

2012

Anderson University
School of Theology

Dr. Curtiss Paul DeYoung,
Professor of
Reconciliation Studies,
Bethel University

[“BIBLICAL RECONCILIATION AS ‘GOD’S ONE-ITEM AGENDA’: BROAD REFLECTIONS ON THE DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE”]

Dr. Curtiss Paul DeYoung, Professor of Reconciliation Studies, Bethel University, for the 2012 Doctrinal Dialogue, June 25, 2012

**2012 Doctrinal Dialogue of the Anderson University School of Theology
at the North American Convention of the Church of God
Anderson, Indiana
June 25, 2012**

***“Biblical Reconciliation as ‘God’s One-Item Agenda’:
Broad Reflections on the Doctrine and Practice”***

**Dr. Curtiss Paul DeYoung
Professor of Reconciliation Studies, Bethel University**

The late Samuel George Hines wrote, “When preachers get to a certain age, their preaching usually revolves around a theme. They think in these terms when asked to speak anywhere, whether in halls of power, on street corners, or in churches around the world. Very early in my Christian walk the Lord made it clear to me that the number one priority on God’s agenda, or work in the world, is *reconciliation*.”¹ The mission of the Anderson University School of Theology is to form women and men for the ministry of biblical reconciliation. It is in the memory of the message and ministry of Dr. Samuel Hines and in the spirit of the mission statement of the School of Theology that I am honored to deliver this lecture for the 2012 Doctrinal Dialogue of the Anderson University School of Theology.

In his book, *The End of Words: The Language of Reconciliation in a Culture of Violence*, Duke Divinity School preaching professor Richard Lischer writes:

The multiple traumas of the twentieth and now the twenty-first centuries have produced a sense of futility among those with a vocation in language. Violence has a way of making a mockery of words. After Auschwitz, Hiroshima, Vietnam, Cambodia, Rwanda, all the words seem hollow. What does one *say* after a televised beheading? The proclamation of God’s justice or God’s love meets a wall of resistance first in the throat of the proclaimer, then in the ears of the hearer. ... When the message of Jesus Christ can be Nazified or made the tool of racism, anti-Semitism, apartheid, or capitalism, it is time for preachers to shut up and take stock of themselves.”²

The church and the seminary are places dominated by words. Words are a primary tool of our trade as preachers, teachers, and witnesses to our faith. Are there words we can use to mobilize our constituents for service in a world where differences increasingly cause tensions between people, groups, and nations? Can we find words that are useful in places divided by race, culture, gender, social class, and religion, such as Northern Ireland, Palestine/Israel, Sudan and South Sudan, Venezuela, Burma, and elsewhere—as well as in the cities, suburbs, and rural towns of the United States? Richard Lischer calls for preachers to be silent and look inward. Should we plead with congregants and students to also embrace silence in the face of injustice?

The Message of Reconciliation

Later in his book Richard Lischer tells preachers that they still must preach. And yes, teachers must still teach and we all must witness to our faith. We pause to embrace the reality of injustice and the mixed history of the church, but we still must take seriously the Pauline call that God “has committed to us the message of reconciliation” (2 Corinthians 5:19). Therefore, our call emerges with a message to address the global reality of separation, injustice, and trauma. The message is the word *reconciliation*! As Samuel Hines stated, “God has a one-item agenda listed in one expressive and inclusive word: *reconciliation*.”³

The word *reconciliation* appears only occasionally in the New Testament and, with a few exceptions, always in the Pauline literature. It translates several related Greek words.⁴ These words were utilized by Greek writers to discuss interpersonal relationships. In particular, they were used in peace treaties between nations and groups. So, in common Greek usage, there were very often social and political dimensions to the meaning of reconciliation. When Jewish scholars translated the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, they used these words to translate the

Hebrew words related to atonement—that is, God being reconciled with humanity. In this usage they did not retain the social and political dimensions found in the Greek understanding of reconciliation. On the other hand, when Greek writers used the words they never implied a spiritual connotation to reconciliation. In Paul’s use of *reconciliation*, we find both the spiritual and social meanings. His readership, both Greeks and Jews, would have understood reconciliation in this way as they discussed his letters in their gatherings.

Reconciliation means literally, “to change, or exchange; to effect a change.”⁵ As South African theologian John de Gruchy draws out the implication, when we are “reconciled,” we exchange places “with ‘the other,’ and (are) in solidarity with rather than against ‘the other.’” Reconciliation is a process that causes us to overcome “alienation through identification and in solidarity with ‘the other,’ thus making peace and restoring relationships.”⁶ Biblical scholar James Earl Massey writes, “The image in the word shows something having been set aside or put down: an attitude, a grievance, a position, a deed, a distance, a result, in order to induce or bring about a change for the better. A new disposition is exhibited, a new stance is assumed, a new framework is established granting a rich togetherness where enmity and distance previously were the order.”⁷ Reconciliation can be understood as exchanging places with “the other,” overcoming alienation through identification, solidarity, restoring relationships, positive change, new frameworks, and a rich togetherness that is both spiritual and political. Samuel Hines noted that reconciliation “is a restoration that creates wholeness in relationships where brokenness, dehumanization and polarization have existed.”⁸

Paul used the word “reconciliation” or “reconcile” only a few times (Colossians 1:20, 22; Ephesians 2:16; Romans 5:10, 11; 11:15; and 2 Corinthians 5:18, 19). He reserved this word

reconciliation as his most powerful way of expressing the meaning of the life, death, resurrection, and abiding presence of Jesus Christ.

The process of reconciliation begins when an individual accepts God's invitation to make things right. The Apostle Paul wrote in his letter to the Romans, "For if while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more surely, having been reconciled, will we be saved by his life. But more than that, we even boast in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received reconciliation" (5:10-11). Sin caused our relationship with God to become fractured. The death of Jesus was understood as the action that repaired our relationship with God. Reconciliation comes to us from God as a divine gift. The effect, from God's point of view, is that "everything old has passed away; see, everything has become new!" (2 Corinthians 5:17). When we are reconciled with God our old life passes away and a new life takes over, propelling us toward wholeness. Through a process of casting off dysfunction in our emotions, spirit, psyche, and relationships, we become healthy. In this reconciled relationship with God, we find strength to live like new persons, even though our environment and our world often do not change.

A healthy relationship with God produces the desire to be at peace with our sisters and brothers in the human family. When we have been truly reconciled with God, we hunger for a restoration to a primitive unity that was spoken into existence at the beginning of human history. The writer of Genesis stated, "Then God said: 'Let us make humankind in our image, and according to our likeness ...' So God created humankind in his image, in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them" (1:26-27). Therefore, Scripture implies that through Adam and Eve flow all persons who have ever existed on this earth. We have a common origin. We are one family.

This Genesis text is essential for understanding reconciliation. The word *reconcile* implies there is a pre-existing relationship that is broken and we want to restore and return back to that relationship. This definition of reconciliation makes racial reconciliation undesirable in the United States. We do not want to return to the original relationships between the races in the United States: white Europeans enslaving persons of African descent and committing genocide against the indigenous people of America. So when we speak of racial reconciliation we are calling for a return to God's original intention for the human family. Therefore we can only speak of racial reconciliation in the United States in theological terms—God's original design!

Despite God's original intention for humanity, division has often prevailed. Paul's use of the word reconciliation spoke to the severing of human relations and the widespread hostility among the human family. Paul believed that the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ was a re-creation experience that served as a catalyst for restoring this primitive unity. He declared in Ephesians:

But now in Christ Jesus you who were once far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace; in his flesh he has made both groups into one and has broken down the dividing wall, that is, the hostility between us. He has abolished the law with its commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new humanity in place of the two, thus making peace, and might reconcile both groups to God in one body through the cross, thus putting to death that hostility through it (2:13-16).

The "dividing wall" was a reference to the point in the temple where Gentiles, women, and others considered unclean were not allowed access. Paul was claiming that in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ such walls of exclusiveness were broken down. The act of reconciliation was meant to break down both the walls in religion and those of societal oppression.

A powerful example of breaking down dividing walls can be found in the early years of the Church of God. The institution of slavery had not long been abolished and it had been

replaced by legally enforced segregation. At the Church of God's Alabama State Camp Meeting in 1897, both African Americans and whites attended the services. African Americans sat on one side and Whites on the other side. A rope stretched down the middle aisle in recognition of the legally required segregation. One day, Rev. Lena Shoffner preached about tearing down the "middle wall of partition" (Ephesians 2:14, KJV). Some people were so persuaded by her message that they took down the rope that separated the races. Those assembled knelt down together in prayer—in violation of Alabama State law. This dramatic act of reconciliation did not go unnoticed by a racist and segregated society.

Church of God historian John W. V. Smith described what happened as a result of this act of courage. "That night a mob came to the campground in a wild fury. They threw dynamite under the boarding house and camp house and searched out each of the preachers and evangelists, most of whom had already fled into the night." Smith notes that the mob was so outraged by this defiant act of oneness that the next night "the mob followed them to the homes where they had sought refuge, in some cases up to fifteen miles away from the campgrounds."⁹ Just as the dividing wall between Jew and Gentile was broken down only after Jesus Christ had suffered on the cross; our attempts at unity may require a similar sacrifice.

The Apostle Paul's understanding of unity and the need for reconciliation expanded beyond the relationship between Jews and Gentiles. Paul articulated this in one of his clearest expressions of this theology of reconciliation found in Galatians 3:28, "There is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, there is no longer male and female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus." This statement came from the earliest days of the church.¹⁰ A theology of oneness was not just Paul's particular slant on Christian faith, but his experience and teaching mirrored

that of the earliest followers of the resurrected Jesus Christ. Scholars suggest that the Galatians 3:28 text was part of a baptismal formula used for welcoming new members into the church.¹¹

As biblical scholar Richard Longenecker states, “Early Christians saw it as particularly appropriate to give praise in their baptismal confession that through Christ the old racial schisms and cultural divisions had been healed.”¹² Longenecker further declares:

When early Christians spoke of being “baptized into Christ” they also spoke of the old divisions between Jew and Gentile, slave and free, and male and female having come to an end. Certainly the proclamation of the elimination of divisions in these three areas should be seen first of all in terms of spiritual relations: that before God, whatever their differing situations, all people are accepted on the same basis of faith and together make up the one body of Christ. But these three couplets also cover in embryonic fashion all the essential relationships of humanity, and so need to be seen as having racial, cultural, and sexual implications as well. And that is, as I have argued elsewhere, how the earliest Christians saw them.¹³

Of course, living out this new understanding of faith and community was not easy for the first century church. The difficulty was found primarily in the area of human relationships rather than in an inadequate theology. Paul regularly reminded congregations in his letters that the power of the socially constructed divisions in their society had already been eliminated through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. In Christ ... Gentiles and Jews, slave and free, male and female, were one people.

Today, our theology often seems inadequate for the task of building unity. This first century baptismal confession and doctrine of the church regarding reconciliation is not taken seriously by many in the church. It is not widely taught, and therefore, it is rarely practiced. Of congregations in the United States, 92.5 percent have memberships that are over 80 percent one racial group.¹⁴ Women find it difficult to find pastoral leadership positions. Many congregations experience socio-economic segregation. James Earl Massey comments:

The God-ordained relationship between Christian believers, of whatever previous backgrounds, is not just one of harmony but a oneness where neither group is dominant

nor subservient anymore. The fence that once stood between them is now down. Because believers are reconciled to God, they are also related to one another. A new set of criteria applies now for human relations in the Church. In church life social distance must no longer be the order, and a sense of oneness and equality must prevail when previously-honored differences seek to intrude themselves.¹⁵

The word reconciliation has a theological power that transforms people and even nations when it is employed in the process of personal and social change. Reconciliation is already accomplished through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. All we need to do is just live into that reality. We must practice reconciliation.

In his book, *The Tenderness of Conscience: African Renaissance and the Spirituality of Politics*, anti-apartheid activist and theologian Allan Boesak recounts a story from the days of transition in South Africa that demonstrates the power of reconciliation. In 1993, as the nation was preparing for a transition process that would lead to the national election of Nelson Mandela as president and end apartheid, a team of leaders were planning to establish a truth commission to deal with the crimes of the apartheid era. Boesak states, “Our discussions were interrupted by a request from then President F.W. de Klerk. The National Party was not happy with the term ‘truth commission.’ It felt strongly that South Africa would be better served if the commission was to be a ‘truth *and* reconciliation commission.’” As a theologian and pastor, Boesak welcomed this suggestion but also warned the team about the implications. He continues, “The issue was not reconciliation; it was, rather, our understanding and interpretation of it. ... From experience in the church as well as politics we knew how the Bible was used in Afrikaner politics, and how the radical message of the Bible was made servant to ideology, domesticated for purposes of subjection and control. ... Mr. De Klerk and his party did not intend to allow reconciliation to confront the country with the demands of the gospel, but to blunt the progress of radical change and transformation.”¹⁶

The politicians around the table all agreed this was a good addition. Even those who would soon lead the nation saw value in using the word “reconciliation.” Boesak writes: “They all consciously or unconsciously accepted FW De Klerk’s subliminal text: adding the word ‘reconciliation’ would smooth a process fraught with contradictions, risks and danger, loaded as it was with unspeakable things from the past. The religious twist would help tame it, domesticate it, make it more pliable and palatable for the broader public.”¹⁷ As a theologian, Boesak recognized their faulty reasoning. He declares, “The Scriptures will not be ideologized, manipulated or managed to suit our political endeavors, processes or desires. The demands of the Scriptures will always lay a greater claim than these processes are willing to concede.”¹⁸

Therefore, because of the potency of the biblical call to reconciliation, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) became a powerful force for healing and unmasking the brutality of apartheid. The word that was supposed to make the process soft and impotent imbued the Truth and Reconciliation Commission with enough theological power to reveal the truth of apartheid’s crimes, demand justice, prompt forgiveness, and accelerate the process of healing. As Boesak notes, TRC chair Archbishop Desmond Tutu “could not help himself. The radical nature of the Christian faith and the very reality of biblically motivated reconciliation would often push the TRC into deeper waters than it wanted, or had planned, or could be allowed to go.”¹⁹

As Boesak’s story illustrates, reconciliation is a powerful and radical (to the roots) word. We often do not recognize what we as followers of Jesus Christ have in the message of reconciliation. But the world knows. Richard Lischer reminds us: “If the world knows anything about Christians, it knows they stand for reconciliation. The church has already loaned its vocabulary of reconciliation to the nations, many of whom lack the conceptual resources for addressing past brutalities and the end of hostilities. Nations torn by violence and civil war have

set up commissions on truth, peace, forgiveness, and reconciliation, borrowing generously from the Christian lexicon. Some, like South Africa and Rwanda, where victims have looked upon the face of their tormentors with unveiled horror, have carried out the process in explicitly theological terms.”²⁰

The Mindset of Reconciliation

Let us revisit Richard Lischer’s call for silence that I quoted at the opening of this paper. Announcing the message of reconciliation is not enough. Reconciliation is more than well crafted words. Reconciliation is a mindset and a way of life. Samuel Hines wrote, “We need to embrace a radical new way of thinking. As the saying goes, ‘First things first.’ Thinking reconciliation precedes doing reconciliation. We must learn to comprehend God’s thoughts, because the concept of reconciliation does not originate in our minds. Reconciliation is God’s idea.”²¹ Reconciliation is a spiritual discipline—a Godly habit. Authentic reconciliation emerges out of the silence of contemplation and character development. Spiritual disciplines provide a means by which we learn to surrender to God’s will for our lives. James Earl Massey, in his book, *Spiritual Disciplines: Growth Through the Practice of Prayer, Fasting, Dialogue, & Worship*, writes, “Christian discipline is a way of being obedient; it is faith being exercised, affirming what the believer sees and holds to be the work of God in the soul. Discipline is indeed a human work, but it is a responsive work to the demands of God’s grace.”²² A posture of surrender to God’s grace, or obedience to God’s will, engenders within us a sense of how we can ingrain reconciliation into our very way of life. Noted reconciliation scholar and Christian mystic Howard Thurman included reconciliation as one of seven spiritual disciplines in his 1963 book, *Disciplines of the Spirit*. He wrote, “Reconciliation and the harmony that it produces must be

experienced by the individual as a normal routine.”²³ We must integrate reconciliation into our living in such a way that it becomes as normal and life giving as breathing.

Rabbi Marc Gopin believes that if reconciliation becomes a norm in our lives, our individual life has great promise for encouraging peace in our society. He writes in his book, *Holy War, Holy Peace: How Religion Can Bring Peace to the Middle East*, “One’s character, and the daily internal struggles with anger against others who are different or adversaries, becomes the blueprint of a world that is lived out every day in and through one’s struggle to be a bond, to be the glue that bonds the world together.” The idea that an individual person committed to reconciliation can be a “blueprint” of reconciliation or the “glue” that holds opposing sides together is an unnerving, yet exciting, notion. Gopin goes so far as to suggest that one can create “through one’s own person, a taste of a future world of peace, justice, respect, and love. That world may only exist, in the interim, inside one’s person. But that becomes, and must be recognized as, a unique form of peacemaking that far surpasses dialogue and official programming in terms of spiritual depth.”²⁴

The challenge, and necessity, for ministers of reconciliation is not only to speak the words of reconciliation, but to have lives that communicate the message of reconciliation without a word ever being spoken. Our personal integrity and character must develop to exhibit a spirituality of reconciliation. The theology and spirituality of reconciliation must be internalized. I dare say that the internalization of character and values immersed in biblical reconciliation may be more important than reading all of the books written on the subject. Rabbi Gopin further articulates what this can mean: “It is a compelling religious model in which one’s life and character become an offering to peace, and therefore to God. And it can be contagious, depending on the valuation or ridicule from the rest of us. Needless to say, as the number of

people committing themselves in this way increases arithmetically, their impact increases geometrically, due to the nature of their wide-ranging contacts.”²⁵ If reconciliation can engage us in such a way that we see our lives as “an offering to peace, and therefore to God,” more and more of us will step forward to meet the growing need for reconcilers in this world.

The Ministry of Reconciliation

In the final pages of his book, Richard Lischer writes: “Reconciling speech is not our native language. It comes from outside us in the testimony of Scripture and the lyricism of worship, languages that even the believer may find awkward to use in the marketplace. But because of our baptism and the work of the Holy Spirit, the new way of talking now wells up within us and our communities.” Lischer confirms the importance of the spiritual discipline of reconciliation to shape our character and lifestyle. He continues: “We preach *toward* reconciliation but also *from* a reservoir of forgiveness that, had we not received it and shared it among ourselves, we could not speak of it.” Now he notes this intersection of the message and the mindset, the words and the lifestyle. Finally Lischer moves to the work itself, the call to action, “We now participate in something larger and better than our inherently violent disposition toward enemies. The something Paul terms the ministry of reconciliation. We have found our role in God’s script at last.”²⁶

The ministry of reconciliation is “the role in God’s script” that we are called to embrace. The essence of this ministry is well articulated by Emmanuel Katongole and Chris Rice, in their book *Reconciling All Things: A Christian Vision for Justice, Peace and Healing*. They suggest the following “ten theses”²⁷ as an outline for how we should understand the ministry of reconciliation.

- Reconciliation is God's gift to the world. Healing of the world's deep brokenness does not begin with us and our action, but with God and God's gift of new creation.
- Reconciliation is not a theory, achievement, technique, or event. It is a journey.
- The end toward which the journey of reconciliation leads is the shalom of God's new creation—a future not yet fully realized, but holistic in its transformation of the personal, social, and structural dimensions of life.
- The journey of reconciliation requires the discipline of lament.
- In a broken world God is always planting seeds of hope, though often not in the places we expect or even desire.
- There is no reconciliation without memory because there is no hope for a peaceful tomorrow which does not seriously engage both the pain of the past and the call to forgive.
- Reconciliation needs the church, but not as just another social agency or NGO.
- The ministry of reconciliation requires and calls forth a specific type of leadership that is able to unite a deep vision with the concrete skills, virtues, and habits necessary for the long and often lonesome journey of reconciliation.
- There is no reconciliation without conversion, the constant journey with God into a future of new people and new loyalties.
- Imagination and conversion are the very heart and soul of reconciliation.

These ten theses from Katongole and Rice enrich our understanding of the ministry of reconciliation. They provide a foundation for our dialogue today and for our pursuit of practice as we look ahead.

Conclusion

Rabbi Marc Gopin writes regarding Palestine and Israel: “If the millions of Jews, Christians, and Muslims who are committed in principle to coexistence and compromise actually took the time and developed the skills of reconciliation, the sheer power of their activism, the sheer strength of all their new relationships, would have overwhelmed the political and cultural milieu by now. But they have not because most lack the skills and the courage necessary to engage the stranger, the other who has been an enemy.”²⁸ Let me restate Gopin’s remarks and direct them toward the church. If all the Christians who are committed in principle to reconciliation actually took the time to develop the necessary skills, the sheer power of their activism, the sheer strength of all their new relationships, would have overwhelmed the world by now.

As Samuel Hines often proclaimed, God has a one-item agenda: *reconciliation!*

¹Samuel George Hines, “The Theme of My Life,” in Samuel George Hines and Curtiss Paul DeYoung, *Beyond Rhetoric: Reconciliation as a Way of Life* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2000, 2011), xxi.

²Richard Lischer, *The End of Words: The Language of Reconciliation in a Culture of Violence* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005), 5.

³Samuel George Hines, “The Gospel Ministry: The Call to be Ambassadors of Reconciliation,” in Samuel George Hines and Curtiss Paul DeYoung, *Beyond Rhetoric: Reconciliation as a Way of Life* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2000, 2011), 102.

⁴The verbs *katallassō* and *apokatallassō* and the noun *katallagē*. For good overviews of the meanings of these words see James Earl Massey, “Reconciliation: Two Bible Studies,” in Timothy George and Robert Smith Jr., eds., *A Mighty Long Journey: Reflections on Racial Reconciliation* (Nashville, TN: Broadman and Holman, 2000), 199-210 and Corneliu Constantineanu, *The Social Significance of Reconciliation in Paul’s Theology: Narrative Readings in Romans* (London: T & T Clark International, 2010), 25-31.

⁵Massey, “Reconciliation,” 204.

⁶John W. de Gruchy, *Reconciliation: Restoring Justice* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 51.

⁷Massey, “Reconciliation,” 205.

⁸Hines, "The Theme of my Life," xxii.

⁹John W. V. Smith, *The Quest for Holiness and Unity: A Centennial History of the Church of God (Anderson, Indiana)* (Anderson: Warner Press, 1980), 165.

¹⁰Richard N. Longenecker, *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 41, Galatians* (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1990), 151.

¹¹Longenecker, *Galatians*, 156-157; William S. Campbell, *Paul's Gospel in an Intercultural Context: Jew and Gentile in the Letter to the Romans* (Frankfort am Main, Germany: Peter Lang, 1992), 106-110; Donald H. Juel, "Multicultural Worship: A Pauline Perspective," in Brian K. Blount and Leonora Tubbs Tisdale, eds., *Making Room at the Table: An Invitation to Multicultural Worship* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 42-59.

¹²Longenecker, *Galatians*, 157.

¹³*Ibid.*

¹⁴Curtiss Paul DeYoung, Michael O. Emerson, George Yancey, and Karen Chai Kim, *United by Faith: The Multiracial Congregation as an Answer to the Problem of Race* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 2-3.

¹⁵Massey, "Reconciliation," 208.

¹⁶Allan Boesak, *The Tenderness of Conscience: African Renaissance and the Spirituality of Politics* (Stellenbosch, South Africa: SUN Press, 2005), 182.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 185-186.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, 186.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, 185-186.

²⁰Lischer, 139.

²¹Samuel George Hines, "First Things First: Thinking Reconciliation Precedes Doing Reconciliation," Samuel George Hines and Curtiss Paul DeYoung, *Beyond Rhetoric: Reconciliation as a Way of Life* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2000, 2011), 3.

²²James Earl Massey, *Spiritual Disciplines: Growth Through the Practice of Prayer, Fasting, Dialogue, and Worship* (Grand Rapids, MI: Francis Asbury Press, 1985), 21-22.

²³Howard Thurman, *Disciplines of the Spirit* (Richmond, IN: Friends United Press, 1963, 1987), 110.

²⁴Marc Gopin, *Holy War, Holy Peace: How Religion Can Bring Peace to the Middle East* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2002), 155.

²⁵*Ibid.*, 155.

²⁶Lischer, 163-164.

²⁷Emmanuel Katongole and Chris Rice, *Reconciling All Things: A Christian Vision for Justice, Peace and Healing* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2008), 147-151.

²⁸Gopin, 27.