible consensus on a range of principles of moral derivation.

45) What is important is that the notions of 'justice' and 'democracy' are under incessant critique, not because they are useless, but because they 'are to come'. Relying on Levinas's religiously motivated ethic, Derrida formulates a conception of justice that "considers the 'infinity' of the concrete other" (Honneth, 2008: 117). Thus Derrida conceives of justice as infinite and incalculable and resistant to deconstruction on the one hand, and a justice operationalized as law, on the other hand. The former breed of justice, like democracy, is to come. A caring justice based on the infinite responsibility towards the other emerges here.

---

[48] These concepts will score high on the all time list of concepts explored in written texts.

The forms of responsibilities will differ between human beings. But care or benevolence presupposes a form of solidarity that supplements the notion of justice with a principle of unilateral, entirely disinterested help (*ibid:* 125).

46) *'Jouissance'*, the term interlinking the concepts of *justice and democracy* in this theme, suggest the productivity of the 'pleasure-pain' reflection 'on-the-verge'. It gives us the resources to imagine the infinity of the 'other', outside of the self. In addition, it suggests a certain courage and ecstasy associated with the '*death drive*'[49]. '*Jouissance*[50]', and for now I am postponing (not rejecting) its location in theories of eroticism, is a concept required here to drive the notions of truth, commissions, humanity, participation, justice, human rights, peace studies, environmental justice and democracy to the verge, from where we may (must) return to a different beginning. The ante for research is instantaneously raised higher.

47) If we think of 'justice and democracy to come', then both these concepts and their associated practices are in the realm of immanent unfolding. In this unfolding we have a *responsibility-in-complicity* which presupposes the aims underpinning the notion of *collective futures*. This complicity requires a *jouissance* that images a justice and democracy as a responsibility towards the Other, first.

Spectrality and Hauntology: Implications for reconciliation studies[51]

48) Roudinecso (2008), in a moving account on Althusser in *Philosophy in Turbulent Times*, argues that Althusser, though he felt responsible for and confessed to murdering his wife, was denied the right to be guilty. As is well known, Louis Althusser who strangled Hélène Rytmann to death on 17 November 1980, was "designated mentally ill by experts" [and] never had the chance to revendicate full physical and juridical responsibility" (*ibid:* 99) for the act of murder. *The Future Lasts a Long Time,* Althusser's account of the death of his wife, published posthumously in 1992, suggests that because, in terms of the penal code, there is neither crime nor delict when a person is in a state of dementia at the time of the deed, he became a non-subject of rights. That is, for being declared non-responsible for the deed, the 'right to be guilty' is denied. And because it is impossible, under these circumstances, to claim the right to be guilty, he ceased to be a rights-bearer at that very moment. Thus, for Althusser, the possibility to be guilty of some sort of violation is constitutive of being human. In the absence of such possibility, he lived "out a spectral existence" *(ibid:* 100), as one of the *disappeared*, with reference to Foucault's "designation for madness"..."neither dead nor alive, still unburied" (Althusser, 1992: 16).

49) One can, with some deductive logic, intimate that if the guilt apportioned by history to those who have been complicit as perpetrators, bystanders and beneficiaries, of say Apartheid

---

[49] This concept is mostly associated with Freud. I use it here in the Lacanian- Žižekian sense: "the death drive strives […] to go beyond the pleasure principle and to attain the painful joys of 'jouissance' (see Macey, 2001: 83). The death drive is a 'drive' … a resource for 'reflection-on-the-verge'.

[50] One simply has to read Lacan and Žižek to get a sense of the conceptual productivity of the concept, both for social theory and psychology. Baudrillard also had some interesting ideas on the *Jouissance of Language (2007).*

[51] This theme is converted from the literature review in more detail than the others because of its 'newness'.

South Africa, cannot identify the bearers of the right to be guilty, those 'invisible' and silent owners of guilt, will be doomed to spectral existences...neither dead nor alive, unburied. Let us imagine further, if complicity suggests a differential distribution of guilt which touches everyone, we are all 'spirits' ... admittedly some more than others. I will return to this logic. In Derrida's (2005) last interview, *Learning to Live Finally,* before his death in 2004, he presented himself as an "uneducable spectre who will have never learned how to live". *Spectres of Marx* (1993) marked the first substantive engagement of Derrida with Marxism. In consonance with the general trend of *Spectres*, Bevir (2000: 2) argues that Derrida's interlocution with Heidegger in *Of Spirit* (1989), suggest that 'spirit' "calls our attention to the absent Other. It reminds us of an ethical responsibility prior to ontology; it sets up a 'cosmopolitanism' that precedes all particular identifications and avoids spiritual racism", something Heidegger was accused of. In a logically enterprising move, Derrida argues that Heidegger's *dasein* requires 'being-with' and as such is dependent on the 'proximity to our being' (*ibid:* 11). This demand creates a formulation of an affinity only in proximity and thus "raises the spectre of racism"[52]

50) Derrida contends that there is an Other that comes before "*existential relationship to these others*" with whom we live in proximity *(ibid:* 12). So, in *Spectres of Marx*, Derrida elevated spectrality and hauntology by affirming that which it makes possible: "ontology, theology, positive and negative onto-theology" (1999: 219). To put is simply, the notion of ontology is dependent on grasping the notion of 'spectrality'. "To speak of spectres, the lexicon of ontology is insufficient", as Montag (1999: 71) puts it, because "ontology speaks only of what is present or what is absent: it cannot achieve of what is neither" *(ibid)*. "What exists between presence and absence that prevents the non-present from simply disappearing? [...] how does the absent produce effects?" he continues *(ibid)*.

51) The productivity of an envisioned research programme with spectrality as a theme is limitless. One can imagine how the ghost of Apartheid still haunts us and will continue to do so as a spectre, *in ad finitum.* Such analysis will historically explore the constraints and limitations to reconciliation whilst studying the non-disappearance of apartheid's ghost, its spirit. Namely, those spirits we are carrying, that we give existence to. To study societies and communities as living out spectral existences would be an innovative contribution, since it may just, maybe, provide for an acknowledgement of historical proportional guilt and ensuing social activism from which the spectre may take its leave. Further, the spirit, imagined not as proximity of 'being with', but open to an Other prior to a relationship, can make a positive conceptual contribution to how we conceive of ourselves and others within the context of a cosmopolitan citizenship. With regard to social activism, Derrida argues that the spirit cannot remain spiritual but must produce events, new forms of actions and practice (1999: 245). Thus, *Spectres* is not a metaphysical critique of Marx, but a deconstructive one. One where the messianic is not utopian, but refers to the "coming of an eminently real" *(ibid*: 248) [...] "that call for commitment without delay" *(ibid:* 249). From this vantage point

---

[52] We are still to study the link between the dominance of Heideggerian philosophy in South African universities and its complicity with Apartheid's racism during the 'dark times' ...bad politics always has a bad philosophical counterpart.

Derrida explored an ethic of infinite responsibility towards the other. An ethic one may argue, which is conditional to social justice and reconciliation.

52) The past, especially one of wrongdoing, constitutes itself in the present as a burden. As Berkowitz (2011) observes, Arendt's *The Origin of Totalitarianism* (1973) originally entitled *The Burden of Our Times,* ardently argues that the past "acknowledge what any of us is capable of doing" (*ibid:* 2). Further, because revenge and forgiveness operates in a moral universe of sin, they escape judgment. Therefore, reconciliation "is the only response to a wrong that makes space of a human judgment and human action". As an act of political judgement, only 'reconciliation posits a new concept for solidarity' in response to the act that has sundered the body politic [...] [t]he connection between reconciliation and judgment means that reconciliation and not revenge or forgiveness, can respond to wrongs in a way that fosters the political project of building and preserving a common world" *(ibid:* 2-3). Here we find that the past enters the present as a burden ... as an apparition or phantom, not dissimilar to Derrida's spectre. The past accentuates our capability for wrongdoing. It is the past that discloses our collective complicities. And it is the past that makes reconciliation a political judgment in service of solidarity and a reconciled future. Using the concepts of ghosts, spirits, haunting, ontology of presence, existence, appearance, disappearance, co-existence, culpability and guilt as framing heuristics, a new, innovative research schema on 'reconciliation' is possible.

53) If the spectre calls our attention to the absent Other, we are *reconciled* and *complicit* in advance, before proximity with 'others'. *Collective futures* are spectrally inscribed. Further, if we as scholars of tomorrow love justice, we must learn it from the 'ghosts' (Thurschwell on Derrida, undated: 98)

Mourning, Forgiveness and Legacy

54) "How does the spell of the past remain in the present paradoxically through the suppression of guilt, forgetfulness or the desire to forgive and forget" (Goehr, 2005: xv) was, one could rightfully say, an obsession for Adorno in his reflections on post-war Germany. The 1980s and 1990s, the turn of the century, were particularly significant decades for South Africa. The prelude to a 'revolution' that converted into a 'consensus' ... South Africa emerged as the poster child of human rights, the first 'genetically designed human rights state'. However, these years also saw the reconfiguration of the SADC region, the 'collapse' of the Soviet Union (1991), and ethnic violence and wars in other parts of Africa and Eastern Europe. The political self-understanding of communities of the nation-states influenced by these was thrown in disarray. This disarray generated what Misztal (2003: 2) refers to as the 'commemorative fever' of the 1980s and 1990s in *Theories of Social Remembering.* Commemorations and memorials became part of history's reflection on itself, as was the case in Germany, Rwanda and others.

55) History and memory are not the same. Whilst commemorative rituals demonstrate that all societies "display and require a sense of continuity with the past" (*ibid:* 4), memory is

orientated "to create an atemporal sense of the past in the present" and history suggests a "reflective exploration of past events" (*ibid:* 99). Thus, the term 'historical memory' may be wanting, but it may be useful for now. Given the social importance of memory and commemoration, research may find a productive niche...a socially-relevant function. However, as Misztal (2003) suggests, we have to cast the net wider to include 'memory and identity', 'memory and trauma' and 'memory and justice'. Wilder (2004: 53) introduces the productive concept of 'legacy' into our research explorations: "connotations of legacy are at once objective and subjective, concrete and abstract, material and symbolic, spatial and temporal. To receive a legacy, therefore, is to inherit a real, durable piece of the past and/or to be designated as a representative of the territory or tradition from which it derives". 'Legacy' surpasses 'memory' since legacy is unfolding towards the future.

56) Legacy is not a static inheritance. Time is therefore not continuous but disjointed and the link between the past and the present is not an unchanging bridge of history, but a disruptive re-visitation...in Deleuze's words, a transformative repetition. In the arms of legacy, memory and commemoration take on productive possibilities: "[...] memories may be invented, constructed, or imagined by either dominant or subaltern groups. Alternatively, commemoration may focus on reviving, reconstructing, or representing past events whose memory has been forgotten, buried, denied, effaced, or obscured" (*ibid:* 53). The persistence of the past, its haunting of the present, is commonly studied through psychoanalysis that aims at understanding the relationship between 'the consciousness' and 'the unconsciousness'. Since we do not have immediate access to our unconsciousness, we require a structured method for such access through psycho-analysis. If, as Lacan would have it, the unconsciousness is structured as a language, then it is through language that the unconsciousness can be disclosed (see Rozena Maart[53]). When Derrida in *Resistances to Psycho-analysis* (1996: 27) argues that deconstruction "obeys an analytic exigency, at once critical and analytic", he gives psychoanalysis a deconstructive reading ... one of "undoing, desedimenting, decomposing, deconstituting sediments, artefacta, presuppositions, institutions" (*ibid*). Further, if one considers the advent of psychoanalysis and new techniques of archivization, the very concept of history is at stake (see Derrida, 1996: 40). Quite simply, memory and commemoration studies, and history for that matter, require formats of inquiry yet to be imagined. These demands extend to studying trauma as invading the present that allows the past to obscure the present (see Wilder, 2004). The formulation of traumatic temporality, "where the past is continually present" (*ibid:* 54) provides us with a complex research problem: 'how do we work through a past when emancipation is "identified as the source of historical trauma" (*ibid:* 55). Needless to say, as Arendt (1973) made it clear, 'working through the past as trauma' inflicts those who have to carry the historical burden of wrongdoing as well. In a sense, proportionally and differentially, this is an all-inclusive endeavour.

57) If we take Freud one step further, through the brilliant interpretations of Kristeva (2004: 220-233), that in the "fascinated rejection that the foreigner arouses in us, there is a share of

---

[53] http://rozenamaart.wordpress.com/teaching/psychoanalysis/ [accessed on 11 December 2011].

uncanny strangeness" (*ibid:* 233) within ourselves. By recognizing this "the ethics of psychoanalysis implies a politics" *(ibid)* and a cosmopolitanism within oneself. It suggests a form of solidarity founded on the consciousness of the unconsciousness. "The foreigner is within me, hence we are all foreigners. If I am a foreigner, there are no foreigners" *(ibid)*. Therefore, the notions of cosmopolitanism and solidarity acquire new meaning and the possibilities for grounding 'reconciliation' in new, unexpected ways, are infinite. But, we have to be cautious, because Fanon rightfully "rejects metaphysical attempts simply to leap over or out of present reality into a transcendental cosmological future" (Wilder, 2004: 56). An alternative future demands working through material and psycho-social conditions *(ibid)*. Wilder (*ibid:* 57) suggests that Fanon and Césaire both disclose a race-reason impasse that must be taken up by new intellectual and political projects...a new research agenda, pursuing an alternative temporality.

58) In *Radical forgiveness: transforming traumatic memory beyond Hannah Arendt (*2008), Gobodo-Madikizela[54] gives a rich account of forgiveness in the context of human rights violations. In relation to the work of the TRC, she generally pursues the concept of 'restorative justice' as an analytical category. In an enriching intellectual movement, Gobodo-Madikizela' (2008: 53) introduces the need for psychoanalytic notions of empathy as central to the possibility of forgiveness. Weaving through notions of empathy psychoanalytically, with Arendt, Derrida and Levinas as her main interlocutors, Gobodo-Madikizela suggests, in conclusion, that "where vengeance is arrested, perhaps a word that best captures what is needed is not forgiveness, but empathic repair" *(ibid:* 61). These intellectual movements should no doubt be central to our research agenda. Psychology, critical community psychology and social psychology in particular, have already done productive groundwork on this. The possibilities and need for studies on reconciliation in relation to historical memory, trauma, nostalgia and empathic repair are infinite. The deconstructive (Derridean) movements of psychoanalysis even more so, as a new *politics*. Within this new politics, the contours for a project on *shared complicities; collective future* may be drawn.

Cosmopolitanism

59) There are two strands that "intertwine in the notion of cosmopolitanism", argues Appiah (2006: xv).

> One is the idea that we have obligations to others, obligations that stretch beyond those to whom we are related by the ties of kith and kind, or even the more formal ties of shared citizenship. The other is that we take seriously the value not just of human life but of particular human lives, which means taking an interest in the practices and beliefs that lend them significance.

These strands have a complex physique. As Pollock, Bhabha, Brenkenridge and Chakrabarty (2002: 1) suggest, "cosmopolitanism is not some known entity existing in the world, with a clear genealogy from the Stoics to Kant". Needless to say, demands for productive work lie

---

[54] I can scantly do justice to the oeuvre of her work. I found the book in which this chapter appears to be an insightful compilation of writings on 'justice and reconciliation' in post 1994 South Africa.

ahead, not only conceptually but also pragmatically. This is so because cosmopolitanism, "in its wide and wavering nets, catches something of our need to ground our sense of mutuality in conditions of mutuability [...] to learn to live tenaciously in terrains of historic and cultural transition" *(ibid:* 4). Referring to the work of Chattterjee, Pollock (2002: 47-48) intimates that cosmopolitanism suggests an attachment to the past that is prior to any successful transformation. Such attachments may be religious or cultural in nature ... they represent the wealth from which transformation may proceed. Here, the vernacular, the particular are not substituted by or for a universal cosmopolitanism, but are constitutive and possibly reconcilable with such an idea of cosmopolitanism. The thread of reconciled forms of thinking and practices, which I hope has been running through my treatment of the various themes, is at once a weaving and an unbinding. It is an acknowledgement that a multiplicity of vernacular forms interface with one another under a 'cosmopolitan canopy'. This canopy, ultimately, is the space where the politics of redistribution, recognition and representation plays itself out as an integrative exercise.

60) Derrida insights in his explorations in *Of Hospitality (2000*), *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness* (2001) and the *Politics of Friendship (1997)* are instructional. It came as no surprise that Derrida was criticized as having an *African bias* by his detractors[55]. Let us start with the concept of 'différance'. Derrida created this term to combine the actions of 'to differ' and 'to defer'. The iterability of an element divides is "own identity a priori" (Derrida, 1988: 53). It is within itself differential, and differential in relation to other elements. Thus, it can be repeated and while the same, it is not identical (Stocker, 2006: 174). Différance "indicates a non-identity within the same" *(ibid:* 175). This *a priori*, inherent, différance in the structure of language, makes 'otherness' and 'difference' foundational. Something can be something other than itself in semiological repetition. Extending this to the social, thus, if there is an otherness even in the same, difference and alterity becomes the hallmark of human society. Benhabib (2004: 226) can therefore argue that the task of "politics today is the reconceptualization of new forms of association which will let the 'differend', the other, appear". The task is no different for research.

61) Cosmopolitanism presupposes a contradictory imperative. First, there is an unconditional hospitality which "is in advance open to someone who is neither expected nor invited [... it] is a hospitality of visitation rather than invitation (Derrida, 2003: 129). This hospitality which is neither "juridical nor political, is nonetheless the condition of the political and the juridical" *(ibid)*. Conditional hospitality ensues from an invitation, with rules*,* rituals and norms *(ibid)*. Unconditional hospitality has the same logical structure as justice ...therefore 'justice' and 'hospitality' does not end with law, rules and norms. It goes beyond a duty, obligation and debt. Within the steering frames of différance, difference, non-normativity, hybridity, otherness, social cohesion, identity, friendship, hospitality, love, mutual vulnerability and precariousness, social practices related to conflict resolution and diversity management will be limitlessly enriched. Research has the massive task of exploring social reality through

---

[55] See also Wise's (2002) approving analysis of Derrida's work as a YES to Africa; and his book *Derrida, Africa, and the Middle East (* 2009).

these productive frames which so obviously host some of the seeds for the conceptual architecture of *shared complicities; collective futures.*

Humanity, Science, Technology and Cyborg-Bio Techno-sciences

62) One has to look no further than De Gruchy (ed, 2011) on *The Humanist Imperative in South Africa* to get a feel for the philosophical debates on 'being human' that have been going on since forever. Also, one does not have to peep away from this compilation to start worrying that we are asking all the wrong questions all over again … returning us to the same beginning. In true modernist logic, the 'improved' conception of the 'human' is linked to the 'advancement' of various kinds of knowledges. And the 'improved' human condition is the one adjudicated as such by modernity's narration. Such contradiction, the advancement of 'humanity' through the 'conditions' that generate the 'inhuman' should have resulted in intellectual disruptions of volcanic proportions. You won't find it in this book. Returning humanity to the human rights mirror and its conjoined twin of a dignity-injected ethics, this compilation at best may serve to draft a declaration for something like the 'moral regeneration movement'. The chapter on *Science, Technology and Humanity* is bleached from any criticality and its mantra is the 'enhancement of humanity' through technology. The demand to rethink, in a deep epistemological fashion. The relationship between science and humanity scarcely enters the 'faculties'.

63) Heisenberg's technical and mathematical proof that the velocity and position of a subatomic particle can never be simultaneously determined first gave rise to the 'uncertainty' principle, and second to Niels Bohr's principle of complementarity in 1927.[56] 'Electron and participle and electron as wave', though contradictory, found an integrative form of thinking and description. Scientific 'reality' is uncapturable and "is irreducible to anything other than a partial representation", complementary to other representations, but always incomplete.[57] Bohr's argument suggests the necessity of 'wholeness' in the scientific endeavour inclusive of scientific observations, and the "whole situation created to study atomic 'objects' of inquiry in the laboratory".[58] And further, "the necessity of taking into account the conditions under which the experience is obtained"[59] and the crucial question of 'language' – "how we have to speak of nature – in the scientific representation of reality"[60]. Two consequences follow: First, the importance of 'conditions' in observation, and second, the centrality of language in representation. It is precisely these undergirding constituents of science which have been ignored or neglected up until today that created a relationship between science and humanity in the most dehumanizing image possible. That is, in rejecting the wholeness inclusive of the human in the 'act' of doing science, the only relationship possible between science and humanity is that of instrumental nature. A logic that is overwhelmingly dominant in the future, from where it reproduces itself in the present.

---

[56] Howard, 2007: p156.
[57] *Ibid*
[58] *Ibid: 157*
[59] *Ibid: 157*
[60] *Ibid: 160*

64) The epistemic injustice that obeys this scientific posture is as culpable for the everyday structural violence and conflict, than those human actions that forces, as a daily diet, ethnic strife and murder down our throats. This scientific bearing made choices between 'forms of knowing', forms of 'truth' disclosures and adjudicates the legitimacy of and knowability of 'what can be known'. Not only is the 'human' confined to a preferred image, but its cultural constitution - the human scientific act -, is exorcised from the wholeness of that which should be science. This is an obvious, profound violence which legitimized and legitimizes so many further human rights violations on a continuing basis … incalculable injustice. Here one can argue for a simple wholeness as an inclusivity of forms of knowing and doing science, still within the ambit of scientific rigor, but tuned toward a justice and a democracy to come.

65) Three other 'natural' scientists had a dramatic impact, at least in theory, on the philosophy of science. Kuhn's Structure of Scientific Revolutions (1962), Feyerabend's Against Method (1975) and Lakatos' Proofs and Refutations (1976) all challenged the standard conception of the progress of science and its atomistic (anti-wholeness) methodological orientation. Rather, the scientific endeavour is a collage of disunity made up of many 'non-scientific' elements. It is here, in the spaces between this disunity, where the relationship between science and humanity is logically constituted, but scammed[61]. This deception, constituted by ideology, power and interests, has been critically disclosed by Habermas, Foucault, Derrida and many others over the past 50 years.

66) No doubt, the scientific and technological developments over past 15 years, has projected 'humanity' into the simulacrum. Bio- and nanotechnologies are now giving rise to android and cyborg ethics, paradoxically in a world where social suffering, so hard to bear, results in the increasing medicalization and psychologization of human existence[62]. These technologies, with other pathologies, both constitute and are constituted by these trends in human existence. Baudrillard, philosopher of 'fatal theories', suggests that it is the 'inhuman that thinks us'[63] and that 'television watches us'[64]. Photography is a two-way gaze ... the photo gazes back at the photographer. 'A cage went out in search of a bird', is a Kafkanian diary entry that Baudrillard hauls before logic to argue that language is a form in search of content. Would it be different, I propose, to think of humanity as a form in search of prosthesis ... in search of technological extensions? Such proposal is only possible to think because technology has become fetishized commodity, in a Marxian sense, but so unnoticed as to be rational. The silent disappearance of the 'real' ensues from modernity's philosophy of 'accumulated' progress. So, through science and technology humans are 'cloning God' to perfect a world from which they are perversely excluded futuristically.[65] The outcomes of COP17 should be sufficient evidence for confirming that this form of seduction placed us in a catastrophic order.[66] The virtual, 'the matrix' becomes the actual. Technology now begins to manage the representation of reality. Transcendence is no more a possibility, even if it was

---

[61] See Keet (2010) on 'Transdisciplinarity'.
[62] Roudinesco, (2010): pxi-xii.
[63] 2007: p101.
[64] *Ibid:* p103.
[65] *Ibid: p28 (human extermination is easily achievable today).*
[66] Baudrillard on *Forget Foucault, XX*

only an escapist one before, or one of only a few options to return to. We can now only 'downcend' into a genetic code. Meaning is fractionalized into the digital void[67] which is completing the simulacrum. If humanity is thought through the lens of the simulacrum, it is easily acceptable to suggest that science and technology control us. The construction of the simulacrum is aided by the religious aim at perfecting the world. That is, both science and religion have a shared teleology. The genealogy of the [B] book, underscores this argument, both in terms of science and religion, from the Chinese to the British.[68] The idea that we are in an ecological and moral catastrophic order has only recently started questioning the pursuit of perfection. The ecological catastrophic logic is obvious. On genetics's moral side Habermas (2003) argues as follows:

1. Our current understanding of what it is to be moral a—presupposes a self image of ourselves as free, autonomous, self-legislating beings, and b—requires us to treat other moral agents in a way that attributes the same self-understanding to them.
2. Genetic intervention in future generations to select desirable dispositions entails prejudgment of specific life projects, which a—threatens the self-image of a putative moral equal, and b—requires us to act toward a putative equal in a way that is incompatible with the action of a moral agent
3. Therefore, what is at stake is the ethical self-understanding of the species: whether or not we can continue to see ourselves as beings committed to moral judgment and action.[69]

67) Manuel Castells[70] argues that there is a co-evolution between the human brain and computers, but computers cannot become subjects in their own rights because they do not as yet have self-programming capabilities[71]. Humanists, in general will underscore this sentiment, but the Deleuzian 'desiring machine'[72] suggests that this drive for externalizing devices has always been there as an interface between the subject and the world. Thus, we have always identified with our bodies-as-machines, with the mind as the material unfolding of the brain. Is this not perhaps what Solms (2011) has in mind with his text on the neurobiological foundations of humanity and human values? The materiality of the mind is unmistaken, or is it? Immanence trumps transcendence, or does it? Our prefrontal lobes that mediates instincts and make choices and thinking possible, also allow for the truly unique human capacity of self-deception and hypocrisy[73]. The real can escape this deception only by a mind that is thought of "being embedded in the network of social relations and material supplements".[74] Thus instead of arguing against the machinic-technological externalization of human capacities (cell phones, smart phones, computer chips, prosthesis, etc), we should focus on its "liberating dimensions [...], the more our capacities are transposed onto external machines, the more we emerge as 'pure' subjects"[75]. Though humanists will certainly rebel against this logic, we have to consider that externalization perhaps may make us more human. Technologization is in any case logically and morally different, but not less problematic, than eugenics and bio-prospecting.

---

[67] *Ibid: p76*
[68] See Fuller, 2006: p137.
[69] Rorty, (2003): http://ndpr.nd.edu/news/23461-the-future-of-human-nature. [accessed on 22 December 2011]
[70] 2004: p136-137
[71] The work of Searle (2008) on philosophy of mind, neurobiology and cognitive science is worthwhile exploring.
[72] See Due, 2007: p141
[73] See Solms, 2011: p54-55.
[74] Žižek, 2004: p16.
[75] *ibid*

68) *Science and the Theft of Humanity* by Geoffrey Harpham[76] is a typical humanist response to science. Concerns about "cognitive science, cognitive neuroscience, robotics, artificial life, behavioral genetics and evolutionary biology" intimates that the 'human' is under threat'[77]. "Many projects-from the relatively familiar such as stem- cell research and the Human Genome Project to the more exotic, such as attempts to upload the component parts of consciousness into a computer, bioinformatics, and advanced nanotechnology-appear to have serious implications for our basic understanding of human being"[78]. Neurosis and paranoia considered and expelled, I agree with Harpman that "we stand today at a critical juncture not just in the history of disciplines but of human self-understanding, one that presents remarkable and unprecedented opportunities for thinkers of all descriptions. A rich, deep and extended conversation between humanists and scientists on the question of the human could have implications well beyond the academy. It could result in the rejuvenation of many disciplines, and even in a reconfiguration of disciplines themselves-in short, a new golden age"[79].

69) The Harpman suggestion should be conditional on a process where the rules of engagement, within and between the humanities and the sciences, are first re-crafted along the principles of epistemic justice and a justice to come. Something of the sort that Marsen[80] has in mind on Transhumanism, "a social and philosophical movement that explores the uses of technology for the positive transformation of human capacities, and the social, political and ethical implications that such a transformation would carry".

70) Let us conclude this section with a typical Baudrillarian injunction. The exact moment that the real world appeared, was when humans, by means of science, analytical knowledge and the implementation of technology, began to transform it. "[While] taking their leave of it and at the same time lending it force of reality [...] the real begins [...]. "We may say, then, that the real begins, paradoxically, to disappear at the very same time as it begins to exist"[81]. The humanistic, fatal theoretical, scientific, Deleuzian and Žižekian insights provide rich interpretive schemes to study non-racialism, reconciliation and social justice in relation to the 'change' in the 'human' as far as artificial intelligence, neurosciences, machines, androids, computerised automata, prosthetism, cybernetics and bio-technologies are concerned. Exciting, theoretically useful research and just social practices may ensue from this direction. For instance the 'dissolution' of the 'human' may, perhaps, provide for a more just, 'humane' reconstruction. On the other hand, Derrida would argue that deconstruction 'must' delayer the 'human', as an affirmation. Who knows?

---

[76] http://onthehuman.org/about/papers/harpham
[77] I believe this is a permanent self-induced condition.
[78] Harpman, *op.cit*
[79] *ibid*
[80] Marsen,S. (2008): Becoming More Than Human: Technology and the Post-Human Condition, *Journal of Evolution and Technology* - Vol. 19 Issue 1 – September 2008 - pgs i-v http:// jetpress.org/ v19/ marsen.htm
[81] 2009: p2.

71) What should be clear though is that the nature of the 'human' with whom we are *complicit* in building a *collective future*, will also change.

Language, Arts, Culture, Literature and Representation

In the drama of conscious existence, it is not theory and practice that encounter each other, but enigma and transparency, phenomenon and insight. If enlightenment does occur, it does so not through the establishment of a dictatorship of lucidity but as the dramatic self-illumination of existence. – Peter Sloterdijk[82]

72) There are two ways to view this theme. First, as a conduit for the reproduction of inequalities and its resistances housing hegemonic and counter-hegemonic forces alike. Second, as fundamentally constitutive forms that mediate between humans and social reality; the modes included under this theme are potentially the most productive in providing new pedagogies and epistemologies.

73) One cannot begin speaking of culture, arts and music without reference to Adorno. Apart from Adorno's work on the culture industry and *Aesthetic Theory (1970),* his intellectual and practical obsession with 'oppression'; the 'german' experience of 'working through the past; and the 'violence of modernity' places him in a central space as far as this theme in relation to 'reconciliation' is concerned, especially on arts and culture. Though the culture industry was of particular concern to Adorno and Horkheimer in that it became associated with 'mindless entertainment', is was the logic of commodification that steered art and culture away from its liberating potential. On the other hand, new wave art and music always had the possibility to resist assimilation into the industry, and this was the attraction for Adorno.

74) Bolanos (2007: 26) captures Adorno's worries about the culture industry and his belief in the potential of arts and culture as follows: "Adorno's seemingly bleak view of a reified society might be misinterpreted as sheer pessimism. However, I [...] argue [...] that through Adorno's "aesthetics of redemption," it is possible to conceive of art as a medium of creating a dimension of imagined freedom. An artwork can present itself as an opposition to the present and thereby open up the present to the future. The future is a realm of hope; but art does not guarantee that the future will be better than the present. Art can aid us in our battle against total reification and to arouse a sort of *nostalgia without content*. "This is the most that art can do for us since even art can be commodified" (*ibid)*.

75) The very possibility of art, culture and music as representation in opposition to the present, suggests a rich area of research, both substantively, but also in relation to arts, culture and music as mechanisms for critical awareness. '*To let suffering speak* is a condition of all truth' says Adorno in *Negative Dialectics (*1973: 17-18). Perhaps he had art in mind for this kind of speaking[83].

76) Another original thinker, Richard Rorty, suggests that the tension between "the desire to ameliorate ethnographic colonialism and the need to make we-ness (*solidarity;*

---

[82]

[83] For a brilliant assessment of Adorno's work, see Zuidervaart (2007): *Social Philosophy after Adorno.*

reconciliation) into a worldwide hegemonic moral imperative is to turn to novels [...] Novels are both free from the demands of representationalism, and bound by what takes the place of representationalism for Rorty – the familiar" (Rothleder, 1999: 20).

77) We now have commandeered art, culture, music and the novel into the 'project reconciliation'. Also, the 'we-ness' of which Rorty speaks might be an element of 'collective futures'.

78) Mary West's (2009) book *White Women Writing White (Identity and representation in [post] apartheid literatures of South Africa)* is an excellent engagement with 'whiteness' studies and the normativities constructed to adjudicate the mode by which knowing becomes knowable and conscious. Piercing through layered boundaries West opens up a wide area of research in *literature studies*. Suggesting that the deconstruction of whiteness may be a prerequisite for 'collective futures' in one way to read her. Another way is to suggest that a 'shared [moral] complicity' is only possible once 'whiteness' has disclosed its [political] complicity. Other work of importance in this arena includes that of Melissa Steyn (2001), Mark Sanders (2002) and Christi van der Westhuizen (2007)[84].

79) Paul Gready's (2009) *Novel Truths: Literature and Truth Commissions* is a good example of Rorty's position on the novel. "By 'novel truths' I mean the unique truth practices and repertoire available to the novel as a genre, as distinct from other genres such as the human rights report" *(ibid:* 156). For Gready the TRC dominant discourse of 'speaking to reconciliation' has been duplicated by the novel with the concomitant discourses of "forgiveness, catharsis and healing, and linked to a broader nation-building project framed in terms of reconciliation" *(ibid)*. Where I lose Gready is in his contention that human rights made this speech possible *(ibid)*. The dominance of the contemporary rights discourse would have made such speech commonplace, which is not the case. Still, this article is an absolute treat for anybody interested in literature, human rights and reconciliation[85].

80) A vast array of literature, art and music was generated around South Africa's TRC. Truth as a literary and art 'genre' has arrived. A great source in this regard is Kruger's (2011) review of Gready's (2011) *The Era of Transitional Justice: The Aftermath of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa and Beyond;* Cole's (2010) *Performing South Africa's Truth Commission: Stages of Transition*; and Graham's (2009) *South African Literature after the Truth Commission: Mapping Loss[ii]*. Astutely observed by Cole that , while "no one seemed able to agree on exactly what *'genre'* of performance the TRC was - ritual, theatre, drama, bioscope or circus – most seemed to agree that it was a performance" (Kruger, 2011: 187)[iii]. "Only literature can perform the miracle of reconciliation" as Charlton (2011) puts it.

---

[84] See also West and Schmidt (2010).

[85] "The article argues that South African novels have engaged with the speaking truth to reconciliation paradigm, but have also shone a light on issues such as the enduring appeal of revenge and retribution, the prevalence of informing and betrayal on both sides of the political divide, the complicity of white beneficiaries in apartheid's crimes, and the complexity of certain black identities (e.g., those designated "colored" who "played white". Gready (2009: 157).

81) Literature studies in relation to 'reconciliation' would be well-served to take a Foucauldian direction in studying the conditions of the emergence of its artefacts such as novels, books, comics, etc. Then again, these artefacts will, on close reading, disclose the conditions of its own emergence and critique the 'epistemology of the given', a point lucidly made by Tsou (2011) in *Catacresis* and a conceptual position embraced by most of the literary contributors to the *Journal of Asian American Studies*. Pak and Tsou (2011:171) defines the epistemology of the given as the "process of naturalizing representation implies an epistemology that commands a "metaphysics of presence," an erasure of the historicized process of signification such that the meaning of the sign appears immediately "present" to itself without mediation. For history, this epistemology occurs as the "body" of the Asian American subject; for literary criticism, it occurs as an instrumental approach to literature such that its relationship to "Asian America" appears present to itself. Collectively, these essays ask: How might Asian American history be constructed without an Asian American body? How might a literature called "Asian American" be reterritorialized without the content-driven tether of "Asian America"?"

82) Voice, that authentic form of presenting the self, is central to art, literature and cultural studies. But, 'voice' presupposes forms of non-representation which suggests vigilance towards 'inclusivity' and anti-oppression. Feminism[86] and feminist critique in literature, art and film comprise a rich body of knowledge to do exactly that. Macey (2000: 124-126) provides a good summary of its influence. Without doubt, feminist critiques provided some of the most productive contributions, moderations and reconfigurations of social theory over the past sixty years. *Gendering Trauma: Ariel Dorfman's Narratives of Crisis and Reconciliation* in the context of Chile by Amy Novak (2002) is a great example of feminist critique in literature on reconciliation. Research has the obligation to mine these contributions.

83) Though the productivity and importance of this theme for the overall project is axiomatic, it is, again, in Deleuze where we find a framing worthy of a comparison between psychoanalysis and literature:

> "Gilles Deleuze responds to this question by outlining some of the components of a clinical as well as a critical use of literature, which we might summarize along the following lines. First, certain writers have invented concrete semiotic practices that may prove more effective than psychoanalytic discourse in diagnosing the constellation of mute forces that always accompany life and threaten it from within. Second, as a result of this diagnostic and critical function, certain works of modern literature can be understood to produce a kind of "symptomatology" that may prove to be more effective than political critique in discerning the signs that correspond to the new arrangements of "language, labor, and life" (to cite Foucault's abbreviated formula for the grand institutions of instinct or habit); third, perhaps most importantly, literature offers a manner of diagramming the potential forms of resistance, or "lines of flight," which may be virtual to these new arrangements" (Lambert, 1998: 1).

84) Njabulo Ndebele is, to my mind, referring to Deleuze's credence that certain writers have the capacity, better than that of psychoanalysts or political theorists, to disclose those mute forces

---

[86] The shifts in this political and intellectual movement are captured by Fraser (2009).

that arrange social reality in certain ways so that the coordinates of resistance can be made visible. In an interview with Mary West (2010: 123-124), Ndebele argues the following:

> We currently find ourselves in a huge multicultural classroom, and in multicultural work places, which offer new experiences and new ways and forms of knowing ourselves and others. We have to move away from the old rigid certitudes. They no longer hold. What I then hope for is writing that shows there are other avenues of experience that we have not even begun to understand. Writers such as Kopano Matlwa, Antjie Krog, Jonathan Jansen, Phaswane Mpe, Niq Mhlongo, K. Sello Duiker, and other contemporary writers, are helping us enter such new worlds. [...] They offer us a way out of the anguish. We need to understand one another more, go into a new adventure of understanding the South African experience that is no longer dictated by inherited structures, but that reflects how human beings fashion new possibilities through new interconnections. I would hope then that in the writing of the future, in the music of the future, in the dances, in new spatial environments and their new architecture, we'll be enriched by this new world that many of us never thought existed. If only we were to learn to look again, and look closer.

85) The role of the Institute's research programme is to contribute to this "looking again-looking closer" … to disclose the world of *'collective futures', through shared complicities*. This non-transcendental collective future is rooted in the materiality of complicity. Quite simply, a focus on language (reading, writing), art, culture, literature and representation will be a key 'disclosing' mechanism. Strategies and actions around curating, exhibitions, reading, writing, photography, theatre, film, dance, music, etc. will be crucial. One example of this kind of writing is that of Preston (2005) where he argues that reconciliation is a literary and political concept by exploring *Shakespeare Biography and the Theory of Reconciliation in Edward and James Joyce.*[87] One can modestly think of the possibilities of research on 'reconciliation' that focuses on feminism, speaking, writing, narrative, time, discourse, signs, rhetoric, orientalism, art, drama, performativity, the body, post-colonialism and alterity.

---

[87] "In the 1990s the term reconciliation gained new prominence as a concept by which to rebuild political cultures and develop transitional states, from the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission to the Northern Ireland Good Friday Agreement. Forgiveness is the key psychological term in almost any account of reconciliation, and on the South African model forgiveness is sought from two sources. On one hand the new state grants amnesty to almost all of the applicants who have committed human rights abuses on either side of the conflict. On the level of communal healing, on the other hand, a more important element of forgiveness comes from the victims and survivors themselves. Paradoxically enough, this often happens either when they find out the full story of how loved ones have been killed, or when their own narratives of trauma are finally acknowledged publicly in the course of the Commission's official hearings. Archbishop Desmond Tutu has described these acts of forgiveness—by survivors rather than by the state—as acts of sanctification. Reconciliation is not a new term in political discourse, but it has not always been thought to work this way in relation to the state. Victorian imperialist reconciliation, by contrast, did not imply negotiation between the colonizer and the colonized. The colonizers rather enforced their own ideas of justice on the colonized, and the colonized were left to reconcile themselves to the hard facts of their own subalternity. The twentieth-century collapse of Britain's colonial empire brought the colonizer to the negotiation table, and considering where that collapse began it is not therefore surprising that the democratizing reinvention of reconciliation took place early on among Irish writers. Ulysses was published in France two months after the Anglo-Irish Treaty was signed in London, and each document proposed new reconciliations—through sundering—to Irish audiences back home. This essay will describe a transforming moment in the history of reconciliation as a literary and political concept by comparing the opposing models of William Shakespeare's biography in the writings of Edward Dowden and James Joyce".

Conclusion: Shared Complicities; Collective Futures

86) The very beginning of my thoughts on 'shard complicities-collective futures' started in training workshops and classrooms around the pedagogical encounter. Between 1996 and 2007 I literally trained and worked in almost every town in South Africa, rural areas, government training rooms, university lecture rooms. I studied prisons and schools, councils and committees, hospitals and universities, traditional and non-traditional structures and many other places and spaces. I worked on the continent and other parts of the world and began working at the University of Fort Hare in 2008. Shifting between rural workshops, Afrikaans lecture rooms, African university pedagogies and 'mixed' teaching spaces, I began thinking of 'mutual vulnerability' as pedagogy, something that I also explored in my studies and my critique of 'declarationist' human rights education.

87) Then 'collective futures' emerged in my course at the University of Fort Hare and provided the productive counterpoint of my thinking on 'mutual vulnerability', a concept I borrowed from Kwenda (2003). It was the pedagogical encounter in 'unmixed' and 'mixed' spaces that troubled me, obsessively so. The language of hope and possibility of critical pedagogy needed some 'injection'. And, I was most offended by human rights education thinking of itself as peoples' education and critical pedagogy. So these 'black' and 'white' and 'mixed' lecture rooms became permanent reflexive spaces. I am always productively 'anxious' about these spaces and the 'normativities' that tend to 'kill' education even before a lecture started. So 'epistemic justice' and 'mutual vulnerability' become my operative pedagogical concepts. From taught and being taught in lecture rooms, the notion of 'lowering' one's meaning-frame (making oneself vulnerable) so that transformative learning can take place, became all-important. The pedagogical reflections were at once political, it could not be otherwise. Hence, *shared complicities; collective futures.*

88) Through the preceding paragraphs I have tried to build the following constitutive thematic areas (with operating concepts) which may provide building blocks for a research conceptual framework of shared complicities and collective futures. *'Space', 'Race', 'Rights' and Class*; *Justice, Jouissance and Democracy; Spectrality and Hauntology: Implications for reconciliation studies; Mourning, Forgiveness and Legacy*; *Cosmopolitanism; Humanity, and Science, Technology and Cyborg-Bio Techno-sciences; and Language, Culture, Literature and Representation.*

89) The themes are integrative and interdisciplinary. They question our standard research orientations and demand that we can root our endeavours in an empirical desire for those conditions we are studying. Right through these paragraphs, I have tried to show how non-racialism, reconciliation and social justice are not only ontological 'truths', but that a massive body of knowledge, research and conceptual frames supports them as outcomes of different varieties of human projects. I have also argued for an acknowledgment of the complexities that are inherent in these works. There are no neat boundaries between victims, perpetrators, beneficiaries and bystanders. I suggest that history apportion guilt proportionally, but like

Arendt, Adorno and others, I argue that this guilt touches us all. I have placed, in different formats, conceptual frames that range from Marx's social class analysis to Derrida's 'hospitality'. And I have affirmed that no research can ignore the unfurling of predatory capitalism across the world.

90) *Shared complicities; collective futures'* do not imply an equalization of guilt or responsibility. Rather, observable actions within social reality suggest that this conceptual frame should be productive. There are continuous and multiple flashes of 'reconciliation' and acts of forgiveness for all to see. There are also observable acknowledgments of guilt (not nearly enough); and we have measured movements towards a sense of collective responsibility. This responsibility does not equate with differential relations to a past, but rather to a present and future ethic[88] of care. If Honneth (2007: 125) is right and "solidarity constitutes a necessary counterpart to the principle of justice [...], [then] care supplements the principle of justice with a principle of unilateral, entirely disinterested help". The secular resources for 'reconciliation' are thus infinite.

91) We have learned from Deleuze that the past and present, progenitors of violations and reproducers of massive inequalities, requires transformative repetitions. Invented (usable) histories on every side (and there are many more than two) of a multi-sided form that is still to be imagined; must take shape in service of collective futures. There must be forms of historisizing that can develop these manoeuvres. Sanders (2002: 2) argues that the TRC reports precisely suggest these movements. The perpetrators of human rights violations were identified, but the accomplices such as the media, business, prisons, faith communities, the legal system and the health sector were all complicit.

> Their actions and omissions ranged from creating favourable ideological conditions for apartheid (media, faith community), to materially aiding systematic repression of political activity (prisons), to knowingly profiting from apartheid (business), to not challenging racism in their own professions (legal system, health sector, media), and to falsifying medical reports and death certificates of detainees (health sector) *(ibid)*.

92) The 'little perpetrator' in the TRC report takes the notion of shared complicity further by suggesting that the focus on the gross violators, deflected attention away from the 'little perpetrator' is in each one of us. Following Arendt, the potential of evil in all of us, always already makes us complicit in the wrongdoing of others ... in the banality of evil. Complicity is an ethico-political response available to anyone (Sanders, 2002: 3-4). The 'folded-together-ness' of human-beings makes us 'responsible-in-complicity' *(ibid:* 8). If we are to study our past and present as 'folded-together-ness" of being, "marked by degrees of affirmation and

---

[88] See Kamboureli (2007: 959) on the limits of the ethical turn: "Far from exemplifying moral achievement in Nussbaum's terms, *Self*, in the context in which I have examined it, illustrates not only that a turn to ethics involves passing through thresholds beyond those we intend to cross, but also how easily a turn to ethics can go awry. Because there is always a risk of stumbling upon, indeed of reproducing and thus perpetuating, those elements that the turn to ethics as strategy elides, ethical acts should not just orbit around the material interconnectedness of the urgencies they respond to. The ethical turn must also turn towards an ethics of memory so that we remain alert to the contingency, as well as complicity, of the means and methods we employ, but also to the past that bears witness to the present every time we respond to the imperative to care for the self and the other".

disavowal", supporters of apartheid tried to minimize foldedness with the other, whilst its opponents tried to 'minimize acting-in-complicity' by affirming "responsibility-in-complicity" (*ibid:* 11-12). Complicity is omnipresent. For those who fought against apartheid, complicity converted into a responsibility, not for apartheid, but for human togetherness.

93) In today's structural violence and disrespect in human relations we are all 'acting-in-complicity' and are therefore 'responsible in complicity'. There is no human togetherness without the principle of complicity. Let us complicate these principles further. Bourdieu (1990), in his landmark work in sociology, argues that *habitus* refers to durable dispositions resulting from internalized social structures or embodied history. That is, structures generate, at least in part, dispositions and social practices are the outcomes of these dispositions, but it also has positional dimensions. A field, "which is a set of social positions that entails degrees of power/ capital, refers to objective social structures" (Mouzelis, 2008: 120). It follows that no-one is outside of *habitus,* that is, we are all structured by structures, structuring structures. Shared complicities and collective futures reside here ... there are no outsiders, only complicities (I still need to develop this point).

94) Let us discuss these durable dispositions with Bourdieu as our most productive interlocutor. Emergent questions related to the study of racism, reconciliation and social justice, have to take into account the 'little everyday fascisms'[89] that have percolated into a structural violence that seems to be prevalent in so many forms of human relations in modern day society. These fascisms are the interpersonal versions of the ethnic, religious, xenophobic, cultural and economic violence that are raging across the world. They, at all levels, constitute and are constitutive of conflict. The levels of interpersonal, cultural and structural conflict consist of planes of oscillations and interwoven threads that at first present its knots and ties to analysis and at the same time retreat from or resist such analysis. Thus, analyses on racism, reconciliation and social justice either probe the knots and ties on an interpersonal and cultural level to such an extent that material and structurally anchored inequalities are positioned beyond analytical reach. On the other hand, examinations of racism on a structural level conclude that semi-permanent economic arrangements and structures have an overwhelmingly determining effect on social formation and as such the possibility of reconciliation is logically tied to shifts in structural arrangements, which are difficult to achieve. Bourdieu's analytical tools may assist us with this impasse.

95) Structuring structures, the dynamic generative process between social forces and individual dispositions, with the body situated in a *field,* suggests that "the very structures of the world are present in the structures that agents implement in order to understand it" (Grenfell, 2004: 174). If we can further construct ways of 'seeing' how an agent's actions are influenced by social structures and how social institutions in turn are recursively created and recreated by the practices of its members, then complicity is ontological (see Grenfell on Bourdieu, 2004: 174-175). We have to explore this complicity in much greater depth because the discourse on race and the racist discourse in present day South Africa are sufficient to suggest an

---

[89] Roudinecso,

'emptiness' or lack of an innovative interpretive scheme. Such lack, ironically, connects our 'little everyday fascisms' with a morally uncurbed violence[90] that feeds into the globality of gross injustices and inequities. That is, the everydayness of aggression, disrespect, conflict and violence articulates with the gross human violations so endemic to our societies. It is this precarious grounding of 'tolerance' towards and 'respect' for others that appears as uninhibited forms of brutality and aggression[91] reflected in the over proximity of images of human suffering that are littering the social landscape, here and elsewhere. Within this context we need to focus on developing new interpretive frames and languages to both sharpen our conceptual tools, and invigorate our practices. The 'little everyday fascisms' are, in Bourdiean terms[92], the dispositions that make up the practice of everyday violence which in turn, is structured by structuring structures. In essence, the violence of structures, or structural violence, constitute and are constituted by practices that create structuring structures.

96) Let us for a moment change direction but stay on the same route. Intellectually, studies on social and cultural memory transmitted "in the discursive media of education, literary traditions and the pedagogy of museums and memorials"[93] coupled with studies on discourse, identity, nostalgia, grievability, precarity, mourning, forgiveness, cosmopolitanism and reconciliation, are questioning our standard responses to and frames of thinking on racism, racial prejudice and discrimination. Probing the conditions that sustain our most prevalent frames of reference requires an epistemological capacity that can create a social environment for a new language and enduring practice to emerge. This epistemology suggests "that if we are to make broader social and political claims about rights of protection and entitlements to persistence and flourishing, we will first have to be supported by a new bodily ontology, one that implies the rethinking of precariousness[94], vulnerability, injurability, interdependency, exposure, bodily persistence, desire, work and the claim of language and social belonging"[95]. I had, with others (Keet, Zinn and Porteus, 2009) explored mutual vulnerability as a meaning frame to imagine a collective future: In relation to mutual vulnerability Kwenda (2003: 70-71) argues the following.

> Cultural injustice occurs when some people are forced, by coercion or persuasion, to submit to the burdensome condition of suspending – or more permanently surrendering – what they naturally take for granted, and then begin to depend on what someone else takes for granted. The reality is that substitution of what is taken for granted is seldom adequate. This means that, in reality, the subjugated person has no linguistic or cultural 'default drive', that critical minimum of ways, customs, manners, gestures and postures that facilitate uninhibited, unselfconscious action... By cultural justice, we mean that the burden of constant self-consciousness must be shared or, at the very least, recognised and, where possible, rewarded. The sharing part is very important. For it is only in the *mutual vulnerability* that this entails that the meaning of intimacy and reciprocity in community can be discovered.

---

[90] Honneth, p200
[91] Honneth, p200
[92] See Roudinesco, 2009.
[93] Habermas, J. (2006). *Times of Transitions,* Cambridge: Polity, p. 69.
[94] I have had many debates with 'friends' and 'enemies' on this.
[95] Butler, J. (2009). *Frames of War,* London: Verso, p2. Though Butler admittedly focuses on war, her insights are instructional for understanding other forms of human conflict.

97) This concept 'mutual vulnerability' is one of the cornerstones for building a research framework on *shared complicities; collective futures*. But, it is also one of the most difficult concepts to grasp because the possibility of the 'vulnerability' that it proposes, is *a priori* killed off by the 'resistance' it assumes. That is, grasping 'vulnerability' demands an 'openness' that is closed. This double bind is "the call to analysis", as Derrida would say (1996: 36). But, we have to "analyze tirelessly the resistance ... [and] the acheo-logical, analogical and also hermeneutic demand for reason and the principle of reason" (*ibid*: 36). The resistance here has to be acknowledged, since it is also the logic of a 'political resistance' but the resistance must be analyzed, unendingly. Analysing the resistance to analysis, in say for instance our resistance to honest self-reflection, is one of the key objectives of 'mutual vulnerability', which is not the same as 'equal vulnerability'[96]. There is a communicative desire for 'mutual vulnerability', since human beings, in the act of communication[97], assume a pathway of education (in the real sense), for themselves and others. The privilege, power and authority (all are undeserved) that one carries via a social and class 'identity', desires vulnerability unless one has stopped to be educational; a fear that Adorno expressed about American and German societies. The social assignment of privilege and power-knowledge, in a Foucauldian sense, requires more vulnerability from some more than from others ... a differential (not equal) vulnerability. It is the only possibility of an educational 'pedagogy'.

98) Kwenda's references to particular African cultures to empirically mirror his abstractions, aligns with two well-written books by Bell, one on African moral philosophy (2002) in which he argues for a compassion-based notion of justice. The other is on *Rethinking Justice, Restoring Humanity* in which he (2007) enriched the notion of restorative justice with the notions of compassion and generosity. The way in which the thinking of Wiredu, Geyeke and Soyinka is woven together with that of Simone Weil catapults our understanding of restorative and compassion based justice as prerequisites for non-racialism, forgiveness and reconciliation. These forms of justice, with its aversion to the violence of procedure, constitute one of the major building blocks to imagine a sense of collective futures. Such imagination, I contend, is dependent on acknowledging shared complicities. This is an argument that I still have to develop in all its complexities.

99) Samantha Vice's (2010) paper "*How do I live in This Strange Place*" is an interesting argument in support of complicities. Her main focus is the complicity of whites and whiteness in perpetual injustice in South Africa and she argues that shame and guilt should form the contours of an appropriate action of turning one's "attention to the self with silence, and if possible, humility" *(ibid: 338)*. I found her 'struggles' fascinating and productive, but, the 'silence' is already deafening. I am not convinced that a shame-induced silence (a silence that is more silent than silence) is the way to go. The inverted possibility that 'the silence' may reproduce privileged spectator spaces, not so different from that of the 'white liberal' university critic of apartheid in the 1980s and 1990s, is way too real. Authentic moral action can only take shape through social engagement.

---

[96] I will soon write up my debates with friends and enemies on 'mutual' does not mean 'equal'.

[97] One can hardly find a better example of this logic, empirically driven, than in Jonathan Jansen's (2011) *Introduction* to *We need to talk.*

100) The study of 'race', reconciliation and social justice in the context of massive material inequalities, disposition and dominant neo-liberal orientations is something that research cannot ignore. Likewise, if we neglect an ethics of infinite responsibility as modes and modalities central to research agendas on 'reconciliation' and 'social justice', we may just as well remain in conceptual prisons. Our challenge is to develop conceptual architectures that can disclose, through better human relations, how material inequalities operate as a first step to collective social action. *That is, an ethics focussed on the 'Other', is better placed to make material inequalities visible for 'excess', 'self-indulgence', 'decadence', 'poverty' and 'deprivation' to be shown up as conjoined social pathologies.* 'Restitution' and 'redistribution' will then be able to take on rational political form and action. There is a preference to express these conjoined pathologies as attained-unattained aspirations or recognised-misrecognised identities. From here, it is a small step to feed the politics of fear ... *"fear thy neighbour as thyself",* as Žižek[98] puts it.

101) *Fear thy neighbour as thyself* is how Žižek (2009: 34) chose to reflect on violence as a consequence of the politics of fear … a politics which "resorts to fear as its ultimate mobilizing principle: fear of immigrants, fear of crime, fear of godless sexual depravity, fear of the excessive state itself […], fear of ecological catastrophe, fear of harassment". Turning the gaze of this logic inwards, we may choose to see the political-material economies of South Africa's racial politics. This politics signifies itself as 'socially cohesive', but in effect mobilizes around the principle of fear ('swart gevaar', 'wit gevaar', 'rooi gevaar', 'taxi gevaar', 'crime gevaar', 'other' gevaar, etc.)[99] and the paralyzing anxiety of permanent poverty and deprivation. The 'other' becomes an image of fear and/or aspiration. In both directions, the precursors to interpersonal and group violence are spawned.

102) The 'other', in its social and intellectual formulations over the past twenty years, is, as argued by Žižek (2009: 35) "just fine, but only insofar as his (sic) presence is not intrusive […] insofar as the Other is not really other. One has to take Žižek's (2009; 2011) treatise of violence (subjective, symbolic, systemic) into account to make any sense of what 'collective futures' may mean. Add to this Ignatieff's (1998) account of violence and that of Enzberger (XX) as discussed by Honneth (2007: 198-217) and we may arrive at a rich analysis capable of guiding us to study its 'everydayness' and different forms. We need to draw these contours for a *shared complicity* to emerge.

103) Yosso's (2005) work in *Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth* is a useful resource to conclude with. She argues that "critical race theory (CRT) shifts the research lens away from a deficit view of Communities of Color as places full of cultural poverty disadvantages, and instead focuses on and learns from the array of cultural knowledge, skills, abilities and contacts possessed by socially marginalized groups that often go unrecognized and unacknowledged. Various forms of capital nurtured through

---

[98] Žižek in *Violence* (2009).
[99] 'Gevaar' translate directly into 'fear' or a perceived 'threat'.

cultural wealth include aspirational, navigational, social, linguistic, familial and resistant capital".

104) In an argument that I am still to develop in fuller detail, Yosso opens up the following possibility: If cultural capital is present everywhere (in different forms and amounts) and we rightfully have to reject the 'deficit' view, cultural capital presupposes complicity-in-responsibility. Agency suggests complicity, a power to do. The agency associated with cultural capital is only possible to theorise within the parameters of *shared complicity,* from which a responsibility for *collective futures* can emerge. I am acutely aware that such complicities and responsibilities are assigned differentially along various lines of which race, class, power and gender are examples. But it does not negate the logic of *shared complicities; collective futures.* Instead, Yosso's argument serves as a rich conceptual support.

End (for now)
Andre Keet

Endnotes

---

[i] A series of anthologies, studies and research reports on 'race, reconciliation and social justice' have been consulted, especially those published between 1985 and 2011. The end of the 1980's and the decade of the 1990s witnessed international events (the end of dictatorships in some of the Latin American countries, the fall of the Berlin Wall, the collapse of the Soviet Union, 'political' liberation in Namibia and South Africa, the Rwanda and Bosnian genocide, to name a few). See also Tang (2011) on 'reconciliation' and peace studies in post war Europe and East Asia's haunted past. Kupchan (2010) on *How Enemies Become Friends* and Nadler *et al* (eds, 2008) *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Reconciliation* are worthwhile sources. Volumes have been written on the Latin American experiences.

A commemorative 'fever' ensued in the 1990's around memory, heritage, history and 'the past' which has redrawn disciplinary and research landscapes in cultural and archival studies, history, psychology, literature, art, law, education, neurobiological sciences, etc. Fletcher and Weinstein (2002) provide immensely rich intellectual resources and argue that "in the last decade, there has been a burgeoning interest in the question of how countries recover from episodes of mass violence or gross human rights violations. This interest has focused on the concept of transitional justice, a term we use to describe the processes by which a state seeks to redress the violations of a prior regime. As dictatorships and repressive regimes fell in Latin America in the 1980s and 1990s, human rights scholars and advocates pressed states to initiate domestic criminal proceedings against the notorious intellectual authors of mass terror and their faithful subordinates. Further, the character of war has shifted from inter- to intra-state conflict since World War II. These wars reflect intense competition for power and wealth among groups struggling for supremacy. Often characterized as racially, ethnically, or tribally motivated, one commonality among these conflicts is that warring forces target civilian populations, particularly women and children, and cause massive destruction of infrastructure. Mass violence results in the breakdown of societal structures—social and economic institutions, and networks of familial and intimate relationships that provide the foundation for a functioning community. Indiscriminate and episodic violence occurs at random and affects people at a neighbourhood level. Even where the violence is centrally planned (as in Bosnia-Herzegovina or Rwanda), the collaboration of paramilitary with military units produces acts of violence and cruelty that are designed not only to kill but to terrorize and destroy the basis of community life.11 Neighbor-on-neighbor violence is characteristic of this form of aggression as seemingly peaceful community members are swept up in the inexorable process of killing".

In addition, a vast array of models and theories emerged: A vigilante model of justice (Tripp *et al*, 2007); forgiveness theories (Baumeister *et al,* 1998); theories on truth and its [c]omissions (Sanders, 2000, 2002; Titlestad and Kissack, 2006); reconciliation theories (Parent, 2010); social theory, human agency and reconciliation (Hayes, 1998) are a few examples. Hatch (2003; 2006) 'interest-convergence' theory sparked productive debates. Gibson and Claasen (2010) uses Gibson's theory of "equating lack of prejudice with interracial 'reconciliation' to argue that 'interracial contact' has lead to more reconciled South African society. See also Katz and Radzik (2010) discussion on Radzik's book *Making Amends: Atonement in Morality, Law and Politics* and Appiah (2010) *The Honor Code: How Moral Revolutions Happen* which has interesting implications for reconciliation studies.

What seems to have emerged is a productive 'transitional justice' industry, complete with producers, consumers and markets (see Baxi on 'human rights markets', 2002). See also Madlingozi on the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2007: 107).

"Speaking at the Centre for Post-Conflict Justice at Trinity College, Dublin in 2010, Kader Asmal, formerly anti-apartheid activist, recently minister of education, and now professor of law in South Africa, asked the question: "Post-Conflict Justice: Industry or Necessity?" As a critic of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) for allegedly sacrificing justice and the criminal prosecution of perpetrators to the ends of national reconciliation (see Asmal et al.), Asmal may have been a controversial choice to inaugurate a center whose website features Nelson Mandela framed by the new South African flag, and whose members honor the TRC as a key model for the resolution of conflict in Ireland. Nonetheless, the TRC has become, as Paul Gready suggests in *The Era of Transitional Justice* (2011, hereafter Era), both an example for later commissions and the stimulus for commentary on an industrial scale. Gaining "unprecedented attention through the place of apartheid in the international political imagination," the TRC offered a workable if imperfect way to combine the investigation and documentation of systematic human rights abuses, the holding of perpetrators to account in public hearings if not in courts of law, and the creation of fora for survivors to contribute to a process of national resolution (6). At the same time, it has spawned close to a hundred volumes of analysis, or of instruction in the form of handbooks used more recently in Liberia and Sierra Leone. Gready notes that this proliferation of commentary and high expectations has led on the one hand to "overpromised" but "undelivered" benefits to victims (7) and on the other to the "fetishization of the human rights report" as an end in itself or a means, intentional or not, of legitimating the organizations, governmental or nongovernmental (NGO) that produced the document (34). Gready's book and the others under review here, Catherine Cole's *Performing South Africa's Truth Commission: Staging Transition* (2010) and Shane Graham's *South African Literature after the Truth Commission: Mapping Loss* (2009), all acknowledge the industrial scale of commentary on the TRC but each makes a case for the impact of its example less from the calculation of deliverable or undeliverable outcomes but than from the imagination and experience of the hearings and of responses to them in creative expression, mediated representation and public response to both" (Kruger, 2011: 185).

ii Kruger (2011:186): "While not the first to treat "truth as genre" (20), Gready draws on his work on applied human rights and on literary and life writing (such as *Writing as Resistance* and "Novel Truths") to investigate the tricky relationship between instrumental and imaginative deployment of keywords and thus to bridge the gap between the focus on goals and outcomes in human rights discourse and the celebration of complexity and ambiguity by literary critics. As he notes, four genres of truth are outlined in the *TRC Report*: forensic truth corroborated by evidence; personal or narrative truth (experience based narrative whose retelling restores the dignity of the survivor); social or dialogic truth (consensus reached through inclusive participation); and restorative truth, the acknowledgment of shared history to enable healing (1: 110–14). Even before the publication of this volume in 1998, however, these provisional genres of truth generated more controversy than reconciliation. Poet-journalist Antjie Krog's memoir, *Country of My Skull*, provoked debate not only because of her selective citation of testimony but also her choice to attribute specific genres to witnesses, for example, by rendering the testimony of Lekotse as a "shepherd's tale" in blank verse (*Country of My Skull* 278).1 Krog's book, which has sold 17,000 copies, against fewer than 4,000 copies of the TRC Report in print and CD-ROM (Gready *Era* 58–59), has become a touchstone for literary critics writing about the TRC, from Mark Sanders on the "ambiguities of witnessing" to Graham on truth and reconciliation as guiding themes in *South African Literature after the TRC*. Treated too broadly, however, these keywords lose analytic clarity; while truth and reconciliation certainly permeate the work of poets Krog and Ingrid de Kok, and the collectively devised theater pieces *Ubu and the Truth Commission* and *He Left Quietly*, these terms only partially illuminate the work of writers that Graham identifies with "post-apartheid urban spaces" (87–134) or "memory and landscape" (142–77) or the more ambitious "social cartography" that the author initially evokes (21). Sanders's analysis of the tension in the TRC, between the "systematic ambiguities set to work by the commission" (Sanders 185), replayed in different ways by witnesses, commentators, and creators of fiction, and the "wager . . . that the transmission of words, the relay of a witness's voice across distance, awaiting response, would do: something" (x) acknowledges the power of testimony while stringently refusing to resolve that hoped-for "something" into a final equation with reconciliation. Sanders's exploration of this delicate balance between the pitfalls of ambiguity or downright failure and the persistent engagement with dialogue despite broken connections sets an example whose subtlety and modesty invite emulation. Gready acknowledges the ambiguities of narrative truth in personal testimony, in re-presentations of testimony in published memoirs by individuals or, more radically, by writers such as Krog, but departs from literary readings to insist that, while testimony may partake of the "truths of the novel" in its "openendedness, ambiguity, and non-resolution," and while "human rights often needs to balance . . . different rights, "some adjudication is required" to arrive at truth that can restore the dignity of those wronged by gross violations of their rights (*Era* 71–72). Truth commissions, in his view, are "tasked with collaborative, democratic history-making but situated in a transformative process, in which history is an act of . . . vindication for the oppressed and voiceless. Truth, in this process, must take sides . . . and make moral judgments" (73).

iii Kruger (2011: 197): "Going beyond this widespread but often vague acknowledgment, she argues that "careful analysis of the ways in which [these elements] performatively operated," including nonverbal elements such as "gestures, weeping, silences" or the "demonstration" of torture techniques at public hearings, is essential to understand the TRC's "core paradox": that "it was devised to express events and experiences that . . . are unspeakable" (17). While Cole is not the only researcher to reach this insight (see Grunebaum) nor to interpret as performance gestures, weeping and silence as well as the multiple languages spoken in the radio and television broadcasts (see Grunebaum and Robins; Kruger; Phelps; Ross; and Sanders), she reframes the fields of vision and hearing by analyzing them within the matrix of performance *studies*. Deploying the key terms of this field, from Richard Schechner's "restored behavior" to Joseph Roach's "genealogy of performance" to Diana Taylor's insights not only into the interplay of "archive and repertoire" but also into the transformation of trauma, silence, and the "disappearance" of victims perpetrated by the Argentine military into "acts" of re- as well as dis-appearance, she brings them into conversation with comments on the theatricality of the TRC elicited in interviews with commissioners and other participants. This combination enables her to lay out not only a set of terms with which to differentiate kinds of performances and their shifting affiliations with institutions as apparently distinct as law, theatre, or storytelling, but also an account of how the reformulation of these forms over the years of the hearings created a genealogy and a repository of embodiments and texts from which artists, advocates, and ordinary people have drawn to represent South Africa in the decade since the TRC. The critical impact of this work can best be seen in Cole's last two chapters. Chapter 4, on "television and the implicated audience," picks up on the observation by Cherry, Daniels, and Fullard, which Cole like Gready cites in her introduction (7), that the "enduring memory of the commission with be the images of pain, grief and regret, relentlessly conveyed . . . to a public that remained spellbound by what it was witnessing" (Cherry et al. 35). However, where Cherry, Daniels, and Fullard focus on live broadcasting, Cole discusses an unusual television program, *TRC Special Report*, which offered not only a weekly digest of the hearings, but also documentation to explain and sometimes challenge statements made by perpetrators, survivors, and commissioners. In addition to showing that the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC) could be transformed into a postapartheid institution, *TRC Special Report* functioned as a "shadow commission that . . . conducted investigations, aired confessions (including confessions *not* heard by the TRC" (Cole 95). Although the program was anchored by dissident Afrikaans journalist Max du Preez, its team included African journalists who investigated the lives of unknown as well as famous witnesses".

Ed Charlton (2011): "The *au courant* trend "among some academics to trash the [Truth Commission]" that Antjie Krog regrets as she concludes her 1998 novel *Country of My Skull* is a fashion that has enjoyed a shift from relative exclusivity in the years since, becoming an essential item in the critical wardrobe of *most* academics engaging with a disillusioned postapartheid scene (385). Richard A. Wilson's caustic *The Politics of Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa* has patterned much of this critical mode, although he openly cites the influence of André du Toit, Anthea Jeffery, and Mahmood Mamdani over its design. This vogue's attendant devastation of the commission has led to its attenuation from recent critical discourse on the state of the nation. Despite claims made in the commission's final report towards an enduring legacy, both the Truth Commission and the politics of Rainbowism to which it was intimately linked through a shared hope for national reconciliation have found themselves fatally undermined and dismissed. This demise has been attributed in no small measure to the commission's founding upon a series of political compromises struck between the ascending ANC and F. W. de Klerk's outgoing National Party, reminiscent for Colin Bundy of the forces in Shakespeare's *Macbeth*: "as two spent swimmers, that do cling together" (11).
By eschewing this fashion to identify the Truth Commission's failures, however, the studies reviewed below have begun a resurrection of sorts. Congregating around a literariness that lies both within and without the commission, Mark Sanders, Catherine M. Cole, and Shane Graham are pragmatic readers who refuse the teleological markers of reparation and forgiveness that prevail in much critical commentary. Corroborating Erik Doxtader and Philippe Salazar's belief that "[t]here are moments when the question that asks for a definitive judgment is not the question that sheds the most important light," these texts all employ a particularly open mode of reading that helps unsettle any rigid understanding of the commission (xiii). Such a literary critical frame unchains the language of the commission from the foreclosed appraisals that have prevailed in recent years, allowing the processes initiated, but in no way completed, by the commission to be *read* and *performed* anew".